

James Black,
Institute of Archaeology,
34-34 Gordon Square,
London.

14th November, 1980.

Dear Jim,

Many thanks for your letter of 27th October, which I saw on returning from that conference in Muscat (not very good but met interesting people and glad to see places relative to East African history). I am very heartened that some at least of those things have turned up. It also at least demonstrates that the consignment really was received at your Institute. The results of your examination of the two items you did mention are interesting. The Mausoleum plaster can be compared with the white material from the slab ceiling of the eastern chamber at the tomb of numbered Kaleb III.

The report from the Geology Department here says that it can't be lime or gypsum on account of its chemically inert nature. His report is as follows:

Nature of rock	?Devitrified tuff or ash
Minerals:	Mainly quartz-phenocrysts
	Feldspars - abundant
	Pyroxene ? aegerine augite
	& Partially glassy matrix.

Was the plaster from the Mausoleum actually analysed there?

The slag from IW is also interesting; you will remember that we came to the conclusion that that building had been burnt and that the vitrified material was due to that conflagration. It is remarkable that there should also be iron slag about.

Yours

Neville Chittick
Director