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This issue of the *Journal of Oromo Studies* (JOS) brings to its readers articles dealing with two key issues that lie at the heart of the Oromo Studies Association’s (OSA) mission. As the Association’s main publication, JOS is committed to enlightening readers about the Oromo people’s struggle for self-determination and disseminating new research findings on the Oromo. The articles in this issue directly contribute to these twin goals: three articles are designed to help Oromo nationalists take practical steps toward their political objective; the remaining three advance the goal of stimulating intellectually rigorous research and disseminating the results.

The first article, “Meroitic/Oromo Ethiopian Continuity: Call for a Research Project,” deals with, among other things, the development of Meroitic studies, the destruction of Meroitic civilization, the collapse of the state, and the dispersal and migration of remnants of the Meroitic people in the direction of the Blue Nile. Muhammed Shamsaddin Megalommati posits a remarkable hypothesis that these migrants might be the ancestors of the modern Cushitic language.
speaking Oromo nation. This dramatic suggestion, running contrary to the accepted wisdom about the origins of the Oromo, does not contend that the issue of Meroitic ancestry of the Oromo nation is an established fact. It merely underscores that the issue has never been seriously considered and studied. The main objective of this article is thus to call on Meroitic and Oromo scholars to collaborate in investigating the possible Meroitic ancestry of the Oromo nation. This is a call that needs to be heeded not for the compelling evidence that has been unearthed, but because of the impeccable scholarly pedigree of the scholar making the call. Megalommatidis is fluent in Greek, Turkish, English, French, German, Russian and Spanish; competent in reading hieroglyphics, Assyrian, Cuneiform, Ancient and Medieval Greek and Latin; and versed in Phoenician, Ancient Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac. He has what it takes to propose a new research agenda and lead the effort.

In “US Support for Democratization in Ethiopia,” David Shinn assesses US support for democratization in Ethiopia. Fifteen years after Ethiopia embarked on a path of democratization, the process has not produced measurable progress in Ethiopia’s journey toward becoming a functioning democratic society. Shinn notes that the ruling party’s declared new political philosophy of revolutionary democracy appears to be a throwback to TPLF’s old days when it espoused Albanian Marxism as the ideological foundation of its policies. In fact, the elections of 15 May 2005 and the government’s behavior in the following weeks did more to confirm the skeptics’ suspicion than allay fears about the government’s commitment to democracy. Pointing to US assistance on diplomatic and development tracks, Shinn argues that the lack of progress is not because of the US’s failure to pressure the government to move in a more democratic direction, but instead is largely due to the absence of democratic awareness and experience in a country that for two millennia knew only autocratic governments.
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The US realizes that it takes quite a while for a Jeffersonian democracy to take root, much less function smoothly. For that reason, says Shinn, the US remains a critical supporter of the process of democratization in Ethiopia.

Focusing on internal dynamics, the third article, "The Oromo and the Coalition for Unity and Democracy," looks into the sputtering democratization process in Ethiopia. The author, Siegfried Pausewang, grapples with the irony of expecting democratization from political actors who are unlikely to benefit from democratic processes. The election of May 2005 revealed that neither the government nor the main opposition party represented the interest of the single most important majority group among Ethiopia's population, the rural farmers. The EPRDF was given the chance to try its hands at democratization. The evidence is in; it has failed in its mission. The main opposition, the Coalition for Unity and Democracy (CUD), is essentially out of touch with the prevailing Ethiopian reality. It represents the interest of the urban Amhara elite and is utterly incapable of comprehending why the rural populace, the ethnic groups in the southern regions, and Muslim Ethiopians cannot be attracted to its political program.

Pausewang ponders whether the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF), the political 'elephant in the room' that every actor on the Ethiopian political scene wishes were not there, can help play a constructive role in helping move the process forward. Thus far, although it enjoys the support and good will of the Oromo people, the OLF has been a passive spectator of the political process in Ethiopia. Pausewang considers the OLF a political party that can bring in the missing element, the rural dimension, to the urban-dominated politics in Addis Ababa and makes a compelling case that it should no longer cede the field to the CUD to speak for all Ethiopians. As an organization claiming to represent the interests of the largest of the ethnic groups in the south and those of large segments of Muslims and Christians, the OLF can do more good for its
constituents by working within the Ethiopian political process than watching it from the sidelines.

If the OLF were ever to enter into the political process as Pausewang suggests, however, Oromo political organizations must first address the almost intractable problem of organizational disarray and ideological confusion within the Oromo community. This is the theme of the fourth article, "Oromo National Political Leadership: Assessing the Past and Mapping the Future." The authors, Asafa Jalata and Harwood Schaffer, begin by identifying the issues that have thus far militated against the development of an Oromo national political leadership that can be entrusted with the task of leading the Oromo people to the "promised land" of self determination. They argue that the Oromo liberation struggle has been weakened by political fragmentation within the Oromo community, an elite leadership that is unplugged from democratic feedback links to the broader community and the absence of opportunities for a new generation of leaders to develop and hone their leadership skills. In a skillfully constructed essay, grounded in leadership theories and informed by historical and contemporary Oromo leadership styles, the authors contend that, for Oromo nationalism to achieve its long-sought objectives, the Oromo people and Oromo political leaders need to fulfill three imperatives: first, enhance organizational capacity based on the concepts embedded in Oromummaa to unleash the power of Oromo individuals and develop a uniting force for liberation and justice; second, Oromo leadership must eliminate the vestiges of the destructive Abyssinian cultural, ideological, and political behaviors and replace them with strong organizations, visions, and strategies that will unleash the potential of an Oromo society based on Oromummaa; third, Oromo political leadership must develop in themselves and in their followers personal leadership skills such as self-discipline, ability to communicate, and a deep sense of social obligation or commitment to the Oromo cause. An interesting argument
that Jalata and Schaffer advance is their contention that the
task of liberating the Oromo individual and building an effective
and strong political leadership is a shared responsibility
of both leaders and followers.

Returning to the theme of disseminating new research
evident in the first article, this issue of JOS introduces a special
feature that hopefully will continue to appear for some

time. Oromo scholars have long known that there is no dearth
of information to document that the Oromo were a self-govern­
ing people with a complex social organization and a rich
history and culture. Numerous European traveler accounts
have represented the Oromo in a positive light, describing the
people as dignified and admiring their sophisticated political,
economic, and religious institutions. The existence of such
sources did not matter so long as Ethiopianists were bent on
demeaning the Oromo in their writings and the sources re­
mained inaccessible to young Oromo scholars. The problem
of inaccessibility, either due to unavailability of the documents
or lack of language facility, will not be as daunting as it once
was, thanks to Ayalew Kanno’s willingness to put his linguist­
ic acumen to the service of future generations of Oromo schol­
ars.

In this issue, we have featured the English rendition of
Antoine d’Abbadie’s “On the Oromo: A Great African Na­
tion,” a speech he delivered at the General Assembly of the
Institute of France on 5 April 1880. This is a critical docu­
ment for Oromo history. It was published at a time when the
overwhelming majority of the Oromo were a sovereign people
who lived in freedom and independence as masters of their
own destiny and makers of their own history. Antoine
d’Abbadie delivered his speech at the same time Menelik’s
forces were pouring into Oromia bringing to an end the Oromo
people’s sovereign existence. The Oromo lost their indepen­
dence, in part, because they were divided as they faced Menelik’s
marauding forces. A few decades before, d’Abbadie had penned
that nothing would have stood in the way of the Oromo had they not been divided and fighting among themselves. It did not take too long before his prophetic words became a reality. The speech could not have been translated and published at a better time, for his words are as relevant today as they were a little over a century ago.

Translating the now antiquated expressions and quaint concepts of a speech delivered in French in 1880 into modern English is a tall order. Some vocabularies, such as “tribe,” then did not carry the same pejorative connotations they do now. Kanno has chosen to translate literally out of loyalty to the intent and emotions of the original author. Despite such difficulties, he has presented an extremely readable English rendition. JOS readers and scholars of the Oromo will remain indebted to Ayalew Kanno for making available d’Abbadie’s dispassionate observation of a critically important period in Oromo history.

In the last piece, Mohammed Hassen evaluates Antoine d’Abbadie’s contribution to Oromo studies. He points out that d’Abbadie’s article of 1880 constitutes a departure in correcting the many misconceptions in nineteenth century European representations of the Oromo. He compares the Oromo democratic institutions with European ones and, surprisingly, finds the latter to be deficient. The most far-reaching contribution of d’Abbadie to Oromo studies is his inspiring influence on a generation of European scholars. Mohammed Hassen makes it clear that scholars of the Oromo, including himself, have benefited from d’Abbadie works in reconstructing Oromo history. But d’Abbadie was such an avid collector of ethnographic data and a prolific writer that it will take future Oromo scholars many years to comb through his vast treasure of published and soon-to-be published source materials.

Ezekiel Gebissa, Editor
Kettering University
MEROITIC/OROMO ETHIOPIAN CONTINUITY:
CALL FOR A RESEARCH PROJECT

Muhammad Shamsaddin Megalommatis

Despite the plausibility of identifying the modern Oromo nation as descendants of the ancient Meroitic Ethiopians, the issue of Meroitic ancestry of the Oromo nation has not been studied at all, let alone published in an academic journal or scholarly books. The purpose of this article is to offer a general diagram of the historical reconstruction effort that has to be undertaken, to identify the basic arguments on which this reconstruction can rely, and to call on scholars in the field to undertake an interdisciplinary research project on the issue of historical continuity between modern Oromos and ancient Meroitic Ethiopians.

Corollary to establishing a direct Ethiopian continuity is the fundamental argument that Oromos are the genuine Ethiopia...
pians rather than the modern Amhara-Tigrayan or Abyssinians of the present country of Abyssinia that is inaccurately named ‘Ethiopia.’ The article discusses the development of Meroitic studies, the Meroitic civilization, the destruction of the city of Meroe, the dispersal of the Meroitic people after the collapse of their state, the Christianization of the post Meroitic states, the migration of the remnants of the Meroitic people in the direction of the Blue Nile and their possible relation of ancestry with the modern Cushitic language speaking Oromo nation

**MEROITIC STUDIES, THE HISTORY OF KUSH AND MEROE, AND DECIPHERING MEROITIC TEXTS**

Interest in what was Ethiopia for the Ancient Greeks and Romans, which is the Northern territory of present day Sudan from Khartoum to the Egyptian border,\(^1\) led to the gradual development of the modern discipline of the Humanities that long stood in the shadow of Egyptology: Meroitic Studies.

Considerable advances have been made in academic research and knowledge as the result of the exploratory trips of the Prussian pioneering Egyptologist Richard Lepsius\(^2\) (1842-1844) that bestowed upon modern scholarship the voluminous ‘Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien’ (Monuments from Egypt and Ethiopia), and the series of excavations by E. A. Wallis Budge\(^3\) and John Garstang\(^4\) at Meroe (modern Bagrawiyah) in the first years of the twentieth century; Francis Llewellyn Griffith\(^5\) at Kawa (ancient Gematon, near modern Dongola, 1929-1931); Fritz Hintze\(^6\) at Musawwarat es Sufra; Jean Leclant\(^7\) at Sulb (Soleb), Sadinga (Sedeinga), and Djebel Barkal (ancient Napata, modern Karima) in the 1950s and the 1960s; D. Wildung\(^8\) at Naqah; and Charles Bonnet at Kerma. The pertinent explorations and contributions of scholars like A. J. Arkell,\(^9\) P. L. Shinnie,\(^10\) and Laszlo Torok\(^11\) that cover a
span of 80 years reconstituted a large part of the greatness and splendor of this four-millennium long African civilization.

Yet, due to the lack of direct access to original sources and genuine understanding of the ancient history of Sudan, the legendary Ethiopia of the Greeks and Romans, which also corresponds to what was ‘Kush’ of the Hebrews Bible and ultimately ‘Kas’ of the ancient Egyptians,12 we face a serious problem of terminology. We are confined to such terms as Period (or Group) A (3100-2700 BCE),13 Period B14 (2700-2300 BCE that starts with Pharaoh Snefru’s expedition,15 and the beginning of time-honored enmity between Egypt and Kush), Period C16 (2300-2100 BCE, when we have no idea to what specific ethnic or state structures the various Egyptian names Wawat, Irtet, Setjiu, Yam, Zetjau, and Medjay refer),17 Period Kerma18 (2100-1500 BCE, named after the modern city and archeological site, 500 km south of the present Sudanese-Egyptian border). What we know for sure is that, when the first Pharaohs of the New Empire (approx. 1550-1150 BCE) invaded and colonized the entire area down to KurguS19 (more than 1000 km alongside the Nile to the south of the present Sudanese-Egyptian border), they established two top Egyptian administrative positions, namely ‘Viceroy of Wawat’ and ‘Viceroy of Kush/Kas.’ Wawat is the area between Aswan and Abu Simbel or properly speaking, the area between the first and the second cataracts whereas Kas is all the land that lies beyond. With the collapse of the Kerma culture comes the end of the first high-level culture and state in the area of Kush.

We employ the term ‘Kushitic Period’20 to refer to the subsequent period: a) the Egyptian annexation (1500-950 BCE) that was followed by a permanent effort to Egyptianize Kush and the ceaseless Kushitic revolutions against the Pharaohs; b) the Kushitic independence (950-800 BCE, when a site is formed around Napata,21 present day Karima, 750 km south of the Sudanese-Egyptian border); c) the Kushitic expansion
and involvement in Egypt (800-670 BCE, which corresponds mostly to the XXVth—'Ethiopian' according to Manetho—dynasty of Egypt, when the Theban clergy of Amun made an alliance with the Kushitic 'Qore'—Kings of Napata, who had two capitals, Napata and Thebes; and d) the Kushitic expulsion from Egypt (following the three successive invasions of Egypt by Emperors Assarhaddon in 671 BCE, and Assurbanipal in 669 and 666 BCE, and of Assyria, who made an alliance with the Heliopolitan priesthood and Libyan princes against the Theban clergy and the Kushitic kings), and gradual decline (following the invasions by Psamtkik/Psammetichus II in 591 BCE, and the Achaemenian Persian Shah Kambudjiyah/Cambyses in 525 BCE) until the transfer of the capital far in the south at Meroe, at the area of present day Bagrawiyah (at the end of the reign of Qore Nstasen between 335 and 315 BCE).

We call 'Meroitic' the entire period that covers almost 700 years beginning around 260 BCE with the reign of the successors of Nastasen (Arkamaniqo/Ergamenes, the most illustrious among the earliest ones and the first to be buried at Meroe/Bagrawiyah), down to the end of Meroe and the destruction of the Meroitic royal cities by the Axumite Abyssinian Negus Ezana (370 CE). It is easily understood that 'Kushitic' antedates 'Meroitic,' but the appellations are quite conventional.

The Ancient people of Kush (or Ethiopia) entered into a period of cultural and scriptural radiation and authenticity relatively late, around the third century BCE, which means that the development took place when Meroe replaced Napata as capital of the Kushites/Meroites. Before that moment, they used Egyptian hieroglyphic scripture for all purposes of writing, administrative, economic, religious and/or royal. The introduction of the Meroitic alphabetic hieroglyphic writing spearheaded the development of a Meroitic cursive alphabetic scripture that was used for less magnificent purposes than pa-
Meroitic/Oromo Ethiopian Continuity

lateral and sacred relief inscriptions. The first person to publish Meroitic inscriptions was the French architect Gau, who visited Northern Sudan in 1819. Quite unfortunately, almost two centuries after this discovery, we risk being left in mysteries with regard to the contents of the epigraphic evidence collected in both scriptural systems.

The earliest dated Meroitic hieroglyphic inscriptions belong to the reign of the ruling queen Shanakdakheto (about 177-155 BCE), but archaeologists believe that this scripture represents the later phase of a language spoken by Kushites/Meroites at least as far back as 750 BCE and possibly many centuries before that (hinting at a Kushitic continuity from the earliest Kerma days). The earliest examples of Meroitic cursive inscriptions, recently found by Charles Bonnet in Dukki Gel (REM 1377-78), can be dated from the early second century BCE. The latest text is still probably the famous inscription from Kalabsha mentioning King Kharamadoye (REM 0094) and dating from the beginning of the fifth century AD, although some funeral texts from Ballana could be contemporary, if not later.

Despite the fact that F. L. Griffith had identified the 23 Meroitic alphabetic scripture’s signs already in 1909, not much progress has been made towards an ultimate decipherment of the Meroitic. Scarcity of epigraphic evidence plays a certain role in this regard, since as late as the year 2000 we were not able to accumulate more than 1278 texts. If we now add to that the lack of lengthy texts, the lack of any bilingual text (not necessarily Egyptian/Meroitic, it could be Ancient Greek/Meroitic if we take into consideration that Arkamaniqo/Ergamenes was well versed in Greek), and a certain lack of academic vision, we understand why the state of our knowledge about the history of the Meroites is still so limited.

Linguistics and parallels from other languages have been repeatedly set in motion in order to help the academic research. Griffith and Haycock tried to read Meroitic using (modern)
Nubian. K.H. Priese\textsuperscript{41} tried to read the Meroitic text using Eastern Sudanese (Beja\textsuperscript{42} or Hadendawa\textsuperscript{43}); and F. Hintze,\textsuperscript{44} attempted to compare Meroitic with the Ural-Altaic group. Recently Siegbert Hummel,\textsuperscript{45} compared the "known" Meroitic words to words in the Altaic family which he believed was a substrate language of Meroitic. At times, scholars (like Clyde Winters\textsuperscript{46}) were driven to farfetched interpretations, attempting to equate Meroitic with Tokharian, after assuming a possible relationship between the name Kush and the name Kushan\textsuperscript{47} of an Eastern Iranian state (of the late Arsacid,\textsuperscript{48} 250 BCE-224 CE, and early Sassanid,\textsuperscript{49} 224-651 CE, times). However, one must state that the bulk of the researchers working on the Meroitic language do not believe that it was a member of the Afro-Asiatic group.

So far, the only Meroitic words for which a solid translation has been given by Griffith and his successors are the following: man, woman, meat, bread, water, give, big, abundant, good, sister, brother, wife, mother, child, begotten, born, and feet. The eventual equivalence between Egyptian and Meroitic texts was a strong motivation for any interpretational approach, recent or not. More recent, but still dubious, suggestions are the following: arohe- «protect», hr- «eat», pwrite «life», yer «milk», ar «boy», are- or dm- «take, receive», dime «cow», hlbi «bull», ns(e) «sacrifice, sdk «journey», tke- «love, revere», we «dog». It is clear that vocalization remains a real problem.\textsuperscript{50}

Amidst numerous unclear points of the Kushitic/Meroitic history, the end of Meroe, and the consequences of this event remain a most controversial point among scholars. Quite indicatively, we may mention here the main efforts of historical reconstitution.

A. Arkell, Sayce and others asserted that Meroe was captured and destroyed, following one military expedition led by Ezana of Axum.

B. Reisner insisted that, after Ezana’s invasion and victory, Meroe remained a state with another dynasty tributary to Axum.

C. Monneret de Villard and Hintze asserted that Meroe was totally destroyed before Ezana’s invasion, due to an earlier Axumite Abyssinian raid.

D. Torok, Shinnie, Kirwan, Haegg and others concluded that Meroe was defeated by a predecessor of Ezana, and continued existing as a vassal state.

E. Bechhaus-Gerst specified that Meroe was invaded prior to Ezana’s raid, and that the Axumite invasion did not reach lands further in the north of Meroe.51

With two fragmentary inscriptions from Meroe, one from Axum, two graffitos from Kawa and Meroe, and one coin being all the evidence we have so far, we have little with which to reconstruct the details that led to the collapse of Meroe. One relevant source, the Inscription of Ezana (DAE 11, the ‘monotheistic’ inscription in vocalized Geez),52 remains a somewhat controversial historical source and is thus less useful in this regard. The legendary Monumentum Adulitanum,53 lost but copied in a confused way by Cosmas Indicopleustes,54 may not shed light at all on this event. One point is sure, however: a generalized massacre of the Meroitic inhabitants of the lands conquered by Ezana did not take place. The aforementioned
DAE 11 inscription mentions just 758 Meroites killed by the Axumite forces.

What is even more difficult to comprehend is the reason behind the paucity of population attested on Meroitic lands in the aftermath of Ezana's raid. The post-Meroitic and pre-Christian, transitional phase of Sudan's history is called X-Group or period, or Ballana Period and this is again due to the lack to historical insight. Contrary to what happened for many centuries of Meroitic history, when the Meroitic South (the area between Shendi and Atbara in modern Sudan with the entire hinterland of Butana that was called Insula Meroe/Nesos Meroe, i.e. Island Meroe in the Antiquity) was overpopulated, compared to the Meroitic North (from Napata/Karima to the area between Aswan and Abu Simbel, which was called Triakontaschoinos and was divided between Meroe and the Roman Empire), during the X-Group times, the previously under-populated area gives us the impression of a more densely peopled region, if compared to the previous center of Meroitic power and population density. The new situation contradicts earlier descriptions and narrations by Dio Cassius and Strabo.

Furthermore, the name 'Ballana period' is quite indicative in this regard, Ballana being on Egyptian soil, whereas not far in the south of the present Sudanese-Egyptian border lies Karanog with its famous tumuli that bear evidence of Nubian upper hand in terms of social anthropology. The southernmost counterpart of Karanog culture can be found in Tangassi (nearby Karima, which represented the 'North' for what was the center of earlier Meroitic power gravitation).

In addition, in terms of culture, X-Group heralds a total break with the Meroitic tradition, with the Nubians and the Blemmyes/Beja outnumbering the Meroitic remnants and imposing a completely different cultural and socio-anthropological milieu out of which would later emanate the first and single Nubian state in the world history: Nobatia.
Much confusion characterizes modern scholars when referring to Kush or Meroe by using the modern term ‘Nubia’. By now it is clear that the Nubians lived, since times immemorial, in both Egypt and the Sudan, being part of the history of these two lands. But Nubians are a Nilo-Saharan ethnic/linguistic group different from the Khamitic Kushites/Meroites. At the time of X-Group and during the long centuries of Christian Sudan, we have the opportunity to attest the differences and divergence between the Nubians and the Meroitic remnants. The epicenter of Nubian culture, the area between the first (Aswan) and the third (Kerma) cataracts, rose to independence and prominence first, with capital at Faras, near the present day Sudanese–Egyptian border, around 450 CE. Nobatia institutionalized Coptic as the religious (Christian) and administrative language, and the Nubian language remained an oral-only vehicle of communication. The Nobatian control in the south of the third cataract was vague, nominal and precarious. Nobatia was linked with the Coptic–Monophysitic Patriarchate of Alexandria.

The Meroitic remnants underscored their difference from the Nubians/Nobatians, and the depopulated central part of the defunct state of Meroe rose to independence in the first decades of the sixth century. Its name, Makkuria, is in this regard a linguistic resemblance of the name ‘Meroe’ but we know nothing more. The Meroitic remnants inhabited the northern circumference of Makkuria more densely, and the gravitation center turned around Old Dongola (580 km south of Wadi Halfa), capital of this Christian Orthodox state that extended from Kerma to Shendi (the area of the sixth cataract), more than 1000 km alongside the Nile but beyond the area of Karima (750 km in the south of Wadi Halfa) and the nearby famous Al Ghazali monastery we have very scarce evidence of Christian antiquities. The old African metropolis Meroe remained at the periphery of Makkuria, Alodia, and Axumite Abyssinia.
Makkurians highlighted their ideological-religious divergence from the Nubians by adopting Greek as their religious language. They even introduced a new scripture for their Makkurian language that seems to be a later phase of Meroitic Makkurian was written in alphabetic Greek signs, and the Makkurians preferred to attach themselves to Christian Orthodoxy, and more particularly to the Greek Patriarchate of Alexandria.

Alodia has long been called the 'third Christian state' in Sudan, but recent discoveries in Soba, its capital (15 km at the east of Khartoum), suggest that Alodia rose first to independence (around 500 CE) and later adhered to Christianity (around 580-600 CE) following evangelization efforts deployed by missionary Nobatian priests (possibly in a sort of anti-Makkurian religious diplomacy). We know nothing of Alodian scripture so far.

The later phases of the Christian history of Sudan encompass the Nobatian–Makkurian merger (around 1000 CE), the Islamization of Makkuria in 1317, and finally the late collapse of Christian Alodia in 1505. The question remains unanswered until today. What happened to the bulk of the Meroitic population, specifically the inhabitants of the Insula Meroe, the present day Butana? What happened to the Meroites living between the fourth and the sixth cataracts after the presumably brief raid of Ezana of Axum, and the subsequent destruction of Metoec, Mussawarat es Sufr, Naqah, Wad ben Naqah and Basa?

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE POST-MEROITIC HISTORY OF THE KUSHTIC OROMO-NATION

Certainly, the motives of Ezana’s raid have yet to be properly studied and assessed by modern scholarship. The reasons for the raid may vary from a simple nationalistic usurpation of the name of ‘Ethiopia’ (Kush), which would give Christian eschatological legitimacy to the Axumite Abys-
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Sinian kingdom, to the needs of international politics (at the end of 4th century) and the eventuality of an Iranian-Meroitic alliance at the times of Shapur II (310-379), aimed at outweighing the Roman-Abyssinian bond. Yet, this alliance could have been the later phase of a time honored Meroitic diplomatic tradition (diffusion of Mithraism as attested on the Jebel Qeili reliefs of Shorakor). What we can be sure of are the absence of a large-scale massacre, and the characteristic scarcity of population in the central Meroitic provinces during the period that follows Ezana's raid and the destruction of Meroe.

The only plausible explanation is that the scarcity of population in Meroe mainland after Meroe's destruction was due to the fact that the bulk of the Meroites (at least for the inhabitants of Meroe's southern provinces) fled and migrated to areas where they would remain independent from the Semitic Christian kingdom of Axumite Abyssinia. This explanation may sound quite fresh in approach, but it actually is not, since it constitutes the best utilization of the already existing historical data.

From archeological evidence, it becomes clear that during the X-Group phase and throughout the Makkurian period the former heartland of Meroe remained mostly uninhabited. The end of Meroe is definitely abrupt, and it is obvious that Meroe's driving force had gone elsewhere. The correct question would be “where to?”

There is no evidence of Meroites sailing down the Nile to the area of the 4th (Karima) and the 3rd (Kerma) cataracts, which was earlier the northern border of Meroe and remained untouched by Ezana. There is no textual evidence in Greek, Latin and/or Coptic to testify to such a migratory movement or to hint at an even more incredible direction, i.e. Christian Roman Egypt. If we add to this the impossibility of marching to the heartland of the invading Axumites (an act that would mean a new war), we reduce the options to relatively few.
The migrating Meroites could go either to the vast areas of the Eastern and the Western deserts or enter the African forest region or ultimately search a possibly free land that, being arable and good for pasture, would keep them far from the sphere of the Christian Axumites. It would be very erroneous to expect settled people to move to the desert. Such an eventuality would be a unique oxymoron in the history of mankind. Nomadic peoples move from the steppes, the savannas and the deserts to fertile lands, and they settle there, or cross long distances through steppes and deserts. However, settled people, if under pressure, move to other fertile lands that offer them the possibility of cultivation and pasture. When dispersed by the invading Sea Peoples, the Hittites moved from Anatolia to Northwestern Mesopotamia; they did not cross and stay in the small part of Anatolia that is desert. The few scholars who think that Meroitic continuity could be found among the present day Beja and Hadendawa are oblivious to the aforementioned reality of world history that has never been contravened. In addition, the Blemmyes were never friendly to the Meroites. Every now and then, they had attacked parts of the Nile valley and the Meroites had needed to repulse them. It would be rather inconceivable for the Meroitic population, after seeing Meroe sacked by Ezana, to move to a land where life would be difficult and enemies would await them.

Modern technologies help historians and archeologists reconstruct the ancient world; paleo-botanists, geologists, geochemists, paleoentomologists, and other specialized natural scientists are of great help in this regard. It is essential to stress here that the entire environmental milieu of Sudan was very different during the times of the Late Antiquity. Butana may look like a wasteland today, and the Pyramids of Bagrawiyah may be sunk in the sand, while Muzzawarat es Sufta and Naqah demand a real effort in crossing the desert. But in the first centuries of Christian era, the entire landscape was dramatically different.
The Butana was not a desert but a fertile cultivated land; we have actually found remains of reservoirs, aqueducts, various hydraulic installations, irrigation systems and canals in Meroe and elsewhere. Not far from Mussawarat es Sufra there must have been an enclosure where captive elephants were trained before being transported to Ptolemais Theron (present day Suakin, 50 km south of Port Sudan) and then further on to Alexandria. Desert was in the vicinity, certainly, but not that close.

We should not imagine that Ezana crossed desert areas, moving from the vicinities of Agordat, Tesseney and Kessala to Atbarah and Bagrawiyah, as we would do today. And we should not imagine the lands in the south of present day Khartoum, alongside the White Nile, were easy to cross in antiquity. In ancient times, impenetrable jungle started immediately in the south of Khartoum, and cities like Kosti and Jabalayn lie today on deforested soil. At the southernmost confines of the Meroitic state, pasturelands and arable land could be found alongside the Blue Nile Valley.

Since jungle signified death in the antiquity, and even armies feared to stay overnight in a forest or even more so in the thick African forest, we have good reason to believe that, following the Ezana’s raid, the Meroites, rejecting the perspective of forced Christening, migrated southwestwards up to Khartoum. From there, they proceeded southeastwards alongside the Blue Nile in a direction that would keep them safe and far from the Axumite Abyssinians whose state did not expand as far south as Gondar and Lake Tana. Proceeding in this way and crossing successively areas of modern cities, such as Wad Madani, Sennar, Damazin, and Asosa, and from there on, they expanded in later times over the various parts of Biyya Oromo.

We do not mean to imply that the migration was completed in the span of one generation; quite to the contrary, we have reasons to believe that the establishment of Alodia (or
Alwa) is due to progressive waves of Meroitic migrants who settled first in the area of Khartoum that was out of the westernmost confines of the Meroitic state. Once Christianization became a matter of concern for the evangelizing Nobatians and the two Christian Sudanese states were already strong, the chances of preserving the pre-Christian Meroitic cultural heritage in the area around Soba (capital of Alodia) were truly poor. Subsequently, another wave of migrations took place, with early Alodian Meroites proceeding as far in the south as Damazin and Asosa, areas that remained always beyond the southern border of Alodia (presumably around Sennar). Like this, the second migratory Meroitic wave may have entered around 600 CE in the area where the Oromos, descendents of the migrated Meroites, still live today.

A great number of changes at the cultural–behavioral levels are to be expected, when a settled people migrates to faraway lands. The Phoenicians had kings in Tyre, Byblos, and their other city-states, but introduced a democratic system when they sailed faraway and colonized various parts of the Mediterranean. The collapse of the Meroitic royalty was a shock for the Nile valley; the Christian kingdoms of Nobatia, Makkuria and Alodia were ruled by kings whose power was to a large extent counterbalanced by that of the Christian clergy. With the Meroitic royal family decimated by Ezana, it is quite possible that high priests of Apedemak and Amani (Amun) took much of the administrative responsibility in their hands, inciting people to migrate and establishing a form of collective and representative authority among the Meroitic Elders. They may even have preserved the royal title of Qore within a completely different socio-anthropological context.

Call for Comparative Meroitic-Oromo Studies
How can this approach, interpretation, and conclusion be corroborated up to the point of becoming a generally accepted historical reconstitution at the academic level? On
what axes should one group of researchers work to collect detailed documentation in support of the Meroitic ancestry of the Oromos?

Quite strangely, I would not give priority to the linguistic approach. The continuity of a language can prove many things and can prove nothing. The Bulgarians are of Uralo-Altaic Turco-Mongolian origin, but, after they settled in the Eastern Balkans, they were linguistically slavicized. Most of the Greeks are Albanians, Slavs, and Vlachians, who were hellenized linguistically. Most of the Turks in Turkey are Greeks and Anatolians, who were turkicized linguistically. A people can preserve its own language in various degrees and forms. For the case of languages preserved throughout millennia, we notice tremendous changes and differences. If you had picked up Plato and 'transferred' him to the times of Linear B (that was written in Mycenae 800 years before the Greek philosopher lived), you could be sure that Plato would not have understood the language of his ancestors with the exception of some words. Egyptian hieroglyphics was a scripture that favored archaism and linguistic puritanism. But we can be sure that for later Pharaohs, like Taharqa the Kushite (the most illustrious ruler of the 'Ethiopian' dynasty), Psamtik, Nechao, Ptolemy II and Cleopatra VII, a Pyramid text (that antedated them by 1700 to 2300 years) would almost be incomprehensible.

A. National diachronic continuity is better attested and more markedly noticed in terms of Culture, Religion, and a Philosophical–Behavioral system. The first circle of comparative research would encompass the world of the Kushitic–Meroitic and Oromo concepts, anything that relates to the Weltanschauung of the two cultural units/groups under study. A common view of basic themes of life and a common perception of the world would provide significant corroboration to the theory of Meroitic
ancestry of the Oromos. So, first it is a matter of history of religions, African philosophy, social anthropology, ethnography and culture history.

B. Archeological research can help tremendously as well. At this point one has to stress the reality that the critical area for the reconstruction suggested has been totally ignored by Egyptologists, as well as Meroitic and Axumite archeologists so far. The Blue Nile valley in Sudan and Abyssinia was never the subject of an archeological survey, and the same concerns the Oromo highlands. Certainly modern archeologists prefer something concrete that would lead them to a great discovery, being therefore very different from the pioneering nineteenth century archeologists. An archeological study would need to be conducted in the Blue Nile valley and the Oromo highlands in the years to come.

C. A linguistic-epigraphic approach may bring forth even more spectacular results. It could eventually end up with a complete decipherment of the Meroitic and the Makkurian. An effort must be made to read the Meroitic texts, hieroglyphic and cursive, with the help of Oromo language. Meroitic personal names and toponymies must be studied in the light of a potential Oromo interpretation. Comparative linguistics may unveil affinities that will lead to reconsideration of the work done so far in the Meroitic decipherment.

D. Last but not least, another dimension would be added to the project with the initiation of comparative anthropological studies. Data extracted from findings in the Meroitic cemeteries must be compared with data provided by the anthropological study of present day Oromos. The research must encompass pictorial documentation from the various Meroitic temples’ bas-reliefs. To all these I would add a better reassessment of the existing histori-
cal sources, but this is not a critical dimension of this research project.

I believe that if my call for Comparative Meroitic–Oromo Studies reached the correct audience (one that can truly evaluate the significance of the ultimate corroboration of the Meroitic ancestry of the Oromos, as well as the magnificent consequences thereto) such corroboration would have result in,

A. the forthcoming Kushitic Palingenesia—Renaissance if you want—in Africa,
B. the establishment of post-Colonial African Historiography, and, last but not least,
C. the question of the most genuine and authoritative representation of Africa in the United Nations Security Council.

Notes
1. To those having the slightest doubt, trying purely for political reasons and speculation to include territories of the modern state of Abyssinia into what they Ancient Greeks and Romans called “Aethiopia”, the entry Aethiopia in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyklopadie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft consists in the best and irrevocable answer.


Griffith was the epigraphist of Garstang and had already published the epigraphic evidence unearthed at Meroe in the chapter entitled 'the Inscriptions from Meroë' in Garstang's *Meroë, the City of Ethiopians.* After many pioneering researches and excavations in various parts of Egypt and Northern Sudan, Faras, Karanog, Napata and Philae to name a few, he concentrated on Kerma: 'Excavations at Kawa', *Sudan Notes and Records* 14


As regards my French professor's publications focused on his excavations at Sudan: Soleb and Sedeinga in *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* 5, Wiesbaden 1984 (entries contributed by J Leclant himself); also J Leclant, *Les reconnaissances archéologiques au Soudan*, in: *Études nubiennes* 1, 57-60.

His recent volume *Sudan: Ancient Kingdoms of the Nile* (Paris/New York1997), contains earlier bibliography Some of his most authoritative publications: 'A History of the Sudan from the Earliest Times to 1821', 1961 2nd Ed (London); "The Valley of the Nile", in: *The Dawn of African History*, R Oliver (ed), London Arkell is mostly renowned for his monumental 'The Royal Cemeteries of Kush' in many volumes


Many of his publications are listed here http://www.arkamani.org/bibliography%20_files/christian_nubia2.htm#S; also here: http://www.arkamani.org/bibliography%20_files/nubia_and_egypt4.htm#T. In the Eighth International Conference for Meroitic Studies, Torok spoke about 'The End of Meroe'; the speech will be included in the ar kamani online project, here: http://www.arkamani.org/arkamani-library/meroitic/end-of-meroe.htm.


Basic bibliography in: http://www.arkamani.org/bibliography%20_files/prehistory_a_b.htm; http://oi.uchicago.edu/OI/PROJ/NUB/NUBX92/NUBX92_brochure.html More particularly on Qustul, and the local Group A Cemetery that was discovered in the 60s by Dr. Keith Seele: http://www.homestead.com/wysinger/qustul.html (by Bruce Beyer Williams). Quite interesting approach by Clyde Winters as regards an eventual use of Egyptian Hieroglyphics in Group A Nubia, 200 years before the system was introduced in Egypt: http://www.geocities.com/Tokyo/Bay/7051/anwrite.htm
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20 In brief and with images: http://www.hp.uab.edu/image_archive/um/umj.html; also: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kush (with selected recent bibliography) and http://www.mfa.org/collections/search_art.asp?coll_package=26155 (for art visualization) The period is also called Napatan, out of the Kushitic state capital's name: http://www.homestead.com/wysinger/kingaspalta.html


22 Introductory reading: http://www.ancient-egypt.org/index.html (click on Manetho); http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manetho (with selected bibliography). Among the aforementioned, the entries Manethon (Realenzyklopaedie) and Manetho (Lexikon der Aegyptologie) are essential


26 Heliopolis (Iwnw in Egyptian Hieroglyphic — literally the place of the pillars —, On in Hebrew and in Septuaginta Greek) was the center of Egyptian monotheism, the holiest religious center throughout Ancient Egypt; it is from Heliopolis that emanated the Isiac ideology and the Atum Ennead. Basic readings: the entry Heliopolis in Realencyklopaedie and in Lexikon der Aegyptologie; more recently: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heliopolis_%28ancient%29


28 Hakhamaneshian is the first Persian dynasty; it got momentum when Cyrus II invaded successively Media and Babylon. Readings: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Achaemenid_dynasty (with selected bibliography); the 2nd volume of the Cambridge History of Iran is dedicated to Achaemenid history (contents: http://www.cambridge.org/uk/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=0521200911

29 Readings: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambyses_II_of_Persia (with bibliography and sources) Cambyses invaded Kush and destroyed Napata at the times of Amani-natake-lebte, and his embattled army was decimated according to the famous narratives of Herodotus that still need to be corroborated. What seems more plausible is that, having reached in an unfriendly milieu of the Saharan desert where they had no earlier experience, the Persians soldiers, at a distance of no less than 4000 km from their capital, faced guerilla undertaken by the Kushitic army remnants and their nomadic allies.

30 Nastasen was the last to be buried in Nuri, in the whereabouts of Napata. Contemporary with Alexander the Great, Nastasen fought against an invader originating from Egypt whose name was recorded as Kambasawden. This led many to confuse the invader with Cambyses, who ruled 200 years earlier (!) The small inscription on the Letti stela
Meroitic/Oromo Ethiopian Continuity

does not allow great speculation; was it an attempt of Alexander the Great to proceed to the south of which we never heard anything? Impossible to conclude For photographic documentation: http://www.dignubia.org/bookshelf/rulers.php?rul_id=00017&ord=

31 Arkamaniqo was the first to have his pyramid built at Meroe, not at Napata See: http://www.dignubia.org/bookshelf/rulers.php?rul_id=00018&ord=; http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ergamenes. He inaugurated the architectural works at Dakka, the famous ancient Egyptian Pa Serqet, known in Greek literature as Pselkhis (http://www.touregyptnet/featurestories/dakka.htm), in veneration of God Thot, an endeavor that brought the Ptolemies and the Meroites in alliance.

32 For Abyssinia’s conversion to Christianity: http://www.spiritualite2000.com/page.php?idpage=555, and http://www.rjliban.com/Saint-Frumentius.doc The Wikipedia entry (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ezana_of_Axum) is written by ignorant and chauvinist people, and is full of mistakes, ascribing provocatively and irrelevantly to Ezana the following territories (using modern names): “present-day Eritrea, northern Ethiopia, Yemen, southern Saudi Arabia, northern Somalia, Djibouti, northern Sudan, and southern Egypt”. All this shows how misleading this encyclopedia can be. Neither southern Egypt, northern Sudan, northern Somalia and Djibouti nor Yemen and southern Saudi Arabia ever belonged to Ezana’s small kingdom that extended from Adulis to Axum, and following the king’s victory over Meroe, it included modern Sudan’s territories between Kessala and Atbara. Nothing more!


The only inscription giving her name comes from Temple F in Naga (REM 0039A-B). The name appears in Meroitic hieroglyphics in the middle of an Egyptian text. See also: Laszlo Török, in: Fontes Historiae Nubiorum, Vol. II, Bergen 1996, 660-662. The first attempts to render full Meroitic phrases into hieroglyphs (not only personal names, as it was common earlier) can be dated from the turn of the 3rd / 2nd century BCE, but they reflect the earlier stage of the development.
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42. Readings: http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/beja.htm; http://bejacongress.com;


Readings: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sassanid_Empire (with further bibliography); authoritative presentation in Cambridge History of Iran.
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com/EarlyFathers-Other/www.tertullian.org/fathers/cosmas_00_0_eintro.htm

55 Readings: http://library.thinkquest.org/22845/kush/x-group_royalty.pdf


58 Syene (Aswan): see the entries of Realencyclopaedie and Lexikon der Aegyptologie; also: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aswan; http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14367a.htm


60 http://www.numibia.net/nubia/ptolemies.htm; http://rmcisuilet.unifoma1.it/nubiaconference/grzymski.doc Dodekaschoinos was the northern part of Triakontaschoinos; the area was essential for Roman border security: http://poj.peeters-leuven.be/content.php?url=article&id=57&journal_code=AS. More recently: http://dissertations.ub.rug.nl/faculties/theology/2005/j.h.f.dijkstra

