Fig. 1
Map of Hierakonpolis showing the location of cemeteries and settlement areas.
Hierakonpolis is best described as a geographical region on the west bank of the Nile embracing both the flood plain and the adjacent low desert, with occupation clustering near the apex of a large alluvial embayment where it is intersected by the Wadi Abu Suffian (Hoffman 1982; 1987; fig. 1). To either side of this central wadi remains of predynastic habitation extend along the low desert for approximately 1.5 km, and are bounded on the north and south by Wadi Terifa and Wadi Khamsini (Dune Wadi) respectively. Although the extent of the floodplain occupation cannot be accurately assessed, the wadis to the north and south appear to have marked the borders of the site, making the desert portion of Hierakonpolis one of, if not, the largest predynastic site still extant and accessible in Egypt.

Following surveys undertaken in 1967-1982 (Fairservis 1972:11-14; Hoffman 1982; Harlan 1985:31-47), the desert occupation has been characterised as a constellation of more or less discrete localities, amongst which are various cemeteries of predynastic and later date. The cemeteries of the Predynastic/Early Dynastic period located in the central and southern part of the desert site were summarised in a table by Hoffman (1982: table VI.3; idem: 1987: 196; Adams 2000:174; see also Hendrickx & van den Brink 2002: 363) with estimated size, date, status and number of graves supplied almost entirely on the basis of surface indications.

In light of further archaeological and archival investigations this table is now in need of much revision in order to achieve a better understanding of these cemeteries and their relation to the social and geographic landscape of the site. The number and nature of the cemeteries in the floodplain, however, still remain beyond reach with unknown consequences for interpretation.

Table 1 provides a revised summary of the 12 cemetery localities listed by Hoffman, to which has been added those on the northern side of the site described by Harlan (1985; 1982 field notes). The cemeteries are pre-

---

1. Less circumscribed by sandstone hills than the Wadi Abu Suffian, the bordering wadis gave access to the deep desert and the caravan routes therein (cf. Darb el Gallaba). In Dynastic times, these borders appear to have been marked by rock inscriptions and petroglyphs at HK64 on the north, and so-called Flint City on the south (Friedman et al. 1999: 18-29; Friedman & Youngblood 1999: 7-8).

2. Quibell & Green (1902: 2, 54) and Adams (1974: 81, 94) mention one grave of Naqada IIC date within the southern outlier and three others found beneath revetment and beside the temple wall (Naqada III date) on the main mound. All appear to be burials of children.
### Table 1. The Cemeteries of Hierakonpolis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No.of graves</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>c.18,00m²</td>
<td>NIC-IIIB</td>
<td>29 graves excavated in c. 2600m² (c. 15% of area)</td>
<td>Elite cemetry with animal burials. Large tombs with associated wooden architecture</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982; Adams, 2000; 2004; Friedman 2004, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1640m²+</td>
<td>NIC-IIB</td>
<td>No. of pits est. 56+ graves</td>
<td>Possibly continuation of HK6. C ware, perforam macehead</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982; survey 1978; Adams 2000:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4951m²</td>
<td>NIC-IIB</td>
<td>No. of pits est. 243+ graves</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman 1982; survey 1978; Adams 2000: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2960m²</td>
<td>NIC-II</td>
<td>No.of pits est. 250-300 graves</td>
<td>Circular to oval graves Heavily plundered by 1899</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982; Fairservis 1972; Green diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-44</td>
<td>19,20m² minimum. c.160 x 120m</td>
<td>NIIAB</td>
<td>452 graves excavated in contiguous area of 1860m², (&gt; 10% of area) 10+ c.130 by Green</td>
<td>Small oval pits, densely placed Larger rectangular on ridge Smaller tombs north of ridge</td>
<td>Friedman et al.1999, 2002, 2008. Part excavated by Green 1899 (Adams 1974) and Lansing 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1200m²</td>
<td>NIIAB+</td>
<td>c.100 graves?</td>
<td>Probably continuation of HK43-44. C ware observed by Hoffman</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982, part excavated by Green 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>31,266m²</td>
<td>NIIAB+</td>
<td>Unknown no. by Quibell 1898</td>
<td>Model knives</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982, HKII: 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Painted Tomb Cemetery</td>
<td>NIIC</td>
<td>c. 13 excav. by Green 1899</td>
<td>Painted tomb, plus at least 6 rectangular tombs</td>
<td>Adams 1974; Fairservis 1972, fig. 1; Kaiser 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30G</td>
<td>1056m²+</td>
<td>NIII (Dyn 1)</td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>Large tombs in tight cluster and 1+large separate, possibly more to north by HK47</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982, Friedman per. observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>102,00m²</td>
<td>NIIIC-NIII (Dyn 2)</td>
<td>122 by Lansing; 153 by Garstang</td>
<td>Large cemetery, heavily plundered. Possibly contiguous with HK22?</td>
<td>Lansing 1934: Patch pers com: Garstang (Adams 1987); De Morgan (Needler 1984); Green (Adams 1974); Fairservis (1981); Hoffman 1982; Friedman 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20A</td>
<td>c.150 x 50m</td>
<td>NIC-II?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rhomboid slate observed, light scatter of sherds</td>
<td>Harlan 1982 survey, Fairservis 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22A,</td>
<td>c.314m (dia. 20m)</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Probably one contiguous cemetery now separated by modern cemetery Original total at least 300mx 200m?</td>
<td>Harlan 1982; survey notes HKII:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22B/c</td>
<td>c.2826 (dia. 60m)</td>
<td>NII-NIII</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Animal cemetery+human?</td>
<td>Hoffman 1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
presented in geographical clusters, which also broadly mirror their diachronic development according to their thus far observed inception dates. Those active in the Naqada IC-IIB period are: HK6 and its satellites at HK12 and 13 located on the local western (magnetic southern) edge of the site, far back in the Wadi Abu Suffian;3 HK11E in a tributary wadi of the Wadi Abu Suffian; HK43-44 on the southern border of the archaeological zone adjacent to Wadi Kham-sini; and HK20A on the north side by the Wadi Terifa (fig. 1). While all flank and appear to mark the boundaries of the desert habitation zone, HK11E, HK43 and HK20A also seem to be positioned to service the large settlement localities most proximal (cf. HK11; HK54; HK22). Located roughly 2.5 km apart, the placement of these non-elite cemeteries corresponds to the distribution observed in the Abydos and Naqada regions, where settlements and cemeteries were found fairly evenly spaced at 2km intervals (Patch 2004: 913; Hassan 1988). This distribution suggests that ease of access for a particular community/clan was a significant factor in cemetery creation and placement. On the other hand, the location of the cemetery at HK6 (and its satellites) appears to have been selected for different, perhaps more spiritual reasons, as it served as a burial ground restricted to the elite probably since its inception in Naqada IC or earlier.

In the Naqada IIC period there is a notable change in cemetery location. The usage of cemeteries in the Wadi Abu Suffian diminishes and new cemeteries are established on former settlement areas along the edge of the flood plain at HK27 (Fort Cemetery), HK31 (Painted Tomb Cemetery) and HK33. While the Painted Tomb has generally been considered to lay within the HK33 cemetery (e.g. Adams 1996), there is no reason to doubt the plan of F.W. Green, which places it at the far southeastern tip of the desert site (Quibell & Green 1902: pl. LXXIII A). In this same location Fairservis noted a discrete cluster of mortuary remains which he labelled as HK31, when it was still extant. (Fairservis 1972: fig. 1; see also Kaiser 1961: fig. 2). The site has since been overtaken by cultivation (see fig. 1). Whether HK33, which is now only partly preserved, was once part of the Painted Tomb cemetery is unclear. Hoffman (1982) was unable to provide much information about HK33 except that it was large, ‘Late Predynastic’ and heavily disturbed. Surface finds observed in the 1980s include a fish-shaped palette, Decorated sherds and vessels probably of late Naqada II date.4 The graves, apparently of at least Naqada IIC date, excavated by Quibell can with confidence also be attributed to this locality (Quibell & Green 1902: 26, pl. LXIV & LXVII: model knife from grave 225).5 While the founding of the Fort Cemetery (HK27) already indicates a shrinking of desert occupation in Naqada IIC, if HK33 was also extensive at this time, then abandonment of the desert for habitation must have been relatively rapid. The nucleation of the population into floodplain settlements and the commensurate shift in cemetery location has been noted at numerous sites throughout Upper Egypt, and its causes are much discussed (int. al., Patch 2004: 913-16; Wilkinson 1999; Hoffman et al. 1986). However, the cemeteries of Hierakonpolis, especially in light of the new evidence from HK6, hint at a more complex situation at this site, if not elsewhere.

Cemeteries of Naqada IC-IIB

Since the limited excavations of Hoffman in the 1980s (Hoffman 1982: 38-60; Adams 2000), the elite status of the HK6 cemetery

3. The location of Locality 58 listed by Hoffman is unclear. It may be equivalent to Locality 5, for which the 1978 survey notes mention about 20 looted graves and adjacent settlement debris. The estimated size of this locality is 26 x 30m, no date is given.

4. A half-polished bowl, L16g, and straw tempered jar, R65, were registered from HK33 in 1980.

5. On a sketch map (now in Cambridge) Green indicates that Quibell worked in the area to the west of the Painted Tomb in 1898, but does not detail the extent of these excavations. Whether the ’protodynastic’ sherds near the plundered graves observed by Brunton (1932: 273) refer to HK33 or HK31 is unclear.
### Table 2: Tombs and Structure in the Cemetery at HK6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tomb/Str.</th>
<th>size</th>
<th>architecture</th>
<th>occupants</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naqada I-II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.36 x 2.6 x 1.8m</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2 human, 2 goats</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2 x 0.75 x c 0.40m</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 dogs +2 human</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9 x 1.6 x 1.5m</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5 human</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0 x 1.1 x 1.25m</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 human, 3 dog skulls</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5 x 1.0 x 0.9m</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 baboons, cat, hippo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.0 x 1.8 x 0.9m</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3+ human</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>c.4.0 x 3.0m oval</td>
<td>See Str. 24</td>
<td>elephant, bovde bull</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. E8</td>
<td>17 x 9.75+m</td>
<td>24 columns</td>
<td>(T24 inserted)</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4 x 3.1 x 1.17m</td>
<td>Superstr. 6 x 4.5m Fence: 16 x 9m</td>
<td>12 humans</td>
<td>IIAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.65 x 1.4 x 0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Superstr. 2 x 2 m</td>
<td>IIAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 08-1a</td>
<td>7.2 x 5m</td>
<td>3+ columns</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 08-1b</td>
<td>5 x 3m</td>
<td></td>
<td>2+ columns?</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 08-2</td>
<td>6.5 x 3.5m</td>
<td>1+ stone column</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 08-3</td>
<td>17.8-15.6 x 17.8-17.2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. D9</td>
<td>9.5 x 5.75m</td>
<td>8 columns</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 07</td>
<td>10.5 x 15m</td>
<td>24 columns</td>
<td></td>
<td>IIAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str. 08-4</td>
<td>4.5 x 5+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3 x 1.45 x 1.07m</td>
<td>Superstr. 7 x 4.5m Fence: 8 x 5+m</td>
<td>3 humans</td>
<td>IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.9 x 1.2 x c 1m</td>
<td>Fence: c.3 x 2.3m</td>
<td>2 humans</td>
<td>IIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.2 x 0.70 x 1m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 sheep, 1 dog</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4 x 2.2 x 0.9m oval?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 human, goat, 2 dogs</td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0 x 2.3 x 1 m oval?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 human; elephant? 7 dogs, 1 goat</td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dia 1.8m oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 human</td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A</td>
<td>4.3 x 2.6 x 1.2+m</td>
<td>probable</td>
<td>1 human</td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.45 x 2.44 x 1.15m</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 human, 1 dog, 4 sheep/goat</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.52 x 1.4 x 1.12m</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 human, 1 baboon, 3 sheep/goat</td>
<td>IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.96 x 1.97 x 1.4m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aurochs, 7 sheep/goat</td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>probably postholes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC-IIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naqada III brick lined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rock cut</td>
<td>6.25 x 2.1 x 4.11m with side chamber</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5 humans</td>
<td>III (A2-B?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16B</td>
<td>Int: 2.97 x 1.89 x 1.21</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Int: 3.28 x 2.18 x 1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 human (v. frag.)</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ext: 5.7 x 3.0m Int: 4.9 x 2.4 x 2m</td>
<td>Fence: 9.5 x 4.7m</td>
<td>1 child, clay coffin 6 sheep/goat</td>
<td>IIIA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ext: 6.6 x 3.7m Int: 4.76 x 2.7 x 1.75m</td>
<td>Fence: 8.5 x 4.7m</td>
<td>? clay coffin</td>
<td>IIIA2-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ext: 8.2 x 5.4m Int: 6.2 x 3.5 x 2.5m</td>
<td>Fence: 13.75 x 9.5m</td>
<td>1 human</td>
<td>IIIB-C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5 x 2.1 x 0.75m</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>5 cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9 x 0.3 x 0.3m oval</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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in early Naqada II times and its reuse in the Naqada III period have been both recognised and pondered. The large size of the Naqada IIA Tombs 3 and 6 (see table 2 & fig. 2) and the objects (mainly weapons) they still contained, even after serious plundering, indicated burials of high status; yet, they retained nothing that substantially differentiated them from the increasingly large and elite burials at other sites throughout Upper Egypt at this time.6 Hoffman’s excavations also revealed a number of animal burials (Tombs 5, 7 and 12), which were considered to augment the cemetery’s elite status, but whose date and association remained unclear. Fortunately, both the status of the cemetery and the animal burials can now be better understood as a result of the unexpectedly elaborate mortuary compounds uncovered during recent field work.

Since 2000, excavations in the south-central area of the HK6 cemetery have revealed a number of above-ground wooden structures apparently segregated in a precinct currently estimated to cover an area of c. 45 x 50m (see fig. 3 & 4). It was previously suggested that this complex of structures centered on Tomb 23, the largest tomb so far found in the vicinity and the largest tomb of the Naqada IIAB period yet known (see table 2).7 Equipped with a superstructure and enclosure wall, Tomb 23 was flanked on the grid north by grave Tomb 26, which also had superstructure, and on the south and east by three multi-columned structures (Structure E8, Structure D9, Structure 07), which have no substructure or tomb original to them (Droux & Friedman 2007; Friedman 2008). Excavations undertaken in February-March 2008 have led to a revised interpretation of the precinct and now indicate that these structures, which may or may not be associated with Tomb 23, are only the last in a long series of above-

6. Hoffman (1982: 58-60) did, however, surmise that the early tombs (3,4,5,6,9) in the southern sector of the cemetery might be subsidiary to an even larger tomb that had been destroyed when the later rock-cut Tomb 2 was constructed, which may well be the case.

7. The size of the Tomb 23 burial chamber (floor dimensions 5.18-5.40m E-W x 2.60-3.10m N-S) ranks it as the largest of its time. Of known Naqada IC-IIA tombs, only Abadiyah B101 is potentially similar in size. Petrie (1901: 33) states that it was larger than B217 which he reports as measuring 5.59 x 2.03m (220 x 80 inches). Large tombs of comparable date at Naqada are: 1661 measuring 3.8 x 3.0m; 191, 3.56 x 1.78m; T4, a multiple interment, 3.35 x 2.1m and T11, 3.51 x 2.24m—all of which are substantially smaller than Tomb 23. I thank Ezzat Rafaei for his help in compiling the tomb sizes for the Naqada cemeteries.
ground wooden building constructed in what was apparently a special ritual area within the elite cemetery. These remarkable above-ground structures have no tomb in clear association and the entire precinct, at least in its earliest phases, appears to be free of human burials. Given their location within a cemetery and the ritual and prestige objects found within them, these buildings may have been erected for the performance of funerary rites in a location separated from the associated tomb or tombs and/or served to promote the ancestor cult for the cemetery’s elite inhabitants (Adams 2002: 27), perhaps acting as the ‘holy precinct’ later considered to be at Buto, Hierakonpolis’ counterpart in the north.

Wall B7, which has been traced for 55m along the east side of the precinct at the edge of the wadi terrace, appears to form an enclosure wall around the entire cemetery and leaves little doubt that the precinct is an intrinsic part of the cemetery. While no built barrier separating this precinct from the rest of the cemetery has so far been discovered, animal burials at the northeast (Tomb 12, baboons, cat and hippo, see Van Neer et al. 2004) and on the northwest (Tomb 28, dogs and caprids), may mark, define or spiritually protect its boundaries. As a result of the recent excavations at least three building phases within the precinct can be distinguished and within each phase,
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growing levels of size, effort and elaboration can be detected (fig. 3). Although differing in detail, in all cases the above-ground architecture was constructed exclusively from wood and reeds. No mud-brick has been observed. Rows of closely spaced posts of acacia or tamarisk, usually 6-10cm in diameter and c.10cm apart, were used to create the walls of the structures. These posts were placed within foundation trenches up to 50cm deep, cut into the hard, gravelly soil. Against these posts was placed a wattle of reeds, which was coated with white gypsum plaster and in some cases painted. Plaster fragments with red and/or green pigment and black geometric and figural designs have been recovered. The columns to support the roof were generally placed at 2m intervals within the interior of the structures. These columns vary in their preparation, but were generally about 20cm in diameter, although in Structure E8 the columns, made from the trunks of the acacia tree, had a diameter of up to 45cm. In all cases, the columns were placed in postholes, which in the later phases were often over 1m deep, this being the depth required to reach the underlying sandstone bedrock, which appears to have been the goal. Although composed of organic materials, the effort involved in creating these structures shows that they were not intended to be ephemeral. When complete, they must have made a strong and colorful impact on the surrounding wadi landscape, although this did not prevent them from being demolished by later occupants to make room for new, bigger and better structures.

Based on the most recent investigations, the earliest phase of construction included Structures 08-1a (7.2 x 5m) and 08-2(6.5+ x 3.5m), relatively small rectangular buildings in the northern part of the precinct composed of the typical acacia posts, set within a narrow wall trench. Both were oriented with their long axes east-west and apparently entered from the west. Whether they were built at the same time or sequentially cannot be ascertained. Pottery, including a C-ware sherd chinking the posts in the wall trench of Structure 08-2 indicates a Naqada IC/IIA date. Structure 08-4 in the southern part of the precinct may also belong to this phase (a C-ware sherd was also found in the immediate vicinity), but this building as been extensively disturbed by later activities, obscuring its temporal relationships.

In the next observable phase, Structure 08-2 was removed for the building of Structure 08-3(c. 17.8 x 17.2m), as its northeast corner cuts the southern wall of Structure 08-2. Structure 08-3 was a large, nearly square, enclosure that can be detected beneath Structure D9, turning the corner and running along the north side of Structure E8, turning a corner again and running beneath the Tomb 23 complex and turning the corner again before it is lost beneath the tomb and architecture of Tomb 26. Further details of Structure 08-3 are obscure, but it, in turn, was removed when Structure D9 was erected.

Structure D9, defined by post walls, is c.9.5m long by 5.75m wide with eight internal columns arranged in two rows of four. It is oriented with its long axis north-south as is the larger Structure 07, which was likewise defined by post walls, 15m long by 10.5m wide, with 24 columns set in six rows of four each (fig. 5). The size of the internal columns, roughly 20cm in diameter, their spacing at roughly 2m intervals, and other features of the construction suggest that both structures are closely related in time. Both also contained deposits of artifacts near the corners, which included ivory.
objects such as tusk figures in Structure D9 (Deposit D) and ivory ‘wands’ ornamented with hippos in Structure 07 (Deposit G) in conjunction with a masterfully carved malachite statuette of a falcon, the earliest occurrence of this royal motif thus far recovered (Hendrickx & Friedman 2007). Shells from the Red Sea (Deposit E) and copious amounts of ostrich eggshell, some with incised decoration (Deposit F) were also concentrated in both structures. In addition, objects and materials were also apparently placed intentionally within some of the postholes, perhaps as foundation deposits, and include Red Sea shells (a), textiles, with one large bundle containing malachite (b), a cow horn (c) and various ivories (d).

Despite these parallels, lithic artifacts were not found in Structure D9, but were prevalent in Structure 07 and included a large number of transverse (n=43) and hollow based (n=36) projectile points as well as a flint ibex figurine identical to the one found in the Tomb 23 complex in 2000 (Droux & Friedman 2007). The differences in content suggest a certain variation in the activities undertaken within each structure.

The construction of Structure D9 must also have required the removal of Structure 08-1a, if it was still present. The small structure 08-1b (5 x 3m) was built over the central part of 08-1a possibly at this time. In the wall trench on all four sides of Structure 08-1b, ivory cylinders with carved ends decorated with cross-hatching were discovered. These cylinders are identical to the one found in the Tomb 23 complex, which also supports a later date for Structure 08-1b. Like Structure D9, the structure is oriented north-south and it was heavily burned, possibly in the same conflagration that burned Structure D9. The significance, if any, of the change in orientation apparent in this phase is unknown. Both Structure 07 and 08-1b have doors on the west, broad side, while the location of the entrance to Structure D9 remains undetermined.

The temporal relationship of these structures to the more massively constructed Structure E8 remains unclear. Located immediately to the south of the Tomb 23 complex and separated from it by a 4m wide corridor, Structure E8 is a large rectilinear structure, 17m east-west by at least 9.75m wide, bounded on the
north, west and east by a post and reed fence, the plaster from which bore traces of green pigment. The southern wall, buried beneath piles of back dirt, has not yet been located. Within these walls, columns made from the raw trunks of acacia trees, some still retaining their bark and up to 45cm in diameter were set into large postholes up to 1.30m deep and arranged in six rows of four columns each (N-S). The four rows on the west are placed more or less regularly at 2m intervals, but the two rows on the east are spaced more closely (1-1.5m), and a ‘corridor’ of c. 4 m separates the two groups. Internal walls subdivide the area, with one post built wall running east-west between the first set of columns on the north and another running just to the north of the third set. The entrance into the structure has not yet been found; gaps in the fence along the north side are due to modern pitting, but it is likely that the door is in this location.

At some point after its construction, Tomb 24, a grave containing an adolescent African elephant and domestic male bovid (Friedman 2004a), was inserted beneath this structure. This addition required the removal of at least one column, the empty posthole of which was found in the floor of the tomb covered with the textile shroud and the articulated vertebrae and ribs of the elephant. The removed columns may have been replaced above the tomb as the building apparently continued to function. Votive deposits in the northeast and northwest corners (Deposits B and C on fig. 3) contained flints implements, ritual pottery and flint animal figures, one of which depicts an elephant (see Friedman 2008 for more details). Whether Structure E8 pre- or post-dates Tomb 23 is unclear, but at some point a wall was built across the corridor that separates the two enclosures, connecting them to one another. Ceramic evidence, including a C-ware bowl and an imported vessel from Maadi, suggest a date not later than Naqada IIAB for Structure E8.

In light of the modification of Structure E8 to house the elephant burial, it may be asked whether Tomb 23 is a later addition into a pre-existing columned structure or whether it represents a form of burial architecture that combines the tomb with the ‘temple’. This is, of course, a question of some significance for the history of elite mortuary practices of the Predynastic and Early Dynastic period. Based on the available evidence from around Tomb 26, it appears that above-ground architecture was an intrinsic part of these elite burials from at least Naqada IIB and evidence from elsewhere in the cemetery seems to support the presence of superstructure from an even earlier date (see below). Whatever the case, the elaborated architectural fittings in the Tomb 23 complex suggest it is relatively late in the construction sequence of the ritual precinct.

Flanking the long sides of the large, somewhat irregular rectangular, burial chamber of Tomb 23 were the remains of eight squared wooden posts (20 x 20 cm), which would seem to demarcate a superstructure, c. 6.0 x 4.3m in dimensions, directly above the cavity. Six more posts of this type, arranged in two rows running north-south, were found to the east, suggesting an associated, possibly freestanding, structure or ‘offering chapel’ (for lack of a better term) had also been erected. This ‘chapel’ measures at least 2.4 x 4.0m. Surrounding these structures on all four sides was a post fence, which formed an enclosure 16 x 9m in maximum dimensions. Fragments of plaster with red and green pigment were found fallen from this fence on the west side. The enclosure was entered on northeast side. Entered indirectly, a line of additional posts on the west and south forced the visitor to turn eastward, toward the chapel where fragments of the near life-size human, limestone statue were recovered (Jaeschke 2004; Harrington 2004, cf. Saqqara mastaba 3505 with ‘temple’ and statues, Emery 1958: 6-13, pl. 27). A deposit to the east of the entrance included two flint figurines, a carved ivory cylinder and ritual pottery (Deposit A on fig. 3). The tomb was heavily plundered, but still contained a number of fine and unique items commensurate with the proposed status of the owner/s, including fragments of two ceramic masks of the type exclusive to this cemetery (see Figueiredo 2004; Fried-
The legs and feet of three bodies (all adults, one young female) were found in articulation in the northwest corner of the tomb, while scattered remains indicate a minimum of 12 individuals were present, although their contemporaneity to each other or the tomb's construction cannot be determined. Nevertheless, multiple interments are common in large and rich tombs at other sites (Davis 1983; Bard 1994: table 10; Midant-Reynes 2003:191-216), and appear to be the norm for many graves in the HK6 cemetery (see Table 2). Although not at issue for Tomb 23, it should be kept in mind that the interment of multiple bodies may affect the size of a tomb chamber without necessarily implying an increase in the status of its owners (cf. Tomb 18).

Between these buildings and the enclosing fence, a corridor 1.5-2m wide was maintained and kept relatively clean, except on the west, where a small subsidiary tomb (Tomb 25) was inserted, and possibly outfitted with a small superstructure of its own. Whether original to the tomb or adapted for it, the original appearance of the above-ground architecture of the Tomb 23 complex is difficult to determine. Without internal supports, the lateral span of 4.3m (max) over tomb cavity is large for roofing beams, but not impossible, suggesting a roofed structure, rather than, for example, a revetting wall for a mound (cf. Reisner 1936: 1-5, fig. 10). The material used to fill the space between the columns of the superstructure has left no trace, but, if present, apparently required no foundation trench to anchor it. Slats of coniferous wood found adhering to the posts of the so-called chapel suggest that the lower walls (at least) were composed of wood screening to which, one may propose, colourful mats were attached in the manner painted on Saqqara mastaba 3505, among others (Porta 1989: pl. 35-42; Emery 1958). Whether the preserved remains above Tomb 23 may be reconstructed as a prototype for the palace façade must remain a matter for discussion (Hendrickx 2001; Wignall 1998), but present an intriguing possibility.

To the north, Tomb 26 is of slightly later date than Tomb 23. Although smaller, it is still of substantial size (3.30 x 1.45m; depth: 1.07m). Significantly it was also equipped with a superstructure and enclosure wall, which was clearly built for it and cannot be part of a previously existing columned structure. Eight rounded posts flank the tomb chamber; three on each long side, and one at each short end, while a fence of smaller posts formed an enclosure, 8m long and at least 5m wide. A shallow trench running between the postholes on the north side may indicate a wall between them, but the deposits were very eroded by water flow. For further details see Friedman 2008.

The standard 4m wide corridor that runs between the Tomb 23 complex, Structure E8 Structure D9, Structure 07 and possibly Structure 08-1b suggests that all stood together at some point in time. Whether they were built sequentially, perhaps with every generation, or some at the same time remains to be determined. These structures appear to form the last phase of construction in this precinct. Large quantities of beer jars and bread pots datable to the early Third Dynasty (cf. Faltings 1998: Abb. 10a, 10-11; Abb. 9a, 6, 10-11, 16) found in a food preparation area on the southern side, overlaying the earlier Structure 08-4, suggest that at least some of the structures were still the object of veneration and ritual. When digging the ashy pits for heating the bread pots the builders were careful to respect the walls of both Structure E8 and Structure 07, indicating that both were still extant in some form almost a millennium after they were built.

Perhaps not inappropriately, many possible reconstructions of the architectural remains corry cultic associations mainly because the near contemporary depictions of architecture all appear to be concerned with religious structures (cf. Porta 1989; Wignall 1998). However, a large pillared hall found at Naqada South Town (sector ZWE) containing clay sealings (Fattovich et al. 2007: 50; DiMaria 2007: 74-75) and another at HK25...
at the edge of the cultivation, possibly associated with food production (Hikade 2008), indicate that this type of columned architecture was not restricted to ritual purposes, but also may have housed administrative activities (cf. royal palace reconstruction of Ricke 1944: pl. 4). Further excavation will also be required to determine whether similar structures occurred around other large elite tombs in the cemetery, but there are already numerous indications.

Located about 30m to the north of the Tomb 23 complex, Tomb 16, was investigated before the possibility of well-preserved above-ground architecture was realized. Adams (2002: 19-20, fig. 3; 2004: 40-42) described Tomb 16 as a brick-lined tomb of early Naqada III date, which she believed had been built within a specially constructed pit that had been dug through earlier graves. However, following her death, analysis of the large amounts of pottery found around this tomb (see Hendrickx 2008) indicates that the ‘construction pit’ is actually another large Naqada IIA tomb (Tomb 16A), approximately 4.3 x 2.6m in dimensions, into which the smaller brick-lined tomb (Tomb 16B) was inserted later. Although a number of posts were discovered in the vicinity, the hard desert crust was not systematically removed to reveal the full extent of the architectural traces. Nevertheless, the exposed features strongly suggest a superstructure or enclosure fence around the tomb as well as architectural elements of a large associated structure.9 The burial of an elephant (Tomb 14; Friedman 2004a), aurochs (Tomb 19) and presumably subsidiary humans (Tomb 17, 18) in the immediate vicinity also indicate a suite of features comparable to those around Tomb 23. A reinvestigation of this area is planned for the near future.

At the southern end of the cemetery, a line of ‘postmoulds’ along the west side of Tomb 2 suggests another large structure. An accurate plan of these posts cannot be located, but they are reported to have run for 6.5m to the north of the two large postholes called Feature 8 (Hoffman 1982: 54-5; Adams 2000: 26, pl. VIb, fig. 2b). Although, again, the surface crust was not systematically removed, the reported remains do not appear to align with Tomb 2, but suggest an earlier establishment in the vicinity that was obliterated when the later tomb was built. Recent discoveries in the cemetery also suggest that the date and association of Feature 1, the deposit of marine shells and ostrich eggshell to the north of Tomb 2, should be reviewed (Hoffman 1982: 54; Adams 2000: cat. nos. 4 and 50; Van Neer et al. 2004: 80). Posts found along the perimeter of this feature and a series of small postholes in the immediate area suggest the presence of a post fence/enclosure.

Thus, Feature 1 should probably be compared with the corner deposits found in the Naqada II Structures D9 and 07 rather than features of later tombs.10 Naqada I-IIA material disturbed by the later construction of the brick-lined Tombs 11 and 22 (Adams 2000; 2003) shows that a wide expanse of cemetery was in use in the early phase.11 As the ceramic assemblage from Tomb 16A appears to be slightly earlier than that from Tomb 23, one might suggest that the cemetery developed from north to south; however, plunder, continued usage with later burials inserted around the large tombs of earlier family members (?), and the documented predilection for multiple but not necessarily concurrent interments may have obscured the observable pattern significantly. Thus, while it is very tempt-

9. See Adams 2002: fig 3; context 15, the robber trench may instead be a foundation trench for a wall; contexts 22 and 18, Tombs 20, 21 and possibly Tomb 15, all of conical shape, may actually be large disturbed postholes.

10. Feature 1 was previously compared with the impressive number of shell objects deposited within the Naqada III, A-Group grave L17 at Qustul. The vast majority of this deposit was composed of shell ‘hooks’ derived from mollusc, which obviously had special significance at this site (Williams 1986: 117-118, 307; pls. 49-55). Although 52 marine shells were also recovered from the tomb, the parallel with Feature 1 is no longer as compelling as it once appeared (Adams 2000: 176).

11. The flint hippopotamus figurine found on the surface near Tomb 1 may also indicate early Naqada activity in the far north end of the cemetery (Adams 2000: cat. 83).
ing to propose a series of high status tombs progressing in an orderly fashion across the site and mirroring the (pre)dynastic succession of the early elite of Hierakonpolis, a great deal more excavation will be needed to confirm this.

By the standards of their time, the size and wealth of the early Naqada II tombs at HK6, even after serious and repeated disturbances, are impressive. They stand out in even greater relief when compared to the other contemporary cemeteries at Hierakonpolis.

On south side of the site, excavations at HK43 (see fig. 1 & 6) in 1996-2004 were concentrated in a contiguous area of 1860m² and revealed a minimum of 452 graves of Naqada IIAB date (Friedman et al. 1999; 2002; Dougherty & Friedman 2008). Dug into the loose sand at the edge of the Wadi Khamsini, the graves were rarely larger at their base than what was required to fit the flexed body on a layer of matting. Depth from the original surface was usually less than 1m. The full extent of the cemetery is not clear due to modern disturbance, but archaeological testing suggests that in the Naqada IIAB phase it measured c. 80m north-south and at least 100m east-west, but may also have incorporated HK44 and extended westward to HK45. If the grave density in the excavated area of 1 grave per 4.2m² was maintained throughout, this cemetery represents a major burial ground for the non-elite population of the time. In Naqada IIC, burials were places further to the north and west.

The graves appear to be arranged in a circular fashion, densely placed around empty central areas on which were recovered fragments of large domestic vessels of types not found in burials. These concentrations suggest that these central areas were reserved for funerary feasts and rituals, and may have been demarcated only by the pottery left behind. The graves themselves may well have been marked in a temporary fashion with a mound of sand or stones, though no indication remains. Given the close spacing, some marking must have been present, as there are relatively few cases where one burial overlies or cuts part of an earlier burial unintentionally.

Of the 452 burials only 202 still retained grave goods, usually one to three pots, in a limited range of types (B58c; P22ab, R91ab; R93a, R81c [see Quibell & Green 1902: pl. LXIX. 6-7]). The largest number of vessels recovered was 10 in Burial 450 and 8 in Burial 71, both intact tombs containing no other objects. Other notable burials were the intact Burial 333 with four pots, a palette and a basket full of objects including galena, stone amulets, incense, resin, etc (Friedman 2003), and Burial 412 with a fishtail flint knife still hafted to its handle (Friedman 2004b). Overall, grave goods were very limited: palettes were found in only five graves, evidence of copper items in four, beads in only two (both children). The score has no doubt been impoverished by extensive plundering as well as Green’s work here in 1899, during which he removed pots, palettes and heads (Adams 1974: 88-89; graves 104-107).

12. See Castillos 1997; 1998 for discussion of inequality and effort rankings. Previous publications have described the items of fine craftsmanship and precious or exotic materials found in association with many of the graves at HK6. Repeated disturbance has rendered the ceramic assemblage more difficult to determine; however, at least 115 vessels can be attributed to Tomb 16A (Hendrickx 2008), and over 40 to the tomb chamber of Tomb 23 alone. Lesser numbers were found in what may be considered subsidiary tombs: 17 vessels in Tomb 3; 12 in Tomb 6; 20 in Tomb 26. 13. The only grave in the contiguously excavated area of unquestionable Naqada IIC date was B209 (Friedman et al. 2002).

14. Little can be said about the cemetery at HK20A on the less densely populated north side of the site. Harlan observed a rhomboid palette there during surface survey in 1982. 15. A sherd from a straw tempered jar used as a lid for a bottle in the intact Burial 210 was found to join with sherds from a central surface cluster indicating that vessels or fragments thereof were present on the surface of the cemetery in predynastic times. 16. The intentional displacement of earlier burials is suggested by Burial 213, an intact grave which was placed immediately upon the lower matting of an earlier burial (B219), of which only one articulated foot remained (Hendrickx 2002). 17. Lansing also worked in this area according to his photographic archive in New York. He called the site Fossil Bone Hill (D. Patch, pers. comm.).
Nevertheless, Green’s notes indicate nothing at odds with our own discoveries in this phase of the cemetery and he quickly moved on to richer areas. Green’s tomb 104 was relocated when bones bearing this number were found in HK43 Burial 360-361 (Dougherty 2003). Green apparently made no map locating the graves he found while searching for another painted tomb, but according to his general site plan (Cambridge archive FG P/1/3), Tomb 100 (the Painted Tomb) is located over 700m to the north of his tomb 104. Thus, he may have first attempted to determine the parameters of the cemeteries in the area before returning to the vicinity of the Painted Tomb and later concentrated on the Naqada IIC tombs (cf. graves 500-620 in Adams 1974), which seem to have been located to the north of the silt ridge running E-W through HK43. Green’s tomb 500 (Quibell and Green 1902:pl. lxvii), on the basis of size and preserved wooden posts, can be equated with HK43 Burial 163 which is located on this ridge (Square H92). See Figure 6.

While different funerary rituals and beliefs may have played a part, the overall impression is one of relative poverty compared to contemporary cemeteries elsewhere, for example, at Naqada, where a separate cemetery for the elite had also been established from at least Naqada IIB (Bard 1994). This general lack of wealth suggests that those who might have benefited from the largesse of the elite may have been buried in subsidiary graves at HK6 or its satellites HK12-13. Alternatively, this so-called ‘middle class’ could potentially have been buried at HK11E, the cemetery associated with a large concentration of settlement and industrial remains at HK11 in the Wadi Abu Suffian. Located 2km from the cultivation’s edge, its atypical location has been attributed to its function as a service area dedicated to the preparation of grave goods and the maintenance of the cult in the elite cemetery at HK6 (Hoffman 1982: 129; Harlan 1992).

Unfortunately, the HK11E cemetery was already heavily plundered in Green’s time, but by counting craters, Hoffman (1982; 1987) proposed that it contained up to 300 circular graves and calculated a burial density of 1 grave per 9m². Whether the greater space around the graves in comparison to HK43 has significance is unknown. A non-systematic survey of the surviving pottery revealed straw tempered jars and red polished bowls similar to HK43. No marl wares were observed suggesting that, like the HK6 cemetery, it was abandoned in Naqada IIC.

The cemeteries of Naqada IIC-III

Despite efforts by Barbara Adams to locate Naqada IICD activity at HK6, none was found. Thus it was a great surprise when sherds of a W19 and B53 were found in the spoil from a small disturbed tomb immediately west of Structure E8 in 2008. While these finds indicate that the HK6 cemetery was not entirely abandoned in Naqada IIC, it is clear that activity was substantially curtailed when the locus of elite burial shifted to the far south, to the vicinity of the Painted Tomb. This transition may not
have been peaceful. There are clear indications that the superstructures of Tomb 23 and Tomb 26 and part of Structure D9 were burned in antiquity as charred matting still adheres to fence posts. In addition the limestone statue, which may have stood proud in the offering chapel, was not simply broken up, but was intentionally defaced with glancing blows; the core evidently hauled away for reuse.

In light of this evidence, one may speculate that the obvious impermanence of the above-ground architecture was the catalyst for moving various features underground in the Painted Tomb, with its separate chamber modeled on the ‘chapel’ and the painted fences transformed into painted mud-brick walls, decorated with scenes from the ceremonies proclaiming dominion over the human and animal world that were previously undertaken in the elaborate wadi complexes.

Whether the Painted Tomb had a superstructure or not is unknown19 and will unfortunately remain so since its location is now buried beneath modern habitation.20 With about the same volume as Tomb 23, the dimensions of the Painted Tomb (exterior: 5.85 x 2.85m; interior: 5.1-4.7 x 9-2.24 x 1.4m) make it the largest known tomb of the Naqada IIC period.21 Its size combined with the evocative royal themes painted on its walls (int. al. Cialowicz 2001; Hendrickx 1998) suggest that its ‘royal’ status (Kaiser 1958; Payne 1973, Kemp 1973) should not be doubted; however its location may indicate a change in the nature of rule (cf. Campagno 2002).

In light of the new information from HK6, this movement of elite burials to the edge of the flood plain in Naqada IIC may reflect something more significant than simply a change in settlement location (though this and the social upheavals it must have wrought are not insignificant). If not simply an attempt to create distance from the old regime, the more exposed position, at the edge of the floodplain, chosen by the owner of the Painted Tomb seems to signal a change in funerary rites, from those undertaken before the a select crowd in a remote desert wadi to a more public and inclusive display, of a type perhaps eventually leading up to the Dynasty 1 mud brick funerary palaces, or Talbezirken.

Whatever the reason for the move, success in this new location seems limited. Although a cemetery map is lacking, the Painted Tomb appears to be part of a newly founded elite cemetery isolated on the far southeast of the site and accompanied by only a small number of well endowed, but rather small tombs.22 Although earlier researchers considered all of the tombs excavated by Green as part of this cemetery, recent work suggests that the majority of the graves he investigated are actually located over 500m away in HK43-45 (see note 18).

Archaeological testing of the sterile area intervening between the two cemetery areas shows that they are not connected. Located over 300m away, the cemetery at HK33 does not seem to have contained tombs of size or wealth worthy of men-

---

19. Kemp (1973: 37) opined that Green would have noticed indications of superstructure had there been any during his excavations, but this depends on whether he was looking and would have recognized the remnants when he found them.

20. Green triangulated the location of the Painted Tomb from the 'dune', a tall conical mound, at the edge of the Wadi Khamsini, which still exists and holds one of the survey monuments of the current expedition. As a result, the tomb's original location can be fixed with some accuracy; see also Kaiser 1961: fig 2, nos 8-9.

21. Comparable graves include Naqada T5, measuring (interior) 3.99 x 2.84m; and T23 of Naqada IICD date, measuring 5.46 x 1.52m (containing 7 bodies). The architecturally similar brick lined T15 (4.8 x 2.8m) and T20 (estimated at c.5 x 2m) appear to be of later date (cf. Kemp 1973). Tombs over 3.0m in length do not appear to be present in the U cemetery at Abydos until Naqada IID, e.g., Tombs U-127 (4.5 x 1.8 x 1.75m), U-133 (4.2 x 1.9 x 2.5m), U-210 (4.7 x 1.9 x 2.2m). See Kaiser and Dreyer 1982: 242-45, abb. 2; Dreyer et al. 1996.

22. The associated graves presumably include Green’s Tombs 101, 102, and 103, size unstated, and perhaps 153 (2.2 x 1.6m), 154 (brick lined, 2 x 1.1m), 166 (1.4 x 1.0m), and 167-172 (see Adams 1972: 86-93). No notes survive to further describe the two-room tomb mentioned in Quibell & Green 1902: 22.
tion (Quibell & Green 1902: 26). While HK33 could be a satellite of the Painted Tomb cemetery, it could also be a continuation of the HK43-45 cemetery as it expanded along the edge of the diminishing settlement at HK54, or even a new foundation, potentially associated with the long-lived cultic and administrative area at HK29A-34. As a new foundation, it would then parallel the inception of HK27, the better known Fort Cemetery, on the north side of the Wadi Abu Sufian. Excavations by Garstang (1907; Adams 1987) and Lansing (1935) show that this non-elite cemetery began in Naqada IIC with relatively modest tombs at the edge of the wadi, and with time progressed west and northward (Wilkinson 1996). The HK27 cemetery does not appear to be related to HK20A, which at this time had shifted to HK22C-HK21, and later moved onto HK22A and B, mounds overlooking the floodplain (Harlan 1985: 86-87). With as many as five cemeteries possibly in use during the Naqada IIC period, this may be evidence for the transitional or unsettled nature of society at this formative time. Yet, by the beginning of Naqada III, non-elite burial activity appears concentrated on the north side of the site (HK27, HK22AB, HK68?), perhaps reflecting the increased nucleation of the population in the floodplain town and/or greater control of funerary activities, if not a decline in population. Only the small cluster of Naqada III/Dynasty 1 graves at HK30G attests to activity on the southern side of the site (see table 1). The whereabouts of elite cemetery of the Naqada IID period is unknown. At this significant time in state formation, it is very unfortunate that this data is missing, leaving us in the dark regarding the factors leading to and the repercussions of the rise of the Abydos elite. Although the evidence is still limited, when the elite return to HK6 for burial in early Naqada III, it appears to be under much diminished circumstances compared to their contemporaries at Abydos (see Dreyer 1998: abb. 11). It is now clear that the location of these tombs at HK6 was not by chance, but governed by a conscious decision to place their brick-lined tombs above, within or beside the large graves of the earlier elite, reflecting a desire to be closely associated with their distant ancestors and potentially revive past glories. The two early Naqada III Tombs 16B and 22 at HK6 suggest relatively small beginnings, perhaps limited in means or confined by the size of the earlier graves they chose to reuse. The question of superstructure for these tombs remains open pending further investigations; nevertheless, a new or repaired structure to mark them seems likely, especially in light of the traces of wood post architecture found beside an early Naqada III brick-lined tomb at HK27 (Friedman 1999: 16).

23. See Hendrickx 1990 for corrections to relative dates in Adams 1987. The anomalous grave 59 is probably not a grave, but rather a remnant of early Naqada II settlement activity in the area prior to its use as a cemetery.
24. HK21, 22A, 22B, and part of HK22C were identified as late Naqada II-III grave clusters by Harlan (1982 survey notes). Separated by the modern Muslim cemetery, they may originally have formed a continuous cemetery associated with the settlement area at HK22, or more likely settlements located in what is now the cultivated zone. HK22A was described as a roughly oval mound of sand, about 20m in diameter, containing human bone and marl pottery. HK22B, located on a silt terrace over 2m above the cultivation, was estimated to be 60m in diameter in 1982, but in the process of being chopped away, and it has since disappeared. Human bones and possibly up to 20 rectangular depressions of various size (1.5x2m to c.3x3m), believed to be tombs, were observed, and may be equated with the brick-lined graves mentioned by Quibell (Quibell and Green 1902: 25). HK21, also on a mound, contained looted tombs of Naqada III date. There is no clear indication of a connection with HK27 as a substantial area between them seems devoid of artefacts or evidence of plundered tombs, although the area is very denuded.
25. A sherd incised with the numeral ‘103’ was found within the tomb when it was re-excavated in 1999. Tomb 103 was the richest burial found by Lansing (1935), but there is some question whether the marked sherd identifies the actual tomb or just the skull cached within it for a further study that was never undertaken (D. Patch, pers. comm.).
By Naqada IIIA2-B, more ambitious tombs were being designed (Tombs 11, 10, 1; fig. 7 & 8). Although far out-ranked by Tomb U-j, the Hierakonpolis tombs match or exceed the size of the elite single chambered and many multi-chambered tombs at Abydos cemetery U (Dreyer et al. 1996; see also Adams 2000: 176 for further points of comparison). They are amongst the largest tombs of their time period outside of Abydos. Although brick lined, they continued to use wood for the superstructure, which while clearly modeled on the earlier Naqada II prototypes, had been tailored to the needs of their time.

Stout posts to support the superstructure are present around all three tombs,26 but clear indications occur only along the short side of the tomb cavity; large post along the long sides may have been positioned above

---

26. There is also evidence for wood-built superstructure of the recently discovered Tomb 30, but the exact date and configuration of this tomb has not yet been determined.
the thick brick linings and can no longer be traced (Adams 2000: 26-32). Surrounding the superstructure was a post fence. Compared to the layout at Tomb 23, the corridor or open space between the fence and superstructure on the north, south and west is now much diminished. A distance of only 1m separates the fence and tomb superstructure of Tombs 1 and 11, with less than 50cm around Tomb 10, if the preserved posts are not part of the superstructure itself. On the east side is the enclosed area larger, suggesting that, as at Tomb 23, a ritual/offering area was located here. On the east side of Tomb 1, the larger posts placed along the interior face of the east side fence suggest a roofed structure about 1m wide (fig. 7 & 8), while a space of 2.5m is reserved to the east of Tomb 11, which may also have contained a ‘chapel’ (see Adams 1996: fig. 6). Although the space available for ritual activity around these tombs seems somewhat restricted, there is little evidence that the ritual precinct near Tomb 23 was in use at this time. Thus, tomb and ‘temple’ may have been combined at this time, if ritual activities did not take place elsewhere around the site.

27. Unlike the Naqada II structures, the wall posts were not placed within deep foundation trenches, and around Tomb 11 they were only pounded into the mounded soil. Thus the effort involved in the construction was far less and there seems to be less concern with long-term survival. As a result, the traces and trajectory of the architecture is less easily detected.

28. Wignall (1998) has suggested that the ceremonial center at HK29A served this purpose.
Whatever the case, the size and residual wealth in the tombs and temples across the site indicate continued access to prestigious goods, respect for the historical traditions of Hierakonpolis and toleration if not veneration of its seemingly regional peculiarities at a time when the center was clearly based at Abydos. The relationship between the two sites is still a matter of discussion (Hendrickx & Friedman 2003; Castillos 2006), but the privileged position of Hierakonpolis and its patron deities does not suggest hostility. We can no longer credit the suggestion of Hoffman (1983) that the brick lined tombs with their wood-built surroundings on the northern side of the cemetery reflected the swamps of the Delta while the rock-cut Tomb 2 with its side chamber was a Nubian styled cenotaph at the southern end of the cemetery. Nevertheless, it is worth noting the southern regional architectural tradition Tomb 2 represents. Tombs with side chambers were common in the Nubian A-Group and parallels for Tomb 2 can be found in the large and rich tombs at Qustul (Williams 1986; Adams 1996:53-54), as well as across the river at Elkab (Hendrickx 1994). Given its location, from the beginning Hierakonpolis must have looked southward for its powerbase, sphere of influence and trade relations (Hendrickx & Friedman 2003; Takamiya 2004). The southern variant of the Naqada culture, mixing Nubian and Egyptian traditions recently identified spanning the region from Armant to Metardul (c.75km south of Aswan) no doubt found its centre at Hierakonpolis (Gatto 2006).

Concluding Remarks

It is unfortunate that earlier work in the Hierakonpolis cemeteries was so poorly recorded. As a result, much of the history of the site and its early mortuary practices must remain speculative. Nevertheless, new discoveries are beginning to fill in the gaps. Recent work at HK6 is providing new evidence for funerary activities and rituals housed in the previously unsuspected architectural form of a hypostyle hall. This work is also supplying new information on the complex history of tomb and ‘temple’ separation and integration. Whether Tomb 23 is exemplary of tomb superstructure in the early Naqada II period, or an opportunistic use of previously existing architecture remains to be determined; nevertheless, with a volume of over 20 cubic meters, the size of its burial chamber alone ranks it as the largest of its time. Whether similar architecture existed at other sites and was either not preserved or never sought is unknown, but there can be little doubt of the status of the man or the family interred in Tomb 23 and its implication for the history of Hierakonpolis and Upper Egypt in the early Naqada II period. The size, effort and wealth of these early tombs indicate that Hierakonpolis was the premier seat of a regional power from at least Naqada IIAB and continued to be so into the Naqada IIC period. While the Naqada IID period remains a blank, the renewal of elite burial activity at HK6 in the Naqada IIIAB period suggests that an agreement was reached with Abydos that allowed the site and its elite to prosper in a way that those at Naqada apparently did not. The reason for this arrangement may not have been based solely on Hierakonpolis’ strategic position vis-à-vis Nubia or a question of military might, but may also have been reached in recognition of the site’s already hoary and glorious past, memories of which, if somewhat dimmed by the passage of time, continued to reverberate throughout Egyptian history.
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