

## CHAPTER XXIX

### ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

In the preceding chapter, we outlined changes in the archaeological chronology of the Levant that resulted from the use of well-defined groups and the strict application of key termini post quem. These changes resulted not only in a general reduction of the dates usually given to much archaeological material in the Levant and the Nile Valley, but a change in the Babylonian chronology. Alalakh level VII, which is to be correlated to the late Old Babylonian Period, was dated to the MB III B, which began no earlier than 1600 B.C. The novelty is not in the use of the Low Babylonian Chronology, but in direct evidence for it, correlation with Egyptian chronology; the High and Middle Chronologies were ruled out in any case by the Sixteenth Century date of Alalakh VII.<sup>1</sup>

There are thus two different types of result to be discussed in a chapter on historical problems, the results obtained directly from archaeology, and the results obtained by using the Low Babylonian Chronology (Tables 73, 96).

---

<sup>1</sup>The three traditional solutions of the Ammisaduqa Venus Tablets are probably valueless as bases for a precise chronology. However, the sixteenth century date of Alalakh VII rules out chronologies that resemble the High and the Middle. Since Alalakh VII was built in the sixteenth century or MB III B (Above, pp.1157-59), a date for its destruction before 1680 is virtually impossible. A date after 1660 is far more likely. This date would agree with the Low Chronology even if the dates may be a few years higher or lower.

The Nile Valley Before the Hyksos

Although the change from the Twelfth to the Thirteenth Dynasty was fairly drastic in the structure of the state, it resulted in little perceptible change in the standing of Egypt. The control over Nubia was maintained. The relationship with Byblos was also maintained, possibly intensified.<sup>1</sup> Asiatic slaves, probably from EB IV Palestine, continued to be imported.<sup>2</sup> This was also a continuation, perhaps even an intensification of Twelfth Dynasty practice.<sup>3</sup> The most noticeable change was in the political structure; a large number of short-lived, unrelated kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty was substituted for the family of long-lived kings of the Twelfth. Continuity was provided by the bureaucracy, and especially the family of viziers known to have served through much of the Thirteenth Dynasty,<sup>4</sup>

Archaeology offers little to modify this picture, though the evidence tends to emphasize some points. The political break with the Twelfth Dynasty must have been very clear, for the royal enclosures of the Twelfth Dynasty were almost immediately reused as cemeteries in the Thirteenth. This reuse was not haphazard or furtive, as many tombs

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 871-872. Note the objects of Amenemhat III-IV in the Royal Tombs, the adoption of hieroglyphs as the local monumental writing on the sword of Abishemu, the obelisk of Kukum and the relief of Yantin.

<sup>2</sup>Above, p. 123, the date of Haraga 112.

<sup>3</sup>W. C. Hayes, A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum (Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1955), pp. 92-99; F. Ll. Griffith, The Petrie Papyri; Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1890), p. 35, I, 2.

<sup>4</sup>Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, pp. 97-100.

were excavated in long straight rows, as part of a plan.<sup>1</sup> Other tombs were large structures built in pits of blocks that were sometimes pieces of Twelfth Dynasty structures.<sup>2</sup> This change took place before the middle of the Eighteenth Century B.C., as Auibre<sup>c</sup> Hor was buried in a shaft tomb in the complex of Amenemhat III.<sup>3</sup> This burial corroborates the low status of royalty during the Thirteenth Dynasty; aside from the cartouche and the ka statue, nothing in the burial set it apart from other wealthy burials of the time. Indeed the burial was poorer in jewelry than the burials of Khnemit and Ita of the same period.<sup>4</sup>

The tombs of these ladies, along with those of Senebtisi, Nubhetepti-khered, some tombs at Abydos and in Nubia, brought out another feature which was not so well documented in other sources. This feature was a great increase in the amount of gold and precious jewelry to be found in burials. The thousand tombs at Beni Hasan of early Middle Kingdom date yielded very little jewelry despite the un plundered condition of many tombs.<sup>5</sup> Items of jewelry that can be dated to the earlier period tended to be lighter in construction and smaller in size, as well as fewer in number,<sup>6</sup> than that of the Thirteenth Dynasty. The decrease in royal status in the Thirteenth Dynasty was accompanied by an increase

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 132. The condition is alluded to on p. 105, but the tombs inside the enclosure of Amenemhat I were in rows as were those inside that of Amenemhat III at Dahshur.

<sup>2</sup>Above, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup>Above, p. 104.

<sup>4</sup>Above, p. 112.

<sup>5</sup>Garstang, The Burial Customs of Ancient Egypt, register.

<sup>6</sup>Compare Petrie, Tombs of the Courtiers and Oxyrhynchus, plate V, 28 with Hayes, Scepter of Egypt I, p. 233, fig. 150 of Senwosret III, and Smith, The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt, plate 80 A.

in the wealth of many persons of lower status, or at least of their burial goods.

The clearest indication of the relative stability of Lower Nubia is C-Group II a. This period began in the late Twelfth Dynasty. It continued through the Thirteenth Dynasty into the Hyksos Age with much the same pottery with which it began almost two centuries earlier.<sup>1</sup> The relative independence of C-Group culture from Egyptian materials and customs continued.

One change in Egyptian practice in Nubia was of interest. During the Twelfth Dynasty, relatively few Egyptians were buried in Lower Nubia, despite the intensive occupation and exploitation; these burials were very poor.<sup>2</sup> Sometime after the reign of Neferhotep, people began to construct large chamber tombs with stairway approaches in cemeteries near the forts. Burials of some wealth were made in these tombs. This tendency to bury the dead in Nubia increased among the Egyptians living there right through the Hyksos Age.<sup>3</sup> The occupation and exploitation of Nubia became settlement.

Although the Execration Texts mention other southern people, such as the Medjay and Kush, no other peoples than the Egyptians and the C-Group appear in the archaeology of Lower Nubia during the Thirteenth Dynasty. In upper Nubia, the N Cemetery at Kerma yielded evidence of occupation earlier than the age of the great tumuli. Though similar to C-Group in some respects, the pottery of this cemetery was distinctly different; many of the objects and practices found

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 526-529; and A. J. Arkell, A History of the Sudan (London: The University of London, the Athlone Press, 1955), pp. 53-54. He discusses the relations between C-Group and Egyptians.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 600-601.

<sup>3</sup>Above, Chapter XV.

in this cemetery were found later in Pan Grave and Kerma burials.<sup>1</sup>

Alien peoples were not documented in Lower Nubian archaeology; they may be found in some special groups in Egypt. The presence of Asiatic mercenaries, merchants and slaves was documented in materials of Twelfth Dynasty date.<sup>2</sup> Asiatic mercenaries may have been indicated by the burials of persons with fenestrated axes and daggers in the Kom el Hisn cemetery. Such burials without pottery were characteristic of the so-called "Porteurs de Torques" of the MB II A. One tomb at Haraga contained pottery lamps of EB IV type in Palestine. The crude imitations may indicate the presence of an immigrant or slave. After 1750, there were imports of MB II A pottery and Middle Minoan I - II Kamares ware at Illahun, Haraga and Lisht. Only one piece of Kamares ware has been found in a burial, at Abydos. The failure of this pottery to occur in Egyptian burials may indicate that it was intended for use by foreigners living temporarily in Egypt.<sup>3</sup>

Certainly, changes took place in the political and social structure of the Nile Valley in the Thirteenth Dynasty. These changes were limited, however; no degeneration into localism and chaos occurred as happened during the First Intermediate Period. It was true that the kingship had been humbled, perhaps the natural outcome of the great growth of the bureaucracy in the later Twelfth Dynasty. The continuity of kingship was replaced with that of the bureaucracy.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 548-551.

<sup>2</sup>Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XVI, fifth register; above, pp. 1102 - 1103, the "porteurs de torques". These are probably warriors. Merchants can see in Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XXI. For slaves, see above, p. 123 note 1.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1196-1197.

<sup>4</sup>There has been a good deal of speculation on the role that this

in this cemetery were found later in Pan Grave and Kerma burials.<sup>1</sup>

Alien peoples were not documented in Lower Nubian archaeology; they may be found in some special groups in Egypt. The presence of Asiatic mercenaries, merchants and slaves was documented in materials of Twelfth Dynasty date.<sup>2</sup> Asiatic mercenaries may have been indicated by the burials of persons with fenestrated axes and daggers in the Kom el Hisn cemetery. Such burials without pottery were characteristic of the so-called "Porteurs de Torques" of the MB II A. One tomb at Haraga contained pottery lamps of EB IV type in Palestine. The crude imitations may indicate the presence of an immigrant or slave. After 1750, there were imports of MB II A pottery and Middle Minoan I - II Kamares ware at Illahun, Haraga and Lisht. Only one piece of Kamares ware has been found in a burial, at Abydos. The failure of this pottery to occur in Egyptian burials may indicate that it was intended for use by foreigners living temporarily in Egypt.<sup>3</sup>

Certainly, changes took place in the political and social structure of the Nile Valley in the Thirteenth Dynasty. These changes were limited, however; no degeneration into localism and chaos occurred as happened during the First Intermediate Period. It was true that the kingship had been humbled, perhaps the natural outcome of the great growth of the bureaucracy in the later Twelfth Dynasty. The continuity of kingship was replaced with that of the bureaucracy.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 548-551.

<sup>2</sup>Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XVI, fifth register; above, pp. 1102 - 1103, the "porteurs de torques". These are probably warriors. Merchants can see in Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XXI. For slaves, see above, p. 123 note 1.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1196-1197.

<sup>4</sup>There has been a good deal of speculation on the role that this

bureaucratic increase played in the development of the Thirteenth Dynasty: John Van Seters, The Hyksos, A New Investigation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), pp. 149-51; Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, pp. 93-97; W. C. Hayes, "Note on the Government of Egypt in the Late Middle Kingdom", Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 12 (1953), pp. 31-33.

Van Seters wanted to connect the name of Avaris with the administration of Lower Egypt, the name hwt-w<sup>c</sup>rt being "Headquarters of the Department" or perhaps the "Administrative Offices".

The place existed before the coming of the Hyksos as the monuments of Nehsi, second king of the Fourteenth Dynasty refers to it (von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, p. 262, XIV-2, 2). The Hyksos then simply seized the capital of the northern w<sup>c</sup>ret; later, perhaps, they broke up the "Central Division" into smaller vassal states as it had been under the early Dynasty XII and the Herakleopolitans. The Head of the South (tp-rsy) was seized by the Seventeenth Dynasty.

The Hyksos must have taken the "Northern Wa<sup>c</sup>ret" from Dynasty XIV which possessed Avaris in the time of Nehsi. The character of this dynasty is thus a key point in the chronology of the period. Von Beckerath gave it 65 years, from about 1715-1650.

The Fourteenth Dynasty consisted of a number of kings, up to 76, with the list divided into two parts. Kings 1-41 had plausible throne names, though only Nehsi left any monuments. The names of kings 46-76 (there is a gap in the list between 41 and 46 and at the end) are not normal throne names; they were either Hyksos vassals or made-up names.

We might obtain some idea of the length of this dynasty before the Hyksos conquest (probably between numbers 41 and 46 in the Canon) by averaging the lengths of reigns preserved in the Canon:

TABLE 51

## REIGNS OF THE FOURTEENTH DYNASTY, COMPLETE TO THE YEAR

	Years	Months	Days
2 (Nehsi)	0	?	3
3	0	?	3
4	1	5	15
5	3	?	11?
6	3	?	?
7	1	?	?
8	1	?	?
9	0	?	?
11	0	3	?
15	(0?)	5	20
17	0	2	1
18	0	2	5
Total	9	17	57
Minimum Average	10	6	17
Maximum Average	0	10	16
	1	3	12

TABLE 51 (Continued.)

	Years	Months	Days
Mean	1	0	26
Total, Based on Average	43	11	4
Total Additional Maximum	4	3	14

However, seven of the total years of the Dynasty were accounted for by kings 4, 5, and 6. After king number 8, no king has as much as a year, the average of the last four reigns being less than five months. From the uniformly short reigns of this dynasty, it is clear that the length of the reign had nothing to do with the health or ability of the king, but probably only with the bureaucratic policy, also probably the same policy that governed the rule of Dynasty XIII. This policy of short reigns was more rigidly applied here, however. Thus it seems best to allow the kings after number 8 only the average for 11, 15, 17 and 18 or about four months each, or about eleven years for the total 8-41, with another 10 or 11 years for the total 1-8 and possibly another year for kings 41-45 who were only possibly of the "genuine" phase.

The length of the Fourteenth Dynasty before the Hyksos was therefore probably only about 21-25 years. It was founded about 1690 which was coincidentally about the time that the short reigns resumed in the Thirteenth Dynasty. This is admittedly speculation, but it is based on projections from the actual figures preserved.

The history of the Thirteenth Dynasty might be reconstructed in three phases. Phase I consists of a series of short-lived kings under the complete domination of the bureaucracy, from ca. 1785 to ca. 1744. The second phase contained a royal revival of sorts, probably a change in bureaucratic policy which involved an accommodation with kingship. The bureaucracy remained supreme, however. This phase included the era ca. 1744 to 1690, the reigns of Sebekhotep III (XIII-21), Neferhotep I (XIII-22), Sihathor, Sebekhotep IV, Sebekhotep V, Ibyace, Merneferre<sup>c</sup>Ay and possibly Sebekhotep VI. In Phase III, the unity of Egypt was broken. In the Thirteenth Dynasty, which ruled from Memphis to Nubia, there was a return to the short reigns. The Fourteenth Dynasty was established in the Delta, where it controlled Avaris for some time (Nehsi's monument). If anything, this dynasty was even more dominated by the bureaucrats than was the Thirteenth Dynasty.

The next stage followed the Hyksos attack, with the Fifteenth Dynasty in the Delta, the Seventeenth Dynasty in the "Head of the South", possibly Nubia as well, and Dynasty Fourteen and new dynasties allowed to spin out their lives as Hyksos vassals in the area between.



If a certain reduction occurred in the standard of royal art, that was to be expected when the kings had little time to build monuments and only a few completed pyramids.<sup>1</sup> There were certain compensations. Jewelry of the period ranked among the best produced in ancient Egypt. New arts were developed, such as that of modelling faience figurines. These were valued in their own time, and even exported. Today they are among the most prized objects to come from ancient Egypt.

In Nubia, Egyptian power was maintained undiminished; if there were foreigners in Egypt, there had always been some in the Middle Kingdom, often playing a military role. It should be clear that if there were changes in the structure and archaeology of Egypt, they should not be accounted for by decay, but by the spread of wealth and power from a very few to a greater number.

#### Western Asia Through the Reign of Hammurabi

Changes were more substantial in western Asia between 1800 and the end of Hammurabi's reign in the Mid 1680's. In Mesopotamia, the period began with a number of independent states vying for supremacy, or at least independence, including Assyria, Eshnunna, Elam, Babylon, Isin and Larsa as the main actors. New states emerged to the west in this period, including Mari, which dominated the middle Euphrates, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Pyramids assigned to the Thirteenth Dynasty included the Pyramid of Ameni Qemau of unknown type, and four others. In a typological sequence, based on substructures, included the "Pyramid of Khendjer" at Saqqara, Mazghuneh South, Mazghuneh North, and the Saqqara "Anonymous" pyramid. The attribution of a pyramid to Khendjer was based on fragments with his name found in the complex. These included fragments of a pyramidion. However, there were complete pyramidia awaiting installation in the complex. If Khendjer is only a terminus post quem for the complex, these pyramids can be assigned to the longer-lived kings in the middle phase of the Dynasty.

Iamkhad which dominated North Syria. The first break in the period occurred when Naram-Sin of Eshnunna occupied Assyria, possibly igniting a series of events which led to the end of the first stage of the Assyrian colonies in Anatolia and setting the scene for Shamshi Adad I<sup>1</sup> (1749-1717 B.C.).

The career of Shamshi Adad I went far beyond the limited achievements of any other Larsa period ruler. He revived the Assyrian colonies in Anatolia and thoroughly upset the balance of power in Mesopotamia. He finally called himself "King of the (four) Quarters". His ambitions were not only directed to the northwest, where he reestablished the colonies, but to the west. The western policy centered upon his possession of Mari. This kingdom had come into prominence under one Iakhdun-Lim, who seems to have achieved a wide dominion, even campaigning to the Mediterranean.<sup>2</sup> Mari seems to have controlled not only the Euphrates route, but the route across the Syrian Desert via Palmyra to Qatna as well.<sup>3</sup> Shamshi Adad seized the city at the death of Iakhdun-Lim, whose heir, Zimri-Lim, fled to the court of Iarim-Lim of Iamkhad.<sup>4</sup>

This kingdom was also of recent origin; Shamshi Adad had already instigated an attack on it by its neighbors on the Euphrates. Shamshi Adad and Iarim-Lim were enemies; by taking Mari, Shamshi Adad had prevented Iarim-Lim from combining with other enemies such as Eshnunna on

---

<sup>1</sup>J. R. Kupper, Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au Temps des Rois de Mari, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fascicle 142 (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1957), p. 8, note 1; p. 210, note 3.

<sup>2</sup>G. Dossin, "L'Inscription de fondation de Iakhdun Lim, roi de Mari", Syria, 32 (1955), pp. 1-28.

<sup>3</sup>This is demonstrated by the direct communication with Qatna, including the dispatch of troops.

<sup>4</sup>Smith, Alalakh and Chronology, p. 34.

his eastern flank (as in fact later happened).<sup>1</sup> He further turned the flank of Iamkhad by maintaining good relations at Qatna which included a marriage and stationing troops there;<sup>2</sup> an expedition to the Mediterranean may have been connected with this relationship.<sup>3</sup> In the Mari letters of this period, there is no mention of a relationship with Iamkhad, so the enmity must have been continuous.<sup>4</sup> Trade relations were maintained with both Qatna and Hazor.<sup>5</sup>

The death of Shamshi Adad was the occasion for the breakup of his empire. Eshnunna appears to have led the assault by moving in the direction of Mari.<sup>6</sup> Iarim-Lim of Iamkhad seems to have re-established Zimri Lim on the throne at Mari; thereafter, Zimri-Lim acted in close concert with Iamkhad and served as intermediary between Iamkhad and other Mesopotamian states, especially Babylon.<sup>7</sup>

The death of Shamshi Adad meant the temporary return of the politics of the "warring states" phase of the earlier Larsa Period.

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Lewy, "The Synchronism Assyria-Eshnunna-Babylon", Die Welt des Orients, II 5/6 (1959), pp. 438-53; see p. 445.

<sup>2</sup>G. Dossin, "Le Royaume d'Alep au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère d'après les 'Archives Royales de Mari'", Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres (1952), p. 231; G. Dossin, "Le Royaume de Qatna au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère d'après les 'Archives de Mari'", Bulletin de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres (1954), pp. 417 and 420 mention areas of military cooperation; Tocci, Siria nell'età di Mari, pp. 76 ff.

<sup>3</sup>R. Borger, "Shamshi Adad I und seine Nachfolger", Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung, Ergänzungsband V, Heft I (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), pp. 9-19.

<sup>4</sup>Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", p. 17.

<sup>5</sup>Malamat, "Syro-Palestinian Destinations in a Mari Tin Inventory", pp. 31-38.

<sup>6</sup>Lewy, "The Synchronism Assyria-Eshnunna-Babylon".

<sup>7</sup>Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", p. 10.

The smaller states of Eshnunna, Babylon, Larsa, Mari, Iamkhad, Qatna, and to a lesser extent Assyria and Elam, were all involved. Itur-Asdu assessed the western part of this group of states in his famous speech: "No king is mighty by himself. Ten or fifteen kings follow Hammurabi, the man of Babylon, a like number Rim-Sin of Larsa, a like number Ibalpiel of Eshnunna, a like number Amutpiel of Qatana and twenty follow Iarim-Lim of Iamkhad."<sup>1</sup> In addition to these larger states, there were a number of smaller ones, chiefly in northwest Mesopotamia, in the upper Khabur and Balikh valleys.<sup>2</sup> There were also a number of tribes which made life in the country precarious, even for the well-armed, as they could muster considerable bodies of troops.<sup>3</sup>

This age, with its shifting coalitions, numerous wars and non-stop diplomacy, lasted some twenty years. Hammurabi then made his throw for supreme power by attaching Larsa and expelling the Elamites.<sup>4</sup> He then turned northward, conquering Mari, Eshnunna and for a short time, Assyria.<sup>5</sup> He thus established a clear supremacy which lasted through the reign of Shamsuiluna into that of Abieshuḫ, well into the Hyksos Age.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Dossin, "Les Archives épistolaires de Mari", Syria, 19 (1938), pp. 117-118.

<sup>2</sup>Kupper, Les Nomades en Mésopotamie du Temps des Rois de Mari, p. 230, note 1.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.; see also Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", pp. 24-28.

<sup>4</sup>D. O. Edzard, Die 'zweite Zwischenzeit' Babylonien (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1957), p. 182.

<sup>5</sup>Reallexikon der Assyriologie, BER-EZUR, pp. 179-82 (Datenlisten), years 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37 a d 39.

<sup>6</sup>The Babylonian realm was probably intact after Shamsuiluna (1685-47) crushed Rim-Sin, though Iluma-Ilu arose in the Sealands late in his reign. The Fifteenth Dynasty was founded in 1668 using the Wente chronology.

The era from 1800-1670 or so was also apparently a period of consolidation in Syria. At the beginning of this age, the Proto-Canaanites were found only on the coast of the Lebanon, flourishing with their trade, but not widespread (Historical Map 3). The EB IV was still in existence in Palestine, a period of sparse settlement and at least partial nomadism. Little information is available on the political situation in Syria; though there were many cities toward the end of the MB I, the relative chronology of the period is unsettled and no archive of tablets directly illuminates it.

The emergence of Iamkhad is connected with the name of Iarim-Lim, though he was not the founder of the Dynasty. His dynasty continued through the Old Babylonian Period. This Iarim-Lim was the contemporary and rival of Shamshi Adad and both were elder contemporaries of Hammurabi of Babylon.<sup>1</sup> Although Iarim-Lim was attached by some nearby cities such as Carchemish and Urshu, probably early in his reign, by the end of his reign he was the most important power in Syria, with the greatest number of vassals. Another power was mentioned in Syria by Itur-Asdu, Qatna. Although not as great as Iamkhad, it was independent, and enough of a force in Mesopotamian politics to be reckoned in the deliberations of the chiefs Itur-Asdu was addressing. A third king in this region we shall discuss below.

One of the most significant features of this period was trade. The best well-documented trade of the time was between Assyria and the Assyrian Colonies in Anatolia, which must rank as one of the great achievements of ancient organization. These lasted from the mid-Nineteenth well into the early Seventeenth Centuries. Other peoples and

---

<sup>1</sup>Tocci, Siria nell'eta di Mari, p. 62.

states must have been fully aware of this activity; both pottery and persons of Syrian origin can be documented from Kültepe.<sup>1</sup> There were other important developments in trade as well. The trade with the west was taken up by Shamshi Adad when he conquered Mari. Thereafter, it was taken up by Zimri-Lim, who even passed on persons and goods to Babylon.<sup>2</sup> The trade included not only predictable places such as Qatna, Hazor and Laish (Dan), but more remote places, including Byblos, Cyprus (Alashiya a source of copper), and Crete.<sup>3</sup> Cretans were present in the Levant, as one shipment of tin was assigned to the "Caphtorite".<sup>4</sup>

By the end of the period in question, about the time of Hammurabi's death, the amorphous period of warring states had given way to an age of established state systems. The accepted field of activity, as described by Itur-Asdu, stretched from the borders of Elam to southern Syria. The Mari texts hint that it stretched even farther to the south and west. The areas enumerated by Itur Asdu not only had a common field of activity which he recognized as legitimate, they also had another important feature in common. For most of the Mari and Old Babylonian periods

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 1151-53. Note Amuq L period occurrences in Kültepe Karum levels; Louis L. Orlin, Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia, Studies in Ancient History, vol. I (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), pp. 39-40, 207 and 212. Urshu was the site of a karum in Syria.

<sup>2</sup>G. Dossin, "Les archives économiques du Palais de Mari", Syria, 20 (1939), p. 111; Malamat, "Syro-Palestinian Destinations in a Mari Tin Inventory", pp. 31-38; J. R. Kupper, Archives Royales, vol. VI; Correspondence de Bagdi-Lim (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1954), p. 110, number 78.

<sup>3</sup>See note 2 above, and Millard, "Cypriote Copper in Babylonia", pp. 211-13 for a tablet from the time of Shamsuiluna.

<sup>4</sup>Malamat, "Syro-Palestinian Destinations in a Mari Tin Inventory", p. 34, line 28 of the text.

these areas were ruled by "Amorite" Dynasties.<sup>1</sup> If this was not an "Amorite Empire", as envisioned by Clay, it was an oikumene, a community of states.

States that belonged to this community had some other features of political style and structure in common. First, the political style was essentially familial; equals were referred to as brothers, inferiors were referred to as sons, which they often were.<sup>2</sup> Coupled with this familial style of politics was a feudal structure of the state. New areas added to the domain of a given ruler were often left in the hands of a local ruler who might even style himself king. The strength of the state might be expressed in terms of the number of these vassals.<sup>3</sup> This political style and structure contrast with the structures of the Akkadian and Ur III government, which appears to have been bureaucratic, with governors functioning more or less strictly as agents of the king.<sup>4</sup> These older empires, and even the Egyptian empire in Nubia, had been built from a center and tended to be ruled from it. Amorite expansion was more of an emigration. It was most successful when groups went to a new location and either set up new centers or took over old ones.

---

<sup>1</sup>This is not to take sides in the question of MAR·TU-Amorites-Amurru. See Kupper, Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au Temps du Roi de Mari, pp. 147-247; Thomas Thompson, The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives; the Quest for the Historical Abraham, Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 133 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), pp. 67-88. I use the designation Amorite here for convenience; West Semite could be substituted.

<sup>2</sup>Iasmakh Adad of Mari and Ishme Dagan of Ekallatum were the sons of Shamshi Adad I.

<sup>3</sup>Above, p. 1233.

<sup>4</sup>H. Hirsch, "Die Inschriften der Könige von Agade", Archiv für Orientforschung, 20 (1963), p. 14 number 3; these are land sale contracts on an obelisk of Manishtusu in which the beneficiaries were Akkadian officers but with sons of some ensi's in Sumer.

These were generally independent. Another feature of politics among these states may have arisen from the political fragmentation. This was the ability to make and keep far-flung alliances. Shawshi Adad of Assyria sent troops to Qatna across the Syrian desert.<sup>1</sup> Both he and Iqhdun-Lim at Mari reached the Mediterranean. Hammurabi obtained troops from Aleppo with the help of Zimri-Lim to help fight Eshnunna and Elam.<sup>2</sup> Thus the enterprise of rulers at this time was as extensive as their diplomacy. In the sixty years before the establishment of Hyksos rule in Egypt, there were two more or less successful attempts to bring most of the states in this community into one state.

#### The Coming of the Hyksos

The date and foreign nature of the burials at Tell ed-Dab<sup>c</sup>a clearly indicated that they were Hyksos.<sup>3</sup> They possessed the material culture we have called Proto-Canaanite that occupied the coast of Syria, the Lebanon and Palestine in the MB II and III.

In 1800, this culture, occupied only a small area on the coast of the Lebanon, including at least Byblos and Beirut. It was an outgrowth of the same material culture that was found there in the MB I.<sup>4</sup> We have discussed the elaborate features and the considerable wealth of the MB II A civilization at Byblos in some detail. This civilization continued apparently undisturbed until at least the time of Yantin, i.e. the reign of Neferhotep I. Sometime in the Eighteenth Century, the temple

---

<sup>1</sup>Dossin, "Le Royaume d'Alep au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle avant notre ère d'après les 'Archives Royales de Mari'", p. 420.

<sup>2</sup>C. F. Jean, Archives Royales de Mari, vol. II; Lettres Diverses (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1950), number 71.

<sup>3</sup>Above, p. 226-235.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 846-847.



treasures were gathered up and buried in pots that closely resembled each other. (Since one of these deposits contained a large number of elaborate faience animals, it is clear that this event happened in the Late Eighteenth Century.)<sup>1</sup> For some time afterwards, there was little evidence of settlement at Byblos and it would appear that the change in distribution of the MB II Proto-Canaanite civilization was connected with some depopulation in the main center.<sup>2</sup>

This change in the distribution of MB II occurred in the second major phase, MB II B, after the phase of the Deposits of MB II A 2 or about 1725. Sites that contained material of MB II B 1 were scattered all over Palestine and coastal Syria as far as Ras Shamra (Historical Map 8). That this movement was rather sudden is shown by the fact that it occurred in only one of the five phases assigned to the MB II from 1800-1650. It is tempting to consider this movement connected in some way with the western activities of Shamshi Adad at this time, but there is no direct evidence.

Some evidence of Syrian involvement is present in the MB II B 1, however, as an important strain of Syrian influence appears in the pottery which was not found in the MB II A at Byblos.<sup>3</sup> Coupled with this influx of Syrian influence was the loss of Egyptian connections which had been so important in the preceding age.<sup>4</sup>

The Proto-Canaanites who entered Palestine in the MB II B 1 were

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 849, note 1.

<sup>2</sup>Unless the location of the settlement at Byblos was moved. Little MB II B and no clear MB III B materials were found at Byblos. Above, pp. 888-889.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1194-1195.

<sup>4</sup>Above, p. 1205.

not entirely unsophisticated barbarians. Their pottery was already of excellent quality; within a short time it became among the finest ever produced in the Levant (Figs. 298-301). The weapons they used were in use at major centers like Mari on the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup> They contrast with the simple weapons of EB IV. The structures they built were large, well planned and included at least one building of official type, and possibly a large wall with glacis at Tell Poleg.<sup>2</sup> Even in the time of Shamshi Adad, by the time of Zimri Lim, the major center came to be recognized as Hazor in Galilee; it received not only trade goods, but embassies of Mesopotamian origin. Hazor had been accepted into the state system.<sup>3</sup> In addition, there were economic contacts with Byblos, Ugarit and Laish(-Dan), and possibly some indirect political contacts with Ugarit.<sup>4</sup> Hazor was the most important city, however, since it was the only city in the west other than Aleppo whose ruler was explicitly called a king.<sup>5</sup>

Ibni-Adad was king of Hazor in the reign of Zimri Lim. If Hazor remained the chief city in Palestine, it must have his first or second successor that led the Hyksos attack on Egypt.<sup>6</sup> Other names

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 1182, the duck-bill axe. Note that the period of consistent military contact between Mari and Qatna was the reign of Shamshi Adad I. The axe probably indicates that MB II settlement began late in his reign, ca. 1725-1717. Ibni-Adad of Hazor was already mentioned in Shamshi Adad's time. Thompson, The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives, p. 129; A. Malamat, "Northern Canaan and the Mari Texts", in Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century; Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck, edited by James A. Sanders (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1970), pp. 164-71.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 984-985.

<sup>3</sup>Dossin, "Les archives économiques du Palais de Mari", pp. 97-117; Malamat, "Syro-Palestinian Destinations in a Mari Tin Inventory", pp. 31-38.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 37.

<sup>6</sup>If Ibni-Adad was king in the time of Shamshi Adad I and early in the reign of Zimri-Lim, it was most probably his grandson.

from the Syro-Palestine area were characteristically West Semitic in both the Mari and Execration Texts.<sup>1</sup> However, one Wari-Taldu or Yari-Taldu at Laish, mentioned with the king of Hazor in the Mari letter, appears to be Hurrian.<sup>2</sup> This is not especially surprising, since Hurrians were well known in the population of North Mesopotamia and were princes of some small states.<sup>3</sup> Hurrian texts were found at Mari. Slightly later, after 1600, they held positions of great prominence in the Aleppo government which appears to have acted in concert with the Hurrian states in its final agony.<sup>4</sup>

#### The Conquest of Egypt

If the Mari letters correctly indicate the political and ethnic structure of Syria-Palestine in the age 1715-1685, then the Hyksos who entered Egypt in 1670-68 were a mixture of West Semites (Amorites) and Hurrians under the leadership of Hazor.<sup>5</sup>

We have no idea of the proximate cause of this venture; the Mari archive ended almost two decades before it happened. No other archive or historical record before the Armarna Period gave a clear picture of the wide ranging machinations of princes. Much history must be inferred,

<sup>1</sup>Thompson, The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives, pp. 91-92.

<sup>2</sup>Malamat, "Syro-Palestinian Destinations in a Mari Tin Inventory", p. 34, line 20 of the text, and pp. 35-36.

<sup>3</sup>Kupper, Les Nomades en Mesopotamie au Temps du Roi de Mari, pp. 229 and 230, note 1; Dossin, "Les archives economiques du Palais de Mari", p. 109. They ruled greater sites like Urshu and Kasshu.

<sup>4</sup>Kupper, Les Nomades en Mesopotamie au Temps du Roi de Mari, p. 234.

<sup>5</sup>The juglets from Tell ed-Dabca were compared with those at Megiddo, thus those of north Palestine. If Hazor was the seat of a king, it must have been the leader of the effort against Egypt, since the only other potentate of that rank in Palestine and Syria was the king of Iamkhad.

from the narrower scope of the Alalakh archives, from the juxtaposition of events related in official documents of various sorts which not only leave out defeats, but the roles played by allies. Some information may be derived from archaeology.

Archaeology clearly indicates a relationship between northern Palestine and the earliest Hyksos Burials at Tell ed-Dabca.<sup>1</sup> It would be difficult to assume that the ability to combine forces had been lost with the end of the Mari Age. From the exported objects manufactured in the Middle Kingdom but probably sent out of Egypt in the Hyksos Age, we can infer that the Egypt of the Hyksos was in contact with Qatna, Ugarit and even Aleppo (Neirab).<sup>2</sup> It may be that the Hyksos invaders had help from Syria proper, though there is no clear proof.

The conquest of Egypt was carried out by a people who had been in Palestine for little more than a generation or two. It could be called part of a larger movement which had not stopped in Palestine. The conquest took place against a background of increasing political concentration in the "Amorite" ruled area of the Near East. Babylon, in the middle years of Shamsuiluna, was supreme in Mesopotamia. Iamkhad was the chief power in Syria. Though Qatna was independent, it was weaker.<sup>3</sup> Upon entering Egypt, the Hyksos set up a (new) center at Avaris, from which they subjugated Egypt.<sup>4</sup> In characteristic fashion, the leadership migrated.

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 66, 1205-1206.

<sup>2</sup>Wolfgang Helck, Die Beziehungen Agyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971), pp. 68-71. Hyksos power continued in Palestine.

<sup>3</sup>Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", pp. 20-21.

<sup>4</sup>Manetho, Aegyptiaca (epitome), translated by W. G. Waddell, Loeb Classical Library, vol. 350 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964),

No direct evidence supports the conclusion that the Hyksos invasion was sudden. MB II influence had been felt in Egypt from the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty at Illahun and Kom el Hisn.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, prior experience in the Nile Valley does not indicate that the invasion was not sudden. Some experience of the Country would seem to be essential to success. In any case, the invasion occurred in the MB II C, the last phase of the MB II. In the Levant and Palestine, the event is marked by the occurrence of objects of Egyptian manufacture, scarabs and stone vessels, that had not occurred there since the end of MB II A.<sup>2</sup> In Egypt, it was marked by the foundation of the Asiatic cemetery of Tell ed-Dabca.<sup>3</sup>

The weapons found in that cemetery and in contemporary Palestine do not indicate that any exotic types were used. The archaeology indicates that the Hyksos were armed with the rectangular battle axe with a notch in front of the blade, the dagger with widely spaced veins, and the short-socket spear or javelin.<sup>4</sup>

They rode on donkey-back.<sup>5</sup> No tomb of the MB II C contained any evidence that chariots or bows of any sort were used by the Hyksos, though these were known at Mari and in Syria, as was the horse.<sup>6</sup> The success of the Hyksos attack must have lain not with new and unfamiliar weapons, but with some tactical, strategic or political advantage which

---

Fr. 43, pp. 90-91, as quoted by Eusebius; Fr. 49, pp. 98-99 from the Scholia to Plato.

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 49, 138-41. <sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 1204-1206. <sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 66-67.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 231-232. <sup>5</sup>Above, pp. 66-67.

<sup>6</sup>Gadd, "Tablets from Chagar Bazar and Tall Brak", p. 31; Kupper Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au Temps du Roi de Mari, pp. 35-37.

cannot be found in the archaeological record; as said above, the art of making alliances may have played some part.

### Hyksos Rule in Egypt

Opposed views on the Hyksos Age have been espoused by various authors under the respective banners of Manetho and Säve-Söderbergh. The Manethonic view was that the Hyksos were sudden invaders who remained alien, behaved brutally and impiously, and were finally expelled after having been a major disaster for Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Although this view fitted the invasion type theories of earlier generations who found important parallels in known migrations of Aramaeans, Arabs, Goths, Huns, Turks, etc., it found little favor with a generation of scholars who were raised in the traditions of consensus history which emphasized local development. To them, the Hyksos appeared as relatively peaceful immigrants who had legitimately inherited political power from a corrupt and disorderly local dynasty. The bombast of Kamose sounded to them like the rantings of a more recent dictator of unhappy memory. Säve-Söderbergh said: "Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer"<sup>2</sup> describing Kamose in council.

With the discoveries at Tell ed-Dab<sup>c</sup>a and the revision of the archaeological and historical chronology of Western Asia, it is possible to come to more precise results. Further, the recent research has resulted in a new view of the Thirteenth Dynasty. Essentially, this view is that the Thirteenth Dynasty represented a new political settlement of Egypt. The power and continuity of government was wrested from

---

<sup>1</sup>Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Fr. 42, 76-91; Redford, "The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition", pp. 1-47.

<sup>2</sup>Säve-Söderbergh, "The Hyksos Rule in Egypt", p. 70.

the hands of the king and invested in the bureaucracy.<sup>1</sup> The Nile Valley remained unified as far as Aswan; there is positive evidence that Nubia remained in Egyptian hands for much of the Thirteenth Dynasty and there is no evidence that it was torn from Egypt until after that time.<sup>2</sup>

It should be clear then, that the establishment of the Hyksos at Tell ed-Dab<sup>c</sup>a-Avaris about 1670-68 immediately disrupted this unity (Historical Map 9). In addition, Lower Nubia fell out of the grasp of Egypt and into that of Kush, which became a wealthy and powerful principality in the Early Hyksos Age.<sup>3</sup> The earliest Kushite Kerma burials were found in Lower Nubia in the period of the later Seventeenth Century. One was found at Abydos at this time as well.<sup>4</sup> In addition to the Kerma tombs, Pan Graves were found in cemeteries that ranged from Nubia to Dahshur. The Early Hyksos Age was then a period when the unity of the Nile Valley was disrupted and foreign groups were able to come and go in both Upper and Lower Egypt. Even the Pan Grave people, possibly Medjay who were considered friendly to Egypt in the Admonitions of Ipuwer, represented

---

<sup>1</sup>Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, pp. 93-100, especially 97-100.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 102. The so-called destruction of Buhen in 1674 has more to do with the date that the beams were cut, or of the construction than with the destruction of the building. Kerma K III is about 1620. If the sudden increase in the wealth of the tumuli is any indication of control over Lower Nubia, Lower Nubia was not lost to Egypt until the Hyksos Age. The stelae at Buhen were found in the fort, probably removed from Cemetery K. Probability would strongly indicate a date in the Hyksos Age for the stelae, since most tombs of cemetery K belong to this period (Table 61). The stela of Sopd-Hor which refers to the prince of Kush must be Hyksos Age in date. See also T. Save-Soderbergh, "A Buhen Stela from the Second Intermediate Period", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 35 (1949), 50-58.

<sup>3</sup>That is, at the time of K III or in that generation.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 551-576.

a change. Previously, Medjay in the service of Egypt were kept in the forts and used to control other Medjay, trying to enter the valley.<sup>1</sup> Now they were roaming the valley unchecked, and were buried in their own cemeteries, another feature not seen before.<sup>2</sup>

Although some groups of Egyptians may have prospered under the new conditions, the disruption of the unity of the Nile Valley after some three and a half centuries was inevitably a disaster to the inhabitants. This must have been especially true of the official classes.<sup>3</sup> As a disaster, it would naturally not be a period of happy memory. In addition, other aspects of Hyksos rule discussed by Manetho and refuted by Säve-Söderbergh remain issues today.

#### Hyksos Cultural Isolation

One of the features remembered by Manetho was the fact that the Hyksos were foreigners; the Fifteenth Dynasty was even designated as Phoenician in some accounts.<sup>4</sup> Säve-Söderbergh, citing the use of Egyptian names in the cartouches as well as the reverence for Egyptian gods, claimed that the Hyksos had been assimilated and that Apophis was right in claiming that Kamose had attacked him in his own land.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Smither, "The Seman Dispatches", p. 7, dispatch 3, pp. 8-9, number 4, and p. 9, number 5, report catching Medjay in the desert and the resulting interrogations.

<sup>2</sup>Pan Graves, like Kerma, began in the Hyksos Age, see above, pp.

<sup>3</sup>That is, the replacement of bureaucrats with feudal vassals, often of foreign origin.

<sup>4</sup>Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, Frs. 42, pp. 90-91; 48 a, pp. 94-97; 48 b, pp. 96-97; and 49, pp. 98-99.

<sup>5</sup>Säve-Söderbergh, "The Hyksos Rule in Egypt"; these items represent behavior that is paralleled by the Ptolemies.



The archaeology at Tell ed-Dab<sup>ca</sup> indicates that the Hyksos, while adopting many convenient features of Egyptian material culture, retained many key practices in the weapons, types of pottery and burial customs that make them recognizable as a distinct group.<sup>1</sup> Names found on scarabs of the period include not only Semitic types, but such nicknames as <sup>c</sup>Am, "The Asiatic".<sup>2</sup> In addition, the style of politics was almost certainly that practiced by the contemporary Asiatics. There was one central "great king" in Avaris, with many vassals in other places. Some of these used the cartouche, indicating royal pretensions, while others did not, indicating that they might have been inferiors of even the vassals.<sup>3</sup> The regime north of el Qusiya represented a sharp break with prior Egyptian practice. Though this failure to assimilate was not an especially damaging feature, it was one very likely to cause resentment and be politically potent.

#### Hyksos Cruelty

There is little clear written evidence on the subject of Hyksos cruelty. S ave S oderbergh cited the permission given the Thebans by the Hyksos to graze cattle in the Delta as an example of magnanimity, though we do not know what price was exacted for this.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 226-235.

<sup>2</sup>Tomb L/12/5 at Tell ed-Dab<sup>ca</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, pp. 276-80. Royal names includee XVI A-M; N-P were simply hk; h3swt. We could include Teti the son of Pepi in this list, possibly also Teti-<sup>cn</sup> or Aata.

<sup>4</sup>John A. Wilson, "The War Against the Hyksos", in Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Third Edition, edited by James B. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 232.

The clearest evidence is archaeological. There were two human skeletons found with the sacrificed donkeys in the dromos of tomb L/12/5 at Tell ed-Dab<sup>ca</sup>.<sup>1</sup> We cannot be sure that these were sacrifices also, though that is the most likely interpretation. Such human sacrifice was not unknown in Palestine later.<sup>2</sup>

The Kermans were by far the most lavish in the expenditure of human life for ceremonial purposes. There is no evidence that any of these sacrifices were Egyptians; most appear to have been young women, probably of local origin.<sup>3</sup> The habit could not have been unknown to the Egyptians, since there were many settled in Nubia, many of these in the prince of Kush's service. A Kerma tomb at Abydos contained a sacrifice burial.<sup>4</sup>

#### Hyksos Destructiveness and Impiety

Evidence for the destruction and desecration of monuments is to be found in the statuary of Middle Kingdom and Thirteenth Dynasty date found outside the borders of Egypt. Most of it, including the objects from Ras Shamra in the far north and Kerma in the far south, was mutilated in one fashion or another.<sup>5</sup>

The date when this statuary was exported is the key to its historical importance. Objects of Egyptian origin were not found in

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup>Tophets in Phoenicia are examples.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 556-558.

<sup>4</sup>Above, p. 171.

<sup>5</sup>Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée, p. 2; Claude Schaeffer, "Les fouilles de Mineit-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra, troisième campagne (Printemps 1931)", Syria, 13 (1932), p. 20, plate XIV. Schaeffer made much of this mutilation, which he regarded as intentional and done by people at Ugarit. Reisner, Excavations at Kerma Parts IV-V, plate 31. The statue of Sennuwy was found cracked all over.

the MB II of inland Syria or in the EB IV of Palestine. They were found in the MB II A at Byblos. Egyptian objects in the MB II A of Byblos were generally portable goods which might reasonably be exported under normal conditions.<sup>1</sup> Although there were objects with Egyptian inscriptions in the Obelisk Temple, none were imported statuary.<sup>2</sup>

While most of the statues of Middle Kingdom date found in the Levant were found in Late Bronze contexts or out of context, a few were probably found in the Middle Bronze III, the Hyksos Age. These include the statue and sphinxes at Ugarit (two statuettes) Gezer, and probably the statuary from Tell Hizzin.<sup>3</sup> In Nubia, the statues found in the Kerma Tumuli were deposited in the MB III A and B periods (Table 19). The evidence thus indicates that export of these statues and sphinxes began no earlier than the Hyksos Age, when the occurrence of Egyptian objects resumed in MB II C tombs.<sup>4</sup>

The usurpation and destruction of monuments was certainly not unprecedented in the period between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties. Documents from Illahun possibly refer to dismantling part of the complex

---

<sup>1</sup>These included the cylinder-jar of Amenemhat III and the casket of Amenemhat IV as well as other stone vessels, scarabs, jewelry and faience figurines.

<sup>2</sup>Except possibly the bronze sphinx from deposit 14433 and a statuette 15471 in Egyptian style with an inscription in an unknown language.

<sup>3</sup>Schaeffer, *Stratigraphie Comparée*, p. 22, section XIII. He dates the sphinxes to the end of level II, or the Middle Bronze Age. The value of this context is limited. See above, p. 1095, for the circumstances of Tell Hizzin; though the context is unclear, nothing but material of MB III A came from the dig. Weinstein, "A Statuette of the Princess Sebekneferu at Tell Gezer", pp. 49-57; see p. 54 for Horka from Ajjul of MB III B 2 - III C (1575-1510); see p. 55 for two statuettes found by Macalister at Gezer.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 1204-1205.

of Senwosret III.<sup>1</sup> The paving of the offering chamber of Khnemit of the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty contained the re-used stele of an Amenemhat-ankh of the Twelfth.<sup>2</sup> In many instances, kings of this period usurped monuments.<sup>3</sup> Usurpation is not mutilation, however, and the Hyksos could ship delicate pottery long distances without damage, so accident is not a very good explanation. The statue of Sennuwy at Kerma was cracked all over in a fashion that indicates the application of heat.

It should be clear that the Hyksos Age was one in which the usurpation and theft of funerary goods was generally practiced in the Nile Valley.<sup>4</sup> The archaeological record does not go so far as to tell us who practiced it most, but the Hyksos certainly practiced it and were probably remembered for it.

#### The Political Structure of the Hyksos Age

The Kamose Stelae and Carnarvon Tablet inform us of three major political entities in the Nile Valley in the Hyksos Age. In addition, there were subdivisions of each, apparently based on the accustomed practice of each people.

#### Upper Egypt

The Upper Egypt of the Seventeenth Dynasty appears to have been united under a single ruler. Whatever internal divisions existed were

<sup>1</sup>Griffith, The Petrie Papyri.      <sup>2</sup>Above, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup>Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, p. 239, XIII-18 entry 2; p. 241, XIII-21 entry 4; p. 271, XV-4 entry 2; p. 274, XV-5 entry 2; p. 275, entry 3; p. 285, XVII-3 entry 5. These are the more obvious examples.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 28-29.

probably mainly administrative, except perhaps for El Kab.<sup>1</sup>

It may be that Upper Egypt came under the control of the Hyksos directly for some time. The presence of blocks with the name of Khian and Apophis at Gebelein tends to emphasize their power as overlords. In any case, the Seventeenth Dynasty appears to have survived as the major power in Upper Egypt.<sup>2</sup>

Their relations with the power immediately to the south are difficult to trace in this early phase of the Hyksos Age. Kerma burials occurred in Egypt dated to the general times of K III and K X at Abydos and Abadiya. Since at least one of these burials was of the uniform Kerma type, including a sacrifice, the presence of other Kermans at the funeral was indicated. The individual could not have been alone in Egypt.<sup>3</sup> At the end of the Hyksos Age as in the period of the Execration Texts, the relations with Kush were inimical. Since the Kushites ruled over a population of Pan Grave people in Upper Nubia, it may be that the occurrence of the Pan Graves (and Kerma burials that were often found with them) in Egypt and Lower Nubia in the Early and Mid Hyksos Ages represented a period of Kushite campaigning that reached into Egypt.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>El Kab continued to have a dynasty of mayors beginning with the transfer of the office recorded by the Juridical Stela, see above, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup>Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen Geschichte, Gebelein, p. 271, XV-4 entry 3; p. 273, XV-5 entry 3.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 171, 580, 586-587.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 171, 580-588, 365-36 for the tombs Tables 37 and 38. R. S. Merrillees, "Evidence for Bichrome Wheel-Made Ware from Egypt", Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology, 1 (1970), p. 23. He noted that the Pan Graves were found north of El Qusiya at Rifa; he also believed that Sedment Cemetery K was of Pan Grave type. We have noted here Pan Grave pottery from Lisht and Dahshur. It is clear that the Pan Graves were not associated solely with the Seventeenth Dynasty.

The distinctively Nubian burials of Pan Grave people in Egypt are probably distinguished from the Medjay in Egyptian service.<sup>1</sup>

If there were incursions of Hyksos and their Nubian allies into Upper Egypt, they were confined to the period between about 1625-1590/80. By the reign of Kamose, Upper Egypt was under a single rule, more or less secure against the two enemies on either flank. It is notable that the Pan Grave people were either Egyptianized by this time or had disappeared (Table 77).

#### Nubia

The Kamose Stela spoke of Aswan as the border of Egypt. South of that boundary existed a complex of cultures that only temporarily spilled over into Egypt.

The chief people of Nubia during this period were those that followed the Prince of Kush. More than anyone else in Nubia, they had prospered in the Hyksos Age. From the comparatively poor and isolated cemetery at Kerma of earlier times, the Kushites progressed to the enormous tumuli full of material and human wealth. Much of this wealth bore the unmistakable stamp of Egyptian manufacture. Of special interest was the architecture which included some small rooms, of Egyptian type, and a number of large, almost solid brick buildings that differed entirely in plan from anything seen in Egypt, but were constructed with Egyptian columns and decorated with Egyptian paintings of Nubian motifs.<sup>2</sup> If these paintings accurately reflected life, the Kermans possessed a considerable fleet of river transport.

---

<sup>1</sup>Such cemeteries as Balabish, Hu and Qau must have been rather isolated at the time.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 553-556.

The humbler burials of Upper Nubia were closely related to the Pan Graves. These were found in separate cemeteries from those occupied by the rulers at Kerma and Sai. The pottery clearly shows that they were contemporary, however.<sup>1</sup>

During the Hyksos Age, both of these groups spilled over into Nubia. Pan Graves were found associated with C-Group cemeteries, but more often in their own small cemeteries, as in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> Kerma burials occurred as well, of the uniform type found at Kerma which indicated that there were many more Kermans present at the burial as well as substantial amounts of Kerma type goods. These Kerma burials have been found alone, associated with Pan Grave or C-Group cemeteries and once in an Egyptian cemetery. Everywhere they occur in very small numbers, which again indicates that the presence of Kermans was temporary.<sup>3</sup>

If the Kermans who were overlords of Lower Nubia governed it at all directly, the governors were not buried there, for the two groups already present in Lower Nubia often had more imposing tombs than the Kermans buried there.

The Egyptian occupation of Lower Nubia had not ceased with the coming of the Hyksos to Egypt and the Kushites to Nubia. If the burials were any indication, the Egyptian settlement intensified and continued to do so until the end of the Second Intermediate Period (Table 61). Large cemeteries near the forts were begun and used throughout the period. Stelae associated with the cemeteries recorded careers associated with the Prince of Kush; these indicated that the forts remained under

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 557-580.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 589-598.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 580-588.

the command of Egyptian commandants who executed commissions on behalf of the Prince of Kush.

It may be that some of C-Group people obtained a greater measure of independence during this period. In some of the cemeteries, the tumuli grew to large size during the II b or later Hyksos Age.<sup>1</sup> These tumuli often had Egyptian structural features including mud-brick chapels and arched burial chambers.<sup>2</sup> The most striking change in architecture for the living was in the construction of the large, fortress-like buildings at Areika which contrasted with the simple huts built of stone from II a.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting feature of C-Group during the Hyksos Age was the great intensification of change. Under the control of Egypt, the houses and tombs of the C-Group people had shown remarkably little change from I b to II a, from the beginning of the Middle Kingdom to the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty. During II b, the first clear evidence of class differentiation appeared in the cemeteries. Shortly thereafter, the C-Group culture began to disintegrate, losing many characteristic features of the burial customs and pottery that had made it distinctive. Thereafter, under the New Kingdom, Egyptian materials and customs were adopted, so that most Nubian cemeteries of the period are simply called New Kingdom.<sup>4</sup>

#### The Hyksos

The Asiatic rulers of Egypt north of Cusae and overlords of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 529-531.

<sup>2</sup>Above, p. 529, traits 4-6.

<sup>3</sup>Above, p. 544.

<sup>4</sup>Above, p. 542.



Nile Valley have been subjected to repeated scholarly scrutiny.<sup>1</sup> Recent opinion, which regards the plethora of Dynasties in this part of Egypt as a result of the Hyksos' Asiatic background, is certainly the most plausible explanation. Having a great King in Avaris, who ruled an array of lesser kings and non-royal vassals, not only explains the large number of kings assigned to this period, possibly even the later Fourteenth Dynasty, but is fully in accord with contemporary Asiatic practice.<sup>2</sup> The speech of Itur-Asdu, which most vividly described the practice, belongs to the generation that immediately preceded the Hyksos conquest.<sup>3</sup> The establishment of the Dynasty of Alalakh as a vassal dynasty of Aleppo was virtually contemporary with the establishment of the Fifteenth Dynasty.<sup>4</sup> The feudal nature of Hyksos politics was corroborated by the reference to Teti the son of Pepi, who was the local potentate in Nefrusy.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Engberg, The Hyksos Reconsidered, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 18 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939); Säv-Söderbergh, "The Hyksos Rule in Egypt"; A. Alt, Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht; Bericht über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philosophische-historische Klasse, Band 101, Heft 6 (Leipzig: Akademie Verlag, 1961), Von Beckerath, Untersuchungen zur Politischen; Pierre Montet, Le Drame d'Avaris: Essai sur la pénétration des Semites en Égypte (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1941); Hanns Stock, Studien zur Geschichte und Archäologie der 13. bis 17. Dynastie Ägyptens, Ägyptologische Forschungen, vol. 12 (Gluckstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1942); Van Seters, The Hyksos, A New Investigation; Redford, "The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition". This includes only the more important works that specifically deal with the Hyksos.

<sup>2</sup>Redford, "The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition", pp. 17-22.

<sup>3</sup>That is, between 1717 B.C. and ca. 1697 B.C.

<sup>4</sup>Hammurabi of Aleppo was the younger contemporary of Hammurabi of Babylon, so Abbael of Aleppo was in the next generation from about 1770 onward. See J. R. Kupper, "Nouvelles lettres de Mari relatives a Hammurabi de Babylon", Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale, 42 (1968), pp 35-52.

<sup>5</sup>Wilson, "The War Against the Hyksos", p. 233.

Apophis indicated that the Hyksos and Kush had been allied before and should continue to be allied for their own protection.<sup>1</sup> The Seventeenth Dynasty had been subject to the Hyksos at one time.<sup>2</sup>

There is very little written evidence for the presence or extent of Hyksos rule in Asia. Since the Egyptians were concerned only with the Hyksos presence in Egypt, their records contain no information directly relating to events in Asia. The Alalakh archive also contained no reference to events south of Amurru. Since it contained only the records of a subordinate kingdom without wide or independent foreign contacts, this should not be taken as evidence that diplomatic horizons were narrow.<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, there is some evidence that might indicate some continued Hyksos involvement in Asia. Manetho said that the Hyksos retired to Asia after repeated Egyptian failures before Avaris<sup>4</sup> (which were corroborated by the Kamose Stelae). However, we intend to test rather than accept Manetho. The Egyptians did not simply stop at the edge of the Valley after the Hyksos were driven out, but immediately followed into Palestine where they engaged in a long siege and some

---

<sup>1</sup>Labib Habachi, The Second Stele of Kamose (Gluckstadt: J. J. Augustin, 1966), pp. 39-40.

<sup>2</sup>A. H. Gardiner and B. Gunn, "New Rendering of Egyptian Texts II; the Expulsion of the Hyksos", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 5 (1918), pp. 127-38, 179-200 and 242-71.

<sup>3</sup>We may note that Shamsuiluna traded with the west; see Millard, "Cypriote Copper in Babylonia", pp. 211-213. With the rise of the dynasty of the Sealands, this western trade might have increased in importance at least as an alternative to the Dilmun trade in copper, which could be cut off at any time. In any case, the horizons in trading were not suddenly narrowed after the Mari epoch.

<sup>4</sup>Manetho, Aegyptiaca, Fr. 42, pp. 86-89. The Kamose Stelae explain away one such failure. Others later were recounted by Ahmose son of Eben (Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt, II, pp. 8-11).

further campaigning.<sup>1</sup> In the Nile Valley, only Lower Nubia had been reconquered in the south: Kush remained independent.<sup>2</sup> It would appear that the Egyptians did not regard the work of dismantling Hyksos rule completed by the expulsion of the Asiatics from the Delta. This contrasted with the conduct of the early Middle Kingdom rulers who simply expelled intruding Asiatics and did not expel the Nubians at Kubaniyya.<sup>3</sup> The Hyksos themselves had continued to maintain close contacts with Asia as the continued similarity of pottery and weapons types showed. Objects such as scarabs may have been cross-traded as well; there was one type of scarab with a distinctive type of sphinx represented on it which had identical examples at both Tell el Yehudiyya and Tell el 'Ajjul.<sup>4</sup> The other major link between the Hyksos and Asia was Yehudiyya ware. Its distribution in Asia was more restricted than once thought, including only the Syrian coast, southeast Cyprus (and Thera!), the Lebanon and Palestine (Table 94).

In a sense, the distribution of Yehudiyya ware corresponds to areas just at or beyond the limit of the activities described in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilson, "The War Against the Hyksos", p. 233 (Ahmose son of Eben); Claude Vandersleyen, Les Guerres d'Amosis, fondateur de la XVIII<sup>e</sup> Dynastie, Monographes Reine Elisabeth I (Brussels; Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth, 1971), pp. 125-27. Vandersleyen believes that Sharuhēn was the whole campaign but that it was a renewed rather than a continuous siege. However, the reference to a campaign in Djahi by Ahmose pen Nēk-heb is vague. Vandersleyen (p. 124) puts King Ahmose in Qedem as well.

<sup>2</sup>Although campaigns are noted, the Royal Cemetery at Kerma continues through K XVIII and K XX before ending, thus about two generations after the end of the Hyksos Age.

<sup>3</sup>No campaigns into Asia itself are preserved from the early Middle Kingdom. Despite the conquest of Nubia, the Nubian colony at Kubaniyya was permitted to continue into II a.

<sup>4</sup>Williams, Representational Scarabs, fig. 22 q-r.

Alalakh Archive (see Historical Map 7). These activities included Alalakh, Iamkhad, Carchemish and Ibla who were at one time or another associated with Iamkhad. To the south, there were Qatna, Amurru and Ugarit; Qatna was sometimes in conflict, sometimes associated with Iamkhad. Relations with Ugarit and Amurru are not clear.<sup>1</sup> It may be that the area beyond was the sphere of another power whose contacts would be with Aleppo rather than some subordinate kingdom.

This area south of Amurru and Ugarit was an archaeological unit; all of the regions contained materials that could be recognized as coming from the same culture. In addition, sites in all parts of Palestine were fortified in the reign of Apophis with walls and embankments that were clearly intended to withstand organized sieges. These fortifications were repeatedly rebuilt and renewed in an effort so large that it must be due to the anticipation of a military attack by an identified power (Table 50).<sup>2</sup>

Since this area south of Qatna and Amurru had a common culture, which involved common trade goods and common preparations for defense, it seems only reasonable to hypothesize that it belonged to the same large political unit subject to the Hyksos Great King in Avaris. The political structure of this hypothesized political unit would have been the same as that of Aleppo or the Hyksos area of Egypt. The Great King in Avaris would have had subordinates in each of the major regions of Palestine and the Lebanon which would have had further subordinates in

---

<sup>1</sup>Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>Dever, et al., Gezer I, plan I gives an example of this type of fortification.

the smaller centers. Hazor was certainly one of the largest centers; lesser ones in north Palestine included Megiddo, Shechem and Achzib. For the other likely regions, south-inland Palestine, south-coastal Palestine and the Lebanon, no known individual centers were clearly paramount. If the Syrian Coast belonged to the Hyksos sphere, its center was at Ugarit.<sup>1</sup>

If the hypothesis that the Hyksos ruled Asoa south and west of the Qatna-Amurru area is correct, then the state system that governed the Fertile Crescent was in three parts (Historical Map 9). At its height, there were three major centers of West Semitic or "Amorite" power, Babylon, Aleppo and Avaris. These ruled a central area directly and dominated an area beyond by means of vassals. Between the spheres of the major powers, there were states that were at least partly independent. Between Babylon and Iamkhad there was Khana; between Iamkhad and the Hyksos, there were Qatna, Amurru and Ugarit. Iamkhad or Aleppo had a special relationship with the Hurrian states that had come to dominate the area east of the Euphrates, as indicated by their cooperation against the Hittites.<sup>2</sup> Iamkhad's special relationship with the Hurrians included the acceptance of Hurrians as subjects and officials, in addition to the acceptance of Hurrian gods and month names.<sup>3</sup> These Amorite states had come to be on very bad terms with non-Amorite states and peoples beyond their borders. Babylon waged a number of campaigns

---

<sup>1</sup>Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", p. 35. Ugarit was mentioned in Alalakh VII tablets as well as Mari letters. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets, p. 99, number 358.

<sup>2</sup>Otten, "Keilschrifttexte", pp. 78-79 and 82.

<sup>3</sup>Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets, p. 25, number 1 invokes Hepat; p. 85 number 263 contains the month names, and p. 86 number 269 contains the name of a festival.

against the Kassites, probably to the north and east. In addition, she carried on a running feud with the Dynasty of the Sealands. Whatever the origin of this feud, it seems clear from the elaborately Sumerian names of some Sealands rulers, that they saw themselves as heirs to that earlier civilization.<sup>1</sup>

Assyria had returned to Old Assyrian Royal names after the Amorite interlude of Shamshi Adad and Ishme Dagan.<sup>2</sup> We have no idea what caused the rivalry between Aleppo and the great Hittite power to the north, but that rivalry was deadly to Aleppo. The Hyksos were on the worst of terms with the Seventeenth Dynasty by the reign of Kamose.

In addition to the central core of West-Semitic or "Amorite" states and their associates and the ring of inimical non-Amorite states beyond, there were states or peoples beyond these who sometimes acted in concert with the central Amorite states. The alliance between the Hyksos and Kush clearly existed; the attack on Arzawa by Hattushili was a great opportunity for the Hurrians.<sup>3</sup> Since we have no correspondence between the various states except the letter from Apophis to the Prince of Kush, there is nothing that directly states that there was any connection between the various powers. There may be, however, some information to be derived from the juxtaposition of events and later allusions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Landsberger, "Assyrische Königsliste und 'Dunkles Zeitalter'", p. 69 note 1/5; Gadd, "Hammurabi and the End of his Dynasty", p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>Landsberger, "Assyrische Königsliste und 'Dunkles Zeitalter'".

<sup>3</sup>Below, p. 1266.

The End of the Hyksos Age

The Hyksos may not have been outstandingly cruel or impious, but they were undoubtedly foreign and the period of their rule stood out from earlier times as a period of disaster for Egypt. In the final period of their rule, a major assault was launched against them by the Seventeenth Dynasty. If the expulsion finally took place in the eleventh or twelfth year of Ahmose,<sup>1</sup> the struggle consumed at least part of the reign of Seqenenre<sup>c</sup>, all of the reign of Kamose and much of the reign of Ahmose, taking about twenty years. The struggle may have cost the life of Seqenenre<sup>c</sup>.<sup>2</sup>

In Egypt, the period of the struggle is documented mainly by the Kamose Stelae and the biographies of some officers in the tombs at El Kab. The period that immediately followed the expulsion was documented in Asia from archaeological materials. The contemporary struggle of the Hittites in Syria is documented from the "bilingual chronicle", the testament of Telepinu, and some various allusions from other materials.<sup>3</sup> The contemporary archive from Alalakh ended with the opening campaign of this struggle and contained only a little information that related to it.<sup>4</sup>

The Egyptian sources are at least spotty. The Kamose Stelae

<sup>1</sup>Vandersleyen, Les Guerres d'Amosis, pp. 33-40 and 199 especially note 4.

<sup>2</sup>Labib Habachi, The Second Stele of Kamose; Wilson, "The War Against the Hyksos", pp. 232-34; Vandersleyen, Les Guerres d'Amosis, pp. 89-90, 17-21.

<sup>3</sup>E. Laroche, "Catalogue des textes hittites", Revue Hittite et Asiatique, 14 (1956), 58, and 16 (1958), 62, 1-28; Sommer and Falkenstein, Die hethitische-akkadische Bilingue des Hattushili I (Labarna II); Orten, "Keilschrifttexte", pp. 73-84.

<sup>4</sup>Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets, pp. 33-34, line 27.

relates the tale of a campaign that became a hasty retreat. The retreat was occasioned by the interception of a letter from Apophis to the Prince of Kush. The letter showed that the talent for combination against a powerful enemy had not disappeared in the period after the Mari Archive. The record on the stelae also showed the substantial effect that even the threat of action against an unguarded flank could have on a campaign.<sup>1</sup>

In any case, our sources cannot be considered a complete record of the campaigns of the early Eighteenth Dynasty; they concern only the major battles in which the two soldiers from El Kab took part. Since they spread over three reigns, it may be that their military activity became less frequent as time went on. The campaign of Thutmose I was of special importance and may have required a larger levy including the older soldiers of El Kab who must have been over forty.<sup>2</sup>

In any case, the known campaigns came in three major groups, those around the expulsion period, which extended into Kush and Djahy, the campaign(s) of Thutmose I and II (Amenhotep I campaigned at least in Kush and Libya. Asiatic campaigns are unknown) and Thutmose III. The periods in between were at least times of relative military inactivity.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Labib Habachi, The Second Stele of Kamose, pp. 39-40. Kamose did not admit it, but his campaign was cut short by this threat of attack in his rear. Wilson, "The War Against the Hyksos", p. 233, accepted the view that the passage from the biography of Ahmose son of Eben, "Then there was fighting in the Egypt which was south of this town", represented a withdrawal. Could this have been due to a revolt like those of Aata or Teti-can?

<sup>2</sup>Von Beckerath, Abriss der Geschichte des Alten Agypten, p. 66 (the king list). Both men were already adults in the time of Ahmose who fought in the liberation campaigns which were at least three or four and probably fourteen years before the end of the reign. They thus had at least 25 and probably 35 years of adult life between their participation in the Expulsion of the Hyksos and their service with Thutmose I. They were 45 to 55 years old.

<sup>3</sup>There was no spectacular campaign in Amenhotep I's time that



The period before the expulsion involved a number of battles at Avaris which were interrupted at least twice by events in the south which were partly caused by Hyksos diplomacy.<sup>1</sup> After the fall of Avaris, Ahmose invaded Asia.

The first event was the siege of Sharuhen, which lasted several years. This city could not have been Tell Far<sup>c</sup>a South which was only founded at this time or later, but was probably farther north (Table 50).<sup>2</sup> The first destruction levels, probably of MB III B date (or about 1560-50), were found in the south-inland region, and included Jericho, Bethel, Gibeon, and Tell Beit Mirsim (Historical Map 11). These destructions were followed at Jericho, Gibeon and Tell Beit Mirsim by gaps in occupation that lasted over a century (Table 50).<sup>3</sup> They set the pattern for the other destructions in Palestine of MB III B - C and LB I date.<sup>4</sup> If Sharuhen was like other Palestinian cities at this time, it was

---

required the services of the earlier soldiers from El Kab. This does not preclude a lot of siege work done in Palestine by younger men (recruits). The references to Asiatic campaigns in Hatshepsut's reign are vague and resemble formulas (Donald Redford, History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), pp. 57-62). No evidence indicates that Thutmose III himself conquered Gaza before his campaign at Megiddo.

<sup>1</sup>Labib Habachi, The Second Stele of Kamose, pp. 39-40.

<sup>2</sup>The earliest destructions, probably accomplished by Ahmose, were in South-inland Palestine, at Jericho, Tell Beit Mirsim, Gibeon and Bethel. Tell Far<sup>c</sup>a South was founded and well fortified at the same time as Ajjul, Tell el Milh and Khirbet el Mshash in the latest MB III B, probably immediately after the destructions in South-inland Palestine, as frontier fortifications.

<sup>3</sup>None were resettled until LB II.

<sup>4</sup>That is, fortification, elaboration, followed by destruction and a gap. This pattern is occasionally varied, as at Hazor, where there was a large destruction at the end of MB III C, followed by a short period of resettlement that was abandoned in earliest LB I B (in the time of Thutmose III).

surrounded by a wall of large stones and brick, with an embankment heaped against it. The outer embankment might have had a retaining wall that in turn might have had a brick wall above it, making a double line of fortification. The gates were generally of the triple-pier type, which had at least two sets of doors.<sup>1</sup> It has generally been believed that the method of siege was simply blockade which could be carried on in a leisurely manner.<sup>2</sup> However the Hyksos were products of a civilization whose eastern scions made full use of siege towers, ramps and battering rams as well.<sup>3</sup> Earlier representations of Egyptian sieges showed the use of ladders, sometimes equipped with wheels, and a testudo, which protected men who dug at the mud-brick walls with long poles, a variant of sapping.<sup>4</sup> In the MB III B, 1600-1550, the Palestinian cities had been equipped with fortifications that would be especially effective against anyone trying to work close to the wall as is required for the use of the ram, ladders and testudo.

If the struggle to expel the Hyksos was long and bitter, marked by disappointment and setbacks, the long siege of Sharuhen must be taken

---

<sup>1</sup>Dever, et al., Gezer I, plate I.

<sup>2</sup>Margaret Drower, "Syria c. 1550-1400 B.C.", Cambridge Ancient History, Third Edition, Vol. II, Part I, edited by I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), p. 450.

<sup>3</sup>J. R. Kupper, "Notes Lexicographiques", Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archeologie orientale, 45 (1951), pp. 125-28; K. Sethe and W. Helck, Urkunden der 18. Dynastie (Urkunden IV), 22 Hefte Leipzig and Berlin: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), p. 676, line 12.

<sup>4</sup>W. S. Smith, A History of Egyptian Sculpture and Painting in the Old Kingdom (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), figs. 85 and 86. The painting in the chapel of Inti (Fig. 86) shows the sapping done without protective cover. By the Middle Kingdom, some form of testudo has been developed. Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XIV, fifth register.

as proof that the Egyptians were prepared to uproot them from Asia as well; there is no such thing as an easy, leisurely siege in an era before effective logistics. Starvation and disease break out when forage is exhausted. There are always attempts to relieve the beleaguered city.

The second round of destructions was more extensive than the first, which seemed directed at south inland Palestine. The second group were MB III C - LB I A in date and were found on the city mounds of the south-coast and in North Palestine. By this time, many of the cities had still more elaborate fortifications than before, sometimes including a double wall with two glacis.<sup>1</sup> The same pattern was followed; fortification was followed by conflagration which was followed by a gap in the occupation. These gaps included the most significant cities of the country, Gezer and Hazor. They often lasted to the LB II, or well over a generation, even over a century. The country was depopulated.<sup>2</sup>

Three cities survived. Gaza was rebuilt after the destruction of *Palace and City I*, possibly as an Egyptian outpost.<sup>3</sup> Tell Ta<sup>c</sup>annek was rebuilt after a partial destruction, and Megiddo was either rebuilt or survived the period without serious damage (Table 50).

The destructions of the third stage involved mainly Megiddo and Ta<sup>c</sup>annek. Dated to the LB I B, they can be ascribed to the time of Thutmose III. Again, the destruction was followed by a gap.

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 1186-1191.

<sup>2</sup>This does not imply that everyone was massacred, but that the survivors fled, almost certainly northward, and were unable to return. Provisions were presumably destroyed, as in the storerooms at Jericho.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1050-1058--Palace II.

It appears clear that the three phases of destruction and abandonment in Palestine correspond to the three major phases of campaigning recorded from the first half of the Eighteenth Dynasty. As we shall see, no other enemy was active in the area to whom these destructions can be ascribed. It thus appears clear that we are not fully informed by the biographies about the warfare in Asia. The most glamorous episodes are recorded, as was the first siege. The long campaigns of local significance do not appear in the records, though most of them must have preceded the long march of Thutmose I to the Euphrates. It would be wholly impractical to leave the large number of well-fortified and hostile cities in the rear, especially since they belonged to a group that made effective use of blows directed against an unguarded flank.

In any case, the campaigns of destruction in Palestine must have been long and hard-fought. Gezer was far better fortified than Sharuhem could have been earlier. It had the fate of south-inland Palestine to steel its resistance. Yet it is only one of the many destructions to be ascribed to the middle phase.

By the time of Thutmose III, the destruction of Palestine was largely accomplished. Much of the country must have been empty, so it is hardly surprising that he marched as far as Megiddo without opposition. Megiddo was the forward position of a people whose last centers lay in southern Syria and the Lebanon. It is again no accident that the most important subsequent battles and campaigns were fought in the area of Kadesh and Takhsy.

The Egyptian wars against the southern flank of the "Amorite world" were contemporary with and parallel to Hittite wars in the north.

Indeed, the Hittite struggle was more precarious than the Egyptian. It was carried on just as persistently. Unlike the Egyptian wars, we have no idea what precipitated the Hittite wars. Hattushili struck first at Alalakh, which belonged to Aleppo, and then went on to campaign on the Euphrates. The next year, he attacked Arzawa in the southwest; while he was there, the Hurrians struck him in the rear, precipitating a revolt, nearly taking the capital. Hattushili was two years recovering the strength to return to Syria.<sup>1</sup> By the Low Chronology, these events took place perhaps a generation before Murshili's conquest of Babylon, in 1531, or contemporary with the expulsion of the Hyksos and the first Egyptian campaigns in Asia. The strategic blow used by the Hurrians was precisely that outlined by Apophis in his letter to Kush.

In his north Syrian wars, Hattushili clearly faced a coalition of Amorite states led by Aleppo of Hurrian states which included major centers such as Urshu and Kasshu (Historical Map 10). When Hattushili returned to the attack, a new element was added at the battle for Kasshu, called the Umman-Manda.<sup>2</sup>

The term was generally used to describe bands of warriors. It was used to describe an eruption in the time of Naram-Sin, connected with monsters, and it appears in omen texts of the Old Babylonian period. Ammaisaduqa claimed a victory over the Umman Manda just before the Hittite campaigns in Syria. The term was later applied to the Medes before Nineveh at the end of the Assyrian empire.<sup>3</sup> A key element in the use

---

<sup>1</sup>Otten, "Keilschrifttexte", p. 82.

<sup>2</sup>Goetze, "On the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C.", p. 70; Albrecht Goetze, "Alalakh and Hittite Chronology", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 146 (1957), pp. 20-26.

<sup>3</sup>W. F. Albright, "Further Observations on the Chronology of Alalakh", pp. 26-34; Kupper, "Northern Mesopotamia and Syria", p. 38.

of the term seems to be that the groups of warriors were unknown or strange.<sup>1</sup> If this is the case, then the hypothesis that the term Umman Manda refers to the first eruption of the Indo-Aryans who later founded Mitanni is the best explanation for the use of the term here. Indo-Aryans were unknown in the Alalakh VII archive; other hordes or tribes, such as the Kassites, Turukkians or Gutians, were well known. The Umman-Manda were probably not Hurrians who were even better known in the Near East. Thus, the highly probable reading of lines 45-46 of the inscription on the statue of Idrimi, "Barattarna, King of Umman Manda" should demonstrate the connection of the Umman Manda and Indo-Aryans barring positive evidence against it.<sup>2</sup>

The coalition that Hattushili faced certainly included a coalition of "Amorite" and Hurrian states. The Umman Manda who were also involved, were more likely than not to have been the Indo-Aryan founders of Mitanni. It is tempting to include Arzawa in this grouping somehow.

The career of Hattushili continued for some time after the chronicle breaks off in year six. It included a siege of Urshu that involved a number of incidents.

The reign of Hattushili was followed by a minority of Murshili, which was probably a period of inaction. It appears to correspond chronologically with a period of comparative inaction on the part of the

---

<sup>1</sup>O. R. Gurney, "The Sultantepe Tablets IV; The Cuthaeen Legend of Naram-Sin", Anatolian Studies, 5 (1955), p. 93-113.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Albright, "Some Important Discoveries Alphabetic Origins and the Idrimi Statue", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 118 (1950), pp. 11-20; p. 18. The parallelism between Barattarna king of the Khurri people and Barattarna king of the Umman Manda may indicate the two ethnic components of the realm since the Hurrian officers and those (Zaaluti) of the Umman Manda are distinguished in the Kasshu reference.

Egyptians under Amenhotep I.<sup>1</sup> Murshili soon took up the Syrian wars of Hattushili. During these he destroyed Aleppo and defeated the Hurrians.<sup>2</sup> Thereafter he undertook the remarkable adventure that ended in the sack of Babylon. By the Low Chronology, this took place in or about 1531. Thereafter, the Kassites inherited Babylon as the chief beneficiaries of the Hittite assault.

Murshili was assassinated a short time after his return to Anatolia by Hantili who assumed the throne. He also continued the wars against the Hurrians, but with little success. After his reign, the Hittites withdrew from Syria as their Anatolian empire crumbled.

The wars of the Hittites in Syria and the sack of Babylon thus were contemporary with the first two phases of Egyptian operations in Palestine and Syria. Indeed the campaign of Thutmose I to the Euphrates must have happened during the reign of Hantili in the later 1520's. The wars of the Hittites were probably no less devastating to north Syria than the Egyptian wars were to Palestine (Historical Map 11). Alalakh VII was destroyed, and the palace was not replaced for two generations; the rest of the mound may have had a gap of a generation, but the stratigraphy is confused.<sup>3</sup> Tell Mardikh may have been destroyed at this time, and there is a gap.<sup>4</sup> Hama G 3 was destroyed and the site was not resettled until the Fourteenth Century.<sup>5</sup> Far to the north,

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Goetze, "Die historische Einleitung des Aleppo-Vertrages", Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft, 4 (1928-29), p. 60. If Murshili had been a grandson and a second choice for the kingship, some minority would be likely. This appears corroborated by Hattushili's instructions where Murshili is to be taken on campaign after three years, but specially safeguarded.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1160-1161.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 1140-41, 1143. <sup>5</sup>Above, pp. 1132-33.

Korucutepe in the Altinova was destroyed and not resettled for a considerable time.<sup>1</sup> Other destructions of later date, LB I (?), were found at tells Jidle and Hammam in the middle Balikh.<sup>2</sup> Only Ugarit, which was not mentioned in the texts of the period, survived the general destruction.<sup>3</sup>

It seems only reasonable to hypothesize that the deliberate destruction of Amorite Syria and Proto-Canaanite Palestine were connected. They were virtually contemporary and were characterized by the same destructions followed by gaps. They were preceded by the same preparations, glacis fortification which were often accompanied by triple-pier gates.<sup>4</sup> The "Amorite" princes of the Mari Age had previously shown themselves adept at the art of combination, sending large bodies of troops to assist each other or inducing attacks in an enemy's rear. This latter strategy was used by Apophis against Egypt with some success. It would only be reasonable for the main opponents of the Syrian and Palestinian states to seek each other out and coordinate their movements, to prevent the states in the middle from combining against one or the other. Even so, the struggle was long, hard and rather precarious; it ended badly for the Hittites. In addition, we should not underestimate the feud between Babylon and her neighbors, though we have no details. The march on Babylon by Murshili would be most plausible if it were undertaken to assist or reward an ally, in this case probably the

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, p. 1192.

<sup>2</sup>Above, Table 50.

<sup>3</sup>No obvious gap occurs in the materials at Ras Shamra from MB III to LB II, though there might have been some violence in LB I B - II A. Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée, pp. 8-13 for the U. R. 1-3; see above, pp. 1115-1116.

<sup>4</sup>Above, pp. 1185-1191.



Kassites. Similarly Thutmose I's campaign is most understandable as an attempt to aid Khantili or take advantage of the ruined condition of Syria.<sup>1</sup>

It seems only reasonable to hypothesize that the three centers of West Semitic power at the end of the Seventeenth Century were linked in some fashion (Historical Map 10). In the west, these were the Hyksos, with their non-contiguous allies in Kush. In the center was Iamkhad, with its contiguous allies the Hurrian states. During the wars with Hattushili, an alliance was made with the Umman Manda. A connection with Arzawa would parallel the Kushite alliance. There was clearly a connection between Babylon and Iamkhad at the end of the Mari Age. It seems reasonable that it continued.

While the West Semitic states seem closely linked by archaeology on the one hand and old political ties on the other, it is harder to find evidence that the non-Amorite states that fought them were allied. Egypt may have had allies in the Aegean; Queen Ahhotep may have some connection with them. Since there were important connections between the Nile Valley and the Aegean at this time,<sup>2</sup> the identification as Aegeans is far better than any other.

The connection between the Kassites and the Hittites can only be inferred from the results of the sack of Babylon and an attempt to explain it. There was some Kassite connection with Khana of unclear nature.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>By the Wente chronology, 1525 is the earliest date for Thutmose I and 1531 is the Low Chronology date for Murshili's attack on Babylon. The chronology of the latter is not rigidly established, however.

<sup>2</sup>Above, pp. 151-153.

<sup>3</sup>One king of Khana was a Kashtiliash. See Gadd, "Hammurabi and the End of his Dynasty", p. 225.

The connection of the Hittites with Egypt is best indicated by the fact that they were attacking toward the same region at the same times, separated by an interval. In the second set of campaigns, they appear to have campaigned in the same place at the same time which must mean that they were allies or enemies.<sup>1</sup> There is some indication from the time of Shubiluliuma that this alliance was formal and sanctioned by oaths. He regarded a plague as having been the result of his invasion of Egyptian Syria, which violated a treaty.<sup>2</sup> The treaty could have been agreed to anytime before this, but it seems most reasonable that it had been made during the last period of Hittite involvement in Syria, which was the period of Hattushili, Murshili and Khantili or that of Tudkhalia.

After the retirement of the Hittites from Syria, there was a period of inaction on the part of the Egyptians as well. The Amorite states of Aleppo and Babylon had been destroyed; the once populous cities of Palestine were heaps of ruins. Only two areas remained that had not been totally devastated, southern Syria with the Lebanon and the Hurri Lands. These had been severely damaged, however, as the burning of Tell es-Salihiyya, possibly Tell Hizzin and the statements of the Hittites showed.<sup>3</sup> The period between the fall of Babylon and the rise of Mitanni is generally called a dark age, probably with complete

---

<sup>1</sup>Either Murshili or Khantili campaigned in Syria at the time of Thutmose I.

<sup>2</sup>A. Goetze, "Plague Prayers of Mursilis", in Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Third Edition, edited by James B. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 394-95. Paragraphs 4-5 clearly refer to an oath between Hatti and Egypt that recognizes a certain territorial settlement. Paragraph 1 indicates that this precedes the time of Shubiluliuma.

<sup>3</sup>Above, pp. 1163-64.

justification. The period was not as long as once thought however, lasting from the withdrawal of the Hittites, possibly early in the reign of Thutmose II, to the campaigns of Thutmose III.

During this interval, the Indo-Aryans inherited the rule of Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. The fact that they established such a wide realm, from Alalakh on the Orontes to Nuzi on the Tigris, was testimony both to their enterprise and the general exhaustion. This period of the rise of Barattarna came during the reign of Hatshepsut, by the Low Chronology.

If the date is correct and the statements about the role of Mitanni in the Syrian coalition made by Thutmose III are also correct, the Egyptian reaction is understandable. This time, however, Egypt may have acted alone.<sup>1</sup> It required an especially disciplined series of

---

<sup>1</sup>This depends on the date of Tudhaliya who campaigned in Syria, which in turn depends on whether or not there were two kings of the Hittites called Khantili, Zidantash and Huzziya.

Despite Goetze's certainty ("On the Chronology of the Second Millennium B.C.", pp. 55-57), there was no proof one way or the other. Convincing evidence such as different queens for the different kings was lacking.

In the same period, the names of Hattushili's queen, Murshili's queen (the same Kharapshili), Telepinu's queen and Alluwamna's queen are all known. The fact that there is only one complete set of queens for two sets of rulers is a curious coincidence. It is also curious that Khantili II is the only king in the second line who has no known queen since the queen of Khantili I was also the queen of Murshili I.

Bittel in 1970 accepted two Khuzziyas, but only one Khantili and one Zidanta (Hattusha: Capital of the Hittites (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), chronology chart).

A new text discovered in 1967 indicated to Otten that there was one set only. See H. Otten, Die hetitischen historischen Quellen und die altorientalische Chronologie, *Abhandlungen der Geistes- und socialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jahrgang 1968, Nr. 3 (Wiesbaden: Akademie der Wissenschaftlichen und der Literatur in Mainz, 1968). See especially Tafel V, pp. 104-105.

campaigns to maintain the pressure necessary to uproot the remaining centers of Amorite and Proto-Canaanite power in southern Syria and the Lebanon. The task was not completed until the reign of Amenhotep II. It may be that Thutmose III received in Syria the last tokens of the old relationship between the various opponents of the old "Amorite world". Along with the tribute and loot collected from places within reach of Pharaoh there came gifts from Babylon (Kassites), the Hittites and Assyria, soon to be a victim of Mitannian ambition.<sup>1</sup> There were closer states that might have sent such gifts, but did not, or their gifts were not noted.

The Amorite world had been born of the Western Semite's special talent for combination, adaptation and perhaps a certain taste for adventurous politics. In the three centuries from the fall of the Third Dynasty of Ur, West Semites had imposed their dynasties and feudal pattern

TABLE 52

## "DUPLICATE" KINGS OF THE HITTITES

First Set	Second Set
Hantili + Harapshili	Hantili II + Queen Unknown
Zidanta I + Queen Unknown	Zidanta II + Iyaya
Huzziya I + Queen Unknown	Huzziya II + Shummiri

<sup>1</sup>Drower, "Syria 1550-1400 B.C.", p. 464.

of rule from Egypt to the Persian Gulf. These centuries of expansion and consolidation were followed by about a century of rule. During this time they suffered some notable defections. They began to concentrate on defensive measures. They changed from the very active, aggressive politics of the Larsa Age to the defense of the status quo. They were unable or unwilling to impose themselves in Anatolia; their limit of direct rule in Egypt was Cusae. In Babylonia, both the Sealand and the area near the Zagros fell from their grasp.

The reason for the hostility of the Hittites is not clear; perhaps it had something to do with the strangulation of the Assyrian Colonies which had been so profitable to both Assyria and Anatolia. In any case, the period of Hattushili and Murshili was the period when the Hittite state was formed. In Egypt, the period of Hyksos rule was catastrophic to the native ruling classes, possibly the people as well. Further, the Hyksos had failed to assimilate themselves. If they conducted themselves little worse than the natives, they failed to impress them as respecters of the local religion. The reaction to Hyksos rule in Egypt perhaps included the only glimmerings of true patriotism found in the history of Egypt. The soldiers from El Kab speak of "our army" .<sup>1</sup>

Whatever its cause, the reaction is clear testimony to the hatred and fear that the Amorite dynasty of Syria and the Hyksos in Egypt engendered in the Hittites and Egyptians. In the century that followed the expulsion of the Hyksos, the Hittites and Egyptians returned to the attack again and again, leaving most of Palestine, Syria and much of northern Mesopotamia depopulated for many decades and Babylon in the hands of the Kassites. It is a remarkable testimony to the vitality of

---

<sup>1</sup>Sethe and Helck, Urkunden IV, Heft I, p. 9, line 38.

the Proto-Canaanites that they were not crushed by this but recovered to go on to greater things.

The last years of Thutmose III were free of Syrian expeditions of consequence. In his seventh year, Amenhotep II went campaigning in Syria, capturing 550 maryannu and 640 Canaanites.

"While his majesty was going south in the midst of the Plain of Shàron, he met a messenger of the Prince of Naharin, carrying a letter of clay at his throat . . ." <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wilson, "The Asiatic Campaigning of Amenhotep II", Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Third Edition, edited by James B. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 246.