

## La etapa persa de la ciudad de Tiro a través de sus acuñaciones monetarias

Juan A. Belmonte Marín - Universidad de Castilla – La Mancha  
Campus Universitario s/n, Edificio Benjamín Palencia, 02071 ALBACETE

De nuevo nos encontramos ante un estudio numismático\* sobre una ciudad fenicia: Tiro. El anterior estuvo dedicado a Sidón (J. Elayi & A. G. Elayi, *Le monnayage de la cité phénicienne de Sidon à l'époque perse (Ve-IVe s. av. J.-C.). Supplément à Transeuphratène* 11. Gabalda: Paris 2004). Que además se suma a otro trabajo también publicado por entonces sobre la amonedación en Filistea: H. Gitler & O. Tal, *The Coinage of Philistia of the 5th and 4th Centuries BC: A Study of the Earliest Coins of Palestine*. Edizioni Ennerre: Milano 2006.

Este trabajo comienza con una *Introduction* (pp. 7-24) donde se muestran los elementos constitutivos del mismo, resumidos en estas palabras «firstly, and basically, a traditional numismatic study, as systematic and elaborate as possible. But it is at the same time a study in all the other fields of research enlightened by numismatic studies: in particular metrology, iconography, epigraphy, technology, political and economic history, history of religions, etc.» (p. 14). Al mismo tiempo que indica las dificultades técnicas para su elaboración, debido a las peculiaridades inherentes del *corpus*: catálogos con fotografías de mala calidad, las monedas obtenidas por excavaciones regulares es restringido, deficientes datos arqueológicos sobre los niveles persas de Tiro, el problema de las falsificaciones, etc.

El primer capítulo titulado *Catalogue of the Tyrian coins* (pp. 25-200) supone el núcleo del estudio. Éste es un «long-awaited» corpus numismático de Tiro de época persa (ss. V-IV a.C.) que aporta un elenco de 1814 piezas, elaborado siguiendo las «special rules» que marcan los recientes estudios numismáticos sobre «archaic and classical Greek coinages», como afirman los autores (p. 25). Cada moneda es catalogada cronológicamente por medio de series, describiendo también sus características (peso, medidas,..., iconografía, lugar de conservación y bibliografía). Un asterisco detrás de cada anverso y reverso de moneda (O1\*-R1\*) nos indica que la podemos observar en el listado de ilustraciones (*Plates* 1-51).

\* J. Elayi & A. G. Elayi, *The Coinage of the Phoenician City of Tyre in the Persian Period (5th – 4th cent. BCE)*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 188, Peeters, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2009 (460 pages, 57 figures and 51 plates). ISBN: 978-90-429-2202-0, 85 € (Hardcover).

Le sigue un segundo denominado *Study of dies and relative chronology* (pp. 201-220) que pretende, a través de un análisis exclusivamente numismático, reagrupar las monedas en grupos y series: I. *Dolphin* (I.1. Sin impresión incusa en el reverso y I.2. Con impresión incusa en el reverso). II. *Deity riding on seahorse* (II.1. Estándar Fenicio [II.1.1 Anepígrafas y II.1.2. Inscritas] y II.2. Estándar Ático [II.2.1-13. Siclos inscritos] y [II.2.14-29. Siclos de ‘Ozmilk]). III. *Unclassified series*.

En el tercer capítulo *Analysis of the monetary inscriptions* (pp. 221-252) los autores ponen en práctica un método que fomenta el diálogo entre la Numismática y la Filología Semítica, no tenido en cuenta en anteriores estudios. Con estos cinco apartados: 1. *The monetary inscriptions* (pp. 224-238). 2. *The monetary graffiti* (pp. 238-240). 3. *The monetary countermarks* (pp. 240s.). 4. *Paleographical analysis of the Tyrian monetary inscriptions* (pp. 241-249). 5. *Sociocultural aspects of the Tyrian monetary script* (pp. 249-252) buscan conseguir sus objetivos. Llegado a este punto de nuestra exposición, convendría indicar algunas apostillas que pretenden mejorar los objetivos de este capítulo:

P. 226 n. 28: Hubiera sido más correcto añadir también la obra de R. Krahmalkov, *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*. *Studia Phoenicia* XV. Peeters: Leuven 2000, p. 466 s.v. ŠLŠN (e incluir, por tanto, dicho diccionario en la p. 422 de *Bibliography*).

Pp. 226-230. Los autores presentan un detallado análisis de las posibles interpretaciones de los letreros inscritos en las monedas (indicamos aquí las transliteraciones dadas en el *Catalogue of the Tyrian Coins*): *MHŠGR* (o *MH | ŠGR / MHŠ | GR*) en el «Group I», Series I.1.2., I.2.2. y I.2.3.; *MR* en el «Group I», Series I.1.3. y I.2.4.; *HY/M* en el «Group I» Serie I.2.5. y, quizás también, en la Serie I.1.4. (n<sup>os</sup> 21 y 25 con dos letras ilegibles, véase p. 31).

1. Para acercar a los lectores el *status quaestionis* sobre las abreviaturas en la lengua epigrafía fenicia no hubiera estado de más indicar que hay aportaciones anteriores a las indicadas en la nota 33 (p. 226), p. ej. H. Seyrig, *Notes on Syrian Coins. Numismatic Notes and Monographs* 119. The American Numismatic Society: New York 1950, pp. 23-28; J. B. Chabot, “Le système d’abréviation usité dans l’écriture phénicienne”, *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux historiques* 1943-1945 (1951) 217-224 y 237-244 (especialmente las pp. 243-244, que recoge abreviaturas citadas en el *Supplément de La Numismatique de l’ancienne Afrique* de L. Müller); H. Seyrig, “Le monnayage de Ptolémaïs en Phénicie”, *Revue Numismatique* 4 (1962) 25-50 [esp. p. 38 n. 3]; M. Szynger, “Rapport sur les conférences *Antiquités et épigraphie nord-sémitiques*: Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Malte, II”, *Annuaire de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études (IV<sup>me</sup> Section)* 106 (1973-1974) 131-153 (esp 132-133).

2. En cuanto a *MHŠGR*, como quiera que la misma inscripción aparece en monedas de diferente peso (Series I.1.2. y I.2.2.: 2.50 g / 3.40 g y Serie I.2.3.: 1.55 g) no parece oportuno dar la siguiente explicación: “half of a half(-shekel)” (p. 229). Lo que nos lleva ahora a «discutir» los pasos utilizados por los autores para llegar a esta conclusión:

2.1. *MHŠ* no parece que pueda corresponder a los cognados hebreos *MHŠH* «mitad» o *MHŠYT* «mitad», «medio, centro» (o incluso *HŠY* «mitad», «media altura», «medio»<sup>†</sup>), términos proveniente de una raíz *HŠH/HŠŠ* «dividir, partir», «distribuir, repartir»<sup>‡</sup>.

†. Las menciones de este término en textos fenicios y púnicos son en contextos dudosos, dañados o sin relación con cuestiones numismáticas (véase J. Hoftijzer – K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. E. J. Brill: Leiden 1995 [= *DNWSI*], pp. 398s. s.v. *hšy*<sub>1</sub> «to distribute, to divide + obj.» / *hšy*<sub>2</sub> «half»). Por contra los cognados que aparecen en textos moabita, hebreo y arameo sí presentan relación con la temática numismática.

‡. Cf. I. K. H. Halayqa, *A Comparative Lexikon of Ugaritic and Canaanite*. Ugarit-Verlag: Münster 2008 (= Halayqa, *Comparative Lexikon*), p. 164; véase también L. Koehler – W. Baumgartner, *Hebräische und Aramäische Lexikon zum Alten*

2.2. Las traducciones de los términos **mḥṣ<sub>1</sub>** «to strike, to kill (?)» y **mḥṣ<sub>2</sub>** «half» recogidas en *DNWSI* pp. 614s., deben ser tomadas con reservas. En cuanto a la primera, véase S. Izre'el, "A New Dictionary of Northwest Semitic and the Amarna Glosses", *IOS* 18 (1998) 421-429 (esp. p. 425: *da-ku-šu: ma-aḥ-šú-ú* «they killed him») y G[AZ.ME]Š: *mi-ḥi-ša* «they have been killed»); G. Del Olmo – J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica. Vol. II*. AUSA: Barcelona 2000, p. 270 (/m-ḥ-ṣ/ «herir, golpear, aplastar, matar»); Halayqa, *Comparative Lexikon* p. 214 (MḥṢ «to beat, crush, kill»). Sobre la segunda, todas las traducciones ofrecidas parecen venir de las propuestas de J. W. Betlyon en 1982 (*The Coinage and Mints of Phoenicia. The Pre-Alexandrine Period*. Scholars Press: Chico) pp. 41 y 64 n. 20 (> מִחְצִית / מִחְצִיָּה). No conviene hacer de מִחְצִיָּה una *lectio difficilior* de lo recogido en las monedas, pues habría en tal caso una incongruencia sintáctica con relación al estado constructo del femenino singular (מִחְצִיָּה / מִחְצִיָּה), quien no pierde las desinencias -(a)t/-t, -(ī)t y -(ū)t (véase J. Friedrich – W. Röllig – M. G. Amadasi – W. R. Mayer, *Phönizische-punische Grammatik*. Istituto Biblico: Roma 1999, p. 149 § 227).

2.3. Ante la propuesta de los autores para entender el segundo componente como *PR* (abreviatura de *PR(S)*<sup>§</sup>), conviene indicar que este vocablo no parece significar «portion», «half a measure» o, en las monedas estudiadas, «half a shekel» como afirman los autores (véase A. Wolters, "Metrological *PRS*-Terms from Ebla to Mishna", C. H. Gordon – G. A. Rendsburg (eds.), *Eblaite: Essays on the Ebla Archives and Eblaite Language*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake 2002, pp. 223-241, esp. 239: «As for the metrological value of \**parsum* and its cognates, there is striking agreement between Eblaite, Old Aramaic, Official Aramaic, Phoenician, and Mishnaic Hebrew, all of which use these terms to designate a half-mina»).

2.4. ¿Qué podemos aportar a esta controversia? Plantearemos aquí a modo de hipótesis de trabajo relacionar el término fenicio *MḥṢ* recogido en las monedas de Tiro con cierta acepción del verbo acadio *maḥāṣu* ««to assume guarantee for somebody»»\* (una evolución desde una raíz protosemítica \*MḥD > Mḥ/HṢ, en acadio, ugarítico, cananeo y fenicio, o \*MḥD > Mḥ' > Mḥ', en arameo, no presentan ningún problema de aceptación<sup>††</sup>). Y para el segundo componente *GR*, quizás a relacionar con la segunda

*Testament*. E. J. Brill: Leiden 1967ss (= *HAL*), I pp. 329 s.v. מִחְצִיָּה, 330a s.v. מִחְצִיָּה y 330b s.v. מִחְצִיָּה; *HAL* II [1974] p. 541 s.v. מִחְצִיָּה / מִחְצִיָּה).

§. Lo que todavía no acabamos de aceptar. Sobre todo si nos atenemos a la bibliografía anteriormente citada, con relación a las abreviaturas usadas por los fenicios, pues parece que éstas se generan con la primera letra y la última del vocablo a expresar.

\*\* Recogido en las expresiones siguientes: 1. *pūtu maḥāṣu* (W. Von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, I-III, Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden 1965-1981 (= *AHw*) p. 580b: «schlagen, weben; ... 1) d) β) > māḥiṣu 5. γ) mB, Nuzi *pūt* (Stirn) X m. sich verbürgen für»; *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Oriental Institute Press: Chicago 1956ss (= *CAD*) M/1, p. 80 s.v. *maḥāṣu* 4d: «to assume guarantee for somebody»; J. Black – A. George – N. Postgate (eds.), *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden (= *CDA*), p. 190: «idiomatic expressions; [Nuzi] *pūt* PN m. "vouch for, guarantee"»); 2. *qātu/qātē/qātāte maḥāṣu* (*AHw* p. 580b: *qātam* m. "Hand wegschlagen, Annahme verweigern"; *CAD* M/1, p. 80 s.v. *maḥāṣu* 4g: «to refuse a deal» [Véase igualmente K. Deller – W. R. Mayer, "Akkadische Lexikographie: *CAD* M", *OrNS* 53 (1984) 72-124 [p. 76: nA *qātē maḥāṣu*]; K. Radner, *Die neuassyrischen Privatrechtsurkunden als Quellen für Mensch und Umwelt*, Helsinki 1997, pp. 362-367 [nA *qātāte maḥāṣu*] y K. Radner, "The Neo-Assyrian Period", R. Westbrook – R. Jasnow (eds.), *Security for Debt in Ancient Near Eastern Law*, E. J. Brill: Leiden 2001, pp. 265-288 [p. 268: «... that the surety assumes responsibility, the phrase *qātātē ša* [debtor] *issu qātātē* [creditor] *maḥāṣu*, lit., "to strike the hands of the debtor out the hands of the creditor", is used]). Para E. Lipiński ("Old Aramaic Contracts of Guarantee", J. Braun *et al.* (eds.), *Written on Clay and Stone. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Krystyna Szarzyńska on the Occasion of her 80th Birthday*. Agade: Warsaw 1998, pp. 39-44) la expresión aramea *mḥ' yd* «struck the hand» es su paralela. 3. *māḥiṣ pūti / māḥiṣ pūtūtu* (*AHw*, p. 584 s.v. *māḥiṣu* «Bürge, Garant»; *CAD* M/1, 101 s.v. «warrantor»; *CDA*, pp. 190s. «Nuzi/NB *māḥiṣ pūti* "guarantor, bondsman; *māḥiṣ pūtūtu* "warranty"»).

†† Véase igualmente R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik. Der Inschriften des 10.- 8. Jh. V. Chr.* Franz Steiner: Wiesbaden 1969, p. 42 § 21 y B. Halpern, "Dialect Distribution in Canaan and the Deir Alla Inscriptions", D. M. Golomb – S. T.

acepción<sup>‡‡</sup> del término acadio *girû* «in formulae referring to the fineness of silver alloy» (*CAD G*, 96s.)<sup>§§</sup>. Lo que nos podría llevar a un significado que estuviera relacionado con la siguiente expresión: «(con) garantía de aleación».

3. Con relación a *MR*, parece lógico proponer que es una abreviatura de nuestra anterior interpretación. Pero en ningún momento abreviatura de *MĤṢ PR(S)*, como proponen los autores, pues estaríamos ante una abreviatura de abreviatura!

4. La propuesta de interpretar *HY/M* como *HM(ŠM)*, «fiftieth» (de siclo) no concuerda con los pesos de las monedas que portan esa inscripción: 0.23 g / 0.36 g / 0.31 g / 0.17 g. Por lo que convendría buscar otra explicación, que en el momento actual de la investigación no logramos percibir.

El *Analysis of iconography* (pp. 253-280) es la temática del capítulo cuarto, donde se pasa revista a los nueve aspectos decorativos que la conforman: lechuza (el más representativo), delfín (motivo decorativo muy numeroso), caballito de mar (después de la lechuza y el delfín, el más numeroso), deidad (posiblemente Melqart), concha, cabeza de león, ariete, roseta y media luna (sólo recogido en dos siclos y como contramarca). Según los autores, los iconos concha, cabeza de león, ariete y roseta son los menos significativos. Siendo los relacionados con la divinidad tutelar de la ciudad y ciertos animales protectores (lechuza, delfín y caballito de mar) los símbolos que lógicamente mejor representan la ciudad de Tiro.

El quinto *The Tyrian monetary workshop* (pp. 281-310) tiene por argumento estudiar las técnicas usadas para la fabricación de monedas. Los metales utilizados (la ceca de Tiro utiliza plata y, más tarde y con menos frecuencia, bronce), cospeles, troqueles, acuñación, alteraciones no relacionadas con el proceso de fabricación y la organización del trabajo en la ceca son los temas desarrollados en este capítulo. Interesantes resultan las últimas páginas del mismo, donde los autores realizan estimaciones sobre el número de acuñaciones las emisiones monetarias de Tiro (p. ej. las de ‘Oz milk con unos 2.400.000 siclos, 16.32 toneladas de plata en 15 años) y su comparación con las ejecutadas por los monarcas de Sidón (mucho menos cuantiosas).

Con el capítulo *Metrological study* (pp. 311-321), los autores retoman unos anteriores estudios sobre la metrología fenicia en general (pp. 312-318), para después abordar en particular lo relativo a la ciudad de Tiro (pp. 318-321). Con relación a esta primera parte del capítulo, hemos echado de menos algunos títulos que hemos recogido en esta nota<sup>\*\*\*</sup>. Trabajos que también pueden aportar más datos para la discusión. En

Hollis (eds.), *Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin. Working with no Data*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake 1987 (pp. 119-140), p. 123.

‡‡. La primera es «one twenty-fourth of a shekel» (cf. también *CDA* 93b: «1/24 shekel NB; < Aram. “carob-seed”»), que pasa al heb. גרה «d. kleinste Gewicht, 1/20 d. שקל» (*HAL* I, 194b). Por el contrario véase R. Kletter, “The Inscribed Weights of the Kingdom of Judah”, *Tel Aviv* 18 (1991) 121-163 (esp. 137ss): «The 24 *gera* thesis is analogous to the Mesopotamian weight system, whereas I know of no system of 20 sub-units in geographical or chronological proximity ... The third alternative, that there are 24 *gera* in a shekel, best fits the evidence».

§§. Véase igualmente M. A. Powell, “Masse und Gewichte”, *RIA* 7/5-6 (1989) 457-517 (esp. p. 512a); M. A. Powell, “Money in Mesopotamia”, *JESHO* 39/3 (1996) 224-242 (esp. 231ss.); M. A. Powell, “Wir müssen alle unsere Nische nutzen: Monies, Motives and Methods in Babylonian Economics”, J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia (Proceedings of the First MOS Symposium, Leiden 1997)*. Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: Leiden 1999, pp. 5-23 (esp. 19-22).

\*\*\*. Véase A. Archi, “Reflections on the System of Weights from Ebla”, *Eblaïtica* 1 [= C. H. Gordon – G. A. Rendsburg – N. H. Winter (eds.), *Essays on the Ebla Archives and Eblaïte Language*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake] (1987) 47-89 (esp. pp. 52, 54, 61 y 66 [n<sup>os</sup> 38 y 39]). A. Archi – E. Klengel-Brandt, “I pesi provenienti da Zincirli”, *SMEA* 24 (1984) 245-261. P. Bordreuil, “A propos de BAALIM II, II.2”, P. Bordreuil – E. Gubel (eds.), “Bulletin d’antiquités archéologiques du Levant inédites ou méconnues [= BAALIM] VI”, *Syria* 67/2 (1990) 483-520 (esp. p. 489). P. Bordreuil, “Métropoles et métrologies poliades”,

cuanto a la segunda parte, resulta interesante ver que el ciclo de Tiro durante la parte final del tercer cuarto del siglo V a.C. corresponde a ca. 13.90 g. Lo que nos lleva a una mina de 417 g, si entendemos el epígrafe de estas monedas *šlšn* por «treintavo» (véase pp. 225s.). A relacionar por tanto con la ática de 436 g, que a su vez se componía de 50 estateras de 8.72 g. Alineamiento que para llevar a buen término la aceptación del «Estándar Ático» de Tiro (ca. 8.77 g) a partir de mediados del siglo IV a.C.

A través del último capítulo *The coinage of Tyre and the history of city* (pp. 323-389) los autores buscan, por medio de los resultados obtenidos del análisis numismático, llegar a una interpretación histórica del periodo persa de Tiro. Pues según ellos «none of the historical studies published until now on this area use the numismatic sources correctly». Varias son las cuestiones abordadas dignas de resaltar en este capítulo. Se inicia este apartado con la presentación de la ciudad en los momentos anteriores a la instauración de la ceca (ca. 450 a.C.). Sobre la evolución de la economía palatina de Tiro anterior a la época persa, los datos recogidos en el Antiguo Testamento (1 Reyes 5: 23-24) y en el «tratado entre Asarhaddon y Baal de Tiro»<sup>†††</sup> son las fuentes básicas para poderla definir. Con la llegada de los persas, Tiro se integró necesariamente en la economía persa (los autores dan por hecho que su relación con los persas debió ser similar a la que tuvo Sidón, si bien las fuentes escritas aportan más información sobre esta última). Si bien, desde el punto de vista monetario, Tiro no se sumó rápidamente a los usos que imponía la unificación persa<sup>‡‡‡</sup>. Por lo que para nuestros autores, el problema central que ellos deben resolver es el porqué del retraso en la adopción de la moneda en Tiro («Group I.1»). Según exponen, el orden de aceptación de la moneda por las ciudades fenicias fue primero Biblos y después Tiro, Sidón y Arados. El comienzo de la acuñación en Biblos fue motivada por el deseo de imitar a las ciudades chipriotas de Kition y Lapethus<sup>§§§</sup>. Pero las explicaciones para Tiro, Sidón y Arados parecen ser distintas. El coste elevado para

*Semitica* 43-44 [= *La ville de 1200 avant J.-C. à l'Hegire*] (1995) 9-20. F. Bron – A. Lemaire, “Poids inscrits phénico-araméens du VII<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C.”, *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici* (Roma, 5-10 novembre 1979). CNR: Roma 1983, pp. 763-770. N. Parise, “Unità ponderali e rapporti di cambio nella Siria del Nord”, A. Archi (ed.), *Circulations of Goods in Non-Palatial Context in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the International Conference Organized in the Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*. Edizione dell'Ateneo: Roma 1984, 125-138. N. Parise, “The Mina of Ugarit, the Mina of Karkemish, the Mina of Khatti”, C. Zaccagnini (ed.), *Production and Consumption in the Ancient Near East*, University Press: Budapest 1989, pp. 333-341.

†††. Sobre esto último (p. 325 nn. 9-10), echamos en falta aproximaciones más recientes (véase p. ej. S. Parpola – K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*, University of Helsinki Press: Helsinki 1988, 24-27; M. Botto, *Studi storici sulla Fenicia L'VIII e il VII secolo A.C.*, Università degli Studi di Pisa: Pisa 1990, pp. 79ss.; C. Saporetti, «nA 39. Trattato Ba'al-Asarhaddon» en: M. Botto, *Studi storici sulla Fenicia L'VIII e il VII secolo A.C.*, Università degli Studi di Pisa: Pisa 1990, pp. 212-224; N. Na'aman, «Esarhaddon's Treaty with Baal and Assyrian Provinces along the Phoenician Coast», *RSF* 22 (1994) 3-8 [Anotado por los autores en la página 269 nota 63, pero sin lograr detectar en qué parte de su trabajo N. Na'aman trata asuntos sobre el panteón de Tiro. ¡El artículo aborda realmente cuestiones geopolíticas!]; J. A. Belmonte Marin, *Cuatro estudios sobre los dominios territoriales de las ciudades-estado fenicias. Cuadernos de Arqueología Mediterránea* 9. AUSA: Barcelona 2003, pp. 108 y 126; S. Parpola, «National and Ethnic Identity in the Neo-Assyrian Empire and Assyrian Identity in Post-Empire Times», *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 18/2 (2004) 5-40 [esp. p. 27] que puedan entrar también en «diálogo científico» con lo ya dicho por J. Elayi en *Économie des cités phéniciennes sous l'Empire perse* (Istituto Universitario Orientale: Napoli 1990) pp. 4-6.

‡‡‡. Con relación a la plata estampillada «con la marca *ginmu*», añadir en la n. 21 de la página 326 estos títulos: M. A. Powell, “*Wir müssen alle unsere Nische nutzen: Monies, Motives and Methods in Babylonian Economics*”, J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia (Proceedings of the First MOS Symposium, Leiden 1997)*. Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: Leiden 1999, pp. 5-23 (esp. 21ss.); A. C. V. M. Bongenaar, “Money in the Neo-Babylonian Institutions”, J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia (Proceedings of the First MOS Symposium, Leiden 1997)*. Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten: Leiden 1999, pp. 159-174 (esp. 172-174); P. Briant, *Bulletin d'Histoire achéménide II, 1997-2000*. Thotm-éditions: Paris 2001, pp. 146ss.

§§§. En la p. 330 n. 40 hubiera sido interesante dar a conocer un trabajo realizado por P. Filigheddu («Die Ortsnamen des Mittelmeerraums in der phönizischen und punischen Überlieferung», *UF* 38 (2006) 149-265) para observar las menciones de los topónimos *Kition/KT(Y)* (pp. 178-181) y *Lapethus/LPŠ* (pp. 184s.) en las fuentes numismáticas. Con ello quizás hubiera llevado a

el mantenimiento de una gran flota, que sufría pérdidas importantes en los enfrentamientos de la Segunda Guerra Médica, debería ser suficiente para explicar la inauguración de las cecas fenicias. Sin embargo, para los autores, tampoco hay que descartar una posible relación entre la creación de una ceca por una ciudad y la proclamación de autonomía política (aunque las fuentes históricas no nos ayuden mucho para confirmar este supuesto). Al grupo de monedas que inician la ceca de Tiro le sigue el «Group I.2». Éste mantiene ciertas características del anterior, aunque el segundo grupo, con 217 sículos preservados, parece más importante que el primero, quien presenta 28 ejemplares. Los autores encuentran dificultades a la hora de datarlo, así como el contexto político en el que tuvo lugar (aun así apuestan por una datación en la última parte del tercer cuarto del s. V a.C.). La aparición del «Group II.1.1» (ca. 425-394 a.C.), con una ejecución más cuidada que la realizada anteriormente, parece debido a un cambio de rey o de dinastía (si bien los autores no precisan quién fue). El «Group II.1.2» (ca. 393-358 a.C.) fue la última serie antes del cambio al «Estándar Ático». Sus monedas pertenecen a una fase de complicado contexto político (exhaustivamente expuesto en la obra), de ahí que el volumen de producción decreciera significativamente (183 ejemplares frente a los 367 de la serie precedente). Finalmente es analizado el «Group II.2» (357-333/2 a.C.), el más numeroso (653 ejemplares) y, sin ningún tipo de duda, el mejor conocido. Grupo relativamente bien datado, en parte por su coincidencia con los 17 años de 'Ozmlk (ca. 349-333/2). Otra característica a destacar de éste es el uso del «Estándar Ático» (8.77 g) en lugar del «Estándar Fenicio» (13.56 g), cambio que se debió a las dificultades económicas heredadas de la etapa anterior. A estos problemas hay que añadir la revuelta de 'Abd-'Aštart de Sidón y la represión persa posterior.

El trabajo finaliza con una breve *Conclusion* (pp. 391-395). A ello habría que añadir dos anexos *Hoards containing Tyrian coins* y *False or dubious Tyrian coins* (pp. 397-402 y 403-404). Terminando con una amplia *Bibliography* (pp. 405-430 [pp. 405-409: *Abbreviations*]), una no muy cuidada lista de *Indexes* (pp. 431-460)<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>, junto a *Figures* y *Plates*.

Los lectores de esta obra debemos estar agradecidos a los autores por su amplio y profundo estudio. Trabajo realizado con un método propio, más objetivo y más imparcial, según sus palabras. Realmente la metodología histórica utilizada presenta un marcado carácter multidisciplinar. Junto con los análisis habituales en *Numismática* (producción monetaria, el volumen de las emisiones, las técnicas y procesos de fabricación,...), los autores igualmente nos ofrecen un detallado estudio de las inscripciones (*Epigrafía*) y de la iconografía monetaria (*Arqueología*). Del mismo modo han procesado con acierto todos los datos estadísticos obtenidos (*Economía*). En fin, una investigación histórica de gran calado que les ha permitido llegar a conclusiones de interés. Por último, si a lo aquí expuesto añadimos la producción historiográfica hasta ahora realizada por los autores, véase p. ej. los 37 ítems bibliográficos recogidos en las pp. 406-407 y 418-419, podremos entender cómo esta acertada trayectoria investigadora les ha permitido alcanzar con éxito sus diferentes acercamientos al mundo fenicio en época persa.

los autores a matizar en parte lo expresado en la p. 224: «Although the specialists of West-Semitic epigraphy in general do not consider the monetary inscriptions...».

\*\*\*\*. Véase pp. 455ss: las entradas de los índices contienen muchos errores cuando se indican *links* a partir de las pp. 252ss (véase p. ej. Abu Shusheh, (...), 401 (realmente aparece en p. 399, línea 2); Akko, (...), 326 (está citado en p. 324), 352 (citado en p. 350), 353 (en p. 351), 354 (en p. 352), (...); Akshaf, 391 (citado en p. 389), Alep<sup>sic</sup>, (...), 376 (citado en p. 374), (...); Al-Mina, 254 (citado en p. 252); Amrit, 277 (citado en p. 275); Antioch, 22, 301 (citado en p. 299); etc.; etc.). Por lo tanto no del todo inservible, pero sí se debe tener presente “este desfase de dos páginas”. Hubiera sido necesario una más que exhaustiva revisión última para depurar estas pequeñas (pero “inoportunas”) erratas.

## Egypt and the Levant during the Old Kingdom

*Andrés Diego Espinel* - CCHS – CSIC, Madrid  
Albasanz, 26-28 – 28031

This book\* by Karin N. Sowada is an extended and updated version of her 2002 doctoral dissertation presented at the University of Sydney.<sup>1</sup> It is the first comprehensive monograph on the contacts between Old Kingdom (OK) Egypt (3<sup>rd</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> dynasties) and its eastern (and northern) neighbours. The work is mainly centred in the Levant during the Early Bronze Age (EBA) III-IV, but it also includes other regions such as Anatolia, Cyprus and the Aegean world. Unlike studies by other researchers, based on interpretations of a restricted and fragmentary range of textual, iconographic and tempting (but unreliable) out-of-context archaeological remains, Sowada's analysis is as innovative as important, since it is grounded basically on reliable archaeological evidence or, in other words, on materials discovered in clear archaeological contexts either in Egypt or the Levant. Actually, her "sceptical" stance on suspicious decontextualized evidence, that includes the use of archaeometric tools such as a PIXE-PIGME study of Levantine pottery from Egypt,<sup>2</sup> is the main virtue –among many others– of this study. As it will be stated below, through this premise, the book sheds newer and clearer light on the ever-complex problem of the contacts of Egypt with Levant during the EBA. In this regard, this work is a serious research, rather more rigorous and closer to the evidence than previous studies –as some by the reviewer himself– that are usually more centered in creating attractive, but more hypothetical and, consequently, weaker historical reconstructions.

The book is formed by eight chapters, a conclusion, a bibliography, different indices, two appendixes including the list of *aegyptiaca* from Montet's foundation deposits at Byblos (appendix I), and the results of a PIXE-PIGME study of combed ware jars from Egypt, made by Sowada and Peter Grave (University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia) (appendix II), and, finally, a section including a great number of figures and plates.

The first chapter, "1. Studies in Old Kingdom Foreign Relations: A Survey" (pp. 1-24), serves as an introductory study. It includes a very complete overview on the previous research of the connections between Egypt and Levant with a brief survey on the pictorial, textual and archaeological data connected to the subject. Furthermore, parameters of the research, along with employed methodologies –and their subsequent problems and advantages– are briefly, but efficiently explained. The author shows a

\* Karin N. Sowada, *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom: An Archaeological Perspective. With a contribution by Peter Grave* (Orbis Biblicus Orientalis, 237), Fribourg, Academic Press Fribourg – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2009, pp. xxiv + 295 + 5 + 7 + 48 (figs.) + 19 (pls.) – ISBN: 978-3-7278-1649-9; 978-3-525-53455-7.

1. Karin N. Sowada, *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom: A Re-appraisal of the Archeological Evidence*, Faculty of Arts, University of Sydney, 2002 (available at <http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/handle/2123/4127> [2/9/2011]).

2. This kind of study permits to characterize materials by means of the measurement of proton induced X-rays (PIXE) and gamma rays (PIGME).

comprehensive knowledge of the evidence and bibliography and, at the same time, a great capacity for displaying and analysing them. Regrettably, she hasn't been able to include in her review of previous studies several textual records recently discovered that, no doubt, would have been relevant to her research: the still unpublished texts discovered by a French mission at Ain Soukhna mentioning sea-expeditions on Byblos-ships (kbnyt) from Ain Sukhna to the Sinai;<sup>3</sup> and the biographic text of a 6<sup>th</sup> dynasty official called *Iny* that has been recently reassembled by Michele Marcolin and the reviewer.<sup>4</sup> These texts mention several expeditions by this official to Byblos and the Lebanese area, and confirm, as it will be stated below, several conclusions and suspicions by the author. She has not been able to include some new readings of old texts either, as Khnumhetep's inscription at the tomb of Khui at Qubbet el-Hawa<sup>5</sup>. There are also some newly discovered iconographic depictions that, for the sake of completeness, can be mentioned in order to enrich Sowada's studies. In p. 201, there are some new parallels to the relief of "starving Asiatics" from the Unas causeway coming from the same monument and from Sahure's mortuary complex,<sup>6</sup> and the "apparent peaceful arrival of Asiatics" depicted in Sahure's causeway has also a close parallel in a scene from the same site depicting the arrival, with similar poses, of an Egyptian expedition to Punt.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the reviewer has studied a fragment of relief which could demonstrate the depiction of a siege scene in the Unas causeway, enriching the examples given by Sowada in pp. 111-112.<sup>8</sup>

The second chapter, "2. Patterns of Egyptian Foreign Relations in the EBA I and II" (pp. 25-53), as a prolegomenon to the OK contacts with its eastern neighbours, is a synthesis of the Egyptian connections in Canaan (i.e. Israel, Jordan and Palestine) from Naqada IIB phase to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> dynasty. Sowada

3. See the preliminary reports by P. Tallet, "Prendre la mer à Ayn Soukhna au temps du roi Isési", *BSFE* 177-178 (2010) 18-22; B. Midant-Reynes and S. Denoix, "Travaux de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale 2009-2010", *BIFAO* 110 (2010) 303-477 at 379.

4. M. Marcolin, "Iny, a much travelled official of the Sixth Dynasty. Unpublished reliefs in Japan", in M. Bárta, F. Coppens and J. Krejčí (eds.), *Abusir & Saqqara in the Year 2005*, Prague 2008, 282-310; *id.*, "Una nuova biografia egiziana della VI dinastia con iscrizioni storiche e geografiche", *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 144 (2010) 43-79; and M. Marcolin and A. Diego Espinel, "The sixth dynasty inscriptions of Iny: more pieces to the puzzle", in M. Bárta, F. Coppens and J. Krejčí, *Abusir and Saqqara in the Year 2010. Volume 2*, Prague, 2011, 570-615. Iny's texts coincides in time with the discovery of the biography of Khnumhetep from his tomb at Dashur (12<sup>th</sup> dynasty) which also provides new perspectives on the Egyptian activities in the Levant during the Middle Kingdom. On this text, see J. P. Allen, "The historical inscription of Khnumhotep at Dahshur: a preliminary report", *BASOR* 352 (2008) 29-39; *id.*, "L'inscription historique de Khnumhotep à Dahchour", *BSFE* 173 (2009) 13-31. Other studies on OK texts related to Levantine connections have escaped Sowada's watchful eye. That is the case, for example, of comments on the OK Sinai inscriptions in E. Edel, *Beiträge zu den ägyptischen Sinaiinschriften*, Göttingen, 1983; and J. Baines and R. B. Parkinson, "An Old Kingdom record of an oracle? Sinai inscription 13", in J. van Dijk (ed.), *Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman te Velde*, Groningen 1997, pp. 9-28; or the possible mention of an Egyptian campaign to the Levant in M. Baud and V. Dobrev, "Le verso des annals de la VI<sup>e</sup> dynastie. Pierre de Saqqara-Sud", *BIFAO* 97 (1997) 35-42 at 36-38, fig. 3 and photo 2.

5. See A. D. Espinel, "Minima epigraphica", *Discussions in Egyptology* 59 (2004) 7-20 at 15-18; and E. Edel, *Die Felsgräbernekropole der Qubbet el-Hawa Bei Assuan. I Abteilung. Band 3. Architektur, Darstellungen, Texte, archäologischer Befund und Funde der Gräber QH 102 – QH 209*, Paderborn 2008, p. 1528, n. 93.

6. See respectively, Y. Harpur, "Re-used Blocks in the Eighteenth Dynasty Tomb of Maya at Saqqara: A preview of nine reliefs from an unpublished corpus", in D. Magee, J. Bourriau and S. Quirke (eds.), *Sitting beside Lepsius. Studies in Honour of Jaromir Malek at the Griffith Institute*, Leuven/Paris/Dudley MA 2009, pp. 203-227 at 204-205, 222, fig. 1; T. el-Awady, *Abusir XVI: Sahure - The Pyramid Causeway. History and Decoration Program in the Old Kingdom*, Prague 2009, 202-203, fig. 93, pl. 9.

7. T. el-Awady, *Abusir XVI*, pp. 155-160, figs. 81a-b, pl. 5.

8. A. Diego Espinel, "Blocks from the Unas causeway recorded in Černý's notebooks at the Griffith institute, Oxford", in N. Strudwick and H. Strudwick, *Old Kingdom, new perspectives: Egyptian Art and Archaeology 2750-2150 BC*, Oxford 2011, pp. 50-70 at 61-62, fig. 9.



underlines the existence of several phases of commercial interaction defined previously by Levy and van den Brink.<sup>9</sup> During the first phases, exchanges between Egypt's and Canaan's elites increased, particularly in southern Canaan, via Sinai. Later, mainly from the so-called dynasty 0 to early 1<sup>st</sup> dynasty, Egyptians settled directly in the area approaching a trade network that reached further regions such as Galilee or the Lebanese coast. At the beginning of the EBA II, from the reigns of Aha to Djer, Egyptians retreated from southern Canaan for unknown reasons. The withdrawal coincided with several epigraphic attestations pointing to an increasing of Egyptian military activity in the area. From that moment on, Egyptian interactions with the Levant were mainly focused on Arad, in the northern Negev, which possibly was the main provider to Egypt of the so-called Abydos ware; northern Levant, according to the discovery of native raw materials and pottery in Egypt; and southern Sinai.<sup>10</sup> In this regard, unfortunately, the author couldn't include again in her study a recent published finding that provides new evidence on Egyptian activities (and supposed aggressiveness) in the peninsula: the graffiti of king Den and Semerkhet (or Sened?) at Wadi el-Humur, in Sinai, being the oldest written evidence of the Egyptian presence in the area.<sup>11</sup>

The following three chapters, "3. A corpus of imported material in Egypt" (pp. 54-90), "4. A corpus of Egyptian imports in Canaan" (pp. 91-127), and "5. A corpus of Egyptian imports in the northern Levant" (pp. 128-153), form a comprehensive and very useful group of *corpora* of the archaeological material connected to the Egyptian contacts with the Levant. They include some important unpublished material studied directly by the author: the Egyptian materials from Tell Yarmuth, or some Canaanite-shaped jars from Abusir. However, there are again some few significant additions to make to the exhaustive bibliography and to the lists of objects. From the moment that the text was submitted for publication several new findings and a wide range of studies have appeared enriching –and confirming– Sowada's ideas.

Concerning the bibliography, the book by An. Bevan on stone vessels in the Mediterranean couldn't be included.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, another important work by R. Th. Sparks on stone vessels in Middle and Late Bronze contexts published in 2007 is mentioned in the bibliography, but it seems to be a relative last minute addition, since it is, according to the reviewer's view, barely mentioned in the main text.<sup>13</sup> Regarding the objects mentioned in chapter 3, several publications on Canaanite pottery discovered at the

9. T. Levy and E.C.M. van den Brink, "Interaction models, Egypt and the Levantine periphery", in E.C.M. van den Brink and T. E. Levy (eds.), *Egypt and the Levant. Interrelations from the 4<sup>th</sup> through the Early 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium B.C.E.*, London/New York 2002, pp. 3-38.

10. The author eludes the alleged contacts and influences between Egypt and Mesopotamia during this period. On this matter, based in extremely ambiguous evidences, see, for example, F. Guyot, "Structuration sociale et dynamisme des émulations interculturelles. Quelques considérations sur les contacts entre l'Égypte et la Mésopotamie au 4<sup>e</sup> millénaire", *Archéo-Nil* 14 (2004) 81-100, or Ph. Quenet, *Les échanges du nord de la Mésopotamie avec ses voisins proche-orientaux au III<sup>e</sup> millénaire (ca 3100-2300 av. J.-C.)*, Turnhout 2008, pp. 260-262. See, however, H. Wilde and K. Behner, "Salzherstellung im vor- und frühdynastischen Ägypten. Überlegungen zur Funktion der sogenannten Grubenkopfnägel in Buto", *MDAIK* 58 (2002) 447-460.

11. M. Rezk Ibrahim and P. Tallet, "Trois bas-reliefs de l'époque tinte au Ouadi el-Humur: aux origines de l'exploitation du Sud-Sinaï par les égyptiennes", *RdE* 59 (2008) 155-180; *id.*, "King Den in South-Sinai: the Earliest Monumental Rock Inscriptions of the Pharaonic Period", *Archéo-Nil* 19 (2009) 179-184. Several articles dealing with the contacts during the Early Dynastic have appeared recently. See, for example, M. Chłodnicki's paper and the contributions in the "Foreign relations" section in B. Midant-Reynes and Y. Tristant, *Egypt at its origins 2*, Leuven/Paris/Dudley MA 2008, pp. 489-500; 637-837; see the paper by E. Braun in R. F. Friedman and P. N. Fiske (eds.), *Egypt at its origins 3*, Leuven/Paris/Dudley MA 2011, pp. 975-1001; see also T. Bagh, "'Tributes' and the Earliest Pictorial representations of Foreign Oil and Wine Vessels", in Czerny *et al.* (eds.), *Timelines. Studies in Honour of Manfred Bietak. Volume II*, Leuven/Paris/Dudley MA 2006, pp. 9-23.

12. An. Bevan, *Stone vessels and values in the Bronze Age Mediterranean*, Cambridge 2007.

13. R. Th. Sparks, *Stone vessels in the Levant*, Maney 2007.

Egyptian sites of Giza, Abusir, Saqqara, Elephantine,<sup>14</sup> or Abydos can be included.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, in chapter 4, Sowada has overlooked a finding that, surprisingly, has escaped the eye of almost all the recent studies devoted to OK interconnections: several fragments of Egyptian vases of anorthosite gneiss discovered at Tell Afis (Syria) in EBA IV contexts.<sup>16</sup> Less significantly, she has also omitted, even though some studies mentioning these data are included in the bibliography, several OK and/or Early Dynastic stone vessels retrieved in Middle and Late Bronze Age archaeological levels at the Amman Temple, Tell Mevorakh, Tell Migne,<sup>17</sup> Kamid el-Loz, the “tomb of Goats” at Ebla, or, more recently, in the so-called “royal tomb” and “tomb VII” at Qatna.<sup>18</sup> Despite of being discovered in later contexts, these evidences could have been considered in the same way than other Egyptian stone vases mentioned by Sowada in sites such as Lachish (p. 103), Ugarit (p. 141),<sup>19</sup> Alalakh (p. 146), or the mysterious objects allegedly discovered in Anatolia near the Pactolous Valley and Dorak (p. 146).<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, in the Sinai section of Egyptian sites (p. 91 [105]), it should be noted that recently S. Parcak has detected several stone circles similar to the Tell Ras Budran fort, at the south of the Markha plain that could be also OK military enclosures. Since they haven’t been surveyed yet, it is impossible to advance any clear conclusion on their date and function.<sup>21</sup> Maybe these structures, along with Tell Ras Budran, could be connected to the *wnt*-structures mentioned by Sowada (pp. 13-14), being a reference either to Egyptian strongholds out of Egypt or, as Weni’s biography mentions, to Canaanite sites.<sup>22</sup>

Regarding the Cretan findings, again a book published after the manuscript’s submission is relevant here: Phillips’ improved version of her PhD thesis on Egyptian imports in Crete that Sowada used in her book.<sup>23</sup> It should be also noted the appearance of some recent articles connected to this matter by Colburn and, more indirectly, by Barrett.<sup>24</sup>

14. On this discoveries, see the bibliography provided by K. N. Sowada herself in a later article: “An Egyptian imitation of an imported two-handled jar from the Levant”, in D. Aston, B. Bader, C. Gallorini, P. Nicholson and S. Buckingham (eds.), *Under the potter’s tree. Studies on Ancient Egypt presented to Janine Bourriau of her 70<sup>th</sup> birthday*, Leuven/Paris/Walpole MA 2011, pp. 885-893. I am very grateful to the author for providing me a copy of the work. See also some additional information given by A. Wodzińska in her review to Sowada’s book in *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 3:1 (2011) 11-13 (available at <https://journals.uair.arizona.edu/index.php/jaei/article/view/96/98>).

15. Ch. Knoblauch, “Preliminary report on the EBA III pottery from contexts of the 6<sup>th</sup> dynasty in the Abydos Middle Cemetery”, *Ä&L* 20 (2010) 243-261.

16. See G. Scandone-Matthiae in St. Mazzoni and M. Cecchini, “Tell Afis (Siria) 1994 – Rapporto preliminare”, *EVO* 18 (1995) 243-306 at 257-258, fig. 13, pl. 13. No new fragments have been discovered at the site so far. I am very grateful to St. Mazzoni for this information.

17. On these three findings see, e.g., Sparks, *Stone vessels*, pp. 50-52, fig. 14.

18. On bibliography of these objects see, e.g., A. Ahrens, “A journey’s end – two Egyptian stone vessels with hieroglyphic inscriptions from the royal tomb at Tell Mishrife/Qatna”, *Ä&L* 16 (2006) 15-36 at 18, n. 11; see also *id.*, “A stone vessel of princess Itakayet of the 12<sup>th</sup> dynasty from tomb VII at Tell Misrife/Qatna (Syria)”, *Ä&L* 20 (2010) 15-29 at 16.

19. On a recent overview of *aegyptiaca* from Ugarit, see A. Caubet and M. Yon, “*Ougarit et l’Égypte*”, in Czerny *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-95.

20. Quenet, *op. cit.*, 266-267, mentions some possible –but rather improbable– Egyptian influences in EBA sites of Mari and Tell Banat.

21. S. Parcak, “The sceptical remote sencer: Google Earth and Egyptian archaeology”, in S. Ikram and I. Dodson (eds.), *Beyond the Horizon: Studies in Egyptian art, archaeology and history in honour of Barry J. Kemp. Volume II*, Cairo 2009, 362-382, at 364, figs. 1-4.

22. On attestations of the “overseer of the wenets” office (*imy-r wnw*), see, for example, D. Jones, *An index of ancient Egyptian titles, epithets and phrases of the Old Kingdom. Volume I*, Oxford 2000, p. 103, no. 418.

23. J. Phillips, *Aegyptiaca on the island of Crete in their chronological context: a critical review*, Wien 2008; see also *id.*, “Why? ... and why not? Minoan reception and perceptions of Egyptian influence”, in Czerny *et al.* (eds.), *Timelines*, pp. 293-300.

24. C. S. Colburn, “Exotica and the Early Minoan Elite: Eastern Imports in Prepalatial Crete”, *AJA* 112 (2008) 203-224; *id.*, “Egyptian gold in Prepalatial Crete? A consideration of the Evidence”, *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 3:3 (2011)

The following chapters, “6. Imported Ceramics in Egypt and their origins” (pp. 154-182), “7. “The Egyptian-Levantine commodities trade” (pp. 183-209), and “8. The Egyptian-Levantine trade in manufactures goods” (pp. 210-244), examine critically the different materials which served as articles of commerce between Egypt and Canaan. Chapter 6 deals exclusively with the Canaanite pottery discovered in Egypt. It includes an overview of previous studies and a complete analysis of the potteries comprising their typologies, their iconographic depictions on Egyptian art,<sup>25</sup> their possible contents, or their possible modes of transportation. Here, two sections are underlined. First, Sowada’s study on distribution patterns of imported ceramics –mainly combed ware– in space and time shows that the bulk of the pottery arrived to Egypt in the 4<sup>th</sup> dynasty. During this period their distribution was restricted to necropolis connected to royal pyramids as Meydum, Dashur and, above all, Giza. Later, from the early 5<sup>th</sup> dynasty, vessels started to appear in the provinces (as the newly findings at Abydos confirm), but again, most of them were deposited in the Memphite area (Giza, Abusir and Saqqara). Sowada (p. 180) suggests that diffusion out of Memphis “may likewise represent a reduction in state control over the fruits of foreign missions”. On the contrary, as the findings of Canaanite pottery at Abydos point out, this distribution could be explained because Egyptian administration was more flexible and the state and its accomplishments could arrive further than the royal court, for instance, by means of the participants in expeditions abroad. For example, Abydos vessels were found in three mastabas owned by important officials. Actually, one of them, Weni, was a courtier involved in a military expedition to the Levant.

Second, this chapter, along with Appendix II (pp. II.1-II.7), includes a recent overview of several Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) and PIXE-PIGME studies, some of them made by the author herself and Peter Grave, of Levantine pottery from different Egyptian and Canaanite sites. Leaving aside the question of some Egyptian imitations, mainly detected at Abusir,<sup>26</sup> pottery provenances confirm previous studies on the role of Byblos/northern Syria as an important trade centre. Other provenances, moreover, have been detected in central Levant, southern Canaan and Cilicia. It should be noted that editors by accident have omitted table 12 in p. II.8. The reviewer has been able to include it in these pages by kind courtesy of the author.

Chapter 7 deals with a study on the commodities traded between Egypt and Canaan. Among the wide range of imports arrived to the Nile, Sowada includes, for example, lapis lazuli, copper and turquoise, silver, animals, olive oil, wine, different kinds of timbers, or slaves,<sup>27</sup> but as she states, the lack of technical analysis on these supposed imported materials, and the reduced information of textual and iconographic evidence are the main obstacles for determining with certainty actual trade goods and their provenances. Fortunately, the aforementioned biography of Iny, being reassembled by Michele Marcolin and the reviewer currently, permits to confirm the purchase by the Egyptians of certain Levantine commodities and their purveyors. At the moment, the retrieved text includes the mention of several missions by this official to the eastern Mediterranean coast in order to get several products. In his first attested trip to the Levant, Iny mentions “(...) I did Amaaw (*amAAw*), Khenty-She (*xnty-S*, Lebanese

1-13; C. E. Barrett, “The perceived value of Minoan and Minoanizing Pottery in Egypt”, *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 22/2 (2009) 211-234; see also Bevan, *Stone vessels and values*, pp. 93-99.

25. Depictions of the Egyptian containers of the sacred oils could also be useful in order to detect new examples to the Egyptian representations of foreign pottery shapes mentioned by Sowada (pp. 158-160). See, e.g., B. Gilli, “Le rappresentazioni dei vasi per gli oli sacri a Saqqara nella VI dinastia”, *KASKAL* 3 (2006) 31-67, for possible examples (not identified by Gilli as foreign pottery).

26. Recently the author has confirmed another example from Ballas, see Sowada, “An Egyptian imitation” (see n. 14).

27. For later parallels on this subject, see S.J. Larkman, “Human cargo: Transportation of Western Asiatic People during 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> dynasty”, *JSSEA* 34 (2007) 107-113.

coast?) and Pawes[...] (*pAws*[...]) four times, while I was sealbearer of the god under the Majesty of Pepy (I), my lord. I brought him silver and every good produce his *ka* desired and his Majesty praised me for it very greatly”. The text is followed immediately by another expedition sent by Pepy’s I successor: “I was sent to Byblos (*kbn*) under the majesty of Merenre, my lord. I brought back three (?) Byblos-ships and [I made (?)] the great ships of the court. I brought back lapis lazuli, lead/tin (*DHty*), silver, *sft*-oil and every good product his *ka* desired. I was praised for it into the court and gold rewards were given to me. I went down to Byblos from Ra-Hat (*r(A)-HAt*, i.e. a port in the Nile Delta?) and I came back safely. Never was the like done by any expedition leader that any god sent formerly (...).” Finally, in a second biographic inscription, Iny mentions: “(...) the majesty of Neferkare (i.e. Pepy II), my lord, sent me to Khenty-She. I brought (back) one Byblos-ship and several/three *imww*-cargo-ships loaded with silver, *aamu*-men and *aamu*-women. The majesty of my lord praised me (...)”.

In few lines, Iny’s texts permit to prove the Levantine provenance of several materials listed by Sowada. From Byblos, Iny mentions the import of wood in the form of ships, lapis lazuli, lead or tin, silver and *sft*-oil (determined by a two-handled Combed Ware-shaped jar). From other areas, mainly from Khenty-She, he mentions again wood (boats), silver and human cargo. According to these mentions the Lebanese coast and, above all, Byblos are confirmed, as Sowada and other authors have suggested, as important middlemen between Egypt and the Near Eastern trade nets that extended from Afghanistan or India to the Nile Valley. Iny’s list and recent studies also permit to precise several aspects arisen by Sowada on Levantine products. For example, the possibility of translating *sTt j* (“Asiatic copper”) as tin (pp. 187-188) is minimized by the oldest mention of *DHty* in Iny’s text.<sup>28</sup> On the other side, the *sft*-oil (pp. 198-200) has been translated recently by Bardinnet as a generic term for any kind of substance made of resins mixed or dried with flax oil.<sup>29</sup>

Unfortunately, Iny didn’t precise the Egyptian exports destined to the trade with Levant and, consequently, the list of products from the Nile valley remains more dubious than the former one: raw stones and shells, gold, foodstuffs, and animals products (ivory, ostrich egg shells, etc). The most visible Egyptian exports to the Levant, the manufactured goods, are studied in chapter 8. The main item, the stone vessels, are analysed taking into account the many difficulties that this kind of evidences exhibits (see also pp. 16-18 in the introduction). Sowada’s usual scepticism on the historical interpretation of the data provided by these vases is centred mainly in the stone vessels discovered at Byblos and, more logically, in Crete. Concerning Byblos, she denies any kind of proofs of the cult of Hathor at the Lebanese port during the third millennium BCE (pp. 218-222), but she does not even mention some small pieces of inscriptional evidence raised by the reviewer that could permit to reconsider the existence of this cult during the 6<sup>th</sup> dynasty despite of being discovered out of EBA archaeological contexts.<sup>30</sup> On the contrary, she is not too sceptical on possible direct commercial and/or diplomatic contacts between Egypt and Ebla. Actually, she thinks that Egypt could be mentioned in the Eblaite archives following the much-contested interpretation

28. On some mentions of *sTt j* as “Asiatic copper” in OK Egyptian texts not mentioned by Sowada, see, e.g., P. Posener-Kriéger (+), M. Verner and H. Vymazalová, *Abusir X. The pyramid complex of Raneferef. The papyrus archive*, Prague 2006, pp. 244-246, 248.

29. Th. Bardinnet, *Relations économiques et pressions militaires en Méditerranée orientale et Libye au temps des pharaons*, Paris 2008, 215; see also B. Koura, *Die “7-Heiligen Öle” und andere Öl- und Fettamen*, Aachen 1999, pp. 177-180. There are other interpretations, however. R. Germer, *Handbuch der altägyptische Heilpflanzen*, Wiesbaden 2008, 48, thinks it is a resinous product from the *aS*-tree; for a similar idea see M. Serpico, “Resins, amber and bitumen”, in P. T. Nicholson and I. Shaw (eds.), *Ancient Egyptian material and technology*, Cambridge 2000, 430-474, at 464.

30. A. Diego Espinel, “The role of the temple of Ba<sup>c</sup>alat Gebal as intermediary between Egypt and Byblos during the Old Kingdom”, *SAK* 30 (2002) 103-119 at 109-110, fig. 2a-b.

by Pettinato of the toponym *DU<sup>ki</sup> DU<sup>ki</sup>* as “Egypt”.<sup>31</sup> Even though Iny’s inscriptions point that Egyptian activities in the East were more intense than thought, a direct contact between Ebla and Egypt should be regarded cautiously as a remote possibility. Egyptian vases, more feasibly, would arrive to Ebla from Byblos, apparently the main intermediary between the Nile Valley and the Syrian states.

Along with the vases, Sowada studies other possible *aegyptiaca* such as slate palettes, faience objects, textiles or furniture, for instance. She also considers several Egyptian architectural features as possible proofs of contacts between Egypt and Levant. The more plausible example would be the use of the Egyptian cubit in the planning of several EBA elite buildings at Tel Yarmuth and Megiddo.<sup>32</sup> In the opposite direction, it should be stressed that recently Bietak has detected some Canaanite features in the planning of the OK/EBA III temple at Tell Ibrahim Awad in the eastern Nile Delta.<sup>33</sup>

The final section, “Conclusion: A revised view of Egyptian relations with the Levant in the Old Kingdom – EB III/IV” (pp. 245-255) is an excellent synthesis of the historical development of the contacts between both regions from the predynastic-EBA I to the end of the OK – EB III/IV.

The author has detected along the book several minor mistakes, some of them connected to the transcription of Egyptian terms. Here there are the most significant ones: p. 9 mentions *kbn wnt* instead of *kbn wnTt*; p. 12, *n ˆia* instead of *n ˆiA*; p. 31, Ogden instead of Ogdon; or p. 200, 70,000 instead of 7000. In any case, these mistakes can be explained because of the quantity of data mentioned by the author.

Summing up, Sowada’s study is an excellent work destined to be the main study on OK contacts with the Levant for long, even though this is an ever-developing subject of study.<sup>34</sup> As a historian attached to the written evidence, the reviewer considers that if some kind of criticism can be levelled at this book, it would be connected to the relative absence of comments and interpretations of the Egyptian textual and epigraphic evidence. This secondary –but in any case not marginal– use of the texts and images is, however, its main virtue too. Regrettably, Egyptology studies continue to be too tied to the written evidence, and more strict archaeological approaches still remain secondary, notwithstanding the extremely rich range of material culture retrieved in the Nile Valley and the neighbouring regions, and the many informative possibilities they can provide through pertinent archaeometric analyses. For this very reason, this book will remain as a pivotal work in the historiography on the subject. Furthermore, *insha’allah*, it will open, with its mixture of well-balanced scepticism to the written and iconographic evidences, and of

31. See M. Bonechi, *Répertoire géographique des textes cuneiforms. Band 12/1. I nomi geografici dei testi di Ebla*, Wiesbaden, 1993, 105; and A. Archi, P. Piacentini and F. Pomponio, *I nomi di luogo dei testi di Ebla (ARET I-IV; VII-X e altri documenti editi e inediti)*, Roma, 1993, where Pettinato’s interpretation is not even considered.

32. In this regard, the reviewer has to point out that his previous date of the so-called *relief de la maisonette* at Byblos to the OK in Diego Espinel, *SAK* 30, pp. 106-107, fig. 1, should be considered with extreme caution since he currently thinks it is a later object.

33. M. Bietak, “The Early Bronze Age III temple at Tell Ibrahim Awad and its relevance to the Egyptian Old Kingdom”, in Z. Hawass, P. der Manuelian and R. B. Hussein, *Perspectives on Ancient Egypt. Studies in honor of Edward Brovarski*, Cairo 2010, pp. 65-77.

34. See, for example, these recent proceedings of several conferences connected to this matter: M. Bietak and E. Czerny (eds.), *The Bronze Age in the Lebanon: studies on the archaeology and chronology of Lebanon, Syria, and Egypt*, Wien 2008; *Interconnections in the Eastern Mediterranean. Lebanon in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Proceedings of the international symposium, Beirut 2008*, Beirut 2009; J. Mynářová (ed.), *Egypt and the Near East – the Crossroads: proceedings of an international conference on the relations of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age, Prague, September 1-3, 2010*, Prague 2011; K. Duistermaat and I. Reguluski, *Intercultural contacts in the ancient Mediterranean. Proceedings of the International Conference at the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo, 25<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> October 2008*, Leiden/Paris/Dudley MA 2011; or the celebration of the recent conference “Egypt and the Southern Levant in the Early Bronze Age: C14, chronology, connections” held at Berlin, where the author herself has participated.

confidence on accurate analyses of the archaeological evidence, a more trustworthy path in the research on the international contacts in the EBA.

P. S. Along with the recent discoveries at Ain Sukhna, an IFAO mission has recently identified at Wadi al-Jarf a new harbour in the Egyptian Red Sea coast, 90 km south of the former site, dated to the 4th and early 5th dynasties. Due to its location, exactly opposite to the fortress of Tell Ras Budran, in the Sinai shore, this place could be identified as the point of departure of early Old Kingdom maritime expeditions to the Sinai. On this new site, only preliminarily surveyed and excavated, see P. Tallet and G. Marouard, "An early pharaonic harbour on the Red Sea coast", *Egyptian Archaeology* 40 (2012), 40-43.

Table 12: PIXE-PPVME results for samples and replicates of the Ohio Red Clay Standard

Sample	All results expressed as parts per million																			
	Al	Ca	Cl	Cr	F	Fe	K	Li	Mg	Mn	Na	Nb	Ni	Rb	Sr	Ti	Zn	Zr		
2001	97781	95343	523	314	148	104322	15033	42	14803	1124	1024	35	241	1	268381	334	13074	1064	180	340
2002	61905	106093	842	135	195	48686	9497	22	24678	882	2511	22	108	24	328381	201	63073	1744	87	228
2003	64408	65859	661	164	147	53058	8950	13	12772	844	2910	25	99	25	389361	108	7037	1807	90	258
2004	78743	71510	780	205	140	63257	7374	32	20469	254	2079	22	87	31	360037	131	7472	2446	61	290
2005	71777	77057	735	137	182	57311	11731	24	10185	743	3114	18	93	52	336886	199	6857	1566	115	222
2006	79954	107207	1059	240	222	39214	11847	15	9227	534	1918	33	206	--	250046	352	10885	593	207	252
2007	40068	301128	707	67	461	30214	20052	17	17200	553	4341	19	24	13	186452	732	5056	941	132	167
2008	109244	94884	556	202	252	91398	17723	41	10120	900	1465	56	212	13	252775	329	13823	3632	189	421
2009	00986	166637	650	116	228	74132	9886	46	7663	838	911	46	146	--	216522	262	9377	279	242	262
2010	110226	80923	664	184	143	63963	12250	65	8539	439	785	69	123	2	221060	261	17067	154	169	813
2011	103106	75063	614	165	244	105682	13854	46	7510	754	1654	37	171	--	216404	217	12465	261	223	423
2012	59840	253149	609	97	184	41587	35514	16	32058	819	1556	19	--	15	161029	180	5679	142	124	150
2013	112053	57966	753	169	118	87265	16399	69	4094	431	1306	61	81	9	256093	171	13439	151	185	516
2014	42227	351444	643	84	504	34833	21526	61	7336	431	3439	20	--	55	151843	411	4463	171	180	194
2015	55719	280103	527	58	245	39510	34054	16	15481	982	1549	27	--	18	166522	188	5142	181	168	136
2016	105728	113146	1303	173	253	91757	16309	61	9640	1019	2618	49	135	--	214853	303	11266	285	244	350
2017	56710	162802	717	94	241	42256	19897	16	22098	820	4882	15	40	4	274272	510	5589	159	120	301
2018	93337	87596	671	250	259	104076	11964	35	15008	750	882	29	199	--	245550	320	12989	256	162	301
2019	93061	86014	837	222	284	104069	11208	40	18227	819	888	29	192	--	238537	317	13972	296	190	328
2020	70035	180904	715	83	482	48865	13187	6	17145	623	2103	22	82	6	249732	289	7830	188	160	319
2021 [86]	74801	119801	1021	305	884	95646	12156	38	19386	983	4680	37	286	--	238505	400	11998	3130	164	242
2022 [9]	59862	97381	2632	121	432	45456	10621	--	38072	446	9049	31	98	33	311369	272	5835	1093	65	266
2023 [15]	77582	99555	3268	226	746	93536	9651	30	20544	574	2348	28	228	1	286860	384	12164	2161	159	294
2024 [9]	64618	64925	3717	137	222	52204	10284	--	36295	844	4258	12	91	47	383135	132	7194	2053	62	263
2025 [18]	79704	160764	1837	243	384	88368	9812	29	11642	913	2152	39	248	--	253627	245	9896	3762	116	310
2026 [6]	85131	24007	3304	154	438	67222	16696	--	18201	850	15885	31	70	40	334592	299	10428	1745	104	307
2027 [7]	58685	81472	3628	116	622	45745	13662	--	56001	444	10761	12	70	22	315705	104	6043	608	70	218
2028 [8]	59764	71002	6651	154	327	44977	10800	6	45499	485	4976	34	63	21	325022	155	6194	962	81	268
2029	128062	7955	863	233	149	57770	14281	51	6286	228	1106	40	75	42	310940	164	18048	--	142	496
2030	122094	116200	591	220	275	82056	16203	55	10590	723	2212	59	168	--	199080	485	10899	251	253	314
2031	116571	110017	588	180	167	84892	13360	77	7339	779	1288	54	128	--	237580	364	13207	222	254	469
2032	44648	274563	796	118	485	38996	21244	--	25928	531	5210	18	15	2	183420	686	5523	196	220	188
2033	46662	342306	533	121	424	35875	24827	--	8906	438	3323	20	--	33	157806	427	4556	151	177	125

  

Ohio Red Clay Standard (n=4) average and coefficient of variation (C.V.)																			
Al	Ca	Cl	Cr	F	Fe	K	Li	Mg	Mn	Na	Nb	Ni	Rb	Sr	Ti	W	Zn	Zr	
96261.25	4853.25	581.75	107.75	270.25	60104	40179.25	113.25	13422.5	334	1113	24.3	89.5	168.72	335229.5	67.75	7316.5	45.5	130	252
1.42	6.28	6.47	13.39	4.15	1.47	2.18	3.17	3.57	4.70	2.76	17.79	12.69	2.71	1.68	8.03	0.91	13.49	6.31	11.65
%C.V.																			