**THE ANRA SCARAB:
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL APPROACH**

FIONA RICHARDS

Ph.D

University of Edinburgh

1996

DECLARATION

I, Fiona Richards, declare that this thesis has been composed by myself and that the research reported herein has been conducted by myself unless otherwise indicated.

30th June 1996

FIONA RICHARDS

ABSTRACT

This thesis consists of six chapters of description and analysis of the anra scarab seal, found throughout the Levant, Egypt and Nubia during Egypt's Second Intermediate Period (SIP). Analysis centres on a thorough typology of the scarab, as well as an examination of its archaeological contexts. A new interpretation of the hieroglyphs inscribed on the seal is proposed.

Chapter one reviews the background of the scarab seal, its history, significance, and use as an amulet or seal. A history of research of both the scarab seal in general and the anra scarab in particular is undertaken, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of previous studies.

Chapter two outlines the political and historical background of the period in which the anra scarab occurs. It discusses relevant evidence from the four countries in which the anra scarab is found, and looks at the interaction between each of those countries in both the period immediately prior to the popularity of the anra scarab, (the Middle Bronze Age (MBIIA) or Middle Kingdom (MK)), as well as international relations during the MBIIB-C and SIP.

Chapter three briefly examines the problems of relative and absolute chronology, the division of the Middle Bronze Age, terminology of Egyptian periods and the dating of the anra scarab.

Chapter four provides a detailed typological analysis, including both iconographical and epigraphic surveys of the anra scarab. The base designs are divided into twenty six categories, highlighting any geographical or chronological patterns which may exist. Possible prototype designs of the scarab are examined, together with the earliest and latest designs. The anra sequence is also examined on cylinder seals, private and royal name scarabs.

Chapter five undertakes a comprehensive contextual analysis of the anra scarab. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first section examines all the contexts in which the anra scarab occurs, which include thirty four sites throughout Nubia, Egypt, Palestine and Syria. The second section conducts a detailed contextual analysis at nine sites. Here it was possible to compare the anra scarab contexts with not only other scarab contexts, but also non scarab contexts.

Chapter six looks at the possible interpretations of the anra scarab, and suggests a new reading based on Egyptian group writing or syllabic orthography. The anra scarab is then considered in the wider context of the MBIIB-C or SIP, to see if new information can be offered regarding the complexities of this period, and the nature of the relationship between Egypt and Palestine at this time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I began my studies in Edinburgh, I could not have envisaged that I would spend so much time moving house and living in a number of different countries. Therefore this thesis could not have been completed without the help of a number of people and institutions, which I would like to mention here.

First and foremost, I must thank my supervisor, Professor Eddie Peltenburg. The thesis could not have been completed without his unending help, encouragement and advice for which I will always be most grateful. It could also not have been undertaken without a Postgraduate Studentship from the University of Edinburgh, and a three year Overseas Research Award.

While living in Cyprus, Dr. Stuart Swiny very kindly welcomed me at the Cyprus American Archaeological Institute in Nicosia. Similarly, while living in the south of England, I was fortunate to have an Associate Membership of the MCR, Merton College, Oxford. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Roger Moorey, Dr. John Taylor, Professor John Baines and Dr. Jaromir Malek for all their time and advice while I was at Oxford. While in Australia, Mrs Corinne Doherty and Dr. Franz Pinz, librarians at the Land Warfare Centre, Canungra, have kept me in touch with larger libraries and Franz deserves special mention for translating numerous German texts. I would like to thank Miss Trish Glover, Griffith University, for providing E-Mail access and keeping me in touch with the outside world.

The following should also be mentioned for kindly putting their collections of scarabs at my disposal. Dr. Piotr Bienkowski (Liverpool), Dr. Elizabeth Goring (Edinburgh), Dr. John Prag (Manchester), Dr. Helen Whitehouse (Oxford), Professor Harry Smith (University College London), Dr. Baruch Brandl (Israeli Antiquities Service), Daphna Ben-Tor (Israel National Museum). Thanks are also due to the following for the use of their unpublished material: Professor Manfred Bietak (Tell el-Dab'a), the late Professor A. Kempinski (Kabri), Professor Ahmi Mazar (Beth Shan), Daphna Ben-Tor (Rishon), David Jeffreys, Janine Bourriau and the EES (Memphis).

I would also like to thank the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, the Palestine Exploration Fund and the Abercromby Fund for grants which enabled me to visit Israel in order to research current excavations and collections. The Australian Institute of Nuclear Science and Engineering provided a grant enabling me to conduct the neutron diffraction research into scarab material, and I would like to thank Dr. Margaret Elcombe for making that research possible.

Special thanks are due to Ms. Christa Mlinar for her advice regarding not only the Tell el-Dab'a scarabs, but scarab material in general. The catalogue of anra scarabs could not have been completed without Christa's help. Not only did she ink all of my scarab drawings, but she contributed many of her own drawings. I

would like to thank Professor William Ward for all his generous advice, and reading a draft of Chapter IV. I am also most grateful to my mother, Patricia Richards, who undertook the onerous task of editing my manuscript, although all remaining mistakes are my own.

There is one final thank you for someone who has supported me both financially and emotionally throughout this thesis. That person is my husband, Stuart Norman, and it could not have been completed without him.

CONTENTS

VOLUME I: TEXT

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of figures in text	vii
List of Graphs and Tables in text	ix
List of Maps in text	x

INTRODUCTION

xi-xv

CHAPTER I: THE SCARAB SEAL

I.I	Introduction	1
I.II	Scarab Functions	4
I.II.I	Scarabs as Amulets	4
I.II.II	Scarabs as Seals	7
I.III	Material	11
I.IV	Scarab Production in the Levant	12
I.V	History of Research	15
I.V.I	Early Publications	15
I.V.II	Recent Publications	17
I.VI	The Anra Scarab	23

CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND RELATIONSHIPS: THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE - SYRIA, PALESTINE, EGYPT, NUBIA

II.I	Introduction	28
II.II	Syria	29
II.III	Palestine	37
II.IV	Egypt	49
II.V	Nubia	69
II.VI	Conclusions	

CHAPTER III: CHRONOLOGY

III.I	Introduction	72
III.II	Terminology	72
III.III	Absolute chronology	77
III.IV	The Thera Eruption	79
III.V	The Present Work	80
III.VI	Dating of Anra scarabs	81

CHAPTER IV: TYPOLOGY

IV.I	Introduction	84
IV.II	Typological Classification	89
IV.II.I	Type A	89
IV.II.II	Type B	96
IV.II.III	Type C	111
IV.II.IV	Type D	142
IV.II.V	Type E	148
IV.III	Plaques/Cylinder seals	157
IV.IV	Two signs	160
IV.V	Debased anras	162
IV.VI	The N sign	164
IV.VII	Supplementary signs	165
IV.VIII	Epigraphic type series	167
IV.VIII.I	<i>^c-r-n-^c-r-n</i>	167
IV.VIII.II	<i>^c-r-n-^c-r</i>	170
IV.VIII.III	<i>^c-r-n-r-^c</i>	170
IV.VIII.IV	HTP sequence	173
IV.IX	Early Series	180
IV.IX.I	The Lotus Group	180
IV.IX.II	Earliest Anra Scarabs	180
IV.X	Late Series	184
IV.XI	Royal/Private Name Associations	186
IV.XI.I	Scarabs/Seals	186
IV.XI.II	Royal Name Scarab Features	188
IV.XII	Conclusions	189

CHAPTER V: CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

V.I	Introduction	206
V.II	The Sites	209
V.II.I	Conclusions	244
V.III	In Depth Site Analysis	246
V.III.I	Introduction	246
V.III.II	Sites and Results	249
V.IV	Conclusions	272

CHAPTER VI: THE MEANING OF ANRA: THE EL FACTOR

VI.I	Introduction	277
VI.II	Syllabic Orthography	278
VI.II.I	$n + r = l$	280
VI.II.II	The use of <i>ilu</i> in Egyptian	282
VI.III	The God El	283
VI.III.I	$ilu > el$	285
VI.III.II	The Status and Character of El	286
VI.III.III	El and Ba'al	287
VI.III.IV	El and Yahweh	288
VI.III.V	Representations of El	290
VI.III.VI	El in Canaan	293
VI.IV	Conclusions	297
 CONCLUSIONS		 303
 Abbreviations		 310
 Bibliography		 312-353

VOLUME II: APPENDICES AND CATALOGUE OF ANRA SCARABS

APPENDIX A: Neutron Diffraction Analysis	354-362
APPENDIX B: Ward and Tufnell's Typological Classification	363-370
APPENDIX C: Contextual Analysis Data	371-437

THE CATALOGUE OF ANRA SCARABS

Introduction	i
Index	iii
Abbreviations	v
The Catalogue	1-145

LIST OF FIGURES IN TEXT

Frontispiece	Statuette of seated god. (Weiss 1985, catalogue no.: 134)	
Fig. 1.1	The God Khepri. (Ben-Tor 1989, 9).	1
Fig. 1.2	Scarabaeus sacer. (Ben-Tor 1989, 8).	2
Fig. 1.3	The Dung Beetle. (Ward 1978, 101).	3
Fig. 1.4	Khepri in solar bark of sun god Re. From Book of the Dead. (Ben-Tor 1989, 10).	5
Fig. 1.5	Use of scarab as seal. (Keel 1995, 117, pl.223-4; 120, pl.232; 126, pl.243).	8
Fig. 1.6	Overseer of the Treasury supervising others. Part of a wall painting from a tomb at Beni Hasan. (Ben-Tor 1989, 26).	9
Fig. 1.7	Sealing of Jars. From tomb at Beni Hassan. (Newberry 1906, figs. 5-7).	9
Fig. 1.8	Scarab set as a ring. (Keel 1995, 108, pl.191-192).	10
Fig. 1.9	The Omega Group. (Keel 1995, 31, pl.14-17).	13
Fig. 1.10	The Jasper Group. (Keel 1995, 32, pl.18-22).	14
Fig. 1.11	Unfinished scarabs from Palestine. (Keel 1995, 34, pl.24-27).	15
Fig. 1.12	Anra scarabs	24
Fig. 2.1	Statues from Tell el-Dab'a and Alalakh. (Bietak 1991, pl.10. Woolley 1955, 6:(b)).	54
Fig. 4.1	Type classes of the anra scarab	86
Fig. 4.2	Type A(i): Fills whole field	90
Fig. 4.3	Type A(ii): Design fills whole field, with filling element	93
Fig. 4.4	Type B(i)a: Basic Division	
	Type B(i)b: Upper and Lower Sections: Linear	97
Fig. 4.5	Type B(i)c: Upper and Lower Sections: Ankh signs	
	Type B(i)d: Upper and Lower Sections: Papyri	101
Fig. 4.6	Type B(i)e: Upper and Lower Sections: Papyri and crowns	
	Type B(i)f: Red Crowns tête-bêche	105
Fig. 4.7	Type B(ii): Horizontal divisions: Cartouche	109
Fig. 4.8	Type C(i): Vertical divisions: bipartite	112
Fig. 4.9-10	Type C(ii)a: Vertical divisions: tripartite, without lines	115-116
Fig. 4.11-12	Type C(ii)b: Vertical divisions: tripartite, with lines	119-120
Fig. 4.13	Type C(ii)c: Vertical divisions: tripartite, lines with uraei	123
Fig. 4.14	Type C(ii)d: Hyksos royal border	126

Fig. 4.15	Type C(ii)e: Shrine Motif	129
Fig. 4.16-18	Type C(iii)a: Anra Cartouche	132-134
Fig. 4.19	Type C(iii)b: Open Ended Cartouche	137
Fig. 4.20	Type C(iii)c: Cartouche with anra surround	140
Fig. 4.21	Type D(i): Scroll border: Interlocking scroll	143
Fig. 4.22	Type D(ii): Scroll border: Paired scroll	146
Fig. 4.23	Type E(i)a: Cobras	
	Type E(i)b: Horus hawk	
	Type E(i)c: Sphinx	
	Type E(i)d: Antelope/goat	150
Fig. 4.24	Type E(ii): Human Figures	155
Fig. 4.25	Cylinder seals	158
Fig. 4.26	Examples of 'Two sign' anras	161
Fig. 4.27	'Debased' anra scarabs	163
Fig. 4.28	Sequence I: $^c-r-n-^c-r-n$	168
Fig. 4.29	Sequence II: $^c-r-n-^c-r$	171
Fig. 4.30	Sequence III: $^c-r-n-r-^c$	174
Fig. 4.31-32	<i>Htp</i> Sequence	177-178
Fig. 4.33	Early series: The Lotus Group	181
Fig. 4.34	Earliest Anra Scarabs	183
Fig. 4.35	Late Series	185
Fig. 4.36	Anra sequence associated with Royal Name Scarabs	187
Fig. 4.37	Scarabs from Tell el-Dab'a	191
Fig. 6.1	Representations of El in Bronze(a), Stone(b) and Pottery(c)	291
	(a: Schaeffer 1966a, 7, fig.3)	
	(b: Yon 1991, 336, fig. 16a; Schaeffer 1937, pl.xvii)	
	(c: Yon 1991, 336, fig. 16b)	
Fig. 6.2	Seated male figures from Byblos and Kamid el-Loz	292
	(Byblos: Seeden 1982, 113, fig.19)	
	(Kamid el-Loz: Seeden 1982, 113, fig.21)	

APPENDIX A

Fig. 1	Quartz pattern	360
Fig. 2	Enstatite pattern	361
Fig. 3	Talc pattern	362

APPENDIX B

Fig. 1	Parts of a Scarab	
	(Ward 1978, frontispiece)	364
Fig. 2	Typology of Scarab Heads	
	(Ward and Dever 1995, fig. 9.1)	366
Fig. 3	Typology of Scarab Backs	
	(Ward and Dever 1995, fig. 9.2)	368
Fig. 4	Typology of Scarab Sides	
	(Ward and Dever 1995, fig. 9.3)	368

LIST OF TABLES AND GRAPHS IN TEXT

Table 4.1	Geographic distribution of design types	193
Table 4.2	Geographic distribution of types by sites	195
Graph 4.1	Related back and design types	198
Graph 4.2	Related back and design types	199
Graph 4.3	Related head and design types	200
Graph 4.4	Related head and design types	201
Graph 4.5	Related leg and design types	202
Graph 4.6	Related leg and design types	203
Graph 4.7	Related size and design types	203a
Graph 4.8	Related size and design types	203b
Table 5.1	Associated objects in anra scarab contexts	245
Graph 5.1	Megiddo	250
Graph 5.2	Tel Aviv	253
Graph 5.3	Jericho	255
Table 5.2	Associations of Jericho type groups and objects	257
Graph 5.4	Lachish	259
Graph 5.5	Tell Far'a (south)	261
Graph 5.6	Tell el-Yehudiyeh	263
Graph 5.7	Gurob	265
Graph 5.8	Esna, scarab tombs	267
Graph 5.9	Esna, non-scarab tombs	269
Graph 5.10	Ukma West	271
Table 5.3	Summary of site details for contextual analysis	273
APPENDIX A		
Table 1	Correlation of Pella scarabs with core patterns	359
APPENDIX C		
Table 1	Anra Scarab Contexts	372-375
Table 2	Classification and occurrence of objects in anra scarab contexts	376-379
Table 3	Scarab Contexts	380-388
Table 4	Classification and occurrence of objects in scarab contexts	389-396
Table 5	Non Scarab Contexts	397-417
Table 6	Classification and occurrence of objects in non scarab contexts	418-437

LIST OF MAPS IN TEXT

Map 4.1	Geographic Distribution of Anra Scarabs	88
Map 4.2	Distribution of type A(i)	91
Map 4.3	Distribution of type A(ii)	94
Map 4.4	Distribution of type B(i)a	98
Map 4.5	Distribution of type B(i)b	99
Map 4.6	Distribution of type B(i)c	102
Map 4.7	Distribution of type B(i)d	103
Map 4.8	Distribution of type B(i)e	106
Map 4.9	Distribution of type B(i)f	107
Map 4.10	Distribution of type B(ii)	110
Map 4.11	Distribution of type C(i)	113
Map 4.12	Distribution of type C(ii)a	117
Map 4.13	Distribution of type C(ii)b	121
Map 4.14	Distribution of type C(ii)c	124
Map 4.15	Distribution of type C(ii)d	127
Map 4.16	Distribution of type C(ii)e	130
Map 4.17	Distribution of type C(iii)a	135
Map 4.18	Distribution of type C(iii)b	138
Map 4.19	Distribution of type C(iii)c	141
Map 4.20	Distribution of type D(i)	144
Map 4.21	Distribution of type D(ii)	147
Map 4.22	Distribution of type E(i)a	151
Map 4.23	Distribution of type E(i)c	152
Map 4.24	Distribution of type E(i)d	153
Map 4.25	Distribution of type E(ii)	156
Map 4.26	Distribution of Sequence I	169
Map 4.27	Distribution of Sequence II	172
Map 4.28	Distribution of Sequence III	175
Map 4.29	Distribution of <i>Htp</i> Sequence	179

INTRODUCTION

"...the neglect of this subject is too apparent...showing how little attention has been given to them."

(Petrie 1889, 6)

"Pourquoi cette fréquence du nom, et surtout cette extrême diversité dans la manière de l'écrire, en l'abrégeant, en l'allongeant, en répétant indéfiniment le même groupe de signes ou en les mêlant à d'autres?"

(Weill 1918, 741)

Petrie's comment regarding scarab research is as relevant today, as it was over one hundred years ago. Although it is undeniable that the number of scarab publications has increased, particularly in the last twenty years, the potential of the scarab seal is still neglected by many archaeologists. The scarabs are primarily considered for chronological purposes, and so their capacity as an historical document is underrated, as is their value as an archaeological tool. An exploration of the history of scarab research shows a propensity towards typological studies, with little regard for contextual analysis, or the assignment of the scarab seal in a wider historical setting. Unlike its sister, the cylinder seal, which is revered for its pictorial record, glyptic art and ability to comment on cultural interaction, the design type scarab seals are used only sparingly in these matters. This is most likely due to the design scarab being overshadowed by scarabs with royal names, which have been utilized primarily for chronological purposes, rather than historical. Therefore, if a scarab lacked dating potential, it was often described as an heirloom, meaning it had no worthwhile archaeological value. Luckily, more recent studies are beginning to assess the archaeological and historical value of scarabs, and in particular design scarabs, revealing them as potential indicators of cultural interaction. However, these studies are still in the minority, but it is within this genre that the anra scarab is considered.

In 1918 Weill wrote a history of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt which included a

study of a type of scarab which he named 'Anra or Nera' (1918, 193). His study was the major work on this type of scarab, and many of the questions he raised then (see above quote) are still relevant to the study today. The anra scarab is identified and defined by a sequence of hieroglyphs which always include the letters *c*, *n* and *r*, although there are a number of intrusive signs. Weill ignored the supplementary signs, while noting that the numerous diverse forms made the original name difficult to read (1918, 191). The majority of anra scarabs belong principally to the Second Intermediate Period (SIP), which Weill recognised as he associated these scarabs with the Hyksos rulers (1918, 234ff, 729ff). However, he believed that the scarabs were associated with Asiatic kinglets who settled in the Delta at the time of Sobekhotep (1918, 731). He also proposed that the anra scarabs flourished in Palestine, particularly at the time of Tuthmosis III (1918, 738). These chronological ambiguities will be one aspect of the anra scarab that will be investigated in this thesis.

Weill found so many of these scarabs in Egypt and Palestine, that he called them 'innumerable' (1918, 731). To date, there are at least four hundred scarabs of this type which have been collected for this thesis. They are found in Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Nubia and Cyprus. Although every effort has been made to collect all known examples of this type of scarab, it is recognised that it is highly likely that there will always be examples that have been missed. However, a corpus of four hundred is still a large body of one type of design scarab, particularly as the hieroglyphs inscribed on the base of the scarab have been dismissed as a 'nonsense' (Giveon 1985, 18).

The use of hieroglyphic signs on scarab seals is not unusual, having been utilized for design scarabs since the FIP (Ward 1978, 55-56) and becoming more complex in nature in the XIIth dynasty (Tufnell 1984, 117-123). The hieroglyphs found on the anra scarab have been the subject of a number of differing interpretations (Weill 1917, 1918, 1953; Petrie 1919, 1925; Murray 1949; Niccacci 1980, Tufnell 1984). It appears that Weill could not decide whether to interpret the name of the

anra scarabs as belonging to one person, or three, and thereby representing a family name (1918, 741). A new interpretation of the hieroglyphs of the anra scarabs is investigated in this thesis, and the wider implications this would have on the relationship between Egypt and particularly Palestine during the MBII-B-C or SIP.

While Weill based his conclusions regarding the status of the anra scarab on the interpretation of the hieroglyphs alone, in this thesis it is based on an in depth investigation of the contexts in which the anra scarab occurs. Questions relating to the manufacture of the anra scarab are also considered. Due to the large number of anra scarabs found in Palestine, Weill found himself faced with the question of origin of that scarab, a problem that still exists today. Were the anra scarabs manufactured in Palestine or Egypt? Could the scarabs have been imported to sites in the Egyptian Delta from Palestine? (Weill 1918, 733). The question of local manufacture is considered in this thesis, although it is still difficult to come to definite conclusions some eighty years later.

The aim of this thesis is to therefore establish the status, function, meaning and significance of the anra scarab. It is also envisaged that a study of the anra scarab might offer new information regarding the complexities of the relationships between the countries of Africa and the Levant during the latter part of the Middle Bronze Age.

The first three chapters of this thesis provide the background necessary for a thorough investigation of the anra scarab. The first chapter discusses the scarab seal, its history, significance and use as an amulet or seal. Also featured in chapter one is a history of scarab research, which indicates their propensity towards typological (and therefore chronological) studies and a history of research of the anra scarab, which has concentrated on the interpretation of the base design only. The general strengths and weakness of the scarab material are also highlighted, and the latest scarab studies are reviewed. Chapter two provides the historical

background of the SIP/MBIIB-C, to which the anra scarab is linked. The political situation in each of the four countries in which the scarab occurs, and their relationship to one another, are important in defining the role of the anra scarab. Chronological factors are considered in chapter three, including a brief resumé of the current chronological problems, and how they affect the anra scarab. A thorough typological study is undertaken in chapter four, which considers both epigraphic and iconographical studies. Other aspects of the scarab such as an early series and possible prototypes of the design, its latest chronological parameters and its association with private and royal name scarabs are also featured in this chapter. A contextual analysis of the scarab is undertaken in chapter five, possibly a new type of investigative analysis with regard to scarab seals. The anra scarab is found in at least thirty one sites throughout Egypt, Nubia, Palestine and Syria. All the contexts of the anra scarab are considered, and an in depth analysis involving the comparison of anra scarab, other scarab and non scarab tombs or deposits is undertaken at nine sites. Chapter six suggests a new reading of the base design of the anra scarab, which has bearing on the historical situation in the Levant, and the relationship between Egypt and Palestine during the Second Intermediate Period.

NOTES FOR THE READER: THE CATALOGUE (VOL. II)

References throughout the text refer to the catalogue of the anra scarabs, which can be found in volume II. They are arranged geographically, north to south, from Syria to Nubia. A list of abbreviations of site names can be found at the front of the catalogue, but most are self explanatory (e.g. TBM = Tell Beit Mirsim, LACH = Lachish). All numbers, e.g. TBM3, LACH17, refer to the arrangement within the catalogue. Where possible, the catalogue provides information regarding the location, dimensions, material, and back, legs and base of each scarab, plus publication details and parallels (from within the collection). Drawings of each scarab are provided wherever possible, although sometimes only a photograph or photocopy of a photograph were available.

CHAPTER I

THE SCARAB SEAL

" At first sight it might be supposed that the subject was boundless..."

Petrie 1917, 1.

I.1 INTRODUCTION

The Latin name, *scarabaeus*, was given by Pliny and is most probably a distortion of the Greek word *χαοαβος* (Pieper 1927, 447). The term 'scarab' is commonly understood to refer to the Egyptian seal which appeared in the form of a beetle, representing the emblem of the creator sun-god, Khepri. The importance of the beetle to the Egyptians lay in the fact that the beetle appeared to be self engendered. The dung beetle is hatched from a ball of dung, in which the female has laid her eggs (see fig. 1.3). Unaware of the female's role in the hatching process, the Egyptians thought that the beetles were self engendered as they hatched in the warm sun. Thus the hieroglyph of the beetle *hpr*, means 'to become', or 'come into existence', and the image of the beetle represented life after death, an important part of the Egyptian ethos (Ward 1978, 44; Ben-Tor 1989, 9).

Fig. 1.1: The God Khepri

The creator god Khepri is known as 'he who came into being of himself' (Lurker 1986, 74), or 'he who came forth from the earth' (Lurker 1986, 104). The god in the form of a beetle rose from the Netherworld as the morning sun, having been born from the womb, i.e. the eastern horizon, of his mother Nut, the sky (Lurker 1986, 74). As the beetle pushes the ball of dung before it, so it was thought that Khepri rolled the solar ball across the sky (Lurker 1986, 104).

Therefore the beetle was conceived as the embodiment of the creator god, and he later became associated with Re, the sun god. Khepri became the god of the rising sun, who was depicted in Egyptian art as a scarab headed man (see fig. 1.1), (Ward 1978, 44; Ben-Tor 1989, 9). Thus the beetle became a symbol of rebirth, likened to the morning sun which is re-born every day from the earth, or underworld (Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 13-14; Ben-Tor 1989, 10).

The revered nature of the beetle in Egypt is evidenced from predynastic times, where dried beetles were found in jars in burials (Petrie 1917, 2). Early representations are found at Naqadeh (Petrie and Quibell 1896, pl.lviii), Tarkhan (Petrie 1914, pl.I) and Abydos (Petrie 1902, pl.xiv:282). It would seem in the early period there were two types of beetles represented in the graves. The beetles frequent in the earliest graves, (Tarkhan and Naqada), are long and thin and are described as the *nh*-beetle, after a similar representation in the Pyramid Texts which portray a long, thin beetle as the determinative (Keimer 1931, 177; Ward 1978, 43). These become rare in the First Intermediate Period burials (Brunton 1928, pl.xcvii 41C3). The *scarabaeus sacer* (the type of beetle copied for the later scarab seals as we know them, see fig. 1.2), was first portrayed as an alabaster charm in the form of a reliquary case (Petrie et al., 1913, pl.iii:4, pl.xiv:19). This type of scarab is identified as the *hpr*-beetle by the Egyptians (Ward 1978, 44 and fn.131), and personified by the god Khepri.

Fig. 1.2: *Scarabaeus Sacer*

Ward believes that scarabs of the First Intermediate Period were not used as seals, but as amulets. As they were uninscribed, Ward thinks this indicates that it was the beetle itself which provided the magical qualities, rather than the later engraving on the base of the object (Ward 1978, 43). He sees no evidence for their use as seals before the end of the XIth dynasty

Fig. 1.3: The Dung Beetle

The ball of dung which the Egyptians saw the beetle rolling was actually of cattle dung, on which the beetle feeds (1). After rolling the dung into a ball, it is hidden for consumption. Often there is a battle for the ball by another beetle (2). The Egyptians were unaware of the pear shaped pellet into which the female deposits her eggs. This ball is made of sheep dung, and is produced in an underground chamber (3).

(Ward 1978, 46). By the XIIth dynasty large numbers of scarab seals existed, for example from Lisht (Ward 1971, 117, fig.26). Their popularity in Palestine comes later, and coincides with the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt¹.

I.II SCARAB FUNCTIONS

The use or function of the scarab seal is inevitably linked with its interpretation, and there are a number of different associations with both royal and design scarabs. It is important to remember that the scarab could have a number of different uses at the same time (protection, medicinal, status symbol), and that it could have consecutively different functions over a period of time (Keel 1995, 266). It is also debated whether the main use of the scarab seal was for the living or the dead. Many scarabs are found at burial sites, but Petrie points out the many scarabs found in the towns which 'strongly points to their being usually made for the living rather than for the dead. If made for the benefit of the dead, we should not find any but stray examples in towns; if for the living, we may probably find many buried like any other possession with the people who had worn them in life' (Petrie 1925, 9). Hall argues that the name of Osiris, god of the dead, rarely appears on scarabs, while his figure is never inscribed on small scarabs. Therefore, Hall also suggests that the ordinary scarab seals (as opposed to the larger Heart Scarabs which are inscribed with the figure of Osiris) are intended for the protection of the living rather than the dead (Hall 1913, xix). Their use to commemorate memorable events (see below) would also indicate they were used for the living (Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 16).

I.II.I Scarabs as Amulets

The beetle was an emblem of the creator god Khepri and therefore a symbol and guarantee of his assistance to the deceased (Petrie 1917, 3). Therefore some would

¹

See Chapter II.IV: the XVth dynasty would appear to be responsible for their rising popularity in Palestine.

argue that the first use of the scarab was amuletic (Ward 1978, 46; Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 13; Tufnell 1984, 1). An amulet is generally used to ward off evil and often has magical properties. By wearing the beetle as an amulet, the ancient Egyptians were hoping to protect themselves and associate themselves with the regenerative powers of Khepri (see fig. 1.4). Ward likened the scarab as an amulet to a rosary (1902, 21), while Keel sees its powers as similar to an aspirin (Keel 1995, 268).

Amulets had special meanings to different gender groups. Many scarabs are found associated with females, particularly with reference to child birth, a dangerous

Khepri and other gods in the solar bark of the sun god Re. Illustration for a spell from the Book of the Dead on papyrus

Fig. 1.4

occupation which needed magic and religious protection (Ward 1978, 45). Many of the scarabs found in early graves (2300-2000BC) are associated with women and babies and the amulets were worn on strings around necks and wrists. In the graves of Qau and Badari, only 11 of the 229 seals are from male graves² (Brunton 1927, 58), leading Brunton to suggest

that scarabs are mainly associated with women and children³ (Brunton 1937, 108; 1948, 50). Scarabs were used by men to protect against male problems or dangers such as impotence, war or long journeys (Keel 1995, 267).

Scarabs with private names and titles of officials are also seen by some as primarily

²

There are problems however in determining gender in burials, sometimes it is difficult to determine from the skeletal remains, and many of the graves at Qau and Badari are not clear contexts.

³

While Brunton was referring to the VIth-Xth dynasties, Keel also believes that in the XIIIth - XVth dynasties scarabs were also mainly associated with women and children. He cites the statistics from the Tell el-Dab'a graves: 52% of the 77 scarabs at the site are found with women, 19.5% with children and 28.5% with male graves (Keel 1995, 267).

amuletic. There are over 1900 such scarabs known to date, almost all from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period (Martin 1971). While their use as a seal is debated (see below), and as a small percentage bear funerary epithets following the name, it is suggested that the entire corpus of private name scarabs were funerary amulets of the officials whose names and titles are inscribed (Ben-Tor 1994, 8). Williams also sees private name scarabs with a funerary function (1977, 137), but distinguishes three uses of the scarab: as amulets, funerary amulets and seals (1977, 138). Van Haarlem investigated the relationship between the occurrence of amulets in Egyptian texts and the real use of amulets in funerary contexts. He found discrepancies between amulets in text and their use. For example, the texts described the scarabs positioned on the throat, but in reality this did not occur (1992, 237). Some scarabs with royal names are seen as amulets and not seals. Royal name scarabs were produced in large numbers, often for the religious connotations of the names and also perhaps for the transference of the might of the king to the owner, which would also apply to past kings⁴. This would explain why the scarabs were re-issued after the king had died (Givon 1985, 10; Ward 1994, 190).

Souvenirs

Based on their amuletic nature, but combining hieroglyphic signs for good luck, pictures of gods or rulers, or defending against evil, a type of scarab was produced by temples and courts to be given to visitors, in the manner of a modern souvenir (Ward 1994, 189). The souvenirs not only filled a requirement for the visitor, it was thought to provide a profitable business for the producers, and supply propaganda for the relevant deity (Keel 1995, 274-5). For example, the priests at Memphis used seal amulets of Ptah to demonstrate the superiority of Ptah over Re in Heliopolis (Keel/Keel-Leu/Schroer 1989, 281-323).

The scarabs as amulets could also have been used to demonstrate political

⁴

For example, see Jaeger 1982, for the numerous scarabs of Tuthmosis III produced after his death.

connections or loyalties. The hundreds of contemporary amulets with the names of Amenophis III or Ramesses II, are not thought to have come from graves or have been used for the Kings' business. Instead it is thought that they were used by the court as a means of political propaganda and to further loyalty (Ward 1994, 189; Keel 1995, 276).

Scarabs were also used to commemorate historical events, as seen by the scarabs of Amenhotep III and IV. These scarabs were used to honour specific occasions such as the marriage with Queen Tiy, the construction of a lake for Tiy, the marriage with the Mitannian Princess Gilukhepa, a Wild Bull Hunt or Lion Hunt (Blankenberg van Delden, 1969).

I.II.II Scarabs as Seals

Petrie sees a straightforward handover of power from the scarabs' existence as an amulet to its use as a seal. The sacred and magical aspects of the amuletic associations were passed on to the name of the person inscribed on the base, while still keeping its religious connotations (1917, 4). He maintains that the use of the scarab as a seal remained secondary, because once the scarab had been glazed, 'we see that a large part of the lines were so filled with glaze that no impression could be taken from them' (1917, 4). Ben-Tor would also agree that the use of scarab as a seal was secondary, the designs unimportant, and were chosen for sealing at random (1994, 8). Alternatively, Pieper believes that the use of the scarab as a seal was its primary conception. He points to the smooth bases of the earliest scarabs as evidence that they were always intended for an inscription or illustration, arguing that the Egyptians were capable of rendering the beetle completely naturalistically if they had intended it as an amulet (Pieper 1927, 449).

Administrative

Scarab seals with private names or names of officials are often seen to represent administrative purposes. The numbers of scarabs with the names of officials

Sealing of a door knob on a shrine from the Tomb of Tut'ankhamun

Papyri from Elephantine

Jar handle from Shiloh

Box from Shiloh

Fig. 1.5: The scarab used as a seal

increased in the XIIIth dynasty due to the decrease in central bureaucracy (Johnson

Overseer of the treasury supervising weighing (left); temple scribe recording the results (right). Part of a wall painting from a tomb in Beni Hasan

Fig. 1.6

1977, 143). Martin proposes that the seals of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period with administrative and private names, were primarily used as a means of identification and to authenticate and seal documents (Martin 1971, xii).

Giveon notes (1985, 11) that for these purposes one seal for each official would have been enough, although for the Chancellor Har (Second Intermediate Period), there are more than 100 scarabs (Martin 1971, 78-85). Therefore he concludes that the multi-issuing of these seals means the scarabs might have been used as a visiting card or small present (Giveon 1985, 11). Winter sees the scarabs as identification cards (1987, 69), while Keel assumes them to hold a primary legal function (Keel 1995, 270).

Fig. 1.7

The use of the seal as identification of property or mark of ownership would seem to have been utilized by non-officials too (see figs. 1.5, 1.7). Newberry cites the seal as a mark of the owner who identified his wine or food stocks with his own seal impression (1906, 16-17). The *anra* seal from Shiloh in Palestine, which came from sealing a box (see fig. 1.5), indicates a similar use there. The mark of ownership demonstrated by the scarab seal is associated today with the popular

custom of marriage. When a marriage took place in ancient Egypt, the husband would give his new bride a ring with his seal, so that both symbolically and in reality, she would now be in charge of the household goods. It would appear that this is the foundation of the custom of exchanging wedding rings in today's society (Newberry 1906, 19-20). Not all scholars see the seal impression as an identification of possession: Keel believes the impression had amuletic characteristics and indicated the magic sealing of things or the giving of a protective formula (Keel 1995, 268).

Jewelry

Fig. 1.8: Scarab set as a ring

Many scarabs are found buried with their owners and are often excavated in a position indicating that they were worn around necks and wrists. This points to a decorative function, possibly as a type of jewelry. Further evidence for this includes the scarabs

set in gold as finger rings (see fig. 1.8), the type of materials used (such as amethyst or carnelian), the brightly glazed colour, and appealing motifs. Such aesthetic values are seen by some scholars as not totally disconnected from the scarabs' original protective function as an amulet (Keel 1995, 277).

Conclusions

The original use of the scarab, as amulet or seal, is therefore debated. However, rather than one function excluding the other, the combination of values was important. There was the seal, which was used either as a mark of ownership or in a purely decorative manner, and the amulet which represented magical qualities and protection for the user. The use of the scarab as a seal perhaps followed the

lead of the cylinder seal⁵, and was used by all levels of society: the King, his officials and subjects (whether it be by private names or design). The use and meaning of the scarab seal seems to have changed in the New Kingdom. It appears to have gained more religious connotations, with prayers and wishes inscribed on the base. These were enhanced by the amuletic nature of the scarab, and so increased the power of the prayer (Giveon 1985, 12).

I.III MATERIAL

Scarabs were manufactured from a range of materials, including hard stones of amethyst, carnelian, jasper, or quartz and also gold, silver or bronze (Tufnell 1984, 38-43; Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 22-23; Ward 1994, 190). Steatite is the most common material used for scarab production. This is a naturally occurring soap stone, which is easy to carve, being basically comprised of talc (Lucas and Harris 1962, 155-6; Richards 1992, 5-8). The steatite is then fired (during the glazing process), converting the basic talc content to enstatite, making it much harder (Tite and Bimson 1989, 87). Steatite does not occur naturally in Palestine, but is found in the mountainous regions of Syria and Cyprus as well as Egypt (Richards 1992, 7; Lucas and Harris 1962, 155). Although not all the records of the anra scarabs indicate what they are made of, most appear to be of steatite. Many were encased in gold or bronze and worn as rings⁶.

Faience is the second most popular material used in scarab manufacture, which is also known as frit, paste or a glazed composition. It has the same ingredients as glass (Lucas and Harris 1962, 160), and although an entirely different composition to steatite, it can be difficult to tell them apart after the glazing process, if the scarab is undamaged. There have been a number of publications on glazed

⁵ As witnessed by XIIth dynasty contacts with Syria, see Chapter II.II. Cylinder seals in Syria were used for sealing documents, both in a legal and administrative fashion (Kelly-Buccellarti 1986, 133-142; Gorelick and Gwinett 1990, 47).

⁶ For example: at Tell Kabri (KAB 1), Megiddo (MEG 4,6), Gezer (GEZ 2), Jericho (JER 22,27), Lachish (LACH 4), Tell el-Ajjul (TEA 9,10,11,13,35), Gurob (GUR 4)).

materials, concerning both steatite and faience⁷, but these have tended to concentrate on the glazing process of both materials, often in an effort to establish geographically the origin of both the process and the object. In order to identify the material composition of a group of scarabs from Pella, a site in the Jordan Valley, new research has been undertaken involving neutron diffraction. This previously unused technique is able to analyze the core of the scarab and its material, to determine its composition (of either steatite or faience), without destroying the object. It is important to be able to reach the core material of the scarab, so that the original material is tested rather than the outer material, which is often glazed or heated material. The results are correlated in Appendix A.

I.IV SCARAB PRODUCTION IN THE LEVANT

With the popularity of scarab seals in Palestine during the Second Intermediate Period, a new issue has arisen concerning the question of scarab production outside Egypt. Weill first suggested that these scarabs in Palestine were of local origin, produced by Asiatics who had travelled to Egypt during the XIIIth dynasty, absorbing the technique of manufacture and then producing their own style and repertoire (Weill 1917, 94ff). He particularly focused on a type he named *anra*, which he thought were exported to Palestine and produced there until the time of Tuthmosis III, while production had ceased in Egypt 100 years earlier (Weill 1917, 94f). The idea of local production was accepted by Offord (1918) but refuted by Petrie (1919), who saw the *anra* reading as an epithet and not a name, and would not believe in local production until he found a factory in Palestine (1919, 46).

More recent scarab studies have distinguished a number of motifs which are foreign to the Egyptian repertoire, and therefore by implication are manufactured outside of Egypt. Stock suggested a number of motifs had Middle Eastern origins,

⁷

For research on steatite see: Tite and Bimson, 1987, 1989; Tite 1987. For research on faience see: Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, 1983; Tite and Bimson, 1986; Tite et al., 1983, 1984, 1987; Noble 1969.

such as the man with the long robe, nude goddess, animals or palm trees (1942, 27-34), which have since been expanded upon. Tufnell commented on the toga wearers (1956), while a recent study by Shroer has shown them to be a west Asiatic motif with their prototypes on cylinder seals (1989, 93-121). The depiction of divine figures in a frontal position is generally contrary to Egyptian practice, so both subject matter and method of representation is seen as Canaanite and not Egyptian (Ward 1994, 191). Other scholars believe implicitly in the local production of scarabs and concentrate on distinguishing different styles and schools (Williams 1970). Two Levantine workshops have been recognised. The first is distinguished by a symbol which represents the Greek letter Omega (see fig. 1.9). The designs are always executed in high relief, and they are said to derive from cylinder seal impressions (Keel et al., 1989, 39-87). The symbol is said to represent the Canaanite fertility goddess, based on prototypes found on Syrian and Mesopotamian cylinder seals (Ward 1994, 191; Ward and Dever 1994, 118).

Fig. 1.9: The Omega Group

The second workshop is called the Jasper Group, as all the scarabs are made of hard stone (see fig. 1.10). The group is characterised by stick figures and careless engraving, and is again closely related to the material and designs of a group of cylinders from a workshop on the Syrian coast (Keel et al 1989, 213-42; Collon 1986; Teissier 1990).

These groups are influenced by the cylinder seals of North Syria, which become a key component in isolating them as locally manufactured and not imported from Egypt (Ward and Dever 1994, 118). However, Ward is still convinced that most of the scarabs at sites in Palestine were imported from Egypt, seeing no way of

isolating an 'Egyptian' as opposed to 'Canaanite' style except in individual pieces (Ward and Dever 1994, 119). He believes any differences in typological features (heads, backs, legs) that exist between sites in Palestine, are due to the buyers in each city obtaining scarabs from different sources in Egypt (Ward and Dever 1994, 120). Ward is also concerned about the significance of the Egyptian iconography to the Canaanites. He believes that they are copied without any significance to the local population (Ward 1994, 191), while Keel sees Egyptian symbolism adapted to suit Canaanites' beliefs, and the local population quite aware of the significance of the scarab and its designs (Keel 1995, 35).

Fig. 1.10: The Jasper Group

Following the evidence of the Jasper and the Omega groups, and the scarabs produced in local workshops in Phoenicia, Greece and Italy in the first millennium (Ward and Dever 1994, 120), it is likely that local workshops in the Levant existed. Scarabs with poorly cut hieroglyphs are often thought to have been produced locally (Petrie 1930, 2-4; Ben-Tor forthcoming), although well-executed symbols are harder to localise. Partially manufactured scarabs have been found in Palestine, at Tell el-Ajjul and Tell Beit Mirsim (and some unprovenanced pieces, Keel 1995, 33-34). These pieces are the best evidence to date for the existence of a local workshop.

Fig. 1.11: Unfinished scarabs from Palestine

I.V HISTORY OF RESEARCH

As Petrie suggested in 1917, the study of scarab seals, at first sight, might be considered boundless (1917, 1). However, at first he only considered 'named scarabs', believing they were the most important type of scarab, which narrowed the field of study considerably (1917, 1). Petrie's concern for named scarabs is reflected in the nature of scarab research, as will be seen below. A history of scarab research is also based on the history of scarab typology, and this is often due to the nature of scarab publications. Although most publications comment on the use and meaning of the scarab seal, a major feature of these publications was the establishment of a classification system. Therefore, a review of scarab research, particularly in the early publications, is dominated by the quest for a scarab typology.

I.V.I Early Publications

Early publications of scarabs consisted mostly of collections or catalogues of museum deposits, with a general text which was often aimed at interested collectors, not necessarily archaeologists. They recognised the importance of the scarab seal, but this was mostly limited to scarabs with royal names. Therefore they concentrated on the chronological value of the royal scarabs and their historical implications, but rarely considered their archaeological context, although this is hardly surprising as many of the scarabs were bought and thought to be

confined geographically to Egypt. With each new publication came more understanding of the importance of difference aspects of scarab research.

Early scholars were quick to recognise the importance of considering a number of scarab features to determine its chronological value, and their work rapidly became dominated by typological considerations rather than archaeological. In the publication of a collection by Fraser (1900), he considered the materials and glazes used throughout the dynasties, but also that 'when the dating is based on the names combined with a consideration of the style, the scarab is one of the most valuable aids which we have for dating purposes' (Fraser 1900, iv). Fraser only published the base of his scarabs, but two years later Ward included the backs of the scarabs in his general study of scarabs, and used photographs, recognising that they 'reproduced the actual signs on the face, and the form of the object itself' (Ward 1902, vi). He realised that the backs had chronological implications and also considered the use and meaning of the scarab (1902, viiff). Newberry was the first to illustrate the different parts of the scarab (prothorax, elytra etc.) and to distinguish different back types for different periods. Although based on a general overview, he still only published illustrations of the bases of the scarabs (1906, 70ff).

The first attempt at a typology of the scarab seal fell to Hall in his publication of the scarabs in the British Museum. He catalogued eight different backs and side types, from the more elaborate to the simpler types, but no head types, feeling that they were of minor importance (1913, xxx). Even at this early stage of a typology, he realised that 'the types often combine and a scarab can often be described as a cross between one type and another, or even between one class and another' (1913, xxx). Hall only published the scarab bases and dealt with royal or private name scarabs, a trend which continued until Petrie's publication of *Buttons and Design Scarabs* in 1925. In 1917 Petrie had published a further collection of *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names* which had also included a typology of backs and sides. This is considered by some scholars as the first truly detailed

examination of scarabs (Ward 1978, 1). However, both of Petrie's publications were based on unexcavated material, and in the latter (1925) he ignored side types, leading to his assumptions on stylistic development open to question. Rowe's catalogue of scarabs in the Palestine Archaeological Museum included scarabs from both Egyptian and Palestinian sites. He produced an extensive catalogue of back, side and head types, although some of these were only based on one scarab (1936, pl.xxxii-xxxv). The scarab publications that followed were limited by their focus of material⁸. These publications only considered their collection or specialised study, and the lack of cross references to other typologies resulted in little chance for continuity to arise within scarab terminology.

I.V.II Recent Publications

The most important role of scarab studies today is to establish a typological sequence of scarab features which can be utilized chronologically to comment on historical and archaeological contexts. A reliable scarab sequence would thus be required, primarily based on tell material. For the Middle Bronze Age this unfortunately does not exist. The problem lies in the material chosen to supply the excavated sequence, as will be seen below. There has also been a predisposition to rely on the royal name series for basic typological features, which has caused problems when applied to the design scarab sequence.

Forty years after Rowe's typology, Ward (1978) and Tufnell (1984) published their study of scarab seals, which included the most comprehensive typology to date. Their typology was innovative because they were the first to consider not only the head, back, sides and base, but also the dimensions of the scarab and both the royal and design type seals. The most important feature of their work lies in their attempt to define a typology from an excavated sequence, based mainly on Palestinian sites. Early typologies had concentrated on combining stylistic criteria

⁸

For example Weill 1953, Stock 1942, Martin 1971, Hornung and Staehelin 1976, Niccacci 1980, Jaeger 1982.

with the royal-name counterparts, but no one had yet established a typological sequence based on excavated material. Although Ward and Tufnell's methodology has been questioned⁹, their work was pioneering and they presented the first comprehensive typology.

O'Connor produced a paper in a similar vein to Tufnell's work at about the same time, and it is useful to use his paper to illustrate the difference in the production of a comprehensive typology. Where Ward and Tufnell produce clear and descriptive terms for all scarab features, which try to be as objective as possible, O'Connor arranged his typology by '...the generalised but distinct visual impression that is conveyed by the combined effect of the principal attributes of the scarab back' (O'Connor 1985, 3). He is therefore bogged down in subjective terminology such as 'highly-naturalistic', 'naturalistic', 'naturalistic-schematic', 'schematic', and 'highly schematic'. O'Connor based his typology on Egyptian material (as opposed to Ward and Tufnell's Palestinian based typology), which is said to be questionable, and he ignores archaeological contexts¹⁰.

O'Connor is said to have based his terminology on a study of private names and titled scarabs by Martin, who offers a comprehensive listing of over 1900 of these scarabs from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period (Martin 1971). Martin saw that backs, heads and sides were all important when establishing a typology, but he finally concentrated on back types only for his proposed chronology (1971, 3). As he combines back and head types in his typology, he therefore only really omits side types for consideration (1971, 149-154, pl.48-57). His absolute dates are established on comparison with royal name scarabs, but he notes the problem of XIIth dynasty royal name scarabs (such as Sesostris I or III and Amemenhet III) achieving cult status after their deaths, and therefore being reissued (1971, 1). His comparative XIIth dynasty material is therefore taken from

⁹ This seems to have centred more upon the dating of the Montet Jar deposit than anything else: see Schulman 1989, 621-22.

¹⁰ See Ward and Dever 1994, 13-20 for a detailed review of O'Connor's work.

the tombs of El-Lahun and Dahshur, and what he calls the *absolutely-dated* royal tombs at Byblos¹¹ (1971, 3).

Ward and Dever 1994

Ward and Dever's new publication seeks to redress the problems of Ward and Tufnell's first manuscript. Once again, concentrating on providing a chronological guide for archaeological deposits, they look mainly at establishing a sequence for the earlier deposits of the MBIIA and transition MBIIA/B. A new factor in chronological problems is the Egypt v. Canaan factor, which also applies to scarab studies. As will be briefly discussed in Chapter III, there are problems concerning the absolute dates of the Middle Bronze Age phases (MBIIA, B and C) based on Egyptian chronology and the three tier dating system that has emerged in recent years. By teaming up with Dever, Ward hoped to provide an archaeological basis for the dates of the scarabs by considering the archaeological material together with the scarab material. This is what he and Tufnell started originally, but here Ward offers a refinement of his earlier publication based on Dever's chronology.

Ward streamlines his typology, leaving out some features of his earlier publication, and incorporating others. He lists seven points (Ward and Dever 1994, 5) which form the basis for the refinements for his typology and now defines seven chronological periods¹². Dever provides the chronology for the MBIIA and MBIIA/B sites (Ward and Dever 1994, 25-87), and Ward uses the scarabs from these deposits to show the development of scarab style in each period. Ward classifies each scarab in each deposit by the Ward and Tufnell classification scheme and is then able to provide overall patterns that appear for each group.

¹¹ Tufnell 1969, 6-10, and Dever 1976, 27 fn.69, both question a homogeneous early date for ceramics from these tombs, while Gerstenblith 1983, 38-42, also questions whether the material is really from closed deposits.

¹² Period I: FIP, XIth dynasty maybe early XIIth dynasty. Period II: Montet Jar collection, c.1950BC. Period IIA: later MBIIA, transitional MBIIA/B, or XIIth dynasty. Period III: Early MBIIIB deposits based on Jericho (groups I-II) and Megiddo (Phases A-D). Period IV: late MBIIIB based on Jericho groups III-IV, Megiddo phase E-F and lower levels of Tell el Ajjul as defined by Tufnell in 1984 i.e. dates later XIIIth and early XVth dynasty. Period V: MBIIIC and XVth dynasty. Period VI: early XVIIIth dynasty. (Ward and Dever 1994, 5-6).

Ward addresses the problem of the royal name type series and its application to the design type series. Royal name scarabs are important in providing some access to absolute dating, but there are problems inherent in transferring a royal name typology to a design scarab typology. The major problem with the royal type series is determining which scarabs were contemporary with the kings whose names they portray, and which were produced later (Ward and Dever 1994, 125). This is apparently only a problem for XIIth dynasty kings, as seen by Martin (above). Problems arose in early typologies that used later, re-issued scarabs, or those with mistaken names or abbreviated spelling to form the basis of their typologies¹³. Ward isolates two main differences between the royal name and design type series: the royal name series is interrupted by the XIIIth dynasty styles of the Sobekhotep group and therefore does not show a continuous and unbroken series, and the royal name series is characterized by features which are little used on design scarabs. This is of primary importance, for as Ward recognises, 'it is primarily for the latter reason that royal name scarabs must be considered a class separate from design scarabs, and why the two kinds of scarabs should be examined by themselves' (Ward and Dever 1994, 125).

Ward notes that even his new typological scheme has limits, the main one being the inability of any typological system to provide unequivocal dates for individual scarabs (Ward and Dever 1994, 147). The Ward and Tufnell typology is said to work best for a group of scarabs where a range of typological details are available so that they can be fitted into Ward's overall patterns. This is because within the history of scarab manufacture, features will recur at various times within that history. Ward has provided a statistical analysis for each of his periods and each typological feature of head, back, side and scarab length, so it is possible to see which features are most popular at which time (see his chapter nine for statistical tables). For example: the general head type D occurs in all (Ward's) periods, is

13

For example those of Rowe 1936 and Weill 1953. It was only in Stock's analysis of scarabs of the XIIth and XIIIth dynasties that he asserted that misspellings and abbreviations cannot be considered royal names (1942).

quite popular in period IIA but is most popular in period V; or back type PS again occurs throughout Periods I-VI, is popular from Period IIA onwards, but peaks in popularity in period V. When dealing with individual scarabs, there are some typological combinations which are so common or so rare, that without supporting evidence, it would not always be possible to define the date of their manufacture (Ward and Dever 1994, 147).

In some cases it is possible to offer dates to scarabs without archaeological contexts. For example, a scarab which is a surface find from Tell Jerishe has an A3 head, LS¹³ back, and e11a side. The head is common in the early scarab history, little used from XIIth to XVth dynasties and characteristic again at the beginning of the XVIIIth dynasty. The back is rare in the XVth dynasty but used extensively in the New Kingdom. Side type e11a is only characteristic of the XVth dynasty, and only rarely appears in the New Kingdom. Therefore Ward places the scarab in the early New Kingdom rather than the XVth dynasty which was previously suggested on the basis of the style of the design (Ward and Dever 1994, 147-148). It is quite time consuming for scarab specialists to classify and then compare with Ward's statistical tables, and the average layman might not follow this through. A huge amount of work has gone into Ward's statistical analysis and even he admits that the most significant problem in defining a typological history of scarabs is their diversity (Ward and Dever 1994, 156). Unless made in moulds (which only happened in the NK), each scarab was unique, i.e. it would appear that the range of typological variations available to the artist was huge. It might not be unreasonable to predict that certain typological features were used in a certain manner at certain times, but Ward's work has proved that this is precisely not the case. He notes that the possible combinations (head, back, sides) for Period V (MBIIC) from the main sample alone could permit over 61,000 combinations

13

Despite Ward's criticism of O'Connor he has adopted his terminology for back types, which is totally unnecessary. He first utilizes them in his 1987 article and only states in 1994 that Tufnell's backs have been replaced by a modified version of O'Connor's back types (1994, 161), without explaining why he replaces them. O'Connor's phraseology is too subjective, and so Tufnell's original back types have been utilized for this thesis.

(Ward and Dever 1994, 156).

Any disadvantages to Ward's work is based on the Ward and Tufnell classification system. While this is the best classification system offered to date, I find it difficult to always determine which head is D8 or D9, which side type e11 or e9, and so forth. This is bound to happen when trying to utilize someone else's scheme, but it must be persevered with, because if there are numerous typological systems on offer there will be little hope of overall continuity. His new statistical analysis calls for all scarab features to be considered, and rightly so, but with scarab publications in the past, this was often impossible to achieve. Hopefully in the future this will be possible, and then all features can be compared in order to compose the most likely combinations of features for a given period. Finally, although Ward's stylistic criteria generally confirm Dever's dates of the archaeological deposits, further work should be carried out to confirm these dates. An ideal situation would be to base the scarab typology on tell sequences rather than burial sequences, which might be possible in the not too distant future.

Keel 1995

Keel's latest publication is the first volume in the publication of all the scarabs found in the Levantine region. It is a general text covering all basic scarab features, uses, typologies and so forth. He provides a summary of past typologies and discussion of scarab features, without offering a new one of his own (1995, 39-57). He examines the uses of scarabs (1995, 266-277) and how they were manufactured (1995, 129-135). A major part of this work is the detailed discussion of design types, following Tufnell's design classes (158-246). He has a small section on the problems of dating (260-265). Keel bases his dates on Krauss 1985 for the XIIth and early XIIIth dynasty, which are approximately 20 years older than Tufnell's dates. Keel also notes the difference in pieces that he allocated to the MBIIA and those allocated by Ward and Dever, indicating how subjective the criteria are for including or eliminating pieces in a chronological discussion (Keel 1995, 260).

There have been a number of scarab publications in recent years, and it is good to see that publications no longer concentrate on 'named scarabs' only, but also research other aspects of the scarab seal, such as local production, the establishment of local workshops or the origins of motifs¹⁵. However, a major problem that still exists in scarab research today, is the establishment of a uniform classification system. Ward and Tufnell have provided the best alternative to date, and although not entirely 'user friendly', it is utilized in this thesis in an effort to establish some continuity in scarab terminology¹⁶. The problem lies in the number of different head, backs and side types. To define a type based on one scarab only, can appear misleading (as Rowe did in his 1936 publication). Alternatively, having too many types makes the purpose of classification absurd (Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 32). There is also the necessity of having a type series based on archaeological contexts that are securely dated, although with the current debates on chronological issues, this would seem at present not possible to achieve. Finally, classification systems rely on good publication of the scarabs themselves. Each scarab needs to be published with photographs and drawings, and with details of their archaeological contexts. If the basic ingredients exist, then it will be possible for debates on scarab classifications systems to continue for many years to come.

I.VI THE ANRA SCARAB

This thesis seeks to examine the anra scarab in both an archaeological and historical context. The *anra* scarab is defined and identified by a sequence of hieroglyphs which appear on the base of the scarab and always include the letters 'a', *n* and *r* (see fig. 1.12). Over four hundred of these scarabs have been collected

¹⁵ See particularly the work by Keel and Schroer 1985, Keel/Keel-Lou/Schroer 1989, and Keel/Shuval/Uehlinger 1990. Other general works include Givon 1985, 1988, Ben-Tor 1989, and even a comprehensive list of 685 scarab publications compiled by Martin in 1985.

¹⁶ The design class categories however, have had to be modified to cope with such a specialised study of one type of design.

for this thesis and they are found in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Nubia¹⁷. Primarily confined to the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt and the MBIIB/C in Palestine, they are therefore commonly associated with the Hyksos, although over eighty percent of these scarabs are found in Palestine.

Fig. 1.12: Anra scarabs

An initial investigation of the anra scarab was instigated when it was noted that seventy five percent of the scarab designs appeared to be associated with 'Egyptian royal symbols' such as cartouches, red crowns, uraei, and the Hyksos 'royal panel design' - unusual for a so-called design scarab.

History of Research

The *anra* scarab has not been previously considered in any depth by any scholars, although it was noted as a distinctive type of scarab as early as 1908. Grenfell noted "...à la formule mystique 'Ra-n-Ra' (Ra qui vient de Ra)... cette formule avait une valeur amulétique" (1908, 135) and in a later article she identifies "[the] sacred formula so much used in the Hyksos period" (1915, 222) and also that "the formula is repeated occasionally on scarabs of a later date" (1916, 23).

It was Weill, writing his history of the Middle Kingdom in Egypt (1917, 1918, 1953), who first named this type of scarab as *Anra* or *Nera* (1918, 193). His work

¹⁷

There is also one example from Cyprus. It is found in a catalogue of the Cyprus Museum (Myers and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899), pl.viii:4544 'scarab with elaborate border', a surface find from Amathus. It is on display in the Cyprus Museum at Nicosia as ref: 1946/ix-25/4, no. D84 (4541), noted from Ayios Irini. However, there was no Bronze Age Necropolis at that site, only Greco-Phoenician tombs (Myers and Ohnefalsch-Richter 1899, 175). Dr. Pavlos Flourentzos, Curator of Museums, Nicosia, believes it is made of faience, although it would appear to be made of steatite.

is still the major study undertaken on the *anra* scarab to date. Weill suggested that this type of scarab seal was produced in Palestine, following the movement of Asiatics to Egypt during the XIIIth dynasty where they had assimilated the production of scarab manufacture (1917, 94). He also believed that the *anra* scarab was produced in Palestine by the locals until the time of Tuthmosis III, even though production had ceased in Egypt 100 years earlier (1917, 95). He also associated the *anra* combination with a King or Prince of this name (1918, 193; 1953, 138), although this idea has never been received favourably.

Petrie initially proposed a reading of Du-ne-Ra 'Gift of Ra' for the combination, therefore indicating an epithet rather than a name (1919, 46). Later he suggested that it was 'ra-ne-ra' which he took as a mistaken writing of 'Ra-gave', a frequent type of theophoric name in the Middle Kingdom (1925, 17). In 1930 Petrie finally suggested it was perhaps copied from an Egyptian original, which may have been 'sa-ra', 'protection of Ra' (1930, 3). Rowe accepted his former reading of 'ra-ne-ra' and suggested several variants (1936, 327).

M. Murray was the first to investigate the meaning of the *anra* combination. She believed, based on the fine workmanship, material used and the fact that the scarabs were often set in gold, that the hieroglyphs found on the *anra* scarab should not be so easily dismissed as 'nonsense' (1949, 95). She argued that such skill and subsequent cost would not have been spent on ignorant copies of misunderstood inscriptions and that the inscriptions must have been important and relayed some meaning to the wearers (1949, 96). She concluded that this was, in fact, intended for the magical protection of the Royal 'name'. Due to the associations with royal emblems it seemed probable that these scarabs were intended to commemorate 'the solemn ceremony of the giving of the *Re*-name to the King, and to protect that name when given' (1949, 96).

Van Seters only briefly referred to the *anra* scarab in his work on the Hyksos, and mentions Murray's interpretation of their meaning (1966, 64). Niccacci's

publication of two collections of scarabs from Jerusalem actually singles out the *anra* scarab for special attention, and while agreeing with Murray that they were important, he considers that they were not used as seals but as amulets, due to their magical power ordained through the possession of the name (1980, 30). The *anra* signs have also been interpreted as part of the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions (Pieper 1930, 190, 195).

In Hornung and Staehelin's publication of the Basle collection of scarabs, the interpretation of the *anra* combination still posed difficulties (1976, 51-52). They suggested either a connection with the name of the sun god Re, when the inscriptions are presented in their full, unshortened form, or possible associations with one of the 'abracadabra' magical words that exist in later Egyptian magical texts (1976, 51). They, like Ward (1987, 526), also follow Stock's suggestion (1942, 24) that the *anra* scarabs could have originated in the Neferzeichen patterns of the Middle Kingdom (1976, 51). Ward concludes from this that the symbols should at least make some sense in Egyptian (1987, 526 n.77).

Tufnell ascribes these scarabs to her class 3C or formulae scarabs (1984, 121). She notes that they are neatly cut and arranged and that the designers of the formulae were well acquainted with Egyptian hieroglyphic motifs although they appear only to make limited sense (1984, 121). She believed, however, that they represented more than a haphazard collection of Egyptian signs, and that their association with at least one XIIth dynasty king supported the idea of an amuletic intention (1984, 124). Contrary to Tufnell's conclusions, Givon in his publication of scarab material in the British Museum, found the 'combinations are meaningless, although pleasing to the eye' (1985, 18). Finally, Keel sees the *anra* signs as filling the space next to figures where their names and titles used to be written. That is, the *anra* signs are taking the place of the name and title on scarabs found in Palestine (1994, 214-218; 244-246).

This thesis will offer yet another interpretation of the *anra* scarab, which will also

be open to debate. However, it is hoped that the thesis will convince the reader that the hieroglyphs found on the anra scarab are more than just a collection of 'meaningless' hieroglyphs, and that the scarab itself holds more significance than just a piece of decorative jewelry.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND RELATIONSHIPS: THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE SYRIA, PALESTINE, EGYPT, NUBIA

"A time of internal governmental weakness coincided with a period of prosperity and political growth in Palestine and Nubia so that, for once, the Egyptians found themselves the victims of both the political initiative and cultural momentum of others".

Kemp 1983, 172-3.

II.I INTRODUCTION

As research into the anra scarab encompasses both the political and economic fortunes of Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period (as summarised by Kemp above), this chapter considers briefly (due to time and spatial considerations) the historical background of the period in which the anra scarab occurs. As the study of iconography is closely bound to its historical and cultural context, an historical perspective is vital (Teissier 1989, 3). The anra scarab is mainly a product of the SIP, and therefore the XVth or XVIIth dynasties in Egypt and MBIIB/C in Palestine, but is also possibly found in the XIIth dynasty/MBIIA. To assess the historical considerations of the anra scarab, it is therefore necessary to have knowledge of its historical background in the four countries in which it occurs (Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Nubia), and how they interacted. To determine the extent of foreign interplay between the Levantine and African areas, and in particular Egypt's association with Syria, Palestine and Nubia, the amount of foreign material found in each country is brought into consideration. While this is not an ideal indication of foreign contacts, (as the iconography of one country may be more readily discernible than another), it is anticipated that together with the epigraphic evidence, a comprehensive picture will emerge of international relations during the MBII-MK/SIP periods.

The controversy surrounding the high, middle and low chronologies is not explored in this thesis. Relative and absolute chronology is discussed in Chapter III, and a

general guideline for dates follows van Seters: the MBIIA correlates with the XIIth dynasty in Egypt, MBIIB the XIIIth dynasty and MBIIC the SIP (1966, fig.1). In this thesis, the XIIIth dynasty is considered part of the MK (see section II.IV below), and as seen above, the MB II is divided into three periods¹. A cohesive relative chronology is difficult for Syria and Egypt, despite a suggested correlation between Neferhotep I of XIIIth dynasty, Yantin-Ammu of Byblos and Zimri-Lim of Mari (Albright 1945, 17). On the basis of this association, Teissier recommends a correlation between Mesopotamian middle chronology and Egyptian low chronology (Teissier 1989, 29), while Lilyquist favours the high Egyptian chronology with middle Mesopotamian chronology² (Lilyquist 1993, 29), indicating how difficult it is to gain agreement on aspects of dating. As Ward pointed out in 1979, and it would appear to still be valid today: "... a relative chronology can be established between Mesopotamia, Syria-Palestine and the Aegean, but we are as yet unable to relate this relative chronology to Egypt, the only area where absolute dates can be given with assurance for the earlier second millennium" (1979, 806).

II.II SYRIA

"Syria³ was neither a political entity of its own (i.e. with a sequence of dynasties ruling all the country) nor are all periods evidenced sufficiently by (sic.) textual material from Syrian sites" ...therefore a history of Syria is also... "the history of the neighbouring countries which intervened in Syria and left written evidence

¹ All these assumptions are discussed in Chapter III, although it is acknowledged that the correlation of XIIth dynasty to MBIIA etc, is probably an oversimplification of the situation.

² The names of Yantin-Ammu and Neferhotep I both appear on a block found at Byblos, giving rise to the suggestion by Albright (1945) for their correlation. Teissier follows Helck's suggestion (1971, 64-66) that it is a different Yantin that is associated with Neferhotep I (Teissier 1989, 29). Lilyquist notes a correlation between Zimri-lim and Neferhotep I would involve Neferhotep to have existed 50 years earlier than Kitchen's high chronology (Lilyquist 1993, 58, fn.1). See also Ward 1961, 151; Kitchen 1987, 48 and Gates 1987, 77.

³ For the purpose of this thesis, 'Syria' includes present day Syria, and The Lebanon.

behind" (Klengel 1992, 16). During the MBIIA/B period in Palestine, Syria had a strong dynastic tradition of city states throughout the country, closely tied and allied to Mesopotamia, and linked with Palestine and Egypt. A comprehensive economic administration existed, importing material from all over the Levantine area including Cyprus, Anatolia and the Aegean (Kupper 1973). There was also a clear linguistic and cultural unity that existed from the Syrian coast to the plain of Antioch (Archi 1984, 241). This sophisticated political background is witnessed as early as the second half of the third millennium at Ebla⁴, where the texts from the palace archives show an administrative and economic centre for inland northern Syria, ruled by a king, and synchronising with other regions in Syria and Mesopotamia (Klengel 1992, 27). However, by the time of the MBIIIC/SIP period, Syria was experiencing a period of turmoil, brought about by invasions from the north.

The degree of contact with Egypt is debatable during the early MK⁵ (i.e. the XIth dynasty) although it is purported to flourish again at this time (Ward 1971, 58ff). This is perhaps indicated by a large number of scarabs and other Egyptian objects which were found at Byblos in the Montet Jar collection⁶ (Tufnell and Ward 1966, Tufnell 1984, 3, Ward and Dever 1994, 89ff). During the later MK (i.e. XIIth and

⁴ There are a large number of publications regarding the texts and excavations at Ebla. The texts are published by the Archaeological Mission of the University of Rome in the ARET series and at the University of Naples in the MEE series. For a comprehensive bibliography of the texts see Klengel 1992, 24 and for a bibliography on the publications of the site in general until 1986 see Baldacci and Pomponio 1987, 429-456.

⁵ Although it would seem to have increased following the FIP, where it would appear that contacts existed, although in a more reduced form to the OK (Ward 1971, 1991). See also Ben-Tor 1991 for the discussion of OK contacts with Syria.

⁶ The date of the Montet Jar collection is still debated. Ward and Tufnell originally argued for an early Heracleopolitan date, with Ward later revising that to the XIth dynasty (1978). He now advocates a date of the early XIIth dynasty (Ward 1987, 512; Ward and Dever 1994, 90). Porada had suggested a lower date, paralleling the cylinder seals to Kultepe Level II (c.1940/20-1830BC) (Porada 1966, 246, 254). Other dates proposed include the Hyksos period (Montet 1928, 129; Kemp and Merrillees 1980, 45; Giveon 1973, 88), while O'Connor dates the jar to the XIIIth dynasty (1985, 38-40). For a thorough discussion on the date of the Montet Jar see Weinstein 1992, 36.

XIIIth dynasties) there are a number of objects of Egyptian origin⁷ found at Syrian sites, and the nature of their occurrence is discussed below. There appears to be a particularly strong relationship between Egypt and the coastal sites of Byblos and Ugarit during the XIIth dynasty, which would be expected considering the sea trade routes between the two countries.

XIIth dynasty/MBIIA

The period following the Eblaite texts and preceding that covered by this thesis (c.2000-1800BC), is often considered a dark age of Syrian history due to the lack of written records from Syria itself, and therefore the lack of information regarding the political situation at that time. The history of Syria is followed through the texts of the Akkadian kings of Mesopotamia and their campaigns into Syria. It would appear that at this time there was a major influx of the Amorite population and a seizure by them of political power⁸ (Kenyon 1966, 36ff). This is attested to by the personal names found in the dynasties of such major sites as Ugarit, Byblos, Halab, Karkamesh, Qatna, Mari, and Babylon as well as in Mesopotamia, during the 19th to 16th centuries (Klengel 1992, 43). While Ebla is not included in the list of major centres at this time, it is still believed to have played a primary role in the establishment of the north-west Semitic culture (Matthiae 1989, 55). Texts from Egypt such as the *Tale of Sinuhe* and the Execration texts (Sethe 1926, Posener 1940) would also indicate a number of tribal groups that co-existed with larger centres and rulers.

⁷ As opposed to 'Egyptianizing' objects which imply an object which utilises elements of Egyptian iconography which are intrusive to the general design. This thereby infers it is most likely to have been manufactured by a local craftsman and does not have an Egyptian origin. There are however, a number of objects from a range of media (faience vessels, statues, stone vases, cylinder seals) from all the main sites, Alalakh, Ebla, Ugarit, Byblos which can be termed 'Egyptianizing'.

⁸ An inscription with uncertain date from the upper slopes of the acropolis at Ebla belongs to Ibbit-Lim, son of Igrish-hepa, and would appear to identify an Amorite ruler of Ebla at the end of the third millennium/early second millennium (Pettinato 1970, 73ff). However, the *hepa* part of the father's name is disputed: does it represent a Hurrian element of the name or a name in the Eblaite tradition? (see Klengel 1992, 41, fn.2 with references).

The MBIIA would appear to be the most popular period for contacts with Egypt, based on the number of objects found in Syria at that time. As mentioned above, Byblos would appear to have a special relationship with Egypt, illustrated by the local rulers adopting a number of Egyptian titles and writing their names within a cartouche (Ward 1961, 134-5). Rather than indicating Egyptian domination of the site, the rulers of Byblos were perhaps imitating a new and fascinating culture. The Egyptian objects dating to the XIIth dynasty at Byblos include: a fragment relief of a seated Hathor figure dated to Sesostri I (although the cartouche is damaged: Dunand 1958, pl.clxxxviii:8503), an obsidian vase (from Tomb I) which has the prenomen of Ammenemes III (Montet 1928, 155 no.610), and an elongated bead, also of Ammenemes III (Dunand 1937, pl.cxxvii:2905). There is also an obsidian box with lid of vase (from Tomb II) of Ammenemes IV (Montet 1928, 157,159 nos. 611, 614), and a cylinder of an Ammenemes (Dunand 1937, pl.cxxiv:1551).

At Ugarit, the XIIth dynasty is represented by a carnelian bead with the inscription of Sesostri I (Schaeffer 1935, 167, fn.1) and a statuette of Khnumit, wife of Sesostri II⁹ (Schaeffer 1932, 20). There are also fragments of two sphinxes, one thought to be the daughter of Ammenemes II, *Hmmt-nfr-hdt* (Schaeffer 1932, pl.xiv:1, fig.13), the other with the cartouche of Ammenemes III (Schaeffer 1933, 120, pl.xv:4). A piece often used to illustrate the nature of Egypt's involvement with the region is the triad of the vizier Senusertankh and his family¹⁰ (Schaeffer 1934, pl.xiv).

At Ruweise a scarab of Sesostri I was found in T.66 and Sesostri II in T.73 (Ward 1971, 132-133; Tufnell 1975-6, 31,140; 1984, 3) and at Beirut, a sphinx

⁹ Ward believes that this statuette is actually of an unnamed Egyptian princess. He sees the inscription as a title that occurs without a name, used primarily by Princesses in the XIIth dynasty (Ward 1979, 801 & 806).

¹⁰ Breasted argued that Senusertankh was an official envoy to Ugarit, proved by the inscription 'gold of honour' on his statue, an award given for foreign service (1935, 318-20). While this is possible, Ward finds it a tenuous argument (1979, 804-806). Due to the formula on the statue, it may date to the beginning of the XIIIth dynasty (Bennett 1941, 77ff; 1958, 120ff).

with the name of Ammenemes IV was excavated (Dunand 1928, 300). Two further sphinxes were found at Qatna and Neirab: the first belonging to Ita, daughter of Ammenemes II, (du Mesnil du Buisson 1928, 10) the second also belonging to Ita, but daughter of Ammenemes III (Porter and Moss 1951, 395). Alabaster vase fragments were discovered at Hama (Fugmann 1958, fig. 120:100) and Alalakh (Woolley 1953, 292), although Teissier believes they cannot be firmly attributed to Egypt (Teissier 1989, 54). A fragment of an alabaster vessel with a possible hieroglyphic inscription was found further afield at Tel Leilan (Meijer 1986, fig.7:a,b). There is no inscribed material attributed to the XIIth dynasty found at Ebla.

XIIIth dynasty/MBIIB

Syrian political history from 1800-1600BC is dominated by large city states with vassal cities, dynasties and alliances with Mesopotamia. This period is known from the cuneiform texts found at Alalakh, Mari and Hattusha (in Anatolia) (Klengel 1992, 44ff). One of the main dynasties in Syria at this time is of Yamhad, with its capital at Halib (Aleppo)¹¹. This dynasty is first mentioned in a text by the ruler of Mari, Shamshi-Adad I, who had campaigned in Syria while on a timber expedition to the Mediterranean coast (Dossin 1955, 1-28). Shamshi-Adad had ousted the heir to the throne at Mari (Zimri-lim) who had fled to Syria and sought asylum with the Kingdom of Yamhad. The war between Shamshi-Adad and Yarim-Lim (Yamhad) saw alliances struck with other major centres: Shamshi-Adad with Karchamesh and Qatna (the latter by marriage) (Dossin 1952, 231; Durand 1990, 276ff), and Yarim-Lim with Eshnunna and Babylon (Klengel 1992, 55). Further alliances were forged in the next generation between the kings of Yamhad and Mari, once Zimri-lim had regained the throne after the death of Shamshi-Adad I. While Zimri-lim had been in exile in Aleppo he had married the king's daughter (Dossin 1952, 236f), while also cultivating a relationship with Babylon to the south (Kupper 1973, 10). The king of Yamhad acted as an intermediary for the king of Ugarit who wished to see the palace at Mari (Dossin 1952, 236), while Zimri-lim, the king of Mari, secured an alliance between Qatna and Aleppo (Dossin 1954,

¹¹

For a suggested revision of the dynasties of Aleppo and Alalakh see Nagel and Eder 1992.

423).

Other major centres of power at this time in Syria were Karkamesh, Qatna, Eshnunna, Ebla, Ugarit and Byblos (Kupper 1973, 14ff). Ugarit is mentioned in the Mari texts as the centre of trade between the Euphrates region and Crete¹², and it is thought to have belonged to the area controlled by Yamhad (Klengel 1992, 78). Byblos is reported to be the most prominent harbour town for trade between Asia and the Nile Valley c.1800-1600BC, although it is not possible to reconstruct a sequence of rulers for this city (Klengel 1992, 79).

There is little evidence of Palestinian or Nubian material in Syria before the Late Bronze Age, although they may have traded in perishable commodities, and it is known that Ugarit acted as an intermediary for the sale of tin to the Aegean and copper from Cyprus to Syria and Mesopotamia (Klengel 1992, 78). Contacts between Syria and Egypt appear to have been at their height during the XIIth dynasty, as less Egyptian objects are attributable to the XIIIth dynasty or SIP, although Egyptianising elements are still popular on local products¹³. The Execration texts which list the enemies of the Pharaoh in the XIIth and XIIIth dynasties do not mention Ugarit or Qatna, perhaps indicating a close relationship with those cities, or alternatively, showing an awareness by the Egyptians of Syrian political power. Ties between Syria and Tell el-Dab'a in the Delta will be discussed in section II.IV, but it would appear that there were trade connections between the two areas, and possibly a sharing of ethnic background. Byblos is mentioned in an Egyptian religious text on a sarcophagus dating to the XIIIth dynasty (Montet

¹² For a list of the kings of Ugarit dating to this period and beyond, see Kitchen 1977.

¹³ For example, the papyrus plant motifs and seated figure with hieroglyphs on faience vessels at Alalakh (Woolley 1955, pl.lxxxiii:f (AT/38/6) and pl.lxxxiii:h (AT/46/223), level V), or male statue in 'Egyptian' style (Woolley 1955, pl.lx (AT/47/62), level VII) or cylinder seals, also from level VII with Egyptian signs and symbols, also utilized with the ruler of Yamhad (Collon 1975, 144-147, nos.5,6,65,141,147). There are also a number of similar items from Ebla, see below.

1928, 266ff), and a scarab of Wahibre Yayebi of the XIIIth dynasty (Dunand 1958, pl.cc:6923) was recovered. The most important object from Byblos at this time is a block with the name of Neferhotep I and Yantin-Ammu inscribed together (Montet 1928, 90-93, fig.8). A sphinx was found at Tel Hizzon (near Baalbek), dating to Sobekhotep IV along with a statue of the nomarch *Df-h'pj* I-III (Montet 1954, 76).

Ebla was an important centre during the MBIIB/C, and a number of Egyptian and Egyptianizing objects were found, mainly in three tombs in the Lower City beneath Palace Q (Matthiae 1984) and a store room in the Northern Palace (Matthiae 1989, 1990). The most important item is an Egyptian ceremonial mace, discovered in the Tomb of the Lord of the Goats. The mace head has an inscription between two baboons of King Hetepibre of the XIIIth dynasty (Matthiae 1984, 25). Other objects from this tomb, (and also the Tomb of the Princess and the Tomb of the Cisterns at Ebla, all dated within c.1800-1650BC), such as faience and alabaster vases, jewelry, and a ceremonial club, are thought to be Egyptian or inspired by Egypt (Scandone Matthiae 1988, 71). They are compared with objects from Egypt: the stone vases matching typologically those from Egypt and the jewelry resembling that from the royal tombs of the XIIth dynasty at Lisht and Dahshur¹⁴ (Scandone Matthiae, op.cit.). The mace is significant for later discussions regarding Hyksos origins as the Pharaoh Hetepibre adopted as one of his royal titles "son of the Asiatic" (Scandone Matthiae 1979, 122-23). In a store room in the grand Palace a number of ivory fragments were recovered, thought to be part of a bed or throne. The motifs include a number of Egyptian symbols: the *djed* pillar and papyrus flowers, but also a number of Egyptian deities: Hathor, Horus and the crocodile god, Sobek, as well as the *atef* crown of Osiris (Matthiae 1989, 44ff; 1990, 417-422). Matthiae dates these fragments 1700-1600BC, and compares their technique with similar ivories from Kerma and Jisr, near Jaffa in Palestine

14

However, as their origin is debateable, these objects, along with similar material from Byblos and Ugarit have not been considered as Egyptian imports (for the purposes of the discussion on the type of relationship Egypt and Syria have during the MK), but rather Egyptianizing material, probably made in Syria (see footnote 7, above).

(Matthiae, *ibid.*)

SIP/MBIIC

The end of the XIIIth dynasty, c.1600BC, coincided with the Hittite kings invading Northern Syria. The campaigns of Hattusili I and Mirsili I are recorded on texts found in the archives of Hattusha and show the destruction of Halib and perhaps also Alalakh VII (Klengel 1992, 80-82). – Contacts between Egypt and Syria continued, and can be seen by the number of scarabs found at both the coastal sites of Ugarit¹⁵, Byblos (Dunand 1937, pl.cxxvii-cxxv), and Kafar-Garra and Qrayé (near Sidon, Guigues 1938, 27 fig.42, 40 fig.65, 49 fig.72 and 1939, 54 fig.2, 55,58), as well as the inland site of Ebla (Scandone Matthiae 1976). It is not unusual for contacts with Egypt to have continued¹⁶, especially as some see the Hyksos as originating from a noble family in Syria (Matthiae 1989, 184). A sealing of Ibi at Byblos (Montet 1925, 29; 1928, 212(852)) is dated to the SIP, as well as a fragment of faience vase with the name Ibishem, who is thought to be the same person (Montet, 1925, 29; 1928, 212(853))

Egypt and Syria

Egypt's involvement in Syria, and to a lesser extent Palestine, has been the subject of enormous speculation and discussion. There are a number of theories concerning Egyptian foreign involvement in the region and yet the evidence for these ideas are surprisingly small in number. The number of objects with Egyptian origins from the Middle Kingdom (XII and XIIIth dynasties) amount to less than twenty five in all, with most coming from the west and coastal area of Syria. It was originally conceived that the Egyptian objects found in Syria were evidence of an Egyptian 'empire'. This idea of an 'empire' was first initiated by Albright (1922b, 221), and

¹⁵ Schaeffer 1932, pl.xi; 1939a, pl.v, incorporating 1939b, fig.113 and 1938, fig.14 and 1962, pl.xvii:1,2.

¹⁶ Some scholars see a substantial reduction in contacts with Egypt, particularly at sites such as Byblos (Teissier 1989, 56), and this may be attributable to the new pressures from the North (Ward 1961, 140-1, 154). However, it should also be remembered that contacts with the XVth dynasty during the SIP are at this point in time indicated most frequently by scarab seals, which have been found in Syria, as noted above.

followed by Smith (1940), Wilson (1941) and Giveon (1967, 1978, 1981) but has now largely been replaced by a number of other theories. MacDonald sees Egyptian merchants extending their state controlled commercial enterprises to the Levant with backing by the military (1972, 94-5), while Wilson later changed his idea of an Egyptian empire to that of commercial and cultural imperialism (1951, 134). Instead of the Egyptians having 'firm control of the important trade routes from Egypt to Asia' (Giveon 1981, 58) it is thought that the statues found in Syria could have been gifts, given after the lifetime of those represented (von Beckerath 1964, 106f). Perhaps they represented Egyptian diplomats, looking after Egyptian interests abroad (Smith 1965, 16 and van Seters, 1966, 75f, following *The Story of Sinuhe*) or that all statuary was a result of trade after the Middle Kingdom (Weinstein 1974, 56; 1975, 9) and that all the material found in foreign cities was exported there during the Hyksos period (Helck 1976, 101ff; Weinstein 1975, 10). Ward sees the statues as evidence of Egyptian political manoeuvring: they were sent to their Syrian allies in order to maintain the balance of power and to prevent a southward expansion by the strong Hurrian ethnic element in Syria (1961, 137-141). The final understanding of Egyptian involvement with Syria will largely depend on further excavation results. At the present time it seems unlikely that the Egyptians dominated Syria, or the trade routes between the countries, and it is more plausible that they established trading relations with Byblos which flourished, and might even have involved Egyptians living there, perhaps to oversee business. (The adoption of Egyptian titles by the local rulers was not out of submission but more likely as a form of identification with their equals). Egyptian merchants would perhaps be a better term than Egyptian diplomats, and they are more likely to have existed, although there is no denying that foreigners living overseas often act as unofficial diplomats for their countries.

II.III PALESTINE

The Middle Bronze Age in Palestine is seen as the zenith of urban development, encompassing a radical shift in distribution, size and character of settlements in contrast to the earlier intermediate period (Dever 1987, 150, 152). This

information is gleaned generally from the archaeological record as there are few epigraphic records from Palestine itself, and only limited epigraphic evidence from outside the country relating to Palestine in the MBA. Indeed, some early reconstructions of the history of the MB in Palestine have dealt with the larger Levantine context instead (Mazar 1968).

During the MBIIA, Palestine was made up of small settlements which were generally confined to the coast and valleys of Palestine (Kempinski 1992, 166). During the Middle Bronze IIB/C, the number of settlements expanded throughout the country (coastal plains, valleys and hill country), and fell into three categories. These consisted of large sites (20 -175 acres, accounting for 5% of all sites), medium sized sites (7-20 acres, accounting for 10% of all sites) and villages (1-7 acres, making up 85% of the sites) (Dever 1987, 153¹⁷). Therefore Palestine exhibited a similar settlement pattern to Syria, with small sites quite likely to be dependent on the larger site in their area, although it is not known if 'kings' or ruling dynasties existed in the larger cities, comparable to Syria and Egypt. A number of so called palaces have been identified at a number of sites in Palestine dating to the MBA (e.g. Megiddo, 'Ajjul, Kabri, Lachish, possibly Shechem and Hazor¹⁸), which might indicate ruling dynasts existed after all. The Execration Texts, mention three or four rulers for each site in the earlier texts and one ruler in the later texts, perhaps indicating a hierarchical system existed (Sethe 1926, Posener 1940). Further evidence of growing prosperity, urban growth, complex social organisation and advanced technology in the MBIIIB/C is seen in the fortifications that existed at many of the sites in this period. These defense systems implied superior engineering skills and are seen to reflect a highly centralised system of planning and deployment of men and material (Dever 1987, 153-4). As the term fortified is often synonymous with urban, it became important for

¹⁷ Dever uses Kotter, W., *Spatial Aspects of the Urban Development of Palestine during the Middle Bronze Age*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Arizona, 1986, for these statistics.

¹⁸ Both the buildings at Shechem and Hazor were originally thought to be Palaces by their excavators, who later changed their minds and thought them to be temples (Wright 1965, p.103ff and Yadin 1972, 96-98).

archaeologists to ascertain the date of the earliest fortifications. Yadin (1978) believed there were no fortified cities prior to the XIIIth dynasty, although Dever (1976, 1987), Kochavi (et al., 1979) and Kempinski (1992) disagree. Dever believes that many sites were fortified by the nineteenth century BC at the latest (1987, 154), while Kempinski sees the sites situated along the coastal plain and valleys as fortified in the MBIIA, and later for more inland sites (Kempinski 1992, 127).

Syrian influence in Palestine is seen in palace architecture, for example, at Tell el Ajjul, Megiddo and Aphek, although the Palestinian palaces are less complex than their Syrian counterparts (Oren 1992, 113-115). A number of Syrian cylinder seals have been found at sites including Tel Beit Mirsim, Tel el-Ajjul, Megiddo, Tel Beit Mirsim, Beth Shan and Pella (Collon 1987, nos. 203, 2011-12, Parker 1949, Teissier 1989, 39-40). Syrian motifs are also seen on scarab seals of the MBIIB/C, such as the naked goddess and branch motifs (Schroer 1989, 93-5). There would appear to be no Nubian material found in Palestine at this time.

XIIth Dynasty/MBIIA

There are a number of objects which date to the XIIth dynasty found at Palestinian sites, but it is difficult to assign them to MBIIA levels¹⁹. There are two statues of the XIIth dynasty found in Palestine: the Princess Sobeknefru from Gezer (Weinstein 1974, 49-57) and the nomarch Djehutihotep at Megiddo (Wilson 1941, 230-31; Ward 1961, 40ff). Why an Egyptian noble, nomarch and high priest of Thoth at Hermopolis (represented by the latter statue) should be resident at Megiddo remains elusive. Wilson thought he represented diplomatic relations between Egypt and Palestine rather than economic (1941, 231), although Ward sees no reason to assume he was an ambassador, and suggests instead he was perhaps an exile from the reforms of Sesostriis III (Ward 1961, 41). There is also a statuette

¹⁹

MK statuary and other material often appears in MBIIB/C contexts which has led to the suggestion that they were looted from Egyptian tombs and/or traded by the Hyksos (Weinstein 1974, 56; 1975, 9; O'Connor 1974, 33). However, if the Hyksos are seen as Egyptians (section II.IV), it is unlikely that this would be the case.

of Hekaib, a domestic butler, found in a pit at Gezer (MacAlister (Vol.II) 1912, 311-12, fig.450) dating to the XIIth dynasty. From Shechem there is a jar sealing with the name of Amenemhet, a steward (Sellin 1927, 267, pl.30), and from Tell el Ajjul there is a cylinder seal of Amenemhet III (Petrie 1934, 4, pl.ix:352).

There are a number of scarabs and sealings dating to the XIIth dynasty, and these are one of the major sources of evidence for contacts in the MK between Egypt and Palestine. Scarabs and seals of Sesostri I are found at Gezer (MacAlister III, 1912, pl. cciib:1, ccva:9, ccvii:4 and Ward 1971, fig.28:4, 11), which although Ward believes are attributable to his reign (Ward 1971, 133), does not believe they were necessarily transported to Palestine during that reign²⁰ (1971, 133, fn.493). Other scarabs attributable to Sesostri I are found at Beth Shan (Rowe 1930, pl.34:1; Ward 1971, fig.28:1), Beth Pelet (Ward 1971, fig.28:2), Deir Alla (Ward 1971, fig.28:3), Megiddo (Ward 1971, fig.28:5,6,10), Lachish (Tufnell 1958, pl.xxxix:347; Ward 1971, fig.28:8), Gezer (MacAlister 1912 (Vol.II), 315:64, (Vol.III), pl.cciib:1) and Tell el-Ajjul (Petrie 1932, pl.8:145; 1934, pl.4-5:3,61, pl.6-7:268; Ward 1971, fig.28:9)²¹. The scarabs of Sesostri II are found at Megiddo (Rowe 1936, 1,3), Tell el Ajjul (1934, pl.8-9:365, pl.10-11:465; 1952, pl.9:1) and Lachish (Tufnell 1940, pl.xxxii). A scarab of Sesostri III and Amenemhet III was found at Gerar (Petrie 1928, pl. xix:2). There are also a number of private name scarabs and those with titles of officials to be found in Palestine, the majority from the XII/XIIIth dynasties (Ben-Tor 1994). Sealings of Senbef, scribe of the vizier were found at Jericho (Sellin and Watzinger 1913, pl.42(A), 156; Garstang 1934, 124, fig.3). A large group of design scarabs have been recently excavated from the site of Rishon le-Zion and are dated to the transitional MBIIA/B (Ben-Tor, forthcoming). Many of the scarab contexts, along

²⁰ Ward believes two dates should be considered for each scarab. Firstly the date of its manufacture, and secondly the date of the archaeological context in which it was found (1971, 133-4).

²¹ There are other scarabs from Gezer, Megiddo, Lachish and Ajjul which have been attributed to Sesostri I, but these have been discounted by Ward as either incorrect forms of his name or mistaken readings (1971, 127ff).

with the other objects of the XIIth dynasty found in Palestine are debatable. Weinstein believes that no Egyptian objects can in fact be assigned to MBIIA deposits, even at sites with substantial MBIIA stratigraphy such as Tell Beit Mirsim, or Tel Aphek (Ras el 'Ain) (1975, 7, 10). Therefore statues such as the Princess Sobekhotep, do not reflect the economic or political relationship between Palestine and Egypt at this time (Weinstein 1974, 56), nor are the royal or private name scarabs of the XIIth dynasty seen to reflect a relationship between the two countries in the Middle Kingdom (Ward 1961, 39; 1971, 68-9, 133-4; Ben-Tor 1994, 11). It has been suggested however, that architectural features found at Megiddo in Str. XIIIa, such as the glacis and wall/street are the same as those found in Nubian fortresses built in the XIIth dynasty (Harif 1978, 24ff).

The epigraphic evidence for Egyptian relations with Palestine include the *Story of Sinuhe*, the Execration Texts, the Khusobk stele, and tomb and stele evidence from Egypt. Although Weinstein states that the *Story of Sinuhe* provides indisputable evidence of Egyptians in Palestine in the XIIth dynasty, he disregards it as a primary source because the location of the land of Yaa cannot be precisely located and apart from Sinuhe, the rationale for other Egyptians being in Upper Retenu is not known (Weinstein 1975, 11, fn.86). He also disputes the importance of inscriptions from tombs in Egypt which refer to the possible importation of livestock and eye paint from Palestine. The cattle are referred to ('Bulls of the 'Aamu') in a tomb of Ukh-Hotep, (dated to Ammenemes II) at Meir (Blackman 1915a, 13, pl.4) and in a scene in a tomb of Djehutihotep (dated to Ammenemes II and Sesostris III) at Deir el-Bersheh ('cattle from Retenu'²²) (Newberry 1895, 26-28, pl.18). The eye paint is referred to on a relief in the tomb of Khnumhotep II at Beni Hasan (Newberry 1893, 69, pl.30). It is said to have been brought from the Aamu of šw or šwt, which has been identified with šwtw in the Execration texts and has been placed in either Transjordan or the Negev (Weinstein 1975, 12, fn.94

22

This reading is disputed: Blackman reads the text as 'cattle of Retenu during the counting' (Blackman 1915b, 14) while Wilson (1955, 230, n.11) reads 'the cattle at every counting' (Weinstein 1975, 12, fn.96).

with references).

The Execration texts were magical texts used by the Egyptians to supposedly bring about the downfall of their enemies, and they are considered by some archaeologists as 'one of the primary sources of Middle Kingdom foreign relations' (Ward 1961, 141). The texts list sites and rulers considered to be enemies of the Egyptian state in the Middle Kingdom. The texts are written on pottery bowls (known as the Berlin group) (Sethe 1926) or figures of bound captives (known as the Brussels texts) (Posener 1940) and they are undated. A number of dates have therefore been suggested for them, but there appears to be little consensus among scholars²³. The Berlin texts name approximately 20 Palestinian towns and 30 rulers, while the later Brussels texts have 64 place names, plus the names of their rulers and several other countries (Redford 1992, 89ff). A number of differing theories exist regarding the significance of the texts in terms of Egyptian and Palestinian relations. They are viewed by some as the primary evidence of Egyptian domination or an 'empire' in Palestine and Syria (Nager and Eder 1992, 56ff), while others see the increase in the number of towns in the later texts as representing a major expansion in Egyptian and Palestinian relations (Weinstein 1975, 13). It is also thought that the texts were written and broken in order to prevent hostile Asiatic rulers from harming Egypt (Van Seters 1966, 80), or they were broken to harm those who were impeding trade with Western Asia (Helck 1971, 61-62). Ward believes the texts indicate the extent of unrest in Canaan where the MK rulers were powerless to take military action, rather than the extent of military or political authority exhibited by the Egyptians over Palestine (Ward 1961, 142-3). The increase in the number of cities mentioned in the later texts are most likely due to the rise in settlements which are known to the Egyptians. In the light of the Amenemhet II inscriptions (see below) and their record of tribute and

²³ Weinstein believes the Brussels group dates to the end of the XIIth dynasty or early XIIIth dynasty as Hazor is not listed in the Berlin texts but is in the Brussels texts, and there is no MBIIA settlement at Hazor (1975, 13). Kempinski dates the Berlin group to the early XIIth dynasty and the Brussels group to the reign of Sesostriis III (1992, 160). Ward dates both groups to the late XIIth/early XIIIth dynasties (1961, 141-2, 146), while Redford believes there is only half a generation between them (1992, 89).

recalcitrant Palestinian towns in supplying it, the Brussel texts are probably a record of problematic foreign cities rather than a growing apprehensiveness on the part of the Egyptians towards the rising power of the new Palestinian city states (Weinstein 1975, 13). This is supported by the fact that the cities in Palestine with Egyptian objects (Gaza, Gerar, Gezer, Megiddo) are not on the list, signifying a more congenial association between them²⁴.

The stele of Khu-Sobk erected at Abydos, was the only evidence for military intervention in Palestine under the XIIth dynasty (Breasted 1906, 302). Khu-Sobk was an attendant of Sesostri III and the stele describes a campaign to *Skmn*, which has been identified as Shechem (Posener 1940, 68, E6). The campaign has been seen to protect Egyptian interests in Palestine rather than a full scale assault (Weinstein 1975, 11) or a raid to secure plunder for the King, (but not to hold territory abroad (Breasted 1906, 303)). However, if the site of *Skmn* is identified as Shechem, it is rather a long way to venture into Palestine for mere trivialities.

However, the Khu-Sobk stele is no longer the only evidence for Egyptian military activities in Palestine, and Egyptian influence there during the MK might have been stronger than first assumed from the dearth of archaeological material. An inscription of Amenemhet II²⁵ was found on a block of pink granite reused in the pedestal base of a colossal statue of Ramesses II, at Memphis²⁶ (Málek 1992, 18). It lists a number of everyday events at his court, and expeditions sent abroad,

²⁴ Byblos is mentioned in both lists, which is unusual considering the close relationship between the two countries. However, if the texts were dated to the XIIIth dynasty, when Egyptian influence was waning, and Byblos was worried by Hurrian activity to the North, this may explain their inclusion on the lists (Ward 1961, 145).

²⁵ Ward alone disputes this MK date, preferring a XIXth dynasty alternative. He believes the XIIth dynasty prenomen do not refer to living kings, but rather their funerary monuments (1987, 528, fn.91).

²⁶ The text was first observed in the 1950s, although it was not until 1974 that it was first available for study (Málek 1992, 18). It was first published by Farag 1980, 75-82 and summarised by Posener 1982, 7-8. It will be published in full by Málek and Quirke in a final report on the Ptah Temple from Memphis (Málek, pers. comm.). It has also been published in detail by Altenmüller & Moussa 1991, Goedicke 1991, Nagel and Eder 1992, Málek and Quirke 1992.

either for military purposes or in order to obtain rare materials, temple donations or manufactured objects (Málek and Quirke 1992, 13; Nagel and Eder 1992, 59). There are descriptions of the quantity of goods imported, and the problems of obtaining tribute from foreign countries. Apparently Egyptian domination was not homogeneous: the tribute from Nubia arrived without problems, while at other times, the Egyptians had to go to the Eastern Mediterranean to claim it themselves (Nagel and Eder 1992, 61). While Eder sees this as evidence of Egyptian domination and loyalty to Egypt by Palestinian city states (1992, 61), it would seem to reflect a certain tolerance of Egypt, rather than domination. Eder also sees the scarabs of the XIIth dynasty found in Palestine as representing their political influence in the country (1992, 61).

Further contacts between Palestine and Egypt are demonstrated by a seal impression with an Egyptian inscription from Alalakh. The tablet was found in room 22 of the level IV palace, and this was destroyed by fire with the palace in approximately 1400BC. Known as Alalakh tablet 194, it is thought by Teissier to signify a link between Egypt and a southern Levantine centre in the MK. Teissier dates the seal on stylistic and epigraphic grounds to the second half of the nineteenth or early eighteenth centuries BC, and believes it demonstrates the adoption of a nomarchal title by a Levantine ruler, thereby supporting the hypothesis of Egyptian influence on a so far unlocated Levantine centre, south of Byblos, during the XIIth dynasty (Teissier 1989, 31-32, 1990).

XIIIth dynasty/MBIIB

The late MBIIA and beginning of MBIIB is seen by Weinstein to represent the strongest period of affiliation between Egypt and Palestine (1975, 14). This premise is based on the increase in the number of Egyptian artifacts found in deposits dating to this period, compared to the lack of products from MBIIA deposits (1975, 10). Egyptian statuary includes a piece from Gezer, the lower part of a ushabti of Deduamun, a citizen, and found near the high place (Macalister (Vol.II) 1912, 312; Weinstein 1974, 55) and at Tell el Ajjul, a seated statue of

Horka, a scribe (Petrie 1931, 5, 8, pl.xxi-xxii; Ward 1961, 42; Weinstein 1974, 54). These are thought to date to the XIIIth dynasty²⁷. Most of the Egyptian and Egyptianising objects such as small stone vessels, faience vessels, combs and beads are dated by Weinstein to late MBIIA/ early MBIIIB contexts (Weinstein 1975, 9). Royal name scarabs of the XIIIth dynasty are found in Palestine. Hetepibre²⁸ and Sobekhotep V are found in tombs 30 (Garstang 1934, 130-1, fig.4.7; Rowe 1936, 5:18) and B35 (Kirkbride 1965, fig.292:13) at Jericho, while Neferhotep I is found at Ajjul (Petrie 1933, pl.iii:6; 1952, pl.ix:3). Private name seals dating to the XIIIth dynasty are said to reflect the administrative changes in Egypt from a centralised administration to local bureaucracy (Johnson 1977, 143). A jar handle with a sealing from the XIIIth dynasty was found at Jerusalem (Duncan 1924, 183, pl.v:9) while a seal of Wadjkare, late MK, was found at Megiddo (Rowe 1936, 236 (S8A)). The Brussels Execration Texts indicate the expanding knowledge of Palestinian geography to the Egyptians, and contacts, especially indicated by the scarab evidence, seem to have continued.

SIP/MBIIC

The Egyptian culture during the Second Intermediate Period is represented in Palestine by royal, private name and design scarabs. The royal name scarabs of the XV and XVIth dynasties, are to date concentrated in the south, particularly at Tell el-Ajjul. The kings represented include Sheshi, Amu, Ahetepre, Sekhaenre, Auserre Apophis which are all found at Tell el-Ajjul (Weinstein 1981, 9, Tufnell 1984, pl.xliv). The scarabs of Sheshi are the most numerous in Palestine and the most widely distributed. Eight scarabs were found at Tell el-Ajjul (Tufnell 1984, pl.xliv), and also at Jericho (Kirkbride 1965, fig.301:2), Tell Far'a (Petrie 1930, pl.vii:29), the vicinity of Asawir, Gezer, Lachish, Tel Aviv, and Amman (Weinstein 1981, 9). Scarabs of Khyan were discovered at Tell es Safi (Giveon 1965; Weinstein 1981, 8-10) and Gezer (Martin 1971, 92:1181a), while scarabs

²⁷ Porter and Moss date the seated statue to the XIIth dynasty (1975, 370), while Ward assigns the statue a 'MK' date (1961, 42).

²⁸ The scarab of Hetepibre at Jericho was thought by Kirkbride to be an heirloom, as the pottery from tomb 30 includes both Middle and Late Bronze Age vessels, but the scarab was associated with the later groups (Kirkbride 1965, 592).

of Apophis and Nubuserre were found at Pella (Richards 1992, 9ff). Further scarabs of Apophis were located at Lachish (Tufnell 1940, pl.xxxii). Faience vessels were found in closed contexts with Hyksos scarabs and alabaster jars, mostly concentrated in the south at this time. However, some faience vessels were produced for the first time in Palestine during this period, and the faience technique is thought to have come to Palestine with the migrations of Egyptian craftsmen (Sagona 1980, 101, 107).

Private name scarab evidence in Palestine (see below) ties in with cylinder seal Workshop C, distinguished by Teissier (1989, 74-76). This workshop has its origins in the MBIIA in Lebanon, but occurs in, and has affinity with, other glyptic forms from Palestine during the middle to late MBII (MBIIC). The distinguishing characteristic of this group is the use of hieroglyphs spelling personal names within cartouches (Teissier 1989, 39). Teissier notes that the personal names do not seem Egyptian, although the reading is made difficult due to the poor hieroglyphs. She believes that the MBII cylinders with personal names parallel and complement the scarab evidence from Palestine (1989, 39). Teissier's Workshop C is important for this thesis as it can be associated in particular with the anra scarab (see Chapter IV.III).

XVth dynasty

The extent and nature of the Hyksos relationship (i.e. the XVth dynasty) with Palestine has also been greatly debated. Although considered in more detail below in section II.IV, it was thought at one point that a 'Hyksos' empire existed in Palestine, similar to that posited for Egypt in the MBIIA. The Hyksos 'empire' and 'culture' appeared to have been based on the fortification systems which existed in Palestine in the MBIIB/C, horse burials, Tell el-Yehudiyeh pottery and the scarabs that have proliferated at the same time. As the Hyksos were thought to have swept down from the North, through Palestine to Egypt, the MBIIB/C was considered to have been a period of Hyksos domination. Following this assumption, in true circular fashion, the burials from that period were seen to

represent Hyksos funerary customs and beliefs (Stiebing 1971, 110). New tomb types in MBIIB/C culture were attributed to the Hyksos, although it has been proven that no burials can in fact be attributed to them (Stiebing 1971, 116-117). The equid burials in Palestine have been proven to be donkey and not horse, thereby making the centrality of the horse in the Hyksos culture superfluous (Maeir 1994, 231). Tell el-Yehudiyeh ware is manufactured and found in sites in Egypt before the Hyksos period (Kaplan 1980, 122; Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 57). The fortification systems were thought to have been invented by the Hyksos (Albright 1922b, 123; Fitzgerald 1954, 96; disproved by Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 60 and Parr 1968) as a stronghold for them in Palestine against local princes or as base camps in which to launch Asiatic campaigns into Egypt (Dever 1985, 73). However, neither explanation seems credible.

Because Palestine is said to have reached its 'zenith' in the MBIIC, at the same time as the XVth dynasty existed in Egypt, there is said to be a connection between the two (Dever, *ibid.*). The site of Tell el-Dab'a in the Delta region has been identified as the capital of the Hyksos, Avaris, and shows strong Canaanite influences. This site will be discussed in more detail in section II.IV, but due to its geographical proximity to Palestine, the large numbers of XVth dynasty kings on scarabs particularly found in southern Palestine, the pottery made in southern Palestine found at Tell el-Dab'a, types of metal weapons, and the large numbers of design scarab found throughout the country, it would be foolish not to acknowledge that a relationship existed between the two areas (Teissier 1990, 69, Philip 1989, 211ff). As will be seen in section II.IV, this relationship could have been established at an earlier time, mainly due to population movements, Asiatics in the Delta region, and the number of Asiatics living and working in Egypt in the XIIIth dynasty. Giveon sees Hyksos 'rule' in Palestine as a continuation of the MK in the country. i.e. the XIIIth dynasty was an important bridge between XIIth dynasty influence and the Hyksos (Giveon 1987, 32). As there is no real evidence for any Egyptian empire to have existed in Palestine in the XIIth or XIIIth dynasties, there is absolutely no evidence for any Hyksos 'rule' or empire to have existed either.

XVIIth dynasty

The evidence for contacts with Egypt during the SIP are concentrated on the XVth dynasty, mainly because of the number of their royal name and design scarabs found in Palestine. There are a small number (7) of private or official name scarabs also from Palestine in the SIP (Ben-Tor 1994, 7), but as Weinstein notes, it is difficult to know which officials served Hyksos rulers and which served Egyptian rulers (Weinstein 1981, 8). Ben-Tor suggests that the scarabs with titles were not intended to be used as official seals in Egypt, but were made for funerary purposes for those officials (1994, 10). The seals were then plundered from their tombs and sold or taken to Palestine where they were used as decorative seals, with no relation to the official mentioned or his office (and thereby having no direct relationship with the period in which they were issued (Ben-Tor, *ibid.*). There is one scarab of the XVIIth dynasty found in Palestine, from the northern site of Pella. Although the reading of this scarab is debated, the central section reads Wadjkheperre, the prenomen of Kamose, the last king of the XVIIth dynasty (Richards 1992, 13-14, 82-3).

Egypt and Palestine

The changing fortunes of Egyptian politics are once again reflected in their foreign relations, although in a different manner with regard to Palestine than has been seen with Syria. It has been suggested that during the MBIIA, Palestine was part of the Egyptian empire (Albright 1922b, 121) and Givon points to Egyptian involvement in the Sinai as evidence of involvement in Palestine (1987, 23). He believes the royal name scarabs should be reconsidered as evidence of MK contacts, as they can be considered contemporary evidence of Egyptian rule in Palestine (1987, 25-27). Weinstein believes Egypt concentrated on its relationship with Syria and virtually by-passed Palestine, that is, Palestine was less important to Egypt than Syria (1975, 12). It was only when Palestine was growing in political, economic and cultural terms in the MBIIB period, and Egypt was becoming politically weaker in the XIIIth dynasty, that a stronger relationship existed between the two countries based solely on trade (Weinstein 1975, 14).

Ward sees the Egyptian material in Palestine as expected for an area in which Egyptian citizens migrated or maintained commercial contacts with Egypt. He believes there was no Egyptian empire in Palestine, or military or political control: instead Palestine was viewed by the Egyptians only in terms of booty and slaves (1961, 44-45). In the MBIIC period, an equal relationship (i.e. Egypt is not superior) is seen to exist between Palestine and the XVth dynasty (Dever 1985, Tessier 1990, Philip 1989). It is not known what type of relationship, if any, existed between Palestine and the XVIIth dynasty. However, the inscription of Amenemhet II from Mit Rahina would appear to suggest that the Egyptians were more interested in Palestine during the MK than may have been hitherto suggested.

II.IV EGYPT

Following the First Intermediate Period where Pharaonic control of the country had been lost, the final kings of the XIth dynasty pursued policies of consolidation and rehabilitation which ensured the XIIth Dynasty saw the re-emergence of a strong central government. A period of prosperity followed, with mines and trade routes re-opening, and the XIIth dynasty achieving new heights in its foreign relations. Whether these relations involved the creation of an 'empire' is much debated, and although Egypt would definitely appear to be in control in its southern regions (see section II.V), a 'northern' empire is less realistic (see above II.II,III).

XIIth/XIIIth dynasties

There were eight kings of the XIIth dynasty and over seventy kings of the XIIIth dynasty. At the beginning of the Middle Kingdom the capital of the country was transferred from Thebes back to Memphis, a political move designed to unite the country. The new capital was called 'Itj-towy', 'Seizer of the Two Lands', and strategically placed near the junction of Upper and Lower Egypt. This period of prosperity was heralded by new building activity both at home and abroad, and literary and intellectual achievements, so that in later times it would become known as a classical period in Egyptian history. (Baines and Málek 1984, 40). Sesostris

III is credited with the introduction of administrative reforms, which removed the power of provincial governors and divided the country into four regions. A sophisticated bureaucratic system would now appear to be in place (Baines and Málek, *op.cit.*). It was during this period that the idea of co-regencies were introduced, assuring continuity of rule. This proved to be the case when Ammenemes I was assassinated and his son, Sesostris I, was able to take control despite being on a campaign in the western desert (James 1979, 52). This bureaucracy would appear to increase in the XIIIth dynasty, with the number of official titles of all ranks expanding at this time. With so many kings in approximately 150 years, it is suggested that the real power was once again returned to the governors or viziers (Baines and Málek 1984, 41). This lack of central control would perhaps account for the final disintegration of the government in the following years, although Egypt still continued contacts with Syria and Palestine during the MK and was in control of the fortresses in Nubia.

Tell el-Dab'a

Tell el-Dab'a lies in the eastern Delta and is a site of major importance with regard to the history of the Second Intermediate Period. It has been excavated by the Austrians since 1966 and is identified as the capital of the Hyksos, Avaris. The site was first settled in the XIIth dynasty with the name 'Domain of Amenemhet I, the justified, of Mouth of the Two Ways' (Bietak 1991a, 28), indicating its position on the southern bank of the eastern branch of the Nile. The settlement grew quickly during the XIIIth dynasty, primarily due to an influx of Canaanite settlers, who had appeared at the end of the XIIth dynasty²⁹ (Bietak 1991a, 29). The early settlement (stratum e/1-3 in area F/1) was of a purely Egyptian culture (Bietak 1984), primarily consisting of farmers, although the nature of the settlement (uniform houses in double rows) would indicate a planned settlement where the farmers had been used, perhaps as labour, for a project of a XIIth dynasty king (Bietak 1991a, 31). During the XIIth dynasty, the area south of the

²⁹

An investigation by physical anthropologists at the site have shown that the new settlers were non Egyptian in origin (Bietak 1991a, 29).

original settlement was expanded (Area A/II, stratum H). Among these buildings was a Syrian 'Mittelsaal' house, although the tombs were Egyptian in type with brick chambers with vaulted roofs. The burial customs were foreign to Egypt: the contracted body positions, donkey sacrifices and bronze weaponry are all thought to betray the Asiatic origins of some of the inhabitants (Bietak 1991a, 32). The material culture was mainly Egyptian at this time, with 18-20% of the pottery corpus showing MBIIA types, with the remaining 80% as common XIIth dynasty types (Bietak 1991a, *ibid.*).

Strata G/4-E/2 are dated by Bietak to the XIIIth dynasty (see 1991a, fig.3, p.32), and although there was an increase during this period in the number of MBA ceramics appearing at the site, there was still a mixture of both Egyptian and Canaanite in temple, domestic and funerary architecture and customs. In stratum G/4 (Area A/II, F/1) a palace was built with two phases in Egyptian style architecture. In the gardens south of the palace were a number of tombs, again Egyptian in style. However, once again there were donkey sacrifices in front of the entrances to the tombs indicating Asiatic burial customs still existed (Bietak 1991, 34). Egyptian pottery was still prominent in this stratum, with the MBA types still accounting for less than 20% of the total ceramic types found, while once again the bronzes exhibited MBIIA types (Bietak 1991a, 34-5). In the next phase, stratum G/1-3 (Area A/I, F/I), there is a significant increase in the MBA corpus from 20% to 40%, which Bietak identifies with an influx of Canaanites³⁰ (1991a, 38). Bronzes from the graves are nearly all MBIIA types in this phase, with triangular daggers with midribs, notched chisel shaped axes and socketed javelin heads (Bietak 1991a, 38). Stratum F still sees Egyptian architecture at the settlement in the form of the villa house, paralleled at Khayn. However, a new

30

It is debated whether these early Canaanites are the ancestors of the Hyksos or XVth dynasty (van den Brink 1992, 61). Speiser believes that the Hyksos are composed of several disparate groups, with the Hurrians constituting an important element (1933, 49-51). Kempinski sees the ancestors of the XVth dynasty as being local rulers on the fringes of the sphere of influence of the MK, with their home in Palestine (1985, 133). Philip sees links between the XIIth dynasty settlement and the Northern Levant, based on dagger types known only in Syria and at Dab'a (1989, 209-210), while Bietak debates whether the Asiatic soldiers in the XIIIth dynasty are the forefathers of the 'Hyksos' (1994, 21).

temple (Temple III) in area A/II is of MBA type. Tombs still showed warrior burials and donkey sacrifices and were exhibiting foreign vaulting techniques, thought to be Mesopotamian in origin (van den Brink 1982, 93). Ceramics are typical of the XIIIth dynasty and although 40% are of MB types, there were a number of new types, and bronzes were showing a change from MBIIA to MBIIIB types (Bietak 1991a, 39-40). Stratum E/3 saw a second temple added to the east of the main temple in the eastern quarter, and in contrast to Temple III, was constructed in Egyptian tradition. The Egyptian ceramic repertoire remained the same, as does the 40% of MBA pottery (Bietak 1991a, 40). Stratum E/2 saw the end of the XIIIth dynasty and domestic architecture was still primarily Egyptian in nature. Tombs were of mudbrick and donkey sacrifices still appeared in front of the more important burials. The ceramic repertoire remained the same, with typical 'Hyksos' forms appearing only occasionally (Bietak 1991a, 41).

Syria/Palestine

Evidence of Syro-Palestinian objects found in Egypt are concentrated in the Delta region. The archaeological record at Tell el-Dab'a shows a strong affiliation with Palestine and Syria due to the influx of the non-Egyptian population. The Middle Bronze culture is also witnessed at other sites, all situated on the Pelusiac branch in the eastern area of the Delta, although this may be due to the excavation record and will change in the future. There are seven sites, Tell Farasha, Tell Sahaba, Tell Basta, Ghita³¹, Inshas³², Tell el-Maskhuta³³ and Tell el-Yehudiyeh³⁴, and although information is limited, they appear to have similar MB burial practices (vaulted tombs), weaponry and scarabs (van den Brink 1982, 55ff). Besides large

³¹ Nothing has been published on these four sites. See van den Brink 1982, 55-57.

³² Habachi excavated at this site in the 1940s, and uncovered more than 70 tombs dating to the Hyksos period (Desroches-Noblecourt 1949, 12-13).

³³ Excavations were carried out at the site by Toronto University under the direction of J.S. Holladay in 1978 and remains encompass the MBII among the later periods (Roman, Saite, Early Persian). The MBII material includes architecture and tombs (Kuchman 1978, 13; Holladay 1982, 44-47).

³⁴ See chapter V.II.XXIII for a brief history of excavations at the site.

numbers of Syro-Palestinian amphoras imported to Egypt, a small number of Syrian objects were found at Tell el-Dab'a, together with Syrian and Palestinian forms of architecture, including domestic, funerary and religious. Cattle and eye paint (see above) were imported to Egypt from Palestine (MacDonald 1972, 90-1; Weinstein 1974, 12).

During the XIIIth dynasty at Tell el-Dab'a, a Syrian style house and MBA type temple were discovered in stratum F, although actual foreign objects to be listed are limited (although this may in some part be due to publication records). There is a hematite cylinder seal with representation of the Syrian weather god and a duckbill axe from stratum H. The bronze weaponry from the tombs is nearly all of the MBIIA/B types (Philip 1989, 211). A seated statue with a mushroom type hairstyle³⁵ in stratum G/4 is particularly interesting, for a very similar figure was found at Alalakh by Woolley (Woolley 1953, 64-5, pl.16). He thought the figure to be 'modelled on the Egyptian style', but on comparison with Egyptian statuary, it is clearly not. Thus the figure at Tell el-Dab'a once again illustrates ties with the Levantine area (see fig. 2.1).

Nubia

With stability in the Middle Kingdom in Egypt, there came a desire to exploit the resources and trading networks of the Nubians, which had once existed in the Old Kingdom. A series of military campaigns were launched by the Egyptians and control was gained as far as Semna, south of the Second Cataract (Taylor 1991, 17). A series of fortresses were then established to maintain both political and economic control, but these were apparently most needed against the desert nomads (Kemp 1983, 127). It would appear from the pottery evidence that there was a lively trade in a variety of commodities from both Upper and Lower Egypt with Nubia, and it is possible that the forts acted as intermediaries (Bourriau 1991,

³⁵

There seems to be some confusion as to the level of this statue from Dab'a. In one of Bietak's 1991 publications (1991c, pl.16) it is from Tomb F/1-p/19-Nr.1, str. d/2-1. In another, it is in str. G/4 = d/1. (1991a, 49).

Fig. 2.1: Statues from Tell el-Daba (top) and Alalakh (bottom)

130). During the late XIIIth dynasty and SIP, Nubian 'pan grave' pottery and burials were found scattered throughout Egypt (Hayes 1973, 74; Taylor 1991, 26). Named after their distinctive shallow circular pit graves, it is thought that these Nubians were nomadic herdsman or shepherds³⁶, who first entered Egypt when the Egyptian power at sites such as Buhen declined. Their grave sites had numerous weapons, so they are seen as a warrior race, imported as professional soldiers into the Theban army (Hayes 1973, 75). As they became assimilated into Egyptian society, they adopted their culture and so became undetectable (Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 140; Bourriau 1991, 132).

Second Intermediate Period (XVth/XVIIth dynasties)

This period in Egyptian history is dominated by the *ḥkꜣw ḥꜣs.wt* or 'rulers of foreign lands', who took over part of Egypt at the end of the XIIIth dynasty. The term 'rulers of foreign lands' was used by the Egyptians since the OK³⁷ to describe foreign rulers outside Egypt, as those, for example, depicted in the Beni Hassan tombs (Newberry 1893, pl.30). The foreigners became known as the 'Hyksos', a term coined by later Greek historians, which has become synonymous with a certain period in Egyptian history and culture and a number of problems and misconceptions. It is perhaps better to associate the Hyksos only with their capital, Avaris (Tell el-Dab'a) in the Delta region and the XVth dynasty. Therefore the SIP is made up of two main dynasties, the XVth (Hyksos) in the Delta and the XVIIth at Thebes, and groups of local rulers who were grouped by Manetho as the XIVth and XVIth dynasties, and the term SIP should stand as an all encompassing term for the entire period³⁸.

³⁶ There is some debate as to the identification of the pan grave peoples with the Medjay, known mercenaries in the XVIIth Theban army (see Hayes 1973, 75; Kemp 1983, 170; Taylor 1991, 26; Bourriau 1991, 131).

³⁷ The term was used by the Egyptians to describe the chiefs of Nubia in the OK (Sethe 1933, 109, 134) and to the princes of Syria and Palestine in the XIIth dynasty as seen in the Tale of Sinuhe and in the tomb of Khnumhotep at Beni Hasan showing *ḥkꜣ ḥꜣst*, Abisha bringing eye paint to Egypt.

³⁸ Ward dislikes the term SIP, referring only to the XVth and XVIIth dynasties (Ward and Dever 1994, 3).

The Hyksos

The Hyksos are often referred to as foreigners, and there were a number of foreigners in Egypt by the XIIIth dynasty, particularly Asiatics³⁹. It would appear that they had peacefully infiltrated into the country and the late Middle Kingdom presents evidence for assimilated Asiatics in Egyptian society in considerable numbers (Luft 1993, 291; Hayes 1973, 54). Lists of domestic staff show 45 out of 79 are 'Asiatic'⁴⁰, and there are documents from Kahun referring to an 'officer in charge of Asiatic troops', and to the 'scribe of the Asiatics' (Kemp 1983, 155). It also appears that one or more of the XIIIth dynasty kings had possible Asiatic origins: King Hetepibre used 'son of the Asiatic', as one of his titles, Ameni Aamu means 'Ameni the Asian', while other rulers used their rank as a name, e.g. King Mermesha (the General)⁴¹ (Bietak 1994, 21). Second generation Asiatics appear to have taken Egyptian names, as lists of workers show the parents with Asiatic names and the next generation with Egyptian ones (Luft 1993, 293). Van Seters believes the *Admonitions of Ipuwer* (Gardiner 1909) documents the gradual increase in Asiatics who were established in the Delta, which eventually led to co-operation of Egyptians and Asiatics when the Hyksos took control of power⁴² (1966, 103ff). Whether the influx into Egypt of the Asiatics was a result of the population shifts, general nomadic wanderings, or as slaves, is still uncertain and probably involves all three possibilities. There is no archaeological evidence however, for destruction and take-over, as later Egyptian writers so vividly portrayed (see particularly the evidence from Tell el-Dab'a below).

The Hyksos are portrayed by the Egyptians as taking power forcefully, although

³⁹ Aldred claims that there were a number of Asiatics in Egypt as early as the FIP, acting as cooks, brewers, seamstresses, vine-dressers and so forth (1961, 139 and Frankfort 1926, 95ff).

⁴⁰ See particularly Brooklyn Papyrus 35.1446 of the XIIIth dynasty from Thebes (Kemp 1983, 155).

⁴¹ Bietak speculates whether these Asiatics were the forefathers of the Hyksos (1994, 21).

⁴² Redford believes that 'the presence of Asiatics in Egypt prior to the Hyksos accession to power, had no bearing on the nature of the political coup that produced the XVth dynasty' (1992, 102).

the epigraphic evidence, such as the *Sallier Papyrus* or the *Speos Artemidos* inscription of Hatshepsut, is mixed. Both the *Sallier Papyrus I* and the inscription of Hatshepsut portray the Hyksos rulers as tyrants, but it must be remembered that these were written retrospectively. The *Sallier Papyrus I* (from the reign of Merenptah 1224-1214BC) represents Seqenenre as king Apophis' vassal to whom he must pay tribute, while the inscription of Queen Hatshepsut represents the Hyksos as evil and she must restore the land to order after their rule. By exaggerating the vileness of the foreigners, unification and restoration of order can be seen as a greater achievement. However, as evidence for a more peaceful co-existence, there is the priest of Memphis of the XXIIInd dynasty, who traces his ancestry back to the XIth dynasty, including two or three Hyksos kings (von Beckerath 1964, 27-8). There is also the archaeological evidence of the fragment of alabaster vase with the name of Apophis and inscribed, 'the King's daughter, Herit' from the grave of Amenophis I⁴³ (Hayes 1959, 7). The names were not mutilated, as one would expect if they had been such vile and hated rulers. There is also the possibility of intermarriage between the Hyksos and the Thebans (Aldred 1961, 141, Hayes 1973, 61). Finally there is the evidence of the noble's speech on the Kamose stele, which does not portray them as hostile to Hyksos rule (Smith and Smith 1976, 59).

Nature of Hyksos rule

Following this epigraphic evidence, modern historians offer a range of possibilities concerning the Hyksos or XVth dynasty. Hayes postulated two clear stages of Hyksos domination: firstly Asiatic occupation of Avaris (with elevation of Seth to chief god), and then expansion and consolidation in Lower Egypt by minor kings (1959, 4). Von Beckerath sees the establishment of a Hyksos principality in the Delta, where there is a large Asiatic population and weak Egyptian feeling. A dynasty is established at Avaris and from there they would conquer the rest of the

43

Giveon records that the tomb was actually of Ahmose-Nefertiry (1983, 156), while Hayes believes that a Hyksos princess may have married a contemporary ruler of Thebes and therefore may even have been an ancestress of King Amenophis I (1959, 6-7).

Delta and the Nile Valley (1964, 124-5). Redford also suggests an invasion and take-over scenario (1970; 1993, 98ff), while Säve-Söderbergh disagrees with a mass invasion of a different ethnic group and thinks there was simply a change in rulers (1951, 60). He explains that the influx of foreign goods coming into Egypt was because of the disintegration of the XIIth dynasty (1956, 56). Ward also disagrees with the invasion theory, preferring a Delta dynasty (XVth) set up by native Egyptians who were of Canaanite origin (pers. comm). This would mean that when the MK finally collapsed, local dynasts assumed control in various parts of the country. At Thebes, a powerful local family took over the Thebaid, and in Avaris, a powerful local family took control of the eastern Delta. Therefore the SIP becomes more a period of civil war, than Egyptians versus foreigners. As can be seen in modern day, multi-cultural societies, the foreign origins of a people are rarely forgotten, even after a number of generations⁴⁴. The Asiatics in the Delta had been there for some time, and it has often been pointed out that the Hyksos had assimilated with Egyptian culture to the point of having none of their own⁴⁵. A new study of the pottery from Tell el-Maskhuta reveals that 'the Hyksos are peculiarly Egyptian', (Redmount 1995, 188), once again indicating that although

⁴⁴ Redford believes that it is inconceivable that the historical tradition of the Egyptians should count the Hyksos as foreign, if they were not (1970, 14), or refer to them as foreigners if they had long resided in Egypt (1992, 102). However, in many of today's multi-cultural societies, second or third generation immigrants, although accepted by their host country, will still be perceived as foreigners. Therefore, while foreign settlers in Egypt might see themselves as Egyptians after some generations, the Egyptians would not forget their original background.

⁴⁵ The Hyksos were identified with Tell el-Yehudiyeh pottery, fortification systems, the introduction of the horse, and the worship of Seth. All these points have now been reconsidered in some way. Tell el-Yehudiyeh pottery has now been shown to have been produced in Palestine as well as Egypt from an analysis of the fabric used. Fortification systems, with the use of glacis, steeply sloping scarp and heavy battered stone revetment wall at the base of the glacis, are now thought to have been known to the Egyptians before the SIP, re. the Middle Kingdom fortresses in Nubia (Harif 1978, 24-31), or indeed not known in Egypt at all, the 'forts' at Tell el-Yehudiyeh and Heliopolis in fact being temple foundations (Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 60), or not associated with the Hyksos at all (Parr 1968, van Seters 1966, 27ff). The introduction of the horse is now seen to be not a horse but a donkey (Keel 1993, Macir 1994), and the worship of Seth is not taken as necessarily worship of a foreign deity at this time; it would seem that it was the New Kingdom that initiated foreign connotations for that particular god (Hayes 1973, 56). The adze blade with inscription to Sobek, and Auserre Apophis calling himself 'the Son of Re' would appear to illustrate that the Hyksos were not hostile to all Egyptian gods except for Seth (Hayes 1973, 62; Giveon 1983, 157).

many scholars want the Hyksos to show signs of 'foreignness', they still appear to be 'Egyptian'. The use of non-Egyptian personal names which highlight the XVth dynasty, could be explained as a means of distinguishing their rule from other dynasties.

A strong argument in favour of the SIP being a period of civil unrest rather than foreign intervention is the continuation of cultural elements, for example, pottery types or scarab designs. If a group of foreigners had taken over even part of Egypt, these traditions would be expected to show a break, and the emergence of new traditions. One of the most basic observations regarding scarab production in the XVth dynasty is that it continues that of the MK. If the XVth dynasty were foreigners, new designs, and perhaps new carving techniques would be expected in the scarab seal industry. There are none. Obviously, once the scarab seal became popular in Palestine, new design elements can be observed. But the most important factor is that the carving technique, especially of the hieroglyphs on the base designs, remains the same. This was noted by Giveon, although he saw this as evidence that an empire continued to exist in Palestine under the Hyksos as it had under the XIIth dynasty (1987, 32). But he notes that the designs and techniques are so similar, it is only the contexts that can decide which are earlier and which later (Giveon, *ibid.*). This continuity is also shown at sites such as Gebel Zeit, a mining site on the Red Sea. A series of scarabs from the site (some still attached to string which tied up material packages) in the style of MK/SIP designs would attest, along with other evidence, that the mining continued uninterrupted until the end of the SIP at site 2, and into the NK at site 1 (Castel and Soukiassian 1988, 45). Pottery styles are also seen to have continued in Lower Egypt (Bourriau, *forthcoming*). This would appear to confirm that there were no major interruptions to Egyptian life during the SIP.

'Hyksos culture'

As noted above, there are few material remains associated with the XVth dynasty, thereby making it difficult to speak of a 'Hyksos culture'. They added a little to

existing temples, dedicated an offering table and added their names to existing statues and sphinxes of earlier kings, but many Hyksos kings are only known from scarab evidence (Kemp 1983, 155). Until recently, only two monuments were known of the Hyksos kings Khyan and Apophis in Egypt: their names were inscribed on monumental blocks from Gebelein (Giveon 1983, 155ff). A third monumental block has now been recovered at Tell el-Dab'a. The door lintel has the name of an hitherto unknown Hyksos king, his name written within a cartouche and accompanied by a number of titles including *hk₃w h₃s.wt* (Bietak 1994, 24). Although there is a semitic personal name Seker-Her, there is no throne name, and therefore there are problems identifying the King⁴⁶. Several objects with the name of Khyan have also been found in Baghdad (a lion statuette), Boghazgoy⁴⁷ (a fragment of obsidian vase) and Knossos (lid of alabaster vase) (Kemp 1983, 159). Political deductions on this evidence would be rather tenuous, although the newly discovered Minoan wall paintings in the late Hyksos palace at Tell el-Dab'a make a relationship between the Delta and Knossos more feasible (Bietak 1992; 1994, 197ff; Bietak et alii 1993, 46ff; Hankey 1993). The Papyrus Westcar, a fairy tale written in King Cheops' time, was rewritten during the XVth dynasty and a mathematical paper, the Rhind Papyrus, was written in the 33rd year of Apophis' reign, indicating the arts and sciences continued during the Hyksos/XVth dynasty rule⁴⁸ (Redford 1992, 122).

Extent of Hyksos/XVth dynasty rule

The extent of Hyksos/XVth dynasty rule is debated. The Kamose stele shows Egypt divided into three: Northern Egypt under the Hyksos, Upper Egypt under

⁴⁶ There is also a stele from Tell el-Dab'a with the name Yanassi, who is only known from Manetho. He is mentioned as the oldest son of the Hyksos king Khyan, who seems to have succeeded him, although Bietak thinks it unlikely that he became king after the long reign of Apophis (Bietak 1994, 24).

⁴⁷ This could have reached Boghazgoy via Syria. i.e. when Hattusili I and Mirsili I campaigned in Syria, it is possible the obsidian vase was at one of the towns they razed.

⁴⁸ On the basis of these two items, it is perhaps a little overstated to say that literature and science blossomed during the Hyksos period as Bietak suggests (1994, 24-5).

Kamose and Kush under Nubian control (Säve-Söderbergh 1956, 54). However, it is still disputed whether the XVth dynasty controlled the entire Egyptian state. The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus could help to determine the scope of Hyksos rule, if its origins could be determined. The Papyrus is dated to the 33rd year of Auserre Apophis and is thought to have been written in Thebes (Hayes 1959, 6), which if true, has important implications for the Hyksos/XVth dynasty control of Upper Egypt. However, Quirke argues it is difficult to assign provenance on handwriting alone (Bourriau forthcoming, 4). The blocks of granite from Gebelein, with the names of kings Apophis and Khyan, are also controversial. Von Beckerath still believes the Hyksos only ruled the Lower and Middle Egypt, and the Gebelein blocks were part of disused buildings of a defeated enemy which were transplanted and re-used (von Beckerath 1964, 148-9). Winlock suggests that the XVth dynasty territory was extended to Gebelein under Khyan, and then the independence of Thebes was terminated (1947, 145-6), while Hayes sees the Hyksos ruling all of Egypt until Khyan (Hayes 1959, 5-6). Givón believes the Hyksos were on friendly terms with the South (1983, 161) and Redford sees the blocks at Gebelein as indication of a Hyksos fort controlling the area (Redford 1992, 119). For the present time it is likely that the problems of Hyksos control of Upper Egypt will only be determined by fresh evidence. The letter from Apophis to the king of Kush inciting him to join him in crushing his Theban neighbours would indicate a wish for total control, but one not yet attained (Smith and Smith 1976, 61).

The pottery evidence, although not able to confirm the extent of XVth dynasty rule, would appear to show that there was a clear distinction in regional areas during the SIP. The pottery shows that at Memphis, and associated sites of Lisht and Dahshur, the pottery tradition is unchanging from the Middle Kingdom through to the early XVIIIth. In Upper Egypt and some sites in Middle Egypt (Rifeh, Mostagedda, Qau), there is a change in shapes and clays, which starts in the XIIth dynasty and continues on. This pottery tradition reaches Lower Egypt in the XVIIIth dynasty - after unification. Bourriau believes the new tradition starts in

Upper Egypt due to the decline in Northern influence, and shows it developing during the XVIIth dynasty. There is no change or influences of new styles in Lower Egypt because they are under a different administration, where the emphasis is looking North, towards Palestine (Bourriau, forthcoming).

Tell el-Dab'a

At Tell el-Dab'a, the XVth dynasty is associated with three phases, E/1-D/2. During phase E/1, the settlement expands enormously, and the two temples in the eastern part of the settlement were renewed, while tombs continued with vaulting reminiscent of Mesopotamian techniques (Bietak 1991a, 42). The Warrior graves made their last appearance, as did donkey sacrifices. There were significant changes within the Egyptian pottery corpus, but the Middle Bronze Age pottery still accounted for 40% of ceramics (Bietak 1991a, 42-43). Stratum D/3 saw the town becoming more compact in the eastern part of the settlement, with the cemeteries west of the temple precincts not completely covered by settlements, although occupation in the northeastern part of the site was less compact (Bietak 1991a, 43). Changes were taking place both in the Egyptian and Middle Bronze Age pottery corpus, and MBA shapes no longer appeared among the bronzes (Bietak 1991a, *ibid*). The settlement in the eastern town in stratum D/2 became even more compact, making space for tombs very limited, and multiple burials flourished. The large tombs were of an Egyptian type, while infants were buried in MBA amphorae. As in the preceding stratum, there were no weapons or donkey sacrifices. Among the ceramic corpus, the MBA types accounted for 30% of the total output. Noteworthy is the increase in Cypriot pottery appearing at the site (Bietak 1991a, 45-6). This stratum was seen as representing the last occupation of the site by Asiatics, whom Bietak names Canaanites for convenience. Thus it would appear that while maintaining some of their foreign cultural traditions after settling at Dab'a, the population gradually became more integrated as time went on. The final grave offerings in stratum D/2 are noted as being entirely Egyptian

in character⁴⁹ (van den Brink 1982, 9), and it would appear that the blend of both Egyptian and Palestinian features that had been representative in the culture of Tell el-Dab'a by the XIIth dynasty, were still integrated in the XVth dynasty, although perhaps the more overt Palestine rituals, such as donkey burials and warrior tombs had been replaced by Egyptian customs.

One of the major finds of the late XVth dynasty came from a Palace at Ezbit Helmi to the west of the main site. Here a number of fragments of Minoan frescos were found. The wall paintings displayed motifs which were well known in the Minoan world, such as bull leapers and acrobats, animals including leopards and lions and floral patterns (Bietak 1992, 27; 1994, 197ff). Elsewhere in the Levantine area, Minoan paintings have only been recovered at Kabri in Palestine and Alalakh in Syria indicating contacts, not previously recorded from the archaeological record, might exist between them (Hankey 1993, 28). But perhaps more importantly, contacts may have existed between the Delta and Crete, putting Khyan's alabaster lid from Knossos in a new light. The date of the frescos is still under review (see Chapter III.IV), although if they are dated to the mid sixteenth century, the paintings would fill a gap in the record of Minoan painting technique (Bietak 1993, 53).

It seems impossible to determine how Tell el-Dab'a was abandoned, either by warfare or peaceful means, but it is clear that the archaeological evidence stops abruptly with the early XVIIIth dynasty. As there were no major layers of slain soldiers, it appears that the occupants of Avaris may have surrendered, or retreated to Palestine⁵⁰ (Bietak 1991a, 47; Goedicke 1986, 40).

49

This is a contrasting view of the material at Dab'a as interpreted by Eder who writes that the funeral rights in Hyksos times are un-Egyptian and 'have more parallels with Syria and Palestine... and that overall, Egyptian customs are replaced by Palestinian customs' (Nagel and Eder 1992, 65).

50

This is contrary to Dever who in 1985 indicated there was a 'destruction of the Hyksos' (1985, 75, fig.2), which by 1994 had become 'wholesale disruption at end' (1994, 76, fig.3:12). These remarks appear to be based on no evidence from the site of Tell el-Dab'a whatsoever.

Nubia

Nubian 'pan grave' pottery continues to be found in their graves in Egypt during the SIP (Hayes 1973, 74). At Deir Rifa, this pottery was accompanied by scarabs of Sheshi (Petrie 1907, 21, pl.13E). There is also evidence of different Nubians living in Egypt, based on a new ceramic type, identified as the Kerma material (Bourriau forthcoming). This was also found in Upper Egypt during the XVIIth dynasty and eventually spread north to sites such as Memphis and Saqqara by the early XVIIIth dynasty (Bourriau, pers.comm.). It is suggested, based on the pottery evidence, that the Kerma Nubians had an exclusive relationship with the Egyptians of Upper Egypt, encouraged by them at a time when the Egyptians were threatened in the North by the XVth dynasty and the Nubians in the South. At Ballas, a site close to Thebes, there appears to be among the settlement pottery a considerable amount of Classic Kerma ware (see section II.V below), including cooking pots. This is seen by Bourriau as evidence of Kerma people living in Egypt, possibly as part of the army⁵¹ (Bourriau 1991, 131). The gold found in the pan graves at Mostagedda is seen as payment for the Nubian mercenaries, indicating that they were paid well for their services (Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 139). The Egyptian weapons and objects found in these graves are also used as evidence of the Egyptianization of the Nubians over a period of time (Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 140).

II.V NUBIA

XIIth/XIIIth dynasties

During the Middle Kingdom, there would appear to be both a cultural and political diversity between Upper and Lower Nubia. Lower Nubian culture is defined as the C-group, which appears to have its origins in the Old Kingdom, and has been found at numerous sites in Lower Nubia (such as Faras, Aniba and Dakka) (Kemp

⁵¹

It is suggested by Bourriau that these Kerma Nubians may in fact be the XVIIth dynasty Medjay, as opposed to the term usually being applied to the 'pan grave' peoples (Bourriau 1991, 131-2).

1983, 124ff). In Upper Nubia, culture and politics combine at the site of Kerma. Here, the 'Kerma culture' flourished and became known eventually as the kingdom of Kush⁵². Excavations at Kerma, by Reisner and most recently by Bonnet (1991, 1992, Bonnet et al., 1990, 1991, 1993), have shown that there was a high degree of social stratification, and that 'it was the capital of the first important African state outside of Egypt' (Taylor 1991, 21). However, the exact nature and extent of organization of states or chiefdoms in the Middle Kingdom, is debated (O'Connor 1993).

Lower Nubia was dominated by Egypt in the XIIth dynasty, with Sesostri I and III establishing a series of fortresses as far south as Semna, south of the second Cataract (Kemp 1983, 130-1; Taylor 1991, 17). The fortresses were established to maintain economic control, in an area hostile to the Egyptians, but which they needed to occupy in order to uphold trade with the South, or Upper Nubia. Upper Nubia was rich in gold, ivory and slaves, and Kerma, the major site in the South, was the gateway through which luxury products were supplied to Egypt (Ward 1961, 143; Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 61; Adams 1971, 166). That is, the XIIth dynasty claim to Nubia was not to protect Egypt or Lower Nubia from attack from the South. The fortresses were not strategically placed to enable territorial defences, and there is no evidence of any attempt by the Egyptians to protect their desert flanks. The forts were therefore designed 'not to keep the Nubians under control, but rather to keep the Nile under Egyptian control' (Adams 1971, 185). This is confirmed by the large amounts of Egyptian pottery found in Nubia, and especially at Kerma, and it would appear that a considerable amount of trade existed between the two countries during the XIIth dynasty, with the forts acting as intermediaries for that trade (Bourriau 1991, 129-130). The C-Group population

52

The pottery from Kerma is classified as the Middle Kerma culture (corresponds to the MK and is only known in Nubia), Classic Kerma culture (corresponding to the SIP) and post Classic (corresponding to the XVIIIth dynasty). The classic and post classic cultures are found in Egypt. This pottery has also been identified at Ukma West (Vila 1987) and the sequence developed by Gratien at the Nubian site of Sai (1978, 1986). The Middle Kerma culture at Sai, Ukma West and Kerma contained imported Egyptian pottery and other material allowing chronological correlations with Middle Kingdom sites in Egypt (Bourriau 1991, 129).

appears to have co-existed peaceably with the occupying Egyptians, and their culture seems to have progressed independently of the Egyptian conquest (Kemp 1983, 127).

Due to the Egyptian presence at the fortress sites during the Middle Kingdom, there are obviously a number of Egyptian goods to also be found in Lower Nubia. Records of XIIIth dynasty Kings are found at Kerma, in the guise of stone vases with the names of Ammenemes I and Sesostris I (Kemp 1983, 129). Two inscriptions of Sesostris III were found at Semna (Kemp 1983, 132) while fragments of another relating to Ammenemes III was found in the cemetery in Kerma (Adams 1977, 210). A statue of a prince Hepzefa and his wife, contemporary of Sesostris I, were also found in the cemetery at Kerma, in Tumulus III. These statues led Reisner to believe that Tumulus III was the burial site of Hepzefa, and that he was the Viceroy of Kush (Reisner 1923a, 138). However, this conclusion was challenged on the basis that the burial of Hepzefa is known at Assiut, a site in Middle Egypt, and that it was abhorrent for an Egyptian to be buried on foreign soil (Adams 1977, 208-9). It is therefore possible that the statues were part of a later trade system (Helck 1976, 101ff). However, it does appear that there were Egyptians at Kerma, as seen by the architecture of the Deffufas, the paintings in the mortuary chapels and the grave goods (Adams 1977, 209). These can be seen to have been influenced by a small group of Egyptians living at Kerma, supervising native commerce and industry, perhaps on behalf of the Nubian King (Adams, *op.cit.*, 210). Nubia was included in the Execration Texts, arranged according to chiefs and districts. The chiefs were identified not only by their names, but also by those of their mother and father (Albright 1928, 224).

During the latter part of the XIIIth dynasty, the archaeological record suggests that Egyptian influence waned gradually in Nubia (Trigger 1976, 97), most likely attributable to the internal re-organisation within Egypt itself. As is the case in Syria and Palestine, royal names of the XIIIth dynasty are scarce, although once

again the names of Neferhotep I and Sobekhotep IV are found outside Egypt, this time in Nubia. The name of Neferhotep I is found on a plaque at Buhen (Smith 1976, 54), while Sobekhotep IV is represented on a seated statue on the Island of Argo⁵³. A sealing of (Ammenemes) Sobekhotep II is found at Mirgissa (Kemp 1983, 160). At the Semna Gorge, there is a series of graffiti recording unusually high flood levels, from year two of Ammenemes III to year one of Sedjefakara (possibly fifteenth king of XIIIth dynasty)(Kemp 1983, 160).

Second Intermediate Period

The SIP is seen as a time of 'unprecedented prosperity' for Nubia, when the power and wealth of the kingdom was at its height (Trigger 1976, 97; Bourriau 1991, 130). The internal turmoil in Egypt had resulted in the Egyptians withdrawing from Lower Nubia, a gap that was filled by the Kingdom of Kush, who eventually ruled the country as far North as Aswan, and controlled the southern trade routes (Säve-Söderbergh 1956, 54). The second Kamose stele records Ahmose offering to join forces with the King of Kush to attack Egypt from both the North and South, illustrating the Nubian kingdom was a strong political identity now in its own right (Smith and Smith 1976, 61)⁵⁴. This is confirmed by excavations at Kerma which illustrate that it was 'a kingdom of considerable strength and importance, a counterpart to the Hyksos kingdom of the north' (Kemp 1983, 162).

The powerful nature of the Kingdom of Kush is reflected in the massive graves at its capital, the site of Kerma. Reisner originally dated the Tumuli to the MK, based on the statue of Prince Hepzefa and his wife, who were thought to be contemporary with Sesostris I. However, if the inscribed material is taken to be second hand, as a result of trade in a later period, little basis remains for a MK date. From the remaining inscribed stones and mud seal impression, the graves

⁵³ This may have been looted in the XXVth dynasty (Bourriau 1991, 130).

⁵⁴ Bourriau believes the letter of the Kamose stele between the Hyksos and king of Kush does not signify direct relations, but is rather more a literary device by Kamose to justify war by portraying himself trapped between two enemies (1991, 32).

would belong rather to the SIP (Adams 1977, 211ff). As the Tumuli are non-Egyptian in character, especially with the human sacrifices, their existence would then be in keeping for the burials of the rulers of the Kingdom of Kush. The Kerma culture is found at a number of sites throughout Nubia (Sai, Ukma, Saras, Abka, Mirgissa, Abu Sir, Buhen, Aniba and Kubban), also reflecting the extent of the Kingdom at this time (Adams 1977, 213-4). In fact it would appear that the King of Kush not only employed Egyptians, but replaced the Pharaoh as ruler in Lower Nubia. At the site of Buhen there is a stele which is dated by style, epigraphy and content to the SIP (Kemp 1983, 161). Known as the stele of Sepedher, it shows that the former Egyptian stronghold was governed by an Egyptian family on behalf of the ruler of Kush (Barns 1954; Säve-Söderbergh 1949).

Therefore Egyptian influence and contacts still existed in Nubia during the SIP, although the nature of those contacts have changed. The Hyksos are seen to continue the trade with Kerma, which is said to have carried on without interruption (Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 103ff; 1951, 61). There is only one XVIIth dynasty royal name scarab found at Mirgissa of King Nubkheppre (Vercoutter 1976, 280-1, fig.8). Although Bourriau uses the pottery evidence to argue that contacts between Upper Egypt and Kerma continued unbroken throughout the Middle Kingdom and SIP (Bourriau 1991, 130), Säve-Söderbergh believes that the XVIIth dynasty had no active foreign policy with Nubia (1941, 130). The Egyptian presence at Kerma is undeniable, with Egyptian motifs painted on burial chambers of the royal tumulus, KIII. Inside both KIII and KII, the walls were painted with scenes in Egyptian style, depicting ships, giraffes and other animals (Kemp 1983, 166). The Nubian fortress of Areika also shows a number of Egyptian influences (Säve-Söderbergh 1941, 131). Contacts between Lower Egypt, or the XVth dynasty, is witnessed by the large amounts of scarabs found at Nubian

sites, and confirmed by the letter of Apophis in the Kamose stele⁵⁵. The scarabs are seen as evidence of greater contacts existing between Egypt and Nubia, rather than just trade. This is also indicated by the letter of Apophis in the Kamose stele (James 1973, 297).

One Syrian seal was found at Napata in Nubia (Collon 1987, no.213), but it would appear no Palestinian objects were found in Nubia during the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period, indicating little direct contact existed between Nubia and the Levant at this time.

II.VI CONCLUSIONS

The historical background to the period in which the anra scarab exists is most exciting. The scarab generally belongs to the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt and Nubia, or the MBIIC in Palestine and Syria. In Palestine and Nubia there exists a strong political background at this time, while Syria and Egypt are experiencing turmoil. This period in Palestine has been described as the zenith of urban development, and in Nubia it represented a Kingdom at its height of power and prosperity. In Egypt and Syria it is a time of disintegration, for the former is split by civil war, while the latter is experiencing invasions by hostile nations to the North. However, Egypt's foreign relations during the SIP are some of its most interesting, with contacts continuing with both the Levant and Nubia.

The earliest anra scarabs date to the XIIth dynasty/MBIIA, which can be characterised by the extent of Egypt's association and interaction with other countries, and as has been observed, there are many contradictory conclusions as to the presence of Egyptian objects found in Palestine and Syria. From the relatively small amount of actual Egyptian material to be found in both countries,

55

Bourriau sees no evidence of direct contact between Lower Egypt and Kerma, or the rest of Nubia, between the mid XIIIth and early XVIIIth. She sees the Hyksos scarabs in Nubia as circulating through Upper Egypt (Bourriau 1991, 130), which although a possibility, is unlikely due to the large numbers involved.

it is unlikely that an Egyptian empire existed in the Levant before the New Kingdom. As Ward perceived in 1961, 'it is difficult to reconstruct the type of relationship this material represents' (1961, 44). Based on the archaeological and epigraphic evidence, contacts between Egypt and Syria would seem to be strongest in the XIIth dynasty. There was also a certain amount of contact with Palestine at this time, and as the archaeological record in Palestine shows few statues (as found in Syria) and generally smaller objects present, it would appear that XIIth dynasty contacts were on a smaller scale than with Syria. Contacts with the XIIIth dynasty in both Levantine areas were reduced, and appear confined in both Syria and Palestine to three Egyptian kings: Hetepibre, Neferhotep I and Sobekhotep IV. (The latter two are also noted for their contact with Nubia). Once again, Syria has larger objects such as sphinxes, statues and a mace head, while Palestine has mainly scarabs and smaller statues. Hetepibre is the prenomen for 'Sihornedjherytet the Asiatic', and as has been discussed, a number of rulers of the XIIIth dynasty are thought to have had Asiatic origins. This could possibly explain why Ebla is singled out by the XIIIth dynasty (for attention), but not by the XIIth dynasty. With the XVth dynasty, the balance of power changes again. There are few Egyptian objects found in Syria, and only a relatively small number of scarabs. In contrast, there are large amounts of both royal name and design scarabs in Palestine. It must be remembered however, that the XVth dynasty was not known for large monuments, and generally only through its scarabs.

Bietak sees the Hyksos as distributors of various commodities, such as olive oil, copper, and luxury items. Through the trade of these items, they make themselves indispensable to their vassals in Palestine (Bietak 1994, 287). He sees them as having large holdings in southern Palestine as well as having trade and political relationships with Kush, Cyprus and Syria. Their power rested on the military, overseas navigation and trade with distant lands (Bietak 1994, 287). While this is an interesting scenario, Bienkowski sees that a group of Palestinian princes ruling in the Delta could hardly be responsible for the period of prosperity that resulted in Palestine, except indirectly (1989, 169-179). While there is evidence for some

trade and limited contacts with Palestine, Cyprus and now Crete, I believe that like their predecessors in the XIIth and XIIIth dynasties, it is not possible to speak of empires and vassal states that existed. There were definitely contacts throughout the Levantine region at this time, (demonstrated by the exchange of goods (Maguire 1995) and cosmopolitan courts (Morgan 1995)), but to date it is still not possible to define the exact nature of those contacts.

The SIP ended in destruction and repression. The Hittites campaigned in Syria, the Egyptians dominated once again in Nubia, and there were a number of destructions at Palestinian cities. The nature of these destructions has been endlessly debated, with some scholars attributing them to the Egyptians as they pursue the Hyksos out of Egypt (Weinstein 1981, Dever 1985, 1990a). Other scholars have a completely different view, as they see no systematic destruction of Canaanite cities, and favour a prolonged end to the MBIIC (Seger 1975, Hoffmeier 1989, 1990). While both of these options are possible, it is also credible that much of the widespread destruction found in Palestine and Syrian sites at that time, could have been caused by a more natural phenomenon, such as an earthquake (Bourke 1992, 297).

CHAPTER III

CHRONOLOGY

"...the Canaanite Middle Bronze Age is related to the Syrian Middle Bronze, the Aegean Middle Minoan and Middle Cypriot, and all are connected not only to Egyptian chronology but to that of Mesopotamia as well..."

(Ward in Ward and Dever 1994, 1-2)

III.I INTRODUCTION

And therein lies the chronological problems of the Middle Bronze Age in Palestine - the difficulties of co-ordinating differing chronological systems from different geographical areas in an effort to produce an overall picture. Relative chronology between sites can be endlessly debated and the application of an absolute chronology has taken up much of the archaeological debate, especially during the last decade. Absolute chronology has come to resemble a smorgasbord where a student of archaeology might choose from high, middle or low chronologies of either Mesopotamia, Egypt or Palestine. To the inexperienced, it is a mammoth task to wade through the merits of each selection, and then decide which chronological argument seems correct¹. As it is virtually impossible at this stage of the discussions or arguments to pronounce any one particular system, be it high, middle or low, to be correct - the easy option is to stay with the wider chronological parameters and hope that future research will bring a glimmer of light to the situation. A survey of some of the main issues relating to both terminology, absolute chronology, and chronology of the anra scarabs will be briefly addressed here.

III.II TERMINOLOGY

The terms used by archaeologists to classify different periods in history were first standardised in the 1930s. However, as archaeological research has developed since

¹

As Gitin writes in his discussion regarding terminology, "(for the new student)...the problem is real and amounts to an unfair and often traumatic burden" (Gitin 1985, 105).

that time, the original terminology offered in the 1930s has been questioned. It would appear that at the present time, the processes of defining the terminology relating to archaeological periods continues to evolve.

Palestine

The terminology used within Palestinian archaeology is one of a trinity, with stratigraphy and chronology being its partners (Gitin 1985, 99). Through Petrie's early combination of stratigraphy and chronology, the first terms of reference regarding chronology for Palestinian archaeology was acquired. At the site of Tell el Hesi, Petrie observed that the pottery found in different layers represented different periods in history. On the strength of observations with his knowledge of pottery in Egypt and the Aegean, he therefore suggested four periods of chronological classification: Amorite, and Early, Middle and Later Jewish, dating 1600-650BC (Petrie 1891, 14-15, pl. X). Since Petrie's first classification system there have been a number of other suggestions, and the quest for a consistent terminology still remains a problem today. In 1902, Bliss and Macalister suggested alternative terminology, using Israelite, Jewish and Seleucid as the main periods (with the Israelite period divided into pre, early and late (Bliss and Macalister 1902, 72). In 1912, Macalister changed his mind in his Gezer publication, preferring the term Semitic to Israelite, (as that would incorporate a number of different civilizations of Amorites, Hebrews and other ethnic groups) and divided the Semitic period into four groups followed by Persian and Hellenistic (Macalister 1912 (vol.1), p.xxi). In 1913, Sellin and Watzinger used the terms Canaanite and Late Canaanite and Israelite to classify their Jericho finds (1913, 15). It was rapidly becoming apparent that standardisation was needed in classifying terms.

In 1922, Garstang, who was the first Director of Antiquities in Palestine, gathered together eminent archaeologists at the time (Phythian-Adams, Vincent and Albright), to formulate a classification system of terms capable of specifying the phases of historical and archaeological evolution (Gitin 1985, 101). They agreed to a two tier system: firstly dividing the main periods based on the terms

established in European archaeology of Palaeolithic, Neolithic, Bronze, Iron and Arab, and secondly dividing the Bronze and Iron Ages into Early, Middle and Late with further subdivisions where necessary (Vincent 1923, 54-55). In 1932 Albright divided the Bronze Age into a number of subdivisions, and specifically the Middle Bronze into MBI and MBII (1932, 10). In 1937, Wright² linked the EBII with the first dynasty in Egypt and not Albright's EBI, thereby establishing the key to the Early Bronze Age divisions, and the chronology and terminology for the Neolithic to the EBIV period (Gitin 1985, 103).

During the following years, scholars have attempted to modify the traditional system based on their own experience. Kenyon argued on the basis of her excavations at Jericho that the beginning of the Early Bronze Age should be divided into Proto-Urban A, B and C, followed by EB I (Kenyon 1957, 93-102). In 1973 she went on to reason that the Middle Bronze Age should in fact begin with Albright's MBIIA and therefore be called MBI, as this represented the real beginning of Middle Bronze culture, and that the B and C periods should be amalgamated under MBII (1973, 77-116). The idea of the Middle Bronze being divided into two periods has been followed most persistently by Dever in numerous articles (1985, 1992a, 1992b) and Gerstenblith (1983). Although the archaeological perception of the EBIV period has changed with recent excavation, and the concept of the start of the Middle Bronze Age has shifted to the MBIIA, Dever still insists in dividing the Middle Bronze Age into three periods, essentially the same as Albright's A, B and C (Dever 1992a, 1992b, Ward and Dever 1994). His terminology does not seem to have been widely used³: some Israeli archaeologists use the MBI and MBII division (Kempinski 1992), while others maintain Albright's terminology. Therefore, it has now become necessary at the beginning of any article to check or declare which specific terminology is being

² This work was for his thesis *The Pottery of Palestine from the earliest Times to the End of the Early Bronze Age*. Johns Hopkins University.

³ Despite his recent statement regarding his classification system as being a 'simpler, more rational terminology that is gradually being adopted' (Ward and Dever 1994, 86 fn.1), in the twenty years since it was first proposed (Dever 1973), it has not been widely accepted.

used⁴.

IIB v. IIC

The classification of chronological periods and their terminology continues today, and there is at present a discussion on the merits of dividing the MBII period into two. Kempinski and Bienkowski are the main proponents against the idea of division, as they see no grounds for dividing the pottery, i.e. they see no diagnostic criteria for a distinction between periods IIB and IIC (Bienkowski 1989, 172). However, Mazar (1968), Seger (1974, 1975), Cole (1984), Dever (Ward and Dever 1994) believe the two can be divided, for as Dever proposes, the MBIIC 'represents the zenith of the urban MBA in Palestine, and on that basis alone should be set off as a separate phase' (1994, 35). Dever also lists five criteria separating the two periods, which include the fortification of the sites and the first written texts and truly alphabetic script (Dever 1994, 36). Seger also sees a definite break between the two periods, while acknowledging that the division is disputed because of the continuity seen in common cultural forms such as pottery. However, he sees the MBIIC as a new and dynamic phase in the social and political life of the MBA (Seger 1975, 45).

Egypt

It is not only the terminology of Palestinian archaeology that presents problems, there is also much recent debate regarding the correct terminology for some Egyptian periods. For example, should the Middle Kingdom or the SIP include the XIIIth dynasty? As Ward discusses in his recent work, the differing views regarding the XIIIth dynasty are due to different concepts regarding the political strength and geographical extent of the dynasty (Ward and Dever 1994, 3). Some scholars believe that the XIIIth dynasty should be included in the Second Intermediate Period (James 1979, 55ff; Quirke and Spencer 1992, 38ff) while others see the SIP as only incorporating the XVth and XVIIth dynasties (Trigger

⁴

For example Ward/Dever 1994, 3; Lilyquist 1993, 29-32.

et al., 1983, 149ff; Baines and Málek 1984, 36ff; Bourriau, forthcoming, 2). Dever incorporates the XIIIth dynasty into both the MK and the SIP, and further subdivides the SIP into two: the SIP as the XIIIth and XIVth dynasties, and the 'Hyksos' as the XVth, XVIth and XVIIth dynasties (1992b, 3, fig.1). Alternatively, Ward does not regard the XIVth or XVIth dynasties as historical dynasties, rather groups of local rulers, and vassals of either the XIIIth or XVth rulers (Ward and Dever 1994, 3).

The term SIP also raises problems as to its exact meaning. It is often used synonymously with the Hyksos or Hyksos period. For example, scholars often refer to 'SIP type designs' when referring to Hyksos scarabs. Ward now avoids the term except when quoting other scholars (Ward and Dever 1994, 3), while Ward, as has been seen above, allocates it to the XIIIth and XIVth dynasties - nothing to do with the 'Hyksos' or XVth dynasty. I believe the term should be used to encompass the period between the MK and the NK, or as Martin writes, 'the SIP signifies the era between the collapse of the Middle Kingdom and the reunification of Egypt by the princes of Thebes at the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty' (1971, xi, fn.8). That is, it refers to both the XVth and XVIIth dynasties (and also the XIVth and XVIth dynasties). There is also the problem of the term 'Hyksos', 'Hyksos culture' or 'Hyksos empire'. As a term, Hyksos is often used to imply a distinct cultural or geographic entity. As Ward points out, the idea of a Hyksos culture stretching over a Hyksos empire has no basis in fact (Ward and Dever 1994, 3). Essentially, the term describes the six kings of the XVth dynasty who ruled from Avaris (Tell el Dab'a). The nature and extent of Hyksos rule and culture were discussed in Chapter II, and may or may not include parts of Palestine. For terms of reference, the Hyksos period best correlates with the MBIIC and does not refer to a culture common to both areas, but rather to the XVth dynasty at Avaris (Ward and Dever 1994, 4).

III.III ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY

In the last ten years the various chronologies of high, middle and low dates have generated much debate (see Åström 1987a, 1987b and 1989; Bietak 1991a, 27-28), resulting in a range of possible dates for all geographical areas. It therefore becomes possible to support a low chronology for one area, eg. Egypt, while preferring a high or middle for another area, eg. Mesopotamia⁵. The problems relating to the Egyptian absolute dates stem from the location in Egypt where official sightings of the heliacal rising of Sirius were made, thus instituting the Lunar New Year. Long discussions have occupied Egyptologists as to whether the sightings were made at Elephantine (Krauss 1985), Memphis or Heliopolis (Leitz 1989). Others believe this debate is unnecessary since the Egyptian lunar new year could not possibly have begun at the same time throughout the country (Helck 1989, 41). Bietak describes the attributing of dates within Egyptian chronology as 'a dense network of regnal (sic.) dates and genealogical data (which) allows us to calculate from safe fixed points of the first millennium BC backwards within acceptable margins of error' (1991a, 28)⁶. The absolute chronology of Mesopotamia revolves around the rule of Hammurapi and the fall of Babylon which can date 1848 (high), 1792 (middle) and 1728 (low) (Ward 1961, 147).

Even within the high, middle or low options, the range of dates can be manipulated. For example, in Dever's latest work on chronology, he classifies himself as a 'middle' dater (Ward and Dever 1994, 84, fig.3.6). To place himself in this position, he puts Ward as ultra high (although Ward himself no longer

⁵ See Lilyquist 1993, 29 who supports a high Egyptian chronology but a middle one for Mesopotamia. Dever even divides chronologies within a geographical area: following a high chronology until the New Kingdom in Egypt and then switching to a low chronology (1992b, 1).

⁶ Bietak demonstrates that absolute chronology in Egypt is not as straight-forward as calculating from the NK backwards and the MK forwards, and is prone to a large amount of subjectivity. In a discussion concerning the duration of the XIIIth dynasty he writes 'the 153 years of the Barbarus version of Manetho are the *most probable*. Kitchen *feels* that this total may be *approximately correct*'. However, later he writes 'the Barbarus sum of 153 years for XIIIth dynasty is *probably not* a correct figure...' and later uses a date 'that would fit more comfortably with our calculations from the NK backwards based on the current NK chronologies, provided that the XIIIth dynasty lasted about 153 years' (my italics; 1991a, 48).

supports this date, pers. comm.), and Mazar and Epstein as the high daters (presumably not for their starting dates of 2000 or 1950, but for their finishing dates of MBIIA at 1800BC). However, Kempinski also supports a 2000-1800BC date for MBIIA and he is included in the 'middle' daters, along with Dever. Dever actually has three dates for the end of the MBIIA: in the above discussion he dates the end of MBIIA at 1775 (Ward and Dever 1994, 48), in an earlier chart he refers to 1800/1775 (1994, 27, fig.3.1) and in a heading refers to MBIIA as 2000-1750BC (1994, 29), thereby appearing to keep his options open. If Dever is then accepted as one of the high daters⁷, Weinstein becomes the middle dater and Bietak, Kenyon and Albright as the low daters rather than 'ultra' low.

Tell el-Dab'a

The process of association of different countries with Egyptian chronologies to establish absolute dates, has been standard practice since Petrie first compared his pottery at Tell el-Hesi with that he had known from his Egyptian excavations. At the present time, a site in the Delta region of Egypt, Tell el-Dab'a, should provide helpful synchronisms between Palestine and Egypt as, amongst other items, both Palestinian and Egyptian pottery occur together.

Bietak believes that attempts to ascertain a proper chronological relationship between Palestine and Egypt have hitherto failed due to the method of correlating the phases of MBA culture with Egypt on the basis of one of the three chronological schemes used in Palestinian archaeology. Bietak thinks the procedure had grave methodological mistakes, since the region of Syria-Palestine has no independent chronology, but depends on the astronomically based, independent chronology of Egypt or Mesopotamia. That is, the high, middle and low chronology of Syria-Palestine was based on synchronisms with the Babylonian empire, which has chronologies differing by as much as 200 years. Therefore, to date Egyptian assemblages by using Palestinian schemes, is to date Egyptian

7

This is also due to the accepted dates of Mazar (1968) and Epstein (1974) no longer widely used or accepted.

chronology indirectly with a inadequate Mesopotamian chronology (Bietak 1991, 27). Bietak wishes to date the MBA remains at Tell el-Dab'a using Egyptian chronology. However, as this has led to a low chronology for Syria-Palestine, he has encountered opposition from Palestinian specialists, especially Dever. Dever often writes of Syro-Palestinian specialists being opposed to Bietak, but it is really only himself, and he quotes his own references, which do not refer to other scholars⁸. Dever is clearly unhappy with Bietak's chronology, but belittles his own work by his emotive descriptions of Bietak's work e.g. Bietak *drastically* reduces the Palestinian chronology (Dever 1991, 73; 1994, 74), or has suffered a *devastating rebuttal* by another scholar (Dever 1991, 76; 1994, 75).

As seen above, the major problem between Dever and Bietak is Bietak's low MBIIA date. However, it is important to remember that chronological periods are not necessarily exactly duplicated in different areas. For example, the scarabs of Neferhotep I of the XIIIth dynasty are found in Palestine, but the XIIIth dynasty may have existed for a longer period in the south of Egypt than in the Delta. That is, after the rise to power of the XVth dynasty, the XIIIth dynasty may have continued in Upper Egypt before the establishment of the XVIIth dynasty. Therefore, when Bietak's MBIIA starts later than in Palestine, and continues into the XIIIth dynasty, and the MBIIIB starts late XIIIth and goes in to the XVIth dynasty (Bietak 1991, 53), this is quite possible, for the area. Dever seems to have forgotten that in 1985 he wrote 'Bietak reminds me that his low date for the beginning of the MBIIA is *concerned only with Egypt*, not Palestine' (my italics, Dever 1985, p.84, fn.23).

III.IV THE THERA ERUPTION

The date of an eruption of an ancient volcano at Thera on the island of Santorini

⁸

For example, he cites 'Dever 1985, 1991 and references there' (Ward and Dever 1994, 85). However, in Dever 1991, 7, fn.2, he quotes himself forthcoming i.e. his 1992 article, which makes no mention of all the other Syro-Palestinian specialist against Bietak. Nor is there any mention in his 1985 article.

in the Aegean has significance for absolute dating in the Levant. Analysis of the radio carbon dates should be able to provide an absolute chronology for the Aegean Bronze Age which in turn can be linked to Palestine, Egypt, and Cyprus. However, as with many chronological fixed points, there is no consensus as to the date of the eruption. The eruption was originally dated to c.1500 BC (Renfrew 1979, 575-79; Niemeier 1980, 76), although there have been advocates of an earlier date (Michael 1976, Betancourt 1987, Manning 1988). Manning has produced the most recent major study, advocating an earlier radio carbon date of mid to late 17th century (1988, 63). Bourke also disagrees with the earlier date (1992, 289) and associates the MBIIC/LBI destructions in the Levant to the Thera eruption (1992, 290ff). Goedicke notes that the thunder recorded in the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus may, in fact, refer to the Thera Eruption (1986, 41). The date of the eruption may be finally settled by analysis of pumice material from post-Hyksos levels at Tell el-Dab'a (Hankey 1993, 28). The dating of the eruption has important implications for archaeological material such as the Minoan wall paintings found at Tell el-Dab'a. If dated to the sixteenth century, the paintings at Dab'a would fill a gap in the knowledge of Minoan wall paintings, with obviously important historical conclusions. However, if an earlier date is accepted, this would not be the case (Bietak et al., 1993, 53).

III.V THE PRESENT WORK

The problems therefore relating both to terminology of historical periods and the allocation of absolute dates are numerous, as both are subject to frequent revision. Philip in his survey of metal types in the Early and Middle Bronze Ages in Syria and Palestine summarises succinctly the problems of relating archaeological surveys with absolute chronology. 'Small differences between the various absolute chronologies are not of vital importance...most of our material derives from archaeological contexts such as tomb groups or domestic areas which can rarely be tied to absolute chronological schemes. Such contexts are generally dated on the grounds of ceramic typology, which change gradually, at different paces in

different regions, and is related to absolute chronology in a general way only... we are dealing with archaeological material, and our questions must be of a kind which archaeology can answer.' (1989, 3).

It remains therefore to state which chronological system will be followed in this thesis. Although it is a simplified view, and acknowledged as such (as seen in section III. II above), Albright's terminology is adhered to (the Middle Bronze is split into IIA, B and C), with the MBIIA roughly correlating to the XIIth dynasty, the MBIIB with the XIIIth dynasty and MBIIC the XVth dynasty. If dates must be discussed, then the general 2000-1750 for MBIIA, 1750-1650 for MBIIB and 1650-1500⁹ for MBIIC are proposed.

III.VI DATING OF ANRA SCARABS

An important part of the research into the anra scarab is to determine its chronological parameters. While generally identified with the XVth dynasty in Egypt (Grenfell 1915, 222; Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 51; Tufnell 1984, 121), this investigation has shown the anra scarab occurs outside these parameters, with appearances in the XIIIth dynasty (possibly late XIIth dynasty), and in the early New Kingdom. The most important chronological factor of the anra scarab would be the date of its first appearance, as this might determine who first manufactured the scarab and what it was used for. At the present time, it is not possible to differentiate between its first appearance in Palestine or Egypt, as it is present at approximately the same time (see below). That is, even if the scarab contexts at Rishon and Memphis were confirmed, the current chronological systems in place are not sensitive enough to differentiate between the two areas, thus indicating in

⁹

The end of the MBIIC is another well debated subject, which includes ascertaining who was responsible for the destructions and when they occurred (Redford 1979, Shea 1979, Bimson 1981, Weinstein 1981, Dever 1985, 1987, Hoffmeier 1989, 1991). I am an advocate of the Tuthmosis III campaigns in Palestine (see Seger 1975, 45), not believing the Egyptians 'chased' the Hyksos through Palestine at the end of the SIP. Bourke has suggested that the Thera volcano caused widespread earthquakes which affected the Levant and enabled Tuthmosis' armies to overrun Palestine and Syria with greater ease (1992, 297).

which area the scarabs first appeared.

III.VI.I Rishon le Zion v. Memphis

Rishon le Zion

The material from this site has not yet been fully published, and to date there is only one small report in Hebrew on the site. There is a large group of scarabs (approx. 60) from Rishon currently being studied by Daphna Ben-Tor¹⁰. Ben-Tor dates the majority of the scarabs to the MBIIA or A/B transition, which makes them part of a select group belonging to the earliest period in which scarabs first appeared in Palestine. Unfortunately, Ben-Tor is still waiting for a detailed analysis of the pottery from the tombs, and although most of the scarabs appear to have early designs reminiscent of the XII/XIIIth dynasties, she admits there are some designs more commonly thought to belong to the XVth dynasty within the group. So, although she writes 'the Rishon le-Zion group is the largest found so far in a clear MBIIA-B archaeological context with no later intrusions' (Ben-Tor forthcoming), this awaits confirmation.

Memphis

Two anra seal impressions have been discovered at the recent excavations at the site of Kom Rabia, Memphis. Since they were first published (Richards 1992, 32), they have attracted attention, as they were the first seals of this type clearly outside the common XVth dynasty time span allotted to this design. The excavator had dated the deposit on a preliminary examination of the material from mid-late XIIth dynasty. Unfortunately, the pottery from the ash deposits in which the sealings were found are still awaiting final analysis. At the present time, a revised date of late XIIth dynasty to early XIIIth dynasty is suggested (Bourriau pers. comm.).

¹⁰

I am most grateful to Daphna Ben-Tor for discussing the unpublished scarab information with me.

Nubt

While there is little to choose from between the chronological parameters of Rishon and Memphis, there is one anra scarab from the XIIth dynasty site of Nubt. There are two sealings from this site, although unfortunately they are among the many surface finds of sealings, which could lead to some debate about their XIIth dynasty origins. Petrie felt that it was probably older than the XIIth dynasty (1896, 66).

Conclusions

Therefore at the present time the date of the earliest anra scarab cannot be precisely ascertained, but it would appear that they existed before the XVth dynasty. The anra scarabs found in late Bronze Age contexts (Gezer in Palestine and in NK contexts at Gurob and Esna), or with their humeral callosities marked (see Chapter IV), could be heirlooms or a product of a later industry. These options are discussed in Chapter IV (Section IV.X).

CHAPTER IV

TPOLOGY

'Archaeologists have paid scant attention to the reasons for creating typologies, to what they hope to achieve with them. All too often, classification has been seen as an end in itself'.

Philip 1989, 7.

IV.1 INTRODUCTION

The publication of scarab seals over the last one hundred years has concentrated on a number of different classification systems, as discussed in Chapter I. Each new publication offered a different typology, generally determined by the base design of the scarab alone. It has only been in relatively recent times that one classification system has emerged ahead of the others, namely that of Ward and Tufnell¹. This is superior to others offered, as it utilizes all aspects of the scarab seal: length, head, back, and sides, as well as base design. An important criterion of Ward and Tufnell's work has been to create a typology that has wider implications than a stylistic analysis alone. They have endeavoured to show that while one individual scarab will not help chronologically, a group will display certain trends according to different time periods, making scarabs *en masse* a useful chronological indicator (Ward and Dever 1994, 147ff). Thus their typology has not been mindlessly created, and their aims have been clearly stated throughout², unlike some considered by Philips (above). Therefore, it is their classification system that forms the basis for the typology used in this thesis.

The aim of classifying the scarabs by type is to ascertain iconographic, epigraphic, geographical or chronological trends within the small corpus of anra scarabs. To this end, the scarabs are classified in two categories. The first concentrates on the

¹ Ward 1978, Tufnell 1984 and Ward and Dever 1994.

² See Philip (1989, 8ff) for general discussion on typologies. Also Ward (in Ward and Dever 1994, 9ff) on general scarab typologies and (Ward and Dever 1994, 20ff) for his own scarab typology.

iconography of the base design, while the second is based on epigraphy. By covering both options, it is hoped that any geographical or chronological proclivities may emerge. The iconography of the base designs are divided into categories such as bipartite, tripartite divisions of the base, scroll borders, or cartouches. The epigraphy of the designs are also easily divided into three, four and five letter combinations, while supplementary signs, two sign combinations and debased signs are also considered³. A wider discussion incorporating parallels with royal name scarabs and cylinder seals, plus consideration of the earliest and latest anra scarabs, are also included in this chapter.

There are approximately 400 scarabs in the catalogue which fall into three basic groups: provenanced, unprovenanced (from sites) and those from collections. While it would be ideal to only utilise scarabs with contexts, this would leave only a very small sample to be considered. Therefore the three groups have been utilised in the type series, with those in the unprovenanced and museum collections supplementing the type series only where necessary. An attempt has been made in the type series to refrain from distinguishing numerous different types in order that it does not become too complicated, and trends lost in the sheer volume of data. Where appropriate, sub-divisions have been added as they naturally occurred. Figure 4.1 outlines the typological divisions of the base, but there are five basic groups:

A:	Fills whole field
B:	Bi-partite division
C:	Tri-partite division
D:	Scroll borders
E:	Animal and Human figures

Within each division for each group there are four discussion points:

i):	design and supplementary signs
ii):	geography
iii):	scarab features
iv):	chronology

³

Two sign combinations of the original three anra signs are not considered 'true' anra scarabs, but as their designs are clearly based on the original scarabs, they have been included in this discussion. They are included on the relevant plates where space permits, otherwise they can be found in the catalogue.

Type A: Design element fills whole base

- A(i): fills whole field
- A(ii): fills whole field, with filling element

Type B: Horizontal divisions

- B(i)a: basic division
- B(i)b: upper & lower sections: linear
- B(i)c: upper & lower sections: ankh sign
- B(i)d: upper & lower sections: papyri
- B(i)e: upper & lower sections: papyri and crown
- B(i)f: upper & lower sections: crowns
- B(ii): horizontal cartouche

Type C: Vertical Divisions

- C(i): bipartite division
- C(ii)a: tripartite division - no lines
- C(ii)b: tripartite division - with lines
- b(i): anra central
- b(ii): anra flanking
- b(iii): anra all columns
- C(ii)c: tripartite division - lines with uraei
- C(ii)d: Hyksos panel border
- C(ii)e: Shrine motif
- C(iii)a: anra cartouche
- C(iii)b: open ended cartouche
- b(i): open ended cartouche with uraei
- C(iii)c: anra surround cartouche

Type D: Scroll Borders

- D(i): interlocking scroll
- D(ii): paired scroll border

Type E: Animal and Human Figures

- E(i)a: cobras
- E(i)b: horus hawk
- E(i)c: sphinx
- E(i)d: antelope
- E(ii): human figures

Fig. 4.1: Type classes of the anra scarab

It should be noted that all conclusions regarding the typology are based on this corpus only. While every effort has been made to collect all known examples to date of the anra scarab, it is acknowledged that some may have been missed and more are likely to be excavated in the future, which may change the results here⁴. Scarabs belonging to each type group are listed, illustrated⁵ and their geographic distribution mapped (sites underlined with red). Only scarabs with all three anra signs are included, although note is made of two sign motifs. The scarab references (e.g. KER 2, ESN 5) are based on the catalogue, where full details of abbreviations are given and numbers are based on the individual sites. The same system of reference has been utilised for the plates, except the sites names are generally written in full. The abbreviation 'NC', found on the plates, refers to 'no context'. Supplementary signs are those other than *c*, *n* and *r*, and are dealt with in detail in section IV.VII, but are noted where relevant to each type. There are three different writings of the *n* sign, and this is discussed in section IV.VI, although this is also noted when relevant to a particular class.

The anra scarab is found in Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Nubia (with one example from Cyprus, see Chapter I, fn.17) (see Map 4.1). For the purposes of this discussion, Egypt is divided into The Delta region, Middle and Upper Egypt. Palestine is divided into the coastal region, the central highlands and the Jordan Valley.

Scarab features such as the head, back and legs, which are important in scarab typologies, are often overlooked and not included in publications, as the base is concentrated upon. Therefore discussions concerning these features are dealt with in percentage terms⁶. The terminology of head, back and side types are based on

⁴ For example, the author has seen anra scarabs from the site of Tel Nagila in the Israel National Museum, but was unable to study them and they are unpublished.

⁵ Not all scarabs are illustrated for each type, particularly if they exhibit similar designs.

⁶ Only scarabs with the original three anra signs have been used in the analysis of the scarab features. Those scarabs with only two signs have not been included.

Map 4.1: Geographic Distribution of Anra Scarabs

Ward and Tufnell's original work⁷, (see Appendix B). For discussion purposes, the leg and head types have been simplified. For example, leg types are classified as one of four types: 'simple legs', (illustrated as a single incision running around the width of the scarab), simple legs with rear leg marked, triangular legs, and triangular with rear leg marked. Simple legs are generally Ward's type 'e9' or 'e11', while triangular legs could include a number of different types from Ward's classes 'd' or 'e'. Head types are referred to by their general categories of lunate, square, trapezoidal or open, while backs are either plain, divided or decorated. The humeral callosity refers to a natural marking on a live beetle, said to denote its shoulders (Tufnell 1984, 36). This is represented on a scarab by V-shaped marks on the wing-case. These were first associated with Apophis (Tufnell 1984, 36), although they are generally seen to indicate an XVIIIth dynasty date (Ward 1994, 197).

IV.II TYPOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

IV.II.1 TYPE A: FILLS WHOLE FIELD

This is the simplest type of design base and falls into two categories:

A(i): whole field and

A(ii): whole field with filling element.

A(i): Design fills whole field (fig. 4.2, Map 4.2)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)

GEZ 1; JER 1,3,41; RIS 1; TEA 16; TEY 8; TED 1,2,3; MEM 1; GUR 1; SED 4; ESN 1,2,3; DEB 1; MIR 1; UKM 1,2; KER 1; NIC 1.

i): There are three, four and five sign combinations within this type, with the ^c-*r*-*n*-*r*-^c combination found at Esna, Ukma, Mirgissa and Kerma i.e. a predominantly Upper Egyptian and Nubian style. Supplementary signs are found on scarabs from Rishon, Gezer, Jericho, Tell el-Dab'a and Jericho. There are a number of two

⁷

Ward's new terminology for back types based on O'Connor's article (see Chapter I), have not been utilised here.

Dab'a 1
Str. G

Dab'a 2
T.26

Rishon 1

Esna 2
T.221

Jericho 3
J.39

Esna 3
T.223

Yehudiyeh 8
NC

Memphis 1
Pit

Ukma 1
T.189

Ukma 2
T.9

Mirgissa 1
T.39

Kerma 1
KIII

Esna 1
T.163

Ajjul 16
NC

Sedment 4
1256

Jericho 41
J.19

Deberia 1
T.37

Gurob 1
T.67

Gezer 1
T.28II

Dab'a 3
T.2

Jericho 1
T.9

Fig. 4.2: Type A(i): Fills whole field

Map 4.2: Distribution of Type A(i)

sign examples⁸, and all three examples of the letter *n* are found in this type (see section IV.VI). This type is classified by Tufnell under her formulae class, 3C (Tufnell 1984, 121, pl.xvi).

ii): This type is the most widespread of all the design types, as it is found in Palestine, the Delta, Egypt and Nubia. The three letter combinations are found only in the Delta region. The five letter sequence is predominantly Nubian, with one example from Esna and a poor example from Tell el-Ajjul. The four letter combination is found in Egypt, the Delta, Nubia and two examples from Jericho. There are no Syrian examples.

iii): Eighty five percent of backs are plain, with 7.5% both divided and decorated. The most popular head type is trapezoidal accounting for 67%, while 22% of scarabs had open heads and 11% had square heads. The simplest leg type (single incision only) is found on 67% of scarabs, while 33% have a single incision with rear leg marked. The scarab with divided back from Rishon is from an early MBIIA/B context, and this type is more common at this time than in the MBIIB/C or SIP (Ward and Dever 1994, 183).

iv): This type includes both the earliest and latest examples in the anra scarab chronological range. The scarabs from Rishon and Memphis are among the earliest, dating late XIIth/early XIIIth dynasty or MBIIA/B. Other MK examples are found at Esna and the earliest levels of Tell el-Dab'a. The latest examples, from the XVIIIth dynasty, are found at Gurob and Esna, while the scarabs from Jericho are from Kenyon's group IV and V. The scarabs from Ukma West, Sedment, Debeira East, Kerma and Mirgissa date to the 'Hyksos' or XV-XVIth dynasties. Therefore, it would appear chronologically that this type covers the whole MBII range.

A(ii): Design fills whole field with filling element (fig. 4.3, Map 4.3)

(Ward and Tufnell Class 3B6 & 3C)

TM 1; GEZ 3,6; JER 4; TEA 1,17,18; ANB 3; LM 1; BAS 2; HM 1; PET 1,2.

⁸ MEG 1; JER 2; LACH 1; TEA 15; TEY 7; ANB 1,2; KER 3,4.

Tell Michal
Locus 983

Jericho 4
H13

Gezer 3
NC

Ajjul 17
NC

Gezer 6
NC

Ajjul 1
T.1701

Basle 2
NC

LM.1
NC

Ajjul 18
NC

Aniba 3
T.28

Ajjul 19
NC

Kerma 5
KII

Basle 1
NC

Niccacci 2
NC

**Fig. 4.3: Type A(ii): Design fills whole field,
with filling element**

Map 4.3: Distribution of Type A(ii)

i): Two main types emerge from this group: those with the *nbw* (gold) sign in the longitudinal setting, and those with a more linear pattern. *Ankh* signs are the common filling element with the *nbw* sign, and there are either three or four sign combinations between the *nh* signs. The group with the linear filling element have five letter sign combinations, of the *ᶜ-r-n-ᶜ-r* type. There is one example from Aniba of the *ᶜ-r-n-ᶜ-r* sequence. At Jericho, the *r* sign has become more like a *t* or *nb* sign, and at Gezer there is a *šn* sign instead of the *r* sign. Tell Michal has an additional *hᶜ* sign. There are a number of two sign combinations of this type, found at Tell el-Ajjul, Kerma and from the collections⁹. The Kerma example has a crocodile as the filling element. The gold (*nbw*) sign set longitudinally is classified as Tufnell's 3B6 class, and is found on other scarabs without the anra motif at sites such as Pella, Jericho, Tell el-Far'a and Tell el-Ajjul (Tufnell 1984, 120, pl.xv).

ii): This type is found on the coast and inland highlands of Palestine, the Delta (Chabin el-Kahata, see footnote 43) and Nubia. There are none from Syria, or Upper and Middle Egypt.

iii): The most popular back type is the plain back, accounting for 86% of the scarabs. There is one decorated example. Head types are divided between open (14%) and trapezoidal (86%). Side types are simple (80%), with one triangular (20%). These features, the plain back, B and D type heads and simple sides, are typical of the MBIIB/C period (Ward and Dever 1994, 172).

iv): The scarabs from Gezer are without context and the scarab from Nubia dates from the SIP to the NK. The scarab from Jericho is from Group IV, one of the Ajjul scarabs is from the lower city in Block G, and the scarab from Tell Michal is from a LBI/II context. It is not possible therefore, to provide a more precise date other than MBIIB/C, and given the back and side types of the Tell Michal scarab, it is most likely to be an heirloom. Tufnell noted that the greater number of scarabs with the *nbw* sign design were found in tombs of Group IV-V, and also concluded that this group dated to the SIP (Tufnell 1984, 120).

IV.II.II TYPE B: TRIPARTITE HORIZONTAL DIVISIONS

The tripartite horizontal divisions are split into two main groups with the first group classified into five divisions based on their upper and lower sections.

B(i)a: Basic division (fig. 4.4, Map 4.4)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)
GEZ 8; TEA 2,25,26; AM 2.

i): A variety of designs is encompassed within this type. Four and five sign combinations are utilized, the four sign combination as $^c-r-n^c$ and five sign as $^c-n-r^c-n$ and $^c-r-n-n-r$. There are no supplementary signs present. There are a number of two sign combinations in this type¹⁰. The sequence $^c-n^c$ is particularly popular and is found at Tell el-Far'a, Gezer and 'Ajjul. These scarabs are included in Tufnell's formulae class (1984, 121, pl.xvi).

ii): This type is only found in southern and inland Palestine, except for the one example which may be from the Sinai (AM.2). There are no examples from the Delta, Egypt or Nubia.

iii): All backs are plain, and 67% of legs are straight, and 33% triangular. The dominant head type is trapezoidal, accounting for 67% of heads, the remaining 33% are open heads.

iv): No chronological indicators are available for this group.

B(i)b: linear upper and lower sections (fig. 4.4, Map 4.5)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)
TEA 24,28,29; TEY 1; GUR 3.

i): There are three and four sign combinations among the small number of scarabs in this class. The scarab from Gurob has one supplementary sign, and the n sign as a branch is the most common representation of that sign in this group. There are two, two sign combinations (TEA 27, 30). These designs are included in Tufnell's class 3C (1984, 121, pl.xvi).

¹⁰

GEZ 7; TEA 22,23; TEF 1; TBM 1 (see fig. 4.4).

B(i)a: BASIC DIVISION Ajjul 25
NC AM.2
Sinai Ajjul 26
NC Ajjul 2
T.232 Gezer 8
NC Far'a 1
T.568 Gezer 7
NC Ajjul 22
NC Ajjul 23
NC TBM 1
NC*B(i)b: UPPER & LOWER SECTIONS: LINEAR* Ajjul 28
NC Ajjul 29
NC Ajjul 24
NC Yehudiyeh 1
T.37 Gurob 4
NC**Fig. 4.4: Horizontal Divisions: Tripartite**

Map 4.4: Distribution of Type B(i)a

Map 4.5: Distribution of Type B(i)b

- ii): This type comes from southern Palestine, the Delta and Middle Egypt.
- iii): Only one scarab has back/side/head features: it has a trapezoidal head with plain back and triangular legs.
- iv): No dates are available for the Ajjul and Gurob scarabs. The Tell el-Yehudiyeh scarab is dated 1700-1600 BC.

B(i)c: Ankh signs in upper and lower sections (fig. 4.5, Map 4.6)

(No Ward & Tufnell Class)

BS 1; TEY 9,10,11,12; SED 1; ESN 4; MIR 2; MM 1.

- i): This class has three, four and five sign sequences. There are no supplementary signs found in the anra sequence, and the branch motif is found as the *n* sign at Tell el Yehudiyeh and Beth Shan. Tufnell had no examples of this type of design as it was not found at Jericho, Tell el-Far'a or Tell el-Ajjul, and therefore has no corresponding classification.
- ii): This type is most popular at Tell el Yehudiyeh, with two further examples from Egypt. Single examples are found in Nubia and northern Palestine.
- iii): All known backs are plain and sides simple. 75% of heads are open, and 25% trapezoidal.
- iv): Both the Esna and Mirgissa scarabs are dated to the SIP/XV-XVIIIth dynasty.

B(i)d: Papyri in upper and lower sections (fig. 4.5, Map 4.7)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)

MEG 2; TA 1; SHL 1; GEZ 9; TEA 4,31,32; TEF 2,3; TEY 13; AM 1.

- i): There are mainly four sign combinations of ^c-*r*-*n*-^c, and two five sign combinations in this class. Supplementary signs are found at Megiddo and Tel Aviv. This type is included in Tufnell's general 3C class (1984, 121. pl.xvi).
- ii): Although there are examples at Megiddo and Tel Aviv, the best examples of this type without supplementary signs, come from the central highlands and southern Palestine, and the Delta.
- iii): Seventy five percent of backs are plain, with simple sides and trapezoidal heads. They come from the southern regions. Twenty five percent of the scarabs

B(i)c: UPPER & LOWER SECTIONS: ANKH SIGNS *B(i)d: UPPER & LOWER SECTIONS: PAPYRI* **Fig. 4.5: Type B(i): Horizontal Divisions: Tripartite**

Map 4.6: Distribution of Type B(i)c

Map 4.7: Distribution of Type B(i)d

have divided backs and triangular sides. They come from the northern regions.

iv): Two scarabs are found in late deposits (MEG 2, TEF 3), while TEA 4 comes from a pit and niche burial, which is dated to the end of the MBIIC period (Tufnell 1984, 19). The sealing from Shiloh is dated to the MBIIB/C.

B(i)e: Papyri and crowns in upper and lower sections (fig. 4.6, Map 4.8)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3B3b)

MEG 3; NIC 3,4; NEW 1.

i): The Megiddo and NIC 4 scarabs have five sign combinations in the central section. Two scarabs (NIC 3, NEW 1) have four sign combinations, with end supplementary signs. The Newberry scarab also has outstretched *Horus* wings above, instead of papyri. There are two, two sign combinations which have a supplementary sign in the centre instead of the *n* sign (JER 5, TEY 2). MEG 4 has crowns above and below, but not in the style of type Bi(f), and the *n+r* signs are between the crowns rather than in the central panel (see fig. 4.26). These designs are included in Tufnell's class 3B3b (1984, 119, pl.xii).

ii): There is only one example with a context from northern Palestine.

iii): There is only one example with features shown. It is from Megiddo, and has a divided back, no head, and simply represented legs with rear leg shown, and feathering on front and mid legs.

iv): The Megiddo scarab is from T. 5259 which is dated to MBIIB, or Kenyon's group B-D.

B(i)f: Red crowns tête-bêche (fig. 4.6, Map 4.9)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3B3e)

BYB 1; JER 6; LACH 2; GER 1; TEA 33,34; TED 5; TEY 14; ANB 4; UKM 3; KER 2; BAS 3; IM 2; NIC 6,7; NEW 2.

i): There are three, four and five sign combinations within the central sections, with supplementary signs including *hṭp*, *uraei* and *nbw*. There are different examples of the *c* sign (BYB 1) and examples of two sign combinations (TED 4, MAT 1), including TBM 3 which has two different renderings of the *n* sign.

B(i)e: UPPER & LOWER SECTIONS: PAPYRI & CROWNS *B(i)f: RED CROWNS TÊTE-BÊCHE* **Fig. 4.6: Type B(i): Horizontal Divisions: Tripartite**

Map 4.8: Distribution of Type B(i)e

Map 4.9: Distribution of Type B(i)f

Crowns arranged in this manner belong to Tufnell's class 3B3e (Tufnell 1984, 120, pl.xiii).

ii): This sub-type ranges from the south Jordan Valley to the south coast of Palestine to the Delta, and is also popular in Nubia. There is a single example from Syria.

iii): Most heads are trapezoidal (83%), with one example of a square head (17%), and 75% of legs are simply cut with rear leg shown, while 25% are just simply cut. Within the back types there appears to be a geographic difference discernable. That is, the scarabs from Palestine and the Delta have divided or decorated backs, while those scarabs from Nubia have plain backs.

iv): There is perhaps an inclination towards the MBIIB, with the Jericho scarab from Kenyon's Group III, and an early tomb from Lachish (T.129). The scarab from Kerma however dates to the SIP. The earlier date would appear to be confirmed by Tufnell's findings of this type found as impressions at Kahun and Uronarti, and in Jericho groups I-III. i.e. it is present from the XIIth dynasty onwards, although it extends into the early XVIIIth (Tufnell 1984, 120).

B(ii): Horizontal cartouche (fig. 4.7, Map 4.10)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3D1)

PEL 1; JER 7; TEA 5,35; ANB 5; NIC 8,9; UCL 1; IM.16.

i): The sequence within this type of cartouche is $^c-r-n-r^c$. Supplementary signs are found only at Aniba, where the c sign has become an h_t sign. There are poorer examples of the cartouche with four signs at Tell el-Ajjul and from the Israel Museum collection. JER 7 is a particularly poor example of this design, with badly written signs. The example from the Israel Museum is interesting because it may have been inscribed twice. The first base design had a central vertical section with 'Hyksos' borders, before being re-carved with a horizontal cartouche. However, it is possible with the way the signs are facing outwards in the central panel from the cartouche, rather than facing one way, this was a deliberate carving of the base. Five out of six scarabs have double red crowns below the cartouche, and often above as well. The Pella example is notable for the papyri plant (representing the Delta) above the cartouche with an h^c and h_{st} sign below, enclosed between

Niccacci 8
NC

Pella 1
T.62

Niccacci 9
NC

UCL 1
Egypt

Ajjul 35
NC

Aniba 5
T.S26

IM.16
NC

Ajjul 5
T.246

Jericho 7
B.35

Fig. 4.7: Type B(ii): Horizontal Divisions: Cartouche

Map 4.10: Distribution of Type B(ii)

a double ureai. NIC 9 has a R^c at the top of the cartouche. There are three examples of two sign combinations (GEZ 10, JER 8, GER 3), both with supplementary signs. Tufnell does not distinguish between horizontal and vertical cartouches, placing them all within class 3D (Tufnell 1984, 121, pl.xvii-xviii).

ii) The five sign examples with contexts are from Pella and Tell el-Ajjul, with the other three examples from collections. As there are no Egyptian or Delta examples, and only one Nubian example, this design could be considered Palestinian.

iii): Two thirds of backs are plain, with one third decorated. All heads are trapezoidal and all legs are simply cut with rear leg showing.

iv): The Jericho example is from Group IV, while the Pella scarab dates to the MBIIB/C, and the Aniba scarab is from the XV-XVIIIth dynasties, therefore possibly suggesting a later MB date for the horizontal cartouche. The simple cartouche as represented by class 3D1 is said by Tufnell to be used around undoubted or less certain royal names throughout the MBII period (Tufnell 1984, 121-122).

IV.II.III TYPE C: VERTICAL DIVISIONS

This is the largest type of design incorporating nine classes, some with sub-classes.

C(i): Bipartite division (fig. 4.8, Map 4.11)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)

GEZ 11; JER 43; TEA 6,36,37,38,39; TEF 4; TEY 3,15; SED 2,3; LM.2; AM.3; BAS 4; MAT 2,3.

i): There are no supplementary signs in this class within the corpus collected. There are a couple of two sign examples using the letters c and n (JER 9, IM.3). Tufnell incorporates this type into 3C, her formulae class. It is possible that the bipartite division may be confined to the anra series¹¹, as there appear to be no

¹¹

There is a scarab from the Palace of Yarim-Lim, at Alalakh. It could easily have its origins in this type of the anra scarab, but the n sign has become an mn sign and the r a t/nb sign, while the top c has become stylised. It is from level VII, Room 19 of the Palace. (See

Yehudiyeh 3
T.1

Jericho 43
T.5

Ajjul 6
T.187

Sedment 3
1295

Ajjul 36
NC

Ajjul 38
NC

LM.2
NC

Ajjul 39
NC

AM.3
NC

Matouk 2
NC

Matouk 3
NC

Sedment 2
1270

Alalakh 1
Palace

Gezer 11
NC

Basle 4
NC

Far'a 4
T.551

Fig. 4.8: Type C(i): Vertical Divisions: Bipartite

Map 4.11: Distribution of Type C(i)

further examples, at least from the major sites of Jericho, Tell el-Ajjul or Tell el-Far'a. It is also possible that the dividing line is based on earlier scarab designs incorporating the full *sm3* sign (see Tufnell 1984, class 3A1, pl. vii). This is still visible on an example from Sedment (SED 2).

ii): This is predominantly a southern Palestinian/Delta/Middle Egyptian design, There are no examples from Nubia.

iii): Plain backs (88%), trapezoidal heads (63%) and triangular legs (60%) dominate this type. The scarab from Tell el-Yehudiyeh is interesting because of its combination of divided back with a lunate head, which would indicate a possible MK date.

iv): The Jericho example is from Group II, while the other examples date MBIIB/C. However, the Tell el-Yehudiyeh example points to an early date (as noted above), and if the division is based on the *sm3* plant, then this would also indicate a possible early date. The *sm3* plant is the sign of union and was popular in the early period (XIth dynasty), when the union between the Two Lands was strong. There are later examples, including up to the reign of Tutmosis III, but it is most numerous in the XI/XIIth dynasties and Jericho group II (Tufnell 1984, 117).

C(ii)a: Tripartite division - no lines (fig. 4.9-10, Map 4.12)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3C)

MEG 5,6; PEL 2,3; AMN 1; JER 11,12; LACH 3; TEA 7,8,9,40,41,43, 44,45,46; TEF 5,6; TED 7; TEY 4; ESN 5; IM.5; BAS 5,6; AM 4,5,6; PET 3,4; HM 2.

i): This is one of the more popular design types of the anra scarab and a number of sub classes are readily discernable within this class. The first is differentiated by the double *nfr-hpr*-double *nfr* in the central column, with the anra signs in the flanking columns. There are five examples of this type, with a number of others which clearly derive from it, and this type may be modelled on a scarab of Sesostri I (MEG 6). The scarab from Megiddo is a clear example of the anra

Fig. 4.9: Type C(ii)a: Vertical Divisions: Tripartite, without lines

Fig. 4.10: Type C(ii)a: Vertical Divisions: Tripartite, without lines

Map 4.12: Distribution of Type C(ii)a

sequence associated with a royal name scarab (see section IV.XI below). Secondly, there are a number of scarabs with single signs in the central column, usually *nfr* or *nh* signs. Thirdly, there is a group which have red crowns in the lower section which enclose the anra combination. Finally, the central section is taken with up with a loop or spiral design. There are some supplementary signs within the anra sequence, but these are limited (TEA 41, TEY 4, AM.4,5). There are also a number of two sign combinations¹², with the *r* sign often written as an *nb* sign (e.g. TED 6, BAS 7). Tufnell does not assign this type to a special class, rather including it under 3C or other classes, which incorporate features such as the double crowns (3B3, 119-20, pl.xi-xii).

ii): This class is found throughout Palestine and the Delta, indicating it may be a Palestinian design type. There is only a single example from Egypt, at Esna (exactly the same as IM.5), and there are no examples from Nubia or Syria.

iii): All backs are plain except for one decorated example from the Israel Museum collection. Most heads are trapezoidal (74%), with a small number of open heads (10%), and lunate heads (16%). Most legs are triangular, either with (56%), or without (22%), rear leg represented. A small amount (22%), are simply represented by a single incision.

iv): The Jericho scarabs date from Group II-V, with the Tell el-Dab'a scarab dating to the XVth dynasty, while others date to the more general MBIIB/C. The scarab of Sesostri I may indicate an early beginning to this type.

C(ii)b: Tripartite division - with lines (fig 4.11-12, Map 4.13)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3E1)

C(ii)b(i): TEA 51,52; TEF 7; ESN 6,7; BAS 8; AM 7,8; LM 3; IM 6,8; NIC 11; MAT 4-8; HM 3; PET 5,7.

C(ii)b(ii): TEA 55; TED 8; NIC 10; PET 6.

C(ii)b(iii): SHM 1; LACH 4; JER 42; TEA 56,57; KER 7; EM 1; IM 7.

i): This class naturally divides into three sub-classes: i) anra signs in the central column ii) anra signs in the flanking columns and iii) anra signs in all columns.

¹²

TBM 4; TEA 7,42,47,48; TEY 16; TED 6; IM.4; BAS 7.

C(ii)b(i): ANRA CENTRAL

Fig. 4.11: Type C(ii)b: Vertical Divisions: Tripartite, with lines

C(ii)b(ii): ANRA FLANKING *C(ii)b(iii): ANRA ALL COLUMNS*

Fig. 4.12: Type C(ii)b: Vertical Divisions: Tripartite, with lines

Map 4.13: Distribution of Type C(ii)b

Supplementary signs in the anra sequence are more prevalent in sub-class (i), and there are two sign combinations in all sub-classes¹³. Tufnell classifies these scarabs under her 'panel' type of class 3E, and then further subdivides them on the number of signs in the margins (Tufnell 1984, 122-3, pl.xix). All scarabs in Tufnell's class appear to be anra or based on anra types. The tripartite division of the base with lines is only found on XVth dynasty royal name scarabs (not XIIth or XIIIth dynasty scarabs). This is discussed in more detail in section IV.XI below.

ii): Anra signs in the central column are found in southern Palestine and Egypt, the flanking anra columns are found in southern Palestine and the Delta, while anra signs in all columns are found in the central highlands and southern Palestine, and Nubia.

iii): Plain backs, trapezoidal heads and triangular sides dominate all sub-classes. Decorated and divided backs, open and lunate heads and simply cut legs are also present in smaller numbers.

iv): There appears to be no chronological distinction within the sub types of this class. There are no dates associated with type (ii), and both types (i) and (iii) have early examples from Tell el-Ajjul (Block AJ, and lower city in Block G) and MBIIB/C dates at Esna, Kerma and Tell el-Far'a. Tufnell has one example from Jericho II (a two sign combination) and notes that no examples are found in Group V (Tufnell 1984, 123).

C(ii)c: Tripartite division - lines with uraei (fig. 4.13, Map 4.14)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3E1)

GEZ 4; LACH 9; TEF 8; KER 8; NIC 14; AM.9; IM.12; NEW 3.

i): All uraei except for one example wear the red crown. Four examples have the *šn* sign above the red crown, while other examples have a range of signs. The anra sequence is confined to the central column and there are a number of supplementary signs within the sequence. This type is noticeable for the high occurrence of supplementary signs within the sequence. Tufnell has one example

¹³

JER 13; GEZ 12; TEA 53; LM.4; NIC 12.

Gezer 4
C.IV.18

Lachish 9
T.4004

Far'a 8
T.569

Kerma 8
KX

AM.9
NC

IM.12
NC

Newberry 3
NC

Niccacci 14
NC

Fig. 4.13: Type C(ii)c: Vertical Divisions: Tripartite,
lines with Uraei

Map 4.14: Distribution of Type C(ii)c

- of this type which is incorporated into her class 3E1 (Tufnell 1984, 122-3, pl.xix).
- ii): This would appear to be a Palestinian design type, as it is found at Lachish, Tell el-Far'a and Gezer, with only one example found at Kerma. There are no Egyptian, Delta or Syrian examples.
- iii): Back types are divided evenly between plain and decorated examples. All heads are trapezoidal, and two thirds of legs are simply cut with a rear leg, with the remaining one third of legs triangular.
- iv): The Far'a scarab dates MBIIB/C, the Lachish scarab is from a late MBIIC tomb, and the Kerma scarab is dated to the SIP. Combined with the prevalence for divided backs and supplementary signs, this type may tend towards a later MBII date.

C(ii)d: Hyksos border (fig. 4.14, Map 4.15)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3E4)

PEL 4; LACH 6; TEA 58,59,60,61; ESN 8,9; DEB 2; KER 6; (MM 2); BAS 9; MAT 9.

- i): There are a number of different sequences within this class and few supplementary signs exist: a k_3 sign at Tell el-Ajjul and a $\dot{s}n$ sign instead of an r sign at Pella. There is one example of a two sign combination, (NIC 13). This type was classified by Tufnell within her panel design, with cross bars in the margin (Tufnell 1984, 122-3, pl.xx), and Ward shows that it evolves from an MK design (Tufnell 1984, 165).
- ii): This type is found in the north Jordan Valley and southern coastal Palestine, Upper Egypt and Nubia. Examples from the latter countries appear generally to be of a different nature to those found in Palestine. The example from Kerma is particularly poor, and the two examples from Esna are very different to those from Pella, Lachish or Tell el-Ajjul. However, the scarab from Debeira East is similar to the Palestinian examples.
- iii): Plain backs predominate (71%), with the remaining scarabs divided between decorated and divided backs (14.5% each), while 75% of heads are trapezoidal with one lunate example. Forty percent of legs are triangular, with 60% simply carved.

Pella 4
T.62

Lachish 6
T.6002

Ajjul 58
NC

Ajjul 59
NC

Ajjul 60
NC

Ajjul 61
NC

Esna 8
T.305

Esna 9
T.190

Kerma 6
KII

Debeira 2
T.37

Basle 9
NC

MM.2
NC

Matouk 9
NC

Fig. 4.14: Type C(ii)d: Hyksos Royal Border

Map 4.15: Distribution of Type C(ii)d

iv): T.305 at Esna dates to the MK, while the Palestinian and Nubian examples date to MBIIB/C. The early date could account for the difference in style, as noted above. The Hyksos royal border is noted in a Group IV tomb at Jericho (Tufnell 1984, 123) and corresponds to royal name scarabs of Sheshi to Ahetepre, confirming their use throughout the SIP. The panel type design corresponds to the royal name series (see discussion below in section IV. XI) and this type of border is not found on the scarabs of Auserre Apophis. This perhaps indicates that the design was confined to the main Hyksos period, or MBIIC.

Cii(e): Shrine Motif (fig. 4.15, Map 4.16)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3E5)

JER 27; TEA 74; IM 19; NIC 18; MAT 11.

- i): Two examples have the anra sequence only within the shrine, while the remaining examples have anra signs both within and flanking the shrine. There are supplementary signs with the anra sequence on the Jericho and Tell el-Ajjul examples, and there are different signs above the shrine: *wedjet* eyes, Horus hawks and in the case of JER 27, a possible royal name¹⁴. There are a number of two sign combinations of this type¹⁵, and there are also many supplementary signs within the sequences, thereby categorising it as a 'debased' anra type (see fig. 4.27). This type is a variant of Tufnell's panel class (Tufnell 1984, pl.XX, p.122-3), and is predominantly associated with the anra sequence.
- ii): This design is only found in Palestine.
- iii): Backs are plain with two thirds of heads open, and one third trapezoidal. All sides are triangular except one simply cut.
- iv): The Jericho example dates to Kenyon's Group II, and Tufnell found that other examples of this type of shrine dated to Group II or early group III (Tufnell 1984, 123). The two sign combination of this type (IM.20) with humeral callosities

¹⁴ This reading of this scarab has been proposed by Bietak (1994, 483 and 1991, 55-6) as Nubkhepre, although this is not accepted by Ward (1987, 522).

¹⁵ PEL 5; JER 28; TEA 12,73; TBM 6; IM.20.

Ajjul 74
NC

Jericho 27
G.37

IM.19
NC

Niccacci 18
NC

Matouk 11
NC

Fig. 4.15: Type C(ii)e: Shrine Motif

Map 4.16: Distribution of Type C(ii)e

indicates a XVIIIth date, but does not necessarily suggest that this type continued throughout the MBII, but rather that it may have been resurrected at that time (see section IV.X below).

C(iii)a: Cartouche (4.16-18, Map 4.17)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3D)

UGT 2; KAB 1; MEG 9; TA 2; GEZ 2,5,15; JER 10,19,21,22,23,24,36; RIS 2,3; LACH 10,11; TBM 5; TEA 10,63,65,67,70; TEF 9; NUB 1; UKM 4; UCL 2; AM 10,11,13,14; IM 13,14,15,22; NIC 15,16,17; BAS 10,11; NEW 5-11; PET 9-13; MAT 10.

i): There are a number of different styles of cartouche and sequences within the cartouche. There are also a number of supplementary signs included within the anra sequence, with the *hṭp* sign being the most popular inclusion. There are a number of two sign combinations, also covering a range of designs¹⁶. Tufnell classifies all cartouches (including horizontal) under class 3D, and distinguishes six different types (1984, 121-2). The most popular anra cartouche is the simple oblong (3D1), but there are also examples of cartouche with bases (3D4, 3D5) (Tufnell 1984, pl.xvii-xviii).

ii): The anra cartouche is most popular in Palestine, occurring throughout the country. Single examples only are found in Syria, Egypt and Nubia. There are no examples from the Delta.

iii): Plain backs are once again the most popular type with 68%, while decorated backs account for 14%, and divided backs 18%. Trapezoidal heads are also the most numerous, accounting for 59% of all head types, with 15% open, 19% lunate, and 7% square. Triangular legs account for 70% of the scarabs, with 17% as simply cut, and 13% as simply cut with rear leg marked.

iv): The date of the anra cartouche ranges from early MBIIA/B (Rishon) to the LBA/XVIIIth dynasty (Gezer, Field 1¹⁷). They are present in Jericho Groups II-

¹⁶ BYB 2; MEG 10; JER 20; GEZ 14; TEA 64,66,68,69,71; LACH 12,13; LM.5; NIC 15,18; BAS 12; AM.12; IM.17.

¹⁷ Although this scarab is found in a LBA context, it was not necessarily manufactured at that time. See section IV. X below.

Kabri 1
T.902

Rishon 2

Newberry 9
NC

Jericho 22
G.73

AM.10
Egypt

IM.13
NC

UCL 2
NC

Megiddo 9
T.3111

Ajjul 70
H800

Lachish 11
T.153

Lachish 10
T.129

Jericho 36
G.73

Matouk 10
NC

Petrie 9
NC

Gezer 2
Cave 10A

Gezer 15
NC

Fig. 4.16: Type C(iii)a: Anra Cartouche

Jericho 19
D.13

Tel Aviv 2
T.11

AM.13
NC

AM.14
NC

IM.15
NC

TBM 5
Palace

IM.14
NC

Niccacci 16
NC

Niccacci 17
NC

Ajjul 65
NC

IM.22
NC

Fig. 4.17: Type C(iii)a: Anra Cartouche

Fig. 4.18: Type C(iii)a: Anra Cartouche

Map 4.17: Distribution of Type C(iii)a

V, and there is one example from the Israel Museum collection with humeral callosities, indicating a likely manufactured date of the XVIIIth dynasty. This date is confirmed by the poor execution of the hieroglyphs within the cartouche and the human figure standing to the left, which is a late MBII design component¹⁸. The cartouche is used from the XIIth dynasty onwards for royal names (Tufnell 1984, 121). While the simple oblong cartouche (3D1), is found to occur throughout the MBII period, the cartouche with base (3D5) is noted by Tufnell as occurring in the XIIth dynasty, and then again during the reigns of Sheshi and Apophis (Tufnell 1984, 122). An example of cartouche type 3D4 is found associated with Neferhotep (Tufnell 1984, 122).

C(iii)b: 'Open ended' or 'incorrect' cartouche (fig. 4.19, Map 4.18)

(No Ward & Tufnell Class)

UGT 1; BS4; TEA 62; LACH 7,8; IM 9.

- i): This class falls naturally into two sub-classes. The first has the central, open-ended cartouche, and the second a double open-ended cartouche, both in centre field. The second class has a greater number of supplementary signs included within the anra sequence. Tufnell has no examples of this type and therefore it is not incorporated into her classification system.
- ii): There are no examples from Egypt, the Delta or Nubia. The design is confined to Palestine with one example from Syria.
- iii): Plain backs predominate over both sub-types, with one divided back with humeral callosities in the double cartouche group design. The second group has open heads and triangular legs, while the Ugarit scarab has a trapezoidal head.
- iv): Although the date of the Ugarit scarab is generally MBII, the two examples of the double cartouche come from a late tomb at Lachish. The scarab from Beth Shan is also from an LBI deposit. The late date (for the double cartouche) is confirmed by the scarab from the Israel Museum collection with humeral callosities, an XVIIIth dynasty typological feature (see section IV.1, p.89).

¹⁸

The introduction of animal and human figures are relatively late in the SIP repertoire (see Mlinar, forthcoming).

C(iii)b: OPEN ENDED CARTOUCHE

Ugarit 1
Sanctuary

Ajjul 62
NC

Beth Shan 4
NC

Lachish 7
T.4004

Lachish 8
T.4004

IM.9
NC

C(iii)b(i): OPEN ENDED CARTOUCHE WITH URAEI

Gezer 13
NC

IM.11
NC

Petrie 8
NC

Fig. 4.19: Type C(iii)b: Open Ended Cartouche

Map 4.18: Distribution of Types C(iii)b and C(iii)b(i)

C(iii)b(i): 'Open ended' or 'incorrect' cartouche with Uraei (fig. 4.18)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3B1b/d)

GEZ 13; IM 11; PET 8.

- i): The main anra sequence is contained within the central column or cartouche, although the example from the Israel Museum collection also has the anra signs in the flanking columns. All the scarabs have supplementary signs among the basic anra sequence. There is one example of a two sign combination (IM.11). Here the anra sequence lies in the flanking columns above the uraei. Tufnell does not have any similar examples to the anra scarabs, although class 3B1b/d account for cobras addorsed, lined (and crowned) (Tufnell 1984, 118, pl.ix-x).
- ii): This type at this stage appears to be confined to Palestine, with only one example of the two sign combination found in the Delta.
- iii): Backs are either plain or decorated. Heads are trapezoidal or lunate with simply depicted legs.
- iv): There are no dates available for this type, although Tufnell favours an earlier date, as she believes the beginning of the design is associated with the XIIth dynasty (Tufnell 1984, 118).

C(iii)c: Cartouche with anra surround (fig. 4.20, Map 4.19)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3D1/2)

BS 3; JER 26; TEA 72; TEF 11; MEM 2; HM 4.

- i): There are no supplementary signs within the anra sequences and only one two sign combination (BAS 13). In three examples, (JER 26, MEM 2, HM 4) there is a *nsw-bity* sign (indicating the king of Upper and Lower Egypt) above the cartouche, and a *nbw* sign below. This type of design is incorporated into Tufnell's class 3D (Tufnell 1984, 121-2, pl.xvii).
- ii): This design is to be found at sites north and south of the Jordan Valley and on the south coast of Palestine, and from one site in Egypt. There are no Nubian or Delta examples.
- iii): All backs are plain, and heads appear to be either lunate or trapezoidal. Legs are both simply cut and triangular.

*Beth Shan 3
str. XA*

*Jericho 26
Pl*

*Ajjul 72
NC*

*Memphis 2
Pit*

*Far'a 11
T.568*

Fig. 4.20: Type C(iii)c: Cartouche with Anra Surround

Map 4.19: Distribution of Type C(iii)c

iv): The Memphis scarab dates to the late XIIth/early XIIIth dynasty and the Jericho scarab is from Kenyon's Group II, indicating a possible early beginning to this type of design. The Beth Shan scarab is dated to the MBIIC by the excavator, which would indicate its continuance into the MBII.

IV.II.IV TYPE D: SCROLL BORDERS

This type is split into two classes: a continuous border around the base design and the paired scroll border.

D(i): Scroll border (fig. 4.21, Map 4.20)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 7A2a)

UGT 3; MEG 9,12; KAB 1; JER 22,31; RIS 2; TEA 70,75; TEF 12;
TED 9; GUR 4; NIC 19; UCL 2; AM 10; IM.13; BM.1; MET 1;
NEW 8; PET 14; MAT 12.

i): More than half the scarabs with a scroll border have the *hṯp* sign as their only supplementary sign. Other supplementary signs exist (MEG 12, PET 9, NEW 8), as do two sign combinations¹⁹. Scroll borders are associated with the royal name scarabs of Sesostri I, Ammenemes II and Sesostri II (Ward 1971, fig.26; Tufnell 1984, 128), and just under half of the anra examples surround cartouches. Of those cartouches, eighty percent have *hṯp* signs with the anra sequence. Scroll borders are classified under Tufnell's class 7 (Tufnell 1984, 127ff, pl.xxviii-xxix).

ii): Most examples of the scroll border are found throughout Palestine, with single examples from Syria, Egypt and the Delta. There are no scroll borders from Nubia.

iii): Fifty eight percent of backs are plain, 25% are decorated, and 17% are divided. Heads are either trapezoidal (73%), open (18%) or square (9%). Most legs are triangular (71%), the remainder have simply cut legs with rear leg showing (29%).

iv): This type of design would appear to cover the entire MBIIA/B-C period. The

¹⁹

BS 2; TBM 7; NIC 20.

Ugarit 3
Palace Garden

Megiddo 12
T.4055

Gurob 4
T.27

BM.1
NC

Matouk 12
NC

Petrie 14
NC

Niccacci 19
NC

Ajjul 75
NC

Far'a 12
T.549

Jericho 31
H.13

MET.1
NC

**Fig. 4.21: Type D(i): Scroll Border:
Interlocking Scroll**

Map 4.20: Distribution of Type D(i)

Rishon scarab dates to the MBIIA/B, and one Megiddo scarab comes from T.3111 associated with Kenyon's group D, placing it in MBII B, while MEG 13 is from Kenyon's Group G, placing it in the MBII C. The Jericho examples are from Groups IV and V. Tufnell notes that this type is missing from the early phases of Megiddo and Jericho, and are more frequent in Groups III-IV at Jericho and the upper levels at Tell el-Ajjul (Tufnell 1984, 127-8). However, due to the association with the scarabs of Sesostri s I and II, and Ammenemes II, she associated the border with the entire MBII A-C, which is seen in the anra series.

D(ii): Paired scroll border (fig. 4.22, Map 4.21)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 7B3(ii)a)

JER 36,37; TEA 13,76; LACH 10; TEF 13; UCL 3; IM.20; AM.15; NEW 13; MAT 10; PET 9.

i): All scarabs have three pairs of oblong, hooked, scroll borders, and supplementary signs are common throughout this class. Two sign combinations exist (JER 33), which also have two pair (JER 34, 35) and four pair scroll borders (JER 32, TEA 77). The paired scrolled border is classified as type 7B3(ii)a by Tufnell (1984, pl.XXXI, p.129).

ii): This type of scroll border is confined to the south Jordan Valley, the southern coastal area of Palestine, and the Delta (Chabin el-Kahata, see footnote 44).

iii): All backs are plain except for one decorated example. Triangular legs are the most popular type accounting for 67% of the total known, while the remainder are split evenly between simply cut, and simply cut with rear leg. The head types in this class are worth noting. While 63% are trapezoidal, 37% of this head type are lunate. Lunate heads are most popular in the MBII A/XIIth dynasty and then again in the LBA/XVIIIth dynasty (Ward and Dever 1994, 172).

iv): The three paired scroll is most popular at Jericho in Groups IV-V (after appearing briefly in Group II). However, there are examples from Uronarti and this border is associated with Sesostri s II and III, leading Tufnell to conclude that the three pair scroll covered the whole of the XIIth dynasty and SIP (Tufnell 1984, 129). The combination of scroll border and rope border is extremely rare, and is

Jericho 37
H.13

Ajjul 13
T.1532

Ajjul 76
NC

Far'a 13
T.558

UCL 3
NC

AM.15
NC

IM.20
NC

Newberry 13
NC

**Fig. 4.22: Type D(ii): Scroll Borders:
Paired Scroll Border**

Map 4.21: Distribution of Type D(ii)

said to be seldom seen outside of Jericho (Tufnell 1984, 130). Tufnell dates the rope border to 1900-1800BC (Tufnell 1984, 131). Our Jericho example is from Group V, and the Far'a scarab is dated MBII. The scarab from Ajjul is dated to the LBI (Lilyquist 1993, 48), although Tufnell assigns T.1532 no date.

IV.II.V TYPE E: ANIMAL AND HUMAN FIGURES

There are four classes of animal types and one class for human figures.

E(i)a: Cobras (fig. 4.23, Map 4.22)

(Ward (1994) Class 9A)

JER 38; GER 2; AM.16; NIC 21,22; NEW 14,15.

i): The designs are split evenly between cobra wearing red crowns and another above a *nb* or *wedjet* eye. Supplementary signs are included in most sequences and there is one two sign combination from Tel Aviv (TA 3). Tufnell has no class for the single cobra, all her types are confronted (Tufnell 1984, pl.XXXVII, p.132-33). Ward, seeing the gap in the typology, has since added a new class, 9A, to accommodate the single or multiple cobra (Ward and Dever 1994, 168).

ii): This type is found in the south Jordan Valley and central highland area in Palestine, with no examples from Syria, Egypt, the Delta or Nubia.

iii): Backs are plain (50%) or decorated (50%) with both open (50%) and trapezoidal heads (50%). Sides are straight with feathering.

iv): The only date available is from the Jericho scarab from Kenyon's Group V. Animal and human figures are most popular in the MBIIC period (Ward and Dever 1994, 178) with class 9A most popular in the early XVIIIth dynasty (Ward and Dever 1994, 188). However, there is nothing to suggest (from the scarab features) that these examples date to the early NK.

E(i)b: Horus hawk (fig. 4.23)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 3A4)

BAS 13,14; BRK 1; PET 15.

- i): All Horus figures wear the red crown and have supplementary signs as part of the sequence. A number of two sign combinations are found in this class, also with supplementary signs (UGT 3, MEG 13, TEY 5). Tufnell classifies the hawk as part of the 'Egyptian signs and symbols' class (Tufnell 1984, pl.IX), and finds that it is missing at Kahun, Uronarti, Tell Far'a, Tell el-Dab'a (1984, 118).
- ii): There are no examples with contexts of the three sign anra sequence. The two sign combinations are found at Ugarit, Megiddo and Tell el-Yehudiyeh.
- iii): No features are known from the original anra sequence. From the two sign combinations, all backs are plain and two thirds of legs triangular, with one third simply cut with rear leg. Heads are divided between open and trapezoidal.
- iv): There are no real indications as to a date: the Tell el-Yehudiyeh scarab dates 1700-1600 i.e. MBIIB/C. Tufnell favoured an early date for the design, finding that the motif 'hardly survived into the XVth dynasty' (Tufnell 1984, 118).

E(i)c: Sphinx (fig. 4.23, Map 4.23)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 9F)
TEF 14; TEY 6.

- i): These two scarabs have exactly the same design, which consists of only two of the three anra signs with supplementary signs above the back of the sphinx which sits on *nb* sign. Tufnell classifies the sphinx within her heraldic beasts' class (1984, pl.XLI, p.134) and notes two human headed sphinxes from Megiddo (Tufnell 1984, 134).
- ii): The anra design is confined to southern Palestine and the Delta.
- iii): The scarab from Tell el-Yehudiyeh has a plain back, trapezoidal head and straight legs with feathering.
- iv): Other heraldic beasts have been found at Jericho, in Groups III-V, and levels above the burnt layer at Tell el-Ajjul. Tufnell notes that the motif achieved great popularity during the New Kingdom, and these examples probably represent the early stages of the motif (Tufnell 1984, 134).

E(i)a: COBRAS Gerar 2
NC Jericho 38
H22 AM.16
Egypt Niccacci 21
NC Newberry 14
NC Newberry 15
NC Niccacci 22
NC*E(i)b: HORUS HAWK* Brooklyn 1
NC Petrie 15
NC Basle 14
NC Basle 13
NC*E(i)c: SPHINX* Yehudiyeh 6
T.3 Far'a 14
T.73*E(i)d: ANTELOPE/GOAT* Ajjul 78
NC Basle 15
NC Gezer 17
NC Gezer 18
NC

Fig. 4.23: Type E(i): Animal Figures

Map 4.22: Distribution of Type E(i)a

Map 4.23: Distribution of Type E(i)c

Map 4.24: Distribution of Type E(i)d

E(i)d: Antelope/goat (fig. 4.23, Map 4.24)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 9B)
GEZ 17,18; TEA 78; BAS 15.

- i): There are both three and four sign anra combinations above the back of the antelope. No supplementary signs are included, and no two sign combinations exist at the present time. Tufnell classified this animal as an antelope (1984, pl.xxxvi), although Keel in a later study has shown it to be a goat (Keel 1990, 263ff).
- ii): The anra goats are confined to the central highlands and south coast of Palestine. There are no examples from the Delta, Egypt or Nubia.
- iii): The two examples from Gezer have decorated backs with open and trapezoidal heads with straight sides.
- iv): There are no dates available from the anra series. The antelope does not appear at Jericho until Group III and continues in Groups IV-V (Tufnell 1984, 132), and is most popular in the later MBIIC period (Ward 1994, 178).

E(ii): Human Figures (fig. 4.24, Map 4.25)

(Ward & Tufnell Class 10)
LACH 15; TEA 79,81; TEF 16; IM.21.

- i): Three different poses of figures are represented here: the simple standing figure with arms by sides, the figure holding a lotus flower or branch, and the striding figure. Two examples have figures wearing the tightly wrapped Canaanite skirt while the example from Lachish wears the triangular Egyptian counterpart. There are a number of different anra sequences, and there are also a number of two sign combinations²⁰. Tufnell classifies the human figures in class 10, and sub divides them according to stance (Tufnell 1984, 134ff, pl.xlvii-xlviii).
- ii): Figures with anra signs are from the southern coastal area of Palestine only. The standing figure is a common design found at many sites, although mostly from the south of Palestine and the Delta (Richards 1992, 18). Kneeling figures are common throughout Palestine with single examples from Tel el-Dab'a, Gurob and Mirgissa (Richards 1992, 19).

²⁰

JER 39,49; TEA 14,80; LACH 14; TEF 15.

Lachish 15
T.4004

Ajjul 79
NC

Ajjul 81
NC

Far'a 16
T.1026A

IM.21
NC

Fig. 4.24: Type E(ii): Human Figures

Map 4.25: Distribution of Type E(ii)

iii): All backs are plain. Heads are open or trapezoidal and legs are both simply cut or triangular, with no rear legs shown.

iv): The Lachish example is from cave 4004 (used for burials), and no other dates are forthcoming from the anra series²¹. Tufnell only notes that figures with human heads appear from Group III onwards, and those holding flowers or palms precede those holding cobras (Tufnell 1984, 135-6). Human figures are most popular in Ward's period V, or MBIIC (Ward and Dever 1994, 178).

IV.III PLAQUES/CYLINDER SEALS

The anra sequence is also found on plaques and cylinder seals. The plaque is from Gerar (fig. 4.25:1), and the cylinder seals are found in both Syria and Palestine. It is unfortunate that the two cylinder seals which clearly depict the anra motif have no context. The first was published by Petrie in 1889 (fig. 4.25:2) and the second by Weill in 1953 (fig. 4.25:3). The latter seal is most important as it incorporates the anra sequence with a title: *ḥk₃ ḥ₃swt Hy₃n* - the Ruler of foreign lands, Khyan. This title is known on other cylinder seals²² and scarabs²³, and will be discussed in section IV.XI below.

A cylinder seal found at Tell el-Ajjul (fig. 4.25:4) has a cartouche within a range of Syrian and Egyptian glyptic with the signs: (*R^c?*)-*c-n-r/t* (Ward 1965, 44). As well as adopting the Egyptian scarab seal, the Canaanites also adopted the Syrian cylinder seal, and there are a number of cylinders seals found in Palestine during the SIP/MBIIB/C²⁴, although they remain comparatively scarce. To find the anra sequence specifically, rather than other Egyptian signs or symbols on a cylinder seal from this region, would perhaps indicate the importance of the inscription (see Chapter V for discussion of the anra scarab's status as an object).

²¹ The 2 sign combinations at Jericho date to Kenyon's Group III.

²² See Weill 1953, 129: 245,246

²³ Martin 1971, nos. 1171-1181a: pl.40:28-35; pl.41:5; pl.42A:7.

²⁴ See Parker 1949, p.7ff and Collon 1987, nos. 203,211-2.

Fig. 4.25: Cylinder Seals

Two further cylinder seals (fig.4.25:5 & 6) are both made of green jasper and are thought to come from the same workshop in Syria, specialising in precious stones. Collon pinpoints Byblos as the site of this workshop, due to the number of Egyptian motifs incorporated into its designs and their distribution throughout the Mediterranean (Collon 1986 & 1987, 52). The first seal (fig. 4:25:5) is from the De Clercq collection and has the inscription *r-n-r*, thought by Collon to be a personal name, and which resembles the two sign combinations of the anra scarab (see section IV.IV below). The second cylinder seal (fig. 4:25:6) is from a collection in Beirut and its cartouche reads: *R^c-n^c-nb*. Ward compared this cylinder seal to the type of scarabs found in Palestine during the SIP, and read the name within the cartouche as *Noa-neb-R^c*, a name on scarabs also attributed to the SIP (Ward 1965, 35ff). He also suggests that the cylinder seal may belong to a prince of Byblos or a local prince of Syria or Palestine (Ward 1965, 40). Collon attributes both cylinder seals to the 17th century based on stylistic grounds within the progression of the Green Jasper workshop (Collon 1986, 62).

The cylinder seals of the Green Jasper Workshop have also been classified by Teissier as her Workshop C, based on her examination of cylinder seals with Egyptian motifs (1989, 75ff). Workshop C is identified by a number of features including material of a semi-precious nature, strong Egyptianising iconography, inscribed with private names using hieroglyphs within cartouches, and a mixture of both Egyptian and non-Egyptian iconography (1989, loc.cit.). Teissier saw an iconographical link between these seals and scarabs of private names in the XIIth and XIIIth dynasties, such as hawk headed gods or secular figures in mantles (1989, loc.cit.). She noticed that the personal names within the cartouche did not seem to be Egyptian, (although the reading of some were difficult due to the poor hieroglyphs), and offered a central Levantine or Lebanese origin for the group (1989, 39). The importance of this workshop for the anra scarab lies in the hieroglyphs displayed, some within a cartouche. They appear to resemble those of the anra motif, although in a two sign combination. Perhaps these cylinder seals are therefore related to the anra scarab in some way, particularly due to their

Levantine origin (see section IV.XII).

There are a number of Egyptian motifs found on Syrian cylinder seals, and this is attributed to the close relations between the two countries at that time. The writing of a *nb* sign instead of an *r* is common within the anra sequence, and could be an easy mistake, particularly when Egyptian hieroglyphs are being written in a foreign country, perhaps by a foreigner - as is seen in Palestine in the MBII period. Alternatively, this may have been an original name which the anra sequence copied, and this will be discussed in more detail in Chapter VI. The writing of the letter *n* on both Syrian seals should be noted, as it is not the more common 'comb'-like rendering of the sign as seen on many anra scarabs. As will be seen in section IV.VI below, of the three different renderings of the *n* sign, this type is so far confined to Palestine (on the scarabs only).

The interconnections between the countries of Syria, Egypt and Palestine in the first half of the second millennium were close (see Chapter II). A number of Egyptian motifs were incorporated into the Syrian glyptic²⁵, as were a number of Syrian motifs adopted by Palestinian scarab seal cutters²⁶. If the anra motif originated in Egypt (see Chapter VI for further discussion), it is perhaps possible that there existed a two pronged integration of the motif into Palestine. Due to the close ties between Egypt and Syria in the MK, the anra motif may have been introduced into that country and then permeated south, as well as the more direct route from Egypt through the Delta to Palestine.

IV.IV TWO SIGNS

A number of scarabs utilise only two of the three possible signs of the anra

²⁵ See Teissier's Ph.D. thesis, *Egyptianising Elements in the Bronze Age Cylinder Seals of Syro-Palestine*, University of Oxford, 1989. Now published as Teissier 1996.

²⁶ For example, the Syrian naked goddess with branch motif as defined by Schroer 1989, 93-5, or the Omega and Jasper workshops (see Chapter I.V) and Ward 1994, 190ff).

Fig. 4.26: Examples of 'Two Sign' Anras

sequence²⁷ (see fig. 4.26). They occur within all type classes, in all possible combinations i.e. ^c+n ; ^c+r ; $n+r$; and there appears to be no pattern as to their geographical distribution. They are found at both sites in Syria, most of the sites in Palestine, the Delta and the Sinai, two Egyptian sites and one site in Nubia. Chronologically, they do not appear in the earliest series of MBIIA/B, but they do occur in Jericho Group II tombs. There are also scarabs with only one sign from the original three utilised in the anra sequence. I do not consider these scarabs to belong to the 'true' anra group motif; they should really fall within the general category of Egyptian signs and symbols, although the use of the particular sign of c , n or r , may have been originally based on the anra scarab motif.

IV.V DEBASED ANRAS

This term applies to anra scarabs with many supplementary signs - so many that although there are at least two of the three signs of the anra sequence, the nature of the original base design (i.e. the anra sequence) is taken over (see fig. 4.27). These scarabs only occur in Palestine²⁸. Chronologically, it might be expected that they are found late in the MBII period, as a result of the deterioration of anra scarab production over a period of two hundred years or more. While this may apply to some anra scarabs, for example, those from T.934 at Tell el Far'a (see section IV.X below), the 'debased' anra scarab also occurs in the earliest contexts at Rishon and early Megiddo tombs. Therefore, it would appear that in some cases, rather than acting as a deterioration of the main sequence, these scarabs had a parallel life to it: i.e. perhaps these scarabs represent a workshop in Palestine that existed at the same time as another which produced the anra scarabs.

²⁷

E.g.: UGT 4; BYB 2; MEG 1,4,8,10,13; BS 2; PEL 5; TA 3; GEZ 7,10,12,14,16; JER 2,5,7,8,9,13,20,21,25,28,32,33,34,35,39,40; LACH 1,12,13,14; TBM 1,2,3,4,6,7; TEA 11,12,14,15,19,21,22,23,27,30,47,48,49,50,64,66,68,69,71,79,82; GER3; TEF1,10,14,15; TEY 2,5,6,7,16; TED 4,9,10; SEK 1; GUR 2; KER 2,3,4,5.

²⁸

There are some badly drawn scarabs from Aniba, but these do not contain supplementary signs.

Jericho 2
J.1

Ajjul 3
T.1557

IM.1
NC

Yehudiyeh 15
NC

Megiddo 7
T.1752

Jericho 16
J.45

Jericho 30
G.37

Megiddo 11
T.3110

Ajjul 72
Block L

Esna 7
T.238

Rishon 5

Rishon 4

Fig. 4.27: 'Debased' Anra Scarabs

IV.VI THE N SIGN

The hieroglyph for the letter *n* (Gardiner 1957, sign N35) in the anra sequence is often written as a horizontal line divided with short strokes like a comb (Tufnell 1984, 121). This depiction of the sign was singled out by Tufnell as the characteristic feature in the orthography of the anra scarab, and was noted to occur on the royal name scarabs of Sesostris I and a plaque naming Sesostris II (Tufnell 1984, 121).

Although this is indeed the characteristic form of representation of the *n* sign on the anra scarabs, there are also three other ways of writing the sign: .

. The first method accounts for a small number of scarabs and is only found in Palestine, although it is also seen on Syrian cylinder seals of the period²⁹ (see section IV.III above). The second method is the most popular after the comb like *n*, and once again is found throughout Palestine. There is also a single example from the Delta and four examples from three different sites in Egypt. The third method resembles a stylised branch motif more than the letter *n*, but is surely a continuation of the original anra comb-like *n*. This type is most popular in southern Palestine, particularly at Tell el-Ajjul, in the Delta at Tell el-Yehudiyeh, at Esna, and in Nubia. While it may be expected that this 'branch'-like *n* sign would be a continuation of the Syrian-Palestinian motif³⁰, its popularity at Tell el-Ajjul and Tell el-Yehudiyeh would support a 'southern popularity' theory, and possible connection between the two sites. Its popularity at the Nubian sites of Mirgissa, Ukma West and Kerma would perhaps indicate interrelations between the two regions.

²⁹

It should be noted that all three *n* types are found on monuments (e.g. rock or temple inscriptions, stele) in Egypt (Ward, pers. comm.), and the geographical differentiation in this discussion refers to the scarabs only.

³⁰

The palm branch motif originated on Syrian cylinder seal scenes, related to the naked goddess motifs. The motif became important in Palestine because of its relationship to the original goddess and as a substitute for her: the goddess finally became worshipped as a branch goddess because the branch or tree was interpreted as possessing her vital powers (Schroer 1989, 93ff).

IV.VII SUPPLEMENTARY SIGNS

During the initial investigation into the anra scarabs, a remarkable feature of its iconography was the high numbers of scarabs associated with signs and symbols of Egyptian royalty. Seventy five percent of the scarabs were associated with either a cartouche, red crowns of Lower Egypt, Hyksos 'royal' panel design, or signs that are commonly found in royal epithets or titles³¹. These signs are described here as supplementary, as they do not belong to the original sequence of anra signs.

Supplementary signs can be divided into three different categories in which they appear. Firstly, there are the signs that appear within the basic anra sequence. Usually these occur at the top or bottom of the sequence, although in the more debased types, they appear within the sequence. Secondly, the supplementary signs appear in columns flanking the anra sequence (the most common type being the tripartite vertical division with and without lines), and thirdly, and least frequently, the anra sequence appears in columns flanking a column of supplementary signs. The supplementary signs in the second and third categories are more diverse than those that appear in the first category, but they still have a strong association with 'royal' signs and symbols.

The signs which occur most frequently with the anra sequence are:

(Gardiner 1957, S3) <i>dsrt</i> :	red crown of Lower Egypt
(Gardiner 1957, N28) <i>h^c</i> :	hill of sunrise, rising in glory
(Gardiner 1957, N25) <i>h₃st</i> :	foreign land/hill country
(Gardiner 1957, R4) <i>h^tp</i> :	peace, 'setting' of sun
(Gardiner 1957, S12) <i>nbw</i> :	gold

a sign written and could be either:

(Gardiner 1957, O29) <i>c₃</i> :	great
(Gardiner 1957, U36) <i>hm</i> :	majesty
(Gardiner 1957, S24) <i>ts</i> :	knot

³¹

Such as *nsw bity* (King of Upper and Lower Egypt), *bity* (King of Lower Egypt), *nfr nb* (good lord), *nb* (lord), *cⁿh* (life), *dw* (prosperous), *hm* (majesty).

and a sign written which could be:

- (Gardiner 1957, U28) *ḏ3*: an abbreviation of *wḏ3*, 'be sound, prosperous
- (Gardiner 1957, N26) *ḏw*: mountain

There are also variations of the three main signs: is sometimes written for (Gardiner 1957, D36), while *t* (Gardiner 1957, X1) or *nb* (Gardiner 1957, V30) is written instead of an *r* sign (Gardiner 1957, D21). (These variations are often due to the limited spacial considerations on the scarabs, with the *r* sign becoming an *nb* sign when placed on the bottom of the oval). As discussed in section IV.VI there are four different renditions of the *n* (Gardiner 1957, N35) sign: , , , .

The signs which appear frequently with the main sequence are therefore common among royal epithets or clearly associated with royalty. The inclusion of the *h₃st* sign, for foreign hill country may be significantly tied in with the title *ḥk₃ h₃swt*. or even be an abbreviation for it. If the anra sequence was part of a name (see Chapter VI), then the inclusion of these signs would be appropriate. The anra scarab could represent an artifact whose significance could lie in its association with the Hyksos ruling class or administration (see Chapter VI).

The geographical distribution of use of the supplementary signs is interesting, for they generally only occur in Palestine. N25, O29, U36, are all predominantly Palestinian, with one example from Esna and one from Kerma. U28 is also found at Tell el Dab'a, while N28 is found at Tell el Dab'a and Tell el Yehudiyeh and two sites in Nubia - but none in Egypt. It would therefore appear that the additional signs were a Palestinian tradition, rather than an Egyptian one. The use of the red crown of Lower Egypt is not found on any anra designs in Egypt, but it is found throughout Palestine and also in Nubia. Conversely, the *h₃tp* sign is found at all major sites in Palestine, and in the Delta and Egypt. The *nbw* sign as part of the design is again found only in Palestine, while the misrepresentation of

the *r* sign as either *t* or *nb* is also found throughout Palestine. This confirms Ward's theory in 1987, that in Egypt and Nubia the anra scarabs stay closer to the original three signs, while in Palestine there are more supplementary signs which occur in a greater variety (Ward 1987, 524-5).

IV. VIII EPIGRAPHIC TYPE SERIES

IV.VII.I Sequence I: ^c-*r*-*n*-^c-*r*-*n* (fig. 4.28, Map 4.26)

JER 12; LACH 3,4,6,7; TEA 9,39,52,56,57,62; TEY 3;
TED 8; KER 7; IM 6,8,11,20; AM 3; NIC 14; BAS 9.

i): This sequence is found only in Type C designs: vertical tripartite divisions, although they occur in a number of different classes within that type; bipartite, divisions without lines, divisions with lines, panel borders, lines with uraei and open cartouche with and without uraei. However, it should be noted that there are no examples to date of this sequence within a cartouche. There is one example with a scroll border. Twenty four percent of the scarabs have supplementary signs at the beginning or end of the sequence.

ii): The sequence is found at Lachish, Jericho and Tell el-Ajjul in Palestine and in the Delta at both Tell el-Yehudiyeh and Tell el-Dab'a. There is one example from Kerma.

iii): Plain backs dominate, accounting for 81% of back types, with one decorated back and two divided, one with humeral callosities. Legs are divided evenly between triangular and straight. Trapezoidal heads are most popular with 53%, while there are 27% of lunate heads, and 20% of open heads.

iv): The Jericho scarab is found in Kenyon's Group II, although the Lachish examples range from MBIIB-C. The Tell el-Dab'a scarab is without context, while the Yehudiyeh example is from graves dating 1700-1600, and the Kerma scarab dates to the SIP. One Israel Museum scarab has humeral callosities on its back, indicating that this sequence was still being used in the XVIIIth dynasty.

Fig. 4.28: Sequence I: $^c-r-n^c-r-n$

Map 4.26: Distribution of Sequence I

IV.VIII.II Sequence II: $^c-r-n-^c-r$ (fig. 4.29, Map 4.27)

BS 3; JER 24,27; GEZ 2,9; TEA 1,18,25,43; GUR 4; ESN 5; ANB 3; UKM 4; KER 2; LM 1; IM 5,13,19; EM 1; AM 14; BAS 2.

i): Typologically, this sequence is found in Types A, B and C. However, the classes in Type C are different to the Sequence I: there are three examples of tripartite divisions with no lines, but there are no examples of tripartite division with lines (which accounted for the majority of the above sequence), and many of the scarabs have this sequence within a cartouche or shrine. Supplementary signs are only found on JER 27, a $\underline{d}_3$ sign (meaning prosperity, see section IV.VII above), a R^c sign on IM.14, a $\dot{s}n$ sign on ESN 7 and IM.5, and the nsw sign on BS3.

ii): This sequence is found in both the north and south of the Jordan Valley, the central highlands and the south coast in Palestine. It is found at two sites in both Upper and Middle Egypt, and in Nubia.

iii): All backs are plain except for one divided and one decorated example. Most legs are straight (71%), the remaining are triangular, while 79% of heads are trapezoidal and 21% are open.

iv): The scarab from Beth Shan is dated to MBIC, the Jericho example is from Group V, and the Gezer context is a late deposit. The scarabs from Egypt and Nubia date XV-XVIIIth dynasties. It may be possible to allocate a mid to late date in the MBII for this type of sequence.

IV.VIII.III Sequence III: $^c-r-n-r-^c$ (fig. 4.30, Map 4.28)

MEG 3; PEL 1; TEA 8,32,35,36,38; TEY 11,12; ESN 1,8; KER 1; ANB 3,4; MIR 1; UKM 1,2; NIC 4,8,9; IM 2; MM2; EM 1; UCL 1.

i): This sequence is also found in type classes A-C, although it is often found in different classes within the types to the above sequences. For example, Sequence II is found in Type A, but as Type A(ii). This sequence is found predominantly in Type A(i), with only one example from Aniba as Type A(ii). Three examples

Fig. 4.29: Sequence II: ^c-r-n-^c-r

Map 4.27: Distribution of Sequence II

from the Sequence II were found in Type B, from B(i): a, d and f. Here the sequence is from Type B(i): b, c, d and f. There are two bipartite division examples, and two with panel borders in this sequence, and none in the former sequence. This sequence occurs in a cartouche, as does Sequence II, but all these cartouches are placed *horizontally*. There are few supplementary signs in this sequence, only one R^c appears in a cartouche from the Niccacci collection.

ii): This sequence is found in the north and south of Palestine at Megiddo, Pella and Tell el-Ajjul. It is most popular in Nubia, where it is found at four sites: Aniba, Mirgissa, Ukma West and Kerma. The most popular design at the Nubian sites is for the sequence to fill the whole base - type A, with one tripartite horizontal division. There are no cartouches or vertical divisions of this sequence in Nubia. The sequence is also found at Tell el-Yehudiyeh and Esna.

iii): All backs are plain except for two divided examples: one from Megiddo and one from the Edinburgh collection. There is one lotus design back from Pella, and 84% of heads are trapezoidal, 8% open and 8% lunate. Three quarters of the legs are simply cut (50% with rear leg marked, 25% without) and one quarter triangular.

iv): There are no indications from these examples as to an early or late date. All seem to date from the XV-XVIth dynasties or MBIIB/C period, with the Esna example from T.163 dating into the XVIIIth dynasty.

IV.VIII.IV *HTP* SEQUENCE (fig. 4.31-2, Map 4.29)

UGT 3; MEG 9; KAB 1; SHM 1; TA 2; RIS 1,2; GEZ 5; JER 15,19,22,38; TEA 41,67,70; TEF 9,12; TED 4,5; NUB 1; AM 8,10,11,13; UCL 2,3; BAS 11,14; IM 14; BRK 1; NEW 8,10,14,15; BM 1.

i): The simplest sequence of $^c-n-r+\dot{h}tp$ accounts for over 53% of the scarabs with an $\dot{h}tp$ sign. A further 16% have an extra c sign, 13% have an extra r sign, 9% have Sequence II and 9% miscellaneous sequences. While the $\dot{h}tp$ sign has single examples of types A(i), B(i)f, C(ii)a, C(ii)b, and examples from types D(i), D(ii) and E(i)a and b, it is noticeable for the high association with type C(iii) - the cartouche. Overall, a substantial 57% of scarabs with a $\dot{h}tp$ sign have the

Fig. 4.30: Sequence III: ^c-r-n-r^c

Map 4.28: Distribution of Sequence III

hieroglyphs placed within a cartouche. It is the only sequence to have substantial numbers of examples from types D and E³². There are also a further 19 examples of anra scarabs with an *hṭp* sign, although these are not part of a sequence³³. A possible translation of this sequence is discussed in Chapter VI.

ii): These scarabs are distributed among the major Palestinian sites of the MB period, both on the coast and inland: Megiddo, Kabri, Shechem, Tel Aviv, Jericho, Gezer, Lachish, Tell el-Ajjul and Tell el Far'a (south). There is also one example from Ugarit, Tell el Dab'a and Nubt, clearly indicating a Palestinian dominance of this type.

iii): Plain backs are most popular with 52%, although 24% are divided and 24% are decorated. Heads are all trapezoidal except for one lunate and one open example. Triangular sides account for 56% of legs, while 28% are simply cut with rear leg showing and 17% are simply carved.

iv): The earliest example of this sequence is found on two sealings from Nubt in Egypt³⁴, dated to the XIIth dynasty³⁵. Following its appearance at Rishon and in the early levels of Megiddo and Jericho, there is a strong possibility that this sequence follows the Nubt scarab, (see Chapter VI for further discussion). Unfortunately, the example from Tell el-Dab'a does not have a context. The Jericho scarabs with *hṭp* are found in Groups II-IV, and other sites date to the general MBII period (Far'a, Tel Aviv, Shechem)³⁶. The early date for this type is substantiated by the fairly high percentage of decorated and divided backs, both acknowledged as early trends (Ward and Dever 1994, 178 and Tufnell 1970, 95ff).

³² There was only one example from sequence IV.VIII.I with a scroll border.

³³ These include: MEG 6,8; LACH 8,12; TEA 2,35,54,68; NIC 5,18; BAS 11; AM 15; LM.3.

³⁴ I would like to thank Daphna Ben-Tor for bringing this sealing to my notice.

³⁵ It must be remembered that the sealings were surface finds at the site, from the low levels of the town. Most of the scarabs were only known from the sealing. There were some XVIIIth dynasty scarabs found at the site, but the majority of sealings and scarabs came from the XIIth dynasty (Petrie and Quibell 1896, 66-68).

³⁶ Other possible earlier contexts such as Ajjul 54 (Block G, lower city) and Lachish 12 (T.157) show distorted sequences with only two sign combinations.

Fig. 4.31: HTP Sequence

Fig. 4.32: HTP Sequence

Map 4.29: Distribution of HTP Sequence

IV.IX EARLY SERIES

Two groups are included here. The first could be a forerunner of the anra design and the second includes the earliest known anra scarabs.

IV.IX.I THE LOTUS GROUP

This is a group of scarabs identified by a bent over lotus plant, with an *n* sign and a *nb* type sign at the top and bottom of the field (the top *nb* sign is reversed, see fig. 4.33). All known backs and sides consist of lunate heads, divided backs and triangular legs, which would indicate a Middle Kingdom date. Whether they are a forerunner to the anra scarab is debatable, but their similarity of design to the anra signs is striking. It is possible that the lotus plant was eventually replaced by the *c* sign and on one scarab from Abydos, the bottom *nb* sign is more like an *r* sign. Most of these scarabs are from Egyptian sites: with a couple of examples from the Sinai at Serabit el-Khadim and one from Mirgissa, confirming contacts with Egypt in the MK³⁷. Another scarab from Serabit el-Khadim would appear to link the two types of design. This scarab has a two sign anra combination of the *r* and *n* signs, but it has the same back, head and leg features of this earlier group and of the MK, thereby possibly attesting to another possible prototype of the anra group. Although the Qau examples are dated by the excavator to the SIP, they clearly fit into this group³⁸.

IV.IX.II EARLIEST ANRA SCARABS

NUB 1; RISH 1-7; MEM 1-2.

Although the date of the scarabs from Rishon and Memphis have yet to be

³⁷

The Egyptian mining activity at Serabit el-Khadim in the MK has already been discussed in Chapter II, as has the establishment of Egyptian forts in Nubia during the same period.

³⁸

The three scarabs from Serabit el-Khadim are from the Edinburgh Museum collection, nos:1905.284.24N (2 sign), 1905.284.24M, 1905.284.24C. The scarab from Abydos is from T.D8 and in the Liverpool Museum collection, no.:LM2490078. The scarabs from Qau: Brunton 1930, pl.xix: 54-56. The scarabs from Gurob: Brunton 1927a, pl.xl:6. The scarab from Mirgissa: Vercoutter 1975, fig.16b. The scarabs from Esna: Downes 1974, 248:1, 245:4.

Serabit el-Khadim
NC

Serabit el-Khadim
NC

Gurob
NC

Qau
NC

Qau
NC

Qau
NC

Abydos
T.D8

Esna
T.248

Esna
T.245

Mirgissa
T.16

*Fig. 4.33: Early Series:
The Lotus Group*

confirmed, for the purposes of this research they are proposed as part of the earliest group of anra scarabs (see fig. 4.34). This group dates to the MK, keeping in mind that this includes the XIIIth dynasty, which is associated with the MBIIB for the purposes of this study (see Chapter III.II).

The sealing from Nubt was a surface find at the site and is dated to the XIIth dynasty, (see footnote 33 above). Here the anra signs are associated with the *hṭp* sign (see section IV.XIII.IV above). The same sequence including the *hṭp* sign is also present on two of the Rishon scarabs. The Memphis sealings show the anra sequence on its own and also in a flanking position of a central column. Due to the *nsw bity* at the top of the design field, and the *ḥnḥ ḥc* above the central column, it is perhaps possible that the central area had a name of a prince or king, with which the anra was then associated. If only the name had survived, the date of these sealings might be undisputed. It is not unusual for the anra sequence to be associated with royal or private names (see section IV.X below).

The Rishon scarabs are an interesting group because they include a number of scarabs which could be described as 'debased' anra scarabs (see RIS 4,5 and Ben-Tor, forthcoming, nos.:9/92 2558 and 9/92 2626). These scarabs appear to be of a similar type to the anra scarab, showing scroll borders, or open cartouche with uraei, but on closer examination they are predominantly made up of supplementary signs. Because of the early date, these scarabs would indicate that rather than the anra scarab design deteriorating over time and therefore including extra supplementary signs, there was perhaps a parallel workshop producing this other type of scarab.

The earliest anra scarabs illustrate three different types of design. There is the *hṭp* sequence, as seen at Nubt and Rishon, and the simple cartouche, seen at Rishon and Memphis. The simpler types of design might be expected of the first anra sequences, but this idea is destroyed by the tripartite vertically divided sealing from Memphis.

Nubt 1

Memphis 1

Memphis 2

Rishon 1

Rishon 2

Rishon 3

Fig. 4.34: Earliest Anra Scarabs

IV.X LATE SERIES

MEG 7; GEZ 2; LACH 5,7,8,9,15; TEA 13; GUR 1,2,3,4;
IM 8,9,10,18,22.

This category applies to anra scarabs which are found in Late Bronze or XVIIIth dynasty contexts (see fig. 4.35), but whether they were actually manufactured at that time is debatable. The majority of these scarabs are clearly 'debased' i.e. filled with supplementary signs or badly executed designs, which would indicate that they were possibly made after the main period of popularity. Others, such as the ring from Gezer Cave 10, would be better classed as an heirloom, as the execution of their design is as good as in the main period of production. The major clue to a later manufacturing date are the humeral callosities on the back of the scarab, which occur at the beginning of the XVIIIth dynasty (Ward 1994, 197). There is only one two sign anra scarab to date, from a site (Samaria-Sebaste), that has such a back (see Crowfoot et al., 1957, pl.xv:1). All the other scarabs from Megiddo, Gezer, Lachish and Ajjul have typical SIP type plain backs.

However, there are a number of scarabs from the Israel Museum collection which appear to confirm that production of the anra scarab existed in the later period. Here there are five examples of scarabs with anra designs and humeral callosities, with a range of design types and standard of execution. IM 8 has a tripartite vertical design which is executed in such a manner that it could be considered to be from the MBIIB/C. IM 9 and 20 could have also been considered as part of the main sequence in date. There the designs from this collection would appear to show that the anra scarab was manufactured in the later period, and Weill was convinced that the anra scarab flourished again in Palestine during the reign of Tuthmosis III (Weill 1918, 738). However, as to the extent of this manufacture in both *chronology and geography*, it is at present impossible to tell. It would appear from their deposition in NK dated tombs in both Egypt and Nubia, that even if they were still not manufactured in these areas, the scarab was still thought of highly enough to be kept as an heirloom.

Gezer 2
Field 10

Lachish 5
T.4004

Lachish 7
T.4004

Lachish 8
T.4004

Lachish 9
T.4004

Ajjul 13
T.4004

Gurob 1
T.67

Gurob 4
T.27

IM.9
NC

IM.8
NC

IM.18
NC

Fig. 4.35: Late Series

IV.XI ROYAL/PRIVATE NAME ASSOCIATIONS

IV.XI.I SCARABS AND SEALS

The anra sequence is associated with a royal name scarab at Megiddo, and a further three kings whose scarabs or cylinder seals are without context (see fig. 4.37). The scarab from Megiddo of Sesostri I was found in the Palace, area AA in stratum X. This scarab could be either an heirloom or a re-issue, and has a base design which is vertically split into three with the royal name in the centre with the anra $n-r^c$ with double nfr signs below.

From those scarabs or seals without contexts, belongs a cylinder seal of Khyan (as seen in section IV.III above). This cylinder seal is from the Blanchard collection (Martin 1971, 1180, pl.46:3) which has a number of different anra sequences with the name, $Hy_3n \ h\dot{k}_3 \ h_3swt$. Martin notes that the inscription incorporates elements of the prenomen $Swsr-n-r^c$ of Hy_3n (Martin 1971, 92), and there are a number of scarabs which have the same inscription, but without the anra sequence³⁹. Khyan is positioned by Ward at the beginning of the XVth dynasty (1984, 162ff), although as he points out, the only facts attainable are that Khyan and Apophis definitely belonged to the XVth dynasty (Ward 1984, 162). There is also a scarab of Meribre (Weill 1953, 138:307) with the anra sequence surrounding the cartouche⁴⁰. Meribre is a minor king of the XVIth dynasty (von Beckerath 1984, 218). Thus, the anra sequence is associated with the Hyksos kings, as well as those of the XIIth dynasties. But the sequence is also possibly found on royal name scarabs of the XIXth dynasty as seen on two scarabs of Rameses II (Petrie 1895, 50:1565-6). The anra sequence (badly written) lies in the flanking columns, as well as the letters $n+r^c$ in a square cartouche in the central column below the cartouche of Rameses II.

The anra sequence is also found on two private name scarabs. The first dates to the

³⁹ Martin 1971, pl.40: 28-35; pl.41:5; pl.42A:7; pl.46:2. These include one from Gezer and one from Esbit Rushdi in Egypt.

⁴⁰ Weill also associated the anra sequence with Auserre Apophis, but I can find no evidence of this to date (1918, 193).

Sesostris I
Megiddo 6

Meribre
Weill 1953, 138:307

Ramesses II
Petrie 1889:5565

Ramesses II
Petrie 1889:5566

Fig. 4.36: Anra Sequence associated with Royal Name Scarabs

Middle Kingdom and is without context (Martin 1971, 318, pl.41:3). It has a vertical tripartite division, with the anra sequence in the flanking columns. The central column reads: *ꜥpr-ꜥnti ḥkꜣ ḥꜣswt*, which was translated by Petrie as "Prince of the Desert the Terror, Ontha" (Petrie 1925, pl. xxi: 15:1), although Ward proposes 'Ruler of a foreign country, *ꜥpr-ꜥnt*', instead (Ward, pers. comm.). The second has the same vertical tripartite division with the anra sequence in the flanking columns (Martin 1971, 305, pl.41:1). The central column reads: *Ymꜥni, iḥms nꜥt ḥnkt*, which is translated by Ward as 'Benjamin, Apprentice/Attendant of the Kitchen', (Ward 1982, 192 & 194 and pers. comm.). Martin has given this a XVth dynasty back type, but unfortunately, this scarab is also without a context. Ward also dates both scarabs to the XVth dynasty, believing they are vassals of that dynasty (Ward, pers. comm.).

These scarabs date to the XIIth, XIIIth, and XVIIIth dynasties, indicating the anra combination was known in the Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom as well as the Second Intermediate Period.

IV.XI.II ROYAL NAME SCARAB FEATURES

A study of the royal name series of the XVth dynasty, indicates a clear trend in the base design in the use of the vertical tripartite division and other designs. For example, it is only at the beginning of the XVth dynasty, with Seuserenre Khyan, that the first vertical tripartite division of the base is seen in the royal name series. His other scarabs include vertical divisions with cobras in the flanking columns, and three paired scroll borders (Tufnell 1984, pl.lvi). Meruserre Yakuber has only one vertical tripartite division, while his remaining scarabs show three paired scroll borders (Tufnell 1984, pl.lvii). Mayebre (Sheshi) has both three and two sign hieroglyphs in flanking columns, as well as the scroll border, while (Mayerbre) Sheshi has the same types, although now, for the first time, the 'cross stroke' or 'panel' border is introduced (Tufnell 1984, pl.lvii-lvix). Khauserre and Amu have both *nṯr* signs and panel borders (Tufnell 1984, pl.lix,lx), which now continue until

Ahetepre, who also has open bases and scroll borders, returning once again (Tufnell 1984, pl. lxi). Auserre Apophis has no panel or vertical divisions, but cartouches within the whole field or a scroll border (Tufnell 1984, pl. lxii).

With such a definite progression of border types on the royal name scarabs, it should therefore be possible to link the vertical tripartite divisions of the anra scarab designs with the earlier XVth dynasty, and the panel designs from mid to late XVth dynasty. (However, it must be acknowledged that the sequence of Kings of the XVth dynasty is still debated and that the design scarab repertoire might not have followed the royal name series).

IV.XII CONCLUSIONS

The classification of the anra scarab by its epigraphy and iconography have revealed a number of geographic and chronological trends, as well as information regarding the local manufacture, origins of the design and its importance as an object in the Middle Bronze Age.

The most popular type of base design on the anra scarabs is the arrangement of the anra sequence in a cartouche, followed by the division of the base into three vertical columns. The anra sequence is found in both horizontal and vertical cartouches, the former quite rare as they were not included within Tufnell's original typology. The anra cartouche is found throughout Palestine with only single examples from Syria and Nubia (see Map 4.17). The sparseness of examples of scarabs with cartouches from the Delta is interesting, assuming (from the lack of anra scarabs found at sites in Upper Egypt), that the anra scarab is part of the XVth dynasty design repertoire (see Chapter VI). The anra motif is found to flank cartouches in examples from Tell el-Dab'a and Memphis, but to date has only been found within a cartouche on one example from Nubt. This could lead to the assumption that the anra sequence did not represent the name of a King or Prince in Egypt or the Delta, but instead was related to important personages

because of its association with royal or private names. It would appear to be a different matter in Palestine, where as has been seen above, there are numerous examples from all over the country of the anra sequence within a cartouche. A number of possibilities could account for this phenomenon. Firstly, these scarabs were manufactured by Canaanites ignorant of the importance of the cartouche. Secondly, the anra sequence represented something (a name, or god), known to the Canaanites, which they chose to represent within a cartouche. Thirdly, the anra sequence could represent a name of a local king or prince of Palestine (see the epigraphic Sequence IV). It is also possible that the scarab was produced by the XVth dynasty specifically for the Palestinian market. These options are discussed in Chapter VI. The emphasis of a Palestinian design type also incorporates the question of local manufacture, which is considered in more detail below.

The second most popular design type is the tripartite vertical division. This type can be associated with the XVth dynasty royal name scarab series (see section IV.XI.II above). This design type was most common in southern Palestine. The close proximity to the Delta region, home of the XVth dynasty Kings, could account for this type being so popular in that region.

It might be expected that the capital of the XVth dynasty, Avaris, or the site of Tell el-Dab'a in the Delta region, would produce many scarabs with the popular anra motif. However, as will be seen below, most examples of this type of scarab come from Palestine. Tell el-Dab'a has nine anra scarabs, mainly from its early strata of G-E, with only two scarabs from Bietak's main Hyksos levels, D/3-D/2⁴¹ (see fig. 4.38). Half the designs are of Type A or B - the simpler designs. There are two examples of tripartite divisions with no lines, and one example of tripartite division with lines (but no context), and one design with a scroll border, indicating that the simpler types of designs appear to be associated with earlier deposits at Tell el-Dab'a. Following the evidence from Tell el-Dab'a, it might be expected

⁴¹

I would like to thank Professor Manfred Bietak and Christa Mlinar for very kindly sharing the unpublished Tell el-Dab'a material with me.

TED 1
str. G

TED 2
str. F

TED 3
str. E/1

TED 4
str. E/1

TED 6
str. E/1

TED 9
str. D/3

TED 7
str. D/2

Fig. 4.37: Scarabs from Tell el-Dab'a

that the anra motif could be traced from the more simple types of design (Type A) to the more complicated (such as Type C). However, this is not the case in Palestine. The earliest scarabs at Rishon show a range of designs including cartouches and debased motifs. A separate group, such as the anra scarabs from Jericho, also illustrate a mixture of types, including two sign and 'debased' anras in the earliest Group I and II tombs⁴². Type A(i), the simplest type of anra design is also the most popular in the Delta, Egypt and Nubia, while it is only found at three sites in Palestine. There are no animal or human figures on the Dab'a scarabs, which are confined to Palestine, except for one example from Tell el-Yehudiyeh. Therefore it would appear that at Avaris, the simpler type of anra motifs are found in the earliest stratum, while in Palestine, although examples of type A(i) exist, the anra motif appears in a more developed form, or at a more advanced stage. The more complicated early design at Memphis, comes from the anra flanking what appears to be a royal name. As the anra sequence has already been seen on scarabs of Sesostri I, it might be possible to differentiate chronologically between anra motifs associated with royal or private names and those of a design genre.

Geographical trends were convincingly apparent within the Type Series. One of the most important criteria to emerge was that every type of anra design occurred in Palestine, indicating how popular the design was in that country. Based on the geographic distribution of the designs, the type series could be divided into four categories: i) designs distributed throughout Palestine, Egypt and Nubia, ii) designs found in Palestine and Nubia only, iii) designs found in Palestine and Lower Egypt only, iv) designs only found in Palestine (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2). The majority of base designs were found in categories iii) and iv). Only type A(i) (design fills entire field) occurred in Palestine, the Delta, Middle and Upper Egypt and Nubia. Type B(i)c (tripartite division with *ankh* signs) also occurred in all these areas, but

42

See JER 25 (B48, Group I) and JER 9,13,14,29 (G46, Group II), JER 20 (P1, Group II), and JER 30 (G37, Group II).

only at one site in each region. Type C(ii)b (vertical, tripartite division with lines) was further subdivided into three different types: anra signs in the central column, the anra signs in flanking columns and the anra signs in all three columns. This division of types is supported geographically. That is, the first type, with anras in central column, was found in Palestine and Egypt. The second type, with anra flanking, was found in Palestine and the Delta. The third type, anra signs in all columns, was found in Palestine and Nubia. Type C(ii)d ('Royal Hyksos' border) was found in Palestine, Upper Egypt and Nubia. It might have been expected for this type to have been discovered at sites in the Delta and Middle Egypt.

Palestine, Egypt, Nubia	Palestine, Nubia	Palestine, Lower Egypt	Palestine
A(i)	B(ii)	B(i)b	B(i)a
A(ii)	C(ii)c	B(i)d	B(i)e
B(i)c	C(iii)a	C(i)	C(ii)e
C(ii)b		C(iii)c	C(iii)b
B(i)f		D(i)	E(i)a
C(ii)d		D(ii)	E(i)d
		E(i)c	E(ii)

Table 4.1: Geographic distribution of Design Types

Three types were distributed between Palestine and Nubia only. They included type B(ii) (horizontal cartouche), C(ii)c (vertical, tripartite division with lines with ureai) and C(iii)a (anra cartouche). No patterns emerged with the affiliated sites in Nubia. It might have been expected that because of the expansion of the Kingdom of Kush during the SIP, and its known contacts with the XVth dynasty, many anra scarabs would have occurred at Kerma. However, this does not seem to be the case. There are, however, more anra scarabs found in Nubia distributed throughout the country, than are found at sites in Upper and Middle Egypt.

The most popular geographic distribution of design types fell between Palestine,

the Delta and Middle Egypt; and Palestine only⁴³. Of the seven design types which only occur in Palestine, most were limited to a couple of sites. For example, Types B(i)a (basic horizontal tripartite division), and E(i)a (goat) were only found at Ajjul and Gezer. Type B(i)e (papyrus and crowns in upper and lower sections) was only found at Megiddo. Type C(ii)e (shrine motif) was found at Ajjul and Jericho, while type E(i)a (cobras) was at Gezer and Jericho. Type C(iii)b (incorrect cartouche) had a larger distribution, as it was found at Ajjul, Lachish, Beth Shan and Ugarit.

While studying the geographic distribution of the anra scarab, there are a number of striking features. The first has to be the lack of anra scarabs found at Egyptian sites, on comparison with Palestinian sites, although this may be due to the excavation record. Within Egypt, the anra scarab is found mainly in the Delta and Middle Egypt (at sites close to the Delta), which is to be expected as they fall within the probable sphere of influence of the XVth dynasty. However, the relatively large number of anra scarabs found at Esna are more difficult to explain. What was the connection between this site and the XVth dynasty? There are no other anra scarabs from SIP sites in Upper Egypt such as Qau, Mostagedda and Matmar. This could be expected due to their sphere of influence most likely coming from the XVIIth dynasty at Thebes (although other typical 'SIP type' designs are found at these sites). So what was special about Esna? Perhaps the sphere of influence of the XVth dynasty was seen at Gebelein after all.

43

Since completing this chapter, five anra scarabs from a site in the Delta came to my attention (see Weill 1918, 235, nos.1-4 bis). The site is Chabin el-Kahata, located close to Tell el-Yehudiyeh, but little information regarding the site is forthcoming. As the catalogue has been completed, the scarabs are illustrated below:

	A(i)	A(ii)	B(i)a	B(i)b	B(i)c	B(i)d	B(i)e	B(i)f	B(ii)	C(i)	C(ii)a	C(ii)b	C(ii)c	C(ii)d	C(ii)e	C(iii)a	C(iii)b	C(iii)b(i)	C(iii)c	D(i)	D(ii)	E(i)a	E(i)b	E(i)c	E(i)d	E(ii)
Kerna	X							X				X	X													Kerna
Ukma	X							X								X										Ukma
Mirgissa	X				X																					Mirgissa
Debeira	X											X														Debeira
Aniba	X	X					X																			Aniba
Esna	X				X						X	X														Esna
Nubt										X																Nubt
Sedment	X				X																					Sedment
Gurob	X			X																X						Gurob
Memphis	X																									Memphis
Dab'a	X									X	X	X								X						Dab'a
Yehudiyeh	X			X	X	X		X		X	X		X						X							Yehudiyeh
Far'a						X				X	X	X				X			X	X						Far'a
Gerar								X		X	X	X														Gerar
Ajjul	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X	Ajjul
Beit Mirsim																X										Beit Mirsim
Lachish								X			X	X		X		X	X			X						Lachish
Rishon	X										X	X		X		X	X			X						Rishon
Jericho	X	X						X		X	X				X	X			X	X						Jericho
Gezer	X	X	X							X	X		X			X		X						X		Gezer
Amman											X															Amman
Shiloh						X																				Shiloh
Tel Aviv						X										X										Tel Aviv
Tel Michal		X																								Tel Michal
Shechem																										Shechem
Pella									X		X			X												Pella
Beth Shan					X												X		X	X						Beth Shan
Megiddo											X					X				X						Megiddo
Kabri																X				X						Kabri
Byblos																				X						Byblos
Ugarit								X								X	X			X						Ugarit
	A(i)	A(ii)	B(i)a	B(i)b	B(i)c	B(i)d	B(i)e	B(i)f	B(ii)	C(i)	C(ii)a	C(ii)b	C(ii)c	C(ii)d	C(ii)e	C(iii)a	C(iii)b	C(iii)b(i)	C(iii)c	D(i)	D(ii)	E(i)a	E(i)b	E(i)c	E(i)d	E(ii)

Table 4.2:
Geographic distribution of types by sites

Within Palestine itself, it is notable that almost all the design types are found at Tell el-Ajjul (see Table 4.2). It has been asserted that this southern city in Palestine was a major stronghold of the 'Hyksos' ('the Canaanite capital of the XVth dynasty', Kempinski 1992, 191), or alternatively, at least a major city during the MBIIB/C (Kempinski 1992, 171). The latter assertion would appear to be corroborated by the anra scarab. It seems a likely place from which the anra scarabs could be distributed to the rest of the country. While many of the anra scarabs are concentrated in the south of Palestine, they are found throughout the country (at sites on the coast, in the central highlands and the Jordan Valley). Nearly ninety percent of the sites in Palestine with anra scarabs are found either on the coast or on the inland trade routes. There are only two sites, Shechem and Shiloh, which would be harder to reach. Therefore it could be said that the anra scarab was distributed in Palestine among the major trade routes of the MBIIB/C.

The large number of anra scarabs in Palestine could indicate some sort of local manufacture of the design. As will be discussed in Chapter VI, it would appear that the concept for the anra scarab was derived in Egypt, and this would appear to be supported by the (possible) XIIth dynasty sealings from Nubt, the association with scarabs of Sesostris I and II, as well as the sealings from Memphis. While the scarab was perhaps originally marketed for the Palestinian market by the XVth dynasty (see Chapter VI), it is conceivable that at a later date it was actually manufactured in Palestine as well. It is also possible that there were in fact, at least two workshops manufacturing the scarab. The first workshop produced 'true' designs, incorporating the three signs of the anra sequence, while the second produced more debased types, full of Egyptian signs and symbols, which happen to include any of the three signs of the anra sequence. This can be seen at both Jericho and Rishon, where the early examples include both debased, two sign and complicated designs. The manufacture of the anra scarab in Palestine would appear to tie in with a cylinder seal workshop, also thought to be located in the region (see section IV.III). The names written on the cylinder seals bear a strong resemblance to the anra sequence, and could be associated in some way.

A brief analysis of the back (see Graphs 4.1-2), head (Graphs 4.3-4) and leg (Graphs 4.5-6) types of the anra scarabs, show that the most typical head type is trapezoidal, back type is plain and side type is triangular. Leg types show a variation among the different type classes. Types A and B have simply cut legs overall: type A has just the one line, while the last three classes of type B have simple legs with rear leg showing. Type C has all triangular legs except for one class - type C(ii)c: lines with ureai. Triangular legs continue in type D, scroll borders, but all type E have simply cut legs once again. Although each design class had the typical types (trapezoidal head, plain back, triangular or simple legs, see above), it is also worth noting the number of divided and decorated backs which occur within the anra sequence, and also the number of lunate heads. These features are generally quite rare in the MBII, being more common in an earlier period (although a divided back can also be indicative of the XVIIIth dynasty as well). For example, the lunate head, type A, comprises 75% of the scarabs in Ward's period one⁴⁴, and then shows a steady decline until the NK, where it once again emerges as a dominant type (Ward and Dever 1994, 120). Open and trapezoidal heads are rare in the early periods, with type B common in Wards period IIA-V; while type D (trapezoidal) accounts for almost half the scarabs of period V (Ward and Dever 1994, loc.cit.). Divided backs are common in periods I-II, and then return in the NK, while plain backs are the most prevalent type in periods IV and V. Decorated backs appear in periods II-VI, although they are most frequent in periods II-III (Ward and Dever 1994, 121). The anra sides are generally of type 'e', which is common in periods IV and V, along with type 'd', although type 'e's most common period is IIA-III (Ward and Dever 1994, 121).

An examination of the relationship between the size and different design types of the anra scarab (see Graphs 4.7-8) shows distinct trends. Ward and Tufnell saw

44

Ward's period are as follows:

Period I: FIP and XIth dynasty; Period II: Montet Jar, c. 1950BC;

Period IIA: MBIIA and transitional MBIIA/B and XIIth dynasty;

Period III: earlier MBIIIB, XIIth and early XIIIth dynasties;

Period IV: late XIIIth and early XVth dynasties, late MBIIIB;

Period V: MBIIIC, XVth dynasty; Period VI: XVIIIth dynasty. (Ward 1994, 6).

Graph 4.1:
Related back and design types

Graph 4.2:
Related back and design types

HEAD TYPES

Graph 4.3:
Related head and design types

HEAD TYPES

Graph 4.4:
Related head and design types

Graph 4.5:
Related leg and design types

LEG TYPES

Graph 4.6:
Related leg and design types

SIZE TYPES

Graph 4.7:
Related size and design types

SIZE TYPES

Graph 4.8:
Related size and design types

that 'scarabs of the same design bunch together within a certain range of length', and that the peak of scarab size was reached in the XIIIth dynasty and then declined thereafter until the XVIIIth dynasty (1984, 28). Keeping in mind that it was not possible to ascertain exact dimensions for many of the anra scarabs, eighty percent of scarabs in design types fell within the 17-23mm size range. The smaller 11-16mm range was associated with only five design groups: A(i), A(ii), B(i)a, B(i)b and E(i)d, while the largest size range, 24+mm, was associated with type C(ii)b(ii).

Chronological trends were harder to establish within the typology, as the dates given to the scarabs are either wide ranging or are unable to be confirmed. However, some chronological deductions can be made utilizing the information regarding the sizes of design types. Tufnell advocated that size alone should not be used to determine dates for scarabs (1984, 28). However, as the anra scarab also demonstrates a number of back and head traits that are associated with the earlier MB period, it would appear that the features of the anra scarabs indicate that it is associated with the earlier MBIIA/XIIth dynasty period, which has already been suspected from the scarabs' deposits. It would appear that some of the simplest design types are associated with the smaller size range, possibly indicating an SIP date. Types D and E, animal and human figures, are generally later MBII designs (Ward and Dever 1994, 121), perhaps introduced into the 'Hyksos' repertoire from Palestine, while the hieroglyphic designs date earlier, following the MK type designs (Ward and Dever 1994, 121). This would appear to be confirmed by the anra scarabs, although they actually differentiate between the animal designs showing that based on the size criteria, the cobra, horus and sphinx might be earlier than the antelope (see Graph 4.8). As these three animals are part of the Egyptian design repertoire, this could be considered quite appropriate.

While the date of the earliest anra scarabs is debated, i.e. those from Memphis and Rishon, there is an example from Nubt in Egypt possibly dating to the XIIth

dynasty, and scarabs with anra signs flanking royal names from the same period⁴⁵. There are two possible prototypes of the anra design: the Nubt example and the lotus group, both of which date to the MK (see section IV.IX.I). In contrast to the early beginnings of the design, it would appear that some anra scarabs were also kept as heirlooms, or possibly manufactured after the SIP (see section IV.X). This assumption is due to their appearance in LBA/XVIIIth dynasty contexts, however, it is not possible to say if this tradition continued alone in Palestine or Egypt, as there are few examples from contexts with humeral callosities. The chronological parameters of the anra scarab, however, appear to have been widened considerably from its contained association with the SIP (see Chapter I).

Finally, there are a number of both royal and private name scarabs associated with the anra sequence, which must indicate that the scarab represents more than a meaningless design. The anra motif flanks royal names from the XIIth, XVth and XVIth dynasties, and also utilises design elements from the XVth dynasty design repertoire. The motif was also re-used by Ramesses II. The re-use by the great XIXth dynasty king is enlightening, as royal name scarabs were generally only re-issued because of their historical importance (Martin 1971,1). While Ward dismisses the possibility of XVth dynasty kings' names being used for re-issue because of their obscurity (Ward in Tufnell 1984, 152), the re-use of the anra sequence shows that later pharaohs must have considered it to have had some historical significance. The status of the anra scarab is considered in Chapter V, and it will appear to confirm what has been seen here: that the anra scarab is no ordinary design amulet of the Second Intermediate Period.

⁴⁵

Unfortunately there are no measurements of the scarabs from Rishon, and the sealings from Memphis are incomplete. The scarab from Nubt falls within the 17-23mm range.

CHAPTER V

CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

"The designation of an artefact as a marker of high status requires knowledge of its geographical findspot, its archaeological and architectural context, the associated artefact assemblage, the manner and purpose of deposition and its state".

Rupp 1989, 353.

V.1 INTRODUCTION

In order to evaluate the function, role and significance of the anra scarab, its status as an object had to be determined. Therefore the scarabs were considered in their contexts and in the different cultures in which they occurred. Was the anra scarab a highly valued object, an 'élite' or 'luxury' item, an object used ritually, or an item commonly found within all strata of Bronze Age society? Rupp's criteria should apply not only in determining an object to be of high status, but as the basic requirement in evaluating the status of any object. The information pertaining to findspots, contexts and associated artefacts, is often difficult to ascertain, despite the great interest shown in funerary remains during recent years. This difficulty is due to a propensity towards establishing the nature of the social systems in prehistoric times, rather than the analysis of contexts and assemblages. The preoccupation with ancient ranking systems stems from the concept of 'New Archaeology'¹, where numerous models are offered in an attempt to understand ancient societies, and much has been written on the meaning of grave goods as an indicator of rank and status within a community².

¹ See Binford and Binford 1968 and Clarke 1968 for the beginning of this new wave of archaeological thought.

² Ethnographic parallels and the study of burial assemblages have given rise to a number of socio-political theories regarding ancient societies in recent years (Bunimotivz 1992, Finkelstein 1992). While some scholars believe that tomb offerings do not reflect material

An in depth analysis of the archaeological contexts in which the anra scarab, or indeed any scarab occurs, has not (to my knowledge) been previously undertaken. Therefore to evaluate the status of the anra scarab, it was necessary to define a 'luxury' or 'élite' object. However, it soon became apparent that while attention has been given to grave goods as indicators of rank and status within communities, research which analyses objects as 'symbols of authority' or status, has not developed to the same extent (Brown 1981, 30). An investigation into élite or luxury items is therefore difficult because it is often submerged in the quest for identifying ranking systems of ancient societies.

It would appear that within each example of ancient burial systems, parameters must be set in order to determine which objects are considered élite or luxurious, and as yet, there is no general consensus as to what determines such examples³. For instance, Braun (1979) divided a series of Hopewellian grave goods into those whose contexts were exclusively burials and those found in middens. He reasoned that grave goods not found in residential refuse were more likely to function as symbols of authority (Brown 1981, 30). Coldstream identified gold jewelry, bronze vessels, items with personal names and imported pottery as indicators of wealth and status in his discussion of eleventh century Cypriot burials (1989, 328-330). Gorelick and Gwinett see cylinder seals as both social emblems and status symbols (1990, 45), while Philip proposes that weapons are objects of high status, argued on grounds of minority, representational evidence and association with deities (1989, 151, 155).

Binford (1972, 414) and Shay (1983, 33-34) divided objects within a burial into three categories; essential, personal and competitive. Personal equipment

conditions of a society, prehistoric burial practice or actual wealth of an individual (Ucko 1969; Piggott 1969, Pader 1982; Goring 1989), others feel that by the time an adult dies, he has collected a diverse range of social identities or roles which are important in burial rites, and often symbolised or recorded in the artefacts placed with the deceased (Rathje 1977, 25). There have been many general discussions on the 'archaeology of death' (Binford 1972, Chapman et alii., 1981, (with bibliography), Gardin and Peebles 1992).

³

Even in recent publications such as *The Archaeology of Death* (Chapman et alii., 1989), or *The Archaeology of Rank* (Wason, 1994), there is no designation as to which objects constitute rank, or show specific social status.

consisted of articles ultimately connected with the deceased⁴ and Yasur-Landau in his study of burial practices at Jericho, saw the objects from the personal assemblages as representing both the most valuable items and those capable of discerning status and wealth⁵. The objects he designates to this category include scarabs, cylinder seals, toggle pins, beads, alabaster, juglets and weapons (1992, 239-241). It is clear that there are generally two classes of goods: subsistence goods and those of wealth. The former are designated as basic products such as food or cooking utensils, while those of wealth can be described as 'primitive valuables used in display, ritual and exchange and special, rare and highly desired subsistence products' (Brumfiel and Earle 1987, 4).

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section (V.II) considers all sites and contexts in which the anra scarabs occur. The contextual analysis of the anra scarab has been severely hampered by the publication records of the sites in which they are found. Many of the sites were excavated in the first half of the century, and in order to analyse specific contexts, it would be necessary to undertake a complete revision of the sites themselves. While this is obviously impossible due to time and spatial considerations, in depth investigations have been undertaken where feasible. Therefore section one gives as much information as possible regarding every context in which the anra scarab occurs.

The second section (V.III) undertakes a detailed analysis of the anra scarab at nine sites, where the publication record allowed an in depth inquiry⁶. Here, the anra scarab contexts were compared with other scarab contexts and non

⁴ However, in trying to both identify and differentiate between these three classes is difficult as it is undefined what constitutes a minimal essential assemblage and hard to identify competitive objects. Some objects can also be assigned to more than one category (Yasur-Landau (1992, 238-9).

⁵ See also Shay 1983 and Palumbo 1987 for studies of mortuary practices at Jericho.

⁶ Only the contexts of anra scarabs with the full three signs have been investigated in this analysis.

the anra scarab contexts were compared with other scarab contexts and non scarab contexts with interesting, and unexpected, results. The results of the analysis are illustrated by graphs, and supported by tabular data (see Appendix C). For further discussion on the methodology of the analysis, see section V.III.I.

V.II THE SITES

The anra scarab occurs at thirty one sites throughout Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Nubia. They are arranged and discussed here geographically, from north to south (see Map 4.1).

SYRIA

V.II.I RAS SHAMRA-UGARIT

Ras Shamra-Ugarit has been excavated by the French since 1929, initially under the direction of Claude Schaeffer (1929-1974), and then by Marguerite Yon (1978-1990)⁷. Unfortunately, an investigation into the scarabs from Ras Shamra-Ugarit reveals that little is known about them, and so a contextual analysis is not possible⁸. A brief survey of anra and other known scarab

⁷ Reports of each season were published by Schaeffer in *SYRIA* from 1929 onwards. Other major publications include Schaeffer (1939b, 1949, 1956, 1962, 1968, 1969), and Bordreuil and Pardee (1989) with bibliography.

⁸ Schaeffer often refers briefly to a scarab but does not describe it in detail, as seen by the following quotations. "...je signale trois scarabées dont l'un en améthyste et un autre serti d'or..." (Schaeffer 1933, 114). "...nous avons recueilli, en 1931, des objets égyptiens du temps de la XII^e dynastie: grains de colliers, scarabées, fragments de figurines..." (Schaeffer 1934, 113). "L'un contenait un collier composé de coulants en cornaline, lapis, pâte vitreuse égyptienne, nacre, d'un scarabée en pierre verte, d'un perle de forme scaraboïde en cornaline sertie d'or..." (Schaeffer 1935, 153). "Plusieurs scarabées, des faucilles et flèches en bronze et de nombreux clyindres... ont également été trouvés dans ces couches" (Schaeffer 1936, 113). "Dans l'étroite pièce entre le mur supportant l'escalier et le mur fermant le sanctuaire au Nord...au nombre de plusieurs centaines, ainsi que de nombreux scarabées, avaient été déposés au cours des âges." (Schaeffer 1938, 321).

Schaeffer also often publishes a photograph or drawing of the scarabs without any details (Schaeffer 1939a, pl.V.; Schaeffer 1932, pl.XI). The first photograph illustrates 21 scarabs, the second 6 scarabs, so in total there are 27 scarabs. Of these, 14 are drawn,

contexts has been undertaken in order to see if any information can be gleaned regarding the status of these contexts at this site.

There are three anra scarabs from Ras Shamra-Ugarit. They were found in a 'votive sanctuary' (UGT 1), a tomb (UGT 2), and a grave in the Palace Garden (UGT 3). The sanctuary is noted for two statuettes in copper. With the statuettes were found a cache of arms identified as Mitannian, a number of lamps, fragments of Cypriot bulbuls, and a sherd of red on black ware (Schaeffer 1939, 126-128). Schaeffer dates these to the XVII-XVIth centuries, using the six scarabs found with them, which are of the 'Hyksos' type (Schaeffer 1932, 126). The second anra scarab is said in Schaeffer's original report to come from Tomb 83, but there appears to be no information regarding this tomb (Schaeffer 1932, 17). As far as it is possible to determine, this tomb is discussed only in regard to this particular scarab (Schaeffer 1932, 17-19). However, in a later publication, this scarab is reported to be from the 'Maison du Grand Prêtre' (Bordreuil and Pardee 1989, 32). Here it is said to be found with three other scarabs (Bordreuil and Pardee 1989, 32-33). The third anra scarab comes from a grave in the Palace garden (although in Bordreuil and Pardee's later publication it is simply described as courtyard III (1989, 166)). There were two scarabs in the deposit, along with toggle pins, a necklace of beads with a cylinder seal, rings, ear-rings, daggers, together with dipper juglets and vases (Schaeffer 1962, 255-6, 307-8). The grave is dated to the Ugarit Moyen 2 (1900-1700) (Schaeffer 1962, 307).

It was not possible to conduct a comparison of contexts at this site, as information regarding tombs in the relevant areas to the anra scarabs was difficult to ascertain. A survey of the site shows a further eight scarabs from

given numbers and contexts (Schaeffer 1939b, fig.59 & fig.113): which leaves nearly half unaccounted for and some, such as the scarab in amethyst (Schaeffer 1933, 114) and of green stone (Schaeffer 1935, 153), completely unillustrated. Another drawing (fig. 39, Schaeffer 1938) illustrates the backs of two scarabs with rings, no. 9871 & 9873. The first is drawn in detail in fig.59 in the same publication, but there is no information on the second scarab.

tomb deposits, and an undefined number from non tomb contexts. The tomb contexts are briefly looked at here in order to compare anra scarab deposits with other scarab deposits.

Four scarabs are from Tomb LIII (nos. 9440-9443). With them were found a number of pottery vessels including Cypriot Base Ring and a RLWMW spindle bottle (Schaeffer 1938, fig.11 and 12). The two scarabs referred to are clearly XVIIIth dynasty, while the remaining two are Second Intermediate Period. There do not seem to be any other metal items or jewelry associated with this deposit. Tomb LIV had one scarab (9569), clearly of SIP type, together with weapons, toggle pins, decorated ivory, juglets including dippers, bowls, and jugs. There were also Cypriot Base Ring vessels, a RLWMW spindle bottle, and a faience cup with duck handle (Schaeffer 1938, 220). Tomb LVI also had one small SIP style scarab (9710), again with a corpus of pottery including jugs, plates, dippers and vases. There were also a number of bronzes including weapons and toggle pins, plus a necklace of ninety beads including faience, carnelian, green stone and silver which contained the scarab (Schaeffer 1938, 241).

Two scarabs set in rings (9871, 9873) come from Tomb LVII. However, only the former has its base design illustrated, and it is set in silver. This tomb also had a range of pottery shapes and types which include Minoan inspired pottery, Cypriot types, a Tel el-Yehudiyeh juglet and a possible Chocolate on White jug (Schaeffer 1938, fig.36). There were also a number of bronzes including weapons and toggle pins, and two haematite cylinder seals (Schaeffer 1938, 246). The final scarab was found in Tomb XLII (9113). However, this is an XVIIIth dynasty scarab and there is no detailed information to be found regarding this tomb.

A brief survey illustrates that the scarabs at the site of Ras Shamra-Ugarit appear with objects which could be considered élite or luxurious in nature. All

tomb deposits (except one) include weapons, toggle pins, jewelry and imported pottery. The comparison of anra scarab deposits with other scarab deposits, appears to show no distinction between the two, as they are all associated with a range of luxury or imported goods.

V.II.II BYBLOS

The French also conducted excavations at the site of Byblos from the late 1920s, at first under the direction of Montet, and later by Dunand⁹. Although another important coastal site, it again suffers from poor publication of the material, making a contextual analysis of the scarabs impossible. Dunand produced a grid system for the site but this is of little help when trying to assess contexts. Saghie (1983) provides an analysis, but unfortunately only for the third millennium. As Saghie notes in her forward "no synthesis of the results of the excavations has yet appeared...Dunand seems to leave this very difficult task for others to accomplish..." (1983, ix).

There are two anra scarabs found at Byblos. The first scarab (7665) is found alone within grid 14/23, attributed to level I, designated between 28.00-27.80m (Dunand 1954, 130). On the plan there are walls illustrated within the grid reference, but there are no suggestions as to what they may be. The second scarab (19145) is from the surface of level XXV (indicated at 23.00m), and is found within square 18/9 (Dunand 1954, 1065). It is not marked, however, on the plan corresponding to levels 24.00-23.00. There were also two figurines and another scarab from this area (Dunand 1954, *ibid.*). From Schaeffer's *Stratigraphie comparée et Chronologie de L'Asie Occidentale*, (1948, pl.xviii), Level I is dated to 1520 - 1329 and Level XXV 5032 - 5094. Obviously the second scarab has been misplaced. It is conceivable that the design of the first scarab could have continued into the Late Bronze Age, but here it would be

9

Montet (1928/9) and Dunand (1939, 1958, 1973).

more helpful if the back and sides were known.

PALESTINE/JORDAN

V.II.III KABRI

Salvage excavations were carried out at the site at various times in the 1950's, 60's and 70's, generally on behalf of the Department of Antiquities. Excavations began in earnest under the direction of Kempinski and Meron for the Department of Antiquities and Tel Aviv University in 1986, and continue to the present day¹⁰.

One anra scarab has been found in the recent excavations at Kabri by the late Professor Aharon Kempinski¹¹. It is from Tomb 902 and its related objects include a number of imported Cypriot vessels of BLWMW, WPIV and WP cross line as well as six toggle pins, beads, eight scarabs (including two of Yaqabum) and a dagger (Kempinski, pers.comm.).

V.II.IV MEGIDDO

Excavations began at Megiddo in 1903 and continued until 1905 under the direction of Schumacher, for the German Society for Oriental Research. They continued under the auspices of the Oriental Institute of Chicago from 1925 until 1939, with successive directors including Fisher, Guy and Loud. Excavations were resumed in 1960-61 by Yadin on behalf of the Institute of Archaeology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and continued in 1966-67

¹⁰ There are a number of reports on the site, with Kempinski and Niemeier presenting the main preliminary report in 1991. See Kempinski (1993a, 841) for a comprehensive bibliography of the site.

¹¹ I am grateful to the late Professor Kempinski for his kind permission to include this scarab from his recent excavations at Kabri, and sharing the unpublished material from Kabri with me.

and 1971¹².

Megiddo is one of the few sites in Palestine where it is possible to conduct a contextual analysis. There are nine anra scarabs from the site¹³, seven scarabs from six tombs from strata X-XII (MBII), and two from the Palace. The objects found within the tombs included toggle pins, bone inlay, weapons, alabaster, jewelry, and beads, although the last were noticeably scarcer when compared with other sites. No information on skeletal remains or disturbance factors of the tombs was published (Loud 1948, 145-188).

The scarabs from the Palace have not been included in the contextual analysis, and are therefore briefly surveyed here. The position of scarab (MEG2) is unclear from the publication (Loud 1948, fig.384), although it would appear to be associated with deposit 3073 (the scarab is from E=3073). If so, this scarab was associated with gold beads, pendants and jewelry, faience, glass and stone beads, amulets and weapons as well as alabaster and basalt vessels, ivory and ostrich egg fragments, together with local wares of jugs and bowls. Deposit 3073 is a subterranean 3-room unit, with plastered walls, identified as the Palace Treasury (Loud 1948, 31). The second Palace scarab (MEG 7) was

¹² Main publications of the site include: Schumacher (1908), Fisher (1929), Engberg (1934), Lamon (1935), Guy and Engberg (1938), Lamon and Shipton (1939), Loud (1939, 1948), Kempinski (1989), Shiloh (1993). See also Watzinger (1929), Guy (1931), May (1935), Shipton (1939).

¹³ There are a further four, two sign anras from Megiddo. Their contexts are not included in the contextual analysis: (MEG 4 (T.3070), MEG 7 (1752), MEG 10 (T.24)). MEG 1 is from T.4079 which also has a three sign anra scarab, and so the context is included in the analysis. T.24 was a tomb from the early excavations in 1929. It was a large tomb, disturbed by a later Iron Age burial, with an original burial containing a great quantity of pottery and other objects dating 1700-1600 BC (Fisher 1929, 47). Other objects in this tomb included an ivory cosmetic box in the shape of a duck, bronze hair pins, and a splendid collection of scarabs (fig.26) (1929, 47). Although Fisher does not give this tomb a number, the caption under fig. 26 reads 'Egyptian scarabs from T.37' and shows photographs of MEG 10 and 14. However, Fisher does not mention any scarabs in connection with Tomb 37 (1929, 48-50), and Rowe notes that it is T.24, although he gives no evidence for the change in numbers (1936, 1, no.3). Tomb 3070 had a number of pottery vessels, a bronze blade, beads, eight scarabs, an alabaster jug and bone inlays (Loud 1948, 170ff). Deposit 1752 is dated to the Iron Age with a bronze spear butt, three scarabs and shells and teeth (Loud 1948, 152 ff).

found with an amethyst scarab, local pottery and a clay loom weight with a seal impression. The term palace had been applied to this context because of the 'relative architectural grandeur, finds of gold and ivory and important position inside the city gate... there is however, no documentary evidence to support this terminology' (Loud 1948, 16).

V.II.V BETH SHAN

The University Museum of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia excavated at Beth Shan under the direction of Fisher (1921-23), Rowe (1925-28) and Fitzgerald (1930, 1933). In 1983, excavations were continued by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem under the direction of Yadin and Geva. In 1989, excavations were resumed by Mazar on behalf of the Hebrew University and Tourism Administration of Beth Shan¹⁴.

There are four anra scarabs from Beth Shan. Two of the scarabs come from early reports of the site, but there is little information about them or their contexts. The first scarab (BS1), has no provenance and is recorded only by a photograph. The caption for this reads 'from various levels, found 1931'. (Fitzgerald 1932, plate III)¹⁵. The second scarab (BS2), is from 'Tell room no. 1022, Southern Temple of Rameses III'. This is one of the Northern store rooms of the temple, east of room 1021A and north of room 1028 (Rowe 1940, 23). Other objects found in this room include Red Burnished Ware pottery with some white painted decoration, three other scarabs, a Hittite seal, two heart

¹⁴ Main publications include: Rowe (1930, 1940), Fitzgerald (1930, 1931, 1939), James (1966), Oren (1973), Yadin & Geva (1986), Mazar (1993).

¹⁵ Within the text the only references to scarabs or the Hyksos are: 'Numerous Hyksos burials were found in levels XI and XII, adults as well as children having been buried below the floors of levels X and XI' (Fitzgerald 1935, 196) and 'found inscribed jar handle and many scarabs. These found in various graves in the great north cemetery and in various levels on the tell, all dating to periods later than the time of the Hyksos' (Rowe 1930, 9).

shaped amulets of carnelian, beads, a small agate cube pierced by bronze wire and bead, an ivory comb, fragments of an ivory plaque, a tiny silver box which contained a scaraboid and a Mesopotamian diorite cylinder seal (Rowe 1940, 28). The excavators believed that this room may have been used as part of granaries in the Late Ramesside period, but there is no evidence of this (Rowe 1940, 28).

The third anra scarab (BS3), comes from the recent excavations at the site under the direction of Dr. Amihai Mazar¹⁶. It was excavated in the 1993 season, found in Area R, Phase R4, (parallel to stratum Xa in the Pennsylvanian excavations) and is dated by the excavators to the MBIIC. A fourth scarab comes from T.59 in the Northern Cemetery. This tomb was first used in the EBIV period, although the excavator believes it mainly belonged to the 'general horizon of the LB period (Oren 1973, 98). The contents of the tomb included pottery, a calcite juglet and a toggle pin (Oren 1973, 91-98).

V.II.VI PELLA

Pella was first described and mapped in 1887 by Schumacher and surveyed over forty years later in 1933 by the Department of Antiquities. In 1958 Funk and Richardson carried out a two week exploration for the American School of Oriental Research. Excavations began at the site in 1967 by the College of Wooster in Ohio, under the direction of R.H. Smith. These excavations were halted by the Six Day War, and resumed in 1979, where the College of Wooster was joined by the University of Sydney and directors Hennessy and McNicoll¹⁷.

¹⁶ I am grateful to Dr. Mazar for his kind permission to include this scarab in my thesis.

¹⁷ Main publications of the site include: Smith (1973, 1993), Smith and Day (1989), McNicoll et al, (1982, 1992), Richards (1992).

There are four anra scarabs from Pella, all from the same large MBII tomb, Tomb 62. Due to water damage it was impossible to give an exact context within the tomb for each scarab. From the nature of the contents of the tomb and the large amount of skeletons found within, it is thought to have been used successively over approximately 200 years (Richards 1992, 3-4). There were over 2000 objects in the tomb and these included a normal domestic assemblage of jars, bowls, jugs and lamps in buff, white and red slip. There were also a number of imported Cypriot wares: globular Black Lustrous Wheel Made Ware juglets, and a Red Lustrous Wheel Made Ware spindle bottle. The small finds included fifty one other scarabs typical of the SIP style, three cylinder seals, copper, bronze and one gold toggle pin, gold ear-rings, arrow heads, glass beads, bone inlay and incised geometric designs from wooden boxes, bone spindle whorls and calcite flasks (McNicoll et alii, 1992, 69-81).

There are only three other published Middle Bronze tombs at Pella, and they are dated to the end of the MBA (Hennessy 1985, 36). They are in the same area as Tomb 62 (Area XI), and all without scarabs. Beside the usual MB pottery, there are alabastrons, toggle pins and beads (Hennessy 1985, 37-48).

V.II.VII SHECHEM

The site was first excavated in 1913-1914 by an Austro-German expedition. During 1926-33 excavations continued for a further four seasons, although all records and manuscripts of their excavations were destroyed in Berlin during the Second World War. A joint expedition of Drew University in Madison, NJ and the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago, took place under the direction of Wright and Anderson in 1956-7, 1960, 1962, 1964, 1966 and 1968. Salvage and clean up work was carried out by Dever and Seger in 1972-73¹⁸.

¹⁸

Main publications include: Wright (1965), Cole (1984), Campbell (1991, 1993). See Horn (1962, 1966, 1973) for scarab publications pertaining to this site.

A number of scarabs at Shechem have 'typical' designs of the SIP period. They include one anra scarab, but unfortunately little is known of the context of any of the scarabs, as this information was destroyed during the Berlin air-raids (Horn 1962, 4). The only known information is that the anra scarab came from the Fortress Temple¹⁹ in field VI and was found in 'occupation debris of MBIIB pottery' (Horn 1962, 11)²⁰. It was found with two other scarabs, one of XIIth Dynasty date and the other from the Hyksos period (Horn 1962, 8).

V.II.VIII TELL MICHAL

Tell Michal was first surveyed in 1922 by Ory, but the first salvage excavations took place between 1958-1960 by Avigad for the Museum of Haaretz in Tel Aviv. Four seasons of excavations were carried out between 1977 and 1980 by Tel Aviv University under the direction of Herzog and Muhly. Further salvage excavations took place in 1982 by Herzog, when tractors revealed the site of four Iron Age winepresses²¹.

There is a single anra scarab from this site. It was found in locus 983, strata XVI/XV, but there is no further information with regard to its context. Herzog dates strata XVI/XV to LBI/II, (Herzog 1993, 1041), thereby indicating that the anra scarab is most likely to be an heirloom, especially as it has SIP back, head and leg types.

¹⁹ In Horn's original report (1962) the fortress temple is called the palace. However, in a later publication, 'palace' is changed back to a 'fortress temple' (Toombes and Wright 1963, 5).

²⁰ In Toombes and Wright (1961) the 'palace' is discussed but there is no mention of the scarabs (1961, 11-54).

²¹ Main publications of the site are by Herzog 1979, 1981 and Herzog et al, 1989. For further publications see Herzog 1993, 1041.

V.II.IX TEL AVIV

The area of Tel Aviv (the plain of Yarkon and range of hills to the south) was first surveyed in 1950 by Kaplan, and there are numerous sites and publications from the region²². The anra scarabs are from a cemetery situated south of Tel Aviv Harbour. The site marks the end of the kurkar (rock) hills and where the Yargon Valley begins. It is a small site with eighteen graves, and is part of a larger cemetery, the remainder of which has been destroyed by modern buildings or the coastline (Kaplan 1955, 1-2). The excavators believe it was a family burial ground used over a period of c. 100 years, and it is dated to the end of the MBII period (Kaplan 1955, 6-7)²³. This is confirmed by a number

²² See Kaplan and Ritter-Kaplan (1993, 1457) for a detailed bibliography of the area.

²³ The cemetery at Tel Aviv Harbour was originally dated to the MBIIIC period (Kaplan 1955, 6-7), and this date was confirmed by Leibovitch's examination of the scarabs, which he concluded had many XVIIIth dynasty types (1955, 18). In 1975 Weinstein wrote that although the cemetery was originally dated MBIIIC-LBI, Dever had reassigned several of the graves (2, 3A-B, 10A and 16) to the late MBIIA or early IIB. He quoted a forthcoming article of Dever (1976), but with no page reference. In 1994, Dever wrote 'in 1976...I pointed out that *nearly all* of the neglected Tel Aviv Harbour tombs...should be re-dated to MBIIA/B' (my italics, Ward and Dever 1994, 67). This is referenced to page 18 of the 1976 article (Ward and Dever 1994, 66). Dever also stated that he had since been followed on this re-dating by Weinstein (1975, 5,6) and Gophna and Beck (1981, 47) and concluded: 'my date is now confirmed by Ward's re-dating of the scarabs to the XIIth dynasty' (Ward and Dever 1994, 67).

Dever's reference to page 18 of his 1976 article, refers only to a chart, which does not mention Kaplan's tombs. It is in footnote 99, page 34, that he writes only that Tombs 2, 3A-B, 10A and 16 *are probably* late MBIIA or early IIB (my italics) on the evidence of "red cross" bowls from Anatolia. There is no other discussion, and the whole cemetery is by no means dated to this early period, as seems to be the case nearly twenty years later. Therefore, Dever confirms a statement that does not exist, and on this basis continues to look for early parallels for the cemetery. He now dates Tomb 4A to the MBIIA or A/B on the basis of a so called transitional EBIV/MBI toggle pin and intermediate Canaanite bowl, and Tomb 5 to the same date on a platter bowl, dipper juglet and button base piriform juglet (Ward and Dever 1994, 66-67). Ward has included the scarabs from Tel Aviv in his early, IIA group (Ward and Dever 1994, 95ff). While some of the group may fit with his trends for this period, he does not discuss his reasons for originally placing the group in this period. Although Dever uses Ward's results to confirm his own, there is the feeling of a circular argument i.e., the scarabs were included in this group originally because Dever had dated them to MBIIA/B. I do not agree with Leibovitch's date of late MBIIIC-LBI: none of the scarabs has the humeral callosities which are the trademark of the XVIIIth dynasty scarabs, and he was relying on Hall and Rowe's typologies which are superseded today. The backs and sides are more typical of late MK and SIP i.e. MBIIIB-C. The original tombs mentioned by Dever (dating to the MBIIA, i.e. 2, 3A and B, 10A,

of scarabs with divided backs but still portraying simple legs. There were skeletal remains in all the tombs, mostly single graves with three double graves and two triple ones, although in two (5 and 15) the bones had disappeared due to water disturbance.

Of the twenty four deposits²⁴, two have anra scarabs²⁵ (4A,11B), fourteen others have scarabs and seven have no scarabs. Both anra scarab burials have toggle pins, scarabs and jewelry. They have no weapons. All the graves are relatively simple: most have pottery vessels including pithoi, jars, jugs, bowls, dipper juglets and 'cosmetic' juglets. Small finds of non anra tombs are either toggle pins or jewelry (rings, ear-rings, bracelets) and there are two swords and one axe. No beads were found in this cemetery (Kaplan 1955, 12). A detailed contextual analysis of this site is undertaken in section V.III.II

V.II.X SHILOH

Trial soundings at Shiloh were first carried out by Schmidt in 1915, followed by excavations in 1926-1932 by Kjaer with Schmidt and Albright as adviser. Recent excavations in 1981-1984 were carried out by Bar-Ilan University headed by I. Finkelstein, S. Bunimovitz and Z. Lederman²⁶.

The anra scarab from this site is found as an impression on a wooden box (see fig. 1.6), and the clay sealing with impression was attached to the tying cords between two button handles of the box (Brandl 1993, 209-10). The box was

16), do not include the anra scarabs, and as Dever's later argument does not provide conclusive evidence for an earlier date of tombs 4 and 5, I find no reason to date these scarabs to the earlier period, but rather MBIIB-C.

²⁴ See discussion in section V.III.

²⁵ There is one two sign anra scarab from T.5. This burial had one toggle pin (Kaplan 1955, 12).

²⁶ See Kempinski (1993c, 1370) for a bibliography of the site.

found in Room 1526, one of five rooms adjoining the inner side of the city wall, which contained a rich assemblage of vessels (mostly large storage jars and pithoi) and small artefacts. The small finds included weapons, silver jewelry, beads, scarabs, toggle pins, and stone artefacts. The excavators believe that these rooms acted as storerooms due to the large number of storage vessels and the small number of bowls, kraters and other domestic vessels found therein (Finkelstein 1993, 61ff).

V.II.XI AMMAN

Amman was first explored by Conder in 1889, and like Tel Aviv, has undergone a number of excavations of different areas and historical periods²⁷. The anra scarabs come from a tomb on the Amman Citadel, and are compared with two other Middle Bronze tombs from that area and one from Amman itself.

The tomb on the Amman Citadel with the anra scarabs is located west of the western wall of the Roman Temple and is partially disturbed by at least three later phases (Iron Age II, Hellenistic and Roman). A Hellenistic tomb was built directly above it and the foundation trench for the western wall of the Roman temple cut through these layers, resulting in the complete destruction of the eastern part of the chamber (Najjar 1991, 105). Thus the disturbance of bones and breakages of objects was extensive.

The objects excavated from the tomb include five other scarabs besides the anra scarab. They all have typical MBII designs and only one has a divided back. There were four toggle pins and a fragment of a further one, a bronze spatula, alabastron and calcite jar. There were also bone inlays decorated with stylised

²⁷

For an extensive bibliography of the Amman excavations see Homes-Fredericq & Hennessy (1986, 194-198).

birds and incised dots and circles, twenty three beads and pottery vessels (including platters, bowls, pedestal vases, piriform juglet and jars). The excavators date the tomb to 1750-1700 BC (Najjar 1991, 105ff).

Comparative material from three other Middle Bronze tombs on the citadel varied. One tomb had a number of items including beads, bronze rings, bracelets and toggle pins, an astarte figurine and a pendant made of ostrich egg shell, paste and bronze. There were also the usual bowls, vases, flasks, oil flask, dipper juglets, lamps and storage jars (Harding 1953, 16-18). A second tomb was robbed and the third tomb produced local pottery, scarabs (some mounted in gold), bone inlay and toggle pins (Ma'ayeh 1960, 114).

V.II.XII GEZER

Excavations began at Gezer in 1902 by the Palestine Exploration Fund, and continued until 1907 under the direction of Macalister. Although there was a further season in 1934 for the PEF, this time headed by Rowe, excavations began again on a large scale in 1964 with the Hebrew University College Biblical and Archaeological School in Jerusalem. Excavations continued until 1974 with grants from the Smithsonian Institute in Washington and Harvard Semitic Museum, under Wright (1964-5), Dever (1966-71) and Seger (1972-4). Further excavations conducted by Dever took place in 1984, 1990, 1992 and 1994²⁸.

There are thirteen anra scarabs from Gezer²⁹ and only two have contexts with known information. The majority (10) come from Macalister's excavations and are without context. One is from Giveon's publication of the British Museum

²⁸ Main publications include: Macalister (1912), Dever (1993), Dever et al., (1970, 1974, 1986), Seger (1988), Gitin (1990).

²⁹ There are five two sign anra scarabs from Gezer, all without contexts (GEZ 7, 10, 12, 14, 16).

scarabs and is also without a context. Three anra scarabs from Macalister's excavations are given a provenance, but further details on those provenances are elusive³⁰.

The two anra scarabs with detailed contexts are both found in cave deposits. The first, from Macalister's excavations, is from Cave 28II. This was a large cave with ten chambers, and the scarab was found with a large group in chamber 8. Macalister notes that by the virtue of a rock fall, this is one of 'the richest in deposits of any portions of the cave' (Macalister 1912, 122). There were some bones scattered in this chamber, but they were rotten and decayed and thus the manner of interment could not be determined. Objects from this chamber included flint knives, bronze toggle pin and finger ring; silver hairpins, looped crescents and ear-rings, beads, three cylinders, one still set in its silver mount, approximately thirty five scarabs³¹, alabaster vessels and local pottery vessels. Many of the scarabs were set in gold. Other objects from the cave included a gold armlet, further scarabs, cylinders, beads, bronze pins, ear-rings, ostrich eggs, ivory and bone inlays, and alabaster vessels. Macalister dates the cave 'to the Hyksos period' (1912, 141).

The second anra scarab is a fine example set in a ring. The anra signs are set in a central cartouche with further signs around it. This was found in Cave 10A of the recent Hebrew Union College excavations (1964 - 1974) in Field 1. The cave is split into an upper and lower section, the scarab coming from the lower burial phase and therefore dated by the excavators to the LBI, late 15th century (Seger 1988, fig.1). There were remains of eighty eight individuals in Cave 10A, and the area had been both disturbed and reused. Imported pottery

³⁰ These are: GEZ 3, 'from waste ground' (Macalister 1912, 72); GEZ 4, from 'cistern in IV 18' (Macalister 1912, 315) and GEZ 5, 'found with infant interment in III 16' (Macalister 1912, 317).

³¹ It is 'approximately' because while Macalister notes there are 40 scarabs ... 'the majority were from chamber 8; one was from 7, and *a few* were from group A in chamber 2' (my italics) (Macalister 1912, 127), only thirty five can be accounted for.

included forty six Cypriot vessels including a red burnished bottle. A number of weapons were found which included a flanged hilt dagger, tanged dagger, thirty one bronze arrowheads and armour scale. Bronze items included a sickle shape blade and a fish hook, and two bronze bracelets and eight ear or nose rings and two finger rings for scarabs, together with seven toggle pins and forty other pins, six beads and bone inlay (Seger 1988, 157-8). Specialised vessels included two limestone kohl vessels featuring baboon figures holding baskets which the excavators identify as Egyptian in origin (Seger 1988, 50).

V.II.XIII JERICHO

Soundings were first undertaken at Tell es-Sultan by Warren in 1868 for the British Palestine Exploration Fund. An Austro-German expedition led by Sellin and Watzinger excavated between 1907-09, and there was a further campaign between 1930-36 by Garstang for the Neilson Expedition. Kenyon excavated for the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem between 1952-1958³².

Jericho is one of the few sites able to provide a basis for an in depth contextual analysis for the twenty two anra scarabs found at the site³³. The publications of Kenyon provide a wealth of information, and the tombs are also distinguished by their richness of content. Objects within these tombs include the usual beads, jewelry, weapons, bone inlay, faience and toggle pins, but there are also alabaster vessels, wooden furniture and objects, bronze objects, bone objects,

³² There are a large number of publications on the excavations at Jericho. For a full bibliography see Kenyon (1993, 681), although others include: Sellin & Watzinger (1913), Garstang (1948), Kenyon (1957, 1960, 1965, 1981, 1993), Kenyon & Holland (1982, 1983).

³³ There are fifteen two sign anra scarabs (JER 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21, 25, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40) from Jericho and five 'debased' types (14, 16, 18, 29, 30). As seen at Megiddo, those contexts with two sign scarabs have not been included in the contextual analysis (B48, phase I, Group I (JER 25), A134, Group III (JER 35), J45, phase I, Group IV (JER 16), J1, Group IV (JER 2), J12, Group IV, (JER 8), H18, phase I, Group V, (JER 33, 34). Other scarabs fall within deposits with three sign anras.

ostrich eggs, cylinder seals, gold items and baskets or textiles. Most of the tombs have skeletal remains and many are disturbed, often through multiple burials, indicating the tombs have been used over an extended period (Kenyon 1960, 226ff; Kenyon 1965, 206ff).

Four anra scarabs were found by Garstang in three tomb deposits, T.5 (JER 42, 43), T.19 (JER 41) and T.22 (JER 10). Information regarding these tombs and others from Garstang's excavations is limited, and therefore they have not been included in the contextual analysis of this site. Tomb 5 was a large tomb with over 500 objects. It contained Cypriot pottery, bronze toggle pins, tweezers and rings and was dated by Garstang to 1500BC (Garstang 1933, 27-38). Tomb 19 is dated to the MBIIA and B and was disturbed (Garstang 1933, 5,7). Its contents are limited to seven bronze objects, including toggle pins, along with local pottery vessels (Garstang 1933, 4-7). Tomb 22 had eighty two objects, including faience and alabaster objects and bone inlay. This tomb was dated by Garstang to 1600-1500 BC (Garstang 1932, 51ff).

V.II.XIV RISHON LE-ZIYYOU

Recent excavations have been undertaken at the site of Rishon le-Ziyyou sand dunes under the direction of Y. Levi for the Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University. There are three anra scarabs from the site, in two different areas of excavations³⁴. The first, Area A, has 14 tombs divided into two types; shaft tombs and pits. The former were large, with 185 individuals buried, and 4-5 burial levels in each tomb. Two thirds of the burials were secondary, and date to the MBIIA, end MBIIA and beginning of the MBIIIB. The pits contained single burials and dated to the mid MBIIA. (Levi 1993, 49) Area B had 16 tombs with single burials and dated to the MBIIA. Burial

³⁴

I would like to thank Daphna Ben-Tor and the Israel Antiquities Authority for their permission to include the anra scarabs in my thesis.

offerings included weapons, alabaster vessels, beads and scarabs (Levi 1993, 50).

V.II.XV LACHISH

Lachish was first excavated by Starkey for the Wellcome-Marston expedition in 1932, but was abandoned after his murder in 1938. Aharoni excavated in 1966 and 1968 for the Tel Aviv University and Ussishkin continued between 1973-1987 for the Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University³⁵.

There are nine anra scarabs from four tomb contexts at Lachish³⁶. They are spread between the different cemetery sites: Areas 100, 4000 and 6000. A limited contextual analysis is possible from the brief cemetery evidence published by Tufnell, and once again, only the MB tombs have been considered, as no SIP type scarabs were found in later tombs.

Grave goods were limited to toggle pins, weapons, bone inlay, beads, faience and ostrich egg shell. Toggle pins were the most popular object, and there was also a high percentage of weapons associated with the anra scarabs (Tufnell 1958, 229-285).

V.II.XVI TEL BEIT MIRSIM

In 1924 Albright identified the site of Tell Beit Mirsim, and this was followed

³⁵ Main publications are: Tufnell et al., 1940, Tufnell (1953, 1958), Aharoni (1975), Ussishkin (1993). See Ussishkin (1993, 911) for full bibliography.

³⁶ There are five two sign anra scarabs from Lachish (LACH 1, 8, 12, 13, 14). The contexts of LACH 12 (T.157) and LACH 1,13 (T. 1552) have not been included in the contextual analysis. Tomb 157 had a dagger and was dated to 1750-1700 (Tufnell 1958, 231) and T.1552 had two daggers, toggle pins, beads, and ostrich egg shell fragments (Tufnell 1958, 272).

by excavations in 1926, 1928, 1930 and 1932 co-ordinated by Fisher for a joint expedition between the Xenia theological Seminary and the American Schools of Oriental Research³⁷.

As the site was excavated and mainly published before the Second World War, there is little information regarding the scarabs. There is one anra scarab from this site³⁸. The scarab (TBM 5) comes from the 'Palace' (Albright 1938, 41), which Albright places in the 'E period' (Albright 1930, 5)³⁹. This scarab was found with 'characteristic MB pottery', an alabastron and a set of game pieces (Albright 1930, 5). In later reports Albright dates stratum E to the early Hyksos and Stratum D to the late Hyksos (Albright 1932, 8). He notes that the pottery, alabaster and faïences in stratum E are 'exceptionally fine', and that Tel el-Yehudiyeh juglets of the 'best type' are numerous in stratum E, but become 'rare and decadent' in form during stratum D (Albright 1932, 11).

V.II.XVII TELL EL-AJJUL

Tell el-Ajjul was excavated by Petrie between 1930-34 for the British School of Egyptian Archaeology, with a further season in 1938 under Mackay and Murray. Although Petrie published his work in five volumes, it lacks precise

³⁷ Main publications include: Albright (1932, 1933, 1938), Albright and Kelso (1943). See Greenberg (1993, 180) for full bibliography.

³⁸ There are six two sign anra scarabs from Tell Beit Mirsim, and they are allocated to either 'D' or 'E' provenance (TBM 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7). However, Albright's general comments on the scarabs found in these strata are less than illuminating: "...of the ten scarabs found this year, half *probably* belong to str.E, while most of the remainder belong *certainly* or *probably* to str.D" (my italics) (Albright 1932, 10).

The only information concerning the stratigraphy of 'D' and 'E' provenance is as follows. " ...there is no difficulty in separating E-D from GF or C, but it is not easy to differentiate between E/D because of the continuous occupation of the site during the whole of periods E/D... (which) resulted in a succession of at least four building phases that could be more or less clearly defined" (Albright 1928, 26).

³⁹ Although he is reputed to have changed this to stratum D in 1938 (Bienkowski 1989, 51).

information on many tombs and contexts. Although later publications have attempted to fill in the gaps, this type of work remains very difficult⁴⁰, and it is frustrating that at such a major site the contexts are so elusive. However, due to Tufnell's analysis of the scarabs from the site in 1984, it is possible to give a context to forty two of the fifty six anra scarabs⁴¹. However, the information regarding the finds in those contexts is extremely limited.

The scarabs are found in the city, and in burials both in the cemeteries and the city areas. No anra scarabs appear to have been found in the Palaces. One scarab comes from block AS (TEA 43), which Kempinski has identified as a house. It is placed near a complex named AM (consisting of units AM and AK), thought to be the residence of a high ranking official, indicated by the official seals and royal scarabs in the house. The original entrance to complex AM/AK was blocked by the construction of rooms Q-K and house AS (Kempinski 1983, 132-33). One scarab is found in Block AJ (TEA 51), and may be part of a small group associated with the block AC-AD-AJ-AQ which is dated to the XIIIth dynasty (Tufnell 1984, 95). Three scarabs come from three separate 'pit and niche burials', T.445 (TEA 4), 246 (TEA 5) and 263 (TEA 8), in the eastern cemeteries. These burials contained a central area for an equid burial with niches cut in the side for human remains (Tufnell 1984, 19; Petrie 1931, 4). As T.263 contained a WPIV juglet, it is dated c.1650-1625 or 1575-1550 (Tufnell 1984, 19). Two scarabs are from T.2032 (TEA 60,62) a possible horse burial (Tufnell 1984, 22), and one from Grave 1532 (TEA 13) located on

40

See Petrie (1931, 1932a, 1933, 1934, 1952) and also Negbi (1970), Stewart (1974). See Kempinski (1993b, 53) for full bibliography.

41

There are twenty five two sign anra scarabs from Tell el-Ajjul. They are found in Tombs 1557 (TEA 3), 1240 (TEA 11), 1766 (TEA 12), 25 (TEA 14), 2063 (TEA 15), Block AIII (TEA 27), Block B (TEA 30), Block E (TEA 23), Block F (TEA 47), Block G (TEA 54, 64, 68, 71, 77), Block H (TEA 73), Block J (TEA 19, 21, 80), Block L (TEA 69) and Block T (TEA 22). The remaining scarabs are without contexts (TEA 42, 48, 49, 50, 66). Little is known of the tomb contexts. T.25 is found in room V in house T, west of complex AM. It contained two Hyksos scarabs, jugs and a storage jar (Kempinski 1983, 135-6). Tomb 2063 is cut in the ash levels that divide the upper and lower cities in Block G (Tufnell 1984, 15, 101 ff).

the extreme edge of the mound, north of block LA (Tufnell 1984, 23)⁴². Tufnell notes that the grave goods in T.1532, including gold earrings and beads, are comparable to similar objects from Ebla, but provides no date for this tomb⁴³ (Tufnell 1984, 22).

Further information regarding the objects from tomb contexts can be gleaned from the tomb registers in Petrie's publications, although these are often confusing. Publication of the first Bronze Age tombs elicits some comparative information: grave goods are limited to toggle pins, other metal items, and beads. There is one example of an ostrich egg and limited jewelry and weapons - the only examples of which are found in non scarab tombs. Non scarab tombs also have the most examples of bronze rings and bracelets. Toggle pins are the most common item, associated with approximately half the anra and other scarab tombs, with beads as the next most common item (Petrie 1931, pl.lx-lxi; 1932a, pl.lvi-liii, lix; 1933, pl.1; 1934, pl.lxvi-lxviii).

V.II.XVIII GERAR (TEL JEMMEH)

Located 10km south of Gaza, this site had its first trial trench sunk in 1922 by Phythian-Adams, although it was Petrie who undertook the main excavations in 1926-7. From 1970, excavations were resumed by van Beek for the Smithsonian Institute Expedition⁴⁴. With evidence of a flourishing MBII city, as well as LBA, IA, and Persian and Hellenistic remains, it is again frustrating

⁴² One scarab is also attributed to Block A, Level III (TEA 57), and Block B (TEA 63). A number of scarabs are from Block E (TEA 28,32,46,55,80), Block F (TEA 35,61), Block G (TEA 17,20,38,52,56,74), Block H (TEA 16,58,70), Block J (TEA 29,37,67,79), Block L (TEA 26,36,65,76), Block Q (TEA 24) and Block T (TEA 59). Little information can be found regarding T.323 (TEA 2) with regard to its location and there seems to be a duplication of tombs using the 1500 numbers: they are used both in a Copper Age cemetery in AGII (1932, pl.LI) and then again for burials in AGIV (1934, pl.LXVII).

⁴³ Based on the gold work in this tomb, Lilyquist dates it to LB1 (Lilyquist 1993, 48).

⁴⁴ See van Beek (1993, 673-4) for full bibliography.

that no information is known about the scarabs published by Petrie in 1928, or any further information on the MB settlement by further excavations by van Beck from 1970 onwards, most published material centring on the later periods.

There are two anra scarabs from this site, but there is no information regarding them, their contexts or any other scarabs. The only information reads ‘...about 80 scarabs were found, but many without any level, having been merely picked up on the surface or obtained from the people’, (Petrie 1928, 10).

V.II.XIX TELL EL FAR’AH (SOUTH) (BETH PELET)

Tell el Far’ah (south) was excavated by Petrie between 1928-9 for the British School of Archaeology in Egypt, and published in two volumes in 1930 and 1932⁴⁵. There are twelve anra scarabs from Tell el Far’ah, from three different cemetery areas⁴⁶. The majority come from cemetery 500, an area assigned by Petrie to the right bank of the Wadi Gazzeh, 300m NW of the Tell. Cemetery 500 was republished by Price-Williams (1977) and dated to the MBII. His publication makes possible a comprehensive contextual analysis, although details of disturbance and skeletal remains were not always recorded. Objects within the burials were not diverse - some weapons (although relatively scarce), beads, bone inlay, faience objects and toggle pins were the most common.

One anra scarab comes from a large tomb, T.934, in cemetery 900. This was a NK cemetery and this is reflected in the scarab styles. Found with the anra scarab are two other scarabs which might have been modelled on the anra

⁴⁵ See also Price-Williams (1977) and Yisraeli (1993).

⁴⁶ There are four two sign anras from Tell el-Far’a. Their contexts include T.73 (TEF 14), T.554 (TEF 15), and T. 565 (TEF 10). TEF 1 is found in T.568 together with TEF 11, so this context is included within the contextual analysis. There is no information available on T.73. T.554 had a dagger, bone inlay and fragments of a faience vase (Price Williams 1977, 35-38), while T.565 had toggle pins, bone inlay, kohl pots and a faience vase (Price Williams 1977, 73-78).

scarab, but with so many supplementary signs, they cannot even be classed as 'debased' anras⁴⁷. Amulets are more numerous in this cemetery, made of both bronze and paste, and other grave goods include bronze rings and ear-rings, and spear heads as weapons (Petrie 1930, pl.xci-xciii).

Cemetery 1000, a Hyksos cemetery, also had one grave with an anra scarab (T.1026A). The objects within the tomb were slightly more varied than cemetery 500. Along with the usual toggle pins, beads, weapons and bone inlay, there were more bronze rings and bracelets and examples of ostrich egg shell decorations, an ivory dagger handle and an alabaster vase (Petrie 1932b, pl.xic-xc).

EGYPT

V.II.XX TELL EL-YEHUDIYEH

Linant de Bellefonds first visited the site in 1825, followed by Eaton and Greville Chester in 1870. Brugsch first excavated the site, also in 1870 with Naville and Griffith carrying out their own excavations in 1887. Petrie excavated in 1905 for the British School of Archaeology in Egypt and du Mesnil du Buisson was the last excavator of the site in 1928⁴⁸. The site comprises a Hyksos 'camp', a town and a temple of Ramesses III and deposits pre-dating the Hyksos.

There are ten anras scarabs at Tell el-Yehudiyeh, from among the two hundred or so scarabs from the site⁴⁹. Only three of the ten have a context, and they

⁴⁷ See Starkey and Harding 1932, pl.iii:149 and 156.

⁴⁸ Publications include: de Bellefonds (1825), Brugsch (1870), Naville & Griffith (1890), Petrie (1906a), du Mesnil du Buisson (1930), Wright (1968), Tufnell (1978).

⁴⁹ There are six two sign anras, all without contexts except for TEY 2 from T.407. Grave 407 is also located within the camp and although disturbed at the western end, some skeletons remained. Grave goods included six black vases, an 'unusual amount' of red

are found in graves, 1, 3, and 37. Petrie dealt with only a dozen graves found inside the 'camp' and eastern cemetery. He noted that those in the camp were partially destroyed by 'crushing', owing to the 'great height of the ruins' accumulated over them, and those in the cemetery had been plundered and none was complete as they had been dug into by later graves (Petrie 1906a, 10). Mainly due to Tufnell's review of the graves in 1978, it is possible to carry out a limited comparative analysis of these graves plus a further eight.

Grave 1 is described by Petrie as a 'curious deposit in the camp...(with a) heap of bones stacked closely together - most were of animals' (Petrie 1906a, 12). He notes that there was no black pottery at all and the only objects with the two scarabs were a dagger and an amethyst bead. Grave 3 was a burial in a wooden coffin also within the camp. Here there were three anras: two of which were placed on the stomach and the other was among the black incised vases at the feet of the coffin. There were two other scarabs, five juglets, a couple of beads and a kohl pot with lid (Petrie 1906a, 12).

Grave 37 (its whereabouts not confirmed), is described as a 'fine grave' which was cut away in later times along the SW corner. The body within the grave was entirely broken up. The tomb had a brick floor and barrel roof, and contained four black incised vases, plus one in buff with red lines, a bowl and four potstands, a bronze toggle pin, and a string of black beads and white disc beads (Petrie 1906a, 12).

V.II.XXI TELL EL-DAB'A

Tell el-Dab'a has been excavated by the Archaeological Institute of Austria

pottery and five scarabs. The anra scarab was found in position 'on the bones of a hand' with two other scarabs, perhaps indicating they had been worn as rings. Petrie's problem was that he was unable to attach the hand to a particular body (Petrie 1906a, 12). The tomb also had a dagger and a carnelian bead (Tufnell 1978, 92-94).

since the 1960's. Although there are a number of publications dealing with the excavations⁵⁰, grave deposits are still being published and so of the seven anra scarabs from the site⁵¹, only one has published details of its context⁵².

The only anra scarab with a published context (TED 7), is from grave m/13-Nr.2, in area A/II, stratum D/2. The burial comprises a single individual burial, with two scarabs, an amethyst bead, a calcite kohl pot with lid and a faience vase (Bietak 1991b, 293-94, plan 8).

A contextual comparison is not possible at this site, due to the limited number of tombs published to date. Comparative records at this time show that in stratum D/2, in areas I, VII and VIII, eleven other graves were published with only one other scarab and two with needles (Bietak 1991b, 293-313).

V.II.XXII MEMPHIS

A number of expeditions have excavated at the site of Memphis. Petrie was leader of one of the first expeditions to be granted a concession for six seasons, beginning in 1907. Fisher excavated during the First World War for the Pennsylvania Museum, and there were further expeditions in the 1940s and 1950s. In 1981 a new survey of the site was led by Smith for the EES, with

⁵⁰ See Bietak (1975, 1979, 1984, 1989b, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1992, 1994) and van den Brink (1982).

⁵¹ There are three two sign anra scarabs from Tell el-Dab'a (TED 4, 9, 10). TED 4 comes from tomb l/12- Nr.1 in Area A/II, stratum E/1. This appears to be situated near the back of Temple 1 (Bietak 1991b, plan 6). There are eleven burials within this tomb, and the anra scarab is associated with burials 9-11. Also associated with this burial are 5 other scarabs, juglets, bowls and a vase, and three kohl pots (of clay, calcium and serpentine) - two with lids (Bietak 1991b, 177-180). Associated with other burials in the tomb are beads, silver earrings, needles and a necklace of beads (Bietak 1991b, 169-177).

⁵² I would like to thank Professor Bietak for allowing me to study the unpublished scarabs from Tell el-Dab'a, and for permission to use them in my thesis. I would also like to thank Christa Mlinar for all her help and advice concerning the scarabs from the site.

excavations at Kom Rabia beginning in 1984⁵³.

The anra scarabs from Memphis are in the form of sealings⁵⁴. Both come from pit deposits in a terraced enclosure, a kitchen area with pits dug into the floor, perhaps to hold pottery vessels⁵⁵. These deposits are dated by the excavators to the late XIIth - early XIIIth Dynasty and the sealings must be contemporary deposits⁵⁶. As these deposits are as yet unpublished, no further information is available for a contextual analysis.

V.II.XXIII GUROB

Gurob was excavated by Petrie in 1890-91, and then by Brunton and Engelbach in 1927 for the British School of Archaeology in Egypt⁵⁷. It is a NK site situated near the Faiyum oasis, and the sites of Kahun and Lahun. It is relatively poor in grave goods with no weapons, and few stele, ushabtis, and figurines. Graves were generally single deposits, and some disturbance was noted.

There are three anra scarabs from the site, including one mounted in gold⁵⁸. Two scarabs (GUB 1 & 4) were from tomb deposits (T.27, 67) while the

⁵³ Main publications include: Petrie (1909a,b, 1911), Mackay and Wainwright (1910), Wainwright and Gardiner (1913), Engelbach (1915), Smith/Jeffreys/Málek (1983), Smith & Jeffreys (1985), Jeffreys/Málek/Smith (1984, 1986, 1987, 1988).

⁵⁴ I would like to thank the EES for permission to include the sealings in my thesis.

⁵⁵ I am grateful to David Jeffreys for this unpublished information.

⁵⁶ Bourriau pers.comm. These are actually initial dates given to the deposits, the pottery still awaits detailed analysis.

⁵⁷ See Petrie (1890, 1891) and Brunton and Engelbach (1927).

⁵⁸ There is a single two sign anra scarab from Gurob (GUB 2), from T.293. This tomb had a copper pin, strips of bone carving and an alabaster vase, as well as seven other scarab and scaraboids and one fly amulet (Brunton and Engelbach 1927, pl.xvi).

remaining scarab (GUB 3) is without a context. Both tomb deposits had skeletal remains. Tomb 27 was disturbed by roof collapse (Brunton and Engelbach 1927, 10), and there was no information regarding the state of Tomb 67. Tomb 27 had typical XVIIIth dynasty pottery, plus a RLWMW spindle bottle and perhaps a base ring jug, while Tomb 67 had no pottery vessels. Both tombs had beads, and in addition, Tomb 27 had a copper mirror, twenty eight other scarabs and nine alabaster vessels (Brunton and Engelbach 1927, pl.xxii). Tomb 67 had four silver and one copper hair rings and one plain scaraboid (Brunton and Engelbach 1927, pl.xiv).

V.II.XXIV SEDMENT, MAYANA

This site was excavated by Petrie and Brunton for the EES between December 1920 and April 1921. Sedment was the cemetery of Herakleopolis, discovered as they finished excavating the area around Gurob, with remains dating to the IXth, XVIIIth and XIXth dynasties. Also in the desert near Mayana was a cemetery of the XVI-XVIIIth dynasties, with the chief cemetery, K, dating to the SIP.

There are four anra scarabs found in four different tombs from this site (T.1256, 1270, 1295 and 1301). Tombs 1270 and 1295 are described in some detail. The former was a grave with a gabled roof and the body was completely destroyed. It contained the usual local pottery, a blue glaze bottle with handle, small grey limestone kohl pot, and beads of white shell, carnelian and green glaze (Petrie and Brunton 1924, 17). Grave 1295 was of an adult female, wrapped in a cloth and matting. At the head was a fibre pillow, and at her neck three scarabs. She also had shell rings and a silver ear ring (Petrie and Brunton 1924, 18, pl.xlvi). Tombs 1256 and 1301 had no skeletons, but the former had two scarabs and beads of green glaze while the latter had no grave goods besides the scarab (Petrie and Brunton 1924, pl.xlvi). The cemetery was considered generally poor by Brunton, with an absence of wooden coffins and

matting used instead. He deduced that wood was scarce, possibly due to the cessation of trade with Syria. He also thought that the cemetery had a 'non Egyptian flavour', based on the grave goods of beads, leather pillows and the use of yellow wool (Petrie and Brunton 1924, 20).

V.II.XXV NUBT

The site was excavated by Petrie and Quibell for the Egyptian Research Account in 1894-5, and is named after a pyramid of Seth (Petrie and Quibell 1896, 65). The site lies 30 miles north of Thebes, and the oldest dateable remains at the site are of the IVth dynasty, with the main periods of occupation dating to the XIIth and XVIIIth dynasties (Petrie and Quibell 1896, 66-68).

There were many sealings found at the site, including one of the anra type. Petrie noted that there was little sculpture or architecture that could be dated to the Old or Middle Kingdoms at the site, but most dated to the XVIIIth dynasty. However, there were many more scarabs and sealings of the Middle Kingdom than of the New Kingdom (Petrie and Quibell 1896, 68). The anra sealing from Nubt has no context, being one of many surface finds at the site, although Petrie notes that it is probably older than the XIIth dynasty (1896, 66).

V.II.XXVI ESNA

Excavated by Garstang in 1905 and Jones in 1906 for the Institute of Archaeology of University of Liverpool⁵⁹, this site was republished by Downes in 1974, thereby making it possible to carry out a contextual analysis. The cemetery at Esna dates from the Middle Kingdom through to the New Kingdom.

⁵⁹

See Garstang (1907) for the results of the two short seasons.

There are nine anra scarabs from site, occurring in grave deposits from the MK to the NK. Therefore it was necessary to divide the site into seven categories: those tombs with anra scarabs, other SIP scarabs, SIP tombs with no scarabs, plus tombs with and without scarabs of the MK and NK.

Esna was one of the few sites in Egypt that had weapons in the tomb deposits. Other objects included tweezers, pottery figurines or models, bone or ivory inlay and most unusually, gold 'money' rings (see footnote 85, 268). No mention was made of skeletal remains, disturbance or the state of preservation of the tombs (Downes 1974, 116-132).

NUBIA

V.II.XXVII ANIBA

Aniba was first excavated by Woolley and Randall-MacIver for the Eckley B. Coxe Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania between 1907 and 1910, in conjunction with Buhen. This was followed by the Ernst Sieglin Expedition between 1912-1914 and 1929-1933⁶⁰.

Situated above the Second Cataract, the site has a number of buildings including a fort of possible Middle Kingdom origin, a temple of Horus Mi'am (possibly XIIth Dynasty), and cemeteries of various dates. It was most prominent in the New Kingdom when it served as the administrative centre of Wawet, (Lower Nubia between the First and Second Cataracts) (Baines and Málek 1984, 183). Steindorff's reports are comprehensive and provide a detailed picture of the tomb contents, making a contextual analysis possible.

⁶⁰

See Steindorff (1935, 1937) for publication of the site.

There are three anra scarabs from the site⁶¹, two from a single grave in Cemetery B (ANB 3,4), and one from the larger Cemetery S (ANB 5). Cemetery B had thirty two graves (dating from the Hyksos period to the beginning to the XVIIIth dynasty), one with the anra scarabs (B28) and four others with other scarabs (B12, 14, 18, 22). Only the northern section of the cemetery had been excavated, and all tombs had skeletal remains. There was no mention of disturbance (Steindorff 1935, 196-7). Tomb 28 was made of a circle of stones covered with Nile mud. The skeleton was covered in linen and rolled in a mat. Other items within the tomb included a necklace of beads, two bracelets of beads, three scarabs on the hands and various pieces of pottery including a juglet, cup with spout and a bowl (Steindorff 1935, 201).

Cemetery S had 119 graves, and the anra scarab is found in tomb 26. Forty other graves within the cemetery had scarabs. Most of the scarabs were SIP in style, although some graves had a mixture of NK and SIP styles. Although Cemetery S included both single and multiple graves, Steindorff notes that most graves had a large number of bodies. The graves were all disturbed except for two (S91 and S4) (Steindorff 1937, 40). Tomb S26 had two heads of wooden coffins, beads and chain links, four other scarabs, silver finger-ring, bronze with gold leaf ear-ring, fragment of a wooden hair pin, five alabaster make-up vessels with lids, wooden make-up pencil, and some tweezers. There were only two pottery vessels, an oil jug and a Kerma type flask, and also a vase of green paste (Steindorff 1937, 166).

Due to the single anra graves in each cemetery, it was not feasible to carry out

61

There are two, two sign anra scarabs from Aniba. They are both found in Cemetery S, ANB 1 from tomb 36 and ANB 2 from tomb 49. Tomb 36 had three other scarabs, half of a silver armband, seven make-up vessels, and part of a bronze instrument. This tomb had a number of pottery vessels including stands, flasks, jugs and oil jugs (Steindorff 1937, 172). Tomb 49 had a number of different items including half of a ushabti of R3k3, a heart scarab, wooden amulet of human head, beads, scarab of *Mn.w.htp*, two alabaster make-up vessels with a lid, two make-up pencils with a bronze spatula, tweezers, ivory object, faience and alabaster vessels, and a number of pottery vessels (including cups, bowls, jugs, oil jugs, and two handled flasks) (Steindorff 1937, 178).

a contextual analysis at this site. A general survey of the site showed that tomb deposits within Cemetery S (dated XV-XIXth dynasties) included a wide range of objects such as coffins (including an anthropoid sarcophagus in S12), and mummy masks. Other objects in the tombs included beads, make up vessels of either stone, alabaster, wood or faience, make-up pencils, ear-rings, razors, tweezers, ivory, bronze, wooden and alabaster objects, weapons, mirrors, and Tell el-Yehudiyeh vessels, as well as necklaces and bracelets made up of beads (Steindorff 1937, 153-209). Cemetery B was generally quite poor in burial goods, and necklaces of beads were the main accompaniment of the graves (Steindorff 1935, 200-201).

V.II.XXVIII DEBEIRA EAST

This site was excavated as part of the Scandanavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia in the 1960's, launched by UNESCO as part of a Campaign to Save the Monuments of Nubia (Säve-Söderbergh 1970, 11-15). It is designated site 170 and described as a sandstone rock plateau, with forty eight graves, some with a stone superstructure. It had been thoroughly plundered and disturbed by later habitation (Säve-Söderbergh 1989, 192).

There are two anra scarabs from the site, both from T.37. This was one of the largest tombs in the cemetery, with objects including a bronze razor, kohl pot, and a large collection of scarabs. There was also a large collection of beads, including both faience and silver, a ring of gold and an ivory bracelet (Säve-Söderbergh 1989, 195). Twenty five of the forty eight graves are detailed, showing five other graves with scarabs (T.17, 20, 23, 24, 25). Possessions were limited in these graves. T.17 had strings of beads of silver and faience, T.25 beads only, while T.20 had beads and a bronze ring (Säve-Söderbergh 1989, 194). Objects in non scarab tombs included beads, bronze awls, a silver ring, kohl pot, and one gold bead (Säve-Söderbergh 1989, 194-5). The burials are described as classical Pan-grave, with one Classic Kerma grave and the

pottery common to both Pan-grave and the C-Group (Säve-Söderbergh 1989, 194).

V.II.XXIX MIRGISSA

Mirgissa was excavated by the Mission Archéologique Française au Soudan between 1962-1969, under the direction of Vercoutter⁶². It is a fortress site situated on the Second Cataract established in the Middle Kingdom, and is noted for its subterranean tombs, or hypogea, excavated in the rock which were established in the Middle Kingdom (Vercoutter 1975, 31)

There are two anra scarabs from Mirgissa, both from the main cemetery, M.X. The first anra scarab was found in tomb 39, a child's grave (Vila 1975, 69). The second scarab came from tomb 114, which had 31 individuals (Vila 1975, 146). Both tombs had other scarabs with SIP type designs, beads, alabaster vessels, and jewelry (Vila 1975, 69-71, 138-148). Tomb 114 also had two coffins, three examples of funerary masks, bronze tweezers and part of an axe (Vila 1975, 146).

A contextual analysis was not possible at this site because of the nature of the burials, i.e. one was a single grave, the other a multiple burial (see section V.III.1 below). A brief survey reveals grave goods were limited to beads, jewelry, alabaster and amulets. There were no weapons or toggle pins, and jewelry was much less abundant compared to the graves at Aniba. There were substantially less objects associated with non scarab tombs than those with scarabs (Vila 1975, 31-212). Vercoutter could not provide a precise date for the tombs, instead dating Cemetery M.X to the XV - XVIIth dynasties (Vercoutter 1976, 301).

⁶²

See Vercoutter (1970, 1975, 1976).

V.II.XXX UKMA WEST

Discovered during survey work of the 1968-9 Survey Archéologique en Nubie soudanaise, this site was first excavated in 1969, with an initial exploration of the cemetery. The cemetery was completely investigated later that year by Vila under the auspices of the Section Française de Recherches Archéologiques⁶³. The site (labelled 21-H-4 during the survey) is situated just north of the Third Cataract, and comprises a large cemetery of over 200 tombs. These have been well documented and so an accurate picture emerges of the status of the anra scarabs from this site.

There are four anra scarabs from the site found in three tombs (T.9, 102 and 189), with a further seventy one scarabs from thirty other tombs. These tombs had skeletal remains and half were disturbed. There were a further 193 tombs without scarabs, nearly all with skeletal remains and over three quarters of them had been disturbed.

All three anra tombs had skeletal remains, and two out of the three (T.189 and 102) had been pillaged. All three tombs had beads, and tombs 9 and 189 also had necklaces and bracelets of olive and carnelian, and shell fish pieces. Tomb 9 also had an ivory bracelet on the right wrist, and tomb 189 had a belt of beads made up of over 118 beads of orange opaque stones and one green translucent stone. Traces of a funerary couch was also found in tombs 9 and 189. Tomb 189 had a large amount of pottery vessels, and two other scarabs while tombs 9 and 102 had some pottery vessels but in much smaller quantities (Vila 1987, 46-149).

⁶³

For full publication of the cemetery see Vila (1987).

V.II.XXXI KERMA

Kerma was excavated by Reisner in a joint expedition of Harvard University and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts between 1913-16. In 1988, new excavations were undertaken by Bonnet and the University of Geneva Mission to the Sudan, which continue to the present time⁶⁴. Situated south of the third cataract in Upper Nubia, Kerma is the southernmost site, with anra scarabs. There are four anra scarabs from this site (KER 1,2,7,8) and one anra seal impression (KER 6)⁶⁵. The site comprises a number of cemeteries dating to the MK-SIP and a large mudbrick tower. The anra scarabs are from the area noted as Cemetery B which consisted of a number of small tumuli and four large ones (III, IV, X and XVI) which run roughly diagonally north from III - XVI. Most tumuli were made up of a main burial chamber, a corridor that runs the width of the tumuli and various small graves contained within it. All tumuli had been heavily plundered and disturbed. The seal impression is from KII, the Deffufa or mudbrick tower.

Tumulus III is delegated by Reisner to Prince Hepzefa (1923a, 138), and there are two anra scarabs from this tomb. One is found in the sacrificial corridor,

⁶⁴ For Reisner's excavations see Reisner (1923a,b, 1955) and Dunham (1982). For the present excavations by Bonnet, see Bonnet (1991, 1992) and Bonnet et al., (1990, 1991, 1993). See also Gratien (1978) for discussion of the Kerma culture.

⁶⁵ There are three two sign anra scarabs from Kerma, and one seal impression (KER 5). Two scarabs (KER 3, 4) are from Tumulus IV. Tumulus KIV consisted of the same layout as KIII, although it only had one burial chamber. Reisner believed the main burial, the corridor and many of the subsidiary graves were plundered for the first time before the construction of the retaining walls and then again afterwards (Reisner 1923, 191). The two sign anra scarabs are found in the sacrificial corridor, KIVB, and one from a subsidiary grave, K439. There were approximately 110-130 skeletons in the corridor, and the anra scarab was found on body HB, which was set apart from a group of thirty one skeletons nearby (Reisner 1923a, 195). On the body of HB was a small jar together with the anra scarab (Reisner 1923a, 201), and associated with the bodies nearby were objects such as daggers, necklaces, beads, small jars, beakers, and an ivory dagger handle (Reisner 1923a, 196-202). Subsidiary grave 439 was a multiple bed burial, with at least one sacrificial body which had been badly plundered. Objects remaining included a set of ivory inlays from the beds, beads, two bone awls, pottery vessels and alabaster jars (Reisner 1923a, 227).

K301, and the other is from one of the subsidiary graves, K321. The main burial chamber was completely plundered, and Reisner believed some of the contents of the sacrificial corridor come from the main burial as well as the subsidiary burials (Reisner 1923a, 137). There were approximately one hundred skeletons in the corridor, and the anra scarab was found in the chest area of Body A. Large disc beads of white shell were also associated with the body (Reisner 1923a, 141-142). Other items from the corridor itself include beads, bronze mirrors, kohl pots, necklace of blue faience beads, bone awls, fragments of inscribed stele, faience vessels, ivory earstud and a couple of scarabs (Reisner 1923a, 142-144). The subsidiary grave, K321, was a bed burial with one sacrificial body and a ram. It was badly plundered and the only remaining items included a bronze razor, alabaster staff knob, beaded and fringed cloth, a bone awl and a pair of ivory horn protectors (Reisner 1923a, 160).

The anra scarabs from Tumulus KX were confined to the sacrificial corridor. This once again was highly disturbed and plundered (Reisner 1923a, 281). One of the two anras could be associated with a particular body. Body DE had only the anra scarab (KER 8) and a circlet of small blue ring beads associated with the body (Reisner 1923a, 296). The second scarab (KER 7) was unattached and not related to any skeletal remains (Reisner 1923a, 290-312). Other objects from the corridor included necklaces, anklets, gold, giraffe hair and ivory armlets, earstuds, earrings, feather fans, wooden headrests, daggers, colouring matter and paint palettes, alabaster kohl pots and pottery (Reisner 1923a, 314).

At first it was thought that a comparative analysis might be possible at Kerma. However, due to the information regarding skeletal remains and disturbance, it was finally decided that it was not feasible. Although some of the subsidiary graves appeared to be single deposits, many contained sacrificial burials, making them multiple graves. Thus it was impossible to know which objects belonged to the sacrificial bodies or the main burial. Although all the tombs

could have been deemed multiple, to then include them with the comparison of the hundreds of bodies in the sacrificial corridors of both KIII, seemed to be inappropriate. Tumulus X had ninety nine subsidiary graves, but none had anra scarabs. As only six of the subsidiary graves had scarabs, it was also considered inappropriate to conduct a contextual analysis in that tumulus. It was noted that there were a number of objects present in KIII, but not in KIV, such as razors, mirrors and stele. In KIII, the sacrificial ram burials were primarily associated with scarab burials (50% anra, 38% scarab and 17% non scarab).

V.II.I CONCLUSIONS

A limited survey of every anra scarab context shows that the scarabs are found in a number of different contexts and are repeatedly found with items that could be defined as 'élite' or 'luxurious' (see section V.III.I below). That is, although the majority of anra scarabs are found in tomb deposits, they are also found in palaces (Ugarit, Megiddo, Shechem, Ugarit), temples (Beth Shan), sanctuaries (Ugarit) and residences of high ranking officials (Tell el-Ajjul). Conversely their sealings can be found in the more lowly contexts such as ash pits (Memphis). Table 5.1 illustrates the type of objects which occur in anra contexts at each site at which anra scarabs are found. Regional trends and type associations will be discussed in more detail in section V.IV.

In section two of this chapter, nine sites will be considered in detail for a contextual analysis. However, in this first section, a small number of sites which did not have enough information to be considered for the contextual analysis, have provided a little extra information with which to compare the anra scarab contexts. For example, at Ugarit, there was no discernible difference between objects occurring in anra scarab contexts, and those in other scarab deposits. At Pella, few objects occurred in MB tombs without scarabs, while at Amman, other scarab tombs appeared to have the same ensemble of objects as the anra tombs. Sediment in Middle Egypt was generally a poor

	weapons	beads	tog. pins	jewelry	alabaster	faience	bone	br.obj.	wood.obj.	ost.egg	basketry	ivory	gold	amulet	kohl.pot	stele	ptry.figs	tweezers	mirrors	ochre	
Kerma	X	X		X	X	X	X						X		X	X			X		Kerma
Ukma		X		X														X		X	Ukma
Mirgissa	X	X		X	X							X	X		X						Mirgissa
Debeira	X	X		X								X	X		X			X			Debeira
Aniba		X		X	X				X						X						Aniba
Esna	X	X		X	X	X	X	X				X	X		X	X		X			Esna
Nubt																					Nubt
Sedment		X		X											X						Sedment
Gurob		X		X	X										X				X		Gurob
Memphis						X															Memphis
Dab'a		X			X																Dab'a
Yehudiyeh	X	X	X												X						Yehudiyeh
Far'a	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X													Far'a
Gerar													X								Gerar
Ajjul		X	X	X																	Ajjul
Beit Mirsim																					Beit Mirsim
Lachish	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X											Lachish
Rishon	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X											Rishon
Jericho	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								Jericho
Gezer	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X											Gezer
Amman			X	X	X		X	X													Amman
Shiloh	X	X	X	X																	Shiloh
Tel Aviv	X		X	X																	Tel Aviv
Tel Michal																					Tel Michal
Shechem																					Shechem
Pella	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			X	X								Pella
Beth Shan		X	X	X	X		X					X	X	X							Beth Shan
Megiddo	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X								Megiddo
Kabri	X	X	X																		Kabri
Byblos								X													Byblos
Ugarit	X	X	X	X																	Ugarit

Figure 5.1:
Associated objects in anra scarab contexts

cemetery, as opposed to Aniba in Nubia, which had a great range of object types in the tombs at that site. Even non scarab tombs had a wide range of types of objects at Aniba, they just appeared in smaller numbers than found in the scarab tombs. Mirgissa and Debeira East were both relatively poor cemeteries compared to Aniba, and there were few objects found in non scarab tombs at Mirgissa compared to scarab tombs. The anra tomb at Debeira East was one of the largest in the cemetery, although scarabs were in the minority, appearing in only five other burials. However, with the limited information available at that site, there was no discernible difference between scarab and non scarab tombs.

The general survey in section one of this chapter has shown the range of object types associated with anra scarab contexts. Conversely, its brief comparative survey has not been able to give any definitive information regarding the status of the anra scarab. However, this information can be gleaned from an in depth analysis, as will be seen in section two (V.III) below.

V.III IN DEPTH SITE ANALYSIS

V.III.I INTRODUCTION

Previous appraisals of the scarab role, function and significance are often based on an examination of the internal evidence only. Therefore the appraisals fail to regard the scarabs in a contextual manner, and consider the different cultures in which they occur. This analysis seeks to evaluate the status of the anra scarab by considering both of these important criteria.

There are a number of problems associated with a contextual analysis of the anra scarab, and these must be taken into account when undertaking such a project. As a survey of the above sites has shown, there was often little or no information available on the contexts of the anra scarab or other scarabs. As has been seen in the general survey of contexts, the anra scarab is found not

only in tomb deposits, but in sanctuaries, palaces, temples and residences. However, at the sites where an in depth contextual comparison is available, the anra scarabs were all from tomb deposits. Comparisons of contexts at the nine sites were also limited to those deposits which were directly relevant to SIP type scarabs, as it was not feasible to analyse all scarab contexts at a given site. In Egypt, some of the anra scarabs were found in MK or NK tombs. Here it was considered appropriate to include other tombs of the same period in the analysis, mainly to see if the type of grave goods differed between different period contexts. Although it is recognised that dividing scarabs into styles involves a certain amount of subjectivity, there is generally a clear difference between NK and SIP scarab styles⁶⁶.

The analysis of the tombs was divided into three categories: anra, scarab and non scarab. These were chosen to provide a comprehensive review of the comparative contexts, in order to highlight any differences in tomb status which may occur. That is, were there only differences between scarab and non scarab contexts, or between anra and other scarab deposits? An effort was made to distinguish between scarabs and the anra scarab in particular, to see if either were more likely to be associated with 'élite' objects. If there were no special objects associated with the scarabs, on comparison with non scarab tombs, then it could be said that scarabs were a common or relatively undistinguished object. If, on the other hand, they were only associated with objects acknowledged as luxury items, then it would be reasonable to associate scarabs with this type of object.

Tables 1, 3 and 6 (Appendix C) give details of all contexts: skeletal remains, disturbance, dates, and publication. These have been included to confirm which contexts have been used in the analysis. Limited skeletal and disturbance

⁶⁶

It must be emphasised that the ideal media for studying scarab designs is from photographs, and at many sites, e.g. Esna, this was not possible. Therefore the division of scarabs into MK, SIP or NK designs was not always made under ideal conditions.

information is given at most sites, but the problems of multiple burials, disturbance, robbery, and so forth have been taken into account where possible so that similar deposits have been compared at all times. It was important to ensure that the graphs did not represent single versus multiple graves, or non disturbed with disturbed graves. The data were transposed into percentages, and graphs were chosen as the easiest medium of assimilating and presenting all the information. If a single anra context existed, or if there was a single scarab context from a site, they were not included for comparative purposes, as it was felt that the results would not represent a true picture of the comparative contexts.

As seen in the discussion in section V.I, while much has been written on social ranking of ancient societies, less time has been devoted to the definition of the value of grave goods. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, a luxury item is perceived as one which has status due to a number of factors. These include acquirement from a distant source through trade, an object made of an acknowledged precious metal such as gold⁶⁷, bronze, wood, faience, or alabaster⁶⁸ (all which required skill and knowledge in production), or items of jewelry or foreign pottery⁶⁹. A note is made at each site to clarify the

⁶⁷ See Clarke, *Symbols of Excellence*, 1986. It must be remembered however, that what is considered 'precious' to one is not necessarily to another. For example, obsidian was found to be considered a 'wealth item' in prehistoric times due to its concentration in civic-ceremonial centres, as opposed to rural locales; its manufacture was unusual and it was commonly found in special caches accompanying burials or under stele etc. The absence of these traits in a later era led to the suggestion that the obsidian was converted from an item of wealth to a utilitarian commodity (Brumfiel & Earle 1987, 4).

⁶⁸ There is an increasing trend among stone specialists to no longer refer to the term 'alabaster'. This is in order to differentiate between calcite, a hard material, which is found in Egypt and gypsum, a softer version, which was used in Palestine. It is generally assumed that cosmetic vessels made from either of these materials are luxury items, and were not common among grave goods (see Ben-Dor 1945 and Sparks 1995).

⁶⁹ See also Shennan and Shay, who determine that the scale of wealth or value of an item may be determined by three factors: its specific function in the culture, the distance and difficulty in obtaining the raw materials required to produce it and the estimated time required to do so (Shennan 1975, 284; Shay 1983, 32).

selection of objects utilised under general headings. For example, jewelry at one site may include hairpins, while at another metal rings. Some items are included in two categories, such as alabaster kohl pots, which are divided between alabaster and kohl pots. While some objects, such as beads and toggle pins, may be considered common items and not elite in terms of a burial context, they were included for comparative purposes. It was envisaged that they might at least act as a comparative indicator between the three groups (anra, scarab and non scarab, see below).

Tables 2, 4 and 6 (Appendix C) show each context (reference numbers correspond to contextual information in tables 1, 3 and 5) and the objects designated to them. It must be remembered that this is not a quantitative analysis - the aim of the research was not to establish how many alabaster vases were in one tomb or context - just that they occurred. The primary aim was for the association of the object with the context. A quantitative analysis would have added to the problems that already existed. It should be noted that as the type of objects found with each deposit changed regionally, with different cultures, the table headings (in tables 2, 4 and 6) can change on each page, and columns do not necessarily represent the same object as the page before.

V.III.II SITES AND RESULTS

MEGIDDO (Graph 5.1)

The analysis was based on comparative tomb deposits from stratum X-XII using Loud's 'Register of Finds' (1948, 145-188). Multiple entries for one tomb were considered as one entity, i.e. S=T.2126, W=T.2126 and Rm W=T.2126 were taken as one context. There were 8 anra contexts, but only 6 tombs were

Graph 5.1
MEGIDDO

used for comparative purposes⁷⁰ (see table 1.1, ref.: 1006-1013), 37 with scarabs (table 3.1-2, ref.: 2008-2044) and 87 non scarab tombs (see table 5.1-3, refs 3001-3087).

Weapons mainly consisted of bronze blades, and faience beads were classified under both beads and faience. Toggle pins were mainly of bronze, but there were some with silver. Jewelry included gold (and faience) headbands, gold earrings and bracelets, silver bracelets and a crystal pendant. A gold nose ring was classified under both jewelry and 'gold ring'. Bronze objects consisted of a chisel and borer.

Results:

The anra scarabs clearly stand out as having a higher percentage of frequency of occurrence in most object categories. The anra scarab tombs have a high number of beads associated with them, compared to scarab and non scarab tombs. The anra scarab tombs also have more weapons, jewelry, alabaster, bronze objects, toggle pins and bone inlay than associated with scarab or non scarab tombs. There are no faience objects associated with anra scarab tombs, which are associated with both other scarab and non scarab tombs. Of particular note is the high percentage of jewelry (both gold and silver) associated with non scarab tombs on comparison with scarab tombs. Not shown on the graph are bone objects and cylinder seals which are only found in non scarab tombs in small percentages (less than 5%). Also not included on the graph was the cylinder seal found in a scarab tomb (T.5067).

⁷⁰

The anra scarabs from the 'Palace', were not included in the analysis for lack of comparative information. The four tomb deposits with two sign anra scarabs (4079, 3070, 1752, 24) were not included in the analysis. If they had been included as other scarab deposits, then the only result to differ would be in the weapon category. It would be 1% more than anra deposits.

TEL AVIV (Graph 5.2)

The comparative material comes from Kaplan's 'table of finds' (1955, opp. p.12). Although he recorded 18 graves from the cemetery, for comparative purposes, each multiple burial has been assigned a single value, as each burial had its own chamber deposit. Thus 24 deposits were compared: 2 with anra scarabs⁷¹ (table 1.1, ref.: 1020-1021), 14 with scarabs (table 3.2, ref.: 2045-2058), and 8 with no scarabs (table 5.3, ref.: 3088-3095). There were skeletal remains in each deposit, and disturbance was only noted in graves 5 and 15.

Weapons included two swords and an axe, while gold earrings, bracelets, and a hammered sheet of silver and silver crescents were classified under jewelry. One toggle pin had a silver head, and beads were of amethyst and carnelian (Kaplan 1955, 5-6).

Results:

Once again the graph clearly indicates the higher percentage of frequency of occurrence of the anra scarab with toggle pins and jewelry. The non scarab tombs had the highest percentage association with weapons, while there were no weapons associated with the anra scarab tombs. However, there was no jewelry noted with the non scarab tombs.

JERICHO (Graph 5.3)

Kenyon's publications of the Jericho tombs provide ample evidence for a comparative analysis, and all information has been taken from her tomb

⁷¹

There was a single deposit with a two sign anra scarab (T.5). This contained only a toggle pin, which if included in the other scarab tomb deposits, would not have changed the overall percentages.

Graph 5.2
TEL AVIV

descriptions in *Jericho, Volume I and II*⁷². Tombs have generally been treated as a single deposit, for although Kenyon often distinguishes successive layers, they are not defined with enough precision to be of use stratigraphically⁷³. However, there is enough evidence to divide eight tombs into two phases (B48, B35, J45, H18, J14, J42, G1 and H6), and one (A34) into three phases⁷⁴, based on Kenyon's assessment of ancestral and final burials. As the majority of tombs from Jericho show disturbed, multiple, and successive burials, only these have been compared⁷⁵. There are 15 deposits (from Kenyon's excavations) with anra scarabs⁷⁶, (see table 1.1-2, ref.: 1029-1046); 21 with other scarabs (table 3.2-3, ref.: 2059-2079) and 6 without scarabs (table 5.3, ref.: 3096-3102).

As the range of objects in the tombs of Jericho were so diverse, new categories were added for comparative purposes. There were enough objects of wooden manufacture that it was felt two categories were required to distinguish between wooden furniture and wooden objects. There were also large amounts of

⁷² As mentioned in section V.II.13, Garstang's tombs have not been used in this analysis.

⁷³ For example, Tomb G46 '...would not be possible to say all vessels found in a layer belonged together, too much evidence of disturbance of bodies'(1960, 332); Tomb B3 'Though the objects are recorded in layers, it is probable that too much significance should not be place on this' (1960, 395); Tomb G73 '...it is not possible to disentangle the grave goods associated with the different phases, for the process of piling and disturbance was too thorough' (1965, 450).

⁷⁴ Tomb 34, Phase 4 (early Gp III, 1965, 175) has been classified with the anra scarabs, for that is where they occurred. Phase 3 (early Gp II, 1965, 173), has been classified as 'other scarabs', and phases 1-2 (Gp I, 1965, 173) with the non-scarab deposits for self explanatory reasons. Although Kenyon seems to be very sure of these divisions, she does note 'distinction between different phases is not always very clear, particularly where phase 4 directly overlay the similar buff fill of phase 2, without the intervention of phase 3' (1960, 352).

⁷⁵ Therefore P19, J54 and D22 have not been included as they are single burials. J37 was not included as the number of burials were not known.

⁷⁶ There are six deposits at Jericho with two sign anra scarabs (B48, phase 1; A134, J1, J12, J45, phase 1 and H18, phase 1. If these contexts are added to the other scarab deposits, there is no change to the overall percentage results.

Graph 5.3
JERICHO

textiles and basketry within the tombs to warrant inclusion on the graph. Not included on the graph were bone objects, cylinder seals, individual gold items, and ostrich eggs as they occurred in small percentages. Jewelry was classified as bronze rings only.

Results:

The anra scarab showed the highest percentages of frequency of occurrence in all categories (weapons, beads, toggle pins, faience, bronze objects, wooden objects and furniture, ostrich eggs, basketry and textiles) except for jewelry and bone inlay. These categories were associated with other scarab tombs.

The deposits were also divided according to Kenyon's type groups, in order to determine if any patterns existed within Groups I-V (see Table 5.2). Beads, toggle pins, alabaster, bone inlay, wooden furniture and wooden objects were found within all tomb types (Groups I-V) and type groups (anra, scarab and non scarab). Weapons are confined in anra tombs to Groups II-IV, other scarabs tombs to Groups II-III, and non scarab tombs to Group I. Thus it would appear that weapons are phased out by Group V. Jewelry (i.e. bronze rings) did not appear in Group V in any anra or scarab tombs, and did not appear at all in non scarab tombs. Faience objects only appeared in anra tombs in Groups IV and V, although in scarab tombs they occurred in all groups. There were no faience objects in non scarab tombs. Bronze objects, bone objects and ostrich eggs only occurred in the earlier groups in both anra and other scarab tombs - there was only one example of a bone object in a Group IV anra tomb. Two studies on the nature of the EBIV tombs at Jericho have produced opposite results with regard to their egalitarian nature (Shay 1983, found them to be egalitarian, while Palumbo 1987 found them to be clearly socially stratified). It would appear that if the tombs are divided by the presence or absence of scarabs, according to Kenyon's groups, the deposits without scarabs are generally poorer, indicating that in the MBIIB-C, there may indeed be a differentiation in the social structure at Jericho.

		W	J	B	T.P.	F	A	B.I.	W.F.	W.O	BR.O.	B.O.	O.E.	C.S.	BAS.
ANRA SCARAB TOMBS															
G46				X	X		X		X	X	X				X
P1				X			X	X	X	X	X				
G37	II	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		
P23				X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X
D6				X	X										
A34															
Phase 4				X	X										
D13	III	X			X		X				X				
B3				X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X
B35		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X				X
B47		X			X	X	X	X				X			
G73	IV			X	X	X		X	X	X					X
J9			X	X	X		X	X							
H22					X	X	X	X	X	X					X
H13	V			X	X		X	X		X					
J39					X	X	X	X		X					
SCARAB TOMBS															
J14															
Phase 1		X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		
D9															
Phase 1		X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X	X	
A34															
Phase 3	II	X								X					
M11		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X					
B48															
Phase 2				X			X		X	X		X			
H6															
Phase 1				X	X		X	X	X	X					
A38				X	X		X				X				
B51			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
J45															
Phase 2					X		X	X							
P17	III			X	X		X	X		X					X
J19		X			X		X			X	X				X
J20			X		X	X	X	X							
J42															
Phase 1					X		X								
G82					X			X							
J14															
Phase 2	IV			X	X		X	X							
G1			X	X	X		X	X		X					X
J7					X		X	X							
H11					X	X	X	X		X					X
A136	V			X	X		X	X							
H18															
Phase 2				X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X
J42															
Phase 2															
NON SCARAB TOMBS															
A1		X									X				
A34															
Phase 1-2	I				X		X	X							
P21				X				X	X		X		X		
A46	III				X										
H6															
Phase 2				X	X			X	X	X					

Table 5.2: Associations of Jericho type groups and objects

LACHISH (Graph 5.4)

All information came from Tufnell's brief descriptions of the tombs in Areas 100, 1500, 4000 and 6000, concentrating only on those areas where the anra scarabs occurred. In these areas, only the MB tombs were compared, as there appeared to be no SIP type scarabs in later tombs⁷⁷. There is little information regarding skeletal remains and most tombs appear to be disturbed, making conditions homogeneous for comparison. There are 4 tombs with anra scarabs⁷⁸ (see table 1.2, ref.: 1047-1050), 5 graves with other scarabs (table 3.3, ref.: 2080-2084) and 9 tombs without scarabs (table 5.3-4, refs: 3103-3111).

Results:

The anra scarabs had the highest percentage of frequency of occurrence of weapons, beads, faience objects, bronze objects, jewelry and ostrich egg shells. Other scarab tombs had the highest percentage of occurrence of bone inlay. Both anra and scarab tombs had one hundred percent associations of toggle pins.

TELL EL FAR'A (S) (Graph 5.5)

Cemetery 500 was republished by Price Williams in 1977, thereby establishing the site as one of the few to offer a comprehensive contextual analysis. There were thirty two graves in cemetery 500. Disturbance and skeletal remains were not always recorded in the early excavations, and of the anra scarab tombs, only twenty five percent have information regarding skeletal remains and disturbance. There are no multiple burials mentioned. Of other scarab tombs, thirty three

⁷⁷ Graves marked as a quarry (T.168), cave (1542, 1547) or locus (187), are not included in this survey.

⁷⁸ There are two deposits at Lachish with two sign anra scarabs: T.157 and 1552. If these contexts are added to other scarab deposits, then the only category to differ would be jewelry. The extra deposits would change the ratio from 17:20% to 25:20% in favour of other scarab tombs.

Graph 5.4
LACHISH

percent of tombs are recorded as disturbed, but skeletal remains are only recorded in fifteen percent, while in non scarab tombs, eight percent, or one tomb had information on skeletal remains, while thirty three were recorded as disturbed. Ten tombs had anra scarabs⁷⁹ (including cemeteries 900 and 1000)(see table 1.3, ref.: 1094-1103) 15 with other scarabs (table 3.3, ref.: 2085-2099) and 12 without scarabs (table 5.4, ref.: 3112-3123).

There were single anra scarabs from a large tomb in Cemetery 900, and Cemetery 1000. The only comparative information regarding those cemeteries came from Starkey and Harding's registers of those cemeteries (1932 pl.xci-xciii (Cem. 900) and 1932, pl.xc (Cem. 1000)). Cemetery 900 is dated by the excavators to the XIX-XXth dynasty, which is confirmed by the type of scarab found in the graves. It was not felt appropriate to conduct a comparative analysis of either Cemetery 900 or Cemetery 1000. As discussed in section V.III.I, single contexts were not to be considered for comparative purposes, as the results would be misleading⁸⁰.

Results:

The anra tombs showed significantly higher percentages of associated objects in all categories (weapons, beads, jewelry, alabaster, bronze objects and bone inlay), except for toggle pins and faience objects which were associated with other scarab tombs. Toggle pins were the most common object in the cemetery, appearing with seventy five percent of anra tombs and ninety three percent of

⁷⁹ Two deposits from this site had two sign anra scarabs: T.554 and 565. If they were added to the other scarab tomb deposits, the results would not be changed in any way.

⁸⁰ However, a brief examination of Cemetery 1000 (dated to the Hyksos period), showed that of the twenty seven tombs in the cemetery, there were sixteen other graves with scarabs and ten without scarabs. The scarab tombs were associated with the usual beads, weapons, toggle pins, bone inlay, jewelry and ostrich egg shells. A brief analysis showed that all these objects were more frequently associated with the scarab tombs, compared with the non scarab tombs. The non scarab tombs had only small percentages of beads and jewelry.

other scarab tombs. The anra tombs were the only tombs with jewelry, alabaster and bronze objects. There were generally only pottery vessels associated with non scarab tombs, and only one non scarab tomb was found with two faience vessels.

Because of the publication of Cemetery 500, it was possible to analyse the association between the presence of scarabs and the type of tomb which was built. Price-Williams distinguished five different grave types in the cemetery: i) simple; ii) shaft and stepped alcove; iii) stepped shaft and chamber tomb; iv) stepped shaft and bilobate chamber tomb v) stepped shaft and double chamber. Although there was a progression in size, and the larger tombs had more bodies, Williams did not believe that there was necessarily a difference in class, "both small and large tombs contained basically the same units of goods..." (Price-Williams 1977, 149).

However, if the different tomb types are considered in terms of scarab associations, a pattern does emerge. Scarabs are associated with the five different types of tombs. However, the anra scarabs are associated with the greatest number of type IV and V tombs (the larger and more complicated), other scarab tombs have the greatest number of type II and III tombs, while those tombs without scarabs are mostly type I and II (the most simple)⁸¹.

TELL EL YEHUDIYEH (Graph 5.6)

The comparative contexts are taken from Tufnell's review of the graves in 1978. It would appear that most graves were disturbed and that they had skeletal remains, although exact numbers are unknown (Tufnell 1987, 76).

⁸¹

Four of the non scarab tombs are not classified as type 1 but were described as found 'below the surface, implying no recognisable architectural plan' (Price-Williams 1977, 148).

Graph 5.6
TELL EL YEHUDIYEH

There were 3 tombs with anra scarabs⁸² (table 1.3-4, ref.:1104-1106), 5 with scarabs (table 3.3, ref.: 2100-2104), and 3 without scarabs (table 5.4, ref.: 3124-3126).

Results:

There were no grave goods in the three non scarab tombs. Grave goods in the scarab tombs were generally limited to beads, weapons, toggle pins and kohl pots. The anra scarabs had the highest percentages of frequency of occurrence in all categories (weapons, beads, kohl pots), except toggle pins, which had the highest association with other scarab tombs.

GUROB (Graph 5.7)

All information regarding the tombs is taken from the tomb registers (Brunton and Engelbach 1927, pl. xiv-xviii). As the majority of graves were listed in the tomb registers as single, the multiple graves were not considered for comparative purposes. Some graves were listed as disturbed. The cemetery at Gurob is dated to the NK, but there were SIP design type scarabs amongst the tombs. Therefore, the tombs have been divided between those with SIP type designs and the NK type scarabs⁸³. There were 2 anra scarab tombs⁸⁴ (table 1.3, ref.: 1113-1114), 15 tombs with SIP type designs (table 3.3-5, ref.: 2105-2159), 40 with NK scarabs (table 3.4, ref.: 2144-2183) and 233 without scarabs (table 5.4-11, ref.: 3127-3361).

⁸² Tomb 407 had a two sign anra scarab. When this context was added to other scarab tomb deposits, the results did not change.

⁸³ It cases where it was not always possible to classify a scarab as SIP or NK, the scarab has been classified as NK.

⁸⁴ There is a single tomb, T.293, with a two sign anra scarab. If this tomb was added to other SIP scarab deposits, they would have then had the highest percentage of bronze objects and amulets.

Graph 5.7
GUROB

There were no weapons, or items which could be construed as such, at this site. Jewelry included silver, shell and copper hair rings, bone bracelets, and ear rings.

Results:

Although only twenty percent of the tombs had scarabs at Gurob, a marked difference exists between graves with and without scarabs, and the type of grave goods associated with them. The anra scarabs showed the highest frequency of occurrence of all objects with which they were associated - beads, jewelry, alabaster, kohl pots, and mirrors. There was a particularly large difference in the number of mirrors and alabaster objects associated with the anra tombs compared with other scarab tombs. Small amounts of bone objects were found in scarab and non scarab tombs. NK tombs without SIP scarab types had many more types of grave goods, and were associated with ushabti, figurines, amulets and stele. Graves without scarabs showed a marked decline in association with grave goods - twenty five percent had beads, but only six percent had jewelry and ushabti, and one percent or less had bone objects, kohl pots, stele, bronze objects, amulets and figurines.

ESNA (Graphs 5.8-9)

All information is taken from Downe's 'Register of Tombs' (1974, 116-132). In all, 265 tombs were considered, the only tombs not included were those later than early XVIIIth dynasty in date (no SIP type scarabs occurred in tombs later than this). There were 7 tombs with anra scarabs (table 1.4, ref.: 1119-1125), 42 tombs with SIP scarabs (including those in the MK and early XVIIIth dynasty, table 3.5-6, refs: 2160-2201), 46 MK tombs with scarabs (table 3.6-8, ref.: 2202-2247), and 13 early XVIIIth tombs with scarabs (table 3.8, ref.: 2248-2260). There were 51 SIP tombs without scarabs (table 5.11-12, ref.: 3362-3412), 91 MK tombs without scarabs (table 5.12-15, ref.: 3413-3503) and

Graph 5.8
ESNA
SCARAB TOMBS

13 NK tombs without scarabs (table 5.15, ref.: 3504-3516). There was no information regarding grave type, disturbance, re-use or skeletal remains, which should be considered when comparing contexts.

Weapons at this site included copper knives, daggers, flint knife, axe head and copper blade. Ivory objects include sceptres, rings, magic wands, hairpins, boxes, bracelets, spoon and pair of forearms (from a model). Bone objects included pins, rings and decoration. Ivory rings and bracelets were included both under ivory and jewelry. Similarly, alabaster kohl vessels were included both under alabaster and kohl pots, as the large majority of both categories were made up of each item. Jewelry included gold, copper, shell, ivory, bone and 'metal' rings; gold beads, carnelian pendants and silver earrings. At this site it was more appropriate to have a general heading for metal items, and then differentiate between metal, copper and bronze items. Metal rings were included in both the metal and jewelry categories.

Results:

Great diversity is shown among the objects found at Esna, and one third of the tombs had scarab seals. The anra scarab deposits had the highest percentage of frequency of occurrence of beads, jewelry, kohl pots, faience, bone objects, tweezers, ivory objects, gold (money) rings, and metal objects. Fifty seven percent of anra scarab tombs had gold rings⁸⁵ compared with 21% of other SIP scarab tombs, 7% of MK and 8% of NK scarab tombs. This should be an indication of the status of the anra scarab, as gold rings could justifiably be considered a rare and luxurious item.

The MK scarab tombs had the highest percentage of stele, while the NK tombs

⁸⁵

It is unclear what criteria Downes uses to differentiate between gold *money* rings and other gold rings. The only reference to the rings are made under the metal objects category, 'a number of heavy copper rings covered with a thin layer of gold were found at Esna...(and they) were probably hair rings (1974, 103). The anra scarab deposits had 43% of gold 'money' rings and 14% of other gold rings.

Graph 5.9

ESNA

NON SCARAB TOMBS

had the highest percentage of frequency of occurrence of weapons, alabaster and amulets. High percentages of beads were found throughout the tombs with scarabs, and they were also the most common item in non scarab tombs. Very small percentages of weapons were found in MK and SIP scarab and non scarab tombs. There were no weapons recorded for NK non scarab tombs, but their scarab tombs had the highest percentages of association at 15%, while anra scarab tombs had 14% association with weapons.

UKMA WEST (Graph 5.10)

The cemetery was published by Vila in detail in 1987 (37-175). There were 228 tombs, with scarab tombs occurring in fifteen percent of the cemetery. All scarab tombs had skeletal remains, and as the majority of tombs were single, only these were considered. Vila had also recorded the state of each tomb, either intact or disturbed. Three tombs have anra scarabs (table 1.4, ref.: 1131-1133), 30 with other scarabs (table 3.8-9, ref.: 2261-2290) and 192 without scarabs (table 5.15-21, ref.: 3517-3708).

Animal deposits (including lamb, rams and gazelles) and funerary furnishings (such as wooden beads, mats and leather wraps) have been included in the analysis, as they appear to have played an important role in the burial ritual at this site. Jewelry often consisted of necklaces of beads, which have been recorded in both categories. Some beads were made of ostrich egg shell (t.9); one bracelet was made of ivory, bone objects included awls, and bronze objects included a needle point.

Results:

The anra scarabs had the highest percentage of frequency of occurrence of beads, jewelry, ochre, funerary furnishings and animal burials. These were obviously the main items of the burials which occurred in all three types of

Graph 5.10
UKMA WEST

tombs. Only small percentages of amulets or metal, bone, wooden or alabaster objects were recovered, and these were all associated with scarab tombs. Grave goods in non scarab tombs were limited to beads, jewelry, ochre and basketry. Comparatively high percentages of both animal burials and funerary furnishings were recorded in the non scarab tombs, indicating that there did not appear to be a differentiation of these burial rituals between scarab and non scarab tombs.

V.IV CONCLUSIONS

From a survey encompassing thirty one sites, it has only been possible to undertake an analysis of contexts at less than one third of them. Fortunately, the sites were situated throughout Palestine, in the Delta, Upper and Lower Egypt and Nubia, thereby representing all geographic regions (except Syria), in which the anra scarab occurs. The details of the nine sites used in the analysis are summarised in Table 5.3 (below). All the contexts compared in the analysis were from burials, and while every effort was made to compare similar contexts (i.e. not to compare single or multiple burials at the same site, or disturbed with non disturbed graves), this information was not always available. However, despite these problems, the results of this first contextual analysis of the anra scarab are nonetheless enlightening. Over eleven hundred scarab and non scarab contexts have been compared: 138 anra scarab, 298 other scarab and 708 non scarab. Information regarding each site has differed: some well published, other less so, but definite trends have emerged.

The objects within the comparative contexts changed with the different cultures, as might have been expected (see Table 5.1). Some objects such as beads, jewelry, alabaster, faience and bronze objects were found at nearly every site in Palestine, Egypt and Nubia, while others, such as toggle pins, were only found in Palestine and the Delta. The lack of toggle pins in Egypt and Nubia is interesting. There is a high proportion of toggle pins in scarab tombs, and a

distinct reduction of numbers toggle pins in non scarab tombs⁸⁶. One of the uses of the toggle pin is to fasten the scarab on to the garment, at the same time as fastening the garment. The lack of toggle pins in Egyptian and Nubian tombs could indicate another use of the scarab seal, or a different method of displaying the scarab, perhaps set as a ring or strung together as part of a necklace. It might also indicate that the way in which the Egyptians and Nubians wore their clothes had no use for the toggle pin.

SITE	SKELETAL REMAINS	DISTURBED	DATE
Megiddo	u/k	u/k	MB
Tel Aviv	single	u/k	MB
Jericho	multiple	yes	MB
Lachish	u/k	yes	MB
Tell el Far'a	u/k	some	MB
Tell el Yehudiyeh	yes	yes	MB
Gurob	single	yes	NK
Esna	u/k	u/k	SIP-NK
Ukma West	single	some	XV-XVI

Table 5.3: summary of site details for contextual analysis

The Egyptian sites saw the introduction of ushabtis, kohl pots, pottery figures and stele, as well as tweezers and mirrors⁸⁷. It might have been possible that the introduction of the new objects was also due to chronological factors, not

⁸⁶

In the burials at Ur, seals usually occurred with stick pins, close to the right shoulder of the skeleton. This would suggest, at least at Ur, that the usual manner of wearing or carrying the seal was suspended through a shoulder pin which fastened the robe together (Rathje 1977, 26). Although this practice is referring to the cylinder seal, there is no reason why this should not apply to the scarab seal.

⁸⁷

It should be remembered that definitive remarks concerning the occurrence of objects at sites are limited to the material considered for this analysis. It is feasible that objects may have occurred in tombs or at sites not considered in this survey, or may not have even been recorded by their excavators.

just geographical. At Gurob, where the cemetery was of the NK, but included SIP type scarabs, amulets and ushabtis only occurred in NK tombs (with or without scarabs). Stele, wooden objects and pottery figures were also found only to occur in NK scarab tombs (without SIP type scarabs). Therefore, even though the whole cemetery was dated to the NK, there appeared to be some differentiation between tombs associated with SIP scarabs and those of NK scarabs. However, at Esna, a completely different picture emerges. Ushabtis are only found in MK tombs, while stele, amulets and pottery figures are found in all three periods, MK, SIP and NK scarab tombs.

An analysis of comparative scarab and non scarab tomb contexts at the sites in this survey in Palestine, the Delta, Egypt and Nubia, have also shown that there is a clear difference in the type and numbers of different objects associated with scarab and non scarab tombs. Although the type of object within a tomb assemblage has been seen to change geographically, and although there are some exceptions⁸⁸, it can generally be said that firstly, more grave goods are found in scarab tombs as opposed to non scarab tombs and secondly, the types of grave goods in the scarab tombs can be defined as élite or luxury items (as defined in this study).

While it might have been expected to find a differentiation between scarab and non scarab tombs, it was unexpected to find that on comparison of anra scarab tombs with other scarab tombs, the anra scarab had the greater percentage of association with élite or luxury objects than the normal design scarab. This would appear to validate the existence of the anra scarab as an object of importance. This would also seem to be reflected in the number of anra scarab contexts which also have royal name scarabs. For example, T.551 at Tell el-Far'a (south), had a scarab of Nebmaatre (Petrie 1930, pl.vii:11) and two other

88

For example, at Megiddo, there was a high percentage of jewelry found in non scarab tombs, and at Tel Aviv, non scarab tombs had the highest percentages of weapons at the site.

anra scarabs were found in this tomb. At Lachish in T.4004 there was a scarab of (Mayebre) Sheshi (Tufnell 1958, pl.34:140), along with five anra scarabs. At Tell el-Ajjul a scarab of Auserre Apophis was found in area AII, while Neferhotep I was found in area AJ 732 (Tufnell 1984, 11). Both these areas had anra scarabs, although there are no further details on their contexts. At Jericho it is debated as to whether there are three or six royal name scarabs represented at that site, but there are anra associated with all the relevant tombs except B51⁸⁹. Weinstein (1981, 9) lists thirteen sites with royal name scarabs in Palestine (not including Pella). Eight of the thirteen sites are associated with anra scarabs, and at least half of those sites actually have anra scarabs in the same contexts as the royal name scarabs.

As has been seen from both the overall survey of anra scarab contexts (section one, V.II) and the more detailed analysis (section two, V.III), the anra scarab appears to be associated with objects that can be regarded as élite or luxurious. It was also found in a range of different contexts including palaces, sanctuaries, temples, residences as well as tomb deposits. Therefore the findings of this contextual analysis have confirmed what has been seen in the typological survey. The anra scarab is no ordinary design amulet. This would also suggest that the hieroglyphs found on the anra scarab are not 'nonsense', nor represent a meaningless combination of hieroglyphs by the Hyksos (Giveon 1985). Esna alone highlights this assumption. The anra scarabs had by far the greatest association with gold rings, which following the relevant criteria (see Shennan 1975, 284), may be considered an élite or luxury item. It could also be argued that, again due to the relevant criteria, objects of bronze, alabaster, ivory, pieces of jewelry and weapons were valued possessions in prehistoric societies. Therefore due to the high percentage of anra scarabs which are associated with

89

See Ward 1987, Bietak 1991a and Benton et alii, 1992 for the debate on these scarabs. Bietak believes Sesostri III, Sobekhotep IV, Sobekhotep V, Nubkhepre, Mayibre (Sheshi)(twice), are found in the Jericho tombs (Bietak 1984, 482-484; 1991, 55ff). Ward disagrees with the readings for the scarabs of Mayibre (Sheshi) from T.B51, Nubkhepre-re from J37 and Sobekhotpe IV in tomb B47 (Ward 1987, 521ff).

these objects, it is possible to theorise that the anra scarab was also a valued possession in ancient societies. While there are numerous works cautioning the association of burial goods with the rank of the individual (see footnote 2, 206), Shennan found that the grave goods found in the grave really were a reflection of the deceased's status at death (1975, 282). Therefore, by ascertaining that the anra scarab is an elite or luxury item, there is the implication that the user of the anra scarab is a member of the 'higher classes' of ancient society. For as Brumfiel and Earle succinctly ascertain, *"the excitement of the exotic, the pleasure of the beautiful and the significance of the symbolic, combined to make wealth items powerful statements of social status"* (1987, 8).

CHAPTER VI

THE MEANING OF ANRA: THE EL FACTOR

*El is enthroned with 'Attart (of the field);
El sits as judge with Haddu the Shepherd,
Who sings and plays on the lyre...*

*Verily let him rule his offspring in his grace:
To exalt thy might in the earth,
Thy strength before us thy offspring,
Thy grace in the midst of Ugarit
As long as the years of Sun and Moon
And the pleasanse of the years of El.*

Cross 1977, 246.

VI.I INTRODUCTION

There have been a number of different interpretations with regard to the meaning of the three hieroglyph combination found on certain scarabs of the Second Intermediate Period. These have included a name of an unknown Hyksos, Prince Anra (Weill 1918, 193), the meaning, 'protection of Re' (Petrie 1930, 3), and other forms of association with Re (Murray 1949, Niccacci 1980, Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 51). They have also been described as originating from the Neferzeichen patterns of the Middle Kingdom (Stock 1942, 24, Hornung and Staehelin 1976, 51, Ward 1987, 526), being of complete nonsense (Giveon 1985, 18), or acting as a substitute for names and titles on scarabs (Keel 1995, 214-18, 244-46). Schulman interprets the hieroglyphs as cryptograms, or 'texts written in a secret, enigmatic manner, comprehensible only to the initiate' (1975, 68), which served to enhance and increase the potency of the charm (1978, 148).

Like Weill (1918), Pieper also thought that the hieroglyphs on the anra scarab could be read as a name. However, Pieper translated the name as 'El' (Pieper 1930, 190). Although he misread the *ayin* sign as an *h*¹, his interpretation could still be valid, but for different reasons. When the anra scarab is first examined, the

¹

Ward (1976, 359) and von Beckerath (1964, 134, n.6) note that the signs for *ayin* and *h* are practically identical, and can be reversed by mistake.

number of different combinations of ϵ , n and r can be confusing. But if the repeated letters are ignored, and the basic configuration highlighted, then the word spelled by the basic letter sequence becomes clear: 'El. It was common in group writing or syllabic orthography to spell the semitic letter 'l' by the combination of the signs $n + r$ (Schenkel 1986, 215; Hoch 1994, 407). Distinct epigraphic groups can be isolated within the range of anra motifs (see Chapter IV.VIII), and it is possible that one of these groups, with the *h $\dot{t}$ p* sign (see Chapter IV.VIII.IV), combined with the basic ϵ , n and r , make up a name, *H $\dot{t}$ p-El*. Compound names are common both in Egyptian and Syria or Mesopotamian traditions. It was also common to form theophoric names, that is by combining different elements with a deity's name². El is a common word for a god, but also refers to the most important god who was the head of the Ugaritic pantheon (Pope 1955, Cross 1977, de Moor 1980, L'Heureux 1979). While the subject of both El and the use of syllabic orthography could warrant their own in depth investigation, they have been briefly touched upon here in order to elucidate a possible reading of the anra scarab.

VI.II SYLLABIC ORTHOGRAPHY

The term syllabic orthography was introduced by Müller (1893, 1912), although Simons observes the English expression of 'group writing' is less ambiguous (1937, 16 fn.1). The syllabic system was used by Egyptian scribes to transcribe foreign words and names, and was their device to overcome the Egyptian unvocalised writing systems that utilized only a consonantal skeleton of the words with no vowels. It was probably an imitation of Mesopotamian cuneiform, but was not as developed³ (Ahituv 1984, 3).

² For example, see Archi 1984, 238. Three kings and a prince have compound names with the deity Damu at Ebla, indicating he was the divinity of the royal family. Their names were: Ib-Da-mu, Iš-gi-Da-mu, Ru-zi-Da-mu and Sur-sa-Da-mu. Egyptian examples include Sobek-hotep, Amen-em-het, Hotep-ke-Re, Si-Ptah (Von Beckerath 1984).

³ Albright had at first accepted Müller's theory as 'quite evident to a cuneiformist' (1917-18, 89 fn.1), but in 1934 he changed his mind: 'our principles are radically different from those of Müller, whose cuneiform theory we must reject entirely' (1934, 28).

A 'syllable' is understood to be a combination (group) of one consonant with a vowel, with the proper syllables of words and names often containing more than two elements (Simons 1937, 16). That is, group writing employs a relatively small number of sign groups in combinations that were not normally used for native words (Hoch 1994, 5). However, the system is the subject of much debate as it is seen as an imprecise way of transcribing foreign names and words, which fails to present a completely accurate indication of the phonetic value of the syllables (Ahituv 1984, 3). Zeidler summarises the problems as 'whether hieroglyphic "group writing" shows indications of vowels...or whether this is not the case' (1993, 579). The problem would seem to lie with the identification of what in fact, constitutes 'special' writings, as opposed to hieroglyphic ones, showing 'superfluous' or 'weak' consonants (Zeidler 1993, 579).

Hoch agrees that Müller, Edgerton and Edel were correct in assuming that group writing was already in use in the Old Kingdom, although he believes their claims were not based on sound evidence (Hoch 1994, 487). After his examination of newly published material, he concluded that Old and Middle Kingdom group writing seems to be already fully developed at its first appearance, and at the present time it is impossible to trace a gradual evolution from earlier scribal practices (Hoch 1994, 496-7). So, the origins of group writing continue to elude scholars, but 'its sudden appearance and especially its compact and systematic nature would suggest a deliberate invention at a specific time rather than a gradual evolution' (Hoch 1994, 497). Late Egyptian group writing would appear to be descended from the simpler earlier system, and rather than declining in the XXth dynasty, as suggested by Albright, Hoch sees it as being more 'fluid and complex, resulting from evolution over a long period' (unlike its predecessor which was devised at a specific time) (Hoch 1994, 501).

The development of this system has been much debated⁴, and despite the increase of cuneiform transcriptions of syllabically written words, the number of New

⁴

For a history of syllabic orthography see Albright 1934, 1ff.

Kingdom texts, and the cross-checking of names with those written in cuneiform and Hebrew, the debate still continues. This would seem to be because there is no real way of checking the suggestions for pronunciation of words, because 'we do not know how most of the words were pronounced by the Egyptians during the NK' (Zeidler 1993, 579). Hoch, however, believes that there is a return to the consensus that group writing does attempt to express the vocalic as well as the consonantal sounds of foreign and obscure words and names (1994, 5). There would also appear to be a consensus on the group writings of both the letter 'l', and the name 'el', as seen in section VI.II.II below.

VI.II.I $N + R = L$

The Egyptian hieroglyphic tradition did not include the semitic letter 'l'. However, the writing of the letter *l* is quite well attested in Egyptian transcription, and is rendered in three different ways. The most common form is by the Egyptian *r*, , followed by the letter *n* or combination of *n* + *r*, ⁵. In the later NK period the lion sign + *n*, was also used but much less frequently (Burchardt 1909, S.81). Evidence of the *n* + *r* combination dates back to the Old Kingdom (Osing 1980, 945). Edel, in his *Altägyptische Grammatik*, lists an example from the Tomb of Ti, dating to the Vth Dynasty⁶. Edel also has an example from the Middle Kingdom, hfnr (hfl), tadpole (1955, 58) (see also Ranke 1935, 239, no.13).

A survey of the literature produces the following examples of the use of *n* + *r* for *l*, most of which date to the New Kingdom. They include:

⁵ See: Burchardt 1909, S.81; Albright 1934, 31 and 47; Simons 1937, 21; Gardiner 1957, 490, N35; Ranke 1952, 160ff; Ward 1963, 419. fn.1; Helck 1971, 552; Rainey 1978, table p.9; Schenkel 1986, 115; Zeidler 1993, 586, table 5 and 589, table 11; Hoch 1994, 432, table 1 and 435, table 3.

⁶ See Edel 1955, 57, 3. 'melken' .

'An-ra-t(i) and Wa-an-ra-t(i): Ullaza (Amarna) XVIII-XIXth Dynasty (Albright 1934, 47, X, A1)
Inrn (Iln) (Ward 1989, 298:15)
Pehal, Pahil (Pella), (Ahituv 1984, 153. From a list of Amenhotep III at Soleb)
Halsu (Gardiner 1911, 22:6 and Ahituv 1984, 112, from Ramesses II)
'Asqaline (Askalon), (Gardiner 1947, 190, no.262:G and Ahituv 1984, 70, from the reign of Ramesses XI)
p3-'wnbl, (Edel 1980, 74:46)
hnr (hal): be hoarse, wheeze (Ward 1963, 429:15)
hnr (halla): chisel (Ward 1963, 434:20 and Hoch 1994, 243:337)(Dyn. XX)
bnr (bal): outside (Sethe 1907, IV, 655:5 and 661:12 (Tuthmosis III), and Hoch 1994, 96:119)
dnrg (dlg): pygmy ⁸ (Sethe 1906, IV, 31,15 and Ranke 1935, 400:14)
alhamman: pomegranate (Gardiner 1937, 54, 17:5 and Hoch 1994, 24:12)
'idalga, 'id(a)laga: sweet melon, water melon (Gardiner 1937, 22, 2:3 and Hoch 1994, 47:43)(Dyn. XIX)
bahala: shame (Hoch 1994, 109:137)(Dyn. XIX)
pula: beans (Gardiner 1941, pl.28A and Hoch 1994, 118:150)(Dyn. XX)
laha: to revile, verbally abuse (Černý and Gardiner 1957, pl.lxx:2 and Hoch 1994, 186:251)(Dyn. XX)
hamala : to have compassion, show mercy (Marciniak 1974,

8

A late writing of the word pygmy - dng (Faulkner 1986, 314).

73, no.13:10 and Hoch 1994, 226:311)(Dyn. XX)

halla, halila: to long for, to squint (Gardiner 1937, 5,9 and Hoch 1994, 230:320)(Dyn. XIX)

halsa: fortress (Gardiner 1911, 68, 22:6 and Hoch 1994, 247:341)(Dyn. XIX)

tilla: mounds, heaps (Gardiner 1937, 90, vs.2,6 and Hoch 1994, 356:527)(Dyn. XIX)

zalala, zalazala: torments, to torment (Černý and Gardiner 1957, pl.3, 3rt, 11 and Hoch 1994, 388/9:585)(Dyn. XX?)

zalzala: switch, stick, branch (Gardiner 1937, 54, 17:4 and Hoch 1994, 389-90:586)(Dyn. XIX)

salaqta: unknown (Hoch 1994, 392:588)(Dyn. XX)

It should also be noted that the ayin sign in group writing can also represent the aleph (Hoch 1994, table 1, p.431). Therefore the *°*, *n*, *r* on the anra scarabs could spell out *'l* = *'el*. Although much of the evidence comes from the New Kingdom, as mentioned above, this form of group writing is known from the Old Kingdom, and there is no reason why it should not apply to the Second Intermediate Period. Similarly, El is the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, whose tablets of the myths and legends date to the Late Bronze Age (see below, VI.III). But once again, there is no reason why these myths may not apply to an earlier period, as it is thought that they are based on stories which have a much earlier history⁹.

VI.II.II The use of *'ilu* in Egyptian

The concept of *'el* as part of a name is known from the Middle Kingdom, where it is found in both sets of Execration texts as part of the compound names of the

⁹

As Redford argues, over 90% of textual evidence concerning Canaanite religion comes from the LBA, and the accuracy of identification of deities and the propriety of use of this later evidence for the MBA can be questioned. However, this evidence is accepted for it is 'usually assumed that there is a continuum in the tradition between the 17th century and the 14th century' (1993, 117).

toponyms⁹. In these early texts, 'el is written both and ¹⁰, and is seen to have the more general meaning of *ilu*, or god (Schneider 1992, 31ff). Posener noted that the element *i₃w* (*el*) was new in these Middle Kingdom texts¹¹ (1940, 93), but the use of the element *el* became quite common in the New Kingdom¹². Albright noted that the personal names in the Brussels texts were substantially identical in type with the Amorite names known from the cuneiform tablets of the period 2000 - 1600BC, and that the elements *ilu* (or El), *abu* (father), Hadad (storm god) etc., occur again and again (1941, 20)¹³.

VI.III THE GOD EL

El was identified as early as 1908 as occurring in place and personal names in Palestine (Cook 1908, 66), although little was known of the mythology of Canaan until the discovery of the tablets at the site of Ras Shamra (Ugarit) in 1928. Although the Ugaritic texts were found in a level dating archaeologically to the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries, objects with the names of Tuthmosis IV and Amenophis III were found alongside the tablets, plus certain letters of Niqmad, king of Ugarit, (who was named in the colophons of several of the tablets), are addressed to the Hittite king Shuppiluliamash (c.1380-1336BC) (Gibson 1978, 1). Therefore the texts are said to date 1400 - 1350, although as Gibson emphasises;

⁹ For an investigation into the way in which Palestinian geographical names are rendered in Egyptian hieroglyphic writing see Görg, 1974a.

¹⁰ Helck 1971, 542, Ranke 1935, 5 fn.1, and Fischer-Elfert 1986, 180. The 3 is a weak letter and therefore interchangeable.

¹¹ Examples of *el* in the Execration texts include: Sethe 1926, 52, e22: 'I₃w-mkh-tj and 54, e30: 'Ij-m'-i₃w. Posener 1940, 69, E9: jnki-i₃w, 92, E58: J₃p-i₃w and 93, E60 Jt(?)p-i₃w.

¹² For example: Burchardt 1909, S175, nos 254-257: 'Apra-el', 'the fostering of el'; Albright 1934, 40: VIB 7: Bi-ya-ta-ša-'r-ir = Canaanite Bet-'ša'el', "House of El"; Ward 1963, 425 fn.2: Semu'el 'Name of El'; Zivie 1989, 31: 'Aperia ('pri₃) = 'Aper-el.

¹³ A number of scarabs with the reading *Y'qbhr* have been translated as meaning *Jacob-el* (Pieper 1904, 37). Ward argues, however, that as 'el is transcribed into Egyptian as *i₃w* (as noted above), then these scarabs must be read as "My mountain (i.e.god) protects" (Ward 1976, 358-9).

‘ the legends and myths themselves are not necessarily contemporary with the tablets ...(and) not improbably go back in some form or other to a much remoter antiquity’ (Gibson 1978, 1). The tablets fall into four categories: i) pure myths, relating the adventures of the gods El, Ba‘al, Asherah, Anat and other gods of the pantheon; ii) the epics of Aqhat, the son of Danel, a legendary Canaanite king and Keret, king of Hubur (these texts concern the fortunes of human beings but reflect their attitude to the gods and contain such an element of mythology, that it is difficult to distinguish from legend); iii) theophoric names of people living in Ugarit in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries and iv) offering lists, reflecting the latest stages of religious developments at Ugarit as distinct from myths, which reflect the heroic past (Hooke 1991, 80).

In the Ugaritic texts, El is the head of the pantheon and Father of the gods, and is married to Asherah, also known as the lady of the sea, and the mother of the gods. His son Ba‘al¹⁴, is the god of fertility (and as the god of lightning and thunder is also known as Hadad), and there is Anat, the sister of Ba‘al, and Ashtar, son of Asherah, plus other contenders in the myths. The relationship between El and Ba‘al has been well documented over the years (see below), as well as the status and character of El, although both are still heatedly discussed today. As the names of Ba‘al and Hadad are used in later name combinations, it would be quite natural for El to be used in compound names because of his status as head of the Pantheon, even if the nature and extent of his authority is questioned (see below). Why the head of the Ugaritic pantheon should be used by the Hyksos as part of their names is considered later in this chapter.

14

Ba‘al is also called the son of Dagan. L’Heureux explains this anomaly as a result of the Ugaritic pantheon representing a fission of two different theological traditions, ‘which were merged at a certain stage in the history of the Canaanite religion in such a way that the ‘seam’ joining them is still discernible’ (1979, 12). That is, Ba‘al belongs to a separate tradition, along with Dagan, Anat and Sapsu, that was introduced to the Ugaritic pantheon from the area of the Middle Euphrates (1979, 13). De Moor explains the epithet describing Ba‘al as ‘son of El’ as a honorific title, which meant that the son of Dagan could be admitted to the household of El (1980, 174).

VI.III.I *ilu > el*

Although it is now generally agreed that El is the name of a specific god, and refers to the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, at first it was questioned whether *el* referred to just a general god, rather than a specific one. The term *il* had a general appellative meaning of 'god' or 'deity', in the early stages of languages such as East Semitic and Old Akkadian, and is also found in Northwest Semitic, Amorite, Ugaritic, Hebrew and Phoenician (Cross 1977, 242).

Eissfeldt (1951) was one of the first to collect and correlate the passages in the Ugaritic texts in which *il* was found, and classified them as to use and meaning. He found that at Ugarit, *il* was used as the generic appellative for divinity, although it occurred somewhat infrequently in the mythological texts and some of the occurrences are ambiguous. However, in the majority of occurrences, *il* was undoubtedly the personal name of the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, *El*. (Eissfeldt 1951, 29-53). Pope also confirmed that *il* could be used as a proper name or as an appellative, eg. *ilb'l*, "(my) god is Ba'al". However, he believed that in some of the personal names containing *il*, it seemed likely that it should be taken to represent the proper name of the god (1955, 22). Most of the names were composed of *il* plus a verbal form or adjective eg. *ilgn*, "El protects", *ilhbn*, "El loves me", *ilštm*, "El listens" which helped to build a picture of El's nature and activities. Roberts, in his *Earliest Semitic Pantheon*, looked at Semitic deities worshipped in Mesopotamia before Ur III from a grammatical point of view, and came to the same conclusions as Eissfeldt and Pope, that *il* sometimes occurred as the proper name of a specific deity in the old Semitic names (1972, 32). Cross believes that while the term *il* can be used as an appellative, such usage is 'excessively rare' (1977, 242).

Roberts' *Il* is etymologically the same as *El* in other semitic languages, and shares many of the same characteristics. *Il* is linked with childbirth, in the role of the midwife, which appears to be an intrinsic element of *Il*'s nature. This characteristic is also supported by the Ugaritic *El*'s title, '*ab 'adm*', "father of

mankind", and who, in the Keret epic is responsible for the birth of human children (Roberts 1972, 33). *Il* is also portrayed as a 'high, but gracious god, who is interested in man's welfare, and who is particularly active in the giving of children'. This corresponds to what is known of *El* in the rest of the Semitic world (Roberts 1972, 34).

VI.III.II The Status and Character of El

There appears to be little disagreement among scholars that El was indeed the head of the Ugaritic pantheon (Caquot and Suznycer 1980, 11). Although the extent and nature of his power is debated at a later time, 'it is manifest that El was a very ancient and important deity, especially among the western semites' (Pope 1955, 24). The offering lists and legends of Keret and Aqhat show distinctly that El was the paramount authority in social affairs (Gray 1965, 155), and El is translated as originally meaning 'the strong one' or 'the leader' (Albright 1968, 104). Gray describes him as 'the King paramount in the celestial court...who gave his sanction to all decisions among the gods affecting nature and society' (1975, 70), while Pope sees his seniority over all Ugaritic gods everywhere as implicit (Pope 1955, 32).

El has many titles or epithets, and a number reveal El as the Creator, or '*ab 'adm*, father of man (Cross 1977, 245, de Moor 1980, 171ff, L'Heureux 1979, 3, Day 1994, 36). El is said to bless man with children, which no other god can do, not even Ba'al (de Moor 1980, 172). He is known as the Bull, symbolising his strength and creative force, the 'creator of created things'¹⁵ (Gray 1975, 70), and is noted for his wisdom (Cross 1977, 245, L'Heureux 1979, 3, Day 1990, 38). He is also holy and benevolent (Pope 1955, 42-3, Cross 1977, 246). His title 'the father of years', '*ab šnm*, is debated, although it is generally seen as referring to El's status as the father of the divine family (Gray 1965, 155-6). It has also been

¹⁵

Miller does not see the title of 'Bull' as representing fertility. He believes that El is not a fertility god, giving that role to Ba'al instead (1967, 418).

suggested that El is a weak figure, particularly in relation to Ba'al, which is discussed in section VI.III.III below.

VI.III.III El and Ba'al

The relationship between El and Ba'al, as seen in the Ugaritic texts, is a source of constant debate. From myths such as the Prince Sea text, (where the Prince of the Sea comes for Ba'al and El stands by to let him go, and so Ba'al fights back), El is often portrayed as weak and indecisive, or aloof and remote from the centre of activities. However, Miller disputes this characterisation of El. He believes that El could not have achieved his original position, i.e. that of king and ruler, without at least being a warrior of sorts (1967, 412). He sees El's epithet of 'the Bull', not applying to his procreative powers, but rather as a symbol of his strength, might and fighting prowess (1967, 418-9).

The comparative inactivity of El in the Ugaritic texts is seen by some that he has been superseded by Ba'al in importance. Pope sees the god and goddesses coming to him with entreaties and demands, but thinks the actual rule of the world is divided between Ba'al in the heavens and on the earth's surface, and Mot in the netherworld and Yam in the sea. These gods are often in conflict, and El vacillates between them with his support (Pope 1955, 29). Ba'al is seen as causing a revolution within the Canaanite pantheon, which began in the north and gradually moved southwards as he usurped the kingship of El (Oldenburg 1969, 183), and by the time of the composition of the epic myths, El is considered by some as already being otiose (Albright 1968, 104). In this respect, he is often likened to the Greek god Kronos, (who was banished by his sons Zeus, Hades and Poseidon) or the Egyptian god Re, or the Babylonian Ann (Albright, *ibid.*, Pope 1955, 29)¹⁶. Although displaced by Ba'al, some still see him retaining a position within the cult,

¹⁶

Pope actually sees the connection between El/Ba'al and Kronos/Zeus as one of the strongest arguments for the tensions and indirect conflict between El and Ba'al in the Ugaritic myths (1987, 229).

with titles and prestige of former days, although he may no longer be the real head of the pantheon (Pope 1955, 104, Kapelrud 1980, 84). Other scholars, such as Gibson, see no conflict between the roles of El and Ba'al. Rather, each had their own distinctive role, with no essential rivalry (Gibson 1994, 104).

Not all agree with Ba'al's final supremacy over El. Comparative ancient literature is used to support this position. Oldenburg (1969) cites Philo of Byblos and Sanchuniathon as examples. Philo of Byblos who lived c. 100AD, was an historian who translated the work of an ancient Phoenician, Sanchuniathon, into Greek. Sanchuniathon was reported to have lived in Beirut before the Trojan wars and wrote his own *Phoenician History* (Oldenburg 1969, 4). The *Phoenician History* describes El as head of the pantheon, at the summit of this strength, with no dispute as to leadership (Oldenburg, 1969, 183). L'Heureux also uses comparative material to establish the relationship between the two. He compared texts such as Hesiod's theogony, the Kumarbi myths, Sanchuniathon, the Old Testament with epigraphic evidence, and concluded that El was still the ultimate source of authority (l'Heureux 1979, 29ff)¹⁷. Gray believes wholly in El's supremacy, and agrees with Schmidt that El and Ba'al could have co-existed quite happily (Gray 1965, 155; Schmidt 1961, 52-54). He sees the inactivity in the myths as designed to conserve his dignity, and that the ultimate power of the god is beyond disturbance, i.e the kingship of El is static while that of Ba'al was dynamic (Gray 1965, 155). There is the god who is in continual conflict to sustain order against chaos (Ba'al), who is a king, but also the executive of El; and then in social conflicts, (as shown in the ritual texts of Ugarit, which relates to a public fast and rite of atonement for the king and the community), El, and not Ba'al is the active god.

VI.III.IV El and Yahweh

El is also identified as the supreme god in the Old Testament, Yahweh. Yahweh

¹⁷

Pope sees this conclusion as more 'a confession of faith than a critical diagnosis' (1987, 229).

also known as El, revealed himself to Abraham and led him into Canaan where Abraham and his family worshipped El, along with fellow Canaanites (Oldenburg 1969, 1). But is the Semitic El the same as the Old Testament El? A subject that can be discussed at great length, is by necessity, briefly covered here. Generally, it is presumed so, but there are problems with this association. For example, the tradition of Yahweh as the Creator God is a prominent feature of the Old Testament story. While El is also known as the Creator, there is perhaps no explicit evidence that the Semitic El was a creator god, as all the Ugaritic allusions to El's creativity are in terms of generation and paternity (Pope 1955, 49). There is also no evidence that the semitic El was worshipped exclusively, as was Yahweh. Eissfeldt believes that certain segments of the Ugaritic population worshipped El not only as the highest god but as absolute too. This is attributed to the opening lines of text 107, and the elevation formula of text 2 (Pope 1955, 85-88), and until further evidence emerges, the monotheism of El will remain debated.

Some scholars see a similarity in background between Yahweh and El (L'Heureux 1979, 49ff, Day 1992, 35ff), while others believe there are clear distinctions between the two (Gray 1965). It has been suggested that Yahweh, the god of a militant tribal group, was first subordinated to El, the Canaanite high god, before he took over his attributes and functions as king and creator (Gray 1965 161, fn.1). Another suggestion is that Yahweh originated as an El figure, splitting from the old god, when the cult of Israel separated and diverged from its ploythesitic context (Cross 1977, 260). Eissfeldt in a later article suggested that El and Yahweh belonged to separate cults. Yahweh was not hostile to El (as he was Ba'al), but on the contrary endeavoured to assimilate El, thus it would be perceived that the El cult was an older form of belief and that El's attributes and functions would be transferred to Yahweh gradually (Eissfeldt 1956, 35). Day compares a number of attributes accorded to El and Yahweh (such as the title of creator god, their dwelling place, portrayal of wisdom, their heavenly court) and finds them to be very similar, and thus pertaining to the same god (Day 1994). Day found that

there was a direct line of connection between the seventy sons of El at Ugarit and the seventy guardian angels of the nations in later Judaism via the notion of seventy sons of god apportioned to the nations in Deut. 32:8 (Day 1994, 38-39).

VI.III.V Representations of El

A number of representations of El are said to be found at Ugarit. These include stele, scenes on religious tablets and vases, and figurines (see fig. 6.1), although it must be remembered that none of these have been identified through inscriptions, but rather from the excavator's interpretations. These particular figures fall into Seeden's 'seated male gods in the attitude of blessing', and although Seeden does not name them, she believed that they were issued to serve as votive offerings in the sanctuaries of the major urban gods and were produced in voluminous numbers (Seeden 1982, 120). The figure identified as El is usually seated, and clothed in a long robe, wearing sandals (see fig. 6.1a). His right hand is raised with palm showing, (in what Schaffer refers to as the familiar gesture of benediction (1966a, 8)), and his headgear has been described by Negbi as an *atef* crown with Syrian horns (1976, 47-8). Similar figurines have been found at Byblos and Khamid el-Loz (see fig. 6.2), while at Ugarit they are found in both stone and metal (Yon 1991, fig. 16a & 17a,b). Exactly the same characteristics are portrayed in a stele found in a private house, south west of the Temple of Ba'al (see fig. 6.1b). Again El is seated, this time the left hand is raised, and he wears a crown with horns¹⁸. Above the figures is a winged sun disk. The scene from a religious tablet found in the library of a magician who lived in the south of the city, is the same as on a vase, noted to be of 'Syrian' fabric. They both portray a banquet given by the supreme god for the other gods of the pantheon, his sons (Schaeffer 1966a, 2). Again he is seated, with right hand raised (see fig. 6.1c).

A figurine from a cache in a foundation deposit of a house (Schaeffer 1966a, 7; Yon 1991, fig. 17a), and both the stele and the metallic figurine are dated to the

¹⁸

Schaeffer 1937, pl. xvii; Yon 1991, 336 fig. 16a and Niehr 1992.

a

b

c

Fig.6.1
Representations of El in bronze(a), stone(b) and pottery(c)

Fig.6.2
Seated male gods from Byblos (a,b) and Kamid el-Loz (c)

Late Bronze Age¹⁹. The combination of *atef* crown and Syrian horns is also typical of the combination of Egyptian and Canaanite features in art at this time, also noted on cylinder seals, and which dates back to the Middle Bronze Age (Teissier 1989). The combination of features here is particularly important, for although it could just be a whim of the local craftsman to represent El with fashionable Egyptian features, it could also suggest a synchronisation with Egypt, to indicate that he was also known there in earlier times, or perhaps associating El with the Egyptian deity Ptah (see below). As El is also known as the Bull, figurines of this nature are also identified with him and have been found with statues of him (Schaeffer 1966a, 1966b).

VI.III.VI El in Canaan

In both 1962 and again in 1973 Cross asserted that '...in south Canaan and in the Sinai, the cult of El was widespread' (1962, 239, 1973, 20). Cross reached this conclusion from a deduction by Albright, who recognised that the miners of Sinai, in their Proto-Canaanite texts, were using the names of the Canaanite deities identified with Egyptian gods. Albright suggested these gods were Ptah, his consort Sekhmet and Hathor, whose temple is found at Serabit el-Khadim (Albright 1966, Cross 1973, 18).

The first Proto-Sinaitic inscription was discovered and copied by Palmer in the Wadi-Magharah during 1868-1869 (Weill 1904, 154, no.44). Petrie discovered many inscriptions with an unidentified script while he explored at Serabit el-Khadim in 1905 (Petrie 1906b). The script seemed to have strong Egyptian affinities (Albright 1966, 2). It was ten years later before the first break-through in the translation of the texts occurred. Gardiner identified a commonly occurring group of signs as *l-b'lt* "(belonging) to Ba'lat" (1916, 15). Progress continued

¹⁹

There appears to be no date given to the tablet (Schaeffer 1966), and Negbi notes that although the figurine comes from a Late Bronze stratum, an exact date is not ascertainable (1976, 49). See Niehr (1992, 293 and fn.4) for dating the stele to the 13th century.

slowly over the following years²⁰, but joined with further discoveries of alphabetic inscriptions from Syria and Palestine (see Albright 1966, 10ff), decipherment was eventually completed (Rainey 1978, table on p.9). The date of the texts are debated. Some scholars prefer a Middle Kingdom date (Gardiner 1962, 45-48; Butin 1932, 133-135) while others prefer a New Kingdom date (Petrie 1906b, 131; Cross 1967, 12). However, as Albright suggests a date of 1550-1450, or even earlier, the texts could have been written by Semites in the Sinai at the end of the Hyksos period (Albright 1966, 6,15).

El is featured among the inscriptions. In 1958 Cross re-read an inscription that had once been misread and so remained undeciphered. He read it as 'El, the ancient one' or 'El, Lord of eternity'. Further inscriptions also refer to El (nos. 363 and Gerster no.1 at Wadi Nasb, Albright 1966, 16-30), as well as new inscriptions from more recent researches at Serabit (Beit Arieih 1978, 178; Beit-Arieih 1987, 59-61). Interestingly, Pieper as early as 1930 connected the anra scarabs (although he misread the signs) with the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions, because he read the inscription as El (1930, 190). The connection was based on the signs in both cases not making sense in Egyptian. He thought that the Semites used Egyptian hieroglyphs to develop their own script, which then developed into the alphabet (1930, 187, 195).

Cross compared his 1958 reading of an inscription ('El, Lord of eternity) with epithets of the Egyptian god Ptah (*nb dt* or *nb nhh* meaning 'the Lord, or one, of eternity'), and with a similar epithet found on a prism at Lachish (Tufnell 1958, 128, pl.38:295), to form the conclusion that Ptah was identified as El, an affiliation with which Albright agreed (Albright 1963, 13; 1966, 22; Cross 1973, 20). Cross then used Albright's recognition of the epithet 'Lord of Gath' (Albright

20

See Gardiner 1916, Gardiner and Peet 1917, Cowley 1929, Sprengling 1931, Starr and Butin 1936; Albright 1935, 1948, 1950, 1966, and Cross jr. 1954 for discussions on this script. Later publications include, Rainey 1975, 1978, 1981 and Shea 1988. See also Biggs and Dijkstra, forthcoming.

1966, 4, 20)²¹ to identify both inscriptions as liturgical names from an 'El cult at Gath in south-western Palestine²², and as evidence of a widespread cult of 'El in southern Canaan and the Sinai (Cross 1962, 239 and 1973, 19-20).

While evidence of an El cult in Palestine would be welcome in the Middle Bronze Age to strengthen the arguments of this thesis, the evidence that initiated this theory (the Lachish prism) and that used to support it (the inscriptions on the Megiddo ivories, the association of El and Ptah), is rather flimsy. The inscription on the prism found at Lachish has since been re-read. Instead of reading 'El, lord of the winepress' as suggested by Albright, it is now suggested that it reads 'Ptah, the gracious' (Hestrin et alii 1982, 103-4). The inscriptions on the Megiddo ivories are associated with an epithet of Ptah (Wilson 1939), but there is no direct association between El and Ptah. Further references to Ptah at Askalon are also used as evidence of the El cult, and Cross even cites Helck in support of this theory (Cross 1973, 20 fn.43). Unfortunately Helck refutes this evidence as he states that he is not certain there is a temple to Ptah at Askalon (1971, 444).

In a previous publication, Albright had identified Ptah, not with El, but with the Canaanite god Koshar, god of craftsmanship (1948, 17). Holmberg in his extensive study of the god Ptah, makes no mention of any such affiliation, although Ptah is associated with a number of other gods (1946, 115-303). Holmberg does note his presence at Serabit, but attributes a particular stele that represents the god with Sinaitic writing underneath, as an indication that the cult of Ptah had also

²¹ Although Albright in his discussion of inscription no. 353 writes 'for D-GT as an appellation of Ptah = El...discussed above' (1966, 22), it should be noted that in his previous discussion on p.4, he does not actually make this direct association of the two gods. Instead he writes, 'the divinity in question is probably the Semitic equivalent of Eg. Shesmu, a Memphite deity of Ptah's entourage who was regarded as special patron of the wine-press' (1966, 4).

²² The exact location of Gath is disputed, but current opinion favours Tel es-Safi, situated between Gezer and Lachish (Avi-Yonah and Stern 1978, 1024-5). The site was excavated in 1899 by Bliss and Macalister, but the excavation was limited due to modern religious buildings with cemetery, plus the local village. Bliss and Macalister originally dated the earliest levels to the 17th century, but Albright re dated the beginnings of the settlement to the Early Bronze Age from a re-examination of the pottery from the site. However, there appears to be no evidence of an 'El cult', as mentioned by Cross.

spread among the population inhabiting the Sinai peninsula, and was regarded as the protector of artisans and as supervising the supply of material for metal work (1946, 221). Therefore, it would appear that there is no real evidence for an association of Ptah and El, or for a widespread cult of El in southern Canaan, although the fact that he exists in the Proto-Sinaitic texts has important consequences as will be seen below.

Following the Middle Bronze Age, there are a number of references to the cult of El in Palestine. These include a reference in Judges 9:46 to a temple to El-berith, 'the covenant El' or 'El of the covenant' at Shechem. However, the temple at Shechem is also referred to in Judges 8:33 as Ba'al-berith, although this is explained as meaning 'Lord of the covenant', a reading derived from a later period when the deity worshipped was a pagan deity (Wright 1965, 136 and Cross 1973, 44). Clements finds Mulder's suggestion that there were two temples in Shechem, one for El-Berith and one for Ba'al-Berith as improbable (1968, 26). He feels that it is more likely that the title El-Berith was an alternative for Ba'al-Berith, with El used purely in an appellative sense (Clements, *ibid.*). However, Wright sees the name given to the altar at Shechem in Genesis 33:20, 'El, god of Israel', as confirmation that the deity of the sanctuary was of the patriarchal El tradition, and so identifies El and Yahweh (Wright 1965, 136).

A fragment of an inscription found at Jerusalem has a divine epithet with the name of the deity missing. As the epithet is similar to those of El ('Creator of the Earth'), Avigad assumes the inscription is to El (1972, 195-6). Miller uses this evidence to agree with Cross that the Creator god of Jerusalem is El, and also identifies El with Yahweh (Miller 1980, 44-45, Cross 1973, 52). Another inscription of El is found at Khirbet el Kom (Dever 1969-70), and an open air sanctuary with a bull figurine has been found five miles east of Dothan (Dever 1990b, 129ff). Dever makes the connection between the Bull figurine and the god

El, due to the epithet referring to El as the Bull²³ (Dever 1990b, 130). It would appear that there are few temples dedicated to El, most temples being identified with Ba'al and later with Yahweh. It should be remembered that there is no inscriptional evidence to associate such temples with these gods, and it is possible that the later Yahweh temples should in fact be associated with El, due to the association between the two (see section VI.III.V).

VI.IV CONCLUSIONS

The use by Egyptians of a 'foreign god' on their scarabs might, at first, seem paradoxical. However, when viewed against the background knowledge of the XVth dynasty and the socio-political situation of the SIP, it becomes clear that this was an astute manoeuvre on their part. By the adoption of a religious figure, the head of a pantheon known to the neighbouring local population, the XVth dynasty provided a scarab design that could be identified and accepted outside their own country. The reason why they should do this is harder to ascertain.

It has been suggested in this thesis that the rulers of the XVth dynasty were Egyptian and did not have a separate (Hyksos or foreign) culture²⁴. The only factor that differentiates the XVth dynasty from the XVIIth dynasty is their use of non Egyptian names. Studies of the XVth dynasty have commented that they integrated well into Egyptian society, taking on all aspects of Egyptian culture (Hayes 1959, 3-4). This is because by the time the local Delta family came to power in Egypt, they probably considered themselves Egyptian (see Chapter II). Their use of the Semitic names may have been due to a number of factors. It could have been the only aspect of their former culture that they carried with them, or perhaps once they were in power they utilized these names in order to distinguish

²³ Edleman does not agree with Dever. In a review of his book, Edleman says there is no evidence in which to identify the bull figurine with El, and prefers to associate it with a male storm deity (1994, 148-150).

²⁴ As discussed in Chapter II, features used to demonstrate a Hyksos culture such as Tell el-Yehudiyeh ware, fortification systems or horse burials, have since been proven otherwise.

themselves from the Theban dynasty. Equally the use of such names could indicate the strong influences emanating from their Asiatic neighbours. The exact nature of the relationship between Egypt and the Levant, particularly Palestine, during the SIP has been endlessly debated. Some scholars see no special relationship between the two areas (Ward and Dever 1994, 4), while others see a definite relationship between the Delta and southern Palestine (Bietak 1991a, 61), possibly linked by a network of social relationships and exchange networks (Philip 1995, 78). This was indeed a time of trade networks, (witnessed by the circulation of Cypriot material in the Levant and Egypt (Maguire 1995)), cosmopolitan courts, (witnessed by the Aegean wall paintings in Syria, Palestine and the Delta (Morgan 1995, 44)), and of heightened cultural interchange, (as witnessed by the widespread use of Egyptian symbols in MB Levant (Teissier 1996)).

Whether the use of El is due to the origins of the XVth dynasty or the influences felt at the time of the SIP is debatable. It has been noted that certain names of the XVth dynasty, such as Salitis or Khyan are Ugaritic in origin (Bietak 1980, 95), which would strengthen the connection between the two areas. However, as the anra scarab was most popular in Palestine (seventy percent of all anras are found there), it would appear that this scarab was marketed specifically by the XVth dynasty for the Palestinian market. Why this should be so is open to speculation, but it would suggest a deliberate foreign policy on behalf of the XVth dynasty. This would again indicate that there was some sort of relationship between the Delta and Palestine at this time. A deliberate foreign policy would also appear to apply to the *htp-el* scarabs. This scarab is only found in Palestine (except for one example from Tell el-Dab'a and Nubt), accounts for twelve percent of the arna scarabs, and the name appears within a cartouche. The use of theophoric names for private names is known from earliest times, with the choice of deity often changing depending on who was in power at the time²⁵ (Lüddeckens 1985, 105).

25

For example, in the Old Kingdom, Ptah had a sanctuary at Memphis, the capital of Egypt at that time and was the most popular deity in the use of private names. Likewise, in the New Kingdom, Amun was the most popular, particularly around Thebes (Lüddeckens 1985, 105-108).

The use of the divine name as a private name was also very popular in the Near East (Lüddeckens 1985, 107).

The *hꜥp* sign features predominantly in the anra series, which Weill also recognised in his early survey of the anra scarabs (Weill 1918, 191). Most importantly, a statistically significant fifty seven percent of the *hꜥp*-*el* scarabs have the hieroglyphs placed within a cartouche, which might indicate a person of importance²⁶ (see figs. 4.31-2). Geographically, these scarabs are distributed among the major Palestinian sites of this period, both on the coast road and inland: Beth-Pelet, Tell el-Ajjul, Lachish, Rishon, Gezer, Jericho, Tel Aviv, Shechem, Kabri and Megiddo. There is only one example from Tell el-Dab'a and Nubt (see Map 4.29). The lack of Egyptian sites and predominance of Palestinian sites is significant. Chronologically, the dates of the *hꜥp* scarabs show a trend towards late MK/ early SIP rather than late SIP. The earliest examples are from Rishon, dating MBIIA/B, with others from Group II tombs at Jericho. The early date is also confirmed by their features. Although fifty two percent have plain backs, fifty six percent have triangular legs with feathering - an early characteristic of SIP scarabs. In Egypt the earliest anras are found at Memphis, which according to Manetho, was the early capital of the XVth dynasty before moving to the Delta (Waddell 1940, 81).

The main gods of the XVth dynasty are said to be Seth and Ba'al²⁷ (van Seters

26

Although Ward questions whether the local Canaanite population would have understood the significance of features such as the cartouche, there is no evidence to the contrary (Ward 1994, 191, Keel 1995, 35). As seen on a number of artistic mediums (Liebowitz 1978, Tessier 1989), the local populations had already incorporated a number of Egyptian design elements into their own designs, creating what is known as 'Egyptianizing' designs. The XVth dynasty were cleverly incorporating foreign names into Egyptian and placing them within Egyptian design elements, in a manner which would be readily understood and appreciated by their neighbours.

27

Seth is said to be the principal god of the XVth dynasty due largely to inscriptions of the Ramesside period, which are primarily associated with Avaris (Tell el-Dab'a) such as the 400 year Stela (van Seters 1966, 97-103). Some scholars believe that as the Hyksos were foreigners, they syncretised Seth with an Asiatic god, namely Ba'al. This assumption is based on their similar iconography (van Seters 1966, 174ff, Redford 1992, 117-118).

1966, 171ff, Redford 1992, 116-118), although van Seters believes the Hyksos brought a pantheon of gods and mythology to Egypt 'similar to that known from the Ugaritic texts' (van Seters 1966, 180). El is related to Re, and they are identified as one in the Ramesside period. This follows a description of Re as 'the bull residing in Heliopolis'²⁸, in his position as head of a council of gods. In a different text, 'the Deliverance of Mankind from Destruction'²⁹, he is seen as an old god losing control as ruler of gods and men - features which parallel El's character in the Ugaritic texts (van Seters 1966, 178)(see section VI.III). For those scholars who see the Hyksos as foreign interlopers, their acceptance of Re (as seen by the titles of Apophis as 'son of Re', and the use of prenomina and epithets using Re (van Seters 1966, 172)) appeared out of character. However, if the Hyksos were Egyptian, this would explain their acceptance of Re. If Re is also identified as El, this would be a clever double association³⁰. The use of El as part of a private name is not unusual when his position as head of the pantheon of gods is considered. It could be argued that if the XVth dynasty utilized El, why not other gods, such as Ba'al or Anat³¹. But there are very few references to these or other gods (Martin 1971, Ranke 1935, 1952), and it is most likely that El

²⁸ From 'the conquest of Horus and Seth', Pritchard 1955, 14-16.

²⁹ Pritchard 1955, 10-11.

³⁰ If Re is associated with El, then this would provide a meaning for the scarabs in Egypt.

³¹ It has been suggested that Ba'al, in his guise as weather god, is represented on a cylinder seal found in a XIIIth dynasty palace at Tell el-Dab'a (Porada 1984, 487). This could confirm that Ugaritic gods were being utilized at Dab'a as early as the XIIIth dynasty, and therefore the use of El, possibly beginning at approximately the same time, is not so unusual. However, it might also be feasible that the god depicted on the cylinder seal is El and not Ba'al. Porada notes that although there are basic similarities between the weather god depicted at Dab'a and Syrian counterparts, there are also considerable differences between the two, based mainly on the figure's stance, which Porada attributes to lack of Syrian examples to copy (Porada 1984, 486). However, it is known that El's habitat is the mountains: '*then the two set their faces, toward the mountain of El...*' (Cross 1977, 249-251). It is also possible that the goat that Porada identifies next to the figure on the mountains (1984, 485), is in fact a bull, which has been shown to be a common epithet of El (see section VI.III.III). Would it therefore not be possible for the cylinder seal to be depicting El in his mountainous home, the exact location of which has been endlessly debated among scholars (Cross 1977, 249-250).

was chosen because of the unique position he held within the pantheon of gods. This would also appear to be supported by his inclusion in the Proto-Sinaitic texts.

While the propriety of use of evidence from the Late Bronze Age or New Kingdom to identify gods in the Middle Bronze Age or Second Intermediate Period can be open to question, there is an assumption of continuum in tradition between the seventeenth century and the fourteenth century (Redford 1993, 117). In relation to the use of *El* in this earlier period, this would appear to be confirmed by the use of his name in the Proto-Sinaitic texts³². The geographic distribution of the anra scarab indicates that the issue of the scarab was primarily for the Palestinian market. The XVth dynasty did not introduce a scarab with the name of a 'foreign god' for circulation in Egypt, as there would be no political, economic or sociological reason to do so. Instead, this scarab was intended primarily for export (although it could have been manufactured in Palestine, see Chapter I.V), although its actual use can only be the subject of speculation. Found at many of the major sites of the Middle Bronze IIB-C, it is possible that the scarab was used to promote good relations between the two countries, or carried the name of a person of importance, who liaised between the two countries, to secure economic or political ties.

The element *el* was incorporated into names by the time of the New Kingdom, having first been utilized in the Middle Kingdom texts (see section VI.II.II-III). The transliteration of *ilu (el)* changed with the XVth dynasty who used the method of syllabic orthography to spell out the name of *El*, the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, (rather than using the alternative spelling of *i₃w* which was used in the sense of a general god). The late MK and SIP was an exciting time of cultural interaction between the countries of the Near East. While there is much evidence of the use of Egyptian cultural elements outside that country, there is less evidence of Levantine cultures in Egypt. The anra scarab could be the evidence that this cultural interchange was reciprocal. As the Princes of Byblos used Egyptian titles

32

Although their date is still to be confirmed, see section VI.VII.

and the use of Egyptian symbols permeated Syrian glyptic, so the use of El by the Egyptians would not seem out of place, if considered at a time of such heightened socio-political ties.

CONCLUSIONS

*"...a diffusion of demioergoi... throughout the
Mediterranean world... offering the culture of
one civilization to the eyes of another..."*

Sasson 1966, 181

The period in which the anra scarab occurs coincides with a so-called 'turbulent' period in Egyptian history and the 'zenith of urban civilization' in Palestine (Dever 1987, 150; Seger 1975, 45). Despite the lack of a unified government in Egypt, this was a time of prosperity, industry and international relations which included the movement of artisans from one country to another. As a consequence, this led to the interchange of the novelties and complexities of different cultures. The anra scarab was part of an Egyptian industry which existed in regions outside Egypt, thereby demonstrating international trade links and the merging of differing cultures (Philip 1995, Morgan 1995). However, it was one of a number of design scarabs that were popular during the Second Intermediate Period or Middle Bronze IIB-C (Tufnell 1984). It was chosen for this thesis because it appeared that the production of over four hundred scarabs, issued throughout the Levant, Egypt and Nubia, many with royal imagery, could be significant. It was also envisaged that an in depth investigation of one type of scarab, utilizing both archaeological and historical sources, might reveal more information regarding the role and function of scarabs seals in general. An investigation into the anra scarab might also provide socio-political insights about Egypt and her neighbours in the SIP/MBIIB-C.

Some scholars still consider that the scarab seal was used only for its amuletic qualities, and that Egyptian seals found in Palestine were a 'Canaanite adaptation of an Egyptian funerary custom, transmitted through the Asiatics living in the Delta' (Ben-Tor 1994, 11). While the scarab may have contained dual amuletic significance, I believe it is preferable to view the scarab seal as used by the living. This is indicated both by the number of sealings that are found during excavations

(anra sealings were found at Tell el-Dab'a, Shiloh, Nubt and Memphis) and the number of scarabs that are fixed as rings, or were worn as part of a necklace or bracelet (see Chapter I).

Chronologically, it proved impossible to determine when or where the first anra scarabs occurred in the archaeological record (see Chapter III), and hence the origins of the type. The earliest anra scarabs are found in XIIth dynasty contexts in Egypt at the site of Memphis, and at the site of Rishon in Palestine, in tombs dated to the MBIIA and IIA/B. Unfortunately, the chronological systems that are currently in use are not sensitive enough to establish priority. Therefore, it is impossible to categorically state where the scarabs appeared first, at Rishon or Memphis. The anra sequence is found on other MK material, namely a sealing from Nubt and on scarabs of Sesostri I and Meribre (see Chapter IV). Conversely, the anra scarab has been found in Late Bronze Age or NK deposits (Gezer, Ajjul, Gurob), and there is evidence of post SIP/MBIIB-C manufacture as seen by the humeral callosity markings on the back of the scarab (seen to indicate XVIIIth dynasty manufacture, Ward 1994, 197).

In order to investigate the status of the anra scarab, an analysis of all of its contexts was undertaken. This is the first study of its type, and was severely hampered by the poor contextual data. However, it did show that the anra scarabs were commonly associated with objects considered élite or luxurious, such as weapons, jewelry, or objects of rare stone or materials (Shennan 1975). A further in depth contextual analysis was undertaken at nine sites in Palestine, Egypt and Nubia which compared anra scarab, scarab and non scarab tombs. The results of this survey supported the theory that scarabs in general could be considered as luxury items, and there was a significant difference between the type of objects associated with scarab tombs and non scarab tombs. Furthermore, on comparison of anra scarab and other scarab tombs, the analysis indicated that the anra scarab deposits showed higher percentages of association with luxury or élite items than the corresponding scarab tombs. This was an unexpected result, but one that

indicated that the anra scarab was more than just a design scarab. This result also had significant bearing on the possible function or use of the anra scarab, which should be related to the interpretation of the hieroglyphs found on the base of the scarab.

The importance of the anra scarab was confirmed by the contextual analysis, and is also shown by a number of features associated with the scarabs. The anra sequence must have been of some importance to be included on the royal name scarabs of Sesostri I and Meyibre, and on a cylinder seal of Khyan. The sealing from Memphis could also be argued to be of royal significance with the *nsw-b'ity* sign (the sign for the King of Upper and Lower Egypt) at the top of the cartouche. There were also a number of scarabs with this sign above the anra sequence, (often placed within a cartouche (PEL 3; JER 26; UKM 4; NEW 5; NEW 6)). The inscription, 'the Good God, Lord of the two lands', was found above a shrine design of IM.18, and the symbol *R^c* was also included above the anra sequence (IM.13; PET 13, NEW 5,7). Further symbolic imagery used on anra scarabs include the so-called 'Hyksos royal border', uraei, shrines and extensive use of the red crown of Lower Egypt. The anra sequence was also reused by Rameses II, suggesting that it held some significance for that monarch (see Hall 1913, xvi). The anra sequence was also included on private name scarabs and cylinder seals (see Chapter IV).

Although there are a number of possible interpretations of the hieroglyphs found on the anra scarab, it was proposed in this thesis that they were originally intended as a name, *El* (see Chapter VI). The hieroglyphic design was broken down to its basic configuration of three signs, *ᵉ*, *n* and *r*, which, it was argued, spelled in Egyptian group writing the name of El, the head of the Ugaritic pantheon. One of the most frequent signs associated with the sequence is the *ḥtp* sign (Weill 1918, 191). As it was a common practice to use theophoric elements in private names, it is feasible to propose a name, *Hetep-El*, which was found mostly within a

cartouche on the anra scarabs, and only found in Palestine¹. Chronologically, the *hṭp-el* combination appears among the earliest anra scarabs from Rishon, in group II tombs at Jericho, and the possible XIIth dynasty sealing at Nubt.

Seventy percent of the anra scarabs collected for this thesis originate in Palestine². Twenty percent are from Egypt, eight percent from Nubia and two percent from Syria. While these statistics may indicate a bias in archaeological excavation, it is possible that the anra design was manufactured for, or by, the Palestinian market. If the name on the scarab is connected to El, the head deity of what has been called 'the North West Semitic pantheon' (Beit-Arieh 1987, 61), then this could account for its popularity in that country. Therefore, it is possible that the anra scarab was valued for its religious connotations. However, as twelve percent of the anra scarabs exhibit the name *hṭp-el*, displayed within a cartouche, it is also possible that the scarab had political overtones. The *hṭp-el* scarabs are only found in Palestine in the SIP, so it could be speculated that this type was deliberately marketed for the Canaanites, and was of some importance, due to the name being placed within a cartouche. While it has been questioned whether the Canaanites completely understood Egyptian iconography (Ward 1994, 191), there is no evidence to the contrary. The two countries had been in contact either directly or indirectly (through Syria, see XIIth dynasty contacts in Chapter II) for centuries. As has been demonstrated on cylinder seals and other artistic mediums (Liebowitz 1978, Teissier 1989), the Canaanites had often incorporated features of Egyptian iconography into their own designs, but in such a manner to suggest that they understood what they were using (Keel 1995, 35). Therefore the issuing of a scarab with a name within a cartouche, might suggest it was of some importance during the Second Intermediate Period.

A study of the anra scarab also encompasses the wider historical issues relating to

¹ There were single examples from Tell el-Dab'a and Nubt. The latter example was within a cartouche.

² This does not include anra scarabs found in collections.

the Middle Bronze Age IIB-C, and the nature of the relationship between Egypt and Palestine at that time (see Chapter VI). The question of the relationship, if any, that exists between the XVth dynasty and Palestine has been the subject of much debate. Some scholars feel that there is no special relationship between this Egyptian dynasty and its neighbours (Ward and Dever 1994, 4), while others see a Syro-Canaanite background for the dynasty itself, or some sort of XVth dynasty empire which includes parts of Palestine (Dever 1985, 1987, Weinstein 1981, Mazar 1990, Kempinski 1985, Bietak 1980). While these questions remain unresolved, the number of scarabs generally found in Palestine during the MBIIB-C, would indicate that there was contact between the two countries, and as discussed in Chapter VI, the MBIIB-C was a time of cultural interchange. However, the anra scarabs might indicate that influences from the Levant were stronger in Egypt than previously thought. As has been seen at Byblos in the Middle Kingdom, the locals were so strongly influenced by Egypt that they incorporated the use of Egyptian elements into their names and titles. It could therefore be argued that the anra scarab, by utilizing the main deity of a Levantine pantheon, was indicating both a symbiosis of cultures and influence in Egypt which has previously gone unnoticed.

It would appear therefore, that over the two hundred year period of its existence, the anra scarab was first issued with meaning or significance, possibly based on the use of the name El. During the following years due to popularity and perhaps unauthorized issuing, the *h₁tp* sign was dropped, and extra signs were added, and the three original signs repeated. With these added signs, the original meaning of the scarab was finally lost, but the scarabs were kept and still produced for their pleasing appearance.

This thesis on the anra scarab has also highlighted a number of problems associated with study of scarabs in general, which need to be addressed. Firstly, to examine the archaeological material in order to comment on the wider historical problems of any period, scarab seals need to be published not only in both drawings and

photographs, but also with their full contexts. Secondly, there is the problem of scarab typology. Ward and Tufnell initiated the most comprehensive typology of scarab seals, even though it is slightly cumbersome (Ward 1978, Tufnell 1984, Ward 1987, Ward and Dever 1994). However, this typology is based mostly on tomb deposits, and the ultimate scarab typology should be based on tell stratified deposits, which are less open to a variety of interpretations. Thirdly, the study of the anra scarab has highlighted the problems of terminology adhered to in recent chronological debates. The anra scarabs have shown that the style of scarab carving is the same throughout Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, and cannot be specifically associated with either the XVth or XVIIth dynasties. It would therefore appear that there is no separate scarab tradition for those dynasties, as proposed by some scholars (Bourriau, forthcoming). This is an important consideration, for the scarabs found in both Palestine, Nubia and other countries at this time, are generally described as 'Hyksos', indicating a XVth dynasty production. While most of the scarabs with names found outside of Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period are associated with the XVth dynasty, until it can be proven that the design scarabs are produced only by that dynasty (or differentiate somehow between scarabs of both dynasties), it would be more appropriate for these scarabs to be referred to as 'Second Intermediate Period' rather than 'Hyksos'.

The Second Intermediate Period is one of the most fascinating in Egyptian history, because no firm evidence exists to determine the exact political situation in Egypt at that time. The anra scarab is one of the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle of archaeology that can contribute to the overall picture. A thorough investigation has shown that rather than being a design scarab with meaningless hieroglyphs, the original inscription was a clever transference of an old belief incorporated into a new culture. Because of this, the scarab was an important and popular design, found in graves associated with élite and luxury goods. While the exact date of the introduction of the design has yet to be concluded, it appears to have originated in the MK. The scarab was produced in large numbers for the Palestinian market by

the XVth dynasty, and was popular there because of religious or political associations.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAAL	Annual of Archaeology and Anthropology, Liverpool
AAAS	Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes
A&L	Ägypten und Levante
AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research
ADAIK	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Kairo
ADAJ	Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan
AIBL	Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJBA	Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology
AJSLL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
ASAE	Annales du service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Cario
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BAR	British Archaeological Reports
BARB	Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique Classe des Lettres
BMB	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
BZAW	Biblische Zeitschrift
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History
CdÉ	Chronique d'Égypte
CN	Catalogue Number
DM	Damaszener Mitteilungen
EA	Egyptian Archaeology
EI	Eretz Israel
GM	Göttinger Miszellen
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IAE	International Association of Egyptologists
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
JA	Journal Asiatique
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JARCE	Journal of the American Research Center Egypt
JDAI	Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
JEA	Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
JMA	Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JPOS	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society

JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JSSEA	Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities
MDAIK	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft
NARCE	Newsletter of the American Research Center in Egypt
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
PEF	Palestine Exploration Fund
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PEFQS	Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement
QDAP	Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine
RdÉ	Revue d'Égyptologie
RLWMW	Red Lustrous Wheel Made Ware
RDAC	Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus
SMA	Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology
UF	Ugarit Forschungen
ZÄS	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina - Vereins

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, W.Y.,

- 1977 *Nubia: Corridor to Africa*. London.

AHARONI, Y.,

- 1975 *Investigations at Lachish. The Sanctuary and Residency (Lachish V)*. Tel Aviv.

AHITUV, S.,

- 1984 *Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents*. Jerusalem.

ALBRIGHT, W.F.,

- 1922a The Excavations at Ascalon. *BASOR* 6, 11-18.
 --- 1922b Palestine in the Earliest Historical Period. *JPOS* 2, 110-138.
 --- 1928 The Egyptian Empire in Asia in the Twenty-first Century BC. *JPOS* 8, 223-256.
 --- 1929 Progress in Palestinian Archaeology during the year 1928. *BASOR* 33, 1-10.
 --- 1930 The Third Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim. *BASOR* 39, 1-10.
 --- 1932 The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim I: The pottery of the first 3 campaigns. *AASOR* 12.
 --- 1933 The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim IA: Bronze Age pottery of the Fourth Campaign. *AASOR* 13, 55-127.
 --- 1934 *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*. New Haven.
 --- 1935 Some suggestions for the Decipherment of the Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions. *JPOS* 15, 334-340.
 --- 1938 Tell Beit Mirsim II: The Bronze Age. *AASOR* 6, 13-74
 --- 1941 New Egyptian data on Palestine in the Patriarchal Age. *BASOR* 81, 16-21.
 --- 1943 The Furniture of El in Canaanite Mythology. *BASOR* 91, 39-44.
 --- 1945 An Indirect Synchronism between Egypt and Mesopotamia c.1730BC. *BASOR* 99, 9-18.
 --- 1948 The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and their Decipherment. *BASOR* 110, 6-22.
 --- 1950 Some Important Recent Discoveries. Alphabetic Origins and the Idrimi Stone. *BASOR* 118, 11-20.
 --- 1954 Northwest-Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth Century BC. *JAOS* 74, 222-233.
 --- 1963 *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*. New York.
 --- 1966 *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and their Decipherment*. Cambridge.
 --- 1968 *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*. London.

ALBRIGHT, W.F./KELSO, J.L.,

- 1943 The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim III: The Iron Age. *AASOR* 21-22.

ALBRIGHT, W.F./LAMBDIN, T.O.,

- 1957 New Material for Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. *JSS* 2, 113-127.

ALDRED, C.,

- 1961 *The Egyptians*. Thames and Hudson. (revised ed.)

ALTENMÜLLER, H./MOUSSA, A.M.,

- 1991 Die Inschrift Amenemhets II aus den Ptah-Tempel von Memphis. Ein Vorbericht. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 18, 1-48.

AMIRAN, R./EITAN, A.,

- 1965 A Canaanite-Hyksos city at Tell Nagila. *Archaeology* 18, 113-123.

ANDREU, G.,

- 1987 Les Scarabées in: Vila, A., *Le Cimetière Kernaïque D'Ukma Ouest*. Paris, 225-279.

ARCHI, A.,

- 1984 The Personal names in the Individual Cities. in Fronzarli, P. (ed.), *Studies on the Language of Ebla*. Firenze. 225-251.

ÅSTRÖM, P.,

- 1987a *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part I*. Gothenburg.
- 1987b *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part II*. Gothenburg.
- 1989 *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part III*. Gothenburg.
- 1992 Implications of an ultra low chronology. *A&L* III, 19-21.

AVIGAD, N.,

- 1972 Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem 1971 (Third Preliminary Report). *IEJ* 22, 193-200.

AVI-YONAH, M./STERN, E.,

- 1978 *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land I-IV*. London.

BAINES, J./MALEK, J.,

- 1984 *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*. Oxford.

BALDACCI, M./POMPONIO, F.,

- 1987 Bibliografia Eblaita. in: Cagni, L.(ed.), *Ebla 1975-1985: Dieci anni di studi linguistici e filologici*. Napoli. 429-456.

BASS, G.F.,

- 1967 Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck. *Trans Am Phil Soc.* 57.8.

BARNES, J.W.B.,

- 1954 Four Khartoum Stelae. *KUSH* 2, 19-25.

BECK, P.,

- 1975 The Pottery of the MBIIA at Tel Aphek. *TEL AVIV* 2, 45-85.

BECK, P./KOCHAVI, M.,

- 1993 Aphek. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol I.* 62-72.

BECKERATH, J. von,

- 1964 *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der Zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*. Glückstadt.
 --- 1984 *Handbuch der ägyptischen Königsnamen*. MÄS. München/Berlin.

BEIT-ARIEH, I.,

- 1987 Canaanites and Egyptians at Serabit el-Khadim. in: Rainey, A.F. (ed.), *Egypt, Israel, Sinai. Archaeological and Historical Relationships in the Biblical Period*. Tel Aviv University.

BEIT-ARIEH, I./GIVEON, R./SASS, B.,

- 1978 Explorations at Serabit el-Khadim - 1977. *TEL AVIV* 5, 170-187.

BEITZEL, B.J.,

- 1985 *The Moody Atlas of Bible Lands*. Chicago.

BELLEFONDS, L. de.,

- 1825 *Mémoires sur les principauz travaux d'utilité publique*. Paris.

BEN-DOR, I.,

- 1945 Palestinian Alabaster Vases. *QDAP* 1, 91-112.

BENNETT, C.J.C.,

- 1941 Growth of the *Htp-di-nsw* formula in the Middle Kingdom. *JEA* 27, 77-82.
- 1958 Motifs and Phrases on Funerary Stelae of the later Middle Kingdom. *JEA* 44, 120-121.

BENTON, J./GRAVE, P./ROBINSON, T./WRIGHT, R.V.S.,

- 1992/3 Jericho Tomb B47: A Palestinian Middle Bronze Age Tomb in the Nicholson Museum. *Mediterranean Archaeology* 5/6, 59-110.

BEN-TOR, A.,

- 1989 *Hazor III-IV: An Account of the 3rd and 4th Seasons of Excavation, 1957-1958*. Jerusalem.
- 1991 New Light on the Relations between Egypt and Southern Palestine during the Early Bronze Age. *BASOR* 281, 3-10.

BEN-TOR, D.,

- 1988 Scarabs bearing titles and Private Names of Officials from the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period (c.2050-1550 B.C.E.). *The Israel Museum Journal* 7, 35,46.
- 1989 *The Scarab. A Reflection of Ancient Egypt*. The Israel Museum, Jerusalem.
- 1994 The Historical Implications of Middle Kingdom Scarabs found in Palestine bearing Private Names and titles of Officials. *BASOR* 294, 7-22.
- (forthcoming) The scarabs from Rishon le-Zion.

BESTE, I.,

- 1978 *Skarabäen*. Teil 1-3. CAA-Löse-Blatt Katalog Ägyptischer Altertümer. Kestner-Museum-Hannover, Mainz am Rhein.

BETANCOURT, P.P.,

- 1987 Dating the Aegean Late Bronze Age with Radiocarbon. *Archaeometry* 29, 45-49.

BIENKOWSKI, P.,

- 1989 The division of the Middle Bronze IIB-C in Palestine. *LEVANT* XXI, 169-179.

BIETAK, M.,

- 1975 *Tell el-Dab'a II. Der Fundort im Rahmen einer archäologisch-geographischen Untersuchung über das ägyptische Ostdelta*. Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes 1. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1979 Avaris and Piramesse. Archaeological Exploration in the Eastern Nile Delta. Mortimer Wheeler Archaeological Lecture 1979. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*. London, vol lxv, 225-290.
- 1980 Hyksos. in: Helck, W./Westendorf, W. (eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie III*. Wiesbaden.
- 1984 Problems of Middle Bronze Age Chronology: New Evidence from Egypt. *AJA* 88, 471-485.
- 1989a The Middle Bronze Age of the Levant - A New Approach to Relative and Absolute Chronology. *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology held at the University of Gothenburg, 20th-22nd August 1987. Part 3*. Åström, P.(ed.). Gothenburg.
- 1989b Servant Burials in the Middle Bronze Age Culture of the Eastern Nile Delta. *EI* 20, 44-51.
- 1990 The Concept of Eternity in Ancient Egypt and the Bronze Age World: An Archaeological Approach. *EI* 21, 10-17.
- 1991a Egypt and Canaan during the Middle Bronze Age. *BASOR* 281, 27-72.
- 1991b *Tell el-Dab'a V: Ein Friedhofsbezirk der Mittleren Bronzezeitkultur mit Totentempel und Siedlungsschichten*. Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes 8. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1991c Der Friedhof in einem Palastgarten aus der Zeit des späten mittleren Reiches und andere Forschungsergebnisse aus dem östlichen Nildelta. (Tell el-Dab'a 1984-1987). *Ä&L II*, 47-75.
- 1992 Minoan Wall-Paintings unearthed at Ancient Avaris. *EA* 2, 26-28.
- 1994 *Pharaonen und Fremde Dynastien im Dunkel*. Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien Hersteller. Wien.

BIETAK, M./DORNER, J./HEIN, I./JANOSI, P.,

- 1993 Neue Grabungsergebnisse aus Tell el-Dab'a und 'Ezbit Helmi im östlichen Nildelta (1989-1991). *Ä&L IV*, 9-81.

BIGGS, I./DIJKSTRA, M.,

- (forthcoming) *Corpus of Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions*.

BIMSON, J.J.,

- 1981 *Redating the Exodus and Conquest*. Sheffield.

BINFORD, L.R.,

- 1972 *An Archaeological Perspective*. New York.

BINFORD, S.R./BINFORD, L.R.,

- 1968 *New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Chicago.

BLACKMAN, A.M.,

- 1915a *The Rock Tombs of Meir, Part III. The Tomb Chapel of Ukh-hotep son of Ukh-hotep and Mersi (B, no.4).* London.
- 1915b An indirect reference to Sesostriis III's Syrian campaign in the tomb chapel of *Dhwtj-htp* at el-Bersheh. *JEA* 2, 13-14.

BLANKENBERG VAN DELDEN, C.,

- 1969 *The Large Commemorative Scarabs of Amenhotep III.* Leiden.

BLISS, F.J./MACALISTER, R.A.S.,

- 1902 *Excavations in Palestine during the years 1898-1900.* London.

BONNET, C.,

- 1991 Les fouilles archéologiques de Kerma (Soudan): rapport préliminaire sur les campagnes de 1988-1989, de 1989-1990 et de 1990-1991. *GENAVA* 39, 5-20.
- 1992 Excavations at the Nubian royal town of Kerma: 1975-91. *Antiquity* 66, 252: 611-625.

BONNET, C. et al.,

- 1990 *Kerma, royaume de Nubie.* Geneva. Mission archéologique de l'Université de Genève au Soudan.
- 1991 Les fouilles archéologiques de Kerma (Soudan). *GENAVA* XXXIX. 5-41.
- 1993 Les fouilles archéologiques de Kerma (Soudan). *GENAVA* XCI. 1-33.

BORDREUIL, P/PARDEE, D.,

- 1989 *Ras Shamra Ougarit V.* Paris.

BOURKE, S.J.B.,

- 1989 Pella in the Bronze and Iron Ages. in: Hennessy et alii, Pella. *Archaeology of Jordan II.* Leuven 1989, 414-424.
- 1992 *The transition from the Middle to the Late Bronze Age in the Northern Levant: The evidence from Tell Nebi Mend, Syria.* Ph.D. thesis (unpublished), University College London.

BOURRIAU, J.,

- 1981 Nubians in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period. An Interpretation based on the Egyptian Ceramic Evidence. in *Studien zur ägyptischen Keramik.* Arnold, D.(ed). 25-41. Mainz.
- 1987 Cemetery and Settlement Pottery of the Second Intermediate Period to the Early New Kingdom. *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 8, 47-59.
- 1991 Relations between Egypt and Kerma during the Middle and New Kingdoms. in *Egypt and Africa. Nubia from Prehistory to Islam.* Davies, W.V.(ed.). 129-144. London.
- (forthcoming) Beyond Avaris. The Second Intermediate Period in Egypt outside the Eastern Delta. To be published in a series of seminar papers ed. Oren, E. Philadelphia Museum.

BRANDL, B.,

- 1986 The Scarabs from Field VI at Gezer, in: Dever, W.G.(ed.), *Gezer IV: The 1969-1971 Seasons in Field VI, the 'Acropolis', Part 1: Text*. Jerusalem, 247-257.
- 1993 Scarabs and other glyptic finds in: Finkelstein, I.(ed.), *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site*. Jerusalem.

BRAUN, D.P.,

- 1979 Illinois Hopewell Burial Practices and Social Organisation. A re-examination of the Kuink-Gibson Mound Group. in: Brose, D.S./Greber, N. (eds.), *Hopewell Archaeology: The Chillicothe Conference*. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio.

BREASTED, J.H.,

- 1906 *Ancient Records of Egypt. Vol 1*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- 1935 The Ras Shamra Statue of Sesostri-Onekh. *SYRIA* 16, 318-320.

BRIEND, J./ HUMBERT, J.B.,

- 1980 *Tell Keisan (1971-1976). Une Cité phénicienne en Galilée*. OBO (Series Archaeologica 1). Freiburg/Göttingen/Paris.

BRINK, E.C.M. VAN DEN,

- 1982 *Tombs and burial customs at Tell el-Dab'a, and their cultural relationship to Syria-Palestine during the Second Intermediate Period*. Veröffentlichungen der Institut für Afrikanistik und Ägyptologie der Universität. Wien.

BROWN, J.A.,

- 1981 The search for rank in Prehistoric burials. in: Chapman, R./Kinnes, I./Randsborg, K (eds.), *The Archaeology of Death*. Cambridge University Press. 25-37.

BRUGSCH, V.E.,

- 1870 On et Onion. *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à l'archéologie égyptienne et assyrienne*, Vol.8. 1.

BRUMFIEL, E.M./ EARLE, T.K.,

- 1987 Specialisation, Exchange and Complex Societies. An introduction. in: Brumfiel, E.M./Earle, T.K.(eds.), *Specialisation, Exchange and Complex Societies*. Cambridge University Press. 1-9.

BRUNTON, G.,

- 1927 *Qau and Badari I*. London.
- 1928 *Qau and Badari II*. London.
- 1929-31 *Matmar. Vol I*. London.
- 1930 *Qau and Badari III*. London.

- 1937 *Mostagedda and the Tasian Culture*. London.
- 1948 *Matmar*. Vol II. London.

BRUNTON, G./ ENGELBACH, R.,

- 1927 *Gurob*. London.

BUCHANAN, B.,

- 1966 *Catalogue of the Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum. Vol 1: Cylinder Seals*. Oxford.

BUNIMOTIVZ, S.,

- 1992 The Middle Bronze Age Fortifications in Palestine as a Social Phenomenon. *TEL AVIV* 19, 221-234.

BURCHARDT, M.,

- 1909 *Die Altkanaanäisches Fremdworte und Eigennamen im Aegyptischen I*. Leipzig.

BUTIN, R.F.,

- 1932 The Serabit Expedition of 1930. The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions. *HTR* 25, 130-203.

CAMPBELL, E.F.,

- 1991 *Shechem II. Portrait of a Hill Country*. Vale Atlanta.
- 1993 Shechem. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol IV*. 1345-1354.

CAQUOT, A./SZNYCER, M.,

- 1980 *Ugaritic Religion. Iconography of Religions XV:8*. Leiden.

CASTEL, G./SOUKIASIAN, G.,

- 1988 Les Mines de Galène Pharaoniques du Gebel el-Zeit (Égypte). *Bulletin de la Société de Française d'Égyptologie* 112, 37-53.

CATLING, H.W.,

- 1986 The Date of the Cape Gelidonya Ship and Cypriot Bronzework. *RDAC*, 68-71.

CERNY, J./GARDINER, A.H.,

- 1957 *Hieratic Ostraca, Vol. I*. Oxford.

CHAPMAN, R./KINNES, I./RANDSBORG, K. (eds),

- 1981 *The Archaeology of Death*. Cambridge University Press.

CLARKE, D.L.,

- 1968 *Analytical Archaeology*. London.

CLARKE, G.,

- 1986 *Symbols of excellence. Precious Materials as Expressions of Status*. Cambridge University Press.

CLEMENTS, R.E.,

- 1968 Ba'al-Berith of Shechem. *JSS* 13, 21-32.

CLERCQ, L. de/MENANT, J.,

- 1888 *Collection De Clercq - Catalogue méthodique raisonnée, Antiquités assyriennes I, Cylindres orientaux*. Paris.

COLDSTREAM, J.N.,

- 1989 Status symbols in Cyprus in the 11th century BC. in: Peltenburg, E. (ed.), *Early Society in Cyprus*. Edinburgh University Press. 325-335.

COLE, D.P.,

- 1984 *Shechem I. The Middle Bronze IIB Pottery*. Winona Lake.

COLLON, D.,

- 1975 *The Seal Impressions from Tel Atchana/Alalakh*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament. Verlag Butzon and Bercker Kevelaer.
- 1981 The Aleppo Workshop. A Seal Cutter's Workshop in Syria in the Second Half of the 18th Century BC. *Ugarit Forschungen* 13, 33-43.
- 1982 *The Alalakh Cylinder Seals. A New Catalogue of the Actual Seals excavated by Sir Leonard Woolley at Tell Atchana, and from Neighbouring Sites on the Syrian-Turkish Border*. BAR International Series 132, Oxford.
- 1985 A North Syrian Cylinder Seal Style: Evidence of North-South Links with Ajjul. in: Tubb, J.N.(ed.) *Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell*. London, 57-68.
- 1986 The Green Jasper Cylinder Seal Workshop. in: Buccellati, M.K. et al (eds.) *Papers in Honour of Edith Porada*. Malibu.
- 1987 *First Impressions. Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*. British Museum Publications.

COOK, S.A.,

- 1908 *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Second Millennium*. London.

COWLEY, A.E.

- 1929 The Sinaitic Inscriptions. *JEA* 15, 200-218.

CROSS, F.M.,

- 1973 *Canannite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1977 כֶּל. in: Botterweck, G.J./Ringgren, H.(eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol 1. Rev.ed. 242-261.

CROSS, F.M. Jr.,

- 1954 The Evolution of the Proto-Canaanite Alphabet. *BASOR* 134, 15-24.
- 1962 Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs. *HTR* 55, 225-259.
- 1967 The Origin and Early Evolution of the Alphabet. *EI* 8, 8-24.

CROWFOOT, J.W./CROWFOOT, G.M./KENYON, K.,

- 1957 *Samaria-Sebaste III. The Objects*. London.

DAY, J.,

- 1994 Ugarit and the Bible: Do they Presuppose the same Canaanite Mythology and Religion? in: Brooke, G.J./Curtis, A.H.W./Healey, J.F. (eds.), *Ugarit and the Bible. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible, Manchester, September 1992*. Münster. 35-52.

DAJANI, A.,

- 1953 A Hyksos tomb at Kalandia. *ADAJ* 2. 75-78.

DESROCHES-NOBLECOURT, C.,

- 1949 Inchass (Delta). *BSFE* 1, 12-13.

DEVER, W.G.,

- 1969-70 Iron Age Epigraphic Material from the area of Khirbet el-Kom. *HUCA* XL-XLI, 139-204.
- 1976 The Beginning of the Middle Bronze Age in Syria-Palestine. in: Cross, F.M./Lemke, W.E./Miller, P.D. (eds.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God. Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. New York.
- 1985 Relations between Syria-Palestine and Egypt in the Hyksos Period. in: Tubb, J.N.(ed.), *Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell*. London.
- 1987 The Middle Bronze Age. The Zenith of the Urban Canaanite Era. *BA* 50:3, 149-177.
- 1990a "Hyksos" Egyptian Destructions, and the End of the Palestinian Middle Bronze Age. *LEVANT* XXII, 75-81.
- 1990b *Recent Archaeological Discoveries and Biblical Research*. University of Washington Press.
- 1991 Tell el-Dab'a and Levantine Middle Bronze Age Chronology: A Rejoinder to Manfred Bietak. *BASOR* 281, 73-80.
- 1992a The Chronology of Syria-Palestine in the Second Millennium BC. *A&L* III, 39-51.
- 1992b The Chronology of Syria-Palestine in the Second Millennium BCE.: A Review of Current Issues. *BASOR* 288, 1-25.
- 1993 Gezer. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Vol II. 496-506.

DEVER, W.G./LANCE, D./WRIGHT, G.E.,

- 1970 *Gezer I. Preliminary Report of the 1964-1966 Seasons with a contribution by Aaron Schaeffer*. Annual of the Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological School in Jerusalem.
- 1974 *Gezer II. Seasons 1967-1970*. Jerusalem.
- 1986 *The 1969-71 Seasons in Field IV "The Acropolis" 1-2. (Gezer 4)*. Jerusalem.

DIJKSTRA, M.,

- 1983 Notes on some Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions including an Unrecognisable inscription of Wadi Rod el-'Air. *UF* 15, 33-38.

DOSSIN, G.,

- 1952 Le royaume d'Alep au XVIII^e siècle avant notre ère d'après les "archives de Mari". *BARB* XXXVIII, 229-239.
- 1954 Le royaume de Qatna au XVIII^e siècle avant notre ère d'après les "archives de Mari". *BARB* XL, 417-425.
- 1955 L'Inscription de Fondation de Iahdun-Lim, Roi de Mari. *SYRIA* 32, 1-28.

DOTHAN, M.,

- 1955 Excavations at 'Afule. *ATIQOT* 1, 19-70.
- 1956 The Excavations at Nahariyah, Preliminary Report. *IEJ* 6, 14-25.
- 1957 Some Aspects of Religious Life in Palestine during the Hyksos Rule. *Antiquity and Survival* 2, 121-130.
- 1973 The Foundations of Tel Mor and Ashdod. *IEJ* 23, 1-17.
- 1979 Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah. *QEDEM* 10, Jerusalem.

DOWNES, D.,

- 1974 *Excavations at Esna 1905-1906*. London.

DU MESNIL DU BUISSON, R. de.,

- 1928 L'Ancienne Qatna ou les ruines d'el Mishrifé au N.E. de Homs (Émèse). *SYRIA* 9, 6-24.
- 1930 Compte rendu sommaire d'une mission à Tell el-Yahoudiye. *BIFAO* XXIX, 155-77.

DUMORTIER, J.-B.,

- 1974 *Les Scarabées de Tell el Far'ah*. Unpublished dissertation of the École Biblique et Archéologique, Jerusalem.

DUNAND, M.,

- 1928 La sixième campagne des fouilles de Byblos. *SYRIA* 9, 1-5, 173-186.
- 1937 *Fouilles de Byblos I. 1926-32: Atlas*. Paris.
- 1939 *Fouilles de Byblos I. 1926-32: Texte*. Paris.
- 1950 *Fouilles de Byblos II. 1933-38. Atlas*. Paris.
- 1954 *Fouilles de Byblos II. 1933-38: Texte I*. Paris.
- 1958 *Fouilles de Byblos II. 1933-38. Texte II*. Paris.

- 1959 Rapport préliminaire sur les Fouilles de Byblos en 1959. *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 16, 81-85.
- 1973 *Fouilles de Byblos V*. Paris.

DUNCAN, J.G.,

- 1924 Inscribed Hebrew Objects from Ophel. *PEFQS*, 180-186.

DUNHAM, D.,

- 1950 *El Kurru, The Royal Cemeteries of Kush I*. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1957 *Royal Tombs at Meroe and Barkal; The Royal Cemeteries of Kush IV*. Boston.
- 1963 *The West and the South Cemeteries at Meroe. The Royal Cemeteries of Kush V*. Boston.
- 1967 *Uronarti, Shalfak, Mirgissa, 2nd Cataract Forts II*. Boston.
- 1982 *Excavations at Kerma. Part VI*. Boston.

DUNHAM, D./JANSSEN, J.,

- 1960 *Semna-Kumma. 2nd Cataract Forts, Vol I*. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

DURAND, J.M.,

- 1990 Documents pour l'histoire du royaume de Haute-Mesopotamie II. *MARI* 6, 271-301.

DUSSARD, R.,

- 1941 *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament*. 2nd ed. Paris.

EDEL, E.,

- 1955 *Altägyptische Grammatik I*. Rome.
- 1966 *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus den Totentempel Amenophis III*. Bonn.
- 1980 Die Ortsnamenlisten in den Tempeln von Aksha, Amara, und Soleb im Sudan. *Biblische Notizen* 11. 63-79.

EDELMAN, D.,

- 1994 Review of Dever, 1990. *JNES* 53, 148-150.

EDGERTON, W.F.,

- Egyptian Phonetic Writing, From its Invention to the close of the Nineteenth Dynasty. *JAOS* 60, 473-506.

EISSFELDT, O.,

- 1951 *El im Ugaritischen Pantheon*. Leipzig.
- 1956 El and Yahweh. *JSS* 1, 25-37.

EITAN, A.,

- 1972 Tell Beit Mirsim G-F. The Middle Bronze Age IIA Settlement. *BASOR* 208, 19-24.

EMERY, W.B./KIRWAN L.P.,

- 1935 *The Excavations and Survey between Wadi es-Sebua and Adindan 1929-31. 2 Vols.* Cairo.

ENGBERG, R.M.,

- 1934 *Notes on the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age Pottery of Megiddo.* Chicago.
 --- 1939 *The Hyksos Reconsidered.* Chicago.

ENGELBACH, R.,

- 1915 *Riqqeh and Memphis VI.* London.

ENGELBACH, R./ GUNN, B.,

- 1923 *Harageh.* London.

EPSTEIN, C.,

- 1974 Middle Bronze Age Tombs at Kfar Szold and Ginosar. *'Atiqot* 7, 13-39.

ERIKSSON, K.,

- 1994 Red Lustrous Wheel-made Ware: a product of Late Bronze Age Cyprus. in: *Cypriot Ceramics: Reading the Prehistoric Record.* The University Museum of Pennsylvania Philadelphia.

ERMAN, A./GRAPOW, H.,

- 1926 *Wörterbuch der aegyptischen Sprache. Volume I.* Leipzig.

FARAG, S.,

- 1980 Une inscription Memphite de la XIIe dynastie. *RdE* 32, 75-82.

FAULKNER, R.O.,

- 1986 *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford. (rev.ed).

FINKELSTEIN, I.,

- 1992 Middle Bronze Age Fortifications: A Reflection of Social Organisation and Political Formations. *TEL AVIV* 19, 201-220.
 --- 1993 *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site.* Jerusalem.

FISCHER-ELFERT, H.W.,

- 1986 *Die Satirische Streitschrift des Papyrus Anastasi I. Überetzung und Kommentar.* Wiesbaden.

FISHER, C.S.,

- 1929 *The Excavations of Armageddon.* Chicago.

FITZGERALD, G.M.,

- 1930 *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth Shan: 2/2. The Pottery.* Philadelphia.
- 1931 *Beth Shan Excavations 1921-1923. The Arab and Byzantine Levels 3.* Philadelphia.
- 1932 Excavations at Beth Shan. *PEQ* 64, 138-148.
- 1935 Hyksos Burials in Levels XI and XII of Tell Beisan. *QDAP* 4, 196.
- 1939 *A Sixth-Century Monastery at Beth Shan: 4.* Philadelphia.
- 1956 Hyksos Fortifications and Chariot Warfare. in: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third International Congress of Orientalists. Cambridge 1954.* Cambridge.

FRANKFORT, H.,

- 1926 Egypt and Syria in the First Intermediate Period. *JEA* 12, 80-99.
- 1939 *Cylinder Seals. A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East.* London.

FRASER, G.,

- 1900 *A Catalogue of the Scarabs belonging to George Fraser.* London.

FUGMANN, E.,

- 1958 *Hama. Fouilles et recherches 1931-1938. L'architecture des périodes pré-hellénistiques. Vol II/1.* Copenhagen.

GARDIN, J.C./PEEBLES, C.S.,

- 1992 *Representations in Archaeology.* Indiana University Press.

GARDINER, A.H.,

- 1909 *The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage.* Leipzig.
- 1911 *Egyptian Hieratic Texts.* Leipzig.
- 1916 The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet. *JEA* III, 1-16.
- 1937 *Late Egyptian Miscellanies.* Bruxelles.
- 1941 *The Wilbour Papyrus. Vol I.* Oxford University Press.
- 1947 *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica I.* Oxford.
- 1957 *Egyptian Grammar.* Oxford.(3rd ed.)
- 1962 Once Again the Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions. *JEA* 48, 45-48.

GARDINER, A.H/ PEET, T.E.,

- 1917 *The Inscriptions of Sinai. Part I.* London.

GARSTANG, J.,

- 1907 Excavations at Hierakonpolis, at Esna, and in Nubia. *ASAE* VIII, 132-148.
- 1932 Jericho. City and Necropolis. *LAAA* XIX (1-2), 3-22.
- 1933 Jericho. City and Necropolis. *LAAA* XX, 3-42.
- 1934 Jericho. City and Necropolis, 4th Report. *LAAA* XXI (3-4), 99-136.
- 1948 *The Story of Jericho.* London.

GATES, M-H.,

- 1987 Alalakh and Chronology Again. in: Åström, P.(ed.), *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part II.* Gothenburg. 60-86.

GERSTENBLITH, P.,

- 1983 *The Levant at the Beginning of the Middle Bronze Age.* Dissertation Series 5, AmSOR.

GIBSON, J.C.L.,

- 1978 *Canaanite Myths and Legends.* Edinburgh. (2nd ed).
- 1994 The Kingship of Yahweh against its Canaanite background. in: Brooke, G.J./Curtis, A.H.W./Healey, J.F.(eds.), *Ugarit and the Bible. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible, Manchester, September 1992.* Münster. 101-112.

GIDDY, L./JEFFREYS, D.,

- 1993 The People of Memphis. *EA* 3, 18-20.

GITIN, S.,

- 1985 Stratigraphy and its application to chronology and terminology. in: *Biblical Archaeology Today. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984.* Israel Exploration Society.
- 1990 *A Ceramic typology of the Late Iron II, Persian, and Hellenistic Periods at Tell Gezer 1-2. (Gezer 3).* Jerusalem.

GIVEON, R.,

- 1965 A Sealing of Khyan from the Shephala of Southern Palestine. *JEA* 51, 202-204.
- 1967 Royal Seals of the XIIth Dynasty from Western Asia. *RdÉ* 19, 29-37.
- 1973 Review of Ward 1971. *CdÉ* 48, 88-92.
- 1974 Hyksos Scarabs with Names of Kings and Officials from Canaan. *CdE* 98, 222-233.
- 1975 New Egyptian Seals with Titles and Names from Canaan. *TEL AVIV* 3, 127-133.
- 1977 Egyptian Finger Rings and Seals from South of Gaza. *TEL AVIV* 4, 66-70.
- 1978 *The Impact of Egypt on Canaan. Iconographical and Related Studies.* OBO 20, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.
- 1980a A New Hyksos King. *TEL AVIV* 7, 90-91
- 1980b Some Scarabs from Canaan with Egyptian Titles. *TEL AVIV* 7, 179-184.
- 1981 Some Egyptological Considerations concerning Ugarit. in: Young, G.D.(ed.), *Ugarit in Retrospect*, 55-58.
- 1983 The Hyksos in the South. in: *Fontes atque Pontes. Eine Festschrift für Hellmut Brunner*, Wiesbaden, 155-161.
- 1985 *Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia from the Collections of the British Museum.* OBO (Series Archaeologica 3), Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.
- 1986 New Material Concerning Canaanite Gods in Egypt. *Proceedings of the IXth*

- World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem: Division A. Jerusalem, 1-4.
- 1987 The Impact of Egypt on Canaan in the Middle Bronze Age. in: Rainey, A.F (ed), *Egypt, Israel, Sinai. Archaeological and Historical Relationships in the Biblical Period*. Tel Aviv University.
- 1988 *Scarabs from Recent Excavations in Israel*. OBO 83, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen. (eds. Warburton, D./ Uehlinger, C.)

GIVEON, R./KERTESZ, T.,

- 1986 *Egyptian Scarabs and Seals from Acco. From the Collections of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums*. Freiburg/Schweiz.

GOEDICKE, H.,

- 1986 The End of the Hyksos in Egypt. in: Lesko, L.H. (ed.), *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker*. London.
- 1991 Egyptian Military Actions in Asia in the Middle Kingdom. *RdÉ* 42, 89-94.

GORDON, C.H.,

- 1940 *Ugaritic Grammar*. Rome
- 1947 *Ugaritic Handbook*. Rome.

GORELICK, L./GWINETT, A.J.,

- 1981 The Origin and the Development of the Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals; A Hypothetical Reconstruction. *Expedition* vol. 23, No.4, Summer 1981, 17-30.
- 1990 The Ancient Near Eastern cylinder seal as social emblem and status symbol. *JNES* 49, 45-56.
- 1993 Beads, Scarabs and Amulets: Methods of manufacture in Ancient Egypt. *JARCE* 30, 125-132.

GÖRG, M.,

- 1974a *Untersuchungen zur Hieroglyphischen Wiedergabe palästinischer Ortsnamen*. Bonn.
- 1974b Zur Valenz der Gruppe . *GM* 10, 19-20.
- 1983 *tnr* ("stark"), en semitisches Lehnwort? *GM* 68, 53-54.

GORING, E.,

- 1989 Death in everyday life: Aspects of Burial Practice in the Late Bronze Age. in: Peltenburg, E. (ed), *Early Society in Cyprus*. Edinburgh University Press. 95-105.

GRATIEN, B.,

- 1974 *Essai de classification des cultures Kerma*. Thèse de doct. Lille.
- 1978 *Les Cultures Kerma: Essai de Classification*. Lille.
- 1986 *Sai I, Le Necropole Kerma*. Paris.

GRAY, J.,

- 1965 *The Legacy of Canaan. The Ras Shamra Texts and their Relevance to the Old*

- *Testament*. Leiden.
- 1975 *Near Eastern Mythology*. 3rd ed. England.
- GREENBERG, R.,
- 1993 Tell Beit Mirsim. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Vol I. 177-180.
- GRENFELL, A.,
- 1908 Les Divinités et les Animaux. *Reale Accademia dei Lincei XVII*, 135-155.
- 1915 The Scarab Collection of Queen's College, Oxford. *JEA* 2, 217-228.
- 1916 *The Grenfell Collection of Scarabs*. *Ancient Egypt I*, 22-31.
- GRIFFITH, F.I.I.,
- 1890 The Antiquities of Tell el-Yahudiyeh. In: Naville, E., *The Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias*. London.
- 1921 *Oxford Excavations in Nubia*. Vol.8, Liverpool.
- 1923 *Oxford Excavations in Nubia*. Vol.4, Liverpool.
- 1924 *Oxford Excavations in Nubia*. Vol.11, Liverpool.
- GUIGUES, P.E.,
- 1938 Lébé'a, Kafer-Garra, Qrayé, Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne. *BMB* II, 27-49.
- 1939 Lébé'a, Kafer-Garra, Qrayé, Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne. *BMB* III, 53-63.
- GUY, P.L.O.,
- 1931 *New Light from Armageddon*. Chicago.
- GUY, P.L.O./ENGBERG, R.M.,
- 1938 *Megiddo Tombs*. OIP 33, Chicago.
- HAARLEM, W.M. van,
- 1992 A Functional Analysis of Ancient Egyptian Amulets. *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Atti. Volume I*. IAE, 237-240.
- HABACHI, L.,
- 1972 The Second Stele of Kamose and his Struggle against the Hyksos Ruler and his Capital. *ADAIK* 8, Glückstadt.
- HANKEY, V.,
- 1993 Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant. *EA* 3, 27-29.
- HARIF, A.,
- 1978 Middle Kingdom Architectural Elements in Middle Bronze Age Megiddo. *ZDPV* 94, 24-31.

HALL, H.R.,

- 1913 *Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs in the British Museum. Vol I. Royal Scarabs.* London.

HARDING, G.L.,

- 1953 Four Tomb Groups from Jordan. *PEF*.6.

HAYES, W.C.,

- 1953 *The Scepter of Egypt, Part I. From the earliest times to the end of the Middle Kingdom.* New York.
- 1955 *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum, Papyrus Brooklyn 35.1446.* Brooklyn.
- 1959 *The Scepter of Egypt, Part II: The Hyksos Period and the New Kingdom.* New York.
- 1973 Egypt from the death of Ammenemes III to Seqenenre II. *Cambridge Ancient History. Vol II.1.* Cambridge.

HAYNES, J./MARKOWITZ, Y.,

- 1991 *Scarab and Design Amulets. A Glimpse of Ancient Egypt in Miniature.* New York.

HEINSOHN, G.,

- 1993 Who were the Hyksos? Can archaeology and stratigraphy provide a solution to the "enigma of world history"? in: *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Vol II.* Società Italiana per il Gasp.A. 207-219.

HELCK, W.,

- 1968 *Geschichte des alten Ägypten.* Leiden.
- 1971 *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Wiesbaden. rev.ed.
- 1976 Ägyptische Statuen im Ausland, Ein Chronologische Problem. *U.F. VIII*, 101-115.
- 1989 Notes in discussion, in: Åström, P.(ed.), *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part III.* Gothenburg. 40-46.

HENNESSY, J.B.,

- 1985 Chocolate-on-white ware at Pella. in: Tubb, J.N.(ed.), *Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Papers in Honour of Olga Tufnell.* London.

HERZOG, Z./ RAPP, G./ NEGBI, O.(eds),

- 1989 *Excavations at Tell Michal, Israel.* Minneapolis.

HESTRIN, R.,

- 1987 The Lachish-Ewer and Asherah. *IEJ* 37, 212-214.

- 1991 Understanding Asherah: Exploring Semitic Iconography. *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17, 50-59.

HESTRIN, R./SASS, B./OPHEL, A.,

- 1982 The Lachish Prism Inscription: Proto-Canaanite or Egyptian? *IEJ* 32, 103-106.

HOCH, J.E.,

- 1994 *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton University Press.

HOFFMEIER, J.K.,

- 1989 Reconsidering Egypt's part in the Termination of the Middle Bronze Age in Palestine. *LEVANT* XXI, 181-193.
- 1990 Some thoughts on William G. Dever's "Hyksos", Egyptian Destructions, and the End of the Palestinian Middle Bronze Age. *LEVANT* XXII, 83-9.
- 1991 James Weinstein's 'Egypt and the Middle Bronze IIC/Late Bronze IA Transition in Palestine': A Rejoinder. *LEVANT* XXIII, 117-124.

HOLLADAY, J.S.,

- 1982 *Cities of the Delta, part III: Tell el-Maskhuta. Preliminary Report of the Wadi Tumilat Project 1978-79*. Malibu.

HOMES-FREDERICQ, D./HENNESSY, J.B.,(eds.)

- 1986 *Archaeology of Jordan. Vol I*. Leuven.
- 1989 *Archaeology of Jordan. Vol II*. Leuven.

HOOKE, S.H.,

- 1991 *Middle Eastern Mythology*. London.

HORN, S.,

- 1962 Scarabs from Shechem. *JNES* 21, 1-14
- 1966 Scarabs and Seal Impressions from Shechem. *JNES* 25, 48-56
- 1973 Scarabs and Seal Impressions from Shechem. *JNES* 32, 281-289

HORNBLOWER, C.D.,

- 1922 Some Hyksos Plaques and Scarabs. *JEA* 8, 201-208.

HORNUNG, E./ STAEHELIN, E.,

- 1976 *Skarabäen und andere Siegelamulette aus Basler Sammlungen*. Mainz.

JAEGER, B.,

- 1982 *Essai de classification et datation des scarabées Menkhéperrê*. OBO.SA 2 Fribourg-Göttingen.

JAMES, F.W.,

- 1966 *The Iron Age at Beth Shan*. Philadelphia.

JAMES, T.G.H.,

- 1973 *Egypt from the expulsion of the Hyksos to Amenophis I. Cambridge Ancient History. Vol II.1.* Cambridge.
 --- 1979 *An Introduction to Ancient Egypt*. Oxford.

JEFFREYS, D./MALEK, J./SMITH, H.S.,

- 1984 The survey of Memphis 1982. *JEA* 70, 23-32.
 --- 1986 Memphis 1984. *JEA* 72, 1-14.
 --- 1987 Memphis 1985. *JEA* 73, 11-20.
 --- 1988 Memphis 1986, 87. *JEA* 74, 15-29.

JOHNSON, J.H.,

- 1977 Private Name Seals of the Middle Kingdom. in: Gibson, M./Biggs, R.D. (eds.) *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*. Malibu.

KACZMARCZYK, A./HEDGES, R.E.M.,

- 1983 *Ancient Egyptian Faience. An Analytical Survey of Egyptian Faience from Predynastic to Roman Times*. Warminster.

KAPELRUD, A.,

- 1980 The Relationship between 'El and Ba'al in the Ras Shamra Texts. in: Rendsburg, G./Adler, R./Arfa, M./Winter, N.H.(eds.), *The Bible World. Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon*. New York. 79-85.

KAPLAN, J.,

- 1955 A Cemetery of the Bronze Age discovered near Tel Aviv Harbour. *ATIQTOT* 1, 1-18.
 --- 1971 Mesopotamian Elements in the Middle Bronze II Culture of Palestine. *JNES* 30, 293-307.

KAPLAN, J./RITTER-KAPLAN, H.,

- 1993 Tel Aviv. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol IV*. 1451-1457.

KAPLAN, M.F.,

- 1980 *The Origin and Distribution of Tell el-Yehudiyeh Ware*. SMA 62, Göteborg.

KEEL, O.,

- 1993 Hyksos Horses or Hippopotomus Deities? *LEVANT* XXV, 208-121.
 --- 1995 *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel*. OBO Series Archaeologica 10. Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.

KEEL, O./ SCHROER, S.,

- 1985 *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band I.* OBO 67, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.

KEEL, O./ KEEL-LEU, H./ SCHROER, S.,

- 1989 *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/ Israel. Band II.* OBO 88, Freiburg/ Schweiz and Göttingen.

KEEL, O./ SHUVAL, M./ UEHLINGER, C.,

- 1990 *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III.* Freiburg/ Schweiz and Göttingen.

KEIMER, L.,

- 1931 Pendeloques en forme d'insectes faisant partie de colliers Égyptiens. *ASAE* 31, 145-186.

KELLY-BUCCELLARTI, M.,

- 1986 Sealing Practices at Terqa. in: Kelly-Buccellarti, M.(ed.), *Insight through Images, Studies in Honour of E. Porada.* Malibu.

KEMP, B.J.,

- 1983 Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period c.2686-1552 BC. in: Trigger, B.G./Kemp, B.J./O'Connor, D./Lloyd, A.B., *Ancient Egypt: A Social History.* Cambridge University Press.

KEMP, B.J./MERRILLEES, R.S.,

- 1980 *Minoan Pottery in the Second Millennium Egypt.* Mainz.

KEMPINSKI, A.,

- 1974 Tell el-'Ajjul - Beth-Aglayim or Sharuhén?, *IEJ* 24, 145-152.
- 1983 *Syrien und Palastina (Kanaan) in der letzten Phase der Mittelbronze IIB-Zeit (1650-1570 v.chr.).* Wiesbaden.
- 1985 Some Observations on the Hyksos (XVth) Dynasty and its Canaanite Origins. in: Israelit-Groll, S.(ed.), *Pharaonic Egypt: The Bible and Christianity.* Jerusalem. 129-137.
- 1988 *Excavations at Kabri. Preliminary Report of 1987 Season.* Tel Aviv.
- 1989 *Megiddo. A city state and royal centre in North Israel.* Munich.
- 1992 The Middle Bronze Age. in: *The Archaeology of Ancient Israel.* Ben-Tor, A.(ed.). Yale University Press. 159-210.
- 1993a Kabri. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol III.* 839-841.
- 1993b Tell el-Ajjul. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol I.* 49-53.
- 1993c Shiloh. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol IV.* 1364-1370.

KEMPINSKI, A./NIEMEIER, W.D.,

- 1991 *Excavations at Kabri: Preliminary Report of 1989 Season*. Tel Aviv.

KENYON, K.,

- 1957 *Digging up Jericho*. London.
 --- 1960 *Jericho I. The tombs excavated 1952-1954*. London.
 --- 1965 *Jericho II. The tombs excavated 1955-1958*. London.
 --- 1969 The Middle and Late Bronze Age strata at Megiddo. *LEVANT* 1, 25-60.
 --- 1973 Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age. *Cambridge Ancient History, Vol II.1*, 77-116.
 --- 1981 *Jericho III. Architecture and Stratigraphy of the Tell*. London.
 --- 1993 Jericho. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol II*. 674-681.

KENYON, K/ HOLLAND, T.A.,

- 1982 *Jericho IV. The pottery type series and other finds*. London.
 --- 1983 *Jericho V. The pottery phases of the Tell and other finds*. London.

KIRKBRIDE, D.,

- 1965 Scarabs; in: Kenyon, K., *Jericho II*. London.

KITCHEN, K.A.,

- 1977 The King List of Ugarit. *UF* 9, 131-142.
 --- 1987 The Basics of Egyptian Chronology in Relation to the Bronze Age. in: Åström, P.(ed.), *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg 20th - 22nd August 1987. Part I*. Gothenburg. 37-55.

KLENGEL, H.,

- 1992 *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C. A Handbook of Political History*. Berlin.

KOCHAVI, M.,

- 1977 *Aphek-Antipatris. Five seasons of excavations at Aphek-Antipatris (1972-1976)*. Tel Aviv University.
 --- 1990 *Aphek in Canaan. The Egyptian Governor's Residence and its finds*. Israel Museum Jerusalem.

KOCHAVI, M./BECK, P./GOPHNA, R.,

- 1979 Aphek-Antipatris, Tel Poleg, Tel Zoror and Tel Burga; Four Fortified sites of the Middle Bronze IIA in the Sharon Plain. *ZDPV* 95, 121-165.

KRAUSS, R.,

- 1985 *Sothis und Monddaten. Studien zur astronomischen und technischen Chronologie altägyptens*. Hildesheim.

KUCHMAN, L.,

- 1978 Tell el-Maskhuta: First Season, Summer 1978. *NARCE* 105, 12-13.

KUPPER, J.R.,

- 1973 Northern Mesopotamia and Syria. *CAH* Vol. II/I, 1-41.

L'HEUREUX, C.E.,

- 1979 *Rank among Canaanite Gods. El, Ba'al and Repha'im*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 21.

LAMON, R.,

- 1935 *The Megiddo Water System*. Chicago.

LAMON, R./SHIPTON, G.M.,

- 1939 *Megiddo I - Seasons of 1925-1934, Strata I-V*. OIP 42, Chicago.

LEIBOVITCH, J.,

- 1955 Description of the scarabs found in a cemetery near Tel Aviv. *ATIQOT* 1, 13-18.

LEITZ, C.,

- 1989 *Studien zur ägyptischen Astronomie*. Wiesbaden.

LEVI, Y.,

- 1993 Rishon le-Ziyyou sand dunes. *Hadashot Arckhelogiyot* 100, 49-50.

LIEBOWITZ, H.A.,

- 1978 The Impact of the Art of Egypt on the Art of Syria and Palestine. in: Schmandt-Besserat (ed.), *Immortal Egypt*. Malibu.

LILYQUIST, C.,

- 1993 Granulation and Glass: Chronological and Stylistic Investigations at Selected Sites, ca. 2500-1400 B.C.E. *BASOR* 290-291, 29-75.

LOAT, W.L.S.,

- 1905 *Gurob*. London.

LOFTIE, W.J.,

- 1884 *An Essay of Scarabs*. London.

LOKKEGUARD, R.,

- 1953 *A Plea for 'El, The Bull and other Ugarit Miscellanies*. Copenhagen.

LOUD, G.,

- 1939 *The Megiddo Ivories*. Chicago.
 --- 1948 *Megiddo II - Seasons of 1935-1939*. 2 vols. OIP 62, Chicago.

LUCAS, A./ HARRIS, J.R.,

- 1962 *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. London. (4th ed.)

LÜDDECKENS, E.,

- 1985 Die theophoren Personennamen im pharaonischen, hellenistisch-römischen und christlichen Ägypten. *Ägypten-Dauer und Wandel*. Mainz am Rhein. 105-113.

LUFT, U.,

- 1993 Asiatics in Illahun: A preliminary Report. in: *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Atti. Vol.II*. IAE, 291-297.

LURKER, M.,

- 1986 *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt*. London. (3rd ed.)

MA'AYEH, F.,

- 1960 Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Jordan. *ADAJ* 4-5, 114-116.

MACALISTER, R.A.S.,

- 1912 *The Excavations of Gezer 1902-1905, 1907-1909*. 3 vols. London.

MACDONALD, J.,

- 1972 Egyptian Interests in Western Asia to the end of the Middle Kingdom: An Evaluation. *AJBA*, 72-98

MACKAY, E.J.H./ MURRAY, M.A.,

- 1952 *City of Shepherd Kings*. London.

MACKAY, P.E./WAINWRIGHT, G.A.,

- 1910 *Meydum and Memphis (III)*. London.

MAEIR, A.M.,

- 1994 Hyksos, Horses and Hippopotami. A Note. *LEVANT XXVI*. 231.

MAGUIRE, L.C.,

- 1991 *The Circulation of Cypriot Pottery in the Middle Bronze Age*. (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh).
- 1995 Tell el-Dab'a: The Cypriot Connection. in: Davies, W.V./ Schofield, L.(eds.), *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant. Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC*. British Museum Press.

MALEK, J.,

- 1992 The Annals of Amenemhet II. *EA* 2, 18.

MALEK, J./QUIRKE, S.,

- 1992 Memphis 1991: Epigraphy. *JEA LXXVIII*, 13-18.

MANNING, S.,

- 1988 The Bronze Age Eruption of Thera: Absolute dating, Aegean Chronology and Mediterranean Cultural Interaction. *JMA* 1/2, 17-82.

MARGAINE, A-M.,

- 1984 *L'Egypte Ancienne*. Petits guides des Musées de Cannes. Cannes.

MARTIN, G.T.,

- 1971 *Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Seals, Principally of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*. Oxford.
- 1985 *Scarabs, Cylinders and other Ancient Egyptian Seals. A checklist of publications*. Warminster.

MARTIN, M.F.,

- 1964 Six Palestinian Seals. *RSO* 39, 203-210.

MATOUK, F.S.,

- 1971 *Corpus du Scarabée égyptien 1. Les Scarabées Royaux*. Beyrouth.
- 1977 *Corpus du Scarabée égyptien 2. Analyse thématique*. Beyrouth.

MATTHIAE, P.,

- 1969 Empreintes d'un cylindre paléosyrien de Tell Mardikh. *SYRIA* 46, 1-43.
- 1984 New Discoveries at Ebla. *BA* 47/1, 18-32.
- 1989 Masterpieces of Early and Old Syrian Art: Discoveries of the 1988 Ebla Excavations in a Historical Perspective. *Proceedings of the British Academy LXXV*, 25-56.
- 1990 Nouvelles Fouilles à Ébla en 1987-1989. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 384-431.

MAY, H.,

- 1935 *Material remains of the Megiddo Cult*. Chicago.

MAZAR, A.,

- 1990 *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible 10,000 - 586 B.C.E.* New York.
- 1993 Beth Shan. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol I.* 214-223.

MAZAR, B.,

- 1968 The Middle Bronze Age in Palestine. *IEJ* 18, 65-97.

McGOVERN, P.E.,

- 1985 *Late Bronze Palestinian Pendants. Innovations in a Cosmopolitan Age.* JBOT/ASOR Monographs. Sheffield.

McNICOLL, A./SMITH, R./HENNESSY, J.B.,

- 1982 *Pella in Jordan I.* Canberra.

McNICOLL, A., et alii,

- 1992 *Pella in Jordan II.* Sydney.

MEIJER, D.J.W.,

- 1986 *A Survey in Northeastern Syria.* Netherlands Archaeological Institute, Istanbul.

MICHAEL, H.N.,

- 1976 Radiocarbon dates from Akrotiri on Thera. *Temple University Aegean Symposium I*, 7-9.

MILLER, P.D.,

- 1967 El the Warrior. *HTR* 60, 411-431.
- 1980 El, Creator of the Earth. *BASOR* 239, 43-46.

MLINAR, C.,

- forthcoming *Untersuchungen zu den Skarabäen der 2. Zwischenzeit.*(unpublished thesis, Institute of Egyptology, Vienna)

MONTET, P.,

- 1925 Les Fouilles de Byblos en 1924. *AIBL Comptes Rendus*, 25-34.
- 1928 *Byblos et l'Égypte. Quatre Campagnes de Fouilles à Gebeil 1921-1924*, 2 vols. (BAH 11) Paris.
- 1954 'Notes et Documents' *KEMI XIII*, 63-76.

de MOOR, J.C.,

- 1980 El, the Creator. in: Rendsburg, G./Adler, R./Arfa, M./Winter, N.H.(eds). *The Bible World. Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon.* New York. 171-187.

MORGAN, L.,

- 1995 Minoan Painting and Egypt: The Case of Tell el-Dab'a. in: Davies, W.V./ Schofield, L.(eds.), *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant. Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC*. British Museum Press.

MÜLLER, U.,

- 1970 Kritische Bermerkungen zu den Straten XIII-IX in Megiddo. *ZDPV* 86, 50-86.

MÜLLER, W.M.,

- 1893 *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*. Leipzig.
- 1912 *Die Spuren der babylonischen Welschrift in Ägypten*. MVAG XVIII, 3.

MURRAY, M.A.,

- 1949 Some Canaanite Scarabs. *PEQ* 81, 92-99.

MYERS, J.L./OHNEFALSCH, M.,

- 1899 *A Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum*. Oxford.

NAGEL, W./EDER, C.

- 1992 Altsyrien und Ägypten. *DM* 6, 1-108.

NAJJAR, M.,

- 1991 A new Middle Bronze Age tomb at the Citadel of Amman. *ADAJ* XXXV, 105-129.

NAVILLE, E.,

- 1890 *Mound of the Jew and City of the Oasis*. London.

NEGBI, O.,

- 1970 *The Hoards of Goldwork from Tell el-Ajjul*. Göteborg. (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 25).
- 1976 *Canaanite Gods in Metal*. Tel Aviv.

NEILSON, D.,

- 1936 *Ras Shamra Mythologie und Biblische Theologie*. Leipzig.

NEIMEIER, W.P.,

- 1980 Die Katastrophe von Thera und die Spätminoische Chronologie. *JDAI* 95, 1-76.

NEWBERRY, P.E.,

- 1893 *Beni Hasan I*. London.

- 1895 *El Bersheh I.* London.
- 1899 *The Amherst Papyri.* London.
- 1906 *Scarabs, an Introduction to the study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings.* London.
- 1907 *Scarab Shaped Seals.* London.

NICCACCI, A.,

- 1980 *Hyksos Scarabs.* Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Museum 2; Jerusalem.

NIEHR, H.,

- 1992 Ein umstrittenes Detail der El-Stele aus Ugarit. *UF* 24, 293-300.

NOBLE, J.V.,

- 1969 The technique of Egyptian faience. *AJA* 73, 435-439.

O'CONNOR, D.,

- 1974 Political Systems and Archaeological Data in Egypt 2600-1780BC. *World Archaeology*, 6, 15-38.
- 1985 The Chronology of Scarabs of the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period. *JSSEA* 15/1, 1-41.
- 1993 *Ancient Nubia. Egypt's Rival in Africa.* Philadelphia.

OFFORD, J.,

- 1918 Palestinian Scarabs. *PEFQS*, 175-179.

OLDENBURG, J.,

- 1969 *The Conflict between El and Ba'al in Canaanite Religion.* Leiden.

OREN, E.D.,

- 1973 *The Northern cemetery of Beth Shan.* Leiden.
- 1992 Palaces and Patrician Houses in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. in: Kempinski, A./Reich, R.(eds.), *The Architecture of Ancient Israel.* Jerusalem. 105-120.

OSING, J.,

- 1980 Lautsystem. in: *Lexikon der Ägyptologie III.* Wiesbaden. Cols.943-949.

PADER, E.J.,

- 1982 *Symbolism, Social Relations and the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains.* BAR Intl. Series 130. Oxford.

PALUMBO, G.,

- 1987 "Egalitarian" or "Stratified" Society? Some notes on mortuary practices and social structure at Jericho in EBIV. *BASOR* 267, 43-60.

PARKER, B.,

- 1949 Cylinder Seals from Palestine. *IRAQ* XI, 1-43.

PARR, P.J.,

- 1968 The origin of the rampart fortifications of Middle Bronze Age Palestine and Syria. *ZDPV* 84, 18-45.

PEET, T.E.,

- 1914 *The Cemetery of Abydos. Part II 1911-12.* London.

PETRIE, W.M.F.,

- 1886 *Naukratis I, Part I.* London.
 --- 1889 *Historical Scarabs.* London.
 --- 1890 *Kahun, Gurob and Hawara.* London.
 --- 1891 *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob.* London.
 --- 1902 *Abydos, Part I.* London.
 --- 1906a *Hyksos and Israelite Cities.* London.
 --- 1906b *Researches in Sinai.* London.
 --- 1907 *Gizeh and Rifeh.* London.
 --- 1909a *Memphis I.* London.
 --- 1909b *The Palace of Apries (Memphis II).* London.
 --- 1911 *Roman Portraits and Memphis (IV).* London.
 --- 1914 *Tarkhan II.* London.
 --- 1917 *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names.* London.
 --- 1918 *PEF Quarterly Statement.*
 --- 1925 *Buttons and Design Scarabs.* London.
 --- 1928 *Gerar.* London.
 --- 1930 *Beth Pelet I (Tell Fara).* London.
 --- 1931 *Ancient Gaza I.* London.
 --- 1932a *Ancient Gaza II.* London.
 --- 1932b *Beth Pelet II.* London.
 --- 1933 *Ancient Gaza III.* London.
 --- 1934 *Ancient Gaza IV.* London.
 --- 1952 *Ancient Gaza V. City of Shepherd Kings.* London.

PETRIE, W.M.F./BRUNTON, G.,

- 1924 *Sedment I.* London.

PETRIE, W.M.F./BRUNTON, G./MURRAY, M.A.,

- 1923 *Lahun II.* London.

PETRIE, W.M.F./QUIBELL, J.E.,

- 1896 *Naqada and Ballas.* London.

PETRIE, W.M.F./WAINWRIGHT, G.A./GARDINER, A.H.,

- 1913 *Tarkhan I and Memphis V.* London.

PETTINATO, G.,

- 1970 Inscription de Ibbit-Lim, Roi de Ebla. *AAAS* 20, 73-76.

PHILIP, G.,

- 1989 *Metal Weapons of the Early and Middle Bronze Ages in Syria-Palestine*. BAR International Series 526.
- 1995 Tell el-Dab'a Metalwork: Patterns and Purpose. in: Davies, W.V./ Schofield, L.(eds.), *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant. Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC*. British Museum Press.

PIEPER, M.,

- 1927 Art. Skarabäen. in: Wissowa, G./Kroll, W./Mittelhaus, K. (eds.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft III A1*. München. 447-459.
- 1930 Die Bedeutung der Skarabäen für die palästinensische Altertumskunde. *ZDPV* 53, 185-199.

PIGGOTT, S.,

- 1969 Conclusion. in: Ucko, P.J./Dimbleby, G.W. (eds.), *Domestication of Plants and Animals*. London. 558ff

POPE, H.E.,

- 1955 *El in the Ugaritic Texts*. Leiden.
- 1987 The Status of El at Ugarit. *UF* 19, 219-230.

PORADA, E.,

- 1948 *Corpus of Near Eastern seals in North American collections I, The Pierpont Morgan Library Collection*. Washington.
- 1966 Les Cylindres de la Jarre Montet. *SYRIA* 43, 243-258.
- 1984 The Cylinder Seal from Tell el-Dab'a. *AJA* 88, 485-488.

PORTER, B., & MOSS, R.L.B.,

- 1937 *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic texts, Reliefs and Paintings. Vol V: Upper Egyptian Sites*. Oxford.
- 1975 *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic texts, Reliefs and Paintings. Vol. VII. Nubia, the Deserts and Outside Egypt*. Oxford.

POSENER, G.,

- 1940 *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie*. Brussels.
- 1957 Les asiatiques en Egypte sous les XII et XIIIèmes dynasties. *SYRIA* 34, 145-163.
- 1982 A New Royal Inscription of the XIIth dynasty. *JSSEA* 12, 7-8

POTTS, T./COLLEDGE, S./EDWARDS, P.,

- 1985 Preliminary Report on the 6th Season of Excavations by the University of Sydney at Pella in Jordan (1983-1984). *ADAJ* XXIX, 181-210.

PRICE-WILLIAMS, D.,

- 1977 *The tombs of the Middle Bronze Age II period from the '500' cemetery at Tell Fara (South)*. London, Institute of Archaeology, OP.1

PRITCHARD, J.B.,

- 1955 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton.
- 1963 *The Bronze Age Cemetery at Gibeon*. Philadelphia.
- 1980 *The Cemetery at Tel es-Sa'idiyeh, Jordan*. Philadelphia.
- 1985 *Tel es-Sa'idiyeh: Excavations on the Tell 1964-1966*. Philadelphia.

QUIRKE, S./SPENCER, J.,

- 1992 *The British Museum Book of Ancient Egypt*. London.

RAINEY, A.,

- 1975 Notes on some Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions. *IEJ* 25, 106-116.
- 1978 The Toponymics of Eretz-Israel. *BASOR* 231, 1-18.
- 1981 Some minor points in the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions. *IEJ* 31, 92-94.

RANKE, H.,

- 1935 *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen. Band I*. Glückstadt.
- 1952 *Die Ägyptischen Personennamen. Band II*. Glückstadt.

RATHJE, W.L.,

- 1977 New Tricks for Old Seals: A Progress Report. in: Gibson, M. & Biggs, R.D.(eds), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*. Bibliotheca mesopotamica VI. Malibu. 25-32.

REDFORD, D.B.,

- 1970 The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition. *Orientalia* 30, 1-51.
- 1979 A Gate Inscription from Karnak and Egyptian involvement in Western Asia during the early 18th Dynasty. *JAOS* 99, 270-287.
- 1992 *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton.

REDMOUNT, C.A.,

- 1995 Ethnicity, Pottery, and the Hyksos at Tell el-Maskhuta in the Egyptian Delta. *BA* 58/4, 181-190.

REISNER, G.A.,

- 1923a Excavations at Kerma, Parts I-III. *Harvard African Studies*. Vol V. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1923b Excavations at Kerma, Parts IV-V. *Harvard African Studies*. Vol VI. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1955 Clay Sealings of Dynasty XIII from Uronarti Fort. *KUSH* 3, 26-69

RICHARDS, F.V.,

- 1992 *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*. OBO 117, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.

ROBERTS, J.M.,

- 1972 *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon. A Study of the Semitic Deities Attested in Mesopotamia before Ur III*. John Hopkins University Press.

ROSE, J.,

- 1985 *The Sons of Re. Cartouches of the Kings of Egypt*. Warrington.

ROWE, A.,

- 1930 *The Topography and History of Beth Shan, Vol. 1*. Philadelphia.
 --- 1936 *A Catalogue of Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals and Amulets in the Palestine Archaeological Museum*. Cairo.
 --- 1940 *The Four Canaanite temples of Beth Shan, Vol. 2/1*. Philadelphia.

RUPP, D.W.,

- 1989 Puttin' on the Ritz: Manifestations of High Status in Iron Age Cyprus. in: Peltenburg, E. (ed), *Early Society in Cyprus*. Edinburgh University Press. 336-362.

SAGHIEH, M.,

- 1983 *Byblos in the Third Millennium B.C.* Warminster, Aris & Phillips.

SAGONA, A.G.,

- 1980 Middle Bronze Age Faience Vessels from Palestine. *ZDPV* 96, 101-120.

SANDMAN HOLMBERG, M.,

- 1946 *The God Ptah*. Lund.

SASSON, J.M.,

- 1966 A Sketch of North Syrian Economic Relations in the Middle Bronze Age. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 9, 161-181.

SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, T.,

- 1941 *Ägypten und Nubien*. Lund.
 --- 1949 A Buhen Stela from the Second Intermediate Period. (Khartum no.18). *JEA* 35, 50-58.
 --- 1951 The Hyksos Rule in Egypt. *JEA* 37, 53-71.
 --- 1956 The Nubian Kingdom of the Second Intermediate Period. *KUSH* 4, 54-61.
 --- 1989 *Middle Nubian Sites. The Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia. Vol 4:1*. Vddevalla.

SCANDONE MATTHIAE, G.,

- 1976 Un Scarabeo del secondo Periodo Intermedio da Tell Mardikh-Ebla. *Oriens Antiquus* XV, 179-189.
- 1979 Un oggetto faraonico della XIII dinastia dalla "Tomba del Signore dei capridi". *Studi Eblaiti* 1, 119-28.
- 1988 Les Relations entre Ébla et l'Égypte au III^{ème} et au II^{ème} Millénaire av.J-Chr. Waetzoldt, H./Hauptmann, H.(eds.), *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von Ebla. Akten der Internationalen Tagung Heidelberg 4-7 November 1986*. (Heidelburger Studien zum Alten Orient; Bd.Z). 67-73.

SCHAEFFER, C.F.A.,

- 1932 Les Fouilles de Minet el-Beida et de Ras Shamra, troisième campagne (printemps 1931). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XIII*, 1-24.
- 1933 Les Fouilles de Minet el-Beida et de Ras Shamra, quatrième campagne (printemps 1932). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XIV*, 93-127.
- 1934 Les Fouilles de Minet el-Beida et de Ras Shamra, cinquième campagne (printemps 1933). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XV*, 105-136.
- 1935 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, sixième campagne (printemps 1934). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XVI*, 141-176.
- 1936 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, septième campagne (printemps 1935). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XVII*, 105-148.
- 1937 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, huitième campagne (printemps 1936). Rapport sommaire. *SYRIA XVIII*, 125-134.
- 1938 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit, neuvième campagne (printemps 1937). Rapport Sommaire. *SYRIA XIX*, 193-255, 313-344.
- 1939a *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit*. (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1936). London.
- 1939b *Ugaritica I*. Paris.
- 1948 *Stratigraphie comparée et chronologie de l'Asie occidentale*. London.
- 1949 *Ugaritica II*. Paris.
- 1956 *Ugaritica III*. Paris.
- 1962 *Ugaritica IV*. Paris.
- 1966a Nouveaux témoignages du culte de El et de Baal a Ras Shamra-Ugarit et ailleurs en Syrie-Palestine. *SYRIA XLII*, 1-19.
- 1966b Le culte d'el a Ras Shamra-Ugarit et le Veau d'Or. *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*. 327-338.
- 1968 *Ugaritica V*. Paris.
- 1969 *Ugaritica VI*. Paris.
- 1983 *Corpus I des cylindres-sceaux de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia*. Paris

SCHENKEL, W.,

- 1986 Syllabische Schreibung. in: Helck, W./Westendorff, W.(eds.), *Lexikon der Ägyptologie. Band VI*. Wiesbaden.

SCHMIDT, W.,

- 1961 Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. *BZAW* 80, 52-54.

SCHNEIDER, T.,

- 1987 Die Semitischen und Ägyptischen Namen der Syrischen Sklaven des Papyrus

- 1992 Brooklyn 35.1446. *UF* 19, 255-282.
 --- 1992 *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*. OBO 114, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.

SCHROER, S.,

- 1985 Der Mann im Wulstsaummentel. Ein Motiv der Mittlebronzezeit IIB. in: Keel, O./ Schroer, S., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band I*. OBO 67, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen, 49-107.
 --- 1989 Die Göttin auf den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/ Israel. in: Keel, O./ Keel-Leu, H./ Schroer, S., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band II*. OBO 88, Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen, 89-212.

SCHULMAN, A.R.,

- 1967 The Scarabs, in: Bass, G.F., Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck. *Trans Am Phil Soc.* 57.8.
 --- 1975a Egyptian Scarabs, 17th-16th Centuries BC. in: Noveck, M., *The Mark of Ancient Man*. The Brooklyn Museum.
 --- 1975b The Ossimo scarab reconsidered. *Journal of the American Research Centre in Egypt* 12, 15-18.
 --- 1978 Two Scarab Impressions from Tel Michal. *TEL AVIV* 5, 148-151.
 --- 1989 Review of Tufnell, O. *Bibliotheca Orientalis XLVI*, 5/6, 621-22.

SCHUMACHER, G.,

- 1908 *Tell el-Mutesellim I*. Leipzig.

SEEDEN, H.,

- 1982 Peace figurines from the Levant. *Archéologie au Levant, Recueil R. Saidah*. Lyon. 107-121. Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen. No.12.

SEGER, J.D.,

- 1974 The MBIIC Date of the East Gate at Shechem. *Levant* VI, 117-130.
 --- 1975 The MBII Fortifications at Shechem and Gezer. A Hyksos Retrospective. *EI* 12, 34-45.
 --- 1988 *Gezer V: The Field I Caves*. Jerusalem.

SELLIN, E.,

- 1927 Die Ausgrabung von Sichem. *ZDPV* 50, 265-274.

SELLIN, E./WATZINGER, C.,

- 1913 *Jericho*. Leipzig.

SETHE, K.,

- 1906 *Urkunden des 18. Dynastie*. Leipzig.
 --- 1907 *Urkunden des 18. Dynastie*. Leipzig.

- 1926 *Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässscherben des mittleren Reiches*. Berlin.
- 1933 *Urkunden des alten Reichs (Urk. I)*. Leipzig.
- SHAY, T.,
- 1983 Burial customs at Jericho in the Intermediate Bronze Age: A componential analysis. *TEL AVIV* 10, 26-37.
- SHEA, W.H.,
- 1979 The Conquests of Sharuhén and Megiddo Reconsidered. *IEJ* 29, 1-5.
- 1988 Proto-Sinaitic Inscription no. 357. *UF* 20, 301-308.
- SHENNAN, S.,
- 1975 The Social Organisation at Branc. *Antiquity* 49, 279-288.
- SHILOH, Y.,
- 1993 Megiddo. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol III*. 1003-1024.
- SHIPTON, G.M.,
- 1939 *Notes on the Megiddo Pottery of Strata VI-XX*. Chicago.
- SIMONS, J.,
- 1937 *Handbook for the study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*. Leiden.
- SIMPSON, W.K.,
- 1969 The Dynasty XIII stela from the Wadi Hammamat. *MDAIK* 25, 154-158.
- SMITH, H.S.,
- 1976 *The Fortress of Buhen. The Inscriptions*. London.
- SMITH, H.S./JEFFREYS, D.
- 1985 The survey of Memphis 1983. *JEA* 71, 5-11.
- SMITH, H.S./JEFFREYS, D./MALEK, J.,
- 1983 The survey of Memphis 1981. *JEA* 69, 30-42.
- SMITH, H.S./ SMITH, A.,
- 1976 A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts. *ZÄS* 103, 48-76.
- SMITH, R.H.,
- 1973 *Pella of the Decapolis I. The 1967 season of the College of Wooster Expedition*

- to Pella. Wooster.
- 1993 Pella. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J. (eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol III.* 1174-1180.
- SMITH, R.H./DAY, L.P.,
- 1989 *Pella of the Decapolis II. Final Report on the College of Wooster Excavations in Area IX; The Civic Church Complex 1979-1985.* Wooster.
- SMITH, S.,
- 1940 *Alalakh and Chronology.* London. --
- SMITH, W.S.,
- 1965 *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East.* Yale University Press.
- 1969 Influence of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt in Western Asia, especially at Byblos. *AJA* 73, 277-281.
- SPARKS, R.,
- 1995 Egyptian Stone Vessels in Syro-Palestine during the Second Millennium B.C. and their Impact on the Local Stone Industry. *Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 5, 51-66.
- SPEISER, E.A.,
- 1933 Ethnic movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium BC. The Hurrians and their connections with the Habiru and the Hyksos. *AASOR* 13, 13-54.
- SPRENGLING, M.,
- 1931 *The Alphabet. Its Rise and Development from the Sinai Inscriptions.* Chicago.
- STADELMANN, R.,
- 1967 *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten.* Leiden.
- STARKEY, J.L./HARDING, L.,
- 1932 *Beth Pelet II.* London.
- STARR, R.F.S./BUTIN, R.F.,
- 1936 *Excavations and Protosinaitic Inscriptions at Serabit el-Khadim.* London.
- STEINDORFF, G.,
- 1935 *Aniba I.* Glückstadt.
- 1937 *Aniba II.* Glückstadt.

STEWART, J.R., et al,

- 1974 *Tell el-'Ajjul: The Middle Bronze Age Remains*. Göteborg. (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 38).

STIEBING, W.H. Jr.,

- 1971 Hyksos burials in Palestine. A review of the evidence. *JNES* 30, 110-117.

STOCK, H.,

- 1942 *Studien zur Geschichte und Archäologie der 13. bis 17. Dynastie Ägyptens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Skarabäen dieser Zwischenzeit*. Glückstadt.

TAYLOR, J.H.,

- 1991 *Egypt and Nubia*. London.

TEISSIER, B.,

- 1989 *Egyptianising Elements in the Bronze Age Cylinder Seals of Syro-Palestine*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis. University of Oxford.
- 1990 The Seal Impression Alalakh 194: A New Aspect of Egypto-Levantine Relations in the Middle Kingdom. *LEVANT XXII*, 65-73.
- 1996 *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*. OBO Freiburg/Schweiz and Göttingen.

TITE, M.S.,

- 1987 Characterisation of early vitreous materials. *Archaeometry*, 29: 21- 34.

TITE, M.S./BIMSON, M.,

- 1986 Faience: an investigation of the microstructures associated with the different methods of glazing. *Archaeometry*, 28: 69-78.
- 1987 Identification of early vitreous material. *Recent Advances in the Conservation and Analysis of Artifacts* (ed. Black, J.) London. pp.81-5.
- 1989 Glazed steatite: an investigation of the methods of glazing used in ancient Egypt. *World Archaeology* 21: 87-100.

TITE, M.S./BIMSON, M./ COWELL, M.R.,

- 1984 Technological examination of Egyptian blue. *Archaeological Chemistry III* (Ed. Lamber, J.B.). Washington. p.215-42.
- 1987 The technology of Egyptian blue. In *Early Vitreous Materials* British Museum Occasional Paper no. 56. (eds. Bimson, M., & Freestone, I.C.) London. pp.39-46.

TITE, M./FREESTONE, I.C./BIMSON, M.,

- 1983 Egyptian Faience: an investigation of the methods of production. *Archaeometry*, 25:17-27.

TOOMBES, L.E./WRIGHT, G.E.,

- 1961 The Third Campaign at Balatah (Shechem). *BASOR* 161, 11-54.
- 1963 The Fourth Campaign at Balatah (Shechem). *BASOR* 169, 1-60.

TRIGGER, B.,

- 1976 *Nubia under the Pharaohs*. London.

TRIGGER, B./KEMP, B.J./O'CONNOR, D./LLOYD, A.B.,

- 1983 *Ancient Egypt: A Social History*. Cambridge.

TUFNELL, O.,

- 1953 *Lachish III*. London.
- 1956 'Hyksos' Scarabs from Canaan. *Anatolian Studies* VI, 67-74.
- 1958 *Lachish IV*. London.
- 1969 The Pottery from Royal Tombs I-III at Byblos. *BERYTUS* 18, 5-33.
- 1970 Some Scarabs with Decorated Backs. *LEVANT* 2, 95-99.
- 1973 The Middle Bronze Age Scarab-Seals from Burials on the Mound at Megiddo. *LEVANT* 5, 69-82.
- 1975a Seal Impressions from Kahun and Uronarti Fort. *JEA* 61, 67-101.
- 1975b Scarab Seals in Egypt and Palestine during the 2nd Intermediate Period. *Actes XXIXe Congrès des Orientalists*, 104.
- 1975-6 Tomb 66 at Ruweise, near Sidon, *BERYTUS* 24, 5-25.
- 1978 Graves at Tel el-Yehudiyeh: reviewed after a lifetime. in: Moorey, P.R.S. (ed.), *Archaeology in the Levant. Essays for Kathleen Kenyon*. Warminster.
- 1984 *Studies on Scarab Seals, Vol II. Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium BC*. Warminster.

TUFNELL, O./INGE, C.H./HARDING, L.,

- 1940 *Lachish II. The Fosse Temple*. London.

TUFNELL, O./WARD, W.,

- 1966 Relations between Byblos, Egypt and Mesopotamia at the end of the Third Millennium B.C. A Study of the Montet Jar. *SYRIA XLII*, 165-241.

UCKO, P.J.,

- 1969 Ethnography and Archaeological Interpretation of Funerary Remains. *World Archaeology* 1: no. 2, 262-280.

USSISHKIN, D.,

- 1993 Lachish. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol III*. 897-911.

VAN BEEK, G.W.,

- 1993 Gerar. in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol II*. 668-674.

VAN SETERS, J.,

- 1966 *The Hyksos: A New Investigation*. New Haven-London.

VERCOUTTER, J.,

- 1970 *Mirgissa I*. Paris.
 --- 1975 *Mirgissa II*. Paris.
 --- 1976 *Mirgissa III*. Paris.

VILA, A.,

- 1975 La Nécropole du Plateau Occidental (M.X.). in: Vercoutter, J.(ed.), *Mirgissa II*. Paris.
 --- 1987 *Le Cimetière Kermaïque D'Ukma Ouest*. CNRS, Paris.

VINCENT, L.H.,

- 1923 Notes and News: A New Chronological Classification of Palestinian Archaeology. *PEFQS*, 54-55.

WADDELL, E.G.,

- 1940 *Manetho*. The Loeb Classical Library.

WAINWRIGHT, G.A./GARDINER, A.H.,

- 1913 *Tarkhan I and Memphis V*. London.

WARD, J.,

- 1902 *The Sacred Beetle. A Popular Treatise on Egyptian Scarabs in Art and History*. London.

WARD, W.A.,

- 1961 Egypt and the East Mediterranean in the Early Second Millennium BC. *Or.* 30, 129-155.
 --- 1963 Notes on some Semitic Loan-words and Personal Names in Late Egyptian. *Or.* 32, 413-436.
 --- 1965 Un Cylindre Syrien inscrit de la deuxième période intermédiaire. *SYRIA XLII*, 35-44.
 --- 1971 *Egypt and the East Mediterranean World 2200-1900 B.C.* American University of Beirut.
 --- 1976 Some Personal Names of the Hyksos Period Rulers and Notes on the Epigraphy of their scarabs. *UF* 8, 353-369.
 --- 1978 *Studies on Scarab Seals, Vol I. Pre-12th Dynasty Scarab Amulets*. Warminster.
 --- 1979 Remarks on some Middle Kingdom Statuary Found at Ugarit. *U.F.* XI, 799-806.
 --- 1982 The 't hnkt "Kitchen", and the Kitchen Staff of Middle Kingdom Private Estates. *CdÉ* 57, 191-200.
 --- 1984 Royal-Name Scarabs. in: Tufnell, O; *Studies on Scarab Seals, Vol II. Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium BC*. Warminster.
 --- 1987 Scarab Typology and Archaeological Context. *AJA* 91, 507-532.

- 1989 Some Foreign Personal Names and Loan-words from the Deir el-Medineh Ostraca. in: Leonard, A. jr & Williams, B.B.(eds), *Essays in Ancient Civilization Presented to Helène J. Kantor*. Chicago. 287-303.
- 1991 Early Contacts between Egypt, Canaan and Sinai: Remarks on the Paper by Ammon Ben-Tor. *BASOR* 281, 11-26.
- 1992 The Present Status of Egyptian Chronology. *BASOR* 288, 53-66.
- 1993 The Scarabs, Scaraboid and amulet plaque from Tyrian Cinerary Urns. *BERYTUS* XXXIX, 89-99.
- 1994 Beetles in Stone: The Egyptian Scarab. *BA* 57/4, 186-202.

WARD, W.A./DEVER, G.D.,

- 1994 *Scarab Typology and Archaeological Context*. Van Siclen Books. San Antonio, Texas.

WASON, P.K.,

- 1994 *The Archaeology of Rank*. Cambridge University Press.

WATZINGER, C.,

- 1929 *Tell el-Mutesellim II*. Leipzig.

WEILL, R.,

- 1904 Recueil des inscriptions égyptiennes du Sinaï. Paris.
- 1917 La Fin du Moyen Empire Égyptien Compléments. *JA* 11/9, 5-143.
- 1918 *La Fin du Moyen Empire Égyptien*. Vols. I, II. Paris.
- 1953 *XIIIe dynastie, Royauté de Haute-Égypte et domination Hyksos dans le Nord*. Cairo.

WEINSTEIN, J.M.,

- 1974 A Statuette of the Princess Sobeknefru at Tel Gezer. *BASOR* 213, 49-57.
- 1975 Egyptian Relations with Palestine in the Middle Kingdom. *BASOR* 217, 1-16.
- 1981 The Egyptian Empire in Palestine: A Reassessment. *BASOR* 241. 1-28.
- 1991 Egypt and the Middle Bronze IIC/ Late Bronze IA Transition in Palestine. *LEVANT* XXIII, 105-115.
- 1992 The Chronology of Palestine in the Early Second Millennium B.C.E. *BASOR* 288, 27-46.

WEISS, H. (ed.),

- 1985 *Ebla to Damascus. Art and Archaeology of Ancient Syria*. Washington.

WILLIAMS, B.,

- 1970 *Representational Scarabs from the Second Intermediate Period*. MA Thesis. University of Chicago.
- 1975 *Archaeological and Historical Problems of the 2nd Intermediate Period*. Ph.D.Thesis (unpublished), University of Chicago.

WILSON, J.A.,

- 1939 Hieroglyphic Inscriptions. in: Loud, G. *Megiddo Ivories*. Chicago.

- 1941 The Egyptian Middle Kingdom at Megiddo. *AJSLL* LVIII, 225-236.
- 1951 *The Burden of Egypt*. Chicago.
- 1955 The Inscription of Khu-Sebek, called Djaa. in: Pritchard, J.B., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton. (2nd ed.)

WINLOCK, H.E.,

- 1947 *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom at Thebes*. New York.

WINTER, I.J.,

- 1987 Legitimation of authority through image and legend. Seals belonging to officials in the Administrative Bureaucracy of the Ur III state. in: Gibson, M. & Biggs, R.D. (eds.), *The Organisation of Power. Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago. 69-116.

WINTER, U.,

- 1983 *Frau und Göttin. Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt*. OBO 53, Freiburg/ Schweiz and Göttingen.

WOOLLEY, L.,

- 1953 *A Forgotten Kingdom*. Harmondsworth.
- 1955 *Alalakh. An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay. 1937-1949*. Oxford.

WRIGHT, G.E.,

- 1965 *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*. London.

WRIGHT, G.H.,

- 1968 Tell el-Yehudiyah and the Glacis. *ZDPV* 84, 1-17.

YADIN, Y.,

- 1958 *Hazor I. Season 1955*. Jerusalem.
- 1960 *Hazor II. Season 1956*. Jerusalem.
- 1961 *Hazor III-IV, Seasons 1957-1958*. Jerusalem.
- 1972 *Hazor. The Schweich Lecture 1970*. Oxford University Press.
- 1973 The Tell Beit Mirsim G-F Alleged Fortifications. *BAŞOR* 212, 23-25.
- 1978 The Nature of Settlements in the Middle Bronze IIA and the Problem of the Apeh Fortifications. *ZDPV* 94, 1-23.
- 1993 Hazor in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol II*. 594-606.

YADIN, Y./GEVA, S.,

- 1986 *Investigations at Beth Shean: The Early Iron Age strata*. (QEDEM 23). Jerusalem.

YASUR-LANDAU, A.,

- 1992 Socio-political and Demographic aspects of the Middle Bronze Age Cemetery at Jericho. *TEL AVIV* 19, 235-246.

YISRAELI, Y.,

- 1993 Tell el Far'ah (south). in: Stern, E./Lewinson-Gilboa, A./Aviram, J.(eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land. Vol II.* 441-444.

YON, M.,

- 1991 Les stèles de pierre, in: Yon, M.(ed.), *Arts et Industries de la Pierre.* Paris. 273-343.

ZEIDLER, J.,

- 1993 A new approach to the Late Egyptian "Syllabic Orthography", in: *Sesto Congresso Internazionale di Egittologia. Atti. Vol II.* IAE, 579-589.

ZIVIE, A.,

- 1989 Le Trésor Funéraire du Vizir 'Aper-el. *BSFE* 116, 31-42.
- 1991 The treasury of 'Aper-El. *EA* 1, 26-28.