
The Use of Ivories as Interpreters of Political History

Author(s): Christine Lilyquist

Source: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 310 (May, 1998), pp. 25-33

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of The American Schools of Oriental Research

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1357575>

Accessed: 08-10-2019 10:59 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

The American Schools of Oriental Research, The University of Chicago Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research

The Use of Ivories as Interpreters of Political History

CHRISTINE LILYQUIST

Wallace Curatorship in Egyptology
The Metropolitan Museum of Art
1000 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10028-0198
lilquist@interport.net

The hypothesis that art can illuminate Late Bronze Age political connections between Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean is questioned and ultimately rejected as premature, due to the lack of absolute chronology as well as agreement on the dating and categorization of individual objects and object types. It is argued that more agreement about the cultural characteristics displayed by art must be present before political history can be written from it.

In the recently published proceedings of the William F. Albright Conference of 1991, which sought to “chart the course of ancient Near Eastern studies in the century to come” (Cooper and Schwartz 1996: 1), Betsy Bryan argues that extant Late Bronze Age texts and material culture do not indicate long-term *Egyptian* administrative presence in Palestine but rather *local* activity that Egypt used to maintain “trade within Canaan, but particularly with Syria and beyond” (Bryan 1996: 46). While Bryan sees evidence of strong connections between Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean during late Dynasty 18, she believes this connection waned in the later LB II, Dynasties 19–20 (p. 47). She goes further, proposing that particular luxury objects found in Syria–Palestine—i.e., “ivories”—support her reading from extant textual and archaeological evidence.

As an Egyptologist working with material culture, I am concerned by the amount of direct influence or control in the eastern Mediterranean ascribed to Egypt. I rarely see items that “look” to be first-rate Egyptian pieces as I examine objects excavated in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, or Israel. On the other hand, many objects found in those areas are perceived as “Egyptian” by scholars. Are they lesser quality items that were exported from Egypt, items made in the Levant but imitating Egyptian objects, or even items, styles, and iconographies created in the Levant but adopted by Egypt?

Before exploring this and other art- and object-related questions, however, I wish to point out two

textual items that should not be left out of future discussions of Late Bronze Age Egyptian presence in the eastern Mediterranean.

The first relates to Bryan’s statement that there is a lack of evidence for Amarna and Ramesside period “overseers of northern countries” in the Levant (pp. 42–43)—that their extant monuments are found only in Egypt. There is a Tuthmoside scribe statuette in the British Museum that represents an “overseer of northern foreign countries,” Djehuty (Lilyquist 1988: 15–16). This sculpture was purchased in the Levant, and its surface has deposits [calcareous?] of a type I have seen on objects from Sidon and Tyre. It mentions annual contributions; it invokes Hathor, Lady of Byblos; and its scribal pose would have been appropriate in a temple. Yoyotte suggested that the statuette had been set up in a temple at Byblos and that a specific area of Retenu could be meant in the inscription (Yoyotte 1981). Other Tuthmoside monuments naming an “overseer of northern countries and of troops” (found in Egypt, apparently in a tomb at Saqqara) must refer to the same person (Lilyquist 1988). It is also possible that the 19th Dynasty tale of Joppa describes that person; the hero of the tale had a wife and children with him in Retenu during the reign of Tuthmosis III.

The second textual item regards Bryan’s statement that there is little or no infrastructure known from the eastern Mediterranean (pp. 42–43). A hard stone jar found in 1978 in the “*Schatzhaus*” at Kamid el-Loz was inscribed for a mayor (*ḥ3ty-ḥ*)

named Ra-user (Lilyquist 1994: 217). I think it possible that this jar belonged to the inhabitant of the "Schatzhaus," a local official in LB I/II (Hachmann 1996) who used an Egyptian name and title. (Note the parallel in the very early Dynasty 18 grave at Aniba with the locally made Late Minoan alabaster, as described in Lilyquist 1994: 217). The jar with its contents and the Djehuty statue should be part of political discussions.

AN ALTERNATE APPROACH

We turn now to the ivories and what they may or may not be able to contribute to the political history of the Late Bronze Age. (The term "ivory" is used generically by Bryan for bone, hippopotamus, and elephant ivory; "Levant" is used for Palestine and coastal Syria.) How far can ancient art be used to illuminate politics and history? If art has a cultural value separate from text (p. 36), a "unique ability to reflect ancient cultural notions" (p. 35), can we presume—for objects found outside Egypt—that "the more precise the Egyptian elements are, the more direct the influence" (p. 48)? Can an object "participate with authority in the discussion of Levantine [political] history" (pp. 36–37)? I.e., do "Levantine" ivories of late Dynasty 18 indicate strong Egyptian political influence but ivories of the Ramesside period less influence (pp. 47–48)?

Bryan divides Palestinian and coastal Syrian ivories into three groups.

1. *Egyptian-style*. These are the items Bryan considers copies of Egyptian originals. She dates the following categories generally to the second half of Dynasty 18 (1444–1295 B.C.E., starting the New Kingdom at 1550), but primarily to the 14th century: duck boxes, pins, containers, inlays, small animals and insects, and figurine faces. A few Egyptian-style ivories are also ascribed to Dynasty 19 (1295–1187 B.C.E.): spoons, stool legs or harp heads, and gameboards. The various objects have been found at Kamid el-Loz, Alalakh, Lachish, and Megiddo. "Egyptian-style" also covers the Gezer "sundial" with Merenptah cartouche (1213–1204 B.C.E.), the Megiddo palette (assigned to Dynasty 20, time of Ramesses III, 1185–1154 B.C.E.), and Megiddo box plaques (assigned to Dynasty 20, 1187–1069 B.C.E.).
2. *Egyptianizing*. The Levantine ivories in the second of Bryan's categories "combine Egyptian

motifs and techniques with local or other foreign influences," (p. 60) to use "Egyptian symbolism for the local elites." They include the Ras Shamra bed panels (late 13th century, n. 145); the ivory Megiddo openwork panels (late 13th–12th century, pp. 56, 72–73); and the Far'ah incised plaque (12th century). This "Egyptianizing" phenomenon is compared to that which produced Middle Kingdom jewelry at Byblos, and also covers nonivory items from Late Bronze Ras Shamra, including the gold bowl with chariot, late 15th century B.C.E., the bronze Osiris, and Niqmadu vessel sherd, both late 14th century.

3. *Multicultural*. This term is applied to ivories that "have stylistic and iconographic points in common with ivories known from several east Mediterranean locations, including Egypt" (p. 49). The incised Megiddo plaque (13th–12th centuries) is assigned here.

Bryan appoints the greatest number of Levantine ivories to the first of her three categories, a distribution that matches her interpretation of texts and archaeological material. The ivories so assigned show a high point of Egyptian influence at the time of the Amarna letters and somewhat of a resurgence of Egyptian influence in the early 12th century (Dynasty 20).

While I am not a specialist in ivories, I see them as representative of a wide-ranging phenomenon relevant to the interpretation of ancient cultural remains. I focus here on Bryan's paper because it is the most recent in the series of studies of east Mediterranean ivories including those by Kantor (1956), Smith (1965), Barnett (1982), Liebowitz (1987), and Markoe (1990) (I have not seen Matthiae 1962), and because Bryan attempts to bring the study of ancient art out of the vague cultural "interconnections" realm into that of history.

The first problem I see with Bryan's program is chronology. The use of cultural—albeit artistic—material for historical interpretation requires sure dating. However, no absolute chronology exists for linguists and archaeologists, nor is there agreement among archaeologists on the dating of individual art objects. For example, I find Bryan's Egyptian parallels for dress and furniture on the Far'ah plaque relevant and agree that it, the Megiddo pen case, and Megiddo box fragments would be 12th century in Egyptian terms, and that the Megiddo inlay with Ahiram sarcophagus "overtone" would be later.

But I do not agree that the Qau ivories are 18th Dynasty Egyptian (n. 127),¹ nor that roughly 75 of 382 ivories in the Megiddo Treasury that Bryan considers Egyptian-style relate to Dynasty 18 (n. 112).² I consider them mainly Canaanite (as Barnett 1982: 25–28) and would put a good many of them (including the openwork plaques)³ into Dynasty 19, a few into Dynasty 20 *if* we are to judge by Egyptian items.⁴ On the other hand, I would not date the Ras Shamra bed panels ca. 1200 B.C.E., but rather no later than 1300, again assuming that we should date them by Egyptian objects (following the 14th century date suggested by Kantor 1956: 168; Smith 1965: 33; Barnett 1982: 29–30; and Matthiae 1962: 88–89).⁵ Other Palestinian luxury groups I would assign primarily to the Ramesside period are from Aphek (Kochavi 1993; see Lilyquist, in press) and Deir el-Balah (Bryan n. 81).⁶

It is also possible to cite yet another perspective on dating, that of A. Caubet of the Ras Shamra and Kition excavations (personal communication, 22 April 1997). Stating that the Late Bronze Age Ras Shamra palace was first destroyed ca. 1370/1350 B.C.E. and the second ca. 1180, Caubet places virtually all luxury goods found at the site in that 140 year period (ca. 1320–1180 B.C.E.). The objects would not be heirlooms, but contemporary with the local pottery at destruction. The two gold bowls (“stray finds”) would be 13th century, and the ivory group (bed panels, head, table top and legs)—“in use in the second palace”—late 13th or early 12th century. To the 13th–12th centuries she would assign Ras Shamra duck containers (such as those at Kamid el-Loz, Lachish, and Megiddo) as well as all Megiddo Treasury ivories, with the exception of the inscribed Egyptian examples. The latter would be 12th century, as the Minet el-Beida pyxis. All of the above-mentioned ivories, in Caubet’s view, belong to a homogeneous Syro-Palestinian group. The only exception at Megiddo would be the “Anatolian” ivory (Loud 1939: no. 44), from a probable Anatolian–North Syrian center. To the 140-year period ca. 1320–1180 B.C.E. at Ras Shamra, she would also assign stone vessels from the Rhyta Temple (Caubet 1991: 217, 241–44), “in use” ca. 1180.⁷

However, just as there are different opinions on the dating of objects,⁸ there are different categorizations of styles—“Egyptian” versus “Canaanite,” “Syrian,” or “Palestinian.” An example is the cosmetic duck dish that Bryan considers “one of the most distinctively Egyptian objects” (p. 50). She

sees the Kamid el-Loz examples with backward-turned heads as Egyptian reflections, “faithful, but technically inferior . . . [copies of] Egyptian wood models” (p. 49). Alalakh is said to have yielded “excellent ivory examples of Egyptian style,” (p. 50, n. 82, referring to Woolley 1955: pls. 75–77) and the examples from there, Megiddo, and Ras Shamra “made in imitation of Egyptian boxes at about the same times as the originals that inspired them” (pp. 52–53).

In my view, there is a difference between passive (dead, trussed, sleeping, or resting) and active waterfowl (birds with head up, oriented frontally or turned back; see Adler 1996 for a detailed discussion). For “head up” or “turned back” examples, nothing in Egypt can be dated earlier than examples in the eastern Mediterranean, and those in Egypt are objectively later.⁹ The “turned back” examples are certainly more plentiful outside Egypt, and their vibrant style is more at home in the Levant.¹⁰ Rather than seeing the “active” duck containers as poor Egyptian imitations, I see them as Canaanite originals, with the largest example from Kamid el-Loz (Hachmann 1983: 83) being of the highest Syrian quality.¹¹ These are the goods (of Megiddo, Kamid el-Loz, Sidon, Alalakh, Ras Shamra)¹² that the Egyptians wanted in the New Kingdom, and that they imitated or could have had fabricated by Canaanite craftsmen newly resident in Egypt during Dynasty 18, those emigrants no doubt inspired by the interchange of cultures.

I have come to this position as a result of studying motifs (such as the “lily” or “sedge”; “lotus and bud chain”), technologies (granulation, vitreous materials), and shapes and materials (stone vases) of the period (Lilyquist 1988; 1993a; 1993b; 1995; 1996; Lilyquist, in press; Lilyquist and Brill 1993).¹³ Granted, the fact that we have no absolute chronology or comparable climatic conditions hinders the Levantine side. But enough examples are traceable to the Levant to make it necessary to stop considering early occurrences of “Egyptian” motifs outside Egypt automatically anachronistic. In other words, the arts of Egypt were themselves transformed during the New Kingdom; and the reasons for this must primarily have been the stimulating contacts Egypt had with Nubia, the Near East, and Aegean. Egypt had a strong sense of style, a system of royal workshops that turned out goods of equal or higher quality than any other ancient culture, an ability to absorb emigrants as “Egyptian” in name and representation,

and a climate helpful for preserving objects. Egypt also handed down a chronology from written records. But these factors do not mean that the ideas for all items made in Egypt (particularly nonmonumental ones) originated there (or that all objects made in Egypt were made by native Egyptians, especially by the time of the New Kingdom).

Other examples of areas where I do not agree with Bryan that a motif or type was created in Egypt are: the chariot rider on the Ras Shamra bowl in the Louvre (p. 60);¹⁴ the circular box type (p. 55);¹⁵ gameboards with desert animal motifs (pp. 54, 56, cf. Lilyquist 1994: 216; Barnett 1982: 25);¹⁶ round lids with rosettes (p. 55); the proportions and arrangement of figures in the Megiddo plaque (p. 75, fig. 18); a ski-slope forehead and nose (p. 75, "Ramesside"); a female suckling two figures (p. 69; Smith 1965: fig. 57).

I do agree that the collar and kilt on the seated bronze from Ras Shamra (p. 60) look Egyptian (without "uraeus" iconography, however), but another complicating factor introduces itself here. A head-dress with feathers similar to that of Osiris appears in Syrian iconography at least by MB IIC (at Ebla; Scandone Matthiae 1991: fig. 1), and the body pose of the Ras Shamra bronze is Near Eastern: how closely need the Late Bronze Levantine metalworker have looked at an Egyptian model when he made the bronze?¹⁶

Another example is the Far'ah plaque (Bryan 1996: fig. 9), which I believe would be better termed "Canaanite" than "Egyptianizing." Certainly the dress and pose of the principal subject and the woman before him are Egyptian, the figures are thin, and the swamp scene has antecedents in Egyptian tomb painting. But the plaque displays a distinct liveliness, and a number of features are local inventions; these are the spectator at the funerary banquet with folded hands, the duck bearer with springy step, the herdsman carrying a full-scale bull, the trappers with taut poses, and the overlapping bulls in a papyrus thicket. Swamp scenes with musicians indeed appear on minor arts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period, but I doubt that they can be found in Egypt any earlier than in the Levant. In other words, at what point does a motif, a style, a shape take on a life of its own in the culture to which it migrated? (This is the "flip" side of the question, "to what extent did motifs we categorize as Egyptian originate abroad?") At what point do true Egyptian motifs and styles become Levantine?

If, then, there are different judgments of style as well as date, different assessments of iconographical meaning are bound to emerge. For example, the new ivories from Ebla (Matthiae 1989: pl. 8; Scandone Matthiae 1990; 1991) display as pure an Egyptian iconography as anything in Late Bronze Palestine, more pure than anything at Middle Bronze Byblos. Does this mean that Ebla was under Egyptian political control? In my view, no; almost all objects from there—and from contemporary Byblos—are Syro-Canaanite (Lilyquist 1993: 38–47), as are the many seals with Egyptian symbols from Syria–Palestine of the period. The Palestinian site of Nahal Sorek (el-Jisr)—closer to Egypt than Ebla and Byblos—has ivories with less "Egyptian" iconography (two kilts and a Thueris figure [Ory 1946: pl. 14; Amiran 1977: figs. 1–7]), and more similarity with bone and mica plaques from Kerma, an independent African kingdom. And what about Pella, or still-to-be-discovered sites in the Yarmouk Valley? Does Pella's LB I ivory box with a winged disk, djed-columns, and papyrus bouquets (Potts 1987) equate either with political control or an understanding of iconography?¹⁷ Do the Tell ed-Daba paintings mean political Minoan control? Is the reason behind the many royal-name objects in Palestine, including the new ivory sculpture of Merenptah at Ekron (Gitin 1997: 101, fig. 23), or Ugarit's request after it fell to Hatti for a statue of Merenptah (Lackenbacher 1995) emulation, political maneuvering, or something else?¹⁸

One way to look for iconographic and political understanding is to consider methods of transfer. If artisans of the eastern Mediterranean became acquainted with Egyptian iconography and style through small, portable objects that could have been royal or administrative gifts or private items of trade, who was at hand to tell the artisans or owners what this iconography meant? A resident long-term Egyptian population in the eastern Mediterranean controlling artistic production, along with the desire of the local populace to follow it, are not suggested by the style and technology of eastern Mediterranean objects. The artist who carved the *Stabstrauss* of the Megiddo plaques (Loud 1939: nos. 27–29) does not appear to have understood the organic origin of what he carved; would a patron understand the arm pose of the sphinx any better? The uncertainty of knowing what the Levantine artisan/owner thought is one reason the Bes image on the Megiddo plaques is difficult to date

(Bryan finds Ramesside parallels, p. 72). In Egypt, a dancing Bes with knife, snake, and s^3 -symbol (features of the Megiddo plaques) can be later Dynasty 18 (CG 51110, 51113; Romano 1989: nos. 87, 90) or Dynasty 18–Ramesside (Romano 1989: nos. 152–53, 194). But a well-preserved example was excavated at Kition in a 12th-century context (Romano 1989: no. 174) and the wings on the Egyptian and Levantine Bes figures have been ascribed to the Levant (Wilson 1975, as cited by Romano 1989: no. 82).

Another way to approach understanding is through technical and analytic studies. It is now clear, for example, that ivory carving (Caubet and Poplin 1987) and vitreous technology (McGovern 1986) were local Canaanite industries. Pottery studies at Tell Hebua (a fortress at the eastern edge of the Suez Canal) and Serabit el-Khadem (the long-standing mining center in central Sinai) indicate that some ties to the Nile Valley were strong in Dynasties 12 and 18 (the wares include visually identified Nile silt fabric) but weak in Dynasties 13–17 (Seiler 1997; Bourriau 1997). How far into the eastern Mediterranean does this picture continue? We need analyses.

CONCLUSIONS

I suspect that some of the similarity in the material cultures of Egypt and the Levant can be attributed less to “Empire” than to an integration of culture and extraofficial modalities. For the Middle Bronze Age, D. Ben-Tor suggested that “Egyptian” objects occurred in Canaan simply because of the “close contacts between the Asiatics living in the Delta region and their kin living [in Canaan]” (Ben-Tor 1994: 11). During the Ramesside period, the use of West Semitic words in Egypt was at an all time high (Hoch 1994: 460–77); and Schulman (1976; 1986) found evidence there of a political role abroad for “royal butlers” of non-Egyptian origin. We should consider how much interchange occurred on a quasi-official or informal basis.

My current analysis of “Egyptian” material culture from extant remains in the eastern Mediterranean is as follows:

- “Egyptianizing” style is quasi-international; it contains some true Egyptian iconography but is often used without understanding.

- Makers and owners of “Egyptian” or “Egyptianizing” objects in the eastern Mediterranean are mainly local.
- There is less dependence on Egypt during Dynasty 18 for objects from Syria–Palestine than there is a participation in an international style to which Egypt contributed, along with Babylonia and Assyria (the period of Amenhotep III–Tutankhamun was the high point of this style; Bryan 1996: 56, n. 113 alludes to this) and certainly Cyprus (Poursat 1973; Rehak and Younger, in press). The naturalism, finish, and quality materials of Syrian art play a large role in this style, as do the technological inventions and effects of the entire Near East (vitreous, wood- and metal-working).
- There is a high degree of homogeneity between Egypt and Palestine in the Ramesside period, when both areas suffer artistic decline (Egypt’s can be seen in the kohl tube and box cited, Bryan 1996: 59).

These are current judgments, subject to change as more precise dating is extracted from Egyptian and eastern Mediterranean objects and as their cultural character is better defined. Indeed, attributing cultural characteristics correctly (without short-changing the superpowers *or* the lesser polities) is a focus in first millennium studies now, whether it concerns Assyria (Bienkowski 1997) or Greece (Waldbaum 1997). On the problem in general, Sherratt and Sherratt recently wrote (1997: 45) the following:

“... the ancient Mediterranean civilizations co-evolved, and provided the conditions for each others’ existence. This does not mean that all played the same role. The initiative for change often came from the older-established urban areas at the centre of the system of interacting cultures. Yet if cores create peripheries, peripheries also create cores: this is radically different from simplistic diffusionism. Moreover, peripheries grow up into competing cores (with their own, new peripheries), so that the topology is constantly changing, and creating interstices within which new roles can emerge.”

In short, the questions of “Egyptian” vs. “Egyptianizing” and of Mediterranean invention must be sorted out through close study of objects before history can be written by art.

NOTES

¹It is true that simple ivories like those in a Dynasty 18 context at El Amrah (as cited in Brunton 1930: 18–20) are present, but many Qau and Matmar deposit objects (Brunton 1948: 65–67) are more highly developed; and it is doubtful that the double-column kohl tubes flanking a nude frontal female, and the use of convolulus, are Dynasty 18 features. Furthermore, these large deposits of hippopotamus ivory in Middle Egypt have foreign overtones, as exhibited by Aegeanlike animal scenes and Near Eastern criss-cross hatching and decorative drill work, as well as by animal scenes with Cypriot or eastern Mediterranean style. At best, some of the women are reminiscent of those on first millennium Levantine and Mesopotamian ivories.

²On the possibility of styles coexisting even in Egypt, see Lilyquist 1993b.

³One sphinx representation that should be clarified is that ascribed to Hatshepsut by Montet (1937: 173–74) and cited by others. The reference goes back to Prisse and Marchandon 1879: 411, Atlas pl. 35.4 (“Sculpture”), but it is clear that the “Hathsepsut” identification was Prisse’s, and not made by an inscription. The box on which the representation appears was in the Abbott collection in Prisse’s day, but did not arrive with the collection in 1937 at the Brooklyn Museum of Art (R. Fazzini, personal communication, 3 May 1997).

⁴Features I would consider Ramesseid are the elongated palm capitals (Loud 1939: nos. 133–35), long wig and thin body of no. 173, linear patterning of nos. 45–53 and 202–9, plumes and floral complexity of nos. 166–67.

⁵My judgment is based on the large rounded heads with prognathic profiles and almond-shaped eyes, the wigs, naturalistic animals, and simple floral stands. The tomb of Userhet (TT 51, time of Sety I [Davies 1927]) shows some of this style—note the thin bodies and limbs—but in Egypt, I do not know it at 1200 B.C.E., Bryan’s date.

⁶The stone chalice, scarabs, and wine set are Ramesseid and the mirror could be; the excavators also found 13th century parallels (Dothan 1979).

⁷While some of the vessel fragments in or near the Rhyta Temple may be 12th century, I do not believe they are typologically the same as vases found in tombs and elsewhere on the site (for example Margueron 1977), and therefore would not date the latter by the former.

⁸Examples from Syria that I would assign to the 14th century B.C.E. are the rounded gold bowl from Ras Shamra, the bed panels and ivory head, and the majority of stone vessels, *contra* Caubet (personal communication). Gameboards with incised animals, duck boxes, and spoons occur in the 15th century (for incised bone plaques from an LC IA tomb at Toumba tou Skourou, see Vermeule and Wolsky 1990: 332–33, 396, fig. 118); the Ras Shamra flat gold bowl with four-spoked wheel also would fit in the 15th century B.C.E.

⁹I accept a MB II date for the example in Tomb 24 at Megiddo and a LB I date for the example in Tomb 855

(cf. Liebowitz 1987: 5, 14). The excavators specifically state that the example in Tomb 24 was with Hyksos scarabs and Tell el-Yahudiyeh pottery in a “heavily compacted matrix . . . before the LB II occupation” (Guy and Engberg 1938: 48–50). John Larson, custodian of the Megiddo records, now calls my attention to Clarence Fisher’s more detailed description, which leaves no doubt that the duck was found in a layer “as hard as rock” (Fisher 1929: 47–48). The field records are presently inaccessible, but Larson doubts that “any surviving field records” will contradict the information of Guy and Engberg (1938), and Fisher (1929) (J. Larson, personal communication, 9 April 1997).

¹⁰The backward-turned head occurs rarely in the Egyptian-excavated “living waterfowl” vessels (only at Saqqara: I have not examined that object but would not be surprised if it were traced to Syria). Barnett (1982: 26), and possibly Liebowitz (1987: 14), also saw these containers as non-Egyptian. A water bird that actually carries young on its back is rare (Adler 1996: 64–65) and is known to nest in Europe.

¹¹One can find duck representations and hieroglyphs in Egypt, and the box with backturned head is depicted in Kenamun’s tomb, time of Amenhotep II. But in my view, that depiction either shows an import or an Egyptian-made object of Syrian style. The bodies of the Syria–Palestine fowl are thin and the heads often large (as Bryan, p. 49), but I doubt that equates with their being incompetent imitations of Egyptian models.

¹²I disagree that the Megiddo objects (Bryan 1996: 52 [n. 93], 53), referring to Guy and Engberg (1938: pls. 104, 142) are the finest Levantine examples, although OI A22568 (Loud 1948: pl. 245: 23) is of very high quality.

¹³For example, Smith (1969: 281) noted almost 30 years ago that Byblos and Kerma each had similar “Egyptian material,” and “material influenced by Egypt” that was rare in Egypt itself.

¹⁴The motif is the same as that in Userhet’s tomb (TT 56; Lange and Hirmer 1961: pl. 141), but the effect, orchestrated by the rounded format, is totally different. Hunts from wheeled vehicles do not appear earlier in Egypt than in the Near East: the motif need not be Egyptian.

¹⁵There is a well-dated example from Egypt in the time of Hatshepsut (Lilyquist 1994: 215), but I do not consider the shape nor the use of a compass on that example to be traditionally Egyptian.

¹⁶Hansen (1969: 284) suggests that Middle Bronze Age Byblos metal figurines were sometimes the result of grafting “Egyptian iconographic and stylistic features onto something quite un-Egyptian.”

¹⁷The box generally has an Anatolian tone to me, *contra* Potts 1987; cf. Harper 1969.

¹⁸On evidence of the Syrian Bay at Ugarit, see Yon 1992: 119–20.

REFERENCES

- Adler, W.
1996 Die Spätbronzezeitlichen Pyxiden in Gestalt von Wasservögeln. Pp. 27–117 in *Kāmid el-Lōz*, vol. 16: 'Schatzhaus'-Studien, ed. R. Hachmann. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 59. Bonn: Habelt.
- Amiran, R.
1977 The Ivory Inlays from the Tomb at El-Jisir Reconsidered. *Israel Museum News* 12: 65–69.
- Barnett, R. D.
1982 *Ancient Ivories in the Middle East and Adjacent Countries*. Qedem 14. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Ben-Tor, D.
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.
- Bienkowski, P.
1997 Transjordan and Assyria. *ASOR Newsletter* 47, no. 2: A-23.
- Bourriau, J.
1996 Observations on the Pottery from Serabit el-Khadim (Zone Sud). Pp. 19–32 in *Sociétés urbaines en Égypte et au Soudan*. Cahier de recherches l'Institut de papyrologie et d'égyptologie de Lille 18. Lille: Université Charles-de-Gaulle—Lille III.
1997 Second Intermediate Period—New Kingdom in North Sinai. *Cahiers de céramique égyptiennes* 5: 137–39.
- Brunton, G.
1930 *Qau and Badari III*. Publications of the Egyptian Research Account and British School of Archaeology in Egypt 50. London: Quaritch.
1948 *Matmar*. London: Quaritch.
- Bryan, B. M.
1996 Art, Empire, and the End of the Late Bronze Age. Pp. 33–79 in *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference*, eds. J. S. Cooper and G. M. Schwartz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Caubet, A.
1991 Répertoire de la vaisselle de pierre, Ougarit 1929–1988. Pp. 205–64 in *Arts et industries de la pierre*, ed. M. Yon. Ras Shamra–Ougarit 6. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations.
- Caubet, A., and Poplin, F.
1987 Les objets de matière dure animal: étude du matériau. Pp. 273–306 in *Le centre de la ville: 38e–44e campagnes (1978–1984)*, ed. M. Yon. Ras Shamra–Ougarit 3. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations.
- Cooper, J. S., and Schwartz, G. M., eds.
1996 *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Davies, N. de G.
1927 *Two Ramesside Tombs at Thebes*. Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition; Robb de Peyster Tytus Memorial Series 5. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Dothan, T.
1979 *Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah*. Qedem 10. Jerusalem: Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Fisher, C. S.
1929 *The Excavation of Armageddon*. Oriental Institute Communications 4. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Gitin, S.
1997 The Neo-Assyrian Empire and its Western Periphery: The Levant, with a Focus on Philistine Ekron. Pp. 77–103 in *Assyria 1995*, eds. S. Parpola and R. M. Whiting. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Guy, P. L. O., and Engberg, R. M.
1938 *Megiddo Tombs*. Oriental Institute Publications 33. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Hachmann, R.
1983 *Frühe Phöniker im Libanon: 20 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen in Kāmid el-Lōz*. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.
1996 Zur absoluten Chronologie des 'Schatzhauses'. Pp. 17–26 in *Kāmid el-Lōz*, vol. 16: 'Schatzhaus'-Studien, ed. R. Hachmann. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 59. Bonn: Habelt.
- Hansen, D. P.
1969 Some Remarks on the Chronology and Style of Objects from Byblos. *American Journal of Archaeology* 73: 281–84.
- Harper, P. O.
1969 Dating a Group of Ivories from Anatolia. *Connoisseur* 172, no. 693: 156–62.
- Hoch, J. E.
1994 *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Kantor, H. J.
1956 Syro-Palestinian Ivories. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 15: 153–74.
- Kochavi, M.
1990 *Aphek in Canaan: The Egyptian Governor's Residence and its Finds*. Israel Museum Catalog 312. Jerusalem: Israel Museum.

- Lackenbacher, S.
 1995 Une correspondance être l'administration du pharaon Merneptah et le roi d'Ougarit. Pp. 77–83 in *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.*, eds. M. Yon, M. Sznycer, and P. Bordreuil. Ras Shamra–Ougarit 11. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations.
- Lange, K., and Hirmer, M.
 1961 *Egypt; Architecture, Sculpture, Painting in Three Thousand Years*. 3rd ed. London: Phaidon.
- Liebowitz, H.
 1987 Late Bronze II Ivory Work in Palestine: Evidence of a Cultural Highpoint. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 265: 3–24.
- Lilyquist, C.
 1988 The Gold Bowl Naming General Djehuty: A Study of Objects and Early Egyptology. *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 23: 5–68.
 1993a Granulation and Glass; Chronological and Stylistic Investigations at Selected Sites, ca. 2500–1400 B.C.E. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 290–91: 29–94.
 1993b On [Late] Middle Kingdom Style, with Reference to Hard Stone Scarabs, Inlaid Jewels, and Beni Hasan. *Discussions in Egyptology* 27: 45–57.
 1994 Objects Attributable to Kāmid el-Lōz, and Comments on the Date of Objects in the 'Schatzhaus'. Pp. 207–20 in Kāmid el-Lōz, vol. 11: *Das 'Schatzhaus' im Palastbereich: Die Befunde des Königsgrabes*, by W. Adler. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 47. Bonn: Habelt.
 1995 *Egyptian Stone Vessels: Khian Through Tuthmosis IV*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
 1996 Stone vessels at Kāmid el-Lōz, Lebanon: Egyptian, Egyptianizing, or Non-Egyptian? A Question at Sites from the Sudan to Iraq to the Greek Mainland. Pp. 133–73 in *Kāmid el-Lōz*, vol. 16: *'Schatzhaus'-Studien*, ed. R. Hachmann. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 59. Bonn: Habelt.
 In press On the Egyptian-Inscribed Plaques Found at Mycenae. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.
- Lilyquist, C., and Brill, R. H., with Wypyski, M. T.
 1993 *Studies in Early Egyptian Glass*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Loud, G.
 1939 *The Megiddo Ivories*. Oriental Institute Publications 52. Chicago: University of Chicago.
 1948 *Megiddo II: Seasons of 1935–39*. Oriental Institute Publications 62. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Margueron, J.
 1977 Ras Shamra 1975 et 1976. Rapport préliminaire sur les campagnes d'automne. *Syria* 54: 151–88.
- Markoe, G.
 1990 The Emergence of Phoenician Art. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 279: 13–26.
- Matthiae, P.
 1962 *Ars Syra*. Università di Roma, Centro di studi semitici, Serie archeologica 4. Rome: Centro di Studi Semitici, Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente, Università di Roma.
 1989 Masterpieces of Early and Old Syrian Art: Discoveries of the 1988 Ebla Excavations in a Historical Perspective. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 75: 25–56.
- McGovern, P. E.
 1986 *The Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages of Central Transjordan: The Baq'ah Valley Project, 1977–1981*. University Museum Monograph 65. Philadelphia: University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.
- Meza, A. I.
 1996 The Egyptian Statuette in Petra and the Isis Cult Connection. *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 40: 167–76.
- Montet, P.
 1937 *Les reliques d'art syrien dans l'Égypte du Nouvel Empire*. Paris: Société d'édition, les belles lettres.
- Ory, J.
 1946 A Middle Bronze Age Tomb at el-Jisr. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine* 12: 31–42.
- Potts, T. F.
 1987 A Bronze Age Ivory-Decorated Box from Pella (Pahel) and its Foreign Relations. Pp. 59–71 in *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan III*, ed. A. Hadidi. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Poursat, J.-Cl.
 1973 Ivoires de l'Artémision: Chypre et Délos. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Supplément* 1: 415–25.
- Prisse d'Avennes, A., and Marchandon de La Faye, P.
 1879 *Histoire de l'art égyptien d'après les monuments*. Paris: Bertrand.
- Rehak, P., and Younger, J.
 In press International Styles in Ivory Carving in the Bronze Age. *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium: Proceedings of a Conference held at the University of Cincinnati 18–20 April 1997*, eds. E. H. Cline and D. H. Cline. Aegaeum 18. Liège: Université de Liège.

- Romano, J.
1989 *The Bes-Image in Pharaonic Egypt*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Scandone Matthiae, G.
1990 Egyptianizing Ivory Inlays from Palace P at Ebla. *Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes* 40: 146–60.
1991 Una Testa Paléosiriana in Avorio con Corona Atef. *La Parola del Passato: Rivista di Studi Antichi* 46: 372–93.
- Schulman, A. R.
1976 The Royal Butler Ramessesemperré^c. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 13: 117–30.
1986 The Royal Butler Ramessesami^con. *Chronique d'Égypte* 61: 187–202.
- Seiler, A.
1997 Hebua I: Second Intermediate Period and Early New Kingdom Pottery. *Cahiers de céramique égyptienne* 5: 23–30.
- Sherratt, A., and Sherratt, S.
1997 Small Worlds: Interaction and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean. P. 45 in *The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium: 50th Anniversary Symposium, 18–20 April, 1997*, abstracts. Cincinnati: Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati.
- Smith, W. S.
1965 *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East; A Study of the Relationships between the Arts of Egypt, the Aegean, and Western Asia*. New Haven: Yale University.
- 1969 Influence of the Middle Kingdom of Egypt in Western Asia, Especially at Byblos. *American Journal of Archaeology* 73: 277–81.
- Vermeule, E. D., and Wolsky, F. Z.
1990 *Toumba Tou Skourou: A Bronze Age Potters' Quarter on Morphou Bay in Cyprus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Waldbaum, J.
1997 Greeks in the East or Greeks and the East? Problems in the Definition and Recognition of Presence. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 305: 1–17.
- Wilson, V.
1975 The Iconography of Bes with Particular Reference to the Cypriot Evidence. *Levant* 7: 77–103.
- Woolley, L.
1955 *Alalakh: An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay, 1937–1949*. Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries 18. London: Society of Antiquaries.
- Yon, M.
1992 The End of the Kingdom of Ugarit. Pp. 111–22 in *The Crisis Years: The 12th Century B.C., From Beyond the Danube to the Tigris*, eds. W. A. Ward and M. S. Joukowsky. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Yoyotte, J.
1981 Le général Djehouty et la perception des tributs Syriens: Causerie au sujet d'un objet égaré. *Bulletin de la Société française d'égyptologie* 92: 33–51.