

PART I

EGYPT FROM THE END OF THE TWELFTH DYNASTY TO THE
EXPULSION OF THE HYKSOS: TEXT

CHAPTER I

PROBLEMS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CHRONOLOGY OF EGYPT BETWEEN THE OLD KINGDOM AND THE AMARNA PERIOD

Though archaeologists tend to look upon Egyptian materials as better dated and better understood than those elsewhere, we will find the groups in Egypt are more confused and misunderstood than Baghouz or Kerma. Part of this problem is the fault of hasty excavation, careless or purely philological thinking, inadequate preparation and inexpensive publication. To a surprising degree, much of it is the inevitable result of the condition of the material.

The vast majority of all excavations with which we must deal were British excavations done between 1880 and 1950. Relatively few German, Austrian, French (Polish) and American excavations found material from the period with which we are concerned. Far fewer of these were published. Some are known from mediocre preliminary reports. A few were published beautifully, as the tomb of Senebtisi. A few are in process now. English excavators, with the exception of Garstang, maintained a difficult schedule. Petrie, especially, published excavations in an astonishingly short time after completing the season, often nine months or less. These books were produced at low cost, ensuring a continued allocation of resources to the field work which was always just a step ahead, if ahead at all, of the dealers. Had not this routine been followed, most of the material from this period would have

been lost. Yet because of it, some was lost anyway. Some information can be recovered and is being published by the staff of the Petrie collection in a program of supplementary publication.¹ Some information must remain lost as the records are incomplete. We can mourn the loss; we can certainly excuse it as the product of necessity. We can never ignore it. For if we do, we will fail utterly to understand the material. We must point out the major weaknesses and keep them constantly in mind.

Groups were examined hastily in the field. Only rarely was any analysis of the bones in various tombs made to determine the number of individuals. Often the pottery was not kept after it was typed into the corpus.

Groups were treated as essentially unmixed and equal. Pottery in the registers is generally mentioned as from the tomb, but not from individual chambers. In some cases, the groups and plans were not fully published. At Diospolis Parva, where the sequence dating system was developed, the registers were never published.² Though some important records remain in the notebooks of the Petrie collection, they are incomplete, covering only a few cemeteries of this important complex.

Pottery was published by the broken corpus system. That is, only new forms of pottery from individual groups were published in corpora assigned to different dates, such as New Kingdom or Twelfth

¹Barbara Adams, Ancient Hierakonpolis (Warminster: Aris and Philips, 1974); Barbara Adams, Ancient Hierakonpolis Supplement (Warminster: Aris and Philips, 1974).

²W. M. F. Petrie, Diospolis Parva; The Cemeteries of Abadiyeh and Hu 1898-1899, Egypt Exploration Fund Memoir No. 20 (London: EEF, 1901). Only cemetery x (Plates XXXIX-XI) had groups published and there was also E 2 (Plate XXXVIII) both published in the photographs. Otherwise, the Predynastic and Middle Kingdom to Second Intermediate Period tombs were not published as tombs but as collections on Plate XXVI-XXXVII.

Dynasty. Pots in the groups were published only by reference to a corpus number. From the First Intermediate Period through the New Kingdom, the corpora tended to overlap. Some groups from the Tenth-Eleventh Dynasty Corpus belonged in the Twelfth Dynasty and so on.¹ In the Second Intermediate Period, the point of overlap between the Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom corpora was sometime in the Hyksos Age, as we shall see. Thus the fact that some Hyksos Age groups were assigned to the Middle Kingdom and some to the New Kingdom caused considerable confusion in the archaeology of that era. At Qau, large numbers of tombs were found that could be assigned to the Second Intermediate Period. This did not fully clear up the confusion, as these groups lacked the major imported wares of the period, Yehudiyya juglets.

Finally, haste in the field also meant that some pots would be classified with a type to which they had rather little resemblance. Thus important intermediate forms were lost. The chronology of Egyptian materials is damaged to the extent that we cannot write an adequate history of types. We are thus compelled to base our chronology on the presence or absence method of types, a method used in the British School of Archaeology in Egypt volumes with all of its shortcomings. Most important of these is the fact that the resulting groups will be clusters arranged more or less in order. That is, important features will be grouped closely together, tending to constrict the time-range of these

¹Guy Brunton, Qau and Badari II, British School of Archaeology in Egypt Vol. 45 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1928). The registers and corpora are divided differently. Register for VIIth-VIIIth Dynasties, plates LIX-LXIV; the register for Dynasties IX-X is on plates LXIV-LXIX; that for Dynasties X-XI is on LXIX; that for Dynasty XI alone is also on LXIX. The pottery corpus on the other hand is divided into Dynasties VI-VIII on plates LXXXII-LXXXVIII; Dynasty IX-XI is on LXXXIX-XCIII.

features unnaturally. When combined with the mixture of the groups discussed below, which tends to expand that time range, we have two problems that seriously interfere with the construction of a sound chronology. Some features will be assigned a date that includes too much time; others will be given too little.

References to paste and surface is often slight, a problem that does not concern us so much here as we are using mainly the cultural-historical information of shape and decoration.

The remarks made by the authors of these publications concerning the date, history and significance of the materials are informed guesses, based not on systematic research, but on experience. Though experience is an effective teacher, it is rather arbitrary. The unsupported statements to be found in these publications are thus misleading and are at best working hypotheses.

The state of the material is even more dangerous to sound interpretation. Few of the groups we shall consider are single burial tomb groups. Most are from multi-chambered or multi-burial tombs. While a king or wealthy noble might aspire to a single burial chamber, perhaps even surrounded by the burials of his dependents, average subjects only occasionally and at different periods had single graves. At the beginning of our period, in the Twelfth Dynasty, a particular form of multiple burial was in common use that illustrates our problem. "A rectangular shaft would be sunk to a depth where stone or gravel was sufficiently consolidated for a chamber. One chamber would be cut from a short side of the pit. When occupied, a second chamber would be cut from the opposite side. More chambers might be added on the long sides. In one

case at Lisht there are six chambers in one level.¹ Thereafter, the shaft might be deepened to take a second or even third set of chambers. At Lisht, this resulted in a multi-leveled necropolis. Even if the workmen and supervisors were honest, this might result in considerable chronological difficulties. Burials were robbed as often as not, however. Objects were removed, pottery smashed or moved about or also removed; this is the normal group of the period. The so-called burial of ʿAk-Hor, the first of the tomb groups to be published and one of the most famous, has six inscribed objects, no two of them with the same name, one of them with the name of King Taʿo. We cannot be sure that his tomb is indeed that of ʿAk-Hor.² We must therefore be wary of each group.³ Where each group cannot be discussed individually as in the case with the B S A E excavations, no one can be sure of the correct placement of every pot or even every group. I am only reasonably sure of the sequence of types and groups of types.

I have alluded above to the opposite tendency as well, that of fragmentation. That is, objects are removed from contexts and materials removed from structures. Putting objects into contexts which include both architecture and pottery has been most difficult. Except for foundation deposits, an architectural feature is only a terminus post quem for its contexts, both loose objects and excavated tombs. The

¹Alan Mace, "Excavations at Lisht," Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 17 (1922); 4-22, see pp. 5-10, and fig. 2.

²Auguste Mariette, Monuments Divers Recuilles en Égypte et en Nubie, (Paris: F. Vierweg, 1889, pp. 15-17, Plate 51; see below p. 154.

³Bertha Porter and Rosalind Moss, Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings, Vol I: The Theban Necropolis, Part 2: Royal Tombs and Smaller Cemeteries (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), p. 604, Queen Mentuhotep re-used the canopic box of King Dhut.

The dating of Senebtisi is a prime example of grouping features without evidence.¹ "Kahun", called here Illahun town, is another example of the problem. The dating of the great jewelry groups of the Middle Kingdom has been based on the same criteria as the tomb of Senebtisi, proximity to a pyramid, and de Morgan failed to publish a good deal of pottery at Dahshur, in his excitement over the jewelry. The publication of El Qatta merely stated that many pots of various shapes were found.²

Even so, the sequence as it stands is far from useless. No Ptolemaic group has been credited to the First Intermediate Period. There is even no Eighteenth Dynasty and little Thirteenth Dynasty material credited to it. However, much material of the Middle Kingdom is attributed to that age. This state of affairs is due to two main causes. First, there is a lack of systematic or even critical evaluation of groups or logical dating procedures. Second, Petrie's chronology of Egyptian history caused the most important distortion in the time assigned to the various groups.

Sequence Dating in Historical Egypt

Several techniques for sequence dating have long been in use for Egyptian materials in historical times. The one used by the British School was developed by Petrie between the publication of the excavation at Rifa, where it was seen in rudimentary form,³ and that of Diospolis

¹See below, pp. 103-104.

²E. Chassinat, H. Gauthier, and H. Pieron, Fouilles a Qatta, Mémoires de l'Institut français d'archéologie Orientale du Caire, 14, l'Institut Français, 1906, p. 77.

³Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, BSAE 13 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1907) Plate X, A-F.

Parva.¹ Perhaps one of the most effective uses has been by Miss Kenyon at Jericho and Megiddo in Palestine of a variant of sequence dating.

The technique, as outlined for Qau, was as follows. Each tomb was given a card, with the pots represented by numbers on it. These tombs were then compared by a number of pots they had in common.² The resulting series, actually a number of ordered clusters, was dated by local termini post quem, then compared with dated objects and previous excavations to form a more or less dated phase. For the intermediate periods, unequivocal termini were not forthcoming, though a possible occurrence of the name of Amenhotep I in a Second Intermediate period group should have led to hesitation.³ These Intermediate groups were assigned dates based on guesswork and the historical chronology as used by British students of Petrie at that time. It has not, to my knowledge been reviewed and adapted to current chronology.

The basis for the dating of Qau, thus the other sites of the First Intermediate Period, rests in the Sixth Dynasty. Objects from tomb 3202 and 3217 had the names of Pepi II (Neferkare) and Queen Ankhnes-Pepi. Earlier clusters were then labeled Fourth, Fourth-Fifth, Fifth, and Fifth-Sixth Dynasties. Thereafter came groups called Seventh-Eighth, Ninth-Tenth, Tenth-Eleventh and Eleventh Dynasty. From "Sixth--Eleventh Dynasty Clusters" came button seals with loop backs. The earliest of these had been dated to Pepi II "or thereabouts" at Dendera. A vase of Tereru of the "VIIth-VIIIth" Dynasty and a circular copper

¹Petrie, Diospolis Parva, pp. 4-8.

²Guy Brunton, Qau and Badari I, BSAE 44 (London, Bernard Quarich, 1927), pp. 6-7.

³Below, p.210.

ornament dated to the First Intermediate Period at Sedment completed the local evidence.¹ The pottery of these groups had close relations with the complex of sties already mentioned from the period, especially the material from Sedment.

According to the Petrie historical chronology, this all made sense. This chronology required that all of the Intermediate Dynasties be placed end to end and the little known kinglets of each be given reigns of normal duration. Current thinking is somewhat different.

The Twelfth Dynasty is astronomically fixed, with its beginning at 1991 B.C. Dynasty XI as a chronological entity is 143 years, or beginning in 2134. The Tenth Dynasty is almost wholly contemporary, being absorbed in the Eleventh chronologically, or from about 2040. The Ninth Dynasty, the period of great disorders in Upper Egypt, is given about thirty years, based on genealogical material. The Turin Papyrus gives 187 years for the Sixth through Eighth Dynasties, or about 22 years for Dynasties Seven and Eight together. Von Beckerath allows even less time for the period of disorders (Table 5).

A new chronology being developed by Prof. Klaus Baer would increase the length of the period of disorder by about half a century or a little more.²

The First Intermediate Period, which Petrie and Brunton thought

¹Brunton, Qau and Badari I, pp. 7-8.

²W. C. Hayes, "Chronology; Egypt to the End of the Twentieth Dynasty," The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. I, Part 1, 3d Ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1970), 173-192, pp. 179-182; Jürgen von Beckerath, "Die Dynastie der Herakleopoliten," Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache 93 (1967): 000; Jürgen von Beckerath, Abriss der Geschichte des Alten Ägypten (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1971) 23-24, chronology list p. 64; Henry Fischer, Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C. (Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1968), pp. 130-131; Prof. Klaus Baer verbal communication, June 1975.

TABLE 5

THE ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FIRST INTERMEDIATE PERIOD THROUGH THE
TWELFTH DYNASTY ACCORDING TO HAYES AND VON BECKERATH

| Dynasty | Length Hayes | Date Hayes | Length V. Beckerath | Date V. Beckerath |
|---------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| VI | 165 | | | |
| VII | 8½ | 2186 | 1 or 0 | 2155 |
| VIII | 14 | 2178 | ca. 20 | 2155 |
| IX | ca. 30 | 2164 | (With Dyn. X) | ---- |
| XI | 143 | 2134 | 143 | 2134 |
| XII | 206 | 1991 | 206 | 1991 |

was many centuries long, lasted about a century and a half (or two centuries by the higher chronology), including Dynasties VII-X, or two centuries (or two and one half centuries) including the period of unification under the Eleventh Dynasty. Brunton thus assigned materials on considerable chronological significance to periods we now consider to have lasted less than a generation or two.

Though Brunton did attempt to divide the First Intermediate Period materials more finely than those of the Second Intermediate Period or New Kingdom, I feel it most likely that the four archaeological phases he assigned to the First Intermediate Period will have to be assigned dates that extend well beyond that phase. Since the Sixth Dynasty group is dated by termini post quem and there are Old Kingdom groups before it, the only age into which some of these groups can be put is the Twelfth Dynasty.

Thus the Petrie historical chronology is the fundamental source of error in the dating of Egyptian archaeological materials. Particularly in the British School or Archaeology in Egypt volumes, the long First Intermediate Period acted much like a vacuum, drawing groups of later date (earlier groups were dated by termini, thus forming an immovable barrier) into the First Intermediate Period. This set off a chain reaction that extended through the Middle Kingdom, Second Intermediate Period and the early Eighteenth Dynasty to the Amarna Period. The date of this stage, set by the formidable Amarna context, was the second immovable barrier. Between the two barriers, everything was assigned dates that were too early and probably too long. The consequences can be seen today.

Three major corrective influences can be sought in addition to a

full re-grouping of the materials. Tomb representations, foundation deposits and the strict use of termini post quem will all help reestablish a sound chronology. The first may be of especial importance at Beni Hasan. Though the pottery Garstang found there is execrably published, the general run of shapes is available. The decorated tombs came from a period when the representations were in constant change, and were thus taken from life. We thus have a dated series of comparisons.¹

Like tomb representations, it has long been assumed that pottery from foundation deposits is mainly archaizing. This of course explains away the discrepancies between the supposed date of the cemeteries and these deposits. Many however contained ordinary pots; the main problem is the limited range of types.²

Recent excavations in Thebes have given us a group of pottery from the earlier Eleventh Dynasty, of greater importance than most pottery that can be dated by termini. These are associated with the Saff tombs of the Tarif.³

The pottery from the Tarif as published by Mrs. Arnold included many drop-shaped pots with bulged shoulders and slightly grooved necks⁴ that are called VIIIth-IXth Dynasty at Qau.⁵ The simple wavy rim is represented, though the incised and wavy rims called IXth Dynasty at Qau were not found,⁶ nor were any of the bottle types with narrow or

¹Below, pp. 36-40.. ²Below, p. 58. ³Below, pp. 55-56.

⁴Dieter Arnold, "Bericht über die vom Deutsche Archaeologische Institut Kairo im Mentuhetep Tempel und in el Tarif unternommenen Arbeiten," MDIK, 28 (1972), Plate XIIb; Dorothea Arnold, "Weiteres zur Keramik von el Tarif," MDIK, 28 (1972), Plate XIXb.

⁵Brunton, Qau and Badari II, Plate XII, 22L, F, N.

⁶Ibid., Plate XCI, 91 N; XCIII, 94 S.

broad necks.¹ The types are not completely published, nor do they represent a complete sample of the material probably available. Nevertheless, I suspect that the evidence suffices to date the VIIIth - IXth Dynasty group of Qau to the early Eleventh Dynasty.

The Chronology of Egyptian Archaeology in the
First Intermediate Period and the
Middle Kingdom

Having noted the effect of the shorter First Intermediate Period on Egyptian Archaeology, we should undertake a very brief examination of the major sites to determine the extent of the chronological changes required. Though it is regrettable that we must begin so early, it is necessary to lay the foundations for the study of later Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period materials in the early Middle Kingdom.

Beni Hasan and Bersha

The representations in the rock cut tombs of Beni Hasan contribute to the history of pottery no less than that of weapons. The continuous change in the representations from the Tenth-Eleventh Dynasty through the Twelfth may be noted; the siege scenes and wrestling scenes especially have an active history, showing considerable change from generation to generation. We shall refer to the tombs named in Table 6.²

In the following discussion, we shall refer to the shape of the object as in the representation, then the number of the corresponding shape in Garstang's corpus of pottery from the shaft tombs excavated below the great tombs at the foot of the cliffs.

¹Ibid., Plate XC, Series 58.

²The order of tombs is given in Percy Newberry, El Bersheh, Part 1.

TABLE 6

MAJOR TOMBS AT BENI HASAN AND EL BERSHA

| Tomb Number or Location | Owner | Date |
|-------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 29 | Baqtı I | X - XI Dynasty |
| 33 | Baqtı II | X - XI Dynasty |
| 15 | Baqtı III | X - XI Dynasty |
| 17 | Akhtoy | X - XI Dynasty |
| 14 | Khnemhotep I | Amenemhat I |
| 2 | Amenemhat | Senwosret I |
| 3 | Khnemhotep II | Senwosret II-III |

The hemispherical bowl
(Garstang type 57)

Sub-hemispherical bowls were found throughout the series of tomb representations at Beni Hasan.¹ Since the type is not chronologically well defined within this period, it does not merit further discussion. Later, however, we shall see full hemispherical and over-hemispherical

Archaeological Survey of Egypt, Vol. 3 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1902); Wolfgang Schenkel, Frühmittelägyptische Studien Bonner Orientalische Studien Neue Serie, Herausgegeben von Otto Spies, Band 13 (Bonn: Selbstverlag des orientalischen Seminar der Universität, Bonn, 1962) pp. 78-84.

¹Newberry, Beni Hasan, Part II, Archaeological Survey of Egypt Vol. 2 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1894), Plate XXXV, register 1, 2 tomb 33; Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XI, register 4, tomb 2; John Garstang, The Burial Customs of Ancient Egypt (London: Archibald Constable and Co., 1907), Plate XV, no. 57. All pottery numbered from the Garstang corpus comes from plates XII-XV, hereafter indicated only by number.

bowls in the Late Middle Kingdom.

Tapered jar with everted rim (Garstang types 9, 10, 11, 12, 18?)

A variety of these jars occur in the painted tombs of Beni Hasan and Bersheh.¹ While common in the graves at Beni Hasan, these types are again not entirely distinctive, as their chronological range is too long.

Tapered bowls

Represented in all of the decorated tombs, these do not occur in the burials much if at all.²

Pedestal cups (Garstang 56, 62)

These appeared in tomb 2 in a tall tapered form. There were no carinated footed bowls from the burials.³

Globular jars with short necks (Garstang 41)

These are the classic water jars of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom. They are represented in tomb 2, but with a wide neck.⁴ The tall-necked version found at Riqqa, Haraga and southward into Nubia is absent.

Hes jars and related forms (Garstang 1-8)

These were represented in tomb 17 and in that of Djehutyhetep

¹Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XI, registers 1 and 2, tomb 2; XXXIX, reg. 4, 5, tomb 3; Newberry, El Bersheh I, Plate XXV, register 3.

²Newberry, Beni Hasan II, Plate XVII, Register 3, 2, tomb 17.

³Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XI, Register 4.

⁴Ibid., Plate XVII, Register 3, tomb 2; Newberry, El Bersheh I, Plate XV, Register 5, Djehutyhetep.

at Bersheh. They were common in the burials.¹

Tall jars with bottle necks (Garstang 20-24, with wide neck, 25, 26, 28, 29)

Bottle neck jars are shown in the tomb of Djehutyhetep thus at the end of the tomb series.² With the wider neck, they were represented in tomb 29 at the start of the series.³ Normally it was represented with a stopper, with the neck invisible.⁴

Flared-neck jar with long body and pointed base (Garstang 13, 14)

This characteristic jar of the Middle Kingdom was found in tomb 2 paintings.⁵

Conical beer jar (possibly like Garstang 36)

The conical beer jar, usually with a conical stopper, is a characteristic object in the decorated tombs.⁶ It was not mentioned in Garstang's corpus, though there are similar pots.

Foreign pottery types

A flat based jug with handle and trefoil mouth and an amphoriskos

¹Newberry, Beni Hasan II, Plate XV, register 7, tomb 17; Plate XVII, registers 3, 5; Newberry, El Bersheh I, Plate X, XXXIV, register 2, Djehutyhetep.

²Newberry, Bersheh I, Plate XXV, register 3, Djehutyhetep.

³Newberry, Beni Hasan II, Plate XXX, register 1, tomb 29; Plate XV, register 7, tomb 17.

⁴Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XLVI, register 5, tomb 14; Plate XI, register 3, tomb 2.

⁵Ibid., Plate XI, register 2, tomb 2; possibly Plate XII, register 5, also tomb 2.

⁶Newberry, Beni Hasan II, Plate XI, register 4, tomb 15; Plate XVI, register 2, tomb 17; Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XII, register 2,

relate tomb 2 to the EB IV - MB I in the Levant.¹

A quick perusal of Garstang's Beni Hasan register will demonstrate that the types mentioned from his corpus above are characteristic of the groups excavated below the nomarchs' tombs on the cliffs. These, though undated by royal names, should be of the same date as these great tombs of men who were their patrons. We have shown that they contain pottery similar to that represented on the walls of the nomarchs' tombs above.

Important pots normally dated to the Middle Kingdom lacking in the tomb paintings were the flared-neck jar with ovoid or globular body² and the tall-necked water jar.³ Since the representation of small pots was not so clear in the publication, it is best to rest our chronological argument on the bottle-necked jar, the flared-collar jar with the long body and the conical beer jar, along with the baggy jar with shoulder from the Tarif tombs at Thebes.

Since we are not directly concerned with the Middle Kingdom, I will point out only major features of the burials.

tomb 2; Plate XVII, register 5; Plate XXXV, register 3, tomb 3.

¹Newberry, Beni Hasan I, Plate XII, register 4, tomb 2; Plate XXIX, register 2, tomb 3; H. Thomas Schaub, "An Early Bronze IV Tomb from Bab edh-Dhra," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 210 (April 1973), fig. 7, p. 9 the amphoriskos; Robert J. Braidwood, Excavations in the Plain of Antioch I; The Earlier Assemblages, Phases A-J, Oriental Institute Publication LXI, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 415, fig. 318; 435, fig. 335; 437, fig. 337 no. 14; p. 443, fig. 342, no. 3; all came from Amuq phases I-J.

²Garstang, Burial Customs, type 19. This apparently evolved from 17 which in turn arose from the 15-16 series.

³Ibid., types 45 and 46. Type 47 is also a major type missing from the assemblage.

Tomb types

This usually was a vertical shaft, a meter square (1.25 meters x 1 meter x 3-10 meters deep). The chamber was normally to the south, about two meters long by eighty centimeters wide by almost a meter and a half. The chamber was often enlarged for later burials.¹ The tombs were very often robbed and reused.² On rare occasions, more than one chamber was found, added at a higher level from the original.³

Interment

This typically was made in a rectangular coffin with flat lid, hollowed out a bit from the inside. The dead might be covered by a cartonnage mask which in one case was an anthropoid coffin (Userhet). Canopic boxes, when found, contained four compartments, with wrapped packages of viscera.⁴

Grave goods

These included the pottery described above, models of the types made famous by the cache of Meket-Re^c, with the customary granary, brewing and boating models that are well known.⁵ Full size objects of daily use, furniture, musical instruments, weapons (and so on) were included, as well as jewelry and stone vases.⁶ Finally, we should note

¹Garstang, Burial Customs, p. 46 and 40-46 passim.

²Ibid., p. 480.

³Ibid., p. 50. Garstang may have this process reversed here.

⁴Ibid., pp. 55-6, 105-183 passim.

⁵Ibid., pp. 56-98 for examples.

⁶Ibid., pp. 100-162; note tomb 481, plate V is later, also 146, fig. 144, third row. The faience hedgehog fig. 140, p. 142 is also later; see below, pp. 113.

pottery altars,¹ crude mud figurines,² sometimes applied to pottery stands,³ and pottery models, perhaps somewhat later.

Qau

Pottery resembling the materials from Beni Hasan of the early Middle Kingdom was found at Qau and placed in corpora assigned dates from the Sixth through the Eleventh Dynasties. While there are some anomalies in these groups that may have resulted from the sorting, some points seem clear.⁴

Bottle-neck jars

These occur only in the form with the wide neck⁵ (series 58 in the corpora). At Beni Hasan, Sedment, and Kom el Hisn, narrow-necked forms occurred.

Flared-neck jar with long body

These occurred at Beni Hasan, but also here in a very elongated form⁶ (series 66).

Short-necked globular jar

These occurred as at Beni Hasan and Sedment,⁷ (series 51, G-Q).

¹Ibid., Plate XI, fig. 102.

²Ibid., figs. 203, 204, 206, and 207.

³Ibid., figs. 205, 210, and 211.

⁴Brunton, Qau and Badari II, plates LXXXII-LXXXVIII, LXXXIX-XCIII.

⁵Ibid., series 58.

⁶Ibid., series 66.

⁷Ibid., series 51 G-Q.

TABLE 7
A RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF PRINCIPAL CEMETERIES IN EGYPT IN THE MIDDLE KINGDOM

| | XIII | XII | | | | | XI | X | "VI- VIII Dync" |
|---------------------|------|--|------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| | | AIII | SIII | SII | AII | SI | | | |
| Qau | | (Scattered groups from the IX - XI and M.K. registers) | | | | | | | "IX- XI Dync" |
| Beni Hasan Nomarchs | | | | 3 | 2 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 29 |
| Beni Hasan | | | | | Age of the main groups in the Beni Hasan Cemetery | | | | |
| Rifa | | (Scattered Groups) "X - XI Dynasty" | | | | | | | |
| Sedment | | | | | "VI - X Dynasty" Corpus | | | | |
| Riqqa | | B | A | | | | | | |
| Maraga | | A | Scattered Early Groups | | | | | | |
| Hawara | | Pyramid Cemetery | | | | | | | |
| Illahun | | Town and Cemetery Groups | | | | | | | |
| Saqqara | | | | | Scattered Groups from the Teti' Pyramid Cemetery - Coni-em-hat, etc. | | | | |
| Kom el Hisn | | Scattered Later Groups and Foreign Burials | | | | Main Period of the Cemetery | | | |
| | | | | See Text | See Text | Narrow-Neck Bottles | Wide-Neck Bottles | See Text | |

Later types, the flat bottomed jar with moderate proportions,¹ and corrugated-necked jars, do not occur.² Since the later Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties were so poorly represented at Qau, the failure of these types to appear not surprising. Their presence at Beni Hasan was thus due to mixture. Here, the gap noted in the Middle Kingdom may begin rather earlier than the excavators thought, since none of the narrow-necked bottle types were present.

Interment

Tombs were of the shaft type, more rectangular than those of Beni Hasan, with a chamber, generally to the south. Coffins were found, but in such deteriorated condition that few facts could be ascertained about them.³ Canopic chests were not mentioned. Also not mentioned were the wooden models so common at Sedment and Beni Hasan. If they had been present originally, fragments or traces would have been found and some mention would have been made. Present here but not found or mentioned from Beni Hasan and Sedment were the button seals⁴ and tanged spearheads.⁵ These last are not necessarily contemporary with the developed epsilon axes published on the same plates. The spears were of a simple tanged type, a development of the types used in Asia, but with a simple bulge at the end of the tang. From the differences between Qau and the Sedment-Beni Hasan materials, I must consider the main body

¹Garstang, Burial Customs, series 10-11.

²Ibid., series 48-52.

³Brunton, Qau and Badari I, pp. 46-47.

⁴Ibid., plates XXXII-XXXIV.

⁵Ibid., plates XXXVIII, XLII.

of the Qau materials earlier, based upon the wide mouthed bottle neck jars, the lack of models, and presence of button seals.

Haraga

At Haraga, cemeteries C and D contained graves of this period. In C, there were shaft tombs with chambers at either end; in D, only graves. Pottery included the narrow-neck bottle type, the flared beer jar, pedestal cup and tapered jar with flared collar which we have come to expect in late Eleventh and early Twelfth Dynasty groups.¹

Sedment

The corpus called Sixth through Eleventh Dynasties in Sedment I contained pottery that repeatedly paralleled that of Beni Hasan in the representations and the burials which we have dated to the later Eleventh and early Twelfth Dynasties.²

Hemispherical bowls - series 16

The shallow types shown in the tombs are very well represented in series 16 of the corpus.³

Pedestal cups

As in the Garstang tombs, pedestal cups are popular, along with examples which had wavy rims.⁴

¹Reginald Englebach, Harageh, BSAE, 28 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1923), plates XXI-XXXIII.

²W. M. F. Petrie and Guy Brunton, Sedment I, BSAE, 25 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1924), plates XXIX - XXXVI contain the pottery corpus.

³Ibid., series 16.

⁴Ibid., series 30, 38 h and m.

The hes shaped jar

These occur in series 84.¹

Tall jars with bottle neck

The narrow-neck type jars were common; jars with wide necks were rarer.²

Flared-neck jars with long, often pointed body

These are particularly conspicuous in the Sedment groups.³

Conical beer jar

These beer jars were popular at Sedment, and were classified in two series.⁴

Ring vessel

These were also found at Byblos below the Middle Bronze II temple. They occurred at Beni Hasan as well.⁵

Since the groups of Sedment have so much in common with those of Beni Hasan, they must be contemporary, from the late Eleventh through early Twelfth Dynasty. However, a number of points not clear at Beni Hasan can be clarified by the purer groups of Sedment. Tall-necked water jars were absent from these groups as were most miniatures that

¹Ibid., series 84.

²Ibid., series 86 k - v, with wide necks, 65 m.

³Ibid., series 49 k, m. s; 54 g, v - x, 55, 62, 63, 64 (the last four the complete series.)

⁴Ibid., series 36 and 35.

⁵Ibid., series 40; Garstaug, Burial Customs, fig. 212.

we shall see at Riqqa and Haraga. The flared-neck jar with globular or short ovoid body was absent from the Sedment groups. Corrugated-neck jars, found at Beni Hasan with a flat and short body, here had an ovoid body and round or pointed base,¹ instead of a flat base.

All of these types are then later, after the Beni Hasan and Sedment tombs which extend in large measure to Senwosret II. The tomb of Djehutyhetep at Bersha probably represents the transition in pottery types. We shall see later representatives of the bottle-neck jar type at Lahun and Riqqa. The tall-necked water jar, flared-neck jar, corrugated-neck jar with flat base and most miniatures must be dated later, after Senwosret II or later.

Burials

The shaft tombs of Sedment differed from those of Beni Hasan in that the shape of the shaft was more rectangular than square, was shallower and had no chamber.²

Grave goods

Where used, coffins were rectangular, normally undecorated save for eyes, or decorated very simply. No canopic chests were mentioned. There were occasional cartonnage masks.³ Scarabs were found, as at Beni Hasan, but not button seals. Head-rests are the only furniture.⁴ Models of all types occurred, fewer in these poorer graves than at Beni

¹Petrie and Brunton, Sedment I, series 79 e - w often referred to as the "salad mixer" in BSAE publications.

²Ibid., plates XXXVII-XXXIX, the registers.

³Ibid., plates XIII, XVI. ⁴Ibid., plates XIII-XV.

Hasan, but common enough.¹ Pottery offering tables were also included. The types of models and tables parallel those of Beni Hasan.

Kom el Hisn

The pottery from Kom el Hisn in the Delta² included the flared-neck jar with long body,³ short-neck globular jar⁴ and bottle-neck jar.⁵ In other words, the types correspond to those of Beni Hasan and Sedment and are Early Twelfth Dynasty in large part.⁶ Other groups and objects are later, as we shall see.

Interment

Types of burials included brick tombs, sometimes covered over, sometimes open, plaster lined graves and simple pits.⁷ In one case, a brick tomb had four compartments. Coffins, found in fragments, were

¹Ibid., plates XX-XXII, XXVI.

²A. Hamada and M. el Amin; "Excavations at Kom el Hisn Season 1943," Annales du Service des Antiquites de l'Egypte, 46 (1946), 101-111, plates XVIII-XXXIII; Guy Brunton, "The Dating of the Cemetery at Kom el Hisn," ASAE, 46 (1946), 143-145; A. Hamada and Shewfik Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn Season 1945," ASAE, 48 (1948), 195-205, plates XLIV-LXII; A. Hamada and Shewfik Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Third Season 1946," ASAE 49 (1949), 299-308, plates I-XI; A. Hamada and Shewfik Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Fourth Season, 1947," ASAE, 50 (1950), 367-379, plates I-XI.

³Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Second Season," plate LIII, especially 8, 9, 15, 17.

⁴Ibid., plate LIII, 16, 19.

⁵Ibid., plate LIII, 16.

⁶Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Third Season," plate VI; Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Fourth Season," plate III above below is pottery of the Second Intermediate - New Kingdom periods.

⁷Hamada and Amin, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Season 1943," p. 102-3.

rare, possibly because of deterioration in the soil, or possibly because they were not much used. It is probable that models were not found for the same reason.

Weapons

Weapons and jewelry from this site are well known. These included the veined dagger, fenestrated axes, a socketed spearhead and some more native types.¹ These weapons were found in sand pit tombs, alone, with no accompanying pottery.² In a dump about a meter above the burials was a dipper jug with painted Middle Bronze II A 2 decoration.³

Jewelry and seals

Apart from beads of various types, jewelry included uraei on neb signs,⁴ bars of metal with eyes at the ends, ancestral to the torque. Scarabs were fairly common, but the button seals of the preceding ages were quite rare.⁵

It seems clear that the cemetery of Kom el Hisn began in the Eleventh Dynasty contemporary with that of Qau and that it continued into the mid-Twelfth Dynasty contemporary with Sedment. Later

¹Ibid., plate XXXI, 48; Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Second Season", plate LVI, 49; Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Third Season," plate VII.

²Shewfik Farid, oral communication 1973.

³Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Second Season", fig. 15, with wavy and horizontal bands painted on the neck and body.

⁴Hamada and Amin, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Season 1943", plate XXXII; Hamada and Farid "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Second Season," plates LVII-LVIII.

⁵Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Second Season," plate LX; Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Third Season," plate X; Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Fourth Season," plate VII.

materials from the Middle Kingdom are attested from graves without pottery. Such burials without pottery seem to have been fairly common in the Middle Kingdom and Thirteenth Dynasties, as we shall see them in several places. Two graves, for example, were found without pottery in Tell ed-Dab'a G, one with a sarcophagus.¹ The weapons cited from the sand pit burials must, therefore, be dated by the Byblos parallels and the fact that there were no fenestrated axes represented in the Beni Hasan tombs to the late Twelfth Dynasty and later.

Rifa

Materials of the Eleventh to Twelfth Dynasties from Rifa, about five miles south of Assiut, belong to the latter part of the period under discussion here, that is the Early to mid-Twelfth Dynasty.

Tomb types were primarily simple graves, with a soul house descended from the pottery offering trays of the Eleventh Dynasty, placed above the shaft on the grave above ground. A few of these were found at Beni Hasan, but hardly the large number of elaborate types found here.² The earliest of these³ are already more elaborate than the classic simple types of Saff ed-Dawaba, but are in the same general class, and Eleventh Dynasty in date.⁴ All of the rest are of elaborate types which can be dated from the late Eleventh Dynasty well into the Twelfth. It would seem best to regard these not only as offering trays, but as a less expensive variant of the wooden models of the time, combined with

¹Below, p. 64.

²Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, 15-20, plates XIV-XXII.

³Ibid., plate XIV, numbers 14-15.

⁴Petrie, Kahun, Gurob and Hawara (London: Kegan Paul, Trubner and Trench, 1890), plate XIII contains an elaborate type of tray.

the house. Inside some of these were mud models of humans and animals¹ which we shall see separately elsewhere.

The pottery types, arranged on plates XIII A-C of the Rifa publication should be considered as a unit rather than as a series. A few indeed do not belong to this period; on plate XIII C, tomb 100, 259 and tomb 62 are all later. The Hes type jars and pointed-base jars are not out of place in the Twelfth Dynasty at Beni Hasan. Globular jars with short everted necks will be noted later at Riqqa, as they are so consistently found in this time. The corrugated-neck "salad mixer"² occurred in round based forms as did two clumsy flared-mouth jars.³ Other types from small groups cannot be characterized very easily. We should note that a late bottle-neck jar⁴ and some pots had incised and plastic decoration⁵ and painted spots.⁶

From two more wealthy burials came some funerary equipment of special importance.⁷ This included coffins with painted panelling outside, complete anthropoid coffins inside and models of boats and servants (the tomb of Nekht-Ankh and Khnemuankh). The canopic box was both compartmented and contained canopic jars.⁸ There was no pottery. This

¹Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, plate XXII.

²Ibid., plate XIII C, 114, 115, 121, and 122.

³Ibid., plate XIII B, 49 and 50.

⁴Ibid., Plate XIII D, 177.

⁵Ibid., plate XIII D, 181, 170, and 171.

⁶Ibid., plate XIII A, 20-24. The type of pedestal is probably later, so this is out of place.

⁷Ibid., 12, plates XA-E referred to as the tomb of Nekht-ankh and Khnumankh.

⁸Ibid., plate X, A-E.

tomb should be dated in the late Twelfth Dynasty despite the boat models.¹ There were also an ivory wand and limestone figurines.² The elaborate development of the coffins, the anthropoid coffins and the canopic jars require the date.

Dendera

The materials from Dendera were considerably more confused than most of those from Middle Egypt. There is no need here for a systematic resorting of the groups involved, as that would require a complete study of Sixth through Twelfth Dynasty types.

For the forms of tombs, we should note the following points. Brick mastabas with panelled outer corridor or court, and inner, bent-axis corridor chapel continue throughout the period Petrie calls First Intermediate (Sixth - Eleventh Dynasties). Substructures of these are approached by a sloping passage that is generally a trench.³ They began as tunnels.

Side by side with the mastabas with trenches are those with pits and chambers at the end.⁴ These occur in others in two classes, both considered Eleventh Dynasty.⁵

Only one tomb had the pillared forecourt, hypostyle hall and series of corridors and chambers associated with the latest Eleventh

¹Ibid., plate XI.

²Ibid.

³W. F. Petrie, Denderah, EEF, Memoir 17 (London: EEF, 1900), plates XXXI-XXXV, XXIX.

⁴Ibid., plate XXXV, east-west pits.

⁵Ibid., 13, plate XXXII. Note especially the colonnade court in relation to the panelled tomb.

Dynasty private tombs at Thebes.

The pottery of Dendera included a substantial number of problematic associations. The probability that the mastabas were at least partly reused was not approached in any systematic manner and most groups are rather poor anyway. A few points may be noted. First, pottery from the tombs of Merra¹ and Beb² included the rather baggy, nearly shouldered type jar that was documented from deposits in the Saff tombs at Thebes. Since the type was found in both Merra and Beb and these two tombs are in the same group of Petrie's classification, Fisher included this pair in his group of IXth Dynasty and some later officials.³ We should regard them as archaeologically contemporary with each other and the Saff tombs at Thebes. Other pots such as the short-neck globular jars were also found at El Kab.⁴ The pottery altars were far more elaborate than those found at Thebes in the Saff tombs.⁵

The one that resembles them most, from Mera⁶ is from a tomb of Petrie's group E which in fact resembles more the Sixth Dynasty trench type than does group D. The Dendera tomb sequence thus parallels the Saff tombs at Thebes in date, marking the pottery there generally as Eleventh Dynasty.

¹Ibid., plate XVIII, 40-42, group C, Petrie dated this group to the VII-VIIIth dynasty; note number 43 is Beb.

²Ibid.

³Fischer, Dendera in the Third Millennium B.C., pp. 117, 182-184 for Bb. Pp. 129-131 for Mrrr.

⁴Petrie, Dendera, plate XVIII, 53, 59, 61.

⁵Ibid., plate XIX.

⁶Ibid., plate XVII, 3. Not to be confused with Fischer's Mrrr.

Pottery¹ from shaft tombs with chambers at one or both ends was thus generally Twelfth Dynasty and later. Some of it was much later.² Since there are no groups published, it is useful only for comparative purposes. Again globular jars with short necks were common.³ Petrie mentioned that the most elaborate pottery altars were probably Twelfth Dynasty.⁴ This impression is confirmed from the synchronisms above.

TABLE 8

AN APPROXIMATE RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF THE TOMBS AT DENDERA

| Petrie Class at Dendera | Theban Tombs | Features | Date |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| E, C | Saff ed-Dawaba | Trench Substr. | Early XI |
| D | | E-W pit + chamber- Small mast. | XI - XII |
| F | Ashait, Meket-Re ^c | | Late XI |
| G-H | | Large mast. | XI - XII |

Thebes

In Thebes, we have the evidence from Petrie's Qurna volume, the Metropolitan Museum of Art excavations at Dei-el Bahri, and recent excavations in the Tarif. These last provided evidence from deposits of

¹Ibid., plate XVIII.

²Ibid., plate XVIII, 145, 147, 173, 180, possibly 181, and 183.

³Ibid., plate XVIII, 189, 190, 191, and 195.

⁴Ibid., plate XIX; Quibell, El Kab, BSAE, 3 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898), plate V.

early Eleventh Dynasty materials related to the Saff tombs. Though bowls and conical cup forms were of some interest,¹ the jar types had the clearest associations. These jars were primarily baggy with everted rim, often a bulge at the shoulder.² Likewise found in the Saff ed-Dawaba was an offering table of the simplest type found at Dendera. In the "Grab bei Abu Majit" were several more of this type, with the remains of a wooden coffin. Pottery from the latter tomb may be mixed, but the context in the Saff tomb deposits is clear. Most remarkable of all were fragments of polychrome painted pottery with representational motifs.³ We have already pointed out the example from Beni Hasan; there are possibly earlier examples extant. Still later, we shall see examples with funerary motifs.

While the bag jar with simple shoulder is well known from several examples from the cemeteries Petrie dug in the Tarif,⁴ much of the pottery there was more elaborate. Incised decoration, quatrefoil rims and other special features are well known.⁵ Since the Saff tombs are termini post quem for the lesser burials, we have a date of later Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasty for cemeteries A and B. This is further borne out by

¹Dorothea Arnold, "Weiteres zur Keramik von el Tarif," fig. 2.

²Ibid., fig. 3, see especially plate XII bottom and plate XIX; Brunton, Qau and Badari II, plate LXXXI, type 23-4, 30, 35 h - s bu, also LXXXIX, 29-30.

³Arnold, "Weiteres zur Keramik von El-Tarif," pp. 33-36, color plate, fig. 1, plate XVII, and XVIII.

⁴W. F. Petrie, Qurneh, BSAE, 16 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1909), 2-3, plates XIV-XXI, cemeteries A and B; also Arnold, "Weiteres zur Keramik von el Tarif," plate XVIII.

⁵Petrie, Qurneh, plate XV, XVI.

the offering tables which included not only the simple types of the Saff ed-Dawaba,¹ but considerably more elaborate types as well.²

After the Sixth Dynasty mastabas at Thebes, two types of tombs other than the royal Saff tombs were constructed. The first and most elaborate was the portice tomb build in imitation of the Saff. The second was the shaft with chambers at either end of the bottom.

In the later Eleventh Dynasty at Deir el Bahri, the same types of tomb were used. The former is exemplified by the tomb of Meket-Re⁶; the latter in a single chamber form by the tombs of the princesses. Pottery from these tombs remains unpublished, but that in Cairo from Ashait included globular short-necked jars with roll rims, a pedestal cup, hemispherical bowl and hes type jar with concave lower body profile (examples from the Tarif were convex). These simpler types parallel examples in Middle Egypt and Dendera and are ancestral to those of El Kab.³

Also key finds in the Deir el Bahri tombs were the models of Meket-Re and numerous fragments from a chamber full of models from the tomb of Nebhepetre⁶ himself.⁴ These included models of jars that can only be of the bottle-neck type. All but one of these are of the wide-neck variety, shown sealed with mud cones. The other was tapered.

¹Ibid., plate XXI, 609, 610, 627, and 629.

²Ibid., plate XX, 600, 601, 602, and 605.

³Brunton, Qau and Badari II, corpus plates, see above p.42, 51 g. h. q.

⁴Dieter Arnold, "Bericht über die vom Deutschen Archäologischen Institut Kairo im Mentu-hetep Tempel und in el-Tarif unternommenen Arbeiten," plate I-IX, IX, lower left quarter, above.

El Kab

The collection of pottery from the "Early Twelfth Dynasty" cemetery inside the walls at El Kab is a good deal purer than that of Dendera. Groups, however, were largely unrecoverable. We can point out the flower pot shape,¹ pierced ring stand,² wide mouth and baggy beer jar,³ Hes type jar,⁴ short-necked globular jar⁵ and the tapered jar with pointed base, high shoulder and short neck as seen in the Senwosret I deposit at Abydos. The other types cited parallel materials from the tombs at Beni Hasan, all of the forms together indicating an early Twelfth Dynasty date, as thought by the excavator. We can note the elaborate clay offering trays, a type which later developed into soul houses.⁶

The tombs were generally made by excavating a long trench with sloping dromos and building an arched chamber in it. One group of these was built together, as a compartment tomb. We have seen the type at Kom el Hisn, and will see it again at Edfu later.⁷

(Outside the wall, the later tombs were shafts with chambers at either end as Riqqa, Haraga, Lahun. Amenemhat III's name was found in these.)⁸

¹Quibell, El Kab, BSAE 3, (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1898) plate XIII, 3, 4, and 11.

²Ibid., plate XIII, 5. ³Ibid., plate XIII, 8 and 20.

⁴Ibid., plate XIII, 17, 19, 23, and 26.

⁵Ibid., plate XIII, 2, 7, and 16.

⁶Ibid., plate V. See p.50 note 4.

⁷Below, p. 183, Tell Edfu.

⁸Ibid., p. 15.

Abydos

Perhaps the best dated pottery group from Upper Egypt is the pottery from the foundation deposits of Senwosret I at Abydos. These include small dishes with flat bases, round based bowls with everted rims and tapered jars with pointed base, high shoulders and short, straight necks.¹ The deposits were dated by plaques found in bricks which were placed in the deposit.

While it was not intended to rebuilt the archaeological chronology of Egypt in the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties, there were two main points to be made here. First, burial customs in Egypt in the First Intermediate Period were geographically fragmented, particularly in tomb type, perhaps reflecting some of the political fragmentation of the times. Movement across boundaries was doubtless continuous, which provides us with out chronological synchronisms. Despite the fragmentation of burial types and customs, such types as the clay offering tray in the early Eleventh Dynasty, the wooden models in the late Eleventh Dynasty and the shaft tombs with chambers at either end were found from one part of Egypt to the other. Second, chronological synchronisms between history and archaeology were as follows: (Table 7) The BSAE Eighth-Ninth Dynasty group dates from the early Eleventh Dynasty. The BSAE Ninth-Eleventh Dynasty corresponds to the later Eleventh Dynasty. Sedment, Haraga early materials and Beni Hasan are largely to be assigned to the Twelfth Dynasty. In the early Twelfth Dynasty there was some continued geographical fragmentation in burial customs; we have no models at Kom el Hisn or El Kab.

¹Petrie, Abydos II, Egyptian Exploration Society Memoirs, Vol. 24, 1903 (London: Bernard Quaritch), p. 16 and plate XLVI, numbers 187-197; Quibell, El Kab, plate XIII, 16.

CHAPTER II

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE AVARIS AREA AND THE DATE OF YEHUDIYYA WARE

The sequence in the eastern Delta remains incomplete for the Second Intermediate Period. Though the Delta is not unexplored territory, there have been few cemeteries and fewer town sites excavated and published. Of the four sites that yielded material of Second Intermediate Period date, only two, Tell el Yehudiyya and Tell ed-Dab^{Ca}, are useful at present, especially for the Hyksos Age. The Thirteenth Dynasty is not clearly represented in the materials of the Delta. However, the two major sites illustrate the Hyksos Age in some detail. They provided the basis for the entire original inquiry.

Since the sequence at Tell ed-Dab^{Ca} is so important, we shall review the site in some detail. First, the major features of the various strata will be covered, followed by remarks on the chronology of Yehudiyya and Egyptian pottery. The chapter will end with an examination of the absolute chronology of Yehudiyya ware in the Nile Valley.

Tell ed-Dab^{Ca}

The group of four mounds known as Tell ed-Dab^{Ca} lies some eight kilometers north of Faqus, some seven hundred meters east of the road to Tanis, northeast of Bubastis by Qantir.¹ In the Hyksos Age, Tell ed-Dab^{Ca}

¹Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste and zweite Kampagne", p. 79.

and the other three sites to be mentioned below, Tell el Yehudiyya, Inshas and Farasha, stood on or near the eastern bank of the easternmost branch of the Nile.¹ Thus protected from land attack from Egypt, they had also the advantage of unhampered communication with Asia. Tell ed-Dab⁴a, northernmost of the group of sites, had two further advantages. A series of marshes to the east both protected that approach and forced the main trade route from Asia to pass by the tell between the marsh and the river. It is no surprise that this mound is part of a complex that is the best candidate for the site of Avaris.²

The mound Tell ed-Dab⁴a, called mound A, stands five meters above the fields, and measures about five hundred meters east to west. Kom B, part of the same complex, lies northwest of A, about one hundred twenty meters across. Six hundred meters to the north-northwest are C and D, between Ezbet Kostî and Ezbet Rushdi es-Saghira.³

Bietak believes these mounds to belong to a huge ruin field, extending two kilometers to the north of Tell A and 1.5 kilometers to the west, possibly all the way to Qantir.⁴

Activity of the Twelfth Dynasty is attested by remains of a palace gate that Amenemhat I erected and Senwosret III renewed, which is today near Ezbet Helmi. The village itself is on the remains of Tell Qirqafa.⁵

Northwest of Ezbet Rushdi es-Saghira was the mud-brick temple of Amenemhat I, renewed by Senwosret III.⁶

¹Ibid., pp. 82 and 83.

²Ibid., p. 83.

³Ibid., p. 83.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.; Shehatta Adam, "Report on the Excavations of the Department of Antiquities" ASAE, 56 (1959), 208-226, plates II - V.

Remains of the Thirteenth Dynasty were found here, especially by Habachi. These included statues of Sebekneferu and King (CAmu) Qemau Seherndjheriotef.¹ Two pyramidia, one in Cairo and one from Ezbet Rushdi es-Saghira, were also found in the area from this time.² This cannot be taken as evidence for Thirteenth Dynasty activity in the area, however.

The area has long been known as a source of materials from the Hyksos Age. Naville particularly found burials in pots, Yehudiyya ware and a Thirteenth Dynasty sphinx.³

Habachi had also located graves and buildings of Hyksos times. A scarab and Khyan and a statue of a king's sister of Hyksos times completes the series of objects.⁴ It was thought that the area was the site of a major royal residence in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties.

General Characteristics

The results of the excavations at Tell ed-Dab^ca gave the following assignment of levels in Area A I and A II (Tables 9 and 54).

The Thirteenth Dynasty: Level H

In both of Bietak's reports, the remains of H were called meager. On the sandy base there were levels of fences of sandy bricks. Round buildings with them of a type in use today as a protection for trees or

¹Labib Habachi, "Khatana--Qantir, Importance," ASAE, 52 (1954), 443-563. See especially pp. 458-60.

²Ibid., pp. 471-479.

³Ed. Naville, Saft el Henna and the Land of Goshen.

⁴Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne" p. 84; Habachi, oral communication, 1973.

TABLE 9
A SCHEMATIC STRATIGRAPHY OF TELL ED-DAB^{CA}

| Levels | Description | Syro-Palestinian Designation | |
|-------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | Excavator's | Here |
| A 1-3 | Greek-Ptolemaic | | |
| B 1-3 | Ramesside and Late | | |
| C | Clay-packed circular structures, probably tree-pits associated with level B | | |
| D1 | Not clear | | |
| D 2-3 | Hyksos occupation | MB II B-C | MB III B |
| E 1-3 | Occupation, called Hyksos | MB II B-C | MB III A and early B |
| F | Graves of MB II A-B | MB II A, B-C | MB II C and early III A |
| G 1-3 or 4 | Occupation of Dyn. XIII | | MB II C |
| burned H | Occupation of Dyn. XII-XIII | | |

for fodder storage. Many remains seemed to be of houses. There were only a few potsherds, however. In both A II and the sounding beside the village mosque, H was covered by a layer of ash, the one comprehensive destruction at Tell ed-Dabca.¹

The End of the Thirteenth
Dynasty: level G

In the first report, there was little information on level G. Most significant was the mention of a group of round-based small jars, platters and bowls. Juglets of Asiatic type with two part handles were mentioned also. Ashes were found on this layer also.² The ash deposits here were not sufficient to be considered a violent destruction.³

In the second report, architecture was said to be substantial. The walls were a brick and a half thick and bonded. Plans were mostly rectilinear, though there were some rounded facades. The buildings were equipped with courtyards and round structures and they surpassed modern Delta village houses in dimensions. An orientation north-northwest to south-southwest was normal. This orientation continued into the late Hyksos times and the Eighteenth Dynasty. These walls were sometimes reused as foundations in Hyksos times. Especially significant was the ten meter-wide street in squares K - L 12 - 14, perhaps a plaza for an important building.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 89. Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," pp. 17-18, also oral communication 1973. He referred to much wood, possibly from house roofs.

²Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne" p. 89.

³Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," p. 20.

⁴Ibid., p. 18. Later in level E 3, a large building fronted on this space.

Two burials were found in the deposits of G. Both were shallow graves, with no superstructure, with the bodies burned on the backs. There were few grave goods. A scarab was the only object from one grave; it was a type similar to those found in the Montet Jar.¹ The other grave was in a limestone sarcophagus with rounded lid, having an east-west orientation. The only grave goods were a necklace of faience beads and an alabaster kohl vase.²

Pottery from G debris was far less equivocal however. One pot especially belongs to the MB II C.³ It is an ovoid, red-polished jug with long neck and two part handle with ridge around the neck. Others were mentioned that belonged to the MB II, but most were not illustrated. One such object was a rim sherd of a jug with cutaway spout and two-part handle, also MB II C. There were Yehudiyya ware fragments with punctate decoration in rectangular and triangular zones, brown and yellow polished jug fragments.

One important fragment was of the standard Yehudiyya ware, black polished with white filled punctate decoration. This had several narrow bands of decoration. A band of metopes had a band of triangles below. Between this and a band of triangles above the ring base was a band of fish, punctate filled, with lines at the backs of their heads. This is

¹Ibid., pp. 18-19.

²Ibid.

³Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne" plate XXII A, no. 1737; below pp.922-923.

⁴Ibid., plate XIX, pp. 18-19; Kantor, "Egypt and its Foreign Correlations" p. 23, fig. 6; Bietak refers to all Asiatic type juglets as Yehudiyya juglets. He thus accepts a broad definition of this term. Prof. Kantor in Ehrich et. al., Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, p. 22, accepts only the incised and punctate decorated juglets as belonging to the group properly called Yehudiyya ware. Robert S. Merrillees has recently proposed (Trade and Transcendence in the Bronze Age Levant,

the earliest occurrence of representational Yehudiyya ware in context. As such, it helps to date such objects as the Lisht dolphin jug and related fragments.¹

The relationship of this series of pots with early Yehudiyya ware is clear. The date in MB II C also appears clear.

Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology Vol. 39 (Goteborg: Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, 1974), p. 59 that the term El-Lisht ware be used to describe the elaborate stage of Yehudiyya ware. It should be clear that there is no difference between the wares involved, but only the shape and decoration. Further, the shapes and decoration are related. Moreover, the name is inappropriate. Yehudiyya ware was named after the first site where the juglets of this type were found in context. There were few contexts at el-Lisht that could be relied upon. The first place where this particular variant of the pottery was recognized was Illahun town. If it is necessary for the pottery to have been found in context, then the name of Tell ed-Dab^a must be used. Both proposals are, however, an unnecessary elaboration. The following designations are used here.

While the designation Yehudiyya ware could properly be used to describe juglets of all types found at Tell el Yehudiyya, it could lead to tremendous confusion in Palestine, where most juglets are burnished or undecorated. Accordingly, I have used the term juglet to refer to the types found in both Egypt and Palestine. It will be qualified to describe any variants, such as the handleless juglet of Syria. (The dipper juglet is an unrelated form, which will generally be referred to here as the dipper.)

Yehudiyya ware or juglets will be taken here to include incised and punctate decorated juglets of all forms, and the juglets painted with brown-on-cream decoration. The elaborate forms to be described under levels F - E 2 at Tell ed-Dab^a are Early Yehudiyya ware. It has the sub-variants of narrow band Yehudiyya ware with metopes and standing and pendant triangles. This includes some with pictorial representation, Representational Yehudiyya juglets. Transitional Yehudiyya ware refers to the type found only in E 1 at Tell ed-Dab^a with only four pairs of poorly incised standing and pendant triangles. Late Yehudiyya ware or juglets refer to the types found at Yehudiyya itself, but only the simply decorated incised and punctate juglets. These were decorated in vertical or horizontal zones, generally of punctate chevrons. There was a variant with all over punctate decoration. The painted juglets or Painted Yehudiyya ware is the variety with chocolate-on-cream paint.

Thus several forms of juglets are left out of the general definition of Yehudiyya ware. These include the painted juglets of MB II B 1, burnished or undecorated juglets, including those found in Egypt, and the handleless Syrian juglet.

¹Ibid.; Wm. Stevenson Smith, Interconnections in the Ancient Near East (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 41-42, fig. 18.

The age of the Hyksos Conquest:
Level F

Level F consisted largely of the built tombs cut into the burned and other debris of G. If G showed signs of Asiatic influence, F contains evidence of Asiatic dominance.¹

The level contained no domestic building, only the tombs dug and built in the debris, and it apparently had a short duration. Belonging to the level are a small building, partly built over by Temple I (E 2), graves, mostly under Temple I and possibly part of the enclosure wall around the cemetery built before Temple I.

Tomb 1/12/5 was the most important of the individual graves of F. It was a vaulted grave with NE-SW orientation (Fig. 1). South of the building were buried five donkeys and two adolescent or young adult humans. In the chamber, there was a limestone sarcophagus which contained a man on his right side. At his side was a three-veined dagger² and a battle axe with a rectangular shape and notch in front of the socket. He also had a toggle pin and a scarab with the inscription "idnw n imy-r sd3wt c 3 m".³ There were forty pots, mostly plates, with a few storage jars and red-polished juglets.⁴ A red-polished juglet with

¹Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," pp. 20-24.

²Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne," p. 109, fig. 9, 810, 811, plate XXXIII, 1, and 2.

³Reading with the kind assistance of Prof. Klaus Baer; Ibid., p. 93. Bietak gives a slightly different reading, but the name is the important element; von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der Zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten, p. 40 indicates clearly that the name is to be read cm, not Qemau.

⁴Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne," pp. 90-93.

ridge neck and two part handle was of particular importance.¹ The tomb, by the evidence of the dagger, axe and the juglet, belongs to the MB II C. (Fig. 2).

Tomb K/12/1 was of similar date. It was a brick built tomb in a trench. The grave was plundered, but there were some remains. The body had been on the right side. Contents included a juglet with ovoid body, long neck and cutaway or upraised spout. It had a tripartite handle and button base. The surface was brown, polished to a metallic sheen. The type was MC II C at Megiddo.²

Under the wall between the procella and the sanctuary of Temple I were four graves. These were remembered later, as clay tubes were put into the earth toward them at a later date. There were also two side-by-side vaulted tombs that belong to this period. The oldest, 1/11/3, had four burials in various extended positions. Though the tomb was robbed, one of the burials had a steatite scarab with divisions of the wings and spiral decoration. Pottery in the chamber included shallow curved bowls of red-brown clay, mostly with disc bases and inverted rims. Many had red crosses on the inside and bands around the lip, such as we shall see at Tel Aviv in the MB III A 1,³ in Figure 9, f and g. There were also such white slipped vessels of "Middle Kingdom" types as a drop-shaped pot with wide mouth⁴ and two high, basket-shaped vessels with short

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., plate XXII, p. 21. See below pp. 923-924.

³Below, p.1062; J. Kaplan, "A Cemetery of the Bronze Age Discovered near Tel Aviv Harbour," Atiqot I (1955), 11, fig. 4, 10 and 11.

⁴Engelbach, Haraga, plate XXXV, 33 s and H 2, 46 m.

curved necks. One had the potmark "nefer".

Tomb M/10/8 of F was found west of the later temple. Of the two bodies found, the upper had a battle axe (of MB III type) and a triangular veined dagger of MB II type.¹ Most of the pottery consisted of juglets with red surfaces polished to a metallic finish. The juglets had multiple strand handles and button bases; the rims had profiles that gave the effect of a trumpet mouthpiece. There were also brown polished juglets, one with punctate decoration in three zones on the shoulder, belly and lower part of the vessel. These had pendant and standing triangles which made a polished reserve zig-zag in the upper zone, rectangles in the middle and a band of triangles below (Fig. 4). This is classic early Yehudiyya ware. Other juglets were rather barrel shaped with geometric incised decoration.²

The most important facts about F are the clear presence of the Asiatic type weapons, pottery and burial customs, especially donkeys, and the MB II C date of its beginning.³ The date was shown not in one but two tombs, 1/12/5 and k/12/1. The date was demonstrated not only by the weapons, the veined dagger and the rectangular battle axe, but the juglets as well, which are types exclusively MB II in date. By the end of the level, the designation we use is changed to MB III A (1), in M/10/8 Tell ed-Dab^a F thus gives us clear stratigraphic evidence for the end of MB II and the start of MB III in a close parallel to the Ajjul Tomb with the donkey in the dromos from the Courtyard Cemetery.⁴

¹See below, pp. 1183-1184.

²Petrie, Kahun, Gurob and Hawara, plate XII, 11.

³Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," pp. 20-24.

⁴Below, p. 1042.

Level E3

The most important new feature of E3, lowest of the E group, was the long building stretching some 45 meters NNW-SSE in A I. At the NNW corner was the foundation of a large tower, reached through the opening in the wall. The building itself consisted of only a single row of rooms. Behind it was a sort of open court perhaps with a low mound in it. In this court was a small grave, 1/14/7, perhaps of F.¹

The chamber of the tomb was small and massive, the most recent occupant extended. To the SSE was a small chamber that had an amphora with a dipper juglet inside and a red polished bowl in a bronze stand. There were Yehudiyya juglets of early type. Bones of a previous burial were scattered about.²

In the first hall of the building were found numerous fragments of painted plaster with azure ground, and red-brown and yellow ornament.

The Early-Mid Hyksos Age: Level E2

Together with E3, E2 was the great building period of the "Asiatic colony" at Tell ed-Dab^{ca}. The enclosure wall and the new Temple I were built, the latter partly on old foundations.³

Temple I was built of sandy bricks, of the same size as those used in the preceding graves. The ground plan was a wide rectangle with a transverse vestibule, central shrine and two side shrines. The facade wall was about twice the thickness of the others as though higher than

¹Bietak, oral communication 1973, from section profiles.

²Bietak, oral communication 1973.

³Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," fig. 3. On the plan, those parts of the enclosure wall build on old foundations are irregularly shaped.

the rest of the building. No more typical Egyptian plan could be sought.¹ The inner threshold was made of stones and had a single leaf door; the outer doorway was destroyed. The floor of the temple was a series of mud layers with white chalky surfaces, as though from a plaster wall or rainfall. In the pronaos were remains of burnt animal offerings.

A base stood in the middle of the sanctuary, apparently for a statue. At the entrance to the western sanctuary was a mud-brick bench at the wall. Beside the north-east wall was a large Yehudiyya jug, some 28 cm. high with standing and pendant triangle decoration. A large footed bowl was found in a niche at the entry to the east sanctuary (70 cm.) with the clay tubes in the ground leading toward the four level F burials mentioned above.² The fragment of a door jamb was found near the entrance of the temple, in the foundation trench of B - C date. Although unstratified, this fragment was only about 30 cm above what was probably its original position in the doorway of Temple I.³ The remains of the inscription read:

1. ntr nfr nb t₃wy c₃ . . . R^c. 2. s₃ . . . R^c n ht. f
i⁴

¹J. Vandier, Manuel d'Archéologie Égyptienne II, Les Grandes Époques part 2, l'Architecture Religieuse et Civile; Paris, Editions A. et J. Picard, 1955, p. 645, fig. 334.

²Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne," pp. 94-95; see Robert Houston Smith, Pella of the Decapolis, Vol. I; The 1967 Season of the College of Wooster Expedition to Pella (Wooster: The College of Wooster, 1973), 174-5, plates 20 and 41, object 248 for a similar installation of LB II date in Transjordan.

³Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne" 26, fig. 4. The jamb is the small object in square K 11 above the dotted line. Its distance above original position was given in oral communication.

⁴Ibid., plate XIII e, pp. 24-26. The top of the second cartouche contains the top of what is most likely a reed leaf, which can be seen more clearly in the larger photos of the author.

We will discuss the date of this jamb and the level E 2 below.

The largest and most important tomb of the cemetery was assigned to this level, located directly behind the main sanctuary, parallel to the wall (M/12/9). A brick chamber was built in the large trench; it was plundered soon after burial. There were about forty juglets of Yehudiyya ware of special quality present. Clay was well fired and the shapes were precise. Most were red polished with shiny exterior two part handles and button bases. There were a few black examples; two of the best had incised decoration, one with the white paste remaining in the incisions. One juglet had lotus flowers, the other lotus flowers and birds.¹

Other burials included two children. Outside were two equids, identified as asses.²

Lesser tombs were found in this level, with a chamber built only around the head and shoulders; these were poor in objects. Babies' graves had rather more goods, usually Yehudiyya juglets and a necklace.³

The transition to level E 1 was marked by some changes in Yehudiyya ware. Tomb 1/12/2 may have been originally constructed by the end of E 2. In any case its contents may only possibly refer to the end of this level. They are most likely E 1 in date. Most of the eighty-odd vessels were juglets. These were mixed piriform and cylindrical. Decoration included incised and punctate segment fields and horizontal zones above and below the waist of a biconical juglet (NB III B in date). In addition, there were plates and carinated bowls, the latter highly polished.⁴ Three burials were present, one with an axe, one with two

¹Ibid., plate XX, a and b. ²Ibid., 22-28. ³Ibid., 28.

⁴Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne," p. 29.

daggers, the lowest one on its back, perhaps in a wood coffin. This last had an ostrich feather.¹

Level E 1

Since the levels of Tell ed-Dab⁴a are interlocking, some aspects of the stratigraphy, especially the point where one level gives way to another, have yet to be finally decided. Thus some remarks may apply to D 3 as well as E 1. This period was characterized by the growth of the necropolis beyond its boundaries in the early stages, then by the building over of the necropolis. Most of the burials of E 1 and D 3 had vaulted chambers of mud brick. Simple graves also continued.

Many houses seem to have been rebuilt at this time. One large tomb was illustrated from the period, 1/14/5.² The battle axe it contained was a normal Palestinian MB III type. Juglets were almost all black or red polished, some with the punctate Yehudiyya decoration. This was generally in the form with four pairs of poorly executed standing and pendant triangles, transitional between E and D. The tomb thus also has some chronological significance.

Also found in this level however were examples of the simple Yehudiyya decoration on piriform and cylindrical juglets. This is the decoration in segment fields with punctate decoration inside, with the ground outside the fields burnished. It is either vertical (pie-section) or horizontal, in two bands above and below the waist. A type with over-all punctate decoration also appeared.

Cypriote jugs in the pendant line and cross-line styles were

¹Ibid., also tombs from A I, G/3/1 of D 2 and A II, 1/11/1-E.

²Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," plate XvC; Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die erste und zweite Kampagne," plate XV a.

found in this level, possibly exclusively, as whole pots.¹

The late Hyksos Age and the Era of the
Expulsion: levels D 3 - 2

The primary feature of D, already seen perhaps to some extent in E 1, was the growth of the settlement over the necropolis. The great building in the eastern part of the area dug was built over, as was the funerary complex. Houses were rather small in size. Later still, large complexes were added. Wider streets had small structures built in them.²

There was no longer room for a cemetery, so tombs and burials were made in houses. These were probably true family graves, normally with one or two roomy vaulted chambers, generally partly underground. In one case, M/13/1,2, the double tomb was planned as a part of the building. The entry was built right into the wall with a little shaft in front. The trench was filled with clean sand. In the chamber were five burials. As grave goods, there were only plates, bowls and two kohl vases of black-polished pottery (Fig. 26 a, b). The tombs were later plundered and debris either thrown or fell in. Most of the other graves of this phase were likewise plundered, possibly at the end of the settlement.³ In addition to the types of Late Yehudiyya ware mentioned above, with simple zones of ornament, there were theriomorphic fragments attested as well. Other Asiatic types included carinated bowls with red or black surfaces and zig-zag decoration.⁴

¹Bietak, field records and oral communication, 1973. Tomb 2072 was E 1-D 3, 272 was found in a Naville pit area, earlier than D 2; 1704 was from M/11/7 and is E 1 in date.

²Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," p. 29.

³Ibid., p. 31.

⁴Ibid., p. 34; Kathleen Kenyon, Excavations at Jericho; Volume I;

Level D 1

Level D 1 was represented only by a single thick wall traced for thirty meters through the excavated area, NNW-ESE.¹ The wall was four meters wide.

Chronology - Asiatic Pottery

For the purpose of our chronology, a summary of Asiatic and Egyptian pottery types at Tell ed-Dabā is fundamental.

The Middle Bronze II C: level G

Both incised and punctate Yehudiyya juglets and red polished juglets were found in level G. The red-burnished juglet had a ridge at the neck. The incised and punctate juglet was decorated with narrow bands of metopes, triangles and fish. These narrow bands are an elaborate form of the MB II type of early Yehudiyya juglet decoration seen at Megiddo and Affula. The ovoid juglet with the ridge at the neck is also MB II (Fig. 2, Table 54).

The Middle Bronze II C - III A: level F

Two tombs, 1/12/5 and K/12/1 contained a juglet with upraised spout and one with a ridged neck, respectively. The former also had a veined dagger and rectangular battle axe with a notch in front of the socket. Both these tombs are thus MB II in date.² The later tombs of F contained the juglet tradition into MB III A. The ovoid shape of the

The Tombs Excavated in 1952-4 (London: British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, 1965), fig. 140/24 group iii.

¹Bietak, "Vorläufige Bericht über die dritte Kampagne," p. 34, I, pp. 102-3; oral communication 1973.

²Below pp. 917-929, for characteristics of MB II.

early juglets gave way to more piriform type (Fig. 2). Rims in F - E 2 (the MB III A Levels) tended to be of the trumpet mouthpiece type, that is indented inside the rim., which leave a ridge outside.¹ Variants with only the ridge outside have been seen occasionally in the MB III B.² Decoration is incised and punctate, normally with a zone of standing triangles on the shoulder, metopes around the middle, pendant triangles on the lower body. This type of shape and decoration persists through E 3 and E 2 (Fig. 4).

The Middle Bronze III A: level E 3-2

In the E 3-2 range, new forms of representational decoration include the crude birds and lotus (Fig. 5a, b). The well executed representations of fish may still be seen on sherds, but these may be older. Otherwise the shapes and decoration are the same as later F.

If the door jamb mentioned above belonged to Temple I, then part of the reign of Apophis was contemporary with E 2.³ We should note again the Early Yehudiyya ware found in the temple on the floor, that may have borne his name.

Sometime at or shortly after the end of E 2, 1/12/2 and N/12/7 contained pottery with vertical zones characteristic of MB III B, late Yehudiyya ware⁴ (Fig. 6).

¹Bietak, oral communication, 1973.

²In Syria, this type rim continues in use, as the ridged rim of the Ras Shamra U M late 2 and 3 which is in fact MB III B. It is also seen in Alalakh type 137, the handleless juglet which even has this rim in levels VI and V, which overlap LB I (Notes from the Antakya Museum).

³Above, p. 70.

⁴Above, p. 723.

The Middle Bronze III B: level E 1

The juglet with four sets of standing and pendant triangles sloppily made were especially characteristic of E 1 (Fig. 5 g - i).¹ The trumpet mouthpiece rim had all but disappeared. The MB III B types of decoration, vertical zones or horizontal zones (particularly on bi-conical juglets) were dominant to the end of D 2. New in this level or D 3 was the painted type of Yehudiyya ware with chocolate on cream painting in linear style (Figs. 6-7).

We have already noted the Cypriote Pendant Line and Cross Line Style jugs from this level (Fig. 8 a and b).

The Middle Bronze III B: level D 2

Represented by relatively few tombs and houses which preceded the simple wall, this was also MB III B as indicated by the continued juglet types. Two bowls were also found in this level which gave a synchronism between Late Cypriote bowls, 1974 of Proto White Slip and 2100 of White Slip I (Fig. 8 c - e).²

The date of the sequence at Tell ed-Dab^ea is thus fixed to the Middle Bronze Age of Palestine at two points, the end of MB II, start of MB III A and the start of MB III B. A third major item of information is the absence of MB III C from this site.³

¹Above, p. 72.

²Despite the common claim that L. C. I begins with Base Ring I, Karageorghis has published two groups from Northwest Cyprus from Akhera and Pendhaia which have very large numbers of Proto White Slip and White Slip I pots but only one Base Ring cup and no Base Ring juglets, since these are from the area of Cyprus where Base Ring juglets were supposed to have originated, they are especially significant (Below, p. 710).

³Tables 54; 65 for Megiddo; 68, Tell el Ajjul and 77.

There was some information on more exotic materials. First, the high-quality representational Yehudiyya ware we shall see in some quantity at Lisht and elsewhere is related to Tell ed-Dab^a G - E 2, primarily G. As we shall see, there is some relationship with Middle Minoan III in this pottery.¹ Second, the synchronism with Cyprus may help clarify the rather confused chronology of that island, in the L C I.

Egyptian Pottery

The first mention of specific Egyptian pottery in the reports is that of BSAE types 33 s, 33 h 2 and 46 m in 1/11/3 (F) (Figs. 9-13). Also to be seen in the early levels were hemispherical bowls or cups which have already a rather tall side (M/10/9, N/12/7) along with shorter-sided types (M/10/8) (Fig. 10). Present in G was a "salad mixer" type jar. Of some importance was the pot with everted rim (Fig. 11, a, c).² Bowls from the tombs were mainly round-based, though a flat-based type with inverted rim is to be noted (Fig. 9, a - g). Important bowls included examples with bands around the inside of the rim and a cross. Ring stands were present, especially a type with a very heavy roll rim at each end. The pottery mentioned here will be referred to as the Phase of the Conquest in Egyptian materials.

Later Egyptian pottery in these levels, starting about E 2 and referred to here as Early-Mid Hyksos, includes two major changes. First, the bag shaped vessel with nearly vertical or everted rim (Fig. 13 a - f) occasionally with grooves (Fig. 12, e - i) became a major part of the

¹Below, pp.1214-1223 Table 90.

²This will be seen below, p. 572-5 to resemble pottery from Kerma as does another with roll rim and grooves on the shoulder.

assemblage.¹ Second, bowls with a flat, even a ring base became popular (Fig. 9 h - 1). While some of the more globular type jars continued, baggy forms predominated, including those with a roll or everted rim (Fig. 11, 12).² Cups with vertical or nearly sinuous sides occurred, sometimes with a groove near the rim, or with a ring or disc base (Fig. 10). Carinated bowls resembled Palestinian developments. One cup or bowl had four lugs on the side with holes at the tops of the lugs (Fig. 10 e).³

Later divisions to be recognized from materials elsewhere, between Early-Mid Hyksos and Late Hyksos, between Late Hyksos and Expulsion, and between Expulsion age and early New Kingdom materials, were not too clear from the materials available to me from Tell ed-Dab^{ca}. We will see that the difference between Egyptian pottery from Tell ed-Dab^{ca} E 1 and Tell el Yehudiyya is considerable.⁴

Egyptian pottery from Temple I, E 2 included a large bowl with depression in the bottom. There was also a vessel or fruitstand type and a large sherd of the "drum" type seen in Middle Kingdom groups elsewhere.⁵

¹A convex form begins slightly earlier at Kerma and Thebes. Below, p. 579 and 159-60.

²See similar types, below pp. 196-197.

³There were other examples at el Kab, Kubaniyya (and Lisht--unpublished); below p. 182, Fig. 87.

⁴By the names, we anticipate Bietak's dates. Below, pp. 88-97. for confirmation from Kerma.

⁵Below, p. 118.

Miniatures occurred from G onward, in three basic types. A rather conical with flat base seemed descended from miniatures we shall see from the Thirteenth Dynasty. There was a baggy jar with everted rim and a similar type with flat base. These miniatures occurred in large numbers from deposits from various levels.

Asiatic Non-Luxury Pottery

These pots were primarily the amphorae and dipper juglets. Egyptian pottery was used almost exclusively for table service. However amphorae and dipper juglets were found in various levels in the larger tomb groups (Table 80).

Weapons

From F, we cited the Asiatic type veined dagger and rectangular axe of MB II type (Fig. 2). In the E levels, this rectangular axe had become the narrow-bladed axe with molding at the socket (Fig. 3). This type is common in the Palestinian MB III A, somewhat less so in MB III B.¹ An axe from the D level group had a broader blade, with the molding at the socket and a hook immediately in front of the socket. The type is well known from Ugarit but rarer in Palestine.²

Dagger blades changed from the veined type known in F to the flat-bladed types of E and D. New types introduced included the knife with curved cutting edge. These blades are likewise well known in Asia (Table 82).³

¹Below, pp. 1181-1182, MB III A axes.

²Below, pp. 1181-1182, MB III B axes.

³Below, p. 1183, MB III daggers.

Tell el Yehudiyya

The tombs of Tell el Yehudiyya illustrate the period of Tell ed-Dab^a D 3-2 with remarkable clarity. The tombs, while not especially wealthy, nor especially numerous, illustrate effectively the pottery from the MB III B to the LB I B, with a break in Asiatic imports from the latest MB III B through the MB III C, or the early Eighteenth Dynasty. It is not my intention to take up the question of the enclosure at Yehudiyya here.¹

The Sequence

Petrie divided the tombs at Yehudiyya into Second Intermediate, pre-Thutmose III, Thutmose III and Amenhotep II age pottery groups. We have changed the assignment of some groups here.

The Late Hyksos Age and the Era of
the Expulsion: group A

This group contained tombs 1, 2, 3, 5, 16, 19, 22, 32, 33, 37, 43, 106, 407, 4, 6, 120, 8, 20, 104, 36 and 11 (Figs. 31 - 34).

Group A illustrated the simple pottery types of this site, with

¹G. R. H. Wright, "Tell el Yehudiyya and the Glacis" Zeitschrift des Deutsche Palästina-Verein, 84 (1968), 1-17 for the most recent discussion.

²Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities, BSAE, 12 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1906), pp. 10-16, plates IV A - X, XII A; here begins a series of seriations done for this dissertation. They are based on reconstruction groups of the sites concerned. Citation for each group will not be done by page and plate, but by tomb number. In some cases as Tell el Yehudiyya, there was no register to which to refer, only numerical indications on the objects.

In both Egypt and Palestine, the seriations were based on major changes, in the pottery, especially in new types, which could be grouped together as a chronological stage. Even though it is confusing to refer to both a group of tombs as a group and materials from a single tomb or locus as a group at the same time, it is traditional. I hope the difference will be made clear at each point where the word is used.

a large number of the classic late Yehudiyya ware juglets. These last are piriform, cylindrical or globular, sometimes baggy juglets with punctate decoration all over or in vertical or horizontal zones (Fig. 16, and 17). Imitation Middle Cypriot painting is seen on round based juglets in two cases (Figs. 16 a and 17 a). This is the chocolate-on-white or cream Yehudiyya painted ware. Two rather unusual types of Yehudiyya ware should be noted. The first is a group of theriomorphic pots, generally in the shape of fish, like those cited from Tell ed-Dab^{ca} (Fig. 17 c--there one juglet had the form of a hawk). The second odd type was a baggy juglet with vertical bulges. In this case, zones were incised around the four lugs or bulges in the baggy form (Fig. 17 d). Egyptian pottery was basically the flat-based, nearly straight-sided splayed plate or bowl often with a slight bulge in the middle of the side, the classic Egyptian potstand and a bag shaped pot with round bottom and vertical or very gradually widened rim (Fig. 18). Other pots included the sinuous-sided cup, convex cup, a convex-sided jar with flat base and everted rim, and a sinuous-sided bowl. Some taller potstands occurred, one with incised lines and tapered rim. This last was found with a globular jar.

The last seven tombs in the group mentioned above included jars, both baggy and flat based with a wide band of paint or pigment at the rim. Yehudiyya ware from these tombs consisted only of a few bag-shaped juglets with punctate decoration in vertical zones.

Tomb 45

Tomb 45 was a mixed group, pointed out here as an example of the pitfalls of mixing in Egyptian tomb groups. Along with jars of the types

a large number of the classic late Yehudiyya ware juglets. These last are piriform, cylindrical or globular, sometimes baggy juglets with punctate decoration all over or in vertical or horizontal zones (Fig. 16, and 17). Imitation Middle Cypriot painting is seen on round based juglets in two cases (Figs. 16 a and 17 a). This is the chocolate-on-white or cream Yehudiyya painted ware. Two rather unusual types of Yehudiyya ware should be noted. The first is a group of theriomorphic pots, generally in the shape of fish, like those cited from Tell ed-Dab^ca (Fig. 17 c--there one juglet had the form of a hawk). The second odd type was a baggy juglet with vertical bulges. In this case, zones were incised around the four lugs or bulges in the baggy form (Fig. 17 d). Egyptian pottery was basically the flat-based, nearly straight-sided splayed plate or bowl often with a slight bulge in the middle of the side, the classic Egyptian potstand and a bag shaped pot with round bottom and vertical or very gradually widened rim (Fig. 18). Other pots included the sinuous-sided cup, convex cup, a convex-sided jar with flat base and everted rim, and a sinuous-sided bowl. Some taller potstands occurred, one with incised lines and tapered rim. This last was found with a globular jar.

The last seven tombs in the group mentioned above included jars, both baggy and flat based with a wide band of paint or pigment at the rim. Yehudiyya ware from these tombs consisted only of a few bag-shaped juglets with punctate decoration in vertical zones.

Tomb 45

Tomb 45 was a mixed group, pointed out here as an example of the pitfalls of mixing in Egyptian tomb groups. Along with jars of the types

mentioned above were jars with flared necks and a black lustrous LB I A juglet (globular, with band handle, flat base).

The Era of the Expulsion Group and the Early New Kingdom

This group includes tombs 30, 31, 41, 48, 49, 54, 79, 90, 409 and 413.

Because there were so few groups at Yehudiyya, the assignment of early New Kingdom groups is rather difficult. As such, features that could be chronologically distinguished elsewhere are not separated here. This is Petrie's pre-Thutmose III group.

The tall baggy jar was replaced by one with a definitely flared neck and rather biconical body, sometimes with grooves at the neck, plain, or with grooves on the body as well. There was also a shorter jar with an incised spiral around the neck. The sinuous-sided bowl became popular. There were also carinated bowls including one with a tall flared side.

Weapons from Group A

Tapered daggers without rib were found, in some cases with concave (Fig. 15 e - g) edges. There was a knife with convex edge and a toggle pin.

Tell el Yehudiyya was not a particularly rich site. Its primary importance here is to illustrate the MB III B and contemporary local pottery in the late Hyksos Age. The repertoire on local pottery is deceptively simple however. In Upper Egypt at the same time there was a much greater variety of types. The gap in the sequence between the end of the Second Intermediate Period and sometime in the early-mid

Eighteenth Dynasty should be kept in mind.

Inshas

Two other sites in the Delta have yielded evidence of the Hyksos Age of the same type as Tell ed-Dab^{ca} and the tombs of Tell el Yehudiyya. These sites are Inshas, just northeast of Yehudiyya, and Farasha, between Tell Basta and Tell ed-Dab^{ca}.

At Inshas, Habachi excavated vaulted brick tombs, some with donkeys buried in the dromos. Pottery he found there included red, black and brown polished juglets, some with standing and pendant triangles.¹

Farasha

Excavations in progress in 1973 by Mohammed Missallami are yielding similar vaulted grave types with Yehudiyya ware. Dr. Bietak was of the opinion that these tombs resemble the later types at Tell ed-Dab^{ca}.²

Major Occurrences of Yehudiyya Ware in the Nile Valley

Three chronological divisions of Yehudiyya and burnished juglets were discerned at Tell ed-Dab^{ca}. The last of these phases was found at Tell el Yehudiyya as well. Three phases of Egyptian pottery were also found in the Delta; they did not correspond to those of the imports.³

¹Habachi in Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie, (June 1949) 12-13. In an oral communication in 1973, he described some specific characteristics of the Yehudiyya ware that indicate that it was to be dated at least partly to the earlier stage of Tell ed-Dab^{ca}.

²This is an unpublished excavation in progress by the Antiquities Department, under the direction of Mohammed Missalami. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Bakri, director of the Ancient Egyptian Section of the Department of Antiquities, Egyptian Arab Republic, for this information. According to Dr. Bietak, the graves appeared to belong to the later stage of Tell ed-Dab^{ca}.

³See above pp. 75-76.

By the names for the Egyptian phases, we are anticipating the evidence for dating Tell ed-Dab^a; by our designation for the major types of Asiatic pottery, we are anticipating the discussion of Asia. There was, however, no clear evidence at Tell ed-Dab^a or elsewhere in the Delta to say that these materials were entirely Hyksos Age in date. We should, therefore, review other important occurrences of Yehudiyya and related pottery in the Nile valley to determine whether or not they offer direct evidence of date.

The area between Memphis and the entrance to the Fayum produced a number of foreign pottery types, but there were few high quality published contexts.

Giza and Saqqara have produced at least one piece, the MB III B type juglet from excavations of Jequier.¹

The pyramid complexes of Amenemhat I and Senwosret I at Lisht have produced some of the most interesting materials of Yehudiyya ware type in the Nile Valley.² None of these pots came from well defined contexts however, or contexts that have been published. Primarily, sherds of representational and early Yehudiyya ware, these materials came from pit tombs and houses of the village built against the north Pyramid. One fish juglet fragment and a brown-on-cream painted cylindrical juglet show the presence of MB III B.³

¹G. Jequier, Fouilles à Saqqara; Deux Pyramides du Moyen Empire (Cairo: Institut Francais d'Archeologie Orientale, 1933), p. 46, fig. 34 b and c.

²Merrillees, Trade and Transcendence in the Bronze Age Levant, pp. 59-64, figs. 42-50; Kantor, "Egypt and its Foreign Correlations", p. 30, fig. 6 A and B.

³Merrillees, Trade and Transcendence in the Bronze Age Levant, fig. 47, top row, the fish juglet. The painted cylindrical juglet is in the Oriental Institute, unpublished.

Like Lisht, the town at Illahun contained much foreign pottery. These pots included the representational and early Yehudiyya ware. Like the other occurrences these were undated, not found in any context with evidence of date. In addition, we may note the presence of a sherd from an imported Cypriote jug (Fig. 84).¹

At Haraga, the punctate decorated juglets of Early Yehudiyya type were types found primarily in Tell ed-Dab^a E 3-2, not the earlier MB II C types. In general, the contexts at Haraga were not trustworthy. Most of the tombs had been robbed and the materials disturbed. The find-spots were not even specified by chamber. Group 354 was the only occurrence of Yehudiyya ware with Egyptian pottery of "Middle Kingdom" type. As we shall see, the Egyptian pottery is in fact of Thirteenth Dynasty date. Nevertheless, there were no pots with flared necks of this type at Tell ed-Dab^a. We must, therefore, ignore the occurrence as mixed.²

Farther up the Nile, at Rifa, the punctate decorated juglets were primarily found with Pan Graves (Fig. 101 2, aa, dd-ff; Fig. 103 w, x, y).³ Distinctive types included numbers 92, with vertical section decoration; 88, undecorated; 93 and 66 with horizontal zones and painted type 313. These were all MB III B. Egyptian pottery with these juglets

¹Petrie, Illahun, Kahun and Gurob 1889-90, (London: D. Nutt, 1891), plate I, p. 9; Petrie, Kahun, Gurob and Hawara, (London: Kegan Paul, Trubner, and Trench, 1890), plate XXVII, pp. 199-202; Kantor, "Egypt and its Foreign Correlations", pp. 21-23.

²See below, p.124-5. The contexts at Haraga, as at Illahun, were not trustworthy, nor were they well dated. The one Yehudiyya juglet found in a tomb with "Middle Kingdom" pottery was in fact in a Dynasty XIII context. That is, the other pottery was of types not found at Tell ed-Dab^a where juglets of this type were stratified (Fig. 61). We will therefore ignore this group which is not really a single burial tomb group.

³Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, plate XXVI.

resembled that of the later levels of Tell ed-Dab^a. There was, however, no direct evidence of date.

Syrian pottery was mentioned from Qau, some with punctate decoration. Rim sherds from the Pan Grave hut circles now in Oxford included a ridge-rim characteristic of MB III A.¹

Tomb B 13 at Abydos contained a Yehudiyya juglet of early type with standing and pendant triangles and metopes. The date must parallel Tell ed-Dab^a F - E 2, but there were no objects that clearly indicated a date with it.²

Group D 21 contained a biconical juglet with zones above and below the waist. It was characteristic of MB III B, similar to the late juglets of Tell ed-Dab^a E 1 - D 2 and Tell el Yehudiyya (Fig. 37 o and p). Egyptian pottery was considerably more elaborate than that of Tell el Yehudiyya; it included some painted jars. The group is large and may belong in part to the early New Kingdom.³

MB III B type juglets were found at Hu as well; cemetery Y contained a juglet with incised and punctate vertical zones and other with horizontal zones. One Pan Grave had sherds of a juglet with triangles and metopes, MB III A (Fig. 37 q - s).⁶

A juglet from Edfu was decorated with standing and pendant triangles with metopes in narrow bands. The narrow bands and small triangles

¹Guy Brunton, Qau and Badari III, BSAE, vol 50, (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1930), plate XVII, 90c.

²Peet, Cemeteries of Abydos Part II, EEF Memoir 34, (London: EEF, 1914), plate XIII, 8, B 13.

³Below, p. 212.

⁴Petrie, Diospolis Parva, plate XXXVI 186-188.

indicate an MB II C date, but only the place of origin is known.¹

At Thebes, a double juglet of MB III A early Yehudiyya ware type was found at the mouth of the tomb of the vizier Yuy. The findspot is thus Seventeenth Dynasty or later, as the vizier could not have served a Thirteenth Dynasty king at Thebes.²

Though the above list is not entirely complete, it does include the important juglets that have been found in context in Egypt. The incised and punctate decorated juglets from elsewhere in Egypt compare well with those from Tell ed-Dab^ca. Both major stages of Yehudiyya ware, G - E 2 (Early Yehudiyya ware or MB II C - III A) and E 1 - D 2 (Late Yehudiyya ware, MB III B), were found all over the country. Nowhere in Egypt were undecorated cylindrical juglets found alone. The third stage of the MB III that we shall discuss from Palestine is thus entirely absent from Egypt.³

Yehudiyya juglets were found in some numbers in Nubia. Early Yehudiyya juglets were found at Buhen, Uronarti and Kerma.⁴ Late

¹Unpublished, Journal d'Entrée 46743.

²Merrillès, Trade and Transcendence in the Bronze Age Levant, p. 67; H. E. Winlock, "The Museum's Excavations at Thebes", Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, (December 1923), p. 31; William C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt II, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 57-58, fig. 28. The double juglet is clearly of the representational Yehudiyya ware type. The date of Yuy is not earlier than the Seventeenth Dynasty; he had a gilded rishi coffin. A vizier would be buried at Memphis anytime before Dynasty XVII. The findspot of the juglet does not give us much confidence in any connection of the juglet with Yuy, but the date would thus be rather later than earlier than this official. The Seventeenth Dynasty date for this material is somewhat confirmed by this juglet.

³See below, p. 1178, MB III C.

⁴MacIver and Woolley, Buhen (Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1911), plate 49; Dows Dunham, Second Cataract Forts, Volume II; Uronarti, Shalfak, Mirgissa (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1967), fig. 1, 28/11/352, 28/11/470; Kerma, see below, 564-565.

Yehudiyya juglets were found in some numbers at Aniba, Buhen, Mirgissa, and Kerma, to name a few places.¹

The Date of the Kerma Tumuli, The Date of the
Seventeenth Dynasty and the Date of
Yehudiyya Ware

Of all the contexts in which Yehudiyya ware was found in Egypt and Nubia, only the Kerma tumuli provided unequivocal evidence for the date. These tombs were enormous repositories of objects, created at nearly the same time for each complex.² Pottery of both Kerma and Egyptian type changes somewhat from complex to complex, proving that the complexes were not built simultaneously and that their dates do not substantially overlap.³

Four of these tombs concern us here, K III, IV, X and XVI. Of these, IV and X contained juglets of Early type, X and XVI juglets of late type. K IV b, part of the main burial, contained a ring-based red polished juglet (Fig. 177a) which Bietak connected with early levels of Tell ed-Dab^a. From K 1084 came a piriform juglet with standing and pendant triangles of early type (Fig. 177 c). Other subsidiary graves of K X contained juglets of the transitional type, with four sloppy standing and pendant triangles (Fig. 177 d found in tombs 1042, 1045, and 1098). K XVI contained a juglet with vertical sections of late type (Fig. 177 e) and two juglets with high, carinated shoulders, also of late type (Fig. 177 f from tombs 1620 and 1623). K IV thus parallels Tell ed-Dab^a F - E 2, KX parallels E 2 - E 1 and K XVI contained juglets of time of D 3-2.

¹Below, chapters XII and XV.

²Below, chapter XII.

³Below, chapter XII.

On the basis of the imports, the order of the great tumuli must be D IV, X, XVI. Though K III contained no Yehudiyya imports, it can be placed at the head of the sequence by two pieces of evidence. First, the order of the Kerma pottery is the same as that of the imports (see Table 21). Second, the order of the cemetery as indicated by the placement of the tombs in a row, starting from K III followed by IV, X and XVI (Fig. 155 and 156). Finally, the structure of the tumuli changes in an evolutionary pattern from K III to IV to X to XVI (Fig. 160 and 161). K III was the earliest of the four great tumuli. Its contents, main, sacrifice and subsidiary burials, must precede the main burial of K IV.

K 334, a subsidiary grave of K III, was a large group. One of the stone vessels found in the grave was inscribed with the name of Sebeknakht, mayor of El Kab. The form of the title, "h₃ty-p^{ct}", is the peculiar (Fig. 175 t) contracted form found in the tomb of Sebeknakht II, tomb 10 at el Kab and in the contemporary tomb 9. His father, Sebeknakht I purchased the title in year 1 of Nebiryerai I (XVII-6, at least 21 years after the beginning of Dynasty XVII) of the Seventeenth Dynasty.¹ The Seventeenth Dynasty date of the Kerma necropolis of great Tumuli is thus assured, and with it, the Seventeenth Dynasty date of Yehudiyya ware from Tell ed-Dab^ea F - D2, since, as we shall see below,

¹P. Lacau, Une stèle juridique de Karnak, Supplement aux Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte 13, (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1949), pp. 4, 7-8, Index of names, second entry; Reisner, Excavations at Kerma I-III, pp. 171-2; Joseph J. Tylor, The Tomb of Sebeknakht, (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1896), plate II. The curiously contracted form of the title used on the jar, h₃ty-p^{ct}, is the same as that used in tomb 10 at El Kab. This tomb belonged to Sebeknakht II of a dynasty of nomarchs at El Kab. His father purchased the office of mayor of El Kab. The stele on which the transaction was recorded was dated year 1 of Nebiryerai I. I am indebted to Prof. Klaus Baer for this information. He collated the inscription in tomb 10 at El Kab and in the tomb of Horemkhauf, making the relationship between these two tombs clear.

the end of K III must be substantially later than the first year of Nebiryerai I.

The date of the Kerma tumulus K III and thereby the entire series of tumuli at Kerma is thus dependent on the date of the stone jar from K 334. This jar is in turn dependent for its absolute date on the date of the Seventeenth Dynasty. Since the lengths of the reigns of the later kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty were not preserved in the Turin Papyrus, there is no way we could use that dynasty for dead reckoning from the start of the Eighteenth Dynasty as a reliable means of dating either Nebiryerai I or the start of the Seventeenth Dynasty.¹ For chronological reckoning, there remain only the Thirteenth Dynasty and the Hyksos Age.

The Thirteenth Dynasty was a long series of kings with relatively short reigns. Until recently, it could not even be ascertained whether these kings ruled the entire Nile Valley South of Memphis. Recent research into the tombs of Hierakonpolis has provided some evidence, however. A stele belonging to a Horemkhauef has long been known. In it, the owner referred to a visit he made to Itj-Tawy to receive statues from the hand of the king. Although it had been stylistically dated to the later Thirteenth Dynasty, the precise date and clear evidence for it were not forthcoming.² Prof. Baer has pointed out to me that the tomb of this Horemkhauef was decorated by the same artist that decorated the

¹Von Beckerath, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 182-183 and 289-99; R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler* vol. 3, plate 62 a.

²W. C. Hayes, "Horemkhauef of Nekhen and his trip to It-towe", *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 33 (1947), 3-11; for dating, see pp. 9-11.

tomb of Sebeknakht II at El Kab.¹ Since Sebeknakht lived about two generations after the beginning of the Seventeenth Dynasty, Horemkhauef must have visited Itj-Tawy to receive the statues at the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty (that is, its rule over all Egypt). Since the capital of the Seventeenth Dynasty was at Thebes, between Hierakonpolis and Itj-Tawy a date for Horemkhauef in the Seventeenth Dynasty can be ruled out.

Though his tomb may have been decorated later than the carving of the stele, the temporal distance from the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty to the decoration of tomb 10 at El Kab is so great that a date for the visit to Itj-Tawy earlier than the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty can also be ruled out (Table 55). The Nile Valley was, therefore, unified down to the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty in Upper Egypt.

The date of the rise of the Seventeenth Dynasty should thus be put after the last Thirteenth Dynasty King to be recognized in Upper Egypt. The latest king of this dynasty to be securely placed in the Turin Canon and who left remains in Upper Egypt was Djedneferre^c Dudumose (XIII-37), found invoked on stelae from Gebelein and Tell Edfu, blocks from Deir el Bohri, and a graffito near El Kab.² Other kings later than Dudumose (II) left remains in Upper Egypt; these are less securely placed in the Canon or the monuments were more portable. They include Sewahenre^c Senebmiu (XIII-41?),³ Sekhemre^c-se^cankhtawy Neferhotep III (XIII-J),⁴

¹Walter Wreszinsky, Bericht über die Photographische Expedition von Kairo bis Wadi Halfa, (Halle: S. M. Niemeyer, 1927), pp. 80-83, plates 41-43; Tylor, The Tomb of Sebeknakht, plate II. The artist was the wr mdw šm^cw sš kdt Ntrw-sdm. This Netjerusedjem has not only an odd name and titles which occurred in both tombs, but a distinctive style or decoration as well.

²Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen, pp. 256-7. Dudumose may have changed his throne name, so there may be no justification for a Dudumose I and II.

³Ibid., p. 258.

⁴Ibid., p. 259.

Sekhemre^c-sewesertqwy Sebekhotep VIII (XIII K),¹ Sekha^cenre^c (XIII-44?),² Mersekhepeshre^c Ini (XIII 45?),³ Usermont (XIII-L),⁴ Menkha^cure^c Sen^ca^cib (XIII-M),⁵ and Sekhemre^c-neferkha^cu Wepwawetemsaf (XIII-N).⁶ Although there were a few years preserved for at least one of these kings, their placement is uncertain; the argument would best rest on Dudumose (II).

Of the thirty-six kings that preceded Dudumose (II) in the Turin Canon, only fifteen were (including XIII-24) assigned reigns which we can say with some certainty were preserved completely. These totalled slightly over eighty-six years, or averaging about 5.7 years each (Table 11). The minimum total was about eighty-nine, which adds some years from kings whose reigns are not complete in the Turin Canon (Table 12, 15). If we added two years each for the reigns that were unknown (14 kings) or incomplete (8 kings), we obtain an estimate of 133 years for the dynasty or about 1786 to 1653 B.C. These figures are purely arbitrary, since they assume that the twenty-two kings whose reigns are incomplete or unknown in the Turin Canon had far shorter reigns than those whose reigns we know. It also does not take into account the possibility that several kings named by the Canon after Dudumose (XIII 38-50 is the number) reigned over the Nile Valley or at Thebes. Thus the total of the known reigns after the end of the Twelfth Dynasty makes a date for the start of the Seventeenth Dynasty before 1700 physically impossible; this does not allow for any additional time at all for any of the kings whose reigns were unknown or incomplete. Allowing any time

¹Ibid., pp. 259-60.

²Ibid., p. 259.

³Ibid., p. 259.

⁴Ibid., p. 260.

⁵Ibid., p. 261.

⁶Ibid., p. 261.

at all for these kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty (21 kings and Dudumose, as many as 13 after) would require a date in the mid-Seventeenth Century for the change from the Thirteenth to the Seventeenth Dynasties. No earlier date is at all plausible.

Further, it seems entirely implausible that the king Tutimaos to whom Manetho refers was any earlier than Dudumose. There was no other king from the Second Intermediate Period whose name so closely resembled Tutimaos as did Dudumose. The identification is made uncertain by important philological objections however. If Dudumose was Tutimaos, the rise of the Seventeenth Dynasty must be later, as Dudumose was recognized in Upper Egypt.¹ The rise of the Seventeenth Dynasty would thus be contemporary with or later than the establishment of the Hyksos in Egypt, dated 108 years from the expulsion date by the Turin Canon. If the expulsion, dated early in the second decade of the reign of Ahmose, came in 1542, the date the Hyksos Dynasty began was 1650; if the date of the expulsion were higher, about 1558-60, the conquest would have taken place about 1666-70.² These are the limits for the date of the foundation of Hyksos rule in Egypt.

Thus by two independent lines of reasoning, the beginning of the Seventeenth Dynasty must be dated in the mid-Seventeenth Century B.C. The Theban Seventeenth Dynasty must have begun to reign at Thebes after the last king of the Thirteenth Dynasty had reigned in that place.

¹Ibid., pp. 63-64. von Beckerath believed that the Egyptian name of Tutimaos would have come out Dhutemhab.

²Prof. Edward F. Wente, verbal communication, 1975. The 1504 date of the accession of Thutmose III would require a long reign for Thutmose II and Thutmose I, raising the date of the expulsion of the Hyksos rather further, even taking into account the possibility of a coregency between Ahmose I and Amenhotep I.

Since the name of Dudumose occurs on monuments in Upper Egypt and at Thebes, this dynastic change had to take place after his reign. This was after at least 86 years of rule by fifteen kings and an uncertain amount of time for twenty two reigns whose lengths are unknown, all after 1786 B.C.

The date of the stone jar from Kerma K 334 is thus firmly tied to the Seventeenth Dynasty, which is in turn to be dated no earlier than the mid-Seventeenth Century. We must further allow for the likelihood that the stone vessel was not made until well into the lifetime of Sebeknakht I of El Kab, or even more likely, in that of his successor Sebeknakht II. It may even have been intended to be part of Sebeknakht II's funerary equipment as the representations in tomb 10 showed.¹ If the 1490 date for the accession of Thutmose III is correct, no date earlier than about 1625 is even possible for the manufacture let alone deposition of the vessel; even this date is too high to be plausible. If the date of Thutmose III is raised to 1504, and the dates of the kings of the earlier Eighteenth Dynasty raised somewhat beyond, about 20 years, the highest possible date for the manufacture of the stone vessel is about 1645. In neither case is the deposition of the stone jar from K 334 at all likely before 1620. If we accept the higher date for the Eighteenth Dynasty, this date of 1620 allows much more time for the manufacture, shipping and deposition of the vessel later in the life of Sebeknakht I, or, as is more likely, during the lifetime of Sebeknakht II. As the pottery of Kerma K III differs from that of K IV, the last burials in K III (no earlier than 1620) must be earlier than the deposition of K IV. There were also differences between the pottery of K IV and K X

¹Taylor, The Tomb of Sebeknakht, plates II-X.

and KVI respectively. The Kerma great tumuli, and the Yehudiyya ware they contained can thus be firmly dated in the late Seventeenth and Sixteenth Centuries.¹ Late Yehudiyya Ware thus appeared after 1600.

TABLE 10
THE KERMA TUMULI AND THE ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY
OF YEHUDIYYA WARE

| Tumulus | Date B.C. | Yehudiyya Ware |
|---------|-----------|---|
| K III | 1620 | No juglets or Yehudiyya Ware |
| K IV | 1610/00 | MB II C - III A juglets |
| K X | 1600/1590 | Early Yehudiyya juglet (MB III A) and Transitional Yehudiyya juglets (MB III B I) |
| K XVI | 1570 | Late Yehudiyya Ware, other MB III B juglets |

Yehudiyya ware, in its various forms, was not exactly common in the Nile Valley generally. For that reason, there were relatively few closed contexts which contained pottery of this type and only one that also contained unequivocal historical evidence for the date. The contexts at Kerma, where Yehudiyya ware, both early and late, was found, were among the best in the Near East. Not only were the groups closed, burial by burial, but the order of the tumuli was unmistakable, both by the geography of the cemetery, the sequence of the local pottery, and

¹Below, Chapter XII. Tables 11-15 were taken from information supplied by von Beckerath, Untersuchungen, pp. 226-256, normally entry no. 1 for each king, from the Turin Canon. It was checked against Gardiner, The Royal Canon of Turin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959), plate III. The years for XIII 24 were taken from entry 19, the date of a stele from Tell Edfu, p. 249.

the stratified sequence of Yehudiyya ware. The date indicated by the stone jar from K 334 was so clear that we may begin rather than end this dissertation with the date of Yehudiyya ware. As indicated on Table 10, Early Yehudiyya ware as found in Tell ed-Dab^a E 3-2 (even by the end of F) is to be dated by its occurrence at Kerma to the late Seventeenth Century B.C. Late Yehudiyya ware, as found in E 1 - D 2 was produced in the early Sixteenth Century B.C. The date of 1600 for the transition between the two types of Yehudiyya ware was in fact rather too high than too low. With the levels E 3 - D 2 dated in the period from the late Seventeenth Century to the mid-Sixteenth, it should be clear that F belonged in the mid-Seventeenth Century, as it was a short-lived group of tombs immediately preceding E 3. The dates proposed by Bietak for these groups are thereby confirmed. The date of levels F - D 2 at Tell ed-Dab^a is Hyksos.¹

The technical results are most important for our chapters immediately following. Yehudiyya ware, being clearly dated, can be used to date all contexts in which it occurs.² Kerma ware may be similarly dated, by comparison to the tumulus where similar pottery was found. Finally, Egyptianizing pottery found in the Kerma tumuli may be used to date similar types in Egypt. This is especially true where pots were found both at Kerma and Tell ed-Dab^a. In a sense, we are anticipating a result when we state that the use of these dates will show that all of

¹A second major result of the reduced dates for Kerma is also historical. Hintze's hypothesis that the great tumuli of Kerma were the tombs of the princes of Kush is rendered chronologically almost inescapable. We shall discuss this in greater detail in the chapter on Kerma.

²This includes the forms stratified at Tell ed-Dab^a--some rare early types will be discussed in Asia.

the materials previously dated to the Second Intermediate Period generally are to be dated to the Hyksos Age.

The distortion of Egyptian archaeological chronology due to the hypothesis of a long First Intermediate Period has been discussed at length in Chapter I. The reduction in the date of most materials considered Second Intermediate Period (Dynasties XIII - XVII) leaves a chronological "vacuum" in the Thirteenth Dynasty. In the following chapters, materials customarily dated to the Twelfth Dynasty which should be displaced to the Thirteenth will be pointed out and the archaeological chronology of the groups generally considered Second Intermediate Period will be realigned to reflect the new dates given for Kerma and for Yehudiyya ware.

TABLE 11

REIGNS OF THE THIRTEENTH DYNASTY KNOWN TO BE COMPLETE IN YEARS

| Dyn. XIII | Years | Months | Days |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 24 |
| 3 | 6 | ? | ? |
| 5 | 1 | ? | ? |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 15 | 7 | ? | ? |
| 21 | 3 | 2 | ? |
| 22 | 11 | ? | ? |
| 23 | 0 | ? | 3+ |
| 24 ¹ | 8+ | ? | ? |
| 25 | 4 | 8 | 27 |
| 26 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| 27 ³ | 23 | 8 | 8 |
| 28 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 29 | 3 | 2 | ? |
| 30 | 3 | 1 | ? |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | 83 | 34 | 93 |
| TOTALS | 86 | 0 | 18 ² |

¹Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen, p. 249, entry 19. The reign is not necessarily complete, but to exclude the eight years from the total would distort the result. A 365 day year is used here.

²Fifteen kings averaging 5.7 years each.

³Twenty-three confirmed from Papyrus photograph and Gardiner recording: Von Beckerath emended to 13, with Farina.

TABLE 12
 INCOMPLETE REIGNS OF THE THIRTEENTH DYNASTY OF A YEAR OR MORE

| Dyn. XIII | Years | Months | Days |
|---------------------|------------|----------|----------|
| 4 ¹ | 3+ | 4+ | 25+ |
| (24 ² | 8+ | ? | ?) |
| 31 ³ | (5 or 1 | ? ? | 8) 8 |
| 32 | <u>2+</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>4</u> |
| TOTAL Von Beckerath | 6+ | 4+ | 37+ |
| TOTAL Gardiner | 10 | 4 | 37+ |

¹Entry 1 is 2+ years, entry 5 gives this figure.

²Included in Table 11, but reign incomplete.

³Gardiner reads as a complete reign of 5 years, some months, and 8 days; Von Beckerath reads as incomplete 1 year.

TABLE 13
 INCOMPLETE REIGNS OF THE THIRTEENTH DYNASTY, KNOWN IN MONTHS/DAYS¹

| Dyn. XIII | (Years) | Months | Days |
|-----------|---------|--------|------|
| 8 | ? | ? | 4 |
| 9 | ? | ? | 3 |
| 10 | ? | ? | 6 |
| 12 | ? | ? | 12 |
| 14 | ? | ? | 7 |
| TOTAL | | | 32 |

¹Incomplete reigns, possibly of a year or more are Nos. 2, 16, 17 but there is no reason to believe that they had even a year each.

TABLE 14
REIGNS OF THE THIRTEENTH DYNASTY

| | |
|--|----|
| Total of Kings in the Turin Canon | 50 |
| - Names unknown in the Turin Canon Nos. 33-36, 42-43 | 9 |
| + Additional Names A-N ¹ Placement provisional or unknown; | 13 |
| (20 bis, 45 bis; probably identified | 2) |
| Total Known kings; probable maximum for the dynasty | 54 |
| Reigns: | |
| Complete | 15 |
| Incomplete, one year or more | 3 |
| Incomplete, less than one year | 5 |
| Completely unknown | 14 |
| Total reigns through Dudumose | 37 |

¹Djedhetepre^c Dudumose (XIII-I) is possibly the same as Djedneferre^c Dudumose (XIII-37).