

Letters to the Editors

To the Editors of *CSSH*:

I happened just recently to notice the excellent article of B. G. Haycock on 'The Kingship of Cush in the Sudan', which appeared in *CSSH*, Vol. VII (July 1965), 461–80. I have no criticism to make of this serious and interesting study. Indeed, I am persuaded the author's conclusions as to the electoral aspect of the kingship of Cush are correct. One can do so with the more certainty because another student of the history of Cush, the Soviet egyptologist I. S. Katznelson many years ago came to the same conclusion, and has published a series of articles on the results of his researches. These articles are as follows: 1) 'The Nubian State', *Reports and Communications of the Faculty of History, Moscow State University* (Doklady i soobshcheniia Istoricheskovo facul'teta MGU), 1948, no. 8; 2) 'Certains traits de l'organisation d'état en Nubie du VIe au IVe siècle avant notre ère' (*Transactions of the Twenty-fifth International Congress of Orientalists in Moscow*, I, 1960); 3) 'The State Structure of Nubia between the seventh and the ninth centuries of our Era and the Laws of Bocchoris', *The Ancient World* (Drevnei Mir), Moscow, 1962; 4) 'Slaveholding in Kush', *Ancient History Reports* (Vestnik Drevnei Istorii), 1964, no. 2.

When two scholars come to the same conclusions independently, they strongly corroborate each other's discoveries. B. G. Haycock was obviously not influenced by the researches of I. S. Katznelson, because he did not mention them in his article.

M. KOROSTOVTSEV
Professor
Moscow

To the Editors of *CSSH*:

I note with interest the comments of Professor M. Korostovtsev regarding my article 'The Kingship of Cush in the Sudan' published in 1965, and am gratified he accepts my conclusions, and to learn that these are similar to those of Professor Katznelson. I have a good reading knowledge of most Western European languages, Latin, Greek, ancient Egyptian and Coptic,

but unfortunately do not understand Russian. So up to the present I have remained unaware of these Russian studies, as evidently Professor Korostovtsev was unaware of mine for four years after publication. However, as he says, nothing is lost to scholarship, since the fact that we have reached similar conclusions independently may be better support for our views than we could claim had we been aware of each other's work.

One hopes that the new *Meroitic Newsletter* published by Professors Leclant and B. G. Trigger will form a world-wide forum where scholars may report their articles, so that scholars in Khartoum, England or America may know what their colleagues in the Soviet Union are writing. No reference to these Russian studies appears even in the relevant section (pp. 599–649) of the elaborate bibliography compiled by Inge Hoffman, *Die Kulturen des Niltals von Aswan bis Sennar* (Hamburg: De Gruyter, 1967). I may add that I have written in much greater detail about Cushite history and institutions in the following: 'The Later Phases of Meroitic Civilization', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 53: 107–20 (Oxford, 1967), and 'Towards a Better Understanding of the Kingdom of Cush (Napata-Meroe)', *Sudan Notes and Records*, 49: 1–16 (Khartoum, 1968). These articles are based entirely upon renewed study of original sources, written or archaeological, though of course where I am aware of agreeing or disagreeing with earlier writers, I note the state of the discussion.

B. G. HAYCOCK
Department of History
University of Khartoum, Sudan