

GLYPTIC ART UNDER AND AFTER EMPIRE: LATE BRONZE IIB AND IRON I
SCARABS AND STAMP SEALS FROM THE SOUTHERN LEVANT

by
Laura Wright

A dissertation submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Baltimore, Maryland

July 2016

© 2016 Laura Wright
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study systematically establishes a methodology for the dating of scarabs and stamp seals from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I in the Southern Levant. First, it recounts the history of the field's dating of the typological forms of scarabs. Second, it systematically employs three methodologies for dating the typological forms of scarabs from the 19th Dynasty, 20th Dynasty, and early Third Intermediate Period. Each methodology assesses different portions of the glyptic corpus. Next, the study evaluates the dating of scarabs and stamp seals on the basis of stylistic criteria. The complex relationship between the Egyptian empire and Southern Levantine vassals is examined through glyptic art. Egyptianizing motifs rooted in local Levantine traditions from the Middle Bronze reemerge in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Motifs half a millennium old are engraved once more as Egyptian empire wanes during the Iron I. Finally, this methodology for the dating of scarabs and stamp seals is used to examine the representations of deities within the burial cults of the Southern Levant. Though the Egyptian empire is in control of the Southern Levant during the Late Bronze IIB, local traditions continue to govern local material culture and cultic practices.

P. Kyle McCarter, Dissertation Director

Theodore Lewis, Second Reader

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the people and institutions within the field who have assisted me in the development and completion of this project and my broader approach to the field. My colleagues and mentors at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem have provided invaluable opportunities and conversations about my research—Sy Gitin, Baruch Brandl, Matthew Adams, Christopher Rollston, Mark Hamilton, Liz Bloch-Smith, Debi Weisselberg-Cassuto, and Andrea Creel. My colleagues at the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon have shaped immeasurably my approach to the study of Southern Levantine religion through conversations and excavation—Larry Stager, Daniel Master, Sara Hoffman, Elise Jakoby Laugier, Jonathon Wylie, and Michael Press. My colleagues with whom I traveled through graduate school continue to provide questions that shape my research. I would also be remiss not to mention the countless hours of patient assistance by Alegre Savariego at the storerooms of the Israel Antiquities Authority.

Next, those in Hebrew Bible at Johns Hopkins University have provided a generous community that sustains study of the field and the person. My primary advisor, Kyle McCarter, has been a keen mind and has shaped my own thinking by modeling generously his careful thought. He has been attentive to both the tangible and intangible aspects of this project. Ted Lewis has always showed a steady and careful hand as I moved from the unsteady state of a graduate student into the field. Both Drs. McCarter and Lewis have shaped a program, this project, and my broader understanding of the field from my first days as a graduate student until the completion of this project. They have

been attentive to the broader human being while encouraging the best that I could provide at different stages of maturity as I entered the field.

Finally, it is my family and especially my parents who must be thanked for their generous support of me as a person and my scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Glyptic Art and Local Patterns of Consumption	3
A Note on Egyptian Rule and Egyptianizing Art	5
The Problem of Dating Glyptic Art in the Late Bronze	
IIB and Iron I	7
Overview of this Study	14
Chapter 2: A History of Scarab Typology	18
Overview	18
A Survey of the History of Scholarship	21
Broad Scarab Typologies of Multiple Periods (1890s–1950s)	22
Scarab Typologies of a Single Period or Site: Narrowing the	
Field through Specialization	33
Critique of the Two Methodologies	49
A Way Forward: Benefiting from All Methodologies	53
Chapter 3: Toward a Scarab Typology of Late New Kingdom Scarabs	55
A Scarab Typology Based upon the Royal Titulary	58
19th Dynasty	58
20th Dynasty	73
Siamun and the End of the Iron I	81

Analysis of Typological Forms	86
A Scarab Typology Based upon Archaeological Context	94
Late Bronze IIB Corpora	95
Scarabs from Iron I Contexts	116
Analysis of Scarab Typology according to Archaeological Context	141
Conclusions	150
Addendum: A Discussion of Scarab Typology Based on Foundation Deposits	151
Summary of a Typology Based on Foundation Deposits	163
Chapter 4: Stylistic Criteria for Dating Glyptic Art	166
ANRA-Scarabs	166
Later Imitations of Other Middle Bronze Motifs	186
Striding Lion	186
Anthropomorphic Figure with a Lotus Bloom	191
Red Crown	195
<i>WD3T</i> -EYE	205
<i>DD</i> -Pillar	208
Uraei	209
<i>N</i> -Sign	212
Rosette	212
Regional Distribution of Late Bronze and Iron I Imitations of Middle Bronze Motifs	214

So-Called Mass-Produced Ramesside Scarabs	216
Imitating Egyptian Motifs on Local Stamp Seals	226
Locally Made Glyptic Art of the Iron I	228
Pyramidal Form of the Stamp Seal	228
Conoid Form of the Stamp Seal	230
Egyptian Influence on Local Iron I Stamp Seals	231
Egyptian Divine Triads and Dyads	233
The Caprid from the Middle Bronze to the Iron I	234
Non-Egyptianizing Motifs of Locally Produced Stamp Seals	236
Conclusion	237
Chapter 5: Glyptic Art and the Pantheon of Southern Levantine Burial	
Cults	240
Local Glyptic Consumption and Production in the Southern	
Levant: Beyond Empire	240
Ptah Scarabs of the Ramesside Period: Religious Traditions	
and Patterns of Consumption	242
Testing the Hypothesis: Ptah Scarabs in Nubia	246
Nubian Sites with Scarabs of Ptah	248
Earlier Glyptic Traditions of Ptah in the Southern Levant	255
Identity of Ptah in the Southern Levant	256
Egypto-Canaanite Deities in Southern Levantine Burial Cult	258
Winged Figures Wearing a Headdress and Standing on Animals	259
Anthropomorphic Figure on a Caprid	270

Winged Figure with Uraei	273
Anthropomorphic Figure on a Lion	276
Anthropomorphic Figure on a Horse	279
Two Anthropomorphic Figures on a Horse and Lion	280
Female on an Unknown Quadruped	283
Anthropomorphic Figures on Unknown Quadrupeds	283
Conclusion	285
Chapter 6: Conclusion	288
Sources Cited	293

TABLES

Table 1: Scarabs of Seti I	60
Table 2: Scarabs of Ramses II	64
Table 3: Scarabs of Merenptah	71
Table 4: Scarabs of Seti II	72
Table 5: Scarabs of Siptah	73
Table 6: Scarabs of Sethnakht	74
Table 7: Scarabs of Ramses III	75
Table 8: Scarabs of Ramses IV	79
Table 9: Scarabs of Ramses IX	80
Table 10: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Head of Scarabs with the Royal Name	88
Table 11: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Clypeus on Scarabs with the Royal Name	89
Table 12: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Side of Scarabs with the Royal Name	91
Table 13: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Back of Scarabs with the Royal Name	92
Table 14: Scarabs from Late Bronze IIB Contexts	97
Table 15: Scarabs from Iron I Contexts	117
Table 16: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Head of Scarabs Organized by Archaeological Context	142

Table 17: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Clypeus of Scarabs Organized by Archaeological Context	144
Table 18: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Sides of Scarabs Organized by Archaeological Context	146
Table 19: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Backs of Scarabs Organized by Archaeological Context	147
Table 20: Comparing the Two Methods for Determining Diachronic Change in the Typology of the Scarab	149
Table 21: Scarabs with the ANRA Motif Organized by Date of Context	180
Table 22: Scarabs Depicting a Winged, Anthropomorphic Figure with Headdress and Standing on an Animal	260
Table 23: Scarabs Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure Wearing a Streamer and Standing on a Lion	269
Table 24: Seals and Scarabs Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Caprid	271
Table 25: Scarabs Depicting a Winged Figure with Uraei	274
Table 26: Scarabs and Seals Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Lion	278
Table 27: Scarabs and Seals Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Horse	280
Table 28: Scarabs and Impressions Depicting Two Anthropomorphic Figures on a Horse and a Lion, Respectively	282
Table 29: Seal Depicting a Female on an Unknown Quadruped	284

Table 30: Scaraboids Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on	
Unknown Quadrupeds	284

FIGURES

Figure 1: Example of Rowe's Dating a Scarab by Typological Form	32
Figure 2: Upper View of the Scarab's Typological Form	56
Figure 3: Side View of the Scarab's Typological Form	57
Figure 4: Tell el-Far'ah (South) 474	61

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Egyptian imperial presence in Palestine was at a high during the Late Bronze IIB. Egyptian centers guarded the road through the Sinai, aiding travel from Egypt proper to Palestine. Prices of a few staple goods, like sesame oil, rose at the end of the 19th Dynasty as harbingers of what was to come (Janssen 1975a: 330–333). Within decades, an economic crisis overtook Egypt. Other staples spiked during the middle of the 20th Dynasty (Černý 1934: 173–178). The price of emmer, used to make bread, doubled and quadrupled initially until what was once one to two *deben* of copper per *khar* rose to an unthinkable eight and even 12 *deben* (Janssen 1975a: 112–117). Barley, a staple for beer-making, also increased steeply during the reign of Ramesses VII (Janssen 1975a: 119–122). The price of small cattle rose dramatically (Janssen 1975a: 165–167).¹ As intra-Mediterranean trade waned in the Iron IA and food prices soared in Egypt, famine plagued the Hittite regions as well (Harrison 2010: 83–84).

As the price of cereals rose, the Egyptian imperial system maintained those programs, which it deemed central to its mission. Wages at the village of Deir el-Medina, paid in cereals, remained steady during the 20th Dynasty (Jansen 1975a: 555–556). Yet as Deir el-Medina continued unabated, the mines at Timnah in the Negev ceased, and Egyptian imperial presence likely pulled out after Ramses VI (Rothenberg 1988: 122–124). Presumably the mines at Timnah were deemed to no longer be essential to Egypt's retracting foreign presence. As the cost of staples rose dramatically under Ramses VII,

¹ The price of small cattle does fluctuate throughout the 19th Dynasty, but the prices attested under Ramses IX and the later 20th Dynasty are not seen at other times in the Ramesside period (Janssen 1975a: 166).

royal projects in distant reaches of the empire suffered from the weight of a strained Egyptian economy.

As the New Kingdom's presence in the Southern Levant waned toward the end of the Ramesside period, and Egyptian influence retracted during the Third Intermediate Period, the Southern Levant underwent dramatic changes. Vibrant trade through intra-Mediterranean networks between Egypt, the Southern Levant, Syria, Turkey, Crete, and Cyprus once deeply influenced even local ceramic assemblages in Palestine during the Late Bronze. Non-elite traditions were passed between these regions presumably by the presence of foreigners. For instance, the local, Canaanite cooking pot of the Late Bronze IIB used Egyptian technology in its temper (Master 2011: 260–261). Yet as Egyptian trade retracted during the Third Intermediate Period, evidence for subtle Egyptian influence on local ceramic traditions also receded (Master 2011: 262). Egyptian imports to Philistine sites on the southern coast slowed in strata with so-called Philistine bichrome.

Egyptian trade networks did persist into the Iron I, albeit in a diminished capacity. Minimal Egyptian contact continued at small sites in Palestine; local sites like Tell el-Aḥwat and 'En Haggit still purchased an occasional Nile perch. As shifts within the trade networks occurred, this study will look at import patterns and local engraving traditions for these amulets. Some crafted local scarabs, limestone conoids, and pyramidal stamp seals. The engraved, at times, local motifs and form. At other times, Egyptianizing motifs mimicked contemporary Egyptian scarabs like the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside scarabs. Local engravers even resurrected Middle Bronze styles of engraving and motifs.

Surveys showed new sites appearing during the Iron I (Zertal 2004; 1991; 1994; Finkelstein 1988; 1988–1989). Occupation at vibrant urban centers of the Late Bronze IIB—Hazor, Bethel, Beth Shemesh,² Tell Beit Mirsim, and Ta’anach—was disrupted (Lapp 1967b). Though the disruptions were not contemporary due to a single, limited cause, these disruptions were part of a broader transition in the region and the Mediterranean (Bunimovitz 1994: 186).

Even as older urban centers ended, new polities emerged in the Southern Levant. Countless scholars, however, have demonstrated that the material culture of these polities showed continuity with what preceded. A distinct assemblage of material culture also appeared on the Southern Levantine coast identified as the so-called “Sea Peoples.” Yet even in the region under their influence, Late Bronze traditions persisted unseen in bowl-lamp-bowl deposits under walls (Bunimovitz and Zimhoni 1993; Mazow 2005: 436–444). Numerous local ceramic forms from the Late Bronze, like the cooking pot, persisted into the Iron I (Killebrew 1998: 103–104, Ill. III:7:1–4). The corpus of glyptic art will be placed alongside these other studies of this transition from the Late Bronze.

GLYPHTIC ART AND LOCAL PATTERNS OF CONSUMPTION

During this time of waxing and waning trade, Egyptian objects made their way into the cargo on the holds of ships traveling among the ports of the Mediterranean. While many traded commodities no doubt perished from the archaeological record, numerous types of Egyptian goods are attested at ports around the Mediterranean. The Southern Levant

² While Elihu Grant’s excavations with Haverford College from 1923 to 1928 are notoriously unreliable, Shlomo Bunimovitz and Zvi Lederman have returned to the site in 1990 and uncovered a destruction in the city’s occupation between Stratum IV of the Late Bronze and Stratum III of the Iron Age I.

participated in these Late Bronze trade networks along with Cyprus, Syria, and the Aegean.

Scarabs from Egypt moved about the Mediterranean due to intra-Mediterranean trade. This trade was dynamic and not controlled by one entity. Whereas Egypt had dominated the trade routes to the Aegean in the Late Helladic I–II, they became one among many trade partners in the latter Late Bronze (Cline 1994: xvii). Toward the end of the 14th century, Cline argues that Mycenaeans, instead of Crete, came to control trade with Egypt and the Near East (Cline 1994: xvii).

Scarabs found their way among the cargos of these ships. In the Late Bronze shipwreck of Uluburun, scarabs were found among the cargo (Bass 1961: 274; Bass 1986: 293). If the Uluburun shipwreck is indicative, scarabs were not the most commonly traded good. Canaanite storage jars from Syro-Palestine and so-called Cypriot Milk Bowls were the most common item traded in the Aegean (Cline 1994: xvi).

Certain ports did have a likely affinity for certain items (cf. Cline 1994: xvii). It seems that Palestine's preference for glyptic items made its ports favorable for their sale. In contrast to the vast Southern Levantine corpus of Late Bronze scarabs, Cline lists only 49 scarabs found in secure Late Bronze contexts from the Aegean, demonstrating their relative lack of popularity at these ports. Because each port likely had its own purchasing proclivities, local patterns of consumption must be examined. Scarabs should not be reduced solely to a proxy for imperial power where scarabs indicate the administrative nature of a site and royal-name scarabs demonstrates Egyptian imperial presence (*pace* Zertal 2012: 16). Instead, one must examine how local purchasing patterns reveal local

practices. This will be done in the final chapter. Here, scarabs purchased for burial cult will be used to discuss how the pantheon appears in local burial cults.

In the past, local religious trends of the Southern Levant were often explained by comparison with Ugaritic texts. These texts were removed geographically and chronologically from the Southern Levant. Instead of moving to a site on the North Syrian coast to an earlier period, this study of glyptics examines the local religious trends present in burial cult during this otherwise opaque period. It examines locally produced stamp seals of the Iron I alongside imported glyptic items of the Iron I and the Late Bronze IIB to determine trends in both the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I.

A NOTE ON EGYPTIAN RULE AND EGYPTIANIZING ART: HIGGINBOTHAM AND MORRIS

Discussion of local consumption and local production of Egyptian art raises the question of the nature of Egyptian rule in the Southern Levant. The standard narrative among historians and archaeologists of the Southern Levant understood the relationship to be one of direct control during the 19th Dynasty. Shifts in Egyptian imperial strategy to control the *Via Maris* brought larger portions of the region under direct imperial control (Weinstein 1981; Singer 1988; Morris 2005). In recent decades, the nature of that direct rule has been questioned (Higginbotham 1996; 2000; Bryan 1996).

This has brought into focus the following questions: What were the mechanisms of Egyptian administrative and military control in Canaan? What level of control of the region did they maintain? What does Egyptianizing or Egyptian pottery in the Southern Levant mean for the identifying the mechanisms of that control? Particularly relevant for this study is the following question: Can Egyptian art on scarabs indicate direct imperial

control of the region? And does Egyptianizing art necessarily point toward local rule by Egyptian educated elite?

Due to the Egyptian incursions into the Southern Levant during the early New Kingdom, the Egyptian military gained a foothold in the region. Their imperial presence influenced local media and art. The nature and degree of that influence—direct or indirect—has been linked to the imperial control in the region. The influence of empire on local artistic traditions is not determined by a simple correlation where direct rule results in “real” Egyptian artistic forms and indirect rule in Egyptianizing forms. This assumes that local polities are passive recipients of imperial artistic traditions when under direct rule. Instead, both direct and indirect rule may result in Egyptianizing art. This is especially true for a medium like glyptics where scarabs were not solely—if even largely—the gift of the imperial power. Instead, they appear among the cargo of ships, as noted above (Bass 1961: 274; Bass 1986: 293). They were purchased by individuals as amulets in life and in their family’s burials. As such, glyptic art reflects interregional trade as merchants sailed the Mediterranean and local patterns of consumption (cf. Cline and Landau 2007; Pulak 1998). Regardless of whether the local governor was an Egyptian military commander stationed in the area or a local Canaanite ruler, who had been sent to Egypt for education and returned,³ family purchased these amulets for local burial cults to protect their dead as they journeyed to the Underworld. Even the name of

³ This was a practice known from the Amarna letters. Betsy Bryan has argued that during the 19th Dynasty local Canaanite kings were sent to the Egyptian court to be reared (Bryan 1996: 39–40). This practice is attested in the Amarna letters where the residents of Tunip, whose king is dead, request that the heir to the throne, the son of Aki-Teššup, be permitted to return to rule (EA 59:13–20). This same practice likely lies behind a ruler in Canaan, called *Puḫuru*, an Egyptian term meaning “the Syrian.” Albright stated similarly. He argued that Canaanites held the same office as the Egyptian officials bearing the same title. However, one Akkadian term may refer to more than one type of official so that it need not prove that Canaanites held the same Egyptian position. In fact, Albright argued rightfully that multiple Egyptian titles were subsumed under the Akkadian term *rabū* (Albright 1975: 103–104).

kings on royal scarabs were likely believed to have apotropaic effects. Royal scarabs need not indicate local imperial presence at a site. Adherents chose amulets for local burial cults that resembled Egyptian motifs or local motifs that reflect the local iconographic tradition regardless of the ethnicity of their local ruler. Scarabs with local motifs, motifs imitating Middle Bronze traditions, and Egypto-Canaanite deities likely reflect burial cult instead of direct, imperial control of the region.

THE PROBLEM OF DATING GLYPHTIC ART IN THE LATE BRONZE IIB AND IRON I

In order to examine local trends within burial cult, a large roadblock stands in the way. No systematic and full-length study of late New Kingdom and early Third Intermediate Period scarabs and stamp seals has been done (for a study of the Late Bronze, see Lalkin 2008). As a result, dating these items is highly fraught. This study will take key steps toward rectifying that problem.

Early 20th century scholars published studies of scarabs, but few attempted dating any of the corpus other than those scarabs with the royal titulary (e.g., G. Fraser and H. Frasier 1900). Instead, early researchers focused publications on scarabs with royal names or administrative officials (Hall 1913; Petrie 1889 and 1917) because the date of the item could be determined. Study of these small items was altered dramatically when Petrie's archaeological method was able to specify the depositional location of these items. As early as 1888, Petrie recorded the precise context of amulets—including scarabs—better than his contemporaries.

Rowe was the first to make a comprehensive volume of the scarabs and plaques he believed to come from Palestine (1936). Items, purchased or excavated, from what

would become the Rockefeller Museum's collection formed the basis of his publication. He identified a number of scarabs from a variety of archaeological contexts across Palestine. This enabled him, in theory, to date the scarabs' typological forms. While this had been done prior to Rowe, he is the first to base his date on their typological form.⁴ His dates demonstrate that he recognized a number of scarabs to be heirloom items (e.g., 1936: No. 395). Unfortunately, his criteria for dating are almost never explicit, and his sample size too small to state certainly that a scarab is of a narrow date and not an heirloom item. While a number of Rowe's conclusions turned out to be overly precise, he was the first to link a large corpus of scarabs to their archaeological context.

Recent publications of New Kingdom or Third Intermediate Period scarabs have perpetuated these early 20th century problems. They cite literature as outdated as the systems of classification by Newberry (Brandl 2010: 215; 2012b: 377–378, 381, 387) and Rowe (Brandl 1999: 18*–19*; 2004a: 124, 141–142; 2007: 191, 194; 2009: 636–637, 645–646; 2010: 211, 214, 216; 2012a: 234, 235–236, 247–248, 255–256, 259–260). Rowe's range of dates assigned to each typological form—clypeus, side, and elytra—is cited and the overlap of the three ranges becomes the date assigned the scarab. For instance, a scarab with a clypeus used from the 13th to 18th Dynasty and elytra from the 18th to the 26th Dynasty is assigned a date in the 18th Dynasty (Brandl 2007a: 193–194; see also Brandl 2004a: 128 [No. 8]). In the publication of a number of New Kingdom and Late Period glyptic items, Rowe's typology is rarely qualified or critiqued explicitly, though the author no doubt does.⁵

⁴ For an overview of the typological forms and their respective dates, see Rowe 1936: 297–307.

⁵ I thank Baruch Brandl for the conversations in which he noted the tendency of Rowe to date scarabs according to the archaeological context in which they were found.

The typological form, as it is currently understood, is insufficient to date the scarab in a number of instances. Certain forms of the clypeus, elytra, and sides were used from the Middle Kingdom through the Late Period. In these instances, the glyptic specialist must then date the item based on other scarabs with similar motifs or technology from secure archaeological contexts. Systematic errors have found their way into the Late Bronze and Iron I scarabs due to the frequent use of the dates of Petrie and for archaeological contexts. In some instances, scarabs that Petrie purchased were even said to come from excavated context (e.g., Brandl 2007a: 193).⁶

Not infrequently Petrie and his colleagues dated contexts based on inscribed items with the royal titulary which may have been heirlooms themselves (for another example, see Bell 1991: vi–vii); this leads, at times, to a consistent error of higher dates for archaeological contexts. Therefore, dates of scarabs in Egypt have, at times, been based on one item with the royal titulary, found with the scarab. This error is compounded when that scarab from an Egyptian context is then used to date a scarab from the Southern Levant (e.g., Brandl 2012a: 254). In general, contexts with scarabs should not be dated upon a possible heirloom item. Instead, it is more methodologically sound to date the ceramic assemblage. When Petrie and his contemporaries do date contexts based on the ceramics as they understood them, their dates are in need of significant revision based on up-to-date ceramic typologies. Too frequently Petrie is unable to detect Third Intermediate contexts, which are key to this study.

⁶ Brandl dates a scarab based on all excavated parallels which he says come from 13th century contexts. One parallel is said to come from Petrie's excavations at Tell el-Yehudiyeh (Brandl 2007a: 193 [No. 1]) when, in fact, only scarabs marked with a small "F" on the plates are from excavations (Petrie 1906: 15, Pl. XI). The parallel scarab from Egypt was, in fact, bought on the market.

Gurob is a key example of this systematic error. Scarabs from Gurob are frequently cited in current research to support a 19th Dynasty date scarabs in Palestine (e.g., Brandl 2012a: 245; Brandl 2009: 641–642 [No. 55]⁷, 644). At times, circular reasoning results because the scarabs were used to date the ceramics at Gurob (Brunton and Engelbach 1927: 15 [§33]). Brunton and Engelbach date many of the finds from Gurob to the New Kingdom or the 19th Dynasty (Brunton and Engelbach 1927: 9–24). However, David Aston argues that the ceramics of the cemetery show that while the town was occupied into the reign of Ramesses V, the tombs were reused in the Third Intermediate Period until the 8th–7th centuries (Aston 1996: 39). Therefore, the ceramics of each tomb group should be reevaluated based on current ceramic typologies of Egyptian pottery. It is likely that dates of the tombs from Gurob will be lowered.

This re-evaluation is often not possible based only on the publications of Petrie or his colleagues. An example will illustrate the problem. Brandl uses a scarab from a tomb in Gurob to date a Levantine parallel at Tell el-Aḥwat to the 19th Dynasty (Brandl 2012a: 245). Brunton and Engelbach date the tomb of the Egyptian scarab certainly to around the time of Ramses II in the text of the volume (1927: 9), but their date is less certain on the plate of the same volume (Pl. XXIV). The published pottery from this tomb is impossible to date based on Brunton's and Engelbach's publication. The tomb contained two funnel-necked jars (Engelbach and Brunton 1927: Pl. XXIV, No. 15 [43n and 43t]) and a bowl with inflected contour and rounded base (Pl. XXIV, No. 18) according to the publication.

⁷ No specific archaeological context is mentioned for this scarab (Petrie 1891: Pl. XXIII [No. 71]). As such, the site's entire occupation much be considered as the date of the context where it was found, including the 18th Dynasty (Petrie 1891: 20, Pl. XXIV) and the Third Intermediate Period (Aston 1996: 39).

The bowl's form matches that of Group 6 of Aston's Phases I (1996: 60, Fig. 188 b and c) or Group 5 of Phase II (67, Fig. 206i).⁸ It is found in assemblages, like Tomb 359 at Deir el Medineh (Nagel 1938: fig. 26 and 27) and Tell el-Yehudiyeh (Naville and Griffith 1890: Pl. XV, No. 2), which have been identified as 20th Dynasty assemblages (Aston 1989: 12, n. 17). The bowl in Aston's Phase I tends to be found in all Nile fabrics except one and is most commonly uncoated, red-slipped or red-slipped on uncoated fabric (Aston 1996: 60). The same form of Aston's Phase II tends to be found in uncoated or red slipped rim on uncoated and red slipped wares (Aston 1996: 60). In contrast to Aston's careful discussion, Engelbach and Brunton describe the fabric only as 'RED'; this is not uncommon for early 20th century publications. It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify the form from Engelbach and Brunton's publication as either Bourriau's late New Kingdom Phase 3 or Aston's Phase I or II.

The jars of the tomb with the supposed 19th Dynasty glyptic are funnel-necked jars of Aston's Phase I (1996: 63, fig. 194 b–e). The form tends to occur in the 20th Dynasty⁹ as a red slipped or uncoated ware. The phase is dated to 12th through 10th centuries (1996: 59). 20th Dynasty assemblages, like Tomb 359¹⁰ and 1159A at Deir el Medineh or a tomb from Tell el-Yehudiyeh (Aston 1989: 12, n. 17), include this form (Nagel 1938: 31, figs. 21–22, esp. No. 74; 67, fig. 50, No. 9; Naville and Griffith 1890: 45–47, fig. XIV, No. 7).

⁸ For another example of the ceramic form from a 20th Dynasty context, see Naville and Griffith 1890: Pl. XV, No. 2. Aston confirms that this context is 20th Dynasty according to current ceramic typologies (1989: 12, n. 17).

⁹ For examples of the form in 20th Dynasty contexts, see Naville and Griffith 1890: Pl. XIV, No. 6. Aston affirms that according to current ceramic typologies this context contains 20th Dynasty ceramics (Aston 1989: 12, n. 17).

¹⁰ Aston does state that Tomb 359 at Deir el Medineh is mixed with earlier material from Tomb 360 (1989: 12, n. 17), but the form appears in other 20th Dynasty contexts so that he is comfortable listing it among the Phase I assemblage (1996: 63, fig. 194, b–e).

Both forms of the bowl and funnel-necked jars are found in Aston's Phase I. Aston's Phase I comes after Bourriau's New Kingdom Phase 3. Bourriau ends her New Kingdom Phase 3 on the last year of Ramses II's reign (Bourriau 1981: 72), but Aston extends the period at least to the reign of Merenptah based on the ceramics from Merenptah's tomb (Aston 1989: 11). While it is likely folly to date ceramic assemblages to one specific king because assemblages do not change dramatically with each new king, Aston's Phase I and Bourriau's Phase 4 do overlap generally in the 20th Dynasty. Therefore, the forms of the pottery from this Egyptian tomb, used to date Southern Levantine scarabs to the 19th Dynasty, are also found at least during the 20th Dynasty.

The date of the tomb's ceramics—whether Bourriau's New Kingdom Phase 3 or Phase 4—rests on the fabric of the ceramic forms. However, the identification of the fabric cannot be made based on the publication of Brunton and Engelbach alone. Without this key piece of information, the ceramicist is hard-pressed to assign the tomb to Bourriau's New Kingdom Phase 3 of the 19th Dynasty or Phase 4 of the 20th Dynasty. Frequently, the forms remain the same between Bourriau's Phases 3 and 4, but Nile E fabric is proportionally less in the later phase which is contemporary with the 20th Dynasty (Aston 1989: 12). For the pottery from this tomb, Brunton and Engelbach only list the fabric as "LT-RED" and "RED" on the plate (1927: Pl. XXIV). It is unclear if this indicates red slip or the color of the fabric. Petrie's 1927 publication cannot be used to identify conclusively the fabric of the form and scarabs from the tomb cannot be conclusively dated to 19th or 20th Dynasty. A broader date of the 19th and 20th Dynasties must be assigned. Zertal's reliance upon the glyptic art to support a higher date

for the site of Tell el-Aḥwat is called into question, and independent discussions of the ceramics have also questioned a higher date.

While the re-evaluation of the ceramics of each context and tomb group is necessary, especially those of Petrie and his associates, the poor archaeological method is an insurmountable hurdle to accurate dating, especially in the case of Gurob. Martha Bell's dissertation chronicles the problems in Petrie's archaeological method at Gurob (1991: 11). Bell records how Petrie excavated elsewhere, though he visited the site weekly (121–122). He blamed his untrained assistant Hughes-Hughes, who also was not always at the site, for the absence of detailed recording at Gurob (122–123; cf. 140–141). While Petrie was no doubt an observant and skilled excavator, his absence at the site calls into question the trust that Southern Levantine scholars place in the data collected at the site of Gurob. Further, he assumes inaccurately that New Kingdom contexts were undisturbed in the Third Intermediate Period (Bell 1991: 144).

Glyptic art from other sites, dated to the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period and excavated by Petrie, suffer from a similar problem. David Aston notes how Petrie “somewhat arbitrarily” dated a tomb from Tell Nebesheh (1996: 25). Petrie also published the “Great House” from Tell el Retabeh (1906) as dated to 1400–800 BC, but Aston states that there is no pottery later than the New Kingdom in the publication (1996: 27). At Tel el-Yehudiyeh, Petrie published a number of graves and classified the graves according type. While the relative order of Petrie's types was accurate according to Aston, the Ramesside and Third Intermediate Period dates assigned to each type were not (1996: 29). Petrie also dated pottery from Heliopolis to specific dynasties in the Ramesside and Third Intermediate Period, but Aston states that “for the most part,

however, these dates are incorrect” (1996:31). Ceramic forms at Heliopolis, dated by Petrie to the 20th Dynasty, were, in fact, Saite. The now well-known problems with the ceramic typology of the late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period plague Petrie’s work.

The problem of dating ceramic assemblages in the late Ramesside and early Third Intermediate Period is not limited to Petrie’s excavations. Anthes also dated tombs at Memphis to the 21st Dynasty (Anthes 1959; 1965), yet Aston argues that the ceramics are Ramesside (1996: 32–33). Engelbach argued that three cemeteries—B, E, and F—were reused in the Third Intermediate Period (Engelbach 1915: 1), but Aston says only the pottery of one child burial is later than the 19th Dynasty (1996: 37). Due to the problematic dating of contexts in early 20th century excavations, the dates of Egyptian parallel scarabs should only be used cautiously only after the ceramic assemblages have been reevaluated in light of current ceramic typologies. Advances in ceramic typologies for Egyptian pottery *must* be taken into account during these periods when using scarabs from Egypt itself.

OVERVIEW OF THIS STUDY

As shown above, the archaeological contexts of scarabs in Egypt has too often been relied upon. If Aston is correct and these sites are often dated too high, this would have led to a systematic error in the dating of scarabs from the Southern Levant. Instead of relying upon the publication of late New Kingdom scarabs from Egypt where ceramic typology hinders the dating of archaeological contexts associated with these scarabs, this

study will create its own typology of scarabs based on scarabs from secure archaeological contexts in the Southern Levant.

First, this study will offer a history of scarab typology in the Southern Levant in Chapter Two. This history will outline the various methodologies that have been used to date scarabs based on their typological form. It will review and evaluate the three basic methodologies—dating by royal titulary, archaeological context, and foundation deposits—that have been used to date scarabs based on typological form. While the final methodology based on foundation deposit has only been proposed but never been executed, the third chapter will return to Hornung and Staehelin’s proposal. All three methodologies rely upon a sufficiently large sample size to make sure their conclusions.

Second, this study will execute all three methodologies with scarabs that come from Late Bronze IIB and Iron I contexts in Chapter Three. Since each methodology has inherent weaknesses, only by using all three methods can one ensure that idiosyncrasies of, say, royal name scarabs do not skew the overall conclusions about the date of a typological form. It was found that few typological forms are diagnostically significant for dating, though some tendencies can be identified and used together with other features to suggest a date of production. Finally, this study attempted to form a scarab typology based on foundation deposits in Egyptian contexts. Unfortunately, it will be shown that the sample size is limited for this methodology.

Third, this study will date glyptic art based on the motif on their base in Chapter Four. Motifs with a larger sample size will be examined. When more common motifs occur in collocation with other less common motifs, the latter can also be dated. Here, it will be demonstrated that a surge in imitations of Middle Bronze styles and motifs that

were local to Canaan centuries earlier re-emerge. Tempting though it may be to identify simplistically this phenomenon with the Egyptian presence in the Southern Levant during the Late Bronze IIB, this phenomenon is distinct. While it begins in the Late Bronze IIB, it gains momentum in the Iron IA. As imported ceramics taper off and local potters make imitations of imported Mediterranean wares, local artisans also create their own scarabs for local consumption. While these local artisans mimic actual Egyptian motifs from the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside Scarabs, they also resurrect distant local memories. One suspects that the scarab form and these local motifs were not even viewed as Egyptian due to their centuries long use in the region. The category of Egyptian and Egyptianization are not sufficiently nuanced to capture the various phenomenon occurring as the Egypt retracts during the 20th Dynasty and early Third Intermediate Period.

After establishing a means for dating glyptic items based on their typological form and their base, Chapter Five will discuss two distinct phenomena that reveal local religious traditions during the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA. First, imported scarabs during the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA will be examined to show local preference for Ptah in burial cults. The Southern Levant preferred Ptah while Nubia avoided the deity. The local preference in one location and avoidance in another cannot be explained solely as a reflex of imperial control when both locations are under imperial control. Instead, the tendency reflects local preference in burial cult and opens a small window into the pantheon of the Southern Levant as it was refracted through Egyptian imports. Finally, Chapter Five will address the pantheon of Southern Levantine burial cults in the Iron I after Egyptian presence wanes. Locally made stamp seals and scarabs

with similar motifs will be examined here. Deities from an Egypto-Canaanite iconographic tradition continue to be crafted in local production even after the Egyptian empire has retracted.

CHAPTER 2

A HISTORY OF SCARAB TYPOLOGY

During the early 20th century scholars published multiple catalogues of scarabs from Egypt and Palestine. These catalogues included typologies based on the individual corpora in the scholars' possession (Hall 1913; Petrie 1917; Rowe 1936). As archaeologists were increasingly able to date contexts based on loose¹¹ stratigraphic levels¹² (Phythian-Adams 1920; Fitzgerald 1930; Albright 1932b; 1938; 1943a), a parallel typology of scarabs emerged. This chapter will offer a broad overview of the methodologies that have shaped the scarab typologies that the field has used and the principal critiques of those methodologies. Then, it will offer a detailed history of scholarship from the late 19th century through the present. This overview and history will form the backdrop to an analysis of scarab typology during the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I in Chapter Three.

OVERVIEW

¹¹ Archaeological method varied in the early 20th century. Often, they were unable to locate floors—especially beaten earth floors—due to their excavation techniques. For example, Fitzgerald noted at Beth Shean that floors could not be exactly determined, and his rough dates for each stratum were appropriately ambiguous (Fitzgerald 1930: 1–2). Albright was able, at times, to identify what he called beaten earth (1932a: 14; 1938: 27; 1943b: 145), *pisée* (1938: 32), plaster (1938: 35; 1943b: 47), and gypsum surfaces (1938: 40). He also speaks of successive floors with successive pottery assemblages (1932a: 53, 61). However, he was not always able to locate floors and conceded that the frequent destruction of Tell Beit Mirsim permitted him to separate strata that would otherwise remain unidentified (Albright 1932b: xiii). While the day-to-day archaeological technique of the early 20th century was imprecise, notable few archaeologists were skilled enough to limit the negative effects of their archaeological method by choosing more secure contexts as the foundation to their typologies. Interestingly, Albright chose contexts which were relatively more secure when he distinguished B₁, B₂, and B₃ pottery (e.g., stone lined silos in the early Iron Age at Tell Beit Mirsim and the stone floors of the Late Bronze at Bethel). Stone floors also provided a helpful *terminus post quem* (1934: 7).

¹² These loose stratigraphic levels were, at times, assigned an absolute date based on items of glyptic art (Fitzgerald 1930: 5). This date could be lowered later on when the glyptic item was believed to be an heirloom (Rowe 1940: ix).

Since the early 20th century, the dates associated with each typological form have generally been established using two different methodologies. In the first methodology, the royal titulary engraved on the base provided the basis for a scarab's date of production. All scarabs with a royal titulary, regardless of archaeological context, formed the corpus on which specialists based their typologies of backs, sides, and bases. The specialist then dated the so-called design scarabs—those without a royal titulary—based, in part, on the dates assigned to the typological forms. Posthumously produced royal scarabs was the chief barrier to accurate dates for typological forms.

Using the second methodology, typological forms were dated based on archaeological context. The specialist identified the date of the scarabs' archaeological contexts in order to establish diachronic and regional trends. The greatest barrier to accurate dates under this methodology arose due to the use of scarabs as heirlooms in later archaeological contexts. This problem was, at times, mitigated when the sample size of the corpus was sufficiently large enough that the date of popular use could be distinguished from later use as heirlooms.

Ceramic typologies of the early 20th century encountered a similar problem of earlier pottery in later contexts; initially, ceramic specialists were unable to identify pottery used as heirlooms. In the 1920s Phythian-Adams, Albright, and De Vaux recognized that other ceramicists had post-dated archaeological contexts because they failed to recognize that earlier pottery in later archaeological contexts should not date the context.¹³ These three archaeologists overcame the problem of post-dating archaeological

¹³ William Foxwell Albright notes in a personal letter to William Badé in 1925 that he, Père Vincent, and Phythian-Adams had “reacted very strongly against the postdating of ceramic series in Palestine, which leads to the most extraordinary anomalies and contradictions” (Personal letter from William F. Albright to William F. Badé on February 21, 1925. The Archive of the American Philosophical Society).

contexts by noting the relative frequency of a ceramic forms across very broad levels (Phythian-Adams 1920). Similarly, Tufnell and others sought to overcome a comparable weakness in scarab typology by prioritizing archaeological contexts with large corpora of scarabs. A large corpus permitted them to identify the period of initial production, popular production, and heirlooms present in later contexts when the typological form became much less frequent.

In the 1970s Egyptologists Erik Hornung and Elisabeth Staehelin published a key challenge to scarab typology based on these two methodologies. They argued the typological dates assigned to scarabs were less certain than previously thought (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26–29; 32–33). They noted that scarabs with a royal titulary were frequently produced posthumously when the royal name doubled as a cryptographic way to write the name of Amun (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26). Staehelin and Hornung argued that Egyptian kings which ruled for short periods of time—especially those for with a *damnatio memoriae*—would not be likely candidates for posthumous production; scarabs of these less popular monarchs were the best means for forming a reliable typology that avoided posthumous production when dating typological forms. Unfortunately, a corpus of royal scarabs from short-reigning kings would be severely limited in size. Foundation deposits in Egypt, they argued, could provide a sizable corpus of scarabs with the royal titulary from secure archaeological contexts because the context could be dated to only one king’s reign.

As skepticism about the reliability of dates assigned to typological forms grew in subsequent publications, a number of Egyptologists followed Hornung and Staehelin. They assigned broader dates to scarabs (e.g., Teeter 2003: 13–15) or avoided altogether

the dating of scarabs from their excavations, leaving the task to later specialists (e.g., Williams 1992: 104). Despite these objections, a few publications of corpora from Egypt continued to assign tighter dates to scarabs (e.g., Schlick-Nolte and Droste zu Hülshoff 1990;¹⁴ Mlinar 2001). Intriguingly, Egyptologists have been more likely to accept the critique of Hornung and Staehelin than scholars of the Southern Levant (e.g., Ben-Tor 2005). Below, I will argue that the differences between the corpora from Egypt and the Southern Levant have led naturally to a rift between proponents and opponents of a scarab typology which dates the typological forms.

A SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

In the late 19th century, a few scholars used broad typologies to date individual objects. Scholars from the early 20th century—Newberry (1906), Hall (1913), Petrie (1917), the early publication of Tufnell (Tufnell *et al.* 1940), and Rowe (1936)—dared address scarab typology in multiple periods. After 1940, the customary narrowing of specialized fields occurred, and publications of scarab typologies tended to focus on scarabs from shorter periods of time; individual studies systematically covered one or more of the following periods: the First Intermediate Period, Middle Kingdom, and Second Intermediate Period. A clear gap in the scholarship occurred for periods after the Second Intermediate Period. Few scholars after the 1930s and 1940s discussed the scarabs of the New Kingdom, Third Intermediate Period, and the Late Period (Keel 1995a; Lalkin 2008). Even fewer systematically discussed the typology. More often specialists published a limited number of scarabs from individual strata at a single site in the final

¹⁴ This publication does not date specific typological forms of scarabs' backs, sides and heads. Dates are often assigned by the motif on the base in this volume.

report of that site. By the nature of the genre of final reports, no systematic treatment of the broader typology of the period was required.

BROAD SCARAB TYPOLOGIES OF MULTIPLE PERIODS (1890s–1950s)

The earliest publications of scarabs focused on those with the royal titulary (Loftie 1884; Petrie 1889; Fraser and Fraser 1900; Ward 1902). One of Petrie's earliest publication on the topic lamented the poor treatment of the amulet in museums and proposed new criteria for dating so that museums might give scarabs appropriate attention (Petrie 1889: 6). Initially, he argued that scarabs could be dated based on the glaze's color and hardness together with their size (1889: 6–10; cf. Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 27). Petrie did not return to a number of these criteria in his later publications.

As early as the late 19th century, excavators recognized the widespread unreliability of scarabs with the royal titulary for dating archaeological contexts (Naville and Griffith 1890: 17). Already in 1889, Petrie identified scarabs with the royal titulary—especially those of Thutmosis III—as posthumously produced. However, he claimed to be able to date scarabs to the period of their inscribed royal titulary based on two criteria: similar workmanship and a similar color of glaze on scarabs of the same reign where that color was also absent from scarabs of later reigns (Petrie 1889: 9–10). Petrie's early volume on scarabs made no attempt to date the scarabs based on a typology of their sides, heads, and backs. In fact, the backs were neither shown nor discussed in the plates. This was also true for other earlier monographs devoted to scarabs (e.g., Loftie 1884).

John Ward was the first to show images of some—not all—scarabs' backs (Ward 1902: vii, Pls. 1–15). He claimed that an expert could, with some difficulty, make some

conclusions on the date of a scarab based on “the form of the backs of the scarabs and the style of the hieroglyphs or the ornament” (Ward 1902: vii). While Ward claimed scarabs’ backs permitted him to date the items, he offered no explicit typological discussion of those backs and their associated dates. Instead, he primarily published scarabs with the royal titulary; it is unclear how developed his own typology of scarabs’ backs was in 1902.

Like Petrie, Ward argued that the throne name of Thutmosis III was produced posthumously, but he attempted no identification of later, posthumous productions based on the form or color of the scarab (Ward 1902: 51, 53). He did explicitly identify a Middle Kingdom style of engraving. This permitted him to date a few scarabs to the Middle Kingdom that lacked a royal titulary (Ward 1902: 100–101, Pls. 11–12).

A few years later, Newberry identified and dated basic forms of the scarab in his primer for collectors purchasing scarabs from the market (Newberry 1906: 70–76). Newberry surveyed basic shifts in the form before the Middle Kingdom through the 25th Dynasty. For example, he argued that scarabs down through the Hyksos period tended to omit divisions of the elytra (Newberry 1906: 72). While Newberry noted shifts in the typological form, he did not attempt to date scarabs without a royal titulary (Newberry 1906: 189–194, Pls. 39–42).

In 1913, the identification of specific typological forms became much more detailed. Hall identified 50 distinct types in 13 groups (Hall 1913: xxx–xxxv). Hall’s 13 groups were organized along a continuum from naturalistic to schematic forms; this division persists today in some typologies. Hall dated the typological groups based on scarabs with the royal titulary (Hall 1913: xxxv). Based upon this limited corpus, Hall

argued the elytra and legs to be more typologically significant than the head. He discounted Petrie's earlier claim that the color of glaze was diagnostically significant, though he did not mention Petrie by name (Hall 1913: xxx); Petrie himself will also abandon this claim about color in subsequent publications. Hall identified individual characteristics as diagnostically significant for scarabs from certain periods. For example, he argued that a triangle at the corner of the wings' cases, later known as the humeral callosity, occurred in the 18th Dynasty (Hall 1913: xxx).

Hall then used his typology to argue that scarabs of Thutmosis III were manufactured posthumously because his throne name appeared on scarabs with earlier and later typological forms (Hall 1913: xxxvi). For the first time in publications, scarabs were explicitly dated by their typological form and not by their glaze or titulary alone. Four years later Petrie again published the scarabs with royal names, but now he included an extended discussion of scarabs' sides, backs, and heads. He based his typology no longer on the color of the glaze and styles. Instead, it resembled Hall's.

It is unclear how early Petrie adopted typological criteria for dating scarabs. In the intervening years between Petrie's 1889 and 1917 publications of royal scarabs, his excavation reports inconsistently included drawings of scarabs' backs and sides (Petrie 1891; 1906). If he had already begun to date scarabs based on their backs and sides, his publications did not include relevant pictures to verify his dating. Thus, it is unclear when and why Petrie shifted his typological criteria for dating, yet authors publishing prior to his 1917 volume and Hall's 1913 volume allude to their reliance upon Petrie (Ward 1902: vii, ix). It may be that private conversations informed one another's publications, though they did not cite one another explicitly or publish fully their methodology. Following

Petrie's discussions of a typology of scarabs' sides, backs, and heads in 1917 and 1925, there was a marked shift in his published illustrations. Thereafter, Petrie and his students consistently included drawings of the backs, sides, and heads (e.g., Brunton and Engelbach 1927: Pls. 21–31, 40–41; Brunton 1930: Pls. 4, 19, 34, 43).

In Petrie's 1917 volume, he identified twenty-three classes of scarabs. He assigned a range of dates to each class based on the royal names engraved on the base (1917: 5–8, Pls. 59–71; 1925: Pls. 27–30). Petrie noted that the basic classes were commonly manufactured over the span of thirteen dynasties. Therefore, assigning a scarab to a general class in Petrie's early typology was of little help when assigning a narrow date to the object. Instead, Petrie believed these classes were more useful to identify the location of production rather than the date of production (Petrie 1917: 5–6; see also Petrie 1889: 9).

Petrie identified certain characteristics of workmanship as diagnostically significant for dating. He disclosed that characteristics of a short range of time were “often quite trivial” (Petrie 1917: 6)—perhaps even idiosyncratic. Petrie also argued that while certain typological forms were not diagnostic for identifying a narrow date for production, the form still occurred more frequently in certain periods. Therefore, for Petrie, they were significant, though not definitive, when dating an individual scarab (Petrie 1917: 6).

Petrie identified a limited number of characteristics that pointed toward a narrow date of production (1917: 6). His diagnostically significant criteria were as follows:

- (1) Feathered sides were produced in the 10th through 13th Dynasties.
- (2) A square head begins in the middle of the 12th Dynasty and extends through the 13th and 16th Dynasties.

- (3) A pointed clypeus extending over the head is produced only during the Hyksos period.
- (4) A form with a long head, called *Hypselogenia*, is rare in the 12th Dynasty and is not found after Ramses II.
- (5) The palm-branch pattern on the back is produced from the 11th to the 14th Dynasty.
- (6) Curling lines are found on the back from the end of the 12th Dynasty to the end of the 25th Dynasty.

Curiously, the dates of these diagnostically significant traits tended to cluster in the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period. In fact, later chief works on scarab typology would focus on these periods (Ward 1978a; Ward 1978b; Tufnell 1984; Ward and Dever 1994). Petrie's work may suggest indirectly that dating based on idiosyncratic characteristics of the typological form is more readily done in these periods than in the Ramesside period and the early Third Intermediate Period, which is the focus of this study.

Because the combination of diagnostically significant features quickly multiplied the number of typological forms, Petrie identified the order in which one must identify significant features when classifying the scarab. In so doing, he ultimately prioritized what he deemed to be the most diagnostically significant characteristics. First, Petrie identified whether the legs were feathered (Classes C and D); the two classes with feathered legs were then generally divided according to the form of the head (Petrie 1917: 7, Pl. 59). Next, scarabs with notches for humeral callosities were assigned to types E through G and those lacking notches to types H through N. Among the notched scarabs, the types were further sub-divided by the shape of the head (Petrie 1917: Pls. 60–62). Scarabs lacking notches, however, were not divided first by the head; instead, they were divided by the form of the clypeus and then the head (Petrie 1917: Pl. 63–67). Petrie

boasted that each scarab could be assigned a typological form in less than a minute (Petrie 1917: 7).

Petrie offered no reasoning for the order of diagnostic features upon which his classification was built. By examining the order deductively, it seems Petrie identified those characteristics of a narrower date, which did not generally overlap with subsequent groups. For instance, Petrie's first division of feathered legs—Classes C and D—tended to occur prior to the 18th Dynasty with only three exceptions (Petrie 1917: Pl. 59, C28, C36, and D48). The second broad group with triangular humeral callosities—Classes E, F, and G—occurred most often in the 18th Dynasty and later—that is, after the periods assigned to classes C and D. Finally, scarabs with a serrated clypeus (Classes F through K) and a smooth clypeus (Classes L through N) were grouped together.

Petrie did not bracket the scarabs of Thutmose III as posthumously produced in his later work (1917: xxvi–xxix; see also 1889: 9–10), though he argued for their posthumous production earlier. Instead, he now claimed that the great majority of scarabs of Thutmose III were from the reign of Thutmose III himself (Petrie 1917: 26). Petrie's overconfidence in style as a criterion for dating appears to have harmed his typology for the 18th Dynasty and later (cf. Jaeger 1982). Contemporary scholars followed Petrie's earlier views, and argued these scarabs presented problems for dating associated strata (Albright 1935: 12, 14).

The studies of scarab typology during the subsequent decades altered minimally the methodology for dating based on the head, sides, and backs (e.g., Reisner and Wheeler 1930). Steindorff published the personal collection of King Fouad (Steindorff 1936: 162), but his typology was rudimentary with only five proposed types. As with

Hall's typology, the typological forms ranged from realistic to conventional. Steindorff made similar observations to Hall's, like the absence of triangular humeral callosities before the 18th Dynasty (Hall 1913: xxx; Steindorff 1936: 162).¹⁵ Subsequently, scholars published large corpora of scarabs, like that of the Montet Jar (Montet 1928–1929: 45–59), but no significant changes occurred to the typology of scarabs in the 1920s.

Rowe was the next scholar to alter significantly the typology. His typology is still frequently cited in current publications of late New Kingdom scarabs (e.g., Brandl 2012a). Therefore, his typology should be addressed and systematically deconstructed. Rowe helpfully eliminated Petrie's idiosyncratic order for identifying diagnostically significant characteristics. Instead, the side, head, and back were assigned a separate classification (Rowe 1936: x–xi; 297–307; Pls. 32–35). Each form was then assigned a range of dynasties based on other scarabs—royal and non-royal—with that typological form. Within this system, the narrowest range of dates of the combined three typological forms would then give excavators a general date for each scarab.

While an inventive method that relied, no doubt, upon contemporary advancements in the typology of ceramics to date more reliably archaeological contexts, Rowe did not explicitly discuss how he formed the initial classification types nor how he dated each type. Instead, he said it was “self explanatory” (Rowe 1936: x). Due to Rowe's terse presentation, I can only deductively determine his methodology.

Unfortunately, Rowe multiplied unnecessarily the number of typologically significant forms (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26–29; Keel 1995a: 39–40). Whereas

¹⁵ A few decades later Martin widened the corpus of scarabs to include those with private names. Based on his expanded corpus, he also cited the triangular humeral callosities as indicative of the 18th Dynasty (Martin 1971: 4–5, Type 4 aj).

earlier typologies had a continuum of forms ranging from realistic to conventional, Rowe created a new type for each form. Many of Rowe's typological forms were represented by too few scarabs to suggest a reliable date based on the associated archaeological contexts of the group and scarabs with a royal titulary. Many forms occurred on one¹⁶ or two¹⁷ items. Of Rowe's 274 typological forms, 145 occur once and 31 twice.

Approximately two out of three typological forms occurred too infrequently at the time of Rowe's publication to be considered a diagnostically significant form. Further thwarting the typology's utility, those typological forms occurring on a larger number of scarabs tended to be assigned a range of dates so broad that the date of the form was useless.¹⁸

Approximately 20% of Rowe's typological forms were found on a significant number of scarabs and assigned a date narrower than the Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period through the Third Intermediate Period or later.¹⁹ Of the remaining 20% of Rowe's

¹⁶ The following typological forms from Rowe's corpus were represented by only one scarab: HC 2, HC 10, HC 18A, HC 20, HC 21, HC 26, HC 29, HC 34, HC 35, HC 37, HC 40, HC 41, HC 42, HC 44, HC 48, HC 49, HC 53, HC 73, HC 75, HC 77, HC 78, EP 2, EP 4, EP 6, EP 7, EP 9–EP 11, EP 14–EP 24, EP 26, EP 28, EP 30, EP 36–EP 37, EP 39–EP 40, EP 44, EP 46–EP 47, EP 49–EP 52, EP 54–EP 56, EP 59, EP 64–EP 72, EP 74–EP 77, EP 79–EP 108, EP 110–EP 111, EP 113–EP 116, EP 118–EP 128, Side 1, Sides 5–6, Side 8, Side 10, Side 20, Side 32, Side 43, Side 45, Sides 47–49, and Sides 52–67.

¹⁷ The following typological forms were represented by two scarabs: HC 7, HC 19, HC 23, HC 36, HC 60, HC 62, HC 64–HC 66, HC 68–HC 69, HC 71–HC 72, HC 74, HC 76, EP 25, EP 29, EP 31, EP 41, EP 57–EP 58, EP 62, EP 78, EP 109, EP 117, Side 14, Side 17, Side 28, Side 35, Side 46, and Side 50.

¹⁸ 40 typological forms had four or more scarabs, but Rowe dated the typological forms very broadly from the Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period through the Third Intermediate Period or later: HC 1, HC 5–HC 6, HC 9, HC 11–HC 12, HC 24–HC 25, HC 27, HC 31–HC 32, HC 39, HC 51, HC 55, HC 67, HC 79, EP 1, EP 5, EP 27, EP 33–EP 34, EP 42–EP 43, EP 61, EP 73, Side 2, Side 18, Side 22, Sides 26–27, Side 30, Side 31, Sides 33–34, Sides 37–39, Sides 40–41, and Side 44.

¹⁹ 48 typological forms occurred on four or more scarabs dated to a period narrower than the Middle Kingdom or Second Intermediate Period through the Third Intermediate Period. They were as follows: HC 3–HC 4, HC 8, HC 13–HC 17, HC 22, HC 28, HC 30, HC 33, HC 38, HC 47, HC 52, HC 54, HC 56–HC 59, HC 61, EP 3, EP 8, EP 12–EP 13, EP 32, EP 35, EP 38, EP 45, EP 48, EP 53, EP 60, EP 63, and EP 112. See also Sides 4, 7, 9, 12–13, 15–16, 21, 24–25, 29, 36, 42, and 51. Other potentially significant forms with two or three scarabs in the group were assigned a narrower date. It is possible that Rowe's corpus was too small and additional scarabs excavated after Rowe's publication may have rendered these forms diagnostically significant for dating. They included the following: HC 46, HC 50, HC 65, Side 3, Side 11, Side 19, and Side 23.

typological forms, one-quarter are dated to the Middle Kingdom and/or the Third Intermediate Period; these periods are not the focus of this study.²⁰ Overall one might argue that Rowe's typology loosely confirmed Petrie's general conclusion in 1917 that most typological forms were not useful for dating. Nonetheless, scarab typology may still be useful, even if many of Rowe's forms may not be diagnostically significant (Keel 1995a: 40).

Because this study focuses on the scarabs from Late Bronze IIB and Iron I contexts, I will discuss deductively Rowe's method by examining in detail his typology of the 18th Dynasty, the Ramesside period, and the beginning of the Third Intermediate Period.

Rowe identified 70 typological forms as produced only in the New Kingdom.²¹ Only eight of these forms occurred on more than three scarabs in his corpus.²² Rowe's methodology becomes clearer when he dated a form based on one or two scarabs. Rowe preferred to date both the scarabs and their typological forms based on the date of the archaeological context wherein the scarab or scarabs were found;²³ this failed to account for the possibility that his limited corpus may have consisted of heirloom(s).²⁴

²⁰ HC 4, HC 28, HC 33, HC 59, and EP 3. See also Sides 4, 9, 13, 16, 21, 25, and 51. Other potentially significant forms from the Middle Kingdom and/or the Second Intermediate Period included the following: Side 3, Side 11, and Side 19.

²¹ Typological forms identified by Rowe as produced during the New Kingdom: HC 7, HC 15, HC 18A, HC 21, HC 26, HC 34, HC 42, HC 44, HC 46, HC 50, HC 53–HC 54, HC 56, HC 60, HC 65, HC 72, HC 75–HC 76, HC 78, EP 7, EP 10–EP 13, EP 17–EP 19, EP 22, EP 24–EP 26, EP 28, EP 30, EP 35, EP 37, EP 39–EP 40, EP 47–EP 51, EP 54, EP 59–EP 60, EP 62, EP 65, EP 67, EP 71, EP 80–EP 81, EP 83, EP 88–EP 89, EP 109–EP 115, EP 123, EP 128, Side 23, Side 28, Side 35, Side 43, Side 45, Side 49, and Side 64.

²² Forms that occurred on more than three scarabs included HC 15, HC 54, HC 56, HC 60, EP 12, EP 35, EP 48, and EP 112.

²³ I would also like to thank Baruch Brandl who noted in conversation that Rowe's dates tended on the whole to be skewed toward the date of the archaeological context.

²⁴ See the typological forms dated to the 19th or 20th Dynasty by one scarab. These scarabs were found in contexts identified by Rowe as 19th Dynasty. The forms were as follows: HC 44 in Tomb 905B at Tell el-

Consequently, Rowe's typology could contain systematic errors: typological forms may be dated too low and too narrow. In one instance, Rowe failed to recognize the highly distinctive engraving style of scarabs from the Middle Bronze (Rowe 1936: 139, No. 579, Pl. XV; cf. Petrie 1932: Pl. VII, No. 70; Pl. LVII). Instead, he dated this scarab to the 18th Dynasty, which is the period of their archaeological context (Keel 1997: 194–195 [Tell el-‘Ağul 273]). He also dated its head and back—HC 75 and EP 25—solely to the 18th Dynasty based on one scarab (Rowe 1936: 139, No. 579). The methodologies of Rowe and other scholars of the 1930s recognized that scarabs could be heirloom items found in later archaeological contexts, but their methodologies for dating the typological forms did not adequately account for this.

Rowe's chart of typological forms with their respective dates gives the semblance of a certain, tight typology (1936: Pl. XXXII–XXXV) when, in fact, 60% of the forms were based on the date assigned to one or two scarabs. One is reminded of Hornung and Staehelin's later warning that the multiplication of typological forms can be a *reductio ad absurdum* (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 32).

Further, Rowe assigned narrower dates to individual scarabs than was required by the range of dates assigned to the combination of typological forms of the scarab's head, back and side. For example, Rowe dates a scarab from Tomb 967 at Tell el-Far'ah (South) solely to the 19th Dynasty (Rowe 1936: 176 [No. 731]). The scarab's typological form is as follows:

Far'ah (South) (Rowe 1936: 190, No. 800), EP 22 (Rowe 1936: 181, No. 181), EP 71 from Tell el-‘Ajjul's Tomb 1166E (Rowe 1936: 123, No. 519), EP 123 from Tomb 905A at Tell el-Far'ah (South) (Rowe 1936: 169–170, No. 710), HC 21 from Room No. 1078 at Beth Shean dated to Ramses III (Rowe 1936: 200, No. 849).

Fig. 1 – Example of Rowe’s Dating a Scarab by Typological Form



	Typological Form	Range of Dates
Head-Clypeus	Type 27	12th–25th Dynasties
Elytra-Prothorax	Type 33	c. Hyksos–22nd Dynasties
Sides	Type 22	c. 13th–26th Dynasties

Based upon the assigned dates for each typological form (Rowe 1936: 297–307), this scarab can only be dated to the broad period of the Hyksos period through the 22nd Dynasty, yet Rowe dated the item only to the 19th Dynasty, which was approximately the date assigned to this whole tomb by the excavators, based on a jug and a scarab of Ramses II from the group of tombs (Starkey and Harding 1932: 24). As shown above, Rowe tended to date items to the period of the archaeological context where the glyptic was found. No other criterion—such as the base’s motif or engraving style—was explicitly stated by Rowe as narrowing the assigned date of the scarab.

Rowe did not often state his additional criteria for further narrowing of the date of each item’s production. This must be determined deductively. Rowe organized the scarabs of his catalogue chronologically so that, say, scarabs with the throne name of Thutmose III (Rowe 1936: Nos. 473–523)²⁵ preceded those of Amenophis II (Rowe 1936: Nos. 526–532). He assigned most scarabs with the throne name of Thutmose III to

²⁵ Rowe does not discuss how the throne name of Thutmose III may be manufactured after his reign.

the 18th Dynasty and too often shied away from identifying posthumous production of scarabs with royal names (Keel 1995a: §80). Following the grouping by royal titulary, scarabs with similar motifs were grouped together. Presumably the motif guided his dating, though never stated explicitly.

In the decades that followed Rowe's formative, though flawed, publication, significant advancements in the ceramic typology of the Southern Levant occurred. The publication of the ceramics of Beth Shean (Fitzgerald 1930), Tell Beit Mirsim (Albright 1932b; 1938; 1943a) and Lachish (Tufnell *et al.* 1940; Tufnell 1958) by strata enabled the finer dating of archaeological contexts where scarabs were found, though problems in daily archaeological method persisted. As archaeologists dated the contexts with greater certainty and the method of daily excavation in the field improved, the dating of scarabs in the Southern Levant also changed.

SCARAB TYPOLOGIES OF A SINGLE PERIOD OR SITE: NARROWING THE FIELD THROUGH SPECIALIZATION

In the decades after Rowe, short discussions of scarabs were included in the final reports of sites (Guy 1938: 184–186; Lamon and Shipton 1939: Pls. 67–73; Loud 1948: Pls. 148–159; Murray 1953: 360–363; Tufnell 1958: 92–126).²⁶ Often final reports of the early 20th century recognized that scarabs could be heirloom items, but they did not systematically account for that fact in their methods of dating. For instance, Guy listed a possible Hyksos scarab in the same tomb with a scarab he dated to the 19th Dynasty (1938: Pl. 95, Nos. 30–31); he dated the tomb to Ramses II based on the presence of a

²⁶ During this same period, Murray publishes a review of Middle Bronze scarabs but does not date them based on their backs, sides, or heads (Murray 1949). That discussion has not been excluded from this overview.

royal scarab of Ramses II (1939: 40, Pl. 100, No. 5), though the scarab itself could have been an heirloom. Admittedly, the ceramic typology of the Southern Levant was too underdeveloped in the early 1930s to distinguish between Late Bronze IIB, Late Bronze III,²⁷ and early Iron I assemblages.²⁸ In the early 20th century, a scarab with a royal titulary offered hope of greater precision that the ceramic typology could not provide.

In Murray's work on the scarabs of Lachish, she explicitly stated criteria that were once only implicit in Rowe's methodology. Murray's publication of scarabs continued to recognize the foundational observations of Petrie, like the posthumous production of scarabs with the throne name of Thutmosis III, but Murray noted the date of the archaeological context as proof of the posthumous production of scarabs of Thutmosis III (Murray 1953: 360–362).

Despite brief discussions of archaeological contexts associated with scarabs, broad stylistic and technical criteria were the stated basis for dating rather than the typology of the heads, backs, and sides (e.g., Murray 1953: 361, Nos. 1 and 2; 362, No.

²⁷ The problem of the chronology at the end of the Late Bronze has been discussed for decades. Tufnell proposed a Late Bronze III period which included the end of the 18th Dynasty and the 19th Dynasty (1958: 93). Amiran's seminal pottery volume aligned the whole Late Bronze with the Egyptian New Kingdom (1969: 124). She understood the Late Bronze IIB to have similar dates as Tufnell's Late Bronze III, but Amiran determined the upper bounds of the period based on Mycenaean IIB ware. For Amiran, the imports to Akhenaten's short-lived capital of Amarna provided the peg that divided the Late Bronze IIA and IIB. The end of the Late Bronze IIB period has been placed as part of the Iron Age (Stern 1993) and Late Bronze (Ussishkin 1985). Here, I use the term Late Bronze III not to refer to Tufnell's Late Bronze III assemblage, which includes both a Late Bronze IIB assemblage and a transitional assemblage between the Iron I and Late Bronze IIB. Instead, the Late Bronze III refers to the transitional assemblages where Mycenaean imports have tapered off, and imitations of imports are produced in the Southern Levant (e.g., imitations of Cypriot White-Shaved juglets and imitations of so-called Cypriot Milk Bowls). This corresponds to the local stratum S-4 at Beth Shean, which Mazar understands to be the first of the Iron IA strata at Beth Shean (Mazar 2006: 13).

²⁸ Albright was able to identify a Late Bronze II (Stratum C), Iron IA (Stratum B₁) and Iron IB (Stratum B₂) pottery based on the successive contexts associated with stone-lined silos of Tell Beit Mirsim, which provided cleaner contexts than the daily archaeological method sometimes permitted (Albright 1943: 2–4). His prescient ceramic typology, however, did not detect these finer divisions.

156). Unfortunately, Murray only rarely stated her criteria for dating (Murray 1953: 368–373). In the short descriptions included on the plates, she assigned narrower dates within the New Kingdom, but she offered no criteria for dating scarabs to the Ramesside—much less the late Ramesside period (Murray 1953: 368, No. 22). While we may wish for a more thorough and systematic discussion of her criteria, Murray’s publication surpassed the final reports of her contemporaries.²⁹

Murray dated scarabs based on the date of the first appearance of the base’s motif (Murray 1953: 362, No. 14–16). She used the archaeological context of the single, earliest appearance of the motif to date later parallels.³⁰ Murray did not ask whether the earliest scarab was itself an heirloom. The small size of her corpus rendered her conclusions tentative, but she used the evidence in hand as best one could. For a motif that occurred on a sizable corpus, Murray could have argued that the *terminus post quem* for the motif was tentatively the period of the earliest archaeological context.

²⁹ Loud’s brief publication of the scarabs at Megiddo also lacked a systematic discussion of the criteria used to date the glyptic art (Loud 1948: Pls. 149–159). He included a short description of each item on the adjacent plate. The description occasionally included a date, but more often he offered none. Loud only ventured to date two scarabs definitively to the New Kingdom (Loud 1948: Pl. 152, Nos. 154 and 164). With each scarab, he noted the stratum in which the scarab was found and, less often, a parallel for the motif on the base. Loud dutifully published the scarabs’ heads, backs, and sides, but did not comment on them nor date them accordingly (Loud 1948: Pls. 154–159). One does wonder if Loud noted the methodological uncertainties of dating scarabs and was hesitant to apply Rowe’s methodology from a decade earlier. Loud, however, never discussed the scarabs in the text of his second volume other than to list them in the register of finds.

Before Loud’s publication, earlier publication of scarabs and other pieces of glyptic art from earlier excavations at Megiddo also lacked an explicit methodology (Guy 1938: 184–186; Lamon and Shipton 1939: Pls. 67–73). Lamon and Shipton’s 1939 manuscript was submitted in 1937, and there is no engagement with Rowe’s typology (1936). It is uncertain whether Lamon and Shipton doubted Rowe’s methodology or were just unfamiliar with his publication and its application since it was only recently published at the time of their submission. In any case, few used Rowe’s typology during the decades that followed when publishing the final reports of Southern Levantine sites.

³⁰ For example, Murray argued that the motif of Amun-Re’s name flanked by *nb*-signs appeared first in the 18th Dynasty based on the appearance of the motif in the Tomb of Maket (Murray 1953: 362; see also Hankey and Tufnell 1973). She made no argument why this motif could not have been used on scarabs of the early 18th Dynasty, which would have been heirlooms in the Tomb of Maket.

During the subsequent decade, scarabs and their typology became the grounds upon which the battles over chronology were fought. In one instance, Stock used stylistic characteristics of motifs on the bases to argue for a different absolute chronology during the Second Intermediate Period (Stock 1955: 22–23; 45–46). He noted the forms of the backs, but he argued that the bases were more diagnostically significant. In the end, his chronology for the Second Intermediate Period was overturned (Martin 1971: 1), and his methodology failed to offer greater precision in dating.

In the 1970s and 1980s, major monographs were devoted to scarab typology of a limited range of time. Most focused on the corpora of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period (Martin 1971: 1–6, 150–154, 201–203, Pls. 50–57; Ward 1978a; 1978b; Tufnell 1984). Martin’s work repeated and extended the application of Hall’s methodology for establishing a scarab typology. While Hall’s typology used only royal scarabs, Martin expanded the corpus by adding private-name scarabs (Martin 1971: 1–6). He based his typology largely on the backs, in part, for pragmatic reasons—only the backs were published—and, in part, because the backs in this period were distinctive enough to be diagnostically significant on their own (1971: 3). As with Hall’s earlier typology, the backs ranged from the most naturalistic to the most “debased,” stylized forms. He argued the shift toward stylized, so-called “debased” forms increased gradually as production developed from the 12th Dynasty through the Second Intermediate Period (1971: 4–5). Peculiarly, he associated the degeneration of artistic standards in the colossal gateways of the Madâmun temple with the degeneration of the naturalistic scarab backs toward more stylized forms. He argued the smaller number of scarabs made of exotic stones was the result of smaller amounts of available raw materials.

In forming his typology, Martin cautiously excluded all scarabs of the 12th Dynasty which likely had posthumous production—namely, the scarabs of Senusret I, Senusret III and Amenemhat III—in order to avoid the errors of Weill who crafted a chronology where the 12th Dynasty was contemporary with the Second Intermediate Period rulers.

Martin made two primary contributions to the methodology of scarab typology. First, he widened the corpus upon which a typology is founded to include private-name scarabs. These scarabs are far less likely to be posthumously produced. Unfortunately, private-name scarabs are common in the period he studied and not subsequent periods, which are the subject of this study. Martin also systematically reported the size of the corpus on which the date of individual forms was based. As a result, he rightfully acknowledged that he could date certain forms with greater certainty than others.³¹ He also noted that his corpus may have been skewed because of changes in the administrative structure of Egypt during the Middle Kingdom which resulted in greater seal-bearing officials (1971: 5). While Martin noted the reason for the increase in private-name scarabs, he did not state the corollary effect upon scarab typology: the typological form may appear to decrease and go out of style, when in fact, the structure of the administration could have changed and the typological form continued on so-called design scarabs. Therefore, individual typological forms may require a longer date.

Next, Tufnell and Ward moved forward the methodology for establishing the dating of typological forms (Tufnell 1958: 92–111, Pls. 30–41; 1975, 1984; Ward 1978).

³¹ For instance, the three subtypes of Martin's Type 1 were each dated based on the meager evidence of one to three scarabs with either a royal name or a private name, while the form 5d was attested on 59 scarabs and Type 6 on 880 scarabs (Martin 1971: 4–5).

With the advancements in archaeological method and ceramic typology from the 1930s to the 1960s, they were able to assess with greater reliability the typological form of the scarabs based on the date of the archaeological contexts in which scarabs were located.

Tufnell's early work on scarabs covered the scarabs from the Bronze Age contexts at Lachish (1958); this work preceded Weill's and Martin's work on typology. Approximately three decades later, Tufnell published a systematic discussion of the early Second Millennium Scarabs (1984). The methodology of her earlier publication foreshadowed the latter.

In her earlier publication, Tufnell published the sides, backs, and bases of each scarab (1958: Pl. 30–41); she dated them based on a combination of motifs, styles, backs, heads, and sides (1958: 93). Unfortunately, her methodological choices with regard to scarab typology and dating were often implicit in her earlier publication and must be deductively concluded. Her early observations and dates were, at times, logical conclusions based on the corpus she had, but at other times they fail to withstand systematic scrutiny.

She divided the scarabs from the Second Intermediate Period into two groups based on two archaeological contexts with very similar ceramic assemblages (1958: 109–110). She contrasted the two groups—Tombs 157 and 153—by examining their motifs. The former group had only symbols of northern Egypt and the latter a combination of northern and southern symbols. Tufnell interpreted this historically as two successive periods which were so close in date that they had the same ceramic assemblages. She dated the former—Tomb 157—to an earlier period before the rulers expanded out of lower Egypt and the latter—Tomb 153—to a period after expansion. Stratigraphic

observations bolstered her conclusion that Tomb 157 was earlier (1958: 109). She based her methodology for forming a scarab typology first on separating groups based on successive archaeological contexts whose relative order was known through stratigraphic observations. Then she interpreted the motifs on the scarabs' bases through a historical lens.

Tufnell then used the typological forms to argue for relative dates of scarabs within these two archaeological contexts. Unfortunately, her reasoning is not always clear. While she maintained Tomb 153 to be later than Tomb 157, she argued that a scarab from Tomb 153 was of an earlier date based on its back and Side 6 (1958: 102, No. 107). She claimed that the typological form of the scarab pushed the likely date of the scarab to an earlier period; Tufnell identified Side 6 as indicative of the earlier series. There were 11 instances of this side; only one came from an assemblage she identified as earlier (1958: No. 95). If anything, the side's form should have pushed her date later to the period of greatest frequency. Tufnell does date scarabs with Side 6 to the 12th through 18th Dynasties, indicating a long period of production for this typological form (1958: Nos. 168 and 209). Perhaps Tufnell was arguing that Side 6 was more popular during the earlier dynasties, though its range of production was longer. Unfortunately, her corpus did not support this distribution, and she did not state her reasoning explicitly.³²

Another scarab, discussed by Tufnell's early work, came from an archaeological context dated to both the Middle Bronze II and the Early Iron periods (Tufnell 1958: 101, 117, 238, No. 132). In two different sections, she dated the scarab to both the 19th and

³² She dated two of the three scarabs with Side 6 from Late Bronze I–II and Late Bronze III contexts to the Second Intermediate Period (1958: Nos. 209, 215, and 216). Tufnell's reasoning can only be inferred deductively because she never stated explicitly her reasoning.

20th Dynasties (101) and the 18th Dynasty or later (117). In another instance, Tufnell dated a scarab later than the archaeological context in which it was found, and she offered no further explanation (1958: No. 132). Its base had the motif of the rope border, which Tufnell dated to the Second Intermediate Period and the Ramesside period (1958: 101). Rather than date the scarab to the Middle Bronze III—the period of Tomb 511 where it was found—she assigned the scarab to the Ramesside period with no further explanation (1958: No. 132).

Other scarabs in Tufnell's study were assigned dates based on their typological form. Tufnell noted that Sides 11 and 16 placed two scarabs in the middle of the Duweir series rather than early in that series (1958: 94). Tufnell believed these two typological forms to be diagnostically significant for dating scarabs to the Second Intermediate Period.³³

Here, we will follow the data Tufnell assembled for these two forms of the side to ascertain deductively her method for dating typological forms. Her charts showed 27 scarabs with Side 11. Their archaeological contexts clustered during the Second Intermediate Period, which Tufnell dated to the Middle Bronze III³⁴ (Tufnell 1958: Nos. 16, 23, 40, 53, 58, 63, 75, 92, 102, 104–106, 111–112, 115–119, 121–122, 124–125, and 131). Only three scarabs with Side 11 came from Late Bronze contexts. Tufnell dated these two scarabs to the Second Intermediate Period and, thereby, argued they were heirlooms in later contexts (Tufnell 1958: Nos. 207 and 213). Tufnell's analysis,

³³ Tufnell implied that the middle of the Lachish series (1958: 94) referred to the Second Intermediate Period when she said that the middle of the series was, for her, contemporary with Tomb 153, which she dated to the Middle Bronze III (1958: 230–231).

³⁴ My remarks here are not arguing for or against Tufnell's chronology and assessment of the Middle Bronze III. Instead, I attempt to make explicit her methodology for dating the typological forms of scarabs by using her stated dates of the archaeological contexts.

however, did extend the production of Side 11 rarely into the New Kingdom (1958: No. 348). It seems likely, though not explicitly stated, that she based the later date on the motif of Amun-Re's name rather than the date of the specific archaeological context. Elsewhere in her monograph, Tufnell argued that the motif of Amun-Re became popular in the late New Kingdom based on the archaeological contexts of scarabs bearing this motif (1958: 108). In effect, she has determined the range of dates for both the typological form of the side and the motif, and then determined where the two ranges overlapped. While Tufnell argued Side 11 tended to be produced during the Second Intermediate Period, she assigned the scarab a later date because she prioritized the dates of contexts containing scarabs with this motif over the dates of contexts with scarabs using this form of the side.

Tufnell also discussed the date of another typological form, Side 16. According to Tufnell's works, this typological form tended to occur on scarabs in the middle of the Lachish series—the Second Intermediate Period (1958: 94). She identified 11 scarabs with this side. The associated archaeological contexts, according to Tufnell, ranged from the Middle Bronze III to the Iron I, but scarabs with Side 16 tended to cluster in archaeological contexts dated to the Late Bronze.³⁵ Accordingly, Tufnell dated over half of these scarabs to the New Kingdom.³⁶ It seems Tufnell believed Side 16 was produced during both the Second Intermediate Period and the New Kingdom, though she stated that

³⁵ Tufnell identified the archaeological contexts with Side 16 as follows: the Middle Bronze III (No. 26), Late Bronze I–Late Bronze III (1958: Nos. 201, 202), Late Bronze II–III (1958: Nos. 298, 307), Tufnell's Late Bronze III (1958: Nos. 337, 358, 365), and Late Bronze III–Iron I (1958: Nos. 339, 343, 386).

³⁶ The scarabs Tufnell dated to the New Kingdom were as follows: 18th Dynasty (1958: No. 307), 18th–19th (1958: No. 365), and 19th Dynasty or 20th Dynasty (1958: Nos. 337, 339, 343, 358, 386).

the typological form was more popular in the middle of the Lachish series. Her dating of scarabs tended to assign longer dates to typological forms of the scarab.

In a number of instances, Tufnell's unspoken methodology for dating is opaque. For instance, she argued that a scarab with the name of Ahmose I was a Ramesside reissue rather than an heirloom item in a Late Bronze III context (1958: 97, No. 359). She offered no criteria for her conclusion that the item was posthumously produced. The scarab was engraved with Side 38, but, according to her own analysis, this side occurred on scarabs from archaeological contexts dated from the Middle Bronze III to the Iron I.³⁷ She dated the production scarabs with this side equally to the broad and later New Kingdom.³⁸ Her dating of the typological form of the scarab's side nor the motif required her to conclude this was a Ramesside reissue. At best, her criteria are unstated and unidentifiable. If she used a systematic assessment of the typological form of the scarab, we are unable to know it from her publication of scarabs from Lachish in 1958.

In the years following Tufnell's publication of scarabs from Lachish, Kenyon's excavations at Jericho produced 427 scarabs from Middle Bronze contexts, and Diana Kirkbride published them (1965). The corpus was large enough that more certain conclusions and finer chronological divisions between periods were thought to be possible. Kenyon divided the phases of Jericho's tombs into five distinct ceramic phases. However, she was unable to discover smaller chronological divisions (1965: 580). She

³⁷ Scarabs with Side 38 were from the following archaeological contexts: Middle Bronze III (Tufnell 1958: Nos. 41 and 72), Late Bronze I–III (Nos. 208, 219, 242, 253, 255, 261, 264–265, 275–276, and 293), Late Bronze III (Nos. 346, 349–350, 359, 361, 367, and 373) and the Late Bronze III–Iron I (No. 385). By far, the largest number of scarabs occurred in Late Bronze contexts.

³⁸ Tufnell's dates for the scarabs' production are as follows: Second Intermediate Period (1958: Nos. 41 and 72), 18th Dynasty (1958: Nos. 208 and 293), 18th–19th Dynasty (1958: Nos. 261, 276, 346, 350, 361, and 373), 18th–20th (1958: No. 367), 19th Dynasty (1958: Nos. 219, 242, 253, 255, 275, 349, and 359), and 19th–20th Dynasty (1958: No. 385).

argued that the art of the seal engraver was too conservative to detect changes between the five sub-phases of the Middle Bronze. At times, she was able to detect that certain scarabs were popular in different phases. For instance, she argued that the cross pattern died out during Groups IV and V (1965: 586). She helpfully acknowledged that some of the differences may have arisen due to preference for a certain engraver by one family, and they did not reflect typological trends (1965: 581). While she found no vast difference between the scarabs of different periods of the Middle Bronze, she clearly understood that the typology of scarabs was founded upon a logically prior ceramic typology to date the contexts.

Oddly, Kirkbride rarely argued that scarabs without royal names were heirlooms. For instance, scarabs with concentric circles occurred three times in tombs from Group II, seven times in Group III, thrice in Group IV, and twice in Group V. Kirkbride might have interpreted this distribution in two ways. It could have indicated production during Groups II and III while scarabs from Groups IV and V were heirlooms because they were fewer in number. The distribution also could have indicated that they were produced during all these periods, but their popularity tapered off during the final, two periods. Choosing between these two options will always be fraught, though it becomes less fraught the larger the size of the sample. Ultimately, Kirkbride concluded that the motif was produced throughout the whole series (1965: 586). While she explicitly considered the possibility that scarabs with the royal name may have been heirlooms, her methodology for identifying heirlooms among all forms and motifs either can not be known through deductive reasoning or it was inconsistently applied.

Tufnell revisited Kirkbride's conclusions about Jericho's Middle Bronze scarabs in her publication of the scarabs of Megiddo (1973). She reassessed the scarabs of Megiddo after multiple scholars reworked the Middle Bronze stratigraphy of Megiddo (Kenyon 1958; 1969; T. Thompson 1970; Müller 1970). Kenyon pointed out that the archaeological method of the Megiddo excavations, published by Loud and Guy, produced systematic errors. Their excavations assumed architectural features of the same height to be of the same stratum. Terraces and foundations were systematically associated with earlier strata rather than identified as intrusions dug into earlier strata (Kenyon 1958: 51*; 1969: 25). Intramural tombs, common in the Middle Bronze, were particularly problematic because they were dug below architecture. Therefore, the Megiddo excavators misidentified these tombs as from earlier phases (Kenyon 1958: 51*–52*; 59*–60*; 1969: 25–36). To correct the problem, Kenyon redated Megiddo's tombs based on the stratigraphy of the architecture above the tomb as well as the pottery within. She classified the Megiddo assemblages using the groups found in her excavations of Jericho's tombs. Despite her crucial contribution, disagreement remains over the stratigraphic assignment of these tombs and the date of the ceramic assemblages within them (T. Thompson 1970: 40–43; Müller 1970).

Because the stratigraphy of Megiddo shifted, Tufnell re-analyzed the scarabs in order to confirm to herself that her system remained valid (1973: 69). She wanted to verify that the system could be applied to sites other than Jericho. She used the stratigraphic assignments of Müller as the basis for her conclusions. Stratigraphy was again the explicit basis for her scarab typology, though she realized that the proposed stratigraphy could require future modification (1973: 71). While my discussion of the

methodology underlying scarab typology cannot tackle the weighty problem of Middle Bronze chronology here,³⁹ no typology can be formed on the basis of faulty stratigraphy. The disagreements between Kenyon and later scholars must be accounted for lest the scarab typology be proven unreliable.

Tufnell again argued that the sides, backs, and heads were diagnostically significant for dating but offered little discussion beyond a description and lists of the forms for each scarab drawn (1973: 70–71, 73–74). Heads were divided broadly into four types. She correlated the different types of heads with the length of the scarab (1973: 79, 80). While she asserted the significance of the heads, she only described how motifs wax and wane in popularity in the corpora of Megiddo and Jericho in 1973.

Two years later Tufnell published an article on the scarabs from the Egyptian sites of Kahûn and Uronarti (1975). Unfortunately, she dated the occupation of these sites based on inscriptional evidence alone, not ceramics. Earlier periods of lesser occupation may be undetectable in inscriptional evidence. Further, the scarabs were not assigned to stratigraphic contexts or horizons at Kahûn and Uronarti, as occurred with the corpus from Megiddo. The lack of stratigraphic control for the corpora at Kahun and Uronarti is problematic. The inscriptions at the sites assigned a range of approximately 200 years when both sites were occupied. Then, Tufnell created profiles of each site's corpus based

³⁹ I am not referring to the ubiquitous discussion of the Intermediate Early Bronze Age as the 'new' name of the former Middle Bronze I. Kenyon herself was the one to propose the terminology of Intermediate Early Bronze Age for Tell Beit Mirsim H and the 'new' Middle Bronze I was Tell Beit Mirsim G–F (1951: 106, n. 1). Her proposed stratigraphy for Megiddo (1958; 1969) already assumed her proposed shift in terminology. Even with this shift, there were clear differences between her proposed tomb groups at Megiddo and Müller's. In one instance, Müller's XII/1b corresponded to Kenyon's Middle Bronze IIA, Middle Bronze IIB, and Middle Bronze IIF. In another, Müller's XI/2 corresponded to Kenyon's Middle Bronze I, Middle Bronze IIA, Middle Bronze IIIB, and Middle Bronze IIC. Also, Müller's IX/2 corresponded to Kenyon's Middle Bronze IIA, Middle Bronze IIB, Middle Bronze IIC, Middle Bronze IIF, and Middle Bronze IIG.

on the different design classes. She compared these profiles with that of Megiddo, the corpus from the Montet Jar, Jericho's Groups I–V, and Ruweise's Tomb 66; she then formed a relative order of these corpora. The Montet Jar was said to be earliest⁴⁰ (Tufnell and Ward 1966). Megiddo was slightly earlier than Jericho. Kahun was said to be closest to Tomb 66 at Ruweise, and Uronarti was closest to Jericho Groups IV–V (1975: 70).

Tufnell identified differences in the corpora to be of chronological significance.

Differences may also have reflected regional differences since the sites are located on the Syrian coast, Palestine, and Egypt. Explicitly stated criteria identified as diagnostically significant for chronology were related to motifs rather than typological forms. There is no systematic discussion of the heads, backs, and sides in Tufnell's 1975 publication.

Tufnell's seminal work on scarabs and their typological forms appeared less than a decade later. Building upon her earlier publications (1958; 1973; 1975; 1975–1976; Tufnell and Ward 1966), she drew together her previous observations about individual corpora together with other Southern Levantine corpora in a full monograph entitled *Studies on Scarab Seals: Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium B.C.* (1984). It also followed Ward's earlier volumes (1978a, 1978b). As in her earlier articles, the volume focused on scarabs from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period. Her corpus was comprehensive when published.

She identified the different corpora where either a context or a set of contexts formed an assemblage of scarabs to which she assigned an overall date. The assemblages

⁴⁰ While Tufnell and Ward dated the collection to the end of the First Intermediate Period (1966), Tufnell noted that the jar included items which could also have been dated to the Middle Kingdom (1984: 3). The overly narrow dates may reflect the overall tendency of the corpus, but the corpus may, in fact, have scarabs from the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom. In the end, though, I am not arguing here for a certain date of the Montet Jar or other corpora. I only wish to make explicit her methodology.

reflected her earlier article (1975): Kahun, Uronarti, Montet Jar, Ruweise's Tomb 66, Jericho's Groups I–V, Megiddo E–G, and Ajjul's AT or Ajjul's Level III. She intentionally chose corpora from a geographical range so that she could identify geographic changes from the 12th Dynasty on (1984: 52). She also chose corpora with a narrow chronological range so she could determine smaller shifts from the 12th Dynasty through the Second Intermediate Period; she believed that corpora of too long a period would blur her conclusions (Tufnell 1984: 53).

After choosing her corpora, she established the date of each corpus based on inscriptions, the ceramic assemblage of the context, other artifacts from that context, and/or its relative stratigraphic order. When one means of dating was missing, as occurred with the stratigraphic location of the Montet Jar, she relied more heavily on other criteria.

After she established the date of her corpora, the motifs of each corpus were assessed and compared chronologically. For example, Design Class 1—geometric designs—was found to decrease from the First Intermediate Period through the Second Intermediate Period while motifs with Egyptian signs and symbols increased (Tufnell 1984: 24–25, 45, Table 2). She used the same methodology to assess the chronological range of the typological forms of the heads (1984: Table 3), backs (1984: Table 4), and sides (1984: Table 5) of each scarab. She produced the same assessment for each corpus within the Middle Bronze itself to determine the typological progressions within the Middle Bronze itself (1984: 47–52, Tables 6–25).

Overall Tufnell placed too much trust in the conservative craft of engraving scarabs to solve chronological problems in the Middle Bronze. She argued that scarabs were a better basis for chronology than ceramics, which had shorter periods of use:

“The advantage of using groups of scarab-seals rather than pottery as a final common denominator in an attempt to solve the problems of Middle Bronze chronology is that they are the products of an industry closely linked in the repertory of design and in the traditions of the craft for a thousand years. The skill required to shape and engrave the stone with complicated designs was not easily learnt, but the final product was hardly affected by the regional and economic differences which disturbed the contemporaneous development of pottery forms and of ceramic craftsmanship.” (Tufnell 1984: 53)

Tufnell expected the engraving of a very soft stone, like steatite, to be too technologically difficult for numerous workshops to master the art of production in different artistic traditions. Therefore, she believed the tradition to be constant across regions due to the engravers’ training; scarabs permitted her to link firmly and tightly Southern Levantine and Egyptian chronologies. She was right to assert that pottery may have regional developments that must be accounted for in a typology. However, she replaced ceramics with a much more conservative art form, like scarabs, and created further problems. Further, Ben-Tor’s later demonstration of the regional variation between Egyptian and Southern Levantine production undermines the methodological assumptions undergirding Tufnell’s work (2007). Imported ceramics of shorter duration, not scarabs, form a tighter alignment of relative assemblages across regions.

Tufnell distinguished between scarabs with a royal titulary and scarabs with decorative scarabs, exhibiting stylistic criteria. She noted the tendency of royal scarabs to be heirloom items, capable only of providing a *terminus post quem* rather than a *terminus ante quem* (Tufnell 1984: 24). The royal scarabs could only be used explicitly for dating, she argued, when stylistic considerations also agreed. It is unclear why she assumed that

scarabs without royal names were not in danger of also being heirloom items. Presumably she thought scarabs without the royal name would be valued less by later generations and, therefore, were less likely to be kept as heirlooms.

This volume, unlike her earlier articles, categorized systematically all heads, sides, and backs. Her earlier article plotted only the correlation between the frequency of four basic forms of the head and the length of the scarab (1973: 79–81, Fig. b). Both aspects were diagnostically significant for Tufnell's earlier typology. Her later volume charted the four basic types of heads systematically through different corpora (1984: 31–38), but she drew the correlation not between head types and scarab length, but head types and motifs (Tufnell 1984: 31). Because Tufnell deemed motifs to have greater chronological significance, she charted the correlation presumably to show a chronological progression between different types of the head.

Ward cautioned against solely using style to date scarabs (Ward 1978a: 1). Tufnell shared this caution but noted that when a site with short-lived occupation can yield significant numbers of scarabs to provide a representative sample of the period's trends, style could be combined with the form of the scarab to date the item of glyptic art (Tufnell 1984: 115).

CRITIQUE OF THE TWO METHODOLOGIES

From this overview of the history of scholarship, it is apparent that scholars of Syria-Palestine and Egypt have used two broad methodologies to form a reliable scarab typology that can be used to date these pieces of glyptic art. One methodology uses scarabs with royal and private names, presumed to be of a certain date, to date the

production of typological forms of the scarab. The other uses large corpora of scarabs from contemporary archaeological contexts to determine when different forms were first produced and later became popular.

As noted above, each methodology has its inherent weaknesses. Typologies based on scarabs with royal and private names are particularly alluring because of their promise of precision. They date production to a specific reign of an Egyptian king, even when the item was found in a later archaeological context, a less secure archaeological context, or a collection of scarabs of unknown provenance.⁴¹ The reliability of this methodology rests upon the identification and elimination of posthumous production from the corpus. Hornung and Staehelin astutely identified those scarabs from kings who reigned shortly or experienced a *damnatio memoriae* as least likely to be produced posthumously (1976: 27). The queen's scarabs were also less likely to be posthumously produced. These royal scarabs form a reliable corpus for dating typological forms. Unfortunately, the corpus would be too small to make reliable conclusions about the relative levels of popularity of forms across reigns. Further, the absence of a typological form of scarab during a reign might not be evidence of the absence of production because the sample size was limited due to the short reign of the king.

Posthumous production of scarabs with a royal name is especially likely when the royal titulary doubles as cryptographic writing of Amun. Hornung and Staehelin pointed out that cryptographic spelling of Amun's name became popular in the New Kingdom according to their analysis of scarabs of unknown provenance (1976: 42). The throne names of Thutmose III (*mn ḥpr Rḡ*) and Amenophis III (*nb m'ṯt Rḡ*) were likely

⁴¹ The perpetual danger of forgery makes this option untenable, though Hornung and Staehelin attempted analysis of scarabs of unknown provenance (Hornung and Staehelin 1976).

candidates for a cryptographic writing of Amun (Drioton 1957: 19 [cf. Nos. 13 and 33]; Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 42). Posthumous production would be more common among scarabs with these throne names. As noted above, scarabs with a portion of the royal titulary of Thutmosis III and Amenhotep III were identified as posthumously produced since the late 19th century (Petrie 1891: 27; Ward 1902: 51, 53; Hall 1913: xxxvi), though their cryptographic writing was not identified. Interestingly, Hornung and Staehelin concluded plausibly, though not definitively,⁴² that among their collections of likely Egyptian scarabs, the relative frequency of a scarab tended to correspond to the length of the king's reign, except during the reigns of common posthumous production—Amenhotep I, Thutmosis III, and Amenhotep II (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 54, 63). Further, the distribution between the five different parts of the royal titulary would be skewed toward one name that consisted of three signs that could be read cryptographically as the name of Amun. The popularity of the throne name of Thutmosis III is explained by a variety of factors, including the posthumous production of the cryptographic writing of the name of Amun and the later use of the throne name in burial contexts, as seen on coffins of the 21st Dynasty (1976: 61). The popularity of Amenhotep I's scarabs may also have occurred because of the later worship of Ahmes-Nefertari, mother of Amenhotep, and Amenhotep I as protector deities at Thebes during the 19th, 20th, and 21st Dynasties (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 56). Their scarabs were produced during the Ramesside period as amulets to protect during death. Interestingly, Hornung

⁴² Unfortunately, most conclusions of Hornung and Staehelin cannot be conclusive because they were based on seals of unknown provenance, which they assumed to be from Egypt and to be looted equally from different regions and archaeological contexts across ancient Egypt. They are to be praised for working skillfully under imperfect conditions; few scarabs from secure contexts in Egypt were available, yet they came to plausible conclusions while recognizing the limits of their corpus. Hornung and Staehelin found that their vast corpus exhibited striking statistical trends. Scarabs with a specific royal titulary were relatively as frequent as the length of reigns, except for those with cryptographic writing of Amun.

and Staehelin noted that there may have been similar rates of production at the accession of a king, but the variety of forms and motifs on these scarabs argued against a uniform series issued by standardized royal workshops (1976: 55). The foundation deposit of Hatshepsut in Deir el-Bahri confirms their conclusion, showing diversity in form, motif and writing during one period of production (1976: 55). If the name can be confidently identified as not cryptographic, the likelihood of posthumous production decreases markedly.

Posthumous production also ramped up during later periods when foreign rulers—Persian and Ptolemaic—controlled Egypt. Hornung and Staehelin supposed that foreign kings' names did not have the same magical value as Egyptian kings' names so that later production of earlier names became advantageous (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 28). If scarabs do not come from contexts dated to the Iron IIC or Persian period or later in the Southern Levant, this danger is mitigated. This is the case in our study. A scarab typology using royal names lures the researcher with its promises of a precise date of production no matter the archaeological context, but the researcher must carefully examine each reign to determine its reliability. Unfortunately, the sample size will likely be small when posthumous production is least likely. In these cases, conclusions will necessarily be less certain.

The second methodology is founded upon dating typological forms based on the archaeological context of each scarab. One approach prioritizes a few large corpora from the archaeological record. The corpora are arranged in relative order to one another, and the researcher identifies diachronic trends in typological forms and motifs between these corpora (e.g., Tufnell 1984; Ben-Tor 2007). This methodology benefits from a larger

sample size than one based on royal name scarabs. Like the previous methodology, it suffers from the intrinsic problem of heirloom items.

The problem of heirlooms is best addressed by enlarging the corpus upon which the typology is based. As noted above, a similar problem was encountered in early ceramic typologies of the 1930s; Phythian-Adams and others overcame the problem of post-dating by doing statistical analysis of the frequency of ceramic forms in each period (1920: 62–65, Figs. 3 and 5). When the frequency of a form was highest, the form was considered to be popular. As the frequency of the form tapered off in subsequent periods, the form was presumed to be an heirloom. Frequency of a form during different periods should form a bell-shaped curve. A typology of scarab forms would do well to follow a similar process. The frequency of each typological form should be plotted according to period. This methodology requires a large sample size. The larger the sample size, the more reliable the typology becomes.

A WAY FORWARD: BENEFITING FROM ALL METHODOLOGIES

This study focuses on two archaeological horizons with distinct, successive ceramic assemblages: Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA/IB which correspond broadly to the 19th Dynasty, 20th Dynasty, and the beginning of the Third Intermediate Period. Both methodologies will be employed because they complement one another and address different corpora. If the scarabs with the royal titulary were made in different workshops from non-royal scarabs, their typological forms may even be different. Following the suggestion of Hornung and Staehelin, a third methodology will also be implemented; it will be based on scarabs from Egyptian foundation deposits of one ruler. By employing

all three methodologies, we may be able to detect slight differences between scarabs with the royal titulary and those without. By using all three methodologies, typological forms deemed diagnostically significant for dating will become more secure and the weaknesses of each methodology will be lessened.

CHAPTER 3

TOWARD A SCARAB TYPOLOGY OF LATE NEW KINGDOM SCARABS

The previous chapter outlined the history of scarab typology and identified two broad methodologies for determining diachronic changes within that typology. This study will employ both methodologies in order to limit the weaknesses of each. A typology based on scarabs with the royal titulary offers precision in dating typological forms from shorter reigns when there is less posthumous production, but the sample size is limited. A typology based on the archaeological context of scarabs works best when the sample size is large. Both methodologies will be employed below both to expose and shore up the weaknesses of the other.

The field has classified typological forms in two broad ways. Some studies have multiplied the number of typological forms (Rowe 1936) while others limited the number of typological forms. Rowe did the former. He divided heads into 78 types, backs into 128 types, and sides into 67 types. Hornung and Staehelin would accuse this method of *reductio ad absurdum* (1976: 32). No scarab is like the next. On the other end of the spectrum, the field tended toward simplification of the typology. The backs were narrowed to approximately five types that ranged from realistic to schematic (Hall 1913; Steindorff 1936; Martin 1971; Tufnell 1973). This methodology, however, failed to capture idiosyncratic changes in style which may be unique to a limited period of time and are diagnostically significant for dating. It is most prudent to permit the number of forms to proliferate, if only to determine through this study that a typological form is not diagnostically significant for dating.

Fig. 2 – Upper View of the Scarab's Typological Form – Modified image of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1927 (27.3.206, top). Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art.



First, I will offer an extended note about the systems of classification used below. The classification of the clypeus, head, pronotum, and elytra follows Keel, and Keel, in turn, relied upon his predecessors in the field (Keel 1995: 39–57). Keel tends to use systems which permit him to track smaller variations within the typological forms, while not dividing the forms *ad nauseum*. Keel's classification of heads follows Tufnell's corrected typology (1984: 32, Fig. 12; Keel 1995: 43, Fig. 45). Tufnell's system classifies the forms according to that which was common during the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period. Occasionally her typology lacks forms common in the New Kingdom. Keel and Egger provide an amended version of Tufnell's chart, which has been used here (Keel 1995: 51, Figs. 54–66 Egger 2006: XVI, Fig. 1). Heads A1 and D4 are often confused with one another. Both forms tend to be rounded, and it is difficult to determine when the head should be classified as trapezoidal (i.e., Type D) instead of lunate (i.e., Type A). Tufnell's classification of the heads does not include the clypeus. I

have rectified this by documenting the ridges on the top of the clypeus where it meets the head and grooves at the bottom, which are adjacent to the shaft's end. These aspects are designated in the third and fourth columns of the charts below.

Fig. 3 – Side View of the Scarab's Typological Form – Modified Image of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1927 (27.3.206, side). Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art.



The sides are classified according to Tufnell's modified system (1984: 37, Fig. 14 = Keel 1995: 55, Fig. 69). Tufnell divides them broadly into two groups: those that are chip-carved (see Fig. 2) and those which are less deeply engraved with scoring (1984: 36). Occasionally, the depth of engraving is subjective so that forms D1 and D5 are, at times, confused with E4 and E5. Hirsute forms—D6, D7, D8, and D10—were hashed on the sides (see Fig. 2).

I have modified Keel's classification of the back so that greater detail can be documented to determine if individual features are diagnostically significant for dating (see Fig. 1). Keel records the presence or absence of humeral callosities. I have added a description of the type of humeral callosity and noted when the engraver changes its location. Further, I have noted both the line(s) between the elytra and the line(s) between

the pronotum and the elytra (see Fig 1). These divisions are noted in the seventh column. The first notation refers to the division between the elytra and the pronotum and the second notation refers to the division between the elytra. For example, when the seventh column notes “I / II,” it indicates that there is one line dividing the elytra and two dividing the elytra from the pronotum. Then, I have identified whether or not there is a recessed line around the edges of the elytra. Lastly, I have noted “yes” when the recessed line joins the line dividing the elytra. When an element is no longer extant, it is marked with a dash.

A SCARAB TYPOLOGY BASED ON THE ROYAL TITULARY

A typology based on scarabs with the royal titulary must guard against two primary phenomena: posthumous production of earlier, popular kings and later production of a titulary that doubled as cryptographic writing of the name of Amun. Hornung and Staehelin proposed the problem be avoided through examining kings whose reigns were shorter or for whom there was a *damnatio memoriae*. (1976: 27). This ensures less posthumous production. Other than Ramses II and possibly Ramses III, the scarabs of most rulers of the 19th and 20th Dynasties and the early Third Intermediate Period are helpful for determining a typology.

19TH DYNASTY

Ramses I. This king had a sufficiently short reign so that posthumous production of scarabs with his royal name was unlikely. Unfortunately, an abbreviated form of his birth name would have been indistinguishable from later Ramesside kings (e.g., Keel 2010a: 102–103 [Bet-Schean 16]; 268–269, 294–295 [Bet-Schemesch 120, 179]; 2010b: 252–

253, 256–257, 332–333, 400–401 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 525, 535, 715, 715, 885]), as long as his epithets were omitted. His throne name, however, was distinct from other kings (Beckerath 1999: 148–149; e.g., Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 270, Nos. 393–394), and they may be used to form a typology. Unfortunately, the reign was so short that no scarab with the distinctive throne name was found in an archaeological context from the Southern Levant.

Seti I. Seti I succeeded Ramses I. Though his reign was substantially longer than Ramses I, the number of his scarabs found in the Southern Levant was still far less than his successor, Ramses II, for whom posthumous production was almost certain. Possible attestations of Seti I’s royal titulary occur on four scarabs from Deir el-Balah, Tell el-Far’ah (South), and Tall Deir ‘Alla. Only one is certainly a scarab from the reign of Seti I.

Deir el-Balah 57. This scarab comes from an anthropoid sarcophagus at Deir el-Balah, excavated illicitly by Moshe Dayan. As such, its archaeological context is uncertain, though the site of its origin is known. The first phrase of the throne name of Seti I is clearly engraved on the base (*mn m’ṯ Rḫ*; Beckerath 1999: 150–151), but there are two additional signs: *wsr* and a poorly executed *ḥq’* or *ḥh* (cf. Newberry 1906: Pl. XXXIV, No. 16; Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 270, No. 397). If the sign is a poorly executed *ḥq’*, this may be part of the epithet mentioned in one of Seti I’s throne names (Beckerath 1999: 150–151 [T7]; cf. Newberry 1906: Pl. XXXIV, No. 19) where the *m’ṯ* is not rewritten. Other scarabs from the Southern Levant write the name similarly (Keel 2010b: 262–263 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 547]). The other sign, *wsr*, remains unexplained. Keel argued that it may be an anomalous combination of the throne names of Seti I and Ramses II (Keel 2010a: 426). Interestingly, there are a number of scarabs where both throne names are engraved and *m’ṯ* doubles as part of both throne names (Petrie 1917: Pl. XL, No. 51; cf. Nos. 46–50). While there are parallels, the phenomenon has not been completely explained. Was this a locally produced scarab from the Southern Levant? The local artisan may have been less familiar with the Egyptian writing system and may have amalgamated the names. If the collection of Hornung and Staehelin is, in fact, from Egypt as they suppose, then this phenomenon may also be an Egyptian practice (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 270, No. 397). These questions suggest that this scarab should not be used when forming a typology.

Tell el-Far'ah (South) 519. This is a rectangular plaque with a rounded back. The base has the throne name of Seti I possibly combined with the throne name of Ramses II *mn m³t R^c wsr m³t R^c* (Beckerath 1999: 150–151 [T1]; Petrie 1917: Pl. XL, Nos. 46–51). The back of the domed plaque has a cartouche with either a cryptographic instance of Amun's name or the throne name of Thutmosis III. The cartouche is flanked by antithetical *m³t* signs.

Tell el-Far'ah (South) 547. This scarab is an abbreviated form of Seti I's throne name *mn m³t R^c hq³ m³t* (Beckerath 1999: 150–151 [T7]). The *m³t* is written only once (cf. Petrie 1917: Pl. XL, No. 51). As the only definitive scarab with the royal titulary of Seti I, the typological form of the scarab is significant, and it is discussed in the chart below. The head is Tufnell's A1. Both humeral callosities are depicted, and the division between the wings is a single line. The form of the legs is Tufnell's E9A.

Tall Deir 'Alla 13. As in Deir el-Balah 57 and Tell el-Far'ah South 519, the base has the throne name of Seti I possibly combined with the throne name of Ramses II. The base reads *mn m³t R^c wsr [m³t R^q]* (Beckerath 1999: 150–151 [T1]; Petrie 1917: Pl. XL, Nos. 46–51). This scaraboid is made of faience in the form of a hippopotamus.

Table 1 – Scarabs of Seti I

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Tell el-Far'ah South 547 ⁴³	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (horizontal line), Not Grooved	D1 ⁴⁴	Two (equilateral, slightly inset)	I / I ⁴⁵	None

As is clear, the sample size of this king's scarabs is very small. Conspicuously, three of the four scarabs found in the Southern Levant do not have a clear writing of Seti I's royal titulary. Three of these scarabs from the Cisjordan and Transjordan were a

⁴³ I have cited scarabs by noting the English name of the site with Keel's number from his four volumes of his comprehensive corpus (Keel 1997; Keel 2010a; Keel 2010b; Keel 2013).

⁴⁴ Keel classifies this scarab as E9a instead of D1 as I have done. The distinction between E and D typological forms is the method of engraving. Scarabs of the E-type are notched or grooved, not chip-carved. The depth of the engraving determines the classification. I was not able to view items that were held by the Institute of Archaeology or the British Museum in London. I must rely upon the published photographs. The engraving appears too deep to be notching.

⁴⁵ The first notation classifies the type of line between the pronotum and the elytra while the second classifies the line(s) between the elytra. If there is no line between the elytra or the elytra and the pronotum, the column reads '0' for the scarab.

combination of the throne names of Seti I and Ramses II. One wonders if these scarabs were locally produced. Only one scarab—Tell el-Far’ah South 547—clearly has Seti I’s royal titulary. It adds very little to the broader discussion of scarab typolog.

Ramses II. After scarab production tapered off during the Amarna period and the reign of Horemheb, production increases again under the 66-year reign of Ramses II (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 69). While scarabs with the titulary of Ramses II may be alluring when forming a broader typology of scarabs, the systemic problems of the corpus should be addressed. Alternative spellings of the throne name may indicate posthumous production (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 69–70).

The throne name is the most common part of the titulary found on Ramesside scarabs, though the birth name did become more popular during the late 18th and 19th Dynasties (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 70). Ramses II’s throne name was reused by a later king of the Third Intermediate Period, Sheshonq III (Beckerath 1999: 154–155 [T9]; 188–189 [T1]). Therefore, the archaeological context must be known with some degree of certainty in order to ensure that the scarab was not posthumously produced in a later period. When the *terminus ante quem* of the archaeological context excludes a reading of Sheshonq III, then the scarab may be used to form the typology of scarabs during the first half of the Late Bronze IIB. Scarabs with the throne name of Ramses II or Sheshonq III are as follows:

Aphek 30, Tell el-‘Ağul 301, Tell el-‘Ağul 302, Tell el-‘Ağul 369, Tell el-‘Ağul 559, Tell el-‘Ağul 1039, Tell el-‘Ağul 1224, Akko 16, Ashdod 8, Beth Shean 63, Beth Shean 89, Beth Shean 154, Beth Shean 180, Beth Shean 226, Beth Shean 235, Beth Shemesh 204, Beth Shemesh 204, Dan 4, Tall Deir ‘Alla 17, Deir el-Balah 9, Deir el-Balah 11, Dothan 28, Dothan 39, Tell el-Far’ah South 146, Tell el-Far’ah South 232, Tell el-Far’ah South 474, Tell el-Far’ah South 548, Tell el-Far’ah South 549, Tell el-Far’ah South 550, Tell el-Far’ah South 551, Tell el-Far’ah South 647, Tell el-Far’ah South 649, Tell el-Far’ah South 679, Tell el-

Far'ah South 712, Tell el-Far'ah South 714, Tell el-Far'ah South 753, Tell el-Far'ah South 761, Tell el-Far'ah South 762, Tell el-Far'ah South 781, Tell el-Far'ah South 782, Tell el-Far'ah South 783, Tell el-Far'ah South 784, Tell el-Far'ah South 789, Tell el-Far'ah South 819, Tell el-Far'ah South 822, Tell el-Far'ah South 856, Tell el-Far'ah South 866, Gath 24, Gath 33, Tel Gath Carmel 1, Tel Gath Carmel 6, Jerishe 13, Gezer 5, Gezer 390, Gezer 400, Gezer 401, Gezer 613, Tel Harasim 11, Hebron 3, Lachish (Rowe 1936: 161, No. 676); Lachish (Murray 1953: Pl. 43A, No. 10), Megiddo (Rowe 1936: 162, No. 679), Megiddo (Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 212).

Fig. 4 – Tell el-Far'ah (South) 474 – IAA I.7165



Of these scarabs, a number come from unknown archaeological contexts⁴⁶ (Keel 1997: 226–227 [Tell el-‘Ağul 369, 1039, and 1224]; Keel 2010a: 176–177 [Bet-Schean 180], 306–307 [Bet-Schemesch 204]; Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 822] Keel 2013: 104–105, 108–109 [Gat 24, 33], 124–127 [Gat Carmel 1, 6]; 144–145 [Tel Gerisa 13], 168–169, 336–337, 342–343, 430–431 [Geser 5, 390, 440, 441, 613], 558–559 [Tel Harasim 11]; Eggler 2006: 398–399 [Tall Deir ‘Alla 17]) or a context dated to the Iron IIA or later (Keel 1997: 664–665 [Aschdod 8]; Keel 2010a: 138–139 [Bet-Schean 89],

⁴⁶ Scarabs from Akko, Ashdod, and Deir el-Balah have a similar titulary (Keel 1997: 550–551, 594–595 [Akko 60, 182, and 183], 678–679 [Aschdod 46]; Keel 2010a: 454–457 [Der el-Balah 127, 129, 131]), but they were purchased on the market, though they appear in Keel’s volume of scarabs and seals of known provenance. Therefore, these scarabs may reflect the throne name of Sheshonq III, and they should not be used to form a typology of scarabs.

406–407 [Der el-Balah 11], 506–507 [Dotan 39]). Therefore, they cannot be assigned only to Ramses II—instead of Sheshonq III—based solely on the royal titulary engraved on the base. If the scarab comes from a Late Bronze IIB or Iron I context, the archaeological context provides the *terminus ante quem* and the researcher can more certainly assign them to the reign of Ramses II. In one instance, Keel assigns Tell el-‘Ağul 369 to Ramses II and mentions no other stylistic criterion whereby he dates this scarab to Ramses II and not Sheshonq III. A few of these scarabs come from uncertain contexts, but the site itself—Deir el-Balah—was most heavily occupied during the Late Bronze IIB (Keel 2010a: 412–413, 418–419, 442–443 [Der el-Balah 25, 26, 39, 68, 97]). Unfortunately, even this site is occupied during the Iron II (Dothan 2010: 153–162), and these scarabs cannot be definitively assigned only to Ramses II.

Other scarabs with the first half of the throne name of Ramses II cannot be dated to the reign of Ramses II only. Instead, these scarabs are broadly Ramesside. They are incapable of informing a scarab typology that identifies diachronic change between the 19th and 20th Dynasties (Keel 1997: 170–171 [Tell el-‘Ağul 199]; Keel 1997: 684–685 [Aschdod 61], 743–744 [Aseka 27]; Keel 2010a: 118–119, 136–137, 148–149 [Bet-Schean 47, 88, 115], 320–321 [Bet-Zur 8], 406–407 [Der el-Balah 10]; Keel 2010b: 228–229, 264–265, 268–269, 306–307 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 469, 553, 554, 555, 562, 651, 652]; Keel 2013: 102–103 [Gat 19], 288–289 [Gezer 275]).

One scarab with the throne name of Ramses II can be definitively assigned to Ramses II because the spelling of Ramses II’s throne name was used during the first year of his reign (Keel 1997: 536–537 [Akko 16]; Beckerath 1999: 154–155 [T1], Footnote 1). Two other scarabs include an additional epithet “Beloved of Thoth” (Keel 2010a: 404–

405, 430–431, 458–459 [Der el-Balah 9, 68, 134, 135]) which is not part of the titulary of Ramses II according to Beckerath (1999: 154–157), but the epithet may have been used on scarabs from Egypt (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 70–71, No. 401).

Less commonly the birth name appears on scarabs of the Ramesside period. A number of these scarabs can definitively be assigned to the reign of Ramses II. They read *R^c-msw mry Jmn-R^c* (Keel 2010a: 82–83 [Bet-Mirsim 91], 280–281 [Bet-Schemesch 147]; Keel 2010b: 264–265, 306–307, 360–363 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 552, 650, 680, 786, 791]; Keel 2013: 110–111 [Gath 34], 340–341, 348–349 [Geser 398, 418]; Kunath 1985). Other scarabs with the birth name lack an epithet and, therefore, can be assigned to multiple Ramesside kings (Keel 2010a: 102–103 [Bet-Schean 16]).

Based on this evidence, the following scarabs have been analyzed as likely to reflect typological form of scarabs which artisans produced during the reign of Ramses II:

Table 2 – Scarabs of Ramses II

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Tell el-‘Ajjul 301	A1	- ⁴⁷	-	-	0	III / II	-
Tell el-‘Ajjul 302	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three lines, bottom), Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Recessed, No

⁴⁷ When a scarab’s side, back, or head is not known due to the item being lost, stolen, or broken with no image of the item available, I have marked the form with a dash. If the side is either too difficult to see in the available photographs, it has been marked with a question mark.

Tell el- ‘Ajjul 559 ⁴⁸	A1	Trapezoid?	-	D1	0	I / I	None
Akko 16	-	-	-	D1	-	-	-
Aphek 30	-	Rectangular	Ridged (four lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	-	-	-
Beth Mirsim 91	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (equila- teral)	I / I	Reces- sed, ?
Beth Shean 63	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (two lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	2 (right angle)	I / II	Reces- sed, ?
Beth Shean 154	Bifacial Rectangular Plaque						
Beth Shean 226	B6	Trapezoidal	Ridged (four lines, top), Not Grooved	D6	0	0	None
Beth Shean 235	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (four lines, bottom; one line, top), Not Grooved	D6	Back with Cartouche and Two Antithetical Uraei ⁴⁹	0	None
Beth She- mesh 147	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D1	2 (equila- teral)	I / I	Reces- sed, ?

⁴⁸ Because the item is made of faience, it was not carved and its features are less deeply constructed and items of this material are less informative for a scarab typology.

⁴⁹ The custom of engraving a royal cartouche on the back of the scarab comes about in this period (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 71).

Dan 4	A1 (open to clypeus)	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E7	0	II / III	None
Deir el-Balah 9 ⁵⁰	A1 ⁵¹	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	II / II	V-Shape at Rear
Deir el-Balah 103	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (two lines, top), Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Dothan 28	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one line, top), Not Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral, inset)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 146	B5 ⁵²	Trapezoid	Ridged (three lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D1 ⁵³	0	0 / 0, Short Groove	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 232	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5 ⁵⁴	0	0 / 0	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 474	B6 ⁵⁵	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D7 ⁵⁶	2 (equilateral)	I / I (slight triangle created at the	Recessed, No

⁵⁰ This item is made out of carnelian. The stone's greater hardness invariably affects its typological form. Fewer details are possible

⁵¹ While Keel identifies this head as D4 (Keel 2010a: 502), I have identified it as A1 because the slight ridge of the head is visible, separating the head from the clypeus.

⁵² Keel assigns this head to B2 (Keel 2010b: 90). While the head does form an hourglass, a groove separates the upper portion of the head from the pronotum. The head does not curve into the pronotum, however.

⁵³ Keel identifies this scarab's side as D1 (Keel 2010b: 90), though the legs merge with the base and are not squared off as specified in Tufnell's typology (1984: 36).

⁵⁴ Keel identifies the side as E9a, though there are no visible grooves or notching in the photograph.

⁵⁵ Keel identifies the head as D4. However, the images of Tell el-Far'ah South 474 (IAA I.7165) above show that there is both a half oval engraved on the top of the head, and the clypeus is separated from the head by an engraved line.

⁵⁶ Keel identifies this side as E5 (Keel 2010b: 230). However, the front and middle legs are clearly notched in the image of the scarab that is included above.

						top by poor engra- ving)	
Tell el-Far'ah South 548	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 549	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (two, top; four, base), Grooved	D6	0	0 / 0 (short groove)	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 550	D3	Trapezoid	Gently Ridged, Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 551	B8	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	0	0 / 0 (short, hooked groove)	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 552	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom; one, top), Not Grooved	D5	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed (pronotum and elytra), Yes
Tell el-Far'ah South 647	Domed Rectangular, Bifacial Plaque						
Tell el-Far'ah South 649	D3	Rectangular	Ridged (two lines, top), Not Grooved	D6	0	0 / 0 (short, hooked groove)	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 650	D3	Rectangular	Not Ridged; Grooved (three notches)	D6	2 (equilateral)	II / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah	A3	-	Ridged (two lines,	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, ?

South 679			top), Not Grooved				
Tell el-Far'ah South 680	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (equilateral)	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 712	D3	Trapezoid	Ridged (two lines, top), Not Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No (curved)
Tell el-Far'ah South 714	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 753 ⁵⁷	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	?	0	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 761	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah South 762	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved (three, bottom)	D6	0	0 / 0	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 781	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved (two, top; five, bottom)	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 782	D10 (three vertical lines)	Trapezoid	Ridged (horizontal); Not Grooved	E11	0	II / II	None
Tell el-Far'ah	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged,	D1	2 (equilateral)	I / I	None, Two Hori-

⁵⁷ This scarab was engraved in carnelian, and the hard stone decreases the detail with which the scarab's typological form is executed.

South 783			Not Grooved				zontal Lines along Rear above Shaft
Tell el-Far'ah South 784	Cowroid, Type III ⁵⁸						
Tell el-Far'ah South 786	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 789	-	-	-	D5	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah South 791	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah South 819	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah South 856	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	II / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 866	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2 (equilateral)	I / I	None
Tel Jemmeh 24	Impression in Jar Handle						
Gath 34	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2 (right angle?)	I / I	Recessed, Yes?

⁵⁸ The classification of this cowroid follows Keel's typology (1995: 79–80).

Gezer 398	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	2 (equila- teral)	I / I	Reces- sed, No, (cur- ved, two lines engra- ved on rear)
Gezer 418	B2	Trapezoid	Ridged (three lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D8	2 (equila- teral)	I / I	Reces- sed, ?
Hebron 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lachish (Rowe 1936: 161, No. 676)	D10	Trapezoid	Ridged	E5	0	0 / 0	None?
Lachish (Murray 1953: Pl. 43A, No. 10)	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	?	2 (equila- teral, larger)	I / I	None?
Megid- do, (Rowe 1936: 162, No. 679)	A1 + B2 ⁵⁹	Trapezoid?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved?	D5	0	0	None?
Megid- do, (Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 212)	B2?	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	None	I / I	Reces- sed, No?

⁵⁹ The head is lunate (i.e., A1), and there is an hourglass form engraved around the head to form the clypeus.

52 scarabs are likely to have a portion of the titulary of Ramses II engraved on their bases. It is noteworthy that over half of these scarabs come from Tell el-Far'ah (South) alone. The number exceeds even the burials of Deir el-Balah whose connections with Egypt are unquestioned in the Late Bronze IIB.

Merenptah. Scarabs with the titulary of Merenptah (Beckerath 1999: 158–159) decreased markedly during Merenptah's reign. A similar decrease was noted in Egyptian collections of unknown provenance (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 72). Four scarabs from the Southern Levant portray both the throne name and the birth name of this king (Keel 2010b: 112–113, 226–227 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 197, 464]). The birth name occurs on one glyptic while the throne name occurs on the remaining two scarabs. The scarabs tend to come from one site in the southern Coastal Plain on the *Via Maris*. One additional scarab comes from Megiddo.

Table 3 – Scarabs of Merenptah

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Tell el-Far'ah South 197	Falcon or Human-Headed Sphinx of Carnelian						
Tell el-Far'ah South 464 ⁶⁰	A1	Rectangular	Not Ridged; Grooved (two grooves on the bottom)	Unknown ⁶¹	0	I / I	None

⁶⁰ This scarab was engraved on a hard stone, jasper. Fewer details are engraved on seals made of harder stone.

⁶¹ The legs cannot be viewed because the metal encasing covers them.

Tell el-Far'ah South 754	-	-	-	D6	-	-	-
Megiddo, (Loud 1948: Pl. 152, No. 151, 157, No. 151) ⁶²	A1?	-	-	E1	0	I / I	None

Seti II. Two scarabs from the Southern Levant have the throne name of Seti II engraved on their bases. Each scarabs has a different epithet with his throne name (*wsr-hpr(w)-R^c mrj-Jmn*; Beckerath 1999: 160–161 [T3–T6]; Keel 2010a: 180–181 [Beth Shean 188]).

Table 4 – Scarabs of Seti II

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Beth Shean 188 ⁶³	A1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	2 (equilateral?)	I / I	0
Ekron 34	Scarab Covered by Ancient Metal Casing	-	-	-	-	I / I	0

⁶² This item is made of faience, which becomes more popular during the late 19th Dynasty according to Hornung and Staehelin (1976: 72).

⁶³ This item was purchased and should not figure into the overall typology.

Siptah. One scarab from the corpus of the Southern Levant has the throne name of Siptah engraved on its base (*ḥ-n-R^c stp.n-R^c*; Beckerath 1999: 162–163 [T3]; Keel 2010a: 294–295 [Beth Schean 189]; 294–295 Beth-Schemesch 180]; cf. Hall 1913: 228, No. 2275). His reign is short enough to ensure that posthumous production was unlikely.

Table 5 – Scarabs of Siptah

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Beth Shemesh 180	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one line, top), Grooved	E12	0	I / I	0

Tausret. No scarab with her name was found, though a small fragment of a faience vessel was found at Tall Deir ‘Alla with her name engraved (Yoyotte 1962).

20TH DYNASTY

A decline in the number of 20th Dynasty scarabs has been long noted in the Southern Levant. The decline has been used to mark the date of Egyptian withdrawal from the region (Brandl 2004b: 57). The presence of royal scarabs is understood to be a marker of Egyptian economic and military presence in the region, and the absence of glyptic art is evidence of a lack of economic and military relations.

Interestingly, Hornung and Staehelin also noted in their collection of largely Egyptian items a decline in the production of royal scarabs in the 20th Dynasty. There was also a decline in images on scarabs. They presumed the decline in royal scarab use was caused by a weakening of royal institutions. It was no longer presumed, they argued,

that a scarab with the royal titulary would provide protection in the journey to the underworld (1976: 69). Therefore, while the decline in the number of 20th Dynasty royal scarabs in the Southern Levant may reflect changing Egyptian policy in the region, it may also reflect a shift in production in Egypt itself. As royal institutions weaken, it is reasonable that their presence in the Southern Levant also decreased. While Egyptian presence may have declined during the 20th Dynasty, dating final Egyptian imperial presence in the Southern Levant precisely to Ramses IV may be overly certain.

Sethnakht. There is only one scarab with the name of Sethakht. It originally was understood to be a combination of the names of Ramses II and Ramses III (Ohata 1970: 64). Instead, Brandl has astutely pointed out in his helpful article on 20th Dynasty scarabs that the scarab comes from Sethnakht (2004b: 57–58). Indeed the scarab does depict the throne name of Sethnakht (*wsr ḥꜣw-Rꜥ mrj-Jmn stp.n-Rꜥ*; Beckerath 1999: 164–165 [T4]). While found in a Roman tomb, Brandl argues that it “undoubtedly originated in the Iron I, Sea People’s settlement, which existed at the site” (Brandl 2004b: 58), though the site was occupied continuously from the Late Bronze IIB through the Iron I (Kochavi 1993: 1525). Thus, the site was occupied during the reigns of both Ramses II and Ramses III.

Table 6 – Scarabs of Sethnakht

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Zeror (Ohata 1970: 64, Pl. LXIII, No. 2) ⁶⁴	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Ramses III. After Ramses II, Ramses III had the most royal scarabs in the Southern Levant. Half of Ramses II's royal scarabs came from Tell el-Far'ah (South), but only four of the fifteen scarabs of Ramses III come from the same site. The birth name occurs on seven scarabs (*R^c-msj-sw ḥqʿ-Jwnw*, Beckerath 1999: 166–167 [E3]; Brandl 2012a: No. 12; Stager *et al.* 2008: Fig. 15.15; Keel 2010a: 220–221 [Bet-Schemesch 7]; Keel 2010b: 266–267 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 557, 558]; Keel 2013: 210–211 [Gezer 100]; Schulman 1988: 139, Fig. 46:7), and the throne name is engraved on the rest of the corpus.

Table 7 – Scarabs of Ramses III

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Tell el-Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: No. 12)	B2 (pronotum cuts into the head with a	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D5	0	0	None

⁶⁴ Unfortunately, the excavator provides only the image of the bases of both glyptic items. No view of their backs or sides has been published (Ohata 1970: Pl. LXIII, Nos. 2 and 3).

	triangular notch)						
Ashdod 65 ⁶⁵	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ashkelon (Stager <i>et al.</i> 2008: 258, 261, Fig. 15.15)	-	-	-	D5	-	-	None
Beth Shean 85	Domed Rectangular Plaque with Cartouche of Throne Name on Back						
Beth Shean 222	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (1 line, top), Grooved	D6	0	0	None
Beth She-mesh 7	A1	Rectangular	Ridged (1 line, top; 2 lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2 (equilateral)	I / I	None
Beth She-mesh 138	A1/D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved at Base	D5	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah South 556	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (1 line, top; 5 lines, bottom), Grooved	D1	0	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah South 557 ⁶⁶	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah South 558	B5	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None

⁶⁵ Unfortunately, this item was stolen, and its typological form cannot be identified

⁶⁶ This scarab is located in a metal clasp. Its features are not visible.

Tell el-Far'ah South 790	A1	Curved	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	0	0	None
Tel Jemneh 65 ⁶⁷	?	?	Not Ridged?, Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Gezer 100	Bifacial Plaque						
Lachish 388 (Tufnell 1958: 37, 98, 126, No. 388, Pl. 39, No. 388)	B2	Trapezoid	Not Grooved, Not Ridged	D6 ⁶⁸	0	0	None
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 154, Pls. 152: 195, 158: 195)	Scaraboid						
Timnah (Schulman 1988: 139, Fig. 46:7)	B2	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E9A	0	0	None

⁶⁷ Scarab is faience, and details of scarab are highly friable and worn.

⁶⁸ The plates do not show either a photograph or a drawing of the sides of the scarab. Instead, the text states the form of the side (Tufnell 1958: 126). Tufnell provided a plate with images of those side (Tufnell 1958: Pl. 41, No. 22).

Ramses IV. This king's royal scarabs are the third largest group of royal scarabs during the Ramesside period and the beginning of the Third Intermediate Period. The group has sometimes been expanded to include scarabs that read *wsr m³t stp-mn* and ⁶⁹*wsr-M³t mn stp-R^c*. Brandl helpfully noted that these scarabs should be removed from the royal corpus (e.g., Culican 1988: 93, Fig. 14.1; Bliss and MacAlister 1902: Pl. 83.24s; Lalkin 2004: 20, Fig. 1.3) because these pseudo-royal titularies are not attested (Beckerath 1999: 166–169; *pace* Lalkin 2004). Other scarabs depict errors in the writing of the titulary where the throne names of his first year (*wsr-M³t-R^c stp.n-Jmn*; Beckerath 1999: 166–167 [T1]) and his second year (*ḥq³-M³t-R^c stp.n-Jmn*; Beckerath 1999: 168–169 [T5]) are erroneously combined. The errors are not consistently repeated, as if, to create a standardized type of scarab (Keel 2010b: 266–267 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 556]).

Another scarab has been attributed to Ramses IV based on the birth name flanked by two *M³t*-feathers. Some, like Kitchen and Brandl, have confidently assigned the scarab to Ramses IV. While Kitchen and Brandl argue that the flanking *M³t*-feathers are part of the birth name and show examples that prove their writing (Brandl 2004: 62–63, Pl. 5, Fig. a–e), this feature does occur on other scarabs with throne-names where the *M³t*-feathers are not read as part of the titulary (e.g., Jaeger 1982: 70, 83, 92, 99, 100). While many of these examples attest the *M³t*-feathers outside of the cartouche so that they clearly should not be read with the titulary, other examples attest no cartouche with flanking *M³t*-feathers where the engraver intends the *M³t*-feathers to be included within the reading of the titulary (Jaeger 1982: 99, §439). On three scarabs from Aphek, Tel Rehov and Shechem, the *M³t*-feathers is likely a stylistic addition to the birth name. A

⁶⁹ There is an additional scarab of Ramses IV that is not discussed here. Brandl noted that it was forthcoming (Brandl 2004b: 63, No. 9), but I have not located it in publications.

similar phenomenon occurs on a glyptic piece from a foundation deposit of Ramses III (Petrie 1906: Pl. XXXIV). Unfortunately, this group is too uncertain to be assigned to one king and not multiple kings of the Ramesside period (*R^c-msw*; Keel 1997: 84–85 [Afek 17]; Uehlinger 1988: 21; Giv'eon 1988: 46–48).⁷⁰ The caution of Uehlinger and Keel is prudent.

Table 8 – Scarabs of Ramses IV

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Ashdod (Keel and M'unger 2005: 276, Fig. 6.1, No. 4) ⁷¹	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beth Shean 145	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2 (equilateral)	I / I	Recessed line, No
Beth She-mesh 137	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (isosceles)	I / I	Recessed, No (curved)
City of David (Brandl 2012b:	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one horizon-	D5	2 (right angle)	I / I	None

⁷⁰ The scarab appears in a late Iron I archaeological context (Keel 1997: 84; Giv'eon 1988: 46–48). If the archaeological method and stratigraphy of the site was accurate, this glyptic piece *can* be assigned to multiple Ramesside kings because the date of the archaeological context provides a late *terminus ante quem*.

⁷¹ This scarab is described with as much detail as can be collected at the time of its publication because all items of glyptic art were missing (Keel and M'unger 2005: 273).

381–382, Fig. 13.4)			tal), Not Grooved				
Tell el-Far'ah South 559	A1/D 4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (equi-lateral)	I / I	Reces-sed line
Tell el-Far'ah South 716	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (equi-lateral)	I / I	Reces-sed line
Gezer 10 ⁷²	-	-	-	E11	0	-	-
Megid-do (Lamon and Shipton 1939: Pl. 69:27)	A1	Trapezoid ?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	?	?

Ramses V–VI. I know of no scarabs or glyptic items attributed to the reigns of these kings in the Southern Levant.

Ramses IX. Only one glyptic piece from the Southern Levant—not a scarab—has the throne name of Ramses IX engraved on the base (*nfr-kʿ-R^c stp.n-R^c*; Beckerath 1999: 172–173 [T1]).

Table 9 – Scarabs of Ramses IX

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
--------	------	------------------	------	---------------------	--------	-----------------

⁷² The location of this scarab is unknown. The precise details of its typological form cannot be ascertained.

Gezer 103	Cartouche Scaraboid
--------------	---------------------

Ramses X. One scarab has been identified as possibly having the throne name of Ramses X (*hpr-M^ct-R^c*; cf. Beckerath 1999: 174–175 [T1]; Keel 2010b: 98–99 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 164]). If this scarab does, in fact, depict his titulary, it has omitted the epithet *stp.n-R^c*. Further, Keel keenly notes that the signs themselves may also be a cryptographic way to write Amun’s name (Keel 2010b: 174) in which the *hpr*-sign is the second phoneme in the name of Amun (Drioton 1957: 14). Though Drioton may be right, his cryptographic system is so flexible as to be impractical at times. According to Drioton’s system, this sign can, in fact, be used for any phoneme in the name of Amun. Due to these uncertainties, this scarab cannot be definitively assigned to the reign of Ramses X.

SIAMUN AND THE END OF THE IRON I: A NOTE ON CHRONOLOGY

This study is limited to glyptic items from Iron I contexts. The debate over the absolute date assigned to the end of the Iron I in the Low and High Chronologies is relevant to this study. If the High Chronology is correct, scarabs with the titulary of Ramses III and Ramses IV will be found in Late Bronze IIB/Iron I transition or Late Bronze III contexts while scarabs with the name of Siamun will be found in Iron IIA contexts.

The glyptic items from Lachish with royal names have been cited as evidence for the upper bounds of the Iron I (Krauss 1994; Lalkin 2004). Two scarabs from Lachish—one from Ramses III and another from Ramses IV—are of particular interest. In early 20th century scholarship, it was argued that Lachish was destroyed during the reign of

Merenptah at the earliest, though later dates were also considered possible⁷³ (Albright 1937: 23–24; Albright 1939: 11–23; cf. Dothan 1960: 62–63) and even probable⁷⁴ (Tufnell 1958: 36–37) because of a scarab of Ramses III found on the surface of the tell (Tufnell 1958: No. 388). In recent years, advocates of the Low Chronology have argued the Late Bronze IIB/Iron I transition or Late Bronze III must be lowered to include Ramses IV based upon the scarabs from Lachish.

It has been traditionally argued that if the absolute date of the beginning of the Iron I is lowered, the end must also be lowered as well. If this argument is true, scarabs with the titulary of Siamun could be found in archaeological contexts from the end of the Iron I instead of the Iron IIA. Unfortunately, any data set related to this question will be

⁷³ Throughout the 1930s the ceramic chronology becomes more certain. As this occurs, Albright drops incrementally his date for the transition between Strata C and B at Tell Beit Mirsim, which is the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. First, he lowers Lachish's destruction to at least the second half of Ramses II's reign (1935: 13–14). By 1937, Albright says that the destruction of Lachish was, at the earliest, after the fourth year of Merenptah due to a hieratic inscription on a bowl that refers to the fourth year of, what is assumed to be, an Egyptian reign. According to Albright's 1937 argument, the evidence of the bowl dovetails nicely with the stele of Merenptah that records a campaign through the Southern Levant shortly thereafter (1937: 24). While Albright makes the argument for the plausibility of the bowl's reference to Merenptah, he also rightfully notes that the bowl could refer to the fourth year of other Egyptian kings, like Siptah or Seti I (1937: 24; 1939: 21). By 1939, Albright continues to date the destruction to Merenptah but notes that it may have occurred "conceivably at the beginning of the 12th century" (1939: 21). Albright's willingness to date the destruction into the 12th century is even more striking when one recognizes that his article employs the higher Egyptian chronology of Borchardt (1939: 21). This would imply that Albright considered possible—though not plausible—that the destruction of Lachish occurred during the 20th Dynasty. This suggests Albright recognized that the epigraphic date of the hieratic inscription was not tight enough to rule out a date during the fourth regnal year of Ramses III or Ramses IV (*pace* Kraus 2006: 123–124). Albright ruled out these other kings based on the circumstantial evidence of a destruction mentioned by Merenptah.

⁷⁴ Tufnell preferred a later date for the destruction of Lachish VI. She dated it to the reign of Ramses III. The re-examination of a hieratic bowl from Tufnell's excavations confirmed this date, as did the later excavations of Ussishkin. With regard to the bowl with a hieratic inscription, Redford revisited the paleography of the bowl and noted, like Černý before him (1958), that ligature of *bʿ* on the bowl reflected the paleography of either the 19th or 20th Dynasties (Redford 1979: 66–67). Redford, reading the interior of the bowl first, argues that Albright's inclination to date the bowl to Merenptah was correct due to the date of his accession. Goldwasser, however, reads the exterior of the bowl first and dates the bowl to Ramses III (1982: 137–138; see also 1984: 87). However, the order of her reading is not based on an exact parallel from Tel Sera'. Only the exteriors of the bowls from Tel Sera' were inscribed. In the end, one need not choose between the dates of Goldwasser and Redford to date the earliest possible end of Lachish VI to Ramses III. A bronze object with the cartouche of Ramses III was also found by Ussishkin's excavations in Locus 4164, sealed by the destruction debris (Ussishkin 1983: 123–124, 168–169, Fig 13, Pl. 30:1–3; Giv'eon 1983).

limited. There are few scarabs securely dated to any king of the Third Intermediate Period, even among the larger collections of unknown provenance. Only Psusennes I and Siamun are said to be represented in small numbers (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 73).

Münter has cited a scarab engraved with that which he believes to be the birth name of Siamun. The scarab comes from an Iron I stratum at Dor and is evidence for the Low Chronology (Münter 2003: 72, Fig. 4; 2005: 388, 397–399, Nos. 23–24). If true, the Iron I would extend beyond 980 BCE. There is a second scarab with the same titulary from Megiddo, but unfortunately it comes from an uncertain context (2003: 72). The scarab from Dor is within a secure context from Stratum 7 in Area G with a ceramic assemblage dated to the Iron I (2003: 72).

If these two scarabs are, in fact, from the reign of Siamun as Münter argues, they have a shortened version of Siamun's birth name, *z'-Jmn*, and not the fuller version of his name *z'-Jmn mrj-Jmn*, which is the standard way to write his birth name (Beckerath 1999: 180–181). It is crucial to note that the shortened phrase is not limited to royal scarabs of Siamun. The phrase is also found with a lotus bloom in what is likely to be a cryptographic writing of the name of Amun (Keel 1997: Tell el-'Ağul 214; Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 73, 178, Nos. 433–434). One scarab even writes the goose-sign twice, as if, the first sign is to be read as *z3* "son," and the second sign is to be read together with the *mn*-sign as a cryptographic way to write Amun's name (Keel 2010a: Bet-Schean 28).

Münter dismisses the cryptographic reading of Hornung and Staehelin. He states that Hornung and Staehelin have not offered a satisfactory justification for their argument (2003: 72–73; 2005: 399), but does not explicitly dispute their discussion of cryptographic ways to write the name Amun (1976: 177).

Hornung and Staehelin argue that the occurrence of Siamun's birth name on scarabs is atypically large when compared to the number of glyptic pieces with his throne name. They reiterate Jaeger's observations that the first three names of the royal titulary appear only on scarabs from the reign of Thutmose I through Thutmose III (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26, 42; Jaeger 1982: 45 [§108]). In other reigns of the New Kingdom, scarabs employ only the throne name and the birth name, and the throne name is more common. Hornung and Staehelin demonstrate this by calculating the ratio of scarabs with the throne name to those with the birth name (for examples of this method, see Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 55–63). Kings with a short reign or a *damnatio memoriae* have a similar ratio, because there is likely no posthumous production during the reigns of these kings. When the ratio is not as expected, Hornung and Staehelin note that there is an alternative reason that leads to posthumous production. In the corpus of scarabs with the titulary of Siamun, the birth name is abnormally high and written with a non-standard spelling (1976: 177, Nos. 434–435). The birth name is a cryptographic way to write Amun's name in which the goose-sign, G39, can also be read as the phonetic value *m* or, less likely, as a bilateral *mn* (1976: 177). Following Drioton's earlier work on cryptographic writing, Hornung and Staehelin state that bird-signs are one way to write the phoneme *m* (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 176; Drioton 1949: 120–121; cf. Hölbl 1979: 89–102).⁷⁵

⁷⁵ While it is certain that cryptographic writing systems were used during the 18th Dynasty, the flexibility of the system is, at times, overextended. Unfortunately, publications discussing this writing system are scattered over many articles, and there is no systematic treatment of cryptographic texts (e.g., Drioton 1933; 1938; 1940; 1949; 1957; Grapow 1936). The cryptographic writing system tends to follow the Rebus-principle of acrophony where the alternative reading of the sign will often be the first consonant of the alternative reading. For example, the *Ma'at*-feather is typically read as the phoneme *y*, but it can be used in cryptographic writing to represent the first phoneme *m* of the word *Ma'at* (Drioton 1957: 16).

Cryptographic writing is challenging precisely because its conventions are intended to be mysterious. Yet conventions must be accepted and used repeatedly by a community to be comprehensible by that community. Cryptographic readings are often proposed when the standard reading of the signs gives a superficial reading. For example, cryptographic writing was found in the tomb of Thutmose I to write the Book of the Dead (Grapow 1936: 23-29). Because the passage was longer and known, cryptographic writing conventions could be identified and understood. When the text is shorter as on a scarab, the reading is more fraught because there is no broader context to determine that the engraver intends to use cryptographic writing conventions. Instead, one must look for other clues to point to a shift in to cryptographic writing conventions.⁷⁶ Hornung and Staehelin find these clues in the abnormally shortened form of the birth name and the relative frequency of the birth name on scarabs. If the birth name of Siamun were intended, the addition of R^c to the birth name on the scarabs from Megiddo and Dor is unusual (Beckerath 1999: 180–181). For these reasons, it is best to look for alternative readings of these two scarabs. The cryptographic reading is certainly plausible and should

Hornung and Staehelin admit that, at times, Drioton's readings have been overly creative (1976: 174). Indeed, Drioton's own statements that "les applications de ce système variaient presque à l'infini" (1957: 12) do make one hesitate at the system's elasticity. Drioton even lists 14 signs which have three values— j , m , and n —so that any of these fourteen signs could be used to write any letter of the name of Amun (Drioton 1957: 13–15). In fact, Drioton proposes that three identical signs are used to write the name of Amun where each sign represents a different phoneme with the same sign (Drioton 1957: 18–19). He argues that even a cartouche flanked by two uraei is a way to write the name of Amun where the cartouche represents the phoneme m and the uraei write both the initial and final phoneme of Amun's name (Drioton 1957: 18). Drioton finds creative and sometimes implausible ways to read the image rather than view it as an artful way to depict the name of the king flanked by two uraei. Though the problems are notable, Hornung and Staehelin maintain that this form of writing has been used on scarabs, and they credit him with a productive approach to these scarabs (Drioton 1938: 240, 243). While caution is certainly in order when employing Drioton's elastic system, the cryptographic writing conventions are undeniable on scarabs. Determining when these cryptographic conventions are intended is the more difficult task.

⁷⁶ Hölbl notes that cryptographic readings of Amun on scarabs are too often proposed when scarabs with three signs have no apparent reading. With the conclusion in hand, the writing system is deciphered. Hölbl rightfully critiques this methodology which begins with a presumed conclusion (1979: 90–91).

not be dismissed too readily, and these two scarabs cannot certainly be said to date to the reign of Siamun. One must look to broader sets of data to determine whether the High or Low Chronology is preferred. Possibly scarabs of Siamun alone cannot solve the debate over the High and Low Chronologies.

ANALYSIS OF TYPOLOGICAL FORMS: SCARABS WITH THE ROYAL TITULARY

This study has assembled the corpus of royal scarabs from the 19th and 20th Dynasties, which come from archaeological contexts in the Southern Levant. The corpus demonstrates both the strengths and weaknesses of this methodology. First, the corpus is quite limited in size. While there are many scarabs with a portion of the royal titulary engraved on their bases, only 86 royal scarabs of known, Southern Levantine provenance are unambiguously assigned to only one king during the 19th Dynasty, 20th Dynasty, and the early Third Intermediate Period. Scarabs with an abbreviated form of the birth name of Ramses, while numerous, could be assigned to a number of kings during the 19th or 20th Dynasties. Other scarabs have a portion of the royal titulary that matches multiple kings, like the throne-name of Ramses II and Sheshonq III. These factors limit the size of the corpus. Any typology founded on this corpus will have inherent limits.

In order to identify diachronic change from the Late Bronze IIB to the Iron I, we will divide the scarabs into two groups—those from the 19th Dynasty and those from the 20th Dynasty. These groups correspond broadly to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, respectively. There are no royal scarabs from the early part of the Third Intermediate Period due to decreased production of royal scarabs during this period and Egypt's retraction from its empire. Consequently, the corpus from the 20th Dynasty and the early

Third Intermediate Period is smaller than the 19th Dynasty corpus. The 19th Dynasty corpus has 61 scarabs while the later has 25 items. The 20th Dynasty corpus is less than half the size of the earlier group. Some glyptic items were broken or stolen, and this limits further the size of the two corpora.

This study will now compare the relative frequency of the typological forms of the heads, sides, and backs during the 19th and 20th Dynasties. In the tables below, the proportion of scarabs with a certain form during the earlier period will be compared with the proportion of scarabs with that same form from the later period. Unfortunately, the sample size for each period differs. The sample size affects the probability that the data collected is accurate. In the final two columns of each table, this study has calculated the probability that the change in distribution between the 19th and 20th Dynasties is statistically significant.

Changes in proportions are known to be less reliable, especially when the sample size is small. In this study, the corpus of scarabs from the 19th Dynasty is small while the 20th Dynasty corpus is even smaller. Therefore, the Z-test was performed to determine the probability that diachronic change did, in fact, occur. This test assumes a normal distribution.

The results are doubly blind. In other words, my data may attest that the A1 head increases in popularity from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty, but I do not know if this form of the head actually does increase or decrease. The *p*-value is said to be double-tailed. The *p*-value of the test is the likelihood that this study could be replicated with the same results as found here, when the proportions were, in fact, the same during the two periods. In other words, the *p*-value indicates how likely it is that the data I collected is,

in fact, false. Therefore, the lower the p -value, the higher the probability that the data collated here reflects what actually happened in the corpus of scarabs from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty. A p -value should be below 5% when a change between the 19th and 20th Dynasties is said to be statistically significant. If the p -value is below 30%, it may be said that there is some evidence that the data collected by this study reflects an actual change in the typology between the two corpora of scarabs.

Table 10 – Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Head on Scarabs with the Royal Name

Typological Form of the Head	19th Dynasty		20th Dynasty		Z-Value ⁷⁷	P-Value of the Test ⁷⁸
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
A1	18 ⁷⁹	39	8	57	-1.195	23%
A3	2	4	0	0	— ⁸⁰	—
A4	5	11	2	14	-0.289	77%
B2	9 ⁸¹	20	3	21	-0.080	94%
B5	1	2	1	7	-0.701	48%
B6	2	4	0	0	—	—
B8	1	2	0	0	—	—
D3	4	9	0	0	—	—
D4	3	7	2?	14?	-0.699	48%
D10	2	4	0	0	—	—
Total Number of Scarabs	46	—	14	—	—	—

⁷⁷ The Z-test is as follows: $Z = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_1 \hat{q}_1}{n_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2 \hat{q}_2}{n_2}}}$ where \hat{p}_1 or $\hat{p}_2 \neq 0$.

⁷⁸ The P-value indicates the likelihood that the test would be replicated with the same results when, in fact, P_1 and P_2 were the same, and there was no change between the two periods.

⁷⁹ One scarab had a head in the form of both A1 and B2. It was noted twice.

⁸⁰ As noted above, the Z-test can not be used when \hat{p}_1 or $\hat{p}_2 = 0$. Therefore, a dash has been inserted into the table at these points.

⁸¹ See previous footnote.

Overall three forms, which were popular in the 19th Dynasty, remain popular in the 20th Dynasty—A1, B2, and A4. It is tempting to conclude that the A1 head did become more popular in the 20th Dynasty. Based upon the Z-test, there is some evidence that the schematic form of the head—A1—did increase in popularity from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty, though ideally the P-value would be much lower. Also, forms which were represented by one or two scarabs during the 19th Dynasty were rarely even present in the corpus from the 20th Dynasty. This likely reflects the small sample size. A typology founded only upon royal scarabs of known provenance in the Southern Levant cannot speak about levels of production increasing and decreasing. Based upon this data alone, no change in the form of the head is diagnostically significant enough to distinguish between 19th and 20th Dynasty forms.

Engravers also add different details to the clypeus below the head. Some engravers add ridges to the clypeus that are parallel to the shaft of the scarab and extend to the bottom of the clypeus. Some scarabs add ridges at the top of the clypeus, but they tend to be fewer in number. Only rarely are horizontal ridges—perpendicular to the shaft of the scarab—engraved onto clypeus. Finally, the very end of the clypeus which rests on top of the shaft can be notched or grooved (see Fig. 1). The table below analyzes the clypeus to determine if any change is diagnostically significant for dating:

Table 11: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Clypeus on Scarabs with the Royal Name

Typological Form of Clypeus	19th Dynasty		20th Dynasty		Z-Value	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		

Ridged	21	49	4	29	-1.396	16%
1 line, top	5	12	3	21	-0.752	45%
2 lines, top	5	12	0	0	—	—
4 lines, top	1	2	0	0	—	—
Any lines, bottom⁸²	9	21	2	14	-0.627	53%
2 lines, bottom	1	2	1	7	-0.700	48%
3 lines, bottom	6	14	0	0	—	—
4 lines, bottom	2	5	0	0	—	—
5 lines, bottom	0	0	1	7	—	—
Horizontal ridge (perpendicular to shaft)	1	12	1	7	-0.593	55%
Not Ridged	23	53	10	71	-1.257	21%
Grooved / Notched adjacent to shaft	12	28	4	29	-0.071	94%
Not Grooved	30	70	10	71	-0.071	94%
Total Number of Scarabs	43	—	14	—	—	—

Most changes in the form of the clypeus cannot be said to be diagnostically significant between 19th and 20th Dynasty corpora. The Z-test determined that the variation in two variables was statistically significant. First, the number of scarabs with and without ridges varied significantly between the two periods. Second, scarabs with any sort of ridging decreased in the 20th Dynasty while the number of scarabs without any sort of ridging increased. This change is expected if scarabs made of faience increased in the later period. The study will return to the decreasing popularity in ridging later in this chapter where I form a scarab typology based on archaeological context. Beyond the change in the ridging, no significant diachronic change can be detected in the form of the clypeus between the two periods. Next, we will examine the sides of scarabs.

⁸² This is the total number of scarabs with any number of lines at the bottom. As such, this number is the sum of the next five lines.

Table 12: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Side of Scarabs with the Royal Name

Typological Form of Side	19th Dynasty		20th Dynasty		Z-Value	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
D1	6	13	1	6	-0.921	36%
D5	9	20	10	59	-2.931	0.3%
D6	21	46	3	18	-2.360	2%
D7	1	2	0	0	—	—
D8	1	2	0	0	—	—
E1	1	2	0	0	—	—
E5	1	2	0	0	—	—
E7	1	2	0	0	—	—
E9A	0	0	1	6	—	—
E11	4	9	1	6	-0.420	67%
E12	1	2	1	6	-0.654	51%
Total Number of Scarabs	46	—	17	—	—	—

One shift in the form of the legs is statistically significant. The number of scarabs with hirsute legs drops dramatically from 46% to 18% during the 20th Dynasty (D6) while the scarab legs, which are similarly constructed but lacking hair, increase markedly from 20% to 59% during the 20th Dynasty. The Z-test indicates that the two changes are highly likely to have occurred. In fact, the two shifts are likely related. The form of the legs remains the same, but increasingly the hair is not depicted in the 20th Dynasty. Again, this tendency toward schematization and omitting of detail is common on faience scarabs. As will be shown in the final section of this chapter, scarabs with the royal titulary in foundation deposits from Egypt itself increasingly are made of faience during

the 20th Dynasty. The decreasing detail may be related to a change in medium occurring on royal scarabs during the 20th Dynasty.

Next, this study will examine the engraved features on the backs of the scarab—humeral callosities, the division between the elytra, the division between the pronotum and the elytra, and a recessed line along the edges of the elytra.

Table 13: Probability of Typological Change of the Form fo the Back of Scarabs with the Royal Name

Typological Form of the Back	19th Dynasty		20th Dynasty		Z-Value	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
2 Humeral Callosities	25	53	7 ⁸³	44	-0.626	53%
No line dividing the elytra	10	21	6 ⁸⁴	43	-1.517	13%
One line divides the elytra	31	66	8 ⁸⁵	57	-0.603	55%
Two lines divide the elytra	5	11	0	0	—	—
Three lines divide the elytra	1	2	0	0	—	—
No line divides the pronotum from the elytra	10	21	9 ⁸⁶	64	-3.042	0.2%
One line divides the pronotum from the elytra	32	68	8 ⁸⁷	57	-0.739	46%

⁸³ The total corpus has only 16 items so that n = 16 for the Z-test in this case.

⁸⁴ The total corpus has only 14 items so that n = 14 for the Z-test in this case.

⁸⁵ The total corpus has only 14 items so that n = 14 for the Z-test in this case.

⁸⁶ The total corpus has only 14 items so that n = 14 for the Z-test in this case.

⁸⁷ The total corpus has only 14 items so that n = 14 for the Z-test in this case.

Two lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	4	9	0	0	—	—
Three lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	1	2	0	0	—	—
No recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	26	55	12 ⁸⁸	80	-1.981	5%
Recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	19	40	5	33	-0.520	60%
Total Number of Scarabs	47	—	17	—	—	—

Again, the typological forms of the back remain generally stable from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty, except for one feature. Scarabs with no division between the elytra or between the pronotum and the elytra increase. Again, scarabs with the royal titulary tend toward less detail and greater schematization during the 20th Dynasty.

Overall this study shows that the typological form of the scarab generally remains stable from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty, but smaller details are omitted. Typological forms tend toward greater schematization in the 20th Dynasty. Hirsute legs become less popular in the 20th Dynasty, and the number of scarabs with no division between the elytra and the pronotum rises.

Two further observations should be stated. A number of typological forms that are said to be typical of the New Kingdom—especially the 19th Dynasty—are absent from the royal scarabs (Keel 1995: 51, Fig. 54–66). Rarely, if ever, did these forms appear

⁸⁸ The total corpus has only 15 items so that $n = 15$ for the Z-test in this case.

among the royal scarabs (1995: 51, Figs. 60–63). For instance, one form of the head became popular during the late 18th and 19th Dynasty, yet no scarab with the royal titulary uses this form (Eggler 2006: XVI, Fig. 1 [D10]). It seems likely that a different set of artisans engraved scarabs with the royal titulary. Were these artisans commissioned by the royal institutions? Or was there a more conservative tradition of scarab production for scarabs with the royal titulary, and many artisans knew this tradition? These artisans may even have replicated these conservative typological forms in order to add prestige to their items. While the precise nature of production may not be known presently, the typological forms crafted on scarabs with the royal titulary tend to be more conservative, introducing fewer innovations into the typology.

A SCARAB TYPOLOGY BASED UPON ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The second methodology forms a scarab typology based on a larger data set from certain archaeological contexts. Both Rowe and Tufnell based their typologies on this methodology, though they accomplished it with varying levels of success due to the archaeological method of each's day. Unlike earlier periods (Tufnell 1984; Ward 1978; Martin 1971), no broad, in-depth examination of scarab typology has occurred for the later New Kingdom since Rowe's discussion. Instead, there are fragmentary discussions of individual glyptic items in the final reports of different sites. It is key that such a study take place so that royal scarabs alone do not determine the scarab typology of this period because the royal corpus tend toward conservative engraving traditions. Below, this study looks at individual corpora from Late Bronze IIB and Iron I contexts. This study includes no scarabs from the transition between the two periods because the transitional period

spans the 19th and 20th Dynasties. By not including these scarabs, this study will be able to compare the results of a typology based on each methodology. With a larger data set, this study can examine trends among all scarabs and not just those with the royal titulary.

Each method has its own weaknesses. While a typology based on the royal titulary may suffer from posthumous production, a typology based on archaeological context suffers from the opposite problem: typological forms from earlier periods are present in later archaeological contexts. Later forms are not present, as long as excavators use sound archaeological method. A typology based on archaeological context is able to identify typological forms as residual due to their statistical infrequency in the corpus. Fewer and fewer heirlooms are present the later the context is from the date of the scarab's production. For instance, the number of heirlooms from the Second Intermediate Period in Late Bronze I contexts is greater than those in Late Bronze IIB contexts.

LATE BRONZE IIB CORPORA

This study will look only at archaeological contexts where the archaeological method was sufficiently advanced to ensure contexts were excavated in a more secure manner. This excludes scarabs from a number of sites. Sites—like Grant's excavation at Beth Shemesh, Free at Dothan, MacAlister's Semitic Periods at Gezer, Garstang at Jericho, Kelso at Bethel, Sellin at Ta'anach, Badé at Tell en-Naşbeh, and Seller at Beth Zur—were not excavated according to depositional units and cannot be included in this study. This study will also exclude other sites that were admirably excavated according to loci in the early 20th century, but the daily archaeological method was too imprecise, despite being progressive for their day (e.g., Tufnell *et al.* 1940, Pl. XXXIIA–XXXIIIB). This study

must also exclude scarabs from contexts which have been dated by heights, though they were excavated later in the 20th century (e.g., Brandl 2007a).

Other sites, like Rothenberg's work at Site 200 at Timnah, were excavated with an awareness of stratigraphy, yet their method of recording does not enable us to align consistently their stratigraphic observations with the material culture excavated. For instance, the scarabs are said to come from various loci. These loci refer to general areas of excavation rather than discrete depositional acts (Rothenberg 1988: 41–51). Locus 108 is in the southeastern portion of Site 200's structure, and locus 106 is in the southwestern area (Rothenberg 1988: 27, Illus. 10a). Two scarabs are said to come from these two loci (Schulman 1988: 137–139, Eg. Cat. 181* and 190*, Figs. 46:1 and 46:5). They come from a general region of the structure that corresponds to Loci 106 and 108 (Rothenberg 1988: 41–51), but the excavators did not record the precise location within the horizontal plane. Further, within each locus, multiple periods are present. The excavators were aware of the stratigraphic shifts between depositional units within the horizontally designated space of the locus. For instance, they recognized and recorded the olive green-grey interface within Locus 106 (Rothenberg 1988: 44–47). They recorded the relationship of some artefacts to that depositional unit, but not all. So this study cannot determine if these two scarabs were in secondary deposition within the Roman occupational debris of Phase 1 or the earlier New Kingdom occupational debris of Strata III or IV. In only a few instances do the excavators describe the relationship of scarabs to those depositional acts (e.g., Rothenberg 1988: 58 [Eg. Cat. 193*] and 66 [Eg. Cat. 187]). Consequently, only one glyptic can be said to come from a New Kingdom archaeological context, though it is likely true that a number of these items were found in these contexts.

Scarabs coming from Deir el-Balah’s illegal excavations by Moshe Dayan have also been excluded since the site was occupied in multiple periods from the Late Bronze IIB through the Iron II.⁸⁹ Scarabs from contexts where the associated ceramic assemblage have not been published are also not included in the typology at this time because the date of their archaeological context remains uncertain (e.g., Keel 1997: 626–631 [Akko 271, 274–277, 281–282]). Scarabs from tombs of one period will be incorporated into the data set.⁹⁰ Though the archaeological method may be lacking in the excavation of certain tombs, the tomb itself functions as a “sealed” archaeological context. For instance, the tombs at Tell el-Far’ah (South), though excavated early in the 20th century, can be incorporated when they were short in duration, and analysis of the ceramics has been updated (e.g., Braunstein 1998).⁹¹

As the earlier study of royal scarabs separated the 19th from 20th Dynasty, this study will compare the corpora of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Contexts that span the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA will not be included because they may reflect both the 19th and 20th Dynasties.

Table 14 – Scarabs from Late Bronze IIB Contexts

⁸⁹ This is truly unfortunate. The corpus is large and valuable. The corpus seems to support the idea that certain forms—like the D10 head—are not only present in the Late Bronze IIB but popular. Unfortunately, because of Dayan’s so-called excavation technique nothing further can be stated.

⁹⁰ The tombs of Megiddo, as published by Guy, do not distinguish between Late Bronze IIA and Late Bronze IIB burials (Guy 1938: 141). Unfortunately, they cannot be included until their pottery is reassessed.

⁹¹ Tell el-‘Ağul has tombs with scarabs, and the tombs have been dated to the Late Bronze IIB. However, unlike Tell el-Far’ah (South), Petrie’s pottery has not been reassessed. Because this has not yet occurred, these tombs have been excluded from the typology.

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Aphek 4	Stamp Impression						
Aphek 5	B6	Trapezoid	Ridged (five, bottom), Not Grooved	D8	0	0	None
Aphek 6	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D10	0	Notched / 0	None
Aphek 7	E10	Trapezoid	Ridged (horizontal with ridging on head), Not Grooved	E8	0	Notched / 0	Recessed (short line), No
Aphek 8	Ring						
Aphek 11	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	—	0	Notched / 0	None
Aphek 23	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), ?	E11	0	I / I	None
Aphek 24	B1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D5	0	I / II	None
Aphek 25 ⁹²	D4	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	None
Aphek 29	-	-	-	E9	-	-	-

⁹² This item is made of faience. As expected, it is less detailed.

Aphek 34	Cowroid						
Ashdod 3	D8	Triangle	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D5	0	Notched / 0	None
Ash- kelon 109	E2	Inverted Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E5	0	I / I	None
Azor 20	D5	Trapezoid	Ridged (four or five, top), Not Grooved	D6	0	II / II	None
Azor 21 ⁹³	G1	None	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Deir el- Balah (Brandl 2010: 207– 208, No. 1, Fig. 18.1: 1) ⁹⁴	Seal Impression						
Deir el- Balah (Brandl 2010: 210– 211, No. 3, Fig. 18.1:3)	Seal Impression						

⁹³ Because the scarab is not made of steatite, the features are increasingly schematic.

⁹⁴ This scarab comes from Stratum IX, assigned to the Late Bronze IIA by Dothan (T. Dothan 2010). This date was challenged based on what seems to be a rightful reassessment of the stratigraphy and pottery (Killebrew *et al.* 2006). Therefore, these scarabs have been included here.

Beit Mirsim 11 ⁹⁵	D10	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E5	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Beth Shean 16 ⁹⁶	G1 ⁹⁷	None	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 17 ⁹⁸	A1	None	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	Notched / 0	None
Beth Shean 18	-	-	-	E11	-	-	None
Beth Shean 19	G1	None	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	0	0	None
Beth Shean 20	A6	-	-	E7	0	0	None
Beth Shean 21	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom to top), Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Beth Shean 22	A3	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 23	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	None

⁹⁵ While one might rightfully question the excavation technique of early 20th century excavations, Albright notes explicitly the depositional location of this scarab. This item was found in the burned debris of Stratum C, which was under the Strata of B (1932b: 52).

⁹⁶ This scarab is made of faience, and the features are highly schematic.

⁹⁷ Keel classifies the head as A1, but this feature will fail to distinguish those items that have a lunate head and those that have no head and clypeus indicated. In this study, the latter is classified as G1 following Eggler (2006: XVI).

⁹⁸ Again, this item is faience. Its features are schematic.

Beth Shean 24	D1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom)	E11	0	Ridged Horizontally along Line of Pro-notum	None
Beth Shean 25	Duck Scaraboid						
Beth Shean 26	Oval Plate						
Beth Shean 27	Round Plate with Handle						
Beth Shean 29	A8 ⁹⁹	Trapezoid	Ridged (two, top), Grooved	D6	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 30	D4	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 32	D4	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	?	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 33	G1	None	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 34	Oval Bifacial Plate						
Beth Shean 40	Ring						
Beth Shean 41	Bifacial Rectangular Plaque						

⁹⁹ Keel classifies this as A3, but there is a clear circular line engraved inside the head.

Beth Shean 111	A8	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, top to bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Recesed, Yes
Beth Shean 113 ¹⁰⁰	G1	None	-	D1	0	0 / I	None
Beth Shean 114	A1	Curved	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / II	None
Beth Shean 115	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 127 ¹⁰¹	A1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D1	0	0	None
Beth Shean 128	B8	Trapezoid	Ridged (4 lines, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	0	0	None
Beth Shean 129	A5	Trapezoid	Ridged (five, bottom; one, top), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recesed, No
Beth Shean 130	A1	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 131 ¹⁰²	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None

¹⁰⁰ This item is made of faience, and the features are schematic.

¹⁰¹ Again, this item is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

¹⁰² This scarab is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

Beth Shean 133	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Beth Shean 139 ¹⁰³	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 142 ¹⁰⁴	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	Recessed, Yes
Beth Shean 144 ¹⁰⁵	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 150	Ring						
Beth Shean 152	Oval Plate with Handle						
Beth Shean 209	E2	Rectangular	Ridged (three, from top to bottom), Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Beth Shean 224	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Beth Shean 225	D2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Beth Shean 226	B6	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, top; four, bottom)	D6	0	0	None
Beth Shean 227 ¹⁰⁶	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None

¹⁰³ This scarab is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

¹⁰⁴ This scarab is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

¹⁰⁵ This scarab is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

¹⁰⁶ This scarab is made of faience, and its features are schematic.

Beth Shean 228	D4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; four, bottom)	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, Yes
Dor 51	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom; one, top)	D6 ¹⁰⁷	0	0	None
Dor 54	Scaraboid						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 150	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 471	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 472 ¹⁰⁸	G1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 474	D5 ¹⁰⁹	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E5	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 475	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 476	D10 (chec-ke-red)	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	II / II	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 477	D10	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	Notched / 0	None
Tell el-Far'ah	D3 ¹¹⁰	Trapezoid	Not Ridged,	E12	0	Notched / 0	None

¹⁰⁷ While Keel classified this item as E9a, it is clearly hirsute.

¹⁰⁸ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹⁰⁹ Keel classified this head as D4. It seems there are ridges on the lateral sides of the head.

¹¹⁰ Keel classified this head as D4. There are ridges on the lateral sides, however.

(South) 478			Not Grooved				
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 479	D10	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	II / II	None
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 484	D10	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, horizontal), Not Grooved	E5	0	0	Reces- sed, No (angled lines around back end of the shaft)
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 485	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	0	II / II	None
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 513	Fish Scaraboid						
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 514	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; four, bottom)	E12	0	I / I	None
Tell el- Far'ah (South) 777	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; three, bottom)	?	0	I / I	None
Gath / Tell es- Safi 44	Bifacial Rectangular Plaque						
Gath / Tell es- Safi 58 ¹¹¹	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	None
Gath / Tell es- Safi (Keel and	Bifacial Rectangular Plaque						

¹¹¹ This item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

Münger 2012: 457, No. 4, Pl. 18.2:1)							
Gath / Tell es- Safi (Keel and Münger 2012: 457, No. 5, Pl. 18.2:2)	D8 / B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Gath / Tell es- Safi (Keel and Münger 2012: 458, No. 11, Pl. 18.3:3)	Scaraboid						
Gezer 650	A1	Curved	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	Notched / 0	None
Hazor 64	B9	Curved	Ridged (five, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Tel Jerishe 17	Bifacial Oval Plate						
Tel Jerishe 18	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	2	I / I	None

Tel Jerishe 19	A1	Curved	Ridged (five, bottom)	E5	0	II / III	None
Tel Jerishe 23	<i>wḏ't</i> -eye Scaraboid						
Tel Jerishe 40	D10	Circular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E2	0	Notched / 0	None
Lachish (Gi-veon 1988: 82–83 [No. 94])	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 145, Pls. 152: 205, 159: 205)	A6 / B2	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 145, Pls. 152: 178, 158: 178)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Recessed (curved), No
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 146; Pls. 152: 190,	A6	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; five, bottom)	D6	0	Notched / 0	None

158: 190)							
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 146, Pls. 152: 208, 159: 208)	-	-	-	E12	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 148, Pls. 152: 187, 158: 187)	-	-	-	E11	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 148, Pls. 152: 186, 158: 186)	A1	Trapezoid	?	D5	0	Notched / 0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 153, Pls. 152: 207, 158: 207)	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D4	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948:	Unknown, Not Shown on Plates						

154, Pl. 152: 194)							
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 154, Pls. 152: 200, 158: 200)	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 154, Pls. 152: 201, 158: 201)	Scaraboid						
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 154, Pls. 152: 195, 158: 195)	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D4	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 154, Pls. 152: 196, 158: 196)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	D4	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Loud	A1	?	Not Ridged,	E2	0	0	None

1948: 155, Pls. 152: 198, 158: 198) ¹¹²			Not Grooved				
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 155, Pls. 152: 197, 158: 197)	Scaraboid						
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 155, Pls. 152: 193, 158: 193) ¹¹³	A1?	Trape- zoid?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D1	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 170, 158: 170)	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E4	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152:	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None

¹¹² This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹¹³ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

173, 158: 173) ¹¹⁴							
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 174, 158: 174)	D3	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	E7	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 182, 158: 182) ¹¹⁵	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 169, 158: 169)	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 171,	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E2	0	0	None

¹¹⁴ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹¹⁵ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

158: 171) ¹¹⁶							
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 199, 158: 199) ¹¹⁷	?	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E2	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 172, 158: 172) ¹¹⁸	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 156, Pls. 152: 202, 158: 202)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (lines, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 158, Pls. 152: 180, 158: 180)	A1?	Trapezoid	Not Ridged? Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces- sed

¹¹⁶ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹¹⁷ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹¹⁸ This scarab is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

Megido (Loud 1948: 158, Pls. 152: 183, 158: 183)	A1	Curved	Ridged (lines at bottom)	E1	0	0	None
Megido (Loud 1948: 163, Pls. 152: 206, 159: 206)	D8	Triangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / II	None
Megido (Loud 1948: 163, Pls. 152: 188, 158: 188)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom; one, top?), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces- sed (cur- ved), No
Megido (Loud 1948: 163, Pls. 152: 189, 158: 189)	A1	Trape- zoid?	Ridged, Not Grooved	?	0?	I / I	?
Megido (Loud 1948: 163, Pls.	D10	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, horizontal), Not Grooved	E4	0	II / II	None

152: 175, 159: 175)							
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 163, Pls. 152: 176, 159: 176)	D8	Triangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	Notched / 0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 165, Pls. 152: 177, 158: 177)	?	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E7	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 171, Pls. 152: 209, 159: 209)	D8	Curved	Ridged (seven, bottom)	?	0	0	None
Megid- do (Loud 1948: 171, Pls. 152: 204, 159: 204)	A1?	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / II	None
Megid- do	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged,	E11	0	I / I	None

(Loud 1948: 176, Pls. 152: 184, 158: 184) ¹¹⁹			Not Grooved				
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 181, Pls. 152: 203, 159: 203)	A1	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D1	0	I / I	None
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 182, Pls. 152: 179, 158: 179)	D8	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	Notched / 0	None
Megiddo (Loud 1948: 187, Pls. 152: 185, 158: 185)	?	?	?	E11	0	0	None
Timnah (Schulman 1988: 139, Eg.	B2	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None

¹¹⁹ This item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

Cat. 193*, Fig. 46.7)							
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

SCARABS FROM IRON I CONTEXTS

Scarabs discussed in this section will correspond to the 20th Dynasty and Third Intermediate Period. Scarabs from Iron I contexts are securely dated to these Egyptian dynasties. By structuring the two corpora in this way, this study will compare the two methodologies of scarab typologies to determine their relative weaknesses and strengths. This means that scarabs from periods that spanned the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA—like Tell el-Far’ah (South)—have not been included because the period of use of these tombs was too long. While far less egregious, the scarabs from Strata VI (Lower) and VI at Beth Shean that span the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA have also been excluded (e.g., Keel 2010a: 108–111 [Beth Shean 28, 31]).

Scarabs from sites dated to the Iron I whose ceramics have not been adequately published are also excluded from this study. As noted above, the scarabs from Tell el-‘Ağul tombs have been assigned a date by Petrie (1932), but their pottery has not been reassessed recently. Without a reassessment, archaeological contexts may or may not be accurately dated, and I cannot conclude whether the scarabs are certainly from Iron I contexts (e.g., Keel 1997: 174–175 and 188–189 [Tell el-‘Ağul 210 and 257]).

This study also excludes more recent excavations, like those scarabs from Achziv, which Prausnitz excavated and assigned to the Iron I. Giveon first published a number of these scarabs. Giveon reported the dates of each archaeological context, but the pottery from the tombs had not been published. In fact, the date of a key cist tomb for this

study—Tomb 1009—changed throughout Prausnitz’s publications. Initially, he dated the tombs on the tell to the 11th century¹²⁰ (Prausnitz 1969: 85–91), and later he redated Tomb 1009 to the first half of the 11th century based on the finds in Tomb 979 (Prausnitz 1997: 22–23; E. Mazar 2001: 16, Footnote 5). Later Mazar dated the Eastern Cemetery in which Cist Tomb 1009 was located, to the 10th century based on the absence of one Cypriot import—the White Painted Barrel juglet (Mazar 2001: 10). However, Dayagi-Mendels reports that the White Painted Barrel juglet was found in Tomb 17 of the eastern cemetery (ZR) (Dayagi-Mendels 2002). Mazar notes that this vessel was reported as part of Tomb 17 of the Southern Cemetery (Z) rather than the eastern (ZR). Without proper publication of Prausnitz’s excavations at Achziv, problems will persist. Therefore, scarabs from Prausnitz’s excavations have been excluded from this study (e.g., Giveon 1988: 26–30, Nos. 10, 11, and 12, Pl. 1.10–12; Keel 1997: 52–53 [Achziv 92–94]).

Purchased scarabs have also been excluded. This eliminates the Akko corpus that likely has many Iron I seals. While Keel included it in his catalogue of provenanced seals (1997: 530–637), Giveon and Kersetz noted that the corpus came from both locals and grave robbers (1986: 7).

Table 15 – Scarabs from Iron I Contexts

Scarab	Head	Clypeus (Shape)	Clypeus (Ending)	Side	Humeral Callosities	Elytra	Edges of Elytra
Aphek 17	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom; one, top), Not Grooved	D6 ¹²¹	2	I / I	Recessed?

Aphek 31	D3	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D8	0	Notched / 0	None
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 235– 237, No. 1) ¹²²	D9	Triangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	Notched / 0	None
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 237– 238, No. 2)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None

¹²⁰ Eilat Mazar states that Prausnitz dated this set of tombs to the 10th century (Mazar 2001: 16, Footnote 5), but a close reading of Prausnitz's text shows that he was only dating the so-called warrior tomb to the 10th century.

¹²¹ This scarab was unfortunately stolen. Giveon published a photo and drawing of the scarab's back and base, but not the side view (Giveon 1988: 46–48, No. 40). The drawing of the scarab's back indicates that the legs were hirsute. When the hirsute legs are visible from above, the scarab is often the form D6.

¹²² The excavators argue that the site was founded in the second half of the 13th century and then ceased to exist in the first half of the 12th century (Zertal 2012: 51–54). If this were the case, a number of the scarabs would have likely been produced during the Late Bronze IIB. However, as Zertal states, his proposed dates contradict the radiocarbon dating of the site (Zertal 2012: 52; see also Sharon *et al.* 2007: 11–12, 14, and 25), which places the site in the latter half of the Iron I period (Zertal 2012: 51–53). The radiocarbon date of the stratum was determined by twelve olive pits taken from one oil press in Area C1 (Locus 4348); short-lived samples like olive pits tend to give more reliable dates. The number of samples also increases the reliability of the date of the olive press. Sharon *et al.* noted that there was no reliable way to seriate the hill country sites during the Iron I. Instead, the radiocarbon date can only be said broadly to be Iron I (Sharon *et al.* 2007: 12).

Unfortunately, all of the samples come from only one context in Area C1 (Lavie-Alons 2012: 111–112). Zertal hypothesizes that these short-lived samples could have been wrong due to inaccuracies in sampling or continued use of the oil press after abandonment of the site (Zertal 2012: 52–53). The samples can only be said to date the olive press in that area. The room U310 in which the oil press was found was constructed with walls built secondarily (Wall 4314 and Wall 4304) to the wall that abuts the city wall (Wall 3360¹²²). It is possible, though not definitive, that the oil press was secondary stratigraphically to the other buildings of the area. Because radiocarbon dating does not offer greater precision in dating the site beyond a broad Iron I date for the olive press, ceramics must be relied upon to adjudicate between the radiocarbon date and the date proposed by Zertal.

Be'eri and Cohen analyze the pottery as Late Bronze IIB and Iron I (Be'eri and Cohen 2012: 181–224). Sam Wolff raises essential questions about the quantitative analysis of the pottery that would permit one to date the site to the Iron IA instead of the late Iron I (2014: 172–174). Wolff asks: How many Late Bronze cooking pots (CP1–2) occur as opposed to Iron I cooking pots (CP 3–5)? Do they occur in distinct contexts or mixed together? Wolff argues that these statistics would enable the ceramic expert to place the site in the transition from the Late Bronze IIB to the early Iron Age instead of the last half of the Iron I. Because this analysis was not done, it is possible that the site was occupied in the later Iron I. In fact, Sam Wolff argues the site was occupied throughout the Iron I.

Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 241–243, No. 4)	Rectangular Bifacial Plaque						
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 243–244, No. 5)	Scaraboid						
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 244–245, No. 6)	B2	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; five, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces- sed, No
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 246–247, No. 7)	D4	Unclear	Ridged (three, top to bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 247–249, No. 8)	B5	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 249–255, No. 9)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Aḥwat (Brandl 2012a: 255–257, No. 10)	A1	Curved	Ridged (three to four, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None

Ahwat (Brandl 2012a: 260–261, No. 12)	D8 ¹²³	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Arad 21	Lion Scaraboid						
Ashdod 3	D8	Triangular	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D5	0	Notched / 0	None
Ashdod 4	Round Plate						
Ashdod 5	Scarab is missing. There is only an image of the base.						
Ashdod 27	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Ashdod 58	-	-	-	D5	0	I / -	None
Ashdod 59	A1	Curved	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	?	0	I / I	None
Ashdod 60	Scarab was stolen. There are only an image and impression of the base.						
Ashdod 61	Scarab was stolen. There are only an image and impression of the base.						
Ashdod 62	Scarab was stolen. There are only an image and impression of the base.						
Ashdod 63	Scarab was stolen. There are only an image and impression of the base.						
Ashdod 65	Scarab was stolen. There are only an image and impression of the base.						

¹²³ This head is slightly different from the form designated by Tufnell (1984: 32, Fig. 12). The inset triangle on the head opens up to the pronotum, and there is no line dividing the pronotum from the head.

Azor 1	B2 ¹²⁴	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	E1	0	0	None
Beth Shean 7	B10	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 8	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	Notched / 0	None
Beth Shean 9	D10	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	I / III	None
Beth Shean 10	E2	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Beth Shean 11	Scaraboid						
Beth Shean 12	G1	?	Ridged (horizontal), Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Beth Shean 13	D3	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	Notched / 0	None
Beth Shean 14	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 35	Scaraboid						
Beth Shean 59	A1	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 61	G1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 204 ¹²⁵	G1	-	-	E12	-	-	-

¹²⁴ The top of the head extends into the pronotum in a triangular shape.

¹²⁵ I have not seen this item. There is no image of its back, head, and sides. I am relying on the assessment of Keel, here (Keel 2010a: 186–187 [Bet-Schean 204]).

Beth Shean 222	A4	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; six, bottom)	D6	0	0	None
Beth Shean 223	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 229	G1	-	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	Reces- sed, No
Beth Shean 230 ¹²⁶	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 231	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 232	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 233	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2	I / I	None
Beth Shean 234	A4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Beth Shean 235	A5	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; four, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	0	II / II	Reces- sed, No
Beth Shean 236	B10	Rectangu- lar	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E9A	0	Notched / 0	None
Beth Shean 237	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Reces- sed, No
Beth Shean 238	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Beth Shean 239 ¹²⁷	A1	Rectangu- lar	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None

¹²⁶ This item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹²⁷ This item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

Beth Shean 240	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D1	0	0	None
Beth Shean 241	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Beth Shean 242	Rectangular Bifacial Plaque						
Beth Shean 243	Domed Rectangular Plaque						
Beth Shean 244	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Beth Shean 245	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 246	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 247	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 248	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 249	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 250	Stamp Impression						
Beth Shean 251	Stamp Impression						
Dan 18	Rectangular Plaque with Domed Back						
Dan 19	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Dor 23	D10	Rectangular	Ridged (one, horizontal), Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	None

Dor 29	B5	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom)	E11	2	I / I	None
Dor 35	A6	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Reces-sed, No
Dor 55	A6	Trapezoid	Ridged (lines, bottom), Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	None
Dor 56	A3	Rectangu-lar	Ridged (one top; ?), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces-sed, No
Dor 59	Seal Impression						
Ebal 1	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E9A	0	Notched / 0	None
Ebal 2	A1	?	Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces-sed, No
Ebal 3	So-Called Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Ekron 2	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	Reces-sed, No
Ekron 3	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (2, top; ?), ?	D5	2	I / I	Reces-sed (cur-ved), No
Ekron 4	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	-	-	-
Ekron 8	Ring						
Ekron 16	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	2	I / I	Reces-sed, No
Ekron 18	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	2 (right angle)	I / I	None
Ekron 20	Ring						

Ekron 21 ¹²⁸	-	-	-	D5	0	0	None
Ekron 30	-	-	-	E11	-	-	-
Ekron 31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ekron 46	Finger Ring						
Ekron 47	B2	Circular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E2	0	0	None
Ekron 52	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / 0	None
Ekron 64	Seal Impression						
Ekron 69	Oval Plate with Bundled Handle						
Ekron 70	Seal Impression						
Ekron 71	Seal Impression						
Ekron 72	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Ekron 73	Seal Impression						
Ekron 74	Seal Impression						
Horvat Eleq 2	B2	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Tell 'Aitun 3	Conoid Stamp Seal						

¹²⁸ This item is made of faience. Its features are less detailed.

Tell 'Aitun 4	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Tell 'Aitun 5	Scaraboid						
Tell 'Aitun 6	Rectangular Bifacial Plaque						
Tell 'Aitun 8 ¹²⁹	B2	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Tell 'Aitun 9	B5	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	I / I	None
Tell 'Aitun 10	Rectangular Bifacial Plaque						
Tell 'Aitun 11	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Tell 'Aitun 12	Cowroid with Lateral Ladders on Each Side						
Tell 'Aitun 13	F1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	Double V-Shape in Center	None
Tell el-Far'ah (North) 36	D3	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	?	0	Notched / 0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 151	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 152	Fish Scaraboid						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 153	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	None

¹²⁹ Item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

Tell el-Far'ah (South) 154	B5	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 155	A6	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; five, bottom)	D5	0	II / II	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 156	A6	Trapezoid	Ridged (three from top to bottom), Not Grooved	D6	0	I / 0	Recessed
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 157	Conoid / Scaraboid						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 158	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Recessed, No
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 159	D4	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D6	2	I / I	?
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 160 ¹³⁰	A1	?	Not Ridged? Not Grooved?	D5?	0	0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 161	G1	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	?	0	I / ?	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 198	Location of scarab is unknown. There are no images of its side, back, or head.						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 218	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	0	None
Tell el-Far'ah	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	2 (square)	I / I	Recessed, ?

¹³⁰ Item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

(South) 219							
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 220	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 221	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 226	Location of scarab is unknown. There are no images of its side, back, or head.						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 227	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 228	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top; three, bottom)	E9A	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 229	E2	Trapezoid	Ridged (3, bottom; 1, top; triangle engraved onto pronotum above the head), Not Grooved	E11	2 (double lines forming right triangle)	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 232	B2	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E9A	0	I / 0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 237	Rectangular plaque with domed back on which a cartouche is engraved						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 250	E2	Trapezoid	Ridged (two, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I (incomplete lines)	None
Tell el-Far'ah	Conoid Stamp Seal						

(South) 256							
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 264	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 268	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 269	D4	?	Ridged (two, bottom), Not Grooved	E9A	2 (right angle triangle)	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 270	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), ?	D5	2 (vertical lines drawn in humeral callosi- ties)	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 271	Oval Plaque with Bundled Handle						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 285	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 288	Domed Rectangular Plaque						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 289	Oval Plaque with Bundled Handle						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 290	Rectangular Plaque with Domed Back						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 291	Rectangular Bifacial Plaque						

Tell el-Far'ah (South) 292	A3	Trapezoid	Ridged (two, top; 3threebottom), Not Grooved	E11	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 296	Ring						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 297	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 384	Cowroid with ladder decoration on lateral sides						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 385 ¹³¹	A8	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 927 ¹³²	A1?	?	?	D1?	0?	0	None
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 928 ¹³³	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 929 ¹³⁴	Scaraboid						
Tell el-Far'ah (South) 932	A1	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	?	0	Notched / 0	None
Tel Jerishe 7	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						

¹³¹ The item is made of faience. The form is schematic.

¹³² The item is made of faience. The form is schematic.

¹³³ The item is made of faience. The form is schematic.

¹³⁴ The item is made of faience. The form is schematic.

Tel Jerishe 27	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	Notched / 0	None
Tel Jerishe 38	Oval Plaque with Bundled Handle						
Tel Jerishe 39	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Tel Jerishe 45	D10	Rectangular	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E9	2	II / II	None
Gezer 639 ¹³⁵	B9	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E10	0	I / I	None
Gezer 643	B12	Rectangular	Ridged (lines, bottom)	E12	0	I / I	None
Gezer 646	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	2	I / I	None
Gezer 647	-	-	-	E9A	2	I / I	Recessed, ?
Gezer 651 ¹³⁶	D4	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	Recessed?
‘Izbet Šarṭah (Givon 1986: 104, Fig. 25)	D8	Inverted triangle	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E4	0	Notched / 0	None
Tel Keisan (Keel 1990b: 195–	D8 ¹³⁷	Triangle	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E10	0	I / I	None

¹³⁵ Item is made of faience. It has more detail than is typical for faience scarabs.

¹³⁶ This scarab is only known from a drawing because the scarab was lost (Dever 1986: Pl. 61.14). Therefore, the form of the scarab has been concluded based on this drawing.

¹³⁷ The head is formed by two triangles that meet. The form of the head is not exactly like B2, nor is it completely like B8, yet the two superimposed triangles forming the head and the clypeus seems closest to what the engraver was attempting to achieve.

204 [No. 10])							
Tel Keisan (Keel 1990b: 246 [No. 30])	Seal Impression						
Tel Keisan (Keel 1990b: 246–247, [No. 31])	Seal Impression						
Tell Kinrot (Mün-ger 2007: 83–85, No. 1, Fig. 1)	D3	Trapezoid	Ridged (one, top), Not Grooved	E9	-	Notched / 0	None
Lachish (Giv-eon 1988: 86–87, No. 99)	-	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved (three at base)	D6	-	-	Reces-sed, No
Lachish (Giv-eon 1988: 88–89, No. 102)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (horizontal hashing)	D5	2	I / I	None
Lachish (Giv-eon 1988: 90–91, No. 106)	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Grooved	D6	0	I / I	Reces-sed, No

Lachish (Gi- veon 1988: 90–91, No. 107)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	D4	0	0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 1, Pl. 39:1)	?	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D6	0	I / I	None?
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 2, Pl. 39:2)	A1	?	Ridged (four, bottom), Not Grooved	E11	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 3, Pl. 39:3)	?	?	?	?	0	? / I	?
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 4, Pl. 39:4)	G1?	-	?	?	?	?	?
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 5,	A1	Trapezoid	?	?	2 (right)	I / I	None

Pl. 39:5)							
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 6, Pl. 39:6)	-	-	-	?	-	-	-
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 7, Pl. 39:7)	A1	Trapezoid	Not Ridged? Not Grooved	D5	2	I / I	Reces- sed, No
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 8, Pl. 39:8)	Scaraboid						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 9, Pl. 39:9)	A1	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 10, Pl. 39:10)	-	-	-	D5	0	I / I	None?
Megid- do (Har- rison	A1?	?	?	D5	0	0	None

2004: No. 11, Pl. 39:11)							
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 12, Pl. 39:12)	D8	Triangle	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E4	0	0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 13, Pl. 39:13)	Oval Bifacial Plate						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 14, Pl. 39:14)	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged (three, bottom), Not Grooved	D5?	0	I / I	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 15, Pl. 39:15)	Fish Scaraboid?						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 16, Pl. 39:16)	Scaraboid?						
Megid- do	Scaraboid						

(Harrison 2004: No. 17, Pl. 39:17)							
Megid-do (Harrison 2004: No. 18, Pl. 39:18)	G1	-	Ridged (lines, bottom), Not Grooved	E5	0	I / I	None
Megid-do (Harrison 2004: No. 19, Pl. 39:19)	B6	Rectangular	Ridged (two, top; three, bottom), ?	E10	0	Notched / 0	None
Megid-do (Harrison 2004: No. 20, Pl. 39:20)	A1	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	D5	0	0	None
Megid-do (Harrison 2004: No. 21, Pl. 39:21)	B5 ¹³⁸	-	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Megid-do (Harrison 2004: No. 22,	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E4	-	-	-

¹³⁸ While the clypeus is wide, as the form G1 indicates, the head is engraved as a semi-circle within the pronotum.

Pl. 39:22)							
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 23, Pl. 39:23)	D4	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E12	0	Notched / 0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 24, Pl. 39: 24) ¹³⁹	B2?	?	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E11	0	0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 25, Pl. 39:25)	The item's base is only shown in publication.						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 26, Pl. 39:26) ¹⁴⁰	B2	Trapezoid	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E5	0	0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 27,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹³⁹ This item is made of faience. Its features are schematic.

¹⁴⁰ The excavators report that the item is made of blue paste (Guy 1938: Pl. 152). Therefore, its features have little definition.

Pl. 39:27)							
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: No. 28, Pl. 39:28)	B2	Rectangu- lar	Not Ridged, Not Grooved	E4	0	Notched / 0	None
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: Pl. 40:1)	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: Pl. 40:2)	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: Pl. 40:3)	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: Pl. 40:4)	Conoid Stamp Seal						
Megid- do (Har- rison 2004: Pl. 40:5)	Oval Plate with Handle						

Tell en-Naşbeh (Mc-Cown 1947: 149, Pl. 54:34; Shuval 1990: 143 No. 44)	Plate						
Tell en-Naşbeh (Mc-Cown 1947: 153–154, Pl. 55:81; Shuval 1990: 139, No. 35)	Impression						
Qasile (Maisler 1967: 64–67, Fig. 2)	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						
Qasile (Mazar 1985: 18–19, Fig. 6.1, Photo 15) ¹⁴¹	A1	Trapezoid	Ridged, Not Grooved	D6?	0	I / –	None
Qasile (Mazar 1950–1951c: Pl. 36c)	Pyramidal Stamp Seal						

¹⁴¹ This scarab is made of faience. It has more detail than is standard for faience scarabs. There was one additional scarab from Tel Qasile. Its stratigraphic location was uncertain, and it has not been included here (Mazar 1985: 19–20, Fig. 6.2).

Rehov (Keel and Mazar 2009: 65*, Fig. 6.2)	Keel and Mazar only published an impression of the base and a discussion of its archaeological context.
Shiloh (Brandl 1993b: 215– 216 [No. 14])	Seal Impression
Shiloh (Brandl 1993b: 216– 217 [No. 15])	Round Plate
Shiloh (Brandl 1993b: 217– 218 [No. 16])	Pyramidal Stamp Seal
Shiloh (Fin- kelstein <i>et al.</i> 1985: 59, Pl. 20:4; Shuval 1990: 158, No. 80)	Jar Impression
Shiq- mona (Elga- vish 1977: Pl. IXb;	Ellipse?

Shuval 1990: 156, No. 75)	
Ta‘a- nach (Lapp 1967a: 34, Fig. 24; Shuval 1990: 153, No. 69)	Conoid
Ta‘a- nach (Lapp 1967a: 34–35, Fig. 24; Shuval 1990: 132, No. 17)	? ¹⁴²
Yoq- ne‘am (Ornan 2005: 349, No. 3)	Conoid

ANALYSIS OF SCARAB TYPOLOGY ACCORDING TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

This study will now look for diachronic change within the typological forms of scarabs from Late Bronze IIB and Iron I context. First, the study will look at heads to scarabs.

The distribution during the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I is as follows:

¹⁴² There is no image of the back, head, or side of this scarab in the publication (Lapp 1967a: Fig. 24).

Table 16: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Head of Scarabs

Organized by Archaeological Context

Typological Form of the Head	Late Bronze IIB		Iron I		Z-Value	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
A1	38	39	41	37	-0.297	77%
A3	3	3	5	5	-0.743	46%
A4	5	5	2	2	-1.167	24%
A5	1	1	1	1	0	100%
A6	3	3	4	4	-0.394	69%
A8	2	2	1	1	-0.588	56%
B1	1	1	0	0	—	—
B2	9	9	17	15	-1.347	18%
B5	0	0	5	5	—	—
B6	2	2	1	1	-0.588	56%
B8	1	1	0	0	—	—
B9	1	1	1	1	0	100%
B10	0	0	2	2	—	—
B12	0	0	1	1	—	—
D1	1	1	0	0	—	—
D2	1	1	0	0	—	—
D3	2	2	4	4	-0.856	39%
D4	6	6	6	5	-0.316	75%
D5	2	2	0	0	—	—
D8	6	6	5	5	-0.316	75%
D9	0	0	1	1	—	—
D10	7	7	3	3	-1.314	19%
E2	2	2	3	3	-0.465	64%
E10	1	1	0	0	—	—
F1	0	0	1	1	—	—
G1	6	6	7	6	0	100%
Total Number of Scarabs	98 ¹⁴³	—	111	—	—	—

Overall the distribution of forms of the head is remarkably similar for both the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. In almost all forms, there is only a two to three percent difference

¹⁴³ Two scarabs had two possible typological forms for the head. I counted each possibility as one value but then only divided by the total number of heads that were assigned a typological form.

between the two periods. The only forms to experience a shift greater than two to three percent are: B2, B5, and D10. Both B5 and B2 rise in popularity in the Iron I by five to six percentage points while D10 drops to a mere 3%. It is reasonable to conclude that the drop in frequency is due to the fact that D10 has likely become a form of the head present on heirlooms rather than continuously produced in the Iron I. As such, D10 is a head likely produced during the 19th Dynasty or Late Bronze IIB. The Z-test also indicates that there is some evidence that this shift did, in fact, occur. Further, scarabs with the D10 head have not been found in archaeological contexts dated only to the Late Bronze IIA or earlier. Excavations performed during the early 20th century did produce scarabs with this head from contexts dated to the whole Late Bronze II (e.g., Albright 1938: 70–72 and 86, Pl. 32:6; Grant 1934: 31, Fig. 3:7; Keel 2010a: 492–493, 502–503 [Dothan 5 and 29]), but the date of the production of D10 remains secure because of the broad date of these contexts and the questionable archaeological method of these excavations. One scarab with the D10 head is said to come from the Late Bronze I tomb, but this comes from the notoriously problematic excavations of MacAlister where the object was found in a dump which was later attributed to the tomb (1912: 301). Using the current data set, no example of a scarab with this head comes from a certain context prior to the Late Bronze IIB. The form does occur in Egypt (Petrie 1925: Pls. XXVIII [M11], XXIX [P85]; Petrie 1917: Pl. LXVIII, Nos. 50, 55, 78; Brunton and Engelbach 1927: Pl. XXIII, No. 4). This likely indicates that some scarabs with this head were produced in Egypt.

Idiosyncratic variations on the D10 head occur at Tell el-Far'ah (South). A checkered pattern is engraved on the head (Keel 2010b: 230–231, 242–243, 282–285, 316–317 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 476, 500, 597, and 677]; Keel 2013: 448–449 [Geser 657]). A

number of idiosyncratic forms occur on scarabs from Tell el-Far'ah (South), indicating possible local production in the Southern Levant. There is one instance of a checkered head that came from the antiquities market in Egypt, but its provenance is unknown (Petrie 1925: Pl. XXVII, No. 64).

Earlier in this chapter, the scarab typology based on the royal titulary suggested that the A1-head increased in popularity from the 19th to the 20th Dynasty. That typology was based on a sample size of fourteen scarabs for the 20th Dynasty. The larger sample of scarabs from archaeological contexts of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I shows no increase in production of the A1 head. The change is not likely to be diagnostically significant.

Noteworthy is the dramatic rise in the number of typological forms engraved on scarabs without the royal titulary. Some of these typological forms are present because the corpus is larger, and greater variation is more likely in a larger corpus. Additionally, the typological forms of scarabs from earlier periods—heirlooms—were inevitably found in later archaeological contexts, though they were absent from the analysis of scarabs with the royal titulary. When a scarab has the royal titulary of the late New Kingdom on its base, the engraving tradition is more conservative, and the engraver creates fewer forms. Typological forms that are relatively new and especially popular in the New Kingdom (e.g., Keel 1995: 51, Abb. 54–66) are rare or non-existent among the corpus of scarabs with the royal titulary of the late New Kingdom.

Table 17: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Clypeus of Scarabs
Organized by Archaeological Context

Typological Form of the Clypeus	Late Bronze IIB		Iron I		Z-Test	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
Ridged	41	43	45	41	-0.290	77%
1 line, top	14	15	14	13	-0.411	68%
2 lines, top	1	1	3	3	-1.040	30%
4 lines, top	2	2	0	0	—	—
Any lines, bottom¹⁴⁴	29	30	34	32	-0.309	76%
2 lines, bottom	0	0	2	2	—	—
3 lines, bottom	10	10	20	18	-1.671	9%
4 lines, bottom	11	11	6	6	-1.275	20%
5 lines, bottom	5	5	2	2	-1.155	25%
Numerous	3	3	4	4	-0.391	70%
Horizontal ridge (perpendicular to shaft)	3	3	3	3	0.000	100%
Not Ridged	58	60	65	60	0.000	100%
Grooved / Notched adjacent to shaft	3	3	6	6	-1.047	29%
Not Grooved	85	89	94	86	-0.651	52%
Total Number of Scarabs	96	—	109	—	—	—

A comparison between the distribution of typological forms of the clypeus shows again striking similarities between the corpora of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. The distribution of forms is strikingly similar. While there was a 21% drop in forms with ridging on the clypeus among scarabs with the royal titulary, there is no drop among non-titulary scarabs. Either the drop in ridging among scarabs with the royal titulary was caused by a small sample size in the first set of data or the number of faience scarabs with 20th Dynasty names increases, causing increased schematization of the form. It should

¹⁴⁴ This number is determined by adding the five lines that follow. This number helps determine if there was an overall shift in the number of scarabs with any number of lines at the bottom of the clypeus.

not be said that a more schematic clypeus is a feature of all scarabs during the 20th Dynasty or Iron I.

Table 18: Probability of Typological Change in the Sides of Scarabs Organized by Archaeological Context

Typological Form of Side	Late Bronze IIB		Iron I		Z-Test	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		
D1	4	4	2	2	-0.842	40%
D4	3	3	1	1	-1.022	31%
D5	21	21	37	33	-1.981	5%
D6	21	21	15	14	-1.332	18%
D7	0	0	0	0	—	—
D8	1	1	1	1	0.000	100%
D10	1	1	0	0	—	—
E1	1	1	1	1	0.000	100%
E2	4	4	1	1	-1.374	17%
E4	0	0	4	4	-2.151	3%
E5	5	5	2	2	-1.171	24%
E7	3	3	0	0	—	—
E8	1	1	0	0	—	—
E9	1	1	2	2	-0.601	55%
E9A	0	0	6	4	—	—
E10	0	0	3	3	—	—
E11	16	16	21	19	-0.573	57%
E12	15	15	15	14	-0.205	84%
Total	99	—	111	—	—	—

Again there is marked similarity between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I corpora. Only two forms change greater than 5%: D5 and D6. Both have a P-value that indicates there is some evidence that this change is statistically significant. The form D5 rises in popularity, while the form D6 decreases. Interestingly, the same shift was present in the scarabs with the royal titulary. Among scarabs with the royal titulary, the non-hirsute

form—D5—rose in popularity by 39% among scarabs with the royal titulary while the hirsute form—D6—dropped in popularity by 28%. The diachronic change in the popularity of the D5 and D6 forms is clear, and this change is not limited to scarabs with the royal titulary. Unfortunately, it will not be sufficient on its own as a criterion for identifying an object as produced in the 19th Dynasty or 20th Dynasty. It may, however, tip the scales, if other stylistic features are present.

As occurred with the typological forms of the head, new forms are present in the typology of non-titulary scarabs. The new typological forms include D4, D10, E2, E4, E8, E9, and E10. Five of the seven new forms are highly schematic. Scarabs with the royal titulary less commonly use schematic forms of the legs where a single line is engraved around the base. In other words, scarabs with an E-type side are more common among scarabs without the royal titulary. The corpus of scarabs with the royal titulary have sides E11 and E12 on approximately one out of every ten scarabs during the 19th and 20th Dynasty while approximately three in ten without the royal titulary have sides E11 and E12 during the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Highly schematic sides are three times more common among scarabs without the royal titulary.

Finally, this study returns to the engraved features on the back of the scarab.

Table 19: Probability of Typological Change in the Form of the Backs of Scarabs

Organized by Archaeological Context

Typological Form of the Back	Late Bronze IIB		Iron I		Z- Value	P-Value of the Test
	Value	Percentage	Value	Percentage		

2 humeral callosities	22	19	33 ¹⁴⁵	29	-1.772	8%
No line dividing the elytra	46	41	33	29	-1.906	6%
One line divides the elytra	42	37	60	53	-2.449	1%
Two lines divide the elytra	7	6	3	3	-1.091	28%
Three lines divide the elytra	1	1	0	0	—	—
No line divides the pronotum from the elytra	41	36	51	45	-1.384	17%
One line divides the pronotum from the elytra	44	39	55	49	-1.522	13%
Two lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	8	7	3	3	-1.385	17%
Three lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	1	1	1	1	0.000	100%
No recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	84 ¹⁴⁶	74	93	83	-1.657	10%
Recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	17 ¹⁴⁷	15	19	17	-0.410	68%

¹⁴⁵ There were 112 scarabs which did or did not have humeral callosities.

¹⁴⁶ The total number of scarabs with or without recessed lines outlining the elytra is 101. In certain instances, the sides were not extant while portions of the lines dividing the elytra and the pronotum were.

¹⁴⁷ Again, the total number of scarabs with or without recessed lines outlining the elytra is 101.

Notches between pronotum and elytra	13	12	15	13	-0.227	82%
Total	113	—	113	—	—	—

The number of typological forms is greatest among the backs of the scarabs.

However, none of the changes was significant—i.e., greater than 20%. In fact, a comparison with the typological forms of scarabs with the royal titulary shows that few changes were similar.

Table 20: Comparing the Two Methods for Determining Diachronic Change in the Typology of the Scarab

Typological Form of the Back	Typology Based on the Royal Titulary: Change between the 19th and 20th Dynasties	Typology Based on Archaeological Context: Change between LB IIB and Iron I
2 humeral callosities	-9%	+10%
No line dividing the elytra	+22%	-12%
One line divides the elytra	-9%	+16%
Two lines divide the elytra	-11%	-3%
Three lines divide the elytra	-2%	-1%
No line divides the pronotum from the elytra	+43%	+9%
One line divides the pronotum from the elytra	-11%	+10%
Two lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	-9%	-4%
Three lines divide the pronotum from the elytra	-2%	0%
No recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	+25%	+8%
Recessed line along the extremities of the elytra	-7%	+2%

Rarely did the second methodology confirm the change found by the first methodology. In fact, they often moved in opposite directions. For instance, royal scarabs with a single line dividing the elytra decreased in the 20th Dynasty while the form became more common among all scarabs.

Scarabs with the royal titulary became more schematic during the 20th Dynasty, but the schematization of scarabs without the royal titulary far out-stripped the royal scarabs. Engravers of the 20th Dynasty eliminated the division between the elytra, the division between the pronotum and elytra, and the recessed line around the wings. Meanwhile, scarabs without the royal titulary experienced no consistent change in their typological form.

CONCLUSIONS

This study of Late New Kingdom and early Third Intermediate Period scarabs has shown that one cannot date scarabs from the late New Kingdom based solely on the typological form. Rarely does the form even contribute to the dating of the scarab. It can, however, tip the scales. Schematic heads B2 and D10 do increase. Production of the D10 head is even concentrated in the Late Bronze IIB and decreasing in the later Iron I. The form of the clypeus-head is also executed on a possible locally produced scarab (Keel 1997: 184–185 [Tell el-‘Ağul 245]). Non-hirsute legs—D5—also increase in popularity during the Iron I. These forms, however, cannot be used as a sole criterion for dating. They must be considered together with other factors. Rowe’s typology often dated typological forms only to the 19th Dynasty, and his work is still cited today in the publications of Late

Bronze IIB and Iron I scarabs. Despite Rowe's work, the form of the scarab's back, head, and side is often unable to date an item on its own.

**ADDENDUM:
A DISCUSSION OF SCARAB TYPOLOGY BASED
ON FOUNDATION DEPOSITS**

Petrie published a number of collections of scarabs from Egypt, but few published large collections of scarabs excavated later in the 20th century (e.g., Teeter 2001; Williams 1992: 104–117; Figs. 11–16). The date of the archaeological contexts associated with these published scarabs was often wider than is ideal; ceramic typology can often only limit the date of the context to the late 18th through the 19th and sometimes 20th Dynasties. Other collections of Scarabs came from unknown contexts due to the archaeological method employed by late 19th and early 20th century archaeologists like Petrie or Uvo Hölscher. Also, the limited size of the published corpus from sure archaeological contexts rendered dates for the scarab typology tenuous in Egypt (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26–28).

To overcome these problems, Hornung and Staehelin suggested a typology be formed based on foundation deposits (1976: 26). Foundation deposits form unique corpora that rarely suffer from posthumous production¹⁴⁸ or a small sample size. Unfortunately, scarabs were not always present in foundation deposits (Weinstein 1973: lxxiii). Foundation deposits did not include scarabs regularly in the Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, or the Second Intermediate Period (Weinstein 1973: 30–87). The practice was first attested during the reign of Hatshepsut in the New Kingdom (Weinstein 1973: 93),

¹⁴⁸ In only two occurrences were foundation deposits reused in Egypt, and they occurred in the Late Period (Weinstein 1973: 299–300).

and these deposits provided a dateable corpus of scarabs with presumably no posthumous production.

A list of New Kingdom foundation deposits is discussed below. There were few foundation deposits from the 18th Dynasty prior to Hatshepsut. In other literature, scholars have identified some votive deposits or caches of items under temples inaccurately as foundation deposits (Weinstein 1973: lxxi–lxxii). This study will follow Weinstein’s assessment of foundation deposits. A locus will only be identified as a foundation deposits when the cache of items is located in a foundation trench (Weinstein 1973: 92). This will ensure that posthumous production will not creep into this study.

Foundation Deposit of Thutmosis I at Thebes. There was only one known foundation deposit from the reign of Thutmosis I, but it contained no scarabs (Weinstein 1973: 149).

Foundation Deposit of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III at Deir el-Bahri. More foundation deposits were known from the period of Hatshepsut through Amenhotep III than any other period. Weinstein explains that this was due to the heavy building in Abydos and Thebes in this period (Weinstein 1973: 92). At least fifteen foundation deposits—lettered A through N—are known from the temple at Deir el-Bahri. Excavators found another and assigned it the letter ‘W’ (Wysocki 1985: 298). The initial fifteen foundation deposits were found by three successive archaeologists: Naville, the Earl of Carnarvon, Howard, and Winlock. Carnarvon and Carter found two foundation deposits found—J and K. They contained no scarabs according to their publication (Carnarvon and Carter 1912: 30–32). In fact, only one foundation deposit contained scarabs (Weinstein 1973: 149–174). This foundation deposit at Deir el-Bahri contained 334

glyptic items of which 306 were scarabs (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 26; Hayes 1959: 87, Fig. 48; Serpico 2011: 843–884).

Hayes published many of the scarabs from his excavations (1959: Fig. 48), and they are part of the collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The scarabs were inscribed with the names of Hatshepsut, Thutmose III, Neferure, twice with the praenomen of Thutmose I, the name of Amun Re, and decorative motifs (Weinstein 1973: 160, n. 170). The scarabs' forms tend to be traditional. Heads were of the following forms: A1,¹⁴⁹ A3,¹⁵⁰ A5,¹⁵¹ A8,¹⁵² B2,¹⁵³ and F6.¹⁵⁴ A composite form of the head that combines A5 or A3 with A8 is one of the most common forms of the head.¹⁵⁵ Of the 213 known scarab heads from this deposit, 30% are of the type A3, 23% of the type A5, and 42% of a composite A3/A5 with A8 form. Only 3% of the scarabs' heads are not of either

¹⁴⁹ Examples of scarabs with the head A1: 27.3.253, 27.3.267, and 27.3.272.

¹⁵⁰ Examples of scarabs with the head A3: 27.3.168, 27.3.169, 27.3.172, 27.3.174, 27.3.179, 27.3.181, 27.3.184, 27.3.192, 27.3.194, 27.3.195, 27.3.199, 27.3.200, 27.3.205, 27.3.215, 27.3.217, 27.3.231, 27.3.237, 27.3.239, 27.3.255, 27.3.257, 27.3.258, 27.3.259, 27.3.264, 27.3.265, 27.3.269, 27.3.270, 27.3.275, 27.3.280, 27.3.281, 27.3.282, 27.3.283, 27.3.284, 27.3.285, 27.3.286, 27.3.293, 27.3.295, 27.3.296, 27.3.305, 27.3.308, 27.3.317, 27.3.319, 27.3.321, 27.3.323, 27.3.326, 27.3.328, 27.3.333, 27.3.334, 27.3.335, 27.3.336, 27.3.337, 27.3.338, 27.3.339, 27.3.340, 27.3.341, 27.3.353, 27.3.358, 27.3.359, 27.3.362, 27.3.370, 27.3.375, 27.3.378, 27.3.385, 27.3.388, and 27.3.390.

¹⁵¹ Examples of scarabs with the head A5: 27.3.165, 27.3.173 (?), 27.3.176, 27.3.183, 27.3.193, 27.3.195, 27.3.196, 27.3.241, 27.3.292, 27.3.214, 27.3.222, 27.3.224, 27.3.242, 27.3.246, 27.3.254, 27.3.256, 27.3.260, 27.3.266, 27.3.268, 27.3.276, 27.3.278, 27.3.287, 27.3.288, 27.3.289 (?), 27.3.294, 27.3.304, 27.3.307, 27.3.309, 27.3.310, 27.3.317, 27.3.322, 27.3.329, 27.3.330, 27.3.332, 27.3.343, 27.3.346, 27.3.356, 27.3.357, 27.3.360, 27.3.371, 27.3.372, 27.3.373, 27.3.374, 27.3.386, 27.3.387 (?), 27.3.389, 27.3.392, 27.3.393, 27.3.394, and 27.3.395.

¹⁵² Examples of scarabs with the head A8: 27.3.202, 27.3.210, and 27.3.213.

¹⁵³ Examples of scarabs with the head B2: 27.3.198 and 27.3.212.

¹⁵⁴ Examples of scarabs with the head F6: 27.3.204.

¹⁵⁵ Examples of the composite head: 27.3.166, 27.3.167, 27.3.170, 27.3.171, 27.3.175, 27.3.177, 27.3.178, 27.3.182, 27.3.185, 27.3.186, 27.3.187, 27.3.188, 27.3.189, 27.3.190, 27.3.197, 27.3.201, 27.3.204, 27.3.206, 27.3.208, 27.3.209, 27.3.211, 27.3.218, 27.3.219, 27.3.220, 27.3.221, 27.3.223, 27.3.228, 27.3.232, 27.3.233 (?), 27.3.234, 27.3.235, 27.3.236, 27.3.240, 27.3.243, 27.3.244, 27.3.245, 27.3.247, 27.3.248, 27.3.249, 27.3.250, 27.3.261, 27.3.262, 27.3.263, 27.3.277, 27.3.279, 27.3.290, 27.3.291, 27.3.297, 27.3.298, 27.3.299, 27.3.300, 27.3.301, 27.3.302, 27.3.303, 27.3.306, 27.3.312, 27.3.313, 27.3.314, 27.3.315, 27.3.316, 27.3.318, 27.3.320, 27.3.324, 27.3.325, 27.3.327, 27.3.331, 27.3.342, 27.3.344, 27.3.345, 27.3.347, 27.3.348, 27.3.349, 27.3.350, 27.3.351, 27.3.352, 27.3.354, 27.3.355, 27.3.361, 27.3.363, 27.3.364, 27.3.369, 27.3.376, 27.3.377, 27.3.379, 27.3.380, 27.3.381, 27.3.382, 27.3.383, 27.3.384, and 27.3.391.

A3, A5, A8, or a combination of these forms. The clypeus is often decorated with a recessed line around the edge. The sides and legs are almost always a hirsute form of the legs—Type D6¹⁵⁶—and only occasionally the non-hirsute form D5 occurs.¹⁵⁷ Of the 209 scarabs of known sides, 97% are of the hirsute form, D6. The skill of engraving is clearly superior to that found on many scarabs imported to the Southern Levant.

While Hornung and Staehelin argued that there was an overwhelming diversity of scarab forms in Hatshepsut's foundation deposit from Deir el-Bahri (1976: 55), I would counter that there are definite forms which dominate the corpus. In fact, an uncommon composite form of the head—A3 or A5 together with A8—is strangely popular. A common, schematic scarab head—A1—is oddly rare. Hornung and Staehelin argued against royal workshops creating these forms (1976: 55), but the distribution of typological forms of the heads and sides documented here likely points to one workshop. A royal workshop or a workshop commissioned by a royal entity likely made this batch

¹⁵⁶ Examples of scarabs with hirsute legs of the form D6: 27.3.165, 27.3.166, 27.3.167, 27.3.168, 27.3.169, 27.3.170, 27.3.171, 27.3.172, 27.3.173, 27.3.174, 27.3.175, 27.3.176, 27.3.177, 27.3.178, 27.3.179, 27.3.181, 27.3.182, 27.3.183, 27.3.184, 27.3.185, 27.3.186, 27.3.187, 27.3.188, 27.3.189, 27.3.190, 27.3.192, 27.3.193, 27.3.194, 27.3.196, 27.3.197, 27.3.198, 27.3.199, 27.3.201, 27.3.202, 27.3.204, 27.3.206, 27.3.209, 27.3.210, 27.3.211, 27.3.213, 27.3.214, 27.3.215, 27.3.217, 27.3.218, 27.3.219, 27.3.220, 27.3.221, 27.3.222, 27.3.223, 27.3.224, 27.3.228, 27.3.231, 27.3.232, 27.3.233, 27.3.234, 27.3.235, 27.3.236, 27.3.237, 27.3.239, 27.3.240, 27.3.241, 27.3.242, 27.3.243, 27.3.244, 27.3.245, 27.3.247, 27.3.248, 27.3.249, 27.3.250, 27.3.253, 27.3.254, 27.3.255, 27.3.256, 27.3.257, 27.3.258, 27.3.259, 27.3.260, 27.3.261, 27.3.262, 27.3.263, 27.3.264, 27.3.265, 27.3.266, 27.3.267, 27.3.268, 27.3.269, 27.3.270, 27.3.272, 27.3.275, 27.3.276, 27.3.277, 27.3.278, 27.3.279, 27.3.280, 27.3.281, 27.3.282, 27.3.283, 27.3.284, 27.3.285, 27.3.286, 27.3.287, 27.3.288, 27.3.289, 27.3.290, 27.3.291, 27.3.292, 27.3.293, 27.3.294, 27.3.295, 27.3.296, 27.3.297, 27.3.298, 27.3.299, 27.3.300, 27.3.301, 27.3.302, 27.3.303, 27.3.304, 27.3.305, 27.3.306, 27.3.307, 27.3.308, 27.3.309, 27.3.310, 27.3.312, 27.3.313, 27.3.314, 27.3.315, 27.3.316, 27.3.317, 27.3.318, 27.3.319, 27.3.320, 27.3.321, 27.3.322, 27.3.323 (?), 27.3.324, 27.3.325, 27.3.326, 27.3.327, 27.3.328, 27.3.329, 27.3.330, 27.3.331, 27.3.332, 27.3.333, 27.3.334, 27.3.335 (?), 27.3.336, 27.3.337 (?), 27.3.338 (?), 27.3.339, 27.3.340 (?), 27.3.341, 27.3.342, 27.3.343, 27.3.344, 27.3.345, 27.3.346, 27.3.347, 27.3.348, 27.3.349, 27.3.350, 27.3.351, 27.3.352, 27.3.353, 27.3.354, 27.3.355, 27.3.357, 27.3.358, 27.3.359, 27.3.361, 27.3.362, 27.3.363, 27.3.364, 27.3.369, 27.3.370, 27.3.371, 27.3.372, 27.3.374, 27.3.375, 27.3.376, 27.3.377, 27.3.378, 27.3.379, 27.3.380, 27.3.381, 27.3.382, 27.3.383, 27.3.384, 27.3.385, 27.3.386, 27.3.387, 27.3.388, 27.3.389, 27.3.390, 27.3.391, 27.3.392, 27.3.393, 27.3.394, and 27.3.395. Only the forelegs are hirsute: 27.3.373.

¹⁵⁷ Examples of D5 include 27.3.195, 27.3.271, 27.3.356, 27.3.360, 27.3.271, and 27.3.391.

of scarabs as one coherent group to be deposited together. In fact, it is this fact that makes this corpus less useful for forming an overall typology of scarabs for the early 18th Dynasty. Artisans did not replicate the idiosyncratic form of the head in subsequent foundation deposits of the 18th Dynasty.

Foundation Deposit of Thutmosis III at Karnak. Three foundation deposits with scarabs of Thutmosis III marked the corners of a single building at Karnak (Mensan 2007: 21–25). The deposit also contained a copper axe, two adze blades, a knife blade, and two nails (21). A number of glyptic items with the name of Thutmosis III were found. The corpus included nine gold cartouches and 156 faience cartouche-shaped plaques but no scarabs (22–23, 25). The same was true of two foundation deposits of Thutmosis III located east of the Temple of Amun. The deposits had numerous plaques, but the report mentioned no scarabs (Abd el-Hamid 1987: 46, Pl. III).

Foundation Deposits of Thutmosis III at Koptos. Petrie found seven deposits with 18 scarabs (Adams 1975: 103, 105) of which he published 15 (Petrie 1896: Pl. XV, Nos. 44–58; cf. Weinstein 1973: 178–180). The publication only included images of the bases and no backs. Further, the location of only one scarab is currently known (Adams 1975: 105). It is not possible to speak about the heads, sides, and backs of scarabs from the foundation deposits of one king based on one item.

Scarabs from the palace of Amenhotep III at Malkata. Another key collection came from the Palace of Amenhotep III at Malkata, which Amenhotep's son, Akhenaten, abandoned (Hayes 1951: 233, Fig. 34). Due to its limited range of occupation, the collection is useful for dating typological forms (Teeter 2003: 14). Unfortunately, Hayes did not publish the scarabs' backs.

Foundation Deposits from Amenhotep IV through Horemheb. Known foundation deposits are few during the end of the 18th Dynasty (Weinstein 1973: 141–142).

Amenhotep IV built the Triple Temple at Sesebi in Nubia which had four excavated foundation deposits. Unfortunately, there was no final report and only a preliminary report (Blackman 1937; Weinstein 1973: 144–145). These deposits included three scarabs of blue faience and scaraboids (Blackman 1937: 148, Pl. XVII, No. 2; Weinstein 1973: 218). The backs and sides are not shown in the publication in 1937. The Egypt Exploration Society did give one scarab as a gift to the Världskultur Museerna Medelhavet (MM14299; see Blackman 1937: Pl. XVII, No. 2, upper right). Its head is of the form B2 and the side is D5. The two typological forms tend toward schematization, which is typical for faience. I was unable to locate the other two scarabs.

Two more foundation deposits were excavated the following year below the one wall at Sesebi, and excavators found one scarab and scaraboids (Blackman 1938: 153; Weinstein 1973: 218–219). The scarab's side is of the form D1 and its head B2 (Brooklyn Museum, 38.551). Again, the scarab is made of faience and tends toward schematization. While it is helpful to know the typological forms of these two scarabs from the reign of Amenhotep IV, a typology cannot be founded on two scarabs—especially those made of faience.

Hölscher also excavated foundation deposits of Aye at Medinet Habu (Hölscher 1939: 86–98). Hölscher found scarabs in foundation deposit 5 (Teeter 2003: 63, No. 83, Pl. 26c [OIM 14958]) and foundation deposit 6 (Teeter 2003: 30, No. 18, Pl. 5e [OIM14975]; 49, No. 55, Pl. 19b [OIM 14977]; 62, No. 82, Pl. 26b [OIM 14976]; 30 [OIM 14978]). The five scarabs from these deposits were made of faience. Their forms

are, as expected, schematic. The forms of the heads are A1 (Teeter 2003: 63, No. 83, Pl. 26c; 62, No. 82, Pl. 26b) and B2 (Teeter 2003: 30, No. 18, Pl. 5e; 49, No. 55, Pl. 19b). The forms of the sides are D1 (Teeter 2003: 63, No. 83, Pl. 26c; 62, No. 82, Pl. 26b) and E2 (Teeter 2003: 30, No. 18, Pl. 5e; 49, No. 55, Pl. 19b).

Foundation Deposit of the Temple of Seti I at Abydos. The contents of foundation deposits from the 19th and 20th Dynasties tended toward mass production and poorly made objects (Weinstein 1973: 225). These deposits often included more small faience objects in the 19th and 20th Dynasties (Weinstein 1973: 251). The deposit of Seti I at Abydos contained forty-eight faience and steatite scarabs, but there is only a brief reference to the deposit in its publication (Cairo 1956: 138; Weinstein 1973: 252–253). There are no published images of the backs and sides of the scarabs.

Foundation Deposits of Siptah and Tausret at Thebes. Petrie also found foundation deposits for Siptah and Tausret in Siptah's mortuary temple and Tausret's mortuary temple. The deposits contained pottery, scarabs of Siptah and Tausret, plaques, and rings (Petrie 1897: 14–17, 29, Pl. XVI–XIX; Petrie 1917: 28, §58; Aston 1996: 16; Kroenke 2011: 14). Unfortunately, the publication of these deposits was early in Petrie's career when he did not consistently draw the backs, heads, and sides of scarabs (Petrie 1897: Pl. XVI, Nos. 1 and 7; Pl. XVIII, No. 3). Porter and Moss did not mention the current location of the scarabs from the foundation deposits of these two buildings (Porter and Moss 1972: 429 and 447). Petrie scattered many of the items from these foundation deposits throughout the world in exchange for financing his excavations (Kroenke 2011). The University of Pennsylvania's Museum received a few (E2127A, E2127B, E2127C,

E2131, E2137A, and E2137B). A number are in the Petrie Museum (UC 12839,¹⁵⁸ UC 12840; UC 12843–12844;¹⁵⁹ UC 29381a, UC 29381b, UC 29381c,¹⁶⁰ UC 29382–UC 29384, UC 29385a–f, UC 29386–UC 29388, UC 29389a–n, UC 29390–UC 29406, UC 29407a, UC 29407b, UC 29407c, UC 29408, UC 29439, UC 61665, and UC 61683¹⁶¹). The Edwards Department at University College (Kroenke 2011: 16 and 25–26, n. 26), Manchester Museum (Man. 1555–1574, Man. 1577–1581, Man. 1585–1592, Man. 1594¹⁶²), the Ashmolean, and the Fitzwilliam Museum (E.SC.263a) also received items. Three men who financed the excavations also received a significant number of unknown items from these foundation deposits (Kroenke 2011: 17). Some items also became part of Petrie’s personal collection. Petrie’s workers sold off other items from the foundation deposits before Petrie could retrieve them (Petrie 1897: 2), and Reisner reportedly purchased some and gave them to the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology (Kroenke 2011: 19, Fig. 3-1; PHAMA 6-19967–PHAMA 6-19983). Unfortunately, the provenance of these purchased items cannot be known with certainty. Kroenke also pointed out how Petrie’s records and museums’ holdings do not match so that the total number of items is uncertain (Kroenke 2011: 22–23). The University of Arizona returned and excavated the area and found four foundation deposits not excavated by Petrie’s workers (Kroenke 2011: 11; Wilkinson 2011: Fig. 4-7). While Petrie claimed to have cleared all the foundation trenches, the University of Arizona continued to find

¹⁵⁸ This scarab is only partially extant. It may fit with a back that is listed as another item of the inventory.

¹⁵⁹ This item is missing and may have been traded by Petrie, according to the Museum’s assessment.

¹⁶⁰ This scarab is also only partially extant. It may fit with a back that is listed as another item of the museum’s inventory.

¹⁶¹ Kroenke identified these accession numbers as scarabs from these foundation deposits (2011: 25, n. 17).

¹⁶² Kroenke identified these accession numbers as scarabs from these foundation deposits (2011: 26, n. 27).

foundation deposits (Wilkinson 2011: 47). They found over three thousand artifacts throughout their areas of excavation (Wilkinson 2011: 46), but they report no scarabs.

All scarabs from these foundation deposits were reported to be faience (Kroenke 2011: 12, Table 3-1). Images of the backs, sides, and heads were shown for only a limited number of scarabs in these scattered collections. These faience scarabs unsurprisingly have schematic heads of the A1 type (UC 29381a, UC 29385a-f,¹⁶³ UC 29408A, UC 29408B, UC 29408C, UC 29389a-i; E.SC.263a), and their sides, when discernable, are likely the schematic D1 (UC 29407A, UC 29407B, UC 29407C, and E.SC.263a).

Foundation Deposits of Ramses III at the Mortuary Complex at Medinet Habu.

There were green faience scarabs inscribed with the birth and throne names of Ramses III in the foundation deposits of the mortuary complex at Medinet Habu (Weinstein 1973: 273–274; Porter and Moss 1972: 523).

Four foundation deposits were found in and near foundation trenches of the fourth building phase of the Palace “Garden” at Medinet Habu. One corner deposit contained three faience scarabs (Hölscher 1941: 67, fig. 41 D; Hölscher 1951: 18, 47, Fig. 19, cf. Pl. 29; Hölscher 1932: Fig. 14; Weinstein 1973: 274). The photograph of the scarabs showed only the back and head of one scarab, but the image was not high resolution to determine the form (Hölscher 1932: Fig. 14).

Hölscher found a single foundation deposit in the “Royal Stables” at Medinet Habu. It contained one scarab and other items (Hölscher 1934: Pl. 7 [Square H7]; Hölscher 1951: 18, 47, Fig. 19; Weinstein 1973: 275). Its head, back, and sides are not shown in the publications.

¹⁶³ The museum lists six items under this accession number, but only five are shown in the museum’s image.

Teeter published scarabs from foundation deposits from the walls west of the second palace at Medinet Habu (Teeter 2003: 36, No. 29, Pl. 10c (OIM 14933)) and opposite the inner enclosure walls at Medinet Habu (Teeter 2003: 68, No. 93, Pl. 29b (Cairo 59809)). Other scarabs were questionably found in or near foundation deposits of Ramses III at Medinet Habu (Teeter 2003: 64, No. 86; 89, No. 136; 100, No. 159), but they are not included here due to the uncertainty of their exact deposition. Teeter's published scarabs were all reported as faience and, as expected, their forms are schematic. They have heads of types D4 (Teeter 2003: 36, No. 29, Pl. 10c) and B2 (Teeter 2003: 68, No. 93, Pl. 29b). Sides are also of the form D5 with no hirsute details (Teeter 2003: 36, No. 29, Pl. 10c) and E11 (Teeter 2003: 68, No. 93, Pl. 29b).

Foundation Deposits of Ramses III and Ramses IV at Tell el-Retabeh. A

foundation deposit of Ramses III was also found below a fortification wall of Tell el-Retabeh (Petrie 1906: 28, 30, 33, Pl. 34 and 34c [middle]; Aston 1996: 16). Again, this early publication from Petrie did not publish the backs, sides, or heads of these scarabs.

Two foundation deposits of Ramses IV were found while excavating the mortuary temple of Ramses III, but excavators found no associated building (Anthes 1939: 116–117, Pl. 56, 58). In the first deposit, there were eight bronze plaques, six faience plaques, and one faience cartouche (Anthes 1939: 116). In the second deposit, there were four silver plaques, nine faience plaques, two faience cartouches, and one uninscribed scarab in this corpus (Anthes 1939: 116). The scarab is the only item of relevance to this study. It is a dull dark blue faience, and its form can not be ascertained from the publication (Anthes 1939: Pl. 58J).

Foundation Deposits of Ramses IV¹⁶⁴ at Abydos. Two foundation deposits—Deposit 36 and Deposit 74—were found in the southeast and southwest corners of the temple of Ramses IV (Petrie 1903: 19, Pl. LVIII; Ayrton *et al.* 1904: 52, Pl. XXIV; Weinstein 1973: 276). Deposit 36 had eight uninscribed scarabs and Deposit 74 had 15. The back and head of only one scarab is illustrated in the publication, and the B2 head lacks detailed engraving (Ayrton *et al.* 1904: 52, Pl. XXIV, No. 10). Two scarabs from the foundation deposit of Abydos are located in the Penn Museum (E11566 and E11567), two in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 03.4.56a and MMA 03.4.56c), one at the Boston Museum of Fine Art (MFA 03.1761), and two in the British Museum (BM 38126 and BM 38127), but there are no images of these seven items.

Foundation Deposit of Ramses IV at Thebes. Another foundation deposit of Ramses IV contained similar objects (Carnarvon and Carter 1912: 48, Pl. 40). Under the northeast corner of the building, a foundation deposit consisted of a deposit of bricks in the sand. There were 143 electrum and faience items. There were plaques of blue faience, but no scarabs were recorded.

One additional uninscribed scarab of blue faience was found in the second foundation deposit at the mortuary temple of Ay and Horemheb at Medinet Habu. The deposit was dated to the reign of Ramses IV (Hölscher 1939: 115, 116–117, Pl. 58J; Porter and Moss 1972: 459; Weinstein 1973: 279–281). The scarab's back and head were shown in the publication, but its sides were not. The head is likely of the A1 type (Hölscher 1939: Pl. 58J).

¹⁶⁴ Petrie mistakenly identified these foundation deposits as from Ramses III (Petrie 1903: 19), but Gauthier corrected this identification (Gauthier 1913: 186, No. XXXIV; Weinstein 1973: 276).

Two additional blue faience scarabs were found in Deposit 236, which was to the side of the entrance to the tomb of Ramses IV in the Valley of the Kings (Thomas 1966: 127–128, Fig. 13, No. 2; Weinstein 1973: 281–284, Fig. 19). There was no published image of the scarabs, and the current whereabouts of the deposit is unstated (Porter and Moss 1964: 500).

Eight foundation deposits of Ramses IV were also found under the mortuary temple of Ramses IV-V-VI at Deir el-Bahri, but they remained unpublished, except for a short description and two photographs (Lansing 1935: 6–8, Figs. 3–4; Hayes 1959: 371–372, Fig. 234; Weinstein 1973: 278–279). Neither Lansing nor Hayes published a drawing or image of the back of the glyptic items from this deposit (Lansing 1935: Fig. 4; Hayes 1959: Fig. 234) so that it is not possible to tell from the image which items are bifacial oval plaques or scarabs. Weinstein reported that there was an occasional scarab, and Hayes stated that the Metropolitan Museum of Art received one blue faience scarab from these deposits (Hayes 1959: 372). Unfortunately, it is difficult to identify scarabs in these publications.¹⁶⁵

There was no foundation deposit of known provenance after Ramses IV and prior to Psusennes I possibly due to the decrease in construction during this period (Weinstein 1973: 226, 251).¹⁶⁶ No foundation deposits I found from the 21st Dynasty contained a scarab.

¹⁶⁵ As noted above, Hayes stated that one blue faience scarab was given to the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Hayes 1959: 371), but no item in the Metropolitan Museum of Art is identified as a scarab among the accession numbers MMA 35.3.118–286, which are the numbers Weinstein gave for these deposits. However, there were four scarabs identified as coming from foundation deposits at Asasif in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (MMA 16.10.60, MMA 16.10.61, and MMA 16.10.62). There are no images of these three scarabs available.

¹⁶⁶ There is a plaque of Ramses V, but it is unknown provenance (Weinstein 1973: 226).

SUMMARY OF A TYPOLOGY BASED ON FOUNDATION DEPOSITS

The seminal work by Hornung and Staehelin did not abandon the possibility that a typology of scarabs' forms could be identified and securely dated, if dateable corpora without posthumous production could be identified (1976: 26–28; 32–33). Foundation deposits were key because they lacked posthumous production and their date was secure (1976: 26). However, the corpora of scarabs from New Kingdom foundation deposits present four systematic problems.

First, the sample size is exceedingly small. A large corpus may initially seem plausible because the sizeable foundation deposit of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri is well known. However, more than five scarabs in a deposit is rarely attested in foundation deposits outside the anomalous group from Deir el-Bahri. The next two largest corpora of glyptic pieces from foundation deposits are the 48 glyptic items from a foundation deposit of Seti I at Abydos and 23 scarabs from Abydos during the reign of Ramses IV. So far this study has identified 333 scarabs from foundation deposits of the 18th Dynasty, but only 27 come from deposits outside of Deir el-Bahri. Further, the presence of scarabs in foundation deposits is limited chronologically (Weinstein 1973: lxxiii). One could not, say, form a scarab typology of Egyptian-produced scarabs from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period based on foundation deposits.

Second, small faience items increased in number in foundation deposits even as they decreased in quality during the Ramesside period. Faience plaques, cartouche-shaped plaques, and model offerings became more common during the 20th Dynasty. One plausibly imagines one mold for each group of items. That mold produced numerous, identical scarabs, plaques, and model offerings for one foundation deposit. By

the 20th Dynasty, faience scarabs were increasingly uninscribed. Faience scarabs tend toward schematization because detail is less possible in the medium. One might mistakenly identify schematic typological forms as characteristic of the 20th Dynasty scarabs when, in fact, artisans produced more faience for the foundation deposits of this period.

Third, production for royal foundation deposits may not reflect the trends in broader production. As noted in the chapter above, certain typological forms were characteristic of scarabs found in archaeological contexts contemporary with the 19th Dynasty, but they are not found on contemporary scarabs with the royal titulary or in foundation deposits. The popular forms from the foundation deposit of Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri are not necessarily the popular forms on scarabs less likely to have been produced for royal purposes. Consequently, it is difficult to create a general scarab typology from the scarabs of the foundation deposits alone.

Lastly, the scarabs are neither published sufficiently nor are images often available from museums. Due to the way that key excavations, like Petrie's, funded their excavations, individual museums have a single scarab from different foundation deposits. The collection from one foundation deposit may be scattered around the world. I hope to overcome this problem in future work on the problem.

These four systemic problems form formidable barriers to founding a scarab typology based only on the scarabs from Egyptian foundation deposits. These corpora would, however, be useful when used together with other methodologies. While the engraving tradition of scarabs from artisans employed to craft royal scarabs may reflect a smaller range of forms than those in the overall corpus, they remain a key data point

because of their lack of posthumous production and the certainty with which the corpus is dated.

CHAPTER 4

STYLISTIC CRITERIA FOR DATING GLYPTIC ART

This study turns now to the base of the scarab. We will establish a methodology for identifying the criteria used to date motifs to the Iron I and Late Bronze IIB. As in the previous chapter, the size of the corpus will be the primary obstacle to confident identification of these criteria. The corpus must be large enough to demonstrate a normal distribution of glyptic pieces, arranged by the date of their archaeological context. Ideally, a normal distribution will show when artisans began producing a motif, when the motif reached its highest level of popularity and its later appearance as an heirloom. A number of motifs—like the name of Amun-Re—remain popular throughout not only the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I but also the Late Bronze IIA. Motifs that persist throughout the entire New Kingdom will not be addressed here because the motifs cannot be dated to the period studied here. Apart from very popular scenes, few motifs have a sufficient sample size to demonstrate a normal distribution during the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. The motifs with the greatest number of examples will be discussed first. Then, this study will move to smaller groups of seals.

ANRA-SCARABS: LOCAL PRODUCTION IN THE MIDDLE BRONZE AND LATE BRONZE IIB—EARLY IRON I

The group of scarabs referred to as ANRA scarabs is of sufficient size to make conclusions about its dates of production, which include the Middle Bronze, the transition from the Late Bronze IIB to Iron I and Iron I.

This group consists of those scarabs with two or three often repeated signs of varied sequence: *ʿ* (D36), *n* (N35), and *r* (D21). The scarabs come largely from archaeological contexts of two periods in the Southern Levant: most often the Middle Bronze IIB and less frequently the transition from the Late Bronze IIB to the Iron I or the Iron I. In contexts after these two periods of heightened production, ANRA scarabs are less common because they were used as heirlooms after production tapered off.

Middle Bronze: Keel 1997: 96–97 [Afek 51]; 100–101 [Afula 3]; 108–109 [Tell el-‘Ağul 11 and 12¹⁶⁷]; 114–115 [Tell el-‘Ağul 30]; 116–117 [Tell el-‘Ağul 36]; 128–129 [Tell el-‘Ağul 73]; 132–133 [Tell el-‘Ağul 83, 85]; 134–135 [Tell el-‘Ağul 91]; 140–141 [Tell el-‘Ağul 105]; 142–143 [Tell el-‘Ağul 114]; 230–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 378, 381, 387, 390]; 254–255 [Tell el-‘Ağul 447]; 260–261 [Tell el-‘Ağul 463]; 268–269 [Tell el-‘Ağul 486]; 278–279 [Tell el-‘Ağul 515]; 304–307 [Tell el-‘Ağul 596, 598, 602]; 310–311 [Tell el-‘Ağul 614, 615]; 316–317 [Tell el-‘Ağul 628, 629]; 322–323 [Tell el-‘Ağul 644]; 324–325 [Tell el-‘Ağul 652]; 328–331 [Tell el-‘Ağul 666, 672]; 334–339 [Tell el-‘Ağul 678, 683, 694]; 344–345 [Tell el-‘Ağul 706]; 350–351 [Tell el-‘Ağul 725, 726]; 364–365 [Tell el-‘Ağul 763, 767]; 366–367 [Tell el-‘Ağul 773]; 378–379 [Tell el-‘Ağul 804]; 386–387 [Tell el-‘Ağul 831]; 404–405 [Tell el-‘Ağul 883, 884]; 408–411 [Tell el-‘Ağul 895, 900]; 434–435 [Tell el-‘Ağul 974]; 440–441 [Tell el-‘Ağul 987]; 474–481 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1084, 1085, 1086, 1089, 1096, 1099]; 484–487 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1116, 1124]; 514–515 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1207]; 732–735 [Aschkelon 117, 119]; 752–753 [Asor 12]; 756–757 [Asor 23¹⁶⁸]. Keel 2010a: 42–43 [Bet-Mirsim 1, 2¹⁶⁹]; 52–53 [Bet-Mirsim 20, 24]; 54–55 [Bet-Mirsim 28]; 192–193 [Bet-Schean

¹⁶⁷ The certainty of the archaeological contexts of scarabs from Tell el-‘Ağul varies. The precise date of contexts on the tell is less certain due to archaeological method used by Petrie. The following scarabs come from less secure contexts on the tell of Tell el-‘Ağul: 11, 12, 30, 36, 73, 378, 381, 387, 390, 447, 463, 598, 614, 615, 628, 629, 644, 652, 666, 672, 678, 683, 694, 706, 725, 726, 763, 767, 773, 804, 883, 884, 987, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1089, 1116, and 1207. Other scarabs from Tell el-‘Ağul simply have no clear stratigraphic context (e.g., Tell el-‘Ağul 515). Scarabs from tombs at Tell el-‘Ağul, however, are more reliable because the tomb functions like a secure depositional unit. The following scarabs come from tombs at Tell el-‘Ağul: 83, 85, 91, 105, 114, 486, 602, 831, 895, 900, 974, 1096, 1099, and 1124. The same is true for scarabs from other Middle Bronze tombs (e.g., Keel 1997: 752–753 [Asor 12]).

¹⁶⁸ While some may question the archaeological method of Moshe Dothan’s excavations in the 1950s, I do not think these questions warrant exclusion of this scarab from the Middle Bronze corpus. While individual depositional units and their assignment to strata dated to specific sub-phases of the Middle Bronze may be less certain, an assignment to the broader Middle Bronze—the goal of this portion of the study—is not doubted.

¹⁶⁹ While the archaeological method of the excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim may be less than ideal, the assignment of these five scarabs only to the broader Middle Bronze is not questioned. See the previous footnote.

217¹⁷⁰]; 328–329 [Tel Bira 2¹⁷¹]; 596–601 [Tel Esur 2,¹⁷² 6,¹⁷³ 11]; Keel 2010b: 8–9 [Tell el-Far‘a-Nord 14¹⁷⁴]; 20–21 [Tell el-Far‘a-Nord 43¹⁷⁵]; 34–35 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 14,¹⁷⁶ 15]; 38–39 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 24]; 42–43 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 32, 34]; 46–47 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 42]; 52–53 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 56, 57]; 56–57 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 66]; 64–69 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 89, 90, 95]; 74–75 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 111]; 104–105 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 179]; 212–213 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 432]; 216–217 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 439]; Keel 2013: 196–197 [Geser 69];¹⁷⁷ Jericho:¹⁷⁸ Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 282.8, 16, 19, 20; 283.23; 285.9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19; 286.11, 13, 18; 287.1, 9; 290.17, 25, 27; 292.14, 17, 20; 293.7, 10; 294.13, 14, 15; 295.3, 6, 11, 19, 22; 296.10, 11, 12; 297.15; 298.12; 299.15; 200.25, 26, 30; 301.1, 3, 8, 10; 302.1, 2, 18; 303.14. Kabri: Mizrachy 2002: 333–335, No. 22;¹⁷⁹ Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pls. 30.20,¹⁸⁰ 35; 32.90, 105; Megiddo:¹⁸¹ Loud 1948: Pl. 149, Nos. 17, 19, 39, 50, 51; Pl. 150, No. 66; Shiloh: Brandl 1993b: 209–210, No. 6;¹⁸² Transjordan: Egger and Keel 2006: 42–43 [Amman 56].

¹⁷⁰ This scarab comes from Locus 98519 in Area R, and it was assigned to Stratum R-3 (Brandl 2007b: 592–593, Fig. 8.10).

¹⁷¹ While the excavations of Prausnitz are difficult to use due to the archaeological method used, this scarab comes from a Middle Bronze tomb (Locus 1003). Therefore, it has not been excluded on the basis of poor archaeological method because the tomb functions as its own “sealed” context.

¹⁷² All three scarabs from Tel ‘Esur with the ANRA motif come from Grave 3. Though excavated in the 1950s, the tomb functions as a gross depositional unit.

¹⁷³ This scarab has ANRA signs, but the ANRA signs are interspersed with a more diverse set of signs and motifs as is typical in the locally made, Middle Bronze IIB scarabs (Ben-Tor 2007).

¹⁷⁴ This scarab comes from a tomb; the context can be relied upon. Another ANRA scarab from the tell of Tell el-Far‘ah (South) is less certain (Keel 1997: 7–8 [Tell el-Far‘a Nord 13]).

¹⁷⁵ This scarab comes from Grave AA in Field II of Tell el-Far‘ah (North).

¹⁷⁶ All ANRA scarabs from Tell el-Far‘ah (South) come from Middle Bronze tombs.

¹⁷⁷ Though the excavations of Macalister are uncertain due to his early 20th century archaeological method, this scarab comes from a tomb. The tomb functions as a secure depositional unit.

¹⁷⁸ The sequence of Middle Bronze groups at Jericho was reviewed again after Megiddo was reassessed (Kenyon 1958; 1969; T. Thompson 1970; Müller 1970; Tufnell 1975). Here, my conclusions do not rest upon the internal sequence of Middle Bronze contexts at Megiddo and Jericho. It is sufficient to show that these contexts are from the Middle Bronze. Two ANRA scarabs, however, from Garstang’s excavation of presumed Middle Bronze contexts are too uncertain to be included here (Garstang 1932: Pl. 37, No. 50; Pl. 38, No. 88).

¹⁷⁹ This scarab was excavated in Tomb 902 at Kabri (Mizrachy 2002: 319).

¹⁸⁰ Four scarab from Lachish came from Middle Bronze tombs (Tufnell 1958: Pls. 30.20, 35; 32.90, 105). An additional eight scarabs may come from Middle Bronze contexts, but the publication does not consistently state where they were found (see Tufnell 1958: 113–115; Pls. 30.21, 34, 45, 51, 54, 55; 32.87, 88).

¹⁸¹ These scarabs come from Tombs 3111, 4415, 5259, and 3058 at Megiddo. These tombs are all assigned to Middle Bronze Strata XI and XII, and both were considered contemporary with Tell Beit Mirsim’s E₁ and E₂ (Loud 1948: 5). While the internal sequence of Megiddo’s Middle Bronze contexts has been reworked by later archaeologists (Kenyon 1958; 1969; T. Thompson 1970; Müller 1970; Tufnell 1975), my argument does not rest on assigning contexts to specific divisions within the Middle Bronze.

¹⁸² This impression was found in Locus 1526 in Area F, which was assigned to the Middle Bronze III (Brandl 1993b: 209–210; 57–62, Fig. 4.1)

Late Bronze I: Keel 1997: 452–453 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1025 and 1028¹⁸³]; Keel 2010a: 130–131 [Bet-Schean 74¹⁸⁴]; 386–387 [Dan 13]; Keel 2010b: 18–19 [Tell el-Far‘a-Nord 37]. Keel 2013: 452–453 [Geser 667;¹⁸⁵ Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 34.158,¹⁸⁶ 159, 160, 161; 36.232; Pella: Richards 1992: 100–105, Nos. 22,¹⁸⁷ 23, 24, 25, 26.

Late Bronze IIA: Keel 2010a: 398–399 [Dan 38¹⁸⁸]; Keel 2013: 438–439 [Geser 632¹⁸⁹]; ‘Ara: Ben-Tor and Keel 2014: 190–191 [AR 299], 192–193 [AR 302], 196–197 [AR 311, AR 314].¹⁹⁰ Lachish: Keel 2004b: 1539, No. 8, Fig. 23.37.1; 1548, No. 20, Pl. 23.41.2.

Late Bronze IIB: Keel 1997: 80–81 [Afek 5¹⁹¹]; 198–199 [Tell el-‘Ağul 286¹⁹²]; 270–271 [Tell el-‘Ağul 494].¹⁹³ Keel 2010b: 46–47 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 43]; Lachish: Keel 2004b: 1543, No. 19, Fig. 23.41.1; Eggler and Keel 2006: 62–63 [‘Amman Flughafen 7].

Iron I: Keel 1997: 52–53 [Achziv 94].¹⁹⁴ Keel 2010a: 98–99 [Bet-Schean 6]; 204–205 [Bet-Schean 236]; 210–211 [Bet-Schean 249]; 492–493 [Dotan 7]; Keel 2010b: 200–201 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 404]; 216–217 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 439]; 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]; 254–255 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 529]; 276–281 [Tell el-

¹⁸³ The corpus from Tell el-‘Ağul is smaller than one might expect because a number of scarabs have not been included due to the uncertain archaeological method used during their excavation (Keel 1997: 150–151 [Tell el-‘Ağul 133]; 366–367 [Tell el-‘Ağul 770]; 404–405 [Tell el-‘Ağul 881]). Since my argument rests on frequency in different periods, I have listed in this footnote those excluded so that the reader does not have a false perception of the number of ANRA scarabs from possible Late Bronze I contexts.

¹⁸⁴ This scarab comes from Tomb 59 in Square C2. Another scarab from early 20th century excavations on the tell was assigned to the Late Bronze I, but it was not included here (Keel 2010a: 168–169 [Bet Schean 160]).

¹⁸⁵ While most so-called ANRA scarabs from Gezer are from uncertain contexts due to the archaeological method of Macalister’s excavation, this scarab was excavated later in the 20th century after archaeological method had improved.

¹⁸⁶ All five scarabs from Lachish were found in Tomb 4004; the context has been dated to the Late Bronze I (McGovern 1986: 69, 71, 83) despite Tufnell’s date of the Tomb to the transition between Middle Bronze III–Late Bronze III (Tufnell 1958: 281–285). Though the majority of the tomb’s finds likely date to the Late Bronze I as McGovern suggested, the tomb’s use continued into the Iron Age (Tufnell 1958: 281). Ceramics not published by Tufnell point to a later date for the tomb (Margill 2006: 41).

¹⁸⁷ All five scarabs came from the same grave—Tomb 62—in Area XI, though the loci differ.

¹⁸⁸ This scarab comes from Locus 7190 in Area B. The locus has been assigned to Stratum VIIIB.

¹⁸⁹ This scarab comes from Tomb 10A.

¹⁹⁰ The scarabs from graves at ‘Ara, located on the Wadi ‘Iron/‘Ara, spanned the Middle Bronze I through the Late Bronze IIA. The scarabs have been placed under the latest period of use of the tomb, Late Bronze IIA.

¹⁹¹ This scarab comes from Locus 1200 in a tomb in Area G (Givon 1988: 40).

¹⁹² The scarab came from Petrie’s excavation of Tomb 1166 (Petrie 1932: 9). Unfortunately, Petrie dates the tomb largely based on the scarabs with royal names from within the tomb (Petrie 1932: 15).

¹⁹³ This scarab has been listed under the latest possible date of the context, though Petrie dated the context more broadly to the entire Late Bronze II.

¹⁹⁴ See Chapter Three for a discussion of the problematic dating of Grave 1009 at Achziv.

Far'a Süd 578, 579, 581, 582, 585, 586, 587]; 302–303 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 641, 644]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 669]; 320–321 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 686]; 328–331 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 704, 706]; 382–383 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 843];¹⁹⁵ 386–387 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 850]; 392–393 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 867]; Keel 2013: 64–65 [Tel Gamma 146]; 150–151 [Tel Gerisa 27]; Kinneret: Münger 2007: 83–85, No. 1, Fig. 1; Pl. 17, No. 1; Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 39.341;¹⁹⁶ Megiddo: Harrison 2004: 100, No. 5, Pl. 39, No. 11; 100, No. 6, Pl. 39, No. 12 = Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 213; Egger and Keel 2006: 366–367 [Tall as-Sa'idiya 2].

Iron IIA: Keel 2010a: 470–471 [Dor 17]; Keel 2010b: 16–17 [Tell el-Far'a-Nord 32]; 138–139 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 257]; Egger and Keel 2006: 34–35 [Amman 44].

Iron IIB: Keel 1997: 30–31 [Achsib 24, 26]; 44–45 [Achsib 68]; Keel 2010a: 218–219 [Bet-Schemesch 2];¹⁹⁷ 224–227 [Bet-Schemesch 15, 22]; Keel 2010b: 148–149 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 280]; Keel 2013: 24–25 [Tel Gamma 52].¹⁹⁸

Iron IIC: Keel 2010a: 390–391 [Dan 25]; 398–399 [Dan 40]; Keel 2010b: 164–165 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 316]; 394–395 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 869]; Egger and Keel 2006: 124–125 [Chirbat al-Mudayyina 10].

Late Roman: Keel 2010a: 138–139 [Bet-Schean 93].

The ANRA group was not known at the sites that Tufnell identified as late Middle Kingdom—Kahun, Uronarti, and Ruweis (Tufnell 1975: 72; Tufnell 1984: 121). This absence led some to conclude that the group was not produced in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom (D. Ben-Tor 1997: 171). However, Ben-Tor's latest work concluded persuasively that precursors to the group were produced in this period, though they were rare in Egypt (Ben-Tor 2007: 20). Tufnell had already noted a plaque with so-called ANRA signs flanking the name of Senusret III (1975: 72; Weill 1918: 250), but this plaque alone does not conclusively prove Middle Kingdom production because the item

¹⁹⁵ This item was found in Cemetery 900 which is predominantly Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA, but its exact context is unknown and, therefore, somewhat uncertain.

¹⁹⁶ Cave 559 was dated by Tufnell to the Late Bronze III; the cave contained two imitation Base Ring jugs that point toward the Late Bronze IIB/Iron I (Tufnell 1958: 246). A similar assemblage comes from the Iron IA strata after the destruction of Ekron VIII and prior to the appearance of the monochrome Philistine wares in the material studied by Rachel Ben-Dov and Anne Killebrew.

¹⁹⁷ While the pieces of glyptic art from the tell of Beth Shemesh are not included here, Tomb 1 functions as a defined locus where the ceramic assemblage forms the basis for the date of the tomb.

¹⁹⁸ The date of the archaeological context of this impression is not certain.

may have been produced posthumously. Other examples, dated to the mid- to late 12th Dynasty, are known from Memphis (Richards 1992: 32, note 80; cf. Keel 1995a: 175). Ben-Tor concluded compellingly that production of this motif increased in the Second Intermediate Period both in Egypt and the Southern Levant. She argued for Canaanite production of most variants of this type (Ben-Tor 2007: §IIA3c and §IIIA3c). Production of seals with this motif likely continued during the Late Bronze at a reduced rate, and the motif even appeared on cylinder seals from the Southern Levant during this period (Tufnell 1940: Pl. XXXIIIA, No. 44).

The ANRA motif was first noted by Weill who was unable to determine their meaning (Weill 1918: 191–193 and 785–787). At that time, Weill noted the peculiar way the *n*-sign was written on a plaque with the name of Senusret III (1918: 191 and 250; see also Tufnell 1984: 121; Keel 1995a: 175). Weill astutely noted the decorative way the signs could be flipped to fill negative space on the seal’s base (1918: 192), and that the *r* could be engraved as a *nb*-sign to fill negative space at the bottom of tapering areas (1918: 193). Unable to read the signs, Weill asked whether the names in the cartouches were real or illusory (1918: 785).

Early on, Petrie tried to translate the varied sequence (1919: 46). A few years later, he remarked that the group might be “ignorantly written” and that the signs were “mere blunders” for *dj.n R^c* which Petrie translated as “Ra gave” (Petrie 1925: 17). Murray also attempted to read these scarabs (Murray 1949: 92–99; Tufnell 1948: 104–105). She argued that the repeated sequence was a reference to the god *R^c*. For Murray, the signs could not be haphazard and meaningless because the seals of the Hyksos period were of such high quality, workmanship, and material—often encased in gold bezels

(Murray 1949: 95). Murray read the sentence *dj.n m R^c* as “The name of Re is given,” and *rdj.n R^c* as “Re has given” or “The Gift of Re” (Murray 1949: 96). However, even Murray recognized that at times the writing could not be made into intelligible phrases (Murray 1949: 95). She offered strained readings of signs that were flipped pleaseingly on a horizontal axis in order to fill negative space because she failed to recognize the fundamentally decorative nature of the signs. In one instance, a scarab from her publication has an outer symmetrical column with the signs *zʹ-r-n-r-zʹ* which Murray read as *z3 m* from two directions so that the terminal sign, *n*, is shared by both phrases (Murray 1949: No. 22). However, the next scarab in Murray’s corpus has a similar alternating patterns (Murray 1949: No. 23), but the signs of the outer columns can not be read in the same way (*zʹ-n-^cn-zʹ* and *zʹ-n-r-n-zʹ*). The vast variety in the order of repeated signs frustrates attempts to read them. Instead, it is clear that the longer signs are placed at the narrowing ends of the columns while wider signs fill the broader part of the columns.

One scholar has attempted to read these signs as a reference to the god El (Richards 2001). Goldwasser also attempted to read the sign D36 as “giving an offering,” the *n*-sign as a reference to “water” or “drink” and *r*-sign or *t*-sign as “bread” or “cake” (Goldwasser 2006: 130–131). Daphna Ben-Tor rightfully noted, however, that the wide variety of additional signs—including hieroglyphs and pseudo-hieroglyphs—argues against reading the phrase in these ways (Ben-Tor 2009: 86). These false starts and numerous unproductive readings lead the researcher back to Hornung and Staehelin’s conclusions: they argue that, though the sequence could be a magical spell like those that occur in later Egyptian texts (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 51), these signs are

unmistakably decorative due to the malleable way the signs rotate to fill negative space and the shape of the space determines the sign engraved.

It may be that a related sequence of hieroglyphs began in Egypt and was intelligible in its early form, yet as scarabs with this phrase were imported to the Southern Levant, they were replicated by artisans who no longer understood the meaning of the signs. Goldwasser and Ben-Tor have suggested that the unique political relationship between Canaan and Egypt in the Second Intermediate Period may have resulted in elite emulation among locally produced, Levantine Middle Bronze scarabs (Goldwasser 2006: 121; Ben-Tor 2009: 83). For example, a Middle Bronze scarab from Tell el-‘Ağul was likely an import to the Southern Levant. The scarab may read $R^{\epsilon}(N5)$ with a complementary $r(D21)$ and $\epsilon(D36)$ (Keel 1997: 266–267 [Tell el-‘Ağul 483]). Though the precise origin of the phrase is unknown, the sequence became part of the local glyptic tradition in the Southern Levant where it became unintelligible in the hands of novice, local scribes. The sequence varies widely (D. Ben-Tor 1997: 175), frustrating any possible reading. The random distribution of signs, inconsistent sequences, and association with other unintelligible signs points to unintelligible readings on scarabs produced in the Southern Levant (Ben-Tor 2009: 84).

As the signs became an established part of the local glyptic tradition of the Southern Levant, they were used decoratively. At times, one form of a sign was chosen because it fit in the space provided by the registers or cartouche. For instance, when the base is divided by vertical registers so that the upper and lower extremities of the register taper due to the oval shape, a longer and thinner sign is engraved comfortably at the ends of the register (e.g., Murray 1949: Nos. 22 and 23). Circular or oval signs are frequently

engraved at the top and bottom of rounded cartouches. Such examples lead Hornung and Staehelin to conclude that the choice of characters may, in fact, have been based on appearance rather than sound. They note that the long, flat characters—*n*, *r*, *ᶜ*—tend to be reserved for the central portion of a column (Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 51–52).

These decorative signs are also local Levantine approximations of Egyptian hieroglyphs. The most malleable sign of the ANRA group is the *r*, and the engravers often failed to distinguish between *t*, *nb*, and *r*. The blurring of these signs is clear when one column is a symmetrical copy of another. The careless mirror image of the *r*-sign can become either a *nb*-sign or a *t*-sign, while the *n*-sign and *ᶜ*-sign are mirrored across the same axis without change (Keel 1997: 132–133 [Tell el-‘Ağul 83],¹⁹⁹ 222–223 [Tell el-‘Ağul 358]; cf. 434–435 [Tell el-‘Ağul 974]; Keel 2010b: 52–53 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 57]). In one instance, the engraver appears to have intended for two rows of ANRA signs to have the same sequence, yet the upper row has a *nb*-sign while the lower row has an *r*-sign (Keel 1997: 268–269 [Tell el-‘Ağul 486]). The lack of differentiation among these three signs is also clear in a repetitive sequence. For example, one scarab has three columns with the sequence *rnrrn* in which the *r*-signs occasionally resemble the *nb*-sign (Keel 1997: 52–53 [Achsib 94]).²⁰⁰ Three other scarabs repeat the signs in a set order—*r*, *ᶜ*, *n*—but the second *r*-sign resembles a *t*-sign or *nb*-sign (Keel 1997: 386–387 [Tell el-‘Ağul 831], 448–449 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1011], 476–481 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1089, 1096, 1098]; cf. Keel 1997: 348–349 [Tell el-‘Ağul 722]). The *nb*-sign appears relatively frequently after

¹⁹⁹ When discussing the ANRA motif’s tendencies, this study will cite scarabs from primary, secondary, and less secure contexts because, at this time, the broad tendencies of the motif are more important than establishing the date of the individual item.

²⁰⁰ For other repeated sequences, see also Keel 1997: 326–327 [Tell el-‘Ağul 540] and 448–449 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1015]; Keel 2010a: 42–43 [Bet-Mirsim 1, 2]; Keel 2010b: 42–43 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 32]; cf. Keel 1997: 632–633 [Akko 288].

an *n*-sign in a vertical column because the lower edge of the preceding sign creates a negative space that is filled perfectly by the *nb*-sign rather than the *r*-sign or *t*-sign (Keel 1997: 476–481 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1089, 1096, 1098]; Keel 2010a: 42–43 [Bet-Mirsim 1]). The confusion of the *t*-sign with the *r*-sign also frustrates any attempts to read the sequence as “Ra of Ra” as if Ra were self-referential. The evidence is sufficient to demonstrate that the signs are decorative, and the engraver did not know Egyptian well enough to write legibly.

As noted above, the *nb*-sign and *t*-sign fill negative space created by other motifs. Signs are chosen that conform to both the ends of a curved cartouche. Narrower signs are engraved at the end of a tapering column. As expected, the *nb*-sign tends to be written in the curved bottom of a cartouche while the *t*-sign is engraved in the curved top of a cartouche (Keel 1997: 198–199 [Tell el-‘Ağul 286]; 234–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 390]; 410–411 [Tell el-‘Ağul 900]; 474–475 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1082, 1084]; Keel 2013: 64–65 [Tel Gamma 146]; 390–391 [Geser 518]; 438–439 [Geser 632]; 570–571 [Tel Harasim 40, elytra]; Kabri: Mizrachy 2002: 333–335, No. 22; Lachish: Keel 2004b: 1548, No. 20, Fig. 23.41.2). The engravers also tended to chose signs that conform to the negative space created by the extremities of a column. A column that tapers at the top often ends with a *t*-sign (Keel 1997: 254–255 [Tell el-‘Ağul 447]; 442–443 [Tell el-‘Ağul 992]; 448–449 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1015]; Richards 1992: No. 25; Ben-Tor and Keel 2014: 190–191 [AR 299]) or an *r*-sign engraved askew in the negative space (Keel 2010b: 216–217 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 439]), while its lower extremity may end in a *nb*-sign (Keel 1997: 310–311 [Tell el-‘Ağul 615]; 338–339 [Tell el-‘Ağul 694]; 448–449 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1015, 1016];

Keel 2010a: 192–193 [Bet-Schean 217]; 398–399 [Dan 38]; Richard 1992: No. 25; cf. Keel 1997: 310–311 [Tell el-‘Ağul 614]).

The inability to distinguish between these three signs is not limited to the ANRA group. This phenomenon is also known from other locally produced Middle Bronze scarabs from the Southern Levant. For example, an engraver attempting to write the name Ptah mistakenly engraves a *nb*-sign instead of the *t*-sign (Keel 1997: 100–101 [Afula 4]).²⁰¹ This Ptah scarab shows a passive knowledge of the Egyptian writing system in the Middle Bronze, but the knowledge is that of a novice.

Curved 𐎗-signs (D36) also tend to conform to the negative space provided. The 𐎗 sign may curve to fill the ends of a cartouche (Keel 1997: 234–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 390]; 254–255 [Tell el-‘Ağul 447]; 334–335 [Tell el-‘Ağul 678]; 350–351 [Tell el-‘Ağul 726]; 404–405 [Tell el-‘Ağul 881]; 410–411 [Tell el-‘Ağul 900]; 441–442 [Tell el-‘Ağul 987]; Keel 2010b: 42–43 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 32]; Keel 2013: 304–305 [Geser 312]; Lachish: Keel 2004b: 1548, No. 20, Fig. 23.41.2; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 149, No. 17; Egger and Keel 2006: 42–43 [Amman 56]) or the end of a row or column (Keel 1997: 365–366 [Tell el-‘Ağul 763]; 404–405 [Tell el-‘Ağul 883]; 416–417 [Tell el-‘Ağul 919]; 476–477 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1089]; 480–481 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1098]; 514–515 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1207]; 734–735 [Ashkelon 119]; Keel 2010b: 34–35 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 14]; 74–75 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 111]; 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]; 382–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 841²⁰² and 842]; Pella: Richards 1992: No. 22.).

²⁰¹ This study will return to the discussion of the local production of Ptah scarabs in the Southern Levant in Chapter Five.

²⁰² This item’s current location is unknown. Only a drawing of the item is available.

The *n*-sign is often engraved with its peculiar Southern Levantine form of a horizontal line with vertical ticks (D. Ben-Tor 1997: 171), though this sign is occasionally engraved as a standard zig-zag line. Because the Southern Levantine engravers could not distinguish between the peculiar local form and the standard form of the *n*-sign, both forms of the *n*-sign often appear on one scarab's base (Keel 2010a: 42–43 [Bet-Mirsim 1]; 398–399 [Dan 38]; Ben-Tor and Keel 2014: 198–199 [AR 315]).

A number of scholars have noted that the ANRA signs tend to be wide and thin (Tufnell 1984: 121; Keel 1995a: 175). Additional long, thin signs are used in collocation with ANRA signs on Southern Levantine scarabs of the Middle Bronze, while the variety of additional signs combined with ANRA signs decreases sharply on scarabs produced during the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Ward has pointed out the signs typically added to the Middle Bronze ANRA scarabs from Egypt and Nubia (Ward 1987: 24-25). In fact, the forms of these signs tend to be peculiar to the Southern Levant (D. Ben-Tor 1997: 171):

ʿd Keel 1997: 295–296 [Tell el-ʿAğul 566]; 436–437 [Tell el-ʿAğul 981]; 448–449 [Tell el-ʿAğul 1014]; 478–479 [Tell el-ʿAğul 1097]; Keel 2010a: 32–33 [Bet-Gamliel 1]; 52–53 [Bet-Mirsim 24]; 514–515 [Efrat 1]; 600–601 [Tel Esur 11]. Keel 2013: 250–251 [Geser 190]; 294–295 [Geser 290]; 306–307 [Geser 318]; Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 282.19; 286.12, 18; 294.13, 14; 301.8. Lachish: Keel 2004b: 1539, No. 8, Fig. 23.37.1; Garstang 1932: Pl. 38, No. 14; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 150, Nos. 76, 87; Harrison 2004: 100, No. 5, Pl. 39, No. 11.

hṭp Keel 1997: 334–335 [Tell el-ʿAğul 678]; 340–341 [Tell el-ʿAğul 699]; 692–693 [Ashkelon 13]; Keel 2010a: 578–579 [En-Samije 13]; 586–587 [En-Samije 33]; 598–599 [Tel Esur 6]; Keel 2010b: 16–17 [Tell el-Farʿa-Nord 32²⁰³]; 46–47 [Tell el-Farʿa Süd 43²⁰⁴]; 52–53 [Tell el-Farʿa Süd 56]. Keel 2013: 25–26

²⁰³ Only a drawing of this item is extant and must be relied upon for analysis.

²⁰⁴ The form of the sign is not clearly a standard form of *hṭp*. The increasingly wide range of forms of the sign demonstrates the local nature of the writing (see also D. Ben-Tor 1997: Fig. 6, Nos. 6–8).

[Tel Gamma 52]; 304–305 [Geser 312];²⁰⁵ 380–381 [Geser 493];²⁰⁶ Ben-Tor and Keel 2014: 196–197 [AR 314]; Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 290.17, 27; 293.10; 295.6; 297.15; 302.18; Kabri: Mizrachy 2002: 333–335, No. 22; Garstang 1932: Pl. 38, No. 9; Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pls. 32.87, 90; 34.160; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pls. 149, No. 17; 150, No. 66.

*d*²⁰⁷ Keel 2010a: 131–132 [Bet-Schean 74]; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 149, No. 51.

*k*³ Keel 1997: 367–368 [Tell el-‘Ağul 773]; 441–442 [Tell el-‘Ağul 987]; 448–449 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1014]; 478–479 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1097]; 732–733 [Aschkelon 117]; 770–771 [‘Atlit 32]; Keel 2010a: 32–33 [Bet-Gamliel 1]; 192–193 [Bet-Schean 217]; 328–329 [Tel Bira 2]; 514–515 [Efrat 1]; Keel 2010b: 16–17 [Tell el-Far‘a-Nord 32];²⁰⁸ 64–65 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 89 (?)]. Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 293.10; 294.13; 295.19; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pls. 150, Nos. 66, 76; 151, No. 129.

*z*³ At times, the ANRA signs are also collocated with *z*³ or “protection” possibly for amuletic purposes. See Keel 1997: 96–97 [Afek 51]; 132–133 [Tell el-‘Ağul 85]; 164–165 [Tell el-‘Ağul 174]; 234–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 387]; 312–313 [Tell el-‘Ağul 614]; 378–379 [Tell el-‘Ağul 804]; 486–487 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1121];²⁰⁹ 732–733 [Aschkelon 117]; Keel 2010a: 34–35 [Bet-Gamliel 6]; 328–329 [Tel Bira 2]; 600–601 [Tel Esur 11]; Keel 2010b: 38–39 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 24]; 52–53 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 57]; 66–69 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 90 and 95]; Keel 2013: 274–275 [Geser 240]; 314–315 [Geser 337]; 408–409 [Geser 564]; Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 285.16, 17; Garstang 1932: Pl. 37, No. 50. See also the following related scarabs: Keel 1997: 422–423 [Tell el-‘Ağul 936]; 452–453 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1024].²¹⁰

h^c Keel 2013: 250–251 [Geser 190]; 382–383 [Geser 500];²¹¹ Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 282.16; 285.16, 17; 286.13; 287.1; 289.15; 290.17, 27; 293.3; 294.14, 15; 296.11; 297.15; Garstang 1932: Pl. 38, No. 14; Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 34.158, 159; Shiloh: Brandl 1993b: 209–210, No. 6; Megiddo: Harrison 2004: 100, No. 5, Pl. 39, No. 11 = Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 213.

So-called ANRA motifs are found on both scarabs and cylinder seals of the Middle Bronze. Local cylinder seals show the Egyptianizing ANRA signs absorbed into Levantine motifs (Teissier 1996: 37, No. 71) and cartouches with the three ANRA signs

²⁰⁵ This item has not been located in current collections and is only known from a drawing.

²⁰⁶ This item has not been located in current collections and is only known from a drawing.

²⁰⁷ Scarabs have a schematic version of sign N26 (Hoch 1998: 39).

²⁰⁸ This item has not been located in current collections and is only known from a drawing.

²⁰⁹ This item has not been located in current collections and is only known from a drawing. It comes from an unknown context.

²¹⁰ These examples include only one of the three ANRA-signs.

²¹¹ This item also comes from the highly problematic excavations of MacAlister at Gezer, and only a drawing is available.

(Teissier 1996: 31–32, Nos. 61, 62, 217, 218, and 220). These cartouches are situated between what may be either a god and the king (Teissier 1996: No. 217) or the pharaoh and an official (Teissier 1996: Nos. 61, 62). Similar to scarabs discussed above, the order and arrangement of the ANRA-signs on Middle Bronze cylinder seals tend to conform to the shape of the negative space, and the *r*-sign or *nb*-sign fill the negative space created by the curved top or bottom of the cartouche (Teissier 1996: Nos. 217, 61, and 62). The attire of the lower-ranking figure—whether it is the king before the god or an official before the pharaoh—is noticeably Levantine on the cylinder seals with the ANRA motif. These factors point toward local production of cylinder seals with an Egyptianizing motif. Only the *n*-sign is not engraved in the local Levantine form of a straight line with vertical hashes (Teissier 1996: 31, No. 71; Tufnell 1984: 121). The ANRA signs have been incorporated and absorbed into the local Levantine glyptic tradition of the Middle Bronze on both scarabs and cylinder seals. The motif is part of an Egyptian sphere of influence and always appears with Egyptianizing motifs on locally produced Southern Levantine scarabs.

LATER IMITATIONS OF THE MIDDLE BRONZE ANRA-MOTIF

Now that this study has explored the full range of the Middle Bronze tradition of this motif, it will turn to later imitations. As shown above, Southern Levantine archaeological contexts with ANRA scarabs are most often dated to the Middle Bronze and the Late Bronze IIB–Iron I, though they are also found in the interim Late Bronze I period and later Iron II contexts. The distribution of scarabs with this motif is bimodal showing two

periods of likely production. The frequency of scarabs with the ANRA motif is distributed chronologically as follows:

Table 21: Scarabs with the ANRA Motif Organized by Date of Context

Period	Frequency
Middle Bronze ²¹²	151
Late Bronze I	16
Late Bronze IIA	8
Late Bronze IIB	6
Iron I ²¹³	35
Iron IIA	4
Iron IIB	8
Iron IIC	5

²¹² This study has not distinguished between different periods of the Middle Bronze because it is not the focus here. By the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, the memory of these scarabs would almost certainly not have distinguished between scarabs produced in different periods of the Middle Bronze. If the reader is interested in pursuing this question, they should consult the excellent 2007 work of Daphna Ben-Tor.

²¹³ Archaeological contexts from the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I have been included here because the latest date of this transition is during the Iron I. This gives the semblance that production occurred during all of the Iron I when, in fact, there is solid evidence for the rise in production during the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I.

Late Roman	1
------------	---

Early in the 20th century Hall proposed imitations of Hyksos scarabs in the 19th Dynasty (Hall 1913: xv), but he did little more than note that Delta traditions were popular in both periods.

The later imitations of Middle Bronze ANRA signs belie their true date of production by combining ANRA signs with other motifs that became increasingly popular in the Ramesside period. One scarab's base combines ANRA signs with the name of Ptah and Amun-Re, deities who are much more common on late New Kingdom scarabs (Keel 2010b: 276–277 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 579]).

This same scarab from Tell el-Far‘ah (South) also uses a later form of the ϵ -sign with a double loop. Later imitations commonly write the ϵ -sign with a double loop, sometimes resembling the $\underline{d}w$ -sign (Keel 1997: 30–31 [Achsib 24]; Keel 2010a: 138–139 [Bet-Schean 93]; 204–205 [Bet-Schean 236]; 492–493 [Dotan 7]; Keel 2010b: 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]; 254–255 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 529]; 276–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 579, 581, 586, 587]; 302–303 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 641]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 669]; 320–321 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 686]; 380–381 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 834]; 392–393 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 867]). ANRA scarabs from excavations with questionable archaeological method—like Grant's excavations at Gezer—may also be dated to the Late Bronze IIB to Iron I period based on the presence of this form of the sign (Keel 2013: 284–285 [Geer 266]; 306–307 [Geser 317]). Additional scarabs lack the three other signs from the ANRA motif, but they have the same idiosyncratic form of the ϵ -sign. These scarabs are also later imitations (Keel 2010b: 286–287 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 600]; Keel 2013: 432–433

[Geser 618]; Megiddo: Harrison 2004: 100, No. 6; Pl. 39, No. 12 = Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 214).²¹⁴

Though rare, this double-looped sign does occur on locally made items from the Middle Bronze, but it is a different phenomenon on scarabs with the ANRA motif (Keel 2013: 314–315 [Geser 337]; see also Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 286.13; Tufnell 1958: Pls. 32.105; 34.159, 161). As discussed above, ANRA scarabs produced in the Middle Bronze often combine the repeated ANRA-signs with other signs or attempted signs. The *dw*-like sign (N26), which resembles the double-looped form of the *c*-sign, is engraved alongside the ANRA motif on Middle Bronze scarabs. The combination of other repeated signs with the ANRA signs is common on ANRA scarabs from the Middle Bronze, but it is uncommon on scarabs from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Additionally, this sign can be found on other locally made Middle Bronze scarabs in which it is decoupled from the ANRA motif (Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 288.12; 294.13; 298.12). While this form occurs rarely on Middle Bronze scarabs, the double-looped form of the sign is a distinct and common phenomenon on later imitations of the ANRA motif.

The later imitations—like the Middle Bronze scarabs—mistake the *nb*-sign for an *r*-sign (Keel 2010a: 138–139 [Bet-Schean 93]; Keel 2010b: 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]; 276–277 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 578]; 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 586]; 302–303 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 641 and 644]). Unsurprisingly, the “mistaken” *nb*-sign fills the negative

²¹⁴ There are additional scarabs that Keel has identified as Ramesside imitations of the ANRA scarabs with the double looped *c*-sign, but they are from a private collection donated to the Israel Museum and published by Givon and Kertesz (1986). The collectors claimed and it was reported in the IAA log housed at the IAA storerooms in Beth Shemesh that they come from “Akko and the area.” Because an antiquities dealer may increase the value of an item by telling a credible story during its sale, these narratives must be viewed with suspicion and their inclusion in a catalogue of provenance items must be questioned. The scarabs with ANRA signs that reflect this later form of the *c*-sign are as follows: Keel 1997: Akko 27; Keel 1997: Ashkelon 13.

space that commonly occurs when the flat end of the *n*-sign precedes it in the column (Keel 2010a: 138–139 [Bet-Schean 93]. Keel 2010b: 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]; 276–277 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 578]; 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 586]; 302–303 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 641]). As in the Middle Bronze, the undifferentiated *r/t/nb*-signs on later imitations often conform to the negative space on a scarab’s base; *t*-signs are written at the top of the scarab’s base or the top of a curved cartouche (Keel 1997: 30–31 [Achsi 24]; Keel 2010b: 302–303 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 641]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 669]; 320–321 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 686]; 382–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 843]; 392–393 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 867]) and *nb*-signs at the bottom of a base or cartouche (Keel 2010b: 302–303 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 641]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 669]; 320–321 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 686]; 330–331 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 706]; 382–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 843]; 392–393 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 867]; Keel 2013: 284–285 [Geser 266]).

Additionally, the *n*-sign of the ANRA signs tends to have many more vertical ticks on later imitations than on Middle Bronze examples (Keel 2013: 306–307 [Geser 317]), but this criterion on its own is not diagnostic for later imitations because this form of the *n*-sign occurs regularly on Middle Bronze scarabs.

Other signs were also engraved alongside ANRA signs on scarabs from the Middle Bronze. The *hġ*-sign (N28) was one such sign (Keel 2013: 2–3 [Tel Gamma 2]; Keel 2013: 206–207 [Geser 90]; Pella: Richards 1992: No. 23; Ben-Tor and Keel 2014: 196–197 [AR 197]; Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 282.16; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 150, No. 87; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 153, No. 231 = Harrison 2006: Pl. 39, No. 11). During the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, the collocation of the *hġ*-sign with ANRA signs may continue on locally produced scarabs from the southern Coastal Plain; one scarab

engraves $\underline{h}j$, n , r/nb , and ϵ in a column (Keel 2010b: 242–243 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 502]).

The telltale sign of likely, though not definitive, later production is the double-looped ϵ -sign, which has been combined with $\underline{h}j$. Another scarab from a Late Bronze IIB–Iron I context also has a similar $\underline{h}j$ -sign combined with ANRA-signs. Interlocking scrolls surround the column of pseudo-writing (Keel 2010b: 278–279 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 585]).²¹⁵ Another scarab from a Late Bronze IIB and Iron I context features the $\underline{h}j$ -sign at the bottom of a column with the repetitive sequence $r\epsilon r\epsilon r\epsilon$ above (Keel 2010b: Tell el-Far‘a Süd 850). Again, there are no other criteria beyond the archaeological context that point toward the identification of this scarab as a later imitation of Middle Bronze scarabs. It is prudent in these instances not to date the item’s production with any certainty.

Later imitations may very rarely mimic the combination of ANRA signs with a greater variety of signs, which was a common phenomenon in the Middle Bronze. One scarab from Tell el-Far‘ah (South) combines the ANRA signs with the k^j -sign and $\underline{h}pr$ -sign (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 586]). It mimics the layout of Middle Bronze scarabs with three columns of signs, but it may belie its later production by using a later form of the ϵ -sign that more closely resembles the \underline{dw} -sign. The head and clypeus resemble a common Middle Bronze form (D1 from Tufnell 1984: 32, Fig. 12), but the tools used to engrave this scarab failed to create the deep grooves typical of the Middle Bronze.

Archaizing is not limited to the image on the base. In a few instances, even the backs of the scarabs replicate the baroque details of Middle Bronze scarabs. For example, a hashed line is typical of the backs of Middle Bronze scarabs (Keel 1997: 38–39 [Achsib

²¹⁵ I tend not to identify a scarab as a later imitation unless the item exhibits more than one feature of later production.

48]; 140–141 [Tell el-‘Ağul 108]; 206–207 [Tell el-‘Ağul 306]; 232–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 385, 390, and 391]; 238–239 [Tell el-‘Ağul 400]; 254–255 [Tell el-‘Ağul 448]; 292–293 [Tell el-‘Ağul 560 (?)]; 304–305 [Tell el-‘Ağul 592]; 310–311 [Tell el-‘Ağul 614]; 336–337 [Tell el-‘Ağul 683]; 366–367 [Tell el-‘Ağul 773]; 378–379 [Tell el-‘Ağul 807]; 445–446 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1001]; 470–471 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1070]; 474–475 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1083]; 504–505 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1179]; 750–751 [Asor 8]; Keel 2010a: 194–195 [Bet-Schean 220]; 246–249 [Bet-Schemesch 66,²¹⁶ 71]; 254–255 [Bet-Schemesch 85]; Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 283, No. 22). This Middle Bronze element has been added to the back of a later imitation of the ANRA scarabs (Keel 1997: 30–31 [Achsib 24]). Similarly, curved lines are also added on the elytra of Middle Bronze scarabs (e.g., Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 289, No. 2). These curved lines have been imitated on the elytra of later scarabs with the ANRA motif (Keel 1997: 30–31 [Achsib 24]). Also, additional lines appear at angles on the elytra of Middle Bronze scarabs (Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 286, No. 18; cf. Keel 2010a: 18–19 [Betaniën 7]; 292–293 [Bet-Schemesch 171]; Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 292, No. 18). A later imitation of the ANRA motif adds similar lines to the elytra (Keel 1997: 52–53 [Achsib 90]). Lastly, Middle Bronze scarabs occasionally add curled lines to the back of the scarab (Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 293, No. 5; 295, No. 1). A later imitation does likewise (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 587]).

Twenty of thirty-five scarabs from Iron I contexts with the ANRA motif come from Tell el-Far‘ah (South). A production center was likely located at this southern site.

²¹⁶ All three scarabs listed here were excavated by Grant at Beth Shemesh. They come from uncertain contexts. Despite this, the overwhelming evidence from Middle Bronze contexts at other sites makes the conclusion certain.

We will return to the Tell el-Far‘ah (South) below as this study continues to examine later imitations of Middle Bronze motifs.

LATER IMITATIONS OF OTHER MIDDLE BRONZE MOTIFS

While most motifs on scarabs found in Late Bronze and Iron I contexts lack a sufficient number of examples to date them securely to a period narrower than the New Kingdom or Late New Kingdom, the larger corpus of ANRA scarabs produced in the transition from the Late Bronze IIB to the Iron I can be examined for other archaizing motifs from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I period. Because the sample size of later imitations of the ANRA motif is larger, conclusions can be more certain. Later imitations of ANRA scarabs can then be used to identify the telltale signs of later imitations of other Middle Bronze motifs. Motifs which were produced locally in the Middle Bronze reemerge in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I as local production increases yet again. These local traditions were not entirely dormant during the Late Bronze I and Late Bronze IIA, but local production was on a much smaller scale.

STRIDING LION

The motif of a striding lion from locally produced Middle Bronze scarabs is imitated on later scarabs. Leonine motifs vary widely on the Egyptian scarabs of the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period as well as the local Levantine scarabs from the Middle Bronze. Animal motifs were not popular on the Egyptian series of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period; they were increasingly popular on the locally produced scarabs, which Ben-Tor calls the Late Palestinian series (Ben-Tor 2007: 31–33,

97, 147, and 177; Pls. 19, Nos. 6; Pl. 62, Nos. 29–30; Pl. 99, Nos. 35–40; Pl. 100, Nos. 1–36; Pl. 101, Nos. 1–11; Tufnell 1984: Pl. 40). Few animals, apart from the hippopotamus goddess Twosret, appear on Egyptian scarabs of the Middle Kingdom.²¹⁷ Ben-Tor soundly concludes that the relatively small number of examples of lions from the Egyptian series of the Second Intermediate Period and the large number of scarabs with lions from the Late Palestinian series indicates that the motif is of Southern Levantine origin and production (Ben-Tor 2007: 97, §IIA9d). Indeed, the number of scarabs with a leonine motif in the Southern Levant is very high in the Late Palestinian series (Tufnell 1984: Pl. 40; cf. Pls. 36–39, 41; Ben-Tor 2007: 146–147, §IIIA9; 177, §IVA9d).

The leonine motif is both hollowed-out and outlined in Middle Bronze examples (Ben-Tor 2007: 177). When outlined, the raised portions of the lion's body are often hashed in one or two directions, which is typical of other Middle Bronze motifs. The lion may be striding, recumbent, or have lowered hindquarters (Tufnell 1984: Pl. 40; Ben-Tor 2007: Pls. 99, Nos. 35–39; Pl. 100, Nos. 1–35; Pl. 101, Nos. 1–11). The lion may be striding with its feet on the bottom of the scarab's base (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 99, Nos. 35 and 38) or over an enemy (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 99, No. 40) or animal (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 100, Nos. 4, 9, 13, 16, 20, 26, 34; Pl. 101, No. 1). Only rarely does a Middle Bronze scarab depict a lion with an anthropomorphic figure who is not being trampled (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 100, No. 28 and Pl. 101, No. 10).

The later imitation of the striding-lion motif differs from Middle Bronze examples. While Middle Bronze scarabs exhibit greater variation, later imitations narrow the motif to simply a striding lion. The earlier form of the motif depicts the striding lion

²¹⁷ A scarab from Kahun with a recumbent lion is one of the few examples of Egyptian scarabs with an animal motif (Ben-Tor 2007: 31–33, §IA9).

walking on the edge of the scarab's base with his front leg slightly raised (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 99, Nos. 3, 38; Pl. 100, Nos. 1, 3, 5, 18, 19, 29, 36; Pl. 101, No. 2). Often another element—half-circles, an *n*-like sign, a branch, or the uraeus—is engraved in front of the lion's mouth (Keel 1997: 136–137 [Tell el-‘Ağul 96]; 234–235 [Tell el-‘Ağul 388]; 382–383 [Tell el-‘Ağul 816]; 450–451 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1017]; 490–491 [Tell el-‘Ağul 1134]; 732–733 [Aschkelon 118]; Keel 2010a: 194–195 [Bet-Schean 221]; Keel 2010b: 38–39 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 25]; 46–47 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 44]; 206–207 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 418]; 210–211 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 425]; Tell el-Hesi: O’Connell *et al.* 1978: 85f; Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 290.21 and 296.17; Kabri: Mizrachy 2002: 328–329, No. 15; Transjordan: Egger and Keel 2006: 408–409 [Tall Deir ‘Alla 31]; Beqa: Kamid el-Loz: Kühne and Salje 1996: Pl. 19.77; cf. Keel 1997: 258–259 [Tell el-‘Ağul 461]; Tufnell 1984: Pl. 40; Keel 2013: 560–561 [Tel Harasim 15]). While this motif may have been imported occasionally from Egypt (cf. Petrie 1925: Pl. 14.877; Hornung and Staehelin 1976: 344, No. 780; Brandl 1993b: 211–212, Fig. 8.9), its higher frequency in the Middle Bronze corpus of Southern Palestine suggests it was also locally made.

Engravers of the Middle Bronze executed this leonine motif in two ways: a hollowed-out style and a deeply grooved outline (Ben-Tor 2007: 177, §IVA9d). Scarabs with the hollowed-out motif tend to be made of faience. Faience made the standard outlining and hashing of the Middle Bronze style difficult to execute because smaller details could not easily be implemented in the molds (Keel 2013: 190–191 [Geser 53, 53a]). Many of the later imitations are made of other materials, and, accordingly, few execute the motif by hollowing out the lion's body (Keel 2010b: 310–311 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 660]).

Later imitations of the Middle Bronze motif outline the lion's body, but the front leg is lowered. In front of the lion, the artisans added an unidentified motif that consists of one or two lines that conform to the shape of the negative space (Keel 2010a: 282–283 [Bet-Schemesch 153²¹⁸]; 434–435 [Der el-Balah 79²¹⁹]; Keel 2010b: 238–239 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 490²²⁰]; 310–311 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 660²²¹]; 340–341 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 734²²²]; Keel 2013: 58–59 [Tel Gamma 135²²³]; 152–153 [Tel Gerisa 33²²⁴]; 558–559 [Tel Harasim 13²²⁵]). The lion's raised body is not hashed as occurs in the Middle Bronze.

²¹⁸ As noted above, the excavations of Grant are unreliable. Nonetheless, this item has been included as part of a broader corpus of later imitations of Middle Bronze motifs so that the reader can view the full corpus of the proposed motif. This item mimics the Middle Bronze style, but the shallower engravings and further schematization suggest that this scarab is a later imitation of the Middle Bronze motif.

²¹⁹ Both the style of engraving and the form of the head and clypeus point to later production. Note the head and clypeus are of the form D10 which was discussed above in Chapter Three as an indicator of Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA production.

²²⁰ The style of engraving, the even greater schematization of the motif, and the archaeological context indicate that this item is a likely later imitation of a Middle Bronze tradition. The head is highly schematized (B10). This form of the head and clypeus is common on other scarabs that have an imitation of Middle Bronze motifs (Keel 2010b: 340–341 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 734]; Keel 2013: 152–153 [Tel Gerisa 33]).

²²¹ The archaeological context and the form of the head (D10) point toward a later production. The motif imitates the overall layout of Middle Bronze leonine motifs, but the motif is not engraved in the fully schematic style. Instead, it mimics those leonine motifs which were hollowed out.

²²² The archaeological context and shallower style of engraving indicate a later imitation. The head is also heavily schematized (B10) as occurs on other scarabs which imitate a Middle Bronze motif (Keel 2010b: 238–239 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 490]; Keel 2013: 152–153 [Tel Gerisa 33]). Unfortunately, a B10 head is not diagnostically significant for Late Bronze IIB or Iron I production on its own. The archaeological context only extends to the Iron IA, indicating these imitations may have been contemporary with the 19th or early 20th Dynasty.

²²³ The date of this production is indicated by both the shallower engraving and the highly schematized leonine motif. Again, the head and clypeus are highly schematic as well, but this feature is not diagnostically significant on its own, as discussed in Chapter Three.

²²⁴ The shallower engraving and the highly schematized outline of the leonine motif indicate that this item was a later imitation of the Middle Bronze tradition of engraving. Unfortunately, the archaeological context is unknown. The head and clypeus are again highly schematized (B10) as occurs on two other scarabs (Keel 2010b: 238–239 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 490]; 340–341 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 734]).

²²⁵ The style of engraving and the highly schematized outline of the leonine motif point toward later production. Again, the wider range of leonine motifs on Middle Bronze scarabs has been narrowed on the later imitations to only the striding lion motif. The imitation is again executed almost exclusively in an outlined style rather than hollowed out. Unfortunately, the archaeological context is not helpful as a further indicator of its date of production. The form of the head is an idiosyncratic schematization which attempts to mimic imperfectly Middle Bronze ridging.

On Late Bronze II and Iron I scarabs, the motif of the striding lion is not limited to an imitation of a Middle Bronze style. A related striding lion motif is engraved in a New Kingdom style in which leonine features are hollowed out, rather than outlined (Keel 2010b: 286–287 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 601]; 300–301 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 638]; 366–367 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 799]; Keel 2013: 446–447 [Geser 650]; Shiloh: Brandl 1993b: 215–216, No. 14; cf. Keel 2013: 208–209 [Geser 97²²⁶]; 214–215 [Geser 104]). A similar motif is also found on the so-called Mass-Produced Post-Ramesside scarabs, which will be discussed below (e.g., Keel 2013: 144–147 [Tel Gerisa 11 and 16]).

A related sphinx with a lion-body and a human head also appears on one scarab as a Ramesside imitation of a Middle Bronze motif and style. The motif was found on a scarab from a Middle Bronze context (Keel 1997: 258–259 [Tell el-‘Ağul 461] = Tufnell 1984: Pl. 40.2647). Here, it is outlined and engraved in a style common to the Middle Bronze in which the raised motif includes small dashes engraved over the body of the sphinx. The Middle Bronze motif is imitated in the Ramesside period (Keel 2010b: 366–367 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 800]). Like the imitations of the striding lion motif discussed above, the later imitation of the Middle Bronze motif is not engraved deeply. The legs of the sphinx are outlined, the tail ends in an ovular shape, and a double line is engraved to conform to the negative space in front of the sphinx. Like other Ramesside imitations, the motif is more highly schematized with fewer details than the Middle Bronze motif. Further, the head and clypeus of the scarab are a form that tends to have been produced during the Late Bronze IIB and beginning of the Iron I (D10). The context of this scarab

²²⁶ Though Keel dates this item and the following (Keel 2013: 214–215 [Geser 104]) to the second half of the 18th Dynasty through the 19th Dynasty, their archaeological context is highly uncertain due to the excavation techniques of Grant.

from Tell el-Far‘ah (South), the style of engraving, the increased schematization of the motif, and the shape of the head and clypeus confirm that this scarab is a likely Ramesside production in a Middle Bronze style.

ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURE WITH A LOTUS BLOOM

A number of scarabs depict a right-facing anthropomorphic figure with its back arm at the side and front arm extended at a roughly 90-degree angle to the body, often holding an attribute, such as a lotus bud. Ben-Tor noted that the motif of a kneeling anthropomorphic figures is rare among Nubian and Egyptian scarabs, and she identified the motif as a Canaanite production (Ben-Tor 2007: 100–101). The motif is common among the Middle Bronze scarabs of Ben-Tor’s Early Palestinian series, which were found in the Southern Levant (Ben-Tor 2007: 149, Pl. 63, Nos. 20–26). The anthropomorphic figure can hold a bloom, a branch, or nothing, and the body’s stance varies. The motif exhibits greater variety in Ben-Tor’s Early Palestinian Series than is found on later Late Bronze and Iron I imitations. By the Late Palestinian Series, the motif increases markedly in popularity (Ben-Tor 2007: 180, Pl. 104, Nos. 17–40; Pl. 105, Nos. 1–7; cf. Keel 1997: 206–207 [Tell el-‘Ağul 306]; 300–301 [Tell el-‘Ağul 585²²⁷]; 318–319 [Tell el-‘Ağul 634²²⁸]). A variety of collocations and bodily stances appear in Ben-Tor’s Late Palestinian Series.

The motif continued to be produced in the Late Bronze I in a schematized version in faience. Ben-Tor and Keel identified a group of faience scarabs, which they called the Beth-Shean IX group (Ben-Tor and Keel 2012: 87–104), and this group included locally

²²⁷ As noted above, the archaeological contexts on the tell at Tell el-‘Ağul are uncertain.

²²⁸ Again, the archaeological context on the tell at Tell el-‘Ağul is uncertain.

produced faience scarabs with the motif of the anthropomorphic figure (Keel 2010a: 158–159 [Bet-Schean 136]; Keel 2013: 436–437 [Geser 628]; 562–563 [Tel Harasim 22]; cf. Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 37/38, Nos. 308 and 311; Qubeibeh: Ben-Arieh *et al.* 1993: 82, Fig. 5; Ta'anach: Sellin 1904: 28–29, Fig. 23). The artisans of the Late Bronze I motif expanded the range of the motif that was standard in the Middle Bronze, and a variation of the kneeling anthropomorphic motif in which the figure holding the lotus bloom is seated a low-back throne also appears among the scarabs of the Beth Shean IX group (Keel 2010a: 158–59 [Bet-Schean 138]; 308–309 [Bet-Schemesch 206²²⁹]). The engravers of the Southern Levant returned to a common iteration of the local motif at the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA. The anthropomorphic figure is both standing and kneeling while often holding a bloom (Keel 1997: 142–143 [Tell el-‘Ağul 112 and 114]; 200–201 [Tell el-‘Ağul 293]; 306–307 [Tell el-‘Ağul 600]; 338–339 [Tell el-‘Ağul 694]; 358–359 [Tell el-‘Ağul 745]; 752–753 [Asor 15]; Keel 2010a: 144–145 [Bet-Schean 105]; 194–195 [Bet-Schean 220]; 398–399 [Dan 38]; Keel 2010b: 204–205 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 415]; 206–207 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 419]; 212–215 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 432, 434, 436, 438²³⁰]; Keel 2013: 578–579 [Tel Haror 9]; cf. Keel 1997: 108–109 [Tell el-‘Ağul 14²³¹]). The motif is executed in a typical Middle Bronze style in which the legs and front arm are depicted with a double line that outlines the bodily feature. The back arm rests at the figure’s side and is either engraved with a double line (Keel 2010b: 244–245 [Tell el-

²²⁹ The archaeological context of this item is uncertain because of the archaeological method used during its excavation.

²³⁰ Unfortunately, this item was not found and is only known from a drawing (Starkey and Harding 1932: Pl. 44, No. 34).

²³¹ The archaeological contexts of scarabs from the tell is highly uncertain due to Petrie’s excavation by level at Tell el-‘Ağul.

Far‘a Süd 415, 419]; 212–213 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 432]) or a single line that curves inward at the knee so that the arm’s inner side is formed by the outer edge of the figure’s back (Keel 2010b: 212–215 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 434,²³² 438²³³]).

Several scarabs combine the anthropomorphic figure holding a bloom with the ANRA motif discussed above. In a number of instances, the ANRA motif is clearly a later Ramesside imitation because the engraver used the later form of the double-looped ¸-sign (Keel 2010a: 204–205 [Bet-Schean 236]; Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 587²³⁴]; 328–331 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 704²³⁵ and 706²³⁶]; Keel 2013: 24–25 [Tel Gamma 55²³⁷]; cf. Keel 2013: 570–571 [Tel Harasim 40²³⁸]). The anthropomorphic figure on the Ramesside imitations is executed in a clearly Middle Bronze style with double lines for the legs and front arms, yet the artisans of the later imitations have occasionally reverted

²³² This item fortunately came from a tomb. The tomb functions as one depositional unit.

²³³ This item is known only from a drawing. The location of the item itself is unknown.

²³⁴ The ANRA motif is clearly a Ramesside imitation, as is the form of the head and clypeus (D10; see Chapter Three).

²³⁵ The highly schematic style of engraving and the later form of the double-looped ¸-sign indicate that the scarab is a likely Ramesside production. The archaeological context—dated to the Late Bronze IIB through the Iron IA—provides the *terminus ante quem* for the scarab’s production. Each indicator points to production at a time contemporary with the 19th or early 20th Dynasty.

²³⁶ The anthropomorphic form has been combined with the ANRA motif. The later form of the double-looped ¸-sign indicates that this is a Ramesside imitation. Further, the anthropomorphic form is highly schematic and lacks details, which were typical on Middle Bronze versions of the motif. For instance, there is little hashing on the raised portion of the anthropomorphic motif—a feature that is common Middle Bronze examples of the motif. Lastly, the archaeological context—dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA—provides the *terminus ante quem* for the item’s production.

²³⁷ Though the archaeological context is uncertain due to Petrie’s method of excavation, the motif has both the anthropomorphic motif and a later form of the double-looped ¸-sign, common among Ramesside imitations of the ANRA motif. The anthropomorphic figure is even more schematic than the common Middle Bronze motif. Lastly, the form of the head and clypeus (D10) of this scarab also indicates Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA production.

²³⁸ The archaeological context of this scarab is clearly secondary and provides no helpful *terminus ante quem*. The ANRA motif has been added to a cartouche both on the base and the back of the scarab. The ANRA motif does not have the later form of the double-looped ¸-sign. The anthropomorphic figure is highly schematic with few details. The figure does not fill the negative space as most Middle Bronze and Late Bronze IIB imitations do. This may be due to the different material from which this scarab was made. The material likely altered how the tools ran across and shaped the seal. The form of the head and clypeus (D10) is a standard Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA form (See Chapter Three). While this example is not certainly a Ramesside imitation, there are a number of criteria that point in this direction.

to a New Kingdom style by engraving the back arm with a single line that does not curve inward at the knee (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 587, 588]; 328–331 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 704, 706]; 24–25 [Keel 2013: Tel Gamma 55]). In two instances, the head is adorned with three or four straight lines radiating upward as if depicting *very* crudely the crowns of an Egyptian king (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 587]; 328–329 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 704]). The Egyptianizing impulse and local tradition is unmistakable. These factors confirm that this motif was imitated in the Ramesside period. This study has identified sufficient evidence to determine that other scarabs with the anthropomorphic motif holding a bloom are later imitations, though they lack the later form of the ANRA motif (e.g., Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 588]).

The distribution of these local imitations of Middle Bronze motifs follows a similar pattern to that of the ANRA motif noted above. Twenty-three later, local imitations of the Middle Bronze motif are likely extant among the Southern Levantine scarabs of known provenance. The greatest number of scarabs—nine—comes from Tell el-Far‘ah (South). Other sites in the southern Coastal Plain and northwestern Negev account for just under half (ten scarabs). Another three imitations were found at the Egyptian center of Beth Shean. The motif is absent at the following Egyptian/Egyptianizing centers identified by Eliezer Oren as so-called Governors’ Residencies—Tel Sera‘, Tel Hesi, Tel Masos, and Aphek (Oren 1984). The absence of Egyptianizing scarabs at Deir el-Balah is also noteworthy. One should also raise the question whether these imitations of Middle Bronze motifs should be strictly identified as Egyptianizing because the motif was, in fact, also a local motif that had been produced in the Middle Bronze and Late Bronze I. Were these objects even regarded as imitations of

foreign traditions after centuries of use and production in the Southern Levant? It is certainly possible, if not likely, that a long-standing motif may have come to be recognized chiefly as a local phenomenon.

RED CROWN

Tufnell identified the red crown as a motif on Middle Bronze scarabs (Tufnell 1984:119–120). Where possible, Tufnell distinguished between local Palestinian and Egyptian trends in the corpora of the Middle Bronze. Tufnell’s system of classification was followed and refined by Ben-Tor for late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period scarabs (Ben-Tor 2007: 18–19; 79–81; 129–131; 162–163). Ben-Tor acknowledged that the schematic, poorly engraved “L-shaped” red crowns are local Canaanite versions of the Egyptian sign. Ben-Tor noted the presence of this form of the red crown in her Early and Late Palestinian series (Ben-Tor 2007: 19, 80, 130). Only two examples were found in the eastern Delta where Canaanite imports were more common (Ben-Tor 2007: 80), but the *tête-bêche* arrangement of the red crown appeared in the local Palestinian sequence (Ben-Tor 2007: 131).

Production of the schematic, Canaanite imitation of the motif ramped up again in the Late Bronze IIB, and it became even more popular during the Iron IA. These scarabs imitate the Middle Bronze style of engraving. The Egyptian and Palestinian scarabs from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period almost always show the red crown in pairs. Exceptions are most common among the locally made “L-shaped” red crown in the Early (Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 286, No. 7; Tufnell 1973: Fig. 1, No. 20; Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 54, Nos. 26–27) and Late Palestinian series (Tufnell 1958: Pl. 32, Nos. 118 (?) and

124; Giveon 1985: 114–115, No. 10; Mackay and Murray 1952: Pl. 10, No. 102). The later imitations depict the motif in pairs less frequently.

It is clear that Late Bronze IIB and Iron I imitations depict the red crown when the artisan combines the red crown with other motifs already shown to be later imitations. For example, the ANRA motif is combined with the red crown on a number of later imitations (Keel 2010b: 278–279 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 581²³⁹]; 380–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 834²⁴⁰ and 843²⁴¹]). The form of the ¸-sign belies later production in the first two examples noted. The red crown on the Ramesside imitations is highly schematized, but not standardized on later imitations. One crown has a set of two vertical lines that form the back of the crown with another set of lines positioned at a right angle to the crown’s back (Keel 2010b: 278–279 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 581]; 380–381 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 834]). Another crown is crafted with a single line forming the back and a double line at a right angle. At times, on the later imitations the shorter set of double lines is not closed at the end. The likely corpus of later imitations depicting this motif consists of the following scarabs:

²³⁹ The scarab depicts two red crowns at a ninety-degree angle to one another. Adjacent to the red crowns, the ANRA motif uses the double-looped ¸-sign, indicating that the scarab is a later production. The archaeological context—dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA—provides the *terminus ante quem* for the scarab’s production.

²⁴⁰ Unfortunately, this item was lost, and the back and sides were not drawn. Only a drawing of the base is extant. The archaeological context is also unknown. The later double-looped ¸-sign is the only criteria on which one can assert that the scarab is a later imitation. Therefore, this seal is a possible, though not definitive, imitation.

²⁴¹ This item has a Late Bronze IIB form of the head-clypeus (D10). Its precise archaeological context is uncertain, though it comes from the cemetery with tombs of the 900-series. These tombs are dated to the end of the Late Bronze and the beginning of the Iron Age (Laemmel 2012: 171–178). The ANRA motif on this scarab does not exhibit definitive proof of Ramesside imitation, though the many tick marks on the *n*-sign hint that this is the case.

Keel 2010b: 136–137 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 251²⁴²]; 146–147 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 275²⁴³]; 184–185 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 365²⁴⁴ (See upper motif)], 228–229 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 470²⁴⁵]; 238–239 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 491²⁴⁶]; 240–241 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 497²⁴⁷]; 254–255 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 532²⁴⁸]; 276–277 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 580²⁴⁹]; 310–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 662²⁵⁰ and 664²⁵¹]; 322–323 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 691²⁵²]; 354–355 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 770²⁵³ (See upper motif)]; 370–371 [Tell el-

²⁴² Unfortunately, the scarab was lost, and nothing is extant other than a drawing of the base. The scarab comes from Tomb 528. Tombs from the 500-series tend to be dated to Braunstein’s second period, which is the late Iron I and early Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 502–594; cf. 543, 547–548, 569, 572–579, 584–585). Unfortunately, the precise tomb of the scarab’s provenance cannot be identified.

²⁴³ This item comes from a tomb dated to the Iron I and possibly the Iron IIA. The back is highly schematic, but there is no feature that is diagnostically significant.

²⁴⁴ This scarab comes from Grave 212, which is dated to the Iron IIA–B and may extend into the Iron I (Keel 2010b: 184). The form of the scarab is not indicative of a smaller range of dates for the item. The engraving is shallower than its Middle Bronze counterparts.

²⁴⁵ No back of the scarab has been published, and it is located in a collection in Kyoto University. The archaeological context is dated to the Late Bronze and Iron Age (Keel 2010b: 228).

²⁴⁶ This scarab was found in Tomb 930, which is dated to the entire Late Bronze II and early Iron I (Braunstein 1998: 749–750; *pace* Keel 2010b: 238). The form of the scarab has no feature that is diagnostically significant for only the Late Bronze IIB and/or Iron IA.

²⁴⁷ The scarab’s form is not diagnostically significant for the Late Bronze IIB and/or Iron IA. The archaeological context—Tomb 925—indicates that the *terminus ante quem* of the item’s production is the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 738–740).

²⁴⁸ This scarab was located in Tomb 966 which is dated to the entire Late Bronze II and Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 831–832; *pace* Keel 2010b: 254). The form of the scarab’s head, clypeus, and elytra are not indicative of the Late Bronze IIB and/or Iron I.

²⁴⁹ The head and clypeus of this scarab are of the form D10 which is indicative of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA period (See Chapter Three). The item was found in Grave 934, dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 754–769).

²⁵⁰ The form of the scarab is not diagnostically significant for dating the item. The item comes from Tomb 935 which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775). The archaeological context is not sufficient to date this item to the Iron IA or immediately earlier. Instead, the date must be established by dating the motif itself.

²⁵¹ The form of the scarab is not diagnostically significant for dating. The item came from Tomb 935 which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775). The archaeological context is not sufficient to date this item to the Iron IA or immediately earlier. Instead, the date must be supported by the motif or the typological form of the scarab.

²⁵² This scarab has a schematic typological form, but the form cannot be dated to a narrow range within the Late Bronze IIB and/or Iron I. The scarab comes from Tomb 936 which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 776; *pace* Keel 2010b: 322).

²⁵³ The form of the scarab is not diagnostically significant for dating. The scarab came from Grave 982 which is dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 850–854). The archaeological context is not sufficient to date this item to the Iron IA or immediately earlier. Instead, the date must be supported by other criteria.

Far'a Süd 810²⁵⁴]; 380–381 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 834²⁵⁵]; Keel 2013: 120–121 [Gat 57²⁵⁶]; cf. Keel 2013: 24–25 [Tel Gamma 56²⁵⁷].

This corpus of later imitations of a Middle Bronze motif consists of sixteen items. Six of the sixteen items come from contexts dated only to the Iron IA, and thirteen come from contexts that include the Iron IA. The three remaining items come from unknown or insecure contexts. Two items may be residual since they come from contexts that conclude in the Iron IIA or IIB. On this basis, the revival of this Middle Bronze motif dates to the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. Late Bronze IIB production is probable based on the corpus above. Four items come from contexts that could not be dated more narrowly than the Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA. Fourteen of the sixteen later imitations come from one site, Tell el-Far'a South, while the other two scarabs come from sites on the southern Coastal Plain. Their distribution is not unlike the distribution of the ANRA-motif and the anthropomorphic figure holding a bloom, though the motif of the red crown is more restricted in its geographic distribution.

The Middle Bronze form of the red crown frequently uses a thin rectangle to form the back of the crown and a quarter circle to form the lower portion of the crown (Keel 2010b: 390–391 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 859]; Keel 2013: 4–5 [Tel Gamma 9]; 192–193

²⁵⁴ While the form of the scarab's head, back, and sides is highly schematic, this form is not sufficient to establish a narrow and later date for the item. The scarab's archaeological context, Tomb 984, is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 857–864). The archaeological context alone is not sufficient, but the context can point in this direction when combined with another criterion, like the date of the motif itself.

²⁵⁵ See the footnote in the previous paragraph for a discussion of this scarab and its unknown archaeological context.

²⁵⁶ The form of the scarab is highly schematic, but no narrow date can be proposed based on the scarab's form. The item is a surface find. Only the motif may narrow the date of the item. This will be returned to at the end of this section.

²⁵⁷ While the form of the scarab is highly schematic, this is not sufficient evidence to establish a tighter date for the scarab. Further, the archaeological context of Petrie's excavations on the tell are not sufficiently precise to provide a reliable *terminus ante quem* for the scarab's production. Only the motif can be used to establish a date for the item.

[Geser 59]) or an irregular quadrilateral (Keel 2013: 60–61 [Tel Gamma 137]; 104–105 [Gat 23]; 172–173 [Geser 13 and 16]) with a curved line extending upward from the crown's lower half.²⁵⁸ At times, the engraving of the archaizing form of the red crown is so superbly engraved that imitations are very difficult to distinguish from Middle Bronze examples. In two instances, an excellent imitation of a Middle Bronze red crown is combined with a later, highly schematic imitation (Keel 2010b: 184–185 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 365²⁵⁹] and 354–355 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 770²⁶⁰]). The later form of the crown belies the likely Iron IA or Late Bronze IIB production of these two scarabs. Some later imitations are more skilled in their archaization because they mirror the Middle Bronze form of the red crown more closely (Keel 2010b: 318–319 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 682]; 322–323 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 689]; 382–383 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 843²⁶¹]). In addition to the date of its archaeological context, the form of the head and clypeus (D10) of the latter scarab is the primary feature that points to its true date of production because the engraver executed the motif so skillfully (Keel 2010b: 382–383 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 843]).

The later iteration of the red crown motif appears in a range of different collocations. In a number of instances, horizontally oriented scarabs depict an *wḏ3t*-eye or *ḏd*-pillar to the left of the red crown. This collocation occurs on fourteen different

²⁵⁸ A scarab from Gezer, said to be from a Late Bronze I tomb, shows a highly schematized red crown, typical of later imitations. This schematized red crown is engraved at the top of the scarab's base. Unfortunately, the context of this scarab is highly uncertain. Macalister noted that this scarab was part of a group purchased some time after the excavation of the tomb. He reported that this group of scarabs was found in the dump during the excavation of this tomb (Macalister 1912: I 301f, 314, No.4 = Keel 2013: 200–201 [Geser 74]).

²⁵⁹ The scarab's form is more common in the New Kingdom, but its form does not preclude other dates. The motif is shallowly engraved. The scarab comes from Tomb 212 which has been dated to the Iron IIA–B, though no reassessment of the pottery has occurred recently.

²⁶⁰ The form of the scarab is not diagnostically significant for dating this scarab. The scarab came from Tomb 982 which is dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 850–854).

²⁶¹ This item was found in Cemetery 900 which is predominantly Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA, but its exact context is unknown and, therefore, uncertain.

scarabs (Keel 2010a: 172–173 [Bet-Schean 170²⁶²]; 270–271 [Bet-Schemesh 126²⁶³]; 442–443 [Der el-Balah 98²⁶⁴]; Keel 2010b: 80–81 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 125²⁶⁵]; 80–81 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 126²⁶⁶]; 238–241 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 491²⁶⁷ and 497²⁶⁸]; 254–255 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 532²⁶⁹]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 664,²⁷⁰ and 666²⁷¹]; 322–323 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 691²⁷²]; 370–371 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 810²⁷³]. Keel 2013: 16–17 [Tel Gamma 36²⁷⁴]; 120–121 [Gat 57²⁷⁵]). Eight²⁷⁶ other scarabs portray the red crown in a horizontal

²⁶² This scarab comes from a context dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA.

²⁶³ This scarab comes from Tomb 11 which is dated to the Late Bronze IIA through the Iron IIA.

²⁶⁴ This item comes from an unknown context (Keel 2010b: 442–443 [Der el-Balah 98]).

²⁶⁵ This scarab comes from Tomb 902C at Tell el-Far‘ah (South) whose ceramics date to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 690) and possibly the final decades of the Late Bronze IIB (Laemmel 2012: 171–178).

²⁶⁶ The scarab’s head-clypeus, back, and sides point to a New Kingdom date, but this is not definitive. The form of the red crown also points in the same direction, but again this is not a definitive criterion on its own. The scarab comes from Tomb 902C, which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 690). While no one feature on its own indicates this item is a later imitation, the combination of all three criteria make the conclusion more certain.

²⁶⁷ This scarab comes from Tomb 930 which is dated to Late Bronze II and Iron IA based on ceramics (Braunstein 1998: 749–750). The scarab’s form is schematic but cannot be dated to a narrow range of dates within the New Kingdom. The execution of the motif itself is shallow. Again, no one feature on its own indicates that this scarab is not Middle Bronze, but together they point in this direction.

²⁶⁸ This scarab comes from a context dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 738–739; *pace* Keel 2010b: 240). The form of the scarab is highly schematized but not indicative of a narrower date within the New Kingdom. The form of the red crown is of a later Iron IA form.

²⁶⁹ See earlier footnote for a discussion of the Late Bronze II and Iron IA date of the context where this scarab was found.

²⁷⁰ This scarab was located in Tomb 935, dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775).

²⁷¹ Like the previous scarab, this scarab was found in Tomb 935, dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775). The scarab’s form is schematic, but this is not diagnostically significant for dating the item to any period narrower than the New Kingdom. The form of the red crown motif resembles that of the Iron IA imitation of the Middle Bronze motif.

²⁷² This scarab comes from Tomb 936 which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 776; *pace* Keel 2010b: 322).

²⁷³ This item came from Tomb 984 dated to Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 857–864). The form of the scarab is not diagnostically significant for assigning a narrower date to this scarab. Only the motif on the base can point toward a date in the Iron IA and possibly the end of the Late Bronze IIB.

²⁷⁴ This scarab comes from an unknown context which cannot be dated. The head and clypeus of the scarab (D10) are dated largely to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA before it tapers off during the rest of the Iron I.

²⁷⁵ This scarab comes from an unknown context which cannot be dated. The form of the scarab is highly schematic. The form of the motif is the primary criterion on which a narrower date for the scarab’s production rests.

²⁷⁶ There is one additional cowroid that Keel designated as a Ramesside imitation (Keel 2010a: 420–421 [Der el-Balah 42]). The base has a red crown and is oriented horizontally. It is unclear to me that the style of engraving is necessarily indicative of the later imitations. Its archaeological context is unknown since it comes from Dayan’s collection. As such, this scarab lacks an exact provenance.

orientation in which the red crowns flank both sides of a central motif (Keel 2010a: 210–211 [Bet-Schean 250²⁷⁷]; 270–271 [Bet-Schemesch 125²⁷⁸]; 416–417 [Der el-Balah 34²⁷⁹]; 504–505 [Dotan 34²⁸⁰]; Keel 2010b: 146–147 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 275²⁸¹]; 228–229 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 470²⁸²]; 276–277 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 580²⁸³]; 322–323 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 689²⁸⁴]). Thirteen of the twenty-one scarabs come from Tell el-Far‘ah (South). Of the eight remaining scarabs, five come from the southern Coastal Plain. Two were found at the Egyptian center of Tel Beth Shean. This geographical distribution mirrors earlier distributions of imitations of Middle Bronze motifs, but the motif is represented at an even greater number of sites, including Beth Shemesh, Deir el-Balah, and Tell es-Safi/Gath.

Sixteen of the twenty-one scarabs come from a securely dated archaeological context. Ten of those sixteen come from contexts dated only to the Iron IA, strongly indicating Iron IA production. Six scarabs come from contexts that include the Iron IA and extend back into the Late Bronze II or forward into the Iron IIA. One item from Dothan comes from a context dated to the Late Bronze only. If Tomb 1 from Dothan is accurately dated based on the ceramics, the imitation of this Middle Bronze motif must

²⁷⁷ This impression was found in Locus 78717 in Stratum S-3a, which Mazar assigned to the Iron IA through the beginning of the Iron IB.

²⁷⁸ This scarab came from Tomb 11 which has been dated from the Late Bronze IIA to the Iron IIA.

²⁷⁹ The archaeological context of this item is uncertain because it comes from Dayan’s collection.

²⁸⁰ This scarab comes from Tomb 1 in Area K and has been dated to the Late Bronze IIA–B.

²⁸¹ The form of this scarab is highly schematic and is unhelpful for dating its production, though an Iron I date can not be precluded. The scarab itself is engraved shallowly as one expects from a later imitation. Keel dates this item to the Iron IA and extends its date of production into the Iron IIA (Keel 2010b: 146). Unfortunately, the context has not been republished by a ceramist after the days of Petrie’s publication.

²⁸² This scarab comes from Tomb 957 which has been dated the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA (Keel 2010b: 228).

²⁸³ This scarab comes from Tomb 934 which Braunstein dates to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 754).

²⁸⁴ This scarab comes from Tomb 936, which Braunstein dates to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 776). The scarab’s head and legs point toward a New Kingdom date, though they do not preclude other dates. The shallow engraving is similar to other Iron IA imitations of Middle Bronze motifs.

begin in the Late Bronze IIB. The chronological distribution indicates that production almost certainly took place in the Iron IA, but it began in the Late Bronze IIB.

Another collocation of motifs with the red crown orients the scarab vertically; the red crown is over a *nb*-sign and to the right of a *wd3t*-eye, *dd*-pillar, or *nfr*-sign (Keel 2010a: 484–485 [Dor 51²⁸⁵]; Keel 2010b: 184–185 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 365²⁸⁶]; 235–236 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 489²⁸⁷]; 310–311 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 663²⁸⁸]; 318–319 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 683²⁸⁹]; 354–355 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 770²⁹⁰]; Keel 2013: [Tel Gamma 56²⁹¹]; 652–

²⁸⁵ This item appears only in Keel’s volume (2010a: 484). The head-clypeus, back, and sides cannot narrow the date of production beyond the New Kingdom. The engraving is deeper than the typical imitations of the Middle Bronze motifs. The item comes from a context reported to be dated to the Late Bronze IIB. This is one of the few examples of an imitation of a Middle Bronze motif, which comes from a context dated only to the Late Bronze IIB. Either imitations of this Middle Bronze motif were produced in the Late Bronze IIB or this is actually a Middle Bronze scarab. If the latter is true, it is noteworthy that the form of the red crown motif resembles the form of the motif from Ben-Tor’s Early Palestinian Series more than the L-shaped crown. I lean toward assigning the item to the late Late Bronze IIB because the forms of the head-clypeus, sides, and back are more popular in the New Kingdom. Unfortunately, the scarab’s typological form is also known in earlier times, and this criterion is not definitive.

²⁸⁶ As noted in an earlier footnote, this scarab comes from Tomb 212 which is dated to the Iron IIA–B, and the date of the context may extend back into the Iron I (Keel 2010b: 184).

²⁸⁷ Unfortunately, this scarab cannot be found. Only a drawing of the base is extant. Therefore, the forms of its back, sides, and head-clypeus are unknown. The item comes from Tomb 921, which is dated to the whole Late Bronze IIB or Braunstein’s Period I (Braunstein 1998: 732).

²⁸⁸ This scarab’s form is more likely to be from the New Kingdom. Its depth of engraving may indicate that the scarab comes from either the Middle Bronze or Iron IA, though the execution may be ever so slightly less standardized than one expects for the Middle Bronze. The scarab comes from Tomb 935, which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770). These factors, though not definitive, cause me to designate this item as a later Iron IA imitation.

²⁸⁹ This scarab depicts a red crown to the right and above three signs. The depth of engraving and the form of the scarab indicate a later imitation. The archaeological context, Tomb 936, is dated to the Iron IA and indicates a later date for the seal’s production (Braunstein 1998: 776).

²⁹⁰ Unfortunately, the item could not be found by Keel. The forms of the head-clypeus, elytra, and hirsute legs can be detected from the drawing by Starkey and Harding (1932: 26, Pl. 57.353). The scarab’s typological form is more likely, though not definitively, dated to a period after the Middle Bronze. The archaeological context, Tomb 982, is dated to the whole Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 850). Because the item was not found, it is difficult to determine the style and depth of the engraving. These factors point toward a later imitation, but this conclusion cannot be stated unequivocally.

²⁹¹ See footnote 253 for a discussion of this item’s insecure archaeological context.

653 [Tell el-Hesi 9²⁹²]; Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 39, No. 350;²⁹³ Keel 2004b: 1556, No. 33, Fig. 23.45.4²⁹⁴). Yet another combination is oriented vertically, and the red crown is also flanking both sides of a central sign in which all three signs are over a *nb*-sign (Keel 2010b: 318–319 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 682²⁹⁵]).

Finally, there is one instance of addorsed red crowns over a *nb*-sign and under either a *t*-sign or an inverted *nb*-sign (Keel 2014: 564–565 [Tel Harasim 28²⁹⁶]). The scarab comes from a context at Tel Harasim dated to the entire Late Bronze II.

Interestingly, this scarab may hold a clue that points toward local production. The red crowns on the scarab from Harasim are of two types: the local, Middle Bronze L-shaped type and another common Middle Bronze form of the motif. The scarab’s layout consists of a vertically oriented base depicting a *nb*-sign below and above a central row of signs; the central row of signs consists of a red crown and another motif. Scarabs with a similar layout as Harasim’s scarab can be found in the Early and Late Palestinian Series (Ben-Tor 2007: Pls. 54.21, 26, 27; 79.1, 5, 7, 8; cf. Kabri: Mizrachy 2002: 333–335, No. 22). Tufnell also identified the local “L-shaped” crown, which is found on the scarab from Harasim (1984: 119); Ben-Tor also noted the form of the red crown in the Late

²⁹² This item could not be found. Only a drawing of the base is extant. There is no drawing of the form of its back, sides, or head-clypeus. It is said to come from City IV, but Bliss’ excavations of the tell are too unreliable to be used for dating this item.

²⁹³ This scarab comes from Lachish’s Locus 556 which is a pit in Square A.24. Tufnell dated Tufnell the context to her Late Bronze III; Tufnell notes that the context contains both an imported pilgrim flask and a poor imitation of a lentoid flask (1958: 245). Poorly executed, local imitations become popular when trade weakens in the Mediterranean, and local populations continue to demand these ceramic forms which were previously available through intra-Mediterranean trade (Morris 2005: 701).

²⁹⁴ Keel’s scarab from Lachish comes from Locus 3078, which is assigned to Level VI (?) of Ussishkin’s Late Bronze III (Ussishkin 2004: 57).

²⁹⁵ The scarab depicts a *nfr*-sign flanked by two outward facing red crowns over a *nb*-sign and below a stylized *hnp* sign. The form of the scarab’s head and back are more likely to be New Kingdom than Middle Bronze. The context of the scarab itself is Tomb 936, dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 776). The depth of engraving also indicates a later imitation instead of a Middle Bronze scarab. These three factors make likely the conclusion that this scarab is a later Iron IA, possibly Late Bronze IIB, imitation.

²⁹⁶ This item comes from a context assigned to the entire Late Bronze II (Keel 2014: 564).

Palestinian series of the local Middle Bronze scarabs (Ben-Tor 2007: 130). This vertical arrangement of the scarab's base with a *nb*-sign or *hṭp*-sign above and below a row of signs is not found in the Egyptian series from the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period (Ben-Tor 2007: Pls. 8 and 34). The layout of this scarab from Harasim may indicate that this is a local imitation of a local Middle Bronze motif.

Another likely Iron IA imitation of a Middle Bronze motif orients the scarab vertically; the red crown is above a set of motifs—including any of the following signs: *wḏ3t*, *nfr*, or *dd*. All of these signs are engraved over a *nb*-sign (Keel 2010b: 136–137 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 251²⁹⁷]; 235–236 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 489²⁹⁸]; 318–319 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 683²⁹⁹]; 354–355 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 770³⁰⁰]). In another example, a vertically oriented scarab shows an uraeus to the right of an *n*-sign and a *wḏ3t*-eye whose downward tick connects to a lower *nb*-sign; these three signs are below a highly schematized red crown (Tufnell 1958: Pl. 39.341). This scarab comes from a context dated to Tufnell's Late Bronze III where imitation imports, like two base ring jugs, are combined with forms that anticipate the ceramic forms of the Iron I (Tufnell 1958: 246). In another collocation, a vertically oriented scarab depicts a *nfr*-sign between two *dd*-pillar over a *nb*-sign and below a red crown (Keel 2010b: 310–311 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 662³⁰¹]).

²⁹⁷ Unfortunately, this item could not be found. It is only known from a drawing of its base. The forms of its elytra, sides, and head-clypeus are unknown. This study cannot observe the depth or style of engraving to ensure that it is a later Iron IA imitation because it is only known from a drawing. The scarab comes from Tomb 528 which has been dated to late Iron I and possibly the Iron IIA (Keel 2010b: 136). Tombs from the 500-series tend to be dated to Braunstein's second period, which is the late Iron I and early Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 502–594; cf. 543, 547–548, 569, 572–579, 584–585).

²⁹⁸ See the previous paragraph for a description of this scarab, which comes from a context dated only to the Late Bronze IIB.

²⁹⁹ See the previous paragraph for a description of this scarab, which comes from an Iron IA context.

³⁰⁰ See the previous paragraph for a description of this scarab, which comes from a Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA context.

³⁰¹ The scarab's typological form is not diagnostically significant for a narrow range of dates. The depth of engraving could indicate either a Middle Bronze production or an excellent Iron IA imitation. Braunstein dates the archaeological context, Tomb 935, to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770).

In conclusion, there are 41 items determined to be Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations of the Middle Bronze red crowns. 31 of the 41 scarabs come from Tell el-Far‘ah (South). This likely indicates at least one center of local production. 17 of these 41 scarabs come from contexts dated to the Iron IA alone. 26 of the 41 items come from contexts that, at least, include the Iron IA. Two come from contexts dated only to the Late Bronze IIB, demonstrating that there was earlier production prior to the Iron IA, though the motif likely reached its greatest popularity in the Iron IA.

It is noteworthy that the highest level of production of what might otherwise be considered Egyptianizing motifs does not occur during the period of greatest Egyptian hegemony, namely the first half of the reign of Ramses II during the Late Bronze IIB. Instead, this local imitation of earlier local motifs surges at a time when intra-Mediterranean trade has declined. Local imitations of once common Late Bronze ceramic forms—Base Ring Ware and so-called Cypriot Milk Bowls—also surge. Could it be that as intra-Mediterranean trade declines, local population continue to demand amulets in the form of scarabs to protect their dead who are making their precarious passage from this world to the underworld? Local engravers, recognizing this demand, return to local motifs from the Middle Bronze, knowing that the local market will value and purchase scarabs that reflect the long-standing, local traditions.

WD3T-EYE

Among these later imitations discussed above, the *wd3t*-sign was engraved alongside the later imitation of the red crown. The later form of the *wd3t*-sign differs from the Middle Bronze form. Locally made scarabs from Middle Bronze contexts depict the *wd3t*-eye

with a vertical line extending down from the central portion of the eye, but this line does not tend to end with a *nb*-like shape (e.g., Keel 2013: 198–199 [Geser 70]). In contrast, the later form of this sign frequently has a line extending downward from the eye that ends in a *nb*-like sign (Keel 1997: 616–617 [Akko 245³⁰²]; Keel 2010a: 172–173 [Beth Shean 170³⁰³]; 420–421 [Der el-Balah 46³⁰⁴]; 442–443 [Der el-Balah 98³⁰⁵]; Keel 2010b: 240–241 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 497³⁰⁶]; 254–255 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 532]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 664³⁰⁷]; 312–313 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 666³⁰⁸]; 322–323 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 691³⁰⁹]; 370–371 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 810³¹⁰]; Keel 2013: 16–17 [Tel Gamma 36³¹¹];

³⁰² This item comes from an unknown context. The form of the red crown is that of the later Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitation. The form of the scarab’s back, sides and head-clypeus are not diagnostic for dating the item to the New Kingdom.

³⁰³ This scarab comes from Stratum (Lower) VI at Beth Shean which is dated to the very end of the Late Bronze and the Iron IA (Keel 2010b: 172). The scarab is in the shape of a fish; the fish-shaped scarab is produced at the end of the 18th and 19th Dynasty with possible production into the Iron I (Keel 1995: 68–69 [§151]).

³⁰⁴ The form of the scarab does not permit the item to be dated to the Middle Bronze, Late Bronze IIB, or Iron Age I. The schematic form of the red crown on its base is the later form of the sign. The precise archaeological context of this item is unknown since it came from Moshe Dayan’s collection.

³⁰⁵ The form of this scarab does not permit this study to date the item to either the Middle Bronze, the Late Bronze IIB, or Iron I. The schematic form of the red crown on its base is the later form of the sign. The archaeological context of this item is unknown since it came from Moshe Dayan’s collection.

³⁰⁶ The scarab’s form is not diagnostically significant for the Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA. The archaeological context—Tomb 925—forms the basis for the *terminus ante quem* of its production as the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 738–740).

³⁰⁷ This scarab was excavated in Tomb 935; Braunstein dated the tomb to Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775).

³⁰⁸ This scarab comes from Tomb 935, which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 770–775). The scarab’s form does not permit this study to identify the item as either a Middle Bronze scarab or a later imitation.

³⁰⁹ As noted in an earlier footnote, the form of this scarab cannot be dated to a narrow range of dates. It comes from Tomb 936 which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 776; *pace* Keel 2010b: 322).

³¹⁰ This item was discussed above. Braunstein dated this scarab’s archaeological context, Tomb 984, to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 857–864).

³¹¹ While this scarab comes from an unknown archaeological context, the form of the head-clypeus (D10) points toward a Late Bronze IIB or possibly Iron IA date. The scarab depicts both signs in the form of a later imitation of the Middle Bronze motif.

24–25 [Tel Gamma 56³¹²]; Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 39.341,³¹³ Keel 2004b: 1556, No. 33, Fig. 23.45.4,³¹⁴ cf. Keel 2013: 652–653 [Tell el-Hesi 9³¹⁵] or a horizontal tick at the bottom (Keel 2010a: 420–421 [Der el-Balah 42³¹⁶]; Keel 2010b: 238–239 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 491³¹⁷]). This later form of the *wḏ3t*-eye with a tick is also combined with the later imitation of the Middle Bronze motif of an anthropomorphic figure holding a lotus bloom (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 588³¹⁸]). Finally, the *wḏ3t*-eye appears on one scarab as a highly schematic scarab, produced in the Iron IA or Late Bronze IIB; its schematic tendencies are due to its reproduction in faience (Keel 2010a: 278–279 [Bet-Schemesch 141³¹⁹]).

There are eighteen scarabs with the later form of the *wḏ3t*-eye. Seven scarabs are from contexts dated only to the Iron IA, and another seven scarabs come from unknown contexts. Two additional items come from periods that include the Iron IA. Only two scarabs come from contexts dated only to the Late Bronze IIB. As occurred with other imitations of Middle Bronze motifs, this group of later imitations was produced largely in the Iron IA, though production began earlier in the Late Bronze IIB. Approximately half

³¹² Unfortunately, this item comes from Petrie’s excavation on the tell. As such, the date of the context is highly uncertain. The form of the scarab is schematic and cannot be dated to a narrow range of dates. Both the *wḏ3t*-eye and the red crown are later forms of these motifs.

³¹³ This scarab comes from Cave 559, which Tufnell dated to the Iron IA; the cave contained two imitations of a Base Ring jug. The ceramics of the cave and the scarab’s typological form point toward an Iron IA date of production (Tufnell 1958: 246).

³¹⁴ This scarab from Lachish comes from Locus 3078, assigned to Level VI (?) of Ussishkin’s Late Bronze III (Ussishkin 2004: 57).

³¹⁵ This scarab was discussed above. The scarab came from Bliss’ City IV at Tell el-Hesi, but Bliss’ excavations are too unreliable to be used with any certainty.

³¹⁶ The scarab comes from Moshe Dayan’s collection. No narrower date can be offered for the item based on this limited information.

³¹⁷ The scarab comes from Tomb 930, which Braunstein dated to the entire Late Bronze II and early Iron I (Braunstein 1998: 749–750; *pace* Keel 2010b: 238). The typological form of the scarab has no feature that is diagnostically significant for only the Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA.

³¹⁸ The typological form of this scarab does not permit the item to be dated to a narrow range of dates. The scarab comes from Tomb 934, which Braunstein dates to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 754).

³¹⁹ This item comes from the excavations of Grant. Consequently, the date of the archaeological context is uncertain. The scarab is highly schematized because it was fashioned out of faience.

of the scarabs come from Tell el-Far‘ah (South), indicating likely local production at that site. Otherwise, the scarabs are centered at sites in the southern Coastal Plain and western Shephelah (Tell el-Hesi, Lachish, and Tel Jemmeh) and along the coast (Acco and Deir el-Balah).

DD-PILLAR

As shown above, the dd-pillar was engraved on the base of scarabs imitating Middle Bronze motifs of the red crown (Ben-Tor 2007: 18, Pl. 8, Nos. 17 and 20). The central dd-pillar flanked by addorsed motifs—red crowns and uraei—resurges again among Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations of the Middle Bronze style (Keel 2010a: 492–493 [Dothan 6³²⁰]; 504–505 [Dothan 34³²¹]; Keel 2010b: 382–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 843³²²]). The dd-pillar is combined with other Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations of Middle Bronze motifs—like the ANRA signs (Keel 2010b: 382–383 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 843]).

Other collocations with dd-pillars occur. Unfortunately, these scarabs often come from uncertain contexts. In one instance, three dd-pillars form a column along the long axis of the base while two additional dd-pillars are engraved at a right angle to the vertical column, creating four quadrants on the base (Keel 2010: 24–25 [Tel Gamma 54³²³]). In each quadrant, there is an outward facing red crown and the quadrants are symmetrical across the axes created by the dd-pillars. Unfortunately, neither the

³²⁰ The form of this scarab does not permit me to date this item to one period. This scarab comes from Tomb 2 which remains unpublished; its dates are broad and extend from the Late Bronze IIA through the Iron IA.

³²¹ This scarab comes from Tomb 1 at Dothan which has been dated to all of the Late Bronze II period. One cannot assess this broad date for the tomb until the final publication of the tomb has been published.

³²² While this scarab came from an unknown context in Cemetery 900, the form of its head-clypeus (D10) indicates that this is a likely Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA imitation.

³²³ Unfortunately, Keel was unable to find this item. Only a drawing of its base is extant. The item came from Petrie’s excavations of the tell. Therefore, the date of the archaeological context is uncertain.

archaeological context, the typological form of the scarab nor the motif itself can be said to point definitively to a later date of production. In another instance, three *dd*-pillars are engraved at right angles to one another, creating four quadrants in which addorsed red crowns are placed; two *nbw*-signs form the final half of the shorter axis (Keel 2013: 562–563 [Tel Harasim 19³²⁴]). In this instance, the archaeological context does not help to date the scarab, but the form of its head-clypeus (D10) does point to a possible later date for its production. Finally, a scarab from a Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA context depicts a Middle Bronze layout; the scarab may be a later imitation. The *dd*-pillar is flanked by *nfr*-sign and *ḥh*-sign, and a *nbw*-sign is above the motif (Keel 2010b: 244–245 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 506³²⁵]). Unfortunately, no definitive production date can be hypothesized for this scarab.

Of all the later imitations of Middle Bronze motifs covered so far, this motif has the least number of scarabs from securely dated archaeological contexts. Of these six scarabs, three came from uncertain contexts. Only one scarab comes from a context dated only to the Iron IA. The other scarabs were dated to the Late Bronze II as well. Unlike previous imitations, the geographical distribution of these scarabs is not centered at Tell el-Far‘ah (South), though two items do come from this site.

URAEI

³²⁴ Unfortunately, this scarab was a surface find. The scarab’s head-clypeus (D10), however, indicates a likely date of production in either the Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA. Further, the shallow depth of engraving indicates that this is likely a later imitation of a Middle Bronze layout of motifs.

³²⁵ This scarab comes from Tomb 922 which has been dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 734). The form of the scarab’s back, head, and sides is not indicative of a narrower range of dates.

The uraeus appears occasionally on Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations of Middle Bronze styles. A hollowed-out uraeus is engraved to the left of ANRA-signs in which the form of the double-looped ^c-sign clearly marks the seal as a later imitation (Keel 2013: 284–285 [Geser 266³²⁶]). This collocation points toward a likely Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA production; it is prudent to look for other imitations of the Middle Bronze style and motif.

The later form of the uraeus imitates the Middle Bronze outline of the puffed-up upper neck and diagonal hashing across the raised interior of the uraeus which is left by the outline. However, the Ramesside tool may not create the deep, angular grooves of the Middle Bronze, and the engraving style belies later production (see Keel 2004b: 1556, No. 33, Fig. 23.45.4³²⁷).

In another instance, an uraeus is engraved in a hollowed-out, Middle Bronze style. Hashed diagonal lines are engraved on the base of the hollowed out neck and body of the uraeus (Keel 1997: 88–89 [Afek 30³²⁸]). Two lines are engraved on the top of this archaizing uraeus as possible horns or a poorly engraved double-feathered headdress. These so-called horns mimic uraei found on scarabs from the Middle Bronze (Keel 1997: 436–437 [Tell el-‘Ağul 977³²⁹]; 632–633 [Akko 285³³⁰]; cf. Petrie Museum UC 11843)

³²⁶ MacAlister’s archaeological method does not permit one to assign a secure date to the context where this scarab was found. The scarab’s form also does not permit a narrow range of dates to be assigned to this item.

³²⁷ Keel’s scarab from Lachish comes from Locus 3078, Level VI (?) of Ussishkin’s Late Bronze III (Ussishkin 2004: 57), which is equivalent with this study’s Iron IA.

³²⁸ This scarab comes from a context that is dated broadly to the entire Late Bronze and the Iron I (Keel 1997: 88).

³²⁹ This scarab comes from an unknown context. However, the form of the head and clypeus as well as the motif and layout on the base indicate that this scarab is likely from the Middle Bronze.

³³⁰ The archaeological context of this item is uncertain. However, the layout of the motif and its execution on the base indicate that this scarab was produced during the Middle Bronze.

but may also mirror a headdress for the uraeus also found on scarabs from contexts dated to the Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB period (Keel 1997: 226–227 [Tell el-‘Ağul 369³³¹]. Keel 2010b: 98–101 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 165³³² and 166³³³]; 244–245 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 505³³⁴]; 252–253 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 527³³⁵]; 342–343 [Tell el-Far’a Süd 738³³⁶]; Keel 2013: 254–255 [Geser 196³³⁷]). The uraeus faces a cartouche with the throne name of Ramses II ensuring that the scarab executed in a Middle Bronze style was produced at a later date, and, in fact, it is likely an Iron IA or Late Bronze IIB imitation.

Another scarab replicates a standard Middle Bronze motif and layout; it is likely an heirloom from the Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA period that was excavated in a later context, Locus 732, at Ashkelon from the late seventh century (Keel 1997: 721–722 [Ashkelon 84]). Similar, though not identical, layouts occur on Middle Bronze scarabs (Ben-Tor 2007: 161–162, Pl. 77, No. 22). The two uraei and centered falcon are outlined as occurs in the Middle Bronze where an upraised relief often remains. Unlike the Middle Bronze style of engraving, no hashing occurs on the raised relief. It is possible, though

³³¹ This scarab comes from an unknown context. The form of the scarab’s head-clypeus, back, and sides is not diagnostically indicative of a specific narrow period of time. However, the base clearly depicts the throne name of Ramses II.

³³² This scarab comes from Tomb 532, which is dated to the Iron IB (Braunstein 1998: 528). The form of the scarab’s back, sides, and head-clypeus are not indicative of a narrower range of dates.

³³³ This scarab, like the previous item, comes from a tomb dated to the Iron IB (Braunstein 1998: 528). The form of the scarab is unknown because it is covered by a metal bezel.

³³⁴ This scarab comes from Grave 928B which is dated to the Late Bronze II and Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 743).

³³⁵ This scarab comes from Grave 961, which is dated to the Late Bronze IIB through Iron IA (Keel 1997: 252). The form of the faience scarab cannot be used to date the item to a narrow range of dates because faience is often highly schematic and, therefore, non-diagnostic.

³³⁶ This scarab comes from Tomb 960H, which is dated to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 813). The form of the scarab does not date the item to a narrow range of dates.

³³⁷ This scarab comes from an uncertain context due to the excavation techniques of MacAlister. The faience scarab does not have a distinct shape to aid in the dating of the item because faience is often highly schematic.

not certain, that this is an imitation of a Middle Bronze motif in either the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I or Iron II periods.

As noted with the previous motif of the *dd*-pillar, the sample size is small. Three scarabs may be imitations of the Middle Bronze motif. It is impossible to identify a period of popular use based on three scarabs. A larger sample size is required to make a certain conclusion. Further, the three scarabs with this motif come from three different sites. In fact, it is difficult even to speak of the scarabs as a coherent group.

N-SIGN

A number of scarabs that imitate Middle Bronze styles of engraving in the Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB include an idiosyncratic *n*-sign with many vertical tick-marks.

Ramesside scarabs with the later *wḏ't*-eye are one such group that uses this *n*-sign (Lachish: Tufnell 1958: Pl. 39.341; Keel 2004b: 1556, No. 33, Fig. 23.45.4).

Unfortunately, the idiosyncratic form of the sign cannot be used on its own as a criterion for dating because the sample size is too small. It may, however, offer a small clue for dating.

ROSETTE

The four-petalled rosette with curled ribbons in each quadrant may have been produced again in the Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB periods, but the date of this group remains uncertain due to the limited sample size (e.g., Keel 1997: 50–51 [Achsib 88³³⁸]). Four-petalled rosettes are also found on Middle Bronze scarabs and later (Ben-Tor 2007: 169,

³³⁸ This scarab comes from Tomb 1009, whose date is uncertain. See Chapter Three for a discussion of its date.

Pl. 87; Keel 1997: 82–83 [Afek 12]; 116–117 [Tell el-‘Ağul 38]; 146–147 [Tell el-‘Ağul 121]; 194–195 [Tell el-‘Ağul 276]; 356–357 [Tell el-‘Ağul 744]; 388–389 [Tell el-‘Ağul 835]; 754–755 [Asor 21]. Keel 2010a: 106–107 [Bet-Schean 25]; 134–135 [Bet-Schean 81³³⁹]; 172–173 [Bet-Schean 167]; 358–359 [Dan 15]. Jericho: Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 283, Nos. 2 and 16; 285, No. 19; 286, No. 1; 292, No. 3; 293, No. 2). The curled ribbons may also end in concentric circles during the Middle Bronze (Keel 1997: 314–315 [Tell el-‘Ağul 623]; 318–319 [Tell el-‘Ağul 633³⁴⁰]. Keel 2010a: 18–19 [Betaniën 8]). A scarab with concentric circles at the ends of the rosette and in the center may have been reproduced in the Iron I (Keel *et al.* 2010a: 10–11 [Beërscheba 10³⁴¹]). Another rosette motif was found on a scarab from an Iron I–IIA context; it includes a schematic bloom above and below the rosette (Keel 1997: 176–177 [Tell el-‘Ağul 220³⁴²]).³⁴³ The head-clypeus of this latter scarab confirms the suspicion that this is the product of a later artisan.

³³⁹ The archaeological context of this scarab is mixed with debris from the Early Bronze IV, Late Bronze I–IIA, and the late Roman period. The second side includes the throne name of Amenophis II and should likely be dated to his reign since his throne name is not a cryptographic way to write Amun’s name.

³⁴⁰ Brandl cites Tell el-‘Ağul 623 and 633 as comparative material for the later imitations of Middle Bronze motifs (Brandl in Keel 2010a:10). In so doing, Brandl argues that these two scarabs are later imitations. These two scarabs come from Fields T and E, respectively, at a height of 750’. The archaeological context of the excavations of Petrie are notoriously uncertain where heights were used to determine strata. In fact, Keel places all scarabs from a height of 750’ from different areas at Tell el-‘Ağul—including areas J, EB, G, E—together, as if in the same stratum (Petrie 1934: Pl. 5.63–74). Glyptic items from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I were found in Field A. Tufnell notes that there are no recognizable Iron Age objects on the mound, but some graves did include black-on-red III juglets and Philistine pottery of the Iron Ages (Tufnell 1993: 52). Therefore, there was some Iron Age occupation of the tell. Kempinski stated that Fort V lasted from the 13th through the 12th centuries (Kempinski 1993a: 53).

³⁴¹ This scarab comes from an unstratified context (Keel 2010a: 10). The highly schematic form of the scarab cannot be assigned to a narrow range of dates.

³⁴² This scarab comes from Grave 1036, which is dated from the Iron I through the Iron IIA (Keel 1997: 176). Unfortunately, the tombs of Tell el-‘Ağul have not been re-examined recently. The form of the head-clypeus (D10) indicates a Late Bronze IIB or Iron IA date for the item and betrays its later production.

³⁴³ Another scarab with a related rosette motif has been identified as a Ramesside imitation by Keel, but this scarab comes from the market and will not be considered as part of this study (Keel 1997: 564–565 [Akko 99]).

Another scarab with a four-petalled motif is also interspersed with ribbons in each quadrant. The ribbons merge with the tails of uraei; this scarab comes from a Late Bronze IIB–Iron I context and may be a later imitation of the Middle Bronze motif (Keel 2010a: 512–513 [Ebal 1]). Here, the early Iron IA date of the archaeological context helps narrow the date, but it is not definitive. Another possible later imitation may occur on a faience scarab from an early Iron I context (Keel 1997: 682–683 [Aschdod 58]³⁴⁴).

Another Middle Bronze version of the four-petalled motif has an interwoven and curving ribbon (Ben-Tor 2007: 170, Pl. 88; Kirkbride 1965: Fig. 283, No. 18; Fig. 284, No. 1). These variations of the motif may have been imitated in the Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB period (Keel 1997: 52–53 [Achsib 93³⁴⁵]; 58–59 [Achsib 107³⁴⁶]).

In conclusion, there are seven items that have been proposed as Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA imitations of the Middle Bronze motif of the four-petalled rosette. Unfortunately, few of these are from contexts that can be dated accurately and carefully. If the excavators were correct in reporting the archaeological context of these items, then there is possible, though not definitive, proof of later production.

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF LATE BRONZE AND IRON I IMITATIONS OF MIDDLE BRONZE MOTIFS

Many Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations mimicked scarabs which Ben-Tor showed to be locally produced. The highest concentration of these scarabs was clearly found at Tell el-Far‘ah (South). Distribution declined as one moved away from this site. It is

³⁴⁴ This scarab is reported as being located in Stratum XIIIb or the Iron IA (Brandl 1993a: 133).

³⁴⁵ This scarab also comes from Tomb 1009 at Achziv. Please consult Chapter Three for the difficulties in assigning a date of the Iron I or Iron IIA to this tomb.

³⁴⁶ This scarab was a surface find. Its form is not indicative of a narrow range of dates for production.

tempting to note the designation of Tell el-Far‘ah (South) as a so-called Governor’s Residency when discussing these so-called Egyptianizing scarabs (Oren 1984: 47–48; Morris 2005: 744–752). However, these scarabs were noticeably absent at Eliezer Oren’s other so-called Governor’s Residencies in the region—Tell Sera’, Tel Hesi, and Tel Masos (Oren 1984: 39–45; Morris 2005: 752–755). The extensive corpus of Deir el-Balah had only a few instances of later imitations of Middle Bronze motifs despite its full collection of scarabs from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I (Keel 2010a: 420–421 [Der el-Balah 42 and 46]; 434–435 [Der el-Balah 79]; 442–443 [Der el-Balah 98]; 450–451 [Der el-Balah 118]). It cannot be argued that the imitation of Egyptianizing motifs is caused solely by the dominant imperial presence of the Egyptian imperial power in the region. In fact, production seems highest not during the first half of Ramses II’s reign when imperial control was at a zenith but during the Iron IA when intra-Mediterranean trade had waned.

These motifs were already produced locally in the Middle Bronze. After centuries of use as heirloom items and occasional continued production on cylinder seals and the Beth Shean IX group of the Late Bronze I, they had become a local phenomenon. Iron IA and Late Bronze IIB imitations called upon local memories of burial practices and replicated those practices again at this later time.

It is also noteworthy that ANRA scarabs were found only rarely in late New Kingdom contexts in Egypt. Two ANRA scarabs were found at Qustul in Nubia (Williams 1992: Figs. 13a, 14r³⁴⁷), and one is likely from the Middle Bronze due to the

³⁴⁷ Williams identifies Fig. 11k as an ANRA scarab, but the presence of four repeated *r*-signs and one *k*’ is not sufficient to identify this as an ANRA scarab.

typological form of the scarab and the vertical motifs which flank the vertical column of ANRA signs (Williams 1992: Fig. 14r, Pl. 48j). This further confirms that these locally produced scarabs are calling upon local memories in earlier amulets for local burials.

It is also striking that production of these motifs ramped up in the Iron IA rather than the Late Bronze IIB. Their production was not merely a simple response to the strong Egyptian imperial presence in the Southern Levant during the first half of Ramses II. Instead, local production increased even as trade networks connecting the Mediterranean waned. As these trade networks broke down, local populations still demanded the goods once bought through these networks. Local potters produced imitations of Base Ring ware and Cypriot Milk Bowls for local consumption. Even as local populations bought imitations of these ceramic forms, they desired amulets to accompany their dead in burial as they moved from this world to the underworld. When Egyptian scarabs were no longer available for purchase, local engravers increased production of scarabs that evoked Middle Bronze traditions, and local memories reemerged.

Even as local engravers drew upon long-standing local traditions, they also produced newer motifs on locally produced scarabs and stamp seals of the Iron I. This study will now turn to these groups.

SO-CALLED MASS-PRODUCED RAMESSIDE SCARABS

The so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside scarabs form another key group of glyptic art of this period. This group was first noted by Montet (1942: 218–219). The group is characterized by a common style of deep—sometimes called coarse—engraving, heavy

schematization, and a limited range of motifs. While the group has been described as mass-produced due to the greater number of items within this group, the lack of standardization within the group is evident when compared to groups like the foundation deposit of Hatshepsut. Further, many scarabs within this group were made of steatite which requires individual engravers crafting each item.³⁴⁸ If all items were made of faience, the term mass-produced would be more fitting.

Motifs executed in this style include but are not limited to the Master of Crocodiles (Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 341–343; Keel, Keel-Leu, and Schroer 1989: 268–27; e.g., Keel 1997: 60–61 [Achziv 115³⁴⁹]; 170–171 [Tell el-‘Ağul 200³⁵⁰]; 442–443 [Tell el-‘Ağul 996³⁵¹]; 614–615 [Akko 242³⁵²]; Keel 2010a: 222–223 [Bet-Schemesch 10³⁵³]; 474–475 [Dor 26³⁵⁴]; Eggler and Keel 2006: 408–409 [Tall Deir ‘Alla 33]; cf. 570–571 [Akko 115³⁵⁵]; Keel 2010a: 136–137 [Bet-Schean 87³⁵⁶]; Megiddo: Harrison 2004: Pl. 40, No. 4), a lion trampling an enemy (e.g., Keel 1997: 612–613

³⁴⁸ I thank Baruch Brandl for his conversation with me on how items made of steatite cannot be described as mass-produced.

³⁴⁹ This item of glyptic art comes from Tomb 979 at Achziv. Unfortunately, the date of this tomb has not been published fully so that the date remains uncertain. See Chapter Three for a discussion of the date of this tomb.

³⁵⁰ This scarab’s archaeological context is unknown.

³⁵¹ This scarab’s archaeological context is unknown.

³⁵² This scarab comes from a much later context dated to the Hellenistic period (Keel 1997: 614).

³⁵³ This scarab portrays a Master of Crocodiles motif. The form of the head-clypeus (D10) was produced in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I as discussed in Chapter Three. The scarab comes from Tomb 1, which extends from the Iron IIA through the Iron IIB.

³⁵⁴ This scarab comes from a much later context dated to the Persian through Hellenistic period (Keel 2010a: 474).

³⁵⁵ While this item is said to be a surface find from Akko, it comes from the extensive collection of A. Lefkowitz. As such, it is unclear whether or not it has a verified context; it has not been included in the discussion of the group. A dealer may claim an item came from a certain site to increase the scarab’s value; only verified scarabs can be included here.

³⁵⁶ This scarab portrays a motif similar to the ‘Master of Crocodiles,’ but the anthropomorphic figure holds only one crocodile. The seal comes from a grave that contained Early Bronze IV, Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA, and Roman material. As such, the item is likely to be Iron I.

[Akko 233³⁵⁷]; Keel 2010a: 6–7 [Beërscheba 4³⁵⁸]; 428–429 [Der el-Balah 62a³⁵⁹]; Keel 2013: 204–205 [Geser 83³⁶⁰]; Lachish: Rowe 1936: No. S.86, Pl. XXIX;³⁶¹ Tel Rekesh: Münger 2005: 390, Pl. 23.6.36; cf. Keel 1997: 572–573 [Akko 121³⁶²]; Eggler and Keel 2006: 186–187 [Madaba 8³⁶³]; 232–233 [Pella 69³⁶⁴]), a kneeling-anthropomorphic figure over a branch (Keel 1997: 174–175 [Tell el-‘Ağul 210³⁶⁵]; Keel 2010b: 110–111 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 195³⁶⁶]; Eggler and Keel 2006: 372–373 [Tall as-Sa‘idiya 14³⁶⁷]), and a hunting scene with a chariot (Staehelin and Hornung 1976: 192, n. 3; Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 342; Keel 1997: 612–613 [Akko 233³⁶⁸]; Keel 2010b: 124–125 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 224³⁶⁹ and 226³⁷⁰]; 130–131 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 236³⁷¹]; 136–137 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 250³⁷²]; Keel 2013: 360–361 [Geser 448³⁷³]; 446–447 [Geser 651³⁷⁴]; Keel

³⁵⁷ This scarab was a surface find.

³⁵⁸ This scarab was located in a fill, called Locus 1683 from Area A-1, assigned to Stratum 7.

³⁵⁹ Unfortunately, this item has no context since Moshe Dayan excavated the burial and donated his finds to the Institute of Archaeology at Tel Aviv University.

³⁶⁰ This scarab comes from Tomb 96 which is dated to the Iron IB through the beginning of Iron IIA.

³⁶¹ This domed-back plaque was found in Tomb 191, which Rowe assigned to the Iron I (Rowe 1936: 260).

³⁶² This item was reported as a surface find; it appears to come from a collector who donated their collection to the Israel Antiquities Authority. It is a rectangular plaque with a domed back.

³⁶³ Unfortunately, this item was bought, and its provenance cannot be verified with certainty.

³⁶⁴ This scarab comes from Tomb 89 and Locus 1.4 in Area II, which is dated to the Iron I (Keel and Eggler 2006: 232).

³⁶⁵ This scarab comes from Tomb 1029 which has been dated to the Iron I (Keel 1997: 174). Unfortunately, no one has published a full reevaluation of the ceramics of this tomb since Petrie (see also Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 340–341).

³⁶⁶ The archaeological context of this scarab is unknown.

³⁶⁷ This scarab comes from Tomb 65 in Square 200 of Area BB (Eggler and Keel 2006: 372).

³⁶⁸ This scarab was found on the surface of the tell.

³⁶⁹ This item was found in Tomb 533 which is assigned to Braunstein’s Period 2, which corresponds to the end of the Iron I and beginning of the Iron IIA.

³⁷⁰ This scarab comes from Tomb 601 which has been dated to the Iron I (Braunstein 595).

³⁷¹ This scarab comes from Tomb 609 which Braunstein has dated to the end of the Iron IB and beginning of the Iron IIA based on ceramics (Braunstein 1998: 598).

³⁷² This scarab comes from Tomb 506 which has been dated to the end of the Iron I and beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 507).

³⁷³ This scarab was found in the Fourth Semitic period. Unfortunately, MacAlister’s excavations are too uncertain to be of use here.

³⁷⁴ This item was found in Locus 15045 in Field VI and Area NE15.102; the locus is dated to the Iron IB. The item could not be found, however, and only a drawing is available.

1997: 572–573 [Akko 118³⁷⁵]; Qasile: Mazar 1985: 18–20, Fig. 6; Mazar 1950–1951c: Fig. 13a;³⁷⁶ Shiloh: Brandl 1993b: 217–218, No. 16³⁷⁷) or without (e.g., Keel 1997: 698–699 [Ashkelon 25³⁷⁸]; Keel 2010a: 128–129 [Bet-Schean 66³⁷⁹]; 472–475 [Dor 24³⁸⁰ and 25³⁸¹]; Keel 2010b: 120–121 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 216³⁸²]; 142–143 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 264³⁸³]; 186–187 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 369]; 190–191 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 378³⁸⁴]; Keel 2013: 20–21 [Tel Gama 44³⁸⁵]; 34–35 [Tel Gamma 78³⁸⁶]; Ta‘anach: Giveon 1986: No. 95;³⁸⁷ cf. Keel 1997: 560–561 [Akko 87³⁸⁸]; 598–599 [Akko 191³⁸⁹]; Keel 2010a: 486–487 [Dor 57³⁹⁰]; 538–539 [Ekron 49³⁹¹]; Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 823³⁹²]; Keel 2013: 460–461 [Geser 682³⁹³]; Megiddo: Loud 1948: Pl. 163, No. 18; Egger and Keel 2006: 126–127 [Chirbat an-Nuhas³⁹⁴]; Ta‘anach: Lapp 1937: 34, Fig. 24.2; cf. Keel

³⁷⁵ Keel describes this scarab as a surface find, but it comes from the extensive collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 572).

³⁷⁶ This scaraboid came from public Building L in Stratum VIII (Mazar 1950–1951c: 206, Fig. 13a).

³⁷⁷ This pyramidal stamp seal made of bone was found in an Iron I context (Brandl 1993b: 218).

³⁷⁸ This scarab comes from a Hellenistic stratum at Ashkelon and is a likely heirloom.

³⁷⁹ This scarab was found in Locus 1708 of Square P7 assigned to Stratum V (James 1966: 88f, 159, Fig. 75; 332, Fig. 109.8); Yannai date Upper V to the Iron I (1996: Fig. 2).

³⁸⁰ This enstatite scarab comes from Locus 9730 in Area G. It was assigned to Phase G-7b (Iron IB to Iron IIA).

³⁸¹ This scarab comes from Locus 9814 in Area G. It is from Phase G-7b dated to the Iron I and Iron IIA (Gilboa, Sharon, and Zorn 2004: 33, Fig. 1.5 and 39, Fig. 4).

³⁸² This scarab was found in Tomb 133, which was assigned to Braunstein’s Period 2 which spanned the end of the Iron IB and the beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 488).

³⁸³ This scarab comes from Tomb 102 which corresponds to the Iron IB (Keel 2010b: 142).

³⁸⁴ This scarab comes from Cemetery 500, but its exact context within the cemetery is unknown.

³⁸⁵ The archaeological context of this item from Petrie’s excavations is unknown.

³⁸⁶ This scarab comes from Room EM at the base of a wall at a height of 188’.

³⁸⁷ This scarab was found in the courtyard of a cultic area (Giveon 1986: No. 95; Shuval 1990: 132).

³⁸⁸ This item is described as a surface find; it should also be noted that the item comes from an extensive private collection and its true provenance is likely unknown.

³⁸⁹ Again, Keel describes this scarab as a surface find, though it comes from the sizeable collection of Beter. As such, its provenance and assignment to Akko should be questioned.

³⁹⁰ This scarab came from Locus 19053 in Area D2. The seal was unpublished prior to Keel’s volume. Only a broad date of the Iron IB through the Iron IIA is given as the date of the context (Keel 2010a: 486).

³⁹¹ This item was a surface find.

³⁹² The scarab was bought; its archaeological context is uncertain.

³⁹³ This scarab comes from an unknown context. It was part of a collection.

³⁹⁴ This item was a surface find.

1997: 560–561 [Akko 85,³⁹⁵ 86,³⁹⁶ 87,³⁹⁷ and 89³⁹⁸]). Some have expanded the motifs included within this group (Münger 2005: 394–395). Other contemporary motifs are executed similarly with a coarse style of engraving, deeply hollowed-out motifs, and highly schematic elements. One such motif is an anthropomorphic figure standing before a caprid with a scorpion or *n*-sign above the back of the caprid (Keel 2010a: 480–481 [Dor 42³⁹⁹]). Another motif depicts two lion—one above another (Keel 1997: 218–219 [Tell el-‘Ağul 345⁴⁰⁰]; Keel 2010b: 122–123 [Tell el-Far‘a 222⁴⁰¹]; Keel 2013: 510–511 [Tel Hadid 2⁴⁰²]; cf. Keel 1997: 562–563 [Akko 91⁴⁰³]; 574–575 [Akko 126⁴⁰⁴]) or a lion below a possible crocodile (Keel 2010b: 122–123 [Tell el-Far‘a 223⁴⁰⁵]). The motifs on these Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside scarabs do occur on Egyptian scarabs as well; motifs like the Master of Crocodiles (Petrie 1925: Pl. XII, No. 962; Pl. XIX, No.

³⁹⁵ Keel describes the scarab as a surface find (Keel 1997: 560), though the item comes from the extensive collection of Lefkovitz.

³⁹⁶ Keel again describes the scarab as a surface find (Keel 1997: 560), though the item comes from the extensive collection of Lefkovitz.

³⁹⁷ As noted with the previous two scarabs, the item is described as a surface find, though it comes from Lefkovitz’s extensive private collection (Keel 1997: 562).

³⁹⁸ As with the three previous scarabs, Keel describes this as a surface find, though it comes from Lefkovitz’s extensive private collection (Keel 1997: 562).

³⁹⁹ This scarab was found in Locus 17219 in Area D2. Its first publication in Keel’s volume dates the context to the Iron IB–IIA (Keel 2010a: 480).

⁴⁰⁰ This scarab comes from an unknown archaeological context.

⁴⁰¹ This scarab was located in Tomb 135 which has been assigned to the end of the Iron IB and the beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 492). Braunstein describes how parallels of this scarab occur from the end of the Iron I through the end of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 493, Fig. 14.1). While the scarab could have been produced later than the beginning of the Iron I, she assigns the tomb a date based on the ceramic evidence. Unfortunately, this item could not be found in order to be photographed. Only the drawing from Petrie’s excavations is extant.

⁴⁰² This scarab was found in a favissa dated to the Iron IIC.

⁴⁰³ Keel describes this scarab as a surface find, though it was part of the extensive, private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 562).

⁴⁰⁴ Again, Keel describes this scarab as a surface find though it comes from the extensive, private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 574).

⁴⁰⁵ This scarab was excavated from Tomb 135, and it has been assigned to the end of the Iron IB and the beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 492). Unfortunately, this item could not be found in order to be photographed. Only the drawing from Petrie’s excavations is extant.

1561) and the lion over an enemy (Petrie 1925: Pl. XII, No. 967) are known from scarabs originating from Egyptian sites.

Yet another motif is executed in this same style depicting a royal figure, often wearing a white crown and uraeus, seated on a chair while an anthropomorphic figure often stands in front of the seated figure (Keel 1997: 376–377 [Tell el-‘Ağul 798⁴⁰⁶]; 608–610 [Akko 224⁴⁰⁷ and 229⁴⁰⁸]; Keel 2010a: 212–213 [Bet-Schean 251⁴⁰⁹]; Keel 2013: 52–53 [Tel Gamma 117⁴¹⁰]; 406–407 [Geser 560]; cf. Keel 1997: 558–559 [Akko 83⁴¹¹]). A similar motif of a seated, royal figure with an adherent also occurs on scarabs from Egypt (Petrie 1886: Pl. XXXVIII, Nos. 161–162; Petrie 1907: Pl. XXIII, No. 67; Petrie 1925: Pl. XII, No. 961; Petrie and Ellis 1937: Pl. VI, Nos. 65 and 72). One scarab from Beth Shean depicts this motif. It is likely a local imitation (Keel 2010a: 212–213 [Bet-Schean 251]). On the imitation scarab, the torso of the seated royal figure is triangular because the motif has unknowingly mimicked images of the Egyptian royal figure which show arms bent toward the torso, and the upper arms form a triangle (Brunton 1930: Pl. XXXIV, No. 11; Petrie 1891: Pl. XXVI, No. 20; Petrie 1891: Pl. XXIII, Nos. 9–10; Williams 1992: Fig. 13j; cf. Rowe 1936: No. 632). On the scarab from Beth Shean, the triangular upper torso is replicated, though the upper arms are not bent

⁴⁰⁶ This scarab comes from Field T at Tell el-‘Ağul, but its context is uncertain. In fact, the archaeological contexts of most items found on a tell by Petrie’s early twentieth century excavations are uncertain.

⁴⁰⁷ This scarab is described as a surface find.

⁴⁰⁸ This scarab was found on the surface of the tell.

⁴⁰⁹ This impression comes from Locus 98707 which was assigned to Stratum S-2, dated to the Iron IB (Panitz-Cohen and Mazar 2009: Fig. 12.31). The archaeological context provides the lowest possible date of the item’s production.

⁴¹⁰ The archaeological context of the storage jar handle impressed with this seal is unknown; Rowe only states that it came from Tel Jemmeh (Rowe 1936: 256–257).

⁴¹¹ Keel describes this item as a surface find, but it comes from the extensive collection of the private collector Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 558). Interestingly, the motif is so highly schematic that the seated figure lacks markers of his royal status.

toward the torso. Instead, one arm is extended toward the standing figure, and the other is akimbo on the waist. The triangular motif of the upper torso on Egyptian scarabs has become a frozen form that the local engraver imitated without understanding its Egyptian origin.

Other conoids show local production of motifs that mirror this group. The motif of two lions engraved one above another on the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside Scarabs has also been replicated on a conoid of the Iron I and Iron IIA (e.g., Keel 1997: 584–585 [Akko 156⁴¹²]). The deep, hollowed out engraving can also be observed on one conoid from Dor, which portrays a common motif from this group, namely the lion trampling an enemy (Keel 2010a: 484–485 [Dor 48⁴¹³]). Again, another conoid combines the standard, local motif from the Iron I of a bovine figure and its nursing young with the image of a hunter with bow in hand from this group (Keel 2010a: 188–189 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 373⁴¹⁴]).

Another impression is likely made with a seal that was locally produced (Keel 2013: 32–33 [Tel Gamma 70]). The seal from Tel Jemmeh mimics the royal figure wearing a white crown and holding a crook and flail while seated on a throne. The royal figure on the local imitation does not have similar proportions to Egyptian examples of the same motif. Egyptian scarabs often portray the royal figure as having a triangular upper torso (Petrie 1888: Pl. I, No. 22; Petrie 1907: Pl. XIII E, No. 9; Petrie 1909: Pl. XII,

⁴¹² Keel describes this item as a surface find at Akko (Keel 1997: 584), though the item comes from the extensive collection of Lefkovitz. Because the item comes from a private collection, its provenance and the site to which it is assigned should be questioned.

⁴¹³ This conoid comes from Locus 17204 in Area D2. The seals and the stratigraphy have not been officially published. Only Keel provides a rough date for the archaeological context, namely the Iron Age (Keel 2010a: 484).

⁴¹⁴ The conoid comes from Grave 224 which is dated to the Iron IIA (Keel 2010b: 188). The seal itself is likely, though not definitively, produced during the Iron I.

B25; Brunton and Engelbach 1927: Pl. XXIV, No. 12; Petrie 1930: Pl. XX, No.40; Pl. XXXIV, No. 11; cf. Brunton and Engelbach 1927: Pl. XL, Nos. 18 and 23; Engelbach 1923: Pl. XXI, Nos. 153 and 208; Naville and Griffith 1890: Pl. XVI, No. 2) that narrows at the waist and expands toward the knees (Petrie 1888: Pl. I, No. 22; Pl. XLI, No. 14; Naville and Griffith 1890: Pl. XVI, No. 2; Petrie 1907: Pl. XIII E, No. 9; Petrie 1923: Pl. XXI, No. 153; Petrie 1930: Pl. XX, No. 40). Egyptian scarabs do not depict the white crown slumped over the back of the head (Petrie 1888: Pl. I, No. 22; Pl. XLI, No. 14; Petrie 1930: Pl. XX, No. 40; Pl. XXXIV, No. 11; Brunton and Engelbach 1927: Pl. XL, Nos. 23 and 26; Engelbach 1923: Pl. XXI, Nos. 153, 207, and 208) as occurs on the seal from Tel Jemmeh. All of these non-Egyptian aspects of the motif confirm that the scarab is likely locally made.

Local imitations of the hunting scene from this group also occur on a locally produced pyramidal stamp seal made of ubiquitous bone (Brandl 1993b: 217–218 [No. 16]) and conoids of the Southern Levant (Keel 2013: 36–37 [Tel Gemme 83⁴¹⁵]; 218–219 [Geser 113⁴¹⁶]). On one local conoid, the anthropomorphic figure is shortened to fit along the rounded edge of the conoid's circular base (Keel 2013: 36–37 [Tel Gemme 83]). On the other conoid, the anthropomorphic figure appears to be peculiarly seated while raising his bow. His odd bodily form was likely engraved to fit onto the circular face of the seal. In another instance, an elaborate conoid depicts a similar hunting scene; the anthropomorphic figure wears a likely white crown while standing on a chariot with bow

⁴¹⁵ This conoid was found in Room KB at the base of a wall which is 176' high. Unfortunately, archaeological contexts from a tell excavated by Petrie are less than certain, and his dates should be questioned (see Chapter One).

⁴¹⁶ This conoid comes from the Fourth Semitic Period. Unfortunately, the excavations of MacAlister are too uncertain to establish certain dates for his archaeological contexts.

pointed toward a schematic, legless caprid. A figure, wearing a feather, stands in front of the chariot and horse. This figure has been misinterpreted by the Southern Levantine artist; typically, such a figure portrayed with a feather is an enemy on Egyptian scarabs (Petrie 1915: Pl. XVII, No. 64), and his arms are bound behind his back (cf. Teeter 2003: 150–151, No. 242; Petrie 1915: Pl. XVII, No. 72; Qasile: Mazar 1985: 18–20, Fig. 6). This locally made conoid, however, portrays the feathered figure as leading the horse of the royal chariot. Additionally, the Southern Levantine artist has engraved a highly schematic form of the name of Amun on the lateral sides of the conoid where the *n*-sign is a mere line and the sun disk for Re a dash. The writing of Re's name is not written first as is typical for deities' names. The locally made conoid has mimicked the writing and motifs of Egyptian scarabs, though imperfectly. This same conoid also mimics the dyad of deities from Egyptian scarabs on one lateral side (Williams 1992: Fig. 13f; Teeter 2003: 21 [No. 9]; 72 [No. 102]); all defining characteristics of the deities that make up each dyad are eliminated. Instead, two basic stick figures are portrayed with linking interior hands. This conoid has clearly mimicked the motif of the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside scarabs and other Egyptian scarabs while adapting them to local traditions.

While it is clear that there is local production in the Southern Levant mimicking the motifs of the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside Scarabs, the motifs themselves likely originate in Egypt. Scenes on scarabs from Egypt are often more varied and the motifs less standardized than in the Southern Levant. The hunter standing with bow in front of two quadrupeds occurs on scarabs from Egypt (Petrie 1888: Pl. VIII, No. 79; Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, Nos. 963–966 and 1483; Petrie and Ellis 1937: Pl. VI, No.

57). Egyptian scarabs depict the hunter standing (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, Nos. 964 and 965) or kneeling (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, No. 963). The hunter may even be engraved so schematically that his exact posture is unclear (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, No. 966). The hunter pursues his prey before him; this prey consists of one (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, No. 963) or two animals—a lion and a caprid—which may be engraved along the base of the scarab's face (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, No. 964) or one above the another (Petrie 1925: Pl. XIV, No. 966; Petrie and Ellis 1932: Pl. VI, No. 77).

Traditionally, the group was dated to both the 19th and 20th Dynasties of the Ramesside period (Wiese 1990: 89–95). However, Keel rightfully lowered the date of the group's production to the 20th through 22nd Dynasty (Keel, Shuval, and Uehlinger 1990: 272). Münger further lowered the date of the corpus to the end of the 20th Dynasty (Münger 2005: 397–400). Münger expanded his corpus of so-called Mass-Produced Post-Ramesside scarabs to over 200 seals. The corpus was contemporary with a period when Late Philistine Decorated Ware of Qasile X was popular from the late Iron I; this corresponds, for Münger, to the 21st Dynasty, instead of the 19th and 20th Dynasties; he then made an argument for the Low Chronology based on his new date for the group (Münger 2003 and 2005: 400). His argument is aided significantly by arguing one scarab is not a cryptographic writing of Amun but an abbreviated form of Siamun's name. I have argued above that the reading of Siamun's name is less than certain (Chapter Three), and a cryptographic writing of Amun must remain a likely reading of the base.

Münger's date reflects, no doubt, the period of greatest popularity of this group. In addition, the group was produced prior to that period, albeit in faience. A faience scarab with a common motif of this group was found in Qasile XII which is

contemporary with the 20th Dynasty and most certainly predates strata with Late Philistine Decorated Ware (Mazar 1985: 18–20, Fig. 6). While the Low Chronology argues for a lowering of dates assigned to the strata of the so-called Philistine bichrome wares during the later Iron IB (i.e., Ashkelon 18–17; Ekron VI–V; Ashdod XII–XI; Qasile XI–X), the Low Chronology does not lower the immediately earlier strata—Ashkelon 19 and Qasile XII—to the 20th Dynasty or the late Iron I. Since the scarab from Qasile XII can not be excluded from the corpus of so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside scarabs based on its material, the earliest production of this group should be said to begin during the 20th Dynasty. Both the style of engraving and the motifs of this group of scarabs from the 20th and 21st Dynasty were mimicked on locally made seals.

IMITATING EGYPTIAN MOTIFS ON LOCAL STAMP SEALS

In the Iron I, a shift occurs both in Egyptian interaction in the Southern Levant and the glyptic repertoire. In the middle of the 20th Dynasty, the cost of staples rises steeply (Černý 1934: 173–178). A number of texts attest the rising price of emmer, which is used to make bread. Emmer rose from one to two *deben* of copper per *khar* to eight and even 12 *deben* (Janssen 1975a: 112–117). Barley for beer increases steeply during the reign of Ramesses VII (Janssen 1975a: 119–122).⁴¹⁷ The price of small cattle, though fewer texts attest its price, also increases during the later portions of the 20th Dynasty (Janssen

⁴¹⁷ Interestingly, the prices return to normal by the end of the 20th Dynasty for both emmer and barley, though barley continues to fluctuate (Janssen 1975: 116 and 122). This will be addressed later on in this study, where Egyptian imports of limited number are noted on the edges of the hill country in Iron I contexts at sites like El-Aḥwat (Wolff 2014: 173; Lerna 2012: 362–368; Finkelstein 2002a: 193–194) and ‘En Haggit.

1975a: 165–167).⁴¹⁸ Sesame oil may also have risen toward the end of the 19th Dynasty and the middle of the 20th Dynasty (Janssen 1975a: 330–333). As staples fluctuated in price, other non-staple commodities, like furniture remained remarkably steady throughout the 20th Dynasty (Janssen 1975a: 180–184, 187–191, and 555).⁴¹⁹ While the price of cereals rose, the wages of the village of Deir el-Medina, paid in cereals, remained steady during the 20th Dynasty (Jansen 1975a: 555–556). It was, no doubt, advantageous to work directly for the imperial power within Egypt itself. While this community, hired by the royal apparatus for the necropolis, may not have been representative of the broader economic trends in Egypt (Janssen 1975a: 561–562), it is surely not coincidence that the mines at Timnah in the Negev function only through Ramses VI,⁴²⁰ but no royal name is attested beyond this point. As the cost of staples rose dramatically under Ramses VII, royal projects in distant areas of the empire likely suffered under the weight of a strained Egyptian economy.

It may be that trade with the Southern Levant was maintained more than the rest of the Mediterranean. Southern Levantine ceramics were found in contexts in Egypt associated with the 20th Dynasty up through Ramses VI. The burials of Ramses III, Ramses IV, and Ramses VI contained Canaanite storage jars (D. Aston and B. Aston 1987: 27).⁴²¹ While Southern Levantine storage jars were present, there was a noticeable

⁴¹⁸ The price of small cattle does fluctuate throughout the 19th Dynasty, but the prices attested under Ramses IX and the later 20th Dynasty are not seen at other times in the Ramesside period (Janssen 1975a: 166).

⁴¹⁹ Janssen notes that other barter economies experience similar phenomena where the prices of goods are not interconnected (Janssen 1975b: 179–180).

⁴²⁰ See the bracelet from Timnah which attests Ramses VI's name (Rothenberg 1988: 122–124).

⁴²¹ Unfortunately, the Levantine storage jars of the Iron I are difficult to distinguish from the Egyptian storage jars, except by fabric (Aston 1989: 18–19). It is possible that Canaanite storage jars have gone unnoticed in both Egypt and Egyptian storage jars in the Southern Levant. Despite this problem in the publications, Levantine pottery was clearly imported into Qantir during the Iron I (Aston 1989: 19).

decrease in Mycenaean wares during the 20th Dynasty. At Qantir, the earlier capital of Ramses II, the evidence for Aegean imports during the 20th Dynasty is only slight (Aston 1989: 17). Other sites—like Deir el Medineh and Tell el-Yehudiyeh—attest very limited numbers of potential Aegean imports during the 20th Dynasty. (Aston 1989: 17–18).

LOCALLY MADE GLYPHTIC ART OF THE IRON I

As trade networks wane during the 20th Dynasty, locally made stamp seals of the Iron I become increasingly popular. This group consists of conoid and pyramidal-shaped stamp seals. Often, they are made of limestone⁴²² which is readily available locally and less likely to be an import due to its local ubiquity. Below, we will first establish the dates of these items by establishing the *terminus ante quem* for certain forms of the stamp seal; these forms appear first in the Late Bronze IIB/Iron I transition or Iron I. Items which come from Iron I contexts can then be certainly assigned to the Iron I since the form provides the *terminus post quem* for the seal's production and the archaeological context provides the *terminus ante quem*. Then, we will discuss their means of manufacture and finally their motifs. Among these seals, a number show the influence of Egyptian culture, despite the waning presence of the Egyptian empire.

PYRAMIDAL FORM OF THE STAMP SEAL

The pyramidal form of the stamp seal appears initially in contexts dated to the transition between the Late Bronze IIB to the Iron I (Keel 1994: 28–30). Often, the form is constructed from soft stones (Buchanan and Moorey 1988: 17). The form's origin is

⁴²² Keel's article on pyramidal stamp seals shows the overwhelming use of limestone for this type (1994: 29, Nos. 1–5, 7–11, 14–16).

unclear. Initially, Buchanan and Moorey state that the form appears to be particular to Philistine assemblages; they also note that sometimes this form of the stamp seal has Egyptian-related motifs (Buchanan and Moorey 1988: 17). A pyramidal seal from Egypt was found, but the archaeological context of the item is uncertain (Abd el-Maksoud 1998: 42, 259, Fig. 44, No. 449). It remains unknown whether the form in Egypt predates the form in the Southern Levant. Keel, looking for a prototype for this unprecedented form, proposes the form came from a replication of the shape of Late Bronze anchors, which were placed in cultic areas as votive offerings to request protection from deities (Keel 1994: 28). Other excavations, however, showed that a related limestone form of the pyramidal stamp seal was not limited to Philistine areas, and predated Philistine arrival ever so slightly (Brandl 1986–1987: 170–171). Though the group’s geographical origin is unclear, the pyramidal stamp seals begin either at the tail end of the Late Bronze IIB or the Iron IA. The pyramidal stamp seal from Mt. Ebal has been dated to the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I (Brandl 1986–1987: 171) based on two parallels at Tell Beit Mirsim assigned to Stratum C, but Albright himself questioned the security of the assignment to Stratum C (Albright 1936–1937: 73). While it is possible that the pyramidal stamp seal from Mt. Ebal is an heirloom in Stratum IB and should be dated to Stratum II, which is the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, no parallels point to this conclusion definitively (Zertal 1986).⁴²³

⁴²³ This pyramidal stamp seal was excavated deep in the northern portion of Layer C of the fill (Locus 249) which was in Area A (Zertal 1986: 115). The site has two general strata where Stratum II predates Stratum IB. The locus with the limestone pyramid-like seal was assigned to Stratum IB. The overall ceramic assemblage of Stratum IB is dated to an early portion of the Iron I based on the relative frequency of the Late Bronze cooking pot with outward tilted neck (19%) compared with the Iron I cooking pot with a vertical neck (Zertal 1986: 128–131).

CONOID FORM OF THE STAMP SEAL

The conoid form of the stamp seal may be loosely defined as a shape where the height is equal or exceeds the shortest axis of the base (Keel-Leu 1990: 333–378; Keel 1995a: 100–105, §§246–260; Buchanan and Moorey 1988: 15–17); this definition excludes those shorter seals which would otherwise be classified as scaraboids because their oval base is longer than their height. The base of a conoid may be circular, or oval. The upper end of the conoid may be either rounded (Keel 1997: 8–9 [Tell Abu Hawam 12]) or squared. The sides taper as they extend up from the base, and they tend to taper at a steady rate. The lower end of the stamp seal may have a recessed line around the base (Keel 1997: 8–9 [Tell Abu Hawam 12]), or it may be smooth. The dome is often pierced, but this is not always the case.

Schaeffer noted that the conoid form of the stamp seal was found during the Iron I at Enkomi, but it was absent earlier at Ugarit (Schaeffer 1952: 71, Fig 22); this observation has remained more or less valid, though he didn't note that the form began in the Chalcolithic (for a Chalcolithic stamp seal, which Schaeffer classified as Iron I, see Schaeffer 1952: Fig. 29, No. 3). Since his publication, Chalcolithic sites have yielded a number of seals with the conoid form; the Chalcolithic form tends to have a larger diameter on the base, a convex base, and a much shorter height relative to the diameter (e.g., Keel 2013: 524–525 [Ha-Goscherim 25–26], 528–529 [Ha-Goscherim 35], 530–531 [Ha-Goscherim 37]). After a long hiatus, the conoid form began again in earnest during the Late Bronze IIB–Iron I transition (Buchanan and Moorey 1988: 15). The form was found in a stratum at Enkomi contemporary with the end of the Late Bronze IIB in the Southern Levant (Keel-Leu 1990: 337).

Buchanan and Moorey attempt to determine the origin of the conoid form by finding the earliest archaeological context in the Mediterranean with a conoid. They discuss five options: an Aegean, Cretan, Cypriot, Anatolian, or Egyptian origin (Buchanan and Moorey 1988: 16). They conclude rightly that there is not sufficient evidence to support one option over another since they are generally contemporary. Unfortunately, conoids from the Amuq are inconclusive; in fact, no stamp seal in Meyer's publication comes from the Iron I or earlier (Meyer 2008).

Conoids have rarely been found in contexts dated to the Middle Bronze (Keel 1997: 114–115 [Tell el-‘Ağul 31]. Keel 2010a: 60–61 [Bethel 40]; 334–335 [Tel Burga 1]. Keel 2010b: 30–31 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 7]; Kantor 1958a: 81–82, No. 53) and Late Bronzes (Keel 2010a: 60–61 [Bet-Mirsim 40]; Tufnell 1958: 65–66, Pl. 54, No. 13⁴²⁴. Pritchard 1963: 12. Loud 1948: Pl. 162, No. 6⁴²⁵). Unfortunately, a number of these contexts come from excavations with unreliable archaeological method (e.g., Grant 1934: 43). If these archaeological contexts have not been compromised, and I am inclined to believe that there are too many for all to be compromised, the appearance of this form did occur in an earlier period, but it is *very* rare.

EGYPTIAN INFLUENCE ON LOCAL IRON I STAMP SEALS

⁴²⁴ The pottery of Tomb 216 indicates that the burial was used over more than one generation during the end of the Late Bronze I and the Late Bronze IIA (Tufnell 1958: 65–66, Pls. 52–53). McGovern publishes the pottery of the central Baq‘ah Valley Project and confirms the date that Tufnell assigned to the tomb three decades earlier (McGovern 1986: 65, 69, 79). The archaeological context of this ceramic seal is securely dated since no pottery appears to come from a later date.

⁴²⁵ This conoid is assigned to Locus 2105 at Megiddo (Loud 1948: Pl. 162). Glyptic art expert, Meyer, cited this seal as evidence for the appearance of the conoid form during the Middle Bronze–Late Bronze transition (Meyer 2008: 67, n. 375). Loud assigns the conoid only to Stratum VIII, but he assigns the locus itself to the broader Stratum VIII–VIIB (Loud 1948: 191). As such, this conoid may be dated to the Late Bronze I through the beginning of the Late Bronze IIB. If it comes from the Late Bronze IIB, it does not alter the date for the appearance of the conoid form as drastically.

Stamp seals from the Iron I form a unique corpus. They are often made of low-quality, ubiquitous materials, like limestone or bone. As such, they are more likely to be local productions. Fortunately, the date of this corpus can be fixed. Fixing the date of seals is often not easy. This is uncommon in glyptic corpora, where individual seals are often used as heirlooms. However, the production of Southern Levantine stamp seals began in earnest in the Late Bronze IIB–Iron I transition or Iron I providing the *terminus post quem*, and stamp seals from Iron I contexts have a *terminus ante quem* supplied by the archaeological context itself. Therefore, these stamp seals can be dated with a very high level of certainty to the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I and Iron I.⁴²⁶

As the Iron I progresses, Egyptian empire recedes under the 20th Dynasty. Royal scarabs drop off after Ramses IV (Brandl 2004). Items of Egyptian material culture become fewer. Dan Master's petrographic analysis of the rims of Iron I storage jar from Ashkelon shows a drop off in trade in the later half of the Iron I. Evidence for Egyptian interconnections—like Nile Perch—continue into the second half of the Iron I, but they are very limited. Only one Nile perch was found at 'Ein Haggit (Wolff 1998: 453)⁴²⁷ and another at El-Aḥwat⁴²⁸ (Zertal 2012: 364) during the later Iron I. As connections with Egypt remain but decline during the 21st Dynasty, the stamp seal steadily gains popularity.

⁴²⁶ Unfortunately, the greater part of the corpus of Iron I stamp seals does not come from datable contexts. Of 488 stamp seals dated to the Iron I or Iron I/IIA by Keel, 66 come from contexts dated only to the Iron I. 100 stamp seals have been dated by Eggler and Keel roughly to the Iron I or Iron I/IIA in the Transjordan. 22 are from Iron I contexts in the Transjordan.

⁴²⁷ I thank Sam Wolff for pointing out this limited Egyptian influence in the later Iron I both at his site of 'En Haggit and El-Aḥwat.

⁴²⁸ For the lower date of El-Aḥwat's ceramics, see Finkelstein 2007 and Wolff 2014. Unfortunately, the final publication of the pottery from Zertal's site (e.g., Be'eri and Cohen 2012: 192–193), fails to include the relative frequency of forms like the Late Bronze cooking pot and the Iron I cooking pot; similar key data was included in Zertal's own 1986 publication of the ceramics of Mount Ebal (Zertal 1986: 128–130).

EGYPTIAN DIVINE TRIADS AND DYADS

A small group of stamp seals with inscriptions on both the base and four lateral sides demonstrate the use of Egyptianizing motifs typically found on imported scarabs. A conoid-like stamp seal with rounded sides is found at Tel Jerishe in the Iron I. Two of the lateral sides and base engrave the name of Amun and Amun-Re. A winged uraeus is depicted on another side, a striding lion on another, and a winged, falcon-headed figure. The base depicts a reclining lion. The item is made of ivory (Keel 2013: 142) or possibly bone (Shuval 1990: 123)—either material is atypical for Egyptian seals.

The next two seals mix Egyptianizing motifs; one motif has broader implications for a common motif on stamp seals that otherwise might appear generic. A conoid was found at Tell el-Far‘ah (South) on the surface in Cemetery 800 (Keel 1994: 29, Fig. 18; Keel 2010b: 116–117 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 210]); one lateral side depicts the name of Amun-Re, another a striding lion and a third motif that would appear generic, if not for clear echoing of a common Egyptian motif on scarabs. Three figures stand side-by-side with their arms hanging at their sides. This calls to mind the divine triads common on Scarabs of both the Southern Levant and Egypt.

These triads are found on scarabs throughout Egypt—Harageh at the entrance to the Fayum (Engelbach 1923: Pl. 21, No. 159), Memphis (Petrie and Walker 1909: Pl. 34, No. 24), Riqqeh (Engelbach 1915: Pl. 18, No. 98), Nebesheh (Petrie 1888: Pl. 1 [Left column, middle]), Sedment (Petrie and Brunton 1924: Pl. 58, No. 41), and Medinet Habu (Teeter 2003: 73, No. 103). Local stamp seals imitate these divine triads on the local

conoid of Tell el-Far'ah (South) but the distinctive iconography of each god is noticeably absent. The motif becomes simple hollowed-out stick-like figure which join hands.

A similar motif occurs on an Egyptianizing conoid from Ashkelon (Keel 1997: 721–722 [Ashkelon 83]). Instead of a triad, it depicts a dyad. These dyads are also common on Egyptian pieces of glyptic art (Williams 1992: Fig. 13f; Teeter 2003: Nos. 9 and 102). On the Southern Levantine conoid, the divine dyad is shown together. However, in the locally made conoid from Ashkelon, again, there is no iconography to distinguish these gods from others. This tendency to replicate the Egyptian motif without the noticeably Egyptianizing elements of the motif will be returned to in the final chapter.

THE CAPRID FROM THE MIDDLE BRONZE TO THE IRON I

Scarabs with a caprid together with a branch, ¸-sign, or a geometric motif were produced among the local scarabs from the Middle Bronze; Ben-Tor placed this group among her Late Palestinian Series (Ben-Tor 2007: 175; Pl. 96.1–97.5). The motif continued on locally made faience scarabs which were produced during the Late Bronze I or IIA period (Keel 2010a: 160–161 [Bet-Schean 140⁴²⁹]). At the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, local engravers in the Southern Levant return to this motif on scarabs of enstatite (Keel 2010a: 126–127 [Bet-Schean 62⁴³⁰]; Keel 2010b: 393–394 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 865⁴³¹]) and

⁴²⁹ The scarab was found in Square R/7–8, Locus 1213, which was assigned by James to Stratum VII (Late).

⁴³⁰ This scarab, made of enstatite, was found in Locus 1519 of Square R7, which is associated with Stratum Upper V from the Iron IIB. The archaeological context allows for a production date that is later than the Iron I.

⁴³¹ This scarab comes from the Southern Area, Room EF, level 386'2'', which has been assigned to Stratum E and dated to the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. However, excavations on a tell from Petrie's early 20th century excavations are less than certain due to his excavation by level.

conoids made of ubiquitous local stones (Keel 2010a: 126–127 [Bet-Schean 64⁴³²]; 322–323 [Bet-Zur 13⁴³³]; Eggler and Keel 2006: 378–381 [Tall as-Sa‘idiya 27⁴³⁴ and 28⁴³⁵]). The caprid is also depicted on faience objects that poorly mimic the bundled-back handles (Keel 2010b: 128–129 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 233⁴³⁶]). Local traditions continue this motif from the Middle Bronze and Late Bronze I on locally made scarabs down through the Iron I and possibly Iron IIA on locally made conoids (Keel 1997: 50–51 [Achsib 86⁴³⁷]; 412–413 [Tell el-‘Ağul 908⁴³⁸]).

Interestingly, a possible calcite scarab was engraved with a caprid and two dots engraved behind its horns. The motif of the caprid is hollowed out; this style of engraving is similar to a few Middle Bronze scarabs (Ben-Tor 1997: Pl. 96.1 and 96.5; Keel 2013: 120–121 [Ekron 56⁴³⁹]). This scarab was likely made from a local material. It was

⁴³² This conoid was also found in a context associated with Building 1584 assigned to Stratum (Lower) VI of the end of the Late Bronze and the Iron IA (James 1966: 12.20, Fig. 77, 80.2; Mazar 1997:70). The strata of Beth Shean, however, have been reassigned to different periods by later archaeologists. Yannai noted that Building 1700 and 1584 were integrated and both were aligned with Building 1500 to the west and Building 1024 to the east (Yannai 1996: 192, Fig. 2). Yannai believes that all these buildings were constructed together at the same time which was founded in Level VI and continued in Level V. Yannai then dates “Lower V” to the 12th century. According to his analysis, Building 1584 would begin prior to the 12th century and continue into the Iron I (*pace* Keel 2010a: 126). If this is the case, the seal can come from the Late Bronze IIB, Iron I, or later. While Yannai may be correct, the seal’s context has greater problems because the locus’ precise relationship to Building 1584 is ambiguous. It is only said to have been found north of the building. Despite the uncertainty of the archaeological context, the seal’s form and style of engraving is in line with the style of Iron I conoids.

⁴³³ While this conoid is likely an Iron I seal, the item comes from a much later context, which is dated to the Hellenistic period (Keel 2010a: 322).

⁴³⁴ This scaraboid came from Tomb 335 in Square 700 of Area BB, which is dated to the Iron IA. Green assigns this tomb to his Phase 3, which was the Iron IIA–B (Green 2006: 126 and 271).

⁴³⁵ This scaraboid came from the same tomb—Tomb 335 of Square 700 in Area BB—discussed in the previous footnote. The tomb is dated to the Iron IIA–B according to Green’s helpful re-evaluation of the cemetery (Green 2006: 126 and 271).

⁴³⁶ This bundled-back seal comes from Tomb 504, which Braunstein dated to the end of the Iron I and beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 505).

⁴³⁷ A conoid from Achziv uses the form and style of engraving that is typical of the Iron I and Iron IIA. Unfortunately, this specific conoid comes from an unknown archaeological context. Nonetheless, the conoid likely demonstrates continued use of the motif. See also Keel 1997: 58–59 [Achsib 111].

⁴³⁸ Unfortunately, this conoid comes from an uncertain archaeological context at Tell el-‘Ağul.

⁴³⁹ This limestone conoid comes from Area T, Locus 99010, which is dated to the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I.

engraved with a motif mimicking a local Middle Bronze motif, but not the Middle Bronze style of engraving. As such, this scarab is almost certainly produced locally. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of the archaeological context makes it difficult to determine if the *terminus ante quem* for the scarab is the Iron I or Iron IIA.

The motif of the caprid with branch or other object is itself not necessarily Egyptianizing, though a similar motif can be found on Egyptian scarabs. It can be traced from earlier local engravers who inscribed the motif on an Egyptian-type seal form, the scarab. The motif is decoupled from its Egyptianizing seal form and engraved on a local conoid. It is possible that, though the motif was coupled with an Egyptianizing seal form for so many centuries, the motif itself was not considered to be Egyptianizing in any way. It may be that the scarab form had been locally used for so many centuries that the scarab form itself lacked a definitive Egyptian association.

NON-EGYPTIANIZING MOTIFS OF LOCALLY PRODUCED STAMP SEALS

A very common local motif of the Iron I depicts an animal with its young between its legs. Sinuous motifs of likely scorpions fill the negative space above the back and in front of the adult (Ta'anach: Lapp 1967a: 34, Fig. 24;⁴⁴⁰ Yoqne'am: Ornan 2005: 349, No. 3, Fig. III.3 = Shuval 1990: 154, No. 71⁴⁴¹). Often the motif depicts an adult suckling its

⁴⁴⁰ This seal came from a vessel whose neck indicated it was a cooking pot; the vessel contained many objects, including pebbles, a scarab with a man raising a sword or stick toward two animals engraved over one another, a metal baboon, metal turtle, metal frog, heavy metal weights, beads, shell sticks, rectangular hematite block, an iron nail, polishing stones, and this conoid. The area was designated by Lapp as a cult area (Lapp 1967: 34). Lapp notes a similar deposit at Megiddo found in Tomb 912B, though admittedly the deposit from Megiddo is much richer (Guy 1938: Pls. 128–130).

⁴⁴¹ This conoid comes from Locus 2528 in Stratum XVIII–XVIIb? (Ornan 2005: 349, No. 3).

young between its legs, but occasionally a related motif does not (Ornan 2005: 349, No. 3).

Through these Iron I motifs incorporating caprids, local traditions from Late Bronze IIA and IIB re-emerge. Locally produced, rectangular, bifacial plaques from Late Bronze IIA (Brandl 2008) demonstrate the popularity of simple motifs, composed of one figure—almost always an animal and often a caprid or lion (e.g., Petrie 1932: Pl. 7.14 = Keel 1997: 176–177 [Tell el-‘Ağul 218]; Giveon and Kertesz 1986: 40–41, No. 154 = Keel 1997: Akko 130; cf. Keel 1997: 218–219 [Tell el-‘Ağul 342⁴⁴²]). These caprids and lions are executed by simple, engraved line, but their Late Bronze execution was more nuanced than the increasingly schematic, Iron I motifs (Keel 2013: 114–115 [Gat 44]). According to Daphna Ben-Tor, a motif with a caprid was a popular element within the local glyptic during the Late Palestinian Series (Ben-Tor 2007: 175, Pls. 96–97) more so than the Early Palestinian Series (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 62, Nos. 24–30). The motif is almost absent from the Egyptian Series of the Middle Kingdom (cf. Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 19, Nos. 5–18) and Second Intermediate Period (cf. Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 40, No. 30). Similarly, the conoid form, which rose in popularity during the Iron I, often features simple motifs involving caprids, engraved with simple lines. These conoids, which appear in this transition, are often made from ubiquitous limestone—a likely indicator of their local production.

CONCLUSION

⁴⁴² This rectangular, bifacial plaque comes from an unknown context (Keel 1997: 218).

Local production of both scarabs and stamp seals in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I has been demonstrated. Imitations of local Middle Bronze motifs can be shown to mimic local motifs on scarab forms. One might superficially connect these locally produced scarabs to Egyptian imperial influence in the Southern Levant during the 19th and early 20th Dynasties. It might be tempting to note the elevation of the memory of the Hyksos during Ramses II as seen in the 400-year stela (Montet 1933). As such, the rise of Middle Bronze motifs in the Southern Levant during the Late Bronze IIB would be understood to be Egyptian emulation of this earlier period. A careful examination of the evidence, however, points in a different direction.

The local production of these Middle Bronze motifs recalls designs popular in the local Early and Late Palestinian Series—not the Egyptian series of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period. These motifs were popular in local, Canaanite burials, and these scarabs continued to be used as heirlooms throughout the Late Bronze I and II periods. Further, a number of these local motifs continued to be produced in the Beth Shean IX group of the Late Bronze I. Continuous use and production throughout the Late Bronze ensured that these traditions were understood to be part of the local glyptic tradition. Therefore, local engravers returned to these motifs in the Late Bronze IIB. When intra-Mediterranean trade waned in the Iron IA as food prices soared in Egypt and famine plagued the Hittite region, local engravers ramped up production of these local traditions as the local market continued to demand amulets in the form of scarabs for their burials. Local populations continued to demand amulets that would protect their dead as they passed from this world into the underworld.

While Egyptian trade networks persisted into the Iron I, they were diminished. As access waned, local engravers met the demand for amulets by crafting local, limestone conoids and pyramidal stamp seals using, at times, local and, at other times, Egyptianizing motifs that mimicked contemporary Egyptian scarabs like the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside and Post-Ramesside scarabs. The market demanded both local and Egyptianizing motifs to protect their dead as they were led into the underworld.

CHAPTER 5

GLYPHTIC ART AND THE PANTHEON OF SOUTHERN LEVANTINE BURIAL CULTS

With a methodology for dating scarabs and stamp seals of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I in hand, this study will turn to two broad instances of evidence for the local pantheon in the Southern Levant. Both imported scarabs and locally produced scarabs and stamp seals will be examined for evidence of the local pantheon and local cultic practices as they relate to the use of amulets in life and in burial cult. First, imported scarabs will be used to establish local preference for a specific deity during the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA. Second, scarabs and stamp seals largely of the Iron I depicting deities in both local and Egypto-Canaanite traditions will be examined.

LOCAL GLYPHTIC CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION IN THE SOUTHERN LEVANT: BEYOND EMPIRE

During Egypt's New Kingdom, under Thutmosis III, Egyptian imperial power expanded markedly. Thutmosis III's reign became the ideal that subsequent rulers of Egypt emulated when pushing back the foreign forces of chaos that threatened the boundaries of Egypt. Later Pharaohs projected Empire by copying his lists of conquered places. These lists, though more than mere fiction, cannot be taken at simple face value. Early on in the 18th Dynasty, Pharaohs conquered Nubia. New Kingdom Pharaohs projected Empire upon these Nubian subjects through numerous building programs and reliefs. The empire constructed temples and fortresses along the Nile to ensure the movement of gold and other natural resources from Nubia into Egypt's center. The empire's buildings and reliefs reminded Nubians of their subjugated status. The Ramesside monumental gates to

the Nubian cities of Amara West displayed in pictures the story of Nubian defeat lest any subject entering the city dare forget whose subject they were.

At Beit el-Wali, Ramses II constructed a temple that retold the story of conquest over chaos where the walls mirrored the Egyptian empire (Ricke, Hughes, and Wente 1967). Though this temple was modest in size, its iconographic program was mythical in size. The temple told the story of pushing back chaos, a narrative that was common to New Kingdom temples (Baines 1995: 308, 313; Arnold 1997: 177). One entered his temple from the west; the walls to the right and left mirrored the layout of the geography. To the right and left, the Pharaoh charged toward the door, driving the enemies back to the entrance. Piles of enemy bodies gathered in heaps under the hooves of his horse. As one entered, Nubian enemies were depicted to one's right—appropriately placed on the southern wall. The Shasu of the Sinai, Libyans and Syrians were to the left, appropriately located on the northern wall. The foreign chaos was pushed to the edges of the empire and temple.

Once subjugated, Syrians, Libyans, Shasu, and Nubians processed subjugated through the temple's entrance hall, deeper into the temple's hall. Subjects are depicted as vanquished recipients of an Egyptian worldview. They express their new-found conversion to an Egyptian cosmology. A defeated Syrian chief, gripped by his hair as he is about to be slain by the Pharaoh, declares: "I did believe that there was no other like Ba'al, (but) the Ruler—Pharaoh—is his true son forever." Ramses II, about to thrust his weapon into the Syrian, is victoriously declared to be the son of the Syrian deity, Ba'al.

While these reliefs portray the Empire's subjects as passive recipients of the empire's imperial and artistic programs, were the subjects of Egyptian imperial power

truly passive? How did the subjects of empire construct identity under empire? Did they adopt Egyptian imperial ways while also repudiating them? Did they adopt while unknowingly altering the imperial program? Did the Egyptian material culture, loosed from the empire's control, become something the Empire never intended? In Peircean terms of semiotics, did the object itself become generative, accumulating new *interpretants*?

The scarabs and seals of the end of the Late Bronze—the Late Bronze IIB—have been described largely as direct reflexes of Egyptian imperial control. Where the Empire goes, the subject follows, so it is argued. When Ptah rises in the Egyptian pantheon of the 19th Dynasty, there is a simultaneous increase in Ptah scarabs in the Southern Levant. Or the idealization of the Hyksos by the 19th Dynasty in the 400-year stela results in Southern Levantine consumption of scarabs imitating Middle Bronze motifs (See Chapter Four for a different explanation of the phenomenon of imitations of Middle Bronze styles and motifs.). The Southern Levantine subjects of Egypt's empire become passive recipients of the colonizer's cosmological and artistic program. Cultural exchange, it is commonly argued, moves in one direction—from the agent of empire to the subject of empire.

PTAH SCARABS OF THE RAMESSIDE PERIOD: RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS AND PATTERNS OF CONSUMPTION

As argued in the previous chapter, the typological form of a scarab can only rarely be used to date a glyptic to the 19th Dynasty. Instead, the date of a set of objects can be determined by looking at the distribution of the motifs and styles of engraving according to the archaeological context.

Scarabs with images of Ptah himself or writing of his name occur as early as the Middle Bronze and Late Bronze IIA infrequently. Then the number of scarab depicting Ptah rises dramatically in Late Bronze IIB contexts.

The production of scarabs with the name Ptah goes back to the Middle Bronze (Keel 2002: 209–213; Ben-Tor 2009: 87–88). Keel notes nine Middle Bronze scarabs from excavations in Palestine where the name of Ptah was written (Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 55.17; 81.31–37). The written form of the name of Ptah is absent on the contemporary Middle Kingdom Egyptian scarabs (Ben-Tor 2009: 87). The number of scarabs with Ptah is unique to the Southern Levant. This distribution of Ptah scarabs in the Southern Levant is likely because of local production of Ptah scarabs in the Middle Bronze, as Ben-Tor argued. The engraver is likely local with the scarabs inverting the *t*-sign as the common *nb*-sign (Ben-Tor 2007: 165–166).

Following this period of low levels of production, scarabs with Ptah and Sakmet become rare in Late Bronze I and Late Bronze IIA archaeological contexts. One seal with Ptah can be dated to a period contemporary with the Late Bronze I due to the cartouche of Amenophis II (Keel 1997: 194–195 [Tell el-‘Ağul 272]). Four glyptic items that depict Ptah are assigned to contexts dated to the broader Late Bronze I and IIA.⁴⁴³ In contrast to the minimal number of Ptah scarabs from both the Middle Bronze and Late Bronze I–IIA, glyptic items with Ptah dramatically rises to fifty-one items in contexts associated with the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA. A clear spike in consumption in the Southern Levant

⁴⁴³ Scarabs from contexts that have been dated to the Late Bronze I and IIA include: Keel 1997: 186–187, 393–394 [Tell el-‘Ağul 250, 847]; Keel 2010a: 156–157, 160–161 [Bet Schean 134, 143]; Keel 2010a: 248–249 [Bet Schemesch 73].

occurs during this period.⁴⁴⁴ Then scarabs with Ptah decrease during the Iron I to 20% of their previous level as the scarab type becomes an heirloom⁴⁴⁵ and their frequency tapers off.

In the late New Kingdom, Ptah had become prominent in the pantheon of the Egyptian empire.⁴⁴⁶ Throughout Egyptian history, numerous local Egyptian deities, like Ptah, had been associated with the creation of world, but they did not rise to a place of prominence in the pantheon. Ptah's residence, however, was in Memphis. Over time, Ptah came to figure prominently in the pantheon, though he did not have a defined role in the mythology of Egypt—no cycle of Ptah existed like those of Osiris or Re. And yet Ptah would come together with two other deities to form major triads in Egypt.

When the temple of Beit el-Wali was built by Ramses II, the temple's innermost niche was flanked by Ptah to north and Min-Amun-Kamutef to the south. Just as Ptah is centered in the northern town of Memphis, Ptah was placed on the north side of the niche. On the south, Min-Amun-Kamutef, whose worship was centered in Coptos in the south—flanked the southern end of the niche. The temple walls mirrored Egypt's topography.

⁴⁴⁴ Keel 1997: 198–201 [Tell el-ʿAğul 289, 290, 291, 295]; Keel 1997: 754–755 [Asor 20]; Keel 2010a: 108–109, 118–119, 150–151, 196–197, 202–203, 210–211 [Bet Schean 26, 48, 122, 224, 235, and 248]; Keel 2010a: 502–503 [Dothan 30]; Keel 2010b: 82–83, 86–89, 223–224, 232–233, 236–237, 240–243, 250–251, 270–271, 284–285, 294–295, 300–303, 306–307, 316–317, 326–331, 336–337, 350–351, 354–355, 366–367 [Tell el-Far'ah Süd 129, 130, 139, 141, 142, 456, 481, 488, 498, 500, 523, 565, 595, 597, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 639, 642, 651, 677, 698, 700, 702, 705, 708, 722, 762, 769, 772, 774, and 801]; Keel 2013: 122–123 [Gat 58]; Keel 2013: [Geser 100]; Keel 2013: 566–567 [Tel Harasim 30]; Keel 2013: 654–655 [Tell el-Hesi 11]. Another scarab comes from a context dated to both the Late Bronze IIB–Iron IA and late Roman (Keel 2010a: [Bet Schean 90]).

⁴⁴⁵ Keel 1997: 6–7 [Tell Abu Hawam 8]; Keel 2010a: 134–135 [Bet Schean 83]; Keel 2010a: 518–519 [Ekron 8]; Keel 2010b: 92–93, 104–105, 156–157, 384–385 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 152, 175, 296, 846]; Keel 2013: 64–67 [Tel Gamma 148, 152, and 153]; Harrison 2004: Pl. 39:15.

⁴⁴⁶ A quick note on the Memphite Theology. Though Ptah can be shown to have risen in prominence in the Egyptian pantheon, the Memphite Theology can not be martialed in support of this argument. The text equates Ptah with the primeval God Atum who created the cosmos through his heart and tongue. Though the text claims to have been written in the Old Kingdom, it is either Ramesside or later. Even without the Memphite Theology, the rise of Ptah can be demonstrated.

Ptah and Min-Amun-Kamutef were placed in the culminating positions at the end of the entrance and columned halls. They were located in the second deepest point of the temple. Ptah's status was not that of local deity limited to Memphis, but now he was the god of the northern part of the cosmos.

In the temple of Abu Simbel—also in Nubia—Ramses II, again, created a cultic niche which contained an image of himself, Re-Harachte, Amun-Re, and Ptah. Ptah was an integral part of this eminent triad of deities.

In addition to Ptah's prominence in the Beit el-Wali temple and the temple at Abu Simbel, the temple of Gerf Hussein in lower Nubia also depicts Ptah and Ptah-taten prominently. Like the previous two temples, it was built in the reign of Ramses II; it is located 87 km south of the First Cataract on the west side of the Nile (Hawass 2004: 52–120). On the south wall of the Hypostyle hall, one scene depicts the Pharaoh making sacrifices and burning incense to Ptah and in another the king gives cloth to Ptah-Tatnen (Hawass 2004: 59). Four niches at the bottom of the Hypostyle wall contain a divine triad; two triads involve Ptah and the King (Hawass 2004: 58–59). In the sanctuary itself, there is the stone platform, probably for the sacred barque. On the west wall, there is a niche with Ramses II, Ptah, Ptah-Tatnen and Hathor (Hawass 2004: 61, 63). Ptah's rise among the reliefs of 19th Dynasty temples is clear.

With the rise of Ptah, there is a contemporary rise in the number of scarabs using an image of Ptah or referring to Ptah during the 19th Dynasty. Tell el-Far'ah (South) outstrips all sites with 42 items referring to Ptah or showing an image of a mummified Ptah with *w3s*-scepter or *dd*-pillar. Nearly one-third of all Ptah scarabs from the Southern Levant prior to the Iron IB are from Tell el-Far'ah (South). All except one come from

contexts dated to the Late Bronze IIB-Iron I transition, concurrent with the late 19th and early 20th Dynasty. These Ptah-scarabs come from cemeteries at Tell el-Far'ah (South) with the highest density of Egyptian artifacts,⁴⁴⁷ but they also come from cemeteries with less Egyptian material culture.⁴⁴⁸

After Tell el-Far'ah (South), sites identified as having a so-called Governor's Residency—Beth Shean and Deir el-Balah—have the next highest number of Ptah scarabs. After these—sites in the shephelah with no Egyptian garrison form the next group of consumers. Finally, a smattering of sites on the coast, throughout the Jezreel and the Shephelah have one Ptah scarab.

As noted above, this has been explained as the result of Egyptian imperial presence. Because Ptah rose in the 19th Dynasty, Ptah's scarabs are thought to be consumed in the Southern Levant. However, the rise of Ptah only explains production of the scarabs in Egypt. It does not explain consumption. If Egyptian imperial presence were sufficient to cause these scarabs to be consumed, the same situation should occur in Nubia which was arguably under greater Egyptian imperial control than the Southern Levant.

TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS: PTAH SCARABS IN NUBIA

Nubia permits us to test this hypothesis that colonial rule will result in certain consumption patterns by those under imperial rule. Nubia, runs along the Nile, south of the first cataract at Aswan (Welsby 2001: 551). Egypt controlled Nubia since the 18th

⁴⁴⁷ Keel 2005: 749; Keel 2010b: Tell el-Far'a Süd 130, 139, 141, 142, 250, 456, 459, 478, 488, 495, 498, 523, 565, 579, 595, 597, 620–624, 639, 651, 700, 702, 705, 708, 722, 762, 767, 769, 774, 801, and 921.

⁴⁴⁸ Keel 2010b: Tell el-Far'a Süd 152, 175, and 296.

Dynasty. Their grip far exceeded any control they maintained over the Southern Levant, as shown by the complex hierarchy of rulers from Viceroy of Kush and down—a hierarchy not mirrored in the Southern Levant according to the texts we currently have.

Thanks to the multiple dams of the 20th century, the region was explored extensively by archaeologists. With each threat of a dam, the local government issued a call for surveys and excavations. As a result, in the first decade of the 20th century, Reisner and Firth explored the region, and the government in Cairo published their volumes (Welsby 2001: 552). A century of exploration permits us to make more sound conclusions about the Nubian response to Egyptian empire.

During the Second Intermediate Period, the Kushite kingdom had expanded and pushed back the Egyptian empire. By the beginning of the New Kingdom, the Egyptian Pharaoh Ahmose retook northern sites from the Hyksos, causing them to retreat to Sharuhén. In the south, he pushed back the Kushite kingdom (Welsby and Anderson 2004: 94). By the reign of Thutmose I (ca. 1525–1516), Egypt claimed to have expanded through the Third Cataract of Nubia, and the king proclaimed that he “penetrated the valleys which the royal ancestors knew not” (Welsby 2001: 554). 18th and 19th Dynasty inscriptions upstream from the third cataract likely indicate control this far. Beyond that point, there are few sites with heavy Egyptian influence. As Egypt expanded into Nubia throughout the 18th Dynasty, how did local populations negotiate identity and Egyptian empire? Did they adopt Egyptian customs? Adopt but transform them? Repudiate them?

Nubian burials of the New Kingdom show an astounding mixture of thoroughly Egyptian practices with local Nubian traditions. Pyramids topped chambered tombs in which local people were interred in both an Egyptian style of extended burial and a Nubian

flexed position. Even after the Egyptian empire receded in the late 20th Dynasty, local Nubian traditions of burial re-emerge in the Pre-Napatan period, suggesting that all along a complex negotiation of Egyptian identity was taking place—rather than a wholesale adoption. They were not merely recipients of local Egyptian rule who quickly forgot their own traditions.

Now this study will look at the scarabs found in tombs. We will move from the First Cataract southward. The study will note New Kingdom tombs but will point out especially when excavators have noted that there is 19th Dynasty use or reuse of the tombs. Without 19th Dynasty reuse, the absence of Ptah will not be indicative of different patterns in purchasing of scarabs and different emphases in burial cult.

Nubian Sites with Scarabs of Ptah

The Cemeteries from Ginari to Gerf Houssein. These cemeteries are located just south of the First Cataract, and they were excavated by Firth. Firth published 46 scarabs associated with these tombs. None depict Ptah. This is not surprising because a number of these scarabs come from the Middle Bronze when Ptah did not figure prominently among the glyptic corpus (Firth 1912: Pl. 42).

Dakka. Dakka and surrounding cemeteries were excavated also by Firth (Firth 1915). He published 60 scarabs which include 18th and 19th Dynasty items. Three of these depict Ptah or include a phrase related to him (Firth 1915: Pl. 41, Nos. 30-31, 59). Two show Ptah before either a *mꜣt*-feather or a *dd*-pillar with a *mꜣt*-feather on top (Firth 1915: Pl. 41, Nos. 30-31). Another places Ptah with *wꜣs*-scepter in front of a standing

and taller figure. The last scarab has the standard phrase “Ptah [is] lord of truth” (Firth 1915: Pl. 41, No. 59).

Cemeteries between Dakka and Wadi el-Arab. Firth continued his survey of the Nile valley between Dakka and Wadi el-Arab. He excavated 18 cemeteries that yielded 235 scarabs (Firth 1927: x, Pls. 35–36). Of these, three depict Ptah. One scarab from Cemetery 100 has the standard phrase engraved “Ptah [is] Lord of truth” (Firth 1927: 111, No. 111). Another from Cemetery 126 shows Ptah with *wꜥs*-scepter before the phrase *nb tꜣwy*, *mn-hꜣpr-R^c* and a *nfr*-sign behind Ptah (Firth 1927: Pl. 26, No. 181). Finally, a scarab from Cemetery 136 shows Ptah between two *dd*-pillars with *mꜣt*-feathers above each (Firth 1927: Pl. 26, No. 216).

Aniba. Among the 197 scarabs and two rings from Aniba, the throne name of Ramses II is present twice, indicating 19th Dynasty use of the cemetery when Ptah was rising in prominence (Steindorff 1937: Pl. 54, Nos. 29, 31). Two scarabs refer to Ptah. One scarab refers to “Every good work, Ptah richly rewards” (Steindorff 1937: Pl. 54, No. 36) and another says “Ptah [is] lord of Maat” (Steindorff 1937: Pl. 54, No. 41). It should be noted, here, that a number of scarabs here are from the Middle Bronze and a relative absence of Ptah among this collection is not as surprising.

Qustul and Adindan. While the cemeteries at Qustul were dated largely to the 18th Dynasty, Ramesside reuse of the cemetery did occur, as shown by the presence of scarabs with the throne name of Ramses II (Williams 1992: 15). In other words, 19th Dynasty tombs and scarabs are unlikely in this cemetery, but there will be some. However, Williams has no definitive ceramic markers that permit him to subdivide the ceramics after the Amarna period and so he puts together all tombs and contexts from the

late 18th Dynasty, 19th, and 20th Dynasties (Williams 1992: Table 3). No scarabs with Ptah are found.

Cemeteries from Es-Seboua (Wadi el-‘Arab) to Adindan. Along this stretch of the Nile, excavations were performed and 108 scarabs retrieved. One depicts Ptah before a royal figure (Emery and Kirwan 1935: Pl. 32, No. 57).

Debeira East. The tombs of the Debeira, a village 21 km north of Wadi Halfa, were being plundered. Salvage excavation was done for two of the tombs (Sherif 1960: 53–61). Six items were found; there was no depiction of Ptah. Chamber B of Tomb 1 produced a heart scarab with Chapter 30B of *The Book of the Dead* (Habachi 1960: 56), a worn faience scarab with the throne name of Thutmosis III (Habachi 1960: 56), and a green faience, bifacial scaraboid with one side depicting *nfr ntr mn-hpr-R^c* above two uraei and the other depicting four symmetric uraei (Habachi 1960: 57). The second tomb from these salvage excavations also produced a heart scarab (Habachi 1960: 60, No. 21, Pl. 20).

Buhen. On the west bank of the Nile, MacIver and Wooley excavated near the Second Cataract (Randall-MacIver and Wooley 1911). They excavated two cemeteries at Buhen that yielded scarabs: Cemeteries H and J (Randall-MacIver and Wooley 1911: Pls. 56–59). Among 158 pieces of glyptic art, there were no depictions of Ptah. This is not entirely surprising since the main use of the cemeteries was only in the 18th Dynasty (Randall-MacIver and Wooley 1911: 129), but the excavators note that tombs did continue in use during the 19th and 20th Dynasties as a stela to Seti I indicates (Randall-MacIver and Wooley 1911: Pl. 34, No. 10988).

Amara West. Amara West sits on an island in the middle of the Nile north of the third cataract in Nubia. Upon approach, it would have appeared as a thoroughly Egyptian city, despite being in the heart of Nubian territory. When approaching the city through the western gate, scenes of the conquest of Nubia would have surrounded the subjects, reminding them of their relationship to Egyptian imperial power (Spencer 1997: 18–19). This seemingly Egyptian site was established as the administrative center under Seti I, as shown by the stamped cartouches on the mudbricks used to build the town's wall. As such, the site has 19th Dynasty occupation and it was excavated recent enough that the ceramics can be dated to more narrow periods within the later New Kingdom, thanks to David Aston's work. They even argue that they can recognize the Pre-Napatan period ceramics.

The town was surrounded by two cemeteries—Cemetery C to the northeast and Cemetery D to the northwest (Binder 2011; Binder *et al.* 2011). The earliest burials in underground chambers date to the New Kingdom; they resemble those found in Nubia and Egypt proper. Grave goods show a marked affinity for Egyptian modes of burial, and yet the Nubian burial tradition persists in flexed burials and the marking of the underground, central chamber with a mound (Binder *et al.* 2011: 63). The local tradition of burial in a flexed position later resurges in the Post-New Kingdom burials of Cemetery C (Binder *et al.* 2011: 63).

Chamber tombs in Cemetery C with multiple interments have yielded scarabs. Grave 201 is the largest chamber tomb that the excavators have examined and published so far (Spencer 2009: 58; Binder 2011: 42–44). Though it was looted, they estimate the tomb contained 41 adults and 14 children. Despite the looting, the tomb still contained

toiletory items, like wooden pigment containers, a cosmetic applicator, earrings, and a Bes amulet. The tomb includes 18th and 19th Dynasty glyptic items. Seven faience and steatite scarabs remained. Interestingly, scarabs with three burials in the Western chamber were found *in situ* in the hand or beneath the head. No depiction of Ptah appears.

Another chamber tomb, Grave 234, was excavated in Cemetery C, though it also was looted (Binder 2011: 44). It was the third largest chamber tomb excavated with at least eight burials in the eastern chamber and six in the western. All was in the extended position, which is standard in burials of Egypt proper. One individual was in a flexed position—typical of Nubian burials. The excavator notes that the ceramics indicate a late New Kingdom date for this tomb (Binder 2011: 50). There are no depictions of Ptah.

Finally, Tomb 211 was a combination of the chamber and niche type tombs. The niche burial was covered by a slab and was not looted; the chamber tomb contained four adults, a neonate and a child of one or two years (Spencer 2009: 58–59; Binder 2011: 48–50, Fig. 12, Pls. 18–20). While the niche burial was not looted due to the heavy slab, there were no grave goods. The chamber yielded only the glyptic item shown.

Finally, six scarabs were found in Cemetery D of Amara West. Unfortunately, four were noted by the excavations in 1939, but they are not published; it is unclear if they were even recorded in the 1930s (Binder *et al.* 2011: 51, 54). Two scarabs *were* recorded and they have been published (Binder *et al.* 2011: 53, Figs. 31 and 37). Both recorded scarabs were found in a pyramid tomb. The western chamber of the tomb contained an undisturbed ceramic assemblage which the excavators argue can be dated, based on David Aston's typology, to the 19th Dynasty (Binder *et al.* 2011: 57). A hieratic

jar label has also been dated based on paleography to the reign of Ramses II (Binder *et al.* 2011: 53). This is in line with the scarab of Ramses II.

Sai. Sai is one of the largest islands in the Nubian Nile. Due to the alluvium at the edges of the island, it is ideal for cultivation and has been inhabited since the Early Dynastic Period (Welsby and Anderson 2004: 114). The site is located between the Second and Third Cataracts, approximately 15 km upstream from Amara. The site came under Egyptian control during the reign of Ahmose and a life-size statue of Ahmose has been found at the site (Welsby and Anderson 2004: 115). Due to its strategic position, the site remained under Egyptian control throughout the New Kingdom. Two cemeteries are to the south of the site (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012).

Of the 58 glyptic items from New Kingdom burials (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012: 239–264), 18 come from tombs assigned to the late 18th and 19th Dynasties (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012: 12). The items reflect this range with seals from the 18th (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012: 252, T8Cc94) and 19th Dynasty (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012: 258, T20Cb74). Only one scarab mentions Ptah (*pth nb mꜣt*) (Minault-Gout and Thill 2012: 252, T11P1).

Soleb. The site of Soleb is south of the Third Cataract. A New Kingdom necropolis was excavated and published (Giorgini 1971). 62 items were found in this New Kingdom cemetery. Five of them depict Ptah—this is our highest concentration of scarabs—however, it does not even rival the 42 scarabs of Tell el-Far‘ah (South). First, Ptah with two *bꜣ*-birds on *dd*-pillars before an adorant (Giorgini 1971: 207, fig. 284, T17c4). Second, Ptah is displayed with a *wꜣs*-scepter before a *dd*-pillar with an *ꜥnh*-sign on top (Giorgini 1971: 224, Fig. 428, T19p10). Third, Ptah holds a *wꜣs*-scepter and an

uraeus in front of him (Giorgini 1971: 291, Fig. 567, T32p17). Fourth, Ptah holding a *wš*-scepter and a sign for a wall behind him so that the excavators argue this alludes to the epithet “Ptah, south of his wall” (Giorgini 1971: 324–325, Fig. 641, T39c5).

Tombos. Tombos is located at the third cataract, where rocky terrain and treacherous rapids abound (Smith 2007). Its granite quarry drew in Pharaohs of Egypt from different periods who sought to make their colossal or large statuary. It forms a gateway to the fertile Dongola reach. It is the only excavated, New Kingdom cemetery with largely Egyptian material culture in the Dongola reach (Smith 2007: 2). The cemetery of Dokki Gel, further up the Nile, has tombs with mixed Nubian and Egyptian material culture but not predominately Egyptian. Two seals were found in Unit 8, a burial with a large underground chamber. The tomb contained mid-18th Dynasty pottery (Smith 2007: 5, Pl. 4). Both scarabs are also from the early 18th Dynasty (Smith 2007: 4, Pl. 2).

In Unit 6, another underground chamber tomb at Tombos, four scarabs were found. One amphora at the entrance to the chamber tomb is dated by the excavators to the Late Ramesside period (Smith 2007: Pl. 5). The tomb contains typical Egyptian burial goods with two women in a flexed position, according to Nubian burial tradition (Smith 2007: 5, Pl. 7). One woman was buried with one scarab and one oval plaque (Smith 2007: Pl. 7). Because of the mixed Egyptian and Nubian burial traditions, Smith concludes that this woman had become part of the colonizer’s system (Smith 2007: 6). The burial also contains two other scarabs—one of which is relevant to this study. Ptah stands with the *wš* –scepter before a falcon-headed figure with a sun disc. A total of one of scarab from New Kingdom contexts at Tombos depicts Ptah.

This survey shows that scarabs of Ptah are markedly less popular in Nubia during the later New Kingdom than in the Southern Levant. Though both places are under imperial rule, that imperial rule did not dictate all aspects of local consumption. Ptah is prominent in the elite reliefs of the temples, but imperial power has its local limits.

While the rise of Ptah in Egypt may have resulted in greater production of his scarabs, this need not be matched by greater consumption of the amulet sold off ships traveling the Mediterranean. In fact, among the scarabs from secure contexts in the Aegean, as listed by Eric Cline, there are no scarabs with Ptah (Cline 1994). The Aegean had an even smaller desire for Ptah than Nubia.

EARLIER GLYPHTIC TRADITIONS OF PTAH IN THE SOUTHERN LEVANT

What local factors might contribute to greater consumption of scarabs with a Ptah-motif in the 13th century? A closer look at earlier glyptic traditions related to Ptah show that there was already West Semitic—dare I say local—production of scarabs and glyptic pieces related to Ptah in the Middle and Late Bronzes, though there is some disagreement about that production.

Middle Bronze Scarabs referring to Ptah were already produced locally in the Southern Levant, as noted by Ben-Tor, though she does not believe the craftsmen knew what they were writing (Ben-Tor 2007: 132-133). Often, the *t* sign is flipped vertically to engrave the more common *nb*-sign (Keel 1997: Afula 4; Brandl in Keel 2010a: Bet Mirsim 61; Beth Zur 15).

Afula 4.⁴⁴⁹ The name of Ptah is written above a *nbw*-sign and between two *ḥnḥ*-signs. The *t*-phoneme is written upside down, indicating likely local production. Keel dated this to the 13th through 15th Dynasties.

‘Atlit 38. The name of Ptah is engraved above untranslatable signs. The form places this seal in the end of the Middle Kingdom or beginning of the Second Intermediate Period, though the context is broadly Middle Bronze through Late Bronze.

Tell Beit Mirsim 61. This scarab comes from a Middle Bronze context. Brandl notes the common phenomenon of the inverted *t*-sign (Brandl in Keel 2010a: 70).

Beth Zur 15. The scarab has the name of Ptah written in the center, though the *t*-sign and *p*-sign have been inverted.

En-Samije, Northwest of Jericho, this site produced a scarab with an image of Ptah with a *wš*-scepter in front of a figure. Unfortunately, this item was looted by Dayan. The style and form of the scarab point to a Middle Bronze date.

Tel Haror. There is a stamp onto a jar stopper. The form is mummified but not definitively Ptah. Brandl dates the stopper to the Middle Bronze IIC and says that it is locally made (Brandl in Keel 2013: 572 [Tel Haror 3]).

A limited number of scarabs with Ptah have been published from Egypt (Tell el-Yehudiyeh: Griffith 1890: Pl. 10.1; Tell er-Retabeh: Petrie 1906: Pl. 33.2B).

Two locally made glyptic items also portray Ptah. Scarabs with Ptah are known from Akko (Akko 3) but unfortunately this was a surface find.

The possible West Semitic production of glyptic items with Ptah was not limited to scarabs. Another rectangular bifacial plaque from Tel Mor was determined by Baruch Brandl to depict Ptah. While Keel assigns all bifacial plaques to local production, Brandl hedges and notes a similar item at Kamid el-Loz. While the precise location of production in the West Semitic world is difficult to determine, these past patterns of consumption may indicate that local traditions would happily include Ptah in their pantheon—in fact, they may already have done this prior to the 19th Dynasty.

IDENTITY OF PTAH IN THE SOUTHERN LEVANT

⁴⁴⁹ References simply to a site with a number refer to Keel’s indispensable volumes. The anglicized version of the site name has been paired with Keel’s catalogue number. His comprehensive catalogue provides a complete bibliography with each glyptic item.

Ptah is relatively popular in the Southern Levant, especially along the coast and Shephelah yet he is largely absent from the Nubian tombs. Empire alone cannot explain the presence of Ptah scarabs in the Southern Levant. What hints might one glean about local Canaanite religious practice at the end of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA? Most often, this question is answered by turning mechanically to the Ugaritic texts for hints. The equivalent local, West Semitic deity is sought. The Ugaritic texts are mined—one might even say exploited—for information about West Semitic cult in order to equate northern and Southern Levantine pantheons.

Who is Ptah—but a creator and craftsman deity? One says. Then the process turns up Kothar-wa-hasis, a low-level deity in Ugaritic myth who has a somewhat higher profile in the daily life of the cult and in ritual texts.

Kothar is a craftsman deity and artisan in the Ba‘lu and ‘Aqhat cycles (Pardee 1999a: 490). Kothar provides Ba‘al clubs to defeat Yam (*KTU* 1.2 iv: 7–28). In the story of Aqhat, the protagonist is given a set of bow and arrows, made by Kothar-wa-hasis (*KTU* 1.17–19).

This academic process of equating deities, however, is done as if we are ancient scribes, making modern own polyglot lists—where the first column is the northwestern Semitic Pantheon and the archaeological item we have in hand. The process of creating these lexical lists, however, was anything but a foregone conclusion. In the very section of the lexical list where Kothar is identified, the scribe has reached a problem.

The list of gods is organized according to the Sumero-Akkadian column—the first column—so that the god ^DUTU or Shamash is followed by his companion ^DA-A, Mesopotamian goddess Aya, the spouse of Shamash in Sippar, Larsa and perhaps

Babylon (Galter 1999: 126; see also Nougayrol *et al.* 1968: 248, n. 6). However, a problem has arisen. The West Semitic god of the Sun—Shapshu—is naturally aligned with Shamash, but she is a female. Now, the West Semitic companion of Shapshu must be a male. With a little creativity, Galter and Nougayrol suggest that a Hurrian deity is chosen because of the similarities in sound. Hurrian Ay-ya is aligned with Sumerian, ^DA-A. The Hurrian deities had been associated with sweet waters and wisdom—just like Kothar. In any case, the alignment of deities from different pantheons is anything but certain, and must be done with care.

Interestingly, the description of El's image are similar to Ptah. El is known in Ugaritic texts with the epithet referring to the “grey hair of his beard” (KTU 1.4, iv:58; 1.6 iii:4, 10, 14; 1.16 v:23). And ‘the Ancient of Days’, converges with images of the bearded Ptah. One is even tempted to return to the opaque epithet of El from the epic of Aqhat *bny bnwt* which has been interpreted as referring to El's creating power as “Creator of creatures.” Unfortunately, there is little certainty when translating this epithet, tempting though it may be.

If this argument is correct, this study can join numerous previous scholars who argued that El was not demoted in the pantheon of the Southern Levant. One need not make this argument by running solely to the texts of Ugarit—removed geographically and chronologically from the Southern Levant. One can even make this argument based on the material culture of the Southern Levant itself. Through critical analysis of local construction of identity through Egyptian iconography, this study fills the geographic and chronological gap between the evidence from Old Hebrew poetry and the Ugaritic texts themselves.

EGYPTO-CANAANITE DEITIES IN SOUTHERN LEVANTINE BURIAL CULT

Seals, by nature of their limited size, are abbreviated. Attributes, which normally accompany deities are not always included. This can limit the ability of researchers to identify deities portrayed. Further, the style of scarabs in the late New Kingdom and Iron I becomes increasingly schematic. As schematization increases, attributes and unique headdresses once included, are omitted or truncated. By the early Iron IIA, dyads and triads of deities become simple pairs and triplets of stick-like figures. As the tendency toward schematization grows, distinguishing between deities, royal figures, and human adherents becomes progressively more difficult. Two key ways remain to identify deities. First, anthropomorphic figures standing on the back of animals can be conclusively identified as deities. Second, those with a conical headdress or wings are likely deities as long as the headdress is not a crude attempt to convey a royal image by imitating a headdress that resembles the blue crown. Using these criteria, a list of glyptic items from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I has been assembled.

This study will begin with those seals which have numerous attributes and/or identifying elements and move toward those with greater schematization and fewer identifying elements. Seals with the greatest number of attributes show clearly the inherent problems with identifying deities on small glyptic items based on iconographic features where no inscription is present to confirm the identification. It will demonstrate the problems that arise with the reification of iconographic tendencies as “rules” for identifying deities.

WINGED FIGURES WEARING A HEADDRESS & STANDING ON ANIMALS

First, this study will look at three scarabs which have all four elements—a figure with a headdress, streamer, wings, and standing on an animal. Each element will be discussed separately. Two of the three scarabs come from an excavation, though the exact archaeological contexts are fraught for different reasons; the final scarab comes from a private collection. Archaeological context provides little guide toward the dating of these scarabs. Instead, their motif and style of engraving offer clues about their date.

Table 22: Scarabs Depicting a Winged, Anthropomorphic Figure with Headdress and Standing on an Animal

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 1997: 572–573 [Akko 119]	While Keel says it was a surface find, it comes from the extensive private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 560).	Scarab (enstatite)	There is a winged figure with a conical headdress standing on the back of a quadruped. The headdress has no streamer. The quadruped could be a horse and less likely a lion. ⁴⁵⁰ The length of the quadruped's neck is not certain but is closer to a horse, as is the tail. Above the tail of the quadruped there is a schematic <i>wḏ't</i> -eye with no shape at the bottom of the tick marks extending down from the eye. The wings and head of the anthropomorphic figure and the body of the quadruped are hollowed out with hashing in the base of the hollowed out portions. This hashing is reminiscent of a Middle Bronze style of engraving. The conical

⁴⁵⁰ Because animals are so schematic, quadrupeds with a long neck and no horns are generally categorized as horses while quadrupeds with short necks and no long horns are generally lions and quadrupeds with long horns are said to be caprids.

			headdress has one diagonal line engraved on its lower third. A highly schematic uraeus, caprid or horns is engraved protruding from the base of the headdress.
Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tel el-Far‘a Süd 821]	Northern Area, Level 377’ which is a highly uncertain archaeological context	Scarab (enstatite)	A standing anthropomorphic figure is depicted with schematic wings extending from each shoulder. The figure stands on a long-necked quadruped which likely has horns, but the precise identification of the quadruped is uncertain. The figure has an oddly shaped headdress with a protrusion to the front which is likely an imitation of the uraeus on a crown. There is a likely streamer coming off the back of the head.
Jericho: Garstang 1933: 36, Fig. 11 = Rowe 1936: 173, Pl. XVIII [No. 722]	Tomb 11. Iron I? ⁴⁵¹	Scarab (steatite)	Anthropomorphic figure with a conical headdress and streamer standing on the back of a quadruped. The quadruped may be a lion or a bull, but is likely a lion based on its torso-to-legs ratio and its small ears. ⁴⁵² A raised tail is a clear marker of a lion, but it is not clear that the animal has a tail. Cornelius rightfully argues that the figure has wings (1994: 198). The lines extending at a ninety-degree angle from the torso and then another set of lines extending downward at a ninety-degree angle confirm that these are schematic wings. Shuval argues that the figure

⁴⁵¹ Rowe dates this tomb to the entire 18th Dynasty and the early Iron I (Rowe 1936: 173). Due to the fluctuations within ceramic chronologies in the 1930s and the fluctuations in understanding Jericho’s occupation (e.g., Wright 1940: 33–36; 1941: 28), Rowe’s date should not be relied upon too strictly. Shuval slightly expands Rowe’s lower date, asserting that the tomb was in use from the 18th Dynasty through the Iron I. He confirms his Iron I date for the tomb based on the pottery and a scarab with a cryptographic writing of Amun’s name *mn-hpr-R* which is dated to the Iron I based on Jaeger’s assessment. It is unclear from Shuval’s publication which pottery he is assessing. Weippert and Weippert did re-evaluate the ceramics of Jericho’s tell. They found Iron I ceramics, though they were not able consistently to identify the Iron I stratigraphy (Weippert and Weippert 1976: 130).

⁴⁵² The commentators on this scarab demonstrate the difficult nature of identifying the precise identity of this quadruped. Cornelius says that it is either a bull or lion but leans toward lion (Cornelius 1994: 199) while Shuval says that it is a bull with lines marking where a padding for a saddle would have been placed (Shuval 1990: 135). Garstang called it a “hoofed animal, presumably a bull” and Rowe follows this designation (Rowe 1936: 173).

			holds a bundle in his back arm (1990: 135), but Cornelius plausibly identifies this as a schematic uraeus. The uraeus commonly occurs under the outstretched wings (Cornelius 1994: Pl. 47, BM23a–BM 27 and Pl. 48, BM28–BM36, BM 39–BM40). The archaeological context provides the <i>terminus ante quem</i> for the date of the scarab. The archaeological context and the motif point toward either a Late Bronze IIB or Iron I date.
--	--	--	--

The scarab from Akko intentionally executes a motif common in the late New Kingdom while replicating a Middle Bronze style of engraving and a Middle Bronze typological form of the scarab. The back of the scarab exhibits curled lines engraved unevenly on the back of the scarab. The baroque motif engraved on the scarab's back mirrors similar baroque elements on Late Bronze IIB–Iron I imitations (Keel 2010b: 280–281 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 587]) of earlier Middle Bronze typological forms which have baroque, curved lines on the elytra and wings (e.g., Kirkbride 1965: Figs. 293, No. 5; 295, No. 1; Ben-Tor 2007: Pl. 70, Nos. 7 and 9; Pl. 71, No. 4–10, 12, 16–18; Pl. 72, Nos. 1–2, 4). The motif of a winged figure with a conical headdress, however, is not popular until the late New Kingdom; scarabs with this motif come from contexts dated to the transition between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I.⁴⁵³ The motif is not present on any scarab that comes from a context dated only to the Late Bronze IIB. Unfortunately, only nine scarabs with a winged figure came from a datable archaeological context; the sample

⁴⁵³ Scarabs come from contexts dated to the Iron I, though production may begin prior to the end of the Iron (Keel 2010a: 474–475 [Dor 27]; Keel 2010b: 92–93 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 153]; 124–125 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 225]; 130–131 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 238]; 154–155 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 292]; 188–189 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 374]; 334–335 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 718]; 410–411 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 919]; Lachish: Rowe 1936: 138 [No. 575]).

size is not large enough to rule out definitively a date for production during the Late Bronze IIB. Middle Bronze imitations also became popular during the Iron I. The second scarab with a winged figure with headdress standing on the back of an animal occurs on a scarab engraved in the course, hollowed out style of the so-called Mass-Produced Ramesside/Post-Ramesside Scarabs, and this group comes from the Iron IB and early Iron IIA.

Winged Anthropomorphic Figure. Anthropomorphic figures with wings tend to be identified with Baal⁴⁵⁴ and not Reshef within the literature. Studies have shown that instances of a winged figure have never been definitively connected with Reshef. Other deities in Asiatic dress—albeit minor ones like Keserty—also have wings (Stela Cairo JE 87230⁴⁵⁵ in Leibovitch 1948: 435–444; Stadelmann 1967: 123–124; Helck 1971: 466). Winged figures identified with Baal, however, are not based on inscribed examples where the deity is definitively identified.

Unfortunately, images identified as Baal are very rarely inscribed with Baal's name⁴⁵⁶ (Schaeffer and Dussaud 1929: 294; Schaeffer 1931: 10, Pl. VI; Cornelius 1994: 134, 151–153, Pl. 39), while deities like Reshef are repeatedly inscribed with the deity's name. The one image identified explicitly as Ba'al-Zaphon lacks distinctive iconographic markers that are often used to identify Ba'al. The figure on the Mami stela from Ugarit is identified explicitly with Ba'al by its inscription. On this stela, Ba'al wears a conical headdress with a streamer that extends from the top of the hat to the ground and,

⁴⁵⁴ Scarabs with this motif have been occasionally identified with Reshef (e.g., Cassirer 1959; Matouk 1977: 76, 337, Nos. 264–268), but that identification was rightfully rejected (Schulman 1979: 73–74). This will be discussed below.

⁴⁵⁵ This item is of unknown provenance.

⁴⁵⁶ The Mami Stela from Ugarit is a private stela in Egyptian style. Another stela mentions Ba'al-Melqart.

according to Cornelius, ends in a flower. Ba'al-Zaphon holds a *wš*-scepter and faces a table with jar and a lotus. Ba'al-Zaphon is written with the Seth-determinative—a phenomenon that occurs with the writing of Ba'al's name in Egypt (Cornelius 1994: 152, Footnote 5; see also Allon 2007: 19–21. Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 308). Another stela from centuries later mentions Ba'al-Melqart, and a set of seals has similar iconography to the stela, though they are clearly produced later in the first millennium (Culican 1960–1961: Pl. I, Figs. 1b, 1g-h, 1j. Cornelius 1994: Fig. 31c); the divine figure on this stela of Ba'al-Melqart shows a bearded man with a conical headdress while holding an *ankh* in the right hand and the left arm is bent, holding an axe. None of these inscribed items explicitly link Ba'al with a winged figure.

The identification of Seth-Ba'al with a winged figure is based on those items which show a winged anthropomorphic figure in the Asiatic garb of Ba'al, slaying a horned snake (Cornelius 1994: 161–167, Pls. 43 and 44 [BR17 and 19]; Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 314–315, Figs. 89–90) similar to Seth's slaying of Apophis (te Velde 1967: 109; Keel 1998: 76). In addition, two limestone stela, numerous pieces of glyptic art have a similar image (Keel 1978: 50–56, Figs. 46–55; Cornelius 1994: 212–224, Pl. 50–51 [BM74–BM87⁴⁵⁷]). As noted above, Ba'al's name is written with the determinative of Seth because the two deities are identified with one another, though they are not identical. During the Amarna period, the Phoenician king, Abimilki of Tyre,

⁴⁵⁷ Of 14 items listed by Cornelius, three come from known archaeological contexts. The archaeological contexts are as follows: (1) BM 76 from Tell el-Far'ah (South), Tomb 902 of the Iron IA (Braunstein 1990: 690) (2) BM77 from Lachish, Locus 120, Grid A6, No. 5162 which is a Late Bronze chamber that was again used during the latter Iron IIB and IIC (Tufnell 1953: 193–196) (3) BM86 from Ugarit's northern trench and (4) BM87 from a level at Beth Shean attributed to Amenophis III in room 1068. The early 20th century excavations of Beth Shean, however, are notoriously fraught.

knows he can successfully draw upon Ba'al's imagery when writing to and describing the Egyptian king (EA 147).

Quadrupeds on which the Deity stands. These three scarabs depict the winged, anthropomorphic figure standing either on a horse (Keel 1997: 572–573 [Akko 119]), a long-necked quadruped with horns—possibly a gazelle or Seth-animal (Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tel el-Far'a Süd 821]), or a lion (Rowe 1936: 173, Pl. XVIII [No. 722]). As such, they provide a helpful introduction into the fraught discussion of identifying the deity based on the animal whose back it stands upon.

In the first instance, a winged anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a likely horse. The horse has been conclusively identified as the animal upon which female Astarte sits, but it may also be associated with Reshef (Hoffmeier and Kitchen 2007: 1). The inscription on the limestone stela from Tell el-Borg confirms this identification. On this same stela from Tell el-Borg, Reshef was associated with horses as well, but the association was indirect. Reshef was said to be “Lord of the estate (or house) of the stable of horses” (Hoffmeier and Kitchen 2007: 131). Te Velde noted that the horses of Thutmosis III were said to become Seth, and the image of Seth was sometimes engraved on horses' blinkers (1977: 20). This evidence, however, is circumstantial.

A relief from Sai offers better evidence for the connection between Reshef and horses.⁴⁵⁸ This sandstone relief, broken but inscribed, refers explicitly to Reshef; only a horse's head and a shield are shown and they are likely associated with Reshef, who is mentioned in the inscription (Cornelius 1994: 84–85 [RR38]; cf. Cornelius 2004: 40–41; see also Simpson 1960: 65; Schulman 1977: 14; Münnich 2013: 112–115). It is not

⁴⁵⁸ For scholars who say there is no connection between Reshef and horses, see Schulman 1979: 74 and Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 127, Fig. 1a.

implausible that Reshef is occasionally connected with a horse. However, many still argue that the scarab from Akko does not depict Reshef because it depicts a winged anthropomorphic figure on a horse (Keel 1997: 572–573 [Akko 119]). Reshef is never shown definitively to be winged. If the wings are a sure marker of Seth-Ba'al, then they distinguish this male equestrian deity from other male equestrian deities (Cornelius 1994: 211). Would that there were no other minor West Semitic deities with wings⁴⁵⁹ to make this handy rule for identifying Seth-Ba'al certain (Cornelius 1994: 209–212). As noted above, this is not the case.

The second item depicts a similar figure with wings and an oddly shaped headdress with a protrusion; this figure stands on a caprid with long horns (Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tel el-Far'a Süd 821]). This creates a problem. Typically figures on caprids' backs are identified with Reshef (Cornelius 1994: 112–124) while those on lions are identified as Seth-Ba'al (Cornelius 1994: 195–208; Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 294). In addition, figures with wings tend to be identified with Seth-Ba'al, and those without wings are identified with Reshef. One possible way out of this impasse is to identify the animal as the mythical Seth-animal. Unfortunately, the horns of the quadruped on the scarab from Tell el-Far'ah (South) are not awkwardly and unrealistically extending straight from the head as occurs on the Seth-animal. Instead, they curve forward slightly.

Identification of deities is not as simple as outlined above. In fact, a number of winged West Semitic deities are portrayed as standing on lions; they include Ishtar,

⁴⁵⁹ Keserty, another minor West Semitic deity depicted with wings, was noted above. An associated animal with Keserty is unknown. Cornelius also notes other Semitic deities depicted with wings: the female Ishtar, Urartian Haldi, and Shadrpa (Cornelius 1994: 195).

Uartian Haldi, and a minor deity Shadrappa (Cornelius 1994: 195). Further, *very* few items identified definitively with Seth-Ba'al or Ba'al are inscribed. It may be that either the iconography of Ba'al is more varied or this is an entirely different deity depicted here. The tendencies within the iconographic traditions, which were identified by earlier studies, likely remain true, but they do not permit the viewer to identify lesser known deities or less common representations of that deity.

Finally, a scarab from Jericho depicts a winged figure standing on a lion (Garstang 1933: 36, Fig. 11 = Rowe 1936: 173, Pl. XVIII [No. 722]). This anthropomorphic figure would typically be identified with Seth-Ba'al based on both main features—the wings and the animal. However, the previous scarab from Tell el-Far'ah (South) stands as a warning against creating a simplistic, universally applied rule for identification.

Conical headdress. A conical headdress can sometimes resemble the Egyptian White Crown when it is schematically engraved on abbreviated stamp seals and scarabs. West Semitic male deities commonly wear this headdress. They include Reshef (Schulman 1984: Pl. 1α–δ, Pl. 2a–c; Schulman 1985: Figs. 2, 5 [BM 263], 7 [Memphis: M-2792], 8 [Hildesheim 1100], 10 [UCL 14400], 11 [OI 10569], 12 [Cairo JE 70222], 13 [Aberdeen 1578], 14 [Cambridge: EGA 3002.1943], and 15 [Avignon 16]), Ba'al (Cornelius 1994: 138–139), Mekal (Thompson 1970), and Keserty (Stadelmann 1967: 123).

Streamer. The streamer occurs on many different West Semitic deities who are wearing the conical headdress. Deities include Seth-Ba'al (Cornelius 1994: 52–53; 149–

150 [BR8]⁴⁶⁰), Reshef (Cornelius 1994: 64–65 [RR32]⁴⁶¹; Schulman 1984: Pl. 1α–δ, Pl. 2b; Schulman 1985: Fig 5 [BM 263], 7 [Memphis: M-2792], 8 [Hildesheim 1100], 9, 11 [OI 10569], 12 [Cairo JE 70222], 13 [Aberdeen 1578], 14 [Cambridge: EGA 3002.1943], and 16 [Avignon 16]), Mekal (H. Thompson 1970;⁴⁶² Cornelius 1994: 225), and Keserty (Stadelmann 1967: 123; Leibovitch 1948). As such, the streamer is not diagnostically significant for identifying the deity. As such, the headdress and streamers have no bearing upon the identification of the deities on these three scarabs. Further, those glyptic items with only an anthropomorphic figure in a conical headdress with a streamer are unidentifiable.

Six scarabs depict an anthropomorphic figure with a conical headdress and streamer. No other defining characteristic occurs with these scarabs. Five of the six scarabs come from Late Bronze IIB and Iron I contexts. The precise context of the sixth scarab is unknown due to the archaeological method used during Petrie’s excavations in the early 20th century. As noted above, the identity of the deity cannot be determined based on the headdress and streamers. Curiously the majority of the scarabs—four of five—come from an Iron IA context, and the final scarab may show a beginning of production in the Late Bronze IIB. The sample size is small but when combined with other representations of Egypto-Canaanite deities on scarabs, the distribution remains similar.

⁴⁶⁰ The inscription makes the identification certain.

⁴⁶¹ The inscription makes the identification certain.

⁴⁶² Again, the inscription makes the identification certain.

Table 23: Scarabs Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure Wearing a Streamer and Standing on a Lion

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 2010a: 148–149 [Bet-Schean 114]	Square Q8, Locus 1366, Stratum VII (Late Bronze IIB)	Scarab (steatite)	A right-facing anthropomorphic figure has a conical headdress with a streamer hanging down the figure's back. The front arm holds a staff.
Keel 2010a: 408–409 [Der el-Balah 17]	Grave 118 (Iron IA ⁴⁶³)	Scarab (Carnelian)	A right-facing anthropomorphic figure has a conical headdress with a streamer hanging down the figure's back. The front arm holds a staff. The figure's skirt is triangular.
Keel 2010b: 86–87 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 138]	Grave 902C (Iron IA) (Braunstein 1998: 690)	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure wears a skirt and holds a spear that extends from the back wing upraised to the ground. The anthropomorphic figure also wears a conical hat with a streamer and a uraeus.
Keel 2010b: 92–93 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 153]	Grave 542 (Iron IA) (Braunstein 1998: 549)	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure wears a skirt and has two wings outstretched on either side. The anthropomorphic figure also wears a conical hat with a streamer and possibly a double uraei. Two uraei are engraved below the outstretched wings.
Keel 2010b: 94–95 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 154]	Grave 542 (Iron IA) (Braunstein 1998: 549)	Scarab (faience)	An anthropomorphic figure wears a skirt. The anthropomorphic figure also wears a conical hat with a streamer and possibly a double uraei.
Keel 2010b: 388–389 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 855]	Southern Area, Room EF, Level 386', Stratum E	Scarab (faience?)	Two left-facing figures are standing with conical headdresses. One has a headdress that is like the white crown with a streamer and the other is oddly shaped. Only the upper portions of their torso and head were preserved.

⁴⁶³ The drinking set from Tomb 118 comes from the Iron IA (Muhly 2003: 26; cf. Moorey 1980).

Conical headdress with gazelle appendage. The gazelle appendages occur on multiple stela throughout Egypt (Schulman 1984: Pl. 1β [Chicago 10569]; Schulman 1985: Figs. 3, 4 [Cairo 25063], 7 [Memphis: M-2792], 12 [Cairo JE 70222] (?)), though uraei also likely occur on Reshef (Schulman 1984: Pl. 2b; Schulman 1985: Figs. 6 [Berlin 14622 and Turin 50067], 8 [Hildesheim 1100], 10 [UCL 14400], 11 [OI 10569], and 16 [Avignon 16]). As shown by a number of inscribed stelae from private worship in Egypt, a gazelle appendage occurs on the headdress of an anthropomorphic figure who is definitively identified as Reshef on the inscription which accompanies the motif (Cornelius 1994: 32–33 [RR7, OIC 10569]; 41–42 [RR 18]; 46–47 [RR 24]; 59–69 [RR 28]). As is the case with so many features, this appendage is also shown with other deities like Keserty and Shed (Leibovitch 1948: 436–437, Figs. 1–2). It cannot be used to identify conclusively the deity.

Now this study will turn to individual elements in a motif that have been used to identify specific deities.

ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURE ON A CAPRID

13 related glyptic pieces depict one anthropomorphic figure standing on a caprid. Occasionally, these figures have headdresses, but often they do not. Schematization is maximized. Six of the 13 glyptic pieces come from unknown contexts. Of the remaining pieces, they were found in archaeological contexts that cluster within the Iron I with one coming from a Late Bronze context and one from the Iron IIA–B. If the Late Bronze context of Albright's seal from Tell Beit Mirsim is accurate, this may reflect the

beginning of production of this motif while the latter scarab may show that items with this motif continued to be used as heirlooms.⁴⁶⁴

This group is similar to one of the scarabs in the previous group (Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tel el-Far‘a Süd 821]), but the anthropomorphic figures of this group lack wings. Often, a wing-less figure is identified with Reshef (Keel 1990b: 198). As shown above (Keel 2010b: 374–375 [Tel el-Far‘a Süd 821]), the presence of a caprid alone is not definitive for an identification with Reshef. Other deities may be depicted with a caprid. One need only point to the two glyptic items which depict two anthropomorphic figures standing on the backs of caprids (Keel 2010a: 232–233 [Bet-Schemesch 35]; Keel 2010a: 258–259 [Bet-Schemesch 95]). Due to the high schematization in the Iron I and IIA scarabs, precise and certain identification is not possible. Looking at the whole group of glyptic items with deities from these periods, one may reach a plausible conclusion but individual scarabs can not be identified certainly with Reshef.

Table 24: Seals and Scarabs Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Caprid

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 1997: 560–561 [Akko 84]	While Keel says it was a surface find, it comes from the extensive private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 560).	Scarab (enstatite)	There is an anthropomorphic figure with a hollowed out body and head. The base of the hollowed out body is hashed to depict the clothing of the figure. He stands on the back of a caprid whose body is also hollowed out and hashed to show texture. The hollowing-out and hashing is reminiscent of Middle Bronze techniques of engraving.

⁴⁶⁴ It should be noted that a style of engraving from the Iron IIA tends to depict anthropomorphic figures lacking a torso. It may be that this item is not an heirloom from the Iron I but an Iron IIA production. In either case, the motif still tends to be most often found in Iron I contexts.

Keel 1997: 570–571 [Akko 111]	While Keel says it was a surface find, it comes from the extensive private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 560).	Scarab (enstatite)	A hollowed out anthropomorphic figure with a hashed base stands on the back of a presumable quadruped with long horns. The hollowing-out and hashing is reminiscent of Middle Bronze techniques of engraving.
Keel 2010a: 60–61 [Bet-Mirsim 39]	Southwest Quarter, Square 4, Stratum C (Late Bronze)	Ring (Limestone)	It's not definitive that the linear engraving of the quadruped depicts a horned animal, but it is possible. Anthropomorphic figure with arms extended outward and legs downward with the torso extended, giving the appearance of a third leg; two circular engravings above the arms; linear engraving
Keel 2010a: 234–235 [Bet-Schemesh 40]	Grave 1, Iron IIA–B	Scaraboid (limestone)	A crude, linear engraving is used to execute an anthropomorphic figure which lacks a torso and hovers above the back of a horned caprid.
Keel 2010b: 164–165 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 314]	Grave 229 which extends from the Iron I through the Iron IIB and possibly the Iron IIC	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a caprid; two lions one above another are engraved behind the figure's back.
Keel 2010b: 182–183 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 358]	Grave 241 which extends from the Iron I through the beginning of the Iron IIA	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a caprid. The caprid's horns and the anthropomorphic figure fill the negative space created by the vertically arranged base.
Keel 2013: 183–184 [Geser 44]	Fourth Semitic period. Due to the archaeological method, the archaeological context is uncertain.	Conoid (limestone)	There are two caprids engraved over one another and an anthropomorphic figure is engraved standing on the back of the upper caprid.

Keel 2013: 246–247 [Geser 179]	Third Semitic period. Due to the archaeological method, the archaeological context is uncertain.	Scaraboid (limestone)	A highly schematized anthropomorphic figure with only legs and a head hovers above the back of a caprid whose head is turned backward over its body. The quadruped could also be a horse due to its longer neck but the poor execution of the engraving makes the identification of the animal less certain. A possible scorpion is engraved above the head of the head.
Keel 2013: 278–279 [Geser 249]	Fourth Semitic period. Due to the archaeological method, the archaeological context is uncertain.	Scarab (enstatite)	There is an anthropomorphic figure standing on the back of a long necked caprid. The anthropomorphic figure has a streamer that extends from the head down to the tail of the horse.
Keel 2013: 474–475 [Gibeon 20]	Grave 3 dated to the end of the Iron IB through the Iron IIA	Conoid (limestone)	A quadruped with likely horns is engraved in a linear style. An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of the quadruped that has slight protrusions that curve indicating likely horns.
Keisan: Keel 1990b: 195–204, No. 10, Pl. VII, No. 10.	Locus 626, Stratum 9A (Iron I)	Scarab (steatite)	An anthropomorphic figure with a blue crown and either a streamer or a robe stands on the back of a long horned quadruped. Shuval identifies the figure as Reshef (Shuval 1990: 142). This scarab has a side of E11 and reflects the increasing schematization of the Iron I, but that schematization on its own is not definitive for dating. The deep style of engraving, motif and schematic typological form push the date of this scarab toward the Iron I.
Tell en-Naşbeh: McCown 1947: Pl. 54, No. 34.	Tomb 32, Strip N	Bifacial Plaque	On one side, there is a caprid with an anthropomorphic figure standing on the back.

Qasile: Maisler 1967: 64– 67; Mazar 1977: 236 [Hebrew]	Locus QI, Stratum X	Pyramid with all lateral faces engraved	Two of the four faces depict a figure on the back of a caprid. One has an anthropomorphic figure standing on the back of a caprid whose body is hashed. The other lateral side has a quadruped, possibly a caprid or a bull (Shuval 1990: 123), facing right with a seated figure (Maat, Shuval 1990: 123) on its back.
---	------------------------	--	---

WINGED FIGURE WITH URAEI

Six scarabs depict a winged figure with uraei under those wings. Five of the six scarabs come from a known archaeological context and every context is a burial. All archaeological contexts include the Iron IA while one extends backward into the Late Bronze IIB and two extend downward into the Iron IIA. Production may have begun in the Late Bronze IIB, yet the period of greatest use was likely in the Iron IA. While the sample size is small, it mirrors the chronological distribution of other groups of Egypto-Canaanite deities on scarabs and stamp seals.

Table 25: Scarabs Depicting a Winged Figure with Uraei

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 1997: 626–627 [Akko 268]	Unknown context	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure stands with wings outstretched and wears a headdress with two protrusions. There are two outward facing uraei on either side of the figure and below the wings. Below the figure are two signs of an abbreviated form of the throne name of Thutmose III or more likely a cryptogram for Amun.

Keel 2010b: 130–131 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 238]	Grave 635 (Late Bronze IIB–Iron I)	Scarab (enstatite)	A standing anthropomorphic figure is depicted with schematic wings extending from each shoulder. Two outward-facing uraei are engraved below the wings. The figure wears a conical headdress with a streamer.
Keel 2010b: 92–93 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 153]	Grave 542 (Iron IA) (Braunstein 1998: 549)	Scarab (enstatite)	An anthropomorphic figure wears a skirt and has two wings outstretched on either side. The anthropomorphic figure also wears a conical hat with a streamer and possibly a double uraei. Two uraei are engraved below the outstretched wings.
Keel 2010b: 124–125 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 225]	Grave 533, which Braunstein assigns to the Iron I and beginning of the Iron IIA	Scarab (Enstatite)	A standing anthropomorphic figure is depicted with schematic wings extending from each shoulder. Two outward-facing uraei are engraved below the wings.
Keel 2010b: 154–155 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 292]	Grave 117 which has been assigned to the Iron I and beginning of the Iron IIA (Braunstein 1998: 478)	Scarab (enstatite)	A standing anthropomorphic figure is depicted with schematic wings extending from each shoulder. Two outward-facing uraei are engraved below the wings. The figure wears a double protruding headdress.
Keel 2010b: 334–335 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 718]	Grave 960C which has been assigned to the Iron IA (Braunstein 1998: 813)	Scarab (enstatite)	The scarab depicts a likely royal figure standing with wings outstretched while wearing a white crown with a possible uraeus displayed schematically and a streamer falling down the back of the figure. A falcon stands in front of the figure and a hippopotamus is above.

One scarab from an Iron I context depicts a winged figure, but there are no uraei under the wings (Keel 2010b: 334–335 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 718]=Shuval 1990: 134, No. 22). The seal depicts an engraved hippopotamus above the winged figure and a falcon under one wing. The anthropomorphic figure has a beard, a conical headdress, and streamer tied to the top of the headdress. A number of scholars identify him as Seth

(Shuval 1990: 92; Keel, Uehlinger, Shuval 1990: 306; Keel 2010b: 334; Giveon 1985: 46, No. 73) because the falcon and hippopotamus are sacred to Seth (Giveon 1971: 163–164, 246; Keel 1978: 339–340). The connection between Seth and the hippopotamus is not obvious, however. The hippopotamus can be connected easily with Taweret who was said to be the consort of Seth by a much later tradition, Plutarch. Here, the Greek god Typhon is said to be Taweret's consort, and Typhon is identified with Seth (te Velde 1967: 35, 38; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris* 19.1). Would that there were another source connecting Seth and the hippopotamus that was not so late.

On a sandstone stele from a temple at Edfu, there is an image of Horus slaying a small hippopotamus in the water, which is said to be Seth (Keel 1978: 338, Fig. 451). If this is the appropriate reference and not Taweret, Seth is the hippopotamus rather than merely being associated with the hippopotamus. This relief, like Plutarch, is also late and dates to the reigns of Ptolemy IX/Alexander I according to Keel (Keel 1978: 408, Fig. 451). An earlier tradition connecting Seth and a hippopotamus would be ideal. An astral text from the 20th Dynasty may connect Seth with a hippopotamus, but the connection is based solely on proximity of Seth's foreleg to the hippopotamus (Parker 1974: 61). A connection based solely on astral proximity is tenuous at best. It may be that two instances of circumstantial evidence—winged figures being, at times, connected with Seth-Ba'al and a hippopotamus connected tenuously with Seth-Ba'al—are the best one can do. If the wings are a likely marker of Seth-Ba'al, then this scarab and the larger group of scarabs may be said plausibly to depict Seth-Ba'al. Unfortunately, wings alone are not sufficient to identify the deity with complete certainty, as was shown above.

While the identity of the deity in this group is not definitively known, the scarabs do reflect a Canaanite iconographic tradition. Five of six scarabs have a conical headdress and streamer; only one scarab does not. Though the headdress and streamer cannot be identified with a specific deity, they do point to the likely influence of a Canaanite iconographic tradition.

ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURE ON A LION

Six seals depict a male, anthropomorphic figure standing on a lion. Sometimes the anthropomorphic figure wears a conical headdress (Keel 2010b: 376–379 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 828–829]). The glyptic forms include conoids, scaraboids, impressions, scarabs, and a pyramidal stamp seal. Interestingly, only two of these were found in burial contexts. Commonly anthropomorphic figures who stand on lions are identified with Ba‘al or Seth-Ba‘al and those on a caprid with Reshef (Cornelius 1994: 195–208). Reshef is nowhere clearly identified as standing on a lion’s back. Reshef is identified with Nergal in offering lists (RS 20.24; del Olmo Lete 1999: 308–310), and Nergal does stand on a lion (Cornelius 1994: 196). Though the two deities may be identified with one another, they are not identical. Therefore, the connection of Reshef to the lion should ideally be shown rather than relying upon a deity with whom he is associated in sacrificial lists. While it may be true that Seth-Ba‘al more commonly and Reshef never are associated with the lion, a number of other West Semitic deities are portrayed as standing on lions. They include Ishtar, Urartian Haldi, and a minor deity Shadrappa (Cornelius 1994: 195). In general, it is less common for Egyptian iconographic traditions to depict deities on

lions⁴⁶⁵ (Cornelius 1994: 195). Further, glyptic items that portray two anthropomorphic forms standing on a lion confirm that one should identify all instances of this motif with the same deity (Keel 2010a: 120–121 [Bet-Schean 53]; Keel 2013: 216–217 [Geser 108]). As such, the deity is unidentifiable in this group, but the group itself is more at home in the Canaanite iconographic tradition.

Table 26: Scarabs and Seals Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Lion

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 2010a: 606–607 [Tel Eton 3]	Area C, Southwest portion of the Tel, Locus 9, Grave C1 (Iron I)	Conoid (calcite)	This conoid portrays an anthropomorphic figure with no torso, standing on the back of a quadruped which is likely a lion.
Keel 2010b: 376–377 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 828]	Northern Area, Stratum Y. However, excavations on the tell are highly uncertain.	Impression	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a lion. The figure wears a conical headdress and holds either a sword or a spear.
Keel 2010b: 378–379 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 829]	Northern Area, Stratum Y. However, excavations on the tell are highly uncertain.	Impression	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a lion. The figure wears a conical headdress. While the figure may hold a spear, if the same seal was used to make this impression and the previous one (Tell el-Far‘a Süd 828), that spear is not visible here. The impression is less deep.
Keel 2013: 222–223 [Geser 121]	Fourth Semitic period. Due to the archaeological method, the	Scaraboid (limestone)	A “starfish,” stick figure is engraved above a highly schematized quadruped whose head is turned backward over its body.

⁴⁶⁵ The West Semitic influence on the representations of Seth-Ba‘al and Astarte are further emphasized when noting the relative infrequency of this phenomenon in Egyptian traditions (e.g., Hoffmeier and Kitchen 2007). Exceptions to this general observation include Tutankhamun on panthers and Seti II on a lion (Edwards 1977: 190–191), as noted by Cornelius (1994: 195, n. 3).

	archaeological context is uncertain.		The quadruped is uncertain but it does not have an extended neck as is expected on a horse and no horns are depicted. By process of elimination, it is plausibly a lion.
Megiddo: Schumacher: 89, Pl. XXVII, f= Shuval 1990: 145, No. 49.	Near the city gate, Stratum 4	Scarab (faience)	There are two lions over one another on half of the base. The other half shows an anthropomorphic figure standing on the back of a lion.
Qasile: Mazar 1950– 1951c: 206, Pl. 36c	Stratum X (Mazar 1950–1951:	Pyramidal Stamp Seal	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a quadruped. The form is pyramidal like. The quadruped has no distinguishing marks such as a long neck of a horse or clear marks for horns. By process of elimination, this is plausibly a lion.

ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURE ON A HORSE

An anthropomorphic figure with no other identifying marks stands or sits on the back of a horse on three scaraboids from the Iron I and Iron I–Iron IIA. Because the sample size is immensely small, one can not be certain that this motif as produced only in the Iron I on miniature art. As noted above, Seth-Ba'al is certainly and Reshef plausibly connected with the horse (Cornelius 1994: 73–87, 209–212; for Reshef, see especially Cornelius 1994: 84 [RR 37]). In addition, Astarte is clearly shown on a horse within the Egypto-Canaanite tradition (Leclant 1960: Pl. IA, IIA; Keel 1990b: 211; Hoffmeier and Kitchen 2007). She may even be found on one scarab from Akko (Keel 1997: 532–533 [Akko 4]; Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 213, Fig. 39). Astarte's connection with horses is also confirmed within the Ugaritic texts (*ššw qtrt KTU 1.86:6*). Interestingly, a number of instances depict the anthropomorphic figure sitting on the horse rather than standing. Cornelius hypothesized that this may due to a different function of the horse; whereas a

deity stands on a lion and caprid for their numinous power, a figure may sit on a horse for practical purposes, namely to do battle (Cornelius 1994: 81). Since the writing of Cornelius' helpful volume, the stela from Tell el-Borg was found (Hoffmeier and Kitchen 2007). The stela depicts Astarte seated in a chair which rests on the back of a horse. Two seals depict an anthropomorphic figure seated on a horse (Keel 1997: 532–533 [Akko 4]; Keel 2013: 466–467 [Gibeon 4]), but two depict the anthropomorphic figure standing on a horse whose muzzle is led or held by another anthropomorphic figure. Due to the highly schematic nature of these seals, one can not choose one of these three deities over the others.

Table 27: Scarabs and Seals Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on a Horse

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 2010a: 608–609 [Tel Eton 5]	Area C, Southwest portion of the Tel, Locus 9, Grave C1 (Iron I)	Scaraboid (calcite)	This conoid portrays a short anthropomorphic figure with no torso, standing on the back of a horse. Another figure stands in front with arm raised to the muzzle of the horse.
Keel 2013: 466–467 [Gibeon 4]	Grave 3 dated to the end of the Iron IB through Iron IIA	Scaraboid (bone)	A quadruped with a long, notched neck is held by the muzzle by a standing anthropomorphic figure. The long neck and absence of horns likely indicates that the quadruped is a horse. Another anthropomorphic figure is seated on the back of the quadruped.
Keel 2013: 468–469 [Gibeon 8]	Grave 3 dated to the end of the Iron IB through the Iron IIA	Scaraboid (stone or bone)	An anthropomorphic figure stands on the back of a long-necked quadruped with notched neck. Another anthropomorphic figure that lacks a torso holds the quadruped by the head.

TWO ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURES ON A HORSE AND LION

I have saved this group of seals for last. The figures may be identified with a greater degree of certainty. Because the group is more certain, too often the distinguishing elements of this group have been used to identify deities in other motifs. This group consists of glyptic items depicting two standing figures on a caprid and lion, respectively. In every instance, the right-facing caprid is to the right and the lion is second. Four of eight scarabs or impressions depict the second figure, which stands on the lion, with wings (Keel 2010a: 474–475 [Dor 27]. Keel 2010b: 188–189 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 374]; 410–411 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 919]. Lachish: Rowe 1936: 138 [No. 575]); two of those four winged figures also have a streamer (Keisan: Keel 1990: 246: 246–247 [No. 31]). Due to the apparent standardization of the motif, it is likely that the same two deities are intended each time the motif is engraved. The second anthropomorphic figure is believed to be Seth-Ba‘al because of the presence of both wings and the lion (Keel, Uehlinger, and Shuval 1990: 306). If the second figure is Seth-Ba‘al, this narrows the choice for the first figure. Anthropomorphic figures without wings tend to be identified with Reshef (Cornelius 1994: 195–197, 201–203, 205–206 [BM 57–BM 62, BM 67]).

Uniquely only one of these glyptic pieces comes from a grave. This is especially curious when compared with the contexts where other glyptics were found. Could it be that this collocation was not an amulet used primarily for aiding the journey into the underworld?

Table 28: Scarabs and Impressions Depicting Two Anthropomorphic Figures on a Horse and a Lion, Respectively

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 1997: 560–561 [Akko 86]	While Keel says it was a surface find, it comes from the extensive private collection of Lefkovitz (Keel 1997: 560).	Scarab (enstatite)	There are two anthropomorphic figures standing on the backs of two quadrupeds. The first figure has no identifying features but holds either his back arm upward or his back arm holds a sword or staff upward. The first figure stands on a long-necked caprid. The second figure holds a bow and stands on a likely lion. Each element of the motif is executed by hollowing out the motif.
Keel 1997: 680–681 [Aschdod 54]	Surface find	Scarab (enstatite)	There are two quadrupeds arranged along the base of the scarab with an anthropomorphic figure standing on the back of each. The first quadruped has a long neck and horns depicted. The second quadruped is likely a lion. Both anthropomorphic figures have their arms raised but there are no other defining characteristics of these two figures.
Keel 2010a: 474–475 [Dor 27]	Area G, Locus 9251, Phase G-4 or 3; Persian pit	Scarab (enstatite)	There are two figures standing on the backs of quadrupeds. The front figure is standing on the back of a caprid while the back one has arms/wings raised as the figure stands on a lion.
Keel 2010b: 188–189 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 374]	This scarab comes from Grave 224 which has been assigned to the Iron IIA (Keel 2010b: 188).	Scarab (enstatite)	Two anthropomorphic figures stand on the backs of quadrupeds. The first has no defining characteristics and stands on a likely caprid. The second has wings outstretched and stands on a likely lion. Cornelius identifies them as Ba‘al and Reshef (Cornelius 1994: 202 [BM 59]).
Keel 2010b: 410–411 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 919]	Northern Area, Room VL, Level 376’, Stratum V/W. While this stratum is identified as Iron IB and Iron IIA,	Scarab (enstatite)	There are two anthropomorphic figures standing on the backs of two quadrupeds. The first figure has no identifying features and stands on a long-necked caprid. The second figure has wings and an abbreviated streamer. This second figure stands on a lion.

	excavations on the tell are highly uncertain due to the archaeological method.		
Keel 2013: 464–465 [Geser 691]	Field A, Square Y9, Locus 11131, Basket 11340 which is dated to the Iron IB–beginning of Iron IIA by Ortiz and Wolff.	Impression	Two quadrupeds are engraved along the base. The first has a head that is more caprid-like while the second quadruped is more lion-like. The first quadruped has a tree-like motif standing on its back and the second figure has an anthropomorphic figure standing on its back. It's not clear that this impression should be placed under this category since the first figure is clearly not an anthropomorphic figure.
Keisan: Keel 1990b: 246–247 No. 31; Pl. X, No. 31	Locus 635, Stratum 9A (Iron I)	Impression	The impression shows two anthropomorphic figures standing on the backs of two quadrupeds. The first one, which is on the left of the impression, has long ears or horns, and it is a likely caprid. The second quadruped is likely a lion (Cornelius 1994: 201 [BM57]). The first anthropomorphic figure has no distinguishing elements while the second appears to wear a high hat (highly schematized white crown?) with a streamer.
Lachish: Rowe 1936: 138 [No. 575].	Surface find	Scarab (enstatite)	There are two figures standing on the backs of quadrupeds. The first quadruped has portions of the ears or horns extended. The second is a lion (Cornelius 1994: 201–202 [BM 58]). The second quadruped has a winged anthropomorphic figure standing on its back. If Lachish was uninhabited for a portion of the Iron I, the date of this item is curious.

FEMALE ON AN UNKNOWN QUADRUPED

There is only one item which depicts an anthropomorphic figure that is clearly marked as female. This figure is shown on an unidentifiable quadruped. The relative absence of the body marked as feminine is noteworthy.

Table 29: Seal Depicting a Female on an Unknown Quadruped

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 2010b: 138–139 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 256]	Grave 509 which has been assigned a date to the Iron IB	Conoid (limestone)	This is one of the few instances where a female figure appears to stand on the back of a caprid. There may be another caprid in front of this figure.

ANTHROPOMORPHIC FIGURES ON UNKNOWN QUADRUPEDS

Finally, there are three scaraboids whose motif is so schematic that it defies any identification of the quadrupeds or the anthropomorphic figures.

Table 30: Scaraboids Depicting an Anthropomorphic Figure on Unknown Quadrupeds

Seal	Archaeological Context	Form (Material)	Description
Keel 2010b: 410–411 [Tell el-Far‘a Süd 917]	Unknown context	Scaraboid (Limestone)	An anthropomorphic figure with an abbreviated torso floats above a quadruped. Due to the poor execution of the seal, it is likely that the anthropomorphic figure was intended to be portrayed as standing on the quadruped. There is another poorly executed motif in front of the anthropomorphic figure and floating above the head of the quadruped. It is likely a scorpion based on the common motifs of seals of this period but it is difficult to identify the element on its own without other parallels. Its material makes it a likely candidate for local production. Keel lists Tell el-Far‘ah (South) 891 as a parallel for the style and Tell ‘Aitun 3 as a parallel

			for the god. See also Jericho: Rowe 1936: No. 722 = Shuval 1990: 135, No. 25.
Keel 2013: 348–349 [Geser 416]	Fourth Semitic period. Due to the archaeological method, the archaeological context is uncertain.	Scaraboid (limestone)	Two quadrupeds are engraved <i>tête-bêche</i> . An anthropomorphic figure is engraved above the back of one as if standing on its back. The other caprid has a possible “starfish” stick anthropomorphic figure but it may also be a star similar to the one that separates the two quadrupeds.
Megiddo: Harrison 2004: Pl. 39, No. 8 = Loud 1947: Pl. 153, No. 221	Locus 2101, Square K9, Area AA	Scaraboid	A quadruped which is made of three circular engravings for the body and one for the head. The figure above may be either a misshapen anthropomorphic figure or another quadruped at a 90-degree angle. I think it is more likely that the motif is of two animals engraved at right angles to one another.

CONCLUSION

Forty-eight scarabs and stamp seals depict deities that show influence from the Canaanite iconographic traditions. Of the forty-two glyptic items from identifiable contexts, twenty-one come from tombs and twenty-one come from contexts on the tell. Therefore, they likely function as amulets both in life and death. The new Iron I conoids are found in both in graves and on the tell. They mimic the motifs that were found on scarabs, scaraboids, bifacial plaques, and rings. Conoids are found both in burials and on the tell indicating that these new seals mirrored both the motifs of scarabs and their use as amulets in life and death.

Curiously, it is the motifs that one is tempted to associate coarsely with Reshef and Seth-Baal that are most often found on the tell. Five seals with an anthropomorphic figure on a caprid, six seals with an anthropomorphic figure on a lion, and six seals with two anthropomorphic figures on a lion and caprid were found in contexts on the tell. In other words, seventeen of twenty-one seals with Reshef, Seth-Ba'al, or Reshef and Seth-Ba'al were found on the tell. Could it be that these deities were used as amulets for the ailments that plagued the living? Amulets found in graves and, therefore, used to usher the dead into the Underworld appear to be more diverse. They likely include Reshef and Seth-Ba'al, but are not limited to these deities.

With regard to the date of these seals with an Egypto-Canaanite or Canaanite deity, they tend to be found in contexts dated to the Iron I, though their production began during the Late Bronze IIB. Two seals were identified as coming from only Late Bronze contexts, indicating that production of these Egypto-Canaanite traditions began prior to the Iron I.

Twenty-nine total seals come from dateable archaeological contexts. Twelve seals came from contexts dated to the Iron I alone while twenty-two came from contexts that included the Iron I. Three came from contexts dated only to periods after the Iron I, and ten came from contexts that included the Iron IIA. This indicates the the period of greatest use was the Iron I, though production continued into the Iron IIA. Interestingly, this conclusion mirrors broadly the local production of scarabs with motifs that imitate Middle Bronze traditions. Yet again, as Egyptian imperial influence wanes, local traditions of local deities re-emerge. Local engravers chose those local traditions which have Egyptian connections. Thoroughly local images of a simple anthropomorphic figure

on a lion or caprid—representing local gods like Reshef and Ba‘al—are produced alongside Egypto-Canaanite versions of these same gods.

Ellen Morris suggests that Egypt may have intentionally fostered in the Late Bronze IIB the very cults which Egypt and Canaan shared (Morris 2005: 391). If Morris is correct, the production and sale of glyptics in the Egypto-Canaanite traditions during the Late Bronze IIB is expected. When the trade networks that once fed the market with both Ptah-scarabs and scarabs in the Egypto-Canaanite traditions tapered off, local engravers continued to produce these Egyptianizing and thoroughly local versions of these motifs for local consumption as local people sought to protect both the living and the dead from malevolent forces.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

A recent, systematic study of Southern Levantine scarabs and stamp seals from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I had not been undertaken. Studies tended to treat the corpora separately: Lalkin studied Southern Levantine scarabs from the New Kingdom (Lalkin 208). Buchanan and Moorey examined the Iron Age stamp seals within the Ashmolean's collection (Buchanan and Moorey 1988). Though stamp seals and scarabs were treated in separate studies, the stamp seals clearly showed an awareness of the glyptic traditions engraved on scarabs. Motifs on each were interrelated and required that the two corpora be treated in the same study. Keel's seminal review of all scarabs and stamp seals from the Southern Levant was a timely addition to the field (Keel 1995), though an in-depth study of this transitional period was still needed.

Recent studies—often in final reports—covered the glyptic art of only one site. This led to an additional lacuna in the field's treatment of scarabs. There was no systematic treatment of the typological forms of Late New Kingdom scarabs since Rowe (Rowe 1936). While a number of recent studies of late New Kingdom scarabs cited Rowe when dating individual scarabs (Brandl 1999; Brandl 2004a; Brandl 2007; Brandl 2009; Brandl 2010; Brandl 2010a), there was no recent collation of all the data to determine where Rowe's typology was inadequate. This collation had to be undertaken before one could examine the relationship between the locally produced stamp seals of the Iron I, the locally made Egyptianizing scarabs, and the imported Egyptian scarabs. Otherwise, one would be unable to determine whether motifs on Iron I stamp seals relied upon Egyptian or Egyptianizing glyptic traditions from the Late Bronze IIB. In short, one would never

be able to speak about continuity between the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I glyptic corpora without undertaking a thorough study of the typology of late New Kingdom scarabs.

Glyptic studies in numerous final reports dated individual scarabs to only the 19th Dynasty. The date of these glyptic items has occasionally been used to support the date of an entire site (Zertal 2012). The study of the scarab's typological forms showed that, in fact, there were *very* few forms which could be dated to only the 19th or 20th Dynasty. One form of the head and clypeus—D10—could be dated to only the 19th Dynasty. Otherwise, a narrow date is often not possible based solely on the typological form of the scarab. Despite this negative conclusion, trends could be identified.

The form of the scarab's head, side, and back tended toward greater schematization during the 20th Dynasty and in the Iron I. Interestingly, this trend occurred not only on scarabs with and without the royal name in the Southern Levant but also on scarabs from foundation deposits in Egypt proper. Therefore, similar patterns were observed on both locally produced scarabs from the Southern Levant and scarabs with the royal name that were likely produced by artisans connected to the royal administration in Egypt. Schematization increased on both Levantine produced scarabs and imported, Egyptian scarabs as faience became more popular. Despite similar trends toward schematization, the typological forms of scarabs without the royal name were more numerous. In other words, royal scarabs tended toward greater conservatism and less innovation. This may be explained in two ways: it may either confirm the assumption that scarabs with the royal name were produced in Egypt by artisans connected with the royal administration. Alternatively, it could also show that artisans unconnected with the royal administration knew that the consumer preferred greater conservatism on scarabs

with the royal name. Because both royal scarabs from the Southern Levant and royal scarabs from foundation deposits tended toward conservatism, it may be true that both were produced by artisans connected to the royal administration, but it may still be true that artisans not hired by the royal administration were producing royal scarabs because they were marketable as effective amulets that aided both the buyer during life and the dead as they descended into the Underworld.

Interestingly, proportions of scarabs with a certain typological form often remained stable from the Late Bronze IIB to Iron I. If a certain typological form was the most popular form in the Late Bronze IIB, it often retained that level of popularity in the Iron I. In contrast, newer typological forms were less stable. As noted in Chapter Three, idiosyncratic variants of the new D10 head occurred at Tell el-Far'ah (South), a likely center of local production. A unique checkered pattern was engraved on the head of a number of scarabs from Tell el-Far'ah (South) (Keel 2010b: 230–231, 242–243, 282–285, 316–317 [Tell el-Far'a Süd 476, 500, 597, and 677]; Keel 2013: 448–449 [Geser 657]). Locally produced scarabs tended toward greater variation. Scarabs without the royal titulary exhibited this greater variation. A greater number of typological forms of the head, clypeus, and side were noted on scarabs without the royal titulary. This variation points toward decentralization of the local Levantine artisans of the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I. There was likely no centralized administration which hired and trained these local artisans. Instead, they likely produced what they themselves knew the market demanded.

Trends noted on royal scarabs often did not occur on scarabs without the royal titulary. While the A1 head increased in popularity on scarabs with the royal titulary, the

A1 head remained stable on scarabs without the royal titulary. While the frequency of ridging on royal scarabs did not decrease, ridging on scarabs without the royal titulary did. The local artisans, who crafted scarabs without the royal titulary, did not replicate the trends of those artisans producing royal scarabs. This points toward decentralized production.

Decentralized local production also led to an increased number of typological forms engraved on scarabs without the royal titulary. The sides of non-royal scarabs exhibited seven new typological forms that were not present on the scarabs with the royal titular: D4, D10, E2, E4, E8, E9, and E10. Of these seven forms, five were highly schematic. Even the popularity of hirsute legs decreased as non-hirsute legs increased. Non-royal scarabs from local artisans tended toward greater variation and greater schematization than scarabs with the royal titulary. While this does not point to mass-production in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I, increased production did result in less detailed forms.

Decentralized local production also led to a reemergence of local glyptic traditions that were known from the Middle Bronze Age. The following motifs were popular on local Middle Bronze scarabs and later imitations from the Late Bronze IIB and Iron I: the ANRA motif, the striding lion, the anthropomorphic figure with lotus bloom, the red crown, the *wḏ3t*-eye, and the *ḏd*-pillar. Small variations between Middle Bronze and Late Bronze-Iron I forms of these motifs offered telltale signs of later production. Increased schematization and shallower engraving also marked these later imitations by local artisans. As the typological form of the scarab tended toward greater schematization, the locally produced motifs also followed similar trends.

The Beth Shean IX group showed that these local glyptic traditions were not entirely dormant during the Late Bronze I and IIA periods, though production was on a much smaller scale during the Late Bronze I and IIA. The Beth Shean IX group continued to produce the ANRA motif, the striding lion, and an anthropomorphic figure with a lotus bloom in the Late Bronze I. Though hundreds of years intervened between the local Levantine scarab production of the Second Intermediate Period and Late Bronze IIB–Iron I imitations, local traditions persisted.

Scarabs depicting the deity Ptah followed a similar pattern. Ptah-scarabs, though rare, were produced locally in the Southern Levant during the Middle Bronze, Late Bronze I, and Late Bronze IIA. The local popularity of these scarabs likely led to greater consumption of Ptah-scarabs in the Late Bronze IIB when Egyptian production increased dramatically because Ptah rose to prominence during the 19th Dynasty. Local glyptic traditions lay behind consumption patterns of imported Egyptian scarabs and local production. While scarabs often have been viewed as a direct reflection of Egyptian influence in the Southern Levant, a vibrant local tradition has likely reemerged in the Late Bronze IIB and Iron IA. Even as Egyptian empire retreats during the 20th Dynasty, local artisans independently craft seals which the local populations recognize as having a long, local tradition.

Sources Cited

- Abd el-Hamid, S.
 1985 Discovery of a New Foundation Deposit of Thutmosis III at the East of Karnak. A Preliminary Report (With and Annex about a Stela of Pareemheb). *Karnak* 8: 41–50.
- Abd el-Maksoud, Mohamed
 1998 *Tell Heboua (1981–1991). Enquête archéologique sur la Deuxième Période Intermédiaire et le Nouvel Empire à l'extrémité orientale du Delta*. Paris: Ministère des Affaires Étrangères.
- Abu 'Uqsa, H.
 2007 A Burial Cave at Ḥorbat 'Eitayim. *'Atiqot* 56: 65–79 [Hebr.], 76*–78* [Engl.].
- Adams, Barbara
 1975 Petrie's Manuscript Notes on the Koptos Foundation Deposits of Thutmosis III. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 61: 102–113.
- Aharoni, Miriam
 1996 An Iron Age Cylinder Seal. *Israel Exploration Journal* 46 1/2: 52–54.
- Aharoni, Yohanan
 1967 Seals of Royal Functionaries from Arad. *Eretz Israel* 8: 101–103 [Hebr.], 71* [Engl.].
- Aharoni, Yohanan, Volkmar Fritz, and Aharon Kempinski
 1974 Excavations at Tel Masos (Khirbet El-Meshâsh). Preliminary Report on the First Season, 1972. *Tel Aviv* 1/2: 64–74.
- Ahituv, Shemuel
 1978 Economic Factors in the Egyptian Conquest of Canaan. *Israel Exploration Journal* 28 1/2: 93–105.
- Albright, William F.
 1924– The Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 6: 13–74.
 1925 *of Oriental Research* 6: 13–74.
 1928 The Second Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim (Kiriath-Sepher). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 31: 1–11.
 1932a An Anthropoid Clay Coffin from Sahâb in Transjordan. *American Journal of Archaeology* 36/3: 295–306.
 1932b *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim in Palestine*. Vol. 1, *The Pottery of the First Three Campaigns*. AASOR 12. New Haven, Conn.: The American Schools of Oriental Research.

- 1934 The Kyle Memorial Excavation at Bethel. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 56: 2–15.
- 1935 Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 58: 10–18.
- 1937 Further Light on the History of Israel from Lachish and Megiddo. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 68: 22–26.
- 1938 *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim*. Vol. 2, *The Bronze Age*. AASOR 17. New Haven, Conn.: The American School of Oriental Research.
- 1939 The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 74: 11–23.
- 1942 A Case of Lèse-Majesté in Pre-Israelite Lachish, with Some Remarks on the Israelite Conquest. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 87: 32–38.
- 1943a *The Excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim*. Vol. 3, *The Iron Age*. AASOR 21/22. New Haven, Conn.: The American School of Oriental Research.
- 1943b Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 89: 7–17.
- 1952 The Smaller Beth-Shan Stele of Sethos I (1309–1290 B. C.). *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 125: 24–32.
- 1975 The Amarna Letters from Palestine. In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 2, Part 2, ed. I. E. S. Edwards, C. J. Gadd, N. G. L. Hammond, and E. Sollberger, 98–116. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allen, James P.
2001 *Middle Egyptian. An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allon, Niv
2007 Seth is Baal—Evidence from the Egyptian Script. *Ägypten und Levante* 17: 15–22.
- Alt, A.
1944 Ägyptische Tempel in Palästina und die Landnahme der Philister. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 67/1: 1–20.
- Amiet, Pierre
1992 *Corpus des cylindres de Ras Shamra-Ougarit*. Vol 2, *Sceaux-cylindres en hématite et pierres diverses*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Amiet, Pierre, Jacques Briend, Liliane Courtois, and Jean-Bernard Dumortier
1996 *Tell el-Far‘ah. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis Series Archaeologica 14. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires.
- Amiet, Pierre, and Georges Dossin

- 1968 Un Sceau-Cylindre Assyrien. *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 62/1: 27–30.
- Amrian, Ruth
1969 *Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land from its Beginnings in the Neolithic Period to the End of the Iron Age*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Anati, E.
1959 Excavations at the Cemetery of Tell Abu Hawam. In *'Atiqot*, Vol. 2 (English Series), 89–102. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
1963 Notes and News. *Israel Exploration Journal* 13/2: 142–143.
1975 Abu Hawam, Tell. In *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, ed. Michael Avi-Yonah, 9–12. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Anthes, Rudolph
1939 Foundation Deposits of Ramses IV. In *The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty*, Uvo Hölscher, 116–117. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
1959 *Mit Rahineh 1955*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
1965 *Mit Rahineh 1956*. Philadelphia: University Museum.
- Arnold, Dieter
1997 Egyptian Temples. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, Vol. 4, ed. E. Meyers, 174–179. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Artzy, Michal
1994 Incense, Camels and Collared Rim Jars: Desert Trade Routes and Maritime Outlets in the Second Millennium. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 13/2: 121–147.
2001 White Slip Ware for Export? The Economics of Production. In *The White Slip Ware of Late Bronze Age Cyprus*, ed. Vassos Karageorghis, 107–115. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
2003 Mariners and their Boats at the End of the Late Bronze and the Beginning of the Iron Age in the Eastern Mediterranean. *Tel Aviv* 30: 232–246.
2006a “Filling in” the Void: Observations on the Habitation Pattern at Tel Akko at the End of the Late Bronze Age. In *“I Will Speak in Riddles of Ancient Times.” Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, Vol. 1, ed. Aren Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji, 115–122. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- 2006b The Carmel Coast during the Second Part of the Late Bronze Age: A Center for Eastern Mediterranean Transshipping. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 343: 45–64.
- 2006c *The Jatt Metal Hoard in Northern Canaanite/Phoenician and Cypriote Context*. Cuadernos de Arqueología Mediterránea, Vol. 14. Barcelona: Publicaciones del Laboratorio de Arqueología Universidad Pompeu Fabra de Barcelona.
- 2012 Continuities and Change in the 13th–10th Centuries BCE Eastern Mediterranean: Bronze-Working KOINÉ. In *The Ancient Near East in the 12th–10th Centuries BCE. Proceedings of the International Conference held at the University of Haifa 2–5 May, 2010*, ed. Gershon Galil, Ayelet Gilboa, Aren Maeir, and Dan’el Kahn, 27–41. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 2013a The Importance of the Anchorages of the Carmel Coast in the Trade Networks during the Late Bronze Period. *Michmanim* 24: 7*–24*.
- 2013b On the Other ‘Sea Peoples.’ In *The Philistines and Other ‘Sea Peoples’ in Text and Archaeology*, ed. Ann Killebrew and Gunnar Lehmann, 329–344. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Artzy, Michal, and Rori Beeri
 2010 Tel Akko. In *One Thousand Nights and Days: Akko through the Ages*, ed. Ann Killebrew and Vered Raz-Romeo, 15*–23*.
- Artzy, Michal, Ragna Stidsing, and Yossi Salmon
 2013 Market Strategy—Cypriot Bichrome Wheel-Made Ware for Export. In *J. R. B. Stewart, An Archaeological Legacy*, ed. A. Bernard Knapp, Jennifer M. Webb, and Andrew McCarthy, 175–183. Uppsala: Åströms Förlag.
- Artzy, Michal, and Svetlana Zagorski
 2012 Cypriot “Mycenaean” IIIB Imported to the Levant. In *All the Wisdom of the East: Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, ed. by Mayer Gruber, Shmuel Ahituv, Gunnar Lehmann and Sipora Talshir, 1–11. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- Aston, Barbara G., James A. Harrell and Ian Shaw
 2000 Stone. In *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology*, eds. Paul T. Nicholson and Ian Shaw, 55–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aston, David
 1989 Qantir/Piramesses-Nord—Pottery Report 1988. *Göttinger Miszellen* 113: 7–24, Figs. 2.1–9.3.
 1996 *Egyptian Pottery of the Late New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period (Twelfth–Seventh Centuries BC). Tentative Footsteps in a*

- Forbidding Terrain*. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte
Altägyptens Band 13. Heidelberg: Orientverlag.
- 2009 *Burial Assemblages of Dynasty 21–25. Chronology–Typology–
Developments*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Denkschriften der Gesamtakademie 56. Vienna: Verlag der
Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Aston, D., and B. Aston
1987 Luxor—Valley of the kings (Canadian Institute, Cairo). *Bulletin de
Liaison du Groupe International d'Étude de la Céramique Égyptienne*
12: 27–28.
- Ayrton, E. R., C. T. Currelly, and A. E. P. Weigall
1904 *Abydos*, Part III. Egypt Exploration Fund, memoir 25. London: Egypt
Exploration Fund.
- Baines, John
1995 Palaces and Temples of Ancient Egypt. In *Civilizations of the Ancient
Near East*, Vol. 1, ed. Jack Sasson, 303–317. New York, NY: Simon &
Schuster Macmillan.
- Balensi, Jacqueline
1985 Revising Tell Abu Hawam. *Bulletin of the American Schools of
Oriental Research* 257: 65–74.
- Balensi, Jacqueline, M. D. Herrera, and Michal Artzy
1993 Abu Hawam, Tell. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological
Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 1, ed. E. Stern, 7–14. Jerusalem:
Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Bar-Yosef, Mayer, N. Porat, Z. Gal, D. Shalem, and H. Smithline
2004 Steatite Beads at Peqi'in: Long Distance Trade and Pryo-Technology
during the Chalcolithic of the Levant. *Journal of Archaeological
Science* 31: 493–502.
- Barako, Tristan
2007 *Tel Mor. The Moshe Dothan Excavations, 1959–1960*. Israel
Antiquities Authority Reports, No. 32. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities
Authority.
- Bass, George
1961 The Cape Gelidonya Wreck: Preliminary Report. *American Journal of
Archaeology* 65/3: 267–276.
1986 A Bronze Age Shipwreck at Ulu Burun (Kaş): 1984 Campaign.
American Journal of Archaeology 90/3: 269–296.

- Bass, George, Cemal Pulak, Dominique Collon, and James Weinstein
 1989 The Bronze Age Shipwreck at Ulu Burun: 1986 Campaign. *American Journal of Archaeology* 93/1: 1–29.
- Beck, Pirhiya
 2002 *Imagery and Representation. Studies in the Art and Iconography of Ancient Palestine Collected Articles*. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
 2006 Section B: Cylinder Seals. In *The Renewed Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)*. Vol. 3, *The Pre-Bronze Age and Bronze Age Pottery and Artefacts*, ed. David Ussishkin, 1525–1536. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Beckerath, Jürgen von
 1999 *Handbuch der Ägyptischen Königsnamen*. Mainz: P. von Zabern.
- Be’eri, Ron, and Oren Cohen
 2012 The Iron Age Pottery. In *El-Aḥwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age Near Nahal ‘Iron, Israel*, ed. Adam Zertal, 181–224. Leiden: Brill.
- Bell, Martha
 1985 Gurob Tomb 605 and Mycenaean Chronology. In *Mélanges Gamal Eddin Mokhtar*, Vol. 1, ed. Paule Posener-Kriéger, 61–86, Pl. 1–6. Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire.
 1991 *The Tutankhamun Burnt Group from Gurob, Egypt: Bases for the absolute chronology of the LH IIA and B*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Bembry, Jason
 2011 *Yahweh’s Coming of Age*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Ben-Ami, Doron
 2006 Early Iron Age Cult Places—New Evidence from Tel Hazor. *Tel Aviv* 33/2 2006: 121–133.
- Ben-Arieh, S., Daphna Ben-Tor and S. Godovitz
 1993 A Late Bronze Age Burial Cave at Qubeibeh, Near Tel Lachish. *‘Atiqot* 22: 77–89.
- Ben-Dor-Evian, Shirly
 2011 Egypt and the Levant in the Iron Age I–IIA: The Ceramic Evidence. *Tel Aviv* 38: 94–119.
 2012 Egypt and Philistia in the Iron Age I: The Case of the Philistine Lotus Flower. *Tel Aviv* 39: 20–37.
- Ben-Shlomo, David

- 2003 The Iron Age Sequence of Tel Ashdod: A Rejoinder to ‘Ashdod Revisited’ by I. Finkelstein and L. Singer-Avitz. *Tel Aviv* 2003: 83–107.
- 2006a New Evidence of Seals and Sealings from Philistia. *Tel Aviv* 33: 134–162.
- 2006b Selected Objects. In *Tel Miqne-Ekron Excavations 1995–1996. Field INE East Slope. Iron Age I (Early Philistine Period)*, ed. Mark W. Meehl, Trude Dothan and Seymour Gitin, 189–205. Jerusalem: W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem and The Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University.
- Ben-Tor, Amnon
- 2001 Responding to Finkelstein’s Addendum (on the Dating of Hazor X–VII*). *Tel Aviv* 28: 301–304.
- 2009 A Decorated Jewellery Box from Hazor. *Tel Aviv* 36: 5–67.
- Ben-Tor, Daphna
- 1993 *The Scarab: A Reflection of Ancient Egypt*. Jerusalem: Israel Museum.
- 1994 The Historical Implications of Middle Kingdom Scarabs Found in Palestine Bearing Private Names and Titles of Officials. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 294: 7–22.
- 1997 The Relations between Egypt and Palestine in the Middle Kingdom as Reflected by Contemporary Canaanite Scarabs. *Israel Exploration Journal* 47 3/4: 162–189.
- 2005 Review of *Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals and Seal Impressions from Medinet Habu* by Emily Teeter. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 339: 114–117.
- 2007 *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*. OBO Series Archaeologica 27. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- 2009 Pseudo Hieroglyphs on Middle Bronze Age Canaanite Scarabs. In *Non-Textual Marking Systems, Writing and Pseudo Script from Prehistory to Modern Times*, eds. Petra Andrassy, Julia Budka and Frank Kammerzell, 83–100. *Lingua Aegyptia Studia Monographica* 8. Göttingen: Seminar für Ägyptologie und Koptologie.
- 2011 Egyptian-Canaanite Relations in the Late Bronze Ages as Reflected by Scarabs. In *Egypt, Canaan and Israel—History, Imperialism, Ideology and Literature. Proceedings of a Conference at the University of Haifa, 3–7, May 2009*, ed. S. Bar, D. Kahn and J. J. Shirley, 23–43. Boston: Brill.
- Ben-Tor, Daphna, and Othmar Keel
- 2012 The Beth-Shean Level IX Group. A Local Scarab Workshop of the Late Bronze Age I. In *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, eds. Mayer

- Gruber, Shmuel Ahituv, Gunnar Lehmann, and Zipora Talshir, 87–104. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- 2014 Middle and Late Bronze Scarabs. *Salvage Excavation Reports* 8: 187–210.
- Binder, Michaela
 2011 The 10th–9th Century BC—New Evidence from the Cemetery C of Amara West. *Sudan and Nubia* 15: 39–53.
- Binder, Michaela, Neal Spencer, and Marie Millet
 2011 Cemetery D at Amara West: The Ramesside Period and its Aftermath. *British Museum Studies in Ancient Egypt and Sudan* 16: 47–99.
- Biran, Avraham
 1977 Tel Dan, 1977. *Israel Exploration Journal* 27/4: 242–246.
- Biran, Avraham, and Rudolf Cohen
 1976 Aroer, 1976. *Israel Exploration Journal* 26: 139–140, Pl. 28B.
 1993 Zippor, Tel. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. IV, ed. E. Stern, 1526–1527. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Blackman, A. M.
 1937 Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Sesebi, Northern Province, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1936–37. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 23/2: 145–151.
- Bliss, F. J.
 1899a Second Report on the Excavations at Tell Zakarîya. *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*: 89–111.
 1899b Second Report on the Excavations at Tell es-Sâfi. *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* 31/4: 317–333.
- Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth
 1992 *Judahite Burial Practices and Beliefs about the Dead*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 123. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press.
- Borchardt, Ludwig, and Herbert Ricke
 1980 *Die Wohnhäuser in Tell el-Amarna*. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 91. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Bordreuil, Pierre

- 1986 *Catalogue des Sceaux Ouest-Sémitiques Inscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Musée du Louvre et du Musée Biblique de Bible et Terre Sainte*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale.
- Boschloos, Vanessa
- 2012 Late Bronze Age Cornelian and Red Jasper Scarabs with Cross Designs. Egyptian, Levantine or Minoan? *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 4/2: 5–16.
- Bourriau, Janine
- 1981 *Umm el-Ga 'ab. Pottery from the Nile Valley before the Arab Conquest*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brandl, Baruch
- 1979 Scarab, Amulets and Finger Rings. In *Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah*, ed. Trude Dothan, 84–91. Qedem 10. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- 1982 The Tel Masos Scarab: A Suggestion for a New Method for the Interpretation of Royal Scarabs. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 28: 371–405.
- 1986 The Scarabs from Field VI at Gezer. In *Gezer*. Vol. 4, *The 1969–71 Seasons in Field VI, the "Acropolis,"* ed. W. G. Dever, 247–257. Annual of the Hebrew Union College/Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology 4. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College.
- 1986/87 Two Scarabs and a Trapezoidal Seal from Mount Ebal. *Tel Aviv* 13–14: 166–172.
- 1993a Scarabs, a Scaraboid and a Scarab Impression from Area G (1968–1970). In *Ashdod*. Vol. 5, *Excavations of Area G: The fourth-sixth seasons of excavations (1968–1970)*, ed. M. Dothan and Y. Porath, 129–142. 'Atiqot English Series 23. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- 1993b Scarabs and Other Glyptic Finds. In *Shiloh: The Archaeology of a Biblical Site*, ed. Israel Finkelstein, 203–222. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University.
- 1998 A Scarab in Gold Mount from Tel Migne-Ekron. In *Tel Migne-Ekron. Report on the 1995–1996 Excavations in Field XNW: Areas 77, 78, 79, 89, 90, 101, 102. Iron Age I. Text and Data Base (Plates, Sections, Plants)*, ed. Neal Bierling and Seymour Gitin, 52–56. Jerusalem: W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem and The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- 1999a Two First-Millennium Cylinder Seals from Bethsaida (et-Tell). In *Bethsaida, A City by the North Shore of the Sea of Galilee*, Vol. 2, ed. Rami Arav and R. A. Freund, 225–244. Kirksville: Truman State University Press.
- 1999b Two Ramesside Scarabs from Jatt (Tel Gat Carmel). *'Atiqot* 37: 17*–22*.

- 2000 Two Scarabs from Horvat 'Eleq. In *Ramat Hanadiv Excavations. Final Report of the 1984–1988 Seasons*, ed. Y. Hirschfeld, 537–542. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- 2001 Appendix. Figures and Plates of the Scarabs from the Southern Cemetery. In *The Phoenicians in Achziv, The Southern Cemetery, J. L. Joss Expedition, Final Report of the Excavations (1988–1990)*, ed. Eilat Mazar, 165–215. Cuadernos de Arqueologia Mediterranea 7. Barcelona: Carrera.
- 2003 The Cape Gelidonya Shipwreck Scarabs Reconsidered. In *The Synchronization of Civilizations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C. Vol. 2, Proceedings of the SCIEM 2000. EuroConference, Heindorf, 2nd of May–7th of May, 2001*, ed. Manfred Bietak and Ernst Czerny, 249–261. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 2004a Scarabs, Seals, an Amulet and a Pendant. In *Bronze and Iron Age Tombs at Tell Beit Mirsim*, by Sara Ben-Arieh, 123–188. Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 23. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- 2004b Scarabs and Plaques Bearing Royal Names of the Early 20th Egyptian Dynasty Excavated in Canaan—From Sethnakht to Ramesses IV. In *Scarabs of the Second Millennium BC from Egypt, Nubia, Crete and the Levant: Chronological and Historical Implications*, ed. Manfred Bietak and Ernst Czerny, 57–71. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 2007a Glyptics. In *Tel Mor. The Moshe Dothan Excavations, 1959–1960*, by Tristan Barako, 191–210. Israel Antiquities Authority Reports 32. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- 2007b Canaanite and Egyptian Scarabs from Area R. In *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989–1996. Vol. II, The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata in Area R*. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- 2008 From Milos-Phylakopi to Khirbet ed-Dēr: Additional Observations on a Canaanite Group of Bifacial Rectangular Plaques. In *In the Hill-Country and in the Shephelah, and in the Arabah (Joshua 12, 8). Studies and Researches Presented to Adam Zertal in the Thirtieth Anniversary of the Manasseh Hill-Country Survey*, ed. Shay Bar, 134–150. Jerusalem: Ariel Publishing House. In *Scarabs of the Second Millennium BC from Egypt, Nubia, Crete and the Levant: Chronological and Historical Implications*, ed. Manfred Bietak, Ernst Czerny, 57–71. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 2009 Scarabs, Seals, Sealings and Seal Impressions. In *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean, 1989–1996. Vol. 3, The 13th–11th Century BCE Strata in Areas N and S*, ed. Nava Panitz-Cohen and Amihai Mazar, 636–684. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.

- 2010 Two Bullae, A Plaque, Four Scarabs and a Stamp Seal. In *Deir el-Balah: Excavations in 1977–1982 in the Cemetery and Settlement*. Vol. II, *The Finds*, eds. Trude Dothan and Baruch Brandl, 207–223. Qedem 50. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- 2012a Nine Scarabs, a Scaraboid, a Cylinder Seal, and a Bifacial Plaque from El-Ahwat. In *El-Ahwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age near Nahal 'Iron, Israel. Excavations 1993–2000*, 233–263. Leiden: Brill.
- 2012b Scarabs, Scaraboids, Other Stamp Seals and Seal Impressions. In *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985, Directed by Yigal Shiloh*. Vol. VIIB, *Area E: The Finds*, ed. Alon De Groot and Hannah Bernick-Greenberg, 377–396. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.
- Brandl, Baruch, Shlomo Bunimovitz, and Zvi Lederman
- 2013 Beth-Shemesh and Sellopoulo: Two Commemorative Scarabs of Amenhotep III and their Contribution to Aegean Chronology. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 108: 67–95.
- Braunstein, Susan
- 1998 *The Dynamics of Power in an Age of Transition. An Analysis of the Mortuary Remains of Tell el-Far'ah (South) in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.
- 2011 The Meaning of Egyptian Style Objects in the Late Bronze Cemeteries of Tell el-Far'ah (South). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 364: 1–36.
- Briend, Jacques, and Jean-Baptiste Humbert
- 1980 *Tell Keisan (1971–1976), une cite phénicienne en Galilée*. Fribourg: Éditions universitaires.
- Brunton, Guy
- 1930 *Qau and Badari*. Vol. 3. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 50. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Bernard Quaritch.
- Brunton, Guy, and Reginald Engelbach
- 1927 *Gurob*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 41. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Bryan, Betsy
- 1996 Art, Empire and the End of the Late Bronze Age. In *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference*, ed. Jerrold Cooper and Glenn Schwartz, 33–82. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Buchanan, Briggs, and P. R. S. Moorey

- 1988 *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum. Vol. 3, The Iron Age Stamp Seals (c. 1200–350 BC).* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Buhl, Marie Louise, and Svend Holm-Nielsen
 1969 *Shiloh—The Pre-Hellenistic Remains: The Danish Excavations at Tall Sailun, Palestine in 1926, 1929, 1932, 1963.* Denmark: Aarhus University Press.
- Bunimovitz, Shlomo
 1994 Socio-Political Transformations in the Central Hill Country in the Late Bronze-Iron I Transition. In *From Nomadism to Monarchy: Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel*, ed. Israel Finkelstein and Nadav Na'aman, 179–202. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
 1995 On the Edge of Empires—Late Bronze Age (1500–1200). In *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*, ed. Thomas Levy, 320–331. London: Leicester University Press.
 2001 Chronological Separation, Geographical Segregation or Ethnic Demarcation? Ethnography and the Iron Age Low Chronology. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 322: 1–10.
- Bunimovitz, Shlomo, and O. Zimhoni
 1993 'Lamp-and-Bowl' Foundation Deposits in Canaan. *Israel Exploration Journal* 43: 99–125.
- Buzon, Michele
 2006 Biological and Ethnic Identity in New Kingdom Nubia: A Case Study from Tombos. *Current Anthropology* 47/4: 683–695.
- Buzon, Michele, Antonio Simonette and Robert Creaser
 2007 Migration in the Nile Valley during the New Kingdom Period: A Preliminary Strontium Isotope Study. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 34: 1391–1401.
- Cairo, al-Maṭḥaf al-Miṣrī
 1956 *A Brief Description of the Principal Monuments.* Cairo: Government Press.
- Caquot, André, and Maurice Sznycer
 1980 *Ugaritic Religion.* Leiden: Brill.
- Carnarvon, The Earl of, and Howard Carter
 1912 *Five Years' Explorations at Thebes. The Record of Work Done 1907–1911.* London: Oxford University Press.

- Cassirer, Manfred
 1959 A Scarab with an Early Representation of Resheph. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 45 (1959): 6–7.
- Černý, J.
 1934 Fluctuations in Grain Prices during the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty. *Der Alte Orient* 6: 173–178.
 1958 Report on Inscriptions. In *Lachish*. Vol. IV, *The Bronze Age*, ed. Olga Tufnell, 133. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cesnola, Alexander di
 1884 *Salamina (Cyprus). The History, Treasures, and Antiquities of Salamis in the Island of Cyprus*. London: Whiting & Co.
- Chambon, Alain
 1984 *Tell el-Far‘ah 1. L’Âge du Fer*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Clamer, Christa
 1980 A Gold Plaque from Tel Lachish. *Tel Aviv* 7/3–4: 152–162.
- Cline, Eric, and Assaf Yasur-Landau
 1994 *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea. International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*. BAR International Series 591. Oxford: Tempvs Reparatum Archaeology and Historical Associates Limited.
 2007 Musings from a Distant Shore: The Nature and Destination of the Uluburun Ship and its Cargo. *Tel Aviv* 34/2: 125–141.
- Coldstream, Nicolas
 2003 Some Aegean Reactions to the Chronological Debate in the Southern Levant. *Tel Aviv* 30: 247–258.
- Collon, Dominique
 1986 The Green Jasper Cylinder Seal Workshop. In *Insight through Images, Papers in Honor of Edith Porada*, M. Kelly-Buccellati, et al. (eds.). Malibu: Undena Publications.
 1987 *First Impressions: Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*. London: British Museum Publications.
 1988 Some Cylinder Seals from Tell Mohammed Arab. *Iraq* 50: 59–77.
 1998 First Catch Your Ostrich. *Iranica Antiqua* 33: 25–42.
- Cooley, R. E., and Practico, Gary
 1994a Gathered to His People: An Archaeological Illustration from Tell Dothan’s Western Cemetery. In *Scripture and Other Artifacts. Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, Michael

- Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence Stager (eds.). Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- 1994b Tell Dothan: The Western Cemetery, with comments on Joseph Free's Excavations, 1953 to 1964. In *Preliminary Excavation Reports: Sardis, Bir Umm Fawakhir, Tell el-Umeiri, the combined Caesarea Expeditions, and Tell Dothan*, Bill Dever (ed.), 147–190. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Cornelius, Izak
- 1994 *The Iconography of the Canaanite Gods Reshef and Ba'al. Late Bronze and Iron Age I Periods (c 1500–1000)*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 140. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 2004 *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadesh, and Asherah c. 1500–1000 BCE*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 204. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Courtois, Jacques-Claude, Jacques Lagarce, and Elisabeth Lagarce
- 1986 *Enkomi et le Bronze Récent à Chypre*. Nicosia: Imprimerie Zavallis.
- Cross, Frank Moore
- 1973 El. In *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, ed. George Anderson, G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, 260–279. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Crüsemann, Frank
- 1983 Stempelsiegel. In *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf der Hirbet el-Mšāš (Tēl Māšōš) 1972–1975*, ed. Volkmar Fritz and Aharon Kempinski, 96–98, Pls. 105.2, 172.1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Culican, W.
- 1960/1 Melqart Representations of Phoenician Seals. *Ab Nahnd*: 41–54.
- 1988 The Graves at Tell Er-Reqeish. *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 2/2: 66–105.
- Curtis, Adrian
- 1999 Ras Shamra, Minet el-Beida and Ras Ibn Hani: The Material Sources. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, 5–27. Leiden: Brill.
- Dabney, M. K.
- 1993 The Cylinder Seals. In *The Late Bronze Egyptian Garrison at Beth Shan: A Study of Levels VII and VIII*, eds. F. W. James and P. E. McGovern, 227–234. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

- Dajani, Awni K.
1953 An Iron Age Tomb at al-Jib. *Annual of the Department of Antiquities Jordan* 2: 66–74, Plates 9–10.
- Darnell, John Coleman, and Richard Jasnow
1993 On Moabite Inscriptions of Ramses II at Luxor Temple. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52/4: 263–274.
- Davies, Norman De G., and R. O. Faulkner
1947 A Syrian Trading Venture to Egypt. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33: 40–46.
- Dayagi-Mendels, Mikhal
2002 *The Akhziv Cemeteries: the Ben-Dor Excavations, 1941–1944*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- del Olmo Lete, Gregorio
1999 The Offering Lists and the God Lists. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Watson, W. G. E., and N. Wyatt, 305–352. Leiden: Brill.
- Delaporte, Louis
1910 *Catalogue des Cylindres Orientaux et des Cachets Assyro-Babyloniens, Perses et Syro-Cappadociens de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris: Fondation Eugène Piot.
1923 *Catalogue des Cylindres, Cachets et Pierres Gravées du Musée du Louvre. Vol. 2, Acquisitions*. Paris: Hachette.
- Department of Antiquities
1968 Tell ‘Aitun. *Israel Exploration Journal* 18: 194–195.
- Dever, William, ed.
1986 *Gezer. Vol. IV, The 1969–1971 Season in Field VI, the ‘Acropolis.’* Jerusalem: Annual of the Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology.
- Vaux, Roland de, and Marie-Joseph Steve
1969 *Les Fouilles de Tell el-Far‘ah*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Dever, William G.
2003 Visiting the Real Gezer: A Reply to Israel Finkelstein. *Tel Aviv* 30: 259–282.
- Dietrich, Manfred, and Walter Mayer
1999 The Hurrian and Hittite Texts. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, 46–57. Leiden: Brill.
- Dijk, Jacobus von

- 2001 Ptah. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, Vol. 3, ed. Donald Redford. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dikaïos, Porphyrios
 1969 *Enkomi: Excavations 1948–1958*. Vol. 3a, *Plates 1–239*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Din, Nigm ed-, and Mohammed Sherif
 1960 Clearance of Two Tombs at Debeira East. *Kusch* 8: 53–61.
- Dornemann, Rudolph
 1989 Comments on Small Finds and Items of Artistic Significance from Tell Hadidi and Nearby Sites in the Euphrates Valley, Syria. In *Essays in Ancient Civilization Presented to Helene J. Kantor*, ed. Albert Leonard, Jr., and Bruce Williams, 59–75. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Dothan, Moshe
 1983 The Excavations of the Earliest Settlement at Akko. *Qardom* 24/5: 9–18.
- Dothan, Trude
 1960 Review of *Lachish*. Vol. 4, *The Bronze Age*, ed. Olga Tufnell. *Israel Exploration Journal* 10: 58–64.
 1979 Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah. *Qedem* 10. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
 2010 Iron Age II Pottery. In *Deir el-Balah: Excavations in 1977–1982 in the Cemetery and Settlement*. Vol. II, *The Finds*, eds. Trude Dothan and Baruch Brandl, 153–162. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University.
- Drioton, Étienne
 1938 Deux Cryptogrammes de Senenmout. *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 38: 231–246.
 1940 Recueil de Cryptographie Monumentale. *Annales du Service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 40: 305–427.
 1949 La Cryptographie de la chapelle de Toutânkhamon. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 35: 117–122.
 1957 Trigrammes d'Amon. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 54: 11–33.
 1958 Amon avant la fondation de Thèbes. *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie* 26: 33–41.
- Dunham, Dows (ed.)
 1963 *The West and South Cemeteries at Meroë*. The Royal Cemeteries of Kush 5. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts.

- Edelstein, Gershon, and Sara Auran
1992 The 'Philistine' Tomb at Tell 'Aitun. *'Atiqot* 21: 23–41.
- Edelstein, Gershon, David Ussishkin, Trude Dothan and Vasilios Tzaferis
1971 Cemetery of Tell 'Aitun. *Qadmoniot* 14/2: 86–90. [Hebrew]
- Eggler, Jürg
2006 *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Perserzeit*. OBO Series Archaeologica 25. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- Edwards, I. E. S.
1955 A Relief of Qudshu-Astarte-Anath in the Winchester College Collection. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 14/1: 49–51.
1977 Tutankhamun: his Tomb and its Treasures. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art and Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.
- Eissfeldt, Otto
1956 El and Yahweh. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1: 25–37.
- Elgavish, J.
1977 Shikmona. *Revue Biblique* 84: 264–266, pls. 9–10.
- Emery, Walter B, and L. P. Kirwan
1935 *The Excavations and Survey Between Wadi es-Sebua and Adindan 1929–1931*. Cairo: Government Press.
- Engelbach, R.
1923 *Harageh*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 28. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Bernard and Quartich.
1915 *Riqqeh and Memphis*, Vol. 6. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 25. London: School of Archaeology in Egypt and Bernard Quartitch.
- Epigraphic Survey
1986 *The Battle Reliefs of King Sety I*. The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications 107. Chicago, Ill.: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Erman, Adolf
1892 Der Hiobstein. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 15: 205–211.
- Eissfeldt, Otto
1956 El and Yahweh. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1: 25–37.
- Fairman, H. W.

- 1938 Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Sesebi (Sudla) and ‘Amārah West, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1937–8. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 24/2: 151–156.
- Faulkner, R. O.
1947 The Wars of Sethos I. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 33: 34–39.
- Faust, Avraham
2004 ‘Mortuary Practices, Society and Ideology’: The lack of Iron I Burials in the Highlands in Context. *Israel Exploration Journal* 54/2: 174–190.
- Faust, Avraham, and Shlomo Bunimovitz
2003 The Four Room House: Embodying Iron Age Israelite Society. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 66 1/2: 22–31.
- Faust, Avraham, and Hayah Katz
2011 Philistines, Israelites and Canaanites in the Southern Trough Valley during the Iron Age I. *Egypt and the Levant* 21: 231–247.
2012 Survey, Shovel Tests and Excavation at Tel ‘Eton: On Methodology and Site History. *Tel Aviv* 2012: 30–57.
- Feldman, Marian
2009 Hoarded Treasures: The Megiddo Ivories and the End of the Bronze Age. *Levant* 4/2: 175–194.
- Finkelstein, Israel
1983 *The ‘Izbet Şarṭah Excavations and the Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
1988— The Land of Ephraim Survey 1980–1987: Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 15–16: 117–183.
1989 *‘Izbet Şarṭah. An Early Iron Age Site near Rosh Ha‘ayin, Israel*. BAR International Series 299. Oxford: Biblical Archaeology Review.
1996 Ethnicity and Origin of the Iron I Settlers in the Highlands of Canaan: Can the Real Israel Stand Up? *The Biblical Archaeologist* 59/4: 198–212.
2000 Hazor XII–XI with an Addendum on Ben-Tor’s Dating of Hazor X–VII. *Tel Aviv* 27: 231–247.
2002a El-Aḥwat: A Fortified Sea People City? *Israel Exploration Journal* 52/2: 187–199.
2002b Gezer Revisited and Revised. *Tel Aviv* 2002: 262–296.
2007 Is the Philistine Paradigm Still Viable? In *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C. III. Proceedings of the SCIEM 2000–2nd EuroConference Vienna, 28th of May–1st of June 2003*, ed. Manfred Bietak and Ernst Czerny. Wien: Verlag Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- 2010 Kadesh Barnea: A Reevaluation of its Archaeology and History. *Tel Aviv* 37: 111–125.
- Finkelstein, Israel, Shlomo Bunimovitz, and Zvi Lederman
 1985 Excavations at Shiloh 1981–1984: Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 12/2: 123–180, Pls. 13–20.
- Finkelstein, Israel, Alexander Fantalkin and Eliezer Piasetzky
 2008 Three Snapshots of the Iron IIA: The Northern Valleys, the Southern Steppe and Jerusalem. In *Israel in Transition from the Late Bronze II to Iron IIA (ca. 1250–850 BCE)*. Vol. 1, *The Archaeology*, 32–44. New York: T & T Clark.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Nadav Na'aman
 2005 Shechem of the Amarna Period and the Rise of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. *Israel Exploration Journal* 55/2: 172–193.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Eliazer Piasetzky
 2007 Radiocarbon Dating and Philistine Chronology with an Addendum on el-Ahwat. *Egypt and the Levant* 17: 73–82.
 2008 Radiocarbon and the History of Copper Production at Khirbet en-Nahas. *Tel Aviv* 35: 82–95.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Lily Singer-Avitz
 2001 Ashdod Revisited. *Tel Aviv* 28: 231–259.
 2004 “Ashdod Revisited”—Maintained. *Tel Aviv* 31: 122–135.
 2005 Khirbet en-Nahas, Edom and Biblical History. *Tel Aviv* 32: 119–125.
 2009 Reevaluating Bethel. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 125: 33–48.
- Firth, C. M.
 1912 *The Archaeological Survey of Nubia. Report for 1908–1909*. Vol. 1. Cairo: Government Press.
 1915 *The Archaeological Survey of Nubia. Report for 1909–1910*. Cairo: Government Press.
 1927 *The Archaeological Survey of Nubia. Report for 1910–1911*. Cairo: Government Press.
- Fischer, Peter M.
 2008 Tell Abu al-Kaharaz. A Bead in the Jordan Valley. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 71/4: 196–213.
- Fitzgerald, G. M.
 1930 *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan*. Vol. 2, *The Pottery*. Philadelphia: The University Press for the University of Pennsylvania Museum.

- Flamini, Roxana
2010 Elite Emulation and Patronage Relationships in the Middle Bronze: The Egyptianized Dynasty of Byblos. *Tel Aviv* 37: 154–168.
- Frankfort, H.
1939 *Cylinder Seals: A Documentary Essay on the Art and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. London: Gregg Press.
- Fraser, George, and Herbert Fraser
1900 *A Catalogue of the Scarabs Belonging to George Fraser*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
- Frick, Frank
2000 *Tell Taannek 1963–1968*. Vol. IV/2, *The Iron Age Cultic Structure*. Birzeit: Palestinian Institute of Archaeology.
- Fritz, Volkmar
1981 The Israelite “Conquest” in the Light of Recent Excavations at Khirbet el-Meshâsh. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 241: 61–73.
1987 Conquest or Settlement? The Early Iron Age in Palestine. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 1987: 84–100.
1990 *Kinneret. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf dem Tell el-‘Orême am See Gennesaret 1982–1985*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Fritz, Volkmar, and Aharon Kempinski
1983 *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf der Hirbet el-Mšāš (Tēl Māšōš) 1972–1975*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gadot, Yuval
2010 The Late Bronze Egyptian Estate at Aphek. *Tel Aviv* 37: 48–66.
- Gal, Z., and K. Covello-Paran
1996 Excavations at ‘Afula, 1989. *Atiqot* 30: 25–67.
- Galter, H. D.
1999 Aya. In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karl van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Van Der Horst, 125–127. Leiden: Brill.
- Gardiner, Alan
1994 *Egyptian Grammar. Being an Introduction to the Study of Hieroglyphs*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Garstang, John

- 1901 *El Arábah: A Cemetery of the Middle Kingdom ; Survey of the Old Kingdom Temenos ; Graffiti from the Temple of Sety*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
- 1932 *Jericho: City and Necropolis II–IV*. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 19. Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool.
- 1933 *Jericho: City and Necropolis*. Third Report. Vol. V. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 20: 3–42.
- 1934 *Jericho: City and Necropolis*. Fourth Report. Vol. VI. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 21: 99–136.
- Gasperini, Valentina
2014 Mycenaean and Cypriot Pottery from Gurob in the Manchester Museum Collection: A Test of Trade Network Theories for the New Kingdom Fayum. *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 6/2: 10–22.
- Gauthier, Henri
1913 *Le Livre des Rois: Recueil de titres et protocoles royaux, noms propres de rois, reines, princes, princesses et parents de rois, (noms de pyramides et de temples solaires), suivi d'un index alphabétique*. Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, Tome 19. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Gershuny, Lilly
1981 Stratum V at Tell Abū Hawām. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 97/1: 36–44.
- Gibson, John
1999 The Mythological Texts. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, 193–202. Leiden: Brill.
- Gilboa, Ayelet, Ilan Sharon, and Jeffrey Zorn
2004 Dor and Iron Age Chronology: Scarabs, Ceramic Sequence and ¹⁴C. *Tel Aviv* 31: 32–59.
- Gilula, Mordechai
1976 An Inscription in Egyptian Hieratic from Lachish. *Tel Aviv* 3: 106–107.
- Giorgini, Michaela Schiff
1971 *Soleb*. Vol. 2, *Les Nécropoles*. Florence: Sansoni.
- Gittlen, Barry
1981 The Cultural and Chronological Implications of the Cypro-Palestinian Trade during the Late Bronze Age. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 241: 49–59.

Giveon, Raphael

- 1964 Toponymes ouest-asiatiques à Soleb. *Vetus Testamentum* 14/3: 239–255.
- 1965 Two Egyptian Documents Concerning Bashan from the Time of Ramses II. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 40: 197–202.
- 1971 *Les bédouins Shosu des documents égyptiens*. Documental et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 18. Leiden: Brill.
- 1974 A Monogram Scarab from Tel Masos. *Tel Aviv* 1/2: 75–76.
- 1978 Two Unique Egyptian Inscriptions from Tel Apek. *Tel Aviv* 5/2: 188–191.
- 1980 Reshep in Egypt. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 66: 144–150.
- 1983 An Inscription of Ramses III from Lachish. *Tel Aviv* 10: 176–177.
- 1984 Two Egyptian Scarabs from Iron Age Beer-Sheba. In *Beer-Sheba*. Vol. 2, *The Early Iron Age Settlements*, ed. Ze'ev Herzog, 120–121. Tel Aviv: The Institute of Archaeology and Ramot Publishing Co.
- 1985 *Egyptian Scarabs from Western Asia from the Collections of the British Museum*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 20. Freiburg, Switzerland.
- 1986 An Egyptian Scarab of the 20th Dynasty. In *'Izbet Sartah. An Early Iron Age Site near Rosh Ha'ayin, Israel*, 104–105. BAR International Series 299. Oxford: Biblical Archaeology Review.
- 1988 *Scarabs from Recent Excavations in Israel*. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.

Giveon, Raphael, and Aharon Kempinski

- 1983 The Monogram Scarab. In *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf der Hirbet el-Mšāš (Tēl Māsōš) 1972–1975*, ed. Volkmar Fritz and Aharon Kempinski, 102–106. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Giveon, Raphael, and Trude Kertesz

- 1986 *Egyptian Scarabs and Seals from Acco. From the Collection of the Israel Department of Antiquities and Museum*. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.

Glueck, Nelson

- 1933 Further Explorations in Eastern Palestine. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 51: 9–18.

Goldwasser, Orly

- 1980 קנקן-אגירה מצרי מהרובית *Qadmoniot* 13: 34.
- 1982 The Lachish Hieratic Bowl Once Again. *Tel Aviv* 9: 137–138.
- 1984 Hieratic Inscriptions from Tel Sera' in Southern Canaan. *Tel Aviv* 11/1: 77–93.
- 2006 Canaanites Reading Hieroglyphs; Horus is Hathor?—The Invention of the Alphabet in Sinai. *Ägypten und Levante* 16: 121–160.

Gonen, Rivka

- 1992 *Burial Patterns and Cultural Diversity in Late Bronze Age Canaan*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Goren, Yuval, Israel Finkelstein, and Nadav Na'aman
- 2003 The Expansion of the Kingdom of Amurru according to the Petrographic Investigation of the Amarna Tablets. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 329: 1–11.
- 2004 *Inscribed in Clay: Provenance Study of the Amarna Tablets and Other Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Monograph Series 23. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- Grabbe, Lester L., Ed.
- 2008 *Israel in Transition. From Late Bronze II to Iron IIa (c. 1250–850 B.C.E.)*. Vol. 1, *The Archaeology*. New York: T & T Clark.
- Grant, Elihu
- 1932 *Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine) 1928–1931*. Part 2. Biblical and Kindred Studies 4. Haverford, Penn.: Haverford College.
- 1934 *Rumeileh. Being Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine)*. Vol. III. Haverford: Haverford College.
- Green, John
- 2006 *Ritual and Social Structure in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Southern Levant: The Cemetery at Tell es-Sa'idiyeh, Jordan*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of College London, Institute of Archaeology.
- Grapow, Hermann
- 1936 Studien zu den thebanischen Königsgräbern. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 72: 12–39.
- Greenberg, Raphael
- 1987 New Light on the Early Iron Age at Tell Beit Mirsim. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 265: 55–80.
- Guy, P. L. O.
- 1938 *Megiddo Tombs*. Oriental Institute Publications 33. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Habachi, Labib
- 1960 Five Stelae from the Temple of Amenophis III at Es-Sebua' in the Aswan Museum. *Kusch* 8: 45–52, Pls. 16–18.
- Haggi, Arad

- 2006 Phoenician Atlit and its Newly-Excavated Harbour: A Reassessment. *Tel Aviv* 33: 43–60.
- Haggi, Arad, and Michal Artzy
1997 The Harbor of Atlit in Northern Canaanite/Phoenician Context. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 70/2: 75–84.
- Hall, H. R.
1913 *Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs, Etc., in the British Museum*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, R. W.
1935 Excavations at Tel Abu Hawām. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 4: 1–69.
- Hankey, Vronwy
1986 A Sherd in the Simple Style of Late Mycenaean IIIB. In *‘Izbet Şarṭah. An Early Iron Age Site Near Rosh Ha ‘ayin, Israel*, 99–103. Bar International Series 299. Oxford: Biblical Archaeology Review.
- Hankey, Vronwy, and Olga Tufnell
1973 The Tomb of Maket and Its Mycenaean Import. *The Annual of the British School of Athens* 68: 103–111.
- Harrison, Timothy P., *et al.*
2004 *Megiddo*. Vol. 3, *Final Report on the Stratum VI Excavations*. Oriental Institute Publications 127. Chicago, Ill.: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
2010 The Late Bronze/Early Iron Age Transition in the North Orontes Valley. In *Societies in Transition. Evolutionary Processes in the Northern Levant between Late Bronze II ad Early Iron Age*, ed. Fabrizio Venturi, 83–102.
- Hawass, Zahi
2004 *The Island of Kalabsha*. Cairo: SCA Press.
- Hawkins, Ralph K.
2012 *The Iron Age I Structure on Mt. Ebal. Excavation and Interpretation*. Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement 6. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Hayes, William C.
1951 Inscriptions from the Palace of Amenhotep III. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 10/4: 231–242.
1959 *Scepter of Egypt*. Vol. 2, *Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Part II: The Hyksos Period and the New*

- Kingdom (1675–1080 B.C.)*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Hermann, W.
 1999 El. In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karl van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Van Der Horst, 274–280. Leiden: Brill.
- L’Heureux, Conrad E.
 1979 *Rank among the Canaanite Gods. El, Baʿal, and the Repha ʾim*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 21. Ann Arbor: Scholars Press.
- Higginbotham, Carolyn
 1996 Elite Emulation and Egyptian Governance in Ramesside Canaan. *Tel Aviv* 23: 154–169.
 1999 The Statue of Ramses III from Beth Shean. *Tel Aviv* 26: 225–232.
 2000 *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine: Governance and Accommodation on the Imperial Periphery*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hoch, James E.
 1998 *Middle Egyptian Grammar Sign List*. SSEA Publication XV. Mississauga, Canada: Benben Publications.
- Hoffmeier, James, and Kenneth Kitchen
 2007 Reshep and Astarte in North Sinai: A Recently Discovered Stela from Tell el-Borg. *Ägypten und Levant* 17: 127–136.
 2011 Deities of the Eastern Frontier. In *Scribe of Justice Egyptological Studies in Honour of Shafik Allam*, ed. Zahi Hawass, Khaled Daoud, and Ramadan Hussein. Cairo: Ministry of State for Antiquities, 197–216.
 2014 *Excavations in North Sinai. Tell el-Borg I. The “Dwelling of the Lion” on the Way of Horus*. Winona Lake: Indiana.
- Hölb, Günther
 1979 Typologische Arbeit bei der Interpretation von nicht klar lesbaren Skarabäenflächseiten. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 7: 89–102.
- Hölscher, Uvo
 1932 *Excavations at Ancient Thebes 1930/31*. Oriental Institute Communications 15. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 1934 *The Excavation of Medinet Habu. Vol. I, General Plans and Views*. Oriental Institute Publications 21. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 1939 *The Temples of the Eighteenth Dynasty*. Oriental Institute Publications 41. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- 1941 *The Mortuary Temple of Ramses II. Part I.* Translated by Mrs. Keith C. Seele. Oriental Institute Publications 54. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1951 *The Mortuary Temple of Ramses III. Part III.* Translated by Elizabeth B. Hauser. Oriental Institute Publications 55. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Honour, Hugh and John Fleming, ed.
 1970 *A Heritage of Images: A Selection of Lectures by Fritz Saxl.* Middlesex, England: Peregrine Books.
- Hornung, Erik, and Elisabeth Staehelin
 1976 *Skarabäen und andere Siegelamulette aus Basler Sammlungen.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Horowitz, L. Kolska, J. Lev-Tov, J. R. Chadwick, S. J. Chadwick, S. J. Wimmer, and A. M. Wimmer
 2006 Working Bones: A Unique Iron Age IIA Bone Workshop from Tell es-Sâfi/Gath. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 69: 169–173.
- Hrouda, Barthel
 1962 *Tell Halaf. Vol. 4, Die Kleinfunde aus Historischer Zeit.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co.
- Jaeger, Bertrand
 1982 *Essai de Classification et Datation des Scarabées Menkhéperrê.* Fribourg: Édition Universitaires.
- Janssen, Jac J.
 1975a *Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period. An Economic Study of the Village of Necropolis Workmen at Thebes.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.
 1975b Prolegomena to the Study of Egypt's Economic History during the New Kingdom. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 3: 127–185.
- James, Frances
 1966 *The Iron Age at Beth Shan. A Study of Levels VI–IV.* Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.
- James, Frances W., and P. E. McGovern
 1993 The Stratigraphic Framework. In *The Late Bronze Egyptian Garrison at Beth Shan: A Study of Levels VII and VIII*, eds. Frances W. James et al., 1–67. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.
- Johns, C. N.

- 1934 Report on the Excavation at Pilgrims' Castle, Atlit. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 3: 145–164.
- Kantor, Helene
- 1958a The Glyptic. In *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*, ed. Calvin McEwan *et al.*, 69–86, Pls. 69–80. Oriental Institute Publications 79. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1958b The Ivories from Floor 6 of Sounding IX. In *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*, ed. Calvin McEwan *et al.*, 57–68, Pls. 58–68. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Keane, Webb
- 2003 Semiotics and the Social Analysis of Material Things. *Language and Communication* 23: 409–425.
- 2005 Signs Are Not the Garb of Meaning. On the Social Analysis of Material Things. In *Materiality*, ed. Daniel Miller, 182–205. Durham: Duke University Press.
- 2008 The Evidence of the Senses and the Materiality of Religion. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 14/1: 210–127.
- Keel, Othmar
- 1980 La Glyptique. In *Tell Keisan (1971–1976). Une cite phénicienne en Galilée*, ed. Jacques Briand and Jean-Baptiste Humert, 257–295. OBO Series Archaeologica 1. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires.
- 1989a Die Jaspis-Skarabäen-Gruppe: Eine vorderasiatische Skarabäenwerkstatt des 17 Jhs. V. Chr. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, ed. Othmar Keel, Hildi Keel-Leu and Silvia Schroer, 211–242. OBO 88. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1989b Zur Identifikation des Falkenköpfigen auf den Skarabäen der ausgehenden 13. und der 15. Dynastie. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, ed. Othmar Keel, Hildi Keel-Leu and Silvia Schroer, 243–280. OBO 88. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1989c Der ägyptische Gott Ptah auf Siegelamuletten aus Palästina/Israel. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, ed. Othmar Keel, Hildi Keel-Leu and Silvia Schroer, 282–323. OBO 88. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1990a Früheisenzeitliche Glyptik in Palästina/Israel. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, *Die Frühe Eisenzeit ein Workshop*. OBO 100. Othmar Keel, Menakhem Shuval and Christoph Uehlinger, 67–161. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1990b La glyptique de Tell Keisan. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, *Die Frühe Eisenzeit ein Workshop*. OBO 100. Othmar Keel, Menakhem Shuval and Christoph Uehlinger, 163–260. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1994 Philistine 'Anchor' Seals. *Israel Exploration Journal* 44 1/2: 21–35.

- 1995a *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit; Einleitung*. OBO Series Archaeologica 10. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 1995b Stamp Seals—The Problem of Palestinian Workshops in the Second Millennium and Some Remarks on the Preceding and Succeeding Periods. In *Seals and Sealings in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the Symposium Held on September 2, 1993*, ed. Joan Goodnick Westenholz, 93–142. Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum.
- 1997 *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit; Katalog*. Vol. 1, *Von Tell Abu Farağ bis 'Atlit*. OBO Series Archaeologica 13. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- 2001 Egyptian Deities in Middle Bronze Age Palestine. In *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume: Studies in Archaeology and Related Studies*, ed. Shmuel Ahituv and Eliezer Oren, 194–227. Beer Sheva: Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East 15. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- 2004a The Glyptic Finds: Stamp-Seals Amulets. In *Bronze and Iron Age Tombs at Tel Gezer, Israel. Finds from Raymond-Charles Weill's Excavations in 1914 and 1921*, ed. A. M. Maier, 51–54. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- 2004b Scarabs, Stamp Seal-Amulets and Impressions. In *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)*. Vol. 3, *The Pre-Bronze Age and Bronze Age Pottery and Artefacts*, ed. D. Ussishkin, 1537–1571. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- 2010a *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit; Katalog*. Vol. 2, *Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, OBO Series Archaeologica 29. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- 2010b *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit; Katalog*. Vol. 3, *Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*. OBO Series Archaeologica 31. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- 2011 Glyptics. In *Dan*. Vol. 3, *Avraham Biran Excavations (1966–1999). The Late Bronze Age*, ed. Rachel Ben-Dov, 345–348. Annual of the Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology 9. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion.
- 2013 *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel: Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit; Katalog*. Vol. 4, *Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*. OBO Series Archaeologica 33. Fribourg: Academic Press.

Keel, Othmar, Hildi Keel-Leu, and Silvia Schroer

- 1989 *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*, Band II. OBO 88. Friborg: Universitätsverlag.
- 2005 The Stamp Seal Amulets. In *Ashdod*. Vol. VI, *The Excavations of Areas H and K (1968–1969)*, ed. Moshe Dothan and David Ben-Shlomo, 273–279. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.

- Keel, Othmar, and Amihai Mazar
 2009 Iron Age Seals and Seal Impressions from Tel Rehov. In *Eretz-Israel. Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies*. Vol. 29, ed. Joseph Aviram, Amnon Ben-Tor, Israel Eph'al, Seymour Gitin, Ronny Reich, 57*–69*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society.
- Keel, Othmar, and Stefan Münger
 2012 Excavated Stamp-Seal Amulets. In *Tell es-Safi/Gath I: The 1996–2005 Seasons*. Part I: *Text*, ed. Aren Maier. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Keel, Othmar, and Christoph Uehlinger
 1998 *Gods, Goddesses and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Translated from German by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- Keel, Othmar, Menakhem Shuval, and Christoph Uehlinger
 1990 *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 1, *Die Frühe Eisenzeit ein Workshop*. OBO 100. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- Keel-Leu, Hildi
 1990 Die Herkunft der Konoide in Palästina/Israel. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, *Die Frühe Eisenzeit ein Workshop*, ed. O. Keel et al., 378–379. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- Kelso, James L.
 1968 *The Excavation of Bethel (1934–1960)*. The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vol. 39. Cambridge: The American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Kemp, B., and R. S. Merrillees
 1980 *Minoan Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt*. Mainz am Rhein: P. von Zabern.
- Kempinski, Aharon
 1983 Die Keramik/The Pottery. Area A. In *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf der Hirbet el-Mšāš (Tēl Māšōš) 1972–1975*, ed. Volkmar Fritz and Aharon Kempinski, 73–80. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
 1993a 'Ajjul, Tell el-. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 1, ed. Ephraim Stern, 52–53. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
 1993b Masos, Tel. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 3, ed. Ephraim Stern, 986–989. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Kempinski, Aharon and Shlomit Israeli

- 1986 Erani, Tel. In *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 4: 29–30.
- Kempinski, Aharon, Hartmut Rösel, Erel Gilboa and Th. Stahlheber
 1983 Area A. In *Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen auf der Hirbet el-Mšāš (Tēl Māšoś) 1972–1975*, ed. Volkmar Fritz and Aharon Kempinski, 7–34. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kenyon, Kathleen
 1951 Some Notes on the History of Jericho in the Second Millennium B.C. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 83/2: 101–138.
 1958 Some Notes on the Early and Middle Bronze Age Strata of Megiddo. *Eretz-Israel* 5 (1958): 51*–60*.
 1969 The Middle and Late Bronze Age Strata at Megiddo. *Levant* 1 (1969): 25–60.
- Killebrew, Ann
 1998 *Ceramic Craft and Technology during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages: The Relationship between Pottery Technology, Style, and Cultural Diversity*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
 2004 New Kingdom Egyptian-Style and Egyptian Pottery in Canaan: Implications for Egyptian Rule in Canaan during the 19th and 20th Dynasties. In *Egypt, Israel and the Ancient Mediterranean World: Studies in Honor of Donald B. Redford*, ed. Gary Knoppers and Antoine Hirsch, 309–343. Leiden: Brill.
- Killebrew, Ann, P. Goldberg, and A. Rosen
 2006 Deir el-Balah: A Geological, Archaeological, and Historical Reassessment of an Egyptianizing 13th and 12th Century B.C.E. Center. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 343: 97–119.
- Kirkbride, Diane
 1965 Scarabs. In *Excavations at Jericho*. Vol. 2, *The Tombs Excavated in 1955–8*, 580–655. London: The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.
- Kitchen, Kenneth
 1964 Some New Light on the Asiatic Wars of Ramesses II. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50: 47–70.
 1977 Historical Observations on Ramesside Nubia. In *Ägypten und Kusch*, ed. Endesfelder, Erika, Karl-Heinz Priebe, Walter-Friedrich Reineke, and Steffen Wenig, 213–225. Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 13. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
 2001 Review of *Egyptianization and Elite Emulation in Ramesside Palestine. Governance and Accommodation on the Imperial Periphery* by Carolyn Higginbotham. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 11/2: 253–254.

- Knauf, Ernst Axel
 2000 Jerusalem in the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Ages: A Proposal. *Tel Aviv* 27: 75–90.
- Kochavi, Moshe
 1981 The History of Archeology of Aphek-Antipatris: A Biblical City in the Sharon Plain. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44/2: 75–86.
 1993 Zeror, Tel. In *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. IV, ed. Ephraim Stern, 1524–1526. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Krauss, Rolf
 1994 Ein wahrscheinlicher Terminus post quem für das Ende von Lachish VI. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 126: 123–130.
- Kroenke, Karin
 2011 The Artifacts from Petrie's Excavation. In *The Temple of Tausret: the University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition Tausret Temple Project*, ed. Richard Wilkinson, 11–32. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition.
- Kühne, Hartmut, and Beate Salje
 1996 *Kamid el-Loz*. Vol. 15, *Die Glyptik*. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 56. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- Kunath, S.
 1985 Ein Siegel Ramses II. vom Tel Šokah—Nir Dawid. *Biblische Notizen* 28: 27–29.
- Laemmel, Sabine
 2012 A Note on the Material from the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Cemeteries of Tell el-Far'ah South. In *Forces in Transformation. The End of the Bronze Age in the Mediterranean*, ed. Christoph Bachhuber and R. Gareth Roberts, 170–185. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Lambrou-Philipson, C.
 1990 *Hellenorientalia: The Near Eastern Presence in the Bronze Age Aegean, ca. 3000–1100 B.C. Plus Orientalia: A Catalogue of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Mitannian, Syro-Palestinian, Cypriot and Asia Minor Objects from the Bronze Age Aegean*. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Lalkin, Nir
 2004 A Ramesses IV Scarab from Lachish. *Tel Aviv* 31: 17–21.

- 2008 חרפושיות מתקופת הברונזה המאוחרת בארץ ישראל. Ph.D. Dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
- 2009 Scarab and Other Seal Amulets. In *Aphek-Antipatris*. Vol. 2, ed. Y. Gadot and Esther Yadin, 444–459. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University.
- Lambert, W. G.
1985 The Pantheon of Mari. *MARI: Annales de Recherches Interdisciplinaires* 4: 529–539.
- Lamon, Robert, and Geoffrey Shipton
1939 *Megiddo*. Vol. 1, *Seasons of 1925–34. Strata I–V*. Oriental Institute Publications 42. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lansing, Ambrose
1935 The Museum's Excavations at Thebes. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 30/11: 4–16.
- Lapp, Paul
1967a The 1966 Excavations at Tell Ta'anek. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 185: 2–39.
1967b The Conquest of Palestine in Light of Archaeology. *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38/5: 283–300.
- Lavie-Alons, Nirit
2012 Area C1—The Residential Quarter. In *El-Aḥwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age Near Nahal 'Iron, Israel*, ed. Adam Zertal, 88–126. Leiden: Brill.
- Leclant, Jean
1960 Astarté a cheval d'après les représentations égyptiennes. *Syria* 37/1: 1–67.
- Leibovitch, J.
1948 Un nouveau dieu Égypte-Canaanéen. *Annales du Service antiquités de l'Égypte* 48: 435–444.
- Lephoron, Ronald
2001 Titulary. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Donald Redford, 409–411. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lernau, Omri
2012 Fish Remains. In *El-Aḥwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age Near Nahal 'Iron, Israel*, ed. Adam Zertal, 362–369. Leiden: Brill.
- Levy, Thomas, and Mohammad Najjar

- 2006 Some Thoughts on Khirbet en-Nahas, Edom, Biblical History and Anthropology—A Response to Israel Finkelstein. *Tel Aviv* 33: 3–17.
- Levy, Thomas E., *et al.*
 2004 Reassessing the Chronology of Biblical Edom: New Excavations and ¹⁴C Dates from Khirbat en-Nahas (Jordan). *Antiquity* 78/302: 865–879.
- Lewis, Theodore J.
 1989 *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Lipiński, Edward
 1988 Éa, Kothar et El. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 20: 137–143.
 2009 *Resheph. A Syro-Canaanite Deity*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 181. Leuven: Peeters Publishers.
- Loat, L.
 1904 *Gurob*. London: Gilbert and Rivington Limited, St. John's House, Clerkenwell.
- Loftie, W. J.
 1884 *An Essay of Scarabs*. London: Field and Tuer, Y^e Leadenhalle Presse, E. C.
- Loud, Gordon
 1939 *Megiddo Ivories*. Oriental Institute Publications 52. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 1948 *Megiddo*. Vol. 2, *Seasons of 1935–39. Plates*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- MacAlister, R. A. Stewart
 1905 Twelfth Quarterly Report on the Excavation of Gezer. *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* 38: 183–199.
 1912 *The Excavations of Gezer: 1902–1905 and 1907–1909*. 3 Vols. London: Murray.
- Mackay, Ernest, and Margaret Murray
 1952 *Ancient Gaza*, Vol. 5. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 64. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Mackenzie, Duncan
 1912– *Excavations at Ain Shems*. Palestine Exploration Fund Annual 2.
 1913 London: Harrison and Sons.
- Maisler, Benjamin

- 1950– The Excavations at Tell Qasîle: Preliminary Report. *Israel Exploration Journal*
- 1951a 1/2: 61–76.
- 1950– The Excavations at Tell Qasîle: Preliminary Report. *Israel Exploration Journal*
- 1951b 1/3: 125–140.
- 1950– The Excavations at Tell Qasîle: Preliminary Report. *Israel Exploration Journal*
- 1951c 1/4: 194–218.
- 1951 The Stratification of Tell Abū Huwâm on the Bay of Acre. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 124: 21–25.
- 1967 A Philistine Seal from Tell Qasile. *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 31: 64–67 (Hebrew).
- Margalit, Baruch
- 1999 The Legend of Keret. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, 203–233. Leiden: Brill.
- Margill, Pamela
- 2006 *A Researcher's Guide to the Lachish Collection in the British Museum*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Martin, Geoffrey Thorndike
- 1971 *Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Seals Principally of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Master, Daniel, *et al.* (eds.)
- 2005 *Dothan I: Remains from the Tell (1953–1964)*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- 2011 Home Cooking at Ashkelon in the Bronze and Iron Ages. In *On Cooking Pots, Drinking Cups, Loomweights and Ethnicity in Bronze Age Cyprus and Neighboring Regions. An International Symposium held in Nicosia, November 6th–7th 2010*, ed. Vassos Karageorghis and Ourania Kouka. Nicosia: The A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- Matouk, Fouad S.
- 1977 *Corpus du Scarabée Égyptien*. Vol. 2, *Analyse Thématique*. Beirut: Imprimerie Catholique.
- Mazar, Amihai
- 1978 Cylinder-Seals of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages in Eretz-Israel. *Qadmoniot* 9: 6–14 [Hebrew].
- 1985 *Excavations at Tell Qasile*. Part 2. *The Philistine Sanctuary: Various Finds, the Pottery, Conclusions, Appendixes*. Qedem 20. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

- Mazar, Amihai, and Robert Mullins
 2006 Introduction: The Hebrew University Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean. In *Excavations at Tel Beth Shean 1989–1996*. Vol. 1, *The Late Bronze Age IIB to the Medieval Period*, ed. Amihai Mazar, 3–25. Jerusalem: The Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Mazar, Eilat
 2001 *The Phoenicians in Achziv: The Southern Cemetery, Jerome L. Joss Expedition. Final Report of the Excavations (1988–1990)*. Cuadernos de Arqueologia Mediterranea 7. Barcelona: Carrera.
- Mazow, Laura
 2005 Competing Material Culture: Philistine Settlement at Tel Migne-Ekron in the Early Iron Age. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Arizona.
- McCown, Chester Charlton
 1947 *Tell en-Nasbeh. Excavated under the Direction of the Late William Frederic Badè*. Vol. 1, *Archaeological and Historical Results*. Berkeley, CA.: The Palestine Institute of Pacific School of Religion.
- McEwan, Calvin W. *et al.*
 1958 *Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah*. Oriental Institute Publications 79. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- McGovern, Patrick
 1986 *The Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages of Central Transjordan, The Baq‘ah Valley Project, 1977–1981*. Philadelphia: The University Museum.
- Mensan, Romain
 2007 Tuthmosid Foundation Deposits at Karnak. *Egyptian Archaeology. The Bulletin of the Egypt Exploration Society* 30: 21–25.
- Merrillees, R. S.
 1971 The Early History of Late Cypriot. *Levant* 3: 56–79.
- Meyer, Jan-Waalke
 2008 *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem ‘Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*. Fribourg: Academic Press.
- Miller, Daniel, ed.
 2005 *Materiality: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Minault-Gout, Anne, and Florence Thill

- 2012 *Saï. Vol. 2, Le cimetière des tombes hypogées du Nouvel Empire. SAC5.*
Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Mizrachy, Yosef
2002 Glyptic Finds. In *Tel Kabri. The 1986–1993 Excavation Seasons*, ed.
Aharon Kempinski, 319–348. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass
Publications in Archaeology.
- Mlinar, Christa
2001 Die Skarabäen aus dem Grabungsareal A/II-o/14-A/II-p/15 von Tell el-
Dab'a. *Ägypten und Levante* XI: 223–264.
- Montet, P.
1928– *Byblos et l'Égypte. Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Gebeil. 1921*
1929 *–1922–1923–1924. 2 Vols.* Paris: Bibliothèque archéologique et
historique.
1933 La stèle de l'an 400 retrouvée. *Kêmi: revue de philologie et*
d'archéologie égyptienne et copte 4: 191–215.
- de Moor, Johannes
1976 Rāpi'ūma—Rephaim. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
88: 323–345.
2012 Review of *Yahweh's Coming of Age* by Jason Bembry, 2011. *Review of*
Biblical Literature (August). [Retrieved from
http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/8217_8985.pdf on February 19,
2015.]
- Moorey, P. R. S.
1980 Metal Wine-Sets in the Ancient Near East. *Iranica Antiqua* 15: 181–
197.
- Moortgat, Anton
1940 *Vorderasiatische Rollsiegel. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der*
Steinschneiderkunst. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
1941 Assyrische Glyptik des 13. Jahrhunderts. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
und vorderasiatische Archäologie 47/1–2: 50–88.
1944 Assyrische Glyptik des 12. Jahrhunderts. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
und vorderasiatische Archäologie 48: 23–44.
- Moran, William L.
1992 *The Amarna Letters.* Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University
Press.
- Morris, Ellen
2005 *The Architecture of Imperialism. Military Bases and the Evolution of*
Foreign Policy in Egypt's New Kingdom. Leiden: Brill.

- Muhly, James D.
 2003 Greece and Anatolia in the Early Iron Age: Archaeological Evidence and the Literary Tradition. In *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past. Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*, ed. W. G. Dever and Seymour Gitin, 23–35. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Münter, Stefan
 2003 Egyptian Stamp-Seal Amulets and their Implications for the Chronology of the Early Iron Age. *Tel Aviv* 30/1: 66–82.
 2005 Stamp-Seal Amulets and Early Iron Age Chronology. An Update. In *The Bible and Radiocarbon Dating. Archaeology, Text and Science*, ed. Thomas Levy and Thomas Higham, 381–404. London: Equinox Publishing.
 2007 Amulets in context: Catalogue of scarabs, scaraboids and stamp-seals from *Tel Kinrot/Tell el-‘Orēme* (Israel). In *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources*, eds. Susanne Bickel, Silvia Schroer René Schurte and Christoph Uehlinger, 81–99, Pls. 17–18.
- Münnich, Machiej M.
 2013 *The God Resheph in the Ancient Near East*. Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Murnane, William
 1975 The Earlier Reign of Ramesses II and his Coregency with Sety I. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 34/3: 153–190.
 1990 *The Road to Kadesh. A Historical Interpretation of the Battle Reliefs of King Sety I at Karnak*. Chicago, Ill.: The Oriental Institute of Chicago.
- Murray, M. A.
 1949 Some Canaanite Scarabs. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 81/2: 92–99.
 1953 Hieroglyphic and Ornamental Seals. In *Lachish*, Vol. 3, *The Iron Age*. BSAE 48. London: Oxford University Press.
- Müller, Uwe.
 1970 Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Straten XIII bis IX in Megiddo. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 86/1: 50–86.
- Na’aman, Nadav
 1981 Economic Aspects of the Egyptian Occupation of Canaan. *Israel Exploration Journal* 31 3/4: 172–185.
 2000 The Egyptian-Canaanite Correspondence. In *Amarna Diplomacy: The Beginnings of International Relations*, ed. Raymond Cohen and Raymond Westbrook, 125–138. Baltimore, MD.: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Nagel, G.
1938 *La Céramique du Nouvel Empire à Deir el Médineh*. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Nahshoni, Pirhiya, and Shlomit Israeli
2002 Two Burials at Tel Erani. In *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume. Studies in Archaeology and Related Disciplines*, ed. Eliezer Oren and Shmuel Ahituv, 319–324. Jerusalem: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.
- Nataf, Katia Charbit
2011 An Egyptian Mortuary Cult in Late Bronze II Canaan. *Tel Aviv* 38: 52–66.
- Naville, Edouard, and F. L. Griffith
1890 *Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias. Belbeis, Samanood, Abusir, Tukh el Karmus*, Part 1. *The Antiquities of Tell el-Yahûdiyeh*, Part 2. London: Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.
- Negbi, Ora
1976 *Canaanite Gods in Metal: An Archaeological Study of Ancient Syro-Palestinian Figurines*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology.
- Newberry, Percy E.
1905 *Ancient Egyptian Scarabs. Introduction to Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings*. Chicago: Ares Publishers.
1906 *Scarabs: An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings*. London: Archibald Constable and Co. LTD.
1907 *Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Nos. 36001—37521. Scarab-Shaped Seals*. London, England: Archibald Constable and Co., LTD.
- Nodet, E.
1984 Introduction. In *Tell el-Far'ah I. L'Âge du Fer*, ed. Alain Chambon, 9–13. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Nougayrol, J.
1939 *Cylindres-sceaux et Empreintes de Cylindres trouvés en Palestine (au cours de fouilles réguliers)*. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 33. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Nougayrol, Jean, Emmanuel Laroche, Charles Virolleaud, Claude F. A. Schaeffer

- 1968 *Ugaritica V. Nouveaux Textes Accadiens, Hourrites et Ugaritiques des Archives et Bibliothèques Privées d'Ugarit Commentaires des Textes Historiques (Première Partie)*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Nunn, Astrid
1999 *Stamp Seals from the Collections of the Aleppo Museum, Syrian Arab Republic*. Oxford: Archeopress.
- O'Connor, David
1985 The Chronology of Scarabs of the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 15: 1–41.
- O'Connor, M.
1986 Northwest Semitic Designations for Elective Social Affinities. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Society* 18: 67–80.
- Ohata, Kiyoshi
1970 *Tel Zeror. Vol. 3, Report of the Excavation. Third Season 1966*. Tokyo: Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan.
- del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Joaquín Sanmartín
2015 *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated and edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- Oren, Eliezer
1984 “Governors’ Residencies” in Canaan under the New Kingdom: A Case Study of Egyptian Administration. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 14: 37–56.
- Ornan, Tallay
1993 The Mesopotamian Influence on West Semitic Inscribed Seals: A Preference for the Depiction of Mortals. In *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a symposium held in Fribourg on April 17–20, 1991*, ed. Benjamin Sass and Christoph Uehlinger. Fribourg: University Press.
1995 The Transition from Figured to Non-Figured Representations in First Millennium Mesopotamian Glyptic. In *Seals and Sealings in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the Symposium Held on September 2, 1993, Jerusalem, Israel*, ed. Joan Goodnick Westenholz, 39–56. Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum.
2001 The Bull and its Two Masters: Moon and Storm Deities in Relation to the Bull in Ancient Near Eastern Art. *Israel Exploration Journal* 51/1: 1–26.

- 2004 Idols and Symbols: Divine Representation in the First Millennium Mesopotamian Art and its Bearing on the Second Commandment. *Tel Aviv*: 90–121.
- 2005 Stamp and Cylinder Seals. In *Yoqnea 'm II. The Iron Age and the Persian Period. Final Report of the Archaeological Excavations (1977–1988)*, ed. Amon Ben-Tor, Anabel Zarzecki-Peleg, and Shlomit Cohen-Anidar, 347–353. Qedem 6. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Ory, J.
- 1926 A Bronze-Age Necropolis at Ramath Gan, Near Tell el-Jerisheh (Jaffa District). *Palestine Museum Jerusalem, Bulletin* 2: 6–9, pls. 3b–4.
- 1944 A Late Bronze Age Tomb at Tell Jerishe. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 10: 55–57.
- 1945 A Bronze-Age Cemetery at Dhahrat el Humraiya. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 13: 75–89.
- Owen, David
- 1981 An Akkadian Letter from Ugarit at Tel Aphek. *Tel Aviv* 8: 1–17.
- Panofsky, Erwin
- 1967 *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Panofsky, Erwin, and Fritz Saxl
- 1933 Classical Mythology in Medieval Art. *Metropolitan Museum Studies* 4/2: 228–280.
- Pardee, Dennis
- 1996 *Marziḥu, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult: A Minimalist View*. In *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, Religion, and Culture, Edinburgh, July 1994. Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C. L. Gibson*. UBL 12. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 273–287.
- 1999a Koshar. In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karl van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Van Der Horst, 490–491. Leiden: Brill.
- 1999b Kosharoth. In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karl van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. Van Der Horst, 491–492. Leiden: Brill.
- 2000 *Les Textes Rituels*. Fascicule 1 et 2. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- 2002 *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Leiden: Brill.
- Parker, R. A.

- 1974 Ancient Egyptian Astronomy. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 276/1257: 51–65.

Parker, Barbara

- 1949 Cylinder Seals from Palestine. *Iraq* 11/1: 1–43.
 1955 Excavations at Nimrud, 1949–1953: Seals and Seal Impressions. *Iraq* 17/2: 93–125.
 1962 Seals and Seal Impressions from the Nimrud Excavations, 1955–58. *Iraq* 24/1: 26–40.
 1967 A Cappadocian Cylinder Seal. *Iraq* 29/1: 3–5.
 1975 Cylinder Seals from Tell al Rimah. *Iraq* 37/1: 21–38.
 1977 Middle Assyrian Seal Impressions from Tell al Rimah. *Iraq* 39/2: 257–268.

Petrie, William Flinders

- 1888 *Tanis. Part II. Nebesheh (AM) and Defenneh (Tahpanhes)*. Ludgate Hill: Messrs. Trübner & CO., 57 & 59.
 1889 *Historical Scarabs. A Series of Drawings from the Principal Collections Arranged Chronologically*. Chicago: Ares Publishers INC.
 1891 *Illahun, Kahun and Gurob. 1889–1890*. London: David Nutt.
 1896 *Koptos*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
 1897 *Six Temples at Thebes. 1896*. London: Bernard Quaritch.
 1903 *Abydos, Part II*. Egypt Exploration Fund, memoir 24. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
 1906 *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 12. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1917 *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 29. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1919 Notes and Queries. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 51/1: 46–47.
 1925 *Buttons and Design Scarabs*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 38. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1928 *Gerar*. British School of Archaeology of Archaeology in Egypt 43. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1930 *Beth–Pelet*. Vol. 1, *Tell Fara*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 48. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1931 *Ancient Gaza*. Vol. 1, *Tell el-Ajjūl*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 53. London: British School of Archaeology.
 1932 *Ancient Gaza*. Vol. 2, *Tell el-Ajjūl*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 54. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1933 *Ancient Gaza*. Vol. 3, *Tell el-Ajjūl*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 55. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
 1934 *Ancient Gaza*. Vol. 4, *Tell el-Ajjūl*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 56. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.

- 1952 *City of Shepherd Kings*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 64. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Petrie, William Flinders, and Guy Brunton
 1924 *Sedment*. Vol. 1. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 34. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Petrie, William Flinders, Guy Brunton, and M. A. Murray
 1925 *Lahun*. Vol. 2, *The Pyramid*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 33. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Petrie, Williams Flinders, and J. C. Ellis
 1937 *Anthedon, Sinai*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 58. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Petrie, William Flinders, and Ernest Mackay
 1915 *Heliopolis, Kafr Ammar and Shurafa*. British School of Archaeology 27. London: School of Archaeology in Egypt and Bernard Quartich.
- Petrie, William Flinders, and J. H. Walker
 1909 *Memphis*. Vol. 1. British School of Archaeology 15. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
- Phythian-Adams, William J.
 1920 Report on the Stratification of Askalon. *Palestine Exploration Fund* 50–51: 60–84.
- Piankoff, Alexandre
 1949 Une Représentation rare sur l’une des chapelles de Toutânkhamon. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 35: 113–116.
- Pitard, Wayne T.
 1978 The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 232: 65–75.
 1994 The “Libation Installations” of the Tombs at Ugarit. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 57/1: 20–37.
 1999 The Alphabetic Ugaritic Tablets. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, 46–57. Leiden: Brill.
- Platt, Elizabeth E.
 1991 The Objects. In *Madaba Plains Project: The 1987 Season at Tell el-Umeiri and Vicinity and Subsequent Studies*, Vol. 2, ed. Larry Herr, Lawrence Geraty, Øystein LaBianca and Randall Younker, 246–265. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press.
- Porada, Edith

- 1948a The Cylinder Seals of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age. *American Journal of Archaeology* 52/1: 178–198.
- 1948b *Corpus of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in North American Collections*. Vol. 1, *The Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library*. Washington, D.C.: Pantheon Books.
- 1965a Trois cylindres-sceaux d'Akhéra. In *Nouveaux documents pour l'étude du Bronze Récent à Chypre*, by Vassos Karageorghis, 151–153. Paris: En Dépôt aux Éditions E. de Boccard.
- 1965b Cylinder Seals. *Excavations at Jericho*. Vol. 2, *The Tombs Excavated in 1955–8*, ed. Kathleen Kenyon, 656–661. London: British School of Archaeology.
- 1966 Les Cylindres de la jarred Montet. *Syria* 43 3/4: 243–258.
- 1971 Appendix 1: Seals. In *Enkomi: Excavations 1948–1958*. Vol. 2, *Chronology, Summary and Conclusions, Catalogue, Appendices*, by Porphyrios Dikaios, 783–810. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- 1974/ Die Siegelzylinder-Abrollung auf der Amarna-Tafel BM 29841 im
1977 Britischen Museum. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 25: 132–142.
- 1985 Cylinder and Stamp Seals from Kition. In *Excavations at Kition*. Vol. V, *The Pre-Phoenician Levels*, by Vassos Karageorghis *et al.*, 250–254. Nicosia: Nicosia Printing Works.
- 1986 Late Cypriote Cylinder Seals Between East and West. In *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium, "Cyprus between the Orient and the Occident,"* by Vassos Karageorghis, 289–299. Nicosia: Department of Antiquities.
- 1987 *First Impressions. Cylinder Seals in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1989 Cylinder and Stamp Seals. In *Vasilikos Valley Project: Kalavassos-Ayios Dhimitrios*. Vol. II, by Alison South, Pamela Russell and Priscilla Schuster Keswani, *et al.*, 33–37. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Porter, Robert
- 2008 A Note on Ramesses IV and 'Merneptah' at Beth Shean. *Tel Aviv* 35/2: 244–248.
- Porter, Bertha, and Rosalind L. B. Moss
- 1964 *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*. Volume I, *The Theban Necropolis. Part 2. Royal Tombs and Smaller Cemeteries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1972 *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*. Volume II, *Theban Temples*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Prausnitz, Moshe W.
- 1963 Achziv. *Israel Exploration Journal* 13/4: 337–338.
- 1973 Israelite and Sidonian Burial Rites at Akhziv. In *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies, The Hebrew University*,

- Mount Scopus*, ed. Peli Pinchas and Avigdor Shin'an, 85–91.
Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies.
- 1975 Achziv. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 1, ed. Michael Avi-Yonah, 26–30. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- 1997 The Stratigraphy and Ceramic Typology of the Early Iron Age Tombs at Akhziv. *Michmanim* 11: 66*–67* [English], 17–30 [Hebrew].
- Pritchard, James
1963 *The Bronze Age Cemetery at Gibeon*. Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.
- Puech, Émile
1980 Inscriptions sur sceaux et tessons incisés. In *Tel Keisan (1971–1976) Une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, ed. Jacques Briend and Jean-Baptiste Humbert, 296–299. OBO Series Archaeologica 1. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires.
- Pulak, Cemal
1988 The Bronze Age Shipwreck at Ulu Burun, Turkey: 1985 Campaign. *American Journal of Archaeology* 92/1: 1–37.
1998 The Uluburun Shipwreck: An Overview. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 27/4: 188–224.
- Rainey, Anson
1963 A Canaanite at Ugarit. *Israel Exploration Journal* 13/1: 43–45.
1996 Who is a Canaanite? A Review of the Textual Evidence. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 1996: 1–15.
- Randall-MacIver, D., and D. Leonard Wooley
1911 *Buhen*. Eckley B. Coxe Junior Expedition to Nubia 7. Philadelphia: Published by the University Museum.
- Redford, Donald
1970 The Hyksos Invasion in History and Tradition. *Orientalia* 39: 1–51.
1971 The Earliest Years of Ramesses II, and the Building of the Ramesside Court at Luxor. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 57: 110–119.
1979 Egypt and Asia in the New Kingdom. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 10: 63–67.
1986 The Ashkelon Relief at Karnak and the Israel Stela. *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 3/4: 188–200.
1992 *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
1998 Report on the 1993 and 1997 Seasons at Tell Qedwa. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 35: 45–60.

- Reiner, Erica, and Martha Roth, ed.
 1999 *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. 14, R. Chicago, Ill.: Oriental Institute.
- Reisner, George
 1920a The Barkal Temples in 1916. The Buildings B 800 and B 900 (Continued). *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 6/4: 247–264.
 1920b The Viceroys of Ethiopia. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 6/1: 28–55.
 1920c The Viceroys of Ethiopia (Continued). *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 6/2: 73–88.
- Reisner, George A., and N. F. Wheeler
 1930 The Art of Seal Carving in Egypt in the Middle Kingdom. *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts* 28/167: 47–55.
- Reisner, George Andrew, Clarence Fisher, and David Lyon
 1924 *Harvard Excavations at Samaria. 1908–1910*. Vol. 1, *Text*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reyes, A. T.
 1991 The Stamp Seals in the Pierides Collection, Larnaca. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*: 117–128.
 2001 *The Stamp-Seals of Ancient Cyprus*. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology.
- Richards, Fiona
 1988 Preliminary Report on the Eighth and Ninth Seasons of Excavations by the University of Sydney at Pella (ṬABAQAT FAHL), 1986 and 1987. *ADAJ* 32: 148–149, pl. 24.
 1992 *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*. OBO 117. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- Ricke, Herbert, George R. Hughes, and Edward F. Wente
 1967 *The Beit el-Wali Temple of Ramesses II*. The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Roccati, Alessandro
 1972 Une Légende Égyptienne d’Anat. *Revue d’Égyptologie* 24: 152–159.
- Rothenberg, Beno
 1988 *The Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna*. London: Institute for Archaeo-Metallurgical Studies and the Institute of Archaeology, University College, London.

- Rowe, Alan
 1936 *A Catalogue of Egyptian Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals and Amulets in the Palestine Archaeological Museum*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- 1940 *The Four Canaanite Temples of Beth-Shan*. Vol. 2, Part I. *The Temples and Cult Objects*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Salje, B.
 1990 *Der 'Common Style' der Mitanni-Glyptik und die Glyptik der Levante und Zypern in der späten Bronzezeit*. Mainz: P. v. Zabern.
- Schaeffer, C. F. A.
 1931 Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra: Deuxième campagne (printemps 1930) Rapport sommaire. *Syria* 12/1: 1–14.
- 1937 Les Fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit Huitième Campagne (Printemps 1936): Rapport sommaire. *Syria* 18/2: 125–154.
- 1939 *Ugaritica Études Relatives aux Découvertes de Ras Shamra. Première Serie*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- 1966 Nouveaux témoignages du culte de El et de Baal a Ras Shamra-Ugarit et ailleurs Palestine. *Syria* 43 1/2: 1–19.
- Schaeffer, F.-A., and René Dussaud
 1929 Les Fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra (campagne du printemps 1929) Rapport sommaire. *Syria* 10/4: 285–303.
- Schaeffer-Forrer, Claude F.-A., et al.
 1983 *Corpus des cylindres-sceaux de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia*. Vol. 1. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Schlick-Nolte, Birgit, and Vera von Droste zu Hülshoff
 1990 *Ägyptische Bildwerke*. Vol. 1, *Skarabäen, Amulette und Schmuck*. Melsungen: Verlag Gutenberg.
- Schulman, A. R.
 1977 Reshef on horseback? *Newsletter of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 7/4: 13–17.
- 1979 The Winged Reshef. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 16: 69–84.
- 1984 Reshef at Zagazig: A New Document. *Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens: zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf*. Göttingen: Hubert & Co.
- 1985 The Cult Statue "Reshef, He Who Hears Prayers." *Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar* 6: 89–106.
- 1988 Catalogue of the Egyptian Finds. In *The Egyptian Mining Temple at Timna*, Vol. 1, ed. B. Rothenberg et al., 114–147. London: The Arabah Project sponsored by Stiftung Volkswagenwerk.

- Seele, Keith
 1940 *The Coregency of Ramses II with Seti I and the Date of the Great Hypostyle Hall at Karnak*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 19. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 1960 Ramesses VI and the Medinet Habu Procession of the Princes. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 19/3: 184–204.
- Sellin, Ernst
 1904 *Tell Ta'anek*. Vol. 1. Vienna: Buchhändler der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Serpico, Margaret
 2011 The Contents of Jars in Hatshepsut's Foundation Deposit at Deir el-Bahri and their Significance for Trade. In *Under the Potter's Tree: Studies on Ancient Egypt Presented to Janine Bourriau on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday*, ed. David Aston, Bettina Bader, Carla Gallorini, Paul Nicholson, and Sarah Buckingham. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters en Departement Oosterse Studies.
- Sharon, Ilan, *et al.*
 2007 Report on the First Stage of the Iron Age Dating Project in Israel: Supporting a Low Chronology. *Radiocarbon* 49: 1–46.
- Shavit, Alon
 2000 Settlement Patterns in the Ayalon Valley in the Bronze and Iron Ages. *Tel Aviv* 27: 189–230.
- Shuval, Menakhem
 1990 A Catalogue of Early Iron Stamp Seals from Israel. In *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel*. Vol. 3, *Die Frühe Eisenzeit ein Workshop*, eds. Othmar Keel, Menakhem Shuval, and Christoph Uehlinger, 67–161. OBO 100. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag.
- Simpson, William Kelly
 1960 Reshep in Egypt. *Orientalia* 29/1: 63–74.
- Singer, Itamar
 1983 Takuhlinu and Haya: Two Governors in the Ugarit Letter from Tel Aphek. *Tel Aviv* 10: 3–25.
- 1988 Merneptah's Campaign to Canaan and the Egyptian Occupation of the Southern Coastal Plain in the Ramesside Period. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 269: 1–10.
- 1993 A Hittite Signet Ring from Tel Nami. In *kinattūtu ša dārāti. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, ed. A. F. Rainey, 189–193. Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv.

- Smith, Mark S.
 2001 *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 2011 Review of *Resheph: A Syro-Canaanite Deity* by Edward Lipiński. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 362: 86–88.
- Smith, Stuart
 1998 Nubia and Egypt: Interaction, Acculturation, and Secondary State Formation from the Third to First Millennium B.C. In *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology*, ed. James Cusick, 256–287. Center for Archaeological Investigations Research Paper Series 25. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University.
 2007 Death at Tombos: Pyramids, Iron and the Rise of the Napatan Dynasty. *Sudan and Nubia* 11: 2–17.
- Spalinger, Anthony
 1979 The Northern Wars of Seti I: An Integrative Study. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 16: 29–47.
 1980 Historical Observations on the Military Reliefs of Abu Simbel and Other Ramesside Temples in Nubia. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 66: 83–99.
- Spencer, Patricia
 1997 *Amara West: The Architectural Report*. Vol. 1, (*Excavation Memoirs*). London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Spencer, Neal
 2009 Cemeteries and a Late Ramesside suburb at Amara West. *Sudan and Nubia* 13: 47–61.
 2010 Nubian Architecture in an Egyptian Town? Building E12.11 at Amara West. *Sudan and Nubia* 14: 15–25.
- Stadelmann, R.
 1967 *Syrische-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten*.
- Stager, Lawrence
 1974 El-Bouqeï'ah. *Revue Biblique* 81: 94–96.
- Stager, Lawrence, David Schloen, and Dan Master
 2008 *Ashkelon*. Vol. 1, *Introduction and Overview*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns
- Starkey, J. L., and Lankester Harding
 1932 *Beth-Pelet*. Vol. 2, Part 2, *Beth-Pelet Cemetery*. British School of Archaeology in Egypt 52. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt.

- Steindorff, Georg
 1935 *Aniba*. Vol. 1. New York: Druck von J. J. Augustin, Glückstadt.
 1936 Skarabäen mit Namen von Privatpersonen der Zeit des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs aus der Sammlung S. M. des Königs Fuad I. *Annales du Services des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Le Caire* 36: 161–186.
 1937 *Aniba*. Vol. 2. New York: Druck von J. J. Augustin, Glückstadt.
- Stern, Ephraim, ed.
 1993 *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Vols. I–IV. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Stiebing, William
 1970 Another Look at the Origins of the Philistine Tombs at Tell el-Far‘ah (S). *American Journal of Archaeology* 74/2 (1970): 139–143.
- Stock, Hanns
 1955 *Studien zur Geschichte und Archäologie der 13. bis 17. Dynastie Ägyptens. Unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung der Skarabäen dieser Zwischenzeit*. Hamburg: Verlag J. J. Augustin.
- Stos-Gale, Z. A.
 2006 Appendix A: Provenance of Metals from Tel Jatt Based on their Lead Isotope Analyses. In *Jatt Metal Hoard in Northern Canaanite/Phoenician Cypriot Context*, ed. Michal Artzy, 115–120. Barcelona: Publicaciones del Laboratorio de Arqueología Universidad Pompeu Fabra de Barcelona.
- Sweeney, Deborah
 2003 A Lion-Hunt Scarab and Other Egyptian Objects from the Late Bronze Fortress at Jaffa. *Tel Aviv* 30: 54–65.
- Teeter, Emily
 2003 *Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals, and Seal Impressions from Medinet Habu*. Chicago: Oriental Institute Publications.
- Teissier, Beatrice
 1996 *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*. OBO Series Archaeologica 11. Fribourg: University Press.
- Thomas, Elizabeth
 1966 *The Royal Necropoleis of Thebes*. Princeton: T. W. Moorman.
- Thompson, Henry
 1970 *Mekal, the God of Beth-Shan*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Thompson, Thomas
 1970 The Dating of the Megiddo Temples in Strata XV–XIV. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 86/1: 38–49.
- Tubb, Jonathan, P. G. Dorrell, and F. J. Cobbing
 1996 Interim Report of the Eighth (1995) Season of Excavations at Tell es-Sa‘idiyeh. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 128: 16–40.
- Tufnell, Olga
 1958 *Lachish*. Vol. 4, *The Bronze Age*. Plates. Oxford: The University Press.
 1973 The Middle Bronze Age Scarab-Seals from Burials on the Mound at Megiddo. *Levant* 5: 69–82.
 1975 Seal Impressions from Kahûn Town and Uronarti Fort: A Comparison. *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 61: 67–101.
 1975– Tomb 66 at Ruweise, Near Sidon. *Berytus* 24: 5–32.
 1976
 1984 *Studies on Scarab Seals*. Vols. 1 and 2, *Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium, B.C.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips LTD.
 1993 ‘Ajjul, Tell el-. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*, Vol. 1, ed. Ephraim Stern, 49–52. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and Carta.
- Tufnell, Olga, and W. A. Ward
 1966 Relations between Byblos, Egypt and Mesopotamia at the End of the Third Millennium B.C. A Study of the Montet Jar. *Syria* 43 3/4: 165–241.
- Tufnell, Olga, Charles Inge, and Lankester Harding
 1940 *Lachish*. Vol. II, *The Fosse Temple*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Tyson, Stuart, and Michelle Buzon
 2014 Colonial Entanglements: “Egyptianization” in Egypt’s Nubian Empire and the Nubian Dynasty. In *The Fourth Cataract and Beyond. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference for Nubian Studies*, ed. J. R. Anderson and D. A. Welsby, 341–442. British Museum Publications on Egypt and Sudan 1. Leuven: Peeters.
- Uehlinger, Christoph
 1988 Der Amun-Tempel Ramesses’ III. in *pꜥ-knꜥn*, seine südpalästinischen Tempelgüter und der Übergang von der Ägypter- zur Philisterherrschaft: ein Hinweis auf einige wenig beachtete Skarabäen. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 104: 6–25.
- Ussishkin, David, ed.
 1974 Tombs from the Israelite Period at Tel ‘Eton. *Tel Aviv* 1/3: 109–110.

- 1978 Excavations at Tel Lachish—1973–1977. Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 5/1–2: 1–97.
- 1983 Excavations at Tel Lachish: Second Preliminary Report. *Tel Aviv* 10: 97–175.
- 1985 Level VII and VI at Tel Lachish and the End of the Late Bronze Age in Canaan. In *Palestine in the Bronze and Iron Ages*, ed. Jonathon Tubb, 213–230. London: The University of London, Institute of Archaeology.
- 2004 *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)*. Vol. 1, *Introduction*. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Uziel, Joe, and Aren Maier
- 2005 Scratching the Surface at Gath: Implications of the Tell eṣ-Ṣafī/Gath Surface Survey. *Tel Aviv* 32: 50–75.
- Van Beek, Gus W.
- 1989 W. F. Albright's Contribution to Archaeology. In *The Scholarship of William Foxwell Albright*, Gus Van Beek (ed.), 61–73. Harvard Semitic Series 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Van der Steen, Eveline
- 1996 The Central East Jordan Valley in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 302: 51–74.
- te Velde, H.
- 1967 *Seth, ou la divine confusion. Une étude de son rôle dans la mythologie et la religion Égyptiennes*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- 1977 *Seth, God of Confusion. A Study of his Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wace, A. J. B., and Edith Porada
- 1957 Mycenae 1939–1956, 1957: Part II. A Faience Cylinder. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 52: 197–204.
- Waldbaum, Jane
- 1966 Philistine Tombs at Tell Fara and their Aegean Prototypes. *American Journal of Archaeology* 70/4: 331–340.
- Ward, John
- 1902 *The Sacred Beetle. A Popular Treatise on Egyptian Scarabs in Art and History*. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street.
- Ward, William
- 1978a *Studies on Scarab Seals*. Vol. 1, *Pre-12th Dynasty Scarab Amulets*. Warmister, England: Aris and Phillips.

- 1978b *Studies on Scarab Seals*. Vol. 2, *Scarab Seals and their Contribution to History in the Early Second Millennium B.C.* Warminster, England: Aris and Phillips.
- 1987 Scarab Typology and Archaeological Context. *American Journal of Archaeology* 91/4 (1987): 507–532.
- Ward, William, and William Dever
- 1994 *Studies on Scarab Seals*. Vol. 3, *Scarab Typology and Archaeological Context*. San Antonio: Van Siclen Books.
- Weill, Raymond
- 1918 La fin due moyen empire égyptien; étude sur les monuments et l’histoire entre la XII^E et la XVIII^E dynastie. 2 Vols. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Weinstein, James
- 1973 Foundation Deposits in Ancient Egypt. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- 1980 Was Tell Abu-Hawam a 19th-Century Egyptian Naval Base? *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 238: 43–46.
- 1981 The Egyptian Empire in Palestine: A Reassessment. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 241: 1–28.
- 1996 Review: A Wolf in Sheep’s Clothing: How the High Chronology Became the Middle Chronology. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 304: 55–63.
- Weippert, H., and M. Weippert
- 1976 Jericho in der Eisenzeit. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palastina-Vereins* 92: 105–148.
- Welsby, Derek
- 2001 Nubia. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, Vol. 2, ed. Donald Redford, 551–557. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welsby, Derek, and Julie Anderson
- 2004 Sudan: Ancient Treasures. An Exhibition of Recent Discoveries from the Sudan National Museum. London: The British Museum Press.
- Wiese, André
- 1990 *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 96. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag.
- Wilkinson, Richard
- 2011 The UAEE Excavations. In *The Temple of Tausret: the University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition Tausret Temple Project*, ed. Richard Wilkinson, 33–52. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Egyptian Expedition.

Williams, Bruce

- 1983 *C-Group, Pan Grave, and Kerma Remains at Adindan Cemeteries T, K, U, and J*. Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition V. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- 1992 *New Kingdom Remains from Cemeteries R, V, S, and W at Qustul and Cemetery K at Adindan*. Oriental Institute in Nubia 6. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- 1993 *Excavations at Serra East. Parts 1–5, A-Group, C-Group, Pan Grave, New Kingdom, and X-Group Remains from Cemeteries A–G and Rock Shelters*. Oriental Institute Nubian Expedition 10. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Wimmer, Stefan Jakob

- 2002 A New Steal of Ramesses II in Jordan in the Context of Egyptian Royal Stelae in the Levant. Third International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East (3ICAANE), Paris, April 18. Retrieved from http://www/stefan-jakob-wimmer.de/3ICAANE_wimmer.pdf on December 30, 2014.
- 2008 A New Hieratic Ostrakon from Ashkelon. *Tel Aviv* 35: 65–72.

Winter, Irene

- 1989 North Syrian Ivories and Tell Halaf Reliefs: The Impact of Luxury Goods upon “Major” Arts. In *Essays in Ancient Civilization Presented to Helene J. Kantor*, ed. Albert Leonard, Jr., and Bruce Williams, 321–337. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Wolff, Sam

- 1994 Archaeology in Israel. *AJA* 98: 481–519.
- 1998 An Iron Age I Site at ‘En Ḥagit (northern Ramat Manashe). In *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. Thirteenth to Early Tenth Centuries BCE*, ed. Seymour Gitin, Amihai Mazar and Ephraim Stern, 449–454.
- 2008 ‘En Ḥagit. In *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. Vol. 5, *Supplementary Volume*, ed. Ephraim Stern, Hillel Geva, and Joseph Aviram, 1726–1727. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- 2014 Review of *El-Ahwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age Near Nahal ‘Iron, Israel: Excavations 1993–2000* (Leiden: Brill, 2012). In *Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 32: 172–174.

Wreszinski, W.

- 1935 *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte, II*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

- Wright, G. Ernest
 1940 Epic of Conquest. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 3/3: 25–40.
 1941 Archaeological Observations on the Period of the Judges and the Early Monarchy. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 60/1: 27–42.
 1962 Selected Seals from the Excavations at Balâtah (Shechem). *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 167: 5–13.
- Wyatt, Nicolas
 1983 The Stela of the Seated God from Ugarit. *Ugarit Forschungen* 15: 271–277.
- Wysocki, Z.
 1985 The Temple of Queen Hatshepsut at Deir el-Bahri: The Results of Analysis and Studies on the Meaning of the Lines Retained on the South Revetment of the Middle Courtyard Terrace. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Abteilung Kairo* 41: 293–307.
- Yadin, Yigael, *et al.*
 1958 *Hazor*. Vol. 1, *An Account of the First Season of Excavations, 1955*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Yannai, Eli
 1996 A New Approach to Levels VI–V at Tel Beth-Shan. *Tel Aviv* 23: 185–194.
 2000 A Re-evaluation of the Late Bronze Pottery from Tel Şippor. *Israel Exploration Journal* 50 3/4: 203–215.
- Yeivin, Shemuel
 1961 *First Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Tel Gat (Tell Sheykh 'Ahmed el-'Areyny). Seasons 1956–1958*. Jerusalem: The Gat Expedition.
- Yon, Marguerite, and Jacqueline Gachet
 1989 Une statuette du dieu El à Ougarit. *Syria* 66 1/4: 349.
- Yon, Marguerite, Jacqueline Gachet, P. Lombard, and J. Mallet
 1990 Fouilles de la 48e champagne (1988) à Ras Shamra-Ougarit. *Syria* 67/1: 1–29.
- Yoyotte, Jean
 1962 Un souvenir du “Pharaon” Taousert en Jordanie. *Vetus Testamentum* 12/4: 464–469.
- Yurco, Frank
 1978 Merneptah’s Palestinian Campaign. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 8: 70.

Zertal, Adam (ed.)

- 1984 Khirbet el-Ḥammam–1982. *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 2: 39–41.
- 1985 Khirbet el-Ḥammam (Narbata)–1984. *Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 3: 38–39.
- 1986 An Early Iron Age Cultic Site on Mount Ebal: Excavation Seasons 1982–1987. *Tel Aviv* 13–14: 105–165.
- 1991 Following the Pottery Trail–Israel Enters Canaan. *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17/5: 28–47.
- 1994 ‘To the Land of the Perizites and the Giants’: On the Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country of Manasseh. In *From Nomadism to Monarchy: Archaeological and Historical Aspects of Early Israel*, eds. Nadav Na’aman and Israel Finkelstein, 47–70. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- 1995 Three Iron Age Fortresses in the Jordan Valley and the Origin of the Ammonite Circular Towers. *Israel Exploration Journal* 45 (1995): 253–273.
- 2002 Philistine Kin Found in Early Israel. *Biblical Archaeology Review* 28/3: 18–31; 60–61.
- 2004 *The Manasseh Hill Country Survey*. Boston: Brill.
- 2012 *El-Ahwat, A Fortified Site from the Early Iron Age Near Nahal ‘Iron, Israel. Excavations 1993–2000*. Leiden: Brill.

Laura Wright was born on August, 29, 1978, in Columbia, Missouri. She obtained her doctorate after receiving a Master of Divinity and Master of Theology from Princeton Theological Seminary in 2004 and 2005, respectively, and a bachelor's degree in Classical Studies at the University of Missouri, Columbia. She has excavated with the Harvard Semitic Museum at the Leon Levy Expedition to Ashkelon from 2007 to 2016 as a Square and Grid Supervisor. After graduation, she will continue as faculty at Luther College.