

Deposit f (nos. 15121–15567) in the Obelisk Temple at Byblos: Artefact mobility in the Middle Bronze Age I–II (1850–1650 BC) between Egypt and the Levant

Gianluca Miniaci

Abstract

Deposit f (nos. 15121–15567), found in the sanctuary of the Obelisk Temple at Byblos, remained –unexpectedly– rather underrated in Egyptological and Near East studies, lying in a ‘no-man’s-land’ straddling between Egypt and the Levant. Notwithstanding, it includes a high number of key objects over a total of 455 artefacts for understanding Middle Bronze Age I–II (1850–1650 BC) Egyptian material culture in contact. Three main questions remain open: the dating of this deposit; the type of deposit; and the material production of its objects, whether they were manufactured in Egypt and imported or locally produced. The deposit includes also a vast array of faience figurines (294) typically manufactured in the (late) Middle Kingdom Egypt. Through a preliminary analysis, mainly based on the published material, the paper aims at providing a more comprehensive picture of the archaeological context of the deposit, including the nature of the artefacts placed in it. In particular, the corpus of faience figurines seem to have been manufactured in Egypt and imported in the Levant as a result of the frequent relations between the two areas during the Middle Bronze Age.

The so-called ‘Temple of the Obelisks’¹ is located in the heart of the ancient city of Byblos, southeast of a sacred well, which groups together two other major religious complexes: the Balaat-Gebal Temple (‘The Lady of Byblos’) on the north-west and the *Enceinte Sacrée*² on the west. The ‘Temple of the Obelisks’ was erected at the dawn of the second millennium BC over the ruins of an older temple, dated to the third millennium BC, usually referred as ‘L-shaped Temple’.³ The Obelisk Temple closely follows the outline of this earlier structure, partially reusing its blocks, architectural elements, and foundations. In particular, the sanctuary of the second millennium temple was erected over building XIV of the L-Temple complex. The name ‘Temple of the Obelisks’ was given by scholars to the second millennium complex in order to differentiate it from the third millennium structure and refers mainly to the exceptional number of obelisks brought to light in its courtyard. However, it should be noted that obelisks were employed in the foundations of the second millennium temple, as well as in the threshold of the sanctuary; therefore it cannot be excluded that some obelisks were already used in the third millennium structure.⁴ Hence, the designation ‘Obelisk Temple’ adopted to indicate only the MBA complex is not particularly accurate. The discovery of figurines in bronze evoking the iconography of Resheph⁵ in the layers of this temple have led modern scholars to believe that it may have been devoted to the god of war, death, and plague.⁶ The deposit nos. 15121–15567,⁷ found in the sanctuary of the

¹ SAGHIEH 1983, 1.

² SALA 2007, 51–58.

³ JIDEJIAN 1968, 20–21.

⁴ Other obelisks are re-used in the pavement and walls of the second millennium BC building, JIDEJIAN 1968, 36.

⁵ The assumption that Resheph was the main deity of the temple is mainly based on a misinterpretation of the Egyptian god Herishef with Resheph, see LIPÍŃSKI 1995, 67–8; LIPÍŃSKI 2009, 219; SALLES 1998, 70.

⁶ SCANDONE MATTHIAE 1981, 61–80. *Contra* see XELLA 1994, 197; MÜNNICH 2013.

⁷ The group of objects was published by DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 741–781; vol. I, pls. 93–113. In the description of the group (p. 741) and in the following references, Dunand labelled it 15121–15566. However,

Obelisk Temple, remained –unexpectedly– rather underrated in Egyptological studies,⁸ lying in a ‘no-man’s-land’ between Egypt and the Levant.⁹ This is unfortunate as it includes a high number of key objects, including an unparalleled large assemblage of figurines in faience, from which it is possible to draw a more accurate picture of the material culture of Middle Bronze Age Egypt and its contacts with external areas.¹⁰

The archaeological context of the deposit *f* (items nos. 15121–15567)

The Obelisk Temple (see **Fig. 01**) comprised an external trapezoidal forecourt and an antechamber situated before an approximately square court enclosing the sanctuary. Groups of obelisks made of limestone and sandstone occupied the square court; they were found fallen, standing, or reused inside architectonic features of the building, such as walls, thresholds, and floors. The largest batch of obelisks (26) were found still standing in the south-western part of the square court, erected on rectangular or square bases and following an irregular alignment. The sanctuary stands in the center of the square court, erected upon a platform. It is divided into two halves: an irregular square *cella* (sanctuary) on the west and a rectangular *pro-cella* (antechamber/courtyard) on the east. The main element in the *cella* is a stone pedestal, which may once have supported a monumental cult object. The *pro-cella* is divided into three parts, a central flagstone pathway leading to the *cella* and two tiny irregular antechambers to the right and to the left of this passage. On the right of the pathway is the base for an obelisk; while on the left of this passage, on slightly higher ground, are several aligned rectangular niches, which were probably used for offerings.¹¹ In the *pro-cella* two large deposits of objects were uncovered:

1. Deposit nos. 15121–15567 located in a pit beneath huge paving stone slabs of the north-eastern corner of the room (see plan in Fig. 01);
2. Deposit nos. 14560–14607 located in a pit dug in the south-western corner and covered by stone slabs which formed the floor of the room.¹²

Six other deposits of objects were uncovered in the whole Obelisk Temple complex.¹³ Several objects found in these offering caches belong to or show influence from Mesopotamian, Aegean, Egyptian and Anatolian traditions. In particular, deposit 15121–15567 consisted of a large number of different objects, for a total of 455 artefacts. The vast majority of these artefacts are represented by a homogeneous corpus of 294 faience miniature models representing human beings, animals, hybrid creatures, fruits, vegetables and inanimate objects, such as jars and vessels. Another representative category from this deposit are 90 figurines (88 human beings and 2 horned bovinds)¹⁴ made of bronze or copper alloy found in a pottery vessel “*ce pot à moitié rempli d’un magma de bronze, compact, formé par quatre-vingt-dix figurines amalgamées les unes aux autres par l’oxidation [...] (nos 15477 à*

the last object included in the group is no. 15567 (‘*trouvés parmi les figurines précédentes*’, DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 781).

⁸ Cf. PINCH 1993, 79.

⁹ WEINSTEIN 2001.

¹⁰ WEIN 1963, 21–25.

¹¹ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 644–645, fig. 767.

¹² DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 741–766, esp. 741, fig. 767; SAGHIEH 1983, 19–20.

¹³ JIDEJIAN 1968, 38.

¹⁴ Some are nudes with emphasized sexual attributes, some wearing a short kilt, helmet or conical cap; some are equipped with one or two sticks, a weapon or a missing item, cf. ARUZ, BENZEL and EVANS 2008, 52–53, cat. no. 23; cf. NEGBI 1976, 17, fig. 20.

15566 [sic]”.¹⁵ Other objects belonging to this deposit include models made of stone (mainly human beings); toilet vessels in alabaster; cuboid rods in steatite (?)¹⁶ with the usual small animals pegged on the top of them; tablets and beads; boxes; and pottery vessels of different shapes and sizes (see list in the *Appendix*).¹⁷

Three main issues are connected with this deposit and in general also with every other large deposit found at Byblos: a) the dating, b) the type of deposit, and c) the production place of the objects contained in it. However, since most of the objects from deposit 15121–15567 are closely related to the material culture of late Middle Kingdom Egypt –especially the faience figurines,¹⁸ which are typical of Egypt and rarely known outside Egypt and Nubia–¹⁹ a closer analysis of the diagnostic objects allows for a reassessment of issues *a-c* above.

a. Dating:²⁰ One of the main issues is that Maurice Dunand, who supervised the excavations in Byblos from 1928 to 1970s, failed to provide a clear stratigraphy. Dunand excavated the whole city in rigid horizontal levels (‘levées’) of 20 cm: therefore, the whole stratigraphy of Byblos is based on 42 arbitrary horizontal removals each of 20 cm (*levées* I–XLII), descending from 28 m (the peak of the rocky ridge west of the Baalat-Gebal temple) down to 19.60 m (virgin soil) above sea level.²¹ Therefore, the absence of a traditional stratigraphic methodology has made it extremely difficult to assemble all the finds together in a coherent, sequential sequence. The highly problematic nature of the stratigraphy has forced scholars to combine type of finds with architectonic features in order to tentatively reconstruct correct chronological sequences.²² As for the Temple of the Obelisks (‘area I–unit G’), Muntaha Saghieh attempted a detailed reconstruction of the third millennium levels²³ and identified 6 phases of use (see [Fig. 02](#)):

- *Phases 1–2*: Phases 1–2 (ca. 2600 BC, corresponding to the Egyptian Third and Fourth Dynasties) mainly relate to the first construction of the L-shaped Temple in the eastern part of the complex, and other scattered traces of architectural activities;²⁴
- *Phase 3*: Only in phase 3 (ca. after 2200 BC, corresponding to the end of the reign of Pepi II onwards, end of the Sixth Dynasty) was building XIV constructed on the top of which the sanctuary of the second millennium temple would be erected (see phases 4–6). Building XIV in phase 3 consisted of three *cellae in antis* aligned on an eastwards axis;²⁵

¹⁵ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 775.

¹⁶ Dunand described the object as ‘*calcaire metamorphique*’ (see below n. 49).

¹⁷ A description and a selection of images/drawings in DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 741–781; vol. I, pls. 93–113.

¹⁸ MINIACI 2018a.

¹⁹ For the Levant see below n. 126–129. Other sites in the Near East may attest a similar use of faience figurines in the EBA–MBA. For instance, the graves 5–6, 8, 11, 17 of Assur in the Ur III period (ca. 2112–2004 BC) contained animal models and a small bowl of faience (HALLER 1954, 8–9); nonetheless the style is non-Egyptian. For Syria see MAZZONI 1987, 69, fig. 3 (Ebla). Faience animal miniatures in the Near East are privileged in the form of pendant amulets rather than three-dimensional figures, see MOOREY 1999, 175.

²⁰ I adopted the ‘Low Chronology’ concerning the Levant in this paper: MB I = ±1900–±1710 BC, MB I/II = ±1710–±1680 BC; MB II = ±1680–±1580 BC; MB III = ±1580–±1500 BC, based on BIETAK 2002 and HÖFLMAYER, KAMLAH, SADER, DEE and KUTSCHERA 2016. See also the volume edited by BIETAK, CZERNY 2008. For Egyptian synchronization, late Middle Kingdom approximately corresponds to the mid-MB I (1850/1800 BC) and MB I/II (1680 BC); Second Intermediate Period starts more or less around the MB II, in 1650 BC and ends with the late MB III, in 1550 BC.

²¹ LAUFFRAY 1995.

²² FINKBEINER 1981.

²³ SAGHIEH 1975 and 1983.

²⁴ SAGHIEH 1983, 15–16.

²⁵ SAGHIEH 1983, 16–18.

- *Phase 4*: At the end of phase 3, a fire appears to have ravaged the temple and a thick layer of ash covered the ruins.²⁶ The exact extent of the phase of abandonment of the site is unknown, but after phase 3 a new sanctuary was built over the ruins of the third millennium BC building XIV and, although its external layout substantially remained unchanged, its internal structure underwent some significant transformations: the three *cellae* of the former sanctuary were replaced by a hypaethral (open to the sky) sanctuary built on an elevated podium, partitioned with a *cella* and *pro-cella*.²⁷ The construction of this sanctuary belongs to phase 4, which can be placed around the beginning of the second millennium BC. A lapis lazuli cylinder seal found near the floor (in terms of Dunand's levels at 24.60 m above sea level) of the phase 4 sanctuary²⁸ represents one of the key finds, dating between the Ur III phase and the early First Babylonian Dynasty (2112–1800 BC);²⁹
- *Phases 5–6*: In phases 5–6 the temple continued to be used with little change from the previous phase (4) and its architecture remained substantially the same; it probably continued running its activities without interruption. In terms of Dunand's levels, phases 5 and 6 occupy the layers formed between 24.80 m and 25.20 m above sea level. A chronological anchor for phases 5–6 is provided by the find of a limestone obelisk placed against the northern wall of the sanctuary³⁰ bearing the following hieroglyphic inscription in two columns: '11 *Beloved of Herishef, Abi-shemu, prince of Byblos, renewed in life* 121 [...] *Kukun, son of Rwwq (the Lycian) justified*'.³¹ A prince of Byblos called Abi-shemu has often been identified with a contemporary of Amenemhat III (1842–1797 BC), through the occurrence of his name on one of the artefacts from royal tomb II at Byblos, which gives: Yapi-shemu-abu, son of Abi-shemu. Due to the occurrence in the same archaeological context of an item bearing the name of Amenemhat III, Abi-shemu has been synchronized with the reign of this pharaoh and his son, Yapi-shemu-abu, with that of his successor, Amenemhat IV.³² Although such a synchronism is not always accepted,³³ in general, the materials from phases 5–6 of the temple can be linked with objects found in royal tombs I–III, whose burial equipment are dated to ca. 1850–1550 BC (from late Middle Kingdom, reign of Amenemhat III, to Hyksos Period, i.e. Fifteenth Dynasty).³⁴

The deposit 15121–15567 lay between 24.40m and 24.60m above sea level (*levée XVIII*), according to Dunand's division of artificial horizontal levels, and is located just below the floor of phase 4 and therefore included in the late third millennium layers (see **Fig. 03**). However, no objects inside this deposit seem to date earlier than the EB IV (2100–2000 BC), but all stylistically and typologically belong to the first half of the second millennium. This has led scholars to suppose that deposit 15121–15567 represented an intrusive cut of MBA activities into the third millennium levels, as the stone slabs of the floor could have been easily removed in order to accommodate a group of objects into a pit. The second millennium Obelisk Temple (phases 4–6) seems to have been in use almost throughout the whole of the

²⁶ SAGHIEH 1983, 16–17.

²⁷ SAGHIEH 1983, 18.

²⁸ DUNAND 1937–39, vol. II, 313, no. 4183; vol. I, pl. 34.

²⁹ DOSSIN 1969, 248–250; MOORTGAT 1969, 68–69.

³⁰ Beirut, National Museum, DGA 17917; DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 878, no. 16980; vol. I, pl. 32:2. Photo in ANONYMOUS 1998, 68.

³¹ ALBRIGHT 1959, 33 (whose dating to around the early Twelfth Dynasty is too high).

³² MONTET 1928, 174 f.; ALBRIGHT 1964, 39, 43.

³³ The identification of Abi-shemu with the person living in the years of Amenemhat III/IV is far from being definitively proven, see KOPETZKY 2016; AHRENS 2011a, 35.

³⁴ SCHIESTL 2007, 265–271; KOPETZKY 2015, 393–412; MOURAD 2015, 168–169; see discussion in KOPETZKY 2016 and KOPETZKY forthcoming.

Middle Bronze Age, from ca. 2000 BC to 1550 BC (in terms of Egyptian chronology, from the Middle Kingdom to the beginning of the Second Intermediate Period, *i.e.* Twelfth–Fifteenth/Seventeenth Dynasties).³⁵ Although the chronological limits of deposit 15121–15567 can be broadly defined, the time range of ca. 450 years proposed is probably too great even for a deposit (for the type of deposit see below, issue *b*) which may contain materials ranging from different and extended time-spans; at least, part of the deposit was amassed there at a single point in time.³⁶ For the faience (and the bronze) figurines, Dunand was explicit in his belief of their chronological synchronism: *i.e.* that all these objects had been placed in the deposit on a single occasion: “*Il a été rencontré une masse compacte immédiatement au-dessous d’une grosse dalle du sol de la pro-cella du Temple aux obélisques [...]. Ces pâtes émaillées paraissent avoir été enfouies toutes en même temps et forment un lot homogène. Presque toutes les figurines de bronze sont désespérément identiques les unes aux autres. L’enfouissement de ces deux séries d’objets relève apparemment d’une seule et même cérémonie*”.³⁷

Redefining a. Dating:

The group of the faience figurines may offer a more secure chronological base. This particular type of figurine, made in faience with a distinctive glaze and representing a range of themes, is characteristic of 1850–1650 BC Egypt and occasionally found outside the country itself. The only exceptions where significant quantities of figures have been found outside Egypt are Byblos and Kerma (and a few isolated cases in lower Nubia, Syria (?), and the Levant).³⁸ Although a few examples can be placed in the early/mid Middle Kingdom (2000–1850 BC), a case-by-case analysis of the Egyptian faience figurines in context indicates that over 90.2%³⁹ is associated with diagnostic materials of the late Middle Kingdom (1850–1650 BC).⁴⁰ The range is even narrower for those cases where it is possible to provide a more precise chronological anchor of 1800–1700 BC. In the early Second Intermediate Period (1650–1600 BC), faience figurines are very rarely attested in Egypt and seem to be used as a sort of ‘legacy’ from the previous generation, since they are usually deposited broken, pierced, or reworked.⁴¹ By the end of the Second Intermediate Period (1550 BC), faience figurines completely disappear from documented archaeological contexts⁴² and are no longer visible in the material culture of Egypt; new types of faience figurines using a different technical composition, method of manufacture, and motifs were introduced in the New Kingdom Egypt.⁴³ Outside Egypt, a number of faience figurines close in shape and type with those of late Middle Kingdom Egypt were found in the tumuli of Kerma, which date between the early Second Intermediate Period and the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty, ca. 1650–1500 BC.⁴⁴

Other artefacts from the deposit contain dating elements that point to a late Middle Kingdom (1850–1650 BC) date for the main deposit of objects in the *pro-cella*:

³⁵ BOU-ASSAF 2008, 54, fig. 1; PINNOCK 2007, 125–126; NEGBI 1976, 130.

³⁶ Cf. SALA 2007, 49; FINKBEINER 1981, 13–69.

³⁷ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 953.

³⁸ MINIACI 2018a. For the Levant examples, see below n. 126–129; for Syria see MAZZONI 1987, 69. However, Nubian material culture was heavily influenced by Egypt especially in the late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period, BOURRIAU 2001, 10.

³⁹ This statistic excludes the examples from Byblos.

⁴⁰ MINIACI 2018a. Cf. also KEMP, MERRILLEES 1980, 165–174.

⁴¹ MINIACI 2018a. See for instance the case of the truncated-leg female figurine found in the tomb 3248 at Mostagedda, BRUNTON 1937, 120, pl. LXXI.3248

⁴² MINIACI 2018c.

⁴³ PINCH 1993.

⁴⁴ MINIACI 2018a; LACOVARA 1987, 51–74.

- The bag-shaped jar (no. 15476), in which the bronze figurines were found, has a wide aperture and a flat base of a type attested at Avaris and at Sidon in the late MB I phase (1800–1700 BC);⁴⁵ similar bag-shaped jars were produced in Egypt from around the time of Amenemhat III (ca. 1850–1800 BC)⁴⁶ to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (1700 BC).⁴⁷
- The funnel-shaped bowls with in-turned rim (no. 15743) in the Levantine and Syrian area are not attested before MB I (1800 BC), when carinated bowls gave way to a large diffusion of in-turned rim bowls with slightly concave walls and sometimes a disk base. This type of bowl is well documented in a closed context of the late MB I: Favissa F.5238 at Tell Mardikh.⁴⁸
- The steatite (?)⁴⁹ seal no. 15378⁵⁰ representing a seated human figure with a long garment on a base inscribed with a decorative coil pattern and an inscription reading: *imy-r pr, Wsir anx-nfr; ‘estate overseer, the Osiris Ankhnefer’* is typical of the late Middle Kingdom Egyptian seal production,⁵¹ although both the name and the title are rather unusual (see below, issue c).
- The steatite/limestone (?) figurine of a standing human figure with lion’s mane and ears, usually identified with Aha/Bes, no. 15377⁵² (see Fig. 04) represents a typical motif from Egyptian material culture that appeared during the late Middle Kingdom. Although already attested in a few instances during the Old Kingdom,⁵³ three-dimensional representations of the Aha/Bes entity are unknown before 1800 BC.⁵⁴ However, the stylistic features of no. 15377, with large facial features (eyes, nose and mouth) and pronounced musculature, are comparable with none of the examples found in Egypt, but with an ivory openwork inlay from Alaca Höyük found during the 1936 excavations in Anatolia.⁵⁵ The object is dated by the excavator to a very approximate early second millennium BC (“*in the deepest layer of the Hittite period*”).⁵⁶
- The steatite (?) cuboid rod(s) (probably part of a single object), nos. 15462–15463,⁵⁷ and nos. 15379–15383 (see Fig. 05) surmounted by small pegged animal figurines in the same material, finds an almost identical parallel with the glazed steatite cuboid rod MMA 26.7.1275a–j.⁵⁸ The long sides of both artefacts bear motifs in raised relief, showing a baboon with a flaming torch and a *wedjat*-eye, a crocodile, a striding lion and a wild cat; the short sides are decorated with the representation of a round-eared animal. Both rods have on their upper part a row of three-dimensional animals secured by pegs representing turtles, lions, frogs, and crocodiles. Unfortunately, MMA 26.7.1275a–j is unprovenanced,

⁴⁵ BADER 2003, 34, fig. 4; BADER, FORSTNER-MÜLLER, KOPETZKY, and DOUMET-SERHAL 2009, fig. 1.

⁴⁶ BADER, FORSTNER-MÜLLER, KOPETZKY, and DOUMET-SERHAL 2009, 81.

⁴⁷ SCHIESTL, SEILER 2012, 592.

⁴⁸ NIGRO 2002, 109–111, pl. 52.70.

⁴⁹ Dunand (1950–1958, vol. II, 767) uses the term ‘calcaire métamorphique’ for the following six entries of his catalogue, nos. 15377, 15378–15383 + 15462–15463: a hybrid human-leonine figure, a carved seal, small figurines of a frog, turtle, crocodile, and lions (x2) all bearing a small peg on the base and two joining (?) pieces of a cuboid rod. In Egypt, the most common material for this type of object was steatite; therefore, it is possible to assume that Dunand used the term ‘calcaire métamorphique’ to indicate steatite objects with a faded glaze.

⁵⁰ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. I, pl. 95; vol. II, 767. Beirut, National Museum DGA 1761.

⁵¹ MARTIN 1971, no. 329.

⁵² DUNAND 1950–58, vol. I, pl. 95; vol. II, 767.

⁵³ ROMANO 1989, vol. II, 5–14, cat. nos. 1–3, to which can be added some other doubtful examples from stamp-seal amulet motifs: QUIRKE 2016, 498; and one parietal representation: EL-KHADRAGI 2007, 111.

⁵⁴ QUIRKE 2016, 357–363; MINIACI 2018a.

⁵⁵ Ankara Museum of Anatolian Civilizations 13186; ARUZ, BENZEL and EVANS 2008, 148, no. 87.

⁵⁶ KOŞAY 1944, 31, pl. 44 (AL/A88).

⁵⁷ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. I, pl. 95; vol. II, 772.

⁵⁸ FISCHER 1968, 32–33, no. 92, pl. 9; KEMP, MERRILLEES 1980, 163–164, no. 9; OPPENHEIM, ARNOLD, ARNOLD, and YAMAMOTO 2015, 201–202, cat. no. 132; QUIRKE 2016, 102, 413–414.

although it was sold by the dealer Maurice Nahman at the beginning of Twentieth century together with a large assemblage of faience figurines typical of late Middle Kingdom Egypt.⁵⁹ According to Ludwig Keimer, the entire group of objects was found in a single vaulted brick tomb unearthed by Bedouins at el-Matariya (the ancient Iunu, the Greek Heliopolis, now in the northern part of modern Cairo) and dating to the Middle Kingdom. Although the provenance of objects from el-Matariya is highly questionable,⁶⁰ the combination of the cuboid rod with faience figurines is an expected pattern in the assemblages of the late Middle Kingdom. For instance, in pit tomb 315 from Lisht North, a glazed steatite cuboid rod (MMA 15.3.39–deacc.) with a pegged lion miniature (MMA 15.3.36) was associated with a faience figurine of a hippopotamus (MMA 15.3.38–deacc.) and of a human figure (Brooklyn Museum 61.164) in a clear late Middle Kingdom context.⁶¹ Similarly, from the late Middle Kingdom Ramesseum tomb no. 5, an ivory cuboid rod was associated with a group of faience figurines.⁶² Another late Middle Kingdom cuboid rod comes from the village of Lahun.⁶³ Other comparable steatite rods can be found in the Fitzwilliam Museum, E.426.1982 and E.2.1986, although both of undocumented provenance,⁶⁴ but of Egyptian manufacture beyond doubt and very similar in design to the cuboid rods from the Byblos deposit.

- The steatite kohl container in human form (no. 15374; see **Fig. 06**)⁶⁵ represents a motif typical of ancient Egypt and attested since the end of the third millennium.⁶⁶ The container, shaped in the form of a kneeling female figure on an oval base holding a rimless kohl pot between her hands with a cap of hair covering the forehead and a single pigtail hanging down the shoulders with details of plaiting incised, finds very close parallels in late Middle Kingdom examples: the statuette Cairo CG 18582;⁶⁷ the statuette from the Hoffmann collection.⁶⁸
- The series of barrel, spheroid and cylindrical beads (nos. 15469–15472)⁶⁹ found in the Byblos deposit have some parallels with the series of beads from cemetery A at Harageh, which dates from the time of Senwosret III to the mid-Thirteenth Dynasty (1900–1650 BC).⁷⁰
- The last diagnostic element –with a more problematic dating– is represented by the 90 bronze or copper alloy figurines found in jar no. 15476 (see above). Most are solid-cast figurines of standing or striding male human beings wearing an elongated headdress, similar to the Egyptian white crown, or a conical helmet; some are nude with emphasised genitals, others wear a short kilt, while some have arms at the sides or hold a stick or an undefined item in one hand (belonging to the so-called Type II/class A: ‘*Byblo-Egyptian group*’).⁷¹ Others are made of flattened sheet bronze silhouetting the frontal representation of a figure with an elongated hat and face in profile (belonging to the so-called Type

⁵⁹ Cf. MINIACI 2018a.

⁶⁰ MINIACI 2017, 239–240.

⁶¹ MINIACI 2018a.

⁶² QUIBELL 1898, pl. 3.18; see discussion in QUIRKE 2016, 97–104; MINIACI 2018a.

⁶³ PETRIE 1890, pl. 8.11.

⁶⁴ BOURRIAU 1988, 115, cat. no. 104a, b.

⁶⁵ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. I, pl. 94; vol. II, 766.

⁶⁶ SAAD 1951, 24, pl. XXIVa, b (tomb 1 H 5); SAAD, AUTRY 1969, 131, pls. 46–47.

⁶⁷ VON BISSING 1904, xxvii, 121, pl. 9; BÉNÉDITE 1911, vol. I, 56, pl. 24 (here numbered as CG 18382).

⁶⁸ LEGRAIN 1894, 18–19, no. 44, with fig. For other Middle Kingdom examples, see KEMP, MERRILLEES 1980, 147–150; BOURRIAU 1988, 139, cat. no. 140.

⁶⁹ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 772–773, fig. 877.

⁷⁰ Gabbro spheroid bead Byblos no. 15469 = Harageh tomb 154, ENGELBACH 1923, pl. 53, 79R (in amethyst); Carnelian barrel bead Byblos no. 15471 = Harageh tomb 17, ENGELBACH 1923, pl. 52, 73O. For an overview of the cemetery see MINIACI 2013–14.

⁷¹ NEGBI 1976, 22–24.

II/class B: ‘Byblo-Egyptian group’).⁷² Twenty-two figurines are classified by Negbi as Type II/class A: ‘Byblo-Syrian group’,⁷³ as they present less marked Egyptian traits, i.e. the elongated headdress is replaced by short hair. As these solid-cast figurines have tangs projecting from below the feet they were meant to stand upright on bases, perhaps of clay or wood, which were not preserved in the deposit. Only one of the figurines presents more distinctive Egyptian traits, representing a Bes-like entity (no. 15477)⁷⁴ wearing a kilt and standing on a rectangular base with a short undecipherable inscription. Two other figurines represent horned bovines (nos. 15565–15566). This type of bronze figurine is certainly of Levantine production, as they do not find any precise parallel within Egyptian material culture, although the elongated hat, the posture, and the proportion may suggest Middle Kingdom Egyptian motifs as sources of inspiration.⁷⁵ The study carried out by Ora Negbi on the bronze figurines of the Levant offers a close dating to the late EB IV to late MB I (2000–1750 BC) for the *Type II: ‘Byblo-Egyptian group’*; and a slightly broader range for the *Type II: ‘Byblo-Syrian group’*, spanning EB IV–early MB II (2100–1650 BC; in terms of Egyptian relative chronology from the First Intermediate Period to the end of the Middle Kingdom). However, the dating proposed by Negbi, and unquestioningly followed by other scholars,⁷⁶ is based on an overall analysis that does not take into consideration detailed analysis of each context and also of the stylistic variations within each broad category. For instance, the figurines classified as *Type II: ‘Byblo-Egyptian group’* include nearly seven hundred items from different find spots at Byblos (such as the deposits in the ‘Temple syrien’, ‘Champ des offrandes’, ‘Enceinte sacrée’, etc.). The deposits from Byblos are not of a narrow date but instead they range from the late third to the first half of the second millennium. Only eight figurines of this type do not come from Byblos but from other sites in Lebanon, Syria, Israel, and Cyprus (Negbi 1976, 22). Apart from Megiddo (Negbi 1976, 160, nos. 1173–74) and Tell Soukas (no. 1171), which offer a mid-MB I–MB II chronological range,⁷⁷ the remaining six figurines are of unknown provenance or uncertain context (Negbi 1976, 160, nos. 1169–1177). Therefore, the dating proposed by Negbi is of no help in narrowing the chronological range. Further comparative research into the composition of the Byblos deposits may help in arriving at a more precise chronological range for the use of this type of bronze figurine.

In conclusion, the key elements for deposit 15121–15567 may be dated with a certain degree of confidence to a restricted phase of the material culture of Egypt and the Levant (1850–1650 BC: late Middle Kingdom = mid-MB I–MBI/II), with the exclusion of the bronze figurines that at the moment are ‘floating’ in a wider time span. The absence of inscribed Hyksos material (after the early MB II, i.e. after 1650 BC) in the deposit⁷⁸ may be another good chronological anchor, representing the *terminus ante quem* for the formation of the deposit.⁷⁹ However, redefining the dating for these objects does not necessarily imply that the deposit was created in the same time-range: scholars have strongly warned against an immediate synchronisation between Middle Kingdom Egyptian material and its find context

⁷² NEGBI 1976, 26.

⁷³ NEGBI 1976, 21–22.

⁷⁴ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. I, pl. 110; vol. II, 775.

⁷⁵ HANSEN 1969, 283–284.

⁷⁶ ARUZ, BENZEL and EVANS, 52–53.

⁷⁷ NEGBI 1976, 29, table 5.

⁷⁸ NEGBI, MOSKOWITZ 1966, 23.

⁷⁹ However, the absence of certain diagnostic Hyksos object types from deposit *f* does not necessarily mean proof of absence: a well-defined set of diagnostic types for the material culture in the Levant during the MB II–LBA transition is far from securely established.

in the northern Levant.⁸⁰ Several Middle Kingdom objects of Egyptian manufacture and found in the northern Levant may have actually arrived there only later, as the result of looting actions in Egyptian temples, cultic installations, and tombs happening during the Second Intermediate Period with the aim of bringing into the Levant ‘exotic foreign’ items.⁸¹ Also the absence of Hyksos material does not exclude *a priori* that the deposit may have been formed after 1650 BC: objects of earlier contexts may have been gathered together at a later date. Nonetheless, the consistency of the object dating (ca. 1850–1650 BC) and the high uniformity of object types (384 figurines –in faience and bronze–) seem to speak against a wide chronological gap between the object production and deposition and against a possible provenance from looted contexts. Faience figurines can be hardly considered as a one of the targets of looters, as they were neither considered luxury products (see below, issue *b*), like stone vessels or metal items for instances, nor iconographic emblems of power, as they were not placed in the highest/ruling class Egyptian burials.⁸² Also, the number of faience figurines found in the other sites of the Levant is rather limited to be considered targeted objects for power display.⁸³

b. Type of deposit: Unfortunately, the description of the archaeological context of this deposit provided by Dunand and published in his volume is rather vague:

‘Les objets se trouvaient amoncelés à même la terre et mélangés à elle, sans protection aucune. Mais la dalle de couverture reposait sur un grossier débord des fondations du mur nord de la pro-cella et sur une pierre placée au-dessous du passage médian, en sorte que sa pression ne portait pas sur les objets délicats qu’elle recouvrait [...]. Les animaux se rencontraient dans toutes les positions, comme s’ils avaient été jetés là. Cependant la boîte de terre cuite n° 15468 et la poterie 15476 qui renfermait les figurines de bronze 15477 à 15566 avaient été déposées convenablement, celle-ci avec son couvercle en place’.⁸⁴

From the short description of the archaeological context and from the type and quantity of artefacts, deposit *f* can be defined as a ‘structured deposition’, a term often interchangeably used in archaeology for indicating ‘ceremonial’, ‘ritual’, ‘symbolic’, ‘formal’ and ‘intentional’ assemblages.⁸⁵ A structured deposit stresses intentionality through an act of deposition, involving specific anthropogenic processes, and creating a relationship between the ideology/belief and the deposition of the material itself. Therefore, it was not an occasional accumulation of objects in a layer.

Redefining b. Type of deposit: Deposit *f* can hardly be considered a foundation deposit for the building itself;⁸⁶ the main reason comes from the fact that objects of the same type (except for faience figurines) were found in the higher levels, smashed, broken, and scattered over the sanctuary floor in phases 5–6 corresponding to Dunand’s *levée XVI*, 25.00–24.80 m (*cf.* nos. 13999–14002). Therefore, this evidence suggests that the objects from deposit *f* belong to the ‘life’ of temple (phases 5–6) rather than to its ‘birth’. This also creates a chronological interplay between phases 5–6 of the temple’s life and the objects in deposit *f*

⁸⁰ HELK 1976; WEINSTEIN 1974; *id.* 1975. Also the ceremonial mace of king Hetepibre found at Ebla/Tell Mardikh, often used to establish a more precise chronological anchor, may be a later reuse/recycled object, see also comments in NIGRO 2009. See also comments in ESPINEL 2002, 110–111 for the Old Kingdom in Byblos.

⁸¹ AHRENS 2011a; *id.* 2015; *id.* 2016.

⁸² MINIACI 2018a.

⁸³ *Cf.* PFÄLZNER 2014, esp. 150; recent excavations in the ‘Tomb VII’ at Qatna have brought to light large quantities of Middle Kingdom Egyptian material, including jewellery and stone vessels, and only a single miniature of faience (?) hippopotamus. See also below n. 128.

⁸⁴ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 741.

⁸⁵ On the use of this term in archaeology and a critique see GARROW 2012.

⁸⁶ NEGBI, MOSKOWITZ 1966, 22.

(see above, issue *a*). Evidently, the deposit was actually formed during temple use phases 5–6, around 1800–1550 BC, which cut into earlier levels.

Negbi and Moscovitz advanced the idea that the deposits of Byblos, including 15121–15567, were created with the purpose of ‘hiding valuable objects’ accumulated in the phase of use of the temple –probably immediately before its disuse/destruction– and hidden with the purpose of protection and storage, as a sort of treasure or capital reserve.⁸⁷ In fact, they observed that most of the items were not scattered in the ground but stored and sealed in clay jars; moreover most of these jars contained different types of metals –including, bronze, copper alloy, silver, and gold (mainly as gold foil)– which were considered to be largely precious raw materials at that time.⁸⁸ However, deposit 15121–15567 includes not only bronze items but also faience and pottery artefacts, which were made of common and inexpensive components.⁸⁹ Therefore, the interpretation of deposit 15121–15567 as a storage place for ‘currency’ objects needs further research to be proved.

The most common deposit found in a cult building are those defined as votive offerings, which are related to the custom of placing small objects in shrines, such as institutional or personal gifts to the gods, with the intention of blessing or appeasing a deity.⁹⁰ When the ex-votos had come to fill all the available space, they were removed in order to create room for new items, but, since it was considered sacrilegious to recycle, discard, or destroy votive objects, they were usually carefully deposited either in the foundations of rebuilt shrines or buried in pits within the temple precinct.⁹¹ Although this may seem the most linear approach (*lectio facilior*), there are two evident setbacks: **1.** analogous faience figurine types found in Egypt are, unexpectedly, almost absent from cult contexts during the late Middle Kingdom,⁹² but are predominantly found in funerary contexts;⁹³ **2.** the faience –and bronze– figurines show a uniform style that does not support a wide temporal development.⁹⁴

1.) The presence of the Egyptian faience figurines in a temple deposit of the Middle Bronze Age in Egypt is rather anomalous: the only exception could be a fragmentary faience hippopotamus (Louvre E 12695) found at Elephantine in a large deposit (*cachette*) of cult objects attached to the western wall of the New Kingdom Satet temple. The *cachette* contained groups of objects of different epochs, from the Middle Kingdom⁹⁵ to the Third Intermediate Period.⁹⁶ All the other documented find-spots of faience figurines in Egypt in the Middle Kingdom are overwhelmingly from funerary contexts (over 80%) with several doubtful cases from settlement contexts (20%).⁹⁷ The almost total absence of Middle Kingdom faience figurines in Egypt from temples and shrines is rather remarkable, especially in comparison to the extensive use of faience figurines in cult contexts of the Early Dynastic Period. In third millennium shrines and temples, hundreds of faience (some very similar in shape and motif to those of the second millennium) figurines⁹⁸ have been found scattered

⁸⁷ NEGBI, MOSKOWITZ 1966, 23.

⁸⁸ NEGBI 1976, 127.

⁸⁹ MINIACI 2018b.

⁹⁰ PINCH, WARASKA 2009.

⁹¹ TIRIBILLI 2018, x; DAVIES 2007; EIGNER 2003; KEMP 2006, 121–123.

⁹² BUSSMANN 2017.

⁹³ Less than 1% of faience figurines were securely attested in a domestic environment, see for instance Memphis in GIDDY 2016, 18–19.

⁹⁴ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 953 (see above). Cf. PINNOCK 2012, 96.

⁹⁵ Within the time range of the Middle Kingdom, a large number of objects can be dated to the late Middle Kingdom (object no. doc. 636), DELANGE 2012, 304–305.

⁹⁶ A limestone model of a ram Khnum may be stylistically dated to the Thirtieth Dynasty (object doc. no. 711; DELANGE 2012, 302–303).

⁹⁷ MINIACI 2018a.

⁹⁸ Figurines were also found in other materials such as ivory, mud, clay, BUSSMANN 2011.

everywhere, on floors, in pits, as local foundation deposits, and embedded in the walls.⁹⁹ Certainly, Middle Kingdom temples have survived to a lesser extent in comparison with those of the third millennium BC; nonetheless they are not completely absent from the archaeological record, even though their state of preservation is generally far poorer. Richard Bussmann has stressed a political switch which may have occurred from the third to the second millennium in shrine/temple policy.¹⁰⁰ While royal presence in third millennium cult structures is not prominent and state control appears to be relatively low/absent, in the second millennium the state became more involved in the the running of temples. The main principle of second millennium temples was based on the exclusion of individuals, in order to create exclusive access and privilege. This change is mirrored also in the distribution and pattern of votive objects: while third millennium shrines were crowded with votive figurines, Middle Kingdom temples favoured other types of offerings, like stelae or sizable statues. Small votive figurines –when present– were confined to external areas outside the enclosure walls.¹⁰¹

However, it must be acknowledged that a sporadic (?) use of faience figurines in cult contexts of the late Middle Kingdom is attested, notably in sanctuaries and temples peripheral to Egypt, such as Serabit el-Khadim, Gebel Zeit, Mirgissa and Faras.¹⁰² Probably, the difference in the manner late Middle Kingdom faience figurines were distributed comes down to one of geographical distinction, between central and peripheral areas (as Egypt was the main production center, it must be considered the central area of this geographical model).¹⁰³ Apparently, after the third millennium, central areas favoured other types of offerings and disregarded figurines, while peripheral areas still held traditional customs and included figurines in temples. In this respect, since Byblos may represent a peripheral area to Egypt, the use of faience figurines in the temple could not be considered exceptional but in line with a continued use in temples outside Egypt.

The predominance of funerary context for faience figurines in Egypt during the Middle Bronze Age lends some support to William Albright’s suggestion made in 1957 that the Temple of Obelisks was primarily a mortuary shrine.¹⁰⁴ Albright paralleled the Obelisk Temple with the later *bêt bâmôt* (the ‘High Places’) in Israel, i.e. open air cult installations set on a natural hilltop or on an artificial raised platform, often furnished with standing stones (*maṣṣēbôt*) and sacrificial altar(s).¹⁰⁵ According to Albright,¹⁰⁶ the *bâmôt* were also featured by funerary aspects, playing an important role in ‘fertility cult’ and popular piety;¹⁰⁷ the symbolic stones or stelae erected in these buildings aimed at commemorating an important/heroic defunct.¹⁰⁸ In Albright’s view, the burial of the deceased was not necessarily placed inside the *bâmāh* but in its neighbourhood, as the *bâmāh* represented the place of cult detached from the interment.¹⁰⁹ The Obelisk Temple perfectly fits the general lines of such an architecture: it was an open sky structure with an altar in its center, erected over a platform; the obelisks, which can be compared with the *maṣṣēbôt* or stelae, were occasionally inscribed for deceased persons (maA-xrw = justified), stressing the funerary aspect of the structure; the absence of burials below the temple clearly indicates that the structure was not intended as a

⁹⁹ BUSSMANN 2010.

¹⁰⁰ BUSSMANN 2017, 78–81.

¹⁰¹ PINCH 1993, 248–53.

¹⁰² MINIACI 2018a.

¹⁰³ MINIACI 2018b; *id.* forthcoming.

¹⁰⁴ ALBRIGHT 1957, 252.

¹⁰⁵ NAKHAI 1994; FRIED 2002.

¹⁰⁶ See *contra* BARRIK 1975.

¹⁰⁷ ALBRIGHT 1957, 243.

¹⁰⁸ Also the sacred trees of the mother goddess was occasionally commemorated in the *bâmāh*.

¹⁰⁹ ALBRIGHT 1957, 247.

mortuary temple *stricto sensu* (i.e. a burial place). Nonetheless, the deceased venerated in the temple could have been buried in the neighbourhood: for instance, the obelisk of the ‘deceased’ prince Abi-shemu is located at short distance from the tomb of a homonymous prince, called Abi-shemu, probably the same person.¹¹⁰ In such a perspective, the massive presence of faience figurines in a temple featured by mortuary connotations is more in line with the archaeological evidence coming from Egypt, Nubia and also from other sites of the Levant (Tell-el-Ajjul, Beirut, Qatna, Sarafand check), where faience figurines were predominantly found in funerary contexts.¹¹¹

2.) The uniform style of faience figurines may be explained either with a very limited production time-span (which could occupy less than the proposed window of 200 years) or with the fact that the deposit could have been achieved in a single-time operation intended to group and bury together specific objects. On analogy with *favissae* F.5237–38, P.9308 of Ebla, Frances Pinnock has suggested that the votive deposits found in the temples of Byblos may not represent a casual unification of diachronic objects belonging to temple furniture or treasures but rather one single operation of artificial collection of objects with ritual purpose, such as meals or ceremonies connected with achievement and renewal of the town’s life through the royal prerogative or its ancestor cult.¹¹² Faience figurines –or their remains/fragments– were not documented by Dunand in the floor levels of the Obelisk Temple, strengthening the impression that they were intended for the ritual purpose of being buried under the temple in a single operation.

In conclusion, deposit *f* does not seem to be a ‘standard’ votive deposit, grouping discarded temple ex-votos, buried under the floor to make way for new votive objects in the active sacred area, but a homogenous group of objects gathered for a specific purpose, probably in connection with the funerary sphere or linked to practices of ancestor/important deceased veneration.

c. Material production: The last question concerns the material production of these objects, whether they were manufactured in Egypt and imported or locally produced. When viewed as votive offerings, scholars tend to assume that they were produced in local workshops annexed to a temple and sold as ex-votos to pilgrims visiting the sacred buildings. The existence at Ugarit of non-Egyptian workshops using glazing recipes similar to those used for Egyptian figurines may support the idea of the local production of Egyptianizing artefacts at Byblos.¹¹³ On this line, scholars have repeatedly suggested that deposit 15121–15567 may be good evidence that a school of local craftsmen existed at Byblos, who copied works of Middle Kingdom Egyptian minor arts for use in their local cult.¹¹⁴ In particular, the faience figurines from the deposit were seen as important evidence of objects representative of the MBA ‘Egyptian-ness’. Dunand was the first to suggest a local provenance for this group and advanced three main arguments in support of his hypothesis: **1.** the great variety of motifs and designs among the Byblos examples contrasting the limited range of subjects and ways of representing them found in Egypt; **2.** the more naturalist expression of the Byblos examples contrasting the more static attitude observed in the Egyptian models (“à la statique égyptienne la Phénicie oppose le dynamisme des sujets animés”);¹¹⁵ **3.** the whitish colour of faience and the absence of floral and faunal designs on the figurines from Byblos (“le ton clair de l’émail et l’absence sur le flanc des animaux de toute notation de la flore des

¹¹⁰ Contra see KOPETZKY 2016.

¹¹¹ See below n. 126–129.

¹¹² PINNOCK 2009.

¹¹³ CAUBET, KACZMARCZYK 1987, 48.

¹¹⁴ ARUZ, BENZEL and EVANS 2008, 52; ANONYMOUS 1998.

¹¹⁵ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 953.

marais”).¹¹⁶ Accordingly, also Hansen noted that the Byblos figurines were not characterized by the distinctive bright glaze –and consequently the painted details over the glaze– (point 3), which is almost always present in their Egyptian counterparts. Another element in support of local production is the un-Egyptian styling of certain figurines (point 2) such as, for instance, the pose of the lion no. 15241 (Beirut, National Museum DGA 941; see Fig. 07) with its front paws crossed, which would not occur in Egyptian art until the time of Thutmosis III.¹¹⁷

Redefining c. The material production: In the absence of archaeometric analyses, it is not possible to be certain if the faience figurines from the Byblos deposit represent Egyptian imports or are local copies of Egyptian prototypes.¹¹⁸ However, there are several points in favour of these faience figurines being Egyptian imports:

- *Close analogy.* Analogy with the models produced in the late Middle Kingdom in Egypt is very stringent and in several instances it comes down to sameness. The Middle Kingdom faience figurines display qualities that are difficult to replicate, mainly due to the fact that they were handmade and their production needed trained skills and mastery over the medium.¹¹⁹ Without some form of mechanical reproduction using moulding techniques, it would be difficult to achieve a good degree of similarity by hand especially in such very distant places, unless one assumes that trained and skilled Egyptian craftsmen were working in Byblos at that time or that local artisans had Egyptian-made prototypes available to copy. However, this conflicts with the rare attestations of faience figurines in other layers of Byblos and other sites in the Levant (see below). The faience figurines from Byblos exactly mirror the same variety of designs and motifs of Egyptian examples.¹²⁰

Human

Byblos no. 15357 (DGA 1709; B.8150) = MMA 22.1.124 (Lisht North, Pit 884); Bruxelles, Musées royaux d'Art et d'Histoire E.7421 (unprovenanced) [see Fig. 08];
Byblos nos. 15347 (B.8164), 15338 (DGA 1715/1762; B.8165) = Boston, MFA 11.1524 (unprovenanced); British Museum, EA 59397 (unprovenanced) [see Fig. 09];
Byblos no. 15311 (DGA 1720; B.8145) = British Museum, EA 37298 (Abydos, tomb G 62); British Museum EA 22882, unprovenanced (probably from Lahun, see MINIACI forthcoming) [see Fig. 10];
Byblos 15338 (DGA 1715; DGA 1762; B.8165), DGA 1750 = British Museum, EA 59397 (unprovenanced);
Byblos no. 15316 (DGA 1747; B.8155) = MMA 22.1.286 (Lisht North, Pit 964); British Museum, EA 65679 (unprovenanced); British Museum EA 24409, unprovenanced (probably from Lahun, see MINIACI forthcoming) [see Fig. 11];

Hippopotamus

Byblos no. 15138 (DGA 905; DGA 1748; B.8189) = present location unknown (Abydos, tomb 416);¹²¹ British Museum, EA 36346 (unprovenanced);
Byblos no. 15319 (DGA 1743; B.8129) = MMA 08.200.37 (Lisht North, Pit 805) [see Fig. 12];
Byblos no. 15142 (B.8190) = Cairo, JE 21366 (Thebes, Dra Abu el-Naga);

Baboon

Byblos no. 15220 (DGA 960; B.8267) = MMA 15.3.186 (Lisht North, Pit 475) *not similar but same posture
Byblos no. 15178 (DGA 938; B.8295) = MMA 08.200.33 (Lisht North, Pit 805)

¹¹⁶ DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 953.

¹¹⁷ HANSEN 1969, 282. Cf. HAYES 1959, vol. II, 135, fig. 72.

¹¹⁸ Cf. DUNET-SERHAL 2013.

¹¹⁹ MINIACI forthcoming.

¹²⁰ All figurines are discussed in MINIACI 2018a; here only a few examples have been quoted. ‘DGA’ numbers are the current inventory number in the National Museum of Beirut – Directorate General of Antiquities. ‘B.’ numbers are the numbers given by Dunand after the excavations.

¹²¹ KEMP, MERRILLEES 1980, 144, pls. 10–11, 416.A.07.106.

Lion

Byblos no. 15304 (B.8256) = Liverpool, Garstang Museum E 9318 (unprovenanced)

Byblos no. 15302 (B.8207) = MMA 22.1.178 (Lisht North, Pit 885) [see [Fig. 13](#)]

Dog

Byblos no. 15285 (DGA 924; B.8291) = Brooklyn Museum 14.659 (from Harageh, tomb 56); MMA 08.200.34 (from Lisht North, Pit 805)

Byblos no. 15229 (DGA 919; B.8285) = British Museum, EA 22877 (unprovenanced)

Fruit

Byblos no. 15446 = British Museum, EA 54673 (unprovenanced)

Vessel

Byblos nos. 15393 (B.8128), 15404 (DGA 1785; B.8225; B.8125) = MMA 34.1.170 and MMA 33.1.25 (Lisht South, Radim tomb of Senwosretankh)

The only peculiarities recognizable in the Byblos examples are a monkey playing a harp (no. 15226 [B.8272]), some exceedingly amorphous human beings (e.g. nos. 15352 [B.8166], 15361 [B.8133]), and the rams (see list below in the *Appendix*). Nonetheless, example no. 15226 finds a very close parallel, in terms of proportion, in a painted limestone figurine of a squatting man playing a harp from the late Middle Kingdom tomb 416 at Abydos.¹²² An evocative parallel in faience, although of different proportions, is the figurine of a lion playing a harp (?) in the British Museum (EA 49712; see [Fig. 14](#)); the latter, although of unknown provenance and therefore of unknown date, seems to predate the New Kingdom on account of the type of faience and method of manufacture used. One should also note with the previously mentioned lion no. 15241 that, contra Hansen, this pose is rather well known in the Egyptian iconography of late Middle Kingdom faience figurines (therefore well before the time of Thutmose III); see for instance dog UC 45080 (see [Fig. 15](#)).¹²³ The highly abnormal human beings and the rams are the only categories really absent from the corpus of Egyptian faience figurines known today; although horned herbivorous animals and grotesque creatures are certainly not missing, as attested by the goat or antelope figurine BM EA 37299 (*cf.* Byblos no. 15260). For the sake of clarity, it must be noted that also some models, such as those reproduced on plates 98 (human beings) and 111 (range of vessels), show some variations that are not recorded in Egypt. However, this cannot automatically be considered as a trait of local production, as it could also be due to the fact that such variations have yet to be documented or found in Egyptian contexts. Because these figurines are handmade, the degree of fluctuation and combination within a single type will be very high.

- *Absence of peculiar traits.* Not all of the faience figurines from Egypt express ‘stasis’ (*point 2*) as suggested by Dunand, since ca. 60% of them are represented while performing an action such as roaring, crouching, sleeping, squatting, attacking, holding an object or a person. The same percentage of inactive and performative figures can also be observed in the examples from Byblos, where ca. 40% of figurines are represented motionless. The absence of decoration and the pale colour of the faience figurines (*point 3*) from Byblos can simply be due to climatic and storage conditions, as Byblos’s weather is far moister than that of Egypt; nonetheless, several examples found at Lisht from documented archaeological contexts show the same fading of the glaze, a paler colour and comparable lack of decoration. In addition, not all of the faience figurines from Egypt were decorated

¹²² KEMP, MERRILLEES 1980, 146, no. 416.A.07.108, pls. 10–11, 13, 17.

¹²³ BRAULINKSA 2017.

(including hippopotami), some were simply produced undecorated, i.e. without the application of any black details or motifs over the glaze. At least one faience hippopotamus from Byblos (Beirut, DGA 918; see Fig. 16) still preserves faint traits of a rosette and lotus flower decoration typical of the Egyptian examples. The absence of very distinctive traits in Byblos examples is emphasised by the analysis of Kerma faience figurines of the same period. Faience figurines found at Kerma or at other sites in Nubia show peculiar features and decorative motifs absent in the examples from Egypt. For instance, a lion figurine (Boston, MFA 20.1314; see Fig. 17) found in corridor B, 126 in Tumulus K X at Kerma is notable for its star motif decoration that is otherwise unknown in the Egyptian examples. Similarly, a hippopotamus figurine from K 1001 of Tumulus K X (Boston, MFA 13.4121; see Fig. 18) is decorated with an unusual spiked line (a feather?) unparalleled by any Egyptian figurine. Also the type of faience and the shape of the lion figurines from Tumulus K II, chapel A (Boston, MFA 13.4229) and from tomb 336 at Aniba¹²⁴ do not find any parallels in the Egyptian corpus. In these cases, their local production may be supposed.

▪ *Control over production.* The late Middle Kingdom faience figurines in Egypt were somehow connected with and commissioned by those around the palace and places of power. The high number of items found at Lisht, most likely the closest cemetery to the capital Itjtawy, and the high concentration in other key power (economic, religious, and cultural) sites (Abydos and Thebes) with only a limited circulation elsewhere across the country, indicates that their production was not privately managed but was regulated by centralized systems led by wealthy individuals or powerful groups.¹²⁵ In Byblos, such a picture is replicated with more intensity: the faience figurines were all found amassed in a single spot, in contrast to the bronze figurines, which were found in other deposits in the city, and spread across the country and in the neighbourhood. Other faience figurines were found in the Levant, such as at Tell el-Ajjul (1),¹²⁶ Beirut (4),¹²⁷ Qatna (1),¹²⁸ Sarafand (1);¹²⁹ nonetheless, their number is very circumscribed. Therefore, also the production and consumption of Byblos faience figurines seems to be strongly centralised. A local production lead by workshops annexed to the temple would have implied a much more visible circulation in the city and across the country. Also a local production of these figurines in Byblos would have created some variation, while they all reproduce typical Egyptian motifs (some also exogenous to the Levantine culture) without introducing new local elements.

In conclusion, the close similarities of motifs, manufacture, shape and posture of the models from Byblos seem to support their importation from Egypt. Other objects from deposit *f* point to Egypt as their original place of production or manufacture (see comments above) such as, for instance, steatite rod (no. 15462–63), stamp seal (no. 15378), and steatite woman holding a kohl pot (no. 15374). Nonetheless this does not imply that all the other elements from the deposit were produced in or imported from Egypt. Indeed, artefacts from this deposit seem to display clear Egyptian inspiration but material production outside Egypt, as for instance with the steatite figurine representing Bes (no. 15377), whose design, with large facial features

¹²⁴ STEINDORFF 1935–37, vol. I, 149, pl. 67. All the other figurines are described and illustrated in MINIACI 2018a.

¹²⁵ MINIACI forthcoming.

¹²⁶ PETRIE 1952, 18; BEHRMANN 1989, Dok. 142.f.70.

¹²⁷ BADRE 1997.

¹²⁸ PFÄLZNER 2011; *id.* 2014.

¹²⁹ MINIACI 2018a.

(eyes, nose, mouth) and pronounced musculature, finds no close parallel with any ancient Egyptian figurine.¹³⁰ Also, all of the bronze figurines of standing human figures, though probably inspired by Egyptian art, display a clear Levantine and Anatolian influence. In addition, one of these, no. 15477, probably representing one of the archaic forms of Aha/Bes, bears signs on its base that do not resemble pseudo-hieroglyphs – unless they represent ultra-cursive variants – but appear to be ‘meaningless’ scribbles attempting to imitate hieroglyphic inscriptions.¹³¹

Conclusion

Regular contacts between Byblos and Egypt are attested since the earliest dynasties,¹³² although already in the time of Naqada II –and earlier– Byblos served as a conduit for trade between Mesopotamia and Buto in the western Delta.¹³³ Since the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty, the city-state of Byblos represented one of the main points of interest in a renewed Egyptian trading connection with the Lebanese coast,¹³⁴ as glimpsed in the famous tale of Sinuhe¹³⁵ and more evident in the annals of Amenemhat II inscribed on a slab of found at Memphis (Mit-Rahina).¹³⁶ However, it is only during the second half of the Twelfth Dynasty that contact between Egypt and Byblos became more intense, with Byblos standing out as one of the major commercial partners and political representatives of Egypt on the Lebanese coast.¹³⁷ Not only did Byblos’s rulers emulate royal Egyptian titulary and administrative titles,¹³⁸ adopt the hieroglyphic writing system, embraced certain religious traditions, and exploited Egyptian luxury goods,¹³⁹ but they also allowed Egypt to actively interfere in local political affairs.¹⁴⁰

It is beyond doubt that the bronze figures and some other artefacts from deposit *f* partly emulated and copied artefacts from Egypt, reinterpreting them with a Levantine spin. Following a theoretical model already explored by Carolyn Higginbotham for Ramesside Palestine, the Egyptian-style finds may be evidence of local emulation rather than Egyptian dominion. Due to asymmetrical relations between local low-prestige ruling classes and the powerful and prestigious Egyptian kingship,¹⁴¹ Levantine elite sought to present themselves through an Egyptian(izing) iconography.¹⁴² Not all the Egyptian motifs should have been slavishly copied, as the main aim was to actively reproduce key elements of the foreign iconography, without fully understanding its symbolism and its ‘language’.¹⁴³

Other objects from the deposit *f*, mainly the large group of faience figurines, have a purely Egyptian manufacture. Given the high number of faience figurines found in the deposit *f*, it must be taken into account that their arrival in the Canaanite city and their deposition could have been intentional, playing some kind of role in the contacts between Egypt and Byblos.

¹³⁰ The lack of precise parallels among Egyptian material is highlighted by the scarcity of three dimensional representations of Aha/Bes (except on faience figurines and a few other examples) known for the first half of the second millennium Egypt, QUIRKE 2016, 357–360.

¹³¹ I am grateful to Ben Haring for checking the signs and providing the above suggestions.

¹³² PRAG 1986; BEN-TOR 1991, 4; FRANCIS-ALLOUCHE, GRIMAL 2016.

¹³³ MOOREY 1990.

¹³⁴ BREYER 2010, 101–114.

¹³⁵ WASTLHUBER 2013.

¹³⁶ ALTENMÜLLER, MOUSSA 1991; MARCUS 2007; ALTENMÜLLER 2015.

¹³⁷ BROODBANK 2013, 362–364; FORSTNER-MÜLLER, KOPETZKY 2009.

¹³⁸ KOPETZKY 2016.

¹³⁹ TEISSIER 1995, 2–3.

¹⁴⁰ ALLEN 2008.

¹⁴¹ HIGGINBOTHAM 1996, 155; *id.* 2000.

¹⁴² AHRENS 2011b, 301.

¹⁴³ AHRENS 2011b, 290.

This has been often explained as the need of foreign Egyptian objects from the Levantine high class, in order to sustain long-term relations ‘immersed in a network of bonds mainly based on the exchange of prestige goods’,¹⁴⁴ on the model of LBA gift-exchange.¹⁴⁵ Recently, Karin Kopetzky explained the presence of Egyptian artefacts as a result of their possible misappropriation by Byblos rulers from the scarcely protected Middle Kingdom cemeteries that occurred during the decline of Egyptian power in the late Thirteenth Dynasty–Second Intermediate Period.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, some objects from the Byblos royal tombs show signs of alteration, erasure, and rework which could be seen as evidence of misappropriation. Evidence for such a practice in this period has also been recorded at Avaris, where objects of the Twelfth Dynasty appear in Tell el-Dab‘a tombs during phase F (1710–1680 BC), probably as result of the methodical robbery by the eastern Delta (and Levantine) people to the detriment of the Itjtawy reign, when royal power was eclipsing.¹⁴⁷

The hybrid core of deposit 15121–15567, made of Egyptianizing and Egyptian manufactured products may be incompatible with the idea of prestigious good to be used in the exchange networks or looted from tombs/temples, and find its cultural context in the growing relations between Egypt and Byblos at the turn of MB I. Faience figurines cannot be listed among the valuable goods: first, they were made of inexpensive raw materials and did not require a particularly sophisticated firing technique; therefore they were not particularly targeted among the ancient robbers;¹⁴⁸ second, faience figurines in Egypt belong to wealthier members of society, probably those who raised their social level thanks to commercial transactions,¹⁴⁹ but they were excluded among the highest levels (including royalty) of Egyptian society; therefore, they were not carrying any ruling/power ideology. From this perspective, the large group of faience figurines found at Byblos may indeed represent an import from Egypt by wealthy people (either Egyptians or Levantines) involved in commerce and exchange, who sailed to Byblos from Egypt and brought with them these symbolic protective (?) images. According to the customs of MBA Egypt, these figurines (single or in small groups) would have been placed with the deceased in a burial. The deposit of all these figurines in a single spot inside a cult structure, as the Temple of Obelisks, can be due to a (single?) symbolic event happening in Byblos during the MB I-II, which may be connected to a certain extent with the funerary sphere as well.

Summary of the artefacts from deposit 15121–15567 (discussed in points 1–3):

A. Faience figurines, listed according to type¹⁵⁰

A.1 = 17 standing hippopotami of various lengths, ranging from 5.9 cm (min.) to 19.9 cm (max) and heights from 3 cm (min.) to 10.4 cm (max.)

¹⁴⁴ In fact, the Egyptian objects found in the royal tombs mainly consist of selected objects of restricted variety: prestige goods, such as pectorals, pendants, bracelets and rings, rather than domestic artefacts, FLAMINI 2010, 157.

¹⁴⁵ PFOH 2009; FLAMINI 2010; WASTLHUBER 2013.

¹⁴⁶ KOPETZKY 2016, 157.

¹⁴⁷ FORSTNER-MÜLLER 2008, figs. 97a.7, 8; 97b.10. *Cf.* the burial equipment of the royal tombs of the Third Intermediate Period at Tanis is greatly augmented with objects looted from the New Kingdom (1500–1069 BC) royal tombs in the Valley of the Kings at Thebes.

¹⁴⁸ MINIACI 2018b.

¹⁴⁹ MINIACI 2017; MINIACI 2018a.

¹⁵⁰ In the absence of close first-hand inspection, only preliminary suggestions about these figurines can be advanced here based on published photographic records, drawings and the written description provided by Dunand.

(nos. 15121–15137)

3 roaring hippopotami of various heights, ranging from 3.5 cm (min.) to 19.2 cm (max.)

(nos. 15138–15140)

12 seated/crouching hippopotami of various lengths, ranging from 5.9 cm (min.) to 19 cm (max.) and heights from 2.5 cm (min.) to 6.3 cm (max)

(nos. 15141–15152)

A.2 = 8 standing hippopotami (Ipi/Taweret figures –?–) of various heights, ranging from 4.5 cm (min.) to 19.2 cm (max.)

(nos. 15153–15160)

A.3 = 1 hippopotamus standing on a plinth (length 6.3 cm x height 3.5 cm)

(no. 15161)

A.4 = 67 sitting monkeys of various heights, ranging from 4.1 cm (min.) to 8.3 cm (max.).

Most are represented seated with their arms on their legs and hands on their knees. A few hold either a vessel (no. 15216), a baby monkey (nos. 15217–15218, 15225, 15227), a musical instrument (no. 15226, probably a harp?), an indistinct object (no. 15220 bis), or are shown bringing their hand(s) to their mouth (nos. 15219–15220, 15222, 15224)

(nos. 15162–15227)

A.5 = 7 crouching cats of various lengths, ranging from 5.6 cm (min.) to 7 cm (max.) and heights from 3 cm (min.) to 5.2 cm (max)

(nos. 15228, 15230–15235)

A.6 = 5 standing dogs of various lengths, ranging from 3.9 cm (min.) to 7.5 (max.) and heights from 2.6 cm (min.) to 6.1 cm (max)

(nos. 15229, 15237–15240)

9 sitting or crouching dogs of various lengths, ranging from 6 cm (min.) to 7.5 (max.) and heights ranging from 3.5 cm (min.) to 4.6 (max)

(nos. 15236, 15242–15248, 15267)

2 dogs lying down on their side, length 7.2 cm x depth 3.7 cm x height 2.7 cm (no. 15285) and 6.4 cm x 2.6 cm x 2.9 cm

(nos. 15285–15286)

A.7 = 7 sitting/crouching cows/bovines of various lengths, ranging from 4.8 cm (min.) to 13.5 cm (max.) and heights from 2.5 cm (min.) to 3.8 cm (max)

(nos. 15261, 15264, 15280–15284)

A.8 = 10 sitting/crouching rams of various lengths, ranging from 6.2 cm (min.) to 9 cm (max.) and heights from 3.4 cm (min.) to 5.2 cm (max)

(nos. 15269–15277, 15279)

A.9 = 15 hedgehogs of various lengths, ranging from 4.6 cm (min.) to 10.1 cm (max.) and heights from 2.6 cm (min.) to 5.3 cm (max)

(nos. 15287–15301)

A.10 = 4 lions. No. 15302 stands on its hind legs (height 8.7 cm); no. 15303 is represented standing (length 8.8 cm x height 5 cm); while no. 15304 walking and roaring (length 5.1 cm x height 3.3 cm)

(nos. 15241, 15302–15304)

A.11 = 50 grotesque human characters with dwarfish features of various heights, ranging from 3.8 cm (min.) to 10.5 cm (max)
(nos. 15309–15360)

These figurines have often been identified as representations of dwarves (**Hornemann**, **Dasen add pages and years**); however, they do not seem to properly follow the conventional ancient Egyptian iconography of dwarves. The figurines represent deformed men: bald, with a flat head, protruding abdomen, short legs and arms, as well as prominent –and often exaggerated– sexual attributes. Dunand’s definition, ‘figurine grotesque’, is probably the most appropriate. The connotative feature of each figurine is either its posture or its action; rarely are these ‘human grotesque figurines’ portrayed static. According to the observations made by Dunand, only nos. 15330, 15332 apparently represent a female figure.

A standing figure, sometimes bent at the knees or crouching, holding his protruding belly with both hands (nos. 15309–15311; 15313; 15314 –but squatting; 15315; 15319; 15321; 15323; 15331 –with one hand on the belly, the other in the hair; 15348; 15354–15355, 15359 –all three supine).

A standing figure holding an object, frequently a vessel, in front of his belly. In some instances the object is raised to the mouth (nos. 15316–15317, 15322 –holding a vessel to the mouth; 15344 –holding a vessel; 15320, 15324, 15326, 15329, 15341 –holding an indistinct object; 15325, 15351 –holding a globular object; 15340 –holding a dish; 15343 –holding a musical instrument; 15357 –kneeling with a vessel in front of his face).

A standing figure with hands in various positions (nos. 15312 –with one hand below the chin and the other on the backside; 15327 –with one hand towards the ear and the other on the knee; 15330, 15332, 15337 –with both hands in the hair, apparently female; 15333 –with hand folded in front of the breast).

Figure carrying/holding in the hands or on the shoulders an animal, an infant, or a smaller human being (nos. 15318 –holding a monkey on the shoulder; 15335 –with an infant; 15336 –holding a lamb in the hands; 15338, 15347 –carrying a lamb/ram on the shoulder; 15339 –carrying a lamb on the shoulder; 15342, 15353 –with an indistinct animal/human being–; 15346 –carrying a small human being on the shoulders).

Figure wearing a head ornament, wig or headdress (nos. 15345, 15352).

Groups of figures (nos. 15334, 15360).¹⁵¹

A.12 = 1 human being with no dwarfish features, although of grotesque aspect (no. 15361), height 5.1 cm

A.13 = 8 female figures, so-called truncated ladies, of various heights, ranging from 11.1 cm (min.) to 11.9 cm (max)¹⁵²
(nos. 15362–15372)

A.14 = 25 indistinct animals. Nos. 15251*bis*–15254 have the appearance of a lion or wild cat; no. 15257 of a cow or bovine; no. 15260 of a goat. No. 15278 may belong to the hybrid creature type, as it seems to have human legs and a head similar to that of a ram with horns and an elongated snout

¹⁵¹ To this list it must be added: nos. 15328, 15349–15350 which have no particular features; nos. 15356, 15358 which are tablets representing these grotesque figurines (these two do not count in the total number of 50). DASEN 1993, 282–284, cat. nos. 150–190.

¹⁵² See also MORFOISSE, ANDREU-LANOË 2014, 287–288, cat. nos. 213–232.

(nos. 15249–15260, 15262–15263, 15265–15266, 15268, 15278, 15306–15307)

A.15 = 4 grape models of various lengths, ranging from 7 (min.) cm to 9.1 cm (max.)
(nos. 15446–15449)

A.16 = 4 cucumber models of various lengths, ranging from 7.7 cm (min.) to 11.3 cm (max.)
(nos. 15450–15453)

A.17 = 2 models of bridge-spouted jars
(nos. 15387–15388)

A.18 = 26 models of vessels of different shapes
(nos. 15384, 15389–15413)

A.19 = 3 models of bowls
(nos. 15414–15416)

A.20 = 4 models of lids
(nos. 15417–15420)

B. = a kohl container in the shape of a human female figure holding a kohl pot in black stone
(no. 15374)

C. = Terracotta vessel shaped as a human female figure
(no. 15375)

D. = human figure in black stone
(no. 15376)

E. = a steatite human figure with a lion's mane and ears, probably representing the hybrid entity Aha/Bes¹⁵³
(no. 15377)

F. = a seal of a seated man with a hieroglyphic inscription (no. 15378)

G. = 2 cuboid rods (no. 15462–15463) + the small pegged animals (nos. 15379–15383) belonging to them

H. = 2 calcite vessels (nos. 15385–15386)

I. = Beads
(nos. 15421–15446; 15469–15472)

J. = Various elements
(nos. 15454–15461, 15464–15465)

K. = Handle of a dagger

¹⁵³ Cf. ARUZ, BENZEL and EVANS 2008, 148.

(no. 15466)

L. = Ivory decorative inlay (?) with rounded circles

(no. 15454)

M. = Terracotta box

(no. 15468)

N. = Pottery vessels

(nos. 15473–15476)

O. = 89 bronze figurines + 1 bronze model of a male warrior with a lion face/mask (no. 15477)

(nos. 15478–15566)

Acknowledgments:

I would like to thank Prof. Marilina Betrò who gave the first input for writing this article; Wolfram Grajetzki and Karin Kopetzky for their suggestions; Paul Whelan for revising the English; Lorenzo Nigro, Ben Haring, Alessandra Pecchioli, Frances Pinnock, and Layla AbiZeid for their fruitful discussions. I am grateful to Anne Marie Afeiche and Nathalie Alam for their help in the work in Beirut National Museum and the permission to publish here the faience figurines from Byblos.

Bibliography:

AHRENS, A.

2011a A 'Hyksos Connection'? Thoughts on the Date of Dispatch of Some of the Middle Kingdom Objects Found in the Northern Levant, 21–40, in: J. MYNÁŘOVÁ (ed.), *Egypt and the Near East – the Crossroads. Proceedings of an International Conference on the Relations of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age, Prague, September 1–3, 2010*, Prague.

2011b Strangers in a strange land? The function and social significance of Egyptian imports in the northern Levant during the 2nd millennium BC, 285–307, in: K. DUISTERMAAT and I. REGULSKI (eds), *Intercultural contacts in the ancient Mediterranean: Proceedings of the international conference at the Netherlands-Flemish Institute in Cairo, 25th to 29th October 2008*, OLA 202, Leuven.

2015 The Egyptian objects from Tell Hizzin in the Beqa'a Valley (Lebanon): an archaeological and historical reassessment, *ÄUL* 25, 201–222.

2016 Remarks on the dispatch of Egyptian Middle Kingdom objects to the Levant during the Second Intermediate Period: an addendum to the Egyptian statues from Tell Hizzin (Lebanon), *GM* 250, 21–24.

ALBRIGHT, W. F.

1957 The High Place in Ancient Palestine, *VTSup* 4, 242–258.

1959 Dunand's new Byblos volume: a Lycian at the Byblian court, *BASOR* 155, 31–34.

1964 The Eighteenth-Century princes of Byblos and the chronology of Middle Bronze, *BASOR* 176, 38–46.

- ALLEN, J.P.
2008 The historical Inscription of Khnumhotep at Dahshur. Preliminary Report, *BASOR* 352, 29–39.
- ALTENMÜLLER, H.
2015 *Zwei Annalenfragmente aus dem frühen Mittleren Reich*, SAK Beihefte 16, Hamburg.
- ALTENMÜLLER, H. and MOUSSA, A.M.
1991 Die Inschrift Amenemhets II aus dem Ptah-Tempel von Memphis. Ein Vorbericht, *SAK* 18, 1–48.
- ANONYMOUS
1998 *Liban: l'autre rive. Exposition présentée à l'Institut du monde arabe du 27 octobre au 2 mai 1999*, Paris.
- ARUZ, J., BENZEL, K. and EVANS, J.M.
2008 *Beyond Babylon art, trade, and diplomacy in the Second Millennium B.C.*, New Haven–London–New York.
- BADER, B.
2003 The Egyptian jars from Sidon in their Egyptian context, *AHL* 18, 31–37.
- BADER, B., FORSTNER-MÜLLER, I., KOPETZKY, K. and DOUMET-SERHAL, C.
2009 An Egyptian jar from Sidon in its Egyptian context: some fresh evidence, *AHL* 29, 79–83.
- BADRE, L.
1997 Bey 003 preliminary report: excavations of the American University of Beirut Museum, *BAAL* 2, 6–94.
- BARRIK, W.B.
1975 The Funerary Character of 'High Places' in Ancient Palestine: A Reassessment, *VT* 25, 565–595.
- BEHRMANN, A.
1989 *Das Nilpferd in der Vorstellungswelt der Alten Ägypter*. Vol. II: *Katalog*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 22; Archäologie 38, Frankfurt am Main.
- BÉNÉDITE, M.G.
1911 *Objets de toilette. 1^{re} partie, peignes, épingles de tête, étuis et pots à kohol, stylets à kohol*, Le Caire.
- BEN-TOR, A.
1991 New light on the relations between Egypt and southern Palestine during the Early Bronze Age, *BASOR* 281, 3–10.
- BIETAK, M.
2002 Relative and absolute chronology of the Middle Bronze Age: comments on the present state of research, 29–42, in: M. BIETAK (ed.), *The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant*:

Proceedings of an International Conference on MB IIA ceramic material, Vienna, 24th–26th January 2001. Wien.

BIETAK, M. and CZERNY, E.

2008 *The Bronze Age in the Lebanon: Studies on the archaeology and chronology of Lebanon, Syria and Egypt*, CCEM 17; DGÖAW 50, Wien.

VON BISSING, F.W.

1904 *Steingefässe*, Vienna.

BOU-ASSAF, Y.M.

2008 Organisation architecturale à Byblos (Liban) au Bronze Ancien, 51–60, in: BIETAK, CZERNY (eds) 2008.

BOURRIAU, J.

1988 *Pharaohs and Mortals: Egyptian Art in the Middle Kingdom: Exhibition organised by the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, 19 April to 26 June, Liverpool 18 July to 4 September 1988*, Cambridge.

2001 Change of body position in Egyptian burials from the mid XIIth Dynasty until the early XVIIIth Dynasty, 1–20, in: H. WILLEMS (ed.), *Social aspects of funerary culture in the Egyptian Old and Middle Kingdoms: proceedings of the international symposium held at Leiden University 6–7 June, 1996*, OLA 103, Leuven.

BRAULINSKA, K.

2017 Middle Kingdom dog figurines. General remarks, 35–70, in: G. MINIACI, M. BETRÒ and S. QUIRKE (eds), *Company of Images: Modelling the imaginary world of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000–15000 BC). Proceedings of the International Conference of the EPOCHS Project held 18th–20th September 2014 at UCL, London*, OLA 262, Leuven–Paris–New Malden.

BREYER, F.

2010 *Ägypten und Anatolien: politische, kulturelle und sprachliche Kontakte zwischen dem Niltal und Kleinasien im 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, CCEM 25; DGÖAW 63, Wien.

2010

BROODBANK, C.

2013. *The making of the Middle Sea: A history of the Mediterranean from the beginning to the emergence of the Classical World*, London–New York.

BRUNTON, G.

1937 *Mostagedda and the Tasian Culture*, British Museum Expedition to Middle Egypt 1928, 1929, London.

BUSSMANN, R.

2010 *Die Provinztempel Ägyptens von der 0. bis zur 11. Dynastie*, PÄ 30, Leiden.

2011 Local traditions in early Egyptian temples, 747–762, in: R.F. FRIEDMAN and P.N. FISKE (eds), *Egypt at its Origins 3: Proceedings of the Third International Conference 'Origin of the State: Predynastic and Early Dynastic Egypt'*, London, 27th July – 1st August 2008, OLA 205, Leuven–Paris–New Malden.

2017 Personal piety: an archaeological response, 71–91, in: G. MINIACI, M. BETRÒ and S. QUIRKE (eds), *Company of Images: Modelling the imaginary world of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000–15000 BC). Proceedings of the International Conference of the EPOCHS Project held 18th–20th September 2014 at UCL, London*, OLA 262, Leuven.

CAUBET, A., and A. KACZMARCZYK

1987 Bronze Age faience from Ras Shamra (Ugarit), 47–56, in: M. BIMSON and I. C. FREESTONE (eds), *Early vitreous materials*. London.

DASEN, V.

1993 *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford.

DAVIES, S.

2007 *Bronzes from the sacred animal necropolis at North Saqqara*, 174–187, in: M. HILL and D. SCHORSCH (eds), *Gifts for the gods: Images from Egyptian temples*, New York.

DELANGE, E.

2012 *Fouilles françaises d'Eléphantine (1906–1911). Archives Clermont-Ganneau et Clédat*, Paris.

DOSSIN, G.

1969 Trois inscriptions cuneiformes de Byblos, *MUSJ* 45/14, 241–255.

DOUMET-SERHAL, C.

2013 Tracing Sidon's Mediterranean networks in the second millennium B.C.: Receiving, transmitting, and assimilating. Twelve years of British Museum excavations, 132–141, in: J. ARUZ, S. GRAFF, and Y. RAKIC (eds), *Cultures in Contact: From Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean in the Second Millennium BC*, Yale.

DUNAND, M.

1937–39 *Fouilles de Byblos I: 1926–1932*, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 24, Paris.

1950–58 *Fouilles de Byblos II: 1933–1938*, Études et documents d'archéologie 3, Paris.

EIGNER, D.

2003 *Tell Ibrahim Awad: A sequence of temple buildings from Dynasty 0 to the Middle Kingdom*, 162–170, in: Z. HAWASS and L. PINCH BROCK (eds), *Egyptology at the dawn of the twenty-first century: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Egyptologists, Cairo 2000*, Vol. I, Cairo.

ENGELBACH, R.

1923 *Harageh*, BSAE 28, London.

ESPINEL, A.D.

2002 The Role of the Temple of Ba'alat Gebal as Intermediary between Egypt and Byblos during the Old Kingdom, *SAK* 30, 103–119.

FINKBEINER, U.

1981 Untersuchungen zur Stratigraphie des Obeliskentemples in Bylos, *BaM* 12, 13–69.

- FISCHER, H.G.
1968 *Ancient Egyptian Representations of Turtles*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art Papers 13, New York.
- FLAMINI, R.
2010 Elite Emulation and Patronage Relationships in the Middle Bronze: The Egyptianized Dynasty of Byblos, *Tel Aviv* 37(2), 154–168.
- FORSTNER-MÜLLER, I.
2008 *Tell el-Dab'a XVI: die Gräber des Areals A/II von Tell el-Dab'a*, UZK 28; DGÖAW 44, Wien.
- FORSTNER-MÜLLER, I. and KOPETZKY, K.
2009 Egypt and Lebanon: New Evidence for Cultural Exchanges in the first half of the 2nd Millennium B.C., *BAAL Hors-Série* 6, 143–157.
- FRANCIS-ALLOUCHE, M. and GRIMAL, N.
2016 The Maritime Approaches To Ancient Byblos (Lebanon), *JEMAHS* 4(2–3), 242–277.
- FRIED, L.S.
2002 The High Places (bāmôt) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation, *JAOS* 122(3), 437–465.
- GARROW, D.
2012 Odd deposits and average practice. A critical history of the concept of structured deposition, *Archaeological Dialogues* 19(2), 85–115.
- GIDDY, L.
2016 *The Survey of Memphis IX. Kom Rabi'a: The objects from the late Middle Kingdom installations (levels VI–VIII)*, Excavation Memoir 115, London.
- HALLER, A.
1954 *Die Gräber und Gräfte von Assur*, WVDOG 65, Berlin.
- HANSEN, D.P.
1969 Some remarks on the chronology and style of object from Byblos, *AJA* 73(3), 281–284.
- HAYES, W.C.
1959 *The Scepter of Egypt: A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Vol. II: The Hyksos Period and the New Kingdom (1675–1080 B.C.)*, New York.
- HELK, W.
1976 Ägyptische Statuen im Ausland – ein chronologisches Problem, *UF* 8, 101–115.
- HIGGINBOTHAM, C.
1996 Elite emulation and Egyptian governance in Ramesside Canaan, *Tel Aviv* 23 (2), 154–169.

- 2000 *Egyptianization and elite emulation in Ramesside Palestine: governance and accommodation on the imperial periphery*, CHANE 2, Leiden.
- HÖFLMAYER, F., KAMLAH, J., SADER, H., DEE, M.W. and KUTSCHERA, W.
 2016 New Evidence for Middle Bronze Age Chronology and Synchronisms in the Levant: Radiocarbon Dates from Tell el-Burak, Tell el-Dab‘a, and Tel Ifshar Compared, *BASOR* 37, 53–76.
- JIDEJIAN, N.
 1968 *Byblos through the ages*, with a foreword by Maurice Dunand, Beirut.
- KEMP, B.
 2006 *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a civilization*, 2nd edition, London–New York.
- KEMP, B.J. and MERRILLEES, R.S.
 1980 *Minoan Pottery in Second Millennium Egypt*, Mainz am Rhein.
- EL-KHADRAGI, M.
 2007 Some significant Features in the Decoration of the Chapel of Iti-ibi-iqer at Asyut, *SAK* 36, 105–135.
- KOPETZKY, K.
 2015 Egyptian Burial costumes in the Royal tombs I–III of Byblos, *BAAL Hors-Série* 10, 393–412.
 2016 Some remarks on the relations between Egypt and the Levant during the late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period, 143–159, in: G. MINIACI and W. GRAJETZKI (eds), *The world of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000–1550 BC): Contributions on archaeology, art, religion, and written sources*. Vol. II. London.
 forthcoming, *Tell el-Dab‘a and Byblos: New chronological Evidence*, in: K. KOPETZKY (ed.), *The Synchronisation of Relative Chronologies in the First Half of the Second Millennium BC: Tell el-Dab‘a and the Northern Levant*, CCEM, Vienna.
- KOŞAY, H.Z.
 1944 *Ausgrabungen von Alaca Höyük: ein Vorbericht über die im Auftrage der Türkischen Geschichts kommission im Sommer 1936 durchgeführten Forschungen und Entdeckungen*, Ankara.
- LACOVARA, P.
 1987 The internal chronology of Kerma, *BzS* 2, 51–74.
- LAUFFRAY, J.
 1995 La méthode de fouille de M. Dunand à Byblos, *Topoi* 5, 453–468.
- LEGRAIN, G.A.
 1894 *Catalogue des antiquités égyptiennes*, Collection H. Hoffmann, Paris.
- LIPÍŃSKI, E.
 1995 *Dieux et déesses de l’univers phénicien et punique*, OLA 64, Leuven.
 2009 *Resheph: A Syro-Canaanite Deity*, OLA 181, Leuven.

- MARCUS, E.S.
2007 Amenemhat II and the Sea: Maritime Aspects of the Mit-Rahina (Memphis) Inscription, *ÄUL* 17, 137–190.
- MARTIN, G.T.,
1971 *Egyptian Administrative and Private-Name Seals Principally of the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*, Oxford.
- MAZZONI, S.
1987 Faience in Ebla during Middle Bronze Age II, 65–77, in: M. BIMSON and I.C. FREESTONE (eds), *Early vitreous materials*. London.
- MINIACI, G.
2013–14 Collecting groups: The archaeological context of the late Middle Kingdom Cemetery A at Harageh, *EDAL* 4, 43–60.
2017 *Unbroken stories: Middle Kingdom faience figurines in their archaeological context*, 235–284, in: G. MINIACI, M. BETRÒ and S. QUIRKE (eds), *Company of Images: Modelling the imaginary world of Middle Kingdom Egypt (2000–15000 BC). Proceedings of the International Conference of the EPOCHS Project held 18th–20th September 2014 at UCL, London*, OLA 262, Leuven.
2019 change elsewhere *Miniature Forms as Transformative Thresholds: Faience Figurines in Middle Bronze Age Egypt (1800 BC–1650 BC)*, BMPES 7, Leuven–Paris–London.
2018b Faience craftsmanship in the Middle Kingdom. A market paradox: inexpensive material for prestige goods?, 139–158, in: G. MINIACI, J.-C. MORENO GARCIA, S. QUIRKE, and A. STAUDER (eds), *The Arts of Making in Ancient Egypt: Voices, images, artefacts of material producers 2000–1550BC*, Leiden.
2018c Burial equipment of *rishi* coffins and the osmosis of the ‘rebirth machine’ at the end of the Middle Kingdom, **pages** in: J.H. TAYLOR and M. VANDENBEUSCH (eds), *Ancient Egyptian Coffins: Craft Traditions and Functionality: Proceedings of the Annual Egyptology Colloquium at the British Museum, 28 July–29 July 2014*, BMPES 4, London.
forthcoming The craft of the non-mechanically reproducible: targeting centres of faience figurine production in 1800-1650 BC Egypt, in: J. A. SERRANO and A. MORALES (eds.), *Palace culture and its echoes in the provinces in the Middle Kingdom of Egypt. Jaén, 2nd and 3rd June 2016*, Boston.
- MONTET, P.
1928 *Byblos et l’Égypte: 1921–1924*, Paris.
- MOOREY, P.R.S.
1990 From Gulf to Delta in the Fourth Millennium: The Syrian Connection, *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies* 21, 62–69.
1999 *Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries. The Archaeological Evidence*, Winona Lake, Indiana.
- MOORTGAT, A.
1969 *The Art of Ancient Mesopotamia*, London.
- MORFOISSE, F. and ANDREU-LANOË, G.
2014 *Sésostris III: Pharaon de légende*. LDA Hors-série 27, Dijon.

MOURAD, A.-L.

2015 *Rise of the Hyksos: Egypt and the Levant from the Middle Kingdom to the Early Second Intermediate Period*, Archaeopress Egyptology 11, Oxford.

MÜNNICH, M.M.

2013 *The God Resheph in the Ancient Near East*, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 11, Tübingen.

NAKHAI, B.A.

1994 What's a Bamah? How Sacred Space Functioned in Ancient Israel, *BAR* 20(3), 18–29.

NEGBI, O.

1976 *Canaanite Gods in Metal: An Archaeological Study of Ancient Syro-Palestinian Figurines*, Tel Aviv.

NEGBI, O. and MOSKOWITZ, O.

1966 The 'Foundation Deposits' or 'Offering Deposits' of Byblos, *BASOR* 184, 21–26.

NIGRO, L.

2002 The MB pottery horizon of Tell Mardikh/ancient Ebla in a chronological perspective, 297–328: in: M. BIETAK (ed.), *The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant: Proceedings of an International Conference on MB IIA ceramic material, Vienna, 24th–26th January 2001*, Vienna.

2009 The Eighteen Century BC Princes of Byblos and Ebla and the Chronology of the Middle Bronze Age, 159–175, in: A.-M. MAÏLA-AFEICHE (ed.), *Interconnections in the Eastern Mediterranean: Lebanon in the Bronze and Iron Ages. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Beirut 2008*, Beirut.

OPPENHEIM, A., ARNOLD, DO., ARNOLD, D., and YAMAMOTO, K. (eds)

2015 *Ancient Egypt Transformed: The Middle Kingdom*, New York.

PETRIE, W.M.F.

1890 *Kahun, Gurob and Hawara*, London.

1952 *City of Shepherd Kings and Ancient Gaza V*, BSAE 64, London.

PFÄLZNER, P.

2011 Die Gruft VII. Eine neu entdeckte Grabanlage unter dem Königspalast von Qatna, *MDOG* 143, 63–139.

2014 Royal funerary practices and inter-regional contacts in the Middle Bronze Age Levant: new evidence from Qatna, 141–156, in: P. PFÄLZNER, H. NIEHR, E. PERNICKA, S. LANGE and T. KÖSTER (eds), *Contextualising grave inventories in the ancient Near East: Proceedings of a workshop at the London 7th ICAANE in April 2010 and an International Symposium in Tübingen in November 2010, both organised by the Tübingen Post-Graduate School "Symbols of the Dead"*, Wiesbaden.

PFOH, E.

2009 Some Remarks on Patronage in Syria–Palestine During the Late Bronze Age, *JESHO* 52(3), 363–381.

- PINCH, G.
1993 *Votive offerings to Hathor*, Oxford.
- PINCH, G., and WARASKA, E.A.
2009 Votive Practices, *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, 1(1). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7kp4n7rk>.
- PINNOCK, F.
2007 Byblos and Ebla in the 3rd millennium BC. Two urban patterns in comparison, 109–133, in: L. NIGRO (ed.), *Byblos and Jericho in the Early Bronze I: Social Dynamics and Cultural Interactions. Proceedings of the International Workshop held in Rome on March 7th 2006 by Rome “La Sapienza” University*. Rome “La Sapienza” Studies on the Archaeology of Palestine & Transjordan 4.
2009 Open Cults and Temples in Syria and the Levant, *BAAL Hors-Série* 6, 195–207.
2012 Some Gublite Artifact possibly made at Ebla, *Syria* 89, 85–100.
- PRAG, K.
1986 Byblos and Egypt in the fourth millennium BC, *Levant* 18, 59–74.
- QUIBELL, J.E.
1898 *The Ramesseum / The tomb of Ptah-Hetep*, BSAE 2, London.
- QUIRKE, S.
2016 *Birth tusks: The armoury of health in context – Egypt 1800 BC. Including publication of Petrie Museum examples photographed by Gianluca Miniaci, and drawn from the photographs by Andrew Boyce*, MKS 3, London.
- ROMANO, J.F.
1989 *The Bes-image in Pharaonic Egypt*, Ann Arbor.
- SAAD, Z.Y.
1951 *Royal excavations at Helwan (1945–1947)*, Le Caire.
- SAAD, Z.Y. and AUTRY, J.F.
1969 *The excavations at Helwan: Art and civilization in the first and second Egyptian dynasties*, Le Caire.
- SAGHIEH, M.
1975 *Byblos in the Third Millennium B.C. A Reconstruction of the Stratigraphy and a Study of the Cultural Connections*, PhD dissertation: University of London.
1983 *Byblos in the Third Millennium B.C. A Reconstruction of the Stratigraphy and a Study of the Cultural Connections*, Warminster.
- SALA, M.
2007 Early shrines at Byblos and Tell es-Sultan/ancient Jericho in the Early Bronze I (3300–3000 BC), 47–68, in: L. NIGRO (ed.), *Byblos and Jericho in the Early Bronze I: Social Dynamics and Cultural Interactions. Proceedings of the International Workshop held in Rome on March 7th 2006 by Rome “La Sapienza” University*. Rome “La Sapienza” Studies on the Archaeology of Palestine & Transjordan, 4.

SALLES, J. F.
1998 Byblos, métropole maritime, 66–70, in: ANONYMOUS, *Liban, l'autre rive, catalogue de l'exposition présentée à l'Institut du Monde Arabe*, Paris.

SCANDONE MATTHIAE, G.
1981 Il problema delle influenze egiziane sulla religione fenicia, 61–80, in: *La religione fenicia. Matrici orientali e sviluppi occidentali. Atti del colloquio in Roma, 6 Marzo 1979*, Roma.

SCHIESTL, R.
2007 The coffin from Tomb I at Byblos, *ÄUL* 17, 265–271.

SCHIESTL, R. and SEILER, A.
2012 *Handbook of pottery of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom*. Vol. I: *The corpus volume*; Vol. II: *The regional volume*, CCEM 31; DGÖAW 72, Vienna.

STEINDORFF, G.
1935–37 *Aniba. Mission archéologique de Nubie, 1929–1934*, Glückstadt–Hamburg–New York.

TEISSIER, B.
1995 *Egyptian Iconography on Syro-Palestinian Cylinder Seals of the Middle Bronze Age*, OBOSA 11, Fribourg.

TIRIBILLI, E.
2018, *Bronze Figurines of the Petrie Museum from 2000 BC to AD 400*, GHPE 28, London.

WASTLHUBER, C.
2013 The relationship between Egypt and the Levant during the 12th Dynasty: four case studies and the generation of prestige, 68–93, in: F. DE ANGELIS (ed.), *Regionalism and globalism in antiquity: exploring their limits*, Leuven.

WEIN, E.J.
1963 *7000 Jahre Byblos*, Nürnberg.

WEINSTEIN, J.M.
1974 A statuette of the Princess Sobeknefru at Tell Gezer, *BASOR* 213, 49–57.
1975 Egyptian Relations with Palestine in the Middle Kingdom, *BASOR* 217, 1–16.
2001 *Byblos*, in: D.B. REDFORD (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford.

XELLA, P.
1994 Pantheon e culto a Biblo. Aspetti e problemi, 195–214, in: E. ACQUARO *et al.* (eds), *Biblo. Una città e la sua cultura. Atti del Colloquio Internazionale, Roma, 5–7 dicembre 1990*, Collezione di Studi Fenici 34, Roma.

Abbreviation:

AHL *Archaeology & History in Lebanon*, Beirut

AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
ÄUL	<i>Ägypten und Levante: Zeitschrift für ägyptische Archäologie und deren Nachbargebiete</i> , Vienna
BAAL	<i>Bulletin d'archéologie et d'architecture libanaises</i> , Beirut
BaM	<i>Baghdader Mitteilungen</i> , Baghdad
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i> , Washington
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> , New Haven
BMPES	<i>British Museum Publications on Egypt and Sudan</i> , Leuven
BSAE	<i>British School of Archaeology in Egypt</i> , London
BzS	<i>Beiträge zur Sudanforschung</i> , Vienna
CCEM	<i>Contributions to the Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean</i> , Vienna
CHANE	<i>Culture and History of the Ancient Near East</i> , Leiden–Boston
DGÖAW	<i>Denkschriften der Gesamtkademie, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> , Vienna
EDAL	<i>Egyptian & Egyptological Documents, Archives, Libraries</i> , Milano
GHPE	<i>Golden House Publications. Egyptology</i> , London
GM	<i>Göttinger Miszellen</i> , Göttingen
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> , Baltimore/Boston/New Haven
JEMAHS	<i>Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies</i> , Pennsylvania
JESHO	<i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient</i> , Leiden
MKS	<i>Middle Kingdom Studies</i> , London
MUSJ	<i>Mémoires/Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph</i> , Beyrouth
OLA	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta</i> , Leuven
SAK	<i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i> , Hamburg
Syria	<i>Syria: Revue d'art orientale et d'archéologie</i> , Paris
Tel Aviv	<i>Tel Aviv: the Journal of the Institute of Archaeology</i> , Tel Aviv
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen: Internationales Jahrbuch für die Altertumskunde Syrien-Palästinas</i> , Kevelaer/Neukirchen/Vluyn/Münster
UZK	<i>Untersuchungen der Zweigstelle Kairo des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts, herausgegeben in Verbindung mit der Ägyptischen Kommission der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> , Vienna
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentus</i> , Leiden
VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentus, Supplement</i> , Leiden
WVDOG	<i>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft</i> , Leipzig–Berlin–Saarbrücken–Saarwellingen

Captions of Figures:

Fig. 01: Plan of the Obelisk Temple during the MBA phase, from DUNAND 1950–58, vol. II, 640–641, fig. 767.

Fig. 02: Plan of the different phases of use of the Obelisk Temple, from SAGHIEH 1983, fig. 7.

Fig. 03: Vertical stratigraphy of the Dunand's excavations in the 'area I' of the Obelisk Temple (highlighted the level of the deposit *f*), from SAGHIEH 1983, fig. 7.

Fig. 04: Steatite/limestone (?) figurine of a standing human figure with lion's mane and ears, usually identified with Aha/Bes, Dunand's no. 15377. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 05: Steatite (?) cuboid rod(s), Dunand's no. 15462. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 06: Steatite kohl container in human form, Dunand's no. 15374. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 07: Faience figurine of a lion, Dunand's no. 15241 (DGA 941). Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 08: Faience figurines representing a kneeling human figure; a) Dunand's no. 15357 (DGA 1709; B.8150) from Byblos. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut; b) MMA 22.1.124, from Lisht North, Pit 884 © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York – CC0.

Fig. 09: Faience figurines representing a human figure carrying a calf on the shoulders; in the upper row: a) Dunand's 15338 (DGA 1715/1762; B.8165) from Byblos; b) Dunand's nos. 15347 (B.8164) from Byblos; in the lower row: c) British Museum, EA 59397, unprovenanced; d) Boston, MFA 11.1524, unprovenanced. Credits: a-b) Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut; c) Photo G. Miniaci © Trustees of the British Museum; d) © courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Fig. 10: Faience figurines representing a grotesque human figure; a) Dunand's no. 15311 (DGA 1720; B.8145), from Byblos. From DUNAND 1950–58, pl. 97; b) British Museum EA 22882, unprovenanced (probably from Lahun, see MINIACI forthcoming). Photo G. Miniaci © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 11: Faience figurines representing a grotesque human figure; a) British Museum EA 24409, unprovenanced (probably from Lahun, see MINIACI forthcoming). Photo G. Miniaci © Trustees of the British Museum; b) Dunand's no. 15316 (DGA 1747; B.8155), from Byblos. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 12: Faience figurine of a roaring hippopotamus; a) Dunand's no. 15319 (DGA 1743; B.8129) from Byblos. Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut; b) MMA 08.200.37 from Lisht North, Pit 805 © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York – CC0.

Fig. 13: Faience figurine of a ramping lion; a) MMA 22.1.178, from Lisht North, Pit 885 © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York – CC0; b) Dunand's no. 15302 (B.8207) from Byblos. From DUNAND 1950–58, pl. 108.

Fig. 14: Faience figurine of a lion playing a harp (?), British Museum EA 49712. Photo G. Miniaci © Trustees of the British Museum.

Fig. 15: Faience figurine of a dog with the fore paws crossed, Petrie Museum UC 45080 © The Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology.

Fig. 16: Faience figurine of a hippopotamus from Byblos (DGA 918). Photo G. Miniaci © Ministry of Culture/Directorate General of Antiquities – National Museum of Beirut.

Fig. 17: Faience figurine of a lion found in corridor B, 126 in Tumulus K X at Kerma. Boston, MFA 20.1314 Photograph © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Fig. 18: Faience figurine of a hippopotamus found inside K 1001 of Tumulus K X at Kerma. Boston, MFA 13.4121 Photograph © Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.