



UNIVERSITY  
OF WARSAW | Polish Centre of  
Mediterranean Archaeology



---

**Title:** New insights into Nubian archery.

**Author(s) :** *Lukasz Zieliński*

**Journal:** *Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean* 24/1 (*Research*)

**Year:** 2015

**Pages:** 791 - 801

**ISSN** 1234–5415 (Print), ISSN 2083–537X (Online)

**Publisher:** Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Warsaw (PCMA UW),  
Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego (WUW)

[www.pcma.uw.edu.pl](http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl) [www.wuw.edu.pl](http://www.wuw.edu.pl)

---

**Abstract:** Archeological sites in Nubia are a continuous source of new material connected either generally or specifically with Nubian archery. Objects of this kind discussed here and in other publications of excavated assemblages (including excavations of the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archeology, University of Warsaw) are seldom perceived as such, indiscernible as they are among the range of metal objects judged as being weaponry in a general sense. The lack of any synthetic work on Nubian archery is also evident in the literature in general and the few works that undertake the theme contain errors that are in need of being corrected. This article deals with issues related to the topic, which, although discussed separately, will hopefully work toward establishing the groundwork for a final reconstruction.

**Keywords:** Nubian archery, Nubian bow, longbow, bowman, archer's loose/archer's ring, post-Meroitic

## رؤى جديدة في أسلحة الرماية النوبية .

Łukasz Zieliński

**الملخص :** المواقع الأثرية في النوبة هي مصدر مستمر للمواد الجديدة المرتبطة بشكل عام أو خاص بالرماية النوبية. إن مواضيع من هذا النوع تناقش هنا وفي منشورات من مجموعات أعمال الحفر ( بضمنها أعمال الحفر للمركز البولندي لآثار البحر الأبيض المتوسط - جامعة وارسو ) نادراً ما ينظر إليها على هذا النحو يتعذر تمييزها من بين الأشياء المعدنية ويحكم عليها بأنها أسلحة في المنظور العام . إن قلة الأعمال البحثية عن أسلحة الرماية النوبية يظهر كذلك بشكل واضح في مجال الأدب بشكل عام وعدد قليل من الأعمال تتعهد فكرة رئيسية تحتوي على أخطاء بحاجة إلى تصحيح . هذه المقالة تتعامل مع المواضيع ذات الصلة بالموضوع والتي على الرغم من أنها تناقش بصورة منفصلة، نأمل أنها ستعمل نحو إرساء أساس إعادة التشكيل النهائي .

*POLISH ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (PAM)*  
*Annual of the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Warsaw*

*Editorial Board*

Piotr Bieliński  
Krzysztof M. Ciałowicz  
Wiktor Andrzej Daszewski  
Michał Gawlikowski  
Włodzimierz Godlewski  
Karol Myśliwiec  
Tomasz Waliszewski

*International Advisory Board*

Jean Charles Balty  
Charles Bonnet  
Giorgio Buccellati  
Stan Hendrickx  
Johanna Hlaubek

Peer-reviewed by members of the *PAM* committee of independent reviewers.  
<http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl/en/pam-journal/pam-independent-reviewers/>

POLISH CENTRE OF MEDITERRANEAN ARCHAEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

# POLISH ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

XXIV/1

---

RESEARCH



## ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AA</i>	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger; Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i> (Berlin)
<i>ANM</i>	<i>Archéologie du Nil Moyen</i> (Lille)
<i>ASAE</i>	<i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte</i> (Cairo)
<i>AV</i>	<i>Archäologische Veröffentlichungen, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo</i> (Berlin–Mainz am Rhein)
<i>BAAL</i>	<i>Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises</i> (Beirut)
<i>BAH</i>	<i>Bibliothèque archéologique et historique</i> (Paris)
<i>BAR IS</i>	<i>British Archaeology Reports International Series</i> (Oxford)
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> (Ann Arbor, MI)
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i> (Paris)
<i>BdE</i>	<i>Bibliothèque d'étude</i> (Cairo)
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale</i> (Cairo)
<i>BSAA</i>	<i>Bulletin de la Société d'archéologie d'Alexandrie</i> (Cairo)
<i>BSFE</i>	<i>Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie</i> (Paris)
<i>CCE</i>	<i>Cahiers de la céramique égyptienne</i> (Cairo)
<i>EtTrav</i>	<i>Études et travaux. Travaux du Centre d'archéologie méditerranéenne de l'Académie des sciences polonaise</i> (Warsaw)
<i>FIFAO</i>	<i>Fouilles de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale</i> (Cairo)
<i>GAMAR</i>	<i>Gdańsk Archaeological Museum African Reports</i> (Gdańsk)
<i>GM</i>	<i>Göttinger Miszellen</i> (Göttingen)
<i>IAMS</i>	<i>Institute of Archaeo-Metallurgical Studies</i> (London)
<i>JARCE</i>	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i> (Boston–Princeton–New York–Cairo)
<i>JEJ</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i> (London)
<i>JGS</i>	<i>Journal of Glass Studies</i> (Corning, NY)
<i>JJP</i>	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i> (Warsaw)
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i> (London)
<i>MDAIK</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo</i> (Wiesbaden)
<i>OIP</i>	<i>Oriental Institute Publications</i> (Chicago)
<i>OLA</i>	<i>Orientalia lovaniensia analecta</i> (Louvain)
<i>PAM</i>	<i>Polish Archaeology in the Mediterranean</i> (Warsaw)
<i>PSAS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies</i> (London)
<i>SAAC</i>	<i>Studies in Ancient Art and Civilisation</i> (Kraków)
<i>SAK</i>	<i>Studien zur altägyptischen Kultur</i> (Hamburg)
<i>SAOC</i>	<i>Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization</i> (Chicago)
<i>WVDOG</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i> (Berlin–Leipzig)

# NEW INSIGHTS INTO NUBIAN ARCHERY

Łukasz Zieliński

Independent

**Abstract:** Archeological sites in Nubia are a continuous source of new material connected either generally or specifically with Nubian archery. Objects of this kind discussed here and in other publications of excavated assemblages (including excavations of the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archeology, University of Warsaw) are seldom perceived as such, indiscernible as they are among the range of metal objects judged as being weaponry in a general sense. The lack of any synthetic work on Nubian archery is also evident in the literature in general and the few works that undertake the theme contain errors that are in need of being corrected. This article deals with issues related to the topic, which, although discussed separately, will hopefully work toward establishing the groundwork for a final reconstruction.

**Keywords:** Nubian archery, Nubian bow, longbow, bowman, archer's loose/archer's ring, post-Meroitic

The history of the use of the bow in Nubia is very long and has its origins somewhere in the obscure period referred to as the Khartoum Neolithic. The oldest preserved flint and bone arrowheads date to this period and are known from archeological sites such as the eponymous Khartoum Hospital site (Arkell 1975: 25).

Very little can be said about the beginning of archery in Nubia, because the only archaeological data that we have at our disposal are arrowheads and rock art, mostly petroglyphs, which are difficult to date and only depict part of the true picture that the artist wanted to show. Hunting scenes generally dominate, which suggests that archery in Nubia had its origins in hunting.

The bows represented on the rocks take the form of simple self bows. The self bow is constructed from a single piece of wood, or sometimes from two pieces joined at the handle section. We can judge from their uncomplicated design shown in the pictograms that they were made from a single piece of wood, the typical dimensions being about 110–130 cm. In the absence of other data, we can only extrapolate the other elements used in the manufacture of the bow, such as the bowstring, shaft of flights, as well as the technique of shooting and the possibilities of contemporary archers.

During this era, however, a tradition was formed that played a very important role in local culture, placing the bow and

skill in its use to the forefront. The best evidence of this is the fact that from the very beginning of the establishment of mutual relations between Egypt, then emerging from the Naqada period, and Neolithic Nubia, the Egyptians hailed Nubia as Taseti — Land of the Bow. The Egyptians were quick to recognize the potential and skill of the Nubians in their handling of the bow, and incorporated Nubian troops into their own army in the role of archers.

It is not known exactly when the form of the Nubian longbow, described by Herodotus (VII:69), evolved. Given that this type of bow, due to its very length, was designed to be used on foot, and that Nubians were employed as infantry by the Egyptians during the Old Kingdom period, it can be assumed that bows of this type emerged long before they came to be

described by Herodotus in the 5th century BC. The model from the tomb of Mesehti in Asyut, however, shows Nubian warriors with bows of relatively small size. It is also worth noting that the longbow appears in iconography on a larger scale in the times of Napata and Meroe.

A stele from Gebelein, which belonged to a Nubian archer in the Egyptian service, shows its owner already in possession of a longbow [Fig. 1]. So it appears that bows of this type were already in use by the time of the Middle Kingdom. By the 5th century, when Herodotus described them, they were so common a weapon among Nubians that the Nubian mercenary regiments in the army of Xerxes used them. The Nubian longbow is not a typical self bow as, for example, the English longbow was. The ends of the limbs were



Fig. 1. Nubian mercenary archer holding longbow with unlatched bowstring; left, longbow and weaponry of Nuba tribe in the Ethnographic Museum in Khartoum (note similarities with the Meroitic longbow) (Digitizing Ł. Zieliński after the Gebelein Stele; photo Ł. Zieliński)

bent (probably using steam) into a light reflex shape. With bows of this size this seems to be a rather strange arrangement,



Fig. 2. Meroitic ruler (in blue) with bow (in red) and arrows (in green), relief from the South Pyramid complex in Meroe (Photo Ł. Zieliński)

as the reflex shape is generally used to increase the tensile force of bows with a very short shaft of less than 100 cm, but the Nubian longbow had a length of four ells (approximately 200 cm) as said by Herodotus (VII:69).

But were the bows described by Herodotus really that long? The issue can be examined analyzing a relief from Meroe showing a Meroitic ruler with a longbow. The relief is located in the chapel of the pyramid in the Southern cemetery [Fig. 2]. If it is assumed that the Meroitic ruler was tall, between 170 and 180 cm, and appropriate proportions are maintained, then the length of the bow in its strung state would have been approximately 140 cm and after the removal of the bowstring it would have gained approximately another 10 cm in length [Table 1].

In describing the length of Nubian bows, Herodotus probably had in mind the length of the unstrung shaft, which is longer than the strung length, but is the one adopted by units on the march. It also seems that the size of four ells mentioned




Table 1. Length of longbow and arrows and height of ruler based on an examination of reliefs in Meroe (Estimates Ł. Zieliński)

by Herodotus is an exaggeration caused by the fact that the Nubians with their bows seemed huge to the Greeks, who were of much smaller stature. Comparing further data coming from the relief, it is clear that the arrows shown on it were approximately 70 cm long. This is a size typical for bows of a tension 27 inches long (about 68.50 cm), and this fact is evidence that Nubian longbows already had such a tension.

Interestingly, in order not to weaken the structure of the wood at either end of the limbs, the bow does not have a nock carved into the ends of the shaft, or any device for catching hold of the bowstring. The latter was held in place by leather of string bindings at both ends of the stave. By this device the weight of the working ends of the limbs was slightly increased, slowing down somewhat their movement. One can only imagine under how strong a tensile force the bowstring must have been in these bows, since the designers did not choose to weaken the ends of the stave, frightened of breaking the ends of the bow, and decided on this arrangement instead. Bows of such a large size are usually drawn to a length of 26–28 inches (about 66–71 cm), at which they reach their full potential, that is, a force which is measured in pounds. The best arrow to fit such a bow will normally have a shaft length of at least 70 cm, excluding the arrowhead, which protrudes beyond the outline of the riser and working limbs. It is surprising, then, that the only complete arrows with their shafts preserved, coming from the Meroitic period, which have been found in Nubia in Meroe grave W.122, have a length of only 50 cm, including the arrowhead (Shinnie 1967: 164–165). These arrows, then, were not intended for a longbow.

At this point one should mention another change in Nubian weaponry, which took place during the Meroitic or post-Meroitic periods. It was the use of the Nubian composite reflex bow on a much larger scale than before. Bows made of composite materials, like reflex bows, were known much earlier in Nubia, but it was during the post-Meroitic period that they started to be used on a larger scale. Most finds of bows of this type come from this period (Williams 1991: 76–86). The composite reflex bow is of small size (Nubian specimens have been reconstructed at approximately 100 cm). This type of bow is normally associated with the nomadic populations of the great Eurasian steppes.

From the very beginning this kind of bow was designed with the idea of shooting from horseback, hence its small size. To compensate for the low strength of the short limbs, they had to be bent outwards so that in extreme cases bows of this type changed their shape to the letter C, or Greek Ω, after the removal of the bowstring. Thanks to their construction, bows of this kind would match, or even exceed, the strength of the self bow. To withstand the extreme stress during the flexing of the bow, the makers would combine wood with other materials in a composite structure, which, thanks to the properties of the individual components, appropriately exploited in different zones, gave the bow great strength.

The Nubian composite bow belonged to this group of bows. According to Williams (1991: 76–86), writing on the Qustul bows, the limbs were bent under steam into a double S-shape. As was the case with the longbow, no nock was cut in the limbs from the outside, but the bowstring

was kept in place by braiding which was circled round the ends of the limbs. The bow had a wooden core, although it is not known what type of wood it was, on which was glued a layer of braided fabric. The riser had a reinforcement of a horn plate with a length of 25–30 cm. The limbs on the spine side were covered with animal sinews, while everything was covered with an encircling thong binding. The limbs of the bow were about 1 cm thick.

Since the bow itself was approximately 100 cm in length, its bowstring at approximately 80–85 cm was certainly shorter. Obtaining full tension within the range of 28 inches (about 71 cm) with so short a bowstring is impossible. It means that the arrows accompanying Nubian composite bows were significantly shorter than was the case with the longbows. At this point one should go back to the finds of arrows from the Meroe tomb W.122 mentioned above (Shinnie 1967: 164–165). Since these arrows were 50 cm long, it is reasonable to assume that these were arrows meant for a short draw bow, the composite bow. If that is the case, Tomb W.122 would provide the oldest indirect evidence for the existence of the Nubian composite bow, which accordingly existed as early as the Meroitic period.

Bracelet-gloves in the shape of a fly are not a typical Nubian product. Very similar archer's bracelets were used by the Egyptians, and it seems that Nubians adopted the habit from the Middle Kingdom, when Egyptians occupied the cataracts. Most specimens of this equipment come from the post-Meroitic era. In their richest version the bracelets were made of silver and decorated in repoussé technique with geometric or symbolic patterns over their entire surface.

Examples of richer bracelets of this kind have been found mainly in the royal tombs in Qustul and Ballaṇa (Emery and Kirwan 1938: 232–233, Pl. 52). In poorer versions they were made of rawhide and were mainly decorated on the surface of the “fly wings” with openwork geometric patterns, often in combination with pressing (Adams 2005: 148, 151) [Fig. 3].

Bracelets were worn on the hand holding the bow, and their function was to prevent injury to which the archer was exposed when the arrow was resting on his hand without the adequate support given by the riser (arrow rest). The shape of the bracelet and the fact that leather copies of the “head” of the “fly”, which was worn on the archer's thumb, were not decorated, gave the author reason to think that the Nubian archer rested his arrow on the thumb. Thus, arrows shot by the Nubian technique would have rested on the right side of the grip and not on the left as is the case in contemporary European technique.




Fig. 3. Archer's bracelet-glove from Serra (After Adams 2005: Fig. 59)

Archer's rings are most often found in contexts of Meroitic and post-Meroitic graves (Emery and Kirwan 1938: 233–248). They are also present in the iconography of rulers, mainly on the walls of temples (Shinnie 1967: 110–111). The examples which have been found are usually made of very hard metamorphic rock, carefully worked with almost perfectly smooth surfaces. However, there are also silver rings, and there is also at least one wooden ring known from the excavations of a Polish mission at the El-Ar 1 archaeological site. The archer's ring is actually a cylinder, hollow in the middle, and wider at one end. A large degree of variation exists in the dimensions and shapes found among the rings. Meroitic rings are much shorter and the side surface is almost straight. Post-Meroitic examples, however, are much longer and with the lateral surface often arched inwards. One can see in this change evidence of an evolution toward a particular shape. If so, there was probably a reason, perhaps purely practical, for this change. If we assume, after Mahmoud El-Tayeb (Zieliński 2011: 94 and Fig. 42 on page 99), that the ring was actually a rest under the arrow, and was used interchangeably with the glove on the archer's hand which held the bow, and was held on the right side of the bow's riser, then there could be several reasons for such a transformation. First, the curvature of the ring fits the contour of the riser, and makes it easy to hold when used as a rest on which to place the arrow. Second, the plane on which the arrow rested is much smaller, and so there is less friction impacting the flight path of the arrow. Thus, it seems that some elements support this theory. In any case, in my experience as an archer I have been able to prove experimentally that

a ring could have been used in this way, indeed quite comfortably.

A much older theory, derived from depictions on reliefs and burial finds has it that the archer's ring played the same role as it did in other cultures, where it was a tool used for hooking the bowstring, making it easy to hold the bowstring when drawn. If this were the case then the ring would have been worn on the thumb of the right hand, the digit that was holding the bowstring. It is possible, however, to reconstruct speculatively the Nubian archer's grip quite convincingly. This was attempted by Emery and Kirwan (1938: Fig. 87), but in my opinion their attempts were faulty, because of their lack of experience as archers. The grip they propose would be very uncomfortable for any archer [Fig. 4].

The difficulty in this case is that the archeological data are contradictory. In the iconography, archer's rings are always shown on the subject's right hand,




Fig. 4. Reconstruction of an archer's grip (left) and ring typology (right) (Digitizing Ł. Zieliński, after Emery and Kirwan 1938: Fig. 87)

on the thumb with its wider side closer to its base. Motifs of this kind are known from the context of Meroitic-period temples, such as the Lion Temple in Musawwarat el-Sufra (Shinnie 1967: 110–111). On the other hand, Arkell's excavations in Khartoum (Shinnie 1967: 111) show clearly that in burial contexts the archer's rings were found on skeletons on the nearest phalanx of the thumb of the left hand, the narrower side of the ring on the phalanx base, and therefore the other way round. Identical moreover is the setting of a ring found *in situ* during the NCAM excavations and shown on display in the National Museum in Khartoum [Fig. 5]. This convergence is confusing, and can be explained in many ways, none of which



Fig. 5. Hand with archer's ring found *in situ*, some of the rings visible next to hand are in the elongated variant (National Museum in Khartoum) (Photo Ł. Zieliński)

brings us closer to the truth. Perhaps the Nubians used the rings in two roles, both as a stand under the arrow, and as a typical archer's ring, but this is only a hypothesis. It seems to me that a combination of certain deductions that can be made of the use of the ring in iconography, together with experimental archeology, can give us some idea of Nubian archery techniques.

In the native iconography of Meroitic Nubia there is not a single scene showing an archer in a pose with a taut bow at the moment of release. They are always static, the bow is strung, but the figures just hold it in their hands. In the iconography of Egypt, on the other hand, archers are shown in the act of shooting. It is especially interesting for us to analyze the fingers of the right hand on scenes from the Ramessid period [Fig. 6]. One visible arrangement is the so-called *fig*, in which the fingers which are holding the bowstring are thumb and




Fig. 6. One of the Ramessid archers (archer's "fig" grip) (Digitizing Ł. Zieliński)

forefinger. This pose is comfortable when the fingers are unsecured, and cannot be used with the archer's ring, because the force accumulated in the bowstring will remove the ring from the finger at the moment of shooting (my own experience). The fact that generation upon generation of Nubian archers served and were trained in the Egyptian army leads us to the conclusion that it was probably a technique used by the Nubians as well (on occasions when they did not use the ring). But it was not the only one. The explanation of my hypothesis lies in the ring itself.

As said above, the archer's ring is a cylinder, hollow in the middle, and rather smooth-sided, its edges can be treated in various ways. The ring evolved over time. Meroitic rings were quite short, with rounded edges, but post-Meroitic rings

from Ballaṇa and Qustul are often very long, with sharp edges. The shortest ring described by Emery and Kirwan (1938: 233–248) was 26 mm, the longest 59 mm (almost 6 cm!), whilst the vast majority of rings discovered were between 30 and 40 mm. I now turn to an observation not made by Emery and Kirwan. Namely, the rings were always found on the proximal phalanx of the thumb. The length of the proximal phalanx in the average adult European varies from 35 mm to 40 mm. Even in the case of the individuals examined from the Fourth Cataract in Meroitic and post-Meroitic times the length did not exceed 45 mm. This means that the 6-centimeter ring overlaps a further phalanx of the thumb, immobilizing the phalanx-joint and stiffening the thumb in a straight position. In this setting, it



*Fig. 7. Views of the shorter ring's inner bore  
(Photos Ł. Zieliński)*

is impossible to hold the bowstring in the manner reconstructed by Emery and Kirwan [see *Fig. 4*]. Also the “fig grip” hold is heavily impeded by the thumb being rigid.

For some time the author thought that a different technique had been employed for using the long ring. One candidate could be the Persian shot, in which the ring rests on the upright thumb. The other option would be a technique used by the Chinese, who have archer’s rings similar to Meroitic specimens (Grayson, French, and O’Brien 2007: 44–47). Understanding came with an article by Samantha L. Cook (2012: 165–176) and the author’s own discovery at the El-Zuma cemetery. Studying large series of rings from British collections, Cook was able to prove that these two types of rings were connected with two traditions. The short ring is a usable tool for archers from an earlier date, while the long ring is an element of prestige and probably not usable at all (later tradition). In the El-Zuma cemetery, five archer’s rings were found. Two of them were of the short type with rounded edges, three of the long type

with sharp edges. A thorough examination of these objects has led to some interesting observations.

In microscopic view, the inner bore of the short rings showed traces of smoothing and signs of wear [*Fig. 7*]. However, the inner bore of all three long rings from El-Zuma had the same longitudinal traces of some tool-like file or chisel [*Fig. 8*]. It was very strange considering how precisely the other edges and planes were polished. Long rings are exaggeratedly beautiful (polished and sharp-edged) in comparison to the short rings, but the most important section for the comfort of the archer (inner bore) is unfinished.

Sharp edges were furthermore impractical. A couple of years ago, the author made a replica of the short ring, but with sharp edges. During experimental shooting, after only a few shots the wrapping on the bowstring was spoiled because of the sharp edges. Now there is more clarity on the ring itself.

Returning to shooting techniques, there are two substantially similar possibilities. In Persian shooting, the bowstring



*Fig. 8. View of the longer ring’s inner bore (left) and microscopic view of the same (right) (Photos Ł. Zieliński)*

rests on a ledge that was created by the joint between the proximal phalanx and distal phalanx of the archer's thumb. The other fingers do not participate in the drawing of the bowstring, but the index finger is placed alongside the lateral plane of the ring creating a stable trigger. The technique is quite comfortable and not particularly tiresome, because, as opposed to the techniques described above, in this arrangement no muscle or tendon of the thumb is placed under tension. All of them are loose, and the whole tensile force of the drawn bowstring is placed along the axis of symmetrically held thumb bones. In any other technique, the finger muscles must operate against the tensile force of the bow, which often greatly exceeds 20 kg. Moreover, this technique cannot

be applied without an archer's ring, since in practice it only functions to hook the bowstring. It would, therefore, have been an ideal technique for Meroitic and post-Meroitic archers. The only difference with the Chinese technique is that the index finger is placed askew on the upper plane of the archer's ring (Grayson, French, and O'Brien 2007: 44–47). But the main force is still placed on the thumb and the ring.

All these details are pictured in the reconstruction [Fig. 9]. The archer is using a short composite bow, such as the specimen found in the Ballaña cemetery. Typical of the post-Meroitic bows is the absence of a nock for the bowstring (which is held




Fig. 9. Reconstruction of proper position of an archer with post-Meroitic arms (Model, drawing and digitizing Ł. Zieliński)



Fig. 10. Nubian ruler statue from Mussawarat el-Sufra, quiver location visible (Photo Ł. Zieliński)

in place thanks to loops). The arrows have a barbed type 1a arrowhead, which was common in the post-Meroitic period. The archer is using an archer's bracelet-glove, based on the one found in Serra [see *Fig. 3*], and the arrow rests on the right side of the riser (on the thumb). The archer's ring is used in a different configuration from those shown in the reconstructions of Emery and Kirwan. The quiver is reconstructed on the basis of a specimen from Ballaña, and is placed in a position shown by one of the statues from Mussawarat el-Sufra

(not on the back of archer, but in front) [*Fig. 10*]. In this position it is still possible to draw an arrow from the quiver easily. Other elements, like the headband with vulture feather, or tricuspid male skirt, are well known from Meroitic and Egyptian iconography. The archer is shooting in a slightly downward position as if he was shooting from horseback.

Replicas of the bracelet-glove and archer's ring were made use of for the purposes of reconstruction and experimental shooting.

Łukasz Zieliński  
zielu-05@o2.pl

## REFERENCES

### PRIMARY SOURCES

Herodotus, *The histories*, transl. by R. Waterfield, with an introd. and notes by C. Dewald, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

### SECONDARY SOURCES

Adams, W. Y. (2005). *The West Bank survey from Faras to Gemai II. Sites of Meroitic and Ballaña age* [=BAR IS 1335]. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Arkell, A. J. (1975). *The prehistory of the Nile Valley*. Leiden: Brill.

Cook, S. L. (2012). Archers' looses in Iron Age Sudan: An Asiatic style in an African context. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*, 7(3), 165–176.

Emery, W. B., and Kirwan, L. P. (1938). *The royal tombs of Ballana and Qustul*. Cairo: Government Press.

Grayson, C. E., French, M., and O'Brien, M. J. (2007). *Traditional archery from six continents: The Charles E. Grayson Collection*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Newark, T. (2000). *Ancient armies*. Hong Kong: Concord Publications.

Nicolle, D. (1991). *Rome's enemies V. The desert frontier*. London: Osprey.

Shinnie, P. L. (1967). *Meroe: A civilization of the Sudan* [=Ancient Peoples and Places 55]. London: Thames and Hudson.

Williams, B. (1991). *Noubadian X-Group remains from royal complexes in cemeteries Q and 219 and from private cemeteries Q, R, V, W, B, J, and M at Qustul and Ballana*. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Zieliński, Ł. (2011). *Wojsko w Nubii w okresie Meroickim i Postmeroickim* [Army in Nubia in Meroitic and Postmeroitic period] (unpubl. MA thesis). University of Warsaw [in Polish].

---

## CONTENTS

---

## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	10
ABBREVIATIONS.....	11

### PAM REPORTS

PCMA FIELD MISSIONS AND PROJECTS IN 2012 AND 2013 (WITH MAP) .....	17
--	----

### EGYPT

#### ALEXANDRIA: KOM EL-DIKKA

ALEXANDRIA: EXCAVATIONS AND PRESERVATION WORK ON KOM EL-DIKKA,  
SEASONS 2012 AND 2013

<i>Grzegorz Majcherek</i> .....	29
---------------------------------	----

ISLAMIC NECROPOLIS AT KOM EL-DIKKA IN ALEXANDRIA:  
RESEARCH IN THE 2010–2013 SEASONS

<i>Emanuela Kulicka</i> .....	62
-------------------------------	----

ISLAMIC GLASS FROM AREA U (2012–2013)

<i>Renata Kucharczyk</i> .....	73
--------------------------------	----

#### MARINA EL-ALAMEIN

RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION IN MARINA EL-ALAMEIN IN THE 2012  
AND 2013 SEASONS. THE POLISH–EGYPTIAN CONSERVATION MISSION

<i>Rafał Czermer, Grażyna Bąkowska-Czermer, Wiesław Grzegorek</i> .....	87
---	----

SELECTED CONSERVATION WORK IN MARINA EL-ALAMEIN IN THE 2012  
AND 2013 SEASONS

<i>Marlena Koczorowska, Wojciech Osiak</i> .....	101
--	-----

RESEARCH AND CONSERVATION IN THE ROMAN BATHS OF MARINA EL-ALAMEIN  
IN THE 2012 AND 2013 SEASONS (POLISH–EGYPTIAN CONSERVATION MISSION)

<i>Rafał Czermer, Grażyna Bąkowska-Czermer, Grzegorz Majcherek</i> .....	113
--	-----

#### TELL EL-RETABA

TELL EL-RETABA, SEASON 2012

<i>Sławomir Rzepka, Józef Hudec, Łukasz Jarmużek, Lucia Hulková, Veronika Dubcová</i> .....	139
---	-----

APPENDIX: TELL EL-RETABA 2012. PRELIMINARY REPORT ON ARCHAEOBOTANICAL  
INVESTIGATIONS

<i>Claire Malleson</i> .....	156
------------------------------	-----

TELL EL-RETABA 2012: THE POTTERY

<i>Anna Wodzińska</i> .....	164
-----------------------------	-----

## CONTENTS

---

### TELL EL-FARKHA

TELL EL-FARKHA. EXCAVATIONS, 2012–2013

*Marek Chłodnicki, Krzysztof M. Ciałowicz* ..... 173

### TELL EL-MURRA

TELL EL-MURRA (NORTHEASTERN NILE DELTA SURVEY). SEASONS 2012–2013

*Mariusz A. Jucha, Grzegorz Bąk-Pryc, Natalia Małecką-Drozd* ..... 199

### SAQQARA

SAQQARA: SEASONS 2012 AND 2013/2014

*Karol Mysliwiec* ..... 215

APPENDIX: CONSERVATION WORK IN SAQQARA (2012 AND 2014)

*Zbigniew Godziejewski, Urszula Dąbrowska* ..... 224

SAQQARA 2012: THE POTTERY

*Teodozja I. Rzeuska* ..... 230

### WEST THEBES (ASASIF, DEIR EL-BAHARI) AND VALLEY OF THE NILE

THE TOMBS OF ASASIF: ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION  
IN THE 2013/2014 SEASON

*Patryk Chudzik* ..... 239

TEXTILES FROM TOMB II IN DEIR EL-BAHARI: PRELIMINARY REPORT  
FROM SEASON 2012/2013

*Aleksandra Hallmann* ..... 247

DEIR EL-BAHARI. TEMPLE OF TUTHMOSIS III, CAMPAIGNS 2012–2013

*Monika Dolińska* ..... 257

REPORT FROM FIELD RECONNAISSANCE AT GEBELEIN, KHOZAM AND EL-RIZEIQAT

*Wojciech Ejsmond, Julia M. Chyla, Cezary Baka* ..... 265

### DAKHLEH OASIS

DAKHLEH OASIS PROJECT, PETROGLYPH UNIT: SEASONS 2012 AND 2013

*Ewa Kuciewicz, Paweł Polkowski, Michał Kobusiewicz* ..... 275

### BERENIKE

BERENIKE PROJECT. HELLENISTIC FORT, ROMAN HARBOR, LATE ROMAN TEMPLE, AND  
OTHER FIELDWORK: ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN THE 2012 AND 2013 SEASONS

*Steven E. Sidebotham, Iwona Zych, Joanna K. Rądkowska, Marek Woźniak* ..... 297

### SUDAN

#### DONGOLA

DONGOLA. SEASONS IN 2012–2013

*Włodzimierz Godlewski* ..... 325

APPENDIX: THE SKELETAL REMAINS FROM THE SANCTUARY OF ANNA  
IN THE MONASTERY ON KOM H

*Robert Mahler* ..... 340

---

## CONTENTS

---

WALL INSCRIPTIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST ANNEX TO THE MONASTERY ON KOM H AT DONGOLA: REPORT ON WORK IN THE 2013 SEASON <i>Adam Łajtar</i> .....	344
CRYPT 3 IN THE NORTHWEST ANNEX OF THE MONASTERY ON KOM H IN DONGOLA: REPORT ON THE EXPLORATION IN 2012 <i>Robert Mahler, Włodzimierz Godlewski, Katarzyna Danys-Lasek, Barbara Czaja</i> ....	352
BANGANARTI AND SELIB	
BANGANARTI AND SELIB IN 2011/2012 AND 2013 <i>Bogdan Żurawski</i> .....	369
EXCAVATIONS AT SELIB 2 IN 2012 <i>Roksana Hajduga, Katarzyna Solarska</i> .....	389
SELIB 1. PRELIMINARY REPORT FOR THE 2012 AND 2013 SEASONS <i>Aneta Cedro</i> .....	397
FAUNAL REMAINS FROM THE FORTIFIED SETTLEMENT AROUND THE CHURCH AT BANGANARTI IN SUDAN <i>Marta Osypińska</i> .....	411
EARLY MAKURIA (MTOM) PROJECT	
ANIMAL REMAINS FROM THE EARLY MAKURIAN CEMETERY IN EL-ZUMA (SEASON 2013) <i>Urszula Iwaszczuk</i> .....	425
GHAZALI	
GHAZALI 2012: PRELIMINARY REPORT <i>Artur Obłuski, Grzegorz Ochala, Miron Bogacki, Wiesław Małkowski, Szymon Maślak, Zaki ed-Din Mahmoud</i> .....	431
CYPRUS	
NEA PAPHOS	
NEA PAPHOS. SEASONS 2012 AND 2013 <i>Henryk Meyza</i> .....	443
LEBANON	
JIYEH	
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE 2012 AND 2013 EXCAVATION SEASONS AT JIYEH (PORPHYREON): WORK IN SECTOR D (RESIDENTIAL QUARTER) <i>Tomasz Waliszewski, Magdalena Antos, Piotr Jaworski, Piotr Makowski, Marcin Romaniuk, Rafał Solecki, Agnieszka Szymczak</i> .....	453
PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF A STRATIGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF LATE ROMAN AND EARLY BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE IN THE RESIDENTIAL QUARTER OF JIYEH <i>Michał Dzik</i> .....	475

## CONTENTS

---

RESULTS OF A SURVEY CONDUCTED IN THE AREA OF THE JIYEH MARINA RESORT HOTEL COMPLEX IN THE 2012 SEASON <i>Zofia Kowarska, Szymon Lenarczyk</i> .....	491
---	-----

### KUWAIT

#### AL-SUBIYAH AND FAILAKA ISLAND

TUMULUS BURIAL FIELD ON THE NORTH COAST OF KUWAIT BAY. PRELIMINARY EXCAVATION REPORT ON THE SPRING SEASON IN 2012 <i>Łukasz Rutkowski</i> .....	505
CHRISTIAN SETTLEMENT AT FAILAKA, QUSUR SITE (KUWAIT): EXCAVATIONS IN 2011 AND 2013 <i>Magdalena Żurek</i> .....	529
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE JOINT KUWAITI–POLISH MISSION, FAILAKA ISLAND, 2012 <i>Franciszek Pawlicki</i> .....	547
FAILAKA ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH PROJECT. PRELIMINARY RESULTS AFTER THE FIRST SEASON OF EXCAVATION AT THE KHARAIB EL-DESHT SITE IN 2013 <i>Agnieszka Pieńkowska</i> .....	560
APPENDIX 1: KHARAIB EL-DESHT 2013: POTTERY. PRELIMINARY REPORT <i>Marta Mierzejewska</i> .....	571
APPENDIX 2: SURVEY OF KHARAIB EL-DESHT BAY ON FAILAKA ISLAND: PRELIMINARY REPORT <i>Magdalena Nowakowska</i> .....	579

### IRAQI KURDISTAN

NEWCOMERS AND AUTOCHTHONS. PRELIMINARY REPORT ON 2013 ACTIVITIES IN THE KURDISTAN AUTONOMOUS REGION, IRAQ <i>Dorota Ławecka</i> .....	591
---	-----

### PAM STUDIES

LEVALLOIS TRADITION EPIGONES IN THE MIDDLE NILE VALLEY: SURVEY IN THE AFFAD BASIN <i>Marta Osypińska, Piotr Osypiński</i> .....	601
ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TELL ARBID. PRELIMINARY REPORT <i>Maciej Makowski</i> .....	627
PLANT MACROFOSSILS FROM THE SITE OF TELL ARBID, NORTHEAST SYRIA (3RD–2ND MILLENNIUM BC). PRELIMINARY REPORT <i>Aldona Mueller-Bieniek, Krystyna Wasylkowa, Anna Smogorzewska</i> .....	657
THE ANIMAL ECONOMY OF PEOPLE LIVING IN THE SETTLEMENT OF TELL RAD SHAQRAH (SYRIA) <i>Joanna Piątkowska-Matecka, Rafał Koliński</i> .....	675

---

## CONTENTS

---

THE SOLAR ALTAR IN THE TEMPLE OF HATSHEPSUT AT DEIR EL-BAHARI: ARCHITECTURE AND IDEOLOGY <i>Andrzej Ćwiek</i> .....	693
FAIENCE OBJECTS FROM THE TOMB MMA 1152 AT SHEIKH ABD EL-GURNA <i>Patryk Chudzik, Andrzej Ćwiek</i> .....	701
INDIAN STEEL: A FORGOTTEN COMMODITY OF THE GREAT TRADE ROUTES <i>Marek Woźniak</i> .....	709
MONETIZATION OF ROMAN EGYPT DURING THE FLAVIAN DYNASTY (AD 69–96): THE CASE OF ALEXANDRIA AND BERENIKE <i>Katarzyna Lach</i> .....	727
CROSS-CULTURAL BEAD ENCOUNTERS AT THE RED SEA PORT SITE OF BERENIKE, EGYPT. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT (SEASONS 2009–2012) <i>Joanna Then-Obluska</i> .....	735
A NEW LOOK ON SOME OLD GLASS FINDS FROM PALMYRA <i>Krystyna Gawlikowska</i> .....	779
NEW INSIGHTS INTO NUBIAN ARCHERY <i>Łukasz Zieliński</i> .....	791
INDEX OF SITES .....	803
GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS .....	804
PCMA PUBLICATIONS .....	805

*POLISH ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (PAM)*  
*Annual of the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Warsaw*

PAM Editor-in-chief: Iwona Zych

Volume 24/1: Research

All texts peer-reviewed.

<http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl/en/pam-journal/pam-independent-reviewers/>

Press-reviewing process: Urszula Wicenciak

Bibliographic editor: Aleksandra Zych

Language consultation: Iwona Zych

Technical editor: Iwona Zych

Digital processing: Ewa Czyżewska-Zalewska

Image processing and copyediting assistance: Ewa Czyżewska-Zalewska, Szymon Maślak, Marta Momot, Marek Puzkarski, Urszula Wicenciak

Original graphic design: Jerzy Kowalski, updated by Ewa Czyżewska-Zalewska for PCMA

DTP: Ewa Czyżewska-Zalewska, assisted by Agnieszka Dzwonek

Cover: Tumulus SB 100 from the Al-Subiyah region of Kuwait during exploration  
(Photo M. Makowski)

**ISSN 1234–5415 (Print), ISSN 2083–537X (Online)**

© Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Warsaw, Warszawa 2015

© Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology of the University of Warsaw.

Polish Centre of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Warsaw

00-497 Warszawa, Poland, ul. Nowy Świat 4

e-mail: [pam.pcma@uw.edu.pl](mailto:pam.pcma@uw.edu.pl)

[www.pcma.uw.edu.pl](http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl)

Orders can be placed c/o Agnieszka Pieńkowska

[a.pienkowska@uw.edu.pl](mailto:a.pienkowska@uw.edu.pl)

University of Warsaw Press

00-497 Warszawa, Poland, ul. Nowy Świat 4

[www.wuw.pl](http://www.wuw.pl); e-mail: [wuw@uw.edu.pl](mailto:wuw@uw.edu.pl)

Internet Bookshop: [www.wuw.pl/ksiegarnia](http://www.wuw.pl/ksiegarnia)

*Printed in Poland*

## POLISH ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Published annually since 1990

PAM XXIV/1 *Research*

### REPORTS

Fieldwork projects carried out by PCMA teams in the Ancient Near East and Africa

- scope: archaeological, geophysical, restoration and study work
- areas of interest: Egypt, Sudan, Cyprus, Syria, Lebanon, Kuwait, Iraq
- timespan: ten millennia from prehistory and protohistory through the medieval period

### STUDIES

- archaeological, architectural and material research within the fields of study covered by PCMA fieldwork

PAM XXIV/2 *Special Studies*

*Deir el-Bahari Studies*

Editor Zbigniew E. Szafrński

Volume dedicated to research on specific egyptological and archaeological themes resulting from the ongoing work of the Polish conservation and restoration project in the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahari (West Thebes, Luxor, Egypt). The 11 contributions included in this book concern mostly a later phase in the occupation of the complex, in the Third Intermediate Period (11th–8th century BC), when the abandoned temple was reused as a burial ground. A few of the articles refer to the original architectural form and decoration of the temple from the times of Hatshepsut (15th century BC). Also included is an article on tombs of three other queens of the Eighteenth Dynasty in the Valley of the Kings.

Available as full texts on-line at [www.pcma.uw.edu.pl](http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl)

PAM volumes 17 to the present available on-line from [www.ceeol.com](http://www.ceeol.com)

Information and orders:

[www.pcma.uw.edu.pl](http://www.pcma.uw.edu.pl)

[pcma@uw.edu.pl](mailto:pcma@uw.edu.pl)

[pam.pcma@uw.edu.pl](mailto:pam.pcma@uw.edu.pl)

[www.wuw.pl/ksiegarnia](http://www.wuw.pl/ksiegarnia)



RESEARCH

PAM XXIV/1

POLISH CENTRE OF MEDITERRANEAN ARCHAEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

# POLISH ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

## XXIV/1

RESEARCH

