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Chronology and local traditions: the representation of power and the royal name in the late predynastic period

Alejandro Jiménez-Serrano

SUMMARY
The main aim of this paper is to present an alternative hypothesis about the origin of the serêkh. From current archaeological evidence, it will suggest that the three elements (falcon, palace-façade and hieroglyphic) that compound the royal serêkh have their origin in different parts of the Nile Valley, being associated with the royal figure during the unification process. Other depictions considered serêkh will also be discussed.

"A group of people becomes a society when members of the group develop a set of signs and rituals that are mutually recognized and acknowledged."

"What emerged in the Early Dynastic Period was one set of preferences selected and refined by a controlled group, accompanied by a loss of diversity."

Introduction
Some years ago, Kaiser tried to give sense to many Late Predynastic representations, which symbolized power. In most of the Late Predynastic cases, they were palace-facades surmounted by falcons but unnamed. In other cases, the representations were of a different type, but surely connected to the ruler. It is essential, to understand the elements that compound the royal name, because of the religious and political implications derived from it. Recently, I have developed a theory that considers the serêkh as a sum of three elements (falcon, palace-façade, and hieroglyph) that had their origin in different parts of the Nile Valley.

3. Jiménez-Serrano (2000a: 2000b; in press). See also van den Brink (2002), who discussed one of the ideas developed in depth in this paper.
Then, the "classical" serekh would have been the result of the assimilation by the ruler of Upper Egypt of different ways of representing power, which culminate with the unification of Egypt shortly before the First Dynasty. In other respects, some representations, doubtless connected with the king, were not royal names, as some scholars have claimed recently. Thus, it is necessary to discuss critically all the representations that have been considered royal names.

**Definition of serekh**

A "classical" serekh is formed by three elements: a falcon (the god Horus), the name of the king, and a section of a niche or façade. The term serekh has been interpreted in different ways: as a standard for the god Horus, as a throne or false door of a palace façade. The latter interpretation is followed here, because many authorities currently accept it. Moreover, the Late Dynastic and Early Dynastic palaces were not only the residence of the king, but also the royal stores were situated there, implying re-distribution and trade. The palace was also the political and religious centre of the country. In this regard, Baines affirms "Le palais est un grand espace réel et symbolique qui démontre et définit la présence du roi". But niche architecture was not only reserved for royal use, since it appears also in private tombs, i.e. Minhot Abu Omar. Funerary enclosures of the Early Dynastic period, and surely in many walls of cities, which has also a coercive meaning.

As I have mentioned above the "classical" serekh is formed by three elements. However, as will be seen below, many royal names and representations are wrongly denominated serekhs (e.g. Iry Hor). To avoid confusion and erroneous denomination, I prefer to use the term "classical" serekh for those that present the three elements: the falcon, the palace façade and the royal name. I am aware of a palace façade as a serekh, but I will refer to them as palace façades.

The key point of this article is the role of the serekh or the elements that form it. A "classical" serekh (or its element(s)) is full of meaning, not only religious or symbolic, as has been seen above, but also political. During the whole Predynastic period, the Egyptians created many religious symbols, many of which survived and (evolved) until historic times. In the Late Dynastic period, due to the necessities of a more complex society, the birth of the élites and the development of the proto-kingsdoms, the adoption of symbols that represented the new social organisations was needed. The "classical" serekh is the result of this process.

Sources:

Archaeology and Epigraphy are the most important sources for the study of the Late Predynastic and Early Dynastic periods. Royal names of these ages have been found on seal-impressions, labels, palettes, mace-heads, incised pot-marks, and rock-carvings. Names or representations on seal-impressions, labels, palettes, mace-heads, and rock carvings are usually easier to contextualise chronologically because of other iconographic elements that accompany them. However, incised pot-marks are normally represented unaccompanied or with some signs that provide us with much less information. Yet, in some cases it is possible to use ceramic analyses of the clay, although until the present there is only one case of a pot with a royal name. This case together with other analyses of Predynastic unmarked pots from different sites show that most of the pots were made locally. Although it is tempting to generalise this tendency, it must be taken into account that there was an important trade of goods between different regions of Egypt (and neighbouring regions) at the end of the Predynastic period, which implied the interchange of ideological concepts.

The precedent hypotheses:

At the beginning of the 1980s, Kaiser created a chronological system of the representations of royal names for the Late Predynastic period and the beginning of the First Dynasty. He based it on the evolution that it is possible to detect in the serekhs before the First Dynasty. He divided the serekhs in three different stages (Horizonten):

- **Horizont A (before Iry-Hor)**
- **Horizont B (Iry-Hor to Narmer)**
- **Horizont C (from Horus Aha)**

The first two Horizonten were dated to Naqada IIB1-IIB2 periods. Bruce Williams, in a short study of some scenes carved on a small bowl, concluded that the earliest serekhs could be traced to the Naqada I period. However, the examples prior to Naqada II, which he considered serekhs, must be understood as huts. Certainly, these huts are not connected with early Egyptian élites. Some years later, Edwin van den Brink suggested a new division, because he noted that:

16. Horizont C was later abandoned by Kaiser (1990: 289, Abb.1).
17. In this article, Kaiser's and Hendrickx's stages (Stufen) are followed. Apart from the chronological differences will be discussed below, the main distinction is that Kaiser's Stufen are shown in small letters (i.e. Naqada IIIa), while Hendrickx's are in capitals (i.e. Naqada IIIa). Hendrickx's system has not been used here completely, because it would be necessary to re-date many monuments, which require deeper analysis and discussion. For Hendrickx's system see also (1996).
Kaiser assigned different types of pottery to the same Horizon. Jars of the same type, in one case with identical serekhs, are assigned to different Horizons.

There was no typological distinction between different groups of jars. After his analysis of the serekhs, van den Brink suggested a new division into four groups: I, II, III, and IV. A tentative correlation with the relative chronology suggested by him can be made:

I-II: Naqada III B
III-IV: Naqada III C1

However, Kaiser's and van den Brink's systems are based on a hypothesis, which assumes that Egypt is under the same central power. This power would have developed a palace façade as an element of identification. Then, all the royal representations were monarchs who ruled from Abydos or from independent centres derived from Upper Egyptian expansion. Basically, I follow the chronological assignations of the royal representations made by van den Brink.

The last kings of the Late Predynastic period and the First Dynasty

It is essential to identify the kings correctly, but the main aim of this paper is also to determine what was the sphere of their influence. Currently, there is no problem with the order of the kings of the First Dynasty, whose succession was definitely established by some seal impressions found at Umm el-Qa'-ab.24 Nefer, Aya Djer, Djed, Den, Anubis, Sennedjehet, and Qaa. However, problems arise when we try to reconstruct the sequence of the kings who ruled before Narmer. The main problem is the absence of evidence that confirms whether Egypt was unified or not. This implies many possibilities of reconstruction. Kaiser & Dreyer25 calculated that there were ten or twelve generations of kings before Narmer. From this argument, Andelkovic26 suggested the following succession: two unidentified kings, Pe Hor, Scorpion I, Double Falcon, Ni Hor, Hat Hor, Iry Hor, Hurus Ka, Horus Crocodile, Horus Scorpion II, and Horus Narmer. Some years later, Dreyer proposed the following succession based on artistic and archaeological evidence: Standard of an Oriz (?), Mallusc, Fish (?), Elephant, Bull (= Bull head standard?), Stork, Canine, Bull Head Standard, Scorpion I, Falcon I, Standard of the God Min plus a piece of a plant, an unknown king?, an unknown king? (Falcon II), Lion, Double Falcon, Iry Hor, Ka, Scorpion II and Narmer. However, these sequences must be criticized, because they have not taken into account that

- Many names found in different parts of the Nile Valley (e.g., Lower Nubia to the Delta) have been considered kings of Abydos, when there is no epigraphic evidence from Abydos that supports this idea.
- The artistic/epigraphic evidence of some kings is minimum (e.g. Lion), if they are compared to others (e.g. Scorpion II).
- Religious concepts related to kingship are mistaken for human beings (e.g. Double Falcon, see below).

As it is possible to appreciate, an exact sequence of the kings of the Naqada III period is almost impossible to reconstruct, because of the lack of epigraphic evidence. However, it is easier to establish the sequence of three kings who ruled before Narmer, mainly because of a greater number of monuments. In the 1960s, Kaiser24 proposed a sequence of kings for the transition between the Late Predynastic period and the First Dynasty: Ka, Narmer, and Aha, although thirty years later he included to Scorpion II between Ka and Narmer. In this regard, Wilkinson25 has confirmed that Ka preceded Narmer. However, I follow a different sequence, based on the inscription found by Petrie26 in the Memos of Abydos (fig. 1; Type 3A-TA1). The inscription is on the back of a large tile, which shows the now-plant together with three ideograms: a mouth, a scorpion and two arms. The association of the now-plant and the three hieroglyphs confirm the signs were royal names. Thus, the succession of the kings before Narmer is as follows: Iry Hor, Scorpion II and Ka.

A study of the royal names, palace façades and serekhs from a stylistic and geographical point of view

In the following pages, I will discuss royal names, palace façades and serekhs, analysing their common features and the elements that form the representation. The chronological identification of the examples will be essential to obtain a picture close to reality. I have divided the types of representation of power into six groups. The main reason for this "artificial" division is because these six groups may well represent the features of all the examples that will be studied.

- Ideograms or phonetic signs.
- Ideograms or phonetic signs surmounted by a falcon.
- Buildings surmounted by at least one falcon.
- "Classical" serekhs.
- Palace façades with (at least) an ideogram or a phonetic sign in its interior.
- Palace façade.

Fig. 1

24. (1964: 95). In this respect, Needler (1984: 43) proposed a different sequence: Scorpion II, Iry Hor, Ka and Narmer.
Ideograms or phonetic signs
Before beginning the study of specific cases, it is necessary to explain briefly some aspects about the origin of writing. My intention is not to discuss how, when or why writing began, but simply to clarify where it began. There are two major theories about the origin of writing: indigenous (Egyptian) or imported (from Mesopotamia). Some years ago, most scholars held that Egyptian writing had its origin in Mesopotamia. However, the discovery of Tomb U-j at Umm el-Qaab27 has challenged this theory and seems to indicate a local origin.28 Although Helck29 claimed that Egyptian writing appeared in the Delta after the Mesopotamian influence, the earliest examples found at Umm el-Qaab point out that Egyptian writing originated in Upper Egypt.

It is also necessary to differentiate between symbol and writing, because, as Vernus30 has explained, many later hieroglyphs were used during the Naqada I and II periods, not as part of a writing system, but as elements which were part of a symbolic system. Therefore, it is necessary to be very careful with the first signs, many of which must be analysed in a symbolic meaning, not in their later phonetic meaning. Thus, Vernus31 offers some clues for differentiating the first writing from the symbolic system:

1° de son association avec l’objet, bien connu, par ailleurs, comme signe d’écriture.
2° de la manière où les (...) signes sont agencés (...) son artifice même révèle un système de conventions sous-jacent.
3° du parallèle avec d’indiscutables inscriptions, occupant des positions analogues sur des objets analogues, trouvés dans le même contexte archéologique, etc.

It is easy to imagine that shortly after the advent of writing, Upper Egyptian kings found this new technique very useful to differentiate themselves from the common people. Moreover, as Bard has noted32 “These early hieroglyphs are captions used in an elaborate symbolic/iconographic system of scenes demonstrating the king’s power.” Thus, it seems logical that early kings used this new tool not only to differentiate themselves, but also because writing would rapidly acquire a magic character, above all it was related to the name33 or, in this case, to the royal name.

There are many pots and stone vessels with animals depicted, which probably represented the name of the owner or the depiction of a god,34 but it is very difficult to perceive where the border between the symbol and early ideograms lies. In this regard, Dreyer (1998: 173-180) has suggested that there were kings who lived before the owner of the tomb U-j and they were called Standard of an Oryx (?), Mollusc (from a representation of a pterocerus shell), Fish (?).

Elephant, Bull, Stork, Canine, Standard of a Bull Head. However, as some scholars have already claimed,35 most of these representations can be explained as symbols or as religious standards.

Many kings of Dreyer’s sequence are based on the reliefs that can be observed in the Copitos Colossi and other monuments. Against Dreyer’s argument about the Copitos Colossi, two recent studies36 reject the linguistic character of many signs and stress the symbolic aspects, because most of the animals represented were common in the Eastern Desert (oryx, canine, bull37), other depictions are goods obtained from the Red Sea via Wadi Hammamat (pieroceras, ivory (?)) or are related to a god: the standard of Min, pteroceras, … There are many examples38 that show different animals and this must not be interpreted as a sequence of kings. Therefore, those representations integrated in the Copitos Colossi had to be understood as religious aspects of the god. As Kemp39 has stated: “…more of the material is explained if we assume that the predynastic animals were emblems of spiritual forces which could also act as signifiers of groups of people. Some of the latter provided goods for the burial of the ruler at tomb U-j at Abydos, but it is to the former that we should look for the explanation of the signs on the Colossi. This direction of argument has the merit of addressing the dual nature of the contexts, sacred and administrative, within which these symbols appear”.

However, it is easier to accept Dreyer’s identification of the owner of tomb U-j. According to him, he was called Scorpion (?)40. In this case, I follow Dreyer’s interpretation because in tomb U-j many depictions of scorpions have been found, not only on pots or labels, but also on seal-impressions. In addition, evidence of this name (not only referring to this king) has been found in Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia (see below). Furthermore, many representations of royal names without palace-façades and falcons are common at the beginning of the First Dynasty (see below).

In accordance with the pottery, Scorpion I lived in the Naqada IIIA1 (IIIa2) period.41 The representations of Scorpion I (Types 1A-UQ1-66) are numerous and were discovered in Tomb U-j at Umm el-Qaab: many drawings on pots,42 three seal-impressions,43 and two labels.44 There is also another piece of evidence, which supports the existence of Scorpion I. This is a relief discovered recently at Gebel Tiwai.45 As Friedman and Hendrickx46 show, there are many iconographic motifs that connect this

38. Bulls and canines were very often used to represent the ruler.
39. For example, Cisloowska (1992), with references; Davis (1992).
43. Dreyer (1998: 47-58, Abb. 33-39). In this regard, remember van der Brink’s (1992b: 274) words about portraiture: “…a key to a proper understanding may lie in focusing on the principles of a denotative system in those pomegranates which perhaps points to clear administrative entities.”
47. Friedman & Hendrickx (2002).
relief with the owner in tomb U-1. This relief represents a record of a military operation carried out by Scorpion I and may be divided into two registers "The lower register begins with a falcon (...), above a scorpion. Thereafter follows a figure carrying a staff, before which is an image, partially lost, perhaps depicting a standard on a pole. A long-necked bird with a serpent at its beak comes next, followed by a bound captive with long, streaming hair, arms tied behind his back, held by a rope connected to a bearded male figure with close-cropped hair and holding a mace. Between these two figures is a bucranium on a pole." One of the most important points in this article refers to the connection between the falcon and the scorpion (Type 1A-GT1). This particular is not so clear as Friedman and Hendrickx stated above, as they note: "The scorpion below is carved on the lower plane of the rock face on the lower side of the fissure that serves to separate the two registers." In addition, in tomb U-1 there is no connection between the Horus title and the name of the king. A relief on a fragmentary ivory object from Hierakonpolis shows a scorpion (fig. 2) which was considered by Petrie the name of Scorpion II. However, there are many similarities in the composition with the seals-impressions found at tomb U-1. After Scorpion I, royal names in Upper Egypt are unknown until the reign of Iry Hol. Since this reign, it is possible to attest many examples of royal names represented only by ideograms or phonograms. This fact might be explained as maintenance of a traditional system of representation in this region (see below).

Figure 2
Relief on an ivory fragment, after Quibell (1900: pl. XIII, no. 2).

Quibell discovered in the so-called Main Deposit of Hierakonpolis (among other objects) some bows and vases with some hieroglyphs on their surface. In the same publication, Petrie analysed them and concluded that some of them represented the name of Ka and the others Scorpion II. After a personal analysis of some of those vases kept at the Petrie Museum (UCL), I can propose that the scorpions depicted on bowls UC 14953 and UC 14954 represent the name of Scorpion II (Type 3A-HK2) (see also below). In both cases, inscriptions might refer to the royal ka.

There are also other examples that might be dated in the reign of Scorpion II. Among them, the Scorpion II mace-head is the best known, which was discovered in the Main Deposit in Hierakonpolis by Quibell. The name of the king

(1CA-HK1) is represented as a single scorpion accompanied by a rosette. Another piece of evidence of the reign of Scorpion II was discovered at Lower Nubia. The relationship between Lower Nubia and Egypt had a military character from at least the reign of Scorpion II until the beginning of the First Dynasty. Scorpion II attacked at least the region of the Second Cataract as the minor relief at Gebel Sheikh Salehman shows. This relief represents a scorpion (Type 3A-GSS1) in the top centre, facing left. It held between its claws a prisoner dangling from a rope, while a second figure, a little below and to the left, brandishes a weapon, which could be a mace-head. Below the scorpion, there is a third man who is pointing with a bow and arrow towards the prisoner.

Figure 3
(a) seal-impresion of unknown origin, after De Morgan (1897: fig. 857); (b) stone vase from Hierakonpolis with a scorpion on the surface, after Quibell (1900: pl. XVII).

Much more problematic is the interpretation of a cylinder-seal65 of unknown provenance (fig. 3a) and a stone vessel with a scorpion in relief66 (fig. 3b), because of the many symbolic readings that might be suggested. However, it is important to note their existence and their possible relationship with Scorpion II. There are many examples of representations of just the king's name during the First Dynasty, which means that this system of representation subsisted together with the "classical" serekh. In this case, the examples of the reign of Narmer are studied due to their relevance. In a cylinder-seal from Hierakonpolis,67 the catfish sign (part of Narmer's name: type 4A-HK1) holds a stick for snaring captives. Very similar to the latter representation of the king's name is one found recently on a label at Umm el-Qaab,68 but in this case, the catfish is holding a mace-head (Type 4A-UQ1).69 Also, in the reverse of the Narmer palette,70 the king's name appears without any other element except the signs (Type 4A-HK2).

55. Neider (1967), who held (id.: 90-91) that this relief commemorates Scorpion II's victory over Nubia.
56. First published by De Morgan (1897: 257, fig. 857); Quibell (1904: 1905: no. Cat. 14518).
57. Quibell (1900: pl. XVII, picture XXXIII). Petrie, in Quibell (1900: 7) affirmed that this vase belonged to Scorpion II. See a possible parallel in Lower Nubia, Williams (1986: 151-152, pl. 96b).
58. Quibell (1900: pl. XV, no. 7).
60. On this label, two systems of representation of the royal name have been used, just signs and the serekh.
61. Quibell (1900: 10, pl. XXIX).

55. Neider (1967), who held (id.: 90-91) that this relief commemorates Scorpion II's victory over Nubia.
56. First published by De Morgan (1897: 257, fig. 857); Quibell (1904: 1905: no. Cat. 14518).
57. Quibell (1900: pl. XVII, picture XXXIII). Petrie, in Quibell (1900: 7) affirmed that this vase belonged to Scorpion II. See a possible parallel in Lower Nubia, Williams (1986: 151-152, pl. 96b).
58. Quibell (1900: pl. XV, no. 7).
60. On this label, two systems of representation of the royal name have been used, just signs and the serekh.
61. Quibell (1900: 10, pl. XXIX).
There is another case that could be part of this type, but there are some doubts as to whether it really represents Narmer's name, because the original graffiti is heavily damaged.\(^{62}\) According to Bruce Williams,\(^{63}\) on one of the Coptos Colossi,\(^{64}\) there is one graffiti that represents a catfish. However, Kemp\(^{65}\) has recently suggested a different reconstruction: a falcon on a perch.

**Discussion**

From all the evidence discussed above, it is possible to conclude that at least from the reign of Scorpion I, Egyptian rulers clearly used writing in the representation of their names. Surely, those early names and their representations were full of a symbolic meaning, which would include magic and coercive aspects.\(^{66}\) It is also possible to delimit an area in which the representation of Type A developed: the south part of Upper Egypt.\(^{67}\) Surely, this is mainly due to the fact that this is the place where writing appeared. This means that as soon as writing was used by emerging elites, the type of representation of the royal name was established in the area under their control and acquired a distinctive value. This tradition continued until the beginning of the First Dynasty and was not in contradiction to the use of other types of royal name representations, which will be analyzed below.

**Falcons surmounting a sign**

The representations of falcons increased rapidly from the beginning of the Naqada III period, although they were common in the Naqada II period. Yet in those times, it is possible to make a clear connection between the representations of the falcons and different gods, in most cases Horus.\(^{68}\) Then, the representations of falcons (labels and drawings on pots) in tomb U-1 do not indicate the name of a king, but the origin of the article (the temple, palace, ...).\(^{69}\)

In this respect, it is remarkable that from Scorpion I the falcons usually accompany the figure of the king, as in the Gebel Tja'aiti relief, or are found in a royal context (the royal tomb), as some labels found at Tomb U-1 show. It is necessary to differentiate between the presence of a god in a royal ambit and the association of this god with the king. Thus, it might be suggested that in the reign of Scorpion I the king has not acquired complete identification with the god Horus, just an association.\(^{70}\)

The identification of Horus and the king might be traced from the reign of Iry Hor. This king was primarily identified by Petrie (1902: 4–5), who called him Iry. However, until the re-excavation of his funerary complex at Amin el-Qasab, the existence of Iry Hor and the reading of his name were not confirmed.\(^{71}\)

However, some scholars have refuted the existence of Iry Hor. In this regard, Wilkinson (1993) has argued:

- The name of Iry Hor is not enclosed in a serekh, particularly when incised on pottery vessels.
- The name of Iry-Hor is not attested elsewhere and, furthermore, that tomb B1 contains fragments of inscriptions of serekhs that had the catfish of Narmer’s name.
- The ‘Iry-hor’ mark is not a name but the mark of the “Royal Treasury”.

In this respect, Barta (1990: 55–58) has argued that Iry Hor’s potmarks are not a royal name but a proper noun, which would mean, “companion of Horus”. Adams (1995: 49), referring to the inscriptions with the name of Narmer found at tomb B1/2 (Iry Hor) and B7/9 (Ka) at Abydos, affirms that presumed Iry Hor’s potmarks could make reference to the mouth of (the king) and the ka (of king) Narmer respectively.

However, the argument which holds that Iry Hor’s name has been found only at Unnu el-Qasab\(^{72}\) (Types 2B-UQ18, 2B-UQ18), has not taken into account, that apart from the potmarks and two seal-impressions\(^{73}\) found at Unnu el-Qasab, some other inscriptions bearing his name have been found in other sites: a seal-impression at Zawiyet el-Aryan\(^{74}\) (Type 2B-ZA1\(^{75}\)) and three vases and bowls at Hierakonpolis (see below).

---

62. Kemp (2000: 223-224); also, Baquè Mansano (personal communication).
63. (1988: 26–38, fig. 1).
64. For the chronology of the Coptos Colossi, see Dreyer (1995: 56).
66. As D. B. Redford (1986: 120, note 10) noted: "The personal names of the kings of the First Dynasty indicate bellicosity, (…), rather than the personification of benevolence and fertility."
67. Although there is a case in Lower Nubia (minor gebelel of Gebel Shleib Suleiman), this must be explained as the result of an Egyptian military campaign.
68. Also, Anty.

Dreyer (1998: 142) holds that the sign depicted under the falcon is the sign S37, however, it might also be interpreted as a stockade. For a similar parallel of the First Dynasty, see Petrie (1901: pl. X, no. 2). It might also be an early form of the signs N36, see Kahl (1994: 612), therefore the reading would be mr-Hwr or mr-nTr. About the phonetic value of the falcon on a perch as nTr, see Kahl (1994: 513-516).
Map 1 - Types of royal representations in the Naqada IIIa. 2/b1 period and before.
The appearance of the name of Narmer in his tomb can be explained not only by the vicinity of the Narmer’s tomb but also by tomb robberies. The presence of one of the two elements that compose the name must be remarked. That is the falcon. From this moment, Horus is united to the figure of the king for more than three thousand years, therefore a composition with the falcon together with a hieroglyph, found in different contexts (royal cemetery, private cemetery, and a temple area) must lead to the conclusion that Iry Hor was a ruler. In addition, the inscription on the tile discovered by Petrie (see above and fig. 1) present the succession of three kings, two of them (Ka and Scorpion) accepted by scholars.

As I mentioned before (see above), I had the chance to analyse some vases and bowls found at the Main Deposit of Hierakonpolis, concluding that two of them could be donated or consecrated by Horus II. In addition, three vases (UC 14951, UC 14952 and UC 14962) represent the name of Iry Hor (Type 3BH–HK1–3), which means that they were consecrated by Scorpion I’s predecessor.

There are a couple of royal representations that have been attributed to Iry Hor. But a more carefully study might offer a different interpretation. One of them was found in ‘En Besor (Canaan) I (Type 4–ENB1) and was dated by Schultman27 to the reign of Den. Kaiser & Dreyer28 considered (with some doubts) that it represented the name of Iry Hor, an argument which was accepted some years later by Schultman.29 However, from the original picture and drawing, it seems unlikely that this serkhu belonged to Iry Hor, and seems more likely that it represented the name of Narmer30 or Qaa. The second case is a palace-façade with a sign in its interior (Type 4E–HK1), which was discovered at Hierakonpolis.31 Although Kaiser & Dreyer32 attempted this representation in the same row as Narmer’s serkhus, in Plate no. 14 they included it as a mark of Iry Hor (pl. 15). The similarities between this representation and the sign in its interior with Narmer’s serkhus lead me to conclude that the sign in the interior of the palace-façade is a schematic catfish, as Kaiser & Dreyer33 had already presumed.

Very similar to the type on Iry Hor’s vases from the Main Deposit are the representations of the name of Horus II: a falcon in a boat and a scorpion below (Type 3BH–HK1). Petrie34 already noted that “The hieroglyphs on the jar appear to read, the Horus Scorpion”. On the same vase, other signs seem to show close contact between Lower Nubia (t3 iry) and Egypt.35 The same type may be observed in the inscriptions of some vases and bowls from the Main Deposit, which unfortunately I could not study personally, because many of them are in different museums of the United Kingdom and the United States. But, from Quibell’s publication36 it is possible to read the name of Ka (Type 3BH–HK2). The association of these two elements, the falcon and the sign, is also attested in the First Dynasty, specifically in a seal27 (Type 4B–UQ1), in which Lower Egypt is also mentioned. In Helwan, Saad38 found a rectangular piece, which represents a falcon surrounding Djed’s sign (Type 4B–HLW1). Even, on the seal-impressions39 (Type 4B–UQ2) that have permitted us to reconstruct the sequence of kings of the First Dynasty, all the kings are represented only by a falcon and the signs of their names.

Finally, it is necessary to reject the existence of king Hut–Hor, proposed recently by Kähler40 (fig. 4). According to the latter, this king lived in the Nasqada IIIb period or even in the First Dynasty, and ruled in the Eastern Desert. However, as the scholar herself confessed, this might not be a royal representation, but the name of the goddess Hathor, who was associated with this mining area.

**Discussion**

The first examples found of Type B are dated to Iry Hor. This means that from Scorpion I to Iry Hor, two elements that originally had a different meaning, the representation of a particular god (Horus) and the royal name, were used to represent the same concept: the royal name. This implies that some aspects of the figure of the king and the god Horus evolved together and crystallised when the king assumed as his own the image of Horus. This process is surely full of political connotations and reveals the importance that Hierakonpolis enjoyed in a (proto-)kingdom with its capital in Abydos.

As in the preceding case (Group A), most of the evidence has been discovered in the south of Upper Egypt, particularly in two centres, the royal cemetery (Unmn el-Qaab/Abydos) and one of the most important religious centres of Upper Egypt, Hierakonpolis. The presence of Iry Hor’s name close to the Memphite regions indicates that Upper Egyptian political influence and trade are spreading out to the north.

---

27. The appearance of grave goods of some kings in later or earlier tombs is very common in many tombs of the cemeteries of Unmn el-Qaah.
32. Carnang (1907: 135, pl. 11, no. 1).
35. In Quibell (1906: 8).
37. (1950: pl. XXXIV); also see Quibell & Green (1962: pl. XIIIDa).
39. (1947: 165, fig. 16). Drawn by Jiménez Serrano from the picture published in the original publication.
Falcons surmounting a building (also Addendum I)

In tomb U-3, Dreyer (1998: Abb. 180, nos. 127-129) found three labels similar (fig. 5a-c) to another published by Petrie92 (fig. 5d), almost a century earlier. According to Baines,93 they could represent an early example of palace-façade surmounted by a falcon. In contrast, Dreyer94 relates these depictions to the temple of Deyeba, in Buto.95 What seems clear from these depictions is that the bird is not a falcon, because, as has been mentioned before, many depictions of falcons have been found at tomb U-3 and there are no similarities between them. Therefore, they are not a representation of the royal name and they have no connection with the royal name in any case. As has been commented above, currently it is impossible to conclude whether the niche architecture is indigenous or has a Mesopotamian origin. Although there are many similarities between Egyptian and Mesopotamian niche architecture, Cervello Autuori96 has noted that the structure of niche architecture is the most stable when using mud-bricks and it can be found in many regions of Africa. But, what is important for this paper is the use and meaning that the Egyptians gave to the palace-façade together with the falcon and the royal name.

Recently, I have proposed that the earliest palace-façades were used for representing the emerging élites of Lower Egypt.97 I have basied my suggestion on the earliest palace-façades discovered in Egypt, which were found in the Memphite region, Lower Egypt, the "Way of Horus" and south Canaan. In this paper, I have attested the existence of palace-façades in the middle of the

92. (1903: pl. II, no. 12).
93. (1996: fig. 3).
95. For a different interpretation of these depictions, see Jiménez Serrano (2002b), where I suggest that this building might represent the early temple of Nekhen (not to be confused with the one found at Locality III 29A).

Figure 5

Labels from Umm el-Qaab.

The representation of power and the royal name in the late predynastic period

Naqada II period from pot-marks found at Maadi. However, Hendrickx was not convinced. According to him, "examples [with palace-façade architecture] from the Memphite region, formally pertaining to Lower Egypt, and Upper Egypt are both far more numerous and older [than that burial attested at Minshat Abu Omar]. Although this argument cannot be refuted, it is necessary to specify some points. First of all, there are only two examples from Upper Egypt (Hierakonpolis and Naqada) dated earlier than the burial of Minshat Abu Omar (second half of the First Dynasty), but there are many more examples from the Memphite region (Tarkhan and Saqqara). As is well known, the Memphite region was more related culturally to Lower Egypt than to Upper Egypt (for example, Maadi and es-Saff98) in the Predynastic period and even during the Dynastic period.99 Then, the problem is that only one palace has been discovered in Egypt, and this has been found at Hierakonpolis, being dated in the First Dynasty. Hendrickx also identifies as palace façades some representations found in Lower Nubia and dates most of them in the Naqada IIIA/B period. However, a comparison between Egyptian palace façades (with any date) and Nubian representations shows just one similarity, which is that both of them are buildings, but Nubian buildings are squared at the top, while the Egyptian ones tend to have a completely flat roof (see below Addendum I). Furthermore, these Nubian buildings are surrounded by a falcon, a fact that cannot be seen in Egypt until after the end of the Naqada IIIB period. Hendrickx also points out that the earliest representations of palace façades appear as pot-marks on wine jars and comments that "wine was not produced in Upper Egypt in early times and for that reason there is of course a greater possibility that wine jars and fragments with serekhs will be found in the north." (cf. van den Brink 2001). Abydos is an exclusion for it can be supposed as the destination for most of the wine prior the first dynasty when the royal court was still located at Abydos. Because serekhs refer to ownership or distribution of the jars, this may indicate that the jars found in the north did not originate from the place where they have been found. From these lines, one might ask, if the palace-façade motif (Hendrickx's serekhs) was originally from Upper Egypt (or Abydos), why is there no pot-mark prior to the beginning of the Naqada IIIB period, whereas they did exist in Lower Egypt?100 It seems more likely that these pot-marks made reference to Lower Egyptian owners of imports rather than Upper Egyptian. If Upper Egyptian élites imported the wine, many pot-marks with palace-façades would be found all around Upper Egypt, above all if it is a luxury product, as wine was. However, this is not the case. Then, the complete absence of these pot-marks means that Lower Egyptian élites would re-distribute the goods in their territories, thus they would strengthen the ties with their subordinates or allies and would justify their position, because they could provide exotic products. Finally, four palace-façades found at Maadi (Types 1F-MAAI-4) and with a possible chronology of Naqada III/C were not discussed by Hendrickx.

99. A tomb of a number of the royal family dated in the reign of Abu, De Morgan (1897).
100. About es-Saff cemetery, see Habachi & Kaiser (1985).
101. The name of Memphis was considered the first name of Lower Egypt.
102. Hendrickx (2002: table 2) dates all the representations of palace façades. However, most of the cases that I discuss in my paper - Jiménez Serrano (2001) - were not dated by Hendrickx due to unknown reasons. The dates that I follow in my paper were taken from Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: Abb. 1.13) and van den Brink (1996).
Obviously, with his argumentation he cannot explain how the palace façade motifs appear on pots with a Lower Egyptian ceramic tradition and very similar examples are carved some years later on pots with an Upper Egyptian ceramic tradition. In my opinion, there is only one explanation: during the Naqada IED period there was a change of the fabric (from indigenous to Upper Egyptian), but this did not necessarily have as result a political change, since some cultural aspects survived as well.

In this C Group, two different sets of representations are studied. The first set is formed by the representations of just one falcon surmounting a palace façade, and two falcons surmounting a palace façade from the second group.

In the 1960s, the Oriental Institute excavated Cemetery L at Qustul. In this cemetery, the rulers of the Second Cataract region were buried in tombs of a great size mainly during the Naqada III period. In one of these tombs, a pot-mark, which was read by Williams as Pe Hor (Type 3C-QST1), following the same procedure as Kaiser and Dreyer in the case of Iry-Hor. However, I have already refuted this reading, preferring another interpretation: it was a schematic representation of a palace façade. Its similarity with a pot-mark dated to the reign of Narmer and found in Wadiyat el-Aryan (Type 4D-ZA1) might also be taken into account.

There is a palette in the Metropolitan Museum of unknown origin, although Hayes (1953: 29, fig. 22) suggested that it might well come from Lower Egypt. On this palette, a falcon surmounting a palace façade was depicted (Type 3C-LE1). The iconography of this palette is earlier than Narmer, but not very far from him.

In Helwan, Saad found a cylinder seal, whose impression shows two giraffes separated by an unknown element with two elements related to the god Min.

There was a man praying (?) and beside him a palace façade surmounted by a falcon. The interior of the palace façade was very similar to that of one of the major Gebel Sheikh Salehian relief (see below). Saad dated the cylinder seal to the reign of Narmer or Djer, because of two faience pieces found close to it. Williams related all the elements to some monuments dated to the reign of Narmer. Köhler has dated it to the Naqada IIIa2/IIb period.

However, I have recently suggested that this cylinder-seal can be dated to the reign of Ka, because the association between the palace façade surmounted by a falcon and the raised arms of the man, who might be interpreted as a pharaohogram and also participate in the scene (Type 3C-HLW3).

One of the numerous graffiti found at Gebel Tusti is a palace façade surmounted by a falcon (Type 3C-GT1), which has been interpreted by Darnell and Darnell as a representation of Narmer. However, there is no sign in the interior of the palace façade, which permits its ascription to any king. Yet, there is a sign outside the palace façade surmounted by the falcon that represents a falchion or palm. It is the same that is found on the seal-impression from Helwan and in other representations.

Although this sign may be interpreted as a religious emblem, the coincidences with the preceding case might indicate that this rock carving belongs to a date close to the reign of Ka.

In Wadi el-Qasir, there is a palace façade surmounted by a falcon (Type 3C-WQ1), together with a "classical" serekh of Narmer (Type 4C-WQ1). Although there is no hieroglyphy in the row reserved for the royal name, it might be suggested that this palace façade surmounted by a falcon was carved close to the reign of Ka, because of the shape of the falcon, very similar to the examples of this reign (see examples below). In addition, the serekh of Narmer seems to be connected with the first representation, as an intent to represent continuity.

The major relief from Gebel Sheikh Salehian was dated by Arkell (1950) to the reign of Djer, although some scholars expressed their doubts some years later. More than a decade later, Murnane and Williams confirmed that the major Gebel Sheikh Salehian relief (Type 3C-GSS1) was earlier than the First Dynasty. Murnane pointed out that the sign of the name of Djer (Type 4C-GSS1) was a later addition and it was possible to reconstruct a complete falcon if the sign of Djer was deleted. Due to some similarities, I have suggested that the original palace façade surmounted by a falcon might have been done by Ka or a little earlier.

One of the graffiti found in Alamat Tal Road has been interpreted by Darnell and Darnell as a falcon surmounting a palace façade (Type 3C-ATR1). Although its state is precarious, it is possible to compare it with similar examples of the time of Ka, because this representation does not show any hieroglyphy in the interior of the palace façade.

Dreyer defends the existence of a king called by him Double Falcon from some pot-marks, which represent two falcons surmounting a palace façade.

103. According to Hendrickx (2002), the origin of the palace façade might be found in Upper Egypt. He based his arguments on the hypothesis of the existence of early falcon images in the Naqada IIIa1 period. Although there is no evidence of niche architecture in the substructure of tombs at Unnás el-Qasir, as he confessed, symbolic rendering of doves by narrow alabaster ossuaries occurred from the very beginning of the Naqada IIIa1 period, around 3300 BC, in the substructure of elite and royal tombs. However, the symbolic use of falcon imagery should not necessarily be connected with a kind of architecture, because the union of both elements might have happened much later.

104. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

105. Williams (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).


107. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

108. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

109. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

110. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

111. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

112. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).

113. See Dreyer (1938: 10, pl. 25, pi. XI, at 1).
These pot-marks have been found in the Sinai (Type 2C-SIN1), Beda (Type 2C-BDI & 2C-BD2), Tell Ibrahim Awd (Type 2C-TIA1 2C-TIA1) Turah (Type 2C-TU1), Abydos and Adâia (Type 2C-AD1). If Dreyer's opinion is followed, the name of the king would be read Nebui (nbiw, "The Two Lords"), because it is a well-known figure, which makes reference to the gods Horus and Seth. However, it is easier to understand this representation not as a name of a specific king, but as a concept that refers to the kingship and the association of these two gods with the figure of the king. In this regard, there is no parallel of this case (to name a king with elements outside the palace- façade) in the history of Egypt. The closest example is the case of Khasekhemui, who was entitled Horus-Seth. In addition, there are more representations of two falcons at least since the Naqada II period.132 In Palmahim Quarrr, a unique design of palace-façade was found (2C-PQ1).133 The top of the upper register is concave and was filled with small punctures; the lower part represents a schematic palace-façade with horizontal lines concentrated in the right side of the depiction, leaving empty space on the left. In the upper part of this depiction, there are two small strokes, that have been interpreted as an abbreviation of the two falcons.134 This interpretation has been based on similarities with the pot-mark found at Beda (2C-BD2).

Discussion

The oldest examples of Type C are those Dreyer calls Double Falcon. Their appearance in the north of Egypt must be understood as the expansion of Upper Egyptian religious concepts throughout Lower Egypt and the Sinai, in this case the union of two major gods from Upper Egypt. The double falcon representations would show the duality of the Upper Egyptian kingship and could respond to a mixture of religious and political reasons, because the (Upper Egyptian) palace is protected by two very important gods, both with coercive aspects. The other representations which show a falcon and a palace-façade are dated to the reign of Ka or Narmer and demonstrate that they were not very common, surely because Type D (see below) gained favour very rapidly. However, it is very significant that just two symbols represented the kingship.

125. Ciren (1979: 184, fig. 37).
126. Cédès (1914: 119, fig. 3.4.6), Van den Brink (1996: table 5) dated to the Naqada IIIB(2) period. Falconers of Type 2C-BD2 seem to surround a mountain sign, see van den Brink (2001b).
127. Van den Brink (1992a: 5, fig. 8.1).
129. See van den Brink (2001) (Group 2a).
130. I would like to thank B. Midant-Reynes for kindly providing me with this fragment. See also van den Brink (2001) (Group 2c.2.21).
131. About this religious figure, see the discussion of Cervelli Autorei (1996: 200-203), with references.
132. See Williams (1909: 269-310), who refers to many of them.

"Classical" serkrkh

The oldest examples of "classical" serkrkh named two different rulers. One of these names was Horus Crocodilus, according to Dreyer's135 reading. Dreyer's suggestion, which identified Horus Crocodilus as king of the Fayum region, seems very probable. Dreyer also proposes that this king lived between the end of the reign of Ty Hor and the beginning of Ka, which means that he was surely contemporary of Scorpion II.136 However, B. Adams137 considers the inscriptions of Horus Crocodilus as mentions of the Fayum region and the relationship between this region and an official who lived under the reign of Narmer. But, the two serkrkh138 found at Tarkhan (Types 3D-AD1, 3D-AD2) present the same hieroglyphs as those on a seal-impression (Type 3A- TARR), which are also associated with a palace-façade surrounded by a bacrarium. These coincidences and associations with typical symbols of the monarchy might be interpreted as the name of a ruler. Certainly close in time, Scorpion II ruled in Upper Egypt. There is just one example of "classical" serkrkh from his reign139 and it was found at Minhat Abu Omair140 (Type 3D-MAO1).

There are more examples from the reign of Horus Ka. Most of them have been found at Umm el-Qaab141 (Types 3D-UQ1-28), one from Adaima142 (Type 3D-AD1), three examples were discovered at Helwan143 (Types 3D-HLW1, 3D- HLW2, & 3D-HLW3) and one from Tarkhan144 (Type 3D-TARS).

Recently, one uncompleted serkrkh has been found at Adaima145 (Type 3D-AD2).

135. (1929c: 260). Previously, Kaplan (1963: 1090) had attributed those inscriptions to Scorpion. For a reading of this name as Horus (Crocodilus) the Subduer, see van den Brink (2001b).
136. Although, Hendel (2002) considers that he could be contemporaneous with Ka and even Narmer, here Dreyer's interpretation is followed, very similar to van den Brink's (1996: table 5) conclusions.
138. Although both representations do not present niched architecture, I have included them in Type D because on the seal impression appears a palace-façade with niched architecture. Therefore, the absence of the niched architecture in the serkrkh might be explained as a result of the early phase of design of this Type.
139. Although Jonscher (1992: 5-7, Abb. 4) identified a serkrkh of Scorpion II on a pott from Turah, infra-red rays showed that it was really the name of Djer, Kaiser (1966: 102-104).
140. Kroeber & Walzberg (1985: 75, Abb. 21.3), Kroeber (1986-1987: fig. 70), Adams (1995: 48, note 19) comments that the design of this example is very similar to Horus Crocodilus. However, there are two reasons why both representations do not belong to the same king: - Two signs, one crocodile and one spiral, compose the name of Horus Crocodilus. However, the pot-mark found at Minhat Abu Omair presents only one sign. - In the examples of Horus Crocodilus, the animal is always depicted from a lateral point of view, while the animal on the pot-mark from Minhat Abu Omair was depicted from an aerial point of view.
141. Petrie (1901: pl. XIII, 1902: pls. I-III, nos. 1-30, 33-36). According to Giroy (2001: 69), there is an uncompleted palace-façade with the name of Ka in its interior that was surely surrounded by a façade.
142. As yet unclassified. The sector in which the shard was found has been dated to the Naqada IIIAB period and a neighbouring C14 on charred grain gave 4494 ± 43 (cal. 3941-290 BC). I would like to thank B. Midant-Reynes for the picture and the information. This depiction has been drawn by the author from the picture.
143. Köhler & van den Brink (2002: 62-64, figs. 1.3.4, 2.3-2.4, pls. 3-4).
144. retene, wawasit èt gašišet (Dyd. xii, 22, plb. 1, no. 6, XXX, nos. 105, 106).
145. It was found on the surface of the settlement, Midant-Reynes et Bucher (2002: 236, n°17 et fig. 5, 35, n°17).
Map 3 - Types of royal representations in the Naqada IIIC period/pre-Narmer.

Map 4 - Types of royal representations in the First Dynasty, mainly Narmer.
Although no hieroglyph has survived, it is tempting to relate it to Horus Ka, due to the other šerekh found in this site (3DA01). Anyway, this representation must not be dated prior Horus Ka.

In two of the plates that Winkler published in his investigations in the Eastern Desert, Wilkinson (1975) recognised the name of an early ruler. As Wilkinson could not read the name of this ruler clearly, he decided to call him "King B" (fig. 6). However, it is preferable to interpret the bird surrounding the quadrangle as a swallow (sign G36) rather than a falcon, because its body is usually more vertical. In the interior, the sign at the bottom might be interpreted as H (512) "gold", and the quadrangle as the sign J (O1) "house". Therefore, the inscription would read pr nbw, attested in some inscriptions of the Early Dynastic period.\textsuperscript{109}

![Figure 6](image)

The so-called "King B", after Wilkinson (1995: fig. 1).

Other reasons that refute the existence of this king are that only two examples have been discovered, and these in a peripheral area, which contrasts with the evidence left by other kings at Abydos, Hierakonpolis or Tarkhan. In addition, in another picture of Winkler's publication\textsuperscript{110} the same signs appear curved, but this time they are not surrounding a falcon. Recently, another "šerekh" has been attested in the Eastern Desert, specifically at Wadi Mineh (central) (fig. 7).\textsuperscript{111} Here, it is only mentioned, because it might be considered a Late Predynastic example of "classical" šerekh, although there is no clue of its real date and it "appears to be surrounded by a swallow rather than a falcon".\textsuperscript{112} In addition, it represents a rectangle with a blank space for the name and a star in the space reserved for the vertical lines of the palace-façade.

![Figure 7](image)

Swallow surrounding a palace-façade with a star in its interior, after Roehl (2000: 99, 2).

![Figure 8](image)

Swallow surrounding a palace-façade with a star in its interior, after Roehl (2000: 99, 2).

As it has commented above, Ka's successor was Narmer. Many šerekhs with his name have been found all over Egypt and in some neighbouring regions (Canaan and the Eastern Desert): Arad\textsuperscript{113} (Type 4D-ARD1), Minhaat Abu Omar\textsuperscript{114} (Type 4D-MAO1), Ezbet el-Tell\textsuperscript{115} (Type 4D-EZT1), Zawiyet el-Aryan\textsuperscript{116} (Type 4D-ZA1), Soqara\textsuperscript{117} (Type 4D-SAQU), Tarkhan\textsuperscript{118} (Type 4D-TAR1), 4D-TAR2, 4D-TAR3-4 in fig. 8), Lahun el-Qasab\textsuperscript{119} (Type 4D-UQ1-4), Wadi el-Qasab\textsuperscript{120} (Type 4D-WQ1-2) and Hierakonpolis\textsuperscript{121} (Type 4D-HK1).

As is well known, from this moment most of the kings used their own šerekh for their name, although since at least the Fourth Dynasty other ways of representing the royal name acquired more importance.

**Discussion**

With the current evidence, the oldest examples of "classical" šerekh (Type D) are dated to the reign of Horus Crocodile and Horus Scorpion II. But it is impossible to know during which reign the first "classical" šerekh was created. My suggestion is that the "classical" šerekh was born in the contact region between Upper and Lower Egypt, which might well be the northern part of Upper Egypt and the Fayum. This place, as Dreyer suggested (see above), probably developed an autonomous proto-kingdom and one of its kings would be Horus Crocodile, which might have taken typical elements from his neighbouring regions -the falcon and the hieroglyphs from Upper Egypt and the palace-façade from Lower Egypt (see below)- and adopted them, perhaps adding in some cases local elements (the bucranium)\textsuperscript{122}. Another fact that supports this idea is that all of the names found in the Memphite area after Horus Ka belong to Type D, while in other parts of Egypt "classical" šerekh are found together with the local methods of representation.\textsuperscript{123}

The increase of "classical" šerekh in the reign of Horus Ka means that the central administration has chosen a set of symbolic elements that represent and define the monarchy.

\textsuperscript{109} Amézquita (1997: fig. 1, no. 1, pl. 1).

\textsuperscript{110} Kroemer (1988: 16, fig. 141).

\textsuperscript{111} Bakr (1988: 52, pl. 1a); Van den Brink (2001) holds that the sign in the interior of the šerekh must be read as Nj, thus it would be a "classical" šerekh of Nj Hor. However, Van den Brink (1996: table 5) has also dated the jet, which bears this depiction, more close to Narmer than King Nj.

\textsuperscript{112} Dunham (1979: 25-26, pl. XIa-b).

\textsuperscript{113} Lucas & Kaiser (1961: 1-2, pl. 1, roo. 1).

\textsuperscript{114} Petrie, Wace & Gardner (1913: 9, 11, 28, pl. XXXII, nos. 68-69). There is another šerekh -in this case unrealistic-, which was interpreted by Petrie, Wace & Gardner (1913: 28) as the name of Narmer, but Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: Abb. 15) attributed it to Abu, Tyna 4D-TAR-4, see Kaplan (1964: 31-32, Tab. 23, nos. 1061-1062).

\textsuperscript{115} This šerekh presents a masive head below the cowl, which is an exceptional case.

\textsuperscript{116} Petrie (1900: pl. IV, no. 2; 1901: pl. IX, nos. 4-5, X, roo. 1, XIII, nos. 91-92, XII, nos. 359). Dreyer et alli (1998: 138-141, Abb. 29, Tab. 5c, Abb. 50).

\textsuperscript{117} Wadi (? -1938: 1b, 25, pl. XI, no. 1).

\textsuperscript{118} Renee Friedman (personal communication) informed me about the presence of another šerekh of Narmer, as yet unpublished. I wish to thank her for this information.

\textsuperscript{119} In Narmer masc-head, Quibell (1900: 4, pl. XXXVII).

\textsuperscript{120} There is a representation of a temple – Petrie (1901: pl. VIII, no. 8), whose shaft was surrounded by a similar bucranium, which has been interpreted as the temple of Harshef, for a discussion see Wilkinson (1999: 284-285), with references.

\textsuperscript{121} This bucranium can be observed also in the use of the palace-façade surrounding entire tombs at El-Kab during the Fourth Dynasty, when this feature is no longer discussed at other sites, see Hendrickx (2002).

\textsuperscript{122} In this case, it is necessary to differentiate between the central administration situated in the royal palace and the peripheral administration, more conservative and far away from the circles which designed political and religious concepts.
Palace-façades with (at least) one hieroglyph in its interior

Type E is characterised by a highly-evolved method of representation, because its earliest examples combine for the first time the palace-façade and the hieroglyphs. The absence of the falcon surmounting the palace-façade must be noted and interpreted as the lack of the falcon’s protection over some rulers. This occurs mainly in areas where Haurus was not so important as for example in Hierakopolis. Thus, these kings must not be entitled “Haurus” because there is no evidence that relates their names to the falcon Haurus. Although recently there has been an attempt to avoid the existence of the two first kings that are studied, there is no evidence that the association of two elements is unquestionable: the palace-façade and the hieroglyphs in its interior. As will be seen, there are many similar examples of later kings (i.e. Narmer) and the existence of these first two kings must not be questioned. The earliest examples are dated by van den Brink (1968) to the Naqada IIIb1/2 (2). Kaiser and Dreyer (1986) read in a couple of sarcophagi (Type 3-EUQ-1 & Type-EUQ-2) found in Turah the name Haur; but as I have mentioned before, the idea that is accepted, the reading of Horus must be avoided, being simply king Haur. Afterwards, some other examples with the same name have been found at Tell el-Fara' in 173 (Buto) (Type-EUQ-1) and at Tal Malhata (2009) (Canaan) (Type-EUQ-1). A similar example to the preceding ones is the so-called king Haur Hor (1971) (Type-3-TEAR-I), who is called here king Haur (following the same principle). The next examples belong to kings that used different types indiscriminately for representing their names, Ka and Narmer. There are many examples from the reign of Ka, which were found at Lod (1974) (3-F-LOD-I) Umm el-Qab (1974) (3-F-LOD-I-1), Tell El-Awad (1974) (3-F-TEAR-I) and Kafr Hassaan (Douad) (3-EH-LOD-I). There are even more examples of the reign of Narmer: Lod (1974) (3-F-LOD-I-6), Tel Erani (1974) (3-F-TEAR-I), Tell Ma‘ahar (1974) (3-F-TEAR-I).

167. Hendrickx (2002), who affirms that “In my opinion these ‘names’ can just as well refer to the rolled up door curtains which is part of the false doors and which is already known for the Naqada IIIa period from tombs U-j14.
170. Nocher (1912: Abb. 37, nos. 3-4).
172. Amiran, Ian & Aron (1983: 88, fig. 7c) read the partially conserved sign as a catfish (Narmer), but it seems more similar to the other examples attributed to king Nj.
173. Van den Brink (1992a: 32, fig. 8.2). Due to the fragmentary state of this pot-mark it is impossible to know if the palace-façade was surmounted by a falcon, but from the orientation of the arm, it might be suggested that it was not (compare with the other examples).
174. Van den Brink (1992a: 32, fig. 8.2). Due to the fragmentary state of this pot-mark it is impossible to know if the palace-façade was surmounted by a falcon, but from the orientation of the arm, it might be suggested that it was not (compare with the other examples).
175. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Fedir A. Hassaan, who allowed me to study this unpublished material and publish this sarcoph in this paper.

180. Amiran & van den Brink (2001: 31ff-41, fig. 5.5.4). Although, unfortunately the name is not conserved, the data of the jar and the great occurrence of the name of Narmer in neighbouring sites make likely the attribution of the palace-façade to Narmer.
181. Amiran & van den Brink (2001: 38, fig. 5.5.5) also considered another fragmentary pot-mark as a sarcoph. However, it is difficult to conclude this from the fragmentary state of conservation.
182. Drawn by Jimenez Serrano from the original picture at Leve et al (1995: 55, fig. 21 left).
183. Van den Brink (1992a: 35, fig. 8.3).
184. Drawn by Emam Saraf from the original picture at Bialy (1980:9 pp. 16). Although the pot-mark is not completed, I have included it in this type because there is at least one thing certain, it is a palace-façade with a catfish and a chisel in its interior. There are two very similar examples from Hierakopolis (see above).
185. Drawn by Jimenez Serrano from the original picture at Saad (1947: 165, fig. 15). It is in a fine piece and the absence of the falcon might be due to the shape of this piece.
186. This example was divided into at least two fragments. The first fragment was discovered by Petrie (1900: pl. XI, fig. 2) and the second was published by Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: 300, Abb. 14, no. 40).
188. Two examples in the Narmer palette, Qa‘ab (1900: 19, pl. XX).
190. Petrie (1914: 10, pl. VI, nos. 110, XX, no. 2), who transcribed the pot-marks as “beloved of Nar.” See also, Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: 14), who ascribed this name to Narmer.
191. (1996: 149). For the chronological position of this king, see id. (table 5, no. 10). See van den Brink also (2001).
193. (2001: 67-68, fig. 1, pl. 3-4).
194. (1996: 147, Table 5).
195. About similar readings of this name, w3, see Gardiner (1915: 74) and Kaiser (1964: 82), who also interpreted the signs as a name.
197. Fischer (1963: 44-47, fig. 1, pl. Via c).

Nabah Tiliah (180) (Type 3-NT1), Tell Ibrahim Awad (182) (Type 3-NT1), Elbetel-I-Tell (183) (Type 3-NT1), Helwan (184) (Type 3-NT1), Umm el-Qab (185) (4-UEQ-1), Hierakopolis (Types 3-HK1 (186) HK2) (187). There is a unique case that has been integrated into this Type E because it has the two elements: palace-façade and hieroglyph. I refer to a pot-mark (Type 3-LEI) recently studied by Dreyer. According to his analysis, the mud of the pot was originally from the Nile Delta and the marks were made before the firing. There is an example of this type that many scholars (188) ascribed to Narmer (Type 3-TEAR-I), although, recently, van den Brink (1968) has noted that the jar, which bore the pot-marks, is much earlier than Narmer. However, this jar was found together with jars dating from the reign of Narmer. Therefore, this mark is currently dated to the reign of Narmer. Gilfors (189) has published a very similar pot-mark—presumably from Petrie’s excavations at Umm el-Qab (Type 3-UEQ-1), in which he reads the name of Narmer. Van den Brink (1968) suggested that in these rare pot-marks might be read the name of the captive that appears depicted on the Narmer stele head w3, because he found a similar similarity of the following pot-marks (two from Tura) and (from the Delta) with Gardiner’s sign M8. However, here Gardiner’s reading of the particular scene of the Narmer palette is followed: “The falcon-god Horus (i.e. Narmer) leads captive the inhabitants of the
papyrus country". The reason why the connection between these pot-marks and the scene of the Narmer palette is not accepted here is because I believe that the sign under the falcon is not MB, but MB, which represents Lower Egypt. Even, in the base of the sign M16 is the sign N16 personified with a human head, forming the word ‘m3w ‘Lower Egypt’. I also disagree with Wilkinson, who calls these pot-marks ‘King A’, because although most of these pot-marks might be dated close to Narmer (200 years later than Narmer), then, a symbolic explanation might be suggested. All of these pot-marks have in common three plants germinating. Possibly, this generation of life might be connected with a re-birth cult related to the farming cycle of death and resurrection. Furthermore, this idea of resurrection is shown forming a palace-façade, which implies the association of two concepts: resurrection and the king. Recently, Köhler and van den Brink have published an unknown pot-mark from Helwan, which represent a palace-façade in its interior, the cursive form of the goddess NJ (the goddess of the underworld). Beside the façade, there is a falcon. These scholars have suggested the possibility that this representation might be considered a new king, Horus NJ. ‘Who belongs to Neith’. However, it seems strange that the name of a king might be related with a goddess, mainly because of the feminine aspects associated with her. Moreover, this representation is not surmounted by a falcon, but it is just beside the palace façade. Then, it seems more plausible that this pot-mark refers to a good related to a queen (NJ) to (NJ) to (NJ) than a name of a king. Thus, the function of the falcon and the palace-façade are to reinforce the relationship between this person (the queen) and the palace with the hawk.

Discussion

It is noticeable that most of the first royal names associated with palace-facades appeared in the region of contact between Upper Egypt, where writing was used very early to the name of the ruler, and Lower Egypt, where the palace-façade was associated with the elite. It seems that elites of this border region have adopted in their benefit two ‘foreign’ elements of representation. With the current evidence, it seems unlikely to confirm whether king NJ ruled over a part of the Delta, because there is just one piece of evidence, which only proves that there were contacts between Buto and the Fayum region.

209. Found in the same stratum than 2F-HIT1, Brann et alii (2001: 74, fig. 4.5.1).  
210. Amiran, Ilan & Atzwig (1985: 77, 80-81, fig. 7a-b) dated both to the reign of Reiman, but possibly close to the reign of NY, see Jimenez Serrano (2001a).  
211. This palace-façade was really discovered at Wadi el-Arish and not in Badris, see van den Brink (1996: 126, note 16 also van den Brink 2001a). Amiran (1970: 88, pl. 1), dated by van den Brink (1996: Table 5) in the Naqada IIIA2/III period. Gophna (1976: 54), dated by van den Brink (1996: Table 5) in the Naqada IIIA1/II period.  
212. Schiff (194: 20, no. 28, 35, Abb. 15a, 15b, 150, 150-152, 162-163, Taf. XII, 28). Dated by van den Brink (1996: Table 5) in the Naqada IIIB1 period.  
213. Eldredge (194: 120, Fig. 3).  
214. Drawn by Jimenez Serrano from the picture published by Bakh (1984: 81, pl. 6). It seems likely that another two examples not conserved completely might be added to this group.  
215. Kroeper (1984: 14, fig. 94, 16, fig. 146), dated by van den Brink (1996: Table 5) in the Naqada IIIB1 period.  
216. Van den Brink (personal communication) believes that the element on the top of the palace-façade might be a (cursive) sign, as in some representations of Narmer. However, this palace-façade reminds me of a mixture of the typical palace-façade and the pr-wr which usually represents it in the way it shows.  
217. Marizazzis (personal communication) presented in the 8th International Congress of Egyptologists four uncompleted palace-facades dated by him to the Naqada IIIB1-c period. None of them had any hieroglyph or hieratic.  
219. The palace-façade is accompanied by an additional incised sign, which has been interpreted by Köhler and van den Brink as a schematic representation of a tree. These scholars suggest that the possible reading might be “plantation” or “estate”.  
220. The type 3FHA is very similar to the first group dated to the Naqada IIIB period. Kroeper (1984: 14-15) relates it to the “classical” arench of Scorpion II (Type 3FHA).  
221. Below some of these palace-facades, Dreyer (1990: 58) wrote the “Two Lands” from a pair of horizons. However, there are other examples in which there are three lakes instead of two, see Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: Abb. 11b-c).
One question that arises when all these examples are studied is why the palace-façade representation became more elaborate. The easiest answer is because of the increasingly sophisticated architecture of the royal palaces, and this would modify the depictions of the palace-facades. However, a petroglyph found near the Locality 6 at Hierakonpolis might (Type 1F-HK1) suggest a more refined approach. However, an analysis of the features of the petroglyph suggests that it might be a combination of different buildings: a palace-façade and an early representation of the pr-wr. Concerning the pr-wr, as it is well-known that it was one of the temples of Hierakonpolis, and, as can be seen on the labels from Umm el-Qaab, the pr-wr was in many cases associated with elephants, and probably its original shape might be related to this animal. Therefore, this petroglyph does not represent a palace-façade (Adam's serekh) with some features of the bull, but the pr-wr, which has many characteristics of an elephant: tusks, long legs (ports) and tail. Concerning the chronology of this petroglyph, as Adams (2000: 20) reveals "Hoffman believed that Tomb I was aligned not only with the inscription in this shelter, but also through several pots and large rock in the centre of the tomb..." However, there is no evidence that supports this belief, because the cemetery was used in different periods, one of them was the Nagada III period. There are more palace-facades dated by Kaiser and Dreyer at a later moment, being contemporaries with the "classical" serekhs. Their origin is diverse: Zawiyet el-Aryan (Type 4F-ZA1), Umm el-Qaab (Type 4F-UQ1), 4F-UQ2, 4F-UQ3 and 4F-UQ4, Abu Rawash (Type 4F-AR1). In the Tombs of Abidos was discovered a palace-façade (Type 4F-TA1) very similar to the others discussed above, which might be dated to the reign of Narmer.

Discussion

The existence of elites in Lower Egypt has been a thought-provoking idea since the beginning of Egyptology. However, there is no evidence which supports any confirmation of this. Yet, many authors recognized that Lower Egypt followed a very similar process in the creation of the State to Upper Egypt. Therefore, if in the Nagada II period there are many signs that indicate the existence of a complex society in Upper Egypt, where an increasingly complex elite began to rule, why are scholars so reluctant to entertain the hypothesis of the existence of an elite in Lower Egypt? The acceptance of the hypothesis that suggests the existence of at least a Lower Egyptian elite is basic in order to understand the role of the palace-façade representations from the second half of the Nagada II period. As I have already explained, the palace-façade is a metonymy of power, as much later will be the word pr-fít (in origin "the great house", "the palace") and the king. The main argument of my paper about the palace-façades was that the oldest palace-façades are found in Lower Egypt or regions with a close relationship with Lower Egypt (South Canaan). In this respect, it might be suggested that the palace-façade established a "legal" owner and this would be a warning for the nomads that surrounded the "Way of Horus" to desist from attacking the cargo. At the same time, the palace-façade might well evoke the walls of the cities, transmitting the idea of military power.

Palace-façade representations continued for some centuries because it was a good way of symbolizing the monarchy and surely the easiest to be understood by the majority of the people from Lower Egypt. This system continued successfully together with the "classical" serekhs mainly in Lower Egypt, because it was there where the former was developed. Again, it is possible to detect the conservation of local traditions.

The evolution of the shapes is also remarkable, because the first simple squares with lines in their interior are followed by a square divided into two parts: a blank space and the rectangle with vertical lines in its interior. Possibly, this fact is due to a major complexity of the royal palace, although a possible influence on the design of the palace-façade representation by other motifs derived from other buildings (such as the pr-wr) full of semantic weight must also be taken into account. Thus, Upper Egyptians assimilated a Lower Egyptian concept (the palace-façade) which at the same time was combined with local elements full of specific meanings (mostly religious) for them.

222. Adams (2000: p. 59). 223. Adams (2000: 20). 224. See Dreyer (1998: Abb. 77, nos. 61-69). 225. For some early examples of the pr-wr, see Friedman (1996: Fig. 15). 226. About the identification of the pr-wr at Hierakonpolis, see Friedman (1996: 33-34), who, following M. A. Huffman's suggestion, interprets the monumental centre of Hierakpolis as the pr-wr. 227. Furthermore, in Locality 6 has been found the skeleton of an elephant, which connects this animal with the elite necropolis, see Adams (1988/1990; 1999) preliminary papers. Although this skeleton has been dated by Adams in Nagada I, representations of elephants in the Nagada III period are quite common, see Adams (1999/2000: 50). 228. The chronology of Tomb I of Locality 6 has presented some problems, because it has been dated to the Nagada IIB (562 BC), but the radiocarbon analysis offers a more modern dating, around 3500 BC, for a discussion of all these contradictory data see Adams (1996: 7 & 14). 229. In the recent report of the excavations, Adams (2000: 179) dates Tomb I in Nagada IIB-C1 230. (1982: ASA 14, nos. 45, 46 (F), 48, 49, 50). 231. D'Amare (1978: 26, p. XVIIIB), surely very close to Narmer. 232. Petrie (1901: 534, 383, 386). The two of these marks are contemporaries with Aha and the others were found in Cemetery II. 233. Claesens (1959). See also Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: Abb. 15 nos. 8 & 88). Von den Brink (1996: Table 5) dated it close to the reign of Narmer. 234. Petrie (1901: III, nos. 216). Petrie's (id: 27) affirms that the name is lost, but it is possible to appreciate in the picture that the scarab was originally blank. This similarity with the others discussed previously caused this palace-façade to be dated in the beginning of the First Dynasty, although there is no clue about its archaeological context.

235. See van den Brink (2001a), who discussed most of the data presented in this group. 236. See for example, Wilkinson (1999: 50). 237. There have been found many arrows in the settlements of the "Way of Horus", which means that the existence of troops defending the cemeteries, Wiktat (2000).
Addendum 1: Representations from Lower Nubia considered as palace-façades

During the fourth millennium BC, Lower Nubia was occupied by the so-called A Group. Contacts between Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia increased at the same time that both regions developed their own material cultures and societies. Therefore, it seems likely that concepts travelled from north to south and vice-versa.

In some areas of Lower Nubia, some local representations quite similar to the Egyptian serekh have been found. All of them have been found in tombs of the local elite or at least related to the elite. These depictions are dated in the Naqada IIIA period and probably not far from the ruler buried at Tomb L24 of Qustul, who lived close in time to Scorpion I.200

Caso

Seal-impressions from Siala241 (Type I-C-SIA1). From some fragmentary seal-impressions it has been possible to reconstruct the original impression of the seal. Then, the original impression represented a seated bearded man in the centre of the scene with his right arm touching the jaw of an animal (probably a bovine), which is standing on a pedestal. His left arm is upheld over a bow that is read as in Egyptian, the oldest name for Lower Nubia.242 In front of him, there is a façade of a building far from any similarity with Egyptian palace-façades.243 This façade is surmounted by a falcon, which is surrounded by two semicircular objects. Apart from other elements, it should be noted that above the head of the seated man there are two falcons surmounting their respective 'M' shaped objects (Type I-C-SIA1). These two different representations – of what I consider the same building – appear repeated in other objects discussed below.

One of these objects that presents both types of representations is the incense burner found in Tomb L24 at Qustul, which has been dated some years later than the Siala seal-impressions.453 According to Williams' reconstruction, this incense burner has the 'M'-shaped element surmounted by a falcon (Type I-C-QST1) and the building, which in this case it is impossible to discern whether it was surmounted by a falcon. It seems that the complete scene represented a royal festival, in which the main protagonists were the king, who wears the White Crown, a rossette, three boats, a captive and his guard, some animals and the entrance door referred to above.

In the seal of Faras244 (Type I-F-FA1), the entrance door is also represented three times, a rossette surmounting the one in the middle. Beside the representations of the entrance door there is a seated man playing a flute (?).

According to Williams' reconstruction of an incense burner found at Tomb L11, it is possible to see two "M" shaped representations, each one surmounted by a falcon (Types I-C-QST2 & I-C-QST3). In the major Gebel Sheikh Suleiman relief,246 there is a building that seems to be Nubian.247 Its shape is very similar to the entrance doors that have been commented on above and it must be taken into consideration as a possible representation of this Nubian building, although this time from an Egyptian point of view. As has already been pointed out, the first version of the major Gebel Sheikh Suleiman relief might be dated to the reign of Ka (see above).

Discussion

The representations found in Lower Nubia show a building that Williams250 denominated 'palace-façades'. However, the design is different. Egyptian palace-façades present a square shape with vertical lines, while Lower Nubian representations have a curved top, which indicates an entrance door as Wignall suggested (see above). It is impossible to know which was the original nature of the building represented, although the appearance of these buildings in some scenes related to religious ceremonies tempts one to suspect that they represent a cultic building. Another argument that would support this hypothesis is that this building is surmounted by a falchion, which in this case is a falcon. The identification of this falcon is very complicated and only two names might be suggested: Horus, who was worshipped at Hierakonpolis,251 or Dedun, who is mentioned in the Pyramid Texts and whose name is written with a determinative of a falcon.252

---

238. Nordstrom (1972); Williams (1986); Jiménez-Serrano (2003).
239. Williams (1986: 170)
241. Pictures of the seal-impressions, in Reisner (1910); drawings, in Kaplony (1964: Taf. 1-2, no. 885), and the reconstruction of the original impression, in Williams (1986: 169-171, figs. 59a, 99).
242. It must be taken into account that Siala is close to the natural border between Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia. Then, in this area, contacts between both regions would be more frequent.
243. This bow together with a rectangular object located below it caused Williams (1986: 169) to make a clear connection between this sign and the representation of the name of Lower Nubia. Again, it is necessary to take into account sign symbol.
244. In this respect, Wignall (1998: 491) considers that these buildings represent entrance doors.
245. Williams (1986: 138-145, pl. 34; for the date, see p. 169).
246. Griffith (1921: pl. 2); Williams (1986: 167-168, fig. 58d).
247. Williams (1986: 145-146, pl. 53); Williams – followed by Claesens (1988: 19) – reconstructed four vertical lines and interpreted them as a palace-façade. However, one of the vertical lines belongs to the prow of a boat, therefore the other three vertical lines might be considered lines of separation between different scenes.
249. Besides this building, there is a captive, whose neck is tied to an Egyptian boat. Note that the other emblems are dead and represented under the boat.
251. Relationships between Hierakonpolis and Lower Nubia were very strong in the Naqada III period. In this respect, see Linford (1991: 108-110) and Adams (2000: 181).
252. Wh. V. 502. Although this is not a definitive argument for a possible falcon shape of this god in the Late Predynastic period, for Dedun and his Nubian origin, see Otto (1973: 1003-1004).
Concerning the Nubian building, it is necessary to discuss the differences between all the representations. There are three types: entrance door (just one example, Faras), entrance door surrounded by a falcon, and "M"-shaped building surrounded by a falcon. The first two seem to be the same building because of their similarity. The reason why I consider that the Nubian representations represent the same building is because all of them are surrounded by a falcon, except in the case of Faras, which is surrounded by a rosette. The "M"-shaped motif was represented in this way because originally the Nubian building was surely constructed with light materials and would need a post to support the roof.

It seems clear that the M-shaped motif is directly related to the Nubian rulers, because it is always represented in a prominent place, specifically in front of the face of the ruler. The other representations of the same building surrounded by a falcon might be interpreted as depictions of the temple in a religious context. Chronologically, the representations found in Lower Nubia are contemporary with the first examples of Lower Egypt and the first names found at Umm el-Qa'ah, which means that in three different areas local elites developed different symbols for representing power.

Addendum 2: Notes about some ink inscriptions beside the royal names

Since the reign of Iry Hor, there are many singular ink inscriptions on the surface of pots just beside the royal name (see an example of the reign of Horus Ka in fig. 8). Some of them begin with a sign, which was interpreted primarily as M 253 or is M 26, although currently scholars follow another interpretation42 (in nfrw "Lower Egypt"). This sign was followed by a hieroglyph that was interpreted as A41 and M9, which has recently been read by Kahl as nhb "provides." The other inscriptions show clearly the sign M 23 stn w "Upper Egypt." Following Fischer, I interpret these inscriptions as the place of origin of the product that pots contained.

With this evidence, it is tempting to reconstruct the territory under the influence or control of the Abydene kings. Therefore, Iry Hor's territory would have extended into Upper Egypt and perhaps a part of the Delta. Horus Crocodile would occupy the Nile Delta and the region of Memphis, as Dreyer (1992b) suggested. In the reign of Ka, the mentions of Upper and Lower increase, probably indicating that his ruler would control both regions, although it is impossible to discern if there were some areas that would escape his control. The same case can be observed in the reign of Nanner (Kahl 1994: Abb. 14).

Conclusions

Over the last twenty years, three different hypotheses on the development of the serekhs have been proposed. This study presents a critical discussion of them. The analysis and study of all the royal representations of the Late Predynastic period and the beginning of the First Dynasty have provided evidence, which permits the construction of an alternative hypothesis, which is based on regional conceptualisations of the image of power.

Late Predynastic Egypt needed writing, as did many other civilisations. Until recently, it was assumed that the hieroglyphic system appeared as a consequence of the influences of neighbouring regions (namely, Lower Egypt or Sana). The geographical origin of the palace-façade is still under discussion, but does not affect this investigation, which assumes the reality of its existence at the end of the Predynastic period and does not discuss the place where it first appeared. Here, it is assumed that palace-façades were firstly used as symbols of power in Lower Egypt.

The unification process of the Nile Valley is still under discussion, but there is some archaeological evidence that permits its affirmation:

- From the middle of the Naqada II period, at least one proto-state existed in Upper Egypt, whose elite were buried at cemetery U at Abydos.
- At the end of the Naqada II period, the whole Nile Valley from Elephantine to the North presents more or less the same material culture.
- Egypt maintained trade contacts with all neighbouring areas: Nubia, the Western and Eastern Deserts, Sinai, Southern Canaan and Mesopotamia. In the Naqada III period, those contacts included two more areas: Phoenicia (mainly Byblos) and Central Nile.

Although social differentiation existed earlier than the Naqada III period, it is at that time when it is possible to detect the appearance of the representations of Egyptian and Nubian elites as a distinct class. All of them developed different types of iconography that influenced inter alia.

Those local variations in the iconography are explained by the existence of different elites (for example, Abydos and Qatual), although in other cases it could be explained by the ignorance of writing or different traditions in the administration.

All the representations have been analysed under a classification that has been specifically created. This classification is based on different elements that constitute the "classical" serekh: falcon, palace-façade, and hieroglyphics. This has allowed me to divide serekhs into six different categories: (A) hieroglyphics, (B) hieroglyphics surrounded by a falcon, (C) buildings surrounded by at least one falcon, (D) "classical" serekhs, (E) palace-façades with (at least) a hieroglyphic in its interior, and (F) palace-façades.

From this classification, a typology of the royal representations of the Late Predynastic and Early First Dynasty has been constructed (see Appendix 1).

253. This is not only because the rosette represents the ruler, Smith (1992: 244). If the ruler is the rosette, as Smith suggests, and the rosette in this case substituting the falcon, then the falcon is the king, as will be seen clearly during the First Dynasty.
259. There is an inscription found at Abydos - Kaiser & Dreyer (1982: Abb. 10c), which is written LMN. The mention of a product from Lower Egypt might also indicate a present or a tribute.
261. For example, cedar wood has been found in the U-J, see Friedrich & Fischer, in Dreyer (1998: 195-199).
263. It must be assumed that many pot marks were made before the piece was fired. In this context, if a potter made pot marks, it does not necessarily mean that he could write and read.
The evolution of the representation of the royal name in the Late Predynastic period until the beginning of the First Dynasty in Egypt:

Since the discovery of tomb U-1, it is known that the administration of the elite at Abydos was in its development stages at the beginning of the Naqada III period. It is possible to presume that this process has parallels in some parts of the Delta, as well as in other parts of the Nile Valley (for example, Lower Nubia) (Map 1).

In Upper Egypt, it is possible that the necessity of a complex instrument of management implied the creation of writing, which was shortly after used to represent the leader.

In some parts of the Delta and its neighboring regions (the region of Memphis, "The Way of Horus" and Southern Canaan), another system of representation of the elite was developed. In this case, it was used as a container to represent the content, in other words a metonymy, in which the image of the palace façade was used to refer to the person who held the power there. After the reign of Scorpion I, some depictions - which evolved directly from those created in the Delta (palace façades) - appeared at Abydos, which indicates the interchange of concepts between the two regions. Probably, this type was created in Lower Egypt, because this design appeared later with hieroglyphics in its interior.

In Lower Nubia, a similar system was developed. From the seal impressions and the reliefs in the inscriptions found at Qustul, it can be assumed that the Nubian elite was always represented by a building, but in those cases, it is not a palace façade, but a temple with a falcon (Horus or Dedun) on the top. In this regard, this type of representation must surely be connected with the close relationship that existed between Lower Nubia and the region of Hierakonpolis, which might explain the appearance of Horus (?) in Lower Nubia. Therefore, in this early phase, Naqada IIIa.2/b.1, the three elements that constitute the "classical" serekh (pharaoh, palace façade, and falcon) have already appeared in the Nile Valley. Concerning the identification of the falcon with the ruler, it must be taken into account that the Lower Nubian elite was the first to assimilate the falcon (Horus?) with the ruler, while in Upper Egypt it has just been associated in this period (Gebel Tjau). During the next phase, the period of Naqada IIIb.1/2, and coinciding with the expansion of the proto-state of Qustul, the systems of representation of the elite began to intermix in Egypt (Maps 2 & 6).

In Upper Egypt, the system of representation with writing evolved and took an element (the falcon) that appeared in Lower Nubia. In this new system, the typical Nubian building is deleted (which has no meaning in Upper Egypt), but a new element appeared: a hieroglyph (for example, Ipy Hor).

264. It is possible that the high number of serekhs found in "The Way of Horus" and in the sites at Southern Canaan might be due to greater research attention that those regions received, in contrast to the recent and difficult excavations in the Delta. Anyway, I can assume that this seems to be the result of representations of Egyptian power had an explicit Egyptian propaganda directed at the foreign lands.

265. It might also be an earlier common tradition of the peoples who inhabited the Western Desert at the beginning of the Neolithic period. For the theory of the substratum as part of the genesis of Egypt, see Ceravolo Ameen (1996).


### Table 1 - Types of royal representations in the Naqada IIIa.2/b1 period and before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi el-Arish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-WA1</td>
<td>1F-WA2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-BD1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezbat el-Tell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-EZT1</td>
<td>1F-EZT2</td>
<td>1F-EZT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell el-Farsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-TF1-</td>
<td>1F-MAA1</td>
<td>1F-MAA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-MAA3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-MAA4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusir el-Meleq</td>
<td>1F-AM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1F-AM2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

268. Four palace façades without any element, yet unpublished.

### Table 2 - Types of royal representations in the Naqada IIIb.1/(2) period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tel Mahata</td>
<td></td>
<td>2E-TM1</td>
<td>2F-TM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sineh</td>
<td>2C-SIN1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representation of power and the royal name in the late predynastic period.
Table 4 - Types of royal representations in the First Dynasty, mainly Narmer.
### CHRONOLOGY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years BC</th>
<th>Styles after Henrick's revision</th>
<th>Rulers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3380 (7) - 3350 (3350 - 3295 BC)</td>
<td>Scorpion I Two or three unknown rulers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3380 (7) - 3350 (3350 - 3295 BC)</td>
<td>Napata IIIB</td>
<td>Iny-hor Scorpion II Horus-Ka and Harmur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3175</td>
<td>Napata IIIC</td>
<td>Aha Djjer Djjer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3075</td>
<td>Napata IIIC2</td>
<td>Den Anedef Senebket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2940 (7) - 2910</td>
<td>Napata IIIE</td>
<td>Qa'a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

269. Rente Friedman (Personal Communication) and unpublished yet.
270. For the chronology see Hussein & Jiménez Serrano (in prep.).
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Proto- and Early Dynastic Necropolis

of Minshat Ezza

Dakahila Province, Northeast Delta

Salem Gabr El-Baghdadi

Minshat Ezza is one of the small villages of the wadbillawon District (Dakahila Province) located 40km to the south of Mansoura and 20km to the southwest of Mendes.2

The excavation areas at Minshat Ezza are agricultural lands. It was unknown to Egyptologists as an archaeological site until 1997. When a farmer using a part of these agriculture lands accidentally found a sculpture fragments, comparable to old kingdom types, and fragments pottery vessels dated to the Late Dynastic Period, the inspection of the Dakahila Province immediately put these lands under the control and supervision of the Supreme Council of the Antiquities.

In 1903, this archaeological site covered more than 50 feddanon Egyptian maps. It became a completely agricultural area before 1970. It was named Tell el-Hegla on old Egyptian maps after 1930. It lies about 1km to the south of Minshat Ezza village, and Kafr Asaam canal splits. The excavation works were concentrated on 4.5 feddans in the western part of the Kafr Asaam canal.

Excavation of Minshat Ezza land

The SCA archaeologists started the excavation in September 1998 and went on until June 1999. The work was carried out by S.C. El-Baghdadi, chief inspector of the area, under the supervision of Mr. M. Abd El-Rehman El-Halabi, general director of the

1. Chief Inspector of Dakahila Province.

2. Mendes was the capital of 16th nome in the Prehistoric Period.

3. 1 feddan = 4200m2.