## The Narmer Catalog

Catalog No. 0547

**Name** Partial Narmer(?) *serekh* from En Besor

Date (Period) Dyn. 1

Date (King) Narmer(?)

Dated By Royal name

Type Vessel

Method of Inscription Incised

Material Pottery

## **References:**

Schulman, 1976, pp. 25-26, p. 25, fig. 2; pl. I.7 Mittmann, 1981, pp. 6-8, p. 6, fig. 3 Kaiser, 1982, pp. 262-264, 266-267, fig. 15.42, p. 263, fig. 14.42 Williams, 1986, p. 175, Helck, 1987, p. 130, Quack, 1989, pp. 18-19, p. 26, p. 19, fig. 1 Kahl, 1994, p. 208, Anđelković, 1995, p. 30, van den Brink, 2001, pp. 68-69; p. 89, no. 80, p. 69, fig. 80 Jiménez-Serrano, 2003, p. 106 (4D-ENB1), Raffaele, 2003, p. 109, Edwin van den Brink, personal communication, 2015, J.-P. Pätznick, personal communication, 2017, Regulski, Database of Early Dynastic Inscriptions,

## Comments

Raffaele 2003 interprets this inscription as belonging to Narmer. Williams 1986 attributes this inscription to Ka. According to van den Brink (personal communication 2015), "I personally doubt that the En Besor fragment actually belongs to a Narmer *serekh*; it is exceptionally diminutive, and, in any case incised (scratched would be the more correct word) post-firing of the vessel." Jiménez-Serrano suggests it is Narmer or Qaa. Schulman (1976) attributes it to Den, while Schulman (1992) attributes it to Den or Iry-Hor. Mittmann 1981, Helck 1987, Quack 1989, Kahl 1994, and Regulski attribute it to Aha. Van den Brink 2001 attributes it to "Aha (?)". Kaiser and 1982 include this inscription in Horizon B (Iri-Hor-Narmer) but classify the name as "??". According to Pätznick (personal communication, 2017), this is certainly not Narmer and could instead be read *grg.t*.

RegionThe Southern LevantSiteEn BesorLocalityUnknownDepositoryUnknownRegistration No.UnknownDimensions1.6 cm H, 1.2 cm L (inscription)

## The Narmer Catalog

