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ABSTRACT

THE TUTANKHAMUN BURNT GROUP FROM GUROB, EGYPT:
BASES FOR THE ABSOLUTE CHRONOLOGY OF LH III A AND B

MARTHA RHOADS BELL
KEITH DEVRIES

In 1888-1890 W. Flinders Petrie excavated the kôm of Gurob, at the entrance to Egypt’s Fayum depression. He discovered a number of so-called “burnt groups”: pits filled with layers of ash and smashed objects. These included Egyptian glass, stone, faience and pottery vessels, toilette articles, and jewellery, as well as Mycenaean Greek vases, mostly stirrup jars of LH III A and B style. Occasionally items with Egyptian royal names were also found, such as the two faience beads from the Tutankhamun Group. Petrie took these to indicate that all the objects in the associated group should be contemporary with the named ruler. Following upon Petrie’s work, Furumark and others, to the present day, have used the groups to provide absolute dates, based on Egyptian absolute chronology, for the Mycenaean pottery styles. The most important group for the Aegean is the Tutankhamun Group, which contained pottery of both styles and which has been used to date the appearance of LH III B to the reign of Tutankhamun in the 18th Dynasty. An examination of the Egyptian objects from the group, however, indicates that, when they can be dated, many of them are Ramesside (Dyn. 19) in character. Further, a reinvestigation of the archaeological contexts of the groups, insofar as they can be reestablished, suggests that they were all intrusive into a royal palace or harim that was occupied until the end of Dynasty 18. They must, therefore, be no earlier
than Dynasty 19. This new assessment of the Burnt Groups, and of the Tutankhamun Group in particular, agrees with the results obtained in other, more recent, excavations: importation of pottery in LH III A2 style continued well into Dynasty 19, and the pottery was possibly still being produced in Greece at this time. LH III B pottery, both Egyptian importation and Aegean production, belongs more properly to Dynasty 19.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The name Kôm¹ Medinet Ghurab means "Mound of the City of Crows" and is usually anglicized and shortened to "Gurob." The site that bears this colorful designation lies on a very slight rise of the desert² just where it meets the edge of the cultivation at the southern side of the natural opening into the Fayum basin. Here the small river called the Bahr Yusef turns northwest into a passage between the desert hills and runs about 10 Km. to Lake Fayum. The site of the modern city of El-Lahun, which is situated on the flood plain at the mouth of this natural entrance, seems a logical place for the development of an urbanized center. A series of sites to the east, and on the north and south desert ridges, including Gurob, seem to be focused on it. Gurob itself had a series of cemeteries from the Early Dynastic to the First Intermediate Period and early Middle Kingdom. At some point³ a dyke or road bed raised above the level of the inundation may have been built, connecting Gurob with Illahun to the north, or so Petrie thought.⁴ The modern road now runs on top of its remains. The cemeteries seem to show a break in activity on the site for the rest of the Middle Kingdom until a possible Hyksos settlement.⁵ In the New Kingdom a series of large structures was built here under the authority of Tuthmosis III, although there may have been earlier buildings already existing elsewhere on the site.⁶ The ruin of this monumental establishment was still preserved high enough in 1888 to be visible from afar when one was approaching through the cultivation. It is this very elevation and visibility that may be
important clues to the choice of the site. The height would have kept it above the annual inundation and also gives it a constant breeze, which would have been a very important consideration during the summer months. The height also, as the recent occupation by Egyptian military forces makes clear, would give it a strategic position, where one could observe activities in the cultivation for some distance, and perhaps from where one could also control access to the Fayum. This latest settlement has been most unfortunate for the site, as about twenty or more large rectangles have been dug into the main mound, and ancient bricks mixed with modern to face the walls. Any areas that might have survived the previous attacks of excavator and treasure-hunter must now have almost certainly been affected.

Like Amarna, the New Kingdom settlement at Gurob was seen to form a great closed-context site. Founded in the 18th dynasty, Gurob did not apparently survive beyond the middle of the 19th Dynasty. In the main occupation area a number of pieces of Mycenaean pottery were found, including vases and fragments from strange deposits of burnt and broken objects. Ever since Petrie and Sayce first discussed this "Aegean" pottery in 1889, it has been recognized as significant for the absolute chronology of Greece. As Petrie observed, "The pottery is doubly important, as it is identical with that of Mycenae, and so dates that to the early age that Schleimann believed." The so-called "Burnt Deposits" (or "Burnt Groups"), which were identified in 1889/1890, were recognized to be even more important, for they "fixed" particular pieces of pottery, which we now know
to be LH III A2 or III B in style, to a particular king's reign. These collections of Mycenaean vases and Egyptian objects, some inscribed with the names of Amenhotep III, Tutankhamun, Ramesses II, and Seti II, have since been used to date the duration of LH III B,\textsuperscript{10} and the transition between LH III A and LH III B,\textsuperscript{11} in absolute terms. It was the early years of the Aegean's chronological dependence on Egypt,\textsuperscript{12} a dependence which has since spread to include most of Europe.\textsuperscript{13}

Even if we leave aside the problems of fixing Egyptian absolute chronology,\textsuperscript{14} the archaeological insecurity of these finds makes their use for absolute chronology an extremely questionable procedure. To understand what real help Gurob can give to Aegean chronology, I will re-examine the whole matter, concentrating on the Tutankhamun Burnt Group.\textsuperscript{15} This is the most critical of all the groups, as it is the only one thought to belong to the 18th Dynasty that is also supposed to contain both LH III A2 and III B pottery. The other early group, that of Amenhotep III, contained Mycenaean pottery but of a developed III B style, so it is never brought up in chronological discussions. The other "dated" groups are all associated with 19th Dynasty kings and so not as interesting: LH III B is well documented as contemporary with this period.

I will begin with a brief discussion of the state of Aegean Bronze Age studies at the time Petrie made his discoveries at Gurob, and try to assess their effect on scholarly thought. Furumark's chronological use of several of the Burnt Groups and other deposits from Gurob is then evaluated, as well
as the impact of his work, which is still felt today. Complementary appendices will present scholarly opinion of the period concerning both Petrie and Furumark. There is an extra appendix for the Petrie-Torr controversy of 1892. The contents of the Tutankhamun Burnt Group are then individually described and assessed. Such conclusions as are possible are drawn from the presence of particular objects in the group. This is followed by a lengthy review of the archaeology of the site, in which an understanding of the stratigraphic position of the Burnt Groups is attempted. An attempt is also made to locate the source of the Ramesside Papyri and to understand their presence on the site and their part in its history. In the conclusions, Aegean absolute chronology as derived from Egyptian sources is investigated, particularly in respect to the date of the transition to LH III B, and the late sherds from Amarna are examined carefully. The effect on Aegean chronology that the loss of Gurob as an 18th Dynasty fixed point might have is considered and suggestions are made for future inquiries. Additional appendices give extracts from Petrie's excavation journals, and a concordance of all the different find groups. The concluding section is a catalogue of all objects with detailed descriptions, measurements and drawings.
CHAPTER 1: ENDNOTES

1 "kom" is a normal and commonly used term in the archaeological literature of Egypt. It is the Arabic for "mound" or "heap" and is used as the equivalent of "tell" in some Egyptian place names. "Tell," which is also Arabic, means "mound," or "man-made hill." In most discussions of the site of Gurob the excavators almost always refer to the area where the two great enclosures were placed as the "kom," and so it seems reasonable to continue this practice here.

2 Angela P. Thomas, Gurob: A New Kingdom Town, Introduction and Catalogue of Objects in the Petrie Collection (Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd., 1981). p. 1, says that it is 30 meters above sea level, but it is only a few meters above the cultivation.

3 The dyke would presumably have been pre-New Kingdom. It has never been excavated and Petrie's suggestion is based only on conjecture. As visible today, it is a wide, raised road-way that certainly was constructed at some time before the completion of the Aswan High Dam, as its purpose is to allow travel despite the high waters of the annual inundation. However, exactly when before this time is unknown. Dieter Arnold, in LAI, III, col. 909 states that the el-Lahun pyramid was built by Sesosiris III of the Middle Kingdom, and that the "damm" between el-Lahun and Gurob should be of the same date.


5 Barry J. Kemp and Robert S. Merrillees, Minoan Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1980), pp. 55-56, and fn. 154, identify the earlier burials in Cemetery C. "Since this was [i.e. Gurob in the New Kingdom] the new center of growth in the area it is important to know if this process had begun already in the Hyksos Period, perhaps replacing the communities at Kahun and el-Haraga." They identify Hyksos objects from the second season and suggest that "The evidence would seem to suggest that this much-excavated site did see an occupation of sorts in the Hyksos Period, but not in the least comparable with the urban settlement of Kahun, el-Haraga and Medinet el-Ghurab itself in the preceding and ensuing periods. The Hyksos objects "probably came from the palace or associated town which seems to have been the principal, and possibly sole, object to that particular season's excavation [1889-1890]. Other possibly Hyksos-associated items are also mentioned. It is difficult to reconcile this view with Barry J. Kemp's previous statement that Gurob was a single phase site (see "The Harim-Palace at Medinet el-Ghurab," ZAS 105 [1978], p. 128), unless he now thinks that the harim/palace/temple was originally founded by Hyksos kings.

6 Brunton and Engelbach reported a series of brick walls, including the so-called "fort," which they thought could have preceded the New Kingdom settlement. These were on the very edge of the cultivation where the rise of the gebel commenced. As Brunton and Engelbach seem never to have excavated the area (except for neighboring cemeteries), and as they supplied no other evidence for their date, we are left with nothing more than their published opinion.
They seem to have been in place by January, 1975, when Kemp was unable to visit the site (Kemp, 'Harim," p. 124). According to Peter Lacovara, they left in 1982; he went to Gurob in 1983. At the time of my own visit in June, 1989, their traces were still quite evident (large holes dug for weapon and bunker emplacements, bathroom installations with concrete floors, etc.).

"Everything I saw there was of the XVIIIth and XIXth dynasties, and the place had evidently been occupied for only a brief space of time. On clearing a great part of it, the period of the town proved to begin with Tahutmes III, and end with Ramessu II, or possibly Merenptah." Ibid., p. 32: "...we can trace a history almost as brief [as Kahun]...the rise of the town may be very closely dated, and we may probably fix the time of its fall almost to a year. Its history covers the end of the XVIIIth dynasty and the beginning of the XIXth...."


Vronwy Hankey and Peter Warren, "The Absolute Chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age," BICS 21 (1974), pp. 147-8, based on the vases found in the Tutankhamun group.

Vronwy Hankey, "The chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age," in Paul Astrom, editor, High, Middle, or Low?, Part 2 (Gothenburg: 1987), p. 40: "Synchronisms for Aegean dating ultimately derive from Egypt. This was recognized by Newton, some years before Petrie brilliantly identified 'Aegean' pottery at Kahun. It is still a fact of chronology. Where cross-contacts with apparently well-dated events appear to provide a basis for absolute dating, Aegean scholars have little choice but to accept the best documented synchronisms...In seeking correlations with apparently well-dated systems outside the Aegean it is necessary to balance the chronological value of foreign objects found in the Aegean against that of Aegean objects found abroad."

N. Kokkinos, P. J. James, J. A. Frankish, "Greece 'Dark Age' Debates," Studies in Ancient Chronology 1 (1987), p. 18: "Overall the general picture for the chronology of the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Balkans is one of complete dependence, either directly or indirectly, on the agreed historical dating for Greece. As with the other European areas reviewed above, this dependence has contributed to a highly unsatisfactory and problematical picture with regard to the dating of Balkan prehistory." Also J. Thorpe, P. J. James, "Introduction," Studies in Ancient Chronology 1 (1987), p. 4: "Areas to the southeast [of Europe] are still dated by their connections with Mycenaean civilization, in itself dated by synchronisms with the accepted chronology for Egypt. Despite apparent confidence in the Mycenaean/Egyptian based chronology for the late 2nd to early 1st millennia, conspicuous problems remain which merit closer examination."
"Mycenaean chronology has influenced European dating as far north as central Europe...."


15 The dissertation title, "A reappraisal of the Egyptian contexts of LH III A2-B pottery, with particular reference to Gurob," was announced in 1979 by Pericles Kouranakis, at Durham (under the direction of J.R. Harris) in Geoffrey T. Martin, "Current research for higher degrees in Egyptology, Coptic, and related studies in the United Kingdom, No. 4." JEA 66 (1980), pp. 174-75. However, Durham no longer has an Oriental Studies department, and there has been no further report on the progress of this dissertation (as of 1985; Geoffrey T. Martin, "Current Research for Higher Degrees in Egyptology, Coptic and Related Studies in the United Kingdom, No. 7." BE 3 (1985), p. 29).
Although it is taken for granted today, not all nineteenth century scholars were prepared to accept a date in the sixteenth century B.C. for the beginning of the Aegean Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{1} It really is Petrie whom we must credit with doing much towards proving that Mycenaean Greece (or the Late Helladic period) was contemporary with the 18th and 19th Dynasties of Egypt, and \textit{not} the 23-26th.\textsuperscript{2} When Petrie began work in the Fayum, Greek Prehistory was still badly known and hardly dated.\textsuperscript{3} There was, in fact, a great deal of controversy about the placing of what we now know to be Bronze Age materials. It had not been many years before that Schliemann's excavations in the Troad and Peloponnesos during the 1870's brought materials of this time to light, and acceptance of their association with the heroic age of the Trojan War had by no means been unanimous.\textsuperscript{4}

Up to the time of Petrie's discoveries, Furtwängler and Loeschcke's\textsuperscript{5} important publication of 1886 was the first comprehensive study of those ceramics which had now begun to be called "Mycenaean." They divided this corpus into "Vasen mit Mattmalerei" and "Vasen mit Firnis\v{z}malerei." This latter category was then further subdivided into four styles, on the bases of technique, form, style and ornament. But dating the period in which this pottery was used caused some problems. It was agreed that the "Dipylon" style succeeded the Mycenaean, and that gave a sequence for that end. But, for the beginning, it was more difficult, and Egypt was already seen as an
important chronological indicator: "Anhaltspunkt für die denkbar frühere Datierung des mykenischen Altertums lassen sich aus der Vergleichung mit ägyptischen Denkmälern gewinnen."Unfortunately, there were not many useful "monuments" available at this point. The decoration of the Orchomenos tholos tomb and of Mycenaean swords was connected with Ramesside art, and the then-recently discovered dagger from the tomb of Aahotep. The authors also had access to the stirrup jar representations in the tomb of Ramesses III. They could already see some of the chronological problems involved in using such materials: "Noch immer bleibt aber die Frage offen, um wieviel die mykenischen Nachahmungen später anzusehen seien als die ägyptischen Vorbilder." They concluded that, although some had already dated the Shaft Graves to the 12th or 11th centuries B.C., on the basis of the Ramesses III tomb (which they placed in the 12th century), and allowing for a long lag between Greece and Egypt, the graves should instead be placed in the 15th or 14th centuries B.C.

When Petrie found the Mycenaean pottery at Gurob in his first season (1898), he was not particularly excited by it, his interest being centered on the earlier site of Kahun and the pyramids of Hawara and Lahun. But, by the end of his first season, he did realize that having dated contexts was important: "all of it [e.g. the "Greek" and "Cypriote" pottery] will be a great surprise as dated 1400 B.C." During his visit, soon after the time of this entry, Sayce not only eliminated the possibility that the pottery was Etruscan but connected it to the materials from Mycenae: "The pottery is doubly important, as it is identical with that of Mykenae, and so dates that
to the early age that Schleimann believed. 11 Even then Petrie realized that his field technique had not been quite as good as it could have been. 12 But, he seems to have thought that this would not matter too much, as the chronological evidence was firmly fixed:

we have now so much certain about the age of Greek pottery here, that the evidence of the finding is now sufficient to corroborate what we already know... Of course if the subject were new I should drop all else and follow it for a time; but all that is found just corroborates what I have already worked out there. 13

In his publication of the season's results, he concluded that "Here the most important historical result was the discovery of Mediterranean pottery," 14 which was like

the earliest pottery found on Greek soil, at Mykenae, at Thera, and at Mitylene.... Here, then, in three cases different evidences require us to take 1300 B.C. as the date, and in one case a rather earlier and the last a rather later age.... It will be noticed that this pottery is like the earliest of Mykenae, and not the later and more ornate styles; and hence we may now feel that firm ground has been reached for dating the beginning of the pottery of Mykenae and Thera to about 1300 B.C. 15

In the second season Petrie seems to have tried to rectify the fieldwork situation, bringing an assistant, W.O. Hughes-Hughes, to supervise Gurob. After the end of this work he concluded that "the age of the Mykenae
pottery, in particular, has been amply fixed by many further finds. He was able to make a primitive typology for the stirrup jar shape:

The false-necked vases can now be well traced; beginning in a globular form, of fine Aegaean ware, with iron-glaze bands, under Amenhotep III; next flatter in form during the end of that dynasty, with discs surrounded by dots; tolerably imitated on a large scale under Ramessu II; roughly copied in native pottery under Seti II; and of very rude style in native clay, under the later Ramessides (Tell el Yehudiyeh). To displace this dating by a century, every stage of this history would need to be altered; the sequence is quite regular so far as Egypt is concerned; and if the type came down to later times in other countries, it must be similarly proved by dated examples in those localities.

However, excavation and recording techniques this season were still not very advanced. To the end of his life, Petrie was defensive about this work at Gurob, blaming his assistant.

He [Hughes-Hughes] came in an unhappy state of irritation with everything, which compelled me to leave him entirely un-checked, merely registering what came in, and only when he had done could I go to make a plan. Shortly after his return to England he vanished. Hence the detail of the discovery was neglected.

This really was very unfortunate, as the contexts of the Mycenaen vases at Gurob have turned out to be at least as important, and possibly even more important, than the Minoan sherds from Kahun. Clearly, Petrie never realized the full importance of the Gurob material until he had finished with
the site, and the wish to retrieve sounder archaeological evidence may have been one of the reasons that brought Brunton and Engelbach back to Gurob, with Petrie’s assistance, thirty years later.\textsuperscript{21}

Having finished his excavations at Gurob, Petrie visited Athens to look at the materials found at Mycenae by Schliemann and Tsountas. He immediately made his new evidence available to classical scholars, publishing an extremely important paper in \textit{JHS} (1890).\textsuperscript{22}

Seven years ago nothing was known in Egypt which could be attributed to a Greek origin before the Alexandrine times\textsuperscript{23}....But now the main light on the chronology of the civilizations of the Aegean comes from Egypt; and it is Egyptian sources that must be thanked by classical scholars for revealing the real standing of the antiquities of Greece. Without the foreign colonies on the Nile, they would still be groping in speechless remains, which might cover either a century of a thousand years, for aught that could be determined in Greek excavations....\textsuperscript{24}

He reiterated, in expanded form, his typology of stirrup jars, giving absolute dates to the different styles (see Appendix: Petrie and Chronology) and concluded:

"The general results of my excavations from the Greek point of view then are:....That we have dated it [Greek pottery] to within a century as far back as 1400 B.C....that we have pushed back the hazy and speculative region to before 2000 B.C., and shown some reasons for looking to a rise of European civilization before 2500 B.C."\textsuperscript{25}
The response to Petrie was not, of course, completely adulatory.\textsuperscript{26} Probably the most severe criticism was voiced by Cecil Torr, representing a school of thought that preferred to associate Mycenaean culture with the eighth century B.C.\textsuperscript{27} After a series of spirited exchanges with Petrie,\textsuperscript{28} Torr published a book-length exposition of his views, *Memphis and Mycenae* (Cambridge, 1896). He began:

A statement is current that the Mycenaean age in Greece can definitely be fixed at 1500 B.C., or thereabouts, on the strength of evidence from Egyptian sources....On pressure, however, it [this statement] splits in two, and becomes a pair of propositions; one being that the Mycenaean age in Greece was contemporary with the reigns of certain kings of Dynasty 18 in Egypt, the other being that these kings were reigning there at some such date at 1500 B.C.....But, obviously the Mycenaean age should not be dated on the strength of evidence from Egyptian sources only. There is also a quantity of evidence from Greek sources; and that all seems to point another way.\textsuperscript{29}

Listing the evidence for connections between Egypt and Greece, he did mention Gurob,\textsuperscript{30} the stirrup jars from the Burnt Groups of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun. However, he thought the context for the vase from the tomb of the grandson of Pinudjem was more secure.\textsuperscript{31} This is not surprising, as this is still the one context from Egypt that would support his contentions. These were that:

...there certainly is nothing to justify the confident assertion that the Mycenaean age in Greece was concurrent with Dyn. 18 in Egypt, and that this Dynasty began in 1700....the evidence that points to
intercourse, direct or indirect, between Greece and Egypt in the Mycenaean age, points to a period that began in 1271 at latest and ended in 850 or thereabouts.32

And his inclination was to push the lower boundary down even further, closer to 700.

Petrie, of course, could not agree. Although the 1895 publication of the pottery from the Kamares cave soon began the process that corroborated his placement of the Kahun materials,33 and the "reign of Sesostris II became a lynchpin for Cretan chronology...."34, opposition did not cease for some years. Torr's book appeared in 1896, under the aegis of the Cambridge University Press, and Murray's 1900 report on the important British Museum excavations in Cyprus did its best to associate Bronze Age materials with the seventh century.35 However, Petrie did have the last word, more than forty years later:

At Gurob, the foreign connections were the special interest. For the first time, Mykenaean pottery was found in place in Egypt, and so completely mixed up with remains of the end of the XVIIth dynasty as to date it decisively. Efforts to confuse the issue by the Enkomi publication,36 or a dealer's made-up group37 bought for the British Museum and favoured by Cecil Torr, were quite useless, and the date has been abundantly confirmed at Amarna and many other places since.38

What Petrie and Torr were really doing, of course, was hammering out the beginnings of techniques of archaeological interpretation. They were
actually on the “cutting edge” of the beginnings of modern scientific thought on this subject. It is not an unworthy exercise for later scholars to search out, recognize and appreciate the roots from whence they have sprung. Petrie’s early struggles were really the first attempts, untutored and sui generis, to create an archaeological chronology. His innovative archaeological techniques and creative thinking manipulated, in new ways, the data obtained through excavation and produced dated typologies, and relative and absolute chronologies. These not only changed the history of the discipline, but they also changed the perceived history of the world.
CHAPTER 2: ENDNOTES

1 For current controversies, see "Aegean pottery from stratified contexts at Memphis, Kom Rabia," (Cambridge: 1989). Janine Bourriau’s unpublished study of the Egyptian contexts of three early Aegean pieces, including the LM IB sherd from Kom Rabia, which has made a convincing argument for placing the start of the Late Bronze Age in the Aegean into the Second Intermediate Period or beginning of Dyn. 18, contra Peter Warren and Vronwy Hankey, Aegaeon Bronze Age Chronology (Bristol, Bristol Classical Press: 1989), pp. 139-40, 144.

2 See, for example, the opinions cited by Kokkinos, James, Frankish, "Debates," pp. 31-32, which are quoted in Appendix I; e.g., "Murray was a staunch supporter of a low dating for Mycenaean civilization, associating it with the period of colonization and the early tyrants, during the 8th-7th centuries B.C." The Third Intermediate Period lasted from about 1070/69-715 B.C., with Dynasty 23 c. 818-715, and Dyn. 24 c. 727-715. In the Late Period, the 25th Dynasty ruled c. 780-656, and the 26th Dynasty in 664-525 B.C. These dates are taken from Dieter Arnold, "Selective List of Approximate Dates of Dynasties and Rulers of the Pharaonic Period," in William C. Hayes, Scepter of Egypt, II, fourth printing, revised (New York: 1990), pp. 499-500. Although Adolf Furtwangler and Georg Loeschcke, Mykenische Vasen (Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1886), had concluded that the Shaft Graves should be placed in the 15th-14th centuries B.C., there was certainly no consensus, and the temporal relationship of this earlier Mycenaean material to the more fully developed and more easily recognizable stirrup jars of LH III was by no means established. These later materials were often seen as the immediate predecessors of the material culture of historical Greece.

3 For very readable account of the state of the “science” of archaeology when Schliemann went to Troy in 1868 and Mycenaean in 1876, see Michael Wood, In Search of the Trojan War (New York, 1985), pp. 50-1.

4 It is amusing now to note that Schliemann’s work actually brought Egypt down from a position of even higher importance to Greece than it would later take on in terms of chronology: H.R. Hall, The Oldest Civilization of Greece: Studies of the Mycenaean Age (London, 1901), p. 5: “Such considerations as these prompted Mr. Gladstone...to conjure up...a Homeric Greece which had been conquered long before the days of Agamemnon by Thothmes III., and had thereafter been ruled by Egyptian viceroy in the Theban Pharaohs...Schliemann’s...startling discoveries compelled classical scholars once again...to revise their ideas anew.”

5 Furtwangler and Loeschcke, Mykenische Vasen. As reason for studying the pottery they say (p. III): “Denn während die Funde [from Grave Circle A at Mycenae] an Metall, Glas, Elfenbein u.s.w. sich auf wenige und zeitlich einander ziemlich nahestehende Grabanlagen beschränkten, hatten sich Vasenscherben ununterbrochen von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Erstörung Mykenae abgelagert, und wenn für den mykenischen Goldschmuck nur ein geringfügiges Material aus andern Fundstätten zur Vergleichung vorlag, so ließ sich für die Vasen bereits ein weiteres Abstazgebiet erkennen, wenn auch Niemand die jetzt nachweisbare Ausdehnung desselben von Kleinasien und Aegypten bis Sicilien und Unteritalien ahnen konnte.”
The *Atlas* published with their exposition provided excellent illustrations of a wide range of Mycenaean vessels from archaeological contexts (as opposed to dealers' vases) that was heavily relied upon by Furumark in establishing his typologies.

6Furtwangler and Loeschcke, *Mykenische Vasen*, p. XII.

7A few Mycenaean vases from Egypt were known, but almost all were without context—and the value of contexted pieces does not yet seem to have been recognized. See ibid., pp. 31-32, pl. 22.

8Ibid., p. XIII. "Bugelkannen finden sich erst im ausgebildeten dritten Stil und da sie offenbar zur Aufnahme wohlriechender Essenzen bestimmt waren, die langsam verdunstet sollten." In fn. 4 they say that this long usage is only for the small, fine stirrup jars of their form 50 (= FS 171); the big stirrup jars, their form 49 (= FS 164) were for water.


10"Journal," 23-30 March, 1989. The bases for Egyptian absolute chronology that Petrie used are outlined in *KGH*, 12: "the VIth dynasty as fixed by the close of the inundation in the inscription of Una, and the XVIII-XIXth dynasty as fixed by three Sirius festivals of Tahutmes III, Ramessu II, and Merenptah, which are concordant. The XIIith dynasty is fixed by dead reckoning between the VIth and XVIIIth." Although Furtwangler and Loeschcke (see above) had suggested that the Shaft Graves at Mycenae, which are generally associated with the early stages of the Late Bronze Age culture of Greece, should be dated to the 15th or 14th centuries B.C., materials such as stirrup jars, which we would now recognize as belonging to the later stages of that culture, specifically Late Helladic III, were thought to belong to the very end of Greek prehistory, and so to the seventh or eighth centuries B.C.

11"Journal," 1-6 April, 1889. Sayce's influence in recognizing the chronological importance of the Gurob pottery may have been crucial, and probably has not been credited enough. Sayce was not only an eminent scholar and aware of the dating controversy then raging in Greek studies, but was also an associate of Schliemann and certainly knew the archaeological materials first hand.

12*KGH*, 5: "It was quite contrary to my wishes to carry on excavations without proper supervision, as I could only go to these places about once a week, and that entailed a walk of seventeen miles: but it was the only means of saving places which proved, when I worked them, to be of the highest historical value." Cf. M.S. Drower's *apologia*, *Flinders Petrie: A Life in Archaeology* (London, 1985) 144.

13"Journal", 4-11 May, 1899.

14*KGH*, 11.
Ibid, 42-43.

Ibid, 53, in an addendum to this volume.

For later versions of Petrie’s typology, cf. Appendix: Petrie & Chronology. “Relative dating depends on the study of techniques and styles, in all aspects of pottery from the first to latest appearance, i.e., the life cycle of manufacture and use of a particular type. This method was first applied by Petrie in 1900...” Hankey in HML, p. 40, quoting Drower, Petrie, pp. 251-2 for Petrie’s primacy in the technique. Unfortunately, Petrie was somewhat mislead by the kings’ names associated with the groups, and therefore thought that the Simple Style vases of the Amenhotep III Burnt Group should be dated in his reign. This style of pottery, apparently a version of LH III B2, is much more likely to be Ramesside. His flatter form with disc design is the LH III B vase now in University College London, said to be from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group (see below, Chapter IV, Mycenaean vase no. 3). It should be earlier than the Simple Style vases from the Amenhotep III group.


W.M.F. Petrie, 70 Years in Archaeology (London, 1931), p. 111. Cf. also M. Drower’s account of the situation: Petrie, p. 155. “he [Hughes-Hughes] thinks the Arabs ought to learn somewhat of our manners when they deal with us, whereas I always take them on their own basis. He has no approximation to the easy-going... there is so much condescension and superiority in his tone...”: letter from Petrie to Spurrell, 17.12.1889.

As LH III A2 and B pottery is much more wide-spread: many more contexts around the Mediterranean are dated by it than are dated by the Minoan pieces from Kahun.

Brunton and Engelbach surveyed the site and the extensive cemeteries surrounding it, also excavating a large number of tombs. They were the first to attempt a measured plan of the environs, and they marked in new architectural features and also the area of sherd spread; this last may be evidence of occupation. However, they did not excavate on the kóm or in any of the settlement areas. By means of their work in the cemeteries they did enlarge the corpus of Mycenaean pottery known from the site, and reinforced Petrie’s original chronological conclusions about the early placement of this pottery.

Cf. Appendix: Petrie and Chronology. The result of his visit to Greece was also another paper, “Notes on the Antiquities of Mykene,” JHS 12 (1891) pp. 199-205, in which he dated the Mycenaean tholoi to the 14th-12th centuries, on the basis of Egyptian comparisons.

This seems to refer to Petrie’s own excavations in 1884-85 at Naucratis, where he found later Greek pottery: Naucratis, Egypt Exploration Fund, Memoir 3 (London: 1886). It is interesting to note that Arthur Evans also became a curator at the Ashmolean Museum in 1883.


26 Cf. Drower's account in *Petrie*, p. 183. Petrie's evidence refuted Ramsay's theory that the lion-gate at Mycenae was really a Phrygian work of the 8th century.

27 For various opinions of the period on Mycenaean chronology see Appendices 1 and 2.

28 See Appendix: Petrie and Torr. The most important letters were published in the *Academy*; others also appeared in *The Athenaeum* and *The Times*. Other influential papers were written by Torr (the review of *JKG* which started it all) and also Cecil Smith in *Classical Review*. The argument, which erupted after Petrie received Torr's review in the field, was certainly forced on him by nasty *ad hominem* attacks. It lasted through the summer and into the fall, and ended about November, 1891, about when Petrie would have been readying himself or already leaving for another field season. Petrie also allowed Torr to have the final word, at least in *The Academy*, perhaps despairing of ever converting such a fixed attitude, and certainly annoyed, we may imagine, by the waste of time: Petrie's letters are always much shorter than Torr's.

29 *Memphis and Mycenae* (Cambridge, 1896), p. iii.


31 For a discussion of this context, cf. Martha R. Bell, "Preliminary Report on the Mycenaean Pottery from Deir el-Medina (1979-1980)," *ASAE* 68 (1982), p. 161 fn. 3, where I suggested that it was an example of re-use. However, I have since changed my opinion and now consider that it well may be, as Petrie charged, a group made up by a dealer in order to have an attractive sale. Budge, who bought the group, is known to have been rather careless about his purchases, and he also had a long-standing feud with Petrie.


33 Published by John Linton Myres in "paper on some prehistoric polychrome pottery from Kamáraí, in Crete," *Proceedings of Society of Antiquaries* 15 (1895) pp. 351-56. He said, p. 356, "Professor Petrie assigns his pottery from Kahun to the time of the XIith Egyptian Dynasty, and at the same time insists that it is not of Egyptian make....If Professor Petrie's attribution is correct (and there is no valid reason to doubt it), we may consider that the Kamáraí pottery began at least as early as 2300 B.C., and that it continued until the later centuries of the second millennium." He thought that this pottery was contemporary with that of Mycenae, Tiryns and Tell el Yahudiye.

35 A. S. Murray, A. H. Smith, H. B. Walters, *Excavations in Cyprus* (London: 1900). In his *Handbook of Greek Archaeology* (London: J. Murray 1892), Murray had argued that Mycenae and Tiryns could have been built by Greek tyrants.

36 i.e., Murray *et al.*, *Cyprus*.

37 i.e., Pinudjem’s grandson’s group.


39 If archaeology is to be considered a science.

40 H. L. Thomas and R. W. Ehrich, "Some Problems in Chronology," *World Archaeology* 1 (1969), pp. 148-9: "The construction of archaeological chronologies, ..., must, then be conceived in historical terms .... Furthermore, the choice of historical chronology not only must harmonize with the facts of archaeological relationship and connection but also must be supported by an historical interpretation of relationships between the Aegean and the Orient, as well as of those events which are inferred for Europe. Local archaeological connections and sequences, so often the basis of our chronologies, must be related to each other if we are to understand cultural development in human terms. Establishing a chronology, therefore, is not simply a matter of juggling sequences based upon typological or other succession, but is a product of historical synthesis of those sequences and must meet the tests of criticism which have long characterized human thought."

41 See Drower, *Petrie*, p. 251-52 for a description of his development of “Sequence Dating,” really a seriation technique that required the manipulation of hundreds of pieces of data without computer. He also set standards for his sampling technique, not using any tomb unless it had at least five varieties of pottery in it.
CHAPTER III: FURUMARK AND GUROB: THE LATER CHRONOLOGICAL USES

While noting that other scholars did precede Furumark,¹ A. Leonard has rightly credited him with the first systematic analysis of Mycenaean ceramics and their chronology. Leonard suggests that Furumark's typology was, in fact, "somewhat manipulated by chronological preconceptions" and we can see further proof of this in the use of the Gurob material. It is Furumark's citation of Petrie's Burnt Groups as evidence for absolute chronology has lent them credibility. If the citation had come from a lesser authority, they might well have already been questioned by more recent scholars. Furumark seems to have accepted Petrie's dates without qualm, and he uses Petrie's drawings to type vessels without any thought to their accuracy.

All the Mycenaean pottery found at Gurob is of late III A:2, IIIA 2/B, or III B character. The dates given by Petrie to the Mycenaean groups found by him range from Amenophis III to Seti I. It must, however, be remembered that scarabs and other inscribed objects give only termini post quos, even if they generally do not seem to have been old when they were deposited. The following list gives a summary of those Gurob finds for which absolute dates are suggested:²

I have combined Furumark's list with his separately given citation of contexts³, and added my own comments.

a. late 171, III A: 2/B - BM A 985.5

b, c, d. (late 171)? 3 examples. It is not clear from Furumark's text, \textit{Chronology}, p. 114, which of the two styles that he mentions should apply here, but presumably it is III A: 2/B, as he generally associates FS 171 with this stylistic range.

Furumark must be referring to the three vases now in the Ashmolean Museum. As they were not published either in \textit{IKG} or in a \textit{CVA} fascicle, they were surely inaccessible to him, and the classification must be taken as a guess on his part. One of them, 1890.891 is actually referred to as a LH III B "local copy?" in the Ashmolean catalogue card.6 The other two vases have been classed as FS 173, LH III B and 179, LH III B in the catalogue.

e. imit. 173 (?), III B - \textit{IKG}, pl. 17.3 - BM A984 - \textit{JHS} 1890, pl. 14.3, classed as Simple Style (late III B)7 by Furumark.


Petrie said he found two stirrup jars under a wall above the "temple," possibly an unrecognized tomb-group.10 They looked like \textit{KGH}, pl. 28.1 (i.e. Res, FS 171),11 but were broken. Note that Furumark never seems to
have realized that Petrie had revised his history of the site during the second season (see below, Chapter on Archaeology). As the temple had to have been in use until after Akhenaten (to allow for restorations), a house built above it would have been even later. In his addendum to *KGM*, Petrie says "the temple...was not destroyed until after Tutankhamun, instead of by Khuenaten; and some few traces of residence as late as Ramessu III have been found here."¹² So this correlation of vases with year 6, Akhenaten, was incorrect even when Furumark first used it. If the context must be taken seriously, the *terminus post quem* must be at least the end of the 18th Dynasty. The re-used temple fragments Brunton and Engelbach found in Dyn. 19 tombs must mean that the Tuthmosis III temple area was ruinous by about the time of Ramesses II, if not earlier. This would mean that the vase could even be LH III B.

That the attribution of shape and style are educated guesses on Furumark's part seems proved by his fn. 2, which refers the reader to other contexted examples of FS 171. To date, the vases from Group 2 do not seem to have been identified, though they doubtless exist in some British collection.¹³

3. House deposit,¹⁴ *IKG*, p. 17, *terminus post quem*, Tut-ankh-amen, 1st year (i.e. the Tutankhamun Burnt Group).

a. 171, III A:2 - *IKG*, pl. 17.28. Furumark's attribution of shape and style are based on the Petrie plate, which does not accurately reflect any of the materials from the group. But, thanks to the great variety of shapes identifiable as FS 171, he did hit on a shape number that seems to be
represented. Another, previously unpublished, sherd dates to LH III A 2. So, Furumark has made the correct attribution of shape and style, but for the wrong reasons. See below for my discussion of the Mycenaean pottery from this group.

b. 183:6, III B - JHS 11 (1900) pl. 14:2. This vase probably does not belong to this group. See below, Chapter IV, for my discussion of the Mycenaean pottery from this group.

4. House, \(^{15}\) KGH, pp. 42, 44 f., terminus post quem, Late XVIIIth Dyn., 171:36, III A:2 late - KGH, pl. 28:7 - BM A 986.\(^{16}\)

This group was originally identified by Petrie as a burial. He says this twice in his field book: in the original excavation notes he lists "one burial in mid town,"\(^{17}\) and in his concluding list of dated finds he says "Gk. pot. found w/ring of XVIII in grave."\(^{18}\) In the publication he says: "found in a house,"\(^{19}\) and calls it contemporary with Tomb 23. This last, for reasons that will be discussed below, should probably be dated to the very end of Dyn. 18 or the very beginning of Dyn. 19. We probably should not consider this as a burnt group, which seems to be the implication of Furumark’s description ("House deposit," as nos. 1, 3), unless evidence of burning can be established on the objects. The stirrup jar is not burnt. The date was based on a ring,\(^{20}\) which Petrie thought should date to the period of Akhenaten or Tutankhamun, and also on bits of blue glass, supposed to be of late Dyn. 18 color, and a fragment of "green-glazed pottery with violet inlay, style of
Khuenaten [i.e. Akhenaten]."\(^{21}\) He may not be very far off with the general date, but it is clear that the group cannot sensibly be used to document absolute chronology until the date of the Egyptian objects is reviewed.

5. House deposit ("Group 7"),\(^{22}\) sacrificial pit with burnt remains below a house floor, \(IKG\), p. 19, \(terminus post quem\), Late XVIIIth Dyn.

Furumark considered this a closed, single period find-group.\(^{23}\) We can now be quite sure that he placed much more confidence in the context than was warranted.

\[\text{a. 178:12, III A:2 late - Group 7, IKG, pl. 20:7 - BM A 988, GB 294:21}\]

\[\text{b. 195:14, III A:2 late - IKG, pl. 20:9.}\]

Petrie says only that "The group...was found together, and is of the end of the XVIIIth dynasty by the style. Like no. 4, this is an extremely weak basis for any absolute date. A recent evaluation of the glass amphoriskos (pl. 20.12) has placed it in the 19th Dynasty,\(^{25}\) and an examination of the pottery and stone vessels tends to confirm this estimation (see below, Chapter on Objects, under glass).

6. Tomb 23,\(^{26}\) \(KGH\), pp. 39-42, 45, \(terminus post quem\), Seti I, 1st year, 171:35, III A:2 late - \(KGH\), 28:1, BM A 987, GB 294:17.\(^{27}\)
There is some problem about the identification of this vase. Furumark seems to have relied upon Forsdyke and the CVA, 28 which present a LH III A 2 stirrup jar in the British Museum identified as the vase from Tomb 23. 29 However, there may be some question as to whether or not this is the actual vase that Petrie published in KGH pl. 28.1. Many of the details of shape are different, and there are even features in Petrie's illustration, such as the coned disc, that look later 30 (and quite different from) the BM vessel. It is not quite certain how many complete vases Petrie found in 1888-89 and, although he did find two other stirrup jars that he compared to pl. 28.1, these were said to be broken. 31 It is quite possible that there was some confusion when the vessels were distributed, but there can be no certainty until all the vases from Gurob are known.

The context, in spite of some slight confusion, is still one of the better recorded and most secure from Gurob. It was an intact and undisturbed tomb. The confusion comes from Petrie himself, and seems to be the result of his interpretation of the objects in Tomb 22, the tomb chamber that faced, and shared the same tomb shaft, with Tomb 23. In his "Journal," of 23-30 March 1889, Petrie says that he himself excavated the unopened Dyn. 19 tomb of "Amenemapt," Tomb 22. Here he found a ruined coffin, with part of an inscription: ".......of the temple of Amen, Amenemapt," 32 which would now be read as "Amen(em)ope(t)." 33 The spelling of this name can be confirmed from Petrie's field notes: 34
On the chest of the mummy he found a wooden statuette, which was inscribed: "To the ka of Res, the favored of her father; [it is] her son, Amenemipu, who makes her name live." "Amenemipu" is certainly a graphic variant of the common New Kingdom name "Amen(em)ope(t)."

It seems then that he considered Tomb 22 to be the tomb of Amenemapt and, finding the adjoining Tomb 23, he called it the tomb of Res (the "father" of Amenemapt): "False-necked vase, XXIX, 1 [sic]...taken out by myself from the coffin of Res, one of a group of tombs which I date to the time of Seti by the objects found in them." This is repeated by Forsdyke and the CVA. The "poorer" coffin in Tomb 23 was eaten by termites and no inscription remained, so the attribution of the name "Res" to this tomb cannot be substantiated. However, the coffin in Tomb 22 may have actually held the body of Amenemopet, a functionary of the domain of Amun, and son of Res.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that this is a good context, it is not yet a closely datable context, although further research may make it more precise. Petrie concluded that this whole group of tombs belonged to about the time of Seti I, displaying, as they do, features of both late 18th and early 19th Dynasties. No one since has been able to do much better.

In my recent review of the vase and its context, I concluded that the tomb could indeed be dated to the reign of Ramesses II, but hardly any closer than that, although certain objects from the multiple burials do look as if they might have belonged to the earlier part of his long rule.

After presenting this material, Furumark concluded:

All the published false-necked jars of types 171 and 178 and found at Gurob illustrate the transition from Myc. III A:2 1 to Myc. III B strikingly well....The evidence from Gurob, in conjunction with that of the other finds here cited, indicates with absolute clearness that the transition between the Myc. III A:2 and III B styles should be placed in the time of Seti I, i.e. at c. 1300 B.C.

Furumark also uses the later Burnt Groups (Ramesses II B, Seti II, and even Amenhotep III) for his dating of "Simple Style"; however, a consideration of these contexts is outside the scope of this paper.

Reviewing Furumark's seven pieces of evidence, we are forced to conclude that he has not provided evidence that we would now consider strong for the date of the transition. The evaluation of the Burnt Groups (nos. 1, 3 and 5) as chronological tools is the purpose of this study, and will be dealt with extensively in later chapters. My contention is that the archaeological contexts of the Burnt Groups do not support a Dyn. 18 date for any of them but, instead, indicate that they belong in Dyn. 19. No. 2 must be dismissed both as a guess and as insecurely contexted. While no. 4 may have actually been a group, possibly a tomb group, its context is probably forever lost to
us, casting doubt on any possible results from a re-examination of the objects. Only 6 and 7 will stand the test of a critical review. No. 7 does demonstrate an association of LH III B and the reign of Ramesses II, but almost certainly needs to be placed later than "1st year." The most profitable of them all may well turn out to be no. 6. This context may indeed be able someday to place another LH III A2 vase firmly to the beginning of the 19th Dynasty. Even today no. 6 extends the style right to the end of the 18th dynasty. So, even if for the wrong reasons, Furumark's date of the transition from LH III A2 to III H at about the reign of Seti I may be approximately correct, in the final analysis. And certainly the Gurob material does confirm Furumark's association of LH III B with the reign of Ramesses II.47

Following Furumark's use of them, Gurob Burnt Groups have appeared as reliable contexts in other studies of absolute chronology. The most commonly cited are the Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun Groups, as these are the two that appear to put LH III B pottery into Dyn. 18. The Ramesside groups are much less often quoted, as it is much easier to place LH III B pottery in the 19th Dynasty, even without the help of Gurob.

In 1953,48 Wace reviewed Furumark's periodization which had given LH III A2 and III B periods of time that he felt were in inverse proportion to the actual amount of physical remains. To correct this situation, he proposed lengthening the III B phase by placing the end of III A "not long after the close of the Amarna epoch." The argument is published without any
supporting documentation and seems based entirely on interpretative opinion, rather than any new archaeological fact. By 1954,49 he seems to have considered that the idea had gained some acceptance. He said "if L.H. IIIB, as now suggested is held to begin at the end of the Amarna age about 1340 B.C.," he could then place some pieces from Mycenae (with III B type motifs) immediately after it, in what would be the beginning of III B, in the 18th Dynasty. He associated the sherds with III A fabric and style and was clearly reluctant to put them into the 19th Dynasty, as the Furumark date for IIIB would dictate.

Finally, in 1957,50 Wace presented a longer exposition of his idea, addressing in particular Furumark's placement of the transition of styles in the reign of Seti I on the basis of the Gurob evidence. Wace also questioned Furumark's' stylistic definitions51 (with some justification). Although he almost trapped himself in his own logic, in arguing that although earlier pottery can last until later times (such as III A2 pottery lasting into Dyn. 19), later pottery cannot appear earlier (such as III B pottery appearing in the Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun groups), he successfully avoided the implication that LH III B should then be seen to begin in the reign of Amenhotep III, and concluded that the transition took place at the end of the 18th Dynasty, "in other words at the close of the Amarna age."52 The Tutankhamun Burnt Group was an important document for his case.

We have already examined Furumark's LH III A 2 contexts at Gurob, with the result that only his no. 6 may actually be a good context for this style.
The Tutankhamun group is most definitely not a good context. And even
no. 6 will most likely place the style to at least the beginning of the 19th
Dynasty. There is perhaps one other vase from Egypt in a dateable context
that may be LH III A 2, but it also seems to belong to this “transitional”
group of tombs, and will be the subject of a later study. At this point, it
offers no substantiation for Wace’s idea.

Astrom took a slightly different approach in 1962. He emphasized
evidence for the beginning of the III B style: “The date depends on the
interpretation of the earliest instances.” These were the Amenhotep III and
Tutankhamun Burnt Groups and, to his credit, he recognized and dealt with
the problem of the earlier group, concluding that the deposit was actually a
undatable rubbish heap. He also addressed the other problem of
interpretation that has plagued the use of the Gurob groups since Petrie,
even though Torr attacked it at the start: the assumption that all the
artifacts are contemporary with the reign of the king on the inscribed
object. Rejecting this idea, he also rejected the contemporaneousness of the
Tutankhamun pendants and the Mycenaean pottery. His third piece of
evidence was the “Governor’s Tomb” at Tell el AjJul, for which a ring of
Tutankhamun gave a terminus post quem. His conclusions, which still could
be put forward, were that Wace placed the start of III B perhaps too high,
and that Furumark placed it too low.

Stubbings may have been the first to opt for an entirely 19th Dynasty date
for the Burnt Groups. In his 1970 discussion of Aegean chronology in the
Cambridge Ancient History, he stated that the Egyptian materials “show that they [the associated Mycenaean vases] cannot be much earlier than the accession of Ramesses II (1304 B.C.).” However, neither Stubbings’ nor Aström’s hypotheses seem to have gained much acceptance. When Hankey and Warren’s watershed paper of 1974 appeared it pushed everything early yet again.

Without a doubt, theirs has been the most important and influential recent use of the Gurob groups. In this paper, Hankey and Warren proposed an upward revision of the date for the introduction of LH III, associating its appearance with the late 18th Dynasty on the basis of III B pottery from, among other sites, Amarna and Gurob: the Tutankhamun Group and the Tomb of “Res.” Once again, Furumark’s nos. 3 and 6 made their appearance as good Dyn. 18 contexts: the Tutankhamun Group placed in evidence on the basis of the, apparently wrongly-associated, III B vase, and the Tomb of “Res,” despite probably belonging, as Furumark stated, to the reign of Seti I, or thereabouts. Nevertheless, their proposition “that Wace...was correct in placing the transition from III A 2 to III B at the end of Tutankhamun or the end of the 18th Dynasty” has been widely cited.

In their latest word on the subject, Warren and Hankey again argue for an 18th Dynasty start to III B. However, Gurob has now been reduced to only one citation, the Tomb of “Res” no longer being mentioned. “At Gurob an LH III B stirrup jar came from a pit dated to the time of Tutankhamun.” Unfortunately, their stirrup jar is still the very vase that has probably been
misinterpreted as being from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group (Furumark's no. 3.b). It is hoped that the present work will remove from the literature this last mention of Gurob in connection with Dyn. 18.

Petrie would probably not have been pleased to see the mention of his hard-fought Aegean dates cease, but he should have been pleased to see how long his work has remained in active discussion. And, although all the groups are no longer cited individually in Mycenaean chronological studies, most are still brought out to prove various points in Egyptology. We certainly cannot blame Furumark for using Petrie's materials without caveat; they were considered perfectly acceptable then, by Egyptologists and Aegean specialists alike. And they are still in use: in Egyptology by default, for lack of anything better;\textsuperscript{60} in the Aegean, both explicitly, as above, and implicitly, as an unchallenged part of Furumark's underpinnings for his whole analysis of Mycenaean pottery.\textsuperscript{61}
CHAPTER III: ENDNOTES

1A. Leonard, "Some Problems Inherent in Mycenaean/Syro-Palestinian Synchronisms," Problems in Greek Prehistory (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1988), pp. 319, 330 fn. 1. As Leonard, we should note Furtwängler and Loeschcke, Mykenische Vasen, which established 122 forms for four sequential styles of Mycenaean pottery. Also, D. Fimmen, Die kretisch-mykenische Kultur, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: 1924). To which I would add the papers that Furumark himself cited: Mogens B. Mackeprang, "Late Mycenaean Vases" AJA 42 (1938), pp. 537-559; Wilhelm Kraiker, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, Die Nekropolen des 12. bis 13. Jahrhunderts, Kerameikos, vol. I (Berlin: 1939), pp. 162 ff; and Carl W. Blegen, Prosyma: The Helladic Settlement preceding the Argive Heraeum (Cambridge: 1937). The work of John Franklin Daniel, e.g., review of A. Furumark, The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery and The Mycenaean Pottery, Analysis and Classification in AJA 47 (1943), pp. 252-54, should also be noted, as well as Alan J. B. Wace, "Late Helladic III Pottery and its Divisions," ARKHAIOLOGIKH EKHMERIΣ 1953-54 (1955), pp. 137-40. Wace (pp. 137-8) remarked that Furumark "suffered from the disadvantage of not having been able to take an active part in field work and was unfamiliar with the conditions and methods of excavation of a Mycenaean site...Thus his work...is unsatisfactory as a basis for the classification of Mycenaean pottery especially in the Late Helladic III phase. It also allows psychological speculations about shapes and decoration to intrude into what should be a factual discussion." He quoted Blegen's criticism (p. 138): "'...we are not convinced that Furumark's typological divisions...with little scrutiny of or perhaps even acquaintance with, the actual pottery itself, and with almost no regard for fabric, and without adequate stratigraphic evidence, do in all instance provide safe criteria also for a true chronological division.'"

It would be very interesting to know how much Furumark was influenced by contemporary Scandinavian theory of archaeological methodology as applied to Bronze Age studies. For a survey of this see Kristian Kristiansen, "The Place of Chronological Studies in Archaeology: A View from the Old World," OJA 4/3 (1985), pp. 251-53.

2Chronology, p. 113. For absolute chronology, Furumark, p. 110 and fn. 1, followed that of Eduard Meyer, "which I, following the examples of Evans and Fimmen, apply throughout." The accession of Ahmose was dated to c. 1580 B.C., Amenhotep III 1405-1370, Akhenaton 1370-1352, Smenkhkare-Horemheb 1352-1310, Ramesses I 1309, Seti I 1308-1298, Ramesses II, 1298-1232: see Hornung, Untersuchungen, chart and end of book.

3Chronology, p. 113 fn. 8, 114. It may be that Furumark was the first, after Petrie, to use the different groups at Gurob individually, in order to try and set up a sequence of development.

4Furumark's entry in Chronology, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: "1) House deposit: Petrie, Illahun, p. 17, pl. 17: 3; BMC I:1, p. 182 (A 984, 985)." On p. 114 he says "terminus post quem, Amenophis III, 1st year... late 171, (late 171)³, imit. 173 (? , see below, p. 116, n. 5)." On p. 116 he mentions Simple Style stirrup jars that "are similar in shape to late Myc. III B" citing, in fn. 5, "Gurob, Group 1: Petrie, Illahun, pl. 17:3 (= Corpus Gr. Brit.,
When one is familiar with Furumark's shorthand, one can see that the vases from this group are one "late 171"; *possibly* (uncertainty is indicated by the use of parentheses, which are deserved, as he has never seen these vases) three (indicated by the superscript "3": this is not a footnote) late examples of FS 171; and possibly an imitation FS 173. The LH III A:2/B stylistic notation should belong to the FS 171 shape, as this is where Furumark put it; the LH III B should refer to the FS 173, normally a III B shape.

5Furumark must have meant that this vase was III A:2/B, but not also IIIB, as Wace, "Mycenae 1939-1956, 1957: part V. The Chronology of Late Helladic III B," *BSA* 52 (1957), p. 222 arranged for the Amenhotep III vases. Furumark had access to two of the vases, and one was stated to be an "imit:1 173 (?)", which must be the III B example, and must also be *KGl*, pl. 17.3 = BM A 984. Wace instead identifies Furumark's first example as BM 984, which Furumark could never have considered in LH IIIA:2: BM A 985, however, is certainly finer that A 984, and more likely to have been considered an indeterminate IIIA or B, and must be the vase that Furumark types as FS 171. Wace associates the vase with the "(late 171)"* but this should refer to the vases he had not seen, as the parentheses indicate. As Furumark had no access to the Ashmolean vases, he could not have given no. 897 the "imit. 173 (?)" classification (as Wace publishes), which must go to a vase with a published illustration, BM A 984.

6All the materials quoted from the Ashmolean Card Catalogue in this study are used by courtesy of that museum and the keeper, Dr. Helen Whitehouse. The entries reflect many years of hard work by Joan Payne.

7Cf. *Chronology*, p. 116, n. 5.

8Furumark's entry in *Chronology*, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: "2) Beneath wall of house above ruined temple of Akhenaten: Petrie, *Kahun*, p. 44 [sic, read 45]." On page 114 his entry says *terminus post quem*, "Akhenaten, 6th year...(late 171)...III A: 2 [late]."

9Furumark incorrectly cites p. 44.

10Note that in Notebook 39B, p. 35 another tomb here is mentioned. In the Notebook, Petrie writes "under brick wall in stuff 40 deep in mid S town marked 31." The south town in the first season seems to be the area of the temple. Petrie does not seem to have recognized the second, southern, enclosure until the second season, when this seems to become the South Town proper.

11Petrie's comparisons cannot be taken too seriously, as he had a *very* small corpus of material available, and it was only the beginning of the study of styles.

12*KGl*, p. 53.

13Also see my discussion in Bell, "605," p. 86, fn. 124.
Furumark’s entry in *Chronology*, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: “3) House deposit: *Ilahun*, p. 17, pl. 17: 28; *JHS* 11, p. 00 [sic], pl. 14: 2.” On p. 114 the entry is *terminus post quem*, "Tut-anhk-amen, 1st year...171, 183: 6...IIIA.2, III B."

Furumark’s entry in *Chronology*, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: “House: *Kahun*, pp. 42, 44 f., pl. 28: 7.” On p. 114 the entry is *terminus post quem*, "Late XVIIIth Dyn....171: 36...IIIA.2 [late]."

Also given by Wace, *BSA* 52, p. 222, no. 4.

Notebook 39B, p. 34. This reference is sure because he has appended a small sketch of the shoulder motif.

Ibid. p. 37.

*KGH*, 42.

*KGH*, pl. 28.7, mistakenly cited on p. 44 as pl. 23.96.

*KGH*, pp. 44–45.

Furumark’s entry in *Chronology*, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: “House deposit ("Group 7"): *Ilahun*, p. 19, pl. 20:7, 9. Cf. above, p. 57.” On p. 57 he cites "Gurob, Group 7...Sacrificial pit with burnt remains below a house floor....178, 195" as an example of a Myc. III A.2 closed find group, isolated. On p. 114, the entry reads *terminus post quem*, "ditto [i.e. as no. 4, "Late XVIIIth Dyn."...178: 12, 195: 14...IIIA.2 [late]."


Also given by Wace, *BSA* 52, p. 222.


Furumark’s entry in *Chronology*, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: “6) T. 23: *Kahun*, pp. 39-42, 45, pl. 28: 1. On p. 114 he says *terminus post quem* "Seti I, 1st year...171:35...IIIA.2 [late]."
Also given by Wace, *BSA* 52, p. 222, LH III A2 late, FS 171.35.

E. J. Forstdyke, *Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum*, vol. 1, part 1, Prehistoric Aegean Pottery (London, 1925), pp. 182-83, fig. 256, A 987; H. B. Walters and E. J. Forstdyke, *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, Great Britain 7, British Museum 5 (London: 1930), pl. 294.17; also shown in Hall, *Oriental*, p. 221, fig. 287; Wace, *BSA* 52, p. 221, fig. 3; Buchholz, *Funde*, p. 445.d, LH III A2; Frank H. Stubbings, *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 94, later III A. Hankey and Warren, *Absolute*, p. 148, like Furumark, have accepted Petrie's date. All these references do illustrate the vase in the British Museum. The question is, however, if it is really the same vase as shown in *KGR*, pl. 28, 1. It probably is, and fault may belong to inexperienced artist. Drawing stirrup jars requires either an exceptional artist or an educated eye (aware of the chronological and stylistic implications of subtle changes in, for example, body curve or false spout decoration and form).

For a better view of this vase cf. Wace, *BSA* 52, p. 221, fig. 3.

Note that Rosalind Hall, "A Pair of Linen Sleeves from Gurob," *GM* 40 (1980), p. 29 has recently classed this vase as LH III B, which I would think incorrect for the BM vase. However, she may have based her attribution on Petrie's illustration, which does look like a late piece. Cf. Bell, "605," p. 79, fn. 29.

*KGR*, 45.

KGR, p. 38.

This reading courtesy of Lanny Bell.

Notebook 39B.


This translation courtesy of Lanny Bell.

Hermann Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, II (Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1953), p. 263.23, citing this occurrence only, suggesting, in fn. 4, that it is a "mistaken" writing for Amenemope. For similar writings derived from the -ope element in this name, cf. *ibid.*, I, pp. 23.27 (New Kingdom), 27.18 (Late Period). These references courtesy of Lanny Bell.

*KGR*, p. 45.
39 Forsdyke, Catalogue, p. 183, A 987; Walters et al., CVA GB 7 (BM 5), p. 11, no. 17, pl. GB 294.17.


41 KGH, p. 39.

42 Hall, "Sleeves," p. 30 finally concludes, after a struggle: "It therefore seems impossible to be so categoric as to date these artifacts to a particular reign, although a Dynasty XVIII to Dynasty XIX transitional dating is certainly acceptable." She tends to place them into Dyn. 19, which I hope to be able to prove in a later paper. Also see the discussion of the Anen-Tursha burial, Tomb 21, in my Chapter: Archaeology.

43 Furumark’s entry in Chronology, p. 113, fn. 8, reads: "T. 605: Brunton-Engelbach, Gurob, p. 16 f., pl. 29: 39 (closed group).” On p. 114 he says terminus post quem Rameses II...1st year...182: 22...III B.

44 Bell, "605,” pp. 61-86

45 Chronology, p. 114.

46 Ibid., pp. 116, fns. 2, 4, 5; 117, fns. 2, 4.


50 Wace, BSA 52, pp. 220-23.

51 Ibid., p. 221: "It is not always clear either what induced Furumark to class a vase as L.H. IIIA 2 rather than L.H. IIIIB. He even speaks of L.H. IIIA/B and of possible sub-L.H. IIIA 2 classes. His division, therefore, between L.H. IIIA 2 and L.H. IIIIB is by no means definite. In fact by bringing the end of L.H. IIIA 2 down to the end of the fourteenth century he is automatically led to class as L.H. IIIA 2 I pottery which is better classed stylistically and typologically as L.H. IIIIB."
Wace, ibid., p. 223, never argues that the transition took place in the Amarna age, even though he thought that the Tutankhamun group showed that III B pottery had "already appeared by the time of Tutankhamen." He seems to have been willing to allow some time for the transition to be accomplished. It may also be instructive that he did not give absolute dates to the phases in this paper, although he had done so previously (BSA 48, p. 15, fn. 22). The general tenor of his arguments seem to show a possibly more eased position, i.e., by "the end of the XVIIIth dynasty" he may have been willing to accept a point in the period between the abandonment of Amarna and the beginning of Dyn. 19, rather than trying to fix the very moment that Tutankhamun left the site (as Hankey later attempted in MEM, pp. 132, 133.)

Although it has usually been called LH III B in the literature.


He suggests a compromise at about 1320 B.C., but again, this is not really dictated by archaeological fact. Note, that when he was writing the certain identification of III B pottery from Amarna had not yet been made--these late pieces seem to have been the ones Wace was referring to when he said "There are even a few sherds from Amarna which, if found isolated, might possibly be called L. H. IIIB. Here again another possible difficulty can be glimpsed. A borderline sherd might be called by one archaeologist A and by another B." BSA 52, p. 220.


Hankey and Warren, "Absolute." p. 148. They called for "a fresh study of material at Gurob," which I have attempted here, but it has not shown, as they hoped, "that no LH III A 2 pottery there can be dated later than Tutankhamun's reign."

Note that Wace (BSA 52, p. 223) never specifically states this, but instead says "the end of the Amarna Age," or "at the end of the XVIIIth dynasty, in other words at the close of the Amarna Age." It is difficult to understand exactly what he meant. He seems to be using the same Egyptian chronology as Furumark, which places the reign of Seti I at 1300 B.C., and the desertion of Amarna in c. 1350 B.C. In this paper he does not give an absolute date for the transition, perhaps advisedly. However, in an earlier paper (BSA 48, p. 15, fn. 22), Wace had set the date of transition at 1340 B.C., raising it from Furumark's 1300, and that date is possibly to be associated with Tutankhamun. But, whichever king he had in mind, it is sure that he thought it was ten years after the desertion of Amarna.


The Gurob Groups still mark a chronological fixed point for many types of small finds in Egyptology, e.g. glass, jewellery, razors, faience cucumbers, stone vessels, etc.
Note that they seem to be affecting faience typologies: cf. Peltenburg, *Kition*, pp. 303-304, where he cites the Amenhotep III as the *terminus post quem* for the faience pilgrim flask (*IKG*, pl. 17.9) which he uses to date a Cypriote example.

Most of the objects in the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, which were excavated in Petrie's second season at Gurob, were brought back from Egypt and distributed to the British Museum, one of his financial backers. Petrie did, however, keep the "duplicates" for his own teaching collection at University College London.

The British Museum

Because Petrie feuded with E.A. Wallis Budge, the Keeper, he never gave anything to the British Museum's Egyptian Department. So, the Tutankhamun Group was originally accessioned in the British and Medieval Department, then transferred to the Greek and Roman Department, and finally came to the Egyptian Department. In 1982 Dr. Morris Llewellyn kindly gathered the group of objects together for us archivists. Some sherds had already been given accession numbers. Dr. Llewellyn tried to match them with the original sketches from the Greek and Roman Department accession lists, but this was not possible for all pieces (e.g., see 34). The accession numbers were put on before the Sherdlist crossed with the group so mistakes, such as no. 26 ('pilgrim flask' which is actually an
CHAPTER IV: THE "TUTANKHAMUN BURNT GROUP"

The Collections

Most of the objects in the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, which was excavated in Petrie’s second season at Gurob, were brought back from Egypt and distributed to the British Museum, one of his financial backers. Petrie did, however, keep the "duplicates" for his own teaching collection, at University College London.

The British Museum

Because Petrie feuded with E.A. Wallis Budge, the Keeper, he never gave anything to the British Museum’s Egyptian Department.1 So, the Tutankhamun Group was originally accessioned in the British and Medieval Department, then transferred to the Greek and Roman Department, and finally came to the Egyptian Department. In 1980 Dr. Morris Bierbrier kindly gathered the group of objects together for my examination. Some sherds had already been given accession numbers. Dr. Bierbrier tried to match them with the original sketches from the Greek and Roman Department accession lists, but this was not possible for all pieces (e.g. no. 36). The accession numbers were put on before Dr. Bierbrier worked with the group so mistakes, such as no. 26 ("pilgrim bottle," which is wrong), are
original mistakes in identification by the cataloguer, not from incorrect numbering.

Seventy items are registered in the British Museum from this group. The first entry bears the notation: "1-70. found together and dated by no 5 to about the period of the end of the XVIIIth dynasty. c. 1400 B.C.----Gurob. 1890. from a pit with ashes. Petrie Illahun Pl. XVII."

University College, London, Petrie Collection

This collection comprises materials from the group that Petrie decided to keep in "his" collection. As far as I have been able to ascertain, there is no other documentation except the basic identification as belonging to the Tutankhamun Burnt Group. With the exception of five faience finger rings (UCL 27901 [iv]), they are all various kinds of beads and pendants, duplicating most of the British Museum assortment, even to the cartouche-shaped bead bearing the name of Tutankhamun.

University College, London, Museum of Classical Archaeology

The Mycenaean vases from Egypt in this collection were transferred from the Petrie collection, with little accompanying information. During World War II the collection was damaged and there was further loss of
documentation. One vase at the museum has been attributed to the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, UCL 855. This association has not been based on any preserved records, but rather on a misunderstanding of secondary references (see below, Mycenaean Vase No. 3 - Catalogue No. 12).

The Mycenaean Pottery

1. LH III B? Stirrup Jar: *IKG* pl. 17.232; BM 66866, 66867, 66869, and 1890-11-9, No. 69 (Catalogue Nos. 5, 6, 9, 10)

The usefulness of the Tutankhamun Group for Mycenaean chronology rests on the supposed presence of both LH III A and B pottery in the group. This has been interpreted as indicating that the transition between the two styles took place by the time of Tutankhamun’s reign. The vase illustrated in *IKG* pl. 18.28 has been taken as the LH III A piece, identified by Furumark as FS 171, *terminus post quem* Tutankhamun, year 1 (see above, Chapter: Furumark, no. 3a). His determination has been accepted into the general literature. Clearly, no one has previously checked the actual remains, which are much less impressive than the sketch. There are a number of badly burnt sherds from the group in the British Museum that apparently come from three different stirrup jars. On the basis of a visual examination, I have associated BM 66866, 66867, 66869, and 1890-11-9,
No. 69) as originally coming from the same vase. As the foot, spout, and false spout are similar to the *JCG*, pl. 18.28 drawing, these sherds are probably the ones used to make it. However, as can be seen by reference to my own reconstructions, the band groups do not match: Petrie shows three, and neither of the Tutankhamun vases has this number. Possibly Petrie used the lower band group from the second vase (No. 4) as the middle band in his reconstruction. The shape of Petrie’s drawing is, of course, totally wrong. The profile of vase No. 1 can be completely restored from the sherds. The only questions that remain concern decoration: whether or not the base had concentric circles and the shoulder bore non-linear decoration, as very little of both are preserved.6

The absence of shoulder decoration, so useful as a clue to style, is certainly felt for this little vase, which exhibits features of both III A2 and III B styles.7 The neatly formed shape seems to fit best as FS 178,8 Fulumark’s squat III A 2 type.9 Another III A feature may be the lack of concentric circles on the base (however, very little remains of this). It is also possible that the placement of the band groups, flanking the broad, reserved space where the maximum diameter falls, and the use of many fine fill-lines, rather than fewer and thicker lines, is more like III A 2 style, although certainly not restricted to it. The solid, large dot on the disc is sometimes taken as a sign of III A date, but occurs fairly often in III B.10 The rounded profile of the disc edge may be III B in character. More definitely III B is the straight-up spout, with a narrow band of paint in a loop at the base (although paint remained at the top of the spout, the extent of its coverage
could not be ascertained). The loop is also a common III B feature, although it can occur in III A. The handles probably did not have a reserve triangle, and the paint on their backs stops short of the first thick line of the body band, both features often found on III B vases. So, fortuitously for the chronological arguments, there does seem to be a LH III B stirrup jar from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, as the balance of details would place this vase into the LH III B style.

The three Mycenaean vases found in the burnt group, with the exception of No. 2 (and excluding No. 3), were represented by quite a few sherds. There were enough, in fact, to completely restore their profiles. That this quantity was actually collected in the field and then sent back to England probably means that there may have been more bits missed in the deposit, especially as the clay seems to have shattered, possibly into very small pieces. This would make it likely that the vases actually had been deposited intact into these pits (or whatever), or largely so. The fact that Nos. 1, 4 and 5 have been badly burnt, even after they were broken, suggests that they were broken either before or during the burning. The extent of the damage may indicate that they had held flammable contents, which caused their destruction.
2. Shoulder of LH III A 2 Stirrup Jar: unpublished; BM 66864 (Catalogue No. 3)

Again, fortuitously for the chronological arguments, another unpublished fragment in the British Museum is from a LH III A2 vase, a stirrup jar. Although only the top of the shoulder remains, the profile shows it to have been rather flat, and rather large. So, it could possibly have been from a well made and carefully decorated FS 166. 12 It is decorated with a semi-circular variant of the multiple stem and tongue (FM 19:28/29).

This sherd is quite burnt, and so almost certainly came from a burnt group. However, it is strange that there are no more pieces of it, particularly if it was originally a large vase. As demonstrated by vases No. 1 and 4, quite a few sherds were preserved. Why are there no others from this example? It could be that this vase was not intact when placed into the deposit. Further, if it is indeed from this group, one must wonder why Petrie did not illustrate it. He shows a predilection for decorated items, and this is much more attractive than the vase he actually did "publish." However, he clearly also preferred whole objects, and completed them on paper if they were not so in reality. Perhaps the vase's state was too fragmentary. Petrie does mention finding other bits of Mycenaean pottery during the excavations, some of which have still not been identified in collections, and it is quite possible that this fragment could be one of them. 13 However, in the absence of any firm evidence to the contrary, and as it has been accessioned with the rest, No. 2 must be counted as part of the Tutankhamun deposit.
3. Flat-Shouldered LH III B Stirrup Jar: published separately\textsuperscript{14}; UCL 855\textsuperscript{15} (Catalogue No. 12)

UCL 855 is the LH III B vase that has previously been associated with this group. It was illustrated by Petrie in his \textit{JHS} article of 1890.\textsuperscript{16} Furumark used it not only for chronology but as an example of shape. It is his FS 183:6, with FM 27 (sea anemone) in the shoulder zone: very definitely LH III B in shape and decoration.\textsuperscript{17} However, the connection to the Tutankhamun Group is probably quite erroneous.

First of all, although it did have some repairs,\textsuperscript{18} it is in quite good condition, unlike any of the other Mycenaean vases and most of the other objects from the Tutankhamun group. In addition, it has not been much affected by fire. One small area on the side of the spout does show some burning, but the greater portion of the vase has not been affected. Some of the other Mycenaean materials from the Tutankhamun group are burnt quite black. This also seems to be the case for vases from the other burnt groups that I have examined: they are sometimes fairly complete, but they are usually quite badly burnt.\textsuperscript{19}

Most telling is Petrie's publication of the vase separately from the Tutankhamun group.\textsuperscript{20} It is mentioned only obliquely in \textit{IKG}: in suggesting a type development for stirrup jars Petrie says that the "The false-necked vases can now be well traced; beginning in a globular form, of fine Aegean ware, with iron-glaze bands, under Amenhotep III; \textit{next flatter in form}
during the end of that dynasty, with discs surrounded by dots....\textsuperscript{21} Note that he makes no association with either Tutankhamun or the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, unlike the preceding reference to Amenhotep III. In the \textit{JHS} article,\textsuperscript{22} Petrie says only:

Before that, about 1350 B.C. (Tutankhamen), I found perfectly formed examples of the true pale-brown paste, and iron-glaze lines with discs surrounded by a circle of dots as the only ornament. These are of the wide shallow type, elegantly shaped, and mark the highest stage of this form (Pl. XIV, fig. 2, in my possession).

Note that Petrie says only that the vase should be dated stylistically to the reign of Tutankhamun. So, there is no evidence from any of the original citations that this vase belongs to the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, but evidence only that Petrie considered its date to be about contemporary with Tutankhamun. His estimate could have been based purely on the stylistic typology which he was attempting to create.

However, Aegean scholars took the mention of the name of Tutankhamun and made a mountain out of it. It all seems to have begun with Fimmen and was perhaps a misunderstanding on his part. In discussing the Burnt Groups as fixed chronological points he mentions\textsuperscript{23}: "In einer anderen Grube lage Anhängsel der Zeit Tutenchamons...und dabei Stücke von einigen wieder mit Streifenmustern bemalten Bügelkannen." He gives as references, fn. 6: "Nach J.H.S. 1890, 274 auch die Bügelkanne Taf. XIV 2." He seems to have no authority for making this connection of the III B vase
with the archaeological context except for the mention of Tutankhamun's name in connection with each. Furumark, following on, treated the UCL vase as part of the Tutankhamun Burnt Group,²⁴ as did successive scholars.²⁵ Again, I should state here that there has never been evidence for such an identification.

There is, however, new archaeological evidence to the contrary. Written on the base of the vessel in pencil are the words "3 Gurob." This is probably in Petrie's hand, and is a method of field identification that he used elsewhere at Gurob to designate loci on the finds from them.²⁶ So, it should mean that the vase came from Group or Locus ("Find") 3. The vase does seem to have been found in the second season at Gurob, as it was not published or accessioned until 1890. There seem to have been five more or less complete vases found in the first season (1888-89).²⁷ But those mentioned in the KGH list of finds²⁸ can be matched with actual vases, and the other entries are for sherds. "Find 3" in 1888-89 was thought to date to about the time of Akhenaten, but the two vases said to be associated with it were described as broken.²⁹ They are not illustrated, and I have not been able to identify the actual pieces. It is always possible that the UCL vase was not listed in an identifiable way, but if Petrie did find it in the first season he most probably would have mentioned it: it is a very nice example. The decoration is more elaborate and the condition much better than many Gurob examples, and Petrie admired the vase enough to keep it for his own collection. I would conclude that the vase was excavated in the second season.
In the second season there seem to have been at least nine "groups," or "burnt groups." The Tutankhamun Group's number is not known, and it might be Group 5, 6, or 8, as these are not yet identified with archaeological materials (see Appendix). The numbers, if they did indeed have them, of the Amenhotep III, Tutankhamun, and Ramesses II B groups also need to be found. The Burnt Groups seem to have been numbered in the sequence in which they were excavated: the Seti II Group, which is Group 1, was also the first group listed in Petrie's Notebook 39B (14-28 Nov.). The Ramesses II A Burnt Group, which is Group 4, was the next mentioned by name (28 Nov.-5 Dec.), but Petrie says that at this point that Hughes-Hughes had already made three or four finds of Burnt Groups. It is odd that, although Petrie already understood the importance of the Ramesses II object when Group 4 was found, he makes no mention in his notes of the Amenhotep III or Tutankhamun Groups. He does mention the Ramesses II late group (13-19 Dec.), but there is no clear information as to its number (it is possible that this was also called Group 4).

It is certain that Group 3 is the large group now in the Ashmolean, which has other pieces of Mycenaean pottery (advanced LH III B), but no associated royal-name objects. Although "3" does not seem to have been written on the two stirrup jars, I have not yet examined the rest of the objects. But, as these vases were not separated from the entire group, unlike the stirrup jar Petrie kept for his own collection, it may not have been necessary to mark them individually. Petrie did split up other groups, e.g., the Ramesses II A group went to both the Ashmolean and Manchester.
If the UCL vase does come from this group it is difficult to determine why Petrie thought it should be dated to the reign of Tutankhamun. Nothing in the Ashmolean group seems to indicate such a specific date, although the general appearance of the Egyptian material seems appropriate to the late 18th-19th Dynasty. Petrie did date other closed contexts on the basis of his understanding of Egyptian pottery and object sequences.  

There is another possible source for this vase. In the Notebook of his first season (39B, p. 29), Petrie writes: "Grk pot white w/bk [black] + re [red] lines, w/ring of Tut.[ankhamun] abt [about] 1/2 down in stuff--3 ft. thick by tombs in N. town i.e. before age of tomb walls." This vase does not seem to be mentioned anywhere in the published report of this year, and it does not seem to be included in any of the list of dated finds (KGH, pp. 44-45), where one would expect it. As Petrie seems to have found five stirrup jars in 1888-89, and as five vases are listed in KGH, p. 42, one might assume that it must be one of the published stirrup jars. However, the number five may have also been indicating the intact vases (there is a small sketch of a stirrup jar with the number), so this point is not sure. Petrie could be describing some of the early Dynasty 18 painted pottery, that he took as foreign, when he mentions the color variations. But, paint on the University College vase does vary in color from red to brown. The association with a ring of Tutankhamun would see to be a very strong point in favor of identifying the University College vase with the North Village tomb. As for the number 3 on the base, this could also mean "Tomb 3." Petrie publishes
Tombs 20-25 from this area, but never mentions what happened to Tombs 1-19. The particular placement of bands here is also observable on III B vases, with the top of the lower band being placed on or near the

To conclude, it is most unlikely that the UCL vase actually came from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group. It may have come from another such group, a more normal tomb in the North Town, or it could even have been purchased. It should be disassociated from studies of the Tutankhamun Group or any evaluations for absolute chronology.

4. LH III B Stirrup Jar: unpublished; BM BM 66865, 66868 [A, B, C], BM 66879 (Catalogue Nos. 1, 4, 7, 8, 11)

The visual association of the remaining stirrup jar sherds from the group is substantiated by matching profiles. The false-spout (BM 66865) with joining shoulder (BM 66868 [A]) and body (BM 66868 [C]) sherds, also foot (BM 66868 [B]), spout (BM 66879), and body sherds (unnumbered) are restorable as FS 180, a perked-up, squat, globular stirrup jar, of LH III B 1 style. Only the handles are missing. The vase had no shoulder decoration, an absence often observed on III B vases found in Egypt. It also lacked the concentric circles on the base, a feature of III A pottery that is also found in III B. The widened band of paint at the bottom of the spout is the result of painting bands that are almost a loop around the two necks—the pressure against the brush makes a thick stroke at the front, that narrows with the curvature of the neck, as the brush is carried back towards the false spout.
It is seen on other III B vases. The mouth has the more narrow paint band typical of III B. The particular placement of bands here is also observable on III B vases, with the top of the lower band being placed on or near the maximum diameter of the vase, leaving a rather large reserved area below reaching down to the plain foot band.

Like vase No. 1, it was quite shattered and extremely burnt and, as many sherds survived, it had probably been deposited intact.

5. LH III B (Simple Style?) Pilgrim Flask: JKG, p. 17.40; BM 66863 (Catalogue No. 2)

The last piece of imported pottery from the group is the burnt and shattered pilgrim flask, illustrated by Petrie as complete. Most of the pieces seem to have been brought back to the museum, but many are too small to be used in a restoration of the vase, which now consists of the six largest pieces glued together. Originally a rather handsome vase, the fabric, while not as fine as "standard" Mycenaean, does not seem to be Egyptian, and can be classed as "Simple Style." The shape is the "characteristic Levanto-Mycenaean shape" FS 186, belonging to LH III B. It seems to have had a band of paint up the backs of the handles and across the front and back, over the V-shaped, slight elevation caused by the pinching-on of the handles. There was no subsidiary motif on the keel, only a series of concentric circles on each of the broad faces. The best preserved seems to
have them arranged in band groups, a design known from other examples. Only the outer group is preserved, which consists of two thick bands with up to four thin ones inbetween. After a slight reserved space, another thick band seems to follow; it is impossible to see anything else.

The actual technique of manufacturing is worth mentioning. The body seems to have been made in one piece. On one side the wall is much thicker, up to c. 0.9 cm., and there is a thick, spiral "snail" on the inside that shows it was the base of the vessel while on the wheel. The other side, i.e., the "top," is much thinner, about 0.24 cm. only, and seems to have the thin, pulled, twisting traces that result when the clay is drawn up to a close.\textsuperscript{39} Actually, this shape could have been made very much in the same way as the FS 183 was produced, and then simply turned on its side.\textsuperscript{40} A hole for the neck was pushed through on one edge, and then a separately-made neck was placed above this and smoothed down onto the body for a join. The neck was possibly formed around a removable tube of some sort. The thick handles are almost circular in section and rather clumsy.

The flask may have been broken before it was burnt: of two joining sherds, one is clean and unaffected and the other is quite burnt. The clean sherd could, of course, been protected somehow during the firing. The breaks are blackened and some other material has melted and dripped over them. The heat seems to have been intense enough to partially deform some of the fragments.
**Egyptian Pottery**

1. **Small Round-bottomed Jar**: unpublished; BM 66859 (Catalogue No. 1)

Twelve sherds have been joined, restoring most of a small round-bottomed, wide-necked jar, very much like the shape suggested for the monochrome glass vase from this group (BM 67028). It seems to be made of a marl clay, with limestone inclusions, some sand and no irregular pores (possibly Marl D4). The shape is paralleled by other examples which can be dated to the 18th and 19th Dynasties.\(^42\) The fact that much of the vase was found in the deposit makes it likely that it was broken here, so deposited whole, or almost so. Also, the fact that the broken edges are also burnt indicates that the pot was broken when it was burnt, so either this occurred during or before the firing, or, more likely, in the “pit” in which the deposit was found.

2. **Wine Pitcher**: unpublished; BM 66860, 66861 (Catalogue Nos. 2, 3)

The two sherds of BM 66860 and the single sherd of BM 66861 seem to have come from the same vase. The edges of all are burnt, so the vase was broken during or before it was burnt. The fabric may belong to Bourriaud’s class “Fine Marl A,”\(^43\) possibly Variant 3: the color (10 YR 6/3) could be a burnt version of Bourriaud’s 5 Y 8/3. It also has the conspicuous pores and sand inclusions characteristic of this sub-group. It lacks the straw
inclusions mentioned for Variant 4. The sherds seem to come from the shoulder area, possibly from a wine pitcher, with a long slender neck and looped handle. These are known from the middle to at least the end of the 18th Dynasty. Although they were used in daily life, they are also well-known from tombs. The profile of the shoulder also would fit for a rather narrow, round-shouldered amphora of Ramesside date, but this attribution is less likely. Another possibility is the small amphora: these would have served to hold liquids, fruit or grain in domestic situations. They have also been found in tomb groups. The small storage amphora was in use during the late 18th and 19th Dynasties.

3. Small, "Drop" Jar: unpublished; BM 66862 (Catalogue No. 4)

This sherd seems to be of a Nile silt ware. It probably comes from the base of a small, rather straight-sided jar with a slightly pointed base. Although its dimensions are small, it does not seem to be a drinking jar, as its sides curve in too quickly. It is more likely to have belonged to the group of small, ovoid jars with undefined neck and slightly restricted mouth.

4. Storage Jar?: unpublished; BM 66870 (Catalogue No. 5)

This is the most unusual of the Egyptian vases represented in the Tutankhamun group. It is from a very large vessel, possibly a large storage
jar,\textsuperscript{51} and may be of marl clay. However, the painted decoration seems to indicate that it belongs to a small group of large, decorated vessels known from Amarna and Deir el-Medina. Of these, the best parallels are somewhat biconical, squat, open-mouthed jars with rolled rims.\textsuperscript{52} These seem to be late Dynasty 18 in date. However, as only one sherd was found (or kept), and as the original was sizeable, it cannot have been placed whole into the deposit. The fact that it does not seem to be burnt and that the breaks are clean may also indicate a different depositional history from the other Egyptian pottery.

**Faience Vessels**

1. **Faience Kohl Tube** - *IKG*, pl. 17.30; BM 66857, 66868 (Catalogue No. 1)

Although Petrie has published this kohl (\textit{mesdemet}) tube as undecorated and intact it is, in fact, neither. Although it may have suffered some damage since it was found, as the lower fragment's break is rather fresh, there are certainly some breaks from antiquity (as on the upper piece). The decoration is simple, a group comprised of a thin wavy line between upper and lower brackets at each end of the tube.\textsuperscript{53} It might be compared to another tube in the British Museum (dated to Dyn. 18, probably on the basis of its color, which is white with manganese brown ornament).\textsuperscript{54} This has a
lotus band at one end and a cross hatch at the other. An undecorated tube, but of blue color like the Tutankhamun group's example, has been dated to Dynasty 19-20, so the shape seems to have a long span of use. Another plain tube, with possible traces of simple line decoration, was found in the Amenhotep III group (Pl. 17.14), although this was slightly larger in length and diameter. It is probably not possible to date the Tutankhamun example closer than Dyn. 18-19. All these tubes imitate the shape of a simple length of reed, such as was found in the Ramesses II B group (pl. 18. 41). The Tutankhamun tube had originally been sealed with a small bit of cloth, folded into a plug and still stuck into the opening. Although many examples now extant have been taken from tombs, it is known that kohl was used in daily life, and it has been suggested that the examples carrying the names of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun "were probably for distribution as favors on the occasion of festivals and court functions...." That there was a magical aspect, and certainly a medical aspect, to the use of kohl can be seen, for example, in the following text from an 18th Dynasty quintuple tube: "I am the Good One, who applies black eyepaint for the owner, the Scribe It, [I am] the One who vanquishes tears. I am Aha, who guards by means of the sa amulet for the owner every day. Remedy for debat (an eye aliment)."
2. Faience Bowl – *IKG*, pl. 17.44; BM 67061 (Catalogue No. 3)

Faience bowls\(^{59}\) are often found as tomb gifts, as well as offerings in shrines, and were used in this way throughout Egypt. But Milward cites the Gurob bowls as the only examples from “a domestic context” in her later phase of development, which took place during the second half of the New Kingdom.\(^{60}\) She even suggests that “the finds from Gurob may indicate a domestic use, and a group of shallow saucers of this period are the right size and shape for drinking bowls.”\(^{61}\) As the present study should discredit any claims of a domestic use for the Gurob bowls, it may well be that the entire class was for funerary or dedicatory purposes only.\(^{62}\) Except for few examples from Deir el-Medina, said to have the residue of a “milky” material, the tomb examples have also been empty. It is possible that they were offered for themselves, as their decoration is replete with the images of regeneration appropriate to a funerary context.

The typical version of the central motif has been identified as a white lotus\(^{63}\) (*Nymphaea lotus* L.). In Egyptian art this is normally distinguishable from the blue lotus (*Nymphaea caerulea* Savigny) by the pronounced vertical striations shown on its sepals.\(^{64}\) The Tutankhamun bowl, however, has only a central vein, which is normal for blue lotus representations, so it may be that the artist meant to portray a blue lotus here. The multiple pointed petals are also different from the white lotus’ more rounded ones.
A very similar bowl with a similar lotus design was found at Riqqeh. It came from Tomb 201-202, which was dated by the excavator to the reign of Akhenaten. However, the tomb had been disturbed, and was re-used in the Ramesside period, so the bowl could be Ramesside. From Gurob, there is a bowl with related decoration, dotted rim, and plain exterior that is called "Ramesside." A lid with this design can be dated to Ramesses II. The wavy-line rim decoration is paralleled by another bowl from Riqqeh, dated to Dyn. 19 by the excavator. The Tutankhamun bowl may perhaps be dated in Milward's "late New Kingdom" group by "the lack of external decoration" and the use of the white lotus (or a blue-lotus in the typical white-lotus motif). She seems to place this phase after the late 18th Dynasty. Peltenburg says that bowls of this type are "not found...before the Amarna Period."  

3. Faience Jar: KG, pl. 17.43; BM 67060 (Catalogue No. 2)

Once again, Petrie's drawing is rather loosely related to the actual object. The shape of the vessel is approximately correct, but the decoration is a bit more approximate. This is probably because the motif was not well known at the time and so was misunderstood--surface damage makes it hard to see the details. Petrie has shown a repeat design of hanging floral collar and pendant lotus flower: this actually occurs only one time, with the collar larger and the lotus smaller than drawn. It actually was a very handsome piece before being consigned to the flames.
This kind of collar, called a ḫn (ḫnh), is beginning to be understood as having very definite funerary symbolisms. The use of its pendant form as a decoration on pottery, faience and stone is typical of the 19th Dynasty, and the Tutankhamun vase cannot be dated any earlier. At least two other Burnt Groups had examples of these appealing little faience vases: Amenhotep III (pl. 17. 21, 22, and one unpublished), and Ramesses II A (pl. 18. 4, 6). The similarity between the late group's examples and the others reinforces a Ramesside date for them all.

It has been suggested that the faience jars were used to pour wine into saucers or other vessels during festival occasions. A similar shape may be represented in tomb scenes, for pouring some liquid into bowls. But, rather than faience, or even pottery, it is more likely that the original material used for this shape, and the prototype of the faience copies, was metal. One beautiful gold and two silver examples, with floral decoration, have survived in the first Tell Basta hoard of 1906, and are now in the Metropolitan Museum. Again, they are almost certainly late Dyn. 19 in style and in context. The ancient name for them may be ḫw. It is possible that our faience jars, like the faience bowls, were simulacra, never intended for regular use by the living, but tomb furniture only.

The Sedment balsam has been dated as 'Dynasty 19-20.' It came from Tomb 2010 in a plundered cemetery, which was also dated by its excavators as 'Dynasty 19-20.' It had contained at least six coffins and...
4. Faience Cucumber-shaped Melon: Unpublished; BM 67063 (Catalogue No. 5)

This vase may be one of the rarest vessels from ancient Egypt: I know of only two other examples of this type from Egypt, both of which are also from the Fayum area: Amenhotep III group, Sedment Tomb 2010.\(^79\)

Unfortunately, the upper half of the Tutankhamun vase is missing, but the remainder seems to be closest in shape and decoration to the slightly larger example from the Amenhotep III group, accurately shown in \(JG\), pl. 17.11. Both these vases have a bright turquoise color, shading to green on the Amenhotep III piece, where the surface has been damaged. This leads me to suspect that the description of the Sedment example as "green" is only a semantic difference. All three seem different in this regard from a jar found outside Egypt, from a tomb at Enkomi Cyprus. It is said to be "bluish-white,"\(^80\) although one might suspect that damage from moisture has affected its color.\(^81\) More are said to exist in Cyprus, including one with veins inlaid in "blue glaze."\(^82\) It seems likely that the Cypriote examples are Egyptian exports. The Egyptian vases are moulded in two halves and joined on the interior with slurry, a more liquid version of the body material, thinned with water. This technique is clearly visible on the Tutankhamun example, and has also been observed on the Sedment piece.\(^83\)

The Sedment cucumber has been dated as "Dynasty 19-20."\(^84\) It came from Tomb 2010 in a plundered cemetery, which was also dated by its excavators as "Dynasty 19-20."\(^85\) It had contained at least six coffins and
fragmented objects in a variety of good quality materials (glass, ivory, Mycenaean pottery, calcite vessels, a stela, a carved ointment box, etc.). At this point in time it is not possible to date it any closer. It is worth noting that at least one item, a scarab, was said to have been "re-used," as it is of earlier style.

The shape is thought to imitate a variety of cucumber-shaped melon, *Cucumis melo* L. var. *chate* (L.) *Naud. ex Boiss. Chate*, and the ancient Egyptian *ššpt*, still said to be cultivated in the Sudan. The "cucumber," *Cucumis sativis* L. *Gurke*, was probably not known until the Late Period. Actual examples of Chate have been preserved from antiquity.

Although it has been thought that "small bottles and flasks of this sort may have been used to hold additives for beer and wine," it may be possible to substantiate a different purpose. Jürgen Osing has suggested a connection between the Gurob faience vessels and those described in Amarna Letter No. 14. The line of text has been translated by Knudtzon as "I steinerne Gurke, die von gutem öl voll ist." This letter, EA 14, from either Amenhotep III or Akhenaten to Babylon, describes a long list of items being sent from Egypt. More recently it has been suggested that these vessels might be "a gourd- (or melon-) shaped glass container full of perfumed oil." However, the determinative could apply equally well to faience, and the Gurob flasks would seem to fit this textual description quite well. It is also possible that the faiences were funerary simulacra of
glass originals. A vessel shaped as our faience "cucumbers" might be used to shake out drops of oil, sparingly and one by one.

This association of the "cucumber" shape with special oils is further proved by its use for wooden "cosmetic boxes," to hold a solid unguent of some sort (see illustration of wooden ointment box, Berlin 6816). This might be the type of container described in another line from letter 14, translated by Knudtzon as "Ölbehälter-Gurken aus Elfenbein" and, more recently, as "29 gourd-shaped oil containers, (decorated?) with stained ivory." As Egyptian "cosmetic spoons" and "cosmetic boxes" could be made from ivory, it is quite possible that we may take this as a reference to boxes in the shape of "cucumbers" actually carved from ivory, and probably painted, rather than merely "decorated" with ivory.

These cucumber-shaped melons were suitable as funerary gifts, and were typically shown as an offering in New Kingdom religious scenes. Since all three of the known contexts for the faience objects appear to be funerary, it could be that the jar follows the pattern established in our examination of the other faience objects: they are for funerary use only, but may imitate vessels of different (and possibly more durable?) materials, intended for real life use. However, the finds from Cyprus and the Amarna letter references do show that flasks in faience were export items also.
5. Faience Jar Fragment: unpublished in Petrie; BM 67062 (Catalogue No. 4)

There is only one tantalizing fragment of what must have once been a rather handsome faience vessel. The very bottom of the sherd seems to show the beginnings of an outward curve, presumably for a shoulder. This curve, and the exterior mouth diameter of about 9 cm., suggest a long-necked shape, such as a tankard, krateriskos shape, or even amphora. However, the decoration on the interior of the neck seems to indicate that it must be something else, possibly a bowl of some sort.

The dotted rim is a common decorative element in New Kingdom faience, often seen on the rims of bowls and other vessels. The exterior neck-band motif is less common, and so stylized that it is rather difficult to identify. It seems to be a schematic representation of the mandrake fruit, which was a popular Dyn. 19 motif, especially used as part of the horizontal band systems placed on long-necks, or around rims. A very similar design was placed under the rim, spaced out among lotus petals, on a faience bowl from Gurob. Petrie listed this among “foundation deposits,” which may suggest that it also came from a burnt group. Thomas has tentatively dated it to the 19th Dynasty. A faience footed-cup, from Riqqeh, has a dotted circle band, that may be related, in the same position. Another faience goblet, from Deir el-Medina, has a band of these schematic fruits, very similar to those on the Gurob sherd, placed above a pendant lotus petal band. From finds at Deir el-Medineh, it is almost certain that these types of ornament cannot be in use before the
19th Dynasty. The interior design looks quite purposeful, not an accidental splash, but has not yet been identified. It may be another floral or a vining motif.

---

**Stone Vessels**

1. **Travertine** Fish-shaped Dish: *IKG*, pl. 17.41; BM 66875 (Catalogue No. 5)

As usual, Petrie has shown this travertine vase as restored, rather than as it was found, quite burnt and fragmented. However, he does mention that it was "burnt to lime." He has also grossly undersized it on his *IKG* plate (17.41). The shape is of the common bulti or *tilapia nilotica* fish, the "Nile mouth-breeder." It was a popular religious symbol: the "fish were associated with transformations of the dead and with the goddess Hathor and were symbols of fertility and of rebirth." This seems to have arisen from their habit of hatching their eggs in the father's mouth. The release of the young fish suggested "self creation" to the Egyptians, which was a characteristic of the "primordial sun-god."

While such dishes are usually called "cosmetic" dishes, their actual function is not known. Most examples have been found in the tombs (of both sexes),
but not in association with known cosmetic implements and containers. Riefstahl suggests that their use in tombs is amuletic, and points out that the fish, although not sacred, was magical, and perhaps insured the renewal of life. It has also been suggested that the use of the bulti-shape "soll die Wirksamkeit der kosmetischen Produkte erhöhen, die erotische Anziehungskraft verstärken und die Fruchtbarkeit garantieren." This interpretation implies a daily-life use of the vessel.

Dishes of this shape were also made of wood (which may be lidded). Dating of the type is not yet well established: most seem generally classed as "New Kingdom" or "Dyn. 18." There are examples from known contexts, but they have not been very useful so far in establishing a sequence. Merrillees considered a fish dish when trying to date the deposition of objects in Gurob Tomb 070, where it was found, along with Base Ring I and II juglets. Unfortunately, he had to resort to the Tutankhamun dish as a date for his example, and ended up with only a general assessment of Amenhotep III to Horemheb.

The long tail of our dish might have chronological significance, or may be nothing more than a regional or even a workshop variation. Loat’s find at Gurob Tomb 070 is a good parallel, but, as we have seen, not well dated. There was at least one from the Amenhotep III group but it has never been published and may not survive. Petrie published another example rather like the Tutankhamun dish, but its context is not known, although he dated it 18th-19th Dynasty. Both Loat’s example and this one have
carved ridges, perhaps indicating scales, but the Tutankhamun one is plain. Another plain fish, but shorter tailed, was excavated at Deir el-Balah. But, again, no date has been given. The cemetery seems to have been used mostly in the 19th Dynasty, but may have earlier materials. We can only conclude that the Tutankhamun fish dish is an appropriate tomb gift, and that it may be late 18th or 19th Dynasty in date.

2. Travertine Mortar: *IKG*, pl. 17.31; BM 66874 (Catalogue No. 4)

This is probably a small mortar used for grinding household necessities such as cosmetics or medications. Although it is suggested that these "were part of the standard equipment in any kitchen," they are most commonly known from New Kingdom tombs when "almost every large cemetery of the period has produced comparable examples." The usual shape has a flat bottom, which one might consider a practical necessity, and two ears, possibly for gripping. The Gurob vase differs in its rounded bottom and single ear, and may actually be for another purpose. The best parallel known to me is also from Gurob, in the Ramesses II A group (*IKG*, pl. 17.25). Another Gurob example may be related, although it is both larger and decorated. This came from Tomb 705 F, dated by the excavators as Ramesside, a date reiterated in studies of the other objects, such as the glass and the razor. The Mycenaean stirrup jar from the tomb has been called LH III B. Other mortars with rounded bases are...
known, of travertine or limestone. In conclusion, it is not possible to date this object precisely, but it may well be Ramesside.

3, 4. Travertine Lentoid Flasks: IKG, pl. 17.42; BM 66871, 66872136 (Catalogue Nos. 1, 2)

Petrie published one lentoid flask, with some accuracy but omitted the neck of another flask that was found with the group. It seems to be of the same shape, although, as the body is missing, the diagnostic area may have been lost. These vessels are, again, a very common item in New Kingdom burials. In fact, they are so ubiquitous that they have been little studied.137 It is possible that there might be some chronological significance in the development of the elongated body towards the degree we can see in the Seti II Burnt Group (IKG, pl. 19.25).138 A very close parallel to the Tutankhamun flasks was found in the tomb of Apiy at Riqqeh.139 Although there must have been an Amarna period burial here, the tomb seems to have had Ramesside re-use, and the vase could be from either time.140 A more firmly fixed Ramesside flask is from Gurob Tomb 705 F.141 The Ramesses II A Burnt Group example is not very different from the Tutankhamun vases (IKG, pl. 18.21), as is also another, from the "Maket" tomb, dated by the excavator to Dyn. 20.142 However, this whole tomb has been redated to the reigns of Tuthmosis I to III, on the basis of scarabs.143 So, the span for our vessels may be from Tuthmosis I into Dyn. 19.144 The best that can be done under the circumstances is a general date of Dynasties
18-19. The flasks might be 18th Dynasty, but we would probably not be too far off in calling them Ramesside either. Stone lentoid flasks seem to have been used for "cosmetics," judging from their association with other toilet articles, and may not have been restricted to funerary use. An example with the suspension cord still attached was found by Petrie "in the town" at Gurob. However, we cannot ignore the suspicion that it may actually have been from a burial. Petrie had a poor understanding of the site's stratigraphy in his first season.

5. Travertine Jar: not published; BM 66873 (Catalogue No. 3)

Glass Vessels

Petrie omitted this small, pear-shaped jar from the group, perhaps because its neck and rim have been lost. It is a small version of the cosmetic jars well known throughout the 18th and 19th Dynasties in both stone and pottery. Another example is known from Gurob. One stone example is said to have contained soap.

6, 7. Travertine Shallow Bowls: not published; BM 66876, 66877 (Catalogue Nos. 6, 7).

Neither of these small bowls has been published, in spite of the fact that one is almost complete. They were both originally quite elegant, thin-walled,
fine grained and delicate. The larger has a small flattened area on the bottom, to help it sit correctly, while the smaller had the effect of a tiny ring base. A saucer similar to the smaller was found in Tomb 473 at Gurob. It also has a slight indication of a ring base like the Tutankhamun bowl. The tomb seems firmly dated into the 19th Dynasty by its objects. It also incorporated re-used fragments of the 18th Dynasty temple. A badly preserved Mycenaean stirrup jar was one of the finds. It is probably LH III B in style. Again, it does not seem possible to give any more precise date to the bowls than Dynasty 18-19.

Glass Vessels

1. Glass Lentoid flask: *KG* pl. 17.35; BM 37499 (Catalogue No. 1)

Unfortunately, this once-beautiful piece is not as complete as Petrie makes it appear: one handle and part of the body are missing. It has also been badly damaged by fire. Flasks of this sort are well known, most of them probably coming from tomb groups, and other examples have been found at Gurob: from the Ramesses II A group and an unprovenanced piece Petrie brought back to London. They are presumed to be a toilette article, both by the shape and by the delicate nature of the fabric.
The dating of this vase is extremely problematic. Students of Egyptian art have often accepted the Burnt Groups as fixed chronological points and built their typologies from them. This seems to have been the general practice in Nolte's otherwise exemplary study of New Kingdom glass vessels, weakening the work somewhat. The Tutankhamun flask actually exhibits features that might be more typical of the 19th Dynasty. Peltenburg\textsuperscript{156} gives the following review of Nolte's "Werkkreis 4," dated Tutankhamun to Ramesses II, in which she placed the Gurob piece:

Occasional earlier instances do occur...but such borders are diagnostic of Nolte's Group 4...which is consistently dated in the 19th Dynasty (Ramesses II). The evidence for beginning this style in the reign of Tutankhamun is based on examples in the enigmatic Gurob house-deposits which, at least as far as the 18th Dynasty deposits are concerned, Petrie dated too early. Two pieces with these distinctive borders are included: a pilgrim flask...from a deposit with little blue pendants of Tutankhamun...small items that provide a \textit{terminus post quem} for the group and a flask which Nolte cites as firmly dated to the period Tutankhamun-Ramesses II...but which Petrie assigned to the late 18th Dynasty on stylistic grounds only.... These framing bands therefore may be regarded as typical of 19th Dynasty Egyptian glass vessels.

Peltenburg is correct is assessing Nolte's dependence on the Gurob material.\textsuperscript{157} In her list of dated vases from the reign she cites only three from Tutankhamun's tomb and the three from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group.\textsuperscript{158} As the shapes and styles of the two groups differ vastly,\textsuperscript{159} the
acceptably dated material from Thebes cannot be used to prove the date of the Gurob vessels.

For the period between Tutankhamun and Ramesses II, the only examples she can attribute to the reign of Tutankhamun are from Group 7 (*JKG*, pl. 20.11, 12).160 Burnt Group 7 has turned up with some frequency in this study, but its chronological value is quite doubtful. First of all, the fact that it was a burnt group must cast some doubt upon its integrity as a group. It included two Mycenaean vases that Furumark considered LH III A 2 late (FS 178:12 - *JKG*, pl. 20:7, FS 195:14 - *JKG*, pl. 20:9). These could, of course, be quite acceptably placed into the period of Tutankhamun. But, we must resist the temptation to date our Egyptian context by the Mycenaean pottery, which has in turn been dated by Egyptian contexts. Other objects from the group were the two glass pieces, a travertine tazza (pl. 20.8) and tankard (pl. 20.15), a pottery tankard (pl. 20.13) and saucer (pl. 20.14) and a bronze vase and pair of hinges (pl. 20.10).

The tazza is a member of an enormous group found in Egypt and also around the Eastern Mediterranean, and possibly Syrian in origin.161 The shape has not yet been studied in enough detail to establish a typological sequence, although the two-ribbed types are thought to have appeared first during the reign of Tuthmosis III. For the triple-ribbed versions, the Amenhotep III and Ramesses II A Burnt Groups appear again, their examples being called "perhaps the earliest and latest datable examples."162 Certainly the earlier context is not secure, although the later is probably
acceptable as generally Ramesside.\textsuperscript{163} Greene,\textsuperscript{164} simply dates the whole group to "New Kingdom." She is not able to do much better for the tankard (pl. 20.15), described in her catalogue as "Long-necked globular jar with one loop handle." She cannot break the dating down further than "Late Dyn. 18-Dyn. 20."\textsuperscript{165} The Group 7 vase does look quite a lot like the example from the Ramesses II A group (pl. 18.22), but not as advanced as the more elongated version from the Seti II group (pl. 19.20).

The pottery tankard is not much more helpful in establishing a date. Although it looks generally Ramesside,\textsuperscript{166} it is not as elongated as examples from later in the New Kingdom (such as pl. 18.62, from the Ramesses II B group). The example from the tomb of a son of Ramesses II at Gurob\textsuperscript{167} is generally similar to our example, although a bit more slender. The Seti II group's vase (pl. 19.4) also shares a general similarity, although the transition of body to neck zones is more sharply defined. Group 7's vase is very much like the Amenhotep III group vase (Pl. 18.1), but we cannot date that very well either, except to say that the group is probably generally Ramesside in character. An examination of the bowl is even less rewarding than the tankard, although the shape certainly occurs in the 19th Dynasty.\textsuperscript{168}

The conical bronze vase is, unfortunately, not illustrated. One suspects that it might be similar to the small faience vessels found in the Amenhotep III, Tutankhamun and Ramesses II A groups, which should be 19th Dynasty. The hinge is most unusual, and its use and date are difficult to estimate, as
there are almost no parallels. It may possibly have come from a box.\textsuperscript{169}
Such an arrangement would perhaps support a hinged lid, when open.

In Petrie's description of the finds from Group 7 he says: "The group Pl. XX, 7-15 was found together, and is of the end of the XVIIIth dynasty by the style....The pottery with this find was of the types "Kahun" XX, 15, 32; XXI, 59; and here Pl. XIX, 2, 4, 6, 7."\textsuperscript{170} It is here, finally, that there seems to be some better evidence for a Dynasty 19 date for the group. First of all, Petrie's "and here Pl. XIX" must mean \textit{IKG}, pl. 19, which is the Seti II Burnt Group!

Although one might quibble about some of these objects being earlier than the Seti II steatite dish, it is difficult to believe that so many simple and uninteresting vessels in it would be preserved from the 18th Dynasty. These vases are not only late-looking, but their context is also late, and the early dating of Group 7 is defeated immediately. It is unfortunate that Petrie did not actually illustrate the Group 7 vessels, as they might really have been earlier types of the same forms as the Seti II vases. But Petrie did have the other Burnt Groups to use for comparanda, and these do appear to be earlier in the Ramesside sequence than the Seti II pieces, and so closer to his late 18th Dynasty date for Group 7. For example, instead of pl. 19. 4 (Seti II) he could have used pl. 17.1 (Amenhotep III). So, one must conclude that he really meant to compare Group 7 with the later material. Individually, these Seti II forms can also be shown as probably Ramesside:
the small amphora (pl. 19.2) is one example. For the bowl (pl. 19.6) and tankard (pl. 19.4) see above.

As Cooney says, this vase is "the wreck of a fine piece." It differs in somewhat deformed by the heat of the fire, and the circumference is

The large jar published in *KGH*, pl. 20, no. 15 seems to show the Ramesside feature of an elongated neck, and fits comfortably into the Ramesside period. For the tall amphora, *KGH*, pl. 20, no. 32, a Ramesside date is also most likely. David Aston has kindly informed me that vases such as *KGH*, pl. 21, no. 59 are found at Saqqara, where they can be dated as Ramesside.

In conclusion, I think it can be fairly said that the pottery and stone objects from Group 7 are generally and, in some cases, certainly, Ramesside in date. This would then support Peltenburg's contentions, and make it more likely that Group 7 and the three glass vases from the Tutankhamun group should be placed into Dynasty 19, with the rest of the objects in Nolte's category.

We can now given more credence to the close similarity, which Cooney had already noticed, of the Tutankhamun flask to the one from the Ramesses II A group. Cooney said "it [the similarity] could be used as an argument for a similar dating [i.e. to Ramesses II], but as these flasks continued to be duplicated over many generations it is sounder to give a wide date range." In spite of Cooney's hesitation the logic of the stylistic argument, joined with the lack of any proof for a Dyn.18 appearance of the style, is strong enough, in my opinion, to sway the date for this flask to Dyn. 19.
2. Glass Amphoriskos: IKG, pl. 17.37; BM 67027 (Catalogue No. 2)

As Cooney says, this vase is "the wreck of a fine piece." It differs in effect from the lentoid flask and the other amphoriskos in being much finer work. He also considered that it had a different style of decoration. Nolte identifies it as a krateriskos, while Cooney seems to consider it an amphoriskos. As restored, the maximum diameter around the shoulder seems to be somewhere between 6.5 and 7.5 cm.; the vase has been somewhat deformed by the heat of the fire, and the circumference is irregular. Although this makes it a bit large for an amphoriskos, the resulting diameter of the mouth is much too small for a krateriskos. The handle placement also would suit an amphoriskos. Cooney says that the amphoriskos shape was popular in the late 18th Dynasty, and considers that it was copied from the larger, pottery "wine jars." In this size and material it is probably better to be considered as a toilette article.

The Tutankhamun vase has parallels in Group 7 from Gurob, not only in the similar shape of one vessel (pl. 20.12), but also in the use of a twisted thread for a horizontal band across the shoulder of the miniature flask (pl. 20.11). As we have just determined above, Group 7 is probably Ramesside in date. Another Gurob example came from Tomb 705 F, discussed with the travertine mortar and flask of the Tutankhamun group. This tomb does appear to be Ramesside, and Nolte uses the amphoriskos as a fixed point for the Ramesside Period. It is also in her "Werkkreis 4," which it may now be possible to place entirely into Dynasty 19.
The use of spiral threads to mark the upper border of the body pattern does not appear to be that common. Nolte illustrates only a few examples: the vases from the Tutankhamun and Ramesses II A groups, the tiny flask from Group 7, and three unprovenanced pieces, one of them said to be from Luxor (pl. 16, nos. 4, 6, 7). She has been forced, by the use of the groups, to give this motif a wide time span, from Tutankhamun to Ramesses II. By removing this imperative, it may now be possible to re-evaluate the group in terms of stylistic development, and some revisions might be possible.\textsuperscript{183}

3. Glass Amphoriskos: unpublished by Petrie; BM 67395\textsuperscript{184} (Catalogue No. 4)

Petrie omitted this jar, perhaps because it was too fragmentary, although it has now been partially restored. It looks so much like the flask in decoration and general effect\textsuperscript{185} that one might suggest that it came from the same source. The shape is that of an amphoriskos. Cooney dated it to the late 18th Dynasty,\textsuperscript{186} but there does not now seem to be any necessity to continue to do so.
4. **Monochrome Glass Vessel**: unpublished by Petrie; BM 67028\(^{187}\) (Catalogue No. 3)

Cooney suggests that this body sherd came from a wide-necked amphora, as the core has been removed.\(^{188}\) A very slight suggestion of a carination on the piece may support the identification as a krateriskos.\(^{189}\) But, it is most probably from the lower body of a vessel shape that Nolte has termed "Krateriskosformen,"\(^{190}\) or "dickwandiger Krateriskos," with a tall, open, straight, and unrimmed neck, a high, rather flattened, shoulder and a wider, rounded, lower body, and no handles. A remarkable feature is the beautiful color, a lovely light-blue.\(^{191}\) Nolte has placed monochrome vessels of this type in her Group 6, which she dates from Tutankhamun to Pinudjem II. The dated Dyn. 18 examples do not appear to be very closely related to the burnt group piece, although Nolte does compare the shape of one of Tutankhamun's vases to the "Krateriskos-formen" examples.\(^{192}\) Most of the examples from Group 6 are not well dated, but the majority seem to belong to the Ramesside Period.\(^{193}\) So, this vessel might be from the late 18th Dynasty, but is more likely to be Ramesside. Cooney dates it simply as "New Kingdom."
Jewellery

1-11. Stone and Faience Finger Rings: _IKG_, pl. 17.36, 38, 39; BM 68890, 68911, 68914-68916, 68918; UC 27901 (iv) (Catalogue Nos. 12-18)

Five stone finger rings were found in this group; Petrie published only three of them. They are all quite simple, and quite difficult to date. Presumably, they could have been worn in life. Although several others of the groups had rings, they are faience rather than stone. There were also at least six blue faience rings in the Tutankhamun group, burnt. Four were undecorated but one had a crude bezel, more like a drop of faience, impressed with a design that may be a wedjat eye (UC 27901 [iv]). A sixth faience ring (BM 68890), in a blue glaze, also had a wedjat eye bezel. A faience ring with a wedjat eye was also found in the Amenhotep III group. An almost identical ring was found in another Gurob tomb, thought to be Ramesside.

Of the stone rings, the most elaborate is BM 68914 (_IKG_, pl. 17.39), possibly "white feldspar" or quartzite, with a scarab bezel. The support on each side has been carved into a sort of zig-zag decoration, probably representing lotus flowers.

Another decorated ring, BM 68915 (_IKG_, pl. 17.36), of "white feldspar," or perhaps quartzite, has the bezel shaped into a cartouche. The top is
incised with a rather schematic representation of a sistrum. In profile, it is almost stirrup-shaped.

The third ring Petrie illustrated, in stirrup shape, is undecorated, but nicely made of dark brown stone, possibly hematite (BM 68918 - *IKG* pl. 17.38). Another ring of this shape, also plain, but in carnelian or agate, was also part of the deposit (BM 68916). This type of stone ring is uncommon before the Amarna Period. The stirrup may originally be a metal shape, and it was certainly used for signet rings in the New Kingdom.

The remaining ring is of red agate or carnelian (BM 68911), and is broken. The design on the bezel may be another, very free-form sistrum, or perhaps a poppy flower on the stem, or even a floral bouquet. If it is a flower, this would indicate a date most likely in the 19th Dynasty.

12. *Calcite Tube and Boss Earring: IKG*, pl. 17.34; BM 66878 (Catalogue No. 27)

Only the tube half of a calcite tube-and-boss earring has survived. This type of earring seems actually to have been worn. In stone, the type was a simple version of more precious ornaments in metal, that could become very elaborate, when dangling elements were hung from the tube. Similar examples were found in the Amenhotep III group (*IKG*, pl. 18.17,
18. a second tube-half was not published.209 The type is said to occur from the New Kingdom to the Late Period, but to have been especially popular in the New Kingdom.210

13. **Calcite Tube and Boss Earring?**: unpublished in Petrie; BM 68919 (Catalogue No. 28)

This object could be the boss half of earring BM 66878, except that its diameter is greater, and it is lacking a boss. There is a small circular cutting on the flat side that could have held a pin, perhaps in another material. The diameter of the hole matches the diameter of the interior of the tube, so it would have fit. It could also be a knob for a small box. However, these are usually pieced completely through.211

14-36. **Penannular Earrings**: *KG*, pl. 17.32, 33; BM 65782, 68891-68913 (Catalogue Nos. 19-26)

Twenty-four penannular rings of shell, jasper or carnelian and calcite were found in the deposit, most of them showing heavy traces of burning. It is known that the rings were used either individually or in multiples,212 but whether or not they were really placed on or through the ear is not certain.213 Their actual use has been questioned, as the cleft is sometimes extremely narrow, and it has been suggested that they were funerary
simulacra, or even some kind of hair ornament. The desired effect may be seen on an early Dyn. 19 coffin lid, from Deir el-Medina. Made of a white material, either shell or calcite, and worn with tube-and-boss earrings (or plugs) of a similar material, each ring is placed immediately next to and parallel to the face, as they would be if slid onto the ears or through the ear lobe. However, if they were really worn in the ears, and with such a great wig, they would never have been visible. Clearly, the coffin is showing the effect of earrings, but the rings themselves would have had to have been worked into the hair of the wig.

Penannular earrings are a common ornament of 18-19th Dynasty mummies, and apparently could be worn by men or women. Examples were found in the Ramesses II A (IKG, pl. 18.16) and Ramesses II B (IKG, pl. 18.29, four actually found) Burnt Groups.

Petrie seems to have combined the two partially preserved beads to present the drawing of one complete version: the BM bead is missing its upper suspension loop, while the UC version is missing the lower one. They appear to be identical small beads, quite thin and delicate, with the name of Tutankhamun, \textit{Nbt-prw-Rc}, in raised relief. Lanny Bell has noted that this technique is different from Amarna Tutankhamun rings, which normally
show the inscription in sunk relief. The similar beads from one of Tutankhamun's own faience collars are also made with sunk relief, but a ring from Gurob is also raised.

The fragility of the beads has been thought to support an 18th Dynasty date for the entire group. But the dating of the group must rest on the latest item it contains (if indeed it is a closed group), not on the most fragile. As for their fragility, they may not be much more delicate than glass vessels: the survival of both would depend upon their handling. But, they probably were contemporary with Tutankhamun himself, and might be the earliest materials from the deposit.

Few parallels appear in the literature, perhaps because they are the kind of small, non-spectacular item that is often left out of excavation publications, and can only be found in museum collections. Petrie illustrates several of Ramesses II in sunk relief from Gurob, and a similar bead of Ramesses II but in raised relief was found at Buhen. The faience versions probably copy metal, such as the gold beads with the names of the Aten, probably necklace parts, that were found in Kings' Valley Tomb 55. This burial was of Amarna Period personages, and may have been made under the authority of Tutankhamun himself. Such a necklace may have looked like the faience collar found in the tomb of Tutankhamun. As only two cartouches are known from the Tutankhamun group, they were probably not part of a collar similar to Tutankhamun's, with a whole row of cartouches, but were probably combined with the figured beads found
in the group, in an "amuletic" collar (see below). We might expect then that other beads or beads from the group should also be 18th Dynasty in date.

39-44. Faience, Glass and Stone Beads and Pendants: IKC, pl. 17.25 - BM 65779 (also UC 27815); 26 - BM 65781 (also UC 27816); 27 - BM 65780 (also UC 27817) (Catalogue Nos. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11)

Petrie seems to have separated out the beads and pendants into two very similar lots of three strings each. One lot went to the British Museum and the other was kept at the Petrie Museum. It is easier to regroup them and discuss them all together. Several necklaces are probably represented here. The easiest to recognize is a string that would have been made from the carnelian cornflower or pomegranate pendants (three from UC, two from BM). These have been strung (BM) with small, red faience, spacer beads, which probably gives approximately the correct ancient effect. There were approximately 82 in red, 61 turquoise, 3 , probably turquoise but now black from burning, 3 yellow, and 1 white; slightly larger were 3 blue, and 16 red.

The second kind of necklace may have been an sort of amuletic collar, with multiple rows of the small faience elements, separated by the small spacer-beads, and ending in a row of drop beads (11 of these). The small amulets are sometimes difficult to identify, as they have sometimes not moulded very well, and many are also burnt. The small figured pendants
are still quite brightly glazed in a turquoise blue, while the *tyet* and *ankh* amuletic beads are rougher and more affected by fire. There were 11 *tyet*, 7 *ankh*, 237 1 *djed*, 238 2 dates, 239 1 oval (all with suspension beads at top and bottom, some now missing), 11 uraeii, 4 dwarfs, 240 1 falcon, 1 standing mumiform god with scepter, 3 standing goddesses with papyrus scepters 241 and a disc? on the head, 6 seated baboons, 242 2 other seated monkeys, 1 possibly striding monkey or Bes, 243 and 1 undeterminable. 244 The two cartouche-shaped beads could well have gone into a necklace with these amuletic beads. The drop beads (shown upside down in *IKG*, pl. 17.27) normally form the final row of *wesekh* (or "broad"), and sometimes floral, collars 245 and could have taken the same position here. Other necklaces would seem to be indicated by the number of multiple beads, 246 and multiple spacer beads, 247 and also the floral boss beads. 248 Special beads include one example of a yellow, black and white "eye" bead (Petrie considered this type was Ramesside), 249 several scarabs 250 and wedjat eyes. 251 The rest may all be spacer elements. 252 It is difficult to imagine that there are enough beads in this group to complete any kind of elaborate necklace, so either beads are missing, or the necklace was a rather disorganized arrangement. However, if the others from UC are added there might have been sufficient number. From the number of beads that are actually burnt and others that still have ashy material caught in recessed details, it is clear that they were exposed to fire.
Most of the types can be matched by Brunton and Engelbach’s finds from their later work at Gurob, classed as “XVIII-XIX Dynasty.” Many have parallels from Amarna also.\(^{253}\) An eye-bead necklace was found with the Ramesses II B Burnt Group (\(IKG\), pl. 18.30), and a string of figured amulets and cornflower pendants was also found here (\(IKG\), pl. 18.31). The Seti II group had another of cornflower pendants (\(IKG\), pl. 19.24), as did the Amenhotep III group (\(IKG\), pl. 17.24). It seems clear that certain of these types continued well into the 19th Dynasty, and many of the Tutankhamun beads could belong to this time.

45. Faience, Glass and Stone Beads: unpublished by Petrie; UC 27901 (i, ii, iii) (Catalogue Nos. 5, 6, 7)

Thomas\(^{254}\) publishes a description of another larger group of faience beads said to come from this group. As most of them are spacer types, they might make it possible to restore some sort of complete necklace if combined with the others described above. She mentions 191 red spheroids, apparently of agate,\(^{255}\) a 9.6 cm. length of blue and green faience disc beads, and another group of polychrome spheroid and multiple beads. Kaczmarczyk calls these strings early Dynasty 19.\(^{256}\)
Conclusions

The first conclusion that can be drawn from a survey of the objects is that almost all can be separated into only two categories: jewellery and containers. A good number of the containers can further be associated with so-called "cosmetic" functions, that may actually be more religious than aesthetic in nature. Another fact becomes quite clear from the survey: there are very few parallels for the Tutankhamun objects from settlement sites, such as Amarna. So, they would not seem to be the kinds of materials found in settlements. Therefore, they apparently were not appropriate either to a domestic situation, as would be expected if the pits were actually household refuse, or even palatial, rubbish dumps, or to the destruction debris from a burnt harim. The Tutankhamun objects do, in fact, find their parallels in the kinds of objects that were placed in tombs, as Petrie himself determined. And some of them, such as the faience bowl, are found only in tombs, while others are specific to ritual functions, such as the fish dish and faience drop-vase. The Tutankhamun Burnt-Group would then seem to be a special function assemblage, and probably may be identified as a tomb group. This would then be the primary deposition (see Chapter: Archaeology).

When found, the objects were fragmented and heavily burnt. The recoverability of almost entire vessels (stone, faience, pottery and glass) makes it likely that the breakage was done in situ. While this may have
occurred before firing, the intensity of the fire more probably caused most of the devastation. That this was extreme can be gauged, for example, from the blackened and deformed condition of pottery and glass, and the calcined and splintered alabaster. The cause or causes of the fire cannot be established, but the practice of burning coffins inside tombs, possibly to melt off the gold foil embellishments, as described in the Ramesside Tomb-Robbery Papyri, is evocative. 

The objects all look to have been of rather good quality, and the presence of so much glass may even indicate their characterization as "rich." It is curious then that, if the Tutankhamun Burnt Group was a burial of some sort, there was not a normal shaft and tomb chamber or chambers. Burials without constructed or dug chambers seem to have been the recourse of the New Kingdom poor, even in areas where there is not much good rock.

As for the date of the deposit, it must rest on the date of the latest item it included. Although some of the individual pieces must indeed be 18th Dynasty (such as the Tutankhamun beads), there are several that are probably to be placed in the 19th Dynasty (such as the glass vessels), and one that almost certainly cannot be earlier than the 19th Dynasty (the small faience jar). So, the evidence mandates a 19th Dynasty, possibly early, date of deposition.

Internal evidence among the groups also shows this to be the most likely date. The Tutankhamun objects exhibit a close similarity to those in the
Ramesses II A group\textsuperscript{261}: the faience flasks, the almost identical glass lentoid flasks, the travertine mortars, the travertine lentoid flasks, and the faience bowl. It is not likely that the materials from the Ramesses group would all be heirlooms, and the most obvious conclusion to draw from the similarity is a possible near contemporaneity. The faience jars and glass flasks are very strong evidence for this. The Tutankhamun eye and figured faience beads also find parallels in the Ramesses II B group. The further similarity of the faience jars to those from the Amenhotep III group draws this down into the 19th Dynasty also.\textsuperscript{262} There are, of course, many similarities between the Tutankhamun and Amenhotep III deposits, and it may well be that they are indeed the earliest of the bunch, but still only early Dyn. 19. As J.R. Harris said some years ago, none of the LH III B groups at Gurob has to be before Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{263} Stubbings had already voiced a similar opinion: "...the associated Egyptian objects show that they cannot be much earlier than the accession of Ramesses II..."\textsuperscript{264}
CHAPTER IV: ENDNOTES

1 For at least one of the causes of this antagonism see Drower, Petrie, p. 104, and also pp. 64, 125, 211, 341.


3 Hankey and Warren, "Absolute," pp. 148, 162; in Warren and Hankey, Aegean, p. 154 they have modified their views slightly: "At Gurob an LH III B stirrup jar came from a pit dated to the time of Tutankhamun." This vase is UCL 855, and should not be associated with the Tutankhamun Group, cf. discussion below.

4 Chronology, 113, no. 8; 114.

5 E.g., Wace, BSA 52, p. 222: LH III A2, FS 171. This is apparently the vase referred to by Hankey and Warren, "Absolute," p. 162.

6 There is a small bit of area left attached to one handle where one might expect to find the base of a flower pattern (FS 18) or the like, if such a pattern were used. However, there are many larger motifs (e.g. FS 19) that would not need to be started so close to the handle.

7 See the definitions in Patricia A. Mountjoy, Mycenaean Decorated Pottery: A Guide to Identification, SIMA 73 (Goteborg: 1986) pp. 79, 107-108. In the text I have also added my own observations to her remarks.

8 Cf. C. Mee, Rhodes in the Bronze Age: An Archaeological Survey (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1982), p. 10, no. 3: Ialysos, FS 178, III A2. The body dimensions and proportions are very close to the Tutankhamun vase, although the maximum diameter falls slightly raised on the Gurob vase. It also has some of Mountjoy's III B features: very straight-up spout, and narrow paint bands around its mouth and base. I have also noticed that the use of plain, often thicker, horizontal bands as a kind of body-zone decoration tends to be found on III B vases, although it is seen on pieces, dated to III A2, such as this one. It may be a late feature or tendency in III A2. Also cf. Walters et al., CVA, GB 7, BM 5, pl. GB 294, no. 21, FS 178:12, III A2; Mountjoy, Guide, FS 178, cf. fig. 94, p. 80, no. 1, III A2 early.

9 It is so nicely proportioned that a FS 171, type d. classification also seems possible to the eye. However, Furumark has stated as a definition of that style that the maximum width should equal the height, and No. 1's width exceeds its height. It seems very similar in shape (though wider and somewhat flatter-shouldered) and decorative elements to the plain-shouldered FS 171:35 from Gurob, Tomb 23 ("Res," see above, Chapter 3, no. 6), BM A 987, LH III A2; cf. photo of profile in Wace, BSA 52, p. 221, fig. 3.
Also see Vassos Karageorghis, Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Cyprus 2, Private Collections 1 (Nicosia: 1965), pl. 12. 5 (No. 53), called FS 171, as its height is incorrectly said to be same as its maximum diameter. But, the diameter can be seen to be greater in the photo, so this should probably be called FS 178. It is placed in III A2, but it has many III B features: has loop, no reserve triangles, paint on handles stops short of shoulder band. The band decoration is also similar to the Tutankhamun vase. Also cf. Mountjoy, Guide, fig. 94, p. 80, no. 1, FS 178, with similar banding groups, III A2 early!

For the solid dot in III B see: Jean Deshayes, Argos, Les Fouilles de la Deiras, Ecole Francaise d’Athènes, Études Peloponésiennes (Paris:1966), pl. 23, no. 3, IIIB; Vasos Karageorghis, Private Collections, pl. 17, no. 1, FS 171, III B; ibid., pl. 39, no. 6, FS 180, III B; idem, Excavations at Kition, vol. 1 (Cyprus: 1974), pl. 19, nos. 190 (even with flange on base of neck), 198; ibid., pl. 124, IIIB, possibly an FS 173; Stefan Hiller, Mykenische Keramik. Alt-Aghina IV, 1 (1975), pl. 24, no. 239, III A2 1/2 FS 171, which seems to have solid dot; ibid., possibly also pl. 25, no. 242, III B, FS 182.7; Penelope A. Mountjoy, Mycenaean Pottery from Orchomenos, Eutresis and other Boeotian Sites: Orchomenos, vol. V, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Abhandlungen, Neue Folge, fasc. 89 (Munich: 1983), no. 110, p. 20 fig. 6, p. 22, pl. 3b-c.

Sometimes, as on the Tutankhamun vase, the disc has a slight, rounded bump (this may in fact be more common on the III B examples), and the soft paint wears off across it with any use, leaving the impression of a reserve dot in the center of a large painted circle. This may have been the case for the following vases, which appear to have originally had solid large circles: I. A. Todd, M. C. McClellan, "Kalavasos-Mangia: A Late Bronze Age Cemetery," RDAC 1988/1, p. 211, no. 7, LH III B, (FS 173?); also looped; Karageorghis, Private Collections, pl. 17, no. 2, FS 171, III B; ibid., pl. 28, all III B or III A2/B; ibid., pl. 31, no. 2, III A2 FS 166. Also cf. Mee, Rhodes, pl. 9, Ialysos, III A2, FS 166 (also with loop); Carl W. Blegen, Marion Rawson, Lord William Taylour, William P. Donovan, The Palace of Nestor At Pylos in Western Messenia, III (U. of Cincinnati, 1973), p. 274, two vases, both FS 180, but dated III A2.


It is worth noting that there is some similarity between this sherd and the one illustrated in KGH, pl. 28.17: the plate would show the false spout stump, the painted circle around the base of the (missing) spout and part of two of the semi-circular motifs. However, two motifs would also be unreasonably cut off from the drawing. It
is also unlikely that a sherd from 1888-89 would have been mixed in with the 1889-90 Burnt Group.


15 FS 183.6, III B; Chronology, p. 113 n. 4, 114; Buchholz, "Funde," p. 446, no. p: "Die Bugelkanne JHS 11, 1890, p. 274. pl. 14.2 und Fragmente einer weiteren Bugelkanne lagen in einer Grube zusammen mit Objekten der Zeit Tutenchamons (Fimmen, KMK 162 mit Anm. 6)."; Helck, Agais, p. 87; Fimmen, Kultur, p. 162 and fn. 6; see above, Chapter 3.


18 The spout and handles have been reglued, part of the false spout is gone and the body is cracked.

19 The Amenhotep III and Seti II Burnt Groups, also Group 3, Group 4 and possibly Group 2. The publication of Group 7, IKG, pl. 20, shows two fine Mycenaean vases, apparently quite complete.

20 As he used this vase to illustrate his JHS paper, one would think that he would have also presented it with the Tutankhamun group in IKG, instead of using a broken and less interesting piece.

21 IKG, 18; the italics are mine.

22 Petrie, "Egyptian Bases," p. 274: he has made a simple typology based on the Gurob stirrup jars, and thought that the color of the fabric and the elegance of the shape of this vase marked the "highest stage of this form," his fourth stage (from the most debased), which he dated c. 1350. i.e. temp. Tutankhamun.

23 Fimmen, KMK, p. 162 and n. 6.


25 Buchholz, "Funde," p. 446, p, followed by Helck, "Agais," p. 87. It is not clear if Buchholz (and Helck) have added even more sherds to the collection, as they give no reference except JHS for both vase and sherds, and do not mention IKG, pl. 18.28.
Also Åstrom, "Ayios Iakovos," p. 223, n. 1, who cites the JHS vase; followed by Warren and Hankey, Aegean, p. 154, who still use UCL 855 as a chronological pointer.

26 Such as for "Group X," in UCL, Petrie Museum.

27 In the very back of Notebook 39 C-E (Hawara & Gurob, 1889) appears to be a list of finds. Petrie writes "Grk," then seems to sketch a stirrup jar—the "stirrup" is recognizable, although the separate spout is not shown—then "5," with a mark underneath that may be a double underline (or a "2" or a "Z"). I interpret the "5" as meaning that he had 5 stirrup jars, and therefore that these were also fairly complete.

28 Pp. 44-5.

29 KGH 42, 43.

30 The Tutankhamun Group is listed as Burnt Group 2 in W.M.F. Petrie, Methods and Aims in Archaeology (London: 1904), but this was published is 1904, and seems to be rearranged in chronological sequence for use here. Methods lists the Amenhotep III group first, but we know that the Seti II Group was really Group 1 (see text above).

31 Presumably these are Groups 1-4: Seti II, the two groups lacking royal names (2 and 3) and the Ramesses II early Group.

32 E.g. KGH, 44, Kahun and North Town Groups; IKG, 19: Group 7.

33 Wolf Rudolf, "Die Nekropole am Prophitis Elias bei Tiryns," in Tiryns VI, Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut, Abteilung Athenae (Mainz: 1973), pl. 19.1 H. 10.7 FS 180, pl. 102 - III B 2; David M. Robinson and Cornelia G. Harcum, editors, A Catalogue of the Greek Vases in the Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology Toronto, 1 (Toronto: 1930), pl. 7, no. 103, C. 164, in the photo the body shape looks much like the Tutankhamun vase, but the drawing on p. 25 does look different, although clearly it is not accurate; Athanasios J. Papadopoulos, Excavations at Aigion, 1970. SIMA 46 (Goteborg: 1976), pl. 91, FS 180, FM 41:12, LH III:1, Blegen et al., Pylos, III, p. 211, pl. 274, no. 2a, FS 180, FM 18.92, loop. III A2; Deshayes, Argos, pl. 47, no. 2; ibid., pl. 89, 3, similar shape III B (early); Blegen, Prosymna, p. 188, fig. 720, no. 67; Metaxias Tsipopoulos, ΥΣΤΕΡΟΜΙΝΩΙΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΥΣΤΕΡΟΕΛΛΑΔΙΚΑ ΑΓΓΕΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗΣ Κ. ΚΑΙ Μ. ΜΝΤΣΟΤΑΧΗ, SMEA 26 (1987), pp. 289-90, 301, 305, no. π 55, FS 180, FM 19.28/29, III B; Karageorghis, Private Collections, pl. 39, nos. 5-6, FS 180, III B; idem., Cyprus Museum 1, pl. 22, no. 11, FS 180; ibid., pl. 22.6, FS 180, IIIB.

34 See examples listed in fn. above.

35 Ibid. Also cf. Mountjoy, Guide, p. 80, fig. 95, no. 2, FS 178, III A2; p. 107, fig. 130, no. 1, FS 180, III B1.


38 Compare Vassos Karageorghis, Darrell A. Amyx and Associates, *Cypriote Antiquities in San Francisco Bay Area Collections*, Corpus of Cypriote Antiquities, 5 *SIMA* 20:5 (Goteborg: 1974), pp. 23-4, 57, fig. 47; Paul Aström Donald M. Bailey, Vassos Karageorghis, *Hala Sultan Tekke*, 1, *SIMA* XLV.1 (Goteborg, 1976), pp. 73-74, pl. 67.42, IIIB; Karageorghis, *Kition*, 1, p. 36 with references, pl. 128.164, III B, similar neck and handles, concentric circles in band groups (note also the uneven profile—it may have been made in the same way as the Tutankhamun vase; Karageorghis, *Cyprus Museum* 1, p. 37, with references, pl. 31, nos. 1, 3 (similar mouth and handles), 2, 4 (band group decoration); Mountjoy, *Boeotia*, p. 22, no. 122, p. 20 fig. 6, pl. 3d, LH III B. For a similar painted V across the front of the handles, but on a horizontal flask, see Todd, *Kalavasos-Mangia*, p. 211, no. 45, LH III B; Karageorghis, *Nouveaux documents*, p. 215, nos. 3-4; Vronwy Hankey, "A Late Bronze Age Temple at Amman. I. The Aegean Pottery; II. Vases and Objects Made of Stone." *Levant* 6 (1974), p. 155, fig. 8, FS 186, III B Simple Style; D. C. Baramki, "The Impact of the Mycenaeans on Ancient Phoenicia," MEM, pp. 194, 196 no. 2, pl. 23. For parallels from Gurob, see the Ramessess II B and Seti II groups, *IKG*, pls. 18.59, 19.17, considered Simple Style by Furumark, *Chronology*, p. 117, fn. 2.

39 These can be seen on the inside of the tops of stirrup jars in almost every case.

40 Also see William F. Anderson, "The Beginnings of Phoenician Pottery," *BASOR* 279 (1990), p. 47, fig. 8. The Tutankhamun vase's method of manufacture is similar to his Sequence A.


This suggestion courtesy of Peter Lacovara. See *Boston*, p. 92, no. 61, with references, where the type is said to be found from the reign of Amenhotep III until the end of Dynasty 18. This example has a diameter 20 cm., which is comparable to the Tutankhamun vase. Its height is 51 cm. An example was found at Gurob in Tomb 31 (*KGM*, p. 21.43), a burial in the south town said to be with two Mycenaean stirrup jars. It, and the small amphora found with it, should be from the late 18th Dynasty, as this sort of flower garland pattern is probably restricted to that time. There are close parallels from Amarna: e.g., Martha R. Bell, "Regional Variation in Polychrome Pottery of the 19th Dynasty," *Cahiers de la Céramique Égyptienne*, vol. 1 (1987), p. 70, fn. 87, no. 3.

They are a number of examples from Amarna, e.g., *COA*, 1, pl. 51, no. XLI/1056.


Reginald Engelbach, *Riqqeh and Memphis*, vol. 6, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, vol. 26 (London: 1915), pl. 37, type 46 j, Dyn. 18-19; *COA II*, pl. 53, no. XVII 6; or as Nagel, *Céramique*, p. 17, fig. 9, no. 7 and p. 19, fig. 19, no. 12, both from Tomb 359, Ramesside, also p. 83, fig. 64, no. 12, from Tomb 1165.

Boston, p. 86, no. 68. Bourriaud cites here, as an example, Brunton and Englebach, *Gurob*, pl. 38.46 H, from Tomb 6, that seems to have been a large, badly plundered, Ramesside tomb (it re-used blocks from the Thutmosis III temple). It also had a fragment of Mycenaean pottery. For the tomb group see Hermann Muller-Karpe, *Handbuch der Vorgeschichte*, IV/3 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1980), pl. 84.A. Note that this type is very much like the vase from the Seti II group (*IKG*, pl. 19.2), so the type may continue into Dyn. 20. Also see Loat, *Gurob*, pl. 2, nos. 27, 31; pl. 3, no. 57.


Cf. *COA* II, pl. 52, type XIII 8 (much thicker-walled than the BM sherd); pl. 51, type XIII 2 (thinner walled). Also see the good fit for Brunton and Englebach, *Gurob*, pl. 38, type 47 c, light red, drab slip, Tomb 480 A, Dyn 18-19.

*COA* I, pl. 52, type LVI/69 (and 70, not illustrated here); pl. 12.1, a photo of both examples. There is another similar vase from Deir el-Medina. The two vases come from the Workmen's Village, and (p. 141) are said to have "a pinkish buff biscuit and a greenish cream slip. The decoration is in brown." The ground of the Tutankhamun sherd could be described as "greenish cream," and the paint could definitely be "brown." Both Amarna vases have a crosshatched band around the shoulder, much like the Tutankhamun sherd. One has a stylized "lily" or palm on the body. They are definitely unusual vessels. LVI/69 measures approximately max. dia. 40.2, mouth dia. 21.6, h. 39.6, thickness at neck carination 0.9 cm. It came from House No. 1 (p. 70), a larger establishment, with over seventy vessel types. LVI/70 came from the "living room" of No. 20, Type A house (p. 89).

Also cf the three handled, painted jars: *COA* I, pl. 53, LXX/130, with black and brown lotus decoration = pl. 44.1; Bourriaud in *Boston*, p. 81, no. 60, from unknown provenance, suggested to be a wine jar; and *IKG*, pl. 21.5. Bourriaud dates these from Thutmosis III to the end of the 18th Dynasty, basing this date on the Gurob vase, from the "Eighteenth Dynasty town." The handle placement of the unprovenanced, smaller vase would suit the Tutankhamun sherd and the placement of its decoration. The Gurob vase is much larger, about 58 cm. tall from base to neck, with a neck diameter of about 15.5 cm. This would compare to the Tutankhamun group vase, which may have had a neck approximately 19.3 cm. in diameter.

Cf. the border on the faience bowl from the same group: *IKG*, pl. 17.44.

Boston, pp. 221-22, no. 275. BM 66824. For another simple tube, see Georges Bénédi, *Miroirs, Objets de Toilette*. Catalogue Général des Antiquités Egyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Cairo, 1907), pl. 12, pp. 26-27, no. 44.520.
55 *Boston*, p. 222, no. 276, University Museum E. 14187.


58 Ibid., 223-24, no. 281.


60 *Boston*, p. 141.

61 Ibid., pp. 141-42.

62 Barbara Porter, in a lecture entitled "Faience Bowls of the New Kingdom," presented at the Workshop on Ancient Egyptian and Sudanese Ceramics, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, April 29, 1991, concluded that faience bowls of the period up to Tuthmosis IV were indeed only funerary gifts, possibly specifically for women, and to be associated with Hathoric symbolism, and perhaps female beauty, as they are often found with toilette items. She feels that each bowl was "individually conceived and executed," and that it was an "object in its own right" which would have been deposited empty. Although various contents have been suggested, including Dorothea Arnold's that they were used to contain a solid, perfumed unguent, Porter thinks they were never used as containers.

63 *Boston*, p. 144, no. 142, MFA 72.1522; cf. also p. 149, no. 152, Brussels E. 3102.


65 Engelbach, *Riqqeh*, p. 17, pl. 16.3; now in Liverpool Museum. Engelbach calls it "Green glaze pottery of the xviiiith dynasty." There is also a Mycenæan pilgrim flask from this tomb, called LH III A/B by Buchholz, "Funde," p. 444.

67 A faience sherd, apparently from a lid, was found with others, one of which was inscribed for Ramesses II, Tell el Muqdam: Robert Bianchi and Martha R. Bell, study in progress.

68Engelbach, _Riqqeh_, p. 17. Another parallel for the lotus design, on a faience lid, has been dated to the Amarna Period, but this apparently on the basis of the polychrome petals (Vandier d’Abbadie, _Toilette_, pp. 136-37, no. 585). The open flower is a very common motif on lids, and probably should be studied separately, as it may have a different chronological development from bowls.

69Boston, 141, 144 no. 142. Barbara Porter, personal communication, April 1991, has stated that the Gurob bowls are most likely Dyn. 19 in date, in her opinion.

70Edward Peltenburg, “Appendix VI: The Faience Vases,” in Paul Aström, D. M. Bailey, Vassos Karageorghis, editors, _Hala Sultan Tekke_, vol. 1, SIMA, vol. 45:1 (Goteborg: 1976). pp. 106-107. A bowl from Hala Sultan Tekke has similar “Thin walls, plain [this is different from the Gurob piece] narrow rim, undecorated exterior and brown-black line drawn internal designs...which, in combination, are not found on Egyptian bowls before the Amarna Period.” He says that the decorative scheme changes from blue (dark), on blue (light) to black lines on blue ground “at least by the 19th Dynasty....Since the date of all the objects found...[in] the anomalous burnt deposits at Gurob is not as easy as the kohl tube [Amenhotep III], [IKG, pl. 17.7] cannot safely be used as an argument for beginning the style before Amenhotep IV....indeed, as all the remaining dated Gurob deposits indicate, it is a type which only becomes common after c. 1350....”


72Martha R. Bell in D’Auria et al, _Mummies_, p. 139; Bell, “Polychrome,” passim.: the floral collar’s popularity as a decorative motif seems to have begun during the Amarna period, presumably as a religious symbol; but these versions are less common, different, and readily distinguished from the more developed Dyn. 19 examples. Faience sherds from similar vases were found with others inscribed for Ramesses II at Tell el Muqdam: Bianchi and Bell, study in progress. For other examples cf. BM 13161 (unpublished); Egggebrecht, _Weltmacht_, p. 297, no. 252, Turin, Cat. 3358, dated Dyn. 18 (this should now probably be placed in Dyn. 19, although its decoration is a bit different); Uvo Holscher, _The Excavations of Medinet Habu, V: The Late-Ramessid Remains_, Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 66 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1954), pl. 7, no. f = Cairo Museum 59785; Patrick E. McGovern: The Ultimate Attire, Jewelry from a Canaanite Temple at Beth Shan, _Expedition_, vol. 32, no. 1 (1990) 21, fig. 9, shows an example with “lotus flower and lily pad” from the hoard under the Beth
Shan temple stairway. Also found there were an Egyptian glass amphoriskos and "jug." These examples from the later New Kingdom may have developed from earlier funerary vases such as those from the tomb of Tuthmosis IV, which show Dyn. 18 versions of the floral garland: cf. Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, p. 559; Howard Carter and Percy E. Newberry, *The Tomb of Thoutmosis IV* (Cairo: 1904), pp. 95-101, pl. 23; G. Daressy, *Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois* (1898-1899), III, Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Cairo: 1902) 227-28, pl. 46. For a faience vase from Find 5, Gurob, of different shape but with a floral collar, see *IKG*, pl. 20.2; Bell, "Polychrome," pp. 57, 75 fn. 131.

73 Compare, for example, the upper lotus bands on the Ramesses II (pl. 18.6), Amenhotep III (pl. 17.21) and Tutankhamun (pl. 17.43) vases.


75 Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, p. 297, as in Theban Tomb 100, Rekhmire, Dyn. 18. The shape does seem to have an 18th Dynasty history, but the addition of the hanging floral collar takes place only in Dyn. 19. For Bourriau's suggestion (Boston, p. 82-83, no. 62) that spices or flavorings were added to wines in this way cf. Bell, "Polychrome," 74, fn. 119. The widely-held idea that these vessels held flavorings or wine is *not* based on any hard evidence, but simply the modern interpretation of representations. These do indicate that the contents were probably liquid, but *nothing* more. Further, careful research is needed to substantiate such claims. It is often very difficult to tell, in representations, if the vase held is rounded or pointed at the base. The rounded shape must be related and also occurred in small metal examples. For important examples of the solemn, ritual use of this kind of vessel, see, Marianne Eaton-Krauss and Eberhard Graefe, *The Small Golden Shrine from the Tomb of Tutankhamun* (Oxford: Griffith Institute, 1985), pls. 16, 17: the queen pours into a ritual dish, and the king pours into the queen's hand; Emile Vernier, *Bijoux et Orfèvreries*, Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Cairo: 1927), pp. 184-5, pl. 20, no. 52.277. Ali Radwan, *Die Kupfer- und Bronzegefäße Ägyptens*, Prähistorische Bronzelfund, Abt. II, Bd. 2 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1983), pp. 128-29, 130 (with references), suggests that the fluid here could be interpreted as a special oil, or perfume, or even wine.

76 Radwan, *Kupfer*, pp. 126-30, pls. 64-66, "schlauchformige Gefasse," also gives much larger examples of this shape, but many of these are offering vessels from temples. Nos. 347-50, 362 come from tombs, no. 352 is from a house at Amarna (Q 47.1), and the rest of the contexted examples (nos. 351, 353-357) come from temples. Radwan also illustrates smaller examples with handles. They all seem to be plain, except for dedicatory texts. Radwan cites clay prototypes from the First Intermediate Period and Middle Kingdom.

band under the rim. The gold vessel is more elaborate, with a pendant lotus-petal band under the rim and a lotus flower drawn as if enfolding the base, like the faience versions. For a similar vessel in Berlin, of gold with floral decoration and the cartouches of Seti II, see A. Scharff, "Altes und Neues von den Goldschmiedearbeiten der Ägyptischen Abteilung," *Berliner Museen*, 51 (1930), pp. 115-16.

78 See Jac. J. Janssen, *Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period: An Economic Study of the Village of Necropolis Workmen at Thebes* (Leiden: 1975), pp. 433-34, for jšbw, another beer measure or container, probably occurring mostly in pottery, but with a textual reference to a lead example. I regard this as the most likely of several names proposed, as it is the name given to the larger examples of the shape shown on the great offering list of Tuthmosis III at Karnak: W. Wreszinski, *Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, II (Paris: 1988), pl. 33b, nos. 118. This reference courtesy of Lanny Bell; see Raymond O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford: The Griffith Institute, 1962), p. 303, jšb, "a vessel." These large metal jars would have been placed in the nearby stand (no. 117) and should be the same ritual vessels as the real liturgical set found in the temple at Amarna: Radwan, *Kuper*, pp. 126-27, pls. 64-65. Radwan, *Kuper*, p. 130 identifies the ancient name as dš = "jar," and also a "beer measure" (Faulkner, *Middle Egyptian*, p. 316). Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 426, has identified the ancient name as wšm, a which should be a metal drinking vessel, "used particularly for beer." As the only vessel-formed determinant he finds with the name is a situla with handle (Ethiopian Period), there is still some doubt about this. He decides that earlier the "usual drinking-vessel [was] a more or less pointed situla without a handle," i.e. the metal versions of our faience vase. I think it unlikely that the fancy versions (at least) of this shape, which are shown over and over again in ritual situations, would simply be beer mugs. For the small, coarse clay versions that may well have been used in this way, see Eggebrecth, *Weltmacht*, p. 266, no. 206. It might be worth re-evaluating Janssen's assumption that vessel names that do not appear commonly in his lists are normally made of pottery: they may just have been inappropriate to the Deir el-Medina consumer.

79 Note that W. M. F. Petrie, *Tell el-Amarna* (London: 1894), p. 28, said that "In the palace we found many pieces of dishes in the form of half fish, half yellow melons, half green gourds, etc." in faience. I do not know what to make of this, never having seen any evidence of such things, but perhaps the modern excavations at the site will clarify his statement.

80 Lena Åstrom, *Studies on the Arts and Crafts of the Late Cypriote Bronze Age* (Lund: 1967), pp.52, 121, from British Tomb 84, which was used in LC IB-II C, which would be appropriate for a Ramesside date of manufacture in Egypt.

81 Murray, et al., *Cyprus*, p. 38: when found, the tomb had about eight inches of water in it. The vessel is shown in p. 38, and appears to be about seven inches long.

82 Edward Peltenburg, "On the Classification of Faience Vases from Late Bronze Age Cyprus," *Praktika*, Acts of the First International Congress of Cypriote Studies, vol. I (Nicosia) 1972, p. 132. As they are from Enkomi, they are, presumably, also from tombs.

84 Boston, p. 115, no. 102.

85 Petrie and Brunton, Sediment, II, p. 32; for the scarab, pl. 53.45. The plaque, pl. 53.46, looks quite Ramasside.

86 For šsp, see Faulkner, Middle Egyptian, p. 272, where he identifies it as cucumis melo, and translates it as "cucumber." Also accepted by Wolfgang Helck in LdA, II, col. 921, "Gurke - Kürbis - Melone." He identifies dig as a melon. For šb t and dhrq/dhng see Renate Germer, Flora des pharaonischen Ägypten (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1985) 129, with references.

87 L. Keimer, Die Gartenpflanzen im alten Ägypten, vol. 1 (Berlin: 1924), pp. 15, 185; Lise Manniche, An Ancient Egyptian Herbal (London: British Museum Publications, 1989). There still seems to be a certain amount of confusion about this identification (see William J. Darby, Paul Ghalioungui, and Louis Grivetti, Food: The Gift of Osiris, vol. 2 [New York: Academic Press, 1977], pp. 694-95), and whether or not it some of the representations might be of a related sweet melon: Keimer, Gartenpflanzen, 1, p. 16. For the identification with the "faqous," a cucumber-like salad vegetable, see Ludwig Keimer, "Sur quelques petits fruits en faience émaillée du Moyen Empire: V, Melons égyptiens en faience," BIFAO 28 (1929), p. 92. Keimer illustrates three Middle Kingdom faience examples. These look to be solid faience, undetailed, and are said to vary in color from light blue to white. They would not seem to be containers, but perhaps simulacra of offerings. In this they may share some of the same function as the New Kingdom flasks. This model may be the same as illustrated by Darby, et al., Food, 2, pl. 691, fig. 17.13, bottom, no. 4970.

88 Keimer, Gartenpflanzen, 1, p. 15; Germer, Flora, pp. 129-30; cf. Manniche, Herbal, p. 96, suggesting bndt. She identifies šsp as "melon," i.e. a fruit, Cucumis melo L. The medical preparations she cites do include other fruit ingredients, so one might think that a melon would be appropriate. She also identifies many of the tomb offering representations as melons (e.g., TT 217, p. 95), where the do indeed often occur grouped with figs and dates and surrounded by lotus petals. A sweet-tasting or smelling fruit would also seem to have a natural connection with "sweet" or perfumed oils, and might explain why the shape was chosen for ointment vessels. However, the representations, at least, would seem to be almost indistinguishable from her "cucumber," i.e., Cucumis melo var. Chate and Cucumis sativus (p. 96, TT 52), both have the same shape and are heavily striped. Manniche does remark that it is strange that the word bndt does not occur in medical texts, where one would expect to find cucumbers used. This may actually be an indication that something is still lacking in our understanding of the problem.

89 Germer, Flora, p. 129, Dyn. 12 leaves and stem from Kahun, rind from Deir el-Median, said to be Dyn. 18; also see Vivi Laurent-Takholm, Faraos Bloomster (Copenhagen, 1952), p. 165, "meloner."
In *Boston*, p. 115, no. 102.

This suggestion was made to me during a very profitable and pleasant discussion at Chicago House, Luxor, in May 1983, which also included Ricardo Caminos and Lanny Bell.


Prof. Walter Farber, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago has very kindly provided the following information (February 8, 1991): "Cuneiform script uses determinatives to indicate materials of many artifacts. The determinative NA₄, literally 'stone', covers both natural, and man-made, 'stones', such as glass, fritt, glazed bricks, and the like. No specific word for 'faience' is known in Akkadian (cf. A.L. Oppenheim, et al., *Glass and Glassmaking in Ancient Mesopotamia* [Corning: The Corning Museum of Glass, 1970], index s.v.; idem, Realexikon der Assyriologie, 'Glas'), but it is not only reasonable but absolutely safe to assume that "faience" objects would also have been written with the determinative NA₄. Thus I see no problem in connecting the 'stone/glass cucumbers' of the Amarna texts with faience cucumbers from the archaeological realm." See A. L. Oppenheim, "Glas, Glasuren (A. nach dem Texten)," in Ernst Weidner and Wolfram von Soden, editors, *Realexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, III (New York: 1957-1971), pp. 407-410.

British Museum 5980 is made of wood, with a swiveling top pinned to the base at the vine end. Its carved stripes were filled in with a pale, blue-green color. For this see J. Gardner Wilkinson, *The Manners and Customs of The Ancient Egyptians*, Birch edition, vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1878), p. 16, no. 291. Keimer, *Gartenpflanzen*, 15, 85 fn. 8, 171 no. 6, cites "einer aus Holz gefertigten Salbenschale des Berliner
Museums...Berlin 6816, 'Gurke n. R. (Passalacqua Memphis).'' This is the same inventory number given, apparently mistakenly, by Germer, *Flora*, p. 129 and fn. 5, for a New Kingdom faience example. Dr. Rolf Krauss had kindly investigated this object for me and provides the following information (communication of February 27, 1991), through the courtesy of Dr. Karl Heinz Priese, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin: "The object itself...has to be considered as lost." The inventory book entry reads "Salbnapf in Gestalt einer Gurke. Der Deckel, un einen bei a [the narrow, stem end] befestigten Stift drehbar. Bei b [the wide end] steckte ein Knopf zum Festbinden--fehlt.--Herkunft: "Memphis."--Holz.--Länge 15,1 cm.--Sammlung Passalacqua." Dr. Priese has most generously provided the photographs.
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100See, for example, *Boston*, p. 205, 207, 211 no. 250, 212-13 no. 255, 215 no. 261, 275 no. 377; Madeleine Frédéricq. "The Ointment Spoons in the Egyptian Section of the British Museum." *EA* 13 (1927), p. 8, nos. 5975, 5975, 5955, 5963, 32147; Reeves, *Tutankhamun*, p. 158, upper left, in the shape of a trussed duck, with lid. For analyses of contents cf. p. 215, no. 261 with references: "an animal or vegetable fat, beeswax, and an aromatic substance (Cyprus, poppy, or aloe wood)."

101The painting of elegant ivory objects is well-known in the New Kingdom. For example, Tutankhamun's tomb is full of painted ivory items. Probably the most famous is his great chest: cf. Mohammed Saleh and Hourig Sourouzian, *The Egyptian Museum Cairo: Official Catalogue* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1987), no. 188. Also, Hayes, *Scepter*, II p. 317, fig. 199.

102Cf. Keimer, *Gartenpflansen*, p. 171. No. 7 is the Amenhotep III flask. For an example from a Middle Kingdom coffin, see Keimer, "Melons," pl. 8; Keimer, *Gartenpflansen*, p. 85, n. 7.

103See, for example, the "jug" or tankard of faience, but earlier in style (probably Thutmose III): *Boston*, p. 150, no. 154. The neck diameter might be a little large for an amphora: cf. *IKG*, pl. 20.2; Bell, "Polychrome," p. 75, fn. 131.

104Such as the bowls from this group (*IKG*, pl. 17.44), the Ramesses II A group (*IKG*, pl. 18.10, pl. 20.4), the Seti II group (*IKG*, pl. 19.26), and group 9 (*IKG*, pl. 20.3). Also see the amphora, *IKG*, pl. 20.2.

105For its use on small, long necked amphorae in Dyn. 19-20, see Bell, "Polychrome," passim; idem, "605," pp. 68-69, pl.3; *Boston*, p. 100, no. 83. These are not earlier than
the 19th Dynasty. It was also used on other objects, e.g., as a border design on the 
wooden mirror-case of Henut-Tawy, Dyn. 21: Bénédite, Miroirs, pl. 23, no. 44.101B.

106Thomas, Gurob, p. 49, pl. 46, no. 244. Compare this to the calcite bowl, Brunton and 
Englebach, Gurob, pl. 53, Group 705 F, and the metal example, Boston, p. 124, no. 112 = 
Radwan, Kuper, p. 116, pl. 61, no. 337, probably 19th Dynasty.

107Engelbach, Riqqeh, p. 17, pl. 16. Cemetery C surface find.

108Nagel, Céramique, pl. 17, no. 1922.71.

109See Bell, "Polychrome," passim.

110Lanny Bell has suggested that it is a lotus leaf and stem, which may well be the 
correct interpretation.

111"Travertine" has been used instead of the incorrect terms "calcite" and 
"alabaster." Barbara A. Greene, "Ancient Egyptian Stone Vessels: Materials and 
Forms" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1989), pp. 106-108, says that 
calcite was inappropriate for stone vessel making because of its crystal structure, 
although it was used for beads. Alabaster does occur in Egypt, and can be 
differentiated from travertine by its softness. It was used for vessels, but none of 
Greene's examples are from Gurob (pp. 121-29: the New Kingdom pieces are all 
unpublished kohl jars from Ballas). Its ancient names were ḫrē and ḫrēt(?). Travertine, 
pp. 108-120, seems to be the material that has most commonly been mis-named 
"alabaster," the ancient Egyptian ss, and bīt. See also James Harrell, "Misuse of 

112 - W.M.F. Petrie, The Funeral Furniture of Egypt with Stone and Metal Vessels. 

113IEG, p. 17.

114He shows it as about 2 cm. too narrow, and 2.5 cm. to short. The possibility must be 
entertained that the BM dish is not the same one that Petrie drew. However, it is more 
likely to be a draftsman's error, judging from the representations of other objects, 
such as the Mycenaean vase. It could also have been reduced more than the 1:3 of the 
other objects, and the difference not indicated.

115Boston, p. 142, no. 138: M. Dambach and I. Wallert, "Das Tilapia Motiv in der 
Fischkulture im alten Ägypten (Wiesbaden: 1970); D'Auria, et al., Mummies, 134, no. 69. 
They are a popular motif for faience bowls, glass, pottery and alabaster "flasks," 
ointment spoons, and jewellery: e.g. Cyril Aldred, Akhenaten and Nefertiti (London: 
1979), p. 213, nos. 153-544; Elizabeth Riefstahl, "A Unique Glass Vial in the Brooklyn 
46; COA 111, pl. 73.4 (35.395), 5 and 6 (34.177); Boston, p. 103 no. 86, p. 150 no. 155, p. 165
See the convenient summary in *Boston*, p. 207, with references.


Frédéricq, "Spoons," pp. 12-13, pl. 8 nos. 5945, 5952; *Boston*, p. 214, no. 259. The lid of a fish dish in ivory was found in Tomb 2010 at Sedment: Petrie and Brunton, *Sedment*, II, pl. 66.11.

See now Greene, "Stone," p. 383. She groups all "Round-bottomed dishes with animal or plant forms" together and dates the shape Late Dyn. 18 to Third Intermediate Period, using the Tutankhamun Group example for dated evidence. It would, however, still be profitable to study each variant individually.


*IKG*, p. 17: "Of alabaster there were fragments of some dishes like (41)."

Petrie, *Furniture*, pl. 35.886.


*Boston*, p. 132, no. 127. See also Engelbach, *Riqqeh*, pl. 14:S 64, from Tomb R 42, dated to Dyn. 18-19 (pl. 44); Vandier d'Abbadie, *Toilette*, pp. 138-40; Eggebrecht *Weltmacht*, p. 332, no. 284, from Abydos, Tomb D 115, dated generally Tuthmosis III to Amenhotep III.
128 See Greene, "Stone," p. 382. She does not seem to consider the Tutankhamun vase. Her closest shape is the "Round-bottomed dish with toothed projection," or perhaps the "Dish with lug handles," both dated Third Intermediate Period and not very close to our vase (p. 384); cf. also Eggbrecht, Weltmacht, p. 134, no. 42; Schoske, Schönheit, p. 149, no. 137, with four nobs.

129 Cf. the small bowl-shaped, travertine vase with flat bottom from the Seti II group (IKE, pl. 19.19 = Petrie, Furniture, pl. 35, no. 898, also cf. nos. 900, 902, 903.

130 It may well imitate a metal bowl: cf. Boston, pl. 124, no. 112, Dyn. 18-19.

131 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 53, marked "Petrie Dec. 1920." The group is not discussed in the text. See discussion under the glass lentoid flask from the Tutankhamun group.


133 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 53; Boston pp. 190-91, fn. 19.

134 Stubbings, MPL, p. 95: "Other small examples come from contexts of Ramesside date, and are thus more certainly IIIIB." Cf. also Bourriau, Umm, p. 125-26, no. 249; Buchholz, "Funde," p. 446, under "t-z."

135 Vandier d'Abbadie, Toilette, pp. 117-19, nos. 486, 487; also flat-bottomed with one handle, pp. 118, 120, nos. 497-500, all dated to the end of the New Kingdom. These are all classed under "vases et coupes à oreilles." Also cf. Thomas, Gurob, p. 49, pl. 12, no. 149, called a "small cup;" Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 40.11, 13; W. M. F. Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, vol. 13 (London: 1907), pl. 27.A, no. 222, Dyn. 18, travertine.

136 - Petrie, Furniture, p. 24, pl. 36, no. 916.

137 See now Greene, "Stone," p. 380. She dates the form Tuthmosis III -Dyn. 20, citing the Tutankhamun and Seti Burnt Groups as dated evidence.

138 - Petrie, Furniture, p. 36, no. 919. Cf. the similar vase exhibited in the British Museum, BM 24708, in the toilette box of Tutu, wife of the scribe, Ani, c. 1300 B.C., from Thebes. Also cf. Murray Cyprus, p. 54, p. 25 fig. 42, no. 1336, from Enkomi, but uncontexted; Petrie and Brunton, Sediment, II, pl. 46.8, Tomb 2020; A.-M. Margaine, L'Égypte ancienne, Petites guides des Musées de Cannes, vol. 1 (Cannes: 1984), pp. 28-29, no. 52, dated to Dyn. 18-19; Petrie, pl. 28A, no. 504; and the slightly elongated version with a gold mount and a silver foot inscribed for Ramesses II and Nefertari. Petrie, Furniture, pl. 36.917. Greene, "Stone," p. 380, seems independently to have
arrived at the conclusion that these are indeed two separate types of the same shape, and says that the elongated version begins in Dyn. 19.

139 See discussion in the section on the faience bowl from the Tutankhamun group.


141 See discussion under "travertine mortar": Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 53, two examples. The smaller is closer to the Tutankhamun Group vase.

142 *KGH*, p. 23, pl. 27.4. It was found in a "heap of objects," including other stone vessels, apparently pushed into the corner of the chamber when new burials were intruded.


146 *Boston*, p. 81, no. 58, p. 130, no. 121, "introduced at the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty and lasting throughout the New Kingdom." Earlier versions seem to have a slightly different base, less rounded and spreading wider: Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 22.41, Group 27, dated to Amenhotep I; pl. 24.53, Tomb 84, dated Tuthmosis III; Locat, *Gurob*, pl. 6.4, Tomb 041. This may belong to Greene's shape "Bag-shaped jar with neck, flat base, and wide thin rim," dated early Dyn. 18–Amarna Period (p. 376). She lists a number of examples from Gurob as dated evidence: the Maket Tomb (Tuthmosis III); Tomb 96 ("NE"), Tomb 27 (Amenhotep I) and the Amenhotep III Burnt Group (for Amenhotep III). For a small faience versions from the tomb of Tutankhamun, see Reeves, *Tutankhamun*, pp. 200–201; also the faience Amenhotep III example in Vandier d'Abbadie, *Toilette*, pp. 72–73, no. 240, said to be for kohl. Cf. also Petrie, *Furniture*, p. 24, pl. 34, especially nos. 870–71; Vandier d'Abbadie, *Toilette*, pp. 82–83, no. 305.

147 Brunton & Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 40.9, Tomb 96; also cf. no. 10, Tomb 413, in limestone.

149 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 27.8, a similar diameter but a bit more shallow. Greene, "Stone," does not seem to have included this shape in her study. For examples from Palestine, see Hankey, "Amman," pp. 174-75, no. S 39.


151 Ibid., pl. 27.10 "dark buff, surface scaled off"; Stubbings, MPL, p. 95, FS 183; also noted in Helck, Ägais, p. 87.

152 = Nolte, Glas, p. 71, no. 1; p. 116, no. 22; pl. 18.22, "Werkkreis 4"; Cooney, Glass, p. 149, no. 1766; no illustration in either Nolte or Cooney.

153 Cf. Nolte, Glas, pls. 18-19, for exports see pp. 112, 117-18, and nos. 28-31, 33; The Exhibition of Art Treasures of Ancient Egypt, (Tokyo: National Museum, 1988), p. 292, no. 82, pl. 126, Gebel el-Tuna, called "Dyn. 18-19," but has the large, bordered, feather pattern typical of Workshop 4; Boston, p. 167, no. 185 = Nolte Glas, p. 114, no. 91, pl. 16. For other examples of the shape cf. Vandier d'Abbadie, Toilettte, pp. 184-85, nos. 814-19; Engelbach, Riqqeh, pl. 16.

154 IKG, pls. 18.13, 19; also nos. 15, 17 (miniatures).

155 Thomas, Gurob, p. 47, pl. 11, no. 217, neck and shoulder only, dated "Late Dyn. XVIII (?)". Also see nos. 220-235.

156 Kition, p. 133, n. 1, in discussing "The unnecessary narrowing of the upper and lower registers by means of yellow bands [on the Enkomi rhyton, which] is an odd device that only seems to make sense in terms of 19th Dynasty Egyptian glassworking in which the central registers of feather patterns, chevrons and festoons were likewise gratuitously constricted within yellow and white borders." Note that Nolte seems to define her Group 4 more by the use of a large feather pattern, and the absence of the garland, on the body. Horizontal border bands do occur on vases she has put into Group 3 (Amenhotep III-Amenhotep IV), including material from Amarna (see pl. 13), but only on the tankard and amphoriskos and not, apparently, on the lentoid flask or krateriskos.

157 In describing the dating of Workshop 4, Nolte, p. 111, says: "Werkkreis 4 kann mit Hilfe von zehn Gefäßen, Nr. 1-3, 5, 18, 22, 25, 38, 39, 40 zeitlich festgelegt werden. Ausgrabungen brachten die Vasen in der Stadt Gurob zutage und lieferten die Anhaltspunkte zur Datierung des Kreises in den Zeitabschnitt von der Regierung Tutanchamuns bis zur Regierung Ramses II." All the vases listed come from Gurob groups except for no. 39, from the Ramesseide tomb no. 705 F. In dating the lentoid flasks specifically, Nolte says (p. 112): "Während sich die außerhalb Ägyptens zu Tage
getretenen Vasen mit großer Federzier durch Fundumstände selten näher datieren lassen, liegen einige aus Ägypten stammende Gefäße zeitlich fest," she then cites the vases from Group 7 and the Tutankhamun Burnt Group for the period of Tutankhamun, and the Ramesses II A group and Tomb 705 F for the Ramesside period.


159 Although Nolte, *Glas*, pp. 71-72, calls one in each group a "krateriskos," there is no comparison between the vessels except for the extremely general similarity of shape.

160 Ibid., p. 73. Note that the rest of the vases in this section are all from the Ramesses II A group.

161 *Boston*, p 165, no. 181. Wooden prototypes have been suggested: see Hankey, "Amman," p. 174-5, nos. S 41-42 (also for examples from outside Egypt).

162 *Boston*, p. 129, no. 120.

163 Also from Gurob is the taza published by Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 49, pl. 46, no. 248, which she calls "late 18-19." She identifies that as the example from Tomb 20 (*KGH*, pl. 18.6) which came from "a ridge of ground...beneath a later part of the town." This is the same small group of tombs from which the "Res" and "Anen-Tursha" burials belong. They probably should be dated to the very beginning of the 19th Dynasty.

164 Greene, "Stone," p. 368. Examples for her type with three ribs and flat disk base are dated from Amenhotep II to Ramesses II. However, she uses the Amenhotep III and Ramesses II Burnt Groups, which should be omitted from her list.


166 For a related metal example (called a jug) see Trude Dothan, *Excavations at the Cemetery of Deir el-Balah*, Qadem, 10 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1979), p. 66-8, figs. 148-49, T. 118, which also had Mycenaean pottery. Dotham cites other Egyptian examples dated to Dyn. 18 and 19-20 (p. 13 and fns. 26-28 on p. 106). Her pottery example from the Ramesside period burial in Tomb 114 is much like the Group 7 vase in general proportions, shoulder, convex neck, although the lower body could be slightly more rounded (pp. 16-17, Illus. 24, 29). The general character of tomb group 118 seems to be Dyn. 19, and there are many parallels with materials from Gurob. The Group 7 tankard also looks rather similar, although the handle is different, to an example probably from Tell el-Amarna and so most likely to be Dyn. 19: Eggebrecht, **Weltmacht**, p. 258, no. 185. "Mit dem Ende der Amarna-Epoche kommt dieser formschone Krug aus der Mode." Also see Lott, *Gurob*, pl. 3, no. 78, from Tomb 015. Mellinteis (in Kemp and Mellenteis, *Minoan*, pp. 248-49) made a brief survey of "dated" tankards, including the one from the Amenhotep III group, and one from Sedment, Tomb 59 (still with attached rope), and "inclined" towards a Dyn. 19 date.

167 Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 31, no. 33, type 61 h.
See, for example, Nagel, *céramique*, p. 43, fig. 17, no. 188, and others on the plate; also Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 33, no. 21, from Tomb 7, temp. Ramesses II; ibid., pl. 24.7, called “Ramesside.” Also see Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, p. 264, no. 201 “Speiseschale,” from Tell el-Amarna.

S. Clarke and R. Engelbach, *Ancient Egyptian Masonry: The Building Craft* (London: 1930), p. 165; this reference courtesy of Lanny Bell. They say that “The Egyptians did not make use of hinges of modern form for their doors, though the principle of the hinges was known to them and used for the lids of boxes.” They give, as an example, the hinges used on one of Tutankhamun’s caskets: Howard Carter and A. C. Mace, *The Tomb of Tut-ankh-amun*, I (London, 1923), pl. 57. See also Reeves, *Tutankhamun*, p. 191, top right, which shows the “toy chest” with its hinged lid open.

IKG, p. 19.

See Bell, “Polychrome,” p. 68, fn. 80; also cf. passim, for shapes of Ramesside, polychrome-painted amphorae with horizontal handles. A vessel of this shape was also found at Gurob in Brunot and Engelbach’s Tomb 6 (Gurob), pl. 29. Another amphora from this tomb (no. 23) can be dated as Ramesside by the similar vessel found in Tomb 5 (pl. 31.36), the burial of a son of Ramesses II. Cf. also IGH, pl. 21.42. Also see Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, p. 261, nos. 193, 194, both from Tell el-Amarna, Dyn. 18 and compare with p. 260, no. 189, dated Dyn. 18-19. The handles of this last look to be a bit more like the Seti II example. All three are larger than the Seti II vase, which seems to be about 17.66 cm. tall. Also see Loat, *Gurob*, pl. 2, nos. 27, 31; pl. 3, no. 57.

Cf. Colin A. Hope, “Pottery of the Ramesside Period,” xeroxed copy in my possession, p. 8, figs. 5h, 8g, 10, 14g; also cf. Nagel, *céramique*, p. 33, fig. 22, no. 75, from Tomb 359. The pottery from this tomb and its neighbor, 360, were totally mixed and published as one. The tombs were in use from the reigns of Seti I/Ramesses II to Ramesses VI: cf. Bell, “Deir el-Medina,” pp. 156-57; Lanny Bell, “Only One High Priest Ramesse Nakht and the Second Propher Nesamun his Younger Son,” *Serapis* 6 (1980) pp. 10-12. Also cf. Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 38, no. 43 R; W. M. F. Petrie, *Tantist Part II: Nebesheh (Am) and Defenneh (Tahpanhes)*, Egypt Exploration Fund, Memoir 4 (London: 1888) pl. 2.3, 8, from a tomb thought to be Dynasty 20.

This vase also finds close parallels in the material from Deir el-Medineh. Tomb 359 (see fn. above): Nagel, *céramique*, p. 17, fig. 9, no. 8 (with mark no. 304, p. 49, fig. 31 on the shoulder); p. 23, fig. 13, nos. 28-30.

IKG, pl. 18.13. Note that Arielle Kozloff, personal communication, April 1991, has stated that the two flasks are not similar. She has not personally examined either.

Cooney, *Glass*, 149. This is, again, based on the idea that the Gurob groups give fixed, accurate dates. Nolte, *Glas*, p. 112, also noticed the great similarity of her dated lentoids, coming from the Tutankhamun and Ramesses II A groups, but seems to think also that the styles did not change over that period of time, as she concludes that no
finer chronological divisions are possible for the period. For a color photograph of the Ramesses II A flask see Cooney, Glass, pl. 7 and p. 149, no. 1768 (64338).

176 We look forward to the new studies of glass by Arielle Kozloff. Instead of relying solely on stylistic analysis, she has taken into consideration "shape, color (which implies chemical colorant), relative translucency or opacity, trailed decoration, applied decoration, and provenance. I find no one of these field or characteristics valuable in and by itself. They all have to be considered together." (personal communication, February 28, 1991). In her forthcoming paper, "The Malqata/El-Amarna Blues: Favorite Colors of Kings and Gods," in the Aldred Festschrift, she says: "Malqata and el-Amarna type glasses which occur in contexts of later date, such as Kom MEdinet Ghurab, may not be evidence of the survival of a whole glass industry, but merely testimony to the loving care of family heirlooms, which these precious Malqata and el-Amarna glasses must have been."

177 Nolte, Glas, p. 72, no. 3; p. 112, no. 1, pl. 16.1; Cooney, Glass, p. 144, no. 1744, not illustrated.

178 Cooney, Glass, p. 144, no. 1744. Also see Vandier d'Abbadie, Toilette, pp. 186-86, no. 822, Dyn. 18. For Cyprus, see: Jane Johnson, Maroni de Chypré, SIMA, vol. 59 (Goteborg: 1980) pl. 21.113 = Nolte, pp. 120, no. 44; Nolte, Glass, pp. 119-120, nos. 42, 43, 45, 46. For Tell el Deweir: Nolte, Glas, p. 119, no. 41; Muller-Karpe, Handbuch, IV/3, pl. 117, nos. 47 (without horizontal bands), 48 (large feather with horizontal bands).

179 Cooney, Glass, p. 144.

180 Ibid. It has been suggested (Boston, p. 164, no. 177) that the main popularity of the shape was earlier in the dynasty, and that the late 18th Dynasty workshops "preferred the open krateriskos form or the lentoid flask."


182 Nolte, Glas, p. 112. Arielle Kozloff, personal communication, April 1991, is of the opinion that all amphoriskoi are to be dated to Dyn. 18.

183 A kanné from the main city of Amarna also has a twist band used as an upper and lower border: see Nolte, p. 70, no. 4 (with references), pl. 13.18 = CDA I, pl. 12.7. The body has a larger pattern than is normal for Group 3, with a design that seems to be a garland progressing towards a feather. It may be that this is the beginning of the series, as it does appear to be more "experimental" that the later vases. It is possible that the whole group with a twist used in this manner may belong early in Dyn. 19.

184 Nolte, Glas, p. 71, no. 2; p.112; p. 119, no. 40; Cooney, Glass, p. 144, no. 1747 with illustration.

185 Nolte, Glas, p. 72.
Cooney, *Glass*, p. 144, no. 1747. Arielle Kozloff, personal communication, April 1991, says that all glass amphoriskoi should be Dyn. 18 in date.

Not published in Nolte; Cooney, *Glass*, p. 50, no. 436.

Cooney, *Glass*, p. 50, no. 436.


Form IV.9, especially pl. 23.4. This example, unfortunately purchased, is said to be "leuchtend transluzid-blau" (p. 129).

Note that Cooney says this is opaque glass (*Glass*, p. 50, no. 436). Although the Group 6 vases are usually of translucent glass, Nolte does mention opaque glass vases: *Glass*, p. 127. The thickness of the wall also suggests that the vessel belongs in Group 6, as this is one of the group's characteristics.

Nolte, *Glass*, p. 127, No. 4 (pl. 23.4) = Cooney, *Glass*, p. 152, no. 1776 (63785), with illustration, height 9.2 cm., rim diameter 5.5 cm., Dyn. 18, no provenance. Nolte compares this to her Group 6, No. 2, from Tutankhamun's tomb (pl. 23.2). Cooney notes that the shape is rare in glass.

Nolte, p. 127; cf. also *Boston*, pp. 167-168, no. 186-89. The dated Dyn. 18 examples would not seem very close to the Burnt Group vase: p. 129, pl. 23, nos. 1-3, from Tutankhamun's tomb, and no. 10, from Kings' Valley Tomb No. 55, belonging to Tiy or an Amarna-Period king.

Amenhotep III group: Ashmolean, 1890.924, 925 (= *IKG*, pl. 17.16), UCL 12361 (?); Ramesses II B group: Ashmolean 1890.1117; Seti II group: Ashmolean 1890.1014-5, 1018 (= *IKG*, pl. 19.21, 22).

Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 61, no. 407. Thomas says there were five faience rings in the Petrie collection but, as the three broken fragments do not join, there were certainly five, but possibly seven rings in this collection. The information and photograph are courtesy of Barbara Adams, personal communication, February 27, 1991, and the Department of Egyptology, University College London. Mrs. Adams remarks that other rings were found in a "box of loose beads" that has the "generic number UC.27901."

See, for example, *Boston*, p. 249, no. 346; also at *Gurob*: Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 31, Tomb no. 445, no. 18, faience, Ramesside. See *Boston*, p. 249, no. 346 for more elaborate versions in color; also Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 396, fig. 249, "later New Kingdom"; *COA*, II, pl. 77.7.
197 *IKG*, pl. 17. 16 = Ash. 1890.925, in green or light turquoise faience. When I examined this ring I could not confirm that the bezel was a wedjat; it could be melted and deformed.

198 Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 31.18, Tomb 445, p. 15: "The date of this group is certainly Ramesside, the pot, no. 21, type 36 n, never occurring in the XVIIIth dynasty. (Undisturbed.)"

199 See, for example, Boston, p. 249, no. 347, in faience.

200 For Tutankhamun's more elegant version in a double cartouche of green nephrite, with Min and the king on the bezel see Carol Andrews, *Ancient Egyptian Jewellery* (London: British Museum Publications, 1990), p. 166, fig. 149, taken from the king's mummy. For a 19th Dynasty example in gold, with a very schematic figure of Bes on the bezel, see Dothan *Deir el-Balah*, pp. 85, 90-91, figs. 218, 220.

201 Cf. Boston, p. 247, no. 337 for this motif on rings.

202 Cf. Loat, *Gurob*, pl. 6, no. 12, tomb 095, in stone; Dothan, *Balah*, pp. 85 (no. 273/2), 90 (Illus. 219), 91 (Illus. 221), carnelian with a nonsense design of transverse lines on the bezel, which she uses to date it to Dyn. 19.

203 *Boston*, pp. 246-47, no. 336, in jasper, late Dyn. 18; "Rings with the loop and bezel made in one piece of semiprecious stone were uncommon before the Amarna Period." Also see Dothan, *Balah*, pp. 85 and 109 fn. 76.

204 *Boston*, pp. 245-46, nos. 333-335; Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 26, tomb 465, in gold; ibid., p. 15, pl. 27. Tomb 466, in bronze, inscribed with the name of Seti I (as kindly read for me by Lanny Bell). Also see Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 293, fig. 180, late 18th Dynasty stirrup rings in gold, silver, bronze, chalcedony and faience; Cyril Aldred, *Jewels of the Pharaohs* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1971), pls. 68-79, 91.

205 In Palestine, nonsense lines are typical of the 19th Dynasty. For a similar carnelian stirrup-ring with rough, linear bezel ornament, see Dothan, *Deir el-Balah*, pp. 85, 90-91, figs. 219, 221.

206 Note that Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 56, incorrectly calls this a "shell" ear stud. Petrie, *IKG*, p. 17, actually indicates that a penannular ring was made of shell (pl. 17.32).


Cf. Bell, "605," p. 70, jewel box.

Bell, "605," p. 67-68, the mummy of a young woman at Gurob had 3 stone rings at each ear — Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 29.35.

G. Wainwright, *Balabish* (London: 1920), p. 55, pl. 19.2 claimed that he found a mummy with a ring in place "...it also appears to have been passed through a hole in the skin, and not to have been merely nipped on." See *Boston*, pp. 228-29, nos. 290-92. The great gold earrings of Tewosret must also have been worn through the ear lobe: a series of four dangles, that must have hung beneath the ear, show that the slit would then have been behind the ear: Vernier, *Bijoux*, p. 139, pl. 20, 52.399, and fig. 68, which shows the earring as through the ear. For the earrings in color, see Aldred, *Jewels*, p. 234, pl. 131. For other gold examples see Vernier, *Bijoux*, p. 140, pl. 25, nos. 52.402 and 403 (19th Dynasty); Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, pp. 228-29, no. 158.

Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, 16-17.

*Boston*, p. 228, no. 290; Schoske, *Schönheit*, p. 110-11, no. 84, calls them "Peruckenringe," and says that they were only used to separate the individual braids of wigs. She contends that earrings, are only of gold and glass and, although they have the same shape, they also always have the suspension loops for the pin, which would be placed through the ear (cf. *Boston*, pp. 229-30, nos. 293-97, for these types. This disregards the archaeological evidence for their use, and also the logic of the Tewosret pieces. Eaton-Krauss, in *Boston*, p. 228, no. 290, says "...evidence is lacking, both from representations and from burials, that the Egyptians wore such rings in their hair." Cf. also Eggebrecht, *Weltmacht*, p. 229, no. 159.

This is also the opinion of Saleh and Sourousian, *Catalogue*, no. 218, Cairo JE 27309, "Rings and buttons are affixed to the tresses which cover the ears." The coffin was buried in the tomb of Sennedjem and must be dated rather early in Dyn. 19. That this is the place where earrings would have been worn can be seen from the inner lid of the wife of Sennedjem, also from Deir el Medina, and from the beginning of Dyn. 19 (Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 415, fig. 264): she has a round, convex ornament in the same position, approximately where the ear lobes would be, if one could see them through the wig, and these appear to have an X-shaped mark lightly incised. That these are most likely ear studs is suggested by wooden examples with the same cross-marking (see *Boston*, p. 231, no. 300). Also see the coffin lid of Katabet (Andrews, *Jewellery*, p. 101, fig. 79), Dyn. 18-19, with convex disc, colored in the center, which is like a known
type of ear stud (e.g. *Boston*, p. 231, no. 298a; Thomas, *Gurob*, pl. 16, p. 58, no. 381). The "hair-ornament" argument has not yet been extended to ear studs, to my knowledge.

217*Gurob* Tomb 605 had six rings associated with a female mummy, see Bell, "605," pp. 67-68. For gold examples worn by men see *Boston*, p. 229, no. 292; also Aldred, *Jewels*, pl. 116.


219Note: these are called "beads" as they have both upper and lower suspension beads and would have been fixed in place in a network. Pendants are free-hanging elements, with only an upper bead.

220Pl. 23.25 also illustrates a "green pottery," probably meaning green faience, cartouche-shaped bead of Tutankhamun, but with sunk relief. There is no information in the texts as to its source, and it may well have been one of Petrie's purchases from the villagers he had scouring the site for "cartouches." Also see W. M. F. Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names*, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 29 (London: 1917), pl. 37.4, which illustrates relief cartouche of Tutankhamun that looks remarkably like the BM pendant.

221He also shows the bead as much larger than life on *IKG*, pl. 17.29. When enlarged, his drawing adds 0.5 cm. to the length of the bead, although only 0.1 cm. to the width.


223*KGH*, pl. 23.32. Also see Petrie, *Scarabs*, pl. 37.13, 14 (rings), also note no. 7, from Gurob.

224Harry James quoted in Åström, "Ayios Iakovos," p. 223, fn. 1, the letter of Mr. Harry James says that the group is certainly late Dyn. 18 and, as the pendants are of Tutankhamun, whose name would probably not be in circulation for very long after his death, that it is also hard to dispute Petrie's date.

225For examples of Amenhotep III apparently from a floral collar see now Kozloff, "The Malqata/El-Amarna Blues," in press.

226*IKG*, pl. 23.29, 48, 55 appear to be beads; also note *KGH*, pl. 23.19.

228 Also see the double cartouches in electrum from a collar found in the Kings’ Valley cache of Tewosret and Seti II jewellery: Vernier, *Bijoux*, p. 56, 52.684.


230 Cairo Museum no. 945, combined with hes-vase, nefer, and lotus petal elements = Murray and Nuttal, *Handlist*, p. 3, 46b.

231 UCL 27816 does include two faience “date” beads that are usually found as part of floral collars.

232 Cf. *Boston*, p. 238, fig. 314. Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 45.C. Note that Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 56, no. 338 calls these, as well as one of the scarabs, “jasper.”

233 Similar to Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 44, Type 68.0.

234 Cf. Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 45, in original order, from Tomb 276 A; Engelbach, *Riqeqb*, VI, p. 17, frontispiece bottom, thought to be 19th Dynasty; ibid., p. 32, pl. 51.4 (from a robbed grave)! ‘“5 (thought to be Dyn. 19). For a broad collar in gold of pomegranate pendants cf. Vernier, *Bijoux*, pl. 83, no. 53.184; for faience broad collars, cf. Murray and Nuttal, *Handlist*, nos. 44n, 46c; also Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 321, fig. 203. Also see Dothan, *Bala*, p. 43. She identifies this shape as “lotus seed.”

235 Although they do seem to also occur in small numbers as ornaments for simple necklaces: e.g., Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 42, passim; *CA* II, pl. 28.7. For a collar, see Carol Andrews, *Ancient Egyptian Jewellery* (London: 1990), p. 58, fig. 42a, Third Intermediate Period: entire collar composed of figures of a standing goddess in a shrine holding a papyrus scepter. Small ankhs and hes-vases in glass were found in a sort-of netted “scarf” in Tutankhamun’s tomb, shown incorrectly strung as a necklace in *Boston*, p. 236, no. 309. For gold examples with various elements, see Aldred, *Jewels*, pl. 11, from Dahshur and p. 202, and pl. 55, Aahotep’s collar = Vernier, *Bijoux*, pl. 75, no. 53.020, pl. 52, 65, nos. 52.693, 52.733. Aldred, p. 202, remarks that “the profusion and combination of such elements in a collar of traditional [Egyptian] form is distinctly un-Egyptian...” and associated the collar with Hyksos tastes in jewellery. For a collar of faience shabtis from Gurob, possibly from a tomb near to tombs 20-25, and another in the Cairo Museum of *tyet, djed* and shabti figures, see Bell, “605,” p. 72 with references.

236 Cf. Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 44.P. They had attached suspension beads at top and bottom.

Ibid., pl. 17.265.

Cf. *COA*, II, pl. 49, Type IV. D.6. This shape is well-known in polychrome faience from Malkata and from the collars found in Tutankhamun’s tomb (nos. 21u, 46c, 46qq, 46 rr, 53a, 54r); also cf. Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 321, fig. 203.


Similar to but not identical to Petrie, *Amarna*, pl. 17.283.

Similar to Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 42, Type 2.P, but not as detailed. They are not all the same shape, and some are quite indistinct: Barbara Adams identified one as a the figure of a child (i.e. dwarf). Cf. also Petrie, *Amarna*, pl. 17.294.

For Bes with his arms down, see *COA*, I, pl. 13.2.

Note that Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 56, no. 337 calls one of the UCL beads a “leg amulet.”


All the bead sizes for spacer and multiple beads are approximate only. As Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 56.K, 1; approximately as pl. 43., Type 56.F, 27 turquoise, 1 yellow, 1 red; approximately as pl. 43, Type 56.J, 1 turquoise; as pl. 43, Type 56.F but triple, 2 and quadruple, 4.

As Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 55.B except 4 rows X 2 rows, 1 red, and 4 rows by 4 rows, 1 burnt turquoise. As Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 55.P or 0, 1 turquoise, 1 white; as pl. 44, Type 58.P in a multiple bead of 5 tubes, 1 example in red. As pl. 43, Type 55.N, but in a single row, 1 in turquoise. As pl. 43, Type 55.G, but in four rows, 1 in red. As pl. 44, Type 73.T, but a double bead, 1 in red and 1 in burnt turquoise.

Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 43, Type 54.H, one each in red and blue, 2 red, and 8 yellow. Floral beads, truncated cone in section, numbered 16 red and 1 blue. In doubles there was 1 red, burnt. Petrie’s illustration on pl. 17.26 shows these beads as much too large, with a diameter of c. 2.5 cm. for the single bead shown from the front. However, notice that it is visibly larger than the others shown as strung, which are about 1 cm. in diameter, much closer to the estimated size of the dark red boss beads, at c. 0.95 cm.
Journal, 16-23 March, 1889, IKG, p. 26; KGH, p. 39 (yellow glass beads seem to be eye beads). For the use of yellow faience at Ramesside Gurob see Kaczmarczyk, Faience, pp. 247, 251. For examples, see Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 43, Type 46.D; also cf. Boston, p. 241, no. 322, from Abydos cemetery G; Wilkinson, Manners, p. 344, no. 449, D, necklaces from Leiden, strung with small scarabs, wedjat eyes, tube beads, large spheroids and small spacer beads, such as were part of the Tutankhamun Burnt Group.

Very simple, uninscribed, small scarabs, something like Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 41.100: 1 carnelian, 1 blue glass. There are also two larger scarabs, much more carefully carved in greater detail, 1 in burnt turquoise faience, and 1 possibly in carnelian or glass.

These are all different. One, in carnelian, is similar to Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 42, Type 38.D. Two other elaborate versions are also similar to this, in cut-out turquoise faience. A coarser example in turquoise faience also has cut-outs, while a third and fourth are solid but more detailed. For the elaborate faience version from UC 28717, cf. Engelbach, Riqqeh, group of pl. 16.3, possibly from Tomb 202, of Apiy.

Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 45, Type 79.E (1 dark blue glass), K (1 red, 2 turquoise); Type 80.B (1 red, 1 dark blue glass); Type 86.P (2 red, 1 yellow, 1 dark blue), B (1 turquoise), M (1 cream colored, another smaller and thicker perhaps of steatite); Type 92.0 (about 150 turquoise), M (similar to this, 7 turquoise, 1 white), K (2 turquoise). On pl. 44, Type 68.V (2 turquoise), U (2 turquoise), I (1 turquoise), J (1 turquoise); Type 72.F (1 turquoise); Type 58.U (1 turquoise, one larger in turquoise, and another with a flared, rather floral end, in turquoise).

COA II, pl. 28.7; Petrie, Amarna, pl. 17; see discussions under individual beads.

Gurob, p. 56, nos. 340-42.

This information courtesy of Barbara Adams, personal communication of February 27, 1991. Thomas had called them faience.

Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, Faience, nos. 695-97. The bead that Kaczmarczyk analyzed and numbered as 27901 ii apparently really comes from a still unstrung box of beads from the Tutankhamun Group that have been classed as 27901. This information courtesy of Barbara Adams, personal communication 27 February 1991. She adds that the box contains "faience rings and multiples and a few agate spheroids, which included some lumps of charcoal."

Petrie did find real rubbish pits in the village, and these were full of household odds and ends. They are described in his field records.

Ritual "killing" might be one explanation: cf. Bell, "Polychrome," pp. 56, 72, fns. 113, 114.
Eric Peet, *The Great Tomb-Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty* (Oxford: 1943), pp. 49, 61. Three occasions are mentioned, and on two they actually burned the coffins inside the tomb. Morris Bierbrier, *The Tomb-Builders of the Pharaohs* (London: British Museum Publications, 1982), p. 115 has interpreted this action as a way "to extract the jewels and precious metal more easily from the wooden surrounds." In the tomb of Tutankhamun, the supposed robbers stole the unguents and left the elaborate travertine containers (having no resale value? Carter says they were too heavy): Howard Carter, *The Tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amen*, III (London: Cassell and Company, Ltd, 1933), pp. 105, 144. Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 15, pl. 27, Tomb 473, a large Ramesside tomb burnt at some time in its history. Some fragments of the original tomb goods were burnt.

Note that Arielle Kozloff, personal communication, April 1991, is very dubious about a possible Dyn. 19 date for the Gurob glass. She thinks that after Amarna there is very little further glass production in the New Kingdom. She would, apparently, associate the Gurob materials with those from Malkata, which should be approximately contemporary with Amenhotep III. She has never, however, personally examined the Gurob glass.

**IKG**, pl. 18 top; cf. Cooney, BM Glass, 149 for the lentoid flask.

The razor from the Amenhotep III group (**IKG**, pl. 17.19) is like those from the Ramesses II A (pl. 18.3) and B (pl. 18.38) groups. These types are all Dyn. 19 ("butt edge markedly projects"), see Dothan *Bala*, pp. 18-19, illus. 34, citing W.M.F. Petrie, *Tools and Weapons*, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 30 (London: 1917), pl. 62.24-26, pl. 63.45-47. She leaves out the Amenhotep III Group example (pl. 62.23), presumably because of its date, although it is the closest to her example. The whetstone (pl. 17.12) is like that in the Ramesses II B group (pl. 18.50). Although one might object to a comparison of whetstones, the mere fact of their inclusion is strange and remarkable enough to warrant it.


**Stubbings**, "Chronology," p. 245.
CHAPTER V: ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE SITE

The Discovery of the Burnt Groups

The actual archaeological context of the Burnt Groups and the stratigraphic history of the site is irreparably lost to us; we are more than one hundred years too late for such things. It is probably not possible to even make any kind of reliable interpretation of such evidence as has been preserved—the records are too incomplete and subjective. However, to attempt to gain any understanding at all, the best, and perhaps only, way to determine what might have been is to examine the archaeologist's records, the actual field notes where available, in the sequence in which they were made. The field records, as one might expect, are more useful here than the publications, as these present data already interpreted in terms of Petrie's then current historical hypotheses.

In the first season (1888-1889), Petrie worked elsewhere for the first three months (at Hawara and Illahun). He kept a few men with a foreman, but otherwise unsupervised, busy at Gurob to keep the site from the depredations of a rival. He visited the excavations infrequently (once a week, apparently), and must have been informed then, or by messages, about the circumstances of any finds that were brought to him. There were several "groups" with Mycenaean pottery, found in association with walls and tombs under "house" walls, or inside houses, and inside the "town"
(at this point he seems to have interpreted the "temple" as a town). He mentions nothing about burning or ash deposits, but the contents of these "finds" are very similar to those later "Burnt Groups." His dated Find 36 is especially intriguing, as the Mycenaean pottery is preserved only in fragments, as it is often found in the burnt groups. Several of the other finds seem to be of mostly complete vessels, and so very likely from proper tombs. After Petrie began to supervise the work at Gurob, in the middle of March, he concentrated on a series of late 18th or early 19th Dynasty tombs to the north of the great enclosure (Tombs 20-25), and work seems to have finished there for the season.

At Gurob, some more burnt bowls and glass bottles have been found, luckily when Hughes and I were both on the site. We can assume, therefore, that any illicit digging was not obvious, was not close to the kôm, or did not happen. Presumably the condition of the burnt groups had not been disturbed during this time. Work began again at Gurob upon the arrival of a new assistant, the elusive Mr. Hughes-Hughes. He arrived by the week of 1-7 November 1889 and started work by 14-28 November. He may have had no qualifications other than enthusiasm, and he does not seem to have been prepared for the vigorous and spartan life of Petrie's field camp. Petrie continued his practice of making only infrequent visits to the site, and he emphasized later that he left everything to Hughes-Hughes and had no responsibility for it. He was compelled to leave Hughes-Hughes "entirely unchecked," while he himself was "merely registering
what came in.\textsuperscript{11} The Burnt Groups appeared immediately, and Hughes-Hughes must have mentioned them to Petrie, as he notes them in his \textit{Journal}, 28 November-5 December: "3-4 finds of ornamental pottery, &c., in large ash holes in the floors of rooms...though how they come to be here is hard to understand." Petrie himself was finally on site when one of the groups was found. This may have been the last one they discovered, as they stopped work within a fortnight. Petrie's remarks\textsuperscript{12} may be taken to imply that Hughes-Hughes had not always been present when previous groups were excavated:

At Gurob, some more burnt bowls and glass bottles have been found, luckily when Hughes and I were both on the spot. I now see that these strange pits full of burnt valuables, blue bowls, glass flasks, carnelian and blue-bead necklaces, wood-work, and stuffs, were purposely burnt in the holes, and in this case covered over with a layer of potsherds carefully placed before covering with earth. They can thus only be a sacrificial burning of personal effects probably on the owner's death. This is not Egyptian, and seems to be the relic of the Greek funereal pyres, thus kept up after the foreigners had taken to burying in tombs like the Egyptians. Then the household valuables were heaped in a hole in the floor of the house, burnt, and buried.

It is worth citing his published version of this occasion, to compare the differences:\textsuperscript{13}

In many instances the floor of a room has been taken up; a hole about two feet across and a foot deep was dug in the ground. A large quantity of distinctly personal property, such as clothing, a stool, a mirror, necklaces, kohl tubes, and toilet vases of stone and pottery,
were thrown in, and then all burnt in the hole. The fire was
smothered by potsherds laid flat over it; and lastly the floor was
replied...It is evident that the objects buried are such as belong to an
individual personally, and not to a household. No bones were ever
found....

The *journal* entry makes it clear that the idea of an "Aegean" cremation
ceremony had been formed in Petrie's mind *before* the end of the 1890
season. As we have seen, the presence of Aegean pottery in Egypt was
almost a complete novelty, and there were no interpretational precedents.
Knowledge of Bronze Age Aegean burial customs was also not very
extensive at this time, and Petrie seem to have been heavily influenced by
Homer,¹⁴ who reflects Iron Age burial customs more than those of the
Bronze Age.¹⁵ Petrie was disturbed by the lack of bones, which still poses a
problem of interpretation¹⁶, and concluded that the bodies of the "Aegean
foreigners" (the light-haired mummies)¹⁷ were buried in Egyptian fashion,
in tombs, while their personal effects were burnt in an intramural, Aegean,
ceremony. The Greek funeral pyre was said to be "modified" for the
Egyptian circumstances. This theory must have been explosive in
Egyptological circles, and its effect on classical archaeology can be judged by
the passion of Torr's response. It still evokes a scene of great drama--a
hidden (and smoky) ceremony--such as is rarely encountered in modern
historical reconstruction.¹⁸ Unfortunately, from both Aegean and Egyptian
sides it appears to be entirely fantastical.
In the winter of 1903/1904 the next excavations, led by Loat, a zoologist, and Currellly, also found at least one Burnt Group. A scarab of "Ramesses possessing the 9th Sed Festival" (i.e. Ramesses II) was "part of a burnt deposit found in one of the houses of the town." This was probably in the area of the "temple," but could have also been in the south enclosure. Loat did not offer any alternative suggestion for these Burnt Groups and, in fact, says nothing more at all about it. There had also been extensive plundering on the site before Loat arrived. It may, in fact, have been going on since Petrie and Hughes-Hughes left in 1890.

Not long after Loat's excavation Dr. Rubensohn, of Hildesheim, was able to purchase a number of fine 18th Dynasty antiquities at Illahun (December 14, 1904). Illicit excavations being carried on through the winter of 1904/5, the Cairo market was full of objects by March. Borchardt, seeking out the source of these attractive antiquities (e.g., the head of Queen Tiy), visited the site. His keen observations have preserved the best and most detailed archaeological information of the "temple/harim" that has survived.

Borchardt found the walls of the "palace" still standing, some walls to a height of 1.20 m., but all was disturbed by the sebbâkhin in places to below the foundations. Everything was littered with pieces of burnt wood and one wall (in the south enclosure) still had traces of burning. He was told that the head of Tiy came from a rectangular pit near or under the walls, located to the (south) east of the large building, therefore inside the
enclosure wall itself. This was said to have been filled with alternating layers of artefacts and burnt material. Borchardt drew the reasonable conclusion that this pit should relate to Petrie’s earlier Burnt Groups, but did not feel the necessity of resorting to Aegeans for an explanation: he preferred to think of them as cellar pits.

Several more such pits were found by Brunton and Engelbach in their 1920 excavations:

Although we found several of the holes mentioned in sect. 30 of *Kahun, Illahun and Gurob* [sic], we found no untouched ones, but the local workmen all agree that a large number of such burials have been found there since the excavations of 1889.

Note that Brunton and Engelbach call them “burials.” Unfortunately, they give no explanation for their use of this term. Rather than “funerary,” it could simply be “generic,” in the sense that the objects were indeed “buried” under the ground.

**Aegean Cremation Ceremonies**

From such meager indications it is difficult to draw any conclusions that inspire confidence. Petrie’s solution, ascribing the burnt groups to foreigners, was imaginative, but does not work. First of all, the presence of foreign pottery does not necessarily indicate the presence of foreigners.
Further, there are no other artifacts at Gurob, except for the Mycenaean pottery, that give any indication of a connection to Greece or Aegean culture. And the pottery is only of the normal exported type: there are none of the shapes peculiar to them, such as drinking vessels and figurines, that would be expected if Mycenaeans had, in fact settled here. Also the amounts of pottery are small to suggest a colony or entrepot. This is not to say that an occasional Aegean might not have passed through the city, but there is no evidence of a settlement of Mycenaean Greeks.\textsuperscript{34}

Secondly, pale hair does not a Mycenaean make,\textsuperscript{35} although Petrie defended his view ably\textsuperscript{36}:

The causes often supposed to produced the light hair on mummies cannot be granted here: fashion could not have induced the dyeing of the hair hidden under a wig; the soil cannot have changed hair beneath a hair wig which is unaltered; treatment of the mummy can scarcely have affected the hair, as the body was apparently not mummified, but only dried, and had gone to dust; and old age would have made it white or grey, and not brown. We must, then, conclude that the person was light-haired during life, and wore a wig of black, hiding the foreign token.

Petrie never explained why he thought the Greeks were fair-haired.\textsuperscript{37} One might, in fact, expect the Mycenaean Greeks to have had dark hair, judging from their representations.
Thirdly, the Greeks of the Late Bronze Age did not practice cremation but rather inhumation, and extramural inhumation at that. Cremation is taken as a sign of an intrusive culture pattern when it appears in Greece at the very end of the Late Bronze Age. Ceremonial burning of objects was not a usual feature of Mycenaean culture, either. There are Late Bronze Age examples of ritual “killing” of tomb gifts for religious purposes, but these items are broken, and there are objects in the Burnt Groups that have survived intact (possibly including fragile glass vases). As we have see (Chapter: Objects), many of the broken Burnt Group materials seem to have been destroyed by the fire.

Although there are a few Egyptian examples that might be taken as “killed” objects, the idea of burning gifts to accompany the dead would seem to be absolutely “foreign” to Egyptian funerary custom, where the emphasis lies on the preservation of the undamaged object, or its simulacrum, to accompany the (undamaged) deceased. The only possibly Egyptian representation of such an event seems to be the scene shown on a wall relief in Theban Tomb 20, Mentuherkhopshef, temp. Tuthmosis III. Maspero interpreted the drawing of great pools of fire with objects in them as the ritual burning of those objects. However, it is more likely to represent a negative event, a punishment or destruction in the afterworld, and not an actual rite in the funerary ceremonies in this world.

Petrie’s explanation would therefore seem to be completely incorrect. One might suggest that other foreign residents were responsible, as other
foreigners are known to have been at the site. But, if so, they left no other identifiable traces of themselves, either at Gurob or in burnt groups at other sites.

The actual activity of burning things inside a house would have been quite unpleasant. And using potsherds to try to smother a fire in a pit would have been even more unpleasant and impractical. The whole suggested procedure sounds as if it has been derived from a very confused reading of difficult stratigraphy.

The intensity of the fire is difficult to judge without experimentation. Many of the preserved objects do show traces of burning, sometimes severe. It would be useful to know more about the apparently flammable items, such as clothing, that are said to have survived in these pits. Clothing is mentioned by Petrie, but its condition, present whereabouts, or even its nature or form are not known. The shapes may not have been recognizable, as they are never mentioned, and they might well have been partially burnt. Bits of cloth possibly from mummies were found elsewhere on the site. It is tempting to think that these Burnt-Group fragments may also have been from similar sources--possible remnants of the elusive bodies. The very fact that some cloth was still preserved in these pits indicates that the fires, although perhaps strong, were not all-consuming.

The smothering of the fires with potsherds seems an extremely peculiar and impractical idea. One possible explanation is that the sherds are relicts of
vases, broken in situ. Children’s burials in large pots were fairly common at Gurob and bodies are even said, cryptically, to have been “cov.d sherds.” Pottery coffins are known to shatter in this way, and they were rather common in several Gurob cemeteries, dated by the excavators as 18th and 19th Dynasties. Although, only a suggestion, it is not an entirely implausible explanation for the mysterious pottery fragments. Again, one longs for a fuller description from the excavators themselves. Many burials at Gurob were also enclosed in bricks or just wrapped in mats and covered over with bricks. They might have had something of the same archaeological appearance.

Ash Pits or Cellars

The description that Borchardt was given was of rectangular pits, associated with walls, and filled with alternating layers of artifacts and burnt material: “...in einem (?) viereckigen Loch neben oder under der Mauer....Es hätten immer eine Schicht Kohlen und eine Schicht Antiken absechseind übereinander gelegen...” This layering could well have resulted from secondary refilling of pits with a mixture of surface debris (from some sort of large-scale burning activity on top of the kôm ?) with disturbed grave materials, during looting or sebâkt collecting, and possibly in ancient times. The pit which is said to have yielded the wooden head was located to the (south) east of the large building, and therefore inside the enclosure wall itself. Borchardt explained the surface evidence of burning which he
found over the "temple" site as the result of the destruction of its roof by fire (although he only marks one of the walls as burnt). The possibility of large-scale bread making must also be considered. This leaves huge areas of ashes, burnt fuel, as can be seen clearly where the strata have not been disturbed, as at Amarna. However, the areas are also marked by great numbers of bread moulds, but is not certain that Petrie, or even Brunton and Engelbach, would have recognized them or their significance. Bread making on this scale is usually associated with temple sites, where it was distributed as "wages," but it also would have had to occur at a great royal harim on a similar scale and for a similar purpose. It might then be that the ashes would date to the "palatial" period, which I date to the 18th Dynasty, and the objects from the intrusive groups, dug through the ashes, would be later, as I have also suggested.62 This does not, however, explain the purpose of the pits. If they were burials, and especially robbed burials, it might have produced the alternation of ashes and objects that was observed.

Borchardt, however, concludes that these were cellar pits, where burnable rubbish was stored: "Es können einfach zum Verbrennen bestimmte Holzabfälle von altem unbrauchbarem Hausgerät gewesen sein, die mit Kohlen zusammen in den Kellergruben der Häuser aufbewahrt worden."63 He said that similar "Kellergruben," occasionally with charcoal, and frequently with old household equipment, were found in the 1911 excavations at Amarna.64 He did not find the presence of exquisite objects, such as the queen's head, surprising, as their artistic merit would probably
have had little value in antiquity, once the object was damaged or
discarded.\textsuperscript{65} It would have been more useful as fuel. But, the unbroken
objects, such as the bronzes, coming from these groups would seem to have
been still useful, and quite valuable, even by ancient Egyptian standards.
Petrie himself remarked on the perfect condition of the glass vases from the
Ramesses II A group and the superb state of the faience bowls.\textsuperscript{66}

As discussed above, the presence of many objects that are almost
completely restorable from tiny fragments, tends to indicate that they were
damaged at that place. Although dumps may preserve many joining pieces,
it would seem to be unlikely to find so many, especially from such small
bits.\textsuperscript{67} It is most probable that the objects were intact, and still usable,
when placed in the pits.

Even more damaging to Borchardt's theory is the number and richness of
objects in the groups; only a small portion of them appear in the \textit{IKC} plates.
For example, the objects from the Tutankhamun Group include thirty items,
not counting beads, that are not shown on \textit{IKC} pl. 17, including Mycenaean
vases, calcite, faience, glass and pottery items. Griffith's catalogue\textsuperscript{68} has
seven objects in addition to those shown in \textit{IKC} pl. 18 for the Ramesses II
(earlier) Group. Petrie seems to have shown the most complete examples
and the most attractive or unusual items, and then often only one of each
type. There are, for example, many more vases than shown.\textsuperscript{69} The groups
contained masses of still serviceable toilet items, furniture (including chair
parts and head-rests), ornaments, scarabs, and vases and dishes (fine and
coarse, large and small), for containing, storing, and serving. It is difficult to imagine the wealth of a household that would throw away, for example, perfectly good bronze razors and needles, bowls and buckets. Such a household would have had to be extraordinarily wealthy, even for a royal palace. So, although it seemed obvious to Borchardt, this explanation is not satisfactory.

Rubbish Pits

More recently it has been suggested that these were rubbish pits, where broken objects were thrown away. The incorrectness of any identification of Burnt Group objects as “rubbish” should be clear by now. And, by good fortune, it is known what real rubbish pits at Gurob looked like. The field notebook from the 1920/21 season (No. 34A) has a sketch of them, which are said to be 18th and 19th Dynasties in date. These were two to five feet in diameter, with rounded bottoms, and were lined with mud bricks. Petrie calls them “granaries,” which may well have been their original purpose but, when found they were indeed filled with household rubbish of a very humble sort. “In them usually” were little faience figures of gods, fishing nets and weights, old baskets (round and two feet across, oval, and the “market hand type”), needles, combs, peg tops, a boomerang, shells, straw, fish, goat/sheep, crocodile, “rat,” and antelope bones, flint sickle, freshwater mussels, scribe’s palette, potsherds, and wood. In a separate list are drawings of a footed wooden kohl pot, possibly a door
bolt, other wooden items, a wooden shuttle, and the mention of a sickle with flint teeth. It is not clear where on the site these pits were found, but the north village would be a likely place.

Bothroi or Harim Rubbish

In a recent examination of all the material from Gubor in the Petrie Collection, including all the unpublished notebooks and journals, A. Thomas examined and rejected a suggestion that these are burials of discarded temple equipment by priests.\textsuperscript{74} She concluded that the richness of the material shows that the harim was here, within the temple enclosure:

The situation of these finds in holes below the earth floors of houses, suggests that they might well be regarded as rubbish that had been buried and partly burnt, and that houses had later been built over the area. Borchardt's evidence of burnt wood in the temple enclosure may have some bearing on the matter. If, as he suggests, a building here had been destroyed by fire, this would explain the charred condition of the discarded items....

The nature of the objects found in the holes beneath the floors, indicates that they did not, perhaps, come from ordinary houses....The objects...[are] in fact the sort of items and equipment used in a large, important house or harem.

These finds provide evidence that the harem was situated within the temple enclosure.\textsuperscript{75}
She uses the groups to establish that the harim of the Ramesside administrative texts was on this spot until at least the time of Seti II (the Seti II Burnt Group), and was possibly established in the late 18th Dynasty. Again, the unbroken nature of much of the material, including possibly inexpensive, Egyptian pottery vases, certainly always reusable by someone in the household (or so it works today), militates against this conclusion.

Barry Kemp, in an enlightening reappraisal of the site, suggests that the burnt material is below foundation level: "...peculiar burnt underfloor deposits,...cut into the underlying desert, and not into a lower occupation level of a stratified site." His concern was that Petrie's two-fold occupation of the "temple" (i.e. first temple, then village) be revised into a single phase use of the harim. He does not suggest a date or function for the pits, or attempt to explain the ashes and burning of objects, but he does identify the kôm buildings with the Ramesside "harim" of mr-wr (I will propose a different identification below). As the written evidence shows this harim to be in use into the 20th Dynasty, the palace would then have had either to have expanded over them in stages, or to have been cut into at some time during its use. It is most likely that Kemp is correct in that the pits were dug into the "underlying desert," rather than only into debris, as they are described as having form (rectangular or square), and this could have only been held by a hardened material, such as the desert sand (they are never described as built). But, having interpreted the palace...
as 18th Dynasty, I do suggest that the pits were cut through a stratum of occupational debris.

**Ritual purification**

R. Merrillees has suggested another interpretation of the Burnt Groups:

*Whereas the Mycenaean pottery at Gurob gives some indication that non-Egyptian practices, such as, for example, ritual purification by fire, which is attested in Greece in the Bronze Age, were followed by some of the, probably non-indigenous, inhabitants...*  

Mrs. Thomas has replied to this: his theory has "no sound evidence to confirm it. He has studied foreign pottery from Gurob out of its site context, and relies heavily on Petrie's evidence of these finds."  

**Burials**

In 1920, Brunton and Engelbach classified the "holes," perhaps inadvertently, as burials. In my opinion, their description is correct, and the most logical explanation yet available to us: the burnt groups are the remains of intrusive burials. The arguments for and against this interpretation are many, and it does not explain all the preserved
contextual evidence, but it presents, to my way of seeing things, the least fantastic, most economic, and more "Egyptian" explanation, that is, the most in harmony with our present knowledge of ancient Egyptian culture and preservation of archaeological contexts.\textsuperscript{84}

First of all, the nature of the objects found in them is much the same as in other New Kingdom tomb groups, as can be seen quite clearly in undisturbed burials from the site and elsewhere\textsuperscript{85}: “cosmetic” vessels and dishes, other toilette equipment such as mirrors, tweezers, and razors, also jewellery, head-RESTS, chairs or stools and large pottery container vessels. As has already been discussed, many of these same items seem to have a particularly funerary or religious function. Even the size and variety of some of the deposits is typical of tomb groups of the period. A fascinating document has been preserved that perhaps indicates the scale of tomb gifts normally placed in a non-royal tomb of the New Kingdom. It is the record of the inspection of a Deir el-Medina tomb made during the reign of Ramesses III in which the scribe lists the items that he found still in the tomb.\textsuperscript{86} These include coffins, couches, stools, headrests, baskets with cloth, sandals, palette, water bag, calcite vases, two pieces of scenting material, a basket with bronzes (pin, knife, bowl, libation vase, razor case, rotating razor, scraping razor and five mnt-vessels for medicine), a basket with faience amulet and unguents, a basket with stone vessels, one comb, and a tweezer. These are all reminiscent of the Burnt Groups’ objects.
Other burials from Gurob include similar items, as well as some Mycenaean vases.\textsuperscript{87} Even the ground “rubbish” of the disturbed cemeteries where Loat worked was littered with objects of similar type, including glass, calcite and diorite vessels, scarabs, and unbroken Mycenaean vases.\textsuperscript{88}

Oren accepts the Gurob Burnt Groups as 	extit{tomb} groups, with little hesitation, citing specifically the groups of Amenhotep III, Tutankhamun, Ramesses II (early and late), and Seti II. Discussing the mixed Aegean and Egyptian pottery assemblage considered to be typical of funerary and settlement contexts for all New Kingdom Egypt, he says:

A group of XIXth Dynasty tombs from Gurob yielded a large collection of artifacts..., all of which are almost duplicated in the Coffin Group at Beth Shan, yet no coffins are recorded from these tombs...\textsuperscript{89}

He compares these groups to clay-coffin tomb groups from Deir 'Alla, Tell es-Saidiya, Beth Shan, and other sites with similar contents and date (13th into 12th centuries B.C.). Deir el-Balah has a similar mixture of clay coffins and local and foreign pottery.\textsuperscript{90} Again, Petrie’s description of a potsherd covering for his pit is suggestive, given the other similarities to Levantine clay-coffin burials.\textsuperscript{91}

Petrie himself thought that the deposits had a funerary nature: they were personal possessions, and did not belong “to a household...we cannot imagine a general custom of burning and burying valuable property, except on the death of the owner.”\textsuperscript{92} But, there were no bones. The absence of bodies is
indeed a problem but, given the traditions and conditions of burial at Gurob, it may not be inexplicable. Bodies were not always placed in coffins and do not seem to have been mummified: they were often very badly preserved. A partial list of the groups of objects found at Gurob without coffins and yet considered to be grave groups includes:

1. Tomb 276, with two bodies that were bandaged and survived as a "black, powdery mess." There were no coffins, no lining or covering bricks, and no markings of any sort.

2. Tomb 20 had no coffins and was considered undisturbed.

3. Tomb 293 had no coffin.

4. Tomb 245 contained two bodies and a LH II vase laid in a brick trough lined with wood. A wood plank placed on top closed the coffinless burials. As there were no canopic jars, and only the bare skeletons remained, Thomas concludes that no elaborate burial preparations had been made. This seems to be typical of the greater number of surviving bodies from Gurob.

5. Group 217 was a burial without a body. A basket was found filled with small items but there was no body. The excavators could only suggest that it had been a child's burial broken-up by looters. However, the basket was in good order, so the idea of looters is not very convincing.

6. Even one of the bodies of the so-called Aegeans, a body with yellow hair, was apparently not mummified.

If badly preserved bodies were further disturbed, looted and burnt, it is quite possible that little of them would have remained for Petrie to find.
The supposed lack of bones may have pertained to only one burnt group, that single one Petrie saw excavated. Burials at Gurob did not always include canopic jars,\textsuperscript{101} a further indication of the minimal mummification of the bodies. So, a lack of jars in the Burnt Groups would not necessarily eliminate the burial hypothesis. The lack of shabtis is more difficult to understand.

Another feature of the Burnt Groups that is similar to unquestionable burials at Gurob is the use of small, shallow pits. These were frequently used for burials all over the site, probably due to the lack of suitable stone outcroppings in this area.\textsuperscript{102} However, Petrie's description of a pit "two feet across and a foot deep"\textsuperscript{103} would seem too small for an adult burial. Here the question of Petrie's credibility as a careful observer is crucial, but the evaluation of his ability seems to rest as much on belief as on demonstration. If one believes that Petrie was generally precise and accurate, his exact descriptions must be attended to carefully. However, if the opposite opinion is held, the descriptions may be taken more as approximations. Familiarity with the Petrie's Gurob excavation notes has left me with the impression that, although he was an outstanding and even brilliant scholar, his conduct of the excavation of Gurob was not perhaps his finest work, and his observations often seem undisciplined and imprecise. A comparison of Borchardt's plan of the kôm with Petrie's shows how rich Borchardt's is in archaeological detail, and how many omissions must exist in Petrie's, especially architecturally. Surely some of the features Borchardt gives were already visible when Petrie was on the site. Further, Petrie's
evaluation of features that he (or his workmen) did discover is not confidence-inspiring. For example, if his men did dig into Loat's small Ramesside temple (as I suggest in Chapter 6, The Gurob Papyri), Petrie saw only house walls. The question of tomb and village sequence in the North Town was never settled stratigraphically, again due to his apparently inexpert technique (see below). Petrie seems to have been simply too inexperienced at this time to deal very successfully with the complicated stratigraphy of the site.

As may have been the case at Gurob, secondary burials have often been found dug into ruined building sites. The classic example is Deir el-Bahari, filled with Dynasty XXII mummy pits. At Amarna, burials of children and adults, apparently poor, were found against or partly under the walls of small houses and large enclosures on High Priest Street and in the Pnehesi house. The bodies were "wrapped in mats or placed in wooden coffins, now all decayed, and sometimes with a plain pot or two." One aged man wore a bronze ring engraved with Tutankhamun's prenomen, "proving he was buried at or after the end of the flourishing period of the city." Some of the burials were thought to be those of "survivors of inhabitants who lingered on when the place had been partly deserted." These people are thought to have been living nearby and burying their dead in this area. This may have been exactly like the richer burials in Tombs 20-25. Later another such intrusive burial of a young man in Q. 42.7, the Records Office, in the center of the city. The E.E.S. mission has recently (1984) found an intrusive (Dyn. 20/21) burial in the Chapel area of the Workmen's Village.
Borchardt\textsuperscript{108} mentions a Dynasty 20 coffin at a slight depth within House P.47.5 at Amarna. He remarks\textsuperscript{109}: "At this time the outer quarters of the town with their ruined houses thus seem to have served on occasion as a cemetery for the inhabitants settled in the central portions." Pendlebury\textsuperscript{110} described finding four male bodies lying in a row, on their backs, with their "skulls broken" and a wall built over their waists, in House T.34.2. At Deir el-Ballas, Amenhotep I to Tuthmosis III burials were cut through Second Intermediate Period–early Dyn. 18 houses.\textsuperscript{111} Examples were identified at Kahun\textsuperscript{112} and Gurob.\textsuperscript{113} Building walls may have functioned as ready-made tomb enclosures, possibly thought of as similar to the little brick coverings made for so many burials on this site. Tombs using bricks occurred in the main cemetery (P, O, R, Z, T, S) and in the southern cemeteries at G and D.\textsuperscript{114}

**Burials in Re-Used Cellars**

It is possible that these were later burials placed into "cellars" of the 18th Dynasty building, such as were found at Kahun.\textsuperscript{115} Petrie says\textsuperscript{116}:

Many of the houses of the XI\textsuperscript{1}Ith dynasty there [at Kahun] have rock cut cellars, which were closed by massive trap-doors of wood, recessed into a seat and hinging in the stone. One of these cellars became known to people of the XIXth dynasty, and they cleared it, and probably enlarged it, to form a family tomb.
A similar phenomenon could have taken place at Gurob. However, such cellars are usually connected with smaller private houses, as at Deir Medineh. Palaces and temples seem to have had more substantial storage facilities, such as separately built magazines and treasuries.\textsuperscript{117}

Robbers' Caches

One final theory can be suggested, for the sake of completeness: the burnt groups might be robbers' caches.\textsuperscript{118} The groups are composed of apparently rather valuable materials: the bronzes were certainly of some worth, as perhaps also the stone and faience vessels. The many containers, such as the Mycenaean stirrup jars, could have held salable unguents, perfumes, etc. As many types of object occur in multiple examples within a single group, this multiplicity could imply several sources, and that the deposits are the product of raids on several tombs. Such objects could have been taken from tombs all over the site, especially point "W." But, even such deposits would still have been intrusive. The evidence of burning might also be attributed to attempts of robbers to melt down gold and perhaps unguents from funerary equipment (see discussion below, under "Destruction of the Palace/Harim by Fire").
Petrie's Assumptions

Petrie assumed that all the pits were undisturbed\(^{119}\) and used the deposits as closed find groups. His assumption seems to be based on minimal evidence: he had only his observation of the one group and the assurances of Hughes-Hughes and his workmen. It was restated, with increasing vehemence, over the years, as the chronological value of these deposits became ever more clear and critical. Of the foreign pottery groups (1888-1889 season), he said\(^{120}\):

> Each discovery is entirely independent, and is dated by different classes of objects, yet all agree closely in the age to which we are to assign this pottery....and hence we may now feel that firm ground has been reached for dating the beginning of the pottery of Mykenae and Thera to about 1300 B.C.

In 1904 he asserted\(^{121}\):

> Such groups cannot possibly have been disturbed later on to insert objects, as the charcoal and ashes are undisturbed, and the foreign objects are likewise burnt. Hence the evidence of the egyptian objects if clearly dated must carry the foreign objects to the same date....The character of the Egyptian objects thus points to each of these dated objects being contemporary with the rest of their group, and therefore truly dating the group.

His final word, in 1931, was: "Our principal results from Gurob were dated groups of burnt pottery buried in houses...."\(^{122}\)
Petrie's assumption that the groups were undisturbed is one that cannot be maintained with much assurance. However, we do not now have any means of judging the accuracy of his assessment. We do know that no other excavator on the site ever claimed to find an undisturbed Burnt Group, although both the Loat and Brunton and Engelbach expeditions found them, and Borchardt may have observed their placement.\(^{123}\) However, the site had already been greatly disturbed by the time of their work there.

Petrie also assumed that archaeological context of all the Burnt Groups was the same, with a similar reason and manner of deposition: "Such was the arrangement of one instance which I examined in detail; and such is indicated by the state of things in other finds, and the accounts given by Mr. Hughes-Hughes and by the native diggers."\(^{124}\) Although logical, it is an assumption not strictly warranted by the meager reported evidence. However, the contents of the groups do look very much like each other in type and quantity, and the objects also appear to be more or less contemporary within each group.

The one pit that Petrie saw was said to be "two feet across and a foot deep,"\(^{125}\) and he seems to take this as typical. The only other description comes from Borchardt, as rectangular and near a wall, but the dimensions were either not taken or not reproduced in this publication.\(^{126}\) Two feet square and one foot deep is rather small, especially for a burial. The size makes one think that there could be an architectural connection—the "pit" possibly produced by casemate construction, or perhaps where walls or
pillars had been robbed or burnt out. However, even if this might have been enough space for a few vases or bowls, it would certainly not be big enough for the larger groups, such as the Amenhotep III Group. This contained more than 36 items, including five stirrup jars. These last are mostly unbroken and would have almost filled Petrie’s pit by themselves. The group also contained four calcite vases (mostly unbroken) with three lids, eight faience vases, five pottery vases, and numerous smaller items. The “Tutankhamun Group” may actually be one of the smallest groups, and it included five Mycenaean vases, four glass vases, seven calcite vases, four faience vases, probably five pottery vases, and smaller items of jewellery, etc. Obviously, the typical Burnt Group would have required a much larger pit, especially if it were also to house ashes, potsherds, and fill.

Petrie also assumed that the pits were contemporary with the houses above them, since the pits were supposedly dug through the floors by the occupants. There is even less reason to accept this than his other assumptions. Petrie’s understanding of the stratigraphical concept seems to have been slight. He did have some awareness of it, as he does talk about the village spreading over the deserted temple. However, it is never clear that he had any real stratigraphic evidence of this—his historical sequences seem instead to have been based on external evidence, such as the dated scarabs that he was brought and the wars of Merneptah. In the north village, where there does perhaps seem to have been an architecturally visible stratified sequence, he could not place the house walls in a relation with the tombs until he had “dated” the objects from each, again relying on
scarabs and such. We must ascribe this incompetence to lack of knowledge rather than lack of effort. Petrie certainly did everything he could, but archaeological technique was then in its infancy. Indeed, the recovery of a sequence such as Petrie described would be challenging today. If Kemp is correct, and the great buildings are a harim and its out-building, Petrie’s houses disappear, although they still could be contemporary with the harim’s occupation. If I am correct, and the harim is only Dyn.18, then the pits must have been cut through the ruined building at some later date.\textsuperscript{127}

Topography and the Location of the Burnt Groups

Petrie placed the 1889-1890 Burnt Groups inside houses, but exactly which houses is not certain. There was a north village, but little seems ever to have been said about it. Petrie thought that it was established in the early 18th Dynasty (cartouches of Amenhotep II), but was deserted by the time of “Seti I,” when Tombs 20-25 were supposed to have been dug through it. These were later covered over by a Ramesside town that may have lasted into the 20th Dynasty.\textsuperscript{128} The tombs here were unquestionably tombs, with dug chambers, coffins and no traces of burning. They appear to be quite normal, distinct and different from the burnt deposits.

In the south village Petrie described the presence of irregular “houses,”\textsuperscript{129} which he saw as intrusive over the destroyed “temple” site.\textsuperscript{130} In his 1888-1889 version of the site’s history, it was considered to have been started by
stonemasons, dismantling the earlier “temple,” supposedly under Akhenaten’s command. It was filled with foreigners, and continuously occupied until deserted during the reign of Ramesses II, when the north village was re-occupied. The identification of a town here seems based on the presence of these “houses,” i.e. non temple-like interior walls, and it should almost certainly to be located within the northernmost enclosure. Petrie had identified this enclosure as a “temple” apparently on the basis of its size, stone column bases, and some pieces of fittings with the name of Tuthmosis III. He never included any “houses” on a plan, and he complained correctly that the Gurob “houses” lacked many of the features of the town houses at Kahun and indeed of normal houses elsewhere, as at Deir el-Medina and Amarna. This oddity only underlines the unlikelihood of his identification of the walls as the irregular walls of a squatter village, and adds support to Kemp’s harim identification.

Two possible burnt groups may have been found in the first season, although Petrie did not recognize them as such. The least likely is the group of burials reported from “just within the wall of the temple site,” with yellow glass bugle and eye beads, that was reported in the journal entry of 16-23 March. These had, however, mummies and shabtis, and do not appear to have been burnt, as one might expect mention of that if it were the case. While they do demonstrate that the “temple” area must have been unoccupied when they were made, they were probably not burnt groups.
A more likely candidate is "Find 3," which contained the broken remains of several Mycenaean vases. It was found "beneath the walls of a house probably built in the end of the XVIIIth dynasty."\(^{137}\) dated thus as Petrie thought the "houses were begun on the ruins of the temple, probably by Khuenaten."\(^{138}\) The broken condition of the stirrup jars and their connection to walls are features found with other burnt groups. The location, inside the "temple," or northern enclosure, may also be suggestive of a burnt group.

It is interesting to note here that in 1888 the level of deposit must have been high enough to hide the walls of the southern enclosure, as Petrie says nothing of it. Until the second season, his remarks about the south town seem to refer specifically to the "intrusive" town on the "temple" site. On his first visit in 1888 he had the impression that "the whole place is one period; the houses have never been rebuilt, but stand on the desert sand, just filled up, with the upper parts of the walls fallen in."\(^{139}\) In *KGH*, already having identified a temple of Tuthmosis III, he says "Doubtless some dwellings also existed here for the workmen, and a town had sprung up, but there is little evidence of that."\(^{140}\) As Petrie later remarked that five feet of debris had been removed from the temple site by 1920,\(^ {141}\) and as Borchardt observed the walls to be 1.20 meters in height in 1905,\(^ {142}\) it is possible that some of these were still covered when Petrie first arrived. In 1889/90 Hughes-Hughes worked on the south enclosure, and Petrie reported "Nearly all the dwellings of the town are restricted to these two inner enclosures; and most of the square outside of them is base sand, with
only occasional buildings." It is possible that Borchardt's many interior walls and Brunton and Engelbach's additional column bases were deeply buried in debris in 1888 and were gradually cleared by several generations of local "free-lancers," as Petrie calls them. He also admits that more columns and interior plan were not recovered as "this ground was not exhaustively turned over." It is also quite possible that Petrie just did not measure the walls, which he thought were intrusive and so perhaps not very interesting. As he mentions the visibility of walls throughout *KGM*, some of Borchardt's walls inside the "temple" must have also been visible to Petrie. It may also explain their strange omission from Brunton and Engelbach's drawings. But Petrie did seem to have found the site "ruined and the walls overthrown into shapeless heaps..." and these heaps seem to have obscured the south building.

For whatever reason, it was not until the second season, in 1889-1890, that the walls of the southern enclosure were found. It is this enclosure that was now dubbed "south town," and the "temple," or northern enclosure was known as the "main town." The south enclosure was thought to have been founded by Tuthmosis III, along with the temple and great enclosure wall, with foreigners present soon afterwards. Both foreigners and temple continued until the time of Tutankhamun. Then the temple was removed bodily, and by the time of Ramesses II "dwellings had invaded the space with a mass of houses." The town was ruined by the time of Merneptah, during his wars with the Sea Peoples, and their supposed allies at Gurob,
but there was some slight continuation until the time of Ramesses III.\textsuperscript{150}

He gave a summation of his final historical version in 1893\textsuperscript{151}:

At the mouth of the Fayum, on the opposite side to Illahun, stood in later times another town, founded by Tahutmes III, and ruined under Merenptah; thus its history falls within about two-and-a-half centuries. While I was working at Hawara some beads and ornaments were brought to me from this place; I soon went to see it, and found that it was an early site unmixed with any later remains. In the beginning of 1889, I worked out part of the town, and the rest of it was cleared by Mr. Hughes-Hughes in the end of that year, while I worked at Illahun. The general arrangement of it was a large walled enclosure, within which were two other enclosures side by side, on containing the temple, the other a small town. The temple had been founded by Tahutmes III, and had lasted through Khuenaten’s changes only to be destroyed soon after, probably by Ramessu II, when he carried away the temples of Illahun. That the town was ruined early in the reign of Merenptah is indicated by the sudden end of the previous abundance of scarabs and rings with the kings’ names at this point; of later times only one or two objects of Ramessu III have been found.

Of purely Egyptian objects many were discovered, but the main interest of the place is in the remains of foreigners from the Mediterranean who lived here.

As the Burnt Groups were all, or almost all, found in the second season, and as work in the southern enclosure was the new element in this season, it is possible that the Burnt Groups were found somewhere in or near it. Petrie simply said that they came from the town.\textsuperscript{152} It is not clear from the
context whether he is referring exclusively to the Ramesside town over the "temple" or perhaps instead thinking of the Ramesside town as encompassing both south and north enclosures. He never definitely stated that all the Burnt Groups come from the enclosed town houses as opposed to the extension over the temple\textsuperscript{153} or even the houses in the North Town.\textsuperscript{154}

But, I think it quite possible that Hughes-Hughes actually made many of his finds in the more western part of the north enclosure, possibly close to Loat's temple.

Very little was ever published about the southern enclosure. We know that Hughes-Hughes traced its walls, but Petrie's plan (\textit{KGR}, pl. 25) shows no internal features. Judging from Borchardt's version of the enclosure, there were plenty of interior walls to be found, so clearly Hughes-Hughes did very little, if any, work there. This also accounts for the silence in \textit{IKG} concerning the objects, etc. that should have been found there---there is only the most general characterization. However, as will be shown later (Chapter: Papyri), Hughes-Hughes does seem to have done some work in the area near Loat's temple, as he found one of the dedicatory stelae. And he may have worked in the area between the northern enclosure wall and the outer enclosure wall, as Petrie's map shows the outer wall in black, meaning it was actually observed. It is also possible that Hughes-Hughes worked in the middle of the "temple" area too, as this is the only place that any kind of interior walls are noted. It was in this season, under Hughes-Hughes' supervision, that the lintel of Tuthmosis III and the offering table of Tiy\textsuperscript{155} were also found, most probably coming from the northern enclosure. From
all this I conclude that Hughes-Hughes was probably most active in the northern enclosure.

Objects possibly from another burnt group or groups are the broken, but originally very handsome, faience vessels now in the Petrie Collection at University College, London. They have been published for the first time by Mrs. Thomas. She mentions that they are included in the Petrie MSS on glazing, where they are said to be from Gurob and from foundation deposits. One of them (no. 245) is slightly burnt. These vessels are certainly not the type one would normally expect to find in a foundation deposit, but we have seen the bowls in other Burnt Groups. Some of them could even be 19th Dynasty (nos. 241, 244, 245), which might associate them with Ramesside buildings that have not survived, if any such ever existed. No mention was made of a foundation deposit in either KGH or IKG, but the fragments were presumably found in connection with a wall. This context does look suspiciously like another example of a burnt group.

Borchardt puts the site of one pit "[süd]-östlich vom großen Gebäude." It was also probably by or under a wall. It takes a bit of effort to work out exactly where this might be. As the "south" is a later addition to the "east" of the original field notes, it might be understood that the earlier orientation was more of an approximation to the compass point than the later. The obvious field orientation would be along the axis of the two large buildings, and they would be regarded as running east to west. This interpretation seems supported by Borchardt's placement of the dump, which is marked
on the sketch, "An der Südwest-[West-]ecke des großen Gebäudes..." So the field orientation of east, should be the area in the apparent front of the buildings, facing the gisr\textsuperscript{158} and the cultivation. The sketch map shows a number of small walls along this edge of the kôm, outside of the two large enclosures but presumably still inside the great enclosure wall.\textsuperscript{159} There seems to have been a lot of illicit digging in the northern part of this area in particular.\textsuperscript{160} So the pit could have been near the northern or southern enclosure.

**Petrie's Occupational Phases**

If the Burnt Groups may then be possibly connected with the southern building, what is the date of this building and the "houses" in it. As far as I can ascertain, there is no hard evidence for its foundation except by inference. It seems so intimately involved with the planning and placement of the "temple" site that one could well expect it to have been of the same foundation, as Petrie did,\textsuperscript{161} dating them to the time of Tuthmosis III. If the "temple," or northern enclosure, was really a harim\textsuperscript{162} or a palace,\textsuperscript{163} and Kemp's identification of the southern enclosure as a "group of service buildings" is correct,\textsuperscript{164} which seems likely, a contemporary foundation would make excellent sense.

There is ample attestation of occupation of these buildings in the late 18th Dynasty, particularly at the time of the last kings, Amenhotep III,
Akhenaton, and Tutankhamun. It has been suggested that Tiy may have had a special connection to the site, as many objects bearing her name have come from, or are attributed to Gurob, and may well have been from the kôm itself.

Petrie constantly reiterated observations on the paucity of datable material post-Ramesses II and put the end of the "town" occupation to the time of Merneptah, with some slight continuation until Ramesses III, "as his name has been found in two or three instances." The only mention of Ramesses III documents in *IKG* seem to be unprovenanced and of a slight nature--nothing to show the presence of an in-use royal harim.

[The first] were on slips found together, referring to the eastern and western house of Ramessu III in the Fayum, an expression that might refer to Illahun and Gurob as being on the opposite banks of this branch of the Nile.

There actually seems to have been only one wooden "slip," described by Petrie in 1927 as

Wooden dowel (?) with inscription of "the temple of Ra-user-maat, mery Amen (Ramessu III) set up west of the great lake," the Fayum. Gurob. xxth dynasty. The same inscription in a vertical column on the back.

A preferable translation of the text would be: "The House of Ramesses III (Wsr-m3t-Rc mry imn) (upon) the East of Thebes, in Mr-Wr."
Ramesses III is known to have had temples in Karnak, Mut and Luxor, but none of them bear this name.

There is also possibly a scarab of Ramesses III. This must be the same scarab photographed in Petrie, *Scarabs and Cylinders with Names*. Unfortunately, the name of the king is not really clear in the photo; pl. 23.60 belongs to Ramesses II and 61 is broken inopportunistly. Petrie did find, but did not recognize, a faience ring bezel probably of Ramesses IV, reading $\text{Hk}^2\text{m}^2\text{ct}^2-R^c \text{ nb} \text{ nfr}^4$; unfortunately, its provenance on the site is unknown. The ring from Tomb 24 may possibly give the name of Ramesses VI. These slight remains are rather inadequate supports for the substantial 19th and 20th Dynasty center of $\text{Mr-Wr}$ known from the administrative documents.

Petrie's reasons for dating the history of the site as he did are not always evident. Judging from the chronological pointers he used on *KGH*, pl. 24 ("each spot represents a cartouche discovered in these towns"), the problems he had in determining which came first, tomb or town, in his cemetery excavations, and the revisions he was forced to make when he found the restored name of Amun in his second season, it would appear that he relied extensively on royal names to establish a relative sequence. He was only just establishing his object typologies at this time, and his stratigraphic observations were still strongly tied to architectural remains.
In my opinion, the strongest evidence for the end-date of the occupation of the kôm that Petrie reports is the ring of Seti II found in the first season. Petrie is very definite as to its context. It was found on the top of the ruins of a chamber, the walls of which had fallen in and filled it up: over the middle of this large chamber, above all the fallen débris, lay this ring; conclusively showing that the town was ruined and the walls overthrown into shapeless heaps, within a generation after the close of Ramessu's reign.\textsuperscript{180}

However, one would have to be certain that this really was a closed context—another stratum, such as drift sand, sealing off the ring from all above would have made the context indisputable. Then it would strongly indicate that the harim was defunct by the 20th Dynasty. But, as it stands, the ring can hardly be treated as much more than a surface find. It is published by Thomas.\textsuperscript{181}

In her recent survey of the site, Thomas suggests that occupation continued well into the reign of Ramesses V, citing two scarabs of Ramesses IV and V in the Petrie Collection, and the Wilbour Papyrus.\textsuperscript{182} However, the two scarabs are unprovenanced and may well have been surface finds, or even thrown up from robbed tomb deposits. We can add here the Ramesses IV scarab mentioned above that Thomas, following Petrie, had mistakenly classed under Amenhotep III.\textsuperscript{183} At the most, the scarabs show only that there was later Ramesside activity in the area, and to this I would agree.
Even if it were certain that these all came from the kôm itself, they would still not indicate any significant use of the area.

The same argument can be applied to the evidence from the Wilbour Papyrus. It names several large estates connected with Mr-Wr, but there is no necessity at all to connect any of them with the buildings on the kôm at Medinet Gurob. And I (see below) would place the harim or palace of the 19th and 20th Dynasties elsewhere in the general Lahun area.

The Eighteenth Dynasty Evidence

Judging from the objects aside from the Burnt Groups,¹⁸⁴ the main period of the occupation on the kôm would seem to be the late 18th Dynasty: from Amenhotep III, through the restoration of Tutankhamun, and into the reign of Horemheb.¹⁸⁵ Stratigraphic evidence for an 18th Dynasty town occupation of the temple site might be found in the two silver rings, one with the name of Amenhotep III, said to have come from a house built above the "temple."¹⁸⁶ Rings of Akhenaten were also found in the houses over the "temple."¹⁸⁷ It is doubtless due to these inscribed objects that Petrie, in the first season, took Akhenaten as responsible for the destruction of the "temple," and dated the town as to his reign. Petrie did not understand the "house" walls to be contemporary with the "temple," as now seems a more probable reading. As far as I have been able to ascertain,
there is no preserved archaeological evidence that would date the lighter (interior) walls later than the destruction of the "temple" walls.

The Ramesside Evidence

Other later royal names were found in what Petrie termed "the town" but, as almost always, one is not sure exactly what part of the "town" Petrie meant—the northern or southern villages. In most of these cases Petrie probably meant, at most, that these objects did not, to his knowledge, come from the tombs. However, as many of them were certainly purchased, even this may not be correct. A scarab of Merneptah with the name of Tuthmosis III was found, as well as a feldspar ring of Seti II. Petrie's impression certainly was that the houses over the "temple" mostly belonged to the time of Akhenaten.

For Ramesses II, Petrie does mention that "nearly 30 examples of his cartouche" were found in the settlement. This matches his list on pl. 24 of cartouches for chronology, where there are 27 dots. However, here it is certain that he is using the term "town" to mean both parts of the site, or simply the non-tomb material, as he says:

A considerable number of scarabs and rings were discovered in the work, and still more in the searching of the surface of the whole site by the children of the village. All of these...drawn on Pl. XXIII...
117 [are] probably chance examples of about XXIInd dynasty, perhaps not from Gurob, as they were bought.

Some of the 27 “cartouches” must have come from the North Town, as Petrie mentions that they are more typical of that part of the town than of the temple area:

Early in the time of Ramessu...the north town extended over the graves, as rings of Ramessu II are common there, and a great quantity of yellow glass beads which are unknown in the temple site, and therefore subsequent; moreover, a burial just within the wall of the temple site had a string of yellow glass beads, and this must have been when that part of the town was uninhabited.

A Ramesses II ring was also found in the western, Ramesside cemetery.192

Some Ramesses II material may really have come from the kôm. In the beginning of his first season Petrie seems to have kept only a few men on the kôm itself, apparently in the temple area. During this period his Journal entries mention finding the names of Horemheb and Ramesses II (2-8 December, 1888), and 1-20 cartouches between Akhenaten and Ramesses II, “not a fragment of anything there suggests a wider range of date” (14 February 1889). Another scarab of Ramesses II seems to have been found in the kôm in 1889, along with a scarab of Ramesses III: in the first week of Hughes-Hughes' work on the site, Petrie’s Journal (14-28 November 1889) reports the finding of a scarab of Ramesses III (“latest found”), Ramesses II and Amenhotep III, a small vase of violet faience with the name of Queen
Tiy, etc. The Seti II Burnt Group is also reported at this time, as well as clay caps of wine jars with the name of Seti I.

It is possible that Hughes-Hughes was working in the southern enclosure, but I think it more likely that most of his finds came from the northern enclosure, perhaps in the western part. The Dyn. 19 and 20 remains are, however, still less than one would expect from the ruins of a Ramesside palace. Petrie, in fact, never put much emphasis on the Dynasties 19-20 occupation here—he seems to think of it as a village at that time. The imposition of a Ramesside harim has been made on the basis of literary arguments, made long after Petrie. An occupation of some sort down to nearly the end of Dynasty 18 would make use of the site tie in nicely with possible events at other sites closely associated with late Dynasty 18 kings, such as Amarna and Malkata. They may all have had a continuation of use into the reign of Horemheb, before any real damage, destruction and/or desertion took place.

**Ramesside Destruction of the "Temple"**

The real destruction of the large buildings on the kôm may not have begun until the 19th Dynasty, perhaps by Ramesses II, as may have been the case at Amarna. Several pieces of limestone with the remnants of large-scale hieroglyphic texts were found in Ramesside tombs. It was thought that all of these pieces originated from the "temple," and several similar fragments
were actually found on the temple site in this season.\textsuperscript{195} One of these fragments was said to have been "found just below the surface in the inner temple-enclosure."\textsuperscript{196} Whether this indicates that the 18th Dynasty remains lay close to the surface, or that the area had been disturbed, cannot be ascertained at this distance from the event. But, the latter possibility seems more likely, given the many descriptions of sifting and below-wall trenching that had gone on all over the kôm.

The burials of point "W" were the remnants of a heavily plundered Ramesside cemetery of very imposing "mastaba" tombs with large shafts.\textsuperscript{197} Thomas suggests that these tombs belonged to important 19th Dynasty officials of the town and their families.\textsuperscript{198} One of them, in fact, contained the burial of an individual who may have been a son of Ramesses II.\textsuperscript{199} Thomas further suggests that the "mastabas" were tomb chapels and courts, which seems quite likely,\textsuperscript{200} and would further underline their sumptuary elegance and 19th Dynasty character, as compared to the rest of the cemeteries. It is in these tombs that pieces of the Tuthmoside "temple" blocks were found: in tombs 6 and 473. This should demonstrate quite clearly that the "temple" was in ruins by this time. Tomb 6 was "very thoroughly robbed in ancient times, and all the objects were found in the filling."\textsuperscript{202} These included eight limestone fragments and a sherd from a LH III B Mycenaean stirrup jar.\textsuperscript{203} Tomb 473 also contained a LH III B stirrup jar,\textsuperscript{204} and a stele of *Nbt nni-nyswt, Nbt Pr* (House Mistress), probably Ramesside.\textsuperscript{205} "The contents shewed signs of burning, both sculpture and
beads being calcined. 206 It is not stated how the block of Tuthmosis III was used or found.

Thomas identifies further fragments from tombs 474 and 475 as also being from the "temple." 207 However, she gives no reason for this other than citing the plate references in Brunton and Engelbach. As the texts (except for the large-scale figure on Brunton and Engelbach, pl. 50.8) appear to be funerary, and the object published by Brunton and Engelbach, pl. 50.10 is even marked "plaster," it is probably not useful to associate these pieces with the temple unless further information is provided. The statement of the excavator remains the best evidence.

A possibly 19th Dynasty intrusion in the "temple" area may be "Deposit 406," found by Brunton and Engelbach within the "inner temple enclosure on the axis of that temple near the central column." It consisted of a broken limestone bust covered with a broken saucer and buried six inches below the surface. 208 The description of its context is not specific enough to understand its relationship to the "temple" deposit as anything but intrusive and, therefore, post-occupation.

Even more interesting as evidence for a Dyn. 19 desertion of the kôm area is the multiple burial that Petrie found in the South Town, or the "temple" area part of it, in 1888-1889. 209

Just inside the south wall of the town enclosure at Gurob were four bodies buried: they must have been placed there after that part was
deserted, and before the wall had been effaced as it now has by

denudation. From the style of the beads they are said to be of the
time of Ramessu II. One had a necklace of blue and brown and green
glass tube beads, short brown glazed pottery beads, blue and green
 glazed pottery Bes figures, and blue glazed pendant of Bast and
monkey; the style of these pendants shows that they cannot be far
removed from Khuenaten's period, but being coarser than his, the age
of Ramessu II may be well assigned to them; earlier the town would
not be deserted there, later the amulets would not be used. Another
body had a necklace of blue and yellow tube beads of glass, and eyed
pendant beads in black and white on a yellow body. Another body
was unadorned. And the fourth had a wooden ushabti of Pa-ran-a
[$\rho\beta - m - c^3$, "The Great Name"].

This burial is described elsewhere as "a burial just within the wall of the
temple site [which] had a string of yellow glass beads, and this must have
been when that part of the town was uninhabited." Petrie thought that
the yellow beads dated to the reign of Ramesses II.

No description is given of the circumstances of these finds, but the Journal
(16-23 March, 1889) also places them inside the northern (i.e. "temple")
enclosure. Petrie gives no explanation for dating the beads earlier than
Dynasty 20.

Also two necklaces of beads from mummies buried just inside the
town wall. One is clearly Ramesside and cannot be after XX dynasty;
so this and some ushabti of later Ramesside style found with a
neighboring mummy date the interments.
The Notebook 39B, p. 21 entry, "cbr in side S side near SE," has been 'translated' by Thomas\textsuperscript{212} as "south side of the enclosure at the south-east." She places this "not far from the cultivation." It would have been inside the "temple" enclosure, perhaps towards the "front," or south-east, facing towards the gisr and the cultivation (but not really very near either). The probably 19th Dynasty burials must be intrusive and made after the desertion of the harim site.

Petrie's Dated Find 3 of 1889-1890 (Tomb 31) was also made in the middle of the South Town, and so in the northern enclosure.\textsuperscript{213} This could well have been a burnt group: \textsuperscript{214}

Find beneath the wall of a house built on the temple ruined by Khuenaten, and probably therefore about his age: alabaster cup and lid; small round-top tablet of sandstone; carved chair leg; carnelian earring, style of XVIIIth dynasty; alabaster plug; blue painted pottery, XVIIIth dynasty; two pieces of pottery of XVIIIth dynasty, with signs incised ...and two false-necked vases...but broken.

The Notebook entry adds a little information:\textsuperscript{215} "under brick wall in stuff 40 deep in mid S town." From the sketch, the cup seems to have been a round-handled tankard. Although Furumark recognized that this find would be valuable for dating the Mycenaean pottery (it is his No. 2), no further use of it can be made of the group until the objects are found. Petrie was most probably correct in dating the pottery to Dynasty 18. At least two pieces must almost certainly belong to the end of that dynasty (\textit{KCH}, pl. 21, nos. 43, 43). The two vases have a horizontal floral collar that
is typical of this time, and has parallels at Amarna, but does not seem to occur in the 19th Dynasty, when the style of the representations of floral collars change. The tankard (pl. 21.51) also looks much less developed than the examples from the Burnt Groups. Unless one determines that this is not a burial, or that it was a disturbed burial with, perhaps, admixture from the surrounding debris, its date may well be late Dynasty 18, which would indicate that the palace was already fallen into ruin.

So, although it is difficult to date the intrusive burials very specifically, except perhaps for Tomb 31, two things are still clear:

1. Intrusive New Kingdom burials were made inside the large enclosure walls.

2. The palace (or whatever) could not have been in use at the time of the burials.

The desertion of the palace area by the end of Dyn. 18 is, of course, a necessary prerequisite for the hypothesis of the Burnt Groups as burials. And a desertion seems to be born out by such archaeological evidence as can be learned from the excavators' reports. If these burials (and the Burnt Groups) are of Ramesside date, then the palace must be earlier.

The only other possibility that comes to mind that would indicate that burnt groups were contemporary with the “temple,” or town, would be the identification of them as (disturbed) foundation deposits. However, although some Ramesside items do evoke a suggestion of such use, such as
the mysterious wood "slip/dowel" of Ramesses III,\textsuperscript{218} the contents of the Burnt Groups have almost nothing in them to support such a suggestion. While their vases may be taken as those common items in New Kingdom foundation deposits, the Burnt Groups lack all the other characteristic ritual objects.\textsuperscript{219}

The sporadic and irregular evidences of 19th and 20th Dynasty activity on the site of Gurob may parallel Amarna's history. In a small temple there the name of Ramesses III has been preserved.\textsuperscript{220} Partial occupation of the site into the 20th Dynasty has also been suggested.\textsuperscript{221} At Gurob, Loat's small temple, possibly Ramesside in foundation, seems to have been used in the 19th Dynasty and possibly later, on a site that must have been closely connected with the heretical 18th Dynasty family of Theban kings.\textsuperscript{222}

In contrast to the kôm debris, most of the Burnt Groups have 19th Dynasty royal names. And the objects, even those from the Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun Groups, also fit most comfortably into the styles of that period, as we have already seen.\textsuperscript{223}

Stratigraphic Conclusions:

To conclude, there does not seem to be any strong evidence for connecting the date of the construction or use of walls and floors of the buildings with the deposition of the Burnt Groups. And, as has been shown, intramural
funerary deposits, as described by Petrie, are not in keeping with either Mycenaean or Egyptian culture.

Petrie always seems to have felt that the town was not rebuilt, and was only a shallow deposit. He had to make the Burnt Groups contemporary with the walls of his "town" in order to integrate them into his neatly arranged history of the site. This must have been a bit troublesome, and indeed the notebooks seem to indicate that he and Hughes-Hughes could find no explanation for them until the end of the season, when he finally saw one during excavation. The groups were also dated awkwardly late: the Seti II deposit had to be taken to fall in with the ill-defined occupation Petrie saw continuing on the palace site after the Merneptah destruction. Petrie fixed the dates of the site's use, he found the burials of foreigners in his 1888 cemetery excavations, he had foreign pottery in the town to go with the foreign bodies of the tombs, and it all fit together neatly. With the techniques and data that were available to him, it was not such a bad work for its day. We can only wish that he had been present on site more often during more of the work, as his observations could be keen.

That the buildings were in use, if only in part, until the end of the 18th Dynasty seems indicated by the erasure and restoration of the name of Amon on Petrie's stone lintel. There are some fairly substantial objects with royal names of the late 18th Dynasty. And these have no Ramesside parallels from the site. The Gurob Papyrus letter is dated to Amenhotep IV. Although almost all the titles listed by Thomas are from
the 19th-20th Dynasties (most derived from the stelae and literary sources), there are a few that are 18th Dynasty. Although they are all funerary, they do indicate that there was an 18th Dynasty harim at Šhe, and that there was a place that manufactured textiles, and that they were both probably somewhere in the area.²²⁹

An "18th Dynasty village" was seen by Loat in 1904, apparently out in the wady to the southwest of the kôm.²³⁰ There is, of course, no way to tell how Loat reached this conclusion. Somewhere "behind the town" Petrie seems to have found a late Dynasty 18 cemetery.²³¹ He implies that there might have been earlier material here but that it was robbed.²³² The possible location of a cemetery and village of Dynasty 18 (?) date close to the palace/harim and fairly distinct from the more northern and western 19th Dynasty cemeteries could reinforce the idea of a Dynasty 18 date for the occupation of the palace/harim. Buildings immediately to the north of the palace have also been suggested to have been earlier than the "temple."²³³

It is impossible to date the restoration of the name of Amon at Gurob, but Tutankhamun, Ay, or Horemheb make likely candidates.²³⁴ They would all probably have preserved an interest in the site, and Tutankhamun's name appears on several funerary items. It is even possible that aged members of earlier households, such as Amenhotep III's,²³⁵ could still have been lingering on here. There must have been some place for the aging and lesser wives to stay after the death of their husband.
This very connection with the late Dynasty 18 kings may have also been the cause of the site's desertion. The use of the 18th Dynasty palace at Gurob may, and should logically, parallel the history of other late 18th Dynasty royal sites closely associated with the Theban kings, such as Malkata and Amarna. Like them, it was perhaps not abandoned immediately with the opening of Amon's temples. The failing of interest in and maintenance of the older establishments, possible loss of staff, the falling into disuse of the site, must have been at least related to the arrival of a new dynasty with new connections and priorities. Further, it is conceivable that the building of harims would follow the pattern of New Kingdom palaces: each king would want his own. As these buildings would have been mostly in mud brick, it would not have been as costly and time-consuming as one might expect.236

So, it is quite possible that Petrie's impression of an un-rebuilt site was valid, and Kemp's interpretation of this impression seems to me essentially correct.237 This would be a one period site--never heavily built over, if it was ever built over at all. When it was finally left and all the desirable stone and wooden elements removed, the mud brick walls were just left, along with some column bases and odd bits, perhaps damaged in dismantling.238

Mud brick walls do not always seem to have been taken away by their ancient contemporaries. Occasionally one does find reused stamped mud bricks, but not usually in large quantities; reused bricks are usually fired
bricks. The problems of prising the unbaked bricks apart while preserving their integrity may cost too much in time and effort. Also, transporting them would have taken more time and expense, and they may have been structurally slightly unsound. Fresh, strong, neat new bricks must have been much easier and cheaper to produce on demand, especially in the Fayum. Destruction of ancient brick walls seems to be a feature of relatively recent activity in populous areas. But, where the walls stand in more remote venues (such as the Montuhotep Temple on the mountain of Thebes, the ancient enclosures at Abydos and Hierakonpolis, Amarna, the Fayum’s Roman cities), structures of great antiquity have remained erect with relatively little damage.

Destruction of the Palace/Harim by Fire

The main problem that has not yet been discussed is that of the burning itself, and the date of this event and its extent across the site are uncertain. For the meagerest description of the nature of the soil inside the great enclosure, we must rely on Borchardt’s careful 1905 observations, made not too long after Loat and sebbakhin had been active on the site. A large part of the kôm had been excavated, “especially the large building and the east part.” The most recent finds were said to be from the eastern part. The floor was “stark mit kleinen Holakohlenstücken durchsetzt, so daß man denken könnte, das Gebäude sei nach einem Dachbrande verlassen worden.” He did find traces of burning on one wall which seems to have
been in the western half of the southern enclosure. He identified the kôm as the site of a late Dynasty 18 palace, with walls still standing to 1.20 meters but disturbed to below foundation level. Obviously, the site was extremely disturbed. But, the abundance of charcoal seems to have been impressive, and the burnt mark, if correctly identified, would seem to attest to some serious surface conflagration in the area. If the burning of a wooden palace roof did produce all the debris, then it would seem to have no connection with the burnt groups.

Petrie speaks as if the burning were confined to the pits, but there is no way to judge if he ever saw any wider evidence. However it is hard to imagine that he would have missed or ignored the situation described by Borchardt unless this was only uncovered later, by the activities of looters and sebbâkhin, as is quite possible. Petrie admitted that little was done inside the buildings in the enclosure, as is self-evident from the disparity in the numbers of column bases between Petrie and Borchardt, and then later between Petrie and Brunton and Engelbach. The features that he did identify on the kôm seem to be the results of what were, essentially, sondages; only a small total area must have been cleared (horizontally). So, it is possible that the burnt material made up some sort of lower strata, covered by other deposits (rubble from wall collapse, rubbish from ancient or less ancient activities, redim, from pre-Petrie disturbances and antiquities hunting on the site, etc.) and was not visible during Petrie’s work (see Appendix 6 and Lacovara’s stratigraphy). This idea could be supported by the reports of denudation and disturbance given by
Borchardt. The level of the site was reduced in part to the wall foundations by this time. If such indeed were the case, Petrie could not possibly have seen the scale of the burning.

However, Petrie himself remarked on the denudation of the temple walls (down to the foundations, although he says it was done anciently\textsuperscript{245}), and Brunton and Engelbach were strangely silent in their description of the site. They saw remains of burnt pits, recognized them as disturbed, but made no mention of charcoal, or wall-burnings, such as Borchardt saw. The \textit{sebbākhin} may have been working steadily for all the intervening years between Borchardt's visit and Brunton and Engelbach's excavation, but it is very unlikely that even they could have taken away all traces of the large-scale burning that Borchardt reported, even as it is unlikely that they carried away all the small interior walls that have vanished off of the later plan of Brunton and Engelbach.\textsuperscript{246} And tomb-robbers do not usually carry away anything but their loot. One would have expected the deposits to have been well-tossed, but with the individual parts still recognizable. This does seem to be somewhat the way it must have been, judging from Brunton and Engelbach's description of the material as "sifted."\textsuperscript{247}

It is possible that Borchardt was too dramatic, with his burned palace, and that he over-estimated the amount of burnt material. But, it is also likely that Petrie did not see too much evidence of burning beyond the pits, and if he did, he did not recognize it as important, or perhaps just not representative of ancient activity.
The fact that he made no mention of burning is not necessarily significant. Petrie may well not have perceived such a condition as of relevance or interest to the study of the artifact itself: fashions do change. Also, little space is ever devoted to descriptions of even the most important objects, and even the plates illustrate vases as unbroken when they may actually exist in only the most pathetic fragments. These reconstructions are seldom indicated as such.

Petrie’s failure to mention any ash-filled pits, if they indeed existed, must surely be laid at the feet of his poor workmen, who did the actual work. This feature would probably not have had much interest for them. In fact, the knowledge that the workmen were unsupervised for much of the time can even arouse suspicions as to the actual contextual homogeneity of the object collections. The workmen were paid to produce handsome pieces, and would have been intent on providing good specimens for rewards in Petrie’s famous system.248 Who knows how many broken bits of pottery, rotten or burnt wood, odd and ugly scraps, that might have been quite meaningful now, may have been left in the pits.249 And who can tell how many “groups” were formed by coalescing vases and objects actually found separately. Some of the groups are so large that their only parallels are the big, multiple-burial, 19th Dynasty tombs.

It was not until late in his second season that Petrie took any real interest in the burnt condition of the groups.250 Before that he was more interested in the quality and quantity of objects that they produced. When the Seti II
Burnt Group was discovered, no mention whatsoever was made of burning in spite of the fact that at least half of the group, now at the Ashmolean, is definitely affected by fire, and sometimes quite severely.

The *Journal* entry for 28 November–5 December 1889 mentioned the Ramesses II A group and now did say that the objects came from "large ash holes in the floors of rooms; though how they came to be there is hard to understand." Petrie then goes on to describe the quality of the objects and the importance of fixed dates for them. No more mention was made, in spite of the discovery of more Mycenaean vases probably also from Burnt Groups, and the Ramesses II B Burnt Group, now also in the Ashmolean Museum's collection, and also severely burnt, until his visit in the week of 20 December 1889–3 January 1890, when he first wrote down the whole cremation scenario, which appeared, almost verbatim, in the final publication.

Petrie certainly did his best with the material at hand. He cannot be blamed for the bad temper of Hughes-Hughes, and he may well have thought that his description of the one burnt group, which receives a goodly amount of space in the rather abbreviated text of *IKC*, was sufficient. However, he does seem to have grown a bit defensive even by the time of the second season's report. He continued to deny responsibility until the end of his life:

For work at Gurob, which I could not combine with the care of Kahun, I had the help of a new volunteer [Hughes-Hughes], which was better
than leaving it to the natives. He came in an unhappy state of irritation with everything, which compelled me to leave him entirely unchecked, merely registering what came in, and only when he had done could I go to make a plan. Shortly after his return to England he vanished. Hence the detail of discovery was neglected.

Loat’s mention of a Burnt Group is summary, and he fails to remark about any traces of burning. But, the publication of his entire excavation is depressingly summary. Loat does mention that the site had been greatly disturbed.

Another possible interpretation might be the burning of funerary materials connected with tomb robberies. This was not an uncommon practice at Thebes in the New Kingdom, and was apparently used to extract valuables, such as gold, and perhaps unguents, from funerary furniture and bodies. Similar practices are mentioned in the tomb robbery papyri. But these events usually seem to have taken place inside a tomb. The elevation of the kôm at Gurob would be a rather conspicuous place for robbers to be burning their contraband, unless it was in more recent times—long after the ancient authorities were gone. Modern activities might have been responsible for the situation also. But, the scale seems to have been quite large, and Borchardt’s impression seems to have been that this was an ancient fire.

Thomas, following Borchardt’s interpretation, suggests that the harim was destroyed by fire. She postulates that “the situation of these finds in holes below the earth floors of houses, suggests that they might well be regarded
as rubbish that had been buried and partly burnt, and that houses had later been built over the area. If...a building here had been destroyed by fire, this would explain the charred condition of the discarded items. The harim was situated within the temple enclosure. The group of finds dated to Seti II would indicate that the harem was still situated here at this time. It is possible that the harem remained here until the Twentieth Dynasty. It is also possible that the harem was destroyed by fire. If this was after the reign of Seti II and before the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty, it may then have been sited elsewhere in the vicinity. So, the rubbish pits are seen as belonging to period of the harim, as are the objects found in them, and the houses were later built over all.

It seems plausible to connect the evidence for the widespread burning on the site with the apparent layering of burnt materials with strata of unaffected or mixed burnt and unburnt objects. If shallow burials (e.g., "loculi") had been cut into the harim or perhaps down to bedrock on the kôm, and later disturbed, and then possibly burnt or affected by a surface burning of undetermined origin, the Burnt Groups' mixture of burnt and unburnt, whole and broken, dirt and ash, would be exactly what one would expect to find fallen back into the pits. Petrie's observed burnt group is so shallow, said to be only one foot deep (below ancient floor level?) and two feet across, that any kind of superficial disturbance would affect it significantly. This is a rather simple explanation of conditions at Medinet Gurob which could have produced the Burnt Groups, but it is based on well-known ancient practices and modern activities.
The North Town and Tombs 20-25

The identification of an 18th Dynasty use of the North Town is something of a problem, due to Petrie’s uncertainty as to the sequence of activities here, and their possible regnal associations. Petrie localized the North Town about one-quarter mile north of the “temple,” where he found a scarab of Amenhotep “II” in some denuded houses, apparently while excavating tombs (possibly Tombs 20-23). From personal observation in 1989, it seemed that there were large numbers of shaft tombs somewhere in the area marked “B.” These may be related to Petrie’s tombs. However, the distances were not measured and the spot could have been further north along the desert ridge, towards point “V.”

When Petrie finally began “serious” excavations at Gurob in his first season, he himself went to what he came to call the “North Town” area, apparently thinking it only a cemetery. His *Journal* entry of 23-30 March 1889 mentions that the week before he found 19th Dynasty tombs that were “apparently in ground with remains of houses on the surface, just North of the walled are of Gurob. Now this week opens with another such find.” This was the tomb of ḫn-ḥrš², Tomb 21. In this same week he also opened Tombs 21/23. All of these he dated to the 19th Dynasty. In his notebook of the same period, i.e., between the discoveries of Tombs 21 and 22/23, he notes:

N town is [illegible] up as main town[---]small things are identical XVIII style & Tutankhamen ring found shows age. By tombs in that
region built through the stuff and apparently Ramesside perhaps this was only occupied between Khuei [-Akhenaten] + Ramessu II. White pot w/blk & red stripes most [illegible] Greek there, not the buff.269

One of the tombs found in the week before, of the 19th Dynasty, may have been Tomb "N." In the Journal for 16-23 March 1889 Petrie speaks of finding "Several more pieces of Greek pottery...; some down in the bottom of the chambers, and so certain of the age of the town, 1400 B.C." In his Notebook,270 not long preceding the finding of Tomb 21 (which is on p. 27), he gives a complete inventory of the objects from the "tomb well in N. town Gurob broken up--mark N [i.e., marked with an "N"])."271 Tomb N had "bits of Greek pottery." Another Petrie tomb, "P" may also have been in this area.272 The only contents mentioned are three Egyptian vases.

When he wrote up the results of his first season, Petrie felt it more appropriate to date the houses of the North Town to the reign of Ramesses II,273 apparently to tie in with the numbers of Ramesside rings which were found there.274 Probably partly due to this and in consequence of observations made while excavating, Petrie changed his mind about the sequence of cutting the tombs, and said that they were earlier than the town, probably temp. Seti I, or "to the close of the XVIIIth dynasty."275 His reasons were their close proximation to each other, similar burial customs,276 ring with the name of "Amenhotep III"277; pottery of late 18th or early 19th Dynasty date,278 wooden figures "too fine" for the time of Ramesses II and therefore "earlier." The most compelling are the assumed impossibility of cutting graves here while the town was occupied, and his
observation that the sand filling was clean. He remarks, and his opinion
must surely be taken as expert, that if the shafts were cut through the
houses, dirt and occupational debris would have been mixed in.279
Therefore, if the town must have been later and was dated to Ramesses II,
the tomb objects could not be post-Ramesses II. So, there is nowhere else to
place them except in the reign of Seti I (as the objects obviously looked
early Ramesside to Petrie), which is where he did put them: there is nothing
distinctly of the period of Amenhotep III (except for the ring, if is really of
Amenhotep III), and nothing post Ramesses II.

Petrie's first point is that the proximity of the burials should indicate a
closeness in time. This is possible but not necessary. It really is not very
strong evidence. His complementary point is the similarity in style of
burial, also suggesting close chronological placement. This, as we will see,
may not be borne out by the objects. As the coffins were not preserved,
even in field book notations, it is impossible to evaluate them in the light of
recent studies. Petrie's point is again quite weak.

As for the homogeneous date of the objects, the greatest problem is with the
bronze ring from Tomb 24 (KGH, pl. 23, no. 13). Petrie reads this as
"Nebmaatre mery Amun," Amenhotep III (Nebmaatre), with the epithet
"beloved of Amun."280 The signs are either very indistinct in the original or
very badly copied in the drawing, the ankhs that should be held by the
Maat figure is missing, and the feather on her head is unconvincingly
drawn. There is certainly some question as to the identity of the seated god
on the right. While they can be read this way, and Amenhotep III (Nebmaatre) is attested as "beloved of Amun," his scarabs are not arranged in this format.281 It is much more likely to be the name of Ramesses VI, whose name was "Nebmaatre-mer-ay-Amun," the epithet typically being part of the praenomen. The arrangement of the two facing gods is also characteristically Ramesside. As Tomb 24 was poorer in number and quality of objects than Tombs 20-23, one might expect that this difference could indeed also indicate a chronological difference. This could then be a Dynasty 20 burial, put here after the north town was abandoned. However, one of the vases found here is said to be like KGH, pl. 21.44, which is 18th Dynasty in date. In Notebook 39B, p. 31 Petrie gives a sketch of the tomb, which seems to be the normal shaft, with opposing narrow chambers. Above the sketch is written "rush covered bodies." In the area of the left chamber he wrote: "already cleared before." In the middle, apparently the shaft area itself, he has placed a rectangle, above which is written "rush." This would seem to be a square coffin, possibly made of rushes, or covered with a rush mat. In the right-hand chamber is the outline of an anthropoid coffin, with the number 24 written on the "chest." Above it is "rush, " again, probably a rush covering, such as is known from other tombs at Gurob.282 The coffin is said to be "too rotted by whil[ite] ant [i.e., termites] to read." The ring seems to come from the left hand, first finger of this mummy. To the right of the coffin's head is vase "A." From the sketch this can be identified as KGH, pl. 21.45. On the other side of the head, near the chamber wall, are two vases. The sketch indicates that one is KGH, pl. 21.44, and the accompanying note says "+ pan," which must be pl. 20.8, which is
mentioned on p. 39. The tall-necked small amphora with two horizontal handles is a well known 18th Dynasty type.\textsuperscript{283} Although the general type continues into Dyn. 19, there does seem to be an evolution into a more elongated vessel of different proportions.\textsuperscript{284} The notebook also makes reference to "shabti 2R." The reading of the second "word" is uncertain, it may indicate two examples in some material. The mummy apparently had yellow hair. The presence of at least two bodies in the tomb, and the apparently used, then cleared out, chamber, may allow us to posit a Dyn. 20 usurpation of a late Dyn. 19 tomb, with some mixing of the tomb gifts. However, it is much simpler to just set it aside, and consider this tomb as separate from the earlier Tombs 20–23, and perhaps 25. At most, if it is Dyn. 20, it gives us a \textit{terminus post quem} for the end of use of the north village.

A full re-evaluation of all the objects from the other tombs would seem to be very valuable. This would seem to offer the possibility of obtaining a very closely-defined time period for an interesting assemblage of artifacts. Until then, a few points can be made and discussed here.

The pottery from Tombs 20 and 21 does seem to be very similar, in as far as one can tell from Petrie's drawings. Thomas, in dealing with Tomb 20, has dated two pottery vases to the late 18th Dynasty\textsuperscript{285} and other objects, including a black limestone shabti, to the 19th Dynasty.\textsuperscript{286} Hall has observed that the black limestone and yellow and black-varnished wooden shabtis seem more like Dyn. 19 types.\textsuperscript{287} At least one of Thomas'
supposedly 18th Dynasty vases may well be 19th. It exhibits the bulge at the neck and shoulder joint that seems to be a characteristic of Ramesside pottery. Another group of vases from the tomb, the four red-ware examples of KGH, pl. 20.15 may also be Ramesside. The blue painted jars from both Tombs 20 and 21 may belong to the very simple, horizontal banded versions of this style that are beginning to be thought of as Ramesside. So, it may be that all the Egyptian pottery will eventually come to be seen as early Ramesside.

The splendid coffin found by Petrie in Tomb 21, now in the Ashmolean Museum (1921.1321), belonging to _HTšs, Deputy of the Harim in ȝ, will be the subject of a later paper. It is exceptionally interesting not only for its use by a foreigner, but also for its style and decoration. Beautifully proportioned and painted, it has opaque, polychrome, painted ornament on a black ground, with a great floral mšt-collars, and a yellow face and hands. The details of the face, as well as the use of the collar, show a close connection with Amarna-Tutankhamun art and it must be placed somewhere in this period. It should probably be seen as transitional between the earlier black-ground coffins typical of the 18th Dynasty and the characteristic Dynasty 19 yellow-ground type. Petrie objects that the ḫa-figures found in several of the tombs are too well-done for 19th Dynasty work. The type does usually seem to be taken as Dynasty 18, and these certainly are the continuation of a Dynasty 18 tradition in the area, as seen by examples from the Daninos Pasha and
Chassinet tombs. But, it would take very careful study to differentiate between those made during the reigns of Akhenaten-Horemheb and those made under Ramesses I. This may eventually be possible but, until then, the question must be left open, and a provisional Dynasty 19 date cannot be completely ruled out. The figures from Tombs 20-23 may be a trailing out of late Dynasty 18 artistic and religious traits into the new era, and the same phenomenon may be observable in other items, such as the Tomb 21 coffin.

The Mycenaean pottery should really not be used to date the Egyptian tomb groups, as we are here attempting to use Egyptian materials to establish absolute chronologies for the Aegean. However, one might say that the Mycenaean material also looks a bit "transitional." The Mycenaean stirrup jar found in Tomb 23 has recently been called LH III B, but Furumark's LH III A2 attribution is probably still correct. Unfortunately, the other tomb objects do not give a clearer idea of its date.

Another Mycenaean vase was found in "one burial in mid town," i.e. the North Town, Furumark's No. 4, BM A 986, FS 171:36, LH III A2. It is clearly of LH III A2 late style, with a handsome motif on its shoulder. As this is the style typically found at Amarna, it would seem to fit with the other objects from the tomb, most unillustrated, that Petrie seems to have thought were late 18th Dynasty (late Akhenaten-Tutankhamun). In Notebook 39B, he does mention "bit of Ram.[esside] tray." This seems to be the object that appears in KGH, 44, as "half a wooden tray, with carving
of a girl playing a guitar amid the water plants, style of XVIIIth-XIXth dynasty." This type is usually dated as 18th Dynasty in date.

Tomb "N," from a tomb well in the North Town, also contained a Mycenaean stirrup jar (Ashmolean 1889.1063), and this has been dated "LH III A2/B?, FS 178," by Joan Payne. Stubbings calls it "probably" LH III B. This tomb was very rich in objects and had three female ka-figures, a seated figure of Bastet in wood, and parts of two limestone stelae. Any or all of these could probably provide good dates for the group, if they had only been illustrated. Some of the pottery, however, seems to be Ramesside, and this may be the date of the whole deposit.

At any rate, for Tombs 22/23 there were two lots of occupational debris. So the objects from the tombs in the North Town seem to reinforce Petrie's idea, expressed by his attribution to the time of Seti I, that they belong generally to that transitional period between the cultural phases we may see fully expressed in the remains of the time of Akhenaten-Tutankhamun and those of Ramesses II. Many of these tombs seem to have multiple burials, so they may possibly be family tombs, and in use over a certain length of time, not just a very short period.

As for the evidence of the sand filling being clean, it is not clear how much of this may have come from the sand layer itself into which the tombs may have been cut. Instances of apparently deliberate filling with clean sand have also been reported from Gurob (Petrie mentions this for tombs in the North town). Petrie does mention that there is town rubbish in the
upper parts of the shafts. He describes the condition of Tomb 22/23 as "a well lies E & W descending c. 2' through rubbish and 6' thru hardened gravel--opens to 2 chbrs one at either end, scooped out in a bed of soft sand." Petrie makes such a fuss about the fact that he himself excavated this tomb that one wonders if he personally supervised the excavation of any of the others. The Notebook sketches of the disposition of coffins suggests that he was present for the clearance of the chambers, but he may have missed the work on opening up the shafts. It is quite possible that Tombs 22/23 were the only ones of the group that Petrie knew so intimately.

At any rate, for Tombs 22/23 there were two feet of occupational debris, but no mention of house walls. Elsewhere Petrie describes finding in the debris a piece of foreign pottery, perhaps Cypriote rather than Mycenaean. He says "Grk pot white w/bk [black] + re [red] lines, w/ring of Tut.[ankhamun] abt [about] 1/2 down in stuff--3 ft. thick by tombs in N. town i.e. before age of tomb walls." For some reason he does not seem to publish this "dated" foreign sherd recognizably in KGH.

One cannot make too much out of this notice either, except to infer there seems to have been several feet of disturbed surface material or redim in this area. He does, however call the walls "tomb walls," rather than "house walls," so clearly the idea of a village here had not yet crystalized. Brunton and Engelbach do observe later that the cemeteries were "ploughed up," and that "the extent of the ancient site is now strewn by masses of sherds
thrown out from the sieves of these *sabbākhīn.* This is indicated on pl. I and runs through the area of Petrie's work to much further north, to point "Q," where the desert is stopped by a turn of the cultivated land. It is quite possible that a similar, although perhaps less extreme, situation already existed in 1888, and one should probably not expect too much from these early reports.

It would make sense to envision an 18th Dynasty settlement, with perhaps

In fact, the actual existence of town houses in this whole northern area is suspect. Denuded walls are about as much as is mentioned. The rest of the theory seems to come from shuffling about "dated" tomb groups identified and defined only by the structural nature of the tombs themselves, and surface finds in "rubbish." The interpretation does not inspire much confidence or satisfaction. On the other hand, one does have to balance the rather terse notebook and journal entries with the known experience of the archaeologists. The work of Petrie, Brunton and Engelbach is generally quite respectable, and if they all say that they recognize the remains of a settlement on the long, narrow rise along the edge of the cultivation, we must at this point accept their opinion until new evidence proves it wrong. Thomas, essentially following Petrie's plan, has resolved the whole problem rather neatly, but perhaps not finally, with the following suggested sequence: the tombs were cut in the early 19th Dynasty, outside the town but near to the debris of the 18th Dynasty settlement. Very shortly later, under Ramesses II, the town expanded northwards and covered these slightly earlier tombs. Similar town expansions are known
at Deir el-Medina, although the circumstances, such as the restriction of
space in Thebes, are perhaps not quite the same.

The Eighteenth Dynasty in the North

It would make sense to envision an 18th Dynasty settlement, with perhaps
a proper workmen's village somewhere nearby, and other buildings—
whether houses, temples, storerooms, villas, treasuries, or whatever—
generally clustered around the kôm, and possibly on the bit of high ground
that runs generally to the north or north-east of the kôm and fort. Burials
found by Brunton and Engelbach and dated by them to the earlier part of
Dyn. 18 were found in the spread of "main cemetery" that runs along the
west side of this hill. It is clear that the earlier 18th Dynasty burials are
fully part of the main cemetery area and run along this western slope from
points "S" to "O," clustering (perhaps) most heavily around point "T." But,
this is just the same area of the 18th-19th Dynasty main cemetery that was
excavated by Brunton and Engelbach, and they do not mention house walls
here—in fact, it would be very strange indeed to find them; they would be
quite inappropriate.

Clay coffin burials were also found in this cemetery, although their date
cannot be ascertained easily from the publications. These coffins do
occur in the 18th Dynasty but are more common in the 19th-20th
Dynasties.
So, it would seem that this area on the western slope of the small rise running from “S” to “O” should be the New Kingdom cemetery of the settlement. This would leave the rise free to be the site for the New Kingdom town. The Ramesses II objects found on the surface would not then be disconcerting, as they would represent one of the later phases of the town, and a 19th Dynasty foundation should easily continue into the 20th Dynasty (although the Ramesses VI ring from Tomb 24 may mean that the town had been abandoned by then). Judging from the features shown on Brunton and Engelbach’s plan (1), it would make sense for the town to have been built on the rise north of the fort, “V” and then, possibly, to have extended further out past “V” and across the small wadi to the other hill, point “Y.” This may be borne out by the observation of Brunton and Engelbach that Tomb 48, just on the north slope of hill “V” where the wadi turns towards hill “Y,” seemed to be early Dynasty 18—a scarab of Amenhotep I was found—and was “buried below the town ruins which have been sifted by the sebbâkhin.” The legend on pl. 14 describes it as “small recess cut in side of mound.” However, the alabaster duck found with the scarab of the later-deified king certainly looks much later, perhaps even 19th Dynasty. Scarabs with the name of Amenhotep I were mostly manufactured after his reign, with his posthumous deification.

Brunton and Engelbach do say that the graves in the main cemetery are “small graves,” i.e., all pits. Apparently there were no shafts here, and there must originally have been at least double the number of tombs they found. But, as they specifically say “point Q to point S,” it may well be
that the robbed tombs they did not plan were also on the western slope, leaving the ridge free of everything but the "rubbish." The aerial photograph used by Kemp to make the small map\textsuperscript{323} (the date of the photo is 1947) did not seem to indicate anything of the nature of the shaft graves in the area "V" and "Y," although there did seem to be some in what I would interpret as the wadi between "V" and "Y," i.e. east of "R," and running up to "O" and on towards "P." It is quite possible that the area between "P" and "Q" was never anything but a cemetery. It looks to be quite low here, and the preserved tombs seem to be in the middle of the sherd-spread area. There is also the same mixture of middle and late 18th Dynasty and 19th dynasty (as dated by Brunton and Engelbach) graves here. It is quite likely that a certain amount of the "rubbish" and sherd-spread reported for this entire area connected with the main cemetery simply comes from the hundreds of robbed tombs. Nothing but further examination of the site itself, if anything yet remains there, will help to settle these questions.

So, the northern town may indeed have several phases of use, with houses spreading out over rubbish dumps and earlier tombs, and may possibly have also had early 18th Dynasty houses covered by later 18th Dynasty houses.\textsuperscript{324} Others that seem to be 19th Dynasty could also have been cut into already abandoned, ruinous (18th Dynasty) dwellings.\textsuperscript{325} The problem really is that there is no evidence to date the North Town buildings except the reports of surface Ramesside scarabs. These could well have been thrown out in the process of disturbing a Ramesside cemetery. There is even very little reason to accept that a town was really ever built here,
given the mixture of early 18th Dynasty/Tuthmosis III burials—heavily in the "T"--"R" area—with later 18th and 19th Dynasty burials.

To conclude, the actual field description, made with all impressions and information fresh in mind, may be correct. We should possibly accept Petrie's original interpretation of these tombs as cut through debris (perhaps rubbish dumps). The later description (town spread over pre-existing tombs) may have been made in the light of further knowledge of the site through excavation, but it was also clearly influenced by non-archaeologically based theories in Petrie's reconstruction of the settlement's history. However, the general differentiation that Petrie saw in styles of artifacts, with the South Town seeming to produce 18th Dynasty materials, and the North Town, apparently the source of much later, Ramesside objects, does seem to generally support a division of occupation periods, with a Dynasty 18 palace/harim in the south and a 19th Dynasty village (at most) in the north. The harim, founded perhaps by Tuthmosis III, with supporting facilities close by on the west and north, and the cemeteries near them, and perhaps a workmen’s village in the south, may have been in use, or at least standing in reasonable condition, into the early years of the 19th Dynasty.
CHAPTER V: ENDNOTES

1It is to be hoped that a survey, at least, can be made of the site, to map in whatever ancient evidence still remains. If clearance or even excavation is permitted, it should be attempted, although the massive disturbance of the site since 1888 by sebakh (fertilizer, see below) diggers, tomb robbers, archaeologists, and the Egyptian army have probably left very little soil unturned.

2A man named "Kruger."

3KH, p. 44, Find 3. This find was excavated inside the "temple" or "harim" area, the north enclosure. Although the objects have not been found, the fragmentary nature of the vases and the location inside the enclosure make it possible that this was indeed a "burnt group."

4KH, pp. 44-45, Find 2, from the north town. In Notebook 39B, p. 34, Petrie calls this find "one burial in mid town." It can be identified with Find 2 by means of object descriptions; it is not known if the objects were burnt. Petrie's own first impression was that this was a burial. Tomb N, KH, p. 39, Notebook 39B, p. 23, is said to be a tomb well in a house in the North town. The objects may not be burnt and this may belong with the Tomb 20-25 group (see Thomas, Gurob, p. 23). Petrie, Notebook 39B, p. 35, says that this was in the "south town." In the first season he called the "temple," or northern enclosure the south town, in opposition to the north town, which was outside the enclosure walls. He does not seem to have been aware of the south enclosure until the second season, when this became the "south" town and the northern enclosure became the "main" town. The "Journal," 16-23 March, says: "Several more pieces of Greek pottery have been found; some down in the bottom of the chambers, and so certainly of the age of the town, 1400 B.C."

5"Journal," 16-23 March: "Also 2 necklaces of beads from mummies buried just inside the town wall. 1 is Ramesside and cannot be after II, so this and some shabties of later Ram. style found with a neighbouring mummy date the interments." They would have been found inside the north enclosure, which was the south town in the first season.

6That is, third on his list of dated finds: KH, pp. 44-45; see Appendix 5, Concordance of Burnt Groups and Dated Finds.

7Ibid., 26 Sept. 1889-27 June 1890; IKG, vii.

8Kemp, "Harim," p. 128, suggests plundering at the site between seasons.

9We first meet him in KH, 12: "A new friend has joined the work, Mr. W. O. Hughes-Hughes, who has laboured heartily on the preparation of the collections, and will shortly join me in Egypt."

10IKG, vii, viii, 15.
11Petrie, *70 Years*, 111.

12"Journal." 20 Dec. 1889- 3 Jan. 1890. In *IKG*, p. 16 he says: "Such was the arrangement of one instance which I examined in detail; and such is indicated by the state of the things in other finds, and the accounts given by Mr. Hughes-Hughes and by the native diggers." After their return to England, Hughes-Hughes "vanished," so there are no fieldbooks for his excavations.


14Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 13, agrees with this supposition.


16The question of the missing bones is discussed below, under "Burials."

17They were found in the the tombs excavated in 1888 in the North Village (20-25). For Petrie's collection of hair samples to prove his point cf. Bell, "605." p. 80, fn. 39.

18Perhaps wrongly, but not, however, in this case, even though it is still being cited, e.g. Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, *Faience*, p. 155.


20*Loat, Gurob*, pl. 4.8.

21Ibid., pp. 6-7. No other objects from this deposit are published.

22It is difficult to understand how Loat used the word "town." It seems to have been rather loosely, as a generalized term for the whole southern kôm area. He says *Gurob*, p. 1, that his shrine was "to the W.-N.-W. on the outskirts of the ancient town, and about fifty yards from the large temple discovered by Prof. Petrie...." If Borchardt's placement is correct, the shrine was directly connected to the north enclosure, and this may be Loat's "town." My only suggestion for the fifty meter distance from the temple is that perhaps Loat was measuring from the column bases Petrie had found in the middle of the north enclosure. The distance from the wall to the closest line of columns does seem to be about 50 yards on Brunton and Engelbach's pl. 2.

23*Loat, Gurob*, 1.

24*IKG*, p. vi: "So soon as he [Hughes-Hughes] left the rest of the town and tombs utterly perished at the hands of the plunderers."
25 He was apparently connected with the Preussischer Papyrus-Expedition 1904/5.

26 Ludwig Borchardt, Der Porträtkopf der Königen Teje im Besitz von Dr. James Simon in Berlin, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 18 (Leipzig: 1911), p. 2 and fn. 1, 23 (no. 26) and fn. 1.

27 Ibid., p. 1.

28 I have preferred to use the spelling "harim." This not only better approximates the classical Arabic word, but also calls attention to the differences between the non-western institution that it designates and the "harem" in modern English, with its vulgar connotations.

29 This is the Arabic term, very commonly used in Egyptological archaeological literature, for the local farmers who dig into ancient sites searching for sebakh, or "fertilizer," the organic remains, disintegrating alluvial-mud bricks, etc., which could be used to enrich their fields. Their work has accomplished the destruction and even the eradication of innumerable sites.

30 Borchardt, Teye, p. 3.

31 Whether or not Borchardt was correct in associating his pits with those of Petrie cannot be very well assessed, especially as Petrie described only one of at least nine groups, the others of which may have had a great variety of unobserved features that were like Borchardt's. Certainly, Borchardt seems to have felt assured by the local workmen that his pits were typical of the site, and always mixed objects with burnt materials. If Petrie's description is taken as only an approximation, as I have suggested above, Borchardt's pits would seem to share important features with Petrie's: formed shape (i.e., rectangular, not just rounded rubbish holes), burnt materials, and small collectibles.

32 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 3.

33 Cf. M. Gitton, review of A. Thomas, Gurob in Bib. Or. 40 (1983), cols. 357-59; Hall also made a similar observation in 1901, Oldest, p. 171: "We have no reason to suppose either that the people in whose graves Mycenaean vases were found at Gurob were not Egyptians, or that the vases in question were brought to them by anybody except Phoenician traders." Also cf. C. B. Mee, "Aegean Trade and Settlement in Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C.," Anatolian Studies 28 (1978), pp. 121-56.

34 Thomas, Gurob, 6, concludes: "Thus the finds of Cypriote and Mycenaean pottery do not necessarily indicate the presence of a large foreign population at Gurob. Even so, it must be regarded as a distinct possibility that Asiatic slaves, women, and perhaps some foreigners holding official posts, were resident here during the Eighteenth Dynasty." The evidence for these peoples, mostly Dyn. 19, is based on epigraphic materials, not pottery types.
Cf. Thomas, *Gurob*, 6. Petrie took the skull and hair back to London: UC 30139 and 30137–38; not listed in Thomas, *Gurob*. For other mummies with blond hair cf. Donald P. Ryan, "Who is buried in KV 60?" *EMT* 11 (1990), p. 58: "strands of reddish-blonde hair lay on the floor beneath the bald head." It is thought that this mummy should be Dyn. 18 in date, possibly related to royalty, or even Hatshepsut herself (pp. 58–9).

*KGH*, p. 39, for the mummies found in Tombs 23 and 24.

P. Betancourt has kindly suggested that Petrie was most likely basing his opinions on Homer.


It should be noted that evidence of ritual cremation of objects, accompanied by human sacrifice, has now been found on Crete. David Keys, "Homerian line in human sacrifice found," *The Independent*, December 15, 1990, pg. 3, reports on excavations by the University of Crete, directed by Prof. Nicholas Stamplidis, in Eleftherna, Crete, on Mount Ida. The excavators found more than twenty funerary pyres, dating from the 11th to mid-6th centuries B.C. One included a bound human body whose throat had been cut and head severed sacrificially in a ceremony that may have been much as described in *The Iliad*. This seems to have consisted of bringing the sacrificial water in jar, which was used to wet the whetstone, which was used to sharpen the sacrificial knife of iron. These objects were found near the body, along with the remains of bulls, sheep, goats, pots, perfume jars, and grapes. These had been carbonized by the fire, which was estimated to have reached 900°C.

Desborough, *LMTs*, 71; Lorimer, *Homer*, 107; Snodgrass, *Dark Ages*, 323–7; Iakovidès, *Peratí* II, 424, III, 424. However, several Mycenaean tholos tombs are said to have had strata of ash and animal, especially cattle, bones: C. R. Long, *The Ayia Triada Sarco phagus*, SIMA, 41 (Goteborg: 1974), pp. 47, 52 n. 40. Also see Mee, *Rhodes*, pp. 8–9: the burnt bones of Ialysos NT 19 are probably not as early as LH III A1, but could have resulted from "fumigation" or LH III C uses. The concept is said to have come from Anatolia, and the earliest cremation on Rhodes is dated LH III B (90, at Mysgebi). At Alalakh Mycenaean pottery (III B) and a scarab of Amenhotep III was found in cremation graves set just below the floors of houses: P. Bienkowski, "Some Remarks on

In connection with the discussion of the "foreign" practice of cremation, it is interesting to note the following: L. G. Herr, "The Amman Airport Structure and the Geopolitics of Ancient Transjordan," *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 (1983), pp. 224-28, excavated a structure at the Amman airport containing some Mycenaean pottery and other artifacts, and "thousands" of minute, burnt, human bone fragments. He suggests that the structure was a mortuary for cremations practiced by some non-Semitic people, perhaps Hittites. The condition of the bones is presumably the result of the intense fire. The absence of bones at Gurob again points out the improbability of cremations burials there, although if the bones were small enough they may not have been noticed. The absence of bodies was one feature, however, about which Petrie was adamant.

40 It has been suggested that fire was used for fumigation in multi-burial Mycenaean tombs: Wace, *Chamber Tombs*, 141; George E. Mylonas, *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*, (Princeton: 1965), pp. 129-30; Lorimer, *Homer*, 108; Berit Wells, "Death at Dendara," in Hagg and Nordquist, *Celebrations*, pp. 136-38: "the role of fires and burning in the Mycenaean tombs has been exaggerated."


42 *JEG*, pl. 18.13 (Ramesses II A group) seems to have survived intact (Nolte, *Glas*, pl. 18.25), as perhaps also pl. 18.17, from the same group (cf. Nolte, *Glas*, pl. 16.5). Other glass items from the groups may also be mostly unbroken, although burnt. Some of the Mycenaean stirrup jars from the Amenhotep III and Burnt Group 3 are burnt but complete, or nearly so. Many other types of objects are still in good condition, such as the bronzes, penannular rings, etc.

43 See Henry Fischer, review of Ali Hassan, *Stocke und Stabe im Pharaonischen Agypten*, in *JEA* 64 (1978) 160, for wooden staves ritually broken with dummy repairs. He says: "...a perceptive observation of the author [Hassan] regarding the staves of *Sothy*-st, some of which are spliced together from as many as five pieces of wood. He points out (p. 83) that such staves could not have had much strength, and seems to imply that they belong to those cases where staves were deliberately broken and repaired. Since they are dummy staves, not intended for actual use, the jointing need not be explained in this manner, but there is some further evidence that suggests that such an explanation is correct. The actual breaking of staves is discussed at some length on pp. 122-7, without, however, taking into account the widespread distribution of this practice on other cultures." Fischer cites in a footnote his own work: "Notes on Sticks and Staves in Ancient Egypt," *MMA Journal* 12 (1978), § 10, "A Dummy Repair," pp. 25-27, where he describes a group of staves with non-functional, dummy pegs. "...these joints are not functional, but are rather to be considered as an elaboration of the ritual breaking of staves and bows for burial...."

Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, *Faience*, p. 155, has too uncritically accepted Petrie’s theories. In discussing the effect on faience color when tomb contents were burnt, he says “Evidence of such fires has been found in tombs of various periods. In some instances the firing of certain mortuary goods was a part of some burial ritual, as in the case of Petrie’s ‘Burnt Deposit of Tutankhamon’ at Medinet Ghurab.” I have already suggested (Chapter 6, Conclusions) that the Gurob burnings could be related to tomb robberies, which is certainly the explanation for many occurrences of burning in Theban tombs. Also see P. Brissaud, “La céramique égyptienne du règne d’Amenophis II à la fin de l’époque ramesseide,” *BdE* 81 (1979), pp. 30-1. On analogy with Soleb T. 31, where vases were found buried beside a tomb shaft, supposedly indicating a funerary banquet with ritual breaking of the vessels, Brissaud suggests that intramural “dépots tous incinérés, et contenant presque tous plusieurs types de vases identiques, et un objet inscrit au nom d’un pharaon, indique sans double un pratique rituelle précise.” Brissaud may have been misled by Petrie’s illustrations, which publish only a fraction of the material actually said to be from these deposits, much of which would seem to have limited use at a funerary banquet (e.g., kohl tubes, furniture, razors, tweezers, etc.). There is a serious doubt as to whether or not there actually were any such “funerary banquet.” The theory seems to rest heavily on interpretations of Theban tombs with banqueting scenes. In a survey of almost all of these, I have found that they always, with possibly one or two exceptions (which are not funerary occasions, but connected with the bestowal of the “Gold of Honor”), are part of the “Festival of the Valley” rituals. They would then be an annual festival meal taken at the tomb as part of an ancestor cult, not part of the funeral ceremonies. The materials from Tutankhamun’s so-called funerary banquet (H. Winlock, *Materials Used at the Embalming of King Tut-‘Ankh-Amen*), are really ritual vessels, not tableware (personal correspondence from Dr. Dorothea Arnold), but do seem to have been purposefully smashed. For further discussion of pot-breaking rituals see Bell, “Polychrome,” pp. 56, 72 fns. 112-14, with references.


The 18th Dynasty example is Inen-tresha, a man with a non-Egyptian name, who was found buried in Egyptian manner in Tomb 21 (see below, Chapters 6, 7). Cf. also Thomas, *Gurob*, pp. 5-6.

I have noted modern bread ovens inside Ramesside tombs at Dira Abu el-Naga, Thebes, one placed less than five feet from the ceiling with only a crack in the rock roof from which smoke could escape. So, it is just barely possible that the intramural cremations could actually have happened.

This is not to impute fault to the excavators. Archaeology everywhere at this time was in its infancy.
4970 Years, 101: "All over the enclosed town were buried in the floors of houses groups of personal objects, toilet, and clothes, burnt in a pit and covered with a layer of sherds before being earthed over." Also IKG, p. 16; Ten Years, p. 132.

50Linen sleeves are known from Gurob, but they are not from the Burnt Groups: Hall, "Sleeves," pp. 29-39, from Tomb 25; Jac. J. Janssen and Rosalind Hall, "(htri' n) iši = 'pair of sleeves'" GM 45 (1981), pp. 21-26; there are other pairs in the Manchester collection, apparently found in 1889 but never published. Thomas, Gurob, 10, 11 with fns. 111, 112, 40 nos. 101-105, 87 no. 760 (sleeves) lists several bits of fabric from the University College London collection but none are known to be from Burnt Groups. Cat. no. 104 may be from "mummy bandage rather than garments," which might make it appropriate to the Burnt Groups.

51Thomas, Gurob, pp. 11, 40 no. 104. Many of the mummies found by all the excavators had some wrappings preserved.

52Other objects are only marked by fire, rather than deformed, shattered or consumed. David O'Connor has kindly suggested that this could also show that the materials were not burnt in the pit, but elsewhere.

53Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 16 Tomb 480, pl. 17 Tombs 488, 483, 480A; Thomas, Gurob, p. 21. Also CoD 1, p. 17, House K.31.1: in the west jamb of the entrance door at floor level was a pot with an infant burial. The excavators say that it was contemporary with the building and suggest it is a foundation deposit. The pottery register lists LXXXVI/264 (also pl. 54) for this pot, which looks to be much later, possibly Dyn. 21/22 or even Roman, which might make it an intrusive burial. Other objects were the bones, with a few blue-glass beads, and one black and white "paste" bead.

54Brunton and Engelbach. Gurob, pl. 17. Tombs 441, 461.

55See the example in Eliezer Oren, The North Cemetery Beth Shan, fig. 63.2.

56Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 18 type E, Tombs 13, 16, 17, 29, 30, 42, 65, 242, 243, 255, 275, 449, 605; Loat, Gurob, p. 2; Thomas, Gurob, pp. 20-1; KGH, p. 39, Tomb 31, which was intrusive in the South Town.

57As David O'Connor points out, however, one must be aware of the dimensions of the pit that Petrie observed. It would have been much too small to contain an intact clay-coffin burial.

58Cf. Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 18. At Deir el-Balah (Dothan, Deir-el-Balah), p. 5), Tomb 114 contained a clay coffin with multiple bodies which was placed in a shallow pit, then covered with a layer of sand. On this were placed some pottery vessels with a larger storage jar marking the head. More earth was then added. Other burials, some without coffins, were roughly cut into the site, some cuts lined with
rough stone, and then filled in with sand: Trude Dothan, "Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery near Deir el-Balah (Preliminary Report II)," IEJ 22 (1972), pp. 65, 68. These burials could also suggest the original state of Petrie's pits.

59Borchardt, Teje, p. 3.

60Sebakh is the disintegrated (alluvial) mud brick and other organic materials found in ancient Egyptian sites and dug out by local farmers (sebakh in) to use as fertilizer for their fields.

61Ibid., pp. 2-3. For intrusive burials being situated near or under walls, see discussion below.

62David O'Connor points out that this explanation does not fit well with the description of the pit contents. It might, however, explain the phenomena that Borchardt observed.

63Ibid., p. 4. Also note A. Åkerstrom, "Mycenaean Problems," Op. Ath. 12 (1978), p. 40: decayed wood from the shaft graves at Mycenae was originally thought have been burnt, from its appearance. However, this is probably does not explanation the Gurob phenomenon, as great masses of ashes were also described.

64Borchardt, Teje, p. 4 n. 2; Christopher Hulin, "The Archaeology of the Amarna Plain," Papers for Discussion (1981-2), 1, edited by Sarah Israelit Groll (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1982) p. 221: "The poorer people kept grain in pits in the ground, lined with ashes to keep out insects and worms." It was also thought that ashes from burnt halfa grass had been used as a preservative for fish buried in Lot's fish cemetery: Lot, Gurob, p. 4; also Thomas, Gurob, p. 9. Note that Pendlebury, "1930-1," p. 233, found that the owner of a "slum" house "actually disinfected an old rubbish pit in his grounds, by burning, and then built a corn bin on top of it." For a description of one "cellarette," the "usual rectangular underground compartment for storing food or wine about three meters by one, entered through a low doorway from a small square shaft," except with a vaulted roof in this case, see Pendlebury, "1930-1," pp. 243-44.

65Borchardt, Teje, p. 4. Any archaeologist can produce innumerable examples of such destruction, both ancient and modern, of objects valued more for their materials than for their workmanship. An appreciation for art for its own sake and art collecting is not only modern, but has come upon us by degrees: the few odd bits of ancient materials now recoverable from the often-robbed Egyptian tombs, such as broken bits of sculpture, cartonnage, small faïences, etc. are only still there to find because they were rejected as not valuable by earlier generations of archaeologists or thieves.

E.g., from the Tutankhamun Group: BM 66871, 66876, 66875, a stone flask, bowl and fish-dish. When objects are broken, they are normally cleared up—it has been observed that sharp potsherds, etc. hurt bare feet. So, one does not expect to find whole vessels in settlement sites that have been broken during the occupation: the pieces have been swept up and thrown away. This also would seem to produce a certain scatter of the pieces.

Griffith, Manchester, pp. 64, 76.

E.g., Griffith, Manchester, p. 64, for the Ramesses II (earlier) Group lists the travertine pilgrim flask of IKG, pl. 18.21, and two more like it. For the Amenhotep III Group Petrie, Methods, pp. 145–6, states that he found five Mycenaean stirrup jars, but he illustrated only one in IKG, pl. 17.3 (BM A 984).

Thomas, Gurob, p. 14, notes that the toilette articles, jewellery, would have been useful in a harim. Amarna has produced nothing like the Gurob deposits.

Aström, "Ayios Iakovos," p. 223 n. 1. For a rubbish pit "disinfected" by burning, see Pendlebury, "1930-1," pp. 233. David O'Connor suggests that the dimensions of the one pit, as given by Petrie, best fit a interpretation as a robber's cache or rubbish pit. Clearly one has to decide which has the most importance, the size of Petrie's one pit, or the contents of the Burnt Groups. If size is paramount, then rubbish pits or caches would be good candidates. However, if contents are pre-eminent, then neither of these works very well: the objects are too valuable to be rubbish, and the pits are too ubiquitous to be caches.

Cf. also Thomas, Gurob, p. 13.

Although the field notes list "rat" bones, this must be a mistake. Keith DeVries kindly informs me that rats did not reach the Mediterranean world until the Middle Ages.


Ibid., pp. 13-14. Note, that although Thomas' study was not published until 1982, after Kemp's 1978 identification of the harim, she was apparently not able to consider his arguments in detail as her manuscript (although "revised for publication") was written between 1972 and 1974 (ibid., p. v).


Kemp, "Harim," p. 128. It is difficult to reconcile this statement with his remarks in Kemp and Merrerlees, Minoan, p. 56, in which the authors suggest that there was a Hyksos occupation on the site, and probably in the kôm area. If both arguments are to be maintained, the Hyksos would have to be seen as the real founders of the palace/harim/temple, and Tuthmosis III only a renovator.
Such a procedure can be seen at Deir el-Medina and Amarna, where the towns expand over their own earlier rubbish pits.

See Appendix 6 for Peter Lacovara's section which shows the "palace" occupation lying on clean "gebel sand."


Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 25, fn. 47.

Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 3.

Oren, *Beth Shan*, pp. 131-2. 143 implies a similar conclusion.

As David O'Connor points out, the explanation of the groups as burials is impossible if one accepts Petrie's description of the pit size. However, I consider it little more than an approximation; see below.

An idea of the scale of the burnt deposits can be gained from those (some partial) registered in the Ashmolean Museum.

Amenhotep III Group: thirty catalogue entries, including three of the five stirrup jars known from the context.

Seti II Group: about seventy-three items, including at least twelve Egyptian vases.

Group 2: twelve objects, mostly Egyptian vases, but including a clay head rest, and a travertine duck dish.

Group 3: twenty-seven entries, with a bronze mirror, needles and knives, at least two Mycenaean stirrup jars, a sycamore fig, and bits of electrum, including a bead. The flat-shouldered stirrup jar in University College, London, attributed to the Tutankhamun Group may actually come from here.

Group 4 (Ramesses II B): at least fifty-eight objects, including Simple Style vessels, a wooden statuette, bronze mirror, bowl, bucket, tweezers, knife, kohl sticks, razor and awls.

For intact, or nearly so tombs, cf:

1. Gurob, Émile Chassinat, "Un Tombe inviolée de la XVIIIe Dynastie découverte aux environs de Médinet el-Gorab dans le Fayoum," *BIFAO* 1 (1901), pp. 225-34: a collection of objects all said to be from the same tomb group and dated to late Dyn. 18 by the cartouches of Amenhotep III, Tiy and Amenhotep IV. See Hayes, *Scepter*, II, p. 266 & fig. 161; Cyril Aldred, *New Kingdom Art in Ancient Egypt During the 18th Dynasty, 1570-1320 B.C.* (London: 1961), pp. 91, 168, 169, Acc. No. 47.120.3; Vandier d'Abbadie, *Toilette*, pp. 29-30 (no. 67), 46 (no. 122), 48 (no. 125), 47 (no. 126), 64 (nos. 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211), 130-1 (no. 566), 152-3 (nos. 661, 662, 666), 171 (no. 756). Included were wooden figures, boxes, and pins, reed kohl containers, a stone vase and wooden gazelle-spoon. Chassinat, ibid., p. 227, was told that "La trouvaille fut fait, paraît-il,
dans les environs de Médinet el-Gorab, où les paysans mirent au jour un puits inviolé, dont la chambre funéraire leur fournit le riche butin..."

2. Hawaret El-Gurob (PM IV, p. 115: in the "vicinity" of Medinet Gurob), late Dyn. 18 tomb; M. J. E. Quibell, "A Tomb at Hawaret El Gurob." ASAE 2 (1901), pp. 141-3. This group included a stone, glass, faience, wood and pottery vessels; toilette articles (bronze razor and "spatula," reed kohl tubes, mirror, comb, hairpins); ornaments (earrings); a head-rest; wood shabti; and a wood figurine. The kohl jar had the names of Amenhotep III and Queen Tiy. Nolte, Glas, pp. 68, 102, pl. 12.1, puts the unbroken glass amorphosiskos in her Amenhotep III-Akhenaten group.


4. Gurob, Tomb 217: Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 12 and pl. 25. The "tomb" group had no body, but consisted only of a toilette basket, which contained a faience stirrup jar and other simple items.

5. Gurob, Tomb 605: Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 15, pls. 18, 19; Bourriau, p. 77; Bell, "605," pp. 61-86. Dated to Ramesses II (possibly early), this group contained a LH III B vase, wooden staff, boxes, beads, amulets, shabtis, dôm fruit, painted pottery and pottery wine amphorae.

6. Sedment, Group 419; Petrie and Brunton, Sedment, II, p. 25. Thought to be dated to Amenhotep III, this group had a wooden chair part and pottery vases.

7. Thebes, Mond tombs; L. Collins, "The Private Tombs of Thebes: Excavations by Sir Robert Mond 1905 and 1906," JEA 62 (1976), pp. 18-40, especially pp. 36-9. Mond excavated several undisturbed tombs at Thebes in 1905/6. Pit no. 1 contained shabti boxes, a scarab of Amenhotep II, a linen bag with incense, a number of pairs of sandals (including leather ones), furniture parts, baskets, canopic jars, faience bottle, food and tool parts. No. 43 (Neferronpet), a pit, had a seal of Tuthmosis III, a bed, a footstool and sandals. A number of other undisturbed tombs also contained similar goods.

8. Thebes, Davies' excavations: N. de G. Davies, "The Egyptian Expedition 1915-16," BMMA supplement (May 1917), pp. 18-9. Davies excavated many burials of rather poor people of Dynasties 12 to 18. Goods usually included toilette articles, such as kohl jars, mirror, razors/tweezers, pumice stone, an objects of personal adornment. One early 18th Dyn. burial had ivory combs, stone and glass jars, and a hair pin.


11. Thebes, Ramose and Hatnufer: A. Lansing and W. C. Hayes, "The Egyptian Expedition 1935-36," BMMA 32, no. 1, Section II (1937), pp. 27-30. Dated to Tuthmosis III, yr. 7, this tomb contained a basket with a 50-foot long linen sheet, silver wine set, faience necklace, and unguent jars. Another burial found in this same season (ibid., p. 8) had a toilet box holding nuts, roots, rock salt, faience persea fruit, and pieces of
The tomb belonged to a woman. Lansing and Hayes expected "well-to-do" Dyn. 18 ladies to be buried with their mirrors, kohl jar, toilet box or dish, and a faience bowl (ibid., 28).

12. Thebes (Deir el-Medina), Tomb of Sennefer, Dyn. 18, post-Amarna period: Bruyère "1928," pp. 51 ff; Niwinski, in LdA, cols. 437-41. Inside the tomb was an untouched coffin which contained the body and other items: bronze and copper toilette articles, toilette box, leather sandals, two stone unguent vases, beads, shabtis, a head-rest, etc. The tomb also contained an offering table. Another intact group of burials was found in Tomb 1159: Bruyère, "1928," pp. 40-73.

See now also Stuart Tyson Smith, "Intact Tombs of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Dynasties from Thebes and the New Kingdom Burial System," in MDAIK, forthcoming.

86 L. M. J. Zonhoven, "The Inscription of a tomb at Deir el-Medina (O. Wien AEG.1)," JEA (1979), pp. 89-98.

87 Tomb 473, Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 15, pls. 17, 27, was a large Ramesside tomb built with re-used Tuthmosis III blocks and burnt at some time in its history. It contained only fragments of the original tomb goods, some burnt, including a Mycenaean sherd and stone vases. Also see the above discussion of Gurob Tombs 23, 217, and 605. Other disturbed Gurob burials exhibit a similarity of content, e.g., Tomb 474, with Mycenaean pottery (ibid., p. 15, pls. 17, 28).


89 Oren, Beth Shan, p. 143.

90 Dothan, Deir el-Balah, p. 10.

91 Again David O'Conner points out that Petrie's pit would have been too small: I disagree on the accuracy of Petrie's observation, and on extending it to all the pits his workmen found.

92 IKG, p. 16.

93 Cf. Loat, Gurob, pl. 7.3. David O'Conner points out that with the preservation of wood and cloth in the groups, one would also expect parts of the bodies to remain. It cannot be emphasized strongly that my suggestion of the Gurob burnt-groups as burials is only that, a suggestion. It seemed to be the most reasonable alternative that suggested itself, but that does not necessarily make it correct.

94 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 13.

95 Ibid., p. 9.

96 Ibid., p. 14.
97Ibid., p. 13.


102Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 2: main cemetery (points Q-S) had no shafts, and all were small graves; pls. 14-18 have reed or mat-wrapped burials, without brick superstructures/coverings in the main cemetery (points P, O, R, Z, T, S), closer to the kôm (point B), and south of the kôm (G, H, D). Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 20, says the main cemetery had oval or rectangular pits in different sizes, 12" - 100" deep, for infants to adults; p. 21, point G had simple pit burials.

103IKG, p. 16.


106COA III, p. 115. This area had previously been thought to be free of such burials.


112There were intrusive Dyn. 18 burials in the M.K. town of Kahun: IKG, 15.
113 At Gurob Tomb 31 may possibly have been under a brick wall in the South Town: Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 23; *KGH*, 39, 40. As this was the first season, it must have been within the southern enclosure. Loat’s temple had an intrusive Ptolemaic burial in the wall: Loat, *Gurob*, p. 2 and pl. 14.


115 David O’Connor notes that the dimensions of the one pit Petrie observed do not fit the dimensions of cellars.

116 *KGH*, p. 21. The so-called “Maket Tomb” was one of these, although that has been dated to the earlier part of Dyn. 18.


118 David O’Connor suggests that the dimensions of the one pit, as given by Petrie, best fit an interpretation as a robber’s cache or rubbish pit.


120 *KGH*, pp. 42-3.


124 *IKG*, p. 16.

125 Ibid. I take this as being two feet square, with a depth of one foot. It would clearly be too small for the burial of an adult. But, it is also almost certainly too small for the really large burnt groups, such as those now in the Ashmolean.

126 Borchhardt, *Teje*, p. 3.

127 Note that Barry J. Kemp, in a recent work, *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization* (New York: Routledge, 1989), p. 222, states that the harim on the site of Medinet Gurob was founded by Thutmose III and used through the Amarna Period. M. Gitton, in his review of Thomas, *Gurob*, col. 357, also suggested that the harim was destroyed at the end of the 18th Dynasty.

128 Also see Thomas, *Gurob*, pp. 6-7.
"Doubtless some dwellings also existed here for the workmen [on the temple, i.e. he seems to think that Gurob was like Kahun, a special-function town, like a pyramid town, and not a real urban center], and a town had sprung up, but there is little evidence of that; and--common as the scarabs of Tahutmes III usually are--only six have been found in this locality, no disproportionate number to the length of his reign. The early town lay probably outside of the temple enclosure, away on the north continuation of the desert edge; as, about a quarter of a mile to the north, we found a bronze jar (XVIII, 26) and two scarabs (XXIII, 7, 8), one of which is of Amenhotep II."

"A difference was noticeable, moreover, between those found in the town founded over the temple ruins, and those in the external town to the north. From all the data I should conclude that the north town was founded when the temple was built, as a scarab from Amenhotep II was found there. Then the site of the temple became inhabited after its ruin, and objects of the Khuenaten time were the most usual there. The north town was partly deserted, and burials took place close to it, the tombs of Anen-tursha, Sadiamia, Res and the others [Tombs 20-25] being in that sand ridge. Early in the time of Ramessu apparently the town over the temple site was left, and the north town extended over the graves, as rings of Ramessu II are common there, and a great quantity of yellow glass beads which are unknown in the temple site, and therefore subsequent; moreover, a burial just within the wall of the temple site had a string of yellow glass beads, and this must have been when that part of the town was uninhabited....We will therefore notice the beads in two divisions, those of the 2 end of the XVIIIth and those of the beginning of the XIXth dynasty."

"they [Tombs 20-25] cannot be later than the houses, as the sand filling of them was clean and not mixed with earth, and as the houses were probably of the time of Ramessu II, there is no period for the tombs subsequently."

"...the later--north-- town, which we have seen is more likely to be of the time of Ramessu II, contained but little of the buff [pottery]." He seems to mean Mycenaean pottery by this.

Kemp, "Harim," p. 128, is also puzzled by their description as irregular, especially as Borchardt’s plant (Teye, p. 3, fig. 2) shows them as neatly grided. Kemp cannot really explain it. We may be placing too much emphasis on the supposed accuracy of Borchardt’s plant, which he did not claim for himself, and was only worked out by "large steps." Loat’s plan of his shrine, which looks quite reasonable, and so simple that it would be hard to get it too wrong, is placed on Borchardt’s map, the exterior proportions simply cannot be made to fit, and the inner walls are quite different. We may expect that there may be a similar distortion of the palace plan.

Kemp, pp. 32-3.

Ibid., p. 33. They had no regular order, no granaries, colored dados, stairs to the roof, or furniture. For granaries, see Thomas, Gurob, p. 25, fn. 124.

The discovery of two stelai in the first season may indicate some work in the are of Loat’s temple, see discussion below, Chapter 6.

Kemp, p. 32, pl. 22.1; IKG, p. 20, pl. 24.3; Notebook 39B, p. 21.

135 *ZAS*, pp. 128–9. "On Borchardt’s plan the column bases taken on a different significance...they are placed in a relationship to the walls such as makes them appear parts of small columned halls of the type familiar from upper-class houses of the New Kingdom...His plan...makes the internal walls appear...[as] an integral part of the large enclosures...Enclosure B (i.e., the northern enclosure) is evidently the central building of the whole complex, and the only one from which column bases have been reported. As noted above, some of the internal walls in the western part belong to an independent building with its own wall separated from the main one by a corridor...In some respects a comparison can be made with the ‘Palace of the King’ at Malkata...Immediately adjacent is the very slightly shorter enclosure C (the southern enclosure). No column bases have...been reported from here, so suggesting a group of service buildings for block B."

136 *KGH*, pp. 39, 40.

137 Ibid., p. 42.

138 Ibid., p. 43.


140 *KGH*, p. 32.

141 Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 2.

142 Borchardt, *Teje*, p. 3.

143 *IKG*, p. 16.

144 "Journal," 28 April–4 May, 1889; Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pp. 1, 2. Brunton and Engelbach say that sebbâkh in is exposed new traces of town walls. Hughes-Hughes may well have dug pits to find the column bases.

145 *IKG*, p. 16. Petrie says the columns marked on the plan are those he found in the first season, so we may suspect that Hughes-Hughes did little work, if any, in this area.

146 *KGH*, p. 33. This is the condition in which he implies it was left, undisturbed, from antiquity.

147 *IKG*, p. 15.

148 Petrie, *Ten Years*, p. 128: "The general arrangement of it was a large walled enclosure, within which were two other enclosures side by side, one containing the temple, the other a small town." Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 7 thinks that the south town, and
also possibly the north town, were originally "enclosed." She says that the southern enclosure had two gateways and streets.

149 *IKG*, p. 16: but there were not even stone chips left on the site. This is surely a good argument that little stone was used and that it was essentially a mud brick building.

150 *Ibid.*. No Egyptologist would consider using this historical interpretation today. Unfortunately, Petrie’s success in establishing Gurob as a chronological tool has resulted in its use by scholars in other fields. However, it was somewhat shocking to find the destruction of the site dated to “year 5 of Merneptah,” in a recent study: Bryant G. Wood, “Egyptian Amphorae of the New Kingdom and Ramesside Periods,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 50, no. 2 (June, 1987), p. 81, no. 11, dating the amphora shown on p. 80, “Gurob town site. From the fifth year of Merneptah (1232 B.C.E.). Dated by historical circumstances.”

151 *Petrie, Ten Years*, pp. 128-29.

152 *IKG*, p. 16. Strangely enough, he never identified which group he saw, or localized it. It may be that it was one of the groups either without any Mycenaean pottery or without any royal names.

153 E. g., see Petrie’s 1888 house find, which could well have been an unrecognized Burnt Group. It was found in a house built over the destroyed temple: *KGH*, p. 45.

154 It all depends on the use of the word “town.” In later years Petrie has simplified matters (in a popular book), and described the site simply as “a large walled enclosure, within which were two other enclosures side by side, on containing the temple, the other a small town. The temple had been founded by Tahutmes III, and had lasted through Khuennaten’s changes only to be destroyed soon after, probably by Ramessu II, when he carried away the temples of Illahun. That the town was ruined early in the reign of Merneptah is indicated by the sudden end of the previous abundance of scarabs and rings with the king’s names at this point; of later times only one or two objects of Ramessu III have been found.” *Ten Years*, pp. 128-29. However, he definitely considered the temple area a town, at least in 1888-90.

155 *IKG*, pl. 24, nos. 3, 7. See discussion below, Chapter 6.

156 Thomas, *Gurob*, nos. 238, 241, 244, 245, pp. 48-49, pls. 11, 46.

157 Borchardt, *Teje*, p. 3 and fig. 2.

158 The Arabic word for the raised road-way or dyke that runs up to the site from the cultivation (see Chapter 1: Introduction).

159 *Ibid.*, p. 3 and fig. 2.
160Ibid., p. 2: "Endlich haben seit mehreren Jahren die Sabbathin...mit Erlaubnis des Service...ein sehr grosses Stuck der Stadtruine, namentlich das grosse Gebaude und die Teile ostlich davon durchwuhlt."

161IKG, p. 16.


163Cf. Labib Habachi, "Unknown or Little-known Monuments of Tutankhamun and of his Viziers," in J. Ruffle, G.A. Gaballa, K. A. Kitchen, editors, Glimpses of Ancient Egypt (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1979), pp. 32, 41 fn. 7. He feels that the masses of small objects bearing the names of Akhenaten and his family were suitable for a palace, and that they probably had one here. One could also interpret the remains as being a temple with a palace beside it in the southern enclosure, such as one sees at Medinet Habu, Abydos, and elsewhere.

164Kemp, "Harim," p. 129.

165See discussion below.

166Cf. Thomas, p. 17, and fn. 147, who lists Borchardt, Teje, p. 20; G. Roeder, "Thronfolger und König Smenkh-Ka-Re (Dynastie XVIII)," ZAS 83 (1958), p. 66.

167E.g., the objects listed by Borchardt, Teje, pp. 14-23.

168KGH, p. 33; IKG, p. 16; ZAS, p. 27.

169IKG, p. 16.

170Ibid., p. 20, p. 22.32, 33.

171Petrie, Daily Use, 68, no. 111, not illustrated. Thomas cites this reference, with the "111" incorrectly indicated as "III." Cf. also idem., Gurob, p. 35, pl. 42, no. 51 - UC 7962.

172Translation courtesy of Lanny Bell.

173IKG, pl. 23.59.

174Petrie, Scarabs, pl. 45, no. 20.1.17. Note the broken upper left corner; on p. xiv Petrie reads User-Maat, Mer-Amen; Ramses Heq An.

175IKG, p. 23.16; Petrie, Scarabs, IV.18.9.119; Thomas, Gurob, p. 59 and pl. 14, no. 387 = UC 12372. Both Thomas and Petrie incorrectly attribute this to Amenhotep III, reading Nb-m3(2)Rc hks nfr. This correction courtesy of Lanny Bell.
See discussion below.


Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 23; Bell, "605,"97, pp. 64-5.


*KGH*, p. 33.

Thomas, *Gurob*, pp. 11, 60, and pl. 16, no. 399 = UC 23807, of red feldspar.

Ibid., pp. 4-5, 90, 74 and pl. 29, no. 596 = Ramesses IV; 74 and pl. 29, no. 597 = Ramesses V.

Ibid., p. 59 and pl. 14, no. 387 = UC 12372.

E.g. ibid., p. 90. All 19th Dyn. materials are only scarabs, rings, plaques, and the like. Borchardt, *Teje*, passim. All the more monumental objects are Dyn. 18, cf. *IKG*, pl. 24, except for the stelai in Loat’s temple. Also see Habachi, "Unknown," pp. 32, 41 fn. 7.

E.g., see Borchardt, *Teje*, passim.; *IKG*, pl. 24, nos. 7, 8, 10, 12; Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 37, pl. 5, no. 71; ibid. p. 50, pl. 47, no. 254; Labib Habachi, "Varia from the Reign of King Akhenaten," *MDAIK* 20 (1965), pp. 79-84; an ivory kohl tube of Amenhotep III and daughter: *IKG*, p. 35 and Notebook 39B, p. 79. The talatat block, *IKG*, pl. 24.10 looks out of place here and may well have been brought from elsewhere, such as Amarna, in a secondary usage. However it has been suggested that this, and a granite block from the ruins of a Roman house in Ehnasya, have both originated on the kóm: Mohammed Gamal el-Din Mokhtar, "Ehnasya el-Medina," *BdE* 40 (1983), p. 79.


Cartouches from the first season: *KGH*, pl. 23.15-19, of Akhenaten: one a silver ring found in a house with Amenhotep III-IV name; no. 19 (inlay pendant) = Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 65, no. 464; nos. 22-25 = Tutankhamun; 26 = Ankhjesenamen; no. 27 = Ay; nos. 28-31 = Horemheb; nos. 32-33 = Ramesses I; nos. 34-36 = Seti I; no. 20 = Nefertari (*temp.* Ramesses II). The "Amenhotep III" ring found in a house over the temple reads *Nbt-mt-Rc mry Pth: KGH*, 33, pl. 23.10; Thomas *Gurob*, p. 59, pl. 16, no. 385. The silver ring is unreadable: Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 59-60, pl. 14, no. 388.

Petrie’s chart, *KGH*, pl. 24, shows the following numbers of cartouches: Tuthmosis III = 6, Amenhotep II = 1, Amenhotep III = 6, Akhenaten = 5, Semenkhkare = 1, Tutankhamun = 5, Horemheb = 5, Ay = 1, Ramesses I = 2, Seti I = 3, Ramesses II = 27, Merneptah = 1, Seti II = 1.
Scarabs from the second season: *IKG*, pl. 23 (as published): nos. 1-10, 63 = Tuthmosis III (some obviously posthumous); 11-12 = Amenhotep II, 13-15, 17-21 = Amenhotep III; 22 = "Nefertari mer mut." 23-26 = Tutankhamun; 27 = Ankhresamun; 28-30 = Ay (including a clay seal); 31-2 = Horemheb; 33 = Ramesses I; 34-36 = Seti I; 37-42, 44-55, 60-61 = Ramesses II; 59 = Ramesses III; 16 = Ramesses IV. Other clay seals: pl. 23, 56-7 = with no name; faience vase: 58 = "Princess Nefertari."

186Petrie, *KGH*, 32, pl. 23.10, 15; idem., *Scarabs*, pl. 23: 18.9.66, pl. 36: 18.10.5; Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 59, 60, pls. 14, 16, no. 385 (UC 12320) and 388 (UC 12429). The first (UC 12320) is inscribed with the name of Amenhotep III, the other is only figurative.

187*KGH*, p. 33, pl. 23.16-9; Thomas, *Gurob*, no. 385, p. 59 and pl. 16.

188Ibid., p. 33, ?pl. 23.53. One cannot identify this certainly, but it probably is of Merneptah.

189Ibid., p. 33, pl. 23.54.

190Ibid., p. 37

191Ibid., p. 33.

192Ibid., p. 7, pl. 24.10.

193One might also wonder why Ramesses II would remove all the stone from the site, as Petrie accuses and which may be quite possible, if he had his own palace/harim here.

194Bell, "605," p. 85, n. 117; Morris L. Bierbrier, *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stela*, vol. 10 (London: British Museum, 1982), p. 9, pl. 1, 2, p. 70. Note now that some destruction of Akhenaten’s monuments at Karnak has been attributed to Tutankhamun. John Cooney, *Amarna Reliefs from Hermopolis in American Collections* (Brooklyn: 1965), p. 2: “The use of Amarna reliefs [at Hermopolis] by the architects of Ramesses II strongly suggests that the temples and palaces of El-Amarna remained standing for several generations after the court returned to Thebes....This belated dismantling of Akhenaten’s constructions indicates that there was no violent physical reaction against him or his works at Amarna, a situation that was paralleled in the seemingly intact condition of the famous studio of the sculptor Thutmose. This evidence indicates that the city...was neglected, ignored or abandoned but certainly not attacked or vilified with the return to the orthodox faith.”

195Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 19; pl. 49.5, 10, 11; pl. 48.6.

196Ibid., p 19, pl. 48.6.

197Ibid., p. 3.
198 Thomas, Gurob, p. 22.

199 Tomb 5. Thomas, Gurob, pp. 17-8 with references; KRI II 912-14, no. 376; also see Saleh and Sourouzian, Cairo, no. 200, with references; Reginald Engelbach, "The Sarcophagus of Pa-Ramessu from Gurob: Was He the Heir of Seti I?" Ancient Egypt (1922), pp. 9-13; Daniel Polz, "Die Särge des (Pa-) Ramessu," MDAIK 42 (1986), pp. 145-66.

200 Thomas Gurob, p. 22.

Petrie and his followers always considered the northern enclosure the site of a temple founded by Tuthmosis III. Habachi thought that the komple might have held a temple and palace on the order of Medinet Habu, Abydos, etc. The northern enclosure would have been the temple, and the southern a rest-house or palace where the king could stay during his visit to the temple. Kemp has more recently proposed that the northern enclosure was really a harim, while the southern was for "support" stuff, magazines, etc. Lanny Bell has suggested to me (private communication) that the texts of the stone blocks still extant from the "temple" would be appropriate to a temple (there is a mention of the ka), but Barry Kemp has countered (private communication) that, as there are no other known materials from a harim, we cannot tell whether or not the texts might also be appropriate to a harim. Steven P. Harvey has recently lectured on private houses at Amarna: "The House On Earth: Amarna House Space and Symbolism," American Research Center in Egypt, Annual Meeting, Boston, April 27, 1991. He noted that the texts from domestic door lintels and jambs are identical to those from tombs, so perhaps the "temple" inscriptions would also be suitable to a royal harim.

202 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 9.

203 Ibid., pl. 29.15.

204 Stubbings, MPL, 95: LH III B, FS 183; Helck, Ägais, p. 87: LH III B.

205 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 15: "almost certainly XIXth dynasty work."

206 Ibid., p. 15. Not having had access to these pieces, it is impossible to tell if fire or some other process was at work, although it is difficult to imagine what such a process that would affect minerals and that might be found in a tomb would be.

207 Ibid., pl. 50.2-10, 13-16; Thomas, Gurob, p. 22 and fn. 198, 26 and fn. 200.

208 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 14, pl. 48.2; Thomas, Gurob, p. 83, pl. 55, no. 711; cf. also Boston, 300, no. 409. This is not the typical Ramesside Deir el-Medina ancestor bust, but is probably related to the type. Cf. Jean Keith-Bennett, "Anthropoid Busts: II. Not from Deir el Medineh Alone," Bes 3 (1981), pp. 55-6. One wonders what the "surface" meant to Brunton and Engelbach, especially as the whole mound had been so thoroughly disturbed and denuded by this time.
Discussed above. Also see KGH, p. 39; "Journal," 16-23 March, 1889; Notebook 39B, p. 21, "chb in side S side near SE," translated as "south side of the enclosure at the south-east" by Thomas, Gurob, p. 23, who places this "not far from the cultivation." It would have been inside the "temple" enclosure, perhaps towards the "front," facing towards the gisr and the cultivation (but not really near either).


Gurob, p. 23.

KGH, 40; Notebook 39B, p. 21. Thomas, Gurob, p. 23, mentions Tomb 31, under a brick wall in the South Town (Notebook 39B), which she says should possibly be connected with the four bodies inside the south wall of the enclosure, after the area was deserted in Dyn. 19. Notebook 39B puts them close to the south side of the enclosure wall at the south-east, and thus not too far from the cultivation. She draws no chronological conclusions from this.

Petrie, Notebook 39B (1889). Petrie's additional find of two stirrup jars under a wall (perhaps a tomb-group?) above the "temple" (KGH, p. 45) was used by Furumark for absolute chronology (Chronology, 113 n.8, 114 n.2).

Also from Deir el-Medina: Nagel, céramique, p. 59, fig. 42, slightly strangely restored from sherds. It should be Dyn. 18, and seems to come from a similarly dated context, Tomb 1150. It has part of a funerary dedication still preserved on the shoulder. Similar painted vases were also found in the tomb of Kha3 Temp. Amenhotep III: E. Schiaparelli, Cha, p. 141, fig. 124; also see Kayser, Kunsthandwerk, p. 101, fig. 94. For the date of the tomb of Kha3 see Janssen, Commodity Prices, p. 210: Kha3 died during the reign of Amenhotep III.

If the groups are rubbish pits, and since their character is generally Ramesside, one would have to postulate a Ramesside occupation in this area: a village if the objects are seen as ordinary, and a harem if they are taken as too elegant for a village (see Thomas' arguments discussed above). One of the real problems here would be to associate such pits with architecture. If they are taken as Ramesside robbers' caches, one might more confidently see them as being placed in the ruins of an older, deserted building. Whatever the interpretation, a 19th Dynasty intrusion into 18th Dynasty strata best fits my view of the evidence.

See discussion above. It is suggestive of a foundation deposit only by the character of the text. It is not dowel-shaped, but a simple "plank," cut off roughly at one end, and inscribed on both sides: see Thomas, Gurob, pl. 42, no. 51. She gives no explanation
of its function. Its dimensions are 10.8 cm. X 3.5 cm. and about 0.8-0.9 cm. thick. Although James Weinstein, "Foundation Deposits in Ancient Egypt" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1973), p. 159 does mention rectangular blocks of wood from foundation deposits at Deir el-Bahari, they do not seem to be the same thing. See further discussion in Chapter: Papyri.


220 *CAH* II, 128-9. The temple was thought to be in use in Dyn. 26.


222 Note that the deified Tuthmosis III was worshipped here.

223 Many objects in the Burnt Groups, besides those already discussed, point to a date later than Dynasty 18 for them. For example, the long razors found in the Amenhotep III, Ramesses II and Seti II Burnt Groups (*IKG*, pls. 17.19, 18.3, 38, 19.18) are Ramesside types: *Boston*, 190.

224 These were the conclusions of the first season, cf. Notebook 39, p. 37.

225 *KGH*, 9. Sadiamia and Anen-Tursha were really foreign; the light-haired mummies were not. He dated these burials to the 18th Dynasty but finally decided that they were dug before the houses were built; this seems to have been decided mostly on the basis of art history rather than stratigraphy. He does however, observe that the tomb fillings would not have been clean if the shafts had been dug through town deposit, which seems a reasonable assumption, even if backed by very little evidence.

226 *IKG*, p. 24.3, 64" X 31." This piece is now in Australia: Thomas, *Gurob*, pp. 7, 20 n. iv. Thomas dates it to between years 22-30 of Tuthmosis III, based on the form of his name, and observes that the area with the restored name of Amun is now missing.

227 See listing above for "cartouches." Borchardt, *Teje*, passim.; *IKG*, pl. 24, nos. 7, 8, 10 (probably from elsewhere); Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 37, pl. 5, no. 71 (although this may be from a tomb); Habachi, "Varia," pp. 79-84; an ivory kohl tube of Amenhotep III and daughter "Isis" (name in cartouche), not illustrated, perhaps from the "temple," and said to be in Cairo: *IKG*, p. 35; "Journal," 16-23 March, 1889.

228 *P. Gurob I.1 and I.2* : F. Ll. Griffith *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob* (London: 1898) 91-2; Edward Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt*, Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World, 1 (Atlanta, Georgia: 1990), p. 28. As the letter is reporting events in Memphis during year 4 to the absent Amenhotep IV, one wonders if he may have been in residence in Gurob at the time it was written.
Thomas, Gurob, pp. 15-17, nos. 9, 10, 18, 44, 45, 46, and 66: two officials of the harim, a Scribe of the Royal Mansion, and a chief weaver, chief spinner, and master craftsman.

Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 2, locate the 19th Dynasty cemetery of Loat at point D, p. 2 (lower). This general area would accord well with Loat's remarks, Gurob, pp. 1, 3: "The ruins of a small village, also dating from the XVIIIth Dynasty, lies about 500 yards to the south of the old town, in close proximity to an animal cemetery." "A cemetery of animals lay a quarter of a mile to the South of that containing the human burials. Near by were the ruins of a small village. The cemetery itself afforded very few facts as to its age, though it probably dated from the XIXth Dynasty..." Cf. also Thomas, Gurob, pp. 3, 4. On p. 17, note iii. she suggests that this village may have been the earlier settlement of "Southern She." There is really no evidence for or against this assertion.

KGH, 40. Thomas, Gurob, p. 23, says that this is the are of Brunton and Engelbach's "Many open shafts" (Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 2, lower). A tomb of Tuthmosis III was found at point "Q." The main cemetery is said to have lasted from the early 18th Dynasty until the Ramesside period: Thomas, Gurob, p. 20. Mid-Dynasty 18 burials were found at "D": Thomas, 21. Late 18th-early 19th Dyn. burials were found near Tomb 605 of Brunton and Engelbach: Thomas, Gurob, p. 21. Petrie found a tomb with an alabaster monument of Tutankhamun and his wife, KGH, 35.

KGH, 40.

Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pp. 3-4; Kemp, "Harim," p. 126. Petrie, KGH, 32, suggests that the 18th Dynasty village belonging to his "temple" should be in the North Town, but this is probably only as he had not found anything to call and 18th Dynasty town at this point (1888-9).

See now James P. Allen, "Two Altered Inscriptions of the Late Amarna Period," JARCE 25 (1988), p. 125, fn. 55: Amun worship in Thebes was reintroduced by King Nefer-neferu-aten (i.e., Nefertiti), on the basis of the Pawah Graffito.

For the suggestion that Tiy spent her widowhood years here see the discussion, with references, by Thomas, Gurob, p. 17. Thomas estimates the population of the kom as c. 1500 people: Gurob, p. 24, fn. 34.

Amarna is the most staggering example of how quickly royal cities could be assembled.

There was a five-foot higher deposit when Petrie worked there than when Brunton and Engelbach were at the site: Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 2.

The stone could have been removed during the reign of Ramesses II, see citations above of Petrie's ideas, and the re-use of "temple" fragments in Ramesside tombs. Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pp. 4, 15, Tombs 6 and 473. Petrie says that everything
was robbed out of the "temple" (KGH, 32-3), but there may never have been much stone here in the first place. Charles Van Siclen III has suggested to me that many of the Delta sites are preserved only imperfectly today as they used, in the main, only mud brick. Stone (less readily available than in the south), was only used sparingly, and so was most likely removed for reuse. The bricks, of course, could also have been removed, although this is unlikely, or would have just melted back into the alluvium.

239 E.g., at Karnak North: information courtesy of Jean Jacquet.

240 Borchardt, Teye, pp. 2-3.

241 Ibid., pp. 2-3.

242 Ibid., p. 3. See Appendix 6 for Peter Lacovara's observation of a charcoal stratum in 1983.

243 Ibid., p. 3 and fig. 2.

244 See comments by Kemp, "Harim," p. 128.

245 KGH, pp. 32-33.

246 Although apparently they were able to completely obliterate Loat's temple and the western part of the kôm: Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 3.

247 Ibid., p. 2.

248 Petrie, Methods, pp. 33-35.

249 Although many objects from the groups are basically whole, others, such as the Egyptian and Mycenaean pottery from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group are represented only by a few, or even one, sherds. If one is to assume, as I do, although not wholeheartedly, that the vase was committed whole to the pit, and burnt there, the rest of the sherds must have been left behind. If it is assumed that all materials from the pits were retrieved, then the possibility that they were burnt elsewhere and only secondarily placed into the pits must be considered. The integrity of the Burnt Groups as coherent depositional assemblages is quite questionable, in my opinion. However, one must either assume, realizing that it is an assumption, that there was some purposeful association of the objects, or simply give up the exercise.

250 "Journal," 20 December-3 January 1889, when he saw the actual pit.

251 Ibid., 14-20 November 1889.

252 Ibid., 14-20 November 1889.

253 Ibid., 6-13 December 1889.
Petrie and Brunton, Sedment, II, p. 31, encountered such a situation. They found a Dynasty 19 tomb with a huge pit, with a shaft 24 feet deep, leading to a large room. Out of this extended a rough trench, 70" X 100" and 4' deep, with a limestone sarcophagus and two wooden coffins painted black with yellow text, "but the whole burial had been burnt, and but little remained." Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 15: Tomb 473 at Gurob (Ramesside) with re-used Tuthmosis III "temple" blocks, was burnt, and both blocks and other objects were "calcined." Wood was used in burials and was thus available to be burnt: e.g., ibid., p. 9, Tomb 20; p. 13, Tomb 245.

The demand for the "drug" mummia, or the "bitumen" or pitch used for embalming, led to the attack of mummies by at least the 12th century A.D. Marquis of Northampton, Wilhelm Spiegelberg, Percy E. Newberry, Report on Some Excavations in the Theban Necropolis During the Winter of 1898-9 (London: 1908), p. 2 with references. This process may sometimes have involved the burning of the mummies, to melt out the mummia. Wooden coffins were also commonly used as fuel in Luxor in the 17th century, and could have been so employed here, for some modern "industrial" purpose, bread ovens, etc. This might have produced the spread of charcoal across the site. For the burning of coffins in Luxor see ibid., pp. 2-3: "The Kurnawi Arabs also plundered the ancient tombs for the wood contained in them, for, in a country like Egypt, wood is always a valuable commodity. Hoskins relates that during the first quarter of the last century there resided at Thebes an Italian merchant named Piccinini, who, like the Arabs around him, was chiefly indebted to the mummies for the few comforts of life that he possessed. 'A single apartment constituted his whole house; his windows, shutters, steps and floor were all composed of wooden coffins.' The only fuel to be procured at that time at Thebes was the wood derived from the broken mummy chests, and several early travellers lamented that they were obliged to use for cooking purposes 'some of the finest specimens of ancient art.' Baron Minutoli, while residing in Upper Egypt, had his 'daily meal cooked over fires supplied by broken mummy chests of the most beautiful workmanship,' of which, at one time, six camel loads were brought to him. The celebrated Arabic scholar, Lane, also records that during his stay at Kurneh he could obtain no other wood for cooking; and he further states that sometimes his servant brought for this purpose cases so beautifully ornamented that he was reluctant to allow his cook to make use of them."

263 Brunton and Englebach, *Gurob*, pl. 18.

264 Borchardt, *Teyy*, p. 3, implies that the pit had been cut into something that would hold a rectangular shape, and he says that the excavations had gone below the level of the foundations, so they could have been cut into bedrock. This distance may not have been great; see Kemp, "Harim," p. 128.

265 Remembering, of course, that no bones were reported in the pits.

266 *IK*, p. 16. This would seem an awfully small pit for the burial of an adult, although it might work for a child.

267 *KGH*, 32, 36. Associated finds: pl. 18.26, pl. 3.23.7.8. Kemp places this not far north of Brunton and Engelbach’s "Fort," towards point "V": 124 and fig. 2, 125. Tomb 60, near point "S" and perhaps near to Petrie’s work, had a scarab dated by Petrie to Amenhotep II: Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 12, pl. 26.17. This should more probably be taken to read Amenhotep III. (*Imn-htp hkb W*xst*), as suggested to me by Lanny Bell.

268 Notebook 39B, p. 29.

269 *KGH*, p. 43: by "buff" he means Mycenaean pottery (pl. 28, nos. 1 and 7, the two stirrup jars); the striped pottery is a mixture of painted Egyptian, Mycenaean, and possibly Cypriote types (pl. 28, nos. 8-14, 18). Pl. 28.10 is the keel and part of the belly of a perfectly good Amarna-style Mycenaean pilgrim flask. No. 18 could be Cypriote, and the rest seem to be Egyptian.

270 Notebook 39B, p. 23.

271 Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 45, pl. 10, no. 189, suggests that a blue-painted jar in the Petrie Museum may come from Tomb N. She dates it as late 18th Dynasty, but it has a small roll at the join of body and neck, which seems to be a Ramesside feature (based on observations of the Ramesside pottery from the British excavations at Saqqara, courtesy of David Aston). Note that another of these is from Tomb 20: *KGH*, pl. 21, type 65. - Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 45, pl. 10, no. 188, also dated Dyn. 18.


273 *KGH*, pp. 8, 39.

274 Ibid., p. 37.

275 Ibid., p. 39.
Black coffins with yellow texts, bronze finger rings, burial mode, and pottery. The coffin type is often called 18th Dynasty, but does continue into the 19th Dynasty, at least at Gurob: see Bell, "605," pp. 64-65, with references.

There is some question about the reading of this ring; see discussion below.

This should probably be changed to "late 18th and 19th Dynasty date" as some pieces have are similar to Ramesside pottery from the 19th Dynasty tombs at Saqqara: e.g. KGH, pl. 21.60 (UC 19124 = Thomas, Gurob, p. 45, pl. 8, no. 186, Tomb 20), 65 (UC 19123 = ibid., p. 45, pl. 10, no. 188).

KGH, p. 38: "In the ridge of ground close to the cultivated land, beneath the later town of the time of Ramessu II, were several tombs. These were cut through the gravelly top bed down to a layer of sand about 8 to 10 feet under the surface, in which a rough space was scooped out." The type apparently is that shown by Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 18, type B. KGH, p. 39: "The position of the graves, which would probably not be placed there while houses occupied the ground, they cannot be later than the houses, as the sand filling of them was clean and not mixed with earth, and as the houses were probably of the time of Ramessu II, there is no period for the tombs subsequently."

Ibid., p. 39, actually "Ra-ma-neb, meri-amen."

This information courtesy of Lanny Bell.

See Bell, "605," pp. 64, 79, fns. 16, 17.

Boston, p. 127, no. 114. The shape is said to occur in pottery from the reign of Hatshepsut through the Amarna Period. For a very similar vessels, but with slightly more conical lower bellies, see Schiaparelli, Cha, p. 141, fig. 124, upper left and right. For these vases in color, see E. Scamussi, Egyptian Art in the Egyptian Museum of Turin (Turin: 1963), pls. 45, 47, 48.

Nagel, Céramique, p. 25, nos. 37, 38, from Tomb 359, which should be Ramesside.

Thomas, Gurob, p. 45; pls. 9, 10; nos. 187, 188.

Ibid., pp. 45, 49, 83, 84; pls. 8, 46, 55; nos. 186, 248, 714, 717.


David Aston kindly informs me that KGH, pl. 21.65, from Tomb 20 = Thomas, Gurob, pl. 10, no. 188, is Ramesside. Thomas calls Petrie's illustration as a "type," but the only tomb number that he gives for his example is 20, so he must mean the very vase from that tomb, rather than just the "type" of vase.
This shape is also said to have been found in Tombs 21, N, P and in Group 7 (IKG, p. 19). Also see Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 38, type 43R, in light red.

KGR, p. 38, pl. 19; Thomas, Gurob, pl. 15, no. 9, dated Dyn. 19. Petrie’s drawing does a real disservice to our appreciation of the beauty of the piece. Its inaccuracy also inhibits scholarship. The only photograph is published in Valdemar Schmidt, Sarkofager, Mumiekister, og Mumiebylstre i det Gamle Aegypten (Copenhagen), p. 124, fig. 635).

Its closest parallel, to my knowledge, is another, equally beautiful, coffin now in the Cairo Museum, JdE 31378, of the “Overseer of the Double Granaries of the Hwt P3 ḥn. There are also parallels with the burial equipment of Yuyu and Tuyu, but these appear to be earlier stylistically, as well as probably historically.

Cf. Niwinski’s developmental sequence in Lda V, 434-468. This may have to be revised slightly, as it does seem that the black-ground coffins did last into the 19th Dynasty, at least in the Fayum, contra Niwinski: see Bell, “605,” p. 64-65.

E.g. the figure of Henut-Nakhtu from Saqqara, Saleh and Sourouzian, Cairo, no. 155, end of the 18th dynasty.

Quibell, “Hawaret El Gurob,” pp. 141-43, pls. 1, 2; Chassinat, “Un Tombe inviolée,” pp. 225-234. The use of a similar type of ka-figure also occurred in Thebes: e.g., Schiaparelli, Cha; and in Saqqara: Saleh and Sourouzian, Cairo, no. 155.

Prof. Betsy Bryan is currently studying the art of the late 18th Dynasty, and may give us some criteria for differentiating it from the following period.

For the figure from Tomb 22, see Borchhardt, Statuen, III, p. 100, pl. 148, no. 802, JdE 28735, see KGR, p. 38, pl. 22.7 for text).


FS 171.35, LH III A2 late; Furumark’s No. 6. terminus post quem Seti I. See discussion above, Chapter 3. Hankey and Warren, “Absolute,” p. 148, like Furumark, have accepted Petrie’s date. Wace, BSA 52, p. 222 says: “Only one find [the "Res" vase], can be said to be near Seti I in date. Its context is said to be older than Ramses II, but how much older is not clear. In any case it seems unwise to use a vase so indefinite in type as a pivot for chronological purposes.” I note that it is not a very nicely made or painted example of Mycenaean pottery. The body shape would seem to be acceptably III A 2. It also seems to have the wide bands around spout mouth and base that Mountjoy associates with LH III A2, and it bears a certain resemblance to Mee, Rhodes, pl. 10.1, FS 171, FM 18, III A2, from Ialysos. However there is also a slightly coned disc, a plain shoulder, a partial loop around false spout and neck, and the paint of one handle stops above the first shoulder band. All these are more typical of III B.
The Notebook 39B, p. 34 entry simply says "one burial in mid town," which one would take as simply the South Town, were it not for his published mention that this was a "Find in a house at the north town of Gurob" (KGH, p. 44).

Papyrus type, cf. FM 18.99, dated LH IIIA2 late, from a vase found in Cyprus.

Furumark, Pottery, FS 171.36, LH III A2 late; Stubbings, MPL, p. 94; Furumark, Chronology, p. 113 n. 8, 114.

Notebook 39B, p. 34.

KGH, pp. 39-40; Notebook 39B, p. 23.

On the Ashmolean Museum’s Catalogue Card.

Stubbings, p. 95. Buchholz, “Funde,” p. 446. I have not personally examined this vase.

KGH, pl. 21.54, 56; pl. 20.15.

Hall, “Sleeves,” p. 29; see n. 7 (Colin Hope). They suggest that the pottery of Tombs 21-25 is all perhaps of the same date. I think we have, however, seen quite a bit of differentiation in it.

E.g., Tomb 21 had the coffins of Anen-turshe and Nefermennu, a wooden box of a scribe, Sunuro (KGH, pl. 24.1), and a shabti for T-kema-ti (KGH, p. 38).

KGH, pp. 38-39, for Tombs 22 and 23 Petrie says that various objects are in the “sand filling.” Sand fill was deliberately added over the slipper coffin burials at Deir el-Balah, cf. Dothan, Deir el-Balah, p. 5, Tomb 114, Dyn. 19.


Notebook 39B, p. 29. See discussion in Chapter 4, Mycenaean Pottery.

Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 2.

KGH, p. 36: the tombs being in “the north end of the town, among the almost denuded remains of houses…”

Thomas, Gurob, p. 23.

Possibly the village that Loat saw somewhere to the south, apparently near to the mark D on Brunton and Engelbach’s plan: Gurob, pl. 2, lower, p. 2. Judging from Amarna and Deir el-Medina, these villages were hidden or secreted away in wadis and
this wadi behind and south of the kôm would be a perfect place, and would work well with the 18th Dynasty burials also thought to have been found somewhere south/west of the kôm area. Petrie thought that there was a workmen's village (KGH, 32): 

"Doubtless some dwellings also existed here for the workmen, i.e. he seems to think that Gurob is like Kahun, a pyramid town, i.e. functionally connected with a monument, the "temple," and not a real urban center) and a town had sprung up, but there is little evidence of that; and--common as the scarabs of Tahutmes III usually are--only six have been found in this locality, no disproportionate number to the length of his reign. The early town lay probably outside of the temple enclosure, away on the north continuation of the desert edge; as, about a quarter of a mile to the north, we found a bronze jar (XVIII, 26) and two scarabs (XXIII, 7, 8), one of which is of Amenhotep II." He meant the North Village, as he mentions these items later (p. 36) as being from "the north end of the town, among the almost denuded remains of houses...."

316 Ahmose-Tuthmosis I: points "R" (2), "Z" (1), "T" (5), "P" (2) and "Q" (3). Burials of Tuthmosis III period: "Z" (1), "O" (1), "H" (1), "P" (1), "S" (2), "T" (5). This list is not all-inclusive, and the dates given by Brunton and Engelbach have been accepted here for general survey purposes, but should be reinvestigated before any more detailed statistical work is done with the grave materials. For the earlier materials see Kemp and Merrillees, Minoan, p. 55.

317 They were found at points "P" (1), "R" (3), "H" (2), and "Z" (2), although most of them come from cemetery "D" (5).

318 Thomas, Gurob, p. 16, says that one coffin was found at point "H," Tomb 601, a painted example that she dates as "Ramesside." See also Lisa Kuchman, "Egyptian Clay Anthropoid Coffins," Serapis 4 (1977/78), pp. 11-22; for 18th Dynasty clay coffins see pp. 13-14. Thomas' no. 255, p. 39, from point "Z" is called "Ramesside." Tomb 31, KGH, 39, had a pottery coffin, possibly that shown by Thomas, Gurob, p. 82, pl. 54, no. 706, Dyn. 19-20. Tomb 31 was found under a brick wall in the South Town (i.e., the "temple" area): Notebook 39B, p. 35.

319 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 11, tomb 48, pl. 21.

320 Thomas, Gurob, p. 49, pl. 12, no. 251, for the duck dish, which she dates as 18th Dynasty. They have also been found at Amarna. But there are also many 19th Dynasty examples from Deir el-Medina: Nagel, céramique, 172-6.

321 Erik Hornung, in LDA, 1, col. 202. Lanny Bell suggests that this scarab is not contemporary with Amenhotep I, but should be associated with his later cult, perhaps even of the Ramesside period.

322 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 3.

323 Kemp "Harim," p. 124, fig. 2.
Brunton and Engelbach, *Gu窮*, p. 11: Tomb 48, pl. 21—child near point "R" with a scarab of Amenhotep I, "buried below the town ruins which have been sifted by the Sebbakhin." The date of this group is probably much later than published, see above, fn. 321. But, if the tomb is correctly dated to early Dyn. 18, what would be the date of the town here, especially as this area also has 18th and 19th Dynasty tombs.

Brunton and Engelbach *Gu窮*, even found pottery coffin burials in the spread between points "P" (1, no. 16), "R" (3, nos. 65, 242, 243), and "Z" (2, nos. 255, 275).
Gardiner and She

The major stumbling block left to this interpretation of Gurob as an 18th Dynasty and earlier site is the group of documents, concerning the administration of the "harim" of $mr\text{-}wr$ in the 19th and 20th Dynasty, known as the "Gurob Papyri." These are said to have been found at Gurob, which has then led to the identification of the site with the town of $mr\text{-}wr$ mentioned in these and other Ramesside documents.¹ But, despite Gardiner's emphatic acceptance of Gurob as the site of $mr\text{-}wr$, there is still a fair degree of uncertainty in the understanding of the topography of the Fayum, and a more than fair degree of confusion between $mr\text{-}wr$ (- Mi-wer) and the settlement of $\hat{s}$(- She).²

She also had a harim, known, significantly, from the 18th Dynasty.³ $tr\text{-}\hat{s}z$, a Deputy of the Harim of She, was actually buried at Gurob, in Tomb 21 of the "North Town." His coffin seems to belong to the very end of the 18th or the very beginning of the 19th Dynasty.⁴ In the adjoining Tomb 20 were found the shabtis of $nfr\text{-}mnw$, "Captain of Police of the Harim in She."⁵ Gardiner, who accepts that the harim of She is "undoubtedly identical" with the harim of Mi-wer, can only resolve matters by a "highly precarious" hypothesis. He says that the town of Mi-wer extended on both sides of the Bahr Yusef, and Mi-wer proper is the northern part, under the authority of
the Mayor of Mi-wer, while the southern part, with the harim, is She, under
the Mayor of Southern She (Ś rsy6). A fuller reinvestigation of the She
documents than we can make here might be very rewarding, as there is a
distinct possibility that, if the Gurob buildings are a "harim," they may
really represent the ruins of the 18th Dynasty harim of She (and not Ś
rsy7). In his analysis, and to support it, Gardiner seems to make a series of
basic assumptions that may not be valid. He assumes that an ancient city of
a certain name would always be in the same place throughout the length of
Egyptian history, and that there was never more than one city for one name
at one time,8 and that cities, once established, were always there throughout
time. The idea that a city Mi-wer might not have existed before the 19th
Dynasty does not seem to have occurred to him, and the lack of evidence for
a late occupation of Gurob seems also to have been disregarded.

An important city of Mi-wer continued in existence long after the New
Kingdom, and is known from demotic and Greek sources (these are not
from Gurob). In fact, late monuments mentioning both She and Mi-wer
were found at Hawara.9 This later Μοῖρις seems to have been on a
navigable channel of water, as grain shipments to Alexandria were made
from here.10 This would describe a town site down on the cultivation, along
the Bahr Yusef, perhaps even in the general area of Gurob, but surely not in
the desert, on the kôm. Aside from the cemeteries, the only later activity
on the kôm is represented by a suggested 21st Dynasty fort.11 The earliest
mention of Mi-wer seems to be Ramesside,12 so the life span of this town
does not fit with the archaeological record on the kôm.
The Gurob Papyri

The identification of the papyri from Gurob as distinct from those of Kahun has been quite uncertain, owing to Griffith's confusion in the first publication (in *KGC* after the second season). However, it is not too difficult to sort it all out if one refers to the original reports. In the first season at Gurob, in which Petrie was actively involved in the excavation (1888-89), his records mention papyri twice. The first are fragments from Ptolemaic mummy cartonnage, but he correctly observes that these were all late documents. The second mention occurs in the entry for 1-6 April, 1889: "2 small rolls of hieratic papyri much rolled but still a fair amount legible." These papyri could be either 1) the letter in duplicate of year 5, Amenhotep IV, which seems to fit the description, or 2) the "Ramesside letter" of two sheets, dated to the reign of Seti II, in which the name of Ramesses II occurs. For further evidence we have only the published report of the first season, where Petrie mentions "Of papyri a few were found, but none in such fine state as those of Kahun. The only royal name is that of Ramessu II. None of the rolls were sealed, and many were crushed up as waste paper." So, as Ramesses is known in the first season, and as the Amenhotep IV letter is not mentioned until the publication after the second season, it seems we should identify the Ramesside letter as the document found in April, 1889.

Unfortunately, no clear idea can be gained of the find context from the field notes. Petrie himself was working in the North Town, i.e. outside the great
enclosure wall, and had just found the group of tombs, including no. 22, in the previous week (23-30 March, 1889). Discoveries seem to have been slacking off as Petrie soon remarked (8-15 April), "It was hardly worthwhile to go on with the miscellaneous digging; the ground yet unworked will be a reserve to search in for fresh evidence," and he transferred his attention to Kahun. However, he still found Tomb 31 in the South Town (i.e., "temple" area) in this week\(^\text{18}\). The papyri are mentioned in a separate paragraph, along with other notable finds from the week: more pot marks, a small bronze chisel with wooden handle (complete); a piece of bronze hinge, a wooden figure. "For the rest of the week there was not anything very new." So, the papyrus could have come from either north or south towns. It may be that they are slightly more likely to have come from the south, as this is where Petrie seems to have kept his essentially unsupervised crew working, while he took care of the cemetery. Because, one might think that, if Petrie himself had found them, he probably would have given more details of the discovery. We must note, however, that papyri do seem to have come from the Gurob cemeteries, as a Book of the Dead, of "Bakenamun," is noted in passing by Griffith.\(^\text{19}\)

In the second season Petrie noted the discovery at Gurob of a sheet of papyrus with the figure of a king making offerings, possibly of Dynasty 18, but with no name.\(^\text{20}\) As we have already seen, Petrie was not supervising the work at Gurob in this season, so the descriptions are even shorter than before. At Kahun (28 November-5 December, 1889) he found the deposit in House 7, with tools (said to be broken intentionally), a Cypriote Base-Ring
juglet, and with three sheets (one blank) of papyrus, rolled in cloth and put into a bread mould for safekeeping. These are dated to year 33 of Amenhotep III and are concerned with litigations over a servant.\(^{21}\)

Griffith, in his survey of hieratic documents,\(^{22}\) seems to have confused the Kahun papyrus of Amenhotep III with the Gurob papyrus of Amenhotep IV and mistakenly attributes each to the other site. That this is indeed the case is clear from Petrie's excavation records as described above, and from Griffith's own later remarks.\(^{23}\)

Gardiner added a number of other documents, said to be from Gurob, in \(RAD\) (Documents III-XVI) and accepted\(^{24}\) their Gurob attribution for several reasons. First, he believed that they were the additional papyri "alluded to" by Petrie and Griffith, citing the following evidence:

1. "Of papyri a few were found, but none in such fine state as those of Kahun. The only royal name is that of Ramessu II. None of the rolls were sealed, and many were crushed up as waste paper."\(^{25}\)

2. The Amenhotep IV papyri and Ramesside letter were "the most important papyrus" from Gurob.\(^{26}\) Gardiner takes this as "implying that there were others found on the same site."

Petrie's listing of only the royal name of Ramesses II in the first season suggests that the Amenhotep IV papyrus had still not been found. Thus, his
use of "many" does imply the presence of other materials not specifically described. Gardiner notes the additional occurrence of the name of Ramesses II in Doc. IV (G), p. 21, l. 6, but this does not necessarily prove a Gurob provenance, as the Ramesside letter (RADII) also mentions Ramesses II twice and is more likely the piece to which Petrie referred. Griffith\textsuperscript{27} does give a very eloquent description of the masses of hieratic papyri (site not specified) that existed in only one-inch squares, with "many less than half an inch." But, the Gurob papyri are said to be much less numerous, although "more stout" than those from Kahun. So, judging from Petrie's and Griffith's remarks, one can conclude only that there probably were other pieces, probably in bad condition and not necessarily with any further mention of royal names.

2. The Ramesside bronze cup of SII, "Overseer of Heifers" of the Gardiner's second point is that Petrie "explicitly declared them" to be from Gurob when he gave the papyri to Gardiner about 1918.\textsuperscript{28} Petrie may well have believed them to be from Gurob, but that does not prove him correct. The site name was used to indicate the area surrounding the kôm, which included large numbers of Ramesside tombs and traces of Ramesside activity. So, the source could well have been a peripheral area that we would not now connect to the use of the kôm. Petrie was also accustomed to purchase antiquities from his "free-lances" at Gurob and from dealers. If any of them were responsible for the attribution, there would be a high degree of doubt.\textsuperscript{29} In any case, Petrie is unlikely to have seen the actual find spot of the papyri as he concentrated on the cemetery in the first season, and left the site entirely to Hughes-Hughes in the second. To
conclude, Petrie's assignment of the papyri to Gurob may not carry much weight of itself.

Gardiner's final proof is that the "internal evidence clearly points to Mi-wer as the provenance." Gardiner identified the insititution at Mi-wer (known from the texts) with the enclosures on the kôm on the basis of these papyri and the "many monuments" from the site, citing PM III, 112-4. I know of only four objects from the kôm itself that mention Mi-wer.


2. The Ramesside bronze cup of Sti, "Overseer of Heifers of the Harim in Mi-wer."

3. The Ramesside letter found in the first season of excavation and discussed above.

4. Wood "slips" with the ink inscription Pr (Wsr-mȝt-Rc mry ʾmn) (hr) ḫb(t) Wbšt m Mr-wr(t), "The House of Ramesses III-upon-the-east-of-Thebes," in Mi-ler.

There is one additional occurrence of the city name from the general area: from Tomb 37, in area W, the great Ramesside cemetery with the tomb of a
son of Ramesses II, is part of a stela naming Ṣmnḥ-pr, Mayor of Mi-wer and scribe.36 PM mentions only this stela.

To further complicate matters, we can cite the presence of the “Deputy of the Harim in She,37 Ṣn-trṣς,38 whose coffin was found in Tomb 21, North Town. This seems to date to the post-Amarna Period or even the early 19th Dynasty.39 Also buried in Tomb 21 was Nfr-ḥnw, “Captain of Police of the Harim in She,”40 or “Deputy (?) of the Harem in She.”41 A third individual represented in this same tomb was a certain Swl ṣṣ ipt n(y)swt, “Scribe of the King’s Apartments.”42 These people may all be connected with the 18th Dynasty administration, and objects from the tomb group seem generally very late Dynasty 18 and/or very early Ramesside.

Another individual represented in this group of tombs who may also be connected to the 18th Dynasty is Hwḥ, “Chief of Spinners (?), from Tomb 22.43 A ka-figure of the lady Teye, “Chief of Weavers,” was found in Chassinet’s tomb, which has objects with the names of Amenhotep III, Tiy, and Amenhotep IV.44 Thomas dates a certain Mrḥ-Rḥ, “Overseer of Cattle,” to the 18th Dynasty, possibly on the shabti type.45 The titles that mention Ṣ-rṣy all seem to be Ramesside.46 They are mayors, and there is one “Overseer of Prophets.”

So, none of the evidence marshalled by Gardiner forces us to accept the hypothesis that the additional fragments, with their added weight of Mi-wer references, come from the kôm of Gurob itself, although they could
well be from somewhere in the vicinity of the site. Certainly there is no reason to restructure these small and scattered traces of Ramesside activity, almost entirely funerary, into the great institution that the pr-hnrt must have been. However, I would still like to place all the published Ramesside papyri from Gurob, which do have an internal consistency, on the kóm itself, and all in one specific place: the small Ramesside temple that was cleared by Loat in 1904. This would be a most acceptable context for them, and would help explain the appearance of perhaps the same people in both stelai and papyri and the connection of both groups of documents to the administration of Mi-wer. The 18th Dynasty letter could well have come from inside the north or south enclosure.

**Petrie and Loat's Temple**

The small temple that Loat excavated but never placed in association with the other walls, was identified to the west side of the northern inner enclosure (the "temple") by Borchardt, after his visit to the site in 1905. If this placement is correct, it is directly connected to the inner wall at just about the area (and the only part of the west wall) that Petrie marks on his plan as actually seen, and therefore probably excavated. Petrie's men seem to have been working in this area in the first season as he states later that the "temple" (i.e. northern inner enclosure) columns were found in the first year, as was the "outer square wall" (i.e. great temenos enclosure wall). The west part of this exterior wall in this vicinity is also drawn in on
pl. 25. The only certain part of the fragmentary western outer wall is the section that would have lain just on the far side (to the west) of Loat’s little temple.

In the second season, under the direction of Hughes-Hughes, there was apparently also some work done in the temple area as the stone lintel of Tuthmosis III with the restored name of Amun was found, possibly in the “temple” area. The offering table of Tiy found in that season may well have also come from the same area. So, it is quite probable that some trenching was carried on in the area of Loat’s temple, perhaps in both seasons, and possibly never under Petrie’s personal supervision.

Evidence for Petrie’s activity in this area may be seen in the stelai published in KGH from the first season. So many of these small stelae were later found by Loat in the chapels of his little temple that any others from the kôm must almost certainly have come from there. In his “Journal” for 20-26 January 1889 (when he had not yet personally begun to work on the site) Petrie mentions “...a rough but good tablet of Nebamun. It is found re-used in a house.” As Petrie gives the title “Overseer of the King’s girls” and other personal names, there seems no problem in identifying it with the apparently Ramesside stela published on pl. 22.5, but not described in the text. This is not necessarily a funerary piece, and the “re-use” in a house may really describe its situation among the rather non-prepossessing walls of the small temple. Nebamun’s title may be more accurately translated as “Royal Scribe and Overseer of the Heifers of the Lord of the Two Lands.”
As the stela is addressed to Amon-Re Khamutef and *Mwt wr(t) nbt pt*, it may well fit with the other indications of Amen-Re worship that can be observed at Gurob. The stela of Nebamun should have been approximately 56.8 cm. tall, and 32 cm. wide, and it had two suspension holes. Thomas links the overseer of *nfrwt* to the scribe mentioned in *RAD* from year 67 of Ramesses II.

The second stela shown in KGH, pl. 22.5, also apparently Ramesside, is dedicated by *wšt-m²s²t-R²-c-m-hb*, Captain of police, and his wife, Neferetmut, Songstress of Amun. They are dedicating to Re-Horakhty of Heliopolis, Ptah of Memphis, and the local gods Onuris and Mehyt. Petrie records this in his “Journal” entry of 3-16 February. “...a good tablet of User-mat-neb and his wife Nefertmut adoring Ptah, Haremkhuti, Anhur and Nesit a lion headed goddess.” In this period he still had only a few men on the site, so the work was probably on the kôm (not in the north where the cemetery was thought to be located), and he had already found some bronze tools, which also seem to have come from the northern enclosure.

This stela is especially interesting as an individual of the same name is shown dedicating to the deified Tuthmosis III on a Ramesside stela that Loat found. He is called “Chief of Police, Deputy of the Harim of *Mwrt*.” Loat identifies all the stela on pls. 15-18 as from the temple, and this one is possibly stela no. 7 in area F, as shown in the plan on pl. 14. To conclude, both stelai may well belong to the same Captain of Police, and it would not seem too improbable that both came from Loat’s temple. If this
is so, then Petrie’s workmen must have been inside the temple area in the first season.

A third stela, probably found in the second season, would seem to clinch the matter. It, like many of the stelai Loat found, also shows the deified Tuthmosis III being worshiped, here by $R^3-ms-m-pr-	ext{lmn}$, $m\kappa^2-prw$, Royal Scribe of the House of Re, and is Ramesside. Thomas calls it funerary but, because of the subject matter and style, it can quite confidently be placed on the kôm, in Loat’s temple. Petrie mentions no context, and probably did not know any (it being from the second season).

We should also mention here the bronze basin for the $ka$ of Seti, the “Royal Scribe, Overseer of Heifers" of the Harim in $Mi$-wer," which was found with another inscribed for Aha-aa. The pan of Aha-aa says “May you wash your face in health and well-being, may joy enfold you, for the $ka$ of the royal scribe, Aha-aa, $m\alpha \kappa \kappa \kappa \kappa u$.” This ancient definition as a wash-basin has apparently been seen to give it a pragmatic, secular function, but the dedication to a $ka$ has also been taken as identifying a funerary function. I would like to suggest that both these metal basins were temple equipment, and came from Loat’s small temple.

Helping to substantiate an association with Loat’s temple was the find, two weeks before Petrie’s men recovered the basins, of a special bronze knife, of a type thought to be used for the butchering of sacrificial animals.
...only the same two couples have been at work, but some good bronzes have been found....While I was strolling about there after taking this knife [sketch of KGH, pl. 17.31?] another was found [sketch of pl. 17.32] which is the loveliest I ever saw...

In his "Journal" entry for 16-23 March 1889 Petrie writes the circumstances of discovery of the basins:

I told the man to go on clearing the rubbish hole where he found the bronze knife at Gurob and soon he came on a magnificent find. Hidden away behind the rubbish against a wall were 2 bronze pans.

So the basins and the knife seem to have come from the same "rubbish hole." As the basins were duly published as being from the town (i.e. the northern enclosure), placed against a wall, "beneath a rubbish-heap piled against a wall," 71 this also places the knife in the northern enclosure.

This locus in the area of the northern enclosure, the connection of the stelae to Loat’s later finds, the possible ritual character of the bronzes, and the connection of individuals to the administration of Mi-wer makes it seem quite possible Petrie’s workmen unknowingly had made sondages into Loat’s temple, and that these objects came from there, the only spot with certain evidence of real Ramesside activity on the kôm. The finding of the two basins together would also seem to work against a funerary interpretation (such as intrusive burials), which might be suggested by the use of n kš n(y) and mšš-brw. They could, of course, have been robber’s loot, but this seems an even more complicated, and less warranted, reading
of the context. To conclude then, the stelae and bronzes from Petrie's work seem to indicate that his workmen were active in the area of Loat's temple in 1888-1890, and that this area could well be the source of the "Ramesside Letter" and the other Gurob papyri.

Loat's temple was small, made of sun-dried bricks, and with no stone elements. Loat himself described it as lying "on the outskirts of the ancient town," which would place it close in to the center of Petrie's attentions. Loat found the stelae in disorder, lying face down on the ground, with fragments of at least one (no. 13) scattered in different rooms. So, it sounds as if preservation was not good, with some possible disturbance. I think it quite likely that Petrie's workmen could have thought themselves to be working among domestic (e.g., non stone-temple) remains.

Drawing together all my conclusions from this discussion, I can suggest the following:

1. The so-called Gurob papyri do come from Gurob.
2. The papyri do go together with the Ramesside stelae.
3. Stelae, papyri, and bronzes all come from the same place, Loat's small Ramesside temple on the kôm.
4. *Mi-wer* and *She* must have been somewhere in the general area, but the harim of *Mi-wer* was not on the kôm itself.
The Ramesside Kôm

Petrie was always adamant in his denial of a 20th Dynasty occupation, and even found the 19th Dynasty vestiges unimpressive. So, if the pr-hnrt is the sort of large establishment envisioned by Kemp, it is very difficult to find it on the kôm. To continue to place Mi-wer here one would have to think instead of a very village-like settlement, as Petrie indeed suggests, full of fishermen and weavers. There were no regal rooms here for a Hittite princess in the 19th Dynasty. There is, in fact, no compelling reason to date the inner walls of Borchardt's plan any later than Dynasty 18, when it is quite sure that there was a great royal establishment on the site.

The main problem, still unresolved, is why there is a small Ramesside temple on top of this rubble-filled area surrounded by cemeteries, and with perhaps a small village to the north. It may be explicable in Egyptian terms: there must have been Ramesside settlements nearby in the cultivation, judging from the great expanse of Ramesside cemeteries. The kôm itself was ruinous and probably had lost much of any 18th Dynasty "taint" by the reign of Ramesses II. The foundation by Tuthmosis III may have been remembered and could have had significance, given the cult here of Tuthmosis III as deified king: the establishment of temples to one of his deified (and also respectable) forebears was a well-known policy of Ramesses II. Dedications were made here to the deified Tuthmosis III and Tuthmosis IV. Finally, there are some slight hints of special ties to the Theban area or to Theban cults of Amun, which may have brought
Gurob’s Tuthmosis III foundation into esteem. There is also some suggestion that there may have been another village close by that could have used the temple. The presence of the papyri here, mentioning the same officials of the Harim of Mi-Wer who are also present on the stelai, suggests that they may have formed part of an archive, and that the harim should have been relatively nearby.

**Historical Conclusions**

To conclude, I would suggest the following reconstruction of the history of the site:

1. Establishment of royal buildings by Tuthmosis III.

2. Use of the palace/temple/harim (fort? workshops?), village? and cemeteries? until the beginning of the 19th Dynasty, possibly as the harim of She.

3. Possible continuation, on some level, of occupation of a (new?) village into the 19th or even the 20th Dynasty.

4. Abandonment of the palace/harim/temple site at the beginning of the 19th Dynasty, and the digging of tombs in the North Town area.
5. Building of a new Ramesside palace/harim elsewhere, probably in the general vicinity; but only a Ramesside Temple, with a Tuthmosis III chapel, on the kôm, and perhaps a small village to the north.

6. Contemporaneous with No. 5, intrusive burials cut into the older deposits on the kôm; continuation of burials in the "main cemetery"; new cemeteries to the south (?) and to the north-west.

7. Burning at a later, unspecified date?

The presence of large numbers of Mycenaean vases in conjunction with royally-inscribed objects, the peculiarity of Gurob's archaeological circumstances, its ancient importance, its interest as the possible remains of a harim, all of these factors contribute to the continuing scholarly interest in this site. Unfortunately, it is all most likely to remain an almost completely insoluble archaeological puzzle.
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15 IKG, 50; Griffith (1898) pls. 39-40; RAD, Document II, pp. ix-x.
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type with splayed or incurved sides, Dynasty 18. See pp. 45-46, nos. 124-29, which might be similar, also COA II, pl. 33.4, top left. The Kahun axe is probably now in the Petrie Museum, University College London, as Petrie, Tools, pl. 74, A. 71 almost certainly illustrates it, in a reversed position. On p. 62 Petrie mentions it only as a lugged axe. On p. 8 he dates it to Amenhotep II, which may well have been a "typo" (his books are full of such things as they were produced very quickly). However, as he uses the date for a typological sequence, the error (dropping off one stroke) must have happened at some stage in his manuscript preparation, and not just in the printing. However, the unusual break makes it very likely that this is indeed his Kahun axe. Several other papyri from this same archive were purchased by Borchardt from a dealer who swore that the Berlin pieces came from Gurob, not Kahun: Alan Gardiner, "Four Papyri of the 18th Dynasty from Kahun," ZAS 43 (1906), p. 27. See also Ludwig Borchardt, "Der zweite Papyrusfund von Kahun und die zeitliche Festlegung des Mittleren Reiches der ägyptischen Geschichte." ZAS 37 (1899), pp. 89-103.

22 IKG, pp. 48, 50.

23Griffith, Hieratic Papyri: the letter of Amenhotep IV is P. Gurob I.1 and I.2 = Wente, Letters, pp. 28-29, no. 17; the Kahun papyri are listed as Gurob II.I, 2, 3, but clearly indicated as from Kahun. Also see Thomas, Gurob, p. 17, (iii).

24RAD, p. viii.

25KGM, p. 36.

26Griffith, in IKG, p. 50.

27IKG, p. 47.

28RAD, p. iii, "thirty years ago." RAD was published in 1948.

29E.g., the Berlin papyri belonging to the same legal archive as the Kahun find from House 7. These were purchased by Borchardt from a dealer who declared them to be from Gurob, not Kahun: Gardiner, "Four Papyri," ZAS 43 (1906), p. 27. See also W. M. F. Petrie, "Egyptian Working Drawings," Ancient Egypt (1926) p. 24: "Many years ago a petty dealer of Lahnum brought me a roll of papyrus... which had been found at Gurob, almost certainly of the XVIIIth Dynasty." This has sketches of a shrine: W. M. F. Petrie, Weights and Measures (London: 1926), p. 46, pl. 56; Thomas, Gurob, p. 87, no. 756. Also see her note on p. 88 for confusion between objects from Kahun and Gurob.

30As discussed above.

31AEF II, p. 116*.

32Loat, Gurob, pl. 17, no. 3; Kemp, "Harim," p. 131, no. 1; Thomas, Gurob, p. 15, no. 8. Possibly this is to be identified with the dedicatory of one of Petrie's stelai, as Thomas
indicates: *KGH*, pl. 22, no. 5, of a Captain of Police = Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 16, no. 32. The identification with *RAD* 18, 11.10, 13, 28 l. 14 is not secure. The papyri seem restored on the basis of Loat’s stela, which has the fullest version of the name and the only mention of *Mī-wer*.

33This translation courtesy of Lanny Bell. The translation as “heifers,” rather than “maidens” does not affect the identification of a harim at *Mī-Wr*, as several individuals who are concerned with cattle herding are known, and apparently the 19-20th Dynasty harim owned cattle: see Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 17, nos. 66-69. “Overseer of Cattle” belonging to Pharaoh, as well as to Amun-Re. The references in the study by Nord, cited below, also mention cattle belonging to the harim. Also see Loat, *Gurob*, p. 5, pl. 6.10 and Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 9, identify tethering pegs. The harim at Memphis was in the charge of the “Overseer of the Cattle of Karnak,” and the *Mī-Wr* harim may have been controlled by the “Overseer of the Cattle of Amun,” according to Gardiner, *WP*, pp. 18, 128-29. However, this particular case, and the use of “heifers” as opposed to “maidens,” does not mean that the word should not also be translated as “maidens”; it all depends on the context.

*nfrwt* has commonly been translated “maidens,” presumably because it is connected with a “harim.” Yet there is question as to the actual meaning of *bnrt*: see Betsy Bryan, “The Etymology of *bnr* ‘Group of Musical Performers,’ “BE* S* 4 (1982), pp. 35-54; William A. Ward, *Essays on Feminine Titles of the Middle Kingdom and Related Subjects* (Beirut: 1986), pp. 69, 76-77. There are many references to cattle in Gurob-related documents: see Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 17, nn. 66-69; *RAD* 18, 1. 3, 31, 11. 7, 14; *KGH*, pl. 22, no. 6. N. deG. Davies, *The Tomb of Nefer-hotep at Thebes*, I, Publications of the Metropolitan Museum of Art Egyptian Expedition, vol. 9 (New York: 1933), p. 58, no. 20 ref. pl. 20 translates “beauties” and, as he remarks, *nfrwt* is “applicable equally to youths and maidens, foals and heifers.” Surely in this title it refers to heifers. See Petrie’s translation: “Overseer of the King’s Girls,” in “Journal,” 20-26 January, 1889; he also incorrectly dated the stela (*KGH*, pl. 22.6) to Dyn. 18; *CDME*, p. 132; Abd el Hamid Zayed, “Some Notes on a Statuette of a Cow from Sheik Abbada (Antinoe),” *ASAE* 57 (1962), fig. 5 (following p. 142) = temp. Ramesses II: “cows from the harim of the beautiful ones” (reference courtesy of L. Bell): *jdw* (see *AEO*, II, p. 258*) (*i)m *bn(r);*it *nfrwt*.

Del Nord, “The Term *bnr*: ‘Harem’ or ‘Musical Performers’?” in Simpson and Davis, eds., *Ancient Egypt*, p. 144 fn. 74: no. 1—*imy-r kmt *bnr*, “overseer of the (Sacred) Black Cattle of the *bnr.*” no. 2—Middle Kingdom stela, “overseer of priests,” *imy-r kmt *bnr*. no. 3—Middle Kingdom, “Overseer of the Sacred *bnr* Cattle of the *bnr.*” pg. 145: black cattle sacred to Min and reserved for the *bnr*; fn. 84: *nfrt* maidens in the *bnr*. My thanks to Betsy Bryan for pointing out this reference to me.

Also see the following, references courtesy of Lanny Bell: Wolfgang Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, Probleme der Ägyptologie, III (Leiden: Brill, 1958), pp. 325-266, no. 6: Theban mayor *Sn-nfr* (temp. Amenhotep II) = *imy-r nfrwt* (determined with a cow?) of Amun; Aidan Dodson, review of Lana Troy, *Patterns of Queenship*, in *BiOr* 46 (1989), col. 45: Troy says there are two major categories, *bkrt-nsw* and *nfrwt* (unmarried). Dodson says this translation of *nfrwt* is not necessarily so.

Godess Renenutet and her qualities," typescript (Research Archives, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago), pp. 6-7, English summary of idem., De Godin Renenutet (Groningen: 1971; Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen).

The LdA does not address itself to this question.

34 n k$ n(y) s$ (ny-)sw(t) imy-r nfrw(t) Sty n(y) pr-hn(r)t m Mi-wr't1, courtesy of Lanny Bell. The text is given retrograde in Radwan, Kupfer, pl. 60, no. 336, but has been normalized by Petrie, KGH, p. 36, pl. 19, lower. See also Thomas, Gurob, p. 15, no. 16. Kemp, "Harim," p. 131, no. 4. Thomas identifies him with RAD, p. 20, 1. 9 = Doc. IV (G) which is restored from p. 21. 1. 5, where he is only mentioned as a scribe. Also Petrie, Ten Years, p. 128, fig. 96. See further discussion below.

35 IKG, p. 20, pl. 22, nn. 32, 33. For the one now in the Petrie Collection, see Thomas, Gurob, p. 35, pl. 42, no. 51. There is actually some question that there were two inscribed pieces, as both texts are written on the piece in University College, one on each side. Gardiner, WP II, p. 44; and Kemp, "Harim," p. 132, take this to refer to the Wilbour Papyrus' mention of a temple founded by Ramesses II, but this temple belongs to Ramesses III, as Petrie correctly read: see Thomas, Gurob, p. 7. Thomas says: "This seems clear evidence for a temple...[with this name]...having been here during the Ramesside Period." If this is accepted then it must be that the kôm of Gurob is the Ramesside Mi-wer. However, I do not think that this evidence is so "clear" and that there is plenty of room for reasonable doubt. Petrie gives no idea of the context of the slip(s) except that they were found together. As with all the objects from "Gurob," they could actually be from anywhere in the area and, as these are published in the second season, Petrie would have had no way of knowing their provenance. Gardiner also takes the "slip" to identify a Ramesses II foundation at Gurob: WP II, 44, also see Kemp, "Harim." Weinstein, "Foundation Deposits," p. 159, mentions rectangular blocks of wood from foundation deposits at Deir el-Bahari.

36 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 50, no. 1, tomb group pl. 30 with a Mycenaean stirrup jar (no. 45), plan pl. 19, p. 11. The name also occurs on an amulet (pl. 30, no. 28). Thomas, Gurob, p. 14, no. 1, suggests an association with the Overseer of Prophets in RAD, p. 35. 1. 5 = Doc. XVI (BB).

37 Gardiner, WP II, p. 45, says that Intresha mentions She on his coffin "merely substituting She for Mi-wer in another inscription from the same site." Gardiner's substantiating reference is only to a list of titles connected to Mi-Wer. As far as I have been able to ascertain, there are no other monuments of this man from Gurob, so Gardiner has not disproved a harim at She which was separate from that of Mi-Wer. See PN I, p. 38, 25, dated New Kingdom, and mentioning both the Gurob coffin and a statue of this man in Vienna; also PN II, p. 65, 12, coffin only, dated Dynasty 19.

38 Petrie, KGH, pp. 33, 40, says Turshoi were repulsed by Merneptah; see Kenneth Kitchen, Ramesside Inscriptions: Historical and Biographical (Oxford: Blackwell's, 1968-). IV 2.13. Gardiner, AEO, p. 132: list of personal names, beginning with In-; for the prefix with gods, see PN I, 38, 11 and 38, 25, for prefix with countries; also see AEO pp. 128*, 132*. For the prefix with a god, see PN I, p. 265, 13; R. D. Barnett and Černý,


41 Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 15, no. 10. The term is rdw.

42 *KGH*, pl. 24.1 for text; Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 15, no. 18. Thomas dates him as Dyn. 19, but it is more likely that he should be connected with the harim of She, like the others, and so a late 18th Dynasty hold-over. Thomas translates the title as "Scribe of the Royal Mansion," but she may be incorrectly reading ipt n(y)swt, "Harim of the King," as hwt n(y)swt "Royal Mansion."

43 A head-rest, see Thomas, *Gurob*, p. 16, no. 46, "Dyn. XVIII," but called Dyn. 19 in the text, p. 37, no. 68, pls. 4, 44.

44 Ibid., p. 9, although it should really be dated to Amenhotep IV.


46 Ibid., pp. 14-16, nos. 2, 5, 7, 57, from *RAD* (Ramesses II, year 67; Seti II), and *WP* (Ramesses V). Thomas also identifies a pre-New Kingdom offering table from Kahun as having the name of Wdjwr, governor of Southern She. *KGH*, p. 31, pl. 11.14.

47 He says only (*Gurob*, p. 1): "A small temple or shrine was dedicated to the worship of Tahutmes III, and is situated to the W.-N.-W. on the outskirts of the ancient town, and about fifty yards from the large temple discovered by Prof. Petrie about fourteen years ago. It was probably erected at the end of the XVIIIth, or beginning of the XIXth Dynasty, and built of medium-sized sun-dried bricks."

48 Borchardt, *Teje*, p. 3, fig. 2; Loat, *Gurob*, pp. 1-2, pl. 14; Kemp, "Harim," pp. 126, 129-30, fig. 3 on p. 127. Kemp compares this building with the small temples at Deir el-Medina and queries whether or not the Gurob temple could have been "the site of an oracle delivered through the statue of Tuthmosis III." Note that Borchardt's sketch is difficult to match precisely to Loat's plan. There are enough general similarities to make it quite likely that they are representing the same building, but the interior walls are placed quite differently.

49 I.e., where Petrie has surveyed and apparently where Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 3, found stamped bricks of Tuthmosis III. Kemp, "Harim," p. 217, fig. 3. The stamped bricks must have been somewhat newly visible here, as no one had noticed them before. Apparently there had been active brick-robbing in this area, as Loat's temple had also disappeared: Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, p. 3: "Neither did we find
any traces of the shrine mentioned in Gurob (Loat). ... We believe it to have been entirely carried off by the sēbbākhin and stonemasons in recent years."

50 IKG, pl. 25.

51 Ibid., pp. 15-16.

52 Ibid., p. 20, pl. 24, no. 3. The "Journal" of 28 November–5 December 1889 mentions the finding of the corner of a lintel and the block with the ka-name of Tuthmosis III (IKG, pl. 24.9). On 6-13 December they found the rest of lintel, including the part with the name of Amun excised and restored. The lintel was actually, it seems, in at least seven pieces: Thomas, Gurob, p. 20, n. iv.

53 Ibid., p. 20, pl. 24.7. In his "Journal" for 14-28 Nov., 1889 (Hughes-Hughes being in charge on the site) Petrie notes that the "only large pieces are a ka name of T. III on a slab a foot wide [i.e., pl. 24.9] & the corner of a lintel...both from the temple no doubt." The "black granite table" of Tiy is listed on 28 Nov.–5 Dec. 1889, and for 6-13 Dec., 1889 Petrie lists the wood cubit of Tutankhamun (pl. 24.12) and the door lintel of Tuthmosis III (pl. 24.3) with the restored name of Amun.

54 Although there were also stelai found in tombs: KGH p. 39, Tomb N.

55 Courtesy of L. Bell. For nfrt= heifers, see discussion above.

561. Loat's stelai, Gurob, pl. 17.1 = Amon and Mut of Karnak, lintel of Ry.
   2. The wood slip(s) with the name of a temple of Ramesses III in Mi-Wer. IKG, pl. 22, nos. 32, 33.
   3. RAD, p. 30, ll. 11, 15; Thomas, 14, no. 2: ḫmn-m-ipt , Ramesses II, year 67.
   4. Loat, Gurob, pl. 5.5, personal name Teentpet = "She of Luxor," from Tomb 063.
   5. Much later, but still a connection: Amon of Opet Pekashut-y-wer, given a donation of land by the High Priest of Amun. This is dated to the 9th–8th centuries B.C.; Kenneth Kitchen, The Third Intermediate Period (1100-650 B.C.) (Warminster: 1973), p. 480, table 13, giving three High Priests. However, Jan Quaegebeur objects to the exclusive connection of Amun of Opet with Luxor; this information courtesy of Lanny Bell.

57 Thomas, Gurob, p. 15, no. 15.

58 RAD, p. 31, ll. 7, 14 = Doc. XII (L).

59 Loat, Gurob, pl. 17.3.

60 Ibid., p. 7. Thomas, Gurob, p. 15, no. 8, and Kemp, "Harim," 131, n. 42, connect these two stelai and the individual of RAD, 18, ll. 10, 13 (restored); 28, l. 14 = Doc. III (F), temp. Seti II? (RAD, p. 18a, says that the restoration is "proved" by the two stelai); Doc. XI (K). RAD, p. xii identifies the man in Doc. XI with one of the stela. See also Kemp.

61Loat, Gurob, p. 7.

62IKG, p. 20, pl. 24.11, dates it to Dyn. 18, but H.M. Stewart, Egyptian Stelae, Reliefs and Paintings from the Petrie Collection, I. The New Kingdom (Warminster: 1976), p. 49, pl. 39.3 calls it Ramesside, and rightly says it must belong to the “later popular cult of Tuthmosis III.” It is unfortunate that in three publications (and two of them recent) only line drawings have been provided. See also PMIV, p. 113; Thomas, Gurob, p. 16, no. 55, and p. 84, pls. 39-40, no. 721: UC 14386, h. 17.8 cm., w. 14.2 cm., thickness 5.2 cm., of worn limestone.

63Thomas, Gurob, p. 84.

64“tm-anfrw.”

65See discussion above. Lanny Bell notes that the inscription is given as retrograde in Radwan, Kupfer, pl. 60, no. 336, but is normalized in KGH, pl. 19 and Wilhelm von Bissing, Metalgefässe. Catalogue Général des Antiquités Egyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Vienna: 1901), no. 3539. Note that the determinative used for Seti’s name is a Ramesside type (Dyn. 19-20): see M. Bell, “Polychrome,” p. 52, no. 39; 66, fn. 63. To these now add the following, courtesy of Lanny Bell: J. Černý and G. Posener, Papyrus hiératiques de Deir el Medina, I (Cairo: 1978), pl. 12.2; Jocelyne Berlandini-Grenier, “Le Dignitaire Ramesside Ramsès-em-per-Re,” BIFAO74 (1974), p. 15 and nn. 1-2; Fischer, “Sticks,” p. 31 and nn. 174; J. F. Borghouts, “Divine Intervention in Ancient Egypt and its Manifestation (b3w),” Egyptologische Uitgaven I, Gleanings from Deir el Medina, p. 52, n. 64. See also Radwan, Kupfer, p. 119 and fn. 55, who says the determinative should be Dyn. 19. This reinforces the Ramesside dating of this individual. Kemp, “Harim,” 131, no. 4, suggests the bowls come from the southern inner enclosure (i.e. “Town”), but I believe that Petrie did not really know much about this area until the second season. In the first his “town” is always built over the “temple”—and therefore the northern inner enclosure.

66“ḥr k m wdd snb hnn lw 3wt ‘ib n k3 n(v) ss (ny-osw) ḫb3 ṣ3 m3c-brw, courtesy of Lanny Bell. See KGH, p. 36, pl. 19; Radwan, Kupfer, p. 115-116 with references, pl. 61, no. 335.

67Wilhelm von Bissing, Metalgefässe, Catalogue Général des Antiquités Egyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Vienna: 1901), pl. 11, “wirkliches Hausgerät,” Adolf Erman, “Ägyptisches Waschgerath,” ZAS33 (1895), p. 144. See also Dothan, Batshe, pp. 58-59, 68-71, for a “flat bronze platter” that was found inside a clay coffin. A bronze jug had been placed in it, which does make it seem likely that they were used together, and that they were used for liquids. So it is possible that the Gurob example was used for washing, perhaps ritual purification of priests.

68Lanny Bell, personal communication.
The choices are rather restricted otherwise. Although both a similar basin and a fleshing knife were found inside Ramesside coffins by Dothan at Deir el Balah (Balahan, pp. 18, 58-9, 68-71, the basin could be part of a "wine-set"), it is still difficult to interpret the Gurob basins and knife as in-place tomb gifts, as there seems to be no trace of a tomb. The only other alternative that suggests itself is to consider them as robber's loot; they surely would not have been household gear.

Fortunately, a good parallel is available in the late 19th Dynasty Tell Basta hoards. William Kelly Simpson, in "Engraved Designs from the Tell Basta Treasure," AJA 63 (1959), identifies the objects as temple equipment. They include several vases with the dedicatory inscriptions to the ka of Atumemtaneb, Royal Butler. One reads "May thy Ka be before thee in life and beauty, and mayest thou pass eternity in life and well-being. To the Ka of the King's Butler, Atumemtaneb, the justified." Simpson says that the "formula...seems...a conventional one for an inscription on a vessel of metal, stone, or wood..."

"Journal," 24 February-2 March 1889; KGH, p. 34, pl. 17.32 in Boston, pp. 49-50 from a tomb, also see no. 21, p. 50. This last is from a butcher's establishment at Amarna: CDA II, pl. 47.1, top, p. 68, House S. 33.1, "brass fleshing-knife, 19.6 cm. long, no. 30/522. Note that 30/464, base of a LH III A2 piriform jar, also came from here. Also see Petrie, Tools, p. 25, pls. 29. 231 (which he thinks belongs to the Sea-Peoples!); 26 type 142, A. 58.8. Dothan, Balahan, p. 18, found a knife with an animal-leg handle, but a different tip, inside a Ramesside clay coffin burial.

KGH, p. 36, pl. 19; Petrie, Ten Years, p. 128, fig. 96. See von Bissing, Metalgefasse, 54, no. 3539 for Stby; pl. 52, no. 3533 for ph3-3 m3cbrw (= KGH pl. 19, upper: "The Warrior of Aa"). Both are dedicated in k3...n(y).

Loat, Gurob, p. 1.

Note that a ring of Seti II was found above the fallen debris of a room, "conclusively showing" that the town was destroyed by this time: KGH, p. 33. There were certainly no monumental remains of the 19th and 20th Dynasty located on the site by any of the excavators.

Thomas, Gurob, pp. 5, 8-77, no. 33 on p. 24.

J. Yoyotte "Les Grands dieux et la religion officielle sous Séti Ier et Ramsès II," BSFE 3 (1950), pp. 18-19: "La dévotion du roi envers un dieu étant marquée par le choix de sa ville comme lieu de résidence...." P. 22: "...l'énorme masse de documents laissés par Séti Ier et Ramsès II permet de retrouver sous la XIXe dynastie les traces de la concurrence qui avait opposé les grands cultes au temps des Thoutmosides, et des efforts accomplis par la monarchie, à la faveur de ces conflits, pour éviter l'accaparement du pouvoir par le trop puissant sacerdoce thébain."

Thomas, Gurob, p. 20. She incorrectly cites Loat Gurob, pl. 16.2 as Tuthmosis III.
77 Loat, Gurob, p. 16.2. Thomas, Gurob, p. 20, identifies this as of Tuthmosis III, but the plural strokes show quite clearly in the drawing, which would identify it as Tuthmosis IV. However, the name is written very peculiarly, and it may be a modern draftsman’s misunderstanding of a mn-sign, and it could be Tuthmosis III. As this is clearly a cult of Tuthmosis III, this is probable.

78 See discussion above. Also see M. Bell, “605,” pp. 68-69; idem., “Polychrome,” passim, for a type of 19th Dynasty funerary vase typical of Deir el-Medina and unexpectedly found in a tomb at Gurob; also Bernard Bruyère, “Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh 1934-35,” FIFAO, 16 (Cairo: 1939), p. 52.

79 Loat, Gurob, pp. 1, 3, mentions the “ruins of a small village, also dating from the XVIIIth Dynasty,” “about 500 yards to the south of the old town.” As we have seen, Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, p. 2, place this somewhere near point “D” on their pl. 2. This is in a shallow wadi southwest of and behind the palace kôm.

80 The papyri, of course, have had a more pragmatic purpose: at Karnak North a number of clay seals were found near bread ovens, the papyri having apparently been used as fuel (personal communication, Helen Jacquet-Gordon).

81 See Gitton, review of Thomas, p. 357: the great temple, according to Gitton (or harim, or palace), is said to be certainly the work of Tuthmosis III.

82 For a suggestion of what it might have looked like, see Davies, Neferhotep, pl. 14, pp. 23-24, temp. Ay. The queen is shown leaning out of a window of appearances from a building with is identified as the harim of Ay.

83 See Gitton, review of Thomas, p. 358, cites a Gurob temple of Ramesside date but unknown location, but he may be referring to the temples mentioned on Petrie’s wooden slips: see discussion above.
CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS

The Harim

The Harim Economy: Workshops

The palace/harim of the 18th Dynasty certainly had an important economic position, at least in the area. It is most likely that it supported a number of artisans producing goods for the royal patrons. Many objects of Dynasty 18 date that have survived in area tombs and on the site are exceptionally beautiful and sophisticated, and the products of superb craftsmen. It is quite possible that, with further study, an 18th Dynasty Fayum style in wood carving and faïence may be distinguished. If Petrie's chronological distinction is correct between the faïence and glass bead types found in the north of the site and those found in the south, the evidence of the types from the southern kôm may well indicate 18th Dynasty production. These included parts of polychrome faïence floral collars and delicate pierced work (for beads and pendants). Petrie found a faïence "factory" somewhere on site. Textile production may well have been as important to this harim as to that of Dynasty 19. If the kôm is not the site of a 19th dynasty palace, then all the balls of flax thread, shuttles and other weaving paraphernalia that Petrie found could well belong to the 18th Dynasty occupation. Some of them, at least, can be localized in the northern enclosure.
There is ample evidence of skilled faience workshops, perhaps also localized in the Fayum, from the 19th Dynasty Burnt Groups. The beautiful faience bowls, flasks, and jars may show a regional style, and are certainly among the most attractive examples found in Egypt. The faience "cucumbers" may perhaps have also been a local specialty.

A further indication of international contacts which must be explored is that the finds at Gurob include glass vessels that appear to be of a type found in the Levant. This suggests a trade network that extended beyond the immediate area of the Fayum.

There may be even more evidence for a regional style in Dynasty 19 glass production. Petrie saw a greatly increased use of glass for beads in the North Town (Dynasty 19). There may have been a factory built over the walls of a building lying behind the "Fort." Glass has been considered as a luxury item of limited production and distribution, and Cooney has even considered that it was restricted to court circles in the 18th Dynasty. There are several features of the glass vessels from Gurob, mostly from the Burnt Groups, that suggest a local workshop, such as techniques of three-thread overlay, a spoked-wheel pattern on flasks, and the manufacture of miniature flasks, possibly for perfume.

International Trade

That the 19th Dynasty Fayum was not only locally important, but had international contacts seems proved by trade in some of these same specialized items. For faience, Peltenburg has remarked that he finds the best parallels at Gurob for Egyptian vessels exported to the Levant. In this connection we should not forget the "cucumbers," with their odd, but
possibly significant, distribution pattern of the Fayum and Cyprus. The glass needs further study, but it is possible that it too may also show a similar connection between Gurob and exported materials—there is already the example of the cartwheel motif.

A further indication of international contacts, which must be explored elsewhere, may be the localization in Gurob of most of the Mycenaean pottery with dipinti from Egypt. The total number for Egypt is nine, of which three are of unknown provenance. Of the remaining six, one is from Deir el-Medina, one is from "Gourna," and four are from Gurob. Again, this might point to a connection with Cyprus. The Gurob vases may all be from Ramesside funerary contexts.

The recent study of the Ulu Burun shipwreck, by Cemal Pulak, may give a glimpse of the mechanisms that were operating here, and the commercial routes in the late 18th or beginning of the 19th Dynasty. He suggests that this ship was special, in that it "...may represent a single shipment destined primarily for a specific port, and may, in fact, be our first direct evidence for state-administered trade based on gift exchange." Having already stopped in Cyprus, it was sailing to a region west of that island, possibly Crete. From there it may have sailed south to Egypt, "perhaps to the small harbor at Mersa Matruh...The investigators...believe the island served as a victualizing station for ships sailing from Crete toward the Nile Delta and the coast of Palestine."
Foreigners

There are a few actual foreigners known from Gurob. The coffin of ḫn-\textit{t̨r̩s̩} was found in Tomb 21. His name is compounded of a prefix, which cannot be understood, but is possibly Hurrian, and a suffix, the name of a country or people, \textit{t̨r̩s̩}. He was an important official in the Harim of \textit{She}. In the facing Tomb 20 was found the shabti of a sḏm \textit{c̄s} named S̄dy \textit{c̄mȳ}, Sadiami. Petrie took this name to be Hittite, but the most one can say is that the name does not seem to be Egyptian. Both individuals seem to use perfectly normal Egyptian funerary equipment and formulae. Both burials seem to belong to the beginning of the 19th Dynasty and both may perhaps be connected with the 18th Dynasty Harim.

For the 19th Dynasty, there is literary evidence. The letter from Gurob that was probably found in Petrie’s first season was written to the king (Seti II, year 2) concerning foreigners sent to be trained in the skills of weaving, presumably to the harim in \textit{Mi-Wer}. The author mentions an earlier group of foreigners that were brought during the reign of Ramesses II. Clearly weaving was an important activity in the region during the 19th Dynasty, although the training of foreigners seems to have been unusual enough as to be remembered as not occurring more often than once in the time of Ramesses II and once in the reign of Seti II. Another document mentions the preparation of clothing for the Hittite wife, Maahornerfrure, whom Ramesses II married in yr. 34, and one might expect that some of her people were involved in this at the harim.
The Ramesside Harim also had a foreigner as a royal butler (they were usually foreign\textsuperscript{32}). Loat found a stela of Ramessesemperre, $Rc\textit{mss}-m-pr-Rc$\textsuperscript{33}, “Royal Butler of the Lord of the Two Lands,” under Merneptah. This individual was a foreigner, also known as $Bn-\textit{Itn}$ of $Drbsn$. He is very well known from other monuments.\textsuperscript{34}

However, in spite of the great variety of nationalities that seem to have been present in the vicinity at various times, the lack of non-Egyptian remains on the site (except for the Burnt Groups), indicates that all these people must have been Egyptianized. Their stelae, burials, and other monuments appear perfectly normal. As for the Burnt Groups, it should not be forgotten that, although cremation was not practiced in either Mycenaean Greece or Bronze Age Egypt, it still may have been acceptable elsewhere in the ancient world.\textsuperscript{35} We should not expect the internationalism of the Late Bronze Age to have been limited to the purely tangible.\textsuperscript{36}

The Burnt Groups

It has now been demonstrated at length that the Burnt Groups from Gurob, if coherent archaeologically,\textsuperscript{37} were all intrusive into the 18th Dynasty ruin, and can best be seen as Ramesside. They do seem to form a sequence, as a comparison of objects from the Amenhotep III and Ramesses II A groups to
those of the Seti II group illustrates. So, the depositional activity most probably continued throughout the 19th Dynasty, if not later. And all this must bring the Mycenaean pottery found in the groups into this same period. Although the Burnt Groups certainly contained earlier materials, such as the head of Queen Tiy, and the Tutankhamun and Amenhotep III objects, and perhaps even some of the Mycenaean pottery, we must adhere to the principle already expressed: a locus must be dated by its latest evidence.

Petrie’s greatest achievement at Gurob was to fix the Greek Late Bronze Age in the era to which it belonged, essentially contemporary with the 18th and 19th Dynasties in Egypt. But his greatest failure was to forget that the objects with royal names from the Burnt Groups were only termini post quos. After relying so heavily on Petrie throughout the study, it is most surprizing to finish by supporting this crucial criticism of Petrie’s method, which had already been voiced by Torr in 1892.

The Tutankhamun Burnt Group must now been seen, if my proofs are accepted, as Ramesside in date of deposition. However, some of the objects, such as the Tutankhamun beads, did come from the 18th Dynasty. Also, the Mycenaean pottery from the group, any or all of it, could theoretically have been manufactured or imported to Egypt in the 18th Dynasty. But, the vases were all deposited here in the 19th Dynasty and that much is certain, even if it is all that is certain. The Tutankhamun Burnt Group, as well as the Amenhotep III Burnt Group, and in spite of protests to the contrary, does
not prove that LH III B pottery was in use during the reign of Tutankhamun, much less that of Amenhotep III. It does, however, show that LH III A2 pottery was still available in the 19th Dynasty.44

The Date of the Beginning of LH III B

When Hankey and Warren first began their revisions of Aegean absolute chronology, in 1973,45 they placed the transition of LH III A2 to LH III B "at the end of Tutankhamun or the end of the 18th Dynasty." The "end of the 18th Dynasty" was not much of an upward revision from Furumark's date of the reign of Seti I,46 taking in, as it did, only the one-year reign of Ramesses I and a maximum of eight years from Seti I.47 However, a displacement into the reign of Tutankhamun, and specifically his year 3, would have made a difference of forty-three years.48 Their statement was based on the following evidence:

A fresh study of material at Gurob may show, as Wace suggested, that no LH III A 2 pottery there can be dated later than Tutankhamun's reign..." They cite the Tutankhamun Tomb Group and Tomb 23 (the Tomb of "Res").

...the evidence from Amarna, Tell el Ajjur...and possibly Gurob...indicate that LH III A 2 has, at the least, begun during the reign of the same pharaoh [Amenhotep III]." Akhetaten is said to
have been abandoned in year 3 of Tutankhamun, on the basis of Redford.49

The Mycenaean pottery at Amarna includes several features of shape and decoration which show a clear tendency to what is to be standard in LH III B. It also includes an example of AS 182 which would confidently be classified as III B 1 if found anywhere else. If more evidence of Egyptian objects datable to Amenophis IV...or Tutankhamun and lying with III B material comes to light to add to that of Amarna, Gurob, Mycenae and Poros, the argument that such objects are older than their context will be difficult to sustain.

Only the evidence from Egypt is under consideration here. That from the Levant seems constantly under revision, and using it would put us in real danger of circular reasoning.50 The material from Greece is currently under study by Cline.51 The Egyptian evidence is essentially Gurob and Amarna. Warren and Hankey's position has changed little in their latest study, except for crystalizing around the Tutankhamun-LH III B connection,52 although Mrs. Hankey, independently, has accepted a date within the reign of Horemheb, which seems quite reasonable.53 In their recent joint paper, Warren and Hankey still relied heavily on Amarna, but possibly less so on Gurob.54 They did introduce some of the new evidence that they asked for in 1973, but it is not very strong and mostly circumstantial, and they seem to have deliberately ignored some new data that runs contrary to their expectations.55
Amarna Problems

1. The first question is the identity of the actual vases involved in the discussion. In her first discussion of the pottery involved, Mrs. Hankey based her identification of LH III B1 at Amarna on examples of pottery with body zone decoration. She said that "one was found whole in the House of the King's Statue...and sherds of three have been identified from the waste heaps, so far." One sherd is now known to have come from the Petrie Museum in University College London. That leaves two other sherds still unpublished, and the intact vase from the House of the King's Statue. It is quite possible that these sherds have been re-evaluated, and are not now considered to be III B1, as this has been the case with the intact vessel. After a number of years of discussion, it has finally been admitted to be LH III A2. So, we are left with the one stirrup jar from the Petrie Museum, and the new addition of the upper part of a globular stirrup jar (no body zone preserved) from Bonn.

2. The definitions of the LH III A and B styles are not carved in stone. They are definitely most mutable, and this should be kept in mind. The difficulties are especially noticeable where it concerns stirrup jars--it is often not possible to find parallels at Mycenae for the Egyptian material in shape or decoration. Not having settlement assemblages to work from, the definitive distinctions between vertical and horizontal whorl-shells or the introduction of the deep bowl (which may not even occur in Egypt) are
largely irrelevant. If Amarna is proved to be a closed context, it may be necessary to review the whole deposit with a view to its representation of a single style, i.e. the two vases would be redefined as belonging to an "Amarna Style." 64

However, further study of the two pieces might also show that not only are they III B but they are not even early III B, as one would expect. The use of a body or belly zone of decoration is very unusual for the Mycenaean pottery from Egypt, and is very rarely encountered. I have already pointed out that "The appearance of a narrow body zone on this vase [the UCL sherd] separates it from the rest of our collection [my list of FS 182 from Egypt] as much as its provenance and perhaps indicates a closer connection to mainland/Argolid sources for Amarna than for other Egyptian sites." 65

The various evidences of the association of Gurob with Cyprus we have already seen are further indications that this may indeed be the case.

The development of narrow body zone decoration at Mycenae, as applicable to Amarna, can now be further examined, since Hankey has accepted the intact vase as LH III A2. Its wide body decoration can now be accepted as belonging to the experimental stages seen at this time in Greece. Following upon this there seems to have been an intermediate stage, with the stirrup jars exhibiting narrow body zones, but in multiples. 66 It may have been an early phase of III B1 and "the immediate stylistic successor to L.H. III A 2." 68 The final and developed style, closest to the UCL sherd, can be seen in the vases from the later III B1 destruction levels at Mycenae: "In
my opinion this group is the climax of this meticulous globular type with *Flower* shoulder zone and a neat body zone. Experiments which were noted in Late L.H. III A and very early L.H. III B examples have been abandoned.…" So, the UCL vase would seem to represent not the phase immediately following III A2, but a developed stage of III B1. Given the anomalous position of the UCL and Bonn pieces, as the only two out of hundreds to be so advanced, it may be appropriate to explore the possibility of a different history for them—of importation and deposition.

The Bonn example is also probably worth a more extensive study than it has so far received. Its general conformation, the shape of the shoulder, and especially the rather loose arrangement of the lozenges suggests something of Mountjoy’s LH III B2 examples.

A further problem with the two vases is their fragmentary condition. If only the body zone had remained of the FS 171, it would probably still be identified as III B. Having the rest of the profile while making the attribution would be so much more reassuring. The excellent drawings presented by Warren and Hankey have given us as much information as is available, unless further joins can be made.

If we assume that these two vases are III B1, then what are the implications, aside from those already put forward by Warren and Hankey. I think it worth considering, as already mentioned, what it means to have two, and only two apparently, vases of developed style amongst so many
homogeneous hundreds. The oddity of the situation would be especially striking if they are indeed not the direct continuation of the previous style. If this situation had occurred anywhere except Amarna, I think that there might have been a different interpretation. Another problem having bearing on this is the context of the sherds. They are presumed to have come from Petrie’s dump, but Petrie did find pottery elsewhere on the site. If there is any question that they may have come from another part of the site, the case for their association with the III A2 pottery from the dump is immediately, and greatly, weakened.

3. The use of Amarna as a closed context is, in my opinion, the result of extensive propagandizing on the part of Pendlebury. Egyptologists who had excavated at the site were more hesitant in their interpretation of the Mycenaean sherds, and even of the stratigraphy, and they had less of a position to defend. Prima facie, it is an extraordinary statement to make, that an enormous site like Amarna is to be considered as a “closed deposit.” The problem may be semantic: my understanding of the term is that it refers to a situation in which materials are sealed off in some way from any later human activity. It is impossible to think of Amarna in this way, as it is possible to demonstrate later human activity at various parts of the site, perhaps right up to the modern day. The most that can be said for Amarna is that the remains seem to have been deposited in the main part during the reigns of Akhenaten, Smenkhkare, Tutankhamun, and Horemheb.
Modern Egyptologists also have a vested interest in the interpretation of Amarna as a closed context, with the resultant chronological convenience. It is used as a fixed point in developmental sequences for all sorts of Egyptian artifacts, both tangible and intangible. For example, in studies of town planning, the arrangement of architectural remains at Amarna are taken as essentially one period. So, the more "organic," irregular settlement in the north-west is taken as a "slum," rather than as the village it would be seen if it were sited elsewhere. Not only was there a great deal of secondary reuse, the so-called "squatter activity," in this area, but it is also situated at the best (narrowest) river crossing, near to the modern village in fact. Students of Egyptian history have their own axes to grind. Those who wish to postulate an original burial of Akhenaten at Amarna, with a subsequent re-burial at Thebes, in Kings' Valley Tomb 55, must see the disturbance of the Amarna tomb and the closure of the Theban one as happening within the reign of Tutankhamun. It is only through further excavation that we may hope to obtain the data that will put our understanding of the history of activity on the site into a fixed and unequivocal form.

Arthur Evans, although almost certainly biased, thought that the Amarna dump at Amarna as a closed context has recently been reiterated by Bourriaud. She states that the Mycenaean pottery from Amarna, along with Gurob 245 and 605, and the Teti Pyramid cemetery group comes from "closed, if not intact groups." The materials in the dump probably came from a source or sources in the surrounding buildings, not the Palace, 600 or so meters away. Its length of use was probably continuous and contemporary with the occupation of the Central City. So,
the materials probably had a similar depositional history, but it is not a closed context. Too much human activity, after deposition, has occurred. This can be proved by the migration of sherds out of the dump area and into surrounding building remains.\textsuperscript{84} The ruins of Amarna were never sealed off by a layer of melted bricks or the like, and they have remained at a very shallow depth below the soft desert surface.

4. One of the most vexing questions about the Mycenaean pottery from Amarna, and indeed, for all of Egypt, is the question of who was using it,\textsuperscript{85} and for what purpose. Warren and Hankey, in rebutting my earlier comments,\textsuperscript{86} have said "It seems unlikely that anybody who valued social standing would have stayed on at Amarna in company with the pig-keepers, and there seems to be no evidence that, if they did, they bought newly-arrived foreign goods, such as Mycenaean pottery."\textsuperscript{87} The statement seems almost totally composed of assumptions, but the fact remains that we do not know if pig-keepers could have afforded Mycenaean pottery or not. Arthur Evans, although almost certainly biased, thought that the Amarna pottery was fit only for Aegean workmen.\textsuperscript{88} Pendlebury himself admitted the possibility that "squatters" could have "imported the Aegean merchandise."\textsuperscript{89} At Deir el-Medina, the inhabitants certainly were not concerned with social standing, at least in court terms, and find spots at both Kom Rabia and Qantir do not suggest users of very elevated status. The dump is located next to the "Police Barracks," with a large number of horse stables. It was built on a natural elevation and so provides the
possibility for the development of a four-foot depth of deposit, such as Petrie described. It is most tempting to see the uniquely large number of pilgrim flasks found here and a reflection of function, and to connect that with the barracks.\textsuperscript{90} An intact pilgrim flask was found in the North Suburb, in part of the "Greek Grocer's House," the "khan," a large stabling area for animals, with mangers and servants' quarters.\textsuperscript{91} It could be a kind of product specialization that was reflected in packaging. The only intact stirrup jar from the site, the example discussed above, was found in the "House of the King's Statue." This seems to have been a small $ka$-chapel, and two other very special Egyptian ritual vases were also found here.\textsuperscript{92} So, for the stirrup jar there is a religious setting, again perhaps indicating product specialization. In short, there are many rather simple tombs with Mycenaean pottery, and at settlements some of the pottery at least may have had very practical, non-luxury uses.

The economic assumptions underlying ideas of the pottery's expensiveness also need to be questioned. Modern concepts such as distance adding to value, and causing selection of items for trade according to value, may not have been operating anciently. There is no reason to think that Mycenaean pottery was much more than supplementary to more significant trade goods, such as metals. Further, even expensive Mycenaean items may have been cheap to the Egyptians, possessors of gold mines, where "gold was like dust."\textsuperscript{93}
5. The importance of depositional differences must also be questioned. Although most of the Mycenaean pottery comes from Petrie’s dump, which is in itself rather peculiar, sherds and vases have been found elsewhere. The stirrup jar from the House of the King’s Statue, and the pilgrim flask from the North Suburb have already been mentioned. But there were also two small piriform jars found at the Bridge between the Palace and The King’s House. And single sherds were scattered about the site in public and private buildings alike. All of this should be re-examined to try and form a comprehensive theory for the pottery from the whole site.

6. The chronological argument for the Aegean pottery is affected by a problem with the chronological placement of the Egyptian material. As in the Aegean, historical events do not always coincide with moments of ceramic innovation and it is still not really possible to differentiate between materials of the late 18th Dynasty and those of the early 19th Dynasty. As one might expect, they are not very much different. The culture of late 18th Dynasty is itself a development of the earlier 18th Dynasty, and the recognizable 19th Dynasty style still comes out of the 18th. So Bourriau, who treats the Amarna Mycenaean pottery as a closed context, is yet able to say of the Egyptian pottery, “The corpus of pottery is a familiar one from Amarna and from the tomb of Horemheb at Saqqara.” The tomb, of course, had at least one Ramesside burial. Bourriau’s next stratigraphically defined levels at Kom Rabia have the following stage of Ramesside pottery, up to the reign of Ramesses II. So, in ceramic terms, Egyptologists are not
yet able to distinguish between forms of the Amarna Period, and those immediately following into the 19th Dynasty. This obviously has an impact on the absolute dating of the Mycenaean pottery. In Egyptian ceramic terms, the end of occupation at the site can be stated only quite generally. It is, again, only historical assumptions that fix the absolute date.

7. Finally, the date of the end of activity at Amarna that might be connected to the Mycenaean deposit is essentially an Egyptological problem, and Aegean specialists should not expect to be able to solve it with the data now available. Further excavation is, again, the key here.

Taphonomical studies are still in their infancy in Egypt, but if we can apply Hoffman’s evidence from Early Dynastic Hierakonpolis to Amarna, we can suppose that with the abandonment of a structure, the final rubbish will be left on the floor. Hoffman says that “Trash of inorganic as well as organic variety will be left on the floor and appears in the archaeological remains as soil discolorations, clusters of milling stones, groups of broken or even whole pots....In such instances, the distribution of vessel types may be an important clue to the function of different rooms within a house....” We can then say that the unbroken stirrup jar in the House of the King’s Statue should belong to the final use of the building. The other intact vase was the FS 189 in the North Suburb. So, both vessels, presumably in use until the end, were LH III A2. Are these then to be seen as heirlooms? Or are the stylistically later vases to be interpreted as also chronologically later? Or
was the dump in use after both the "Greek Grocer's House" and the House of the King's Statue were abandoned? These questions must really be answered in order to continue to derive a chronological value from the later sherds.

The city consisted mainly of religious buildings and many of these must have continued in use until the proscription. The House of Life, where

I think it is appropriate to present here the conclusions from my 1987 lecture, which will be published elsewhere. Woolley said "no doubt that when Tutankhamun shifted the seat of government back to Thebes Akhetaten fell into decay." This has been the common Egyptological assumption and underlies all interpretive use of the site and its materials. But, was Akhetaten only a seat of government? It is possible that the city, although functioning as an administrative center while a royal city, was primarily conceived of as a religious and ceremonial center, similar to the earlier position of Karnak. Karnak was the chief cult place of the principal god of the earlier 18th Dynasty, Amun, with enormous political as well as religious significance. When Akhenaten closed the temples of Karnak and Luxor, he needed to replace them, insofar as their function continued in his new theology. As Lanny Bell has suggested to me, Karnak may have been supplanted by the Great Temple of Akhetaten, with the Aten as the principal god. This would suggest that an important purpose of the royal city of Akhetaten was to maintain and support this temple. The proscription of the Aten cult seems not to have taken place until sometime during the reign of Horemheb, who, as king, actually made at least one dedication in the Sanctuary of the Great Temple to the Aten. This was certainly some years after the transfer of political power, so the city must
have continued as a religious center at least until this time.\textsuperscript{104} Petrie made this point more than 100 years ago.\textsuperscript{105}

The center city consisted mainly of religious buildings and many of them must have continued in use until the proscription. The House of Life, where Mycenaean sherds have been found, should still have been active. The Military may have also been in place at the Barracks.\textsuperscript{106} If activities in this building did generate Petrie's dump, the dump may also have still been in use. It may also be at this time that we find the last use of the House of the King's Statue, and its stirrup jar with the experimental body zone. So, the evidence suggests that significant occupation at Amarna lasted at least into the reign of Horemheb.\textsuperscript{107} However, we must not forget that this was probably not the \textit{end} of occupation on the site. There seem to have been villagers about,\textsuperscript{108} Ramesses II's workmen looted the stone, and there was a Dyn. 20 temple nearby to the south.\textsuperscript{109}

Mrs. Hankey's most recent independent study of the situation concludes "The handful of LH IIIB\textsuperscript{1} pieces at El Amarna can thus be narrowed to the reign of Horemheb (maximum twenty-two years). On this reasoning LH IIIA\textsuperscript{2} ended in the late XVIIIth Dynasty rather than at the beginning of Ramesses II..." It seems that a consensus is forming. Again, note that Furumark started LH III B with the reign of Seti I.
Aside from Amarna and Gurob, there is now some question as to whether or not finds of Mycenaean pottery from tombs groups at Saqqara will provide evidence for the Dyn.18 beginning of LH III B. They can briefly be examined here.

1. The still unpublished vases from the Tomb of Horemheb, consisting of LH III A2 and III B sherds in a disturbed context, cannot successfully demonstrate that III A2 pottery was not current in the 19th Dynasty. As when the “unacceptably late” Deir Alla correlation of LH III B pottery with Tewosret was first suggested, resort has been made to the “heirloom theory.” LH III A2 material came from a burial identified by the excavators as that of a Ramesside princess which was made during the reign of Merneptah. Although the reign of Merneptah would seem a bit late for III A2, it is no proof that the vase was 100 years old when deposited. One might rather think that they demonstrated a transition of III A to B during the Ramesside use of the tomb. The same seems to be true of the other Mycenaean pottery from the late 18th Dynasty-19th Dynasty tombs at Saqqara: in character they are very much transitional, and they seem to be found in contexts that are Ramesside, although the tombs may well have had earlier use.
2. There is as yet no evidence from Deir el-Medina for placing the III B pottery any earlier than the Ramesside occupation of the site,\textsuperscript{113} and none is expected.

3. The Mycenaean stirrup jar found in Tomb 23 at Gurob has recently been called LH III B,\textsuperscript{114} although Furumark's LH III A2 attribution may still be correct.\textsuperscript{115} As discussed above, this tomb probably dates to the very end of the 18th Dynasty, or even the beginning of the 19th, which is just about where Petrie had placed it, in the reign of Seti I.

4. Potentially the most important new data for this argument are the stratified sherds from the settlement site of Kom Rabia, at ancient Memphis.\textsuperscript{116} Bourriaud has concluded that these suggest "the following synchronism...that LH III A 2 Mycenaean was still in circulation at Kom Rabia during the early XIX Dynasty - up to the beginning of the reign of Rameses II, in 1279 BC." The stratigraphic sequence is firmly fixed, but some of the sherds were in secondary usage. The finds are remarkable also in that they show the pottery in rather humble surroundings.

In a context with materials comparable to those from Amarna and the Tomb of Horemheb were sherds from flasks (FS 188,\textsuperscript{117} and FS 190\textsuperscript{118}), both LH III A2. The horizontal flask may have been used as a scoop. Succeeding strata are associated with the early 19th Dynasty, up to the accession of
Ramesses II. In them were sherds of a very large, globular stirrup jar (FS 170119) in III A2 or III B1 style, and the first example of the shape known from Egypt, and also the clearly identifiable base of a flask, FS 189,120 certainly LH III A2, thought to be reused as a gaming piece.

Bourriau suggests that

Perhaps we ought to allow a time-lag at Kom Rabia, to allow for the Mycenaean pottery to filter through from the higher levels of society where it first entered the country? “The Mycenaean pottery at RAT was used until it became broken or lost, and it shows the signs of that use. Tomb offerings, on the other hand, were simply deposited and left, but could suffer a calamitous later history as tombs were robbed and/or re-used.

5. At the settlement site of Abu Goud, Luxor, a number of Mycenaean sherds have been found. These include an FS 189 that is associated with a 19th Dynasty level, although there was an earlier 18th Dyn. level at the site. The site is part of the ancient city of Thebes, and may be residences of temple functionaries.

6. We should also add the contexts at Gurob that are now probably to be seen as Dynasty 19 in date, such as Group 7, which included two LH III A2 vases.121 Furumark’s No. 2, Petrie’s Dated Find No. 3, would also be a
usable Dynasty 19 context, if the sherds connected with it can ever be identified.

**Chronological Trends**

Leonard, discussing very similar problems in Palestinian archaeology, has concluded that Furumark's chronological evidence is invalid. So, he found himself at the same "crossroads" where we have now arrived. He suggested that the choices were:

1. reject both Furumark's typology and his chronology.
2. keep his typology but appeal to more recently excavated deposits for the dates,
3. keep both his typology and his chronology.

The first path, total rejection, would amount to archaeological heresy (although in time such a course may prove to be necessary). The second option, retention of the typology, has resulted only in a fine-tuning of Furumark's 1941 chronology. This is why many Near Eastern archaeologists have taken the third path (total retention).

The arguments presented in this dissertation have been predicated on the second option, as a review of the absolute chronology is clearly necessary. However, at least for the Egyptian material, the need to reject Furumark's typology has not yet been demonstrated. Mere practicality also dictates the choice of the second option. It is impossible to revise the typological sequence of Mycenaean pottery from across the Mediterranean. This must
be done on the bases of stratification in Greece and pottery producing areas.\textsuperscript{124} Sherratt has been critical of the growth of the "mystique of the ceramic specialist," and the attempts to make a "pottery-based chronology" in which "sharper and more sensitive criteria for identifying stylistic pottery phases must inevitably forward the quest for ever closer dating." She concludes that "Pottery can only operate as a practical framework for chronology at a relatively crude level. The Aegean pottery sequence is already being made to work harder than that of any other part of the pre- or proto-historic world."\textsuperscript{125}

For the earlier phases of the Aegean Late Bronze Age, science is now providing an alternative to pottery chronologies, which has resulted in their elevation.\textsuperscript{126} The same tendency has also been noted independently in pottery chronologies.\textsuperscript{127} However, for the later phases where pottery is still the only available resource, the trend seems definitely in the other direction, both in Egypt, as we have seen, and apparently also in the Levant.\textsuperscript{128} However, these two trends need not be mutually exclusive. The estimation of length of phases has been based on unreliable evidence and assumptions, such as quantities of pottery produced, or amounts of innovation, and this is all quite mutable.\textsuperscript{129} Betancourt has noted,\textsuperscript{130} "If LM IA is raised, then later periods must either be expanded or they must also be raised slightly, an 'accordion effect' which changes several dates." So far, the "accordion" seems to be the method of choice, but it seems that
expansion is a much more logical option. This is an inconvenience, perhaps, but firmly established associations of Aegean materials with the reigns of Egyptian kings cannot be ignored because they are inconvenient.\footnote{The Egyptological data may still help in the development of a historical chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean.\footnote{Finally declare a statement. Petrie was correct that Late Helladic pottery was imported into Egypt in the 18th and 19th Dynasties. However, Torr was also correct in asserting Petrie's assumption. His logical failure in considering that the Burnt Groups could not be earlier than the inscribed objects found in them.}}

Final Remarks

As for Gurob, it is to be hoped that the thesis has been proved, and that the site will now be seen correctly as an 18th Dynasty site with some 19th Dynasty intrusions, a temple, and perhaps some houses. As for III B, it is fairly certain that it did not appear in Egypt any earlier than the final years of the 18th Dynasty, and it is probably more properly to be seen as belonging to the 19th Dynasty. It is to be hoped that the Tutankhamun Burnt Group will no longer appear as evidence for the early arrival of LH III B pottery.

In terms of methodology, it is rather unsettling to find that techniques employed in this paper are little advanced on those disputed by Petrie and Torr. The significant advantage we enjoy is an enormous increase in quantity: the typology of stirrup jars is now based on many thousands of examples instead of the handful Petrie had available from Gurob. But the basis is still the same, style. Over and over again, I have applied the argument that similarity of style means closeness in date, exactly as Petrie
did. It has also been observed that perceived anomalous occurrences may still be attributed to heirlooms, or foreign workmen. Even my operating principle, that the latest item dates the group, had already been stated during the Petrie-Torr controversy of 1892. And here, almost on the centenary of their great dispute, we may finally declare a stalemate: Petrie was correct that Late Helladic pottery was imported into Egypt of the 18th and 19th Dynasties. However, Torr was also correct in assessing Petrie’s methodological failure in considering that the Burnt Groups could not be later than the inscribed objects found in them.

It is to be hoped that more skillful analytical techniques can be developed and applied to this now quite large body of material. There is also a clear need for the development of stratigraphically based sequences in both Greece and Egypt. Finally, we should begin to depend more on the scientific evidence for chronology, as its reliability continues to improve. As Manning has observed, "...if the eruption of Thera can be absolutely established by the combination of several independent means, it, and not the disputed correlations with Egyptian pharaoh chronologies [sic], should then form the basis of Mediterranean chronological correlations." We look forward to the establishment of more such fixed points.

At the beginning of this paper, we found Petrie attacking the recently-antiquated positions of certain classicists, and assisting at the birth of perception of an independent Mycenaean culture. We may here too be
coming full circle, and moving towards a balance of previously antipathetic positions, if Eric Cline’s recent comments presage the future:

Whether Mycenae had already become a major power on mainland Greece at this time, thus stimulating Egyptian interest, or whether it was Egyptian influence that helped Mycenae to rise to a dominant position in the LH III A Aegean is still an unresolved but interesting question. Those who believe in a significant Egyptian influence in the Bronze Age currently constitute a minority within the archaeological community; however, this situation may change as a result of recent and forthcoming publications. In the not too distant future we may have to reevaluate our concepts concerning the relations between Egypt and the Aegean during the Late Helladic IIIA period.135
CHAPTER VII: ENDNOTES

1 M. Gitton, in his review of Thomas, Gurob, col. 358, points out that the 19th Dynasty harim would have had a considerable economic role, due to its weaving industry. Not only was it a domicile for royal women, but also as an “organisme perement assurant autour du roi l’entretien d’un certain ceremoniel.” For the harim as an institution see Reiser, Harim. Del Nord, “Egyptian Words for ‘Harem’ and ‘Concubine’ in the Old and Early Middle Kingdoms,” NARCE 87 (1973), p. 35; Janssen, “Prolegomena,” pp. 167-68. For possible similarities between Gurob and a suggested harim at the Maru Aten see Thomas, “Maru-Aten,” pp. 11-12.

2 A number of wooden figures of the royal family of the late 18th Dynasty have been found at Gurob. It is not impossible that some of them were made in the treasury or workshops that must have been connected to the palace/harim or temple. The head of Tiy is the most notable example, but Borchardt mentions others in his study of the head: Borchardt, Teje, passim, especially pp. 14-23. Also see Hartwig Altenmüller and Wilhelm Hornboestel, Das Menschenbild im Alten Ägypten (Hamburg, 1982), cover photo, p. 49; Kemp, “Harim,” p. 126, fn. 24; Echnaten, Nofretete, Tutanchamun (Hildesheim, 1976), no. 72. Tombs at Gurob have been the source of many beautiful small figures, apparently ka-statues. When they can be dated they seem to be late Dynasty 18, perhaps from Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, but others from Tombs 20-21 might be slightly later. Five are from Chassinat’s tomb (Chassinet, “Une Tombe inviolée,” BIFAO 1 (1901), pp. 225-34), dated by objects of Amenhotep III, Tiy, and Akhenaten. One, with the remains of a name ...iβ..., may have been of Kiya, Akhenaten’s wife: Thomas, “Maru-Aten,” p. 12, with references. For them and others see, e.g.:


No. 2. J. Vandier, Manuel, pl. 173.5 = Brooklyn 54.187, p. 677, III, Chassinet.

No. 3. J. Vandier, Manuel, pl. 173.4, private collection, p. 677, V.


No. 6. J. Vandier, Manuel, pl. 172.3 = MMA 41.2.10, p. 677, I, Chassinet.

No. 7. Ludwig Borchardt, Statuen, p. 100, pl. 148, no. 802, JdE 28735, found by Petrie at Gurob in 1888/89 (see EGH, p. 38, pl. 22.7 for text).

No. 8. Also see Echnaten, Nofretete, Tutanchamun, no. 83, from the Pelizaeus Museum, no. 54; fig. of youth with sidelock, said to be from the palace complex, Gurob. It thought to represent a prince of the royal family, as the base was originally from the figure of Queen Tiy and reads “...for Queen Tiy.”

No. 9. Note the remains (only the feet on a basis) that Petrie seems to have found: Thomas, Gurob, no. 725, p. 85 and pl. 56.

For other Dyn. 18 carved, wooden objets d’art from Gurob see: The Exhibition of Art Treasures of Ancient Egypt, p. 292, no. 82, pl. 126; Boston, p. 213-14, no. 257; Quibell, “Hawaret,” passim. For objects from Chassinet’s tomb, see Vandier d’Abbadie, toilette,
There are a number of very elegant faience objects bearing the names of Queen Tiye and her family from Gurob. Certainly they show that artisans of the highest abilities made them, and possibly even made them in the area. Borchardt, Teje, p. 23, fig. 35; Petrie said he found a violet faience amphoriskos of Tiye in his excavations, "Journal," 14-28 November 1889: "...[sketch of amphoriskos] little model amphora of violet glaze with inlaid black texts of Queen Thii [text appears to read Tiye m'B hnRw]." We might also mention the inscribed kohl tube from the Amenhotep III Burnt Group: IKG, pl. 17.20; the furniture knob, IKG, p. 19, pl. 19.38.

4 KGH, p. 37.

5 KGH, p. 37: "The beads and amulets were actually made here, as several moulds for rings and amulets, and beads stuck together in the baking, were found."

6 From Chassinet's tomb, there is the ka-statueette of the lady Teye, "Chief of Weavers" = Thomas, Gurob, p. 16, no. 45. Also Hewy, "Chief of spinners?" = Thomas, Gurob, p. 16, no. 46, on a headrest from T. 22.


8 "Journal," 8-15 December, 1888: "handsful of scraps of rings, etc. all of late XVIII and early XIX dynasty, beside more netting needles, balls of thread, wooden combs, etc. all of the same date...When I go there and we dig the tombs, we shall do better." 30 December-5 January: "...very little this week beside a piece of stone w/half the cartouches of Tahutmes III...More balls of thread, spindles, etc.; and a complete pottery fire-stand for cooking on." So the thread, etc. most probably came from the unsupervised workmen's excavation, before Petrie began his northern tombs, which were probably in the northern enclosure (also suggested by the find of the stone fragment).

9 IKG, pl. 17-18, 20. Pl. 20, no. 1 and 2 are quite unusual, see my discussion in Bell, "Polychrome," p. 75, fn. 131. For the probable multiplicity of faience workshops see Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, Faience, p. 223. They consider that foreign trade was a royal monopoly, so the use of imported cobalt as a coloring agent for faience is seen as restricted mostly to royal and temple use: two specimens are said to come from Gurob (pp. 252-53.2).

10 Nolte, Glas, p. 111 "Da in Gurob auch andere glaserne Gegenstände [beside the pieces from the Burnt Groups, which she has already listed] in großer Zahl gefunden wurden, mochte man das nicht bekannte Glasherstellungszenrum dieser Zeit in der Nähe der Stadt suchen. Für diese Annahme spricht die Tatsache, daß sich der Schwerpunkt der ägyptischen Politik jetzt nach Norden verlagerte, so daß Oberägypten nicht mehr den Absatzmarkt für wertvolle Glaser bot, den die
vorherbesprochenen Werkstätten von Malkata und Amarna nahe den Residenzen hatten."

11 KGH, p. 37, with the general appearance of eye beads in barrels or discs, small or large; also blue barrel or disc beads with white spots, etc.; short bugle beads of green glass coated with opaque brick red; beads of clear brown, opaque brown and bright opaque yellow; glass earrings; multiple beads common.

12 Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, pl. 1, p. 1: "At the back of the fort are the remains of another smaller square enclosure which we found very difficult to trace, as there had been a good deal of later building on the top of it, such as glass factories and limekilns." The fort, and perhaps this building or others now lost, were presumed to have been earlier than the Tuthmoside enclosure wall, as it makes a jog to accommodate something already built there. These glass factories could, of course, be Dynasty 18 also, there is no way to prove it one way or the other. Aldred, Atenaten and Nefertiti, p. 214 says: "the remains of a glass factory in the precincts of the Palace suggest that it may have been under royal patronage."

13 Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, Faience, p. 222. However, also note that Griffith, "1923-24," p. 303, describes glass and faience manufacturing as taking place "in almost every house" of the 150 they excavated at Amarna in this season. He based this statement on the presence of glass rods and pottery moulds. For a discussion of the question of glass importation from Asia, which is mentioned in the Amarna letters, see pp. 249, 289-90. See now also, Cemal Pulak, "The Bronze Age Shipwreck at Ulu Burun, Turkey: 1985 Campaign," AJA 92 (1988), p.14, for glass ingots. A point that has always seemed puzzling is the abundant amounts of glass waste found at manufacturing sites, such as Amarna (see Boston, p. 162, n. 172). If it was such an expensive material, one should expect to find more "end-of-the-day" pieces, and not so much waste. Perhaps it was not quite as expensive as has been thought.

14 Cooney, Glass, p. 143.

15 Ibid., p. 149, as on the Ramesses II A flask, is characteristic of the Gurob glass factory. The suggestion of a 19th Dynasty date for the Gurob glass is seriously questioned by Arielle Kozloff (personal communication), who seems to think that after the Amarna Period there is very little glass production in Egypt at all. She also disagrees with Cooney on the distinctiveness to Gurob of the thread treatment. She says that it also occurs at Malkata, where it should be contemporary with Amenhotep III.

16 Ibid., p. 150, BM 1771, a lentoid flask, which was found at Ehnasiya. But, according to Cooney, there is "no doubt" that it was made at Gurob, the cartwheel pattern with spokes and three thread use on the handles is "typical" of Gurob, and there is no evidence for other factories in the area. Glass factories seem to have been less common than faience factories; see Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, Faience, p. 222. For
other examples of Cartwheel from Aegean (Cyprus, Crete, see Gladys D. Weinberg, "Two Glass Vessels in the Heracleion Museum, KPHTIKA XPONIKI (1962), pp. 226-29, from LH III contexts; also see Peltenburg, Kition, pp. 112-13, with references: Hayes, Scepter II, pp. 403-404, fig. 255, dates these to Dynasty 19, while Nolte, Glas, pp. 90-96, pls. 6.2, 7.5 puts them into the Amarna Period. This could, of course, be a feature of the 18th Dynasty Fayum production. Kaczmarczyk and Hedges, Faience, p. 303-305 do not consider that the Kition flask is Egyptian faience.

17Cooney, Glass, p. 150: miniature flasks for perfume were a specialty of the Gurob factory.

18Peltenburg, Kition, p. 114; also see idem, Hala Sultan Tekke, p. 108. In considering all these parallels between Gurob and the Mediterranean world, it is important not to forget that the similarities may just be of date. There are no excavated Dynasty 19 sites, such as Amarna and Malkata, available for comparison. However, the situation, and the evaluation of Gurob's position, may change with the publication of the current work in the Fayum and Delta.

19In Hala Sultan Tekke, p. 107, Peltenburg notes that "there was no effort [in Egypt] to cater for foreign tastes thereby increasing exports." As the production of kraters in Greece has been interpreted as such a marketing effort, for sales to Cyprus, he concludes that "The nature of Cypriot trade with the Aegean therefore probably differed in many significant details from that with Egypt."

20See Bell, "605," pls. 5, 6, p. 7.4, with references. See also MPL, pp. 45-52; Nicolle Hirschfeld, "Fine Tuning: An Analysis of Bronze Age Potmarks as Clues to Maritime Trade," Institute of Nautical Archaeology Newsletter 17/1 (1990), pp. 18-21. If Mycenaean pottery being brought to Egypt, perhaps through (or from) Cyprus, were only subsidiary part of a cargo, to fill in the empty spaces after the metals and more precious items were loaded, and if more than one merchant was involved, there could well have been confusion about ownership, which these simple marks would have resolved.


22Thomas, Gurob, p. 6, also points out a few possibly foreign-inspired objects, besides the imported pottery: a cowroid with a figure of Astarte, and a "strange pottery head."

23The face, which is in fact a beautiful, late-Dynasty 18 type, was considered to be "non-Egyptian" by Petrie, KGH, p. 36.

24KGH, pp. 33, 36, 40. See discussion above, Chapter 6. Note that Thomas, Gurob, p. 6, associates him with the 19th Dynasty harem (of Mi-Wr). For tr53, see AEOI, pp. 196*-199*.

25WP, p. 18: the harim lands were administered by the Overseer of the King's Apartments, the Mayor, a Controller (rww, or Overseer of the Cattle of Amun.
26 Thomas, p. 84, pl. 55, no. 717, late dynasty. 18-early 19 = KGH, p. 38, pl. 24.2 (text).

27 KGH, p. 40.

28 It is not discussed in PN.

29 See discussion above, Chapter 6.

30 Wente, Letters, p. 36, no. 34, P. Gurob III.1, rt.

31 RAD, VI, p. xi; Thomas, Gurob, p. 17.


33 Loat, Gurob, pl. 15.2; Thomas, p. 16, no. 35; KRI, 4.105 (2). For the word “butler,” wdb, see Bettina Schmitz in LA VI, cols. 771-72.


35 Herr, “Amman,” pp. 224-28: The cremations found at the Amman airport, with Mycenaean pottery, an Egyptian faience vase similar to the Tutankhamun Burnt Group’s drop pot, etc. is still unexplained, although they have been associated with some non-Semitic people, perhaps Hittites. For the faience vase see H. J. Franken, The Excavations at Deir ‘Alla in Jordan: 2nd Season,” Vetus Testamentum 11 (1961), pls. 4 and 5, with the cartouche of Tewosret. There are also the newly discovered funerary pyres on Crete, with the cremation of objects that may be similar to the Gurob examples: Keys, “Homeric line.”

36 Consider, for example Sh. Yeivin, “Canaanite Ritual Vessels in Egyptian Cultic Practices,” JEA 62 (1976) 110-114: p. 114: “...one may definitely assume that the links between Canaan and Egypt were strong at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty, and they were far from being confined to the political and economic fields, but also found expression in the spheres of cults and ritual practices.”

37 It makes no difference to the use of the Mycenaean vases for chronology if the groups are declared non-coherent. Then the vases have no chronological setting at all.

38 It can be objected that the head of Queen Tiy is not certainly known to have come from a burnt group identical to those of Petrie. However, Borchardt himself certainly associated the phenomenon described to him with Petrie’s pits (Tuye, p. 4). I do not
think we can ignore Borchardt's conclusions, as he was much closer to the discoveries than we are.

39 As Sturt Manning, "The Bronze Age Eruption of Thera: Absolute Dating, Aegean Chronology and Mediterranean Cultural Interrelations," JMA 1 (1988), p. 24, points out, a tomb "only establishes a terminus ante quem for the true date of any item of foreign manufacture therein. The real absolute date could have been much earlier...." This is, of course, correct. But, as there is often no way to estimate how long before the terminus, this is not usually a very useful avenue of inquiry and, in fact, seems brought out by most scholars only to explain evidence contrary to the theory being proposed. Manning continues to observe that, for non-tomb evidence, "it cannot be over-emphasized that one must then only correlate the latest material with the dating established for the find context. Earlier material in assemblages is very common...but its completely irrelevant to absolute dating...."

40 Furumark also emphasized this point, Chronology, p. 113: "It must, however, be remembered that scarabs and other inscribed objects give only termini post quos, even if the generally do not seem to have been old when they were deposited."

41 The Academy, no. 1055 (July 23, 1892), p. 77: "He [Petrie] found these vases at Gurob in surroundings which showed that they could not be earlier than a certain period; and then he made the purely arbitrary assumption that they could not be later than this period. He has never attempted to defend that assumption...."

42 As already mentioned (Chapter IV, Jewellery), the argument can be made that these beads could not have been in circulation after the reign of Tutankhamun. If this is correct, then the Tutankhamun Burnt Group must indeed be of Dynasty 18 date. However, I do not think it is so difficult to imagine them still being in circulation in the early 19th Dynasty; and there are only two of them. Some of the Dyn. 18 materials of the groups could also possibly have come right out of the ruins of the temple/palace/harim itself.

43 Warren and Hankey, Aegean, p. 154: "At Gurob an LH III B stirrup jar came from a pit dated to the time of Tutankhamun."

44 And, although we know that the individual vases were made before deposition, and that they cannot be later than the date of that deposition, this does not mean that the style cannot continue past the point of this particular group's deposition. No evidence from the Tutankhamun Burnt Group forces us to understand that this must be the latest occurrence of LH III A2 pottery in Egypt. It may, in fact, be sounder method not to make such an assumption. All post-Dyn. 18 remains of LH III A2 do not then have to be explained away as heirlooms and secondary usage.


46 Aegean, p. 114.
K. Kitchen in *Serapis*, p. 76. Furumark used Eduard Meyer’s chronology (*Chronology*, p. 110, fn. 1) which dated the reign of Seti I to 1308-1298 B.C. Clearly the year 1300 is chosen simply as a convenience. Furumark says, p. 114, “that the transition between the Myc. III A:2 and III B styles should be placed in the time of Seti I.” For Meyer’s chronology and others see Erik Hornung’s useful chart in *Untersuchungen*.

Still not enough for much of a controversy, when viewed from the Nile Delta side of things. For the total of forty-three years, see Kitchen, *Serapis*, p. 76: Tutankhamun, 9 years total, so 6 years outside of Amarna; Ay, 4; Horemheb, 28; Ramesses I, 1; and 8 of Seti I (Furumark rounded off the start of III B to 1300).

No page numbers are given, only the book citation: Redford, *History*.

For a recent evaluation of Furumark’s Levantine evidence for the absolute chronology of LH III A and B see now Leonard, “Problems,” pp. 319-331.

Eric Cline, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1991. Assessment will need to be taken after this is available.

Mrs. Hankey came down for the Tutankhamun date, abandonment of Akhetaten closer to “year 1/2, 1361/60 B.C.,” in “The Aegean Deposit at El Amarna,” *MEM*, pp. 132-33, which has been widely quoted.

*HML*, pp. 48-49. She also does not use the evidence from Gurob, which is most satisfying to note.


They had access to Janine Bourriaud’s paper on the pottery from Kom Raabia, as they mention it for the earlier phases, but almost completely ignore her later material.


*HML*, p. 150.

Apparently they were all taken to be FS 182: *MEM*, “Additions and Corrections”; Hankey and Warren “Absolute,” p. 148; Marshall Ted Phelps, “A Re-evaluation of the Importance of the Mycenaean Pottery Sherds from Tell el-Amarna, Egypt” (M.A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1978), pp. 128-129. Fig. 5 on p. 128 (lower), seems to be three groups with body zone decoration. Note that in “The Mycenaean Pottery at El Amarna,” (lecture notes, 1982), Mrs. Hankey does not mention FS 182, but does have an FS “183 (?)”.

*COA*, III, pp. 141, 237, pl. 78.9, Cairo JdE 66742.
Discussions between Mrs. Hankey and myself have taken place both privately and in print: Bell, "605," p. 78, fn. 2. I always maintained that this vase was not III B, but instead a FS 171 and good LH III A 2 late. It is quite a handsome piece, finely made and still retaining its glossy polish, and had little in common with the more pedestrian III B vases from Egypt. Further, the body zone, definitive in Mrs. Hankey's opinion, was quite wide, much more so than typically III B, and the chevrons were painted in a manner much more like their careful, and rather wide-spaced use on pre-III B vessels. The vase also had a neck flange and other features that almost never occur in III B. Professor S. Iakovides also supported Mrs. Hankey's position.


63 Mountjoy, *Mycenaean*, p. 67, says: "The division between LHIIIA2 and LH IIIB1 at settlement sites is also not decisive: an earlier demarcation may be adopted with the introduction of the vertical whorl-shell..., a later one with the introduction of the deep bowl.... The later distinction is followed here." Amarna deposit has neither of these features.

64 Mrs. Immerwahr, *Neolithic*, makes some excellent points, to my way of thinking, that have not, however, really been taken up by other scholars in the field. Her Myc. III A:1 (fn. 121) "would thus include transitional II B/III A, III A:1 and whatever of Furumark's III A:2 early is clearly pre-Tell el Amarna." She suggests a stylistic phase "restricted to Tell el Amarna material and its exact parallels elsewhere, and with the later phase [of Myc. III A:2] a more decadent continuation in which some elements of Myc. III B appear toward the end." She notes (fn. 121) that "One of the fallacies of Furumark's Myc. III A:2 late period was that it did not make full use of the closed Tell el Amarna deposit in sorting out the style of the second quarter of the fourteenth century...." As for III B features appearing in the Amarna material, she says (fn. 122): "some of the [Mycenae IIIA:2] material, particularly from the dromos of Tomb 505 and from the terrace on the Atreus Ridge, seems to overlap Myc. III B (at least the stage we would call III B:1). She [Elizabeth French] herself admits that there is some overlap...and prefers to make the dividing line between III A and III B the advent of the deep bowl (Type 284) rather than the vertical murex."

Wace, "Late Helladic III Divisions," p. 138: "Furumark's dating for the division between the L.H.III A and L.H. III B stages is unacceptable. He assigns one hundred and twenty five years to the former which is represented by a comparatively small amount of pottery and only seventy years to the latter to which belongs a great quantity of pottery. This it is far better to extend the L.H.III B stage upwards and place its beginning at the end of the Amarna period soon after 1350 B.C. The L.H.III A stage will correspondingly be shortened. The end of the Amarna period forms a good
chronological division because the Amarna pottery is well known and has clear characteristics."

The role of innovation in the development of a new style should also be taken into consideration. See K. Kilian "Mycenaeans Up To Date," in French and Wardle, Problems, p. 118: "To the known stages of 'floruit' and 'fading' we must add the rather small percentage of innovative shapes and motifs which are included in the floruit of most complexes and phases.... The presence of innovative material cannot any longer be used to date the bulk of the pottery from the floor level; the phasing now has to be based on the development of the major percentages in the stratigraphic sequence of the floor levels. This new approach to a definition of periods of development in Mycenaean ceramics requires a fully representative pottery group to assess the chronological position. Single or isolated features--because of the innovative and fading factors--do not appear to be significant in the main course of the development.

"... chronological identity in regional and interregional comparisons should now be combined with percentages; a single type does not any longer indicate a chronological marker a priori or par excellence."

65Bell, "605," p. 75.

66Elizabeth French, "Late Helladic IIIA 2 Pottery from Mycenae," 60 (1965), p. 193: "For other shapes there is little evidence and what does emerge from this study is how extremely important it has become to obtain from a settlement a control group of L.H. IIIA 2 pottery with all the body sherds of closed vases. Only then can we be certain of the full range. This need becomes particularly obvious when, in the hope of establishing an absolute chronology, we try to compare this material from the mainland with that from Tell el Amarna. The crucial feature of the latter is the use of a narrow decorated body zone on Stirrup Jars. The exact position of this feature in the Mycenaean sequence is not yet certain."

67Elizabeth French, "A Group of Late Helladic IIIB 1 Pottery from Mycenae," BSA 61 (1966), 61, p. 218, fig. 1.

68French, "IIIB 1," p. 216 and fn. 1: this pottery "may even represent an earlier aspect of the L.H. III B 1 style, but this cannot yet be proved."

69Elizabeth French, "Pottery from Late Helladic IIIB 1 Destruction Contexts at Mycenae," BSA 62 (1967), p. 182. Mountjoy, Mycenaean, p. 105, does not address the problem of the appearance of this feature, but shows belly zones for III B1 and says that all stirrup jar type "may now have a belly zone."

70Considering both III A2 late and the developed III B1 as part of the same depositional process at Amarna would also seem to leave very little time for the III B style to develop in Greece.

71Mountjoy, Mycenaean, p. 127, FS 173, especially nos. 2 and 3. Also no. 4 for the shape of the disc. The lack of information for LH III B2 stirrup jars is felt very keenly.
when dealing with the Egyptian material. It may well be that some of the stirrup jars from Deir el-Medina should be classed here.

72 Warren and Hankey, Aegean, p. 150.

73 Pendlebury had claimed some later material from excavations in the North Palace. I have not been able to identify these pieces.

74 Petrie, Amarna, p. 16, found three sherds of one vase in house 11. To the best of my knowledge these have never been identified. He also found 9 sherds in the palace.

75 See Jack L. Davis’ remarks in his review of French and Wardle, Problems in Antiquity 63:240 (1989), pp. 642-44, criticizing lack of reaction to bad arguments “Likewise, in how many other archaeological communities could the assertion that the ‘lifespan’ of a site can be ‘definitely established...by excavation’...pass without challenge.”

76 At one point there was serious discussion of the possibility of the Mycenaean sherd from outside the dump all being in secondary deposition (see Woolley, quoted below). Pendlebury demolished the point with devastating sarcasm: there is “no doubt whatsoever that the Aegean pottery at Amarna is contemporary with the city. Those who argue otherwise must postulate a wandering maniac with a sackful of carefully sorted sherds (all belonging to the same period) who went round the site after the deserted of the city carelessly inserting them into floor deposits.” This is a repetition of his remarks in “1930-1,” p. 235: “Several attempts have been made to prove that the Mycenaean pottery is not contemporary, on the grounds that no complete vase has yet been discovered, and that apparently some wandering maniac went about the site later and scattered broadcast a number of sherds which he happened to have about him. This view cannot be too strongly condemned...” He based his objection of the lack of total clearance of the find spots, which was indeed the case, but which was still not a satisfactory explanation. “...it seems absurd to claim that because all the pieces of a vase are not found therefore that vase must belong to a different period.” With the growth in our knowledge of depositional processes, we can see that the lack of a reasonable number of joins does show that there were no vases on the final floors, and that the possibility of the sherds being intrusive must be admitted. Pendlebury went on to claim that all the sherds of the 1930-31 season, and all others which he could trace, with the exception of rubbish heaps, came from floor deposits. This number must also have excluded Petrie’s sherds (excluding dump), as nothing is known of them. And it is incorrect as concerns a number of sherds that I have examined, which show definite surface burnish, and which were almost certainly in secondary deposition or surface finds. This has usually not been mentioned or recognized in the publications, where they are represented as associated with architectural remains.

    Also see J. D. S. Pendlebury, “Excavations at Tell el Amarna: Preliminary Report for the Season 1933-4,” JEA 20 (1934), p. 135, where he dates the deposit of the Mycenaean sherd to a fifteen year span, in spite of admitted problems. As he considered the Aegean pottery as “of a single date,” he concluded that “It is difficult to imagine a better synchronism.” In OD III, p. 236, he said that the Mycenaean sherds “were again found in circumstances which precluded the possibility of their being later
intrusions." As these circumstances seem to be exactly the same as those which puzzled the Egyptological excavators, it would seem that only attitudes and interpretation, but nothing factual, had changed.

77C. Leonard Woolley, "Excavations at Tell el-Amarna," *JEA* 8 (1922), p. 70, "Nothing can fairly be argued from the fact of this pottery being found at Tell el-Amarna unless the conditions in which it is found be taken into consideration."

The argument may also have been affected by the apparent rivalry between English and German excavators of the site. Ludwig Borchardt ("Ausgrabungen in Tell el-Amarna 1911/12," *MDG* 30 [1912], pp. 8-9), as translated by Peet "Preliminary," p. 185, fn. 1, claimed that "the town must, although only at isolated points, have continued to be occupied continuously after the main body of the inhabitants, namely the rich and the officials, had deserted it after the restoration due to King Horemheb." Peet comments that this "is difficult to follow."

Peet, "Preliminary," p. 185, admits "this evidence shows that from time to time the old city was in part reoccupied, and the stones from the late Ramesside palace or temple even suggest a reoccupation of some importance.

"The most satisfactory solution...would have been to find Aegean vases...definitely associated in floor deposits with objects of known date...we realized that this was most unlikely. Borchardt has rightly emphasized the rarity of Mycenaean sherds in comparison with Egyptian even in the royal waste-heaps."

"...There is evidence to show that after the great desertion Akhetaten was from time to time sporadically reoccupied." But, "If these [the Aegean sherds] are not contemporary with the rest of the rubbish [i.e., no later than the reign of Akhenaten "or thereabouts" we have to suppose that the reoccupiers of Akhetaten who imported them carefully carried their cracked or broken Mycenaean vases to the old disused waste-heaps of Akhenaten's palace, but shot all the rest of their rubbish elsewhere." There are, of course, many points at which this statement may be attacked, but the logic is still good. Peet concludes, "Excavation has not up to the present proved that the...sherds...are contemporary with Akhenaten. I has, however,...established a strong probability that this is the case."

Woolley, "Excavations," p. 70, addressed the problem that very few vases were restorable (it has been reported to me in private conversation by Mary M. Voigt that some Near Eastern archaeologists are now refusing to use anything but whole pots to date living surfaces): three sherds from one house (P. 46.15) seem to have come from one vase, "but all the rest--and the same is true of Professor Peet's examples--are quite isolated, stray little bits of vessels of which the remaining parts have entirely disappeared. One cannot suppose that whenever a Mycenaean vase was broken all the fragments except one were carefully removed and distributed, two on the rubbish-heaps and the rest elsewhere, while the broken sherds have the appearance of having been dropped as broken pieces, not of having been broken off from dropped pots." He concedes that there was constant activity on the site from the moment of abandonment by looter and such, as well as from villages along the river, "but even so it is not easy to explain single Mycenaean sherds being scattered here and there over the site, and still harder to dissociate the rubbish-heap fragments from the numerous dated objects found with them." He could not explain the representation of Mycenaean pottery by only single sherds, if they were really in use on the site, "whereas of the Egyptian wares we can generally gather fragments enough to build up a third or more of the entire pot."

78 Woolley, "Excavations," p. 69, made an extremely similar point in 1922, that seems to have been ignored ever since: after the nobles, etc. left Akhetaten, only the peasants would have remained, "One cannot suppose destestation for the heretic city to have been so strong as to cause good land to be left uncultivated....There must have been a permanent agricultural population." He places this closer to the river, but in the same general location as I have suggested, "probably on the sites of the present villages of Et-Till, Hagg Qandil, El-Amara, and Hawara...."

79 This is controversial, as it can be shown that his canopic jars were never used.

80 For KV 55 see Martha R. Bell, "KV 55," pp. 97-137.

81 We may cite the revelations coming from Kemp's recent work in the main city. For example, the construction of the small Aten temple has been found to belong to various kings, and is not all the work of Akhenaten. See Michael Mallinson, "Investigations of the Small Aten Temple," in Barry J. Kemp, editor, Amarna Reports, V (Cambridge: 1989), pp. 115-142.

82 Bourriaud, "Rabia," p. 2. Methodologically, we might quibble with the appropriateness of describing a disturbed group as closed, unless the disturbance is the defining feature. E.g., the Tomb of Tutankhamun can still be considered "closed" chronologically, as one can take the resealing as a cut-off point. This does not work so well for Amarna.

83 Although, if the connection with the Military Barracks, as suggested below, is correct, it could have had a longer usage. Marianne Eaton-Krauss has suggested to me privately that soldiers could have been stationed here to guard the royal tombs after the court had left. Note that Cyril Aldred, Akhenaten: King of Egypt (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989), in p. 53, fig. 7 locates the "Palace Rubbish Heaps," by which one assumes that he means Petrie's dumps, quite a bit further south and east of their real position, which was between the Police Barracks and the Military Quarters.

84 The evidence of sherds from the same vessels was presented in a lecture by Martha R. Bell, "Mycenaean Pottery from Petrie's Dump at Tell el-Amarna," at an "International Symposium to Commemorate the Centennial Anniversary of the Discovery of Tell El Amarna," in Chicago, February 3, 1987.

85 The assumption that it was a valuable commodity goes back at least as far 1921, for Peet makes much the same argument that Warren and Hankey were to espouse: Peet, 'Preliminary," p. 183: "If the site of Akhetaten was ever reoccupied by people of sufficient standing or importance to be likely importers of Aegean pottery, we should expect to find the signs of this reoccupation in some of the houses." As no traces of rich, later establishments were found, it was then concluded that the pottery belonged
to the period of royal occupation. Stubbings, *MPL*, p. 105, characterized the Mycenaean pottery from Amarna as part of "a special luxury trade, limited in extent as in duration, and there is little trace of it in other parts of Egypt."

86Presented in Bell, "605," p. 85, fn. 117.

87This also goes back to the question of definition of the dump as a closed deposit. It seems strange that Mycenaean pottery is always assumed to have been expensive, but the same does not seem to be claimed for Cypriote pottery, also imported.

88Newton, "Excavations," p. 294: "Sir Arthur Evans and Dr. Duncan Mackenzie say that these fragments are only those of such pots as would be brought over by the ordinary Syrian or Cretan workman coming to Egypt, as part of his household goods, and they are not precious or rare pots such as would have been sent as presents to the king for his use in his palace.

"Further excavation will we hope throw more light on this matter, but at present it seems feasible to suppose that this Aegean pottery was not in use at the time of Akhenaten, but was introduced later by foreign quarrymen, perhaps during the reign of Seti I."

89Pendlebury, "1933-4," p. 134. He notes that most of the foreign pottery was found in the central city. "Not only are many sherds to be found by merely walking over the rubbish heaps [Petrie's]...but also the proportion of sherds found to buildings excavated is far greater in this part than in the domestic quarters of Akhenaten. Now from 'squatters' walls we know that the private houses were frequently taken over and inhabited by the poorer classes who could not afford to travel back with the court to Thebes. It is therefore just arguable that it is they who may have imported Aegean merchandise, though why this privilege should be denied to the wealthy original owners is hard to see, and in any case this hypothesis could only bring down the date of the imports a generation at most."

90We might note here the association of chariot kraters with horse-owning elite in Priscilla F. S. Keswani, "Mortuary Ritual and Social Hierarchy in Bronze Age Cyprus" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan: 1989), pp. 562-67. There is a growing amount of evidence from Cyprus that the krater is a prestige indicator (pp. 556-67, also 567-600; also see idem, "Dimensions in Social Hierarchy in Late Bronze Age Cyprus: An Analysis of the Mortuary Data from Enkomi," *JMA* 2 (1989), pp. 61-62, 64-65). She agrees with Emily Vermeule and Vassos Karageorghis, *Mycenaean Pictorial Vase Painting* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982), that pictorial pottery "is likely to have been locally made." Keswani mentions the mariannu in connection with the kraters and we know that mariannu of Dijahy were present in the harim of Memphis: Janssen, "Prolegomena," p. 168. Alan R. Schulman, "the N'RN at Kadesh Once Again," *JSSEA* 11 (1981), pp. 12-13, considers that the Egyptian chariots (speaking of the battle of Kadesh) called n'rn, would have been considered mariannu, so there may have also been an elite class of Egyptian infantry.

For the possible representation of a FS 53 amphoroid krater, see N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of el Amarna*, III, Archaeological Survey of Egypt, memoir 15 (London: 1905), pl. 14, as part of the gifts of the year 12 "durbar" at Akhetaten. For the "durbar"
see Aldred, *King*, pp. 178–81: "the gifts of Syria and Kush, the West and the East, all lands untied at the one time, and the Isles in the midst of the Great Green Sea.... when they proffered gifts to the King...." The vase looks something like an FS 53 around the neck and shoulder, but the elongated and narrow foot looks more like an FS 54. The decorated neck does have parallels in real life (e.g., A. Kanta, *The Late Minoan III Period in Crete: A Survey of Sites, Pottery and their Distribution*, SIMA, 58 [Goteborg: 1980], pl. 95, no. 6; FS 54:7, Smith, *CTA*, GB 1, pl. 18:11, from Enkome), but the rest of the designs are more Egyptian, albeit vaguely, than Mycenaean. Given the notorious problems of interpreting tomb decorations, it seems best to simply note the presence of this vase, but not to build any theories on it.

There is only one other krater known from Egypt, from the Delta, and LH III B in date: Vermeule and Karageorghis, *Pictorial*, no. V. 24. It may be FS 55, which is Furumark’s III B shape. Although it is said to have been found with faïences, one of which bears the cartouches of Ramesses II (under the V.24 number), nothing more is known of the circumstances of its discovery.

However, one should not forget the presumably Egyptian vessel that looks just like a krater (although the shape could have had a foreign derivation), shown in many tomb scenes of the Great Temple (e.g. N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna*, II, Archaeological Survey of Egypt, memoir 14 [London: 1905], pl. 19). Servants are thought to be watering down the dust of the surrounding courtyard and they seem to use this vessel as a "bucket." Also see *COA*, III, pl. 9.1, from the tomb of Meryre I, with a footed, two-handled krater. A similar handled shape had appeared by the time of Tuthmosis III, as one is represented in his great "Treasure" at Karnak: see W. Wreszinski, *Atlas zu altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, II (Paris: 1988), pl. 33b, no. 98. This may be three-handled, the representation is not clear, and seems to be without a foot, as it rests on a potstand.

---

91Pendlebury, "1930–1," pp. 234–35, and fn. 2: "We dare hardly suggest that the contents of the Mycenaean ‘pilgrim bottle,’ which turn out to be resinous, were imported to give a truly "Mainland" flavour to the local wine. More probably the resin was to be used in some religious purification...." *COA*, II, pl. 40.5, p. 46, no. 30/24, "containing a resinous ointment." from T. 36.39.

92A blue-painted vase with plastic ibex protome, and an amphora decorated with polychrome garlands.

93Amarna Letter EA 16, see Albert Leonard Jr., "Archaeological Sources for the History of Palestine: The Late Bronze Age," *Biblical Archaeologist* 52 (1989), p. 18, with references. It is worth examining if the relative wealth of Egypt to the rest of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean may have been similar to the situation of Persia in the fifth century. For a presentation of Persian wealth and Athenian "poverty," and the inexpensiveness of Greek pottery exports, see Michael Vickers, "Golden Greece: Relative Values, Minae, and Temple Inventories." *AJA* 94 (1990), pp. 613–26. He has remarked, p. 624, that "When all of life is viewed through the eyes of a day laborer, or when what has survived is regarded as an an adequate sample of what there was, the picture becomes distorted and the ancient world is impoverished as a result." Keswani, "Dimensions," p. 465, suggests that possession of metals may indicate a more exalted status than the possession of chariot kraters. In Egypt, even with its preoccupation with royalty, there is probably still no adequate recognition of the
king's real wealth, e.g., it has recently been proposed by Christian E. Loeben, in private conversation, that the alabaster vessels from Tutankhamun's tomb were palace tableware. This is probably wrong, or at best only partially correct: Tutankhamun's tableware, like Alcibiades', was probably of precious metal.

94 CVA III, p. 69, pl. 109.5, no. 35/373, from "The Bridge Proper." There seem to have been as many as 22 sherds, many of them joining, so one can assume that the vases were broken in situ.


96 This was thought to be the daughter of Ramesses II, possibly buried during the reign of Merneptah. Mycenaean pottery was found in various parts of the tomb, which was quite disturbed. The small finds and pottery have not yet been published, but I think it will prove difficult to date any of the uninscribed material to precisely the reign of Horemheb, and no later. Also see now Geoffrey T. Martin, The Hidden Tombs of Memphis (London, Thames & Hudson: 1991), p. 91, who characterizes the Egyptian materials from Shaft i (where the Mycenaean pottery was found) as Ramesside.

97 A good example of the difficulties is the fragment of a blue-painted vessel with a marsh scene found at Karnak. Colin Hope had claimed this type as restricted to Malkata (and therefore to be dated, much in the same way as Amarna, to the reign of Amenhotep III) and Amarna. However another vessel was found at Karnak East, stratified to post-Horemheb, early Dynasty 19 levels. See Edward Werner, "A Fragmentary blue-painted vase from East Karnak," JSEA 13 (1983), pp. 225-27.

98 The Egypt Exploration Society expedition under the direction of Barry Kemp is not only adding data, but also revising old and with a wary eye for foreign pottery. A review of all the Mycenaean imports from EES excavations is now underway.

99 Michael A. Hoffman, "The Social Context of Trash Disposal in an Early Dynastic Egyptian Town," American Antiquity 39 (1974), p. 44, for abandonment of non-elite structures. He finds that elite structures are almost always re-occupied by squatters, but re-occupation of the site seems to have taken place in the northwest, and much of the main city may never have been reused in this way, even though elite structures (i.e., there were too few "squatters" for such a large area).

100 Woolley, "Excavations," p. 69.
Especially during the Amarna Period the pharaoh would have embodied both the religious and political center of the universe, from the Egyptian viewpoint. The boundaries between secular and non-secular may not have even been perceived.

Personal conversation.

Bierbrier, *Hieroglyphic Texts*, p. 9, pls. 1 and 2, with references. Pl. 2 is from a statue base, and pl. 1 lists five fragments from Horemheb dedications which "may all belong to one monument or several." The dedication of statues in this temple could not possibly have happened if the temple had been closed, or if the cult had been proscribed. The pl. 1 texts even mention both Amun and Re, clearly showing that their cults had been reintroduced to Amarna, that the Amarna temple was still in use, and that this was after their reinroduction by Tutankhamun at Karnak:  

See COA III, p. 12 for 26/S. 24, 30, 114-17; pl. 60.3. Other finds included a series of bronze incense burners and situlae, fragments of life-sized statues of "the King or Queen," stelae, and limestone architectural blocks with remains of decoration.

Horemheb seems also to have reused at least one talatat block from Amarna that Petrie found, in the great temple: Petrie, *Amarna*, pp. 9, 43, pl. 11.5. Petrie, p. 44, suggests that after the death of Tutankhamun, "...the Aten worship was not proscribed and the priests appear on the occasion of Horemheb to have put up his name on the existing buildings, from the fragment (XI,5) which was found." Petrie did not realize that the block was originally used as a stretcher, showing a procession of overlapping people, perhaps carrying chairs, has been turned on end and reused as a header by Horemheb. This should even mean that Horemheb was involved in some sort of building project here.

That the proscription of Akhenaten preceded that of the Aten itself may be one interpretation of the lintel from the house of Hatiy, Overseer of Works to the King: Pendlebury, "1930-1," p. 237. This had Akhenaten's name removed, but not that of the queen or the Aten. Also see p. 242, where door jambs of the Bridge had the effaced name of Akhenaten and the undamaged name of Nefertiti. Kenneth Kitchen has already suggested that the city survived into the reign of Horemheb, in his review of Elmar Edel, *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III*, in JEA, 55 (1969), pp. 224. Cooney saw it lasting into the reign of Ramesses II: *Amarna Reliefs*, pp. 1-3, but this was denied by Donald Redford, "Interim Report on the Excavations at East Karnak (1981-1982 Seasons)," *SSEA Journal* 13, p. 214 fn. 10. Also see Åström, "Ayios Iakovos," pp. 222-23; idem, *Swedish Cyprus Expedition IV.1 D* (Lund: 1976), p. 761 and fn. 6. For Dyn. 19-20 monuments see Donald Redford, "On the Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty," *JNES* 25 (1966), pp. 123-24; idem, *History*, pp. 92-94, n. 23.

J. K. Davies and L. Foxhall's cautionary remarks, "Afterword," in *The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context: Papers of the First Greenbank Colloquium, Liverpool 1981*, edited by Foxhall, Lin and John K. Davies (Bristol: University of Bristol, 1984), p. 179, are most applicable here: "Many archaeologists no longer feel it is legitimate to ask historical questions of archaeological data. 'Archaeological events', as revealed by survey and excavation, are so very different in character from 'historical events that the former cannot be used simply and directly to confirm the reality of the latter.
Thus, whether archaeology can lead us straight to Priam's Troy, in the way that even Blegen though it could, must now be seriously doubtful."

105 Petrie, *Amarna*, p. 42, see pl. 11.5 for the talatat block. However, this block could have been re-used and should also be re-examined. He said that it was only after the proscription that "the purpose of the town as a religious center ceased."

106 Barry J. Kemp, *Amarna Reports*, I (Cambridge: 1984). Marianne Eaton-Krauss has suggested to me privately that the Police may have remained there as guards until the royal burials were removed to Thebes.

107 Mrs. Hankey has accepted a date of the accession of Horemheb, in "The Aegean Interest in El Amarna," *Journal of Mediterranean Anthropology and Archaeology* 1 (1980), p. 38; in *HML*, p. 53 she places the end of the Amarna Period at the destruction of the official buildings there and at Karnak "(? year 7)" by Horemheb. However, in Warren and Hankey, *Aegean*, p. 151, they continue to hold out for Tutankhamun: "...we have a beginning for the III B period early in the reign of Tutankhamun at the latest..." Note that there is really no good evidence for dating the end of occupation at Amarna to the date of the removal of the remnants of Aten worship at Karnak. Karnak’s treatment may have been much more severe, whereas Amarna seems to have been pretty much left alone until Ramesses II used it for a quarry. Attacks on the Aten monuments at Karnak may well have begun during the reign of Tutankhamun, and the bottom course of Horemheb’s pylon at Karnak may really have been put in place by Tutankhamun: personal communication from W. J. Murnane. Donald Redford, *Akhenaten: The Heretic King* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 227, envisions a physical and psychological attack on Amarna and its symbolism but a complete demolition of the site: "Not one block was left upon another...Walls were torn down to their foundations, mud-bricks pillaged, and steles and statuary hopelessly smashed. Thereafter the ruins provided a quarry for over a century..." But John Ray, in his review in *GM* 86 (1985) p. 91, calls this an exaggeration, and suggests that "wholesale evacuation of the site would probably produce the [same] archaeological result..."

108 We have already mentioned the intrusive burials on the site in Chapter. Archaeology that were thought to be the deceased from a settlement on the site. See, Griffith, "1923-24," p. 302, thought to be of "survivors of inhabitants who lingered on when the place had been partly deserted." Also *COA* III, p. 115 in Q. 42.7; *Amarna Reports* II, pp. 14-7, Dyn. 20/21 burial in the Chapel area of the Workmen’s Village; Ludwig Borchardt, "Ausbgrabungen in Tell el-Amarna 1912/13." *MDG* 52 (1913), pp. 8-9; a Dyn. 20 coffin, House P.47.5 at Amarna, with inhabitants in the central city; Pendlebury, "1930-31," p. 239, in House T.34.2. Pendlebury admitted that an association of "squatters," who might have imported the Mycenaean materials, could lower its date "a generation" although he thought the pottery should be associated with the official occupation of the city. He also remarked that "the richer classes were uncertain [as to whether or not the court might return] and...they left their houses habitable...[the] poorer classes...could not afford to travel back with the court to Thebes" stayed behind on the site and reoccupied some of the larger houses: "1933-4," pp. 134-5.
As even Kemp and Merrillees admit, Minoan, p. 246 fn. 485. I believe that Mr. Kemp's position towards a lingering on of population at the site after the administrative officials left has somewhat softened since this was written.

Hankey, HML, p. 49: "On current ceramic assessment the pots were old when they found their way into remains of a Ramesside burial." Actually this is quite possible, as the whole deposit is so disturbed it is not very good evidence for any kind of argument. What is does show, however, is that Mycenaean III A2 pottery, and not just fragments, but fairly substantial remains, was present in the 19th Dynasty. One could argue that its presence in the burial shafts, not just on the surface, means that it was connected with the burials, but this is also not very good evidence. As a woman, thought to be a daughter of Ramesses II, was buried here, Warren and Hankey's statement, Aegean, p. 155 "The context of LH III B at Saqqara confirms that the period began no later than the reign of Horemheb" would not seem to be justified. The suggestion that the III A2 pottery was brought to Saqqara by a workman from Amarna is rather fanciful: Hankey, HML, p. 49, citing G. Martin. It is, however, interesting in that it illustrates the excavators' assessment of the value of Mycenaean pottery--used by workmen.

Warren and Hankey, Aegean, p. 151. Martin, Hidden Tombs, pp. 90-91 discusses the imported pottery from tombs at Saqqara. He says "In Shaft i of Horemheb's tomb fragments of painted Mycenaean pottery were found (reassembled to form three vessels). From the associated Egyptian objects these pots ought to date to the Ramesside Period, but some Aegean specialists would like to date them to the time of Akhenaten, about a hundred years earlier. The problem is not yet resolved...."

This includes the pottery from the tombs of Tia and Tia, Maya, and Ramose. The tomb of Paser may have III A2 pottery. The principle that has governed my analysis of the Gurob material also has to be considered here: the latest object dates the whole, especially as these are all quite disturbed.

Mrs. Hankey notes that the town was in operation by year 7 of Horemheb, citing Morris Bierbrier, Tomb Builders of the Pharaohs (London: 1982), p. 26. This is fine to establish with inscriptive evidence, but rather hard to work out on the ground. Interpretation of the Deir el-Medina deposit is better put off until I finish my publication of it. Very little of it can be associated with any features on the site, or even with particular dumps.


FS 171.35, LH III A2 late; Furumark's No. 6, terminus post quem Seti I. See discussion above, Chapter: Furumark. A. Hankey and Warren, "Absolute," p. 148, like Furumark, have accepted Petrie's date. Wace, "Mycenae 1957," p. 222 says: "Only one find [the "Res" vase], can be said to be near Seti I in date. Its context is said to be older than Ramses II, but how much older is not clear. In any case it seems unwise to use a vase so indefinitely in type as a pivot for chronological purposes." I note that it is not a very nicely made or painted example of Mycenaean pottery. The body shape would seem to be acceptably III A 2. It also seems to have the wide bands around spout mouth and base that Mountjoy, Pottery, p. 108, associates with LH III A 2, and it bears a certain
resemblance to Mee, *Rhodes*, pl. 10.1, FS 171, FM 18, III A2, from Ialysos. However there is also a slightly coned disc, a plain shoulder, a partial loop around false spout and neck, and the paint of one handle stops above the first shoulder band. All these are more typical of III B. The vase is probably not any more transitional than those from Saqqara.


117 Said to be made of two saucers joined around the edge, like Mountjoy fig. 95, III A2. It had a flat base, now missing. We may perhaps wonder if the sherd really belonged to an FS 189. If really III A2 early, it would be very important chronologically. I have not seen an illustration of this piece.

118 Looking at a sketch of the sherd, which is from lower body, I think it impossible to rule out a possible FS 171 attribution. However, handle sherds are also said to have been found.

119 It is identified from 4 small sherds only that did not come from mouth, handle, decorated areas, and the profile was not complete. It would be the first example of this shape to be known from Egypt, although it is possible that the Delta sites may produce new shapes for the corpus.

120 The illustration shows an unexceptional LH III A2, Amarna-style ring base with parts of concentric circles on each side (thick outer band) and the beginnings of a curvilinear keel motif.

121 *IKG*, pl. 20, nos. 7, 9, FS 178:12, 195:15.

122 "Synchronisms," p. 324, only three items may be "worthy of discussion."

123 Ibid., p. 324.

124 This is now being done, as K. Kilian pointed out in the discussion after Leonard's presentation, ibid., p. 331.

125 Susan Sherratt, "From *khronos* to *khronologies*: Warren & Hankey's Aegean Bronze Age timetable," *Antiquity* 64 (1990), p. 415. She finds difficulties in agreeing with the authors' "underlying faith in the limitless potential of pottery to provide ever more precise answers to chronological problems, which itself mirrors a long-standing Aegean archaeological obsession with detailed ceramic division and subdivision."


127 Dorothea Arnold, "The Egyptian Context of the Foreign Pottery from Haraga," April 30, 1990, Pottery Symposium 1990, University of California, Berkeley: has been able to establish four pottery phases for Harageh, and can place sherds, which she now identifies as MM II A, traditionally dated 1890-1660, to the very end of the 12th Dynasty or the very beginning of the 13th. For the 12th Dynasty she has enough evidence that she is beginning to be able to date the pottery by reigns, and two imitations of MM II A style found in Tomb 326, can now be dated specifically to the reign of Amenemhat II, i.e. 1901-1866 B.C. These dates are recently given by K. A. Kitchen, "Supplementary Notes on 'The Basics of Egyptian Chronology,'" in *HML*, 3, p. 153. Warren and Hankey, *Aegean*, had identified the sherds as MM I B/II and, following Kemp and Merrillees, placed them "well within the XIIth Dynasty." They conclude that MM II lay "within the decades either side of 1800 BC (1801 BC end of Dynasty XII)."

128 Oren, "New Evidence," p. 333, has new excavation evidence that LH III B lasts to end of Dyn. 19, and that IIIIC1b is during the reign of Ramesses III, and that Philistine pottery is later than Ramesses III, perhaps even after Dynasty 20 (and so not connected to Sea Peoples). Larry Stager, "When Canaanites and Philistines Ruled Ashkelon," *BAR* 17 (1991), pp. 34-6 (this reference courtesy of Frank Yurco), presents much the same argument. He identifies the Sea Peoples as Mycenaean Greeks and dates their arrival, and also the appearance of their monochrome ware (LH III C1), by the Medinet Habu reliefs of Ramesses III, to about 1175 B.C. So, he places Bichrome ware a generation later than it has previously been dated.

129 Sherratt, *Chronos*, p. 415 notes Warren and Hankey's dates for Sub-Mycenaean, and calls these these dates "horribly precise-sounding," when the style's beginning and length rests "solely on the basis of assigning phases to generations." Even chronologies supposed based on science resort to this kind of argument: S. Manning, although beginning his chronology with a C-14 indicated date for the eruption of Thera, proceeds to estimate periods of pottery production by other means. This leads him to assume that the LH II A pottery found in Egypt and the Levant in connection with monuments of Tuthmosis III, must be a generation old (at the least) by the time they were deposited. He seems to think that this kind of argument is going to force Egyptologists to revise their absolute chronologies upward, so that the delay is not more than one generation.

130 Philip P. Betancourt, "Dating of the Aegean Late Bronze Age with radiocarbon," *Archaeometry* 29 (1987), p. 46

131 Manning, "the Third Congress," p. 98: "...due to the correlations from ceramic exchanges between LMIA Thera and Crete, and to the correlations and interrelations between these islands and the contemporary cultures of Greece, Cyprus, and the Near East, the acceptance of the early chronology would also require considerable reassessment of the chronology and history of the Bronze Age Mediterranean in general....The controversy is only beginning! Thus, as Colin Renfrew...concluded, the
Third Thera Congress may mark the beginning of a revolution in Bronze Age chronology."

Sherratt, "Kronos," p. 415, remarks upon the indecision of Aegean archaeology as to whether it is "prehistoric...with a dating framework of relatively coarse resolution, or 'historical' archaeology" requiring a "chronological refinement" that permits the linkage of "events such as destructions...and time[ing] them into some sort of historical or quasi-historical interpretation of these events."

Cecil Smith, The Classical Review 6 (1892), p. 466: "As to the tomb-deposits, we may take it as a principle that the contents of an untouched tomb cannot be earlier than the latest object found with them."


Eric Cline, "An unpublished Amenhotep III Faience Plaque from Mycenae" JAOS 110 (1990), p. 212, with references. Note that Thyrza R. Smith, Mycenaean Trade and Interaction in the West Central Mediterranean 1600-1000 B.C., BAR International Series 371 (Oxford, B.A. R.: 1987), p. 6 infers from "the considerable quantity of LHI and LHIII sherds" in the Aeolian and Phlegrean Islands that the Mycenaeans were involved in trading activity in the west before turning towards the east, where LH II pottery first indicates Mycenaean involvement..." LH II pottery in the Eastern Mediterranean is still, however, sparse. The Egyptians could conceivably have played a role in bringing the Mycenaeans into closer contact with the east when LH III A2 was current, and later, when the distribution of the imports increased appreciably. In considering the models for Mycenaean-Egyptian trade, it is worth considering the suggestion put forth by Henrik Thrane, "The Mycenaean Fascination: A Northerner's View," in Tiberiu Bader, editor, Orientalisch-Aegische Einflüsse in der Europäischen Bronzezeit (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH., 1990), pp. 165, 176:"I think that the whole concept of Mycenaean contacts with the outside world is strongly influenced--if not actually predetermined--by our historic knowledge of the colonisation of the Mediterranean by the Archaic Greeks. The analogy may be satisfactory in the Mediterranean area but hardly applies North of the Alps....It is fun to identify Mycenaean exports and copies thereof, but it is more interesting to study them as components of a diffusion of knowledge (information), beliefs, objects, and individuals."
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Mycenaean Pottery 1)

Number  BM  Unnumbered (90 11-9)
Examined  9/5/80, 6/81
Shape  Stirrup Jar "B," restored as FS 180.

Motif  Linear
Style  LH III B 1
Acquisition  11-9-1890
Publication  Unpublished.

Derivation Condition  Burnt. Two body sherds, joining, and glued together. Body and false spout fragments not as badly burnt as the rest.

Size  Thickness of wall at Max. Dia., 0.35 cm.

Surface Treatment  Slipped, burnished. Burnishing strokes are visible on ground, lying horizontally, as if done on the wheel.
Paint Color  5 YR 4/3 (11:15 AM, in sunlight)
Paint Lustre  Medium.
Paint Cond.

Gd. Color 10 YR 5/2

Gd. Lustre Low--can see burnish strokes: they are horizontal, as if wheel applied.

Surface Inclusions Very nice and smooth surface, no air bubbles, tiny mica present. Surface scratched, spalling badly.

Fabric Simple Style (it is not Egyptian Fabric)

Core/Pores Inclusions Very abundant tiny mica, other inclusions, all too small to measure.

Decor. Band groups, beginning with the lowest thick line of the shoulder (?) group, then a reserved space, then band group of 3 fine between 2 thick (just below max. dia.), then reserved space towards foot.

Technique Wheel-made.

Misc. There are also some tiny chips of pottery, probably also from this vase. It is possible that these sherds were used by Petrie to restore the body of IKG, pl. 17.28.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Mycenaean Pottery 2)

Number  BM 66863 (90 11-9 21)
Mycenaean? Pilgrim Flask

Examined 9/5/80, 6/81, 6/9-10/88

Shape FS 186 Lentoid Flask

Motif Linear

Style Simple Style? (it is not Egyptian fabric)

Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 21: "Pottery brownish pilgrim bottle decorated with brown concentric circles, much of one side lost. H. 7 1/4."

Publication IKG, p. 17: as perhaps Cypriote, pl.17.40. Mentioned in Thomas, Gurob, p. 57, no. 337, as "Cypriote pilgrim bottle." Furumark does not identify this as SS, certainly because no concentric circles are shown in IKG 17.

Derivation Many sherds (about 18) now glued into 6 main pieces. Some very badly burnt, some almost untouched, but all are a bit smoky. Some of breakage after burning, as some material has melted down on broken edges. The sherds are pocked, scratched, and shattered, apparently by the heat. See below, "Misc."

Condition

Size Dia. mouth exterior 2.65, Dia. mouth aperture 1.05, Neck diameter (front-back) 2.25, Dia. of bowl c. 13.7, Tk. c. 7.35, Max. Tk. wall (center belly) 1.03, Tk. other belly center 0.45, W. handle 1.45, Tk. handle 1.2 cm.

Surface Treatment Apparently slipped and burnished. Can see finger marks, so prob. slipped. With 7X lens see burnishing marks on lower body.

Paint Color In sunlight. Taken on least burnt piece, with no. 66863. 2.5 YR 5/8-3/6. (Also read as c. 2.5 YR 4/4-5 YR 3/2.) Almost hopeless.

Paint Lustre Some remains, but cannot tell original amount, probably low-medium.
Paint Cond. Burnt.

Gd. Color (Sunlight) No Munsell chips exactly right, closest is 10 YR 6/4 towards the yellow/red of 7.5 YR 6/6. (Also read as 5 YR 6-5/4).

Gd. Lustre Originally probably low to medium.

Surface Inclusions Tiny mica common, 1 cm. grey chunk in surface spall.

Fabric Burnt, so secondary firing, but can see inner & outer edges as grayer with redder color for core (c. 5 YR 6/6)

Core/Pores Inclusions Nice finish, smooth, well-levigated. See description below, under "Decoration."

Decor. Mouth had ring. Backs of handles painted with solid bands which are connected across the width of the neck. Body has concentric circles: outer is thick, then thin (4 on one side 1-2 on other), then thick band, then reserve space. Fine bands possibly followed. It is very burnt and design cannot be identified.

On thick side 0.5-1.0 mm. inclusions. Abundant .01-.015 mm., also .02 mm.; sparse larger inclusions of 1-2 mm. in dark colors. Interior is all pocked too, as surface. Pores go around neck.

Technique Wheel-made in one piece, on the side—in mould? Wheel-made in bowl form, as have "vertical" turning. One side has thick spiral snail, i.e. the bottom. Then the wall thins out over curve of the carination and up onto other side of body. Small sherd shows drawn up here for closure. Neck is poked through, on side, then spout added & built up. Spout looks as if formed on something solid (stick?). Center of the top (thin) side has "drawing up"—nipple on that side c. 0.24 cm. thick only! Probably made in one piece, with mould to hold the bottom while forming the top?

Misc. The burning goes through the whole thing, so the break made after burning is still grey on both pieces. But there is one sherd that is unburnt, and the join to it is black—so this piece was broken before (or while) it was burnt. The fabric is coarser than other Myc. fabric, such as in stirrup jars, and I can see some pores also; but it is not as coarse as Egyptian pottery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>BM 66864 (90 11-9 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>Larger stirrup jar, possibly FS 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motif</strong></td>
<td>FM 19:28/29 Multiple Stem and Tongue, semicircular, LH III A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>LH III A2 late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 22: &quot;Pottery yellow, fragment of a false necked jar with Greek patterns ochreous. Shewing base of neck &amp; hole beneath the spout L. 3 1/4 [inches].&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication</strong></td>
<td>Unpublished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Derivation**
Shoulder of stirrup jar, with one handle, spout and false spout emplacements. Burnt and badly damaged, apparently after both spouts were broken off. Vase wall is a bit deformed (possibly in original firing?), heavy spalling along edges, salty film, encrustation on top. Inside very rough, possibly salt or sand adhering to surface.

**Size**
Dia. neck false spout c. 2.1, Dia. neck aperture false spout 0.55, Dia. aperture spout 1.1; Tk. wall c. 0.4; L. of sherd 8.45, W. 7.1 cm.

**Surface Treatment**
Slipped and burnished. Where handle has broken off can see original unslipped surface of vase with rillings.

**Paint Color**
In most unburnt place: 2.5 YR 4/6 (at 4:10 PM in sunlight)

**Paint Lustre**
Medium, in areas looks almost high.
Paint Cond. Crackly.

Gd. Color Taken in least burnt area: 10 YR 6/3.

Gd. Lustre

Surface Inclusions (7X lens): common tiny (0.1 mm.) black specks.

Fabric

Core/Pores Inclusions 5 YR 5/6. Where burnt has turned grey brown. Edge of break is spalling and flaked, cannot see inclusions.

Decor. Band around base of spout, then loop (or wide band) around base of false spout connecting on both sides to the spout band. Shoulder motifs: at least 3 in back, 2 in front.

Technique Wheel-made. Hole made at neck for the false spout (or orifice retained from body formation), and edge turned back under. Drawn-up (hollow) false spout applied on top, producing flange. For the spout a hole was poked through, and the separately-formed spout was added on top, with a very wide "smoothing-down" area. The area for handle application also very wide--it was well attached and smoothed down.

Misc.
Number  BM 66865 (90 11-9 23)
Mycenaean Stirrup Jar "B," False Spout (Joins BM 66868 [a])
Examined 9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88
Shape Stirrup Jar "B," restored as FS 180.

Motif Linear
Style LH III B1
Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 23: "Pottery false neck, the top brown with grey circle. H. 1.2."
Publication Unpublished.

Derivation Condition Burnt. False spout only. Vase B is in much worse condition than A. Surface is flaking and spalling just like pastry. An extra box is full little slivers of pottery. False spout and body sherds are not quite so badly burnt as the rest.

Size Dia. disc 2.72, w. disc with handle stubs 3.02, H. preserved 2.96 cm.

Surface Treatment
Paint Color Burnt. Dark brown/black paint.
Paint Lustre
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Mycenaean Pottery 4)

Paint Cond.
6566 (901-924)
Restored as 25.1.76.

Gd. Color
Burnt. All grey.

Gd. Lustre

Surface Inclusions

Fabric
LH III B1

Core/Pores Inclusions

Decor.
Large central dot on disc, narrow reserved band, then thick band around edge. Band around base.

Technique
Wheel-made, drawn-up with hollow core. Disc flat to concave, and neck is narrow.

Misc.
It is possible that this false spout was used for Petrie's pl. 17.23. The other vase "A" has handles, while Petrie shows them as only dashed lines, so he may have been using this piece, which lacks handles.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Mycenaean Pottery 5)  307

Number  BM  66866 (90 11-9 24)
Examined  9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88
Shape  Stirrup Jar "A," restored as FS 178.

Motif  Linear.
Style  LH III B1
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 24: "Pottery false neck, top with one broad brown circle. H. 1.2."
Publication  Restored as IKG, pl. 17.28? (generally similar lower body and multiple fine lines in band groups. Wace, BSA 52 (1957) 222; Chronology, p. 113 n. 8, 114 (FS 171, LH III A:2); Buchholz, 446q, also citing Flommen, p. 162 and Anm. 6; Helck, 87. Possibly Hankey & Warren (1974), p. 162.
Derivation  Burnt, now totally black.
Condition
Size  Dia. 2.72, H. 3.2, W. preserved with handle stubs, 3.4 cm.
Restored Dia. foot c. 5, Max. Dia. c. 12.4 cm. Neck dia. 1.42.
Surface  Treatment
Paint Color  Burnt as dark as pitch—very powdery, crackly. Paint is all burnt, so decoration is now preserved as the lighter color.


6d. Lustre

Surface Inclusions  Linear

Fabric  LH III B1


Core/Pores Sparse pores twisted up. Very fine, clean clay.

Inclusions

Decor.  Center of disc covered with large dot, edge painted with band which spreads out over top of handles (apparently no reserve triangles). Neck base probably has a loop, not a circle.

Technique  Wheel-made, drawn up. Disc flat to slightly convex, not coned. Drawn up.

Diameter: 2.4, Diam. neck 1.57, H. 3.5, Min. diam. aperture c. 0.75 cm.

Misc.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Mycenaean Pottery 6)

Number  BM 66867 (90 11-9 25)
Shape 9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88
Stirrup Jar "A," restored as FS 178. See BM 66866.

Motif Linear
Style LH III B1
Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 25: "Pottery spout grey & brown L 1.7."

Publication Loop around base of spout. Decoration at mouth no longer visible. Shoulder preserves beginning of a band group with thick band; reserved space (cannot tell if originally had fine bands here), thick band below.

Derivation Spout and part of shoulder. Burnt, but not on the breaks or on the Condition interior. Decoration now appears as the lighter color. Spalling inside. Traces of glue, but could not make a join.

Size Dia. mouth 2.4, Dia. neck 1.57, H. 3.5, Min. dia. aperture c. 0.75 cm.
Paint Cond.  
Mycenaean Stirrup Jar "B." Shoulder Fragment (joins BM 66863)  
Examined 9/3/80, 6/81, 6/13/80  

Gd. Lustre

Surface Inclusions

Fabric

Core/Pores

Inclusions

Decor.  
Loop around base of spout. Decoration of mouth no longer visible. Shoulder preserves beginning of a band group with thick band, reserved space (cannot tell if originally had fine bands here), thick band below.

Technique  
Wheel-made. Shoulder has been "poked-through" for spout placement. Separately made spout was added slightly off-center.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Mycenaean Pottery 7)

Number       BM 66868 [a] (90 11-9 26)
Examined     9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88
Shape         Stirrup Jar "B," restored as FS 180.

Motif         Linear
Style         LH III B1
Acquisition   11-9-1890, no. 26: "Pottery fragments of pilgrim bottle? pale brown with dark brown circles. 2 fragments of circumference, one of base."
Publication   Unpublished.

Condition     In handle placement area 1.5 (vertical) X 1.62 (horizontal) cm.
Surface Treatment Slipped and polished
Paint Color   Burnt.
Paint Lustre  Now low to medium.
Paint Cond. Burnt.

Gd. Color

Gd. Lustre

Surface Inclusions Linear

Fabric LH III B1

Core/Pores Inclusions 11-9-1890, no. 26: Pottery fragments of pilgrim bottle? pale brown with dark brown circles. 2 fragments of circumference, one of base.

Decor. Shoulder undecorated. Band at base of false spout, band group at shoulder: 5 fine between 2 thick.

Derivation Burnt, inside spalling. One fragment from foot, burnt inside and out. Three body fragments put under this number: one was formed from lower on the body and were differentially burnt.

Technique Wheel-made, drawn-up. Handle attachment is roundish and large, so handle was smoothed on, not pinched on.

Dimensions Glazed body short. W. 6.05, H. 2.85, Max. Th. wall 0.3 cm. Dia. foot restorable to c. 5.5 cm.

Surface Treatment As Br. 66868 (n).

Misc. Later burnt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>BM 66868 [b,c] (90 11-9 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>Stirrup Jar &quot;B,&quot; restored as FS 180.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motif</strong></td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>LH III B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 26: &quot;Pottery fragments of pilgrim bottle? pale brown with dark brown circles. 2 fragments of circumference, one of base.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication</strong></td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derivation</strong></td>
<td>Burnt, inside spalling. One fragment from foot, burnt inside and out. Three body fragments put under this number: one was formed of two joining and glued sherds (now glued to 66868 [a] and 66865), the other two also joined. They were from lower on the body and were differentially burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>Glued body sherd: W. 6.05, H. 2.65, Max. Tk. wall 0.3 cm. Dia. foot restorable to c. 5.6 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Treatment</strong></td>
<td>As BM 66868 [a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paint Color</strong></td>
<td>Burnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paint Lustre</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paint Cond.  BM 66859 (12.11-9.32)

Mycenaean Stirrup Jar "A," Handle. Cf. BM 56206

Examination  9/6/80, 6/01, 6/13/80

Shape: Stirrup Jar "A," restored as F5 (78. See BM 66856.

Gd. Color  Burnt

Gd. Lustre

Surface Inclusions  Linear

Fabric  EM III B1

Inclusions  [1-9-1990, no. 27: "Pottery: dark brown, fragment of handle. (2 same as 69)." 69 apparently also registered as BM 56269 (16.1).]

Core/Pores

Decor.  Thick band around "ankle" and lower belly--stops just above the foot "carination." The glued sherd is reserved with part of one paint band.

Partiation  Burnt. Now glued to shoulder piece.

Technique  Wheel-made. Foot is raised.

Misc.  The burning of the inside of the foot, and the differences in burning on the joining body pieces show that the vase was broken before (or while) it was burnt.
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, Gurob (Mycenaean Pottery 9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>BM 66869 (90 11-9 27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>Stirrup Jar &quot;A,&quot; restored as FS 178. See BM 66866.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Motif</strong></th>
<th>Linear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>LH III B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acquisition**

11-9-1890, no. 27: "Pottery dark brown, fragment of handle. L.2. (same as 69)." 69 apparently also registered as BM 66869 [bis].

**Publication**

Unpublished.

**Derivation**

Burnt. Now glued to shoulder piece.

**Size**

W. 1.25, Tk. 0.8 cm. Oval section.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Mycenaean Pottery 9)

Paint Cond.

6d. Color

6d. Lustre

Surface Inclusions

Fabric

Core/Pores Inclusions

Decor. Back is painted—may have stopped before reached shoulder band. Has pinched-on join.

Technique

Misc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 66869 [bis] (90 11-9 69)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/81/6/13/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Stirrup Jar &quot;A,&quot; restored as FS 178. See BM 66866.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motif</td>
<td>Linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>LH III B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 69: &quot;Pottery pale yellow with brown glazed bands. Fragments of a vase including handle &amp; part of base. Much discoloured. The handle no. 27 [BM 66869] appears to belong to the same vase.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Possibly the sherds used to restore the stirrup jar illustrated in IK6, pl. 27.28 (judging from the no. of fine lines in the band groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Burnt and salt encrusted. 6 sherds: 2 joining from maximum body diameter, 2 joining from body and foot (now glued), 2 joining from handle and shoulder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Tk. wall 0.4 cm. at Max. Dia. body. Restored Dia. foot c. 5, Max. Dia. c. 12.4 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Presumably slipped and burnished as usual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Color</td>
<td>Really very dark brown: 5 YR 2.5/2 (for thin applications) - 7.5 YR 2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Lustre</td>
<td>Medium.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paint Cond. Burnt.

6d. Color 10 YR 7/3-6/3

6d. Lustre Low.

Surface Inclusions Surface is destroyed, dirty, pocked, scratched. Seems to have air holes, 1 chip mica, sparse to common tiny (0.1mm.) brown

Fabric Burnt, with secondary reduction.

Core/Pores Inclusions Seems to have salt crystals clinging to breaks, matt white c. 2 mm., causing a spall; whitish chip c. 3 mm. long; larger inclusions

Decor. Handle & shoulder: band group of 2 thick bands with 5 thin between. Body: reserve space, then band group of 7 thin between 2 thick, reserve band, thick band. Foot: the last band of the body is the "ankle" band--it stops just above the foot carination. No paint on edge of base. Center of base is missing. Note that IKG pl. 17.28 shows 4 fine in upper band group, 6 fine in belly group, and 4 in "ankle" group.

Technique Wheel-made. Raised foot.

Misc.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Mycenaean Pottery 11)

**Number**
BM 66879 (90 11-9 70)

**Examined**
9/5/80, 6/81, 6/13/88

**Shape**
Stirrup Jar "B," restored as FS 180.

**Motif**
Linear

**Style**
LH III B1

**Acquisition**
11-9-1890, no.70: "Pottery spout of a vase, grey with brown band L. 1.3."

**Publication**
Unpublished.

**Derivation Condition**
Complete false spout. The color of ground and paint, as well as proportions match 66865. Lip all burnt. Blackened down the center front area, like a stripe. Quite damaged by heap, the lip is flaking spirally.

**Size**
Dia. mouth 2.45, Dia. neck 1.56, H. (on side towards handle) 2.85 cm.
Paint Cond.

6d. Color

6d. Lustre

Surface Inclusions

Fabric

Seems to be the same fabric as other sherds grouped as "B." I cannot tell any difference visually.

Core/Pores Inclusions

Decor.

Paint band around the edge & inside of lip. Band (not loop) around base of neck.

Technique

Wheel-made, strongly drawn-up (can see clear, deep spiral inside, rim also flaking spirally).

Misc.

It is possible that Petrie used this spout in his restoration of IKG, p. 17.23. The spout from stirrup jar "A" has shoulder area still attached, and the drawing shows only a spout.
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Mycenaean Pottery 12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>UCL 855, Museum of Classical Archaeology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>1981, 6/1/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>FS 183:6, conical, squat, LH III B (MP, p. 615). On base in pencil &quot;3 Gurob.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motif</strong></td>
<td>FM 27:19 (LH III A2/B)/26-27 (LH III B), sea anemone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>LH III B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>JHS 11, 274: in Petrie's &quot;possession,&quot; to UCL Petrie Collection, and then to Classical Archaeology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Derivation Condition**: Nice vase, spout reglued, middle of spout gone, handles glued on. Burnt on one side of body and spout, as if used for a lamp or as if contents burned. Body appears restored, but may just have deep cracks.

**Size**: Max. Dia. 11.45, Max. Dia. disc 2.5, Max. Dia. spout 2.1, Mn. dia. spout c. 1.0, Mn. Dia. neck 1.35, Max. Dia. foot 4.68, H. c. 8.95, Max. W. handles 5.85, W. handle 1.0, Tk. handle 0.72.

**Surface Treatment**: Slipped and polished.

**Paint Color**: Red (unburnt areas) 2.5 YR 4/8 to brown 2.5 YR 2.5/2 (Noon, sun)

**Paint Lustre**: High. Seems to be thin, as can see slip under it—a thin glaze when applied.
Paint Cond.  Cracked and worn.

6d. Color  10 YR 7/3

6d. Lustre  Low to medium. Cracked, "worm-tracks," spalling

Surface

Inclusions  Salted, abundant tiny black, sparse to common tiny mica. Very nice fabric.

Fabric  Unbroken, so no breaks observable.

Core/Pores

Inclusions  Unobservable.

Decor.  Disc: 4 medium bands, edge band, no reserve triangle. Handle back painted solid from disc to shoulder. Circular band around base of false spout, hemi-circle around front of base of spout. Shoulder band group: 5 fine between 2 thick, reserve band with 2 fine lines, band group just at and below max. dia. of 5 fine between 2 thick, reserve space to "ankle," thick band from "ankle" to just above end of foot. Shoulder has dotted sea anemone, 3 in back, 2 in front, beautifully painted. No decoration on base.


Misc.  Petrie himself does not seem to have associated this vase with the Tutankhamun Burnt Group, although he does seem to think it should be of a similar date. His mark of "Group 3" on the base would seem to differentiate it from the Tutankhamun Group (number not known). It probably should not be considered as coming from the Tutankhamun Group.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Egyptian Pottery 1)

Number  BM 66859
Egyptian Vase (incomplete), restored from 12 sherds
Examed  9/5/80, 6/9-10/88
Shape  Small, round-bottomed jar
Style  18-19th Dynasties, not before Amenhotep III
Publication  Unpublished.
Derivation Condition  Seems to be about 80% complete, mostly the neck is missing. Could have been broken after burning, as not all of the breaks show any traces of this. Interior is solidly blackened, but exterior is only spotted, presumably from the fire.
Size  H. extant 9.3, restored 12.3; max. dia. body, c. 11.6; max. dia. mouth (restored) c. 8.8; max. dia. neck (restored) c. 8.1 cm. Thickness 0.4-0.7 cm.
Surface Treatment  Burnished and slipped
Paint Color  Grey (approaching 5 YR 6/1) with burnt black spots
6d. Color  Medium: very nice effect
6d. Lustre  Very perky, especially on interior
Surface Inclusions  Marl, possibly Marl D.
Fabric  Very brittle. Grey all through, although very tip of rim is red.
Core/Pores Inclusions  Quartz and white chunks are common.
Decor.  Wheel made, perhaps string-cut from wheel.
Number  BM 66860 (90 11-9 18)  
Egyptian Vase Fragments (see 66861)  
Examined 9/5/80, 6/9-10/88  
Shape Wine Pitcher? Probably from same vessel as BM 66861.  
Style Late Dynasty 18?  
Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 18: “Pottery grey & blackish, fragments of a vessel with smooth surface W. 4 3/4.”  
Publication Unpublished.  
Derivation 3 sherds (now in 2 pieces), joining, from a vase body. Burnt.  
Condition Edges are also burnt.  
Size Max. dia. c. 20.5 cm. Max. thickness c. 0.62 cm.  
Surface Treatment Possibly slipped and burnished. All kinds of working marks, but not parallel, as would come from a wheel.  
Paint Color  
Gd. Color Cream colored, 10 YR 6/3 (“pale brown”) taken on the larger sherd, but darkened by fire. The smaller sherd is totally burnt.  
Gd. Lustre  
Surface Inclusions Very porous, especially on interior.  
Fabric Rather rough, and quite brittle. Red (with black splotches, from the fire) on the interior.  
Core/Pores Inclusions Grey chunk 0.4 cm., abundant small white (limestone?) chunks.  
Decor.  
Technique Wheel made, roughly made. Surface is hand-burnished.
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Egyptian Pottery 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 66861 (90 11-9 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian Vase Fragment (see BM 66860)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/9-10/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Wine Pitcher? Probably from same vessel as BM 66860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Late Dynasty 18?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 19: &quot;Pottery grey &amp; blackish, fragment L. 3.0.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Unpublished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>One sherd, burnt. This fits onto BM 66860 section and, as it thins towards one end, suggests that it is near the neck or rim and that the sherds in both groups come from the shoulder, rather than the base, of a vessel. Edges are burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Max. dia. c. 19 cm., and matches vertical slant and diameter of BM 66860. Max. thickness 0.52 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Burnished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Color</td>
<td>Originally cream, now burnt: the closest is approximately 10 YR 6/3 (&quot;pale brown&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Lustre</td>
<td>Medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Inclusions</td>
<td>Very nice finish. Exterior looks like BM 66859, but interior resembles BM 66860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Marl clay. Core is dark red, matching BM 66860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core/Pores Inclusions</td>
<td>Interior all full of air holes, looks like BM 66860.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Wheel-made. Surface has been hand-burnished, and preserves vertical strokes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>BM 66862 (90 11-9 20) Egyptian Vase Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>9/5/80, 6/9-10/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Possibly the bottom of a &quot;drop&quot; vase or other, rather ovoid based,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Dynasty 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 20: &quot;Pottery red with black surface, curved fragment L. 2 1/4.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation Condition</td>
<td>Burnt. Break is also very burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Max. thickness c. 0.45 cm. Max. dia. (restored) c. 9.5 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Treatment</td>
<td>Smoothed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd. Color</td>
<td>Exterior entirely burnt to black; also burnt spot on interior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd. Lustre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Inclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabric</td>
<td>Not as coarse as BM 66861/0, rather nice. Homogeneous color in break, 5 YR 5/4 (&quot;reddish brown&quot;). Probably alluvial clay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core/Pores Inclusions</td>
<td>Common tiny mica, no large inclusions. Inclusions all rather granular but all small.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Wheel-made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number  BM  66862 (90 11-9 20)
Examine  9/5/80, 6/9-10/88
Shape  Possibly the bottom of a "drop" vase or other, rather ovoid based,
Style  Dynasty 18-19
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 20: "Pottery red with black surface, curved
fragment  L. 2 1/4."
Publication  Unpublished.
Derivation  Burnt. Break is also very burnt.

Size  Max. thickness c. 0.45 cm. Max. dia. (restored) c. 9.5 cm.
Surface Treatment  Smoothed.
Paint Color  Gd. Color  Exterior entirely burnt to black; also burnt spot on interior.
Gd. Lustre  Surface Inclusions  Fabric  Not as coarse as BM 66861/0, rather nice. Homogeneous color in
Core/Pores Inclusions  Common tiny mica, no large inclusions. Inclusions all rather granular but all small.
Decor.  Technique  Wheel-made.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT–GROUP, GUROB (Egyptian Pottery 5) 327

**Number**  
BM 66870

**Examined**  
9/5/80, 6/9–10/88

**Shape**  
Large storage jar?

**Style**  
Late Dynasty 18?

**Acquisition**  

**Publication**  
Unpublished.

**Derivation**  
Sherd apparently from upper shoulder and curve to neck. Neither breaks nor body are burnt.

**Condition**

**Size**  
Thickens 0.7; max. extant dia. (restored) c. 29; dia. (restored) neck c. 19.3 cm.

**Surface Treatment**  
Slipped? (possibly self-slipped?)

**Paint Color**  
Dark purple-red, 10 R 3/2 ("dusky red"), matt

**Gd. Color**  
Dark tan, 10 YR 6/4 ("light yellowish brown")

**Gd. Lustre**  
Matt

**Surface Inclusions**  
Abundant large white chunks, a spall c. 11 mm. long. Spalling on both interior and exterior surfaces

**Fabric**  
Greyster core, red on both edges, and outer edge cream. Coarse red. Possibly marl clay.

**Core/Pores Inclusions**  
Abundant large (0.4 mm. and smaller) ls. chunks. Lots of grit, like sand.

**Decor.**  
Linear. A band group on shoulder consisting of approximately 5 horizontal line with short, vertical, cross-hatch strokes across the upper two. Bottom of neck join painted with solid band.

**Technique**  
Wheel made.
Number  BM 66857 and 66858 (90 11-9 14,15):  Faience Kohl Tube

Examined  6/81, 6/13/88

Shape  Kohl tube: Long and slender, closed at one end.

Date  Late Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition  11-9-1890, no 14: "Glazed pottery, blue fragment of a tube, one end of which is closed with a disk of porcelain. L.26.7." No. 15: "Glazed pottery, blue fragment of a tube, probably from the same tube: the mouth stopped apparently with a roll of linen. L. 2.5."

Publication  IKG, pl. 17.30.

Derivation Condition  Very burnt and discolored.

Size  66857 (bottom) ext. dia. 1.7, dia. plug 1.3, h. 6.26 max.; 66858 (top) ovoid, dia. 1.6 X 1.85, l. 6.7 cm.

Surface  Core  Breaks are NOT burnt. The upper fragment's broken edge is old and so dirty; the lower is fresh white frit (i.e. a newer break). Interior--can see grey edge in section about the same thickness as the blue glaze. Is this from the contents, or is it smoked?

Decor./ Misc.  A horizontal band group of a wavy line between two horizontal lines was placed close to the rim in a darker color. Apparently the same design was also around the lower part of the tube.
Number: BM 66860 (90 11-9 12): Falence Vase

Examined: 6/81, 6/13/88

Shape: Very tall and narrow drop vase.

Date: Not before beginning of Dyn. 19.

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 12: "Glazed pottery, blue deep vessel, the rim lost pattern in black outline indistinct, pendant lotus flowers on the sides L. 6 3/4."


Derivation Condition:

Restored from many pieces. The surface is very rough. Interior:

4 cm. from top is blue, but down further is discolored to black/grey--from contents? Base possibly burnt. Possibly cleaned.

Size:

L. 16.9, Tk. wall at rim 0.32 cm., max. dia. 4.93

Surface: Rough, bubbly with air holes, possibly from fire. Medium gloss.

Core: Frit. Breaks are not burnt. Fabric has absorbed something dark from inside the vase--either smoke or ancient contents.

Decor./ Misc.:

Near the rim is a horizontal row of vertical lotus-petals, set between two groups of horizontal lines. Hanging below these is the single representation of a funerary floral collar (wah-collar). It's center seems a solid "dot" (all that remains of design), followed by an empty band edged by two groups of double horizontal lines. From this another row of lotus-petals, finished by two horizontal lines. Hanging from the collar is a pendant lotus flower and two lotus buds. The base of the vase has a band group of a row of tangent circles (mandrakes?) between two groups of double horizontal lines, and ends with a horizontal row of lotus-petals. On the back hang the tasselled ties of the collar. The vase is rather heavy, possibly much of the tip is solid. The fragments are all different colors. An irregular ring of black around the tip marks where it must have sat in a support of some sort (even sand?), as if the support caught some of the contents.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Faience Vessel 3)

Number BM 66861 (90 11-9 11): Faience

Examined 6/81, 6/13/88

Shape Shallow bowl.

Date Ramesside?

Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 11: "Glazed pottery, blue cup, some fragments missing: inside below the rim a wavy ornament between two black lines, & in the centre a lotus flower outlined in black. D 5 1/4."


Derivation Condition Broken and restored. Burnt and partially discolored to purple on the exterior and on the inner rim of the same side. Very thick walls. Much of exterior along rim is very badly burnt.

Size Max. h. c. 4.6, max. dia. c. 13.4, dia. floral design c. 10.4 cm.

Surface Medium turquoise blue, with black paint; medium gloss.

Core Solid frit. Does not really look burnt across the breaks, so breakage may have occurred after burning.

Decor./ Misc. Decoration on interior only. Rim dotted, and beneath this a wavy line between 3 horizontal ones. In the center a large, open blue? lotus-flower. It is centered by a dot and two concentric circles. There are four main petals and then subdivisions behind them. Design is partially lost.
Number: BM 67062 (90 11-9 16); Vase
Examined: 6/81, 6/13/88
Shape: Rim and part of neck of open vessel.
Date: Dyn. 19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 16: "Glazed pottery, blue fragment of vessel from the rim with a black pattern inside & out. L. 2.1."

Publication: Unpublished.
Derivation: Rim sherd.
Condition: Ext. dia. c. 9.5, int. dia. c. 8, tk. at inner carination c. 0.8 cm. X 4.25 cm. Max. h. c. 6.8 cm.

Surface: Light-med. blue ground of med. gloss, glossier thin black paint.
Core: Frit, but terracotta in color. Quite coarse. In break is very porous, with chunks of a black material as temper and white wiggley lines.

Decor./Misc.: Rim is dotted. Below rim on exterior is apparently a horizontal band of mandrake fruits resting on a horizontal line. On the interior is an unidentified motif.
<p>| <strong>Number</strong> | BM 67063 (90 11-9 13): Vase in Cucumber Shape (Fragmentary) |
| <strong>Examined</strong> | 6/81, 6/13/88 |
| <strong>Shape</strong> | Cucumber-shaped bottle. |
| <strong>Date</strong> | Late Dyn. 18 to &quot;Dyn. 19-20&quot; |
| <strong>Acquisition</strong> | 11-9-1890, no. 13: &quot;Glazed pottery, blue fragment of a vessel L.25. section oval (cucumber).&quot; |
| <strong>Publication</strong> | Unpublished. |
| <strong>Derivation</strong> | Burnt. |
| <strong>Condition</strong> | Burnt. |
| <strong>Size</strong> | At height of 4.5 cm. from the base ovoid body measures c. 3.6 x 4.25 cm. Max. h. c. 6.8 cm. |
| <strong>Surface</strong> | Bright turquoise with black lines. |
| <strong>Core</strong> | Moulded in two semi-circular halves and stuck together with slurry, a small amount of which has gathered at the base. |
| <strong>Decor./ Misc.</strong> | 13 black stripes (the veins) radiate out along the keel and the sides from the meeting point at the bottom. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 66871 (90 11-9 29): Stone: Travertine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>6/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Two-handled, lentoid flask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>IKG, pl. 17.42 (restored); noted in Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 337.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation Condition</td>
<td>Very fragile, surface flaking off badly. Restored from many pieces. Burnt--cannot tell if it was before or after it was smashed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Height c. 12.1, body w. (narrow) c. 5.85, w. (wide) c. 9.25, h. base to neck, c. 9.5 (slightly taller than wide), dia. mouth, c. 3.9 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Very fine-grained stone, similar to BM 66874 (mortar), BM 66873 (jar bottom).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Handles are carved out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor/ Misc.</td>
<td>Smooth surface, but no lustre. No tooling marks except tiny scratches around the handle and all the upper body, so it was not ground. Can see circular horizontal marks inside, presumably from the drill. It is very nice and smooth inside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GURUOB (Stone Vessel 2)

Number: BM 66872 (90 11-9 30); Stone: Travertine

Examined: 6/81 (?)

Shape: Probably from lentoid flask.

Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 30: "Alabaster fragment of a bottle. from the neck H. 1.6."

Publication: Unpublished.

Derivation/Condition: Burnt but breaks are clean and unburnt.

Size: Dia. c. 3.8, height (extant) 4.0 cm.

Material:

Technique:

Decor/Misc.: Interior rough, not polished. Exterior smooth, rim edge interior is sharply cut.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 66873 (90 11-9 31):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examine</td>
<td>6/816/81 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>6/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 31: &quot;Alabaster bottle, the neck broken off. H. 1.9.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Unpublished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Neck gone. Fine crystals, but chipping now like coarse type now seen in Luxor. Not calcined, but definitely smoke-darkened. The lower body looks scorched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Max. h. 4.7, max. dia. 4.8, dia. neck c. 1.9, tk. base 0.65, max. tk. wall 0.8 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Fine-grained, similar to BM 66871 (flask) and BM 66874 (mortar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Presumably drilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decor/ Misc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUBOB (Stone Vessel 4)

Number  BM 66874(90 11-9 31): Stone: Travertine

Examined  6/81 (?)

Shape  Cup-like, with lug handle.

Date  Possibly Ramesside.

Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 32: "Alabaster cup with one ear D. 1.8."

Publication  IKG, pl. 17.31; mentioned in Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, No. 337.

Derivation Condition  Burnt. A chip out of side surface, cracked across the lug.

Size  Dia. c. 4.6, width with lug c. 4.8, height c. 3.4 cm. Lug w. c. 1.75, h. c. 0.7 cm.

Material  Very fine-grained stone

Technique  Very smooth. No carved details, such as scales, etc.

Decor/ Misc.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUBROB (Stone Vessel 5)

Number BM 66875 (90 11-9 33): Stone: Travertine

Examined 6/81 (?)

Shape Shallow saucer with outline of multi-fish.

Date Late 18th-19th Dynasty

Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 33: "Alabaster spoon L. 6.0."

Publication IKG, pl. 17.41(restored); noted in Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, No. 337.

Derivation Condition Tail somewhat shattered. Burnt and restored. Some of breaks are clean, some are grey, but none are black, so possibly broken after burning.

Size H. c. 3.15, w. c. 11.9, l. c. 15.7, tk. wall from 0.2-0.5, 0.75 cm. at tail.

Material Very fine-grained stone.

Technique Very smooth. No carved details, such as scales, etc.

Decor/Misc. The tail is mostly missing; Petrie has illustrated it as whole.
Number: BM 66876 (90 11-9 34); Stone: Travertine

Examined: 6/81

Shape: Shallow saucer.

Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 34: "Alabaster saucer D. 4 inches."

Publication: Unpublished.

Derivation, Condition: Burnt, shattered and restored. Scorched on one side, but not calcined.

Size: Dia. c. 10.2, h. c. 2.55, small ovoid flattened area on bottom 3.26 x 3.03, wall thickness 0.3-0.4 cm.

Material: Fine-grained, delicate, as is the rest of the travertine from this group.

Technique

Decor/Misc.
Number: BM 66877 (90 11-9 35): Stone: Travertine

Examined: 6/81
Shape: Shallow footed saucer.
Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 35: "Alabaster fragment of saucer L. 2 1/4 inches."

Publication: Unpublished.

Derivation Condition: Fragmentary, scorched, not calcined. The breaks are not burnt.

Size: Max. dia. c. 7.45, dia. foot c. 3.5, h. c. 1.9 cm.
Material: Very delicate, fine-grained stone.

Technique:
Decor:
Misc.:

DIA. MOUTH 2.98, DIA. NECK 2.07, MAX. W. BODY 7.86, MAX. TC. BODY 4.68, W. HANDLE 0.9, TC. HANDLE c. 0.4, MAX. H. 10.37, MAX. TC. WALL (measurable) c. 0.33 cm. Handle section rectangular. Cooney H. 10.3 cm.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Glass Vessel 1)

Number  BM 37499 (90 11-9 1): Glass

Lentoid flask

Examine  6/81, 6/13/88

Shape  Two-handed lentoid flask.

Date  Dyn. 19? Cooney dates it late 18th-19th Dyn., says it is almost identical to BM 64338 (Ramesses II Group). Although this "could be used as an argument for a similar dating...these flasks continued to be duplicated over many generations [and] it is sounder to give a wide date range." In Nolte's "Werkkreis 4" (Tutankhamun- Ramesses II), dated specifically to Tutankhamun on the basis of Petrie's contextual date as a burnt-group.

Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 1: "Glass flask, dark purple with yellow & white lines & leaf-pattern. made up from fragments, those of the neck being twisted by heat. one handle missing. H. 4 inches."

Publication  IKG, p. 17, pl. 17.35 (restored); Nolte, Glas, pp. 71, 116; Cooney, Glass, p. 149, no. 1766; noted in Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 337.

Derivation  Left handle gone; surface flaking on interior; 1 shard is badly out of shape, melted slightly after broken, as edge is rounded, and there is a big hole on the bottom, lower edge which is also slightly melted on the exterior, also badly melted around handle zones. Badly smashed into tiny pieces. Now scratched & damaged. Cooney: 1 handle gone, gaps in body, small patch on shoulder indicating misfiring (rare in Egyptian pieces); small package of shards inside presumably from this vase.

Condition  Dia. mouth 2.98, Dia. neck. 2.07, Max. W. body 7.88, Max. Tk. body 4.68, W. handle 0.9, Tk. handle c. 0.4, Max. H. 10.37, Max. Tk. wall (measurable) c. 0.33 cm. Handle section rectangular. Cooney: H. 10.3 cm.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Glass Vessel 1)

Surface/Material: Smooth, slight ridges over shoulder bands—they stand out from the surface slightly. Surface is dark reddish purple, a dark raspberry color, possibly due to fire action. Nolte: dark purple; Cooney: opaque amethyst. Finish originally very shiny and nice. Cooney: originally glossy. IKG, p. 17: yellow veins on purple.

Technique: Sand core. Mouth formed and then band (twisted already) applied around it—can see the joint of the rim twist, just at break. Handle applied. Can see lots of air bubbles in body. Cooney: small section at base of handle concave; rim has prefabricated white & amethyst cord like BM 64338 (= 1768, from R. II Burnt Group, Gurob).

Decor/Misc. Mouth: purple in middle and white outside. Band is neatly twisted purple & white. Handle seems to be solid purple with threads of white (4) & yellow (2) alternating on back (not sunk in). Neck: small feather pattern in white & yellow. 2 plain shoulder bands in white & yellow, body has large feather pattern in white & yellow—some of it very thin, and some drawn down under the second band group below. Second band group of white & yellow. Cooney: Body in White, yellow and turquoise. Handles overlaid with 5 white & yellow threads. NOTE: this flask is very similar to the amorphiskos BM 67395, but not like BM 67027, which is finer work.
| **Number** | BM 67027 (90 11-9 3): Glass Amorphiskos (Fragmentary) |
| **Examined** | 6/81 |
| **Shape** | Amorphiskos with handles. |
| **Date** | Possibly Dyn. 19? Cooney: temp. Tutankhamun; Nolte: temp. Tutankhamun (on basis of Petrie's contextual date). |
| **Acquisition** | 11-9-1890, no. 3: "Glass fragments of bottle of the same form as the last, showing neck lip and one handle: ground pale blue, yellow & white lines ring rong mouth purple & white, handle purple yellow & white. H. 2.3." |
| **Publication** | IKG, p. 17, pl. 17.37; Nolte, Glas, p. 72 and pl. 16.1 (enlarged from Petrie's sketch); Cooney, Glass, p. 144, no. 1744; noted in Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, No. 337. |
| **Derivation Condition** | 10 fragments, some are tiny chunks, one is glued from a lot more (about 5)---vase had been badly smashed. This may have been burnt, as grey ashy material is still on the exterior of some and on part of the interior (of the glued piece). In section it gives the appearance of shattered safety glass. Cooney: the "wreck of a fine piece," body very incompletely preserved. |
| **Size** | Dia. mouth with twist 2.8, Dia. mouth interior at top 1.45, Dia. neck. 2.25, H. handle 1.6, W. handle 1.66, Tk. handle 0.35 cm. Nolte: H. 6.1 cm. Diameter is irregular, probably deformed. Maximum diameter at shoulder could be from 5.5 to 7.5 cm. |

Technique: Sand core. Twist of black & white—join preserved, stops short & doesn't overlap. It's very tightly twisted, almost vertical so it looks striped. White has been wrapped around a black thread, not two twisted together, as white is in raised ridges. The same around the middle of the shoulder, black thread with yellow twisted around it. Tiny sherd shows where shoulder ring overlapped—raised overlap. Some tool marks (vertical) on neck—may have only been from making the feather. Cooney: prefabricated twist decoration. Interior is dark grey—can this be original? Air holes make it look like the interior of bone.

Decor/Misc. Handle, applied from the top with yellow & white alternating applied threads, still slightly raised. Threads are thicker on this vase than on the other pieces from the group. Mouth with black & white ring applied, mouth pulled out with tongs (can still see marks). Neck: white and yellow small feather pattern. 3 horizontal shoulder bands in yellow. Black & yellow horizontal threads. Body design cannot be seen clearly, but seems to be a large feather pattern (?) in yellow & white. Ends in 2 horizontal bands of yellow & white. Cooney: festoon of white & yellow, with white & yellow thread at upper level. Shoulder and rim have prefabricated cord in yellow & black (?). Neck has chevron in opaque white & yellow, handle is opaque black, overlaid with yellow & white threads. NOTE: This is different in effect from the other two marvered pieces, which are finer work, and a
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, Gurob (Glass Vessel 3)

Number       BM 67028 (90 11-9 4): Glass
Monochrome Vase (Fragmentary)

Examined     6/81

Shape         Probably like Nolte’s “dickwandiger Krateriskos”; Cooney: Large, wide-necked amphora.

Date          Ramesside? Cooney: “New Kingdom.”

Acquisition   11-9-1890, no. 4: “Glass turquoise fragment of a rounded vessel .2 thick L. 1 3/4.”

Publication   Cooney, Glass, p. 50, no. 436. Not listed in Nolte, Glas.


Size          Tk. wall 0.54-0.6 cm. Cooney: W. 7.1 cm.
Surface/Material

Monochrome. Surface color a lovely light sky-blue all the way through. No crackling like the other ("safety") glass. Cooney: opaque turquoise blue. Finish: Cooney: originally glossy, now filmed.

Technique

Sand core. Common small air bubbles, c. 0.2 mm., in break. Large air-bubbles on surface, several of these are filled in with sand. Do not see any tool marks, but it is not blown glass. Some light scratches on surface, but I could not interpret them.

Acc. 11-9-1890, no. 2: "Glass bottle dark blue with yellow & white lines and pattern. restored like the other, formerly with three handles of which one remains. Base text H. 3 374".

Publication: Noth: Glas, pp. 71-2; Cooney, Glass, p. 146 no. 1747.

Condition: Broken and partially restored. Cooney: about half of body, much of neck, rim and all of base are gone. Root of second handle remains.

Size: Wall Tk. c. 0.45 (on neck). Dia. neck as restored 2.07. Dia. mouth with twist 2.65. Dia. interior mouth 1.25 cm., Shoulder 5:1 as restored. L handle 1.85, W handle 0.62, H. 9.9; Tk handle 0.37 cm. (rectangular section). Noth: H. 9.9 cm. Cooney: H. restored 9.6 cm.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Glass Vessel 4)

Number: BM 67395 (90 11-9 2): Glass

Examined: 6/81

Shape: Three-handled amphoriskos. Cooney: jug with pointed (?) base.


Date: Ramesside? Nolte: Tutankhamun (on the basis of Petrie's contextual date). Cooney: late 18th Dynasty.

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 2: “Glass bottle dark blue with yellow & white lines and pattern. restored like the other, formerly with three handles of which one remains base lost. H. 3 3/4.”

Publication: Nolte, Glas, pp. 71-2; Cooney, Glass, p. 144 no. 1747.

Derivation Condition: Broken and partially restored. Cooney: about half of body, much of neck, rim and all of base are gone. Root of second handle remains.

Size: Wall Tk. c. 0.45 (on neck), Dia. neck as restored 2.07, Dia. mouth with twist 2.65, Dia. interior mouth 1.25 cm., Shoulder 5.1 as restored, L. handle 1.85, W. handle 0.62, H. 9.9, Tk. handle 0.37 cm. (rectangular section). Nolte: H. 9.9 cm. Cooney: H. restored 9.6 cm.


Sand core. Could even be three-handled from the placement of the handle & stubb and gap. The placing of the extant handles is sure from the join of adjoining fragments. Neck and mouth pulled up, then twisted ring put around it. Handle applied from the top. Some flattened areas, probably from tongs? Cooney: prefabricated twists. NOTE: this vase is very similar to the lentoid flask, but is very different from the other amphoriskos.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Jewellery 1)

Number  BM  59597 (90 11-9 5): Faience Bead (see UCL 27818)
Examined  6/81, by LDB
Shape  Cartouche-shaped, with name of Tutankhamun (Neb-kheperu-re). Identical to UCL 27818.

Date  Reign of Tutankhamun
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no.5: "Glazed pottery, blue pendant in the form of a cartouche containing the prenomen of Tutankhamen. [sketch] L. 8."
Publication  IKG, pl. 17.29. This illustration could also be UC 27818.

Derivation  Attachment at upper end probably broken off: slight projection visible from the back, chip in glaze visible from the front.
Condition
Size  H. 1.95, W. 0.80, Max. Tk. 0.22 cm. Very delicate.

Color  Blue, glazed.

Technique/ Misc.  Ring of cartouche and hieroglyphs are in raised relief. This is not a common technique for rings and beads, which are usually in sunk relief. The presence of only two beads is not what one would expect for a broad collar. For this might expect a whole row of them.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 2)

Number  UCL 27818 (Petrie Collection): Faience Bead (see BM 59597)
Examined examined by MRB
Shape Cartouche-shaped, with name of Tutankhamun (Neb-kheperu-re). Identical to BM 59597. See that entry for discussion
Date Reign of Tutankhamun
Acquisition
Publication IKG, pl. 17.29. This could also be BM 59597. Thomas, Gurob, p. 65, no. 465.
Derivation Dirty, so can't see into cracks very well. Bottom of cartouche broken off and also the top ring.
Condition
Size W. 0.86, L. 1.55, Tk. 0.18 cm. Thomas, Gurob: H. 1.6, W. 0.8, Tk. 0.2-3 cm.
Color Bright turquoise blue. Bright, shiny, nice surface finish.

Core, without lens looks like terracotta, but seems to be rough, whitish, frit-type material, which has collected dirt. The ring of the cartouche and the hieroglyphs are in raised relief. See entry for BM 59597 (90 11-9 5).
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUBROB (Jewellery 3)

Number BM 65781 (90 11-9 7): Faience and Stone

Beads (see UCL 27816)

Examined 6/81, through case glass, not handled personally.

Shape 8 flat floral beads in yellow, 2 in red; 16 floral truncated cones in red; small red tube beads; a burnt red tube bead (?); 2 large yellow beveled discs; 1 carnelian wedjat eye; 2 carnelian "long cornflowers."

Date Dyn. 18-19


Publication IKG, pl. 17.26.

Derivation Many of the yellow and some of the read beads look ashy, one of the carnelian "long cornflowers" also looks ashy.

Condition Size Dia. red daisy c. 0.95; yellow daisy c. 0.78; small red barrel c. 0.35. L. cornflower c. 1.48, max. dia. c. 0.6. Carnelian wedjat: Max. Tk. 0.5, L. c. 1.7 W. c. 1.2 cm.

Color Red carnelian; yellow, red, black, blue and red faience.

Technique/ The truncated-cones are ridged to indicate floral petals. The flat floral beads have raised petals.

Misc.
Most interesting are the scaraboids (uninscribed) and the eye bead. Great variety of other shapes: truncated cones, discs, tube, long oval tube, multiple, flat floral, truncated conical floral, round glass, spacers.

B. Adams suggests a multiple bead is Dyn. 19. Possibly also eye.

Publication
Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 338. Some of the beads are the same as BM 65781 = IKG, pl. 17.26. Thomas says "As illustrated in IKG but with other beads added to the string." The IKG illustration is really the BM string, these are duplicates.

Derivation
Some of them are burnt: scaraboids and some of the other beads.

Condition
Not all.

Size
Eye bead: H. 0.9, W. 0.79, Tk. 0.53; Carnelian scarab 0.56 X 0.7 X 0.44 Tk.; blue glass scarab 0.5 X 0.76 X 0.32 Tk.; blue faience scarab 0.76 X 1.1 X 0.62 Tk.; carnelian (or glass?) scarab L. 1.3, W. 0.98, Tk. 0.7; large rounded bead in dark blue opalescing glass: Dia. 1.1, Tk. 0.78; truncated cone in dark blue: Max. Dia. 1.55, Min. Dia. 0.55, Tk. 1.05 cm. Thomas: length of string 37 cm.

Color
The eye bead is of yellow glass surrounding a white body with a black center. The scarabs are in carnelian (?), blue glass, and blue faience (burnt). The "cornflowers" are carnelian. Faience: dark blue, turquoise, red yellow. Dark blue glass. Carnelian "cornflowers." White material may be shell.

Technique/
Thomas, Gurob, no. 338: Ribbed beads in red and green faience; spacers, cylinders, and multiples in red and green faience, glass, and shell, pendants of jasper; scarabs of jasper, glass and faience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>UCL 27901 (i) (Petrie Collection): Faience Beads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>Not examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Thomas: Spheroids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Thomas: &quot;Late Dyn. XVIII&quot; probably from context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 340.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Thomas: 191 beads, Dia. 0.3-04 cm., length of string 65 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Kaczmarczyk: 693 = yellow bead; 696 = yellow bead, 697 = red-brown bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 6)

Number: UCL 27901 (ii)(Petrie Collection): Faience and Glass Beads

Examined: Not examined

Shape: Thomas: 42 small spheroids, 27 multiple beads of blue & green glazed faience, 3 blue glass spheroids, yellow glass spheroid, 2 burnt faience spheroids, burnt faience cylinder bead.

Date: Kaczmarczyk, Faience: nos. 695, 696, 697, dated early Dyn. 19.

Acquisition:


Derivation Condition:

Size: Thomas: length of string 21 cm.

Color: Kaczmarczyk: 695 = yellow bead; 696 = yellow bead, 697 = red-brown bead.

Technique/Misc.
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>UCL 27901(iii)(Petrie Collection): Faience Beads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>Not examined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Thomas: disc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Thomas: &quot;Late Dyn. XVIII&quot; probably from context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 342.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Thomas: many are burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Thomas: Dia. 0.2, Tk. 0.1, Perforation Dia. 0.1 cm., length of string 9.6 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Thomas: blue and green faience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/Misc.</td>
<td>Suspension loops have been attached at both upper and lower edges of beads, which are meant to hang in a collar arrangement. The wedjat eyes have been pierced, but one is coarser work than the others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Jewellery 8)

Number BM 65780 (90 11-9 7): Faience
Beads, Amulets (see UCL 27817)

Examined 6/81, through case glass, not handled personally.

Shape Wedjat eyes (3), tyet knots (8), ankhs (6), drop beads (9), disc beads and small round beads. The amulets could be from an amuletic-type collar.

Date Dynasty 18-19

Acquisition 11-9-1890, no.7: "Glazed pottery, blue green and reddish beads, together with 3 eyes, 6 [sketch ankh] 8 [sketch tyet] and 9 [sketch drop]. L. 14 1/2." IK6 17: in B.M. glass department.

Publication IKG, pl. 17.27, showing the drop beads as upside down.

Derivation Condition The ankh and tyet amulets look burnt or discolored, as do the drop beads. The central wedjat (as strung) looks ashy.

Size Drop: L. 2.65, W. 0.78, Tk. 0.28; Tyet: L. 2.77, W. 0.92, Tk. 0.25; Ankh: L. 2.35, W. 1.2, Tk. 0.28 cm.

Color The amulets are in turquoise blue faience, as are the disc beads, which are in thick and thin varieties. The small, red beads seem be faience, but some might be carnelian.

Technique/ Misc. Suspension loops have been attached at both upper and lower edges of beads, which are meant to hang in a collar arrangement. The wedjat eyes have been pierced, but one is coarser work than the others.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>UCL 27817 (Petrie Collection): Faience Beads, Amulets (see BM 65780)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>MRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>1 Djed, 2 tyet, 1 ankh, 2 wedjat amulets, 5 drop beads, small spacers, multiples and small round beads. Thomas, Gurob, no. 339: &quot;Nine pendant amulets, three wedjet amulets, six ankh amulets, and eight tie amulets.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Thomas, Gurob, p. 56, no. 339. Some of the beads are the same as BM 65780, which is illustrated in IKG, pl. 17.27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Some are burnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Wedjat eye (pierced): W. 1.75 Tk. 0.39 cm. Thomas: total c. 91 beads, length of string 12 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Wedjat eye, drop beads, tyet in nice glaze. One drop bead in light blue. Small beads in red, blue, yellow, black. Thomas: blue glazed faience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/ Misc.</td>
<td>Some amulets (ankh and tyet) are much coarser than others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number: BM 65779 (90 11-9 6). Faience Beads, Pendants (see UCL 27815)

Examined: 6/81, through case glass, not handled personally.

Shape: Amuletic pendants in the shape of baboons, hawks, uraei, child (dwarf?), female goddess with staff?, and king? with offering stand.

Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no.6: "Glazed pottery, blue string of short beads with numerous (22) small pendants flat on the back representing uraei & deities. L. 7 1/2."

Publication: IKG, pl. 17.25. Wedjat eye in incorrect position.

Derivation: Some of the spacer beads and a few of the amulets appear to have been burnt.

Condition: One baboon is thicker (8-8.5 cm) and larger than the rest. One uraeus is only 0.15 cm. White. Thickness: "L. of string 6.60 mm."

Size: All turquoise blue faience. The hawk and goddess are in a different color, not as attractive in quality. The rest are all brightly glazed a nice, deep, turquoise blue.

Technique/Misc.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>UCL 27815 (Petrie Collection): Faience Beads, Pendants (see BM 65779)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>(?) by MRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Amuletic pendants: uraei, dancing figure, baboons, a seated child (?) , other beads as spacers. Thomas: &quot;Small rings and multiples in red, green, yellow, and blue faience, about ninety in number. &quot; 5 apes, 9 uraei, 3 human, 1 leg, 4 degraded figures. Total c. 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication**
Thomas, I, p. 56, no. 337. Some of the beads are the same as BM 65779, and are illustrated in IKG, pl. 17.25.

**Derivation**
Some of the spacer beads and a few of the amulets appear to have been burnt.

**Condition**
One baboon is thicker (0.4 cm.) and larger than the rest. One uraeus is only 0.15 cm. thick. Thomas: "L. of string c. 80 mm."

**Size**
Blue, red, white and yellow faience. The Amulets are all in a nice, deep, turquoise blue, quite glossy. The spacer beads are in the other colors. The yellow is quite shiny and bright.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 12)

Number    BM 68890 (90 11-9 10): Faience

Examined  6/81 By LDB; 6/13/88

Shape      Bezel in shape of wedjat-eye.

Date       Later New Kingdom? Ramesside?

Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 10: "Glazed pottery, blue ring, bezel in the form of a Sacred eye. D. .8."

Publication

Derivation Area of bezel has blackened surface.

Condition

Size      0.90 X 0.50 cm.

Color      Faience with bluish glaze

Technique/ Moulded.
Misc.
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GURUB (Jewellery 13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 68911 (90 11-9 64): Stone: Jasper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finger Ring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>6/81 by LDB; 6/13/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 19?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 64: “carnelian ring bezel [sketch] hoop broken. L. of bezel .825.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>IKB pl. 17.39 “white feldspar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Ring broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>1.82 X 0.82 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Agate/carnelian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/</td>
<td>&quot;Sistrum&quot; incized on bezel. However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>this looks more like a poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on a stem (the design is quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summary), which would probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give it a date of Dyn. 19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GURUOB (Jewellery 14)**

**Number**  
BM 68914 (90 11-9 61):  Stone: Carnelian

**Finger Ring**

**Examined**  
6/81 by LDB; 6/13/88

**Shape**  
Scarab bezel.

**Date**  
New Kingdom

**Acquisition**  
11-9-1890, no. 61: “Burnt chalcedony ring, bezel in the form of a scarabaeus. [sketch] L. .9.”

**Publication**  

**Derivation**  
Inside of ring dirty; some of the markings of the scarab are filled with black material.

**Size**  
1.30 X 0.70 cm. (scarab).

**Color**  
Quartzite (?).

**Technique/Misc.**  
Scarab-shaped bezel with incised wing divisions, and incised zig-zags on the side supports.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, G6UB (Jewellery 15)

Number      BM 68915 (90 11-9 62): Stone: Feldspar
Finger Ring
Examined    6/81 by LDB; 6/13/88
Shape       Bezel shaped like cartouche. Incised with sistrum. Almost stirrup-shaped in profile.
Date        New Kingdom
Publication Possibly IKG pl. 17.36, which seems to show a Isis-knot bezel. The description of "White feldspar" would seem to match BM 68915 (BM 68914 is also called "white feldspar," and is the only other pale-colored and shaped-bezel ring.
Derivation  Inside of ring is dirty.
Condition   
Size        1.55 X 0.55 cm.

Color       Quartzite (?)

Technique/ Sistrum incised on bezel, which is in cartouche shape.
Misc.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 16)  

Number  BM 68916 (90 11-9 63):  
Finger Ring  
Examine  6/81 by LDB; 6/13/88  
Shape  Plain, stirrup-shaped ring.  

Date  Not pre-Amarna Period.  
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 63: "Burnt carnelian ring plain bezel [sketch] L. .85."

Publication  

Derivation  Bezel cracked and chipped.  
Condition  
Size  1.76 X 0.85 cm.  

Color  Agate/carnelian.  

Technique/ Misc.  
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 17)

Number  BM 68918 (90 11-9 65):  Stone: Jasper
         Finger Ring
Examined  6/81 by LDB; 6/13/88
Shape  Plain, stirrup-shaped ring.

Date  Not pre-Amarna Period.
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 65: "Brown jasper ring bezel plain. L. .8."

Publication  Could be IKG, pl. 17.38, said to be "haematite."

Derivation
Condition
Size  1.80 X 0.69 cm.

Color  Haematite (?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>UCL 27901(iv) (Petrie Collection): Faience Finger Rings (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>Not examined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>Thomas: &quot;Plain narrow hoops of different sizes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**

Dyn. 18-19

**Acquisition**

11-9-1890, no. 9: "Glazed pottery, blue faience. [sketch]. 1:05."

**Publication**

Thomas, I, p. 61, no. 407.

**Derivation**

Thomas: "Three are complete, one is in four pieces, and the other consists of fragments."

**Condition**

Size

Thomas: "W. 4mm. Diam. 18,20,21 mm. Thickness 2mm."

**Color**

Thomas: "Blue faience."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 65782 (90 11–9 9)</th>
<th>Faience Penannular Ring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>6/18/88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Wide &quot;D,&quot; Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, type 96 F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 18–19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>11–9–1890, no. 9: &quot;Glazed pottery, blue penannular ornament [sketch] D.95.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derivation</td>
<td>Intact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Tk. 1.12, interior dia. 1.4, exterior dia. 2.37 c.m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique/Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 20)

Number  BM  68891 (90  11-9  38):  Shell  
Penannular Ring
Examine  d  6/18/88
Shape  Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, type 96 C.

Date  Dyn. 18-19
Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 38: "Shell ring penannular [sketch] D. 1.35."

Publication  This should be IK6, p. 1732, as diameters are almost the same, and drawing seems to represent this type of section.

Derivation  Intact.
Condition
Size  Tk. 1.21, exterior dia. 3.5, interior dia. 2.13 cm.

Color  Creamy white.

Technique/Misc.
Number: BM 68892 (90 11-9 39); Shell

Examin ed: 6/18/88

Shape: Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, type 96 G.

Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 39: "Shell ring penannular [sketch] D. 1.05."

Publication: This should be IKG, p. 17.32, as diameters are almost the same, and drawing seems to represent this type of section.

Derivation Condition: Intact.

Size: Tk. 0.55; ext. dia. 2.63, int. dia. 1.7 cm.

Color: Creamy white.
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-6GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 22)

Number          BM 68893 (90 11-9 40): Stone: Limestone
Penannular Ring

Examined       6/18/88

Shape          Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, type 96 C.

Date           Dyn. 18-19
Acquisition 11-9-1890, no. 40: "Crystalline limestone fragment of penannular ring [sketch] D. 1.1."

Publication

Derivation Condition Broken.
Size            Tk. 1.4, ext. dia. 2.9, int. dia. 1.5 cm.

Color          White. (could possibly be faience)
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 23)

Number  BM 68894-908(90 11-9 41-55): Stone Penannular Rings

Examined  6/18/88

Shape  Fifteen rings, Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, types 96 C, C, ?, A, C, A, A, D?, C, D, D, B, H, H.

Date  Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition  11-9-1890, no. 41-55: "Alabaster penannular ring D. .95, .9, .9, .75, .75, .85 broken in two, .75, /75 injured [?] at one end, .7, .675, .75, .675, .65, keeled .6, .5."

Publication  Probably IEG, pl. 17:33, from the diameters (Petrie’s plate shows an ext. dia. of c. 1.5). It is said to be jasper.

Derivation Condition  Nos. BM 68894 (41)-68903 (50) are said to be discolored by fire in the B.M. catalogue. 68901 broken.

Size  894: tk. 1.28, ext. dia. 2.25, int. dia. 0.93 cm.; 895: 1.33, 2.32, 1.08; 897: 1.01, 1.86, 0.734; 898: 1.04, 1.84, 0.72; 899:1.16, 2.15, 0.98; 900: 1.12, 1.9, 0.77; 901: 1.03, 1.88, 0.71; 902: 0.96, 1.74, 0.76; 903: 1.0, 1.59, 0.74; 904: 1.02, 1.87, 0.81; 905: 1.06, 1.68, 0.7; 906: 1.03, 1.58, 0.69; 907: 0.5, 1.46, 0.53; 908: 0.44, 1.21, 0.44.

Color  Limestone or calcite (burnt) 68894-68903, (unburnt) 68904, 68907-908; grey limestone (or calcite), unburnt? 68905-906.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Number</strong></th>
<th>BM 68909 (90 11-9 56): Stone: Jasper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>6/18/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>D-shaped, Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, type 96 K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>11-9-1890, no. 56: &quot;Red jasper penannular ring C..65.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication</strong></td>
<td>Probably IKG, pl. 17.33, from the diameters (Petrie's plate shows an ext. dia. of c. 1.5). It is said to be jasper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derivation Condition</strong></td>
<td>Intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>68910: tx. 0.64; ext. dia. 1.36; int. dia. 0.66; 68911: tx 0.35; ext. dia. 1.17; int. dia. 0.58 cm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technique/Misc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>BM 68910,11(?) (90 11-9 57, 58): Stone: Carnelian Penannular Rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examined</strong></td>
<td>6/18/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shape</strong></td>
<td>Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, types 96 J (&quot;D&quot; shape), K.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**

Dyn. 18-19

**Acquisition**

11-9-1890, no. 57: "carnelian penannular ring injured by fire. C. .55." 11-9-1890, no. 58: "carnelian penannular ring. clear. D. .5."

**Publication**


**Derivation Condition**

Intact. but very burnt.

**Size**

68910: tk. 0.64, ext. dia. 1.36, int. dia. 0.68; 68911: tk 0.36, ext. dia. 1.17, int. dia. 0.58 cm.

**Color**

Both rings are now completely black.

**Technique/Misc.**
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, GUROB (Jewellery 26)

Number  BM 68912-13 (90 11-9 59, 60): Faience (?)  
Penannular Rings  
Examined  6/18/88  
Shape  Brunton and Engelbach, Gurob, types 96 J and K.

Date  Dyn. 18-19  

Publication  IK6, pl. 1734. Noted in Thomas I, p. 56, no. 377, where it is called shell.

Derivation Condition  Intact but very burnt.

Size  68923: tk. 0.47, ext. dia. 1.46, int. dia. 0.79 cm.  68913: tk. 0.47, ext. dia. 1.06, int. dia. 0.55 cm.

Color  Both rings are now completely black.

Technique/ Misc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>BM 66878 (90 11-9 36):</th>
<th>Stone: Calcite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tube and Boss Earring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td>6/81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Tube half of tube and boss earring: hemispherical, with shaft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Dyn. 18-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Acquisition | 11-9-1890, no. 36:    | "Alabaster part of stud the stem hollow. D. 7."
| Publication | IKG, pl. 17.34.   | Noted in Thomas I, p. 56, no. 337, where it is called shell. |
| Derivation Condition | Seems to be perfect. The grain of the stone runs across the diameter. |
| Size     | Dia. boss 2.1, dia. ext. tube 0.85, dia. int. tube 0.55, max. h. 1.55, h. boss 0.9, h. tube 0.75, tk. tube wall 0.1-0.2 cm. |
| Color    |                        |                |
| Technique/ Misc. | The thickness of the tube wall varies. |
TUTANKHAMUN BURNT-GROUP, 6UROB (Jewellery 26)

Number: BM 66919 (90 11-9 37): Stone: Calcite

Examined: 6/81

Shape: Hemisphere with small, circular concavity on flat side (back). Possibly boss part of earring, or knob from box?

Date: Dyn. 18-19

Acquisition: 11-9-1890, no. 37: "Alabaster part of a stud with cavity on under side. D. 1.0."

Publication: 

Derivation Condition: Very white stone, perfect condition. Grain runs across the diameter.

Size: Ext. dia. 2.5, dia. hole 0.55, h. 0.6 cm.

Color: White.

Technique: 

Misc.: 
Plate 3: Map of Gurob
Pl. 4: Plan of the Kôm
Catalogue Nos. 5, 6, 9, 10
Rilling on original surface

Handle Emplacement

Catalogue No. 3
Pl. 10: Mycenaean Stirrup Jar 3
Pl. 12: Mycenaean Stirrup Jar 3
MYC.

Pre-firing dents

Catalogue No. 2

Catalogue No. 12

Pl. 13. Mycenaean Flask 5, Stirrup Jar 3
Pl. 19. Egyptian Vases 1, 3
GLASS

Pl. 33: Jewellery 41-44, 39-40, 15, 32, 37-38, 12, 1, 6, 3; Glass 2
Pl. 36: Jewellery 38, 40, 44, 42
APPENDIX 1: PETRIE AND CHRONOLOGY

1. W. M. F. Petrie, in *The Academy* (April 5 [1890]), quoted in *AJA* 6 (1890), pp. 169-70:

"...in November my friend Mr. Hughes-Hughes took up the work at Gurob, the town of the XVIII-XIX dynasty.

"At Gurob the age of the Mykenae geometrical pottery is now completely settled, ranging from 1400-1200 B.C. Beneath the floors of many of the houses were found holes full of personal property, all burnt. Clothing, chairs, necklaces, mirrors, combs, pins, knives, alabaster cups, blue glazed bowls and kohl tubes, and the false-necked vases of Mykenae, are all found together, and the amulets and ornaments are of Tutankhamen and Ramessu II. These burials are quite un-Egyptian in their nature, and probably are analogous to the Greek funeral pyre, thus maintained after the foreigners here had adopted burial in Egyptian fashion. The next period, the introduction of plant-design, is shown by an Aegean vase with ivy sprigs, found in a tomb at Kahun, which may be dated 1100 B.C."


"The burnt deposits of personal articles found under the rooms, absolutely date the pottery of the first period of Mykenae [i.e. in Furtwangler and Loeschke's system] to Tutankhamen and Ramessu II."
3. W.M.F. Petrie, "The Egyptian Bases of Greek History," *JHS* 11 (1890), pp. 271-77:

"Seven years ago nothing was known in Egypt which could be attributed to a Greek origin before the Alexandrine times;... But now the main light on the chronology of the civilizations of the Aegean comes from Egypt; and it is Egyptian sources that must be thanked by classical scholars for revealing the real standing of the antiquities of Greece. Without the foreign colonies on the Nile, they would still be groping in speechless remains, which might cover either a century of a thousand years, for aught that could be determined in Greek excavations.... I propose here to sketch briefly the main results which have been attained by the recent excavations, in their bearing on the history of the Aegean peoples...."

"In what follows...I give the Egyptian chronology as indicated by the Sirius festival, which is far the most certain result, but is the lowest yet adopted;... The next step...is from the pottery in a tomb at Kahun [the "Maket" Tomb]...about 1100 B.C., or within fifty years of that, either way. It contained some dozens of bodies, and a great quantity of pottery, Egyptian, Phoenician, Cypriote, and Aegean. This latter term I use to avoid the historical question of the race which produced the early pottery, and the local question as to whether it belongs to the Peloponnessos, the islands, or the Asiatic coast.

"The next style to consider is that of the false-necked vases, otherwise called *bügelkannen*, or 'pseud-amphorae.' I will not attempt to limit what their range may be in Cyprus or elsewhere; here we can only notice what is the Egyptian evidence. The most degraded of all were those found by Mr. Griffith at Tell el Yahudiyeh, of about 1050 B.C. (Ramessu VI.). These have no ornament, are roughly formed in a debased and clumsy way, of the plain red pottery of the country.¹ The next stage is a neatly made example of native pottery, unornamented but much modified from the original shape. I found that at Gurob, dated to about 1150 B.C. (Seti II.)²... The next form is
an extra large size of fine paste, but not of the Aegean quality, with traces of red painting: fairly well formed, but not normal. This I found at Gurob dated to about 1200 B.C. (Ramessu II.)\textsuperscript{3}....Before that, about 1350 B.C. (Tutankhamen), I found perfectly formed examples of the true pale-brown paste, and iron-glaze lines with discs surrounded by a circle of dots as the only ornament. These are of the wide shallow type, elegantly shaped, and mark the highest stage of this form (Pl. XIV, fig. 2, in my possession)\textsuperscript{4}. The earliest of all are of a deep globular form, of which several were found dated to about 1400 B.C. (Amenhotep III.), with broad iron-glaze bands, and no other ornament, painted on a base of Aegean paste (Pl. XIV. fig. 3)\textsuperscript{5}....We have then carried back a chain of examples in sequence, showing that the earliest geometrical pottery of Mykenae begins about 1400 B.C. and is succeeded by the beginning of natural designs about 1100 B.C....These are part of the products of that great wave of Graeco-Libyan conquest which swept almost over Egypt time after time....their invasions...had been previously repelled by Ramessu III. (1100 B.C.), by Merenptah (1190 B.C.), and by Amenhotep (about 1600 B.C.). At the mouth of the Fayyum they were firmly established, and Aegean pottery is found there, along with customs of funeral sacrifice of property by fire....The civilization of Mykenae was no sudden apparition; it must have had centuries of preparation; and we now turn to what came before its time. In the ruins of a town of the XIIITH dynasty, about 2500 B.C. [i.e. Kahun], there are many varieties of foreign pottery, altogether different to any known in the times through which we have previously gone back to--1400 B.C....

"The general results of my excavations from the Greek point of view then are: ...(2) That we have dated it [Greek pottery] to within a century as far back as 1400 B.C....(4) that we have pushed back the hazy and speculative region to before 2000 B.C., and shown some reasons for looking to a rise of European civilization before 2500 B.C."

"The essential value of Gurob is in giving us thoroughly fixed dates for the earlier stages of the civilization of Greece."


"Mr. Petrie's paper in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* which must form the foundation of all the chronology of the Mykenean period."


"As Mr. Murray tells us...this Handbook is based on the series of 'Rhind Lectures' which he delivered...in 1887.

"As Mr. Murray points out, the historic period of Greek art can hardly be said to go back to an earlier period than about 700 B.C.; but the discoveries of recent years have slowly accumulated a considerable amount of valuable evidence to the date of vases, gems, and other objects which clearly belong to a more remote period than that which is depicted in the Homeric poems....

"Again, Mr. Flinders Petrie has discovered in various tombs in Upper Egypt painted vases of the well-known 'Mycenae type' in conjunction with native Egyptian objects which can be safely dated between the fifteenth and the
twelfth centuries B.C.; thus confirming the approximate date which, from other evidence, had, at least provisionally, been arrived at for the culminating period of the wealth and power of the Mycenaean kings. By degrees a stylistic classification of Greek pottery in chronological order has become possible; first comes the already mentioned rather rude pottery with incised ornament; next the early 'Mycenaean vases' with realistic painting of marine animals and plants....The third class is characterized by painted geometrical patterns, mixed with very conventional figures of men and animals, often repeated in long lines as a purely decorative and meaningless form of ornament."


"Mr. Middleton tacitly assumes that the vases from Ialysos must be contemporary with a certain king of Egypt, since they were 'associated' with scarabs bearing that king's name. If this is so, the vases from Camiros must be contemporary with Thothmes III....But they are ordinary Greek vases, dating from after 700 B.C....If the argument cannot be applied to the vases from Camiros, why should it be applied to the vases from Ialysos, the next town in the same island?

"Even if those native Egyptian objects could be safely be assigned to that period [15th-12th centuries B.C.], those 'Mycenaean' vases are not to be treated as contemporary with them simply because they were found 'in conjunction' with them....The clearest evidence had been obtained long before Mr. Petrie first went to Egypt....false-necked vases with paintings on them were represented in...the tomb of Rameses III....The inference was that these vases were in use in the time of Rameses III. Under the system of chronology adopted by Mr. Petrie this king was on the throne about 1100 B.C. There is no saying how much longer such vases continued in use."
"His view is that vases of the first [stylistic] class and the second have been found at Ialysos and in Egypt in conjunction or association with objects bearing the names of various kings, the earliest of whom is Amenophis III. But vases of the third class and the fourth ["of Oriental style"] have been found at Camiros in conjunction or association with objects bearing the name of Thothmes III, the great-grandfather or Amenophis III. If such evidence could show that the vases of the first and second classes were contemporary with Amenophis III and some later kings, it would also show that the vases of the third and fourth classes were contemporary with that ancestor of Amenophis III. Mr. Middleton must either put the third and fourth classes before the first and second, or else admit that he has fixed the dates of the first and second by a method that is unsound."


"Through the book Mr. Petrie writes as though the whole question of the Ægean pottery and the Ægean civilization could be settled by evidence from Egyptian sources only. But, even within these narrow limits, he fails to reconcile the inferences he draws from Tell el Amarna with those he drew from Gurob and Kahun.

"Mr. Petrie found some false-necked vases of Ægean ware in two deposits at Gurob; and he fixed the dates of these deposits at 1400 B.C. and 1350 B.C., respectively, because one of them contained a kohl-tube with the cartouche of Amenhotep III, and the other contained a pendant with the cartouche of Tut-ankh-amen. Now,....he makes Amenhotep III the father of Akhenaten; and ...he makes Tut-ankh-amen a son-in-law of Akhenaten....Thus the dates assigned to this Ægean ware from Gurob just cover the period assigned to the Ægean ware from Tell el Amarna. That being so, this Ægean ware from Gurob ought to belong to the same class as the Ægean ware from Tell el Amarna. But that is not the case."
“In conclusion, Mr. Petrie assurs us that ‘we may henceforward remember that there are few facts in all archaeology determined with a more overwhelming amount of evidence than the dating of this earlier style of ægean pottery to the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C.’ We may also remember that what is described here as ‘this earlier style of ægean pottery’ was described just as confidently in his former works as the later style that followed the period of geometric ornament. And we may also remember that the pottery which is dated here to the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C., was dated there with no less certainty to the beginning of the eleventh century.”


“We are obliged, then to ask if the Mycenian world at that time was likely to have dealings with some neighbouring people, in possession of a written history from which higher criticism may obtain information that will help it towards an approximate chronology. Now, so far as I now, the only people answering these conditions are the Egyptians. The sequence of the reigns and of the main facts of the New Empire is so well established that the most cautious historians of Egypt hold that they can creep back from the Sait Pharaohs, whose date appears in the Greek analysts, to the great conquerors of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, without meeting serious lacunae on their path likely to falsity their calculations. 7

The result of excavations carried on in Egypt shows that the Pelasgi and Achaeans had large commercial dealings with the Delta. Since the distinctive peculiarities of Mycenian pottery have been established, many a specimen has been identified among objects in the tombs of that country. In the necropolea of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, Prof. Flinders Petrie has discovered what he calls Aegean pottery. 8
"The presence of Aegean pottery in the deposits of the Twelfth Dynasty is anything but proved; but there is great probability of its having made its appearance during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasty.\(^9\)

"The advent of Amenophis III. to the throne is placed towards 1450 B.C....We cannot go wrong if we place the heyday of the Mycenaean civilization somewhere about the middle of the fifteenth century B.C."\(^{10}\)


In discussing the dating of various Mycenaean artifacts found in Cyprus, the authors time and again are torn between the fifteenth and the eighth/seventh centuries B.C., usually opting for the later date: cf. pp. 8, 17-19, 21, 28.

"...more and more it is being accepted that the so-called Mycenaean art was the immediate predecessor of Ionian Greek art of the 7th century BC...How long before this the Mycenaean art may have lasted is a question which may ultimately be decided by a closer examination of its actual remains and less reliance on the imaginary effects of the Dorian migration about B.C. 1000, or the presence of Egyptian cartouches of the 15th century B.C.

"In several tombs...we found vases of variegated glass...differing but slightly in shape and fabric from the fine series of glass vases obtained from the tombs of Cameiros, and dating from the 7th and 6th centuries, or even later in some cases. It happens, however, that these slight differences of shape and fabric bring our Enkomi glass vases into direct comparison with certain specimens found by Prof. Flinders Petrie at Gurob in Egypt, and now in the British Museum. If Prof. Petrie is right in assigning his vases to about 1400 B.C.,\(^{11}\) our Enkomi specimens must follow suit. It appears that he had found certain fragmentary specimens of this particular glass ware beside a
porcelain necklace, to which belonged an amulet stamped with the name of Tutankhamen, that is to say, about 1400 B.C. But too much reliance must not be placed on trifling ornaments of this sort, made from moulds which may have been in use for centuries....There is in the Museum a glass vase which bears the name of Thothmes III., and which has always been regarded as a contemporary product. Between it and Prof. Petrie's glass there must have been a long lapse of time, if we are to judge by the extraordinary difference of technique, and yet his date allows very little time for so momentous a change. The Thothmes vase is so obviously rude and archaic in shape and fabric that no one can question its being contemporaneous, whereas the glass vases from Gurob and ours from Enkomi represent very nearly the culmination of this peculiar industry, as seen in our glass vases from Cameiros of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C. It is often made a reproach to Egyptian art that it had stood for centuries quite stationary, and if the accepted chronology of the country is right, this reproach would seem to be justifiable. But in any case the glass vases of which we are speaking are not by anyone supposed to be the work of Egyptian craftsmen. They are the product of foreigners, and if these foreigners were the same who made the porcelain rhytons already discussed, we must credit them with an artistic impulse which would have abhorred anything stationary.

"The question is, What was that time? For the present we must either accept Prof. Petrie's date (about 1400 B.C.), based on scanty observations collected from the poor remains of a foreign settlement in Egypt, or fall back on the ordinary method of comparing the glass vessels of Gurob with those from Greek tombs of the 7th century B.C. or later, and then allowing a reasonable interval of time for the slight changes of shape or fabric which may have intervened. In matters of chronology it is no new thing for the Egyptians to instruct the Greeks, as we know from the pages of Herodotus. And who can forget the beautiful passage of Plato in the "Critias," where the manuscript of an Egyptian priest is cited describing the condition of Athens 9,000 years before Plato."
"Twenty years ago our knowledge of Greek history could hardly be said to have extended much further back than the beginning of the seventh century B.C.; before that time all seemed vague and untrustworthy, a realm of legend and of fairy-tale. The historian of Greece could go no further than the limit to which Thucydides and Herodotus could take him; the only glimpse which he possessed of the earlier ages was afforded him by the beacon-light of Homer ....To-day, however the veil which hid the origins of Greek civilization from us has, at least partially, been lifted....He [the historian] does not, however, owe this increased range of vision to himself alone; it is to the spade of the archaeologist....that the discovery of the origins of Hellas is due.13

"...the conviction that the culture of which Schliemann had discovered the remains was not that of the Homeric time, though it was evidently connected with it, gradually gained ground. Was it, then earlier or later?14

[The material from Mycenae was] "...so new and strange that one archaeologist considered the remains to be those of warriors of the Avars and Heruli, buried with their own property and the spoil of Greek cities.15

"When the average student of Greek history is suddenly informed that the pre-Mycenaean culture is closely connected with if not actually derived from the barbaric culture of the pre-dynastic Egyptian, and that it therefore dates back to somewhere about 5000 B.C., he is apt to refuse adherence not only to the announcement...but also to many other archaeological propositions and theories bearing on the early history of Greece and the early relations between Greece and the East, which are in reality worthy of his serious attention....But how far can the results of excavation be trusted? ....Especially must the Oriental evidence bearing on the Mycenaean question be carefully examined: great care must always be exercised in dealing with
objects found in Egyptian tombs and in excavations in Egyptian town
ruins....Yet the occurrence of pre-Mycenaean objects with XIIth Dynasty
remains at Kahun, in Egypt, is unhesitatingly considered to prove the XIIth
Dynasty date of these objects.16

"The working hypothesis assumes that the Mycenaean culture was already
nearly universal in Greece and had entered upon the period of its fullest
development in the sixteenth century B.C., contemporaneously with the
period of the highest development of Egyptian power and prosperity under
the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty.17

"But other evidence now came to light, this time from Egypt itself, which
was considered by many to confirm the XVIIIth Dynasty date of the
Mycenaean culture. This evidence is, however, very varied in quality--
good, bad, and indifferent. Much has been made of the evidence of the
well-known "Maket-tomb" and Kahun....This evidence is, however,
indifferent....An example of bad evidence is a wooden [sic] kohl-pot
inscribed with the cartouche of Amenhetep III., which was found with
Mycenaean pots at Gurob, and is therefore considered to date them to the
time of that king.18 This kohl-pot might have been buried...centuries after
Amenhetep's time, even if it was made at that time, which cannot be
asserted with certainty.19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eg. Dynasties</th>
<th>Date B.C. Circa</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXIII-XXV</td>
<td>700-800</td>
<td>Late-Myc. deposits from Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII-XXIII</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Late-Myc. treasure from Aegina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Myc. Vase, grandson Pinetchem I's tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Imitation stirrup jar, Tell el-Yahudiyeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>1100-1150</td>
<td>Representations of Myc. vases in tomb of Rameses III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX?</td>
<td>?1200-1300</td>
<td>Myc. vases from Gurob and Maket Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Myc. Vase-fragments from Tell el-Amarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Scarabs A. III, Tiy at Mycenae &amp; Ialysos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Mycenaean metal, costumes, Rekhmira, Men-khepperasunb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>2000-2300</td>
<td>Pre-Myc. deposits of black ware [Tell el-Yahudiyeh pottery]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII-XII</td>
<td>2000-2500</td>
<td>Scarabs, Hagios Onouphrios deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2300-2500</td>
<td>Proto-Myc. &amp; Pre-Myc. vase-fragments, Kahun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


"a provisional and approximate date for the meridian age of Mycenaean culture--namely, from the sixteenth to the twelfth century B.C. We have also assumed that the Island culture was already somewhat advanced as far back as the earlier centuries of the second millennium before our era. This latter datum is based immediately on geological calculations: M. Fouqué, namely, has computed a date *circa* 2000 B.C. for the upheaval which buried Thera, and thus preserved for us the primitive monuments of Aegean civilization ....Fouqué’s combinations....have been vigorously, if not victoriously, assailed ....If, then, we can date that bloom-time [of Mycenaean culture] we can control within limits the geologist’s results. Here we call in the aid of Egyptology....To take first the Mycenaean finds in Egypt....Further, at Gurob and elsewhere, the same untiring explorer has traced the Mycenaean false-necked vase...through a series of dated states."

"It may be asked how we come to find such a series in Egypt. These are part of the products of that great wave of Graeco-Libyan conquest which swept almost over Egypt time after time.....At the mouth of the Fayum they were firmly established, and Aegean pottery is found there, along with customs of funeral sacrifice of property by fire."
"While it can hardly be claimed that any or all of these facts amount to final proof, they certainly establish a strong probability that at least from the fifteenth century B.C. there was traffic between Egypt and the Mycenaean world. Whatever be said for the tomb-frescoes of Thothmes; foreign tribute-bearers and the scarabs from Mycenae and Rhodes, we cannot explain away Mr. Petrie's finds in the Fayum. The revelations of Tell-Gurob can leave no doubt that the brief career of the ancient city on that spot--say from 1450 to 1200 B.C.--was contemporaneous with the bloom-time of Mycenaean civilization."22


His developmental list is illustrated on p. 154, fig. 59.

8.] "At Nagada, probably under Tahutmes III, was a globular form, with simple broad bands, and dull face." - Ash. E 2463, called an Egyptian imitation, probably 19th Dynasty or later.

9.] Gurob, Amenhotep III Burnt Group. "...the vases have more broad bands and a polished face (Fig. 59)." - BM A 984, Simple Style, late III B.23

10.] "Under Tutankhamen there were fine line appearing between the bands." This perhaps refers to the Tutankhamun Burnt Group stirrup jar, probably the fragmentary BM vase apparently published as *IKG* pl. 17.28, and called LH III A2. But it may instead refer to the LH III B stirrup jar Petrie associated with Tutankhamun in *JHS* 11 (1890), Pl. XIV, fig. 2.

11.] "Under Ramessu II the form is coarser." - Ash. 1890.973, identified as an Egyptian imitation and probably Dyn. 19.

12.] "And under Sety II is only a coarse unpainted imitation." - Ash. 1890.990, called an Egyptian imitation, Dyn. 19.
13.] "Lastly, under Ramessu VI at Tell el Yehudiyyeh were some rude debased copies." These are probably the ones published by Griffith in _Tell el Yehudiyyeh_ (1890) pl. 15.15, Egyptian imitations, possibly Dyn. 20.

"Here the relative style of the vases agrees with the varying date of the objects found with each; and hence we are justified in not only placing one general period in Greece as contemporary with another period in Egypt, but also in connecting the varied forms with the reigns which are named with them. The evidence which we gain from the mere general admixture, without any proof of the objects originating in the generation by which they were buried, is here further carried on into evidence for the exact age of each type by the sequence of style agreeing to the sequence of the dated objects."24

"For an example of the nature of archaeological evidence it will be best to study the connections of Egypt with early Europe.

"Moreover this evidence has been more actively and continually attacked than any other class of discoveries of late years, and hence the most that can be argued against it is well known.

"Until 1883 nothing was known of the Greeks in Egypt before the Ptolemaic age." This refers to Petrie's work at Naucratis in 1883-4, and the six-month-long suppression of the publication of Greek stelae for six months, for fear that Greeks had not really been there."25

"Hence the evidence of the Egyptian objects if clearly dated must carry the foreign objects to the same date. Several such groups have been found at Gurob."26

"In these cases [tomb groups with Aegean pottery] there is no exact dating, but a consensus of style in each case of the XVIIIth or early XIXth Dynasty; and the connection of the Aegean pottery with it is in some cases absolute and in others only presumptive. The argument for date of the pottery rests
in these cases on the uniformity of the period connected with it, and the absence of any discrepant dating.27

"If we were to further refine on the question, and enquire whether the differences of date of the reigns in Egypt correspond to equal differences in Greece, we are met by the lack of all relative dating yet assignable to the Greek tombs; on that side we have only a vague statement of "Mykenaean period," or some such generality; and it is therefore only that period in general that we can assign to the XVIIIth-XIXth Dynasty in Egypt."28


"Especially the excavations of the last few decades have provided us with rich material which is of the highest interest particularly for the study of foreign peoples....the numerous finds of vases from the Mediterranean civilizations, which latter in part depend for their chronology upon these very finds."


"We may hope that our new [Amarna] excavations...will reveal new evidence...[of] relations between the Greece of the age of the Atridae, when "golden Mycenae" ruled, and Egypt. It is very probable that there was a considerable colony of Greeks in Egypt at that time...."

fn. 2: "We find such foreign colonies in Egypt in this age. That at Gurob, of the time of Tuthmosis III, is a case in point. And the products of Greece were freely imported into Egypt, for the use of Egyptians as well as of the
foreigners themselves. Thus hardly any decent burial of the XVIIIth Dynasty is without its bugelkanne or Mycenaean false-necked vase, no doubt when originally imported containing olive oil or some other Greek product. And we find the bugelkanne and the older 'filler' vase imitated by the Egyptian in his characteristic blue faience...so that they became domiciled in Egypt, so to speak."


"In Gurob war in der 18. Dynastie unter Thutmosis III. eine Stadt entstanden, die, wie die chronologische Liste der gefundenen Kartuschen zeigt, in der 19. Dynastie unter Merneptah wieder verödete."

In pp. 161-63, Fimmen repeats the details of Petrie's finds at Gurob, just as Petrie presented them. They are accepted fully, and without question.


"At Gurob, a town which was largely inhabited by fair-haired men, the tombs and houses are full of Mycenaean stirrup-jars and amphorae which are placed by cartouches or scarabs in the last reigns of the 18th and the 19th dynasties."

18. J. D. S. Pendlebury, "Egypt and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age," *JEAS* 16 (1930), pp. 87, 91 and fn. 6:
"From Gurob come nineteen stirrup vases in deposits ranging from the reign of Amenophis III or Akhetaten to that of Ramesses II; a stirrup vase, a piece of a jug and part of a filler which belong to the very beginning of the style; and another stirrup vases--these last four unstratified.

"What however nothing will explain is the more than Pelopid stupidity of these two invasions. The Peoples of the Sea and Egypt, as we have seen, had traded peacefully with one another for nearly two centuries. Some of the Tursha had even settled in Egypt....

"They had settled particularly at Gurob, where Petrie found their cemetery....It is to settlements such as these that I would attribute the coarsely-made stirrup vases which are usually considered to be Egyptian imitations."

19. N. Kokkinos, P. J. James, J. A. Frankish, "Greece 'Dark Age' Debates," *Studies in Ancient Chronology* 1 (1987), pp. 31-32:

"...Ramsay, Murray, Torr and many others were happy...to date the end of Mycenaean civilization as late as the 9th, or even 7th century BC! Ramsay... drew a connection between 9th to 7th-century Phrygian rock-carving and ...the Lion Gate at Mycenae....Murray was a staunch supporter of a low dating for Mycenaean civilization, associating it with the period of colonization and the early tyrants....Torr drew attention to...the close resemblance between the carved gemstones of the Mycenaean and Geometric ages. He questioned the validity of the Egyptian Sothic chronology and fiercely resisted the attempts of Petrie and others to raise the dates of Mycenaean civilization into the 2nd millennium BC.

"No one today could seriously contemplate the extremely low dates for Mycenaean civilization experimented with by late 19th-century scholars."
Nevertheless the force of their arguments regarding some continuity between the Mycenaean and Geometric civilizations cannot be ignored....
APPENDIX 1: ENDNOTES

1 Note that Petrie did recognize these as local imitations. They probably imitate, in general, the late LH III B forms.

2 Also fig. on p. 274 = Ash. 1890 990, III B. Seti II Burnt Group.

3 = Ramesses II Burnt Group, Ash. 1890 973, III B.

4 = UCL 855, III B.

5 = BM A 984, III B Simple Style.

6 This is still a valid criticism applicable to anyone using the Tutankhamun Burnt Group for an 18th Dynasty date.

7 P. 478.

8 Pp. 480-81.

9 P. 481, fn. 1.

10 P. 483.

11 = IKG, pl. 17, cf. also pl. 18 with two identical glass vases which are assigned to Rameses II.

12 I.e., the Tutankhamun Burnt Group.


14 P. 6.

15 P. 6, fn. 2.


17 P. 48.

18 This is the Amenhotep III Burnt Group.

19 P. 51.

20 P. 317-18.
21P. 318, fn. 2.

22P. 320.

23Note that in *JHS* 11, p. 274, Petrie had said that this was the earliest type of stirrup jar from Egypt.


26P. 145.

27P. 151.

28P. 153.

29P. 161.

I propose to state first of all the facts upon which the supposed early dating of the 'Mycenaean' or (as Mr. Petrie calls it) 'Aegean' pottery is based, and then to give briefly the substance of Mr. Torr's criticism on each point. I should perhaps say that by the term 'Mycenaean pottery' I mean pottery of finely levigated clay with a polished surface on which decoration is laid by means of gilded point; the shapes are easily recognized as distinct from those of other classes of pottery, as will be seen by
APPENDIX 2: PETRIE AND TORR


"The controversy on this subject, which has been winding its way through many weeks and many journals, has not yet reached a definite conclusion; but in view of its possible continuance over yet another six months, it may be useful here to summarize the points at issue, in the hope that readers of the *Classical Review* may see, without searching the columns of the *Academy*, the *Athenaeum*, and the *Times*, what these points are, and what is the present position of the disputants. The discussion arose out of Mr. Torr's criticism of Petrie's *Illahun* (*C.R.* March, p. 127), which was partly based on an article by Mr. Petrie in the *Hellenic Journal* xi. 270. Briefly stated, the main question is this: A certain class of pottery, of a distinctive technique, form and decoration, has been found, on the one hand at Mycenae and other 'Mycenaean' sites in Greece; and on the other hand at certain site in Egypt. I is maintained by Mr. Petrie and others that the circumstances of the Egyptian discoveries enable us to assign a date of about 1400 B.C. to the 'Mycenaean' pottery of those sites and consequently to the mycenaean civilization itself. Mr. Torr, as I understand him, is not occupied so much in denying the possibility of this early for Mycenae, as in arguing that the conclusion is not warranted by the evidence as yet adduced.

"I propose to state first of all the facts upon which the supposed early dating for the 'Mycenaean' or (as Mr. Petrie calls it) 'Aegean' pottery is based; and then to give briefly the substance of Mr. Torr's criticism on each point. I should premise by saying that by the term 'Mycenaean' pottery is meant pottery of finely levigated clay with a polished surface on which decoration is laid by means of glazed point; the shapes are easily recognized as distinct from those of other classes of pottery, as will be seen by
reference to *Myken. Vasen*, Taf. xlv. The most characteristic, as well as the favourite, form is that which the Germans term *Bugelkanne*, and which we may call 'false-necked amphora.'

"In discussing the date of Mycenae, the evidence naturally groups itself under three heads: first we have the literary evidence, that is, the light thrown on the monuments by Homer, and *vice versa*; secondly, the relations which the antiquities of Mycenae and correlated sites bear to those of the historic period in Greece; and thirdly, the relations which such antiquities bear to those of the other nations whose dates have independently been ascertained with comparative certainty. The first category lies outside the present enquiry....As to the second point, it is obvious that much must depend on the completeness of the chain of evidence. and the further we go back, the more strain we must necessarily put on the few facts of which the chain is composed....It is generally agreed that the Dipylon style...succeeded that of Mycenae, so that if we accept the earlier dating of Mycenae (1400 B.C.) we have a gap of at least 700 years; and thou it is likely that the Mycenaean period was of long duration, it is difficult to spread such development as the authors of *Myken. Vasen*, for instance trace, over so many centuries. Moreover, we have in one class of remains from Mycenaen sites,—the engraved gems,—a practically continuous development in art between Mycenae and historic times; and this would certainly not independently suggest such an interval....Are we then to imagine a pre-Dorian race in Greece, passing through eight centuries of declining art and wasting prosperity in struggles with a Dorian race who slowly but surely gained the mastery? That something of this nature occurred, we may readily believe; but the duration of this epoch is at least open to question.

"The third category is that upon which the present controversy hinges. On this head it is contended in several quarters that the results of recent discoveries have settled the question finally in favour of Mr. Petrie's date; so much so that in the *Academy* of Oct. 29, Prof. Sayce actually uses this Mycenaean date as evidence for the dating of Hittite remains....and yet in
the same Academy...is noted a paper by M. Heuzey in which attention is called to the resemblance between the subjects on the famous Mycenaean gold ring and a bas-relief in the Louvre with Hittite characters; M. Heuzey assigns the Hittite sculpture (and therefore presumably the Mycenaean ring) to the ninth century: so that either Prof. Sayce is wrong, or M. Heuzey is not a 'competent archaeologist': which is by no means the general opinion.

"The following is a summary of the points in question, with dates according to Brugsch's latest system of Egyptian chronology....

(i) The Ash-hetep sword. A parallel is drawn between the inlaid daggers of Mycenae and an inlaid sword found near Thebes in 1859....the sword itself bears a name which looks like a misspelling of the first name of the founder of the XVIIIth dynasty....When did she live? Some circumstances of the burial &c. would point to the Xth dynasty...but...some objects in the mummy case have the name of Kames, others of Ahmes the first king of the XVIIIth dynasty....It is conjectured that Aah-hetep may have been the wife of Kames and mother of Ahmes.

(ii) At Ialysos in 1864 was found, among tombs containing Mycenaean objects, a scarab of Amenophis III (1500 B.C.). At Mycenae have been found three separate objects in 'Egyptian porcelain,' all of which have indications of a royal name...Queen Tiy...a cartouche reading apparently [Amen]-hetep...parts of the name and titles of the same king.

(iii) In two graves at Gurob Mr. Petrie found instances of a false-necked amphora among deposits which showed the names of Amenophis III (1500 B.C.) and Tut-ankh-amen (B.C. 1466) respectively.

(iv) A 'Mycenaean' vase was found by Mr. Petrie in a tomb at Kahun (the 'tomb of Maket'), with various dateable objects, among which he proposed to find a limit of date between 1200 B.C. and 975 B.C....

(v) In his most recent excavations on the site of Tel-el-Amarna, Mr. Petrie has found a large quantity of fragments of Mycenaean pottery: since he finds no trace of anything later than Heru-em-heb...he concludes that it was deserted before the XIXth dynasty....All these data would then seem to favour the advocates of the earlier terminology; I may add two more, which in the English correspondence have not yet, I think, been quoted, viz.:
(vi) The wall paintings from three Theban tombs, quoted by Steindorff, *Arch. Anz.* 1892 p. 11, all probably of about the time of Thothmes III. (a) Rekmara. (b) An unpublished tomb: Prisse gives two vases from it as 'vases des tributaires de Kafa'....(c) Tomb of an official who lived under Thothmes III....

(vii) In *Arch. Anz.* 1891 p. 37 Furtwängler says that in the Berlin Museum is a fragment of Mycenaean ware which comes from a 'statum attributed with certainty by Egyptologists to the XVIIth' dynasty (1700-1400 B.C.). This fragment, however was a donation from Mr. Petrie, and is therefore probably from one of the finds already before us and not fresh and independent evidence.

"We now come to the points which have been advanced as direct evidence of the *later* dating.

(viii) On the wall paintings of the tomb of Ramesses III. (about B.C. 1200) are represented five false-necked amphorae of blue glass and pottery, evidently Mycenaean in character.

(ix) In the British Museum...is a false-necked amphora...which...was found at Der el-Bahari in the tomb of one of the grandsons of King Pinetchem, who reigned about B.C. 1033. The tomb would consequently be about B.C. 970.

"Proceeding now to review the evidence, we see that in the nine groups of facts we have, roughly speaking, fifteen instances of suggested dates, the outside limits of which are 1700-970 B.C. If then we can accept as trustworthy the evidence upon which these dates are founded, there would be a strong presumption in favour of the early attribution of the Mycenaean civilization. It is certainly a remarkable coincidence that this Egyptian evidence, such as it is, should point so frequently to the three centuries after 1700 and leave absolutely unmarked the period between 970 and 700 B.C."
"The evidence is threefold in character: royal scarabs or cartouches on objects found in tombs; Mycenaean pottery found in tombs or rubbish heaps; Egyptian wall paintings....

"In the case of the tombs, it will be seen that while (ii) concerns Greek sites, (iii) to (ix) refer to tombs in Egypt. In the Greek tombs, we are dealing with imported objects; and it is obvious that such objects need not necessarily be of the period of the king whose name they bear...On the other hand, it may be urged that this very prominence in Greek legend would seem to imply some original association of Amenophis III. with that portion of the Aegean or with people hailing therefrom; and that even if we may expect scarabs of 'Memnon' to have been eagerly bought in Greece many centuries after his death, we should scarcely expect to find those of Memnon's wife....

"Objects found in a tomb may have come there in a variety of ways: they may have been heirlooms for generations, they may have been buried, dug up at any subsequent period, and then reburied in the tombs in which we find them.... Against this we must see the cumulative evidence of the four examples in (ii), in conjunction with the other evidence pointing to the date of Amenophis III....

"Lastly, there comes the question of style; are these cartouches accepted by Egyptologists as contemporary productions?...Here we may revert to the sword of Aah-hetep (i), on which the hieroglyphics are also incorrect; in that case there are elements in the design which have an undoubtedly un-Egyptian appearance; and M. Daly (Rev. de l'Arch. 1860, p. 103) suggested that the sword must have been made by a stranger to Egypt....

"Coming now to the question of the pottery, we have three definite examples (nos. iii, iv and ix) of tomb-deposits in which 'Mycenaean' pottery is found in conjunction with objects which suggest a definite date; and no. v, in which a large quantity of such pottery is found on a site which apparently has not been occupied later than a given date; the full evidence as to Tel-el-Amarna has not yet been published, and we must therefore for
the present suspend our judgement on this point. Similar evidence has been offered as to the general mass of pottery found at Kahun. Arguments of this nature however (from pottery found on sites where the occupation was presumably of limited duration) must be received with caution; for instances are not unknown of Mycenaean fragments being found on a site and among objects which cannot apparently be earlier than the sixth century B.C.; and yet none I think would seriously argue that Mycenaean pottery was in use in that century. As to the tomb-deposits, we may take it as a principle that the contents of an untouched tomb cannot be earlier than the latest object found with them; Mr. Torr consequently treats the tombs in question as proving merely that the pottery was buried after the date named; such burial may conceivably have taken place a long time subsequently, seeing that tombs were so used at various periods, and that one at least of these (the tomb of Maket) contains deposits of various dates.

"Finally, we have the wall paintings; here again the evidence depends on a similarity of style, which may or may not be accepted....If we accept this evidence, then we are confronted with the problem that the 'Mycenaean civilization was in existence at any rate from 1600 to 1200 B.C. On the other hand, we have the direct evidence of no. ix, the tomb of the grandson of King Pinetchem, which would bring the lower limit of date down to about 970 B.C.: we thus obtain apparently a proof that the are which we call Mycenaean lasted over at least six centuries. If this were so, it requires no great stretch of the imagination to extend it over a further century or so either way. But with an art of so long duration, found over so wide an area, it is extremely hazardous to argue relative dates from classification based upon a regular course of development: the authors of Myk. Vasen suggested such a classification, but even if this were proved, it would cease to be a general test if once we show that all the 'Mycenaean' pottery was not manufactured on the same site. Moreover, such an art might be expected to have left more traces of its existence in Greece; and it is certainly remarkable that we have not the scarabs of other Egyptian kings from Mycenaean sites: on the other hand, we may recollect that, while fresh evidence of Mycenaean remains is almost daily accruing there, very few
Mycenaean sites have yet been thoroughly excavated; and the question, who the true representatives of the Mycenaean civilization really were, still remains to be settled. The present discussion is one of date, not of race; but we may not that the tendency of late has been to look towards Syria as having exercised at least some influence on the civilization which we call 'Mycenaean,' and which may have had its centre in Crete (Winter in Arch. Anz. 1891 p. 38)."


"In the *Hellenic Journal* for October 1890 Mr. Petrie published a sensational article on 'the Egyptian bases of Greek history.' Nobody could take such an article very seriously; but nobody could fairly criticize it at the time, for Mr. Petrie merely stated his results, and reserved most of his evidence for publication in his work on *Ilahun*. This evidence having at length been published, I am going to subject the whole of Mr. Petrie's theory to a little criticism.

[Torr quotes Petrie's discussion of the Maket Tomb and its date]

"Mr. Petrie is singularly inconsistent in his reasoning. He argues first that the absence of pottery of the 18th and early 19th dynasty shows that the tomb is *later* than the early part of the 19th dynasty. And then he argues that the absence of objects belonging to the 22nd dynasty shows that the tomb is *earlier* than the 22nd dynasty. Negative evidence is not worth much. But, if this evidence shows that the tomb is later than the early part of the 19th dynasty, it will also show that it is earlier than the 18th.

"Mr. Petrie assigns the date 1200 B.C. to the reign of Ramessu II. at the beginning of the 19th dynasty and the date 975 B.C. to the 22nd dynasty. And then, opining that the tomb could not be earlier than the one or later than the other, in a rough and ready way he gives it a date midway
between the two, namely 100 B.C. In the *Hellenic Journal* he said very positively: 'This tomb belongs to about 1100 B.C., or within fifty years of that either way.' Few judges would hold that Mr. Petrie was justified in making so positive a statement on such slender evidence.

[Torr quotes Petrie on the dated development of the stirrup jar shape.]

"Mr. Petrie's inconsistency is really surprising....But here he argues that all the objects in the same interment with a tray bearing the name of Seti II. are necessarily contemporary with Seti II., that all the objects in the same interment with a kohl tube bearing the cartouche of Amenhotep III. are necessarily contemporary with Amenhotep III., and so forth. There is no proof of that.

"False-necked vases have been obtained by various persons from various parts of Egypt; but Mr. Petrie speaks only of those few that were found by himself and one of his colleagues at Gurob and Tell el-Yahudiyeh. Possibly he thinks that no other investigators are capable of determining a date. But he ought not to ignore the well known vases of this type that are depicted in fresco in the tomb of Ramessu III....The ornamentation indicates that these vases were very closely related to those that are assigned by Mr. Petrie to the reign of Tutankhamen. But, according to Mr. Petrie's chronology....the date of Ramessu III. is...two hundred and fifty years later.

"Thus, in the first place, the false-necked vases from Gurob have been dated capriciously. And then, in the second place, the date of the whole class of false-necked vases has been deduced from the supposed dates of these few, without regard to the dates assigned on surer grounds to others of the same class.

"This fallacious argument about the false-necked vases leads Mr. Petrie to assert that 'the earliest geometrical pottery of Mycenae begins about 1400 B.C., and is succeeded by the beginning of natural designs about 1100 B.C.' Even if the argument were sound, such an inference would be extremely
hazardous. No doubt, one of the so-called Aegean vases with natural designs was found at Kahun in a tomb assigned on very dubious evidence to 1100 B.C. But that does not prove much.

[Torr quotes Petrie's attribution of the foreign pottery to Libyan settlers in the Fayum]

"This talk about a 'great wave of Graeco-Libyan conquest' would be incomprehensible but that on p. 277 Mr. Petrie talks about 'Libyo-Akhaian invasions.' [In year 5, Merneptah, the Lebu, Aqauasha and others invaded. de Rougé identifies them with Libyans and Achaeans.] So, it was a very ingenious identification, and quite the finest thing of its kind since those comparisons between Macedon and Monmouth in *King Henry V*. Now, the Lebu invaded Egypt several times, but the Aqauasha only once....But Mr. Petrie no only assumes that the Aqauasha were Achaeans or Greeks, but also assumes that they were in permanent alliance with the Lebu.

[Torr quotes Petrie concerning a sculpted stone figure from Abusir that he uses to date 'the marble figures found in the Greek islands' to the 12th century B.C. Torr disagrees. Torr then quotes Petrie and discusses at length the situation and dating of the sherds from Kahun.]

"Mr. Petrie's argument about Kahun really amounts to this. In the rubbish-heaps outside the town he found some of the so-called Aegean pottery intermixed with Egyptian pottery which he assigns to the 12th dynasty. There is therefore a presumption that this Aegean pottery is as old as that Egyptian pottery that is to say, as old as the 12th dynasty. But this presumption must be abandoned, if a single piece of this Aegean pottery can be shown to be of later date. And doubts may perhaps be entertained whether that Egyptian pottery is really as old as the 12th dynasty.

"This argument is of a piece with the arguments about Gurob and the Tomb of Maket. Even if Mr. Petrie has stated the evidence accurately, he has not shown that the evidence necessarily leads to his conclusions: and it is hard
to believe that a man who is so inaccurate in his reasoning, can be altogether accurate in his statement of the evidence. To say the least, his theory is not proven."


Tell el-Amarna, April 30, 1892: "As the important subject of the date of the Aegean pottery in Egypt has--for the first time--received open criticism, I may be misunderstood if I leave without notice the attack in the *Classical Review* for March, which has a last reached me here.

"The discussion therein of the Maket tomb is based on an extraordinary canon of criticism--*i.e.*, that the absence of objects of any particular period proves a deposit to be subsequent to that period. It seems obvious that the deposit may equally be before as after the date when such absent objects were made. Yet this axiom is said to be 'singularly inconsistent.' I may add that all evidence since found shows that if I have erred, it is in taking too late, and not too early, a date for this tomb.

"The discussion on the Aegean pottery from Gurob is solely based on another strange canon--*i.e.*, that if a style is proved to have existed in one period (Ramessu III.), this proves that a pattern "very closely related" to it cannot have existed two or three centuries earlier. As some patterns are known to have lasted for many centuries with scarcely any change, it seems obvious that the later examples cannot bar the dating of the earlier. I need only add that my 'capricious' and 'fallacious argument' has been overwhelmingly proved by my later excavations here. Thousands of fragments of Aegean pottery have now been found intermixed with the rubbish which was probably from the palace of Khuenaten, and which certainly has not produced a single object dateable later than the successor of that king about 1380 B.C., while nearly a hundred examples of the names of Khuenaten and his family were mingled with this pottery.
"The sneers at De Rougé’s identification of the races named on the monuments are in disaccord with the balance of critical opinion at present. To myself it seems that the discovery of a large quantity of the products of the Akhaian race at a period and place where the Aqauasha were in Egypt, is a strong confirmation of De Rougé’s view, if it needed any such help. The question of dating the Aegean pottery found in the heaps of the XIIth Dynasty at Kahun I have always particularly stated to be debatable. I have put the arguments without attempting to enforce an opinion. But I cannot see that any contrary argument is adduced, beyond internal consciousness. The fact that not a single parallel to these Kahun fragments can be found among all the unnumbered examples of Aegean pottery found here, at Tel el-Amarna, of 1400 B.C., nor among all the Greek pottery dateable subsequent to that age, seems to point plainly to their being earlier than the XVIIIth Dynasty, as their position indicates.

4. Cecil Torr, The Academy, 1046 (May 21, 1892), pp. 500-501:

"....Thus is will be seen that I did not set up the theory that the absence of objects of any particular period proves a deposit to be subsequent to that period....

"In his letter Mr. Petrie speaks of patterns that are very closely related, and proceeds to talk about the survival of patterns. But I spoke of vases that are very closely related. If he really means patterns, his remarks are irrelevant. But if he means vases, he bowls over his own argument about Mycenae. His argument was that, inasmuch as vases of a certain type had been found at Mycenae, and similar vases had been found in Egypt under circumstances which (in his opinion) fixed their date exactly, those vases from Mycenae were also of this date. But if he is going to admit that the same type of vase continued in use for many centuries, he will have had to admit that those vases from Mycenae may be many centuries earlier or later that the date which he has assigned."
"In his letter Mr. Petrie speaks of the discovery of a large quantity of the products of the Achaean race....Apparently, he is merely playing with words. He spoke of the discovery of a quantity of Aegean pottery, and explained in the *Hellenic Journal*...that he used the term Aegean "to avoid the historical question of the race which produced this early pottery." He now speaks as though all this so-called Aegean pottery were unquestionably a product of the Achaean race. That has to be proved."

5. W. M. F. Petrie, *The Academy*, 1051 (June 25, 1892) p. 621:

"On my return I find Mr. Torr’s letter of May 21; and as he accuses me of misrepresenting his statements, I am, perhaps, called on to answer it. But as such a discussion threatens to increase rapidly in length, I must deal as briefly as possible with it.

"...What has to be remembered is that we have a totally independent proof of the equal age of the Egyptian and Mykenaean examples. Mykenaean vase types are found in Egypt with scarabs, &c., of the XVIIIth Dynasty, and conversely objects of the XVIIIth Dynasty, including a royal scarab, are found at Mykenae.

"Finally, no discussion has affected in the least the broad facts of the case—that hundreds of pieces of pottery, purely Mykenaean in style, have been found in various dateable discoveries in Egypt, and without exception every datum for such lies between 1500 and 1100 B.C., and earlier rather than later in that range. So far I have not heard of a single fragment of dated evidence to set against these facts."
6. Cecil Torr, *The Academy*, 1052 (July 2, 1892), pp. 18-19:

"The remaining point relates to the false-necked vases from Gurob. I showed...that Mr. Petrie had dated these vases capriciously, and had then deduced the date of the whole class of false-necked vases from the supposed dates of these few, without regard to the dates assigned on surer grounds to others of the same class. He has never attempted to defend his method of dating the vases from Gurob. Yet he seems to think that he is nevertheless entitled to deduce the date of a whole class from the dates which he has assigned to these.

"...I apprehend that there is a great difference between the survival of a mere pattern and the survival of a particular system of ornament in combination with a particular form of vase. If he does not recognise this difference, and is prepared to admit that such a combination of form and ornament might continue in vogue for centuries, just like a pattern, he will have to give up all his former generalisations about the dates of vases; for these have all proceeded on the assumption that, if he can anywhere find a vase under circumstances which fix its date, he may then assign that same date to all vases of the same sort."

7. W. M. F. Petrie, *The Academy*, no. 1054 (July 16, 1892), p. 56:

"(2) If Mr. Torr prefers to deny that Aqauash were Akhaians, he may stand in opposition to the Egyptologists' theories about the races (which, however they differ otherwise, agree in this point against him) without affecting my archaeological results.

"(4) Two columns have now been spent by Mr. Torr in attacking the dating of the Gurob vases, aided with personalities which seem to show how much he values his own arguments. But the sole fact which he has added to the
five dated examples which I published (and the great mass of examples since found at Tell el Amarna) is the instance of drawings in the tomb of Ramessu III. So far from there being any difficulty regarding these, I am sincerely obliged to him for introducing them into the discussion. I hesitated to use mere rough drawing, such as these are...but, so far as they go, they are perfectly in accord with the dating of the actual examples found. I had already stated that form to have lasted in Egypt from Amenhotep III. till after Ramessu III.; and the decoration of these examples is quite different from, and clearly later than, that of all the earlier examples which I have quoted, and accords happily with the rest of the series."


"2. He says that Egyptologists are agreed that the Aaquasha were Achaean. That is not true....The whole theory rests on the fact that the names...both begin with A, and if Egyptologists as a body were to accept a theory on such evidence, no one would be bound by their opinion.

"4....He found these vases at Gurob in surroundings which showed that they could not be earlier than a certain period; and then he made the purely arbitrary assumption that they could not be later than this period. He has never attempted to defend that assumption....

"This other point...was the dating of the false-necked vases as a class. He deduced the date of the whole class from the dates which he had thus assigned to the examples from Gurob, and took no notice of the dates assigned on surer grounds to other examples of this class. I referred particularly to the false-necked vases represented in fresco in the tomb of Ramessu III., as there cannot be any question about their date and these vases are very closely related, in ornamentation as well as form, to those
vases from Gurob which he assigned to the reign of Tutankhamen some 250 years earlier.

"Mr. Petrie's last letter will hardly inspire confidence in his methods....


"The main question of the early date of the vases found at Mykenae, Ialysos, Gurob, and Tel el-Amarna, has been passed by Mr. Torr with the strange remark that I have 'never attempted to defend that assumption.' No. And I do not see why I should...any more that I should defend the date of the Arch of Titus or the Column of Trajan. Those building *may* be of any age subsequent to the events and the names recorded on them; but only a paradoxer could debate their date.

"So, no doubt, the many vases found in Greece and Egypt *may* be later than the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, the names of whose kings are found with them; but in the absence of a single contradictory datum (for those of the XIXth and XXth Dynasties follow in sequence of style), it seems to me a pure waste of time to discuss at length such a possibility."


"Mr. Petrie's collapse seems to be tolerably complete.

"I showed that he had contradicted himself about the decoration on two sets of vases, and I called upon him to specify his grounds for now asserting that the decoration on one set was (a) quite different from, and (b) clearly later than, the decoration of the other set. He makes no reply. I showed also that he had obtained his date for the vases of this class by means of
assumptions which he had never attempted to defend. Here, at last, he does reply.

"...This allusion to the Arch and Column is misleading. There is a difference between getting the name of a king upon the object itself, and getting it upon some other object found at the same time....

Mr. Petrie contends that objects are practically certain to be of the same date, if they are found together. There must always be a doubt whether the Egyptian objects are contemporary with the kings whose names they bear; and he has admitted...that such objects might be handed down as heirlooms, or might be dug up in plundering tombs, and used again.

"He speaks also of 'the absence of a single contradictory datum.' That is an audacious statement after all that has been said about the vases in the tomb of Ramessu III., and their relation to the vases which he assigns to the reign of Tutankhamen, some 250 years earlier....

"....In my article in the Classical Review, I challenged his assumption that a vase must be contemporary with a king if found in the same grave with some object bearing the name of that king. And in all my replies to his letters I have returned to this point...."

11. W. M. F. Petrie, The Academy; 1058 (August 13, 1892), pp. 137-38:

"On the essential question of the date of the vases of Mykenaeian style, the absence of a single fresh datum in the recent letters appears to show that your readers may rely on the following propositions.

(a) That all the data yet found with the widely spread examples in Greece and Egypt show a period of between 1450 and 1100 B.C., the limits which I have assigned in Illahun and adhered to since."
(b) That nearly all of these data are of names before 1300 B.C., and in those which are later the style of vase is distinctly different from the earlier.

(c) That the only hypothesis which could date these vases later than these limits needs the assumption that in every case the vases are associated with the names of long anterior kings to the exclusion of any contemporary datum."


"....4. As regards the false-necked vases from Gurob, he says nothing at all on August 13....His silence is the more remarkable as he...described the dating of these vases as the main issue.

"....Yet he must know very well that a certain fresh "datum" in these letters upsets the second clause of proposition b. Some false-necked vases are depicted in the tomb of Ramessu III., whom he dates at about 1100 B.C.; and these vases are very closely related, in ornamentation as well as form, to those which he found in the same grave with some pendants bearing the name of Tutankhamen, whom he dates at about 1350 B.C.

"The wording of proposition a is ambiguous, and likely to mislead. Examples of Mycenaean pottery have been found at many places, but these "data" have been found with them at very few places indeed, namely Gurob and Kahun in Egypt, and Ialysos and Mycenae in Greece. And the term "datum" is applied to material for determining dates by reference to the names of kings of Egypt, to the exclusion of material for determining dates by reference to the names of kings of Egypt, to the exclusion of material for determining dates in any other way....

"Mr. Petrie's new position is stronger than his old position. Formerly he argued that a vase must be contemporary with a king, if found in the same
grave with some object bearing the name of that king. Now he argues that a class of vases must belong to a certain period, if vases of this class have been found at several places in company with objects bearing the names of kings belonging to that period. And this would be plausible enough, if it were clear that all these objects were contemporary with the kings whose names they bear, and if there were no further evidence to be considered. But there is a mass of evidence from Greek sources—the evidence of history as well as archaeology—which has to be considered in determining the date of the Mycenaean vases.

13. Cecil Torr, *The Academy*, 1060 (August 27, 1892), pp. 177-78:

"The vases from Thera are coming into notice again after a period of oblivion; and the statement is once more current that their date is fixed at about 2000 B.C. by geological evidence...."

"In short M. Fouqué's theory was that the vases must date from about 2000 B.C. at latest...."

"The vases are of no great interest in themselves; but they bear some likeness to vases found at Hissarlik, and at Ialysos and Mycenae. So the date 2000 B.C. has been eagerly adopted by some advocates of extreme views about the antiquity of Greek civilisation."


"A repetition of attacks already answered naturally leads to a repetition of answers. But as I have now fully noticed every fact alleged against my views on the Aegean pottery, I fail to see that I am called on to take further notice of the subject at present."
"Whenever a single clear datum can be produced which stands outside of
the propositions which I laid down in my last letter, I shall be glad to
consider it."

15. Torr, The Academy, 1061 (September 3, 1892), pp. 198-99:

Discussing the date of the Mycenaean vase from The Maket Tomb, he says
"His final statement is this:--'We can only go by the period of the latest
dateable objects in any deposit.' In my opinion the evidence will show that
the Mycenaean vase was buried after the time of Ramess II., but will not
show how long afterwards.

"4. Several false-necked vases were found at Gurob. Five of them were in
the same grave with a kohl-tube inscribed with the name of Amenhetep III.
A few others were in the same grave with a little eye inscribed with the
name of Ramessu II. One was in the same grave with a very small tray
inscribed with the name of Seti II. In the first two instances the vases were
of Mycenaean ware and ornamented with patterns. In the last two
instances the vases were of Egyptian ware, and without ornament.

"Mr. Petrie formerly maintained that a vase must be contemporary with a
king, if found in the same grave with some object inscribed with the name
of that king....He now maintains that a class of vases must belong to a
certain period if vases of this class have been found at several places in
company with objects inscribed with the names of kings belonging to that
period. In this he refers to the Mycenaean vases from Ialysos and Mycenae
itself, as well as those from Gurob and the tomb of Maket, which had alone
been mentioned previously. He refers also to the Aegean vases which he
has lately found at Tel el-amarna; but these cannot be included until he has
given some better account of their discovery, and shown that they are not
only Aegean but Mycenaean."
"At Ialysos some Mycenaean vases were found in the same group of tombs with a scarab inscribed with the name of Amenhetep III. In a volume on Rhodes, which I published seven years ago, I ventured to say that this scarab was a work of the XXVIth Dynasty and consequently about 800 years later than the time of Amenhetep III."

"Nobody is entitled to argue that the Mycenaean vases must belong to a certain period, simply because they have been found in company with objects inscribed with the names of kings belonging to that period, unless he is prepared to prove that these inscribed objects all date from that period.

"Nor is anybody entitled to put forward this argument, unless he can give good reasons for supposing that inscribed objects really dating from this period were not retained in use for any length of time before they were buried with the vases. The evidence points the other way. In the tomb of Maket a Mycenaean vase was found in company with two scarabs inscribed with the name of Tahutmes III. There were no other inscribed objects in the tomb. But there were things there which showed that these scarabs were not buried until at least 250 years after the time of Tahutmes III. It is also worth noting that the ornamentation is substantially the same on the false-necked vases represented in the tomb of Ramessu III., and on the false-necked vases found at Gurob in the same grave with some pendants inscribed with the name of Tutanhamen, who reigned 250 years before Ramessu III.

"But the date of the Mycenaean vases is not to be determined by evidence from Egyptian sources only. This evidence must be weighed against that larger mass of evidence which goes to prove that there is no great gulf between these vases and the purely Greek vases of the seventh century B.C., or between Mycenaean antiquities generally and the purely Greek antiquities of that century. And all this archaeological evidence has to be combined with the historical evidence about the date of the Mycenaean civilisation."

“Permit me to repair an omission in my letter of last week. Among the false-necked vases...at the British Museum...is one...The label says that it was found at Der el-Bahari in the tomb of one of the grandsons of King Pinetchem.

“Pinetchem reigned in the XXIst Dynasty, and was a grandson of King Herheru, the founder of that dynasty. According to the common system of chronology, the dynasty was founded about 1100 B.C. If so, the tomb of the founder’s great-great-grandson can hardly date from before 1000 B.C. Under the system of chronology adopted by Mr. Petrie, the date would be later still.

“...Well, here is a “datum” which “shows a period” of about 1000 years B.C.”

17. W. M. F. Petrie, *The Academy*, 1063 (September 17, 1892), p. 245:

“Perhaps Mr. Torr will be able to ascertain somewhat more about the vase....for unhappily it is not difficult to point out erroneous labels and misplaced objects in that department. No label therefore is scientific evidence, let alone that strict legal evidence otherwise required by Mr. Torr.

“...It may, perhaps, be proved that one vase was buried at a date four centuries later than the dating found with hundreds of others; but until we know more of its history, an anonymous label is no proof.”

"In reply to Mr. Petrie's request for further information about about the false-necked vase,...I beg to state that I have made inquiries in the proper quarter, and received assurances that the vase really came from the tomb of a grandson of Pinetchem...."

"...he [Petrie] ignores the fact that false-necked vases are represented in the tomb of Ramessu III, and must therefore have been in use within about two centuries of the date when this particular vase was buried. In the second place he has hitherto spoken of less than a dozen vases of this class, and has not assigned all these to so early a period as four centuries before the date in question. Perhaps he will be good enough to tell us something more about those hundreds of others, and the 'dating' found with them."


"...So far as we yet know, the whole history of this vase may rest on the mistakes or the fancies of an Arab tomb-grabber or a Luxor dealer. Anonymous statements of the kind are not the sort of proofs required in historical questions, and I should have least expected to have to remind Mr. Torr of this."


"...But, as he is aware, the information given in that label and in those statements is supplied by the responsible officers of the British Museum."
"...With the existing difficulties in the way of getting antiquities from Egypt, nobody is likely to disclose any of the sources of supply. If they were known, English collections would only get the odds and ends which the Egyptian authorities did not think worth keeping for the Museum at Gizeh.

"The evidence now available amounts to this. Those officers of the British Museum whose business it is to see to these matters, have stated on the label that the vase came from a certain tomb; and in reply to my inquiries they have assured me that the vase undoubtedly came from that tomb, as stated on the label....

"....People would not take the trouble to assert that the vase came from this man's tomb if there were any ground for supposing that he was buried in an old tomb among things of earlier date, or that his tomb was used afterwards for burying somebody else with things of later date."

21. W. M. F. Petrie, The Academy, 1067 (October 15, 1892), p. 341:

"We now learn that the needful history of this vase cannot--or must not--be stated. Its evidence must therefore slumber, along with those questions of Museum ethics and official infallibility with which it is at present unhappily obscured. Those who know the local conditions at Thebes will best appreciate such a mystery. Surely the subject may now rest."

22. Cecil Torr, The Academy 1068 (October 22, 1892), p. 369:

"....As a matter of fact, that dating [of stirrup jars given in Ilhabun] has been challenged on four grounds--(1) Because Mr. Petrie's premises do not necessarily lead to his conclusions; (2) because false-necked vases with patterns on them are represented in the tomb of Ramessu III., and must,
therefore, have been in use two centuries after the date assigned by Mr. Petrie to all similar false-necked vases; (3) because one of these vases was found in the tomb of a grandson of Pinuchem, and must therefore have been buried four centuries after the said date; (4) because Mr. Petrie takes no account of the close connection between these vases and the genuine Greek vases of the seventh century B.C.:

"...all that has not been stated is the name, or names, of the person, or persons, who took the vase [from the tomb of Pinudjem's grandson] out of the tomb and brought it to England. And there are reasons why the name, or names, should be withheld. Nobody would imagine that the needful history of a vase consisted of somebody's name."


"As to the Aegean pottery, so long discussed in the ACADEMY, there is much fresh material to be considered; but I have preferred not to bring it forward in the present circumstances, as the flat contradiction of facts, and the weight which has been thrown on the darkest hearsay evidence, do not seem to favour the consideration of scientific conclusions."


"Permit me to point out that there has not been any contradiction of facts on my part. My contention was always been that, assuming the facts to be exactly as Mr. Petrie states them, his facts will not establish his conclusions. I have left his facts alone, and dealt only with his logic."
Thus the facts appear to be that the Ægean pottery was mixed up with Phoenician pottery and Phoenician glass, but was not mixed up with the Egyptian pottery bearing the inscriptions of Amenhotep III and his successors. No doubt, Ægean pottery was found in the rubbish-heaps in company with about a hundred scarabs, rings, etc., bearing the cartouches of those kings; but such objects have been found all over the site, and could easily have got into the rubbish-heaps at any date, these heaps being in many places 'a mere sprinkling' and nowhere more than four feet in depth....Mr. Petrie asserts that since the locality has never been reoccupied since Horemheb destroyed the buildings of Akhenaten; and most likely this is true as regards the royal family. But there is nothing to show that it is true as regards the ordinary population. In fact, these Ægean and Phoenician remains may be adduced as evidence that the place was occupied in later times; and this evidence cannot be dismissed with the remark that the locality has never been reoccupied, for that assumes the point at issue.

Throughout the book Mr. Petrie writes as though the whole question of the Ægean pottery and the Ægean civilization could be settled by evidence from Egyptian sources only. But, even within these narrow limits, he fails to reconcile the inferences he draws from Tell el Amarna with those he drew from Gurob and Kahun.

Mr. Petrie found some false-necked vases of Ægean ware in two deposits at Gurob; and he fixed the dates of these deposits at 1400 B.C. and 1350 B.C. respectively, because one of them contained a kohl-tube with the cartouche of Amenhotep III, and the other contained a pendant with the cartouche of Tut-0ankh-amun....Thus the dates assigned to this Ægean ware from Gurob just cover the period assigned to the Ægean ware from Tell el Amarna. That being so, this Ægean ware from Gurob ought to belong to the same class as
the Egean ware from Tell el Amarna, but that is not the case....[he quotes Petrie's text, *Tell el Amarna*, p. 17 § 30]

"Appearences are rather against a theory that people on the west bank of the Nile imported Egean ware from the west of the Egean via Libya, while their contemporaries on the east bank imported it from the east of the Egean via Syria. And, unluckily this pretty theory leaves Kahun on the wrong side of the river. The Egean ware from Tell el Amarna belongs to the same class as the Egean ware from Kahun; and Kahun is close to Gurob."

sites in Egypt, have Egy. III pottery. In the end of the III A phase and beginning of III B, much...can only be classified as 'transitional III A-B'. The most important is Gurob, but a number...are...of three pots, one may be III A, one III B, and one doubtful..." III B...is a group of five globular stirrup-jars from a tomb dated by Petrie to...Amenhotep III, (i.e. the Amenhotep III Bacei Group).

"...the material from Gurob (the most productive site...after Amarna) belongs to the end of III A and the beginning of III B. (It is this difference of date which accounts for the occurrence at Gurob of flat-topped stirrup-jars, which Petrie supposed came from a different source from those at Amarna.)"

After the Amarna Period: "Apart from Gurob...we have...scattered single pots, which...are too few to imply any real demand in Egypt for such foreign pottery in the thirteenth century B.C."

APPENDIX 3: FURUMARK AND GUROB:
THE LATER CHRONOLOGICAL USES


"...sites in Egypt have...Myc. III pottery...[of] the end of the III A phase and...beginning of III B, much...can only be classified as 'transitional III A-B'. The most important...is Gurob, but a number...are...similar...: of...three pots, one may be III A, one III B, and one doubtful....

"...III B...is a group of five globular stirrup-jars from a tomb dated by Petrie to...Amenhotep III." [i.e. the Amenhotep III Burnt Group]. 1

"...the material from Gurob (the most productive site...after Amarna) belongs to the end of III A and the beginning of III B. (It is this difference of date which accounts for the occurrence at Gurob of flat-topped stirrup-jars, which Petrie supposed came from a different source from those at Amarna.)" 2

After the Amarna Period: "Apart from Gurob,...we have...scattered single pots, which...are too few to imply any real demand in Egypt for such foreign pottery in the thirteenth century B.C." 3

"...We know that the later...IIIA pottery is contemporary with the Amarna Age, because it occurred in quantity in the ruins...a few sherds...might...be called L.H. IIIB....

"Only one...[i.e., Tomb 23, "Res", is] near Seti I in date....If L.H. IIIB did not begin until the time of Seti I, how can pottery of that style be dated to the reigns of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamen?

"...The Gurob evidence then can hardly be said to make it 'absolutely clear' that the transition from L.H. IIIA to L.H. IIIB took place 'in the time of Seti I' as Furumark says, but only that it had already taken place by his reign. We are then justified in placing the transition from L.H. IIIA to L.H. IIIB at the end of the XVIIIth dynasty, in other words at the close of the Amarna Age." 4


[In discussing the Amenhotep III Burnt Group]: "It is clear that the...III B jars must be later than the kohl tube, since the III B style must have been represented at...Amarna, if it had appeared already in the time of Amenhotep III....The pit is a rubbish heap, where objects...have been thrown away when broken; it is impossible to say how long it had been in use.

[For the Tutankhamun Burnt Group]: "...all the objects...from a pit...dated...by the...pendants found in it, do not need to be contemporary with that pharaoh [sic]."

"The earliest possible date for the appearance of...III B pottery is the reign of Tutankhamun...but it may have started later. Wace's date...for the end of...III A:2 late is probably too high and Furumark’s...too low....[As] we only
have *termini post quos* for the dating. Furumark’s date is still defensible. Perhaps a medial date of c. 1320 might be a compromise.

4. **Harry James**, letter cited by Åstrom, p. 222, fn. 7, p. 223, fn. 1:

“Mr. T. G. H. James writes in a letter dated 10th October, 1961: ‘...the objects as illustrated by Petrie are of late XVIIIth Dynasty date. It seems reasonable to date the group precisely to the reign of Amenophis III from the inscription on the fragment of kohl tube.’”

“Mr. T. G. H. James writes: ‘The group is certainly to be dated to the late XVIIIth Dynasty and as one or more pendants clearly carry the name of Tutankhamun it is difficult to dispute the date given by Petrie. Objects bearing the name of that king would not, I think, be in circulation much after his reign.’”


“In his basic...study *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*...Stubbings pointed out that it is only by cross-contacts with the civilizations of the Middle East that any absolute dating for the Aegean Bronze Age can be reached. It is, therefore, rather startling to find that since the diffusion of the Furumark concept and his monumental typology, Mycenaean pottery is itself often used as the cultural cross-contact to date levels at sites in the Middle East where local pottery has as yet, a less accessible typology and where Egyptian dated finds, or seals from Syria and Mesopotamia, however abundant, often have to be distrusted for dating as they provide too wide a margin in time.”

"For the transition from IIIA to IIIB the finds of Mycenaean pottery of this phase at Ghurab...are helpful: the associated Egyptian objects show that they cannot be much earlier than the accession of Ramesses II (1304 B.C.)"


"We still depend on Egyptian dates in the last resort....This was the evidence on which Furumark built his chronology, which...has come to stand as a self-supporting model, although many of its bases are no longer valid in Egyptian terms and have been amended in his own more recent work.....

"....The LH III A pottery found at Tell El-Amarna...in itself delimits neither the beginning nor the end of a Mycenaean phase or style, but it gives a certain span of some part of which must coincide with that style....But more important still is the fact that pots of transitional LH III A and III B style, from Ghurab in the Faiyum, are not found before the accession of Ramesses II in 1304, so that this transition probably falls within the period between the accession of Tutankhamun and the early years of Ramesses II...."
8. **J. R. Harris**, cited in Sandars, ibid., pp. 26-27, fn. 10:

"Dr. J. R. Harris in correspondence advises me that there are no real grounds for assigning any LH III B group at Ghurab to a period earlier than the reign of Ramesses II, and that the Ghurab evidence in no way conflicts with that of El-Amarna, so that the transition from III A to III B can be placed between the accession of Tutankhamun and the early years of Ramesses II, who succeeded in 1304...."


After a long discussion comparing objects from the Coffin Group of Beth Shan to LB II and Iron I contexts at Tell Abu-Hawam, Megiddo, Beth Shan, Tell el-Farah (S), Deir 'Alla, Tell es-Sa'idiyeh, he continues: "Similar collections are recorded in XIXth Dynasty contexts in Egypt, especially in a number of deposits at Gurob which are almost duplicated in the Coffin Group of Beth Shan (Petime 1891, Pls. 17-19).

"Palestinian shapes such as saucer lamps, dipper juglets, storage jars, and especially lentoid flasks associated with imported or local copies of Mycenaean and Cyproite wares are evidently standard features in XVIII-XXth Dynasty contexts at Tell el-Amarna, Deir el-Medineh, Abydos, Gurob, Sedment, Lahun, and Aniba, to mention only a few sites....A group of XIXth Dynasty tombs from Gurob yielded a large collection of artifacts...all of which are almost duplicated in the Coffin Group at Beth Shan, yet no coffins are recorded in these tombs."

"In 1957 Wace, on evidence from Gurob, proposed that the transition from Mycenaean IIIA:2 to IIIB:1 be placed at the end of the El Amarna period, which I take to be at the abandonment of Akhtaten [sic]."5

On her chronological table, Hankey dates Akhenaten from 1379-1361, and Tutankhamun as 1361-1352. "It is likely that the Aegean imports began between 1375 and 1373 B.C., and ceased between 1361 and 1352 B.C., nearer 1361 than 1352."


"In Gurob, Fayum war unter Thutmosis III. eine Stadt entstanden, die unter Merenptah wieder verzödete (Dauer: erste Hälfte des 15. Jhs. bis in die letzten Jahrzehnte des 13. Jhs. v. Chr.); in diesen weiten chronologischen Rahmen gehört die am Ort gefundene mykenische Keramik! A. Furumark hat die Befunde im einzelnen durchgearbeitet...."

"In Gurob--wie überhaupt in Ägypten--ist die keramische Phase SH III C mit original-helladischen Erzeugnissen nicht präsent. Statt ihres begriff bereits D. Fimmen die 'letzten, schön entarteten' Bügelkannen bon Gurob als Parallelerscheinungen zur Philisterkeramik....Er legte in diesem Zusammenhang Gewicht auf helle Haare, welche in Gurob zutagegetreten waren, und auf den Namen eines dort bestatteten Fremden 'An-Turscha', offenbar eines Angehörigen der 'Seevölker.'"

"A fresh study of material at Gurob may show, as Wace suggested, that no LH III A 2 pottery there can be dated later than Tutankhamun's reign...from House deposit [i.e. the Tutankhamun Burnt Group]...1 from T. 23 [i.e. the Tomb of "Res"]....

"Some evidence suggests that the period [LH III B] began before the reign of Ramesses II. This comes from El Amarna, Gurob, Mycenae and Poros (Herakleion)...The evidence from Gurob is mentioned above.

"...If more evidence of Egyptian objects datable to Amenophis IV (Akhenaten) or Tutankhamun and lying with III B material comes to light to add to that of Amarna, Gurob, Mycenae and Poros, the argument that such objects are older than their context will be difficult to sustain. We therefore propose that Wace...was correct in placing the transition from III A 2 to III B at the end of Tutankhamun or the end of the 18th Dynasty."


"The dating of Mycenaean IIIA:2-IIIB:1 pottery is based primarily on its association with datable Egyptian material....The transition from LH IIIA:2 to III B:1 is based on the contexts of Mycenaean pottery from Gurob, dated to the reign of Seti II, c. 1300....A range of c. 1375-1250 is therefore suggested for the LH IIIA:2-IIIB:1 period."

"At Gurob an LH III B stirrup jar came from a pit dated to the time of Tutankhamun."

*Note that Wace, like others except for Aström, avoids the implications of the Amenhotep III Burial Group. If Wace's arguments (see above, 264-52, p. 222) are taken absolutely at face-value, they would show that LH III B must have started during the reign of Amenhotep III, he believes that earlier pottery can survive later, but not that later pottery can appear earlier. "If LH III B did not begin until the time of Tell I, how can pottery of that style be dated to the reign of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamen? This is indeed the question that underlies my entire study."

*Note that Wace actually took the transition ("1340") to be ten years after the descent of Akhetaton ("1350").
APPENDIX 3: ENDNOTES

1 *MPL*, pp. 93-94.

2 Ibid., p. 100.

3 Ibid., p. 108.

4 Note that Wace, like others except for Astrom, avoids the implications of the Amenhotep III Burnt Group. If Wace's arguments (see above, *BSA* 52, p. 222) are taken absolutely at face-value, they would show that LH III B must have started during the reign of Amenhotep III; he believes that earlier pottery can survive later, but not that later pottery can appear earlier: "If L.H. IIIB did not begin until the time of Seti I, how can pottery of that style be dated to the reigns of Amenhotep III and Tutankhamen?" This is indeed the question that underlies my entire study.

5 Note that Wace actually took the transition ("1340") to be ten years after the desertion of Akhetaten ("1350").
APPENDIX 4: PETRIE’S “JOURNAL”

"Journal" 2 October 1888-23 May 1889

25 November-1 December:

A certain “Kruger” had worked at Medinet Wadi, but without success as he found only statuettes, no silver or gold. Now Grebaut was allowing him to work at Illahun and Gurob. “Now these are just my main objects for work this year, and so Hewat at once told me of this, and said I had better put a guard-man on to claim the places....Grebaut had let some old Arab dealer ransack about them....” Petrie goes twice a week to see his men (a foreman and three or four workmen) at Lahun. They are there to protect the site.

2-8 December:

Gurob: many little beads and amulets like Amarna. The site is all late 18th-early 19th Dynasties in date, Horemheb and Ramesses II “are the names”; a Tuthmosis III block had been found a couple of years ago. “The whole place is of one period; the houses have never been rebuilt, but stand on the desert sand, just filled up, with the upper parts of the walls fallen in. Thus it is a very interesting place, even if were only find little bits....The cemetery there I am reserving until I can go to work there myself” [This seems to the the Ptolemaic cemetery.] “We have only 3 men on...with Muhammed [i.e. the foreman].” It is not clear how many were at Gurob. Two of these men may have been at Lahun.
8-15 December:

"...handful of scraps of rings, etc. all of late XVIII and early XIX dynasty, & some pretty complete pots, beside more netting needles, balls of thread, wooden combs, etc. all of the same date. Nothing important, but of interest as dated things. When I go there & we dig the tombs, we shall do better." There were still only three men, "to hold the ground."

30 December-5 January:

"...very little this week beside a piece of stone w/half the cartouches of Tahutmes III. This is plainly a re-used block, a bit of some temple, probably destroyed by Khuenaten & thus waste stone as early as the time of Tell Gurob. More balls of thread, spindles, etc.; and a complete pottery fire-stand for cooking on."

6-12 January:

"...a great bead necklace...has been found, in a room....I also hear of a stone tablet or bit of a tomb with figures, which seems to be early...."

20-26 January:

"...a rough but good tablet of Nebamun, overseer of the King's girls [hieroglyphic text given]...It is found re-used in a house."

14 February:

Hawara is closed, Petrie is living at Illahun and working in the Gurob town too. He dates the occupation of the site to Akhenaton-Ramesses II:
there is nothing with a wider range of date. "Some pieces of rudely decorated pottery are peculiarly interesting, as they are un-Egyptian in style and are identical with archaic Greek pottery," the patterns are radial, "& on a bottle with a solid false neck are concentric quadrant lines." These are dated to the 15th century, B.D. "& connected w/an inland town in Egypt, is of much importance historically."

3-16 February:

Gurob is still "not started," two men were holding the site, five bronze chisels found and "...a good tablet of User-mat-neb and his wife Nefertmut adoring Ptah, Haremkhuti, Anhur and Nesit a lion headed goddess."

24 February-2 March:

More bronze tools found, including the butchering knife: "Among other finds there is a fine bronze knife quite perfect from Tell Gurob." "While I was strolling about there after taking this knife [sketch - IKG pl. 17.31] and then was found [sketch, butchering knife - IKG, pl. 17.32] which is the loveliest I ever saw..."

9-16 March:

Began work "seriously" at Gurob, with fourteen men in the cemetery and five in the town. "Beside the regular work the villagers have found that there is a large amount of beads to be picked up in the surface dust of the town. There are as many as fifty, mostly girls, to be seen crawling about picking up beads and scraps. These are offered to me, and most of them I
buy...." But, often the villagers would not sell them, however Petrie did have enough "to establish what all the varieties of Ramesside glass colours and work are; and so far as I can settle there is not a bit of later stuff offered to me, except a little from Roman tombs."

16-23 March:

"Several more pieces of Greek pottery have been found; some down in the bottom of the chambers, and so certainly of the age of the town, 1400 B.C. I think this must have been brought in by the Achaeians in their invasion with the Libyans under Merenptah. In any case it is of the greatest interest and value historically as giving such an age to such pottery....But everything here, even the pyramid, now fades in interest compared with the dated Greek pottery, so many centuries earlier than what is hitherto known." More finds of another bronze knife and "more bits of Greek pottery....Also two necklaces of beads from mummies buried just inside the town wall. One is clearly Ramesside and cannot be put after XX Dynasty, so this and some ushabti of later Ramesside style found with a neighboring mummy date the interments. I can now fix the age of a class of glass pendants of yellow. Thus I can now fix the age of a class of glass pendants of yellow, [sketch-like Tut group] with an eye of black a white on the side. I have got many from here, picked up, and felt almost certain of their Ramesside age; but now getting them on a mummy by the side of one of XIX-XX dynasty clinches the matter....I told the man to go on clearing the rubbish hole where he found the bronze knife at Gurob,¹ and soon he came on a magnificent find. Hidden away behind the rubbish against a wall were 2 bronze pans." They were
“inscribed for the Ka of Kherau-aa [hieroglyphic text given] and the larger for the Ka of Seti, scribe & overseer of recruits who belonged to the palace at Medinet "in the Great Lake."

23-30 March:

“Last week we found some tombs of the XIXth dynasty apparently in ground with remains of houses on the surface, just N. of the walled area of Gurob. Now this week opens w/another such find.” [He describes Tombs 21-22.] “I do not remember how much I have said about the source of the Greek pottery here, but I have been uncertain between the theory of its belonging to the Achaian allies in the great Libyan invasion under Merenptah, or its belonging to a more peaceable occupation which preceded that war.”

He decides that the foreigners lived at Gurob and adopted Egyptian customs.

“We get several pieces of Greek (or Etruscan) pottery every day, and today a piece was found by the side of a ring bezel of Tutankhamun, plainly showing its contemporaneousness. Some of the pottery seems to me Cypriot: and all of it will be a great surprise as dated 1400 B.C.” [However, he seems to indicate that this vase had red and black lines, so it may not have been Mycenaean.]

“Another unopened tomb of XIX dynasty was found. I was very anxious to see the name in case it should be a foreigner. The chamber was filled with sand which I cleared out myself for fear of damaging anything” (This is tomb 22). Petrie says this is like most of these 19th Dynasty tombs,
a "well" lying east-west was cut through two feet of rubbish and then a further six feet of "hardened gravel," opening to "2 chambers, one at either end, which are scooped out in a bed of soft sand."

Tomb 23 (the so-called Tomb of "Res") lay opposite to Amenemapt, and "therefore of the same age." The coffin was in the same style, but poorer, and had been eaten by termites, so no name was found. The mummy had a bronze finger ring on the left fore-finger, like Amenemapt. It had "remarkable" yellow or light brown hair, with a wig of black plaied to the waist in true Ramesside style. "By the side of the head, in the coffin was a small false-necked jug with spout eccentric, of the regular Greek or Italian pottery. This is at last an unquestionable proof of the XIX dynasty age of this pottery....But it also points to this probably being a foreigner...." He took the skull and hair.² He also found another tomb with a yellow-haired mummy, also Dyn. 19 in date.

1-6 April:

"2 small rolls hieratic papyri much rolled but still a fair amount legible." An alabaster jar filled with some greasy brown substance, and other things, including two pieces of pottery with potmarks "were found in the earth beneath a wall in the town and therefore early" (this might be the context of Vase No. 4, see Appendix 5, Concordance of Burnt Groups and Dated Finds). Sayce visits the site and identifies the pottery as Greek and Cypriote, and not Etruscan. He also studies the pottery marks that Petrie had been carefully collecting. Sayce convinces Petrie that the Greek pottery was identical with material quite recently found at Mycenae: "The pottery is
doubly important, as it is identical with that of Mykenae, and so dates that to the early age that Schliemann believed."

**8-15 April:**

"At Gurob, Sayce agreed with me that it was hardly worth while to go on with miscellaneous digging; the ground yet unworked will be a reserve to search in for fresh evidence, if such is needed; and it is not rich enough in things to make a dealer work it." He also found "2 small rolls hieratic papyri much rolled but still a fair amount legible."

**28 April-4 May:**

"I am being swamped with hideous usabtis of the XX-XXII dyn from Gurob, which some free-lances are continually finding, but which I do not care to go and work for myself. But it is almost too much when it comes to taking in 50 a day, all selected as legible. They are of painted wood." He also took in many threaded beads, a "good" mummy case, and a bier.

**4-11 May:**

"Two charming little finds opened our week's work this morning [at Kahun]. A baby-box once more turned up....Then in the next chamber was a mass of later burials....With these was a Greek false neck vase with patterns [sketch] around it....It is very happy getting such things so certainly, though rather elastically, dated."

"Two Greek pots have been brought to me from Gurob, one found with pottery of XX dyn., the other with a yellow wooden usabti of XIX-XX. I much
wish that I could look after Gurob, but Kahun takes all my time, and is more important, and we have now so much certain about the age of Greek pottery here, that the evidence of the finding is now sufficient to corroborate what we already know. I cannot manage to attend to that as well as Kahun, and yet I cannot stop their work as it would only mean losing everything, and leaving it to be sold to dealers afterwards. So all I can do is to watch carefully all that comes and cross question. Of course if the subject were new I should drop all else and follow it for a time; but all that is found just corroborates what I have already worked out there."

"Journal" 26 September 1889-27 June 1890

The towns are just as they were left, fully guarded, and Petrie began work on 7 October.

18-31 October:

Petrie worked at Illahun and Kahun, finding the Maket Tomb.

1-7 November:

"Mr. Hughes-Hughes arrived safely last Friday, but he has been so strangely sleepless since he came here, that he has not been able to do much."
8-14 November:

"I expect to be in Cairo next week; and Hughes will work Gurob meanwhile."

14-28 November:

"After starting the work at Gurob fairly, and putting it all in Mr. Hughes-Hughes' charge, I went off for a few days to Cairo." Petrie closed his own work at Kahun for this time so that he could "give Hughes-Hughes all the best men to begin with,....The work at Gurob has produced a good lot of small things, but nothing considerable as yet." These items included "swinging" razors, and scarabs of Ramesses II, III, and Amenhotep III, a small faience "amphora," and a faience amphoriskos (in violet) and a "staff-head" of Queen Tiy (possibly *JKG*, pl. 19.38). He also found dozens of "netting bones," and "Pieces of a large sheet of papyrus with the figure of a king offering, no name or head left, but probably end 18th Dyn."

THE SETI II BURNT GROUP - GROUP 1 (*JKG*, pl. XIX): "A large lot of pottery, much of foreign types, and some small alabaster vases were found, together with pottery rings, glass beads, and a small stone dish with the name of Seti II [*JKG*, pl. XIX.233], which dates the whole lot." Petrie felt that all the "glaze, beads, and pots" were later in style than Ramesses II.

Further finds included clay caps of wine jars, one inscribed with the name of Seti I, a stone fragment with the "large ka-name" of Tuthmosis III (*JKG*, pl. 24.9?), and the corner of a stone lintel (*JKG*, pl. 243?), "both from temple here, no doubt....There are some pieces of Greek pottery, and a large number of marks."
28 November-5 December:

Discovery at Kahun of the papyrus of Amenhotep III.

"Gurob has however been more exciting than Kahun, and Mr. Hughes-Hughes has had his hands full of work there." Granite offering table of Queen Tiy to the deceased (?) Amenhotep III (IKG, pl. 24.7).

RAMSES II A BURNT GROUP - GROUP 4 (IKG, pl. 18.1-26), GROUP 9?; FIND 5: "There have been three or four finds of ornamental pottery, &c., in large ash holes in the floors of rooms; though how they come to be there is hard to understand. A large amount of blue glazed pottery has thus come to light, including the finest pieces I have ever seen found. There are bowls (one perfect)⁴ and vases [sketch⁵] all painted with lotus⁶ and other designs in black outline." Petrie continues his description of the faience vessels: "...monkey eating orange⁷, two facing sphinxes,⁸ part of a seated fig., several glass pilgrim bottles (3 perfect)⁹ [sketch of lentoid flask] of the variegated Phoenician type, and a round saucer¹⁰....It is very valuable getting these examples of a well known style, dated thus, with a ring of Ramesses II¹¹." Other finds included a small pair of bronze tools bound together (a knife and a long razor),¹² 2 more swivel cutters, a mirror, carnelian and "eyed" beads [possibly RAMSES II B GROUP],¹³ amber beads, many alabaster vessels, "And in each find one or two examples of Greek pottery."

6-13 December:

"...not so much as last week...greater part of our door lintel of T. III from Temple of Gurob with name Amen cut & restored,"¹⁴ which proved that
the temple had not been destroyed until Seti I, "...Some more Greek false-
necked vases have been found, and a blue and yellow 'Phoenician' glass
vase." 15

13-19 December:

"Gurob has not paid so well, and it is pretty well exhausted now." Finds included the Tutankhamun cubit (pl. 24.12), a blue glaze bowl of an
ibex suckling her young (pl. 20.5), two wooden "wands" ending in hands (i.e.
clappers), a blue-glazed plaque of Nefertari "daughter" of Ramesses II.

"I do not expect that my friends will hear anything more now from
Kahun and Gurob; the places are done for, and well have they repaid us, by
the insight we have gained in the life and manufactures of the XVIIIth and
XIIth dynasties." He planned to finish up in the next week, then to pack and
to leave for an "exploring trip" around the Fayum.

20 December-3 January:

It was too cold in the house to sit up (between 54° and 57°), with no
heating except a "petroleum stove put under the table to warm the feet
occasionally, as Hughes objects to the smell of it." Very little was found in
the last fortnight.

"At Gurob, some more burnt bowls and glass bottles have been found,
luckily when Hughes and I were both on the spot. I now see that these
strange pits full of burnt valuables, blue bowls, glass flasks, carnelian and
blue-bead necklaces, wood-work and stuffs, were purposely burnt in the
holes, and in this case covered over with a layer of potsherds carefully
placed before covering with earth. They can thus only be a sacrificial burning of personal effects probably on the owner's death. This is not Egyptian, and seems to be the relic of the Greek funeral pyres, thus kept up after the foreigners had taken to burying in tombs like the Egyptians. Then the household valuables were heaped in a hole in the floor of the house, burnt, and buried."

18-26 January:

Hughes-Hughes toured with Petrie to "Gherak." "After returning from Gherak, Mr. Hughes-Hughes was not inclined to go to Tamieh, as he was waiting for business letters, so I went alone....Hughes leaves the 28th."
APPENDIX 4: ENDNOTES

1 This was described in the 24 February-2 March entry, and illustrated by a small sketch with makes it possible to identify it as IKG, pl. 17.32. This is an unusual type, thought to be a ritual butchering knife, such as are seen in New Kingdom representations: see Boston, pp. 49-50, no. 20; W. M. F. Petrie, Tools and Weapons, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 30 (London: 1917), p. 25, pls. 26: 145, 29: 231, 232.

2 UC 30139 and 30137-38; not listed in Thomas, Gurob.

3 See below, for 6-13 December, 1889.

4 Possibly pl. 20.3, from "Group 9."

5 Of an undecorated drop jar, perhaps pl. 18.4 or 5, and two others, probably "Find 5," pl. 20.1, 2.

6 Pl. 20.2? "Find 5."

7 Ramesses II A, pl. 18.2.

8 "Group 4" = Ramesses II A, pl. 20.4. See p. 17 and notation on pl. 18.

9 Ramesses II A, pl. 18.13, 15, 17.

10 Ramesses II A, pl. 18.23?

11 Pl. 18.20.

12 Ramesses II A, pl. 18.3.

13 There is a problem here: the R II A group, p. 17, pl. 18.24, did not have any eye beads. The eye beads are in the Ramesses II B group, p. 18, pl. 18.30. It seems that Petrie's description is combining the two, as he also mentions "2 more [swivel] strange bronze cutters (with sketch), and this appears only in the Ramesses II B group (pl. 18.44). As both the Ashmolean, who received the late group, and Manchester, who received the early group, know them as "Group 4," and as Group 4 is also indicated to be the early group in IKG, pls. 18, 20.4, it may well be that the two groups originally came to Petrie in one mass, and that he later separated them out (perhaps because of the glass? See p. 17). They may have been found separately.

14 IKG 20, pl. 24.3; see above 14-28 November, 1889. The lintel was sent to Adelaide. See Thomas, Gurob, p. 7: the form of the Horus name may date the temple to years 22-30. She notes, p. 20, iv, that the section showing the erased and restored name of Amun is missing from the exhibited piece.
This may have been UC 30374, or possibly "Group 7," *IKG*, pl. 20. This plate shows two Mycenaean vases and two glass vases, unattributed. If it were the Tutankhamun or Amenhotep III group one would think that their names would have been mentioned. However, this would be out of sequence, if Group 9 had already been numbered on 28 November-5 December 1889.

1. Vases:

*IKG*, p. 42: List of false-necked vases (the implication is that there was enough left to identify the shaper, as there are five, these seem to be the five listed in the back of Notebook 39 C.E. Hawara and Gurob, at the very end, where there is a list apparently of finds. The entry is:

"Gkr. (sketch of stirrup or?) G."

1). "One (fig. 1) was taken by my own hands from the vault filling of a coffin (Tomb 23)." — Find No. 5, BM A 987, Furumark's No. 5.

2). "The other (7) was found in a house with a piece of wood carving of the early XIXth dynasty, and a blue glazed ring of the end of the XVIIIth dynasty, thus fixing it to just the same age." — BM A 986, Furumark, No. 4. Find No. 2, "Journal," 23-30 March. 2

3). "A similar one was found with scarabia, pottery, and an amulet which requires us to date it to the beginning of the XIXth dynasty again." — (probably) Find No. 1, at Khmun, BM 47980.
APPENDIX 5: CONCORDANCE OF BURNT GROUPS AND DATED FINDS

1888-1889

1. Vases:

KGH, p. 42: List of false-necked vases (the implication is that there was enough left to identify the shape): as there are five, these seem to be the five listed in the back of Notebook 39 C-E, Hawara and Gurob, at the very end, where there is a list apparently of finds. The entry is:

“Grk [sketch of stirrup jar?] 5”

1). “one (fig. 1) was taken by my own hands from the sand filling of a coffin (Tomb 23).…” - Find No. 6, BM A 987, Furumark's No. 6.

2). “The other (7) was found in a house with a piece of wood carving of the early XIXth dynasty, and a blue glazed ring of the end of the XVIIIth dynasty,¹ thus fixing it to just the same age.” - BM A 986, Furumark, No. 4, Find No. 2, "Journal,” 23-30 March.²

3) “A similar one was found with scarabs, pottery, and an ushabti which requires us to date it to the beginning of the XIXth dynasty again.” - (probably) Find No. 1, at Kahun, BM 47980.

4) "Others were found beneath the walls of a house probably built in the end of the XVIIIth dynasty...." - Furumark No. 2, Find No. 3; no information on current location. This is the group with the scratched pot marks: see "Journal," 1-6 April, 1889; KGH, p. 43: "At Gurob two marks were found on potsherds in a rubbish-hole, built over when houses were begun on the ruins of the temple, probably by Khuenaten: these marks (XXVIII, 23, 42) therefore date from about 1370 B.C." In Notebook 39B, p. 35, in a list of dated finds, Petrie gives "△ and □ under brick wall in stuff 40 deep in mid South town marked 31. Another 31 tomb."

5) "...and also in a tomb with glass beads exactly like those found with a ring of Ramessu II...." - Find No. 5. No information on current location.

2. Dated Finds:

KGH, pp. 44-45: "Catalogue of special finds which serve to guarantee the age of the Greek pottery and signs."

1) "Burial, intrusive, in the ruined town of Kahun, without any objects later than the XIId-XIIIth dynasty around it....Date of the burial about the beginning of the XIXth Dynasty, say, 1300 B.C." - BM 47980, possibly Vase No. 3.

3. "Find beneath the wall of a house built on the temple ruined by Khuenaten, and probably therefore about his age...and two false-necked vases...broken." - Furumark No. 2, Vase No. 4, Tomb 31 in Notebook 39B, pp. 23, 35.


5. "Top of a false-necked vase...with beads glazed exactly like those found with a ring of Ramessu II,\(^4\) in a tomb." - Vase No. 5. Current location unknown.

6. "False-necked vase...taken out by myself from the coffin of Res; one of a group of tombs which I date to the time of Seti by the objects found in them." - Vase No. 1 - BM A 987, Furumark's No. 6, Tomb 23.

3. "Journal":

1.14 February: "Some pieces of rudely decorated pottery are peculiarly interesting, as they are un-Egyptian in style and are identical with archaic Greek pottery...& on a bottle with a solid false neck are concentric quadrant lines." These are dated to the 15th century. [Some of these may not be Mycenaean.]
2. 9-16 March: "In the town we have some more pieces of proto-Greek pottery."

3. 16-23 March: "Several more pieces of Greek pottery have been found; some down in the bottom of the chambers, and so certainly of the age of the town, 1400 B.C."

4. 23-30 March: "We get several pieces of Greek (or Etruscan) pottery every day, and today a piece was found by the side of a ring besel of Tutankhamun, plainly showing its contemporaneousness." Probably Vase 2, Find 2, Furumark No. 4.

5. 23-30 March: "By the side of the head, in the coffin, was a small false-necked jug with spout eccentric, of the regular Greek or Italian pottery. This is at last an unquestionable proof of the XIX dynasty age of this pottery...But it also points to this probably being a foreigner...." - Vase No. 1, Find No. 6, BM A 987, Furumark's No. 6.

6. 1-6 April: a fine alabaster jar filled with some greasy brown substance, and some other things including 2 pieces of pottery with letters "were found in the earth beneath a wall in the town and therefore early." This should be Find No. 3, Furumark No. 2, Vase No. 4. The deposit with the pot marks seems to have also had two stirrup jars.

7. 28 April-4 May: the neck of a Greek-ware jar is found at Kahun.
8. 4-11 May: (Kahun) "With these [burials] was a Greek false neck vase with patterns [sketch] around it...." - Find No. 1, BM 47980, possibly Vase No. 3.

9. 4-11 May: "Two Greek pots have been brought to me from Gurob, one found with pottery of XX dyn, the other with a yellow wooden ushabti of XIX-XX"

4. Notebook 39B:
1. Tomb N, described in Notebook 39B, p. 23: tomb well in North Town, Dyn. 19, shallow & plundered. Items marked with an "N." "bits of Greek pottery." - KGH, p. 40. Thomas, Gurob, p. 23, reasonably suggests that it was in the area of Tombs 20-25 (i.e. "Res") and of similar date. One of the vases is Ashmolean 1889.1063, FS 178, LH III A2 or B.

2. Tomb 31, Notebook, pp. 23, 35 - Find 3, Vase No. 4, Furumark's No. 2.

5. KGH, pl. 28, unattributed pottery:
1. KGH pl. 28.17: upper shoulder of a stirrup jar.

2. KGH pl. 28.10 pilgrim flask body sherd.

2. "Journal":
1. 14-28 November: The discovery of the Seti II Burnt Group (KGH pl. XIX). A large lot of pottery, much of foreign types..."
1889-1890

1. **Vases:**

1. *IKG*, p. 17: Amenhotep III Group: "...five examples of the false-necked vases of Aegean ware (3) with iron glaze bands; all of them of this tall globular type."

2. *IKG*, p. 17: Tutankhamun Group: "...several pieces of false-necked vases of Aegean pottery...."

3. *IKG*, p. 18: Ramesses II B Group: "The foreign pottery is of the false-necked vase (52), large, coarse, of Egyptian ware, and evidently an imitation of the real Aegean pottery."

4. *IKG*, p. 18: Seti II Group: "Some is of the foreign form, such as the false-necked vase (12) but of native ware, and evidently made by a potter who had lost the feeling of the original type. The same may be said of the pilgrim bottle (17)."

5. *IKG*, p. 18: "...the next [stirrup jar type] flatter in form during the end of that dynasty, with discs surrounded by dots...."

2. **Journal**:  

1. 14-28 November: The discovery of the Seti II Burnt Group (*IKG*, pl. XIX): A large lot of pottery, much of foreign types...."
2. 14-28 November: "There are some pieces of Greek pottery, and a large number of marks."

3.1 28 November-5 December: Discovery of the Ramesses A & B groups, Group 9, and Find 5: "And in each find one or two examples of Greek pottery."

4. 6-13 December: "Some more Greek false-necked vases have been found...."

3. **Burnt Group Field Numbers:**

The Groups seem numbered in the sequence of their discovery, as the Seti II Group, which was sent to the Ashmolean Museum as Group 1, is the first mentioned in Notebook 39B (14-28 November 1888). The Ramesses II Burnt Group is the next mentioned by name (28 Nov.-5 Dec.), and this seems to have been Field Group 4. Petrie says that Hughes-Hughes had already made three or four such finds by this point.

1. The Seti II Group was sent to the Ashmolean as Group 1.

2. Registered in the Ashmolean Museum as Group 2, this group did not have any foreign pottery or king’s names. This must be one of the two groups without king’s names that Petrie mentions in *Methods*, p. 146.
3. Also sent to the Ashmolean, anepigraphic, but with one Simple Style stirrup jar, and one "imitation" stirrup jar. Probably the other group mentioned in Methods, p. 146.

4. This seems to combine both the early and late Ramesses II groups: IKG, pl. 18.1-26; pl. 20.4. As the sphinx dish of Group 4 (IKG, p. 17, pl. 20.4) came from the Ramesses II early Group, this should be Group 4. Griffith, in the Manchester Catalogue, also lists the Ramesses II A Group as Group 4. However, the Ramesses II late Group was sent to the Ashmolean Museum as "Group 4." In the "Journal," 28 November-5 December Petrie mentions not only the early group, but also, in other finds, "swivel" razors and eye beads. Both of these occur in the later group.

5. Note that Petrie also has a "Find 5," IKG, pl. 20.1 and 2. This discovery was reported in the "Journal," for 28 November-5 December, 1889. It is not clear if a "find" is different from a "group."

6. Unknown.

7. Group 7, IKG, pl. 20.7-15. Objects are listed by Griffith in the Manchester catalogue from both "Group 7" (p. 63) and "Find 7" (p. 75).

8. Unknown.
9. *JEG*, p. 19, pl. 20.3 (saience bowl) - UC 16049. Thomas\(^5\) says: "Found with burnt pottery under the floor of a house....Found with Egyptian and Aegean pottery; a blue glass bottle, two pottery models of trussed fowls."

**Otherwise Unknown Groups**

1. Thomas reports another Burnt Group, "X," found in the Petrie Museum at University College London. It was comprised of eight vases, including two LH III B stirrup jars.\(^6\)

2. Thomas,\(^7\) has two groups "Found Together."
APPENDIX 5: ENDNOTES

1 This is pl. 23.96, which is marked "blue ring found with Mykenae pot."

2 Also see Notebook 39B, p. 37: list of dated finds: "Gk. pot. found w/ring of XVIII in grave." On p. 34 Petrie described "one burial in mid town" that seems to be this find.

3 There seems to be a mention of this in Petrie, Methods, p. 152.

4 This ring might be from the tomb group on KGH, pl. 24.6-12, and p. 40.

5 Thomas, Gurob, p. 48, pls. 11, 46, no. 236.

6 Thomas, Gurob, pp. 44-45, pl. 8 nos. UC 16626, 16631-16637.

7 Gurob, p. 91.

"An exposed section cut by recent construction was visible in the approximate center of the southernmost of the twin structures. The actual layer of occupation debris was quite thin all over the area of the palace as noted in other exposures. The shard material appeared to be of 18th Dyn. date; however, decorated wares were notably absent. The types consisted mostly of bowls, jar stands, amphorae and beer jugs.

Two separate levels of occupation debris were visible; the lower is founded on a bed of cleft pebbles. Above this is a dense sand deposit capped by sand and fallen mudbrick debris. The bricks average 90 X 10 X 7 cm. in size. At the northern end of the enclosure a mud brick pavement was visible."
On January 1, 1983 Peter Lacovara, of the Egyptian Department, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, visited the site. With his kind permission, his report is cited here in full.

"The site was 'demilitarized' just last year. Bunkers, silos and other structures have been cut through or built over the palace and surrounding area. A long line of "dumps" is situated to the [East?] of the palace between it and the water. They appear very regular but it is difficult to tell whether they are excavator's dumps, ancient refuse dumps or the remains of an enclosure wall.

"An exposed section cut by recent construction was visible in the approximate center of the southernmost of the twin structures. The actual layer of occupation debris was quite thin all over the area of the palace as noted in other exposures. The sherd material appeared to be of 18th Dyn. date; however, decorated wares were notably absent. The types consisted mostly of bowls, jar stands, amphorae and 'beer jars.'

"Two separate levels of occupation debris were visible; the lowest is founded on a bed of 'clean' gebel sand. Above this is a dense sherd deposit capped by sand and fallen mudbrick debris. The bricks average ca. 20 X 10 X 7 cms. in size. At the northern end of the enclosure a mud brick pavement was visible."
Musell readings were: Gebel - 7.5 YR 8/6
Occupation Debris - 7.5 YR 5/2
Grey Clay - 7.5 YR 7/2

Comment:
The section comes from the more mysterious South Enclosure and is the only real archaeological information yet available for it. There were two occupation strata but Lacovara (personal communication, March 10, 1991) "could not say from this that this represents two different phases of occupation." As the pottery all seems to belong to Dyn. 18, it may well be that the strata both belong to the "palace period," which would support Kemp's theory of a single-occupation site founded on the bare gebel. It might also be that the lowest level could be pre-Tuthmosis III, and so pre-palace, which would make it likely that the upper level should belong to that occupation. What seems to be clear, however, is that there probably was not a 19th Dynasty settlement in this area. Note that charcoal was observed in the upper occupation stratum, which may indicate that this is the surface that Borchardt saw exposed. Mr. Lacovara "noted charcoal, but not enough to say one way or the other about burning." The layer with dense potsherds (C) may possibly be connected with the sherd area that Brunton and Engelbach saw (see Brunton and Engelbach, *Gurob*, pl. 1).
## Appendix 7: The Absolute Chronology of the New Kingdom

### Certain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1405/02-1367/63</td>
<td>7.6. 1402-Aug. 1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1368/63-1351/45</td>
<td>Aug. 1364-Feb. 1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>1351/45-1342/36</td>
<td>Feb. 1347-Beg. 1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamun</td>
<td>1342/36-1337/31</td>
<td>Beg. 1338-1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1337/31-1307/01</td>
<td>1334-End 1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1307/01-1306/00</td>
<td>End 1306-Beg. 1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1306/00-1290</td>
<td>Beg. 1304-2.6.1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1290-1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>June/Nov. 1290-</td>
<td>3.6.1290-12.7.1224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Probable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1386-1349</td>
<td>1382-1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350-1334</td>
<td>1352-1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336-1334</td>
<td>1338-1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334-1325</td>
<td>1336-1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324-1321</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321-1293</td>
<td>1323-1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293-1291</td>
<td>1295-1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1291-Sept. 1279</td>
<td>1294-1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1279-(July) 1212</td>
<td>1289-Sept. 1279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Certain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>reign</th>
<th>alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1402-1364</td>
<td>1391-1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1364-1347</td>
<td>1353-1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>1347-1338</td>
<td>1336-1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamun</td>
<td>1337-1333</td>
<td>1326-1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1333-1306</td>
<td>1322-1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1306-1304</td>
<td>1295-1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1304-1290</td>
<td>1293-1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1290-1224</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Probable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1401-1363</td>
<td>1382-1344</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363-1347</td>
<td>1352-1336</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349-1347</td>
<td>1338-1336</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347-1338</td>
<td>1336-1327</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338-1334</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334-1306</td>
<td>1323-1295</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306-1305</td>
<td>1295-1294</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305-1290</td>
<td>1294-1279</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290-1224</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1390-1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1353-1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankhetkheperure</td>
<td>1336-1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>1335-1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Tutankhamun]</td>
<td>[1332-1323]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1332-1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1319-1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1292-1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1290-1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1379-1340</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340-1324</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324-1319</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319-1309</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309-1305</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305-1293</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293-1291</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291-1279</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279-1213</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kitchen, *HML*, 1, p. 52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Unitary</th>
<th>Coregency</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1390-1352</td>
<td>1382-1344</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1352-1336</td>
<td>1352-1336</td>
<td>16; 8 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>1338-1336</td>
<td>2 CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamun</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1323-1295</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1295-1294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1294-1279</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Unitary</th>
<th>Coregency</th>
<th>Yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenhotep III</td>
<td>1391-1353</td>
<td>1383-1345</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhenaten</td>
<td>1353-1337</td>
<td>1353-1337</td>
<td>16, 8 CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smenkhkare</td>
<td>1338-1336</td>
<td>2 CR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutankhamun</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ay</td>
<td>1327-1323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horemheb</td>
<td>1323-1295</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses I</td>
<td>1295-1294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seti I</td>
<td>1294-1279</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesses II</td>
<td>1279-1213</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Amon-Re Khamutef: 234
Aniba: 464
Apiy, Tomb of (Riqqeh): 69
Archaeology: 155 fn. 172, 156 fn. 175, 162 fn. 205
Archaeological technique: development of: 14 f.
Aten: 268
Ay: 169
Bahr Yusef: 1, 224
Bakenamun: 234
Beads: 123, 251, 350-54, 470, 479
Faience: Cartouche-shaped: 72, 83 ff., 348 f., 453, 458, 462
Glass: Eye: 86, 164, 351, 472, 478, 490
Yellow tube: 164
Ben Itjen: 255
Beth Shan: 138
Bones (lack of in Burnt Groups): 124, 139 ff.
Bubastis (Tell Basta): 61
Budge, E.A. Wallis: 41
Burning: 125, 129, 130 ff.
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Corpses: 124, 127, 139, 163 ff.
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Deir 'Alla: 138, 270, 464
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Deir el Ballas: 142
Deir el Medina: 57, 59, 137, 148, 264, 271, 464
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  *Penannular: 82 f., 366-73*
  *Tube and Boss: 81 f., 374, 375*
El-Lahun (see Illahun): 1, 9
Enkomi: 420
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   Bowls: 59 f., 123, 132, 143, 330, 478, 479, 490, 491
   Kohl tube: 57 f., 328, 418, 423, 441, 458, 462
   Manufacture: 251 f.
   "Situlae" jars: 329
   Vessels: 331

Fayum: 1, 171
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   Amarna: 264, 258
   Greek colonies in Egypt: 12
   Theban Tombs: 426, 424, 437 ff.

Foundation deposits: 153, 166

Fouqué: 451

Furtwängler, W.: 8 f.

Glass: 420 ff., 491
   Amphoriskos: 77 f., 342 f., 346 f.
   Flask: 71 ff., 123, 340 f., 478
   Krateriskos: 77, 79, 344 f.
   Manufacturing: 252

Granaries: 133

Grebaut: 469

Bronze (Gurob): 143, 227, 478
Bowl: 133
Bucket: 133
Cup: 230
Knife (for butchering): 235 f., 471
Knife: 472, 578
Needles: 133
Razor: 133, 477, 478, 490
Vase: 74-5

Gurob:

Cemeteries: 1, 130, 162, 163, 186, 188ff, 240
Chassinet’s Tomb: 231
Groups, Finds:
   Find 3 (Petrie)- Furumark 2: 22 f., 28, 49 ff., 149, 165 (Tomb 31), 272 f., 484, 485, 486
   Find Group (Furumark) 4: 24 f., 184, 473, 483 f.
   Find Group (Furumark) 5 - Petrie’s Group 7: 25, 28, 73 ff., 77 f., 272, 490
   Group 9: 489
History of site: 1 ff.
North Town: 147, 149 f., 152, 163, 191, 213, 227
Northern Enclosure: 164 f.
Southern Enclosure: 164 f.
Tomb 3: 51 f.
Tomb 5 (Nebweben): 74
Tomb 6: 162
Tomb 20: 139
Tomb 22: 26 f.
Tomb 23 ("Res"): 25 ff., 29, 32, 184, 257, 271, 461, 466, 474, 483, 485, 486
Tomb 31: 165 f., 227, 487
Tomb 37: 230
Tomb 48: 189
Tomb 070: 67
Tomb 217: 139
Tomb 245: 139
Tomb 245: 263
Tomb 276: 139
Tomb 293: 139
Tomb 445: 80
Tomb 473: 71
Tomb 473: 162
Tomb 474: 163
Tomb 475: 163
Tomb 605: 27 f., 29, 263
Tomb 705 F: 68, 69, 77
Tomb N: 179, 185, 192 fn. 4, 487 (North Town)
Tomb P: 179
Town: 70
Hagios Onouphrios: 425
Harim: 154, 224 ff., 240, 251 f.

Hawara: 9, 225, 470

Heuzey: 436

Hierakonpolis: 171

Hissarlik: 451

Hittites: 254, 435 ff.

Horemheb: 160, 161, 169, 258, 262, 266, 268, 269, 270, 436, 469

Hughes-Hughes: 10, 11, 122 f., 144, 145, 149, 151, 152, 160, 168, 175 f.,
229, 233, 476 ff., 489

Huy: 231

Hyksos: 1

Illahun (see Lahun): 1, 9, 151, 155, 464, 469, 470, 476

Intresha: 178, 183, 224, 231, 254, 465

Jewellery: 132, 347-75

Kahun: 9, 11

Kahun: 75, 142, 148, 423, 425, 442, 444, 476, 478, 479, 486

Kahun: Maket Tomb: 69, 423, 424, 436, 439, 442, 443, 452 f., 459, 484, 487

Kamares: pottery: 14

Kamose: 436

Karnak: 268

Khuenaten: see under Akhenaten

King's Valley, Thebes: Tomb 55: 84

Kom Rabia: 264, 266, 271

Kruger: 469

Loat: 125, 176, 230, 232, 234, 237
Loeschcke: 8 f.
Lotus: *Nymphaea caerulea* Savigny: 59
Lotus: *Nymphaea lotus* L.: 59
Maahronefrure (Hittite wife of Ramesses II): 254
Malkata: 161, 170
Mehyt: 234
Menkheper: 231
Merneptah: 151, 155, 255, 270, 415, 429, 442
Meryre: 231
Mesopotamia: 462
Mi-Wer: 135, 156, 158, 224, 230, 231, 232, 236, 237, 238, 254
Military: cavalry elite: 269
Moeris: 225
Murray: 14
Mut: 234
Mycenae: 10, 424, 426, 430, 434 ff., 444, 448, 450, 451, 452, 466
Nagada: 426
Naucratis: 427
Nebamun: 233 f., 470
Nebmaatre-meryamun (Ramesses VI): 181
Neferetmut: 234
Nefermenew: 224, 231
Netting needles: 470, 477
Ointment containers: 62 ff., 64, 70
Olive Oil: 429
Onuris: 234
Orchomenos: 9
Papyrus: 226 ff., 239, 474, 475
Papyrus: Kahun: 228
Papyrus: Ramesses II: 226, 228
Papyrus: uninscribed, with king's figure: 227, 477
Parenna: 164
Pendants: amuletic: 85 f., 355, 356, 357, 358
Pendants: cornflowers (pomegranates): 85, 87, 350, 351
Per Wesirmaatre-meryamun: 230
Per-henret: 232, 238
Petrie, William Finders:
  Date for Gurob: 9 ff., 12, 14
  Gurob, first season: 9 f., 49, 51, 121 f., 148 ff., 160, 168, 179, 226 ff.,
     232, 469-476
  Gurob, second season: 10, 11, 50, 122 ff., 156, 174 ff., 227, 229, 233,
     476-80
  Reward system: 174
  Torr controversy: 275 f., 434 ff.
  Typology of stirrup jars: 11, 12, 47 f., 414 f., 426 f.
Phoenician pottery & glass (so-called): 458, 478
Phyrgia: 430
Pinudjem: Tomb of his grandson: 13, 14, 424, 437, 439 454 ff.
Plato: 421
Poros: 258, 466
Potsherds covering (Burnt Groups): 479
Pottery
  Cypriote: 186, 227, 464, 473, 485
  Egyptian: 55 ff., 75 f., 123 f., 132, 146, 165 f., 182, 266 f., 470, 491
    Marl: 55 f., 57, 323 ff., 327
    Nile Silt: 56, 326
    Tankard: 73, 74, 166
Palestinian: 464
Philistine: 465
Style: 8, 435
Mycenaean:
  Amarna: 258, 259 ff., 267, 418, 436, 438, 443
  Contents: 264 f.
  Economic value: 264 ff.
  Egyptian imitations: 490
FM 18: 184
FM 19: 46
FM 27: 47
FS 166: 46, 303 f.
FS 170: 272
FS 171: 22 ff., 43 ff., 184, 259
FS 173: 22
FS 178: 25, 28, 185, 307-10, 315-18
FS 180: 52, 299 f., 305 f., 311-14, 319 f.
FS 182: 27, 258, 260
FS 183: 24, 47 ff., 54, 321 f., 426, 488
FS 186: 53, 301 f.
FS 188: 271
FS 189: 267, 272
FS 190: 271
FS 195: 25
Gurob: chronological significance: 2, 21 ff.
Gurob: dipinti: 253
LH III A: 2: 184
LH III B: 184
Simple Style: 53, 301, 426, 490
Stratified: 270 ff.
Ptah of Memphis: 234
Qantir: 264
Ramesses III: tomb: 9, 424, 437, 441, 442, 447, 450, 453, 456
Ramesses IV: 156, 157, 159, 156 fn. 175
Ramesses V: 157
Ramesses VI: 181
Re-Horakhty of Heliopolis: 234
Rhodes: 426, 452
Cameiros: 421
Rings:
Faience; 80, 359, 356
Metal: 81
Stone: 80 f., 360-64
Riqqeh: 60, 69
Ritual "killing" of objects: 128, 227
Rubbish Pits: 133 ff.
Rubensohn, Dr.: 125
Sadiami: 254
Saqqara: 75, 270
Teti Pyramid: 263
Sayce: 2, 9 f., 435 f., 474 f.
Scarabs: 351
Collecting: 471
Schliemann, H.: 2, 8, 10, 12
Sedment: 464
Sesostris II: 14
Seti I: 30, 32, 161, 27, 271, 477, 479
Seti II (see under Burnt Group): 157, 159, 168, 254, 441, 461, 466
Seti: 230, 235, 473
Shabtis: 182, 231, 475, 487
Lack of in Burnt Groups: 140
She resy: 225, 231
She: 169, 224 ff., 231, 237, 254
Sherrat: 274
Smenkhkare: 262
Spindles: 470
Spinning: 231
Stelae: 233 ff., 470, 471
Stone: 85 f., 477, 486
  Bowls: 70f, 338 f.
  Fish: 66 ff., 337
  Flask: 69 f. 333 f.
  Jar: 335
  Mortar: 68 f., 336.
  Tankard: 73 f.
  Tazza: 73 f.
Stratigraphy (Gurob): 135, 146, 154, 157, 167 ff., 172, 185, 190, 236, 472, 486, 493 ff.
Sul: 231
Syria: 462
Taphonomy: 267 f.
Tell el Farah: 464
Tell el Yahudiyeh: 424, 427, 441
Tell el-Ajjul: 31, 257
Tell es-Sadiyeh: 138, 464
   Interior walls: 170 f., 173, 238
   Length of use: 168 ff.
Montuhotep, Theban Tomb of: 171
Thera: see under Chronology
Thread: 470
Tiy: 231
   Amphoriskos: 161, 477
   Staff head: 477
   Wooden head: 125, 256
   Offering table: 152, 233, 478
   Scarabs: 424, 436
Torr: 13, 14, 256, 275 f., 434 ff.
Trade: International: 252, 253, 429
Trojan War: 8
Troy: 451
Tsountas: 12
Tutankhamun (see under Burnt Group): 84, 155, 169, 178, 257 ff., 262, 418, 421, 464, 466, 479, 486
Tuthmosis III: 1, 149, 150, 151 f., 154, 159, 162 f., 191, 233, 238, 417, 421, 426, 428, 429, 453
Deified: 234, 235

Tuthmosis IV: 234

Waset: 230

Weaving: 251, 254

Wedjat Eye: 350, 355, 356, 357

Wesirmaatreemheb: 230

Wood: 123, 132, 470, 479

$ka$-figures: 183 ff., 185, 251

Workmen's Village: 169, 188, 239, 240