



The Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities
The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities/Société pour l'Étude de l'Égypte Ancienne
Rm. 200, 4 Bancroft Ave.
Dept. of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON
M5S 1A1
Canada

To whom this may concern,

We are writing at the request of Dra. Roxana Flammini of the Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina (Instituto Multidisciplinario de Historia y Ciencias Humanas) to verify that her article, "Disputed Rulership in Upper Egypt: reconsidering the Second Stela of Kamose (K2)", which appeared in the *Journal of The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities (JSSEA)* volume 38 (2011-12) was published in November 2013.

Dr. Lyn Green, President,
The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities/Société pour l'Étude de l'Égypte Ancienne
For the Editorial Committee of the *Journal of The Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities*

THE JOURNAL OF
THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF
EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES



VOLUME XXXVIII
2011-12

THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES
Toronto, Canada

***JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF
EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES***

VOLUME 38

Editor in Chief:
Katja Goebs

Associate Editor:
Sally Katary

French Language Editor:
Jean Revez

Assistant Editor:
William Cooney

Table of Contents

Message from the editor	v
Courtney McConnan Borstad and Nancy C. Lovell Dental Disease at Ancient Mendes (Tell er-Rubʿa), Egypt	1
Peter Brand, Emmanuel Laroze and Jean Revez Le projet américano-canadien de relevé des colonnes de la Grande Salle Hypostyle de Karnak: objectifs globaux et méthodologie	17
Núria Castellano i Solé Un hypogée gréco-romain à Oxyrhynchos	35
Roxana Flammini Disputed Rulership in Upper Egypt: Reconsidering the Second Stela of Kamose (K2)	55
Nicole B. Hansen Still Laughing After All These Years: An Ancient Egyptian “Joke” Survives the Millennia	77
Sarah L. Ketchley Reliefs from the Tomb of Montuemhat (TT 34) in the Museo Archeologico, Florence	81
Benoît Lurson Compléments à la représentation de la « Sortie de Min » du Ramesseum	97
Ana I. Navajas La poterie de type C (C-Ware) de Nagada I conservée au Musée des Confluences (Lyon): Étude muséographique, historique et archéologique	121
Tara C. Prakash King and Coward? The Representation of the Foreign Ruler in the Battle of Kadesh Reliefs	141
Thomas Schneider Wie der Wettergott Ägypten aus der grossen Flut errettete: Ein "inkultrierter" ägyptischer Sintflut-Mythos und die Gründung der Ramsesstadt	173
Tamás Mekis [Reprinted table from JSSEA 37] Two Hypocephali and Some Other Ptolemaic Finds From Theban Tomb (Kampp) – 43-	195

David A. Aston and Barbara G. Aston. *Late Period Pottery from the New Kingdom Necropolis at Saqqara*.

Steven Blake Shubert

Nathalie Baum. *Le temple d'Edfou. À la découverte du Grand Siège de Rê-Harakhty*.

Cedric Gobeil

Janine Bourriau. *The Survey of Memphis IV. Kom Rabia: The New Kingdom Pottery*.

Rexine Hummel

Arlette David. *The Legal Register of Ramesside Private Law Instruments*.

Sally L.D. Katary

Wolfram Grajetzki. *The Coffin of Zemathor and Other Rectangular Coffins of the Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period*.

Christina Geisen

Glenn Janes. *Shabtis: A Private View and The Shabti Collections 1: West Park Museum, Macclesfield*.

Peter Robinson

David Jeffreys. *The Survey of Memphis VII. The Hekekyan Papers and Other Sources for the Survey of Memphis*.

Andrew Bednarski

Christian Leitz. *Der Sarg des Panehemisis in Wien Mit einer detaillierten Bilddokumentation der Särge des Panehemisis und Horemhab auf DVD*.

Colleen Manassa

A.B. Lloyd, A.J. Spencer, and A. el-Khouli. *Saqqâra Tombs III: The Mastaba of Neferseshemptah*.

Robyn Gillam

Alexandra Philip-Stéphan. *Dire le droit en Égypte pharaonique: Contribution à l'étude des structures et mécanismes juridictionnels jusqu'au Nouvel Empire*.

Sandra L. Lippert

Heike C. Schmidt. *Westcar on the Nile. A Journey through Egypt in the 1820s*.

Daniele Salvoldi

Gábor Schreiber. *The Mortuary Monument of Djehutymes II. Finds from the New Kingdom to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.*

Morris L. Bierbrier

Shaw, Ian. *Hatnub: Quarrying Travertine in Ancient Egypt.*

Sally L.D. Katary

Veldmeijer, André J. *Tutankhamun's Footwear. Studies of Ancient Egyptian Footwear.*

Lyn Green

Carola Vogel. *The Fortifications of Ancient Egypt 3000-1780 BCE.*

Nick Wernick.

Penelope Wilson and Dimitrios Grigoropoulos. *The West Delta Regional Survey, Beheira and Kafr el-Sheikh Provinces.*

Gregory D. Mumford

Guidelines for Contributors	283
About the SSEA	285

Disputed Rulership in Upper Egypt: Reconsidering the Second Stela of Kamose (K2)

Roxana Flammini*

Abstract: The Second Stela of Kamose (K2) has received a wide spectrum of analyses from different points of view. This paper presents a discussion on the use of the title *ḥqꜣ* and on the conception of the social bonds sustained by the Hyksos ruler as preserved in the text.

Résumé: La deuxième stèle de Kamosis (K2) a fait l'objet de nombreuses études aux points de vue différents. Cet article fait le point sur l'utilisation du titre *ḥqꜣ* et sur l'établissement des liens sociaux avec le souverain Hyksos, tels qu'évoqués dans le texte.

Keywords/Mots-clefs: Kamose, Apophis, Second Intermediate Period/Deuxième Période Intermédiaire, Hyksos, rulership/souveraineté, patronage

Introduction

Of the so-called Kamose texts (the First Stela of Kamose –K1; the Carnarvon Tablet –CT;¹ the Second Stela of Kamose – K2²– and the recently identified Third Stela of Kamose – K3),³ K2 is the most representative Egyptian text linked to the final phase of

* Pontifical Catholic University of Argentina / CONICET (r.flammini@conicet.gov.ar)

¹ Two fragments of K1 were found in 1932 and 1935 by Henri Chevrier. These fragments were reused in the building of the Third Pylon of Karnak. Cf. Pierre Lacau, "Un stèle du roi 'Kamosis,'" *ASAE* 39 (1939): 245-271; Labib Habachi, *The Second Stela of Kamose and his Struggle against the Hyksos Ruler and his Capital*, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo (Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1972), 45. CT was found in 1908 by Carnarvon and Carter in a tomb located at Dra Abu El-Naga. This scribal board was first published by Alan H. Gardiner, "The Defeat of the Hyksos by Kamose: The Carnarvon Tablet, No. I," *JEA* 3 (1916): 95-110. Cf. also Hans Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose* (Baltimore: Halgo, 1995), 31.

² On K2, cf. Habachi, *Second Stela of Kamose*; Harry S. Smith and Alexandrina Smith, "A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts," *ZÄS* 103 (1976): 48-76; Wolfgang Helck, *Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und Neue Texte der 18. Dynastie* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983); William Kelly Simpson (ed.), *The Literature of Ancient Egypt. An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, Stelae, Autobiographies, and Poetry* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2003). On the Kamose Texts, including K2, cf. Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose*, 31-120.

³ On K3, two independent papers were published almost at the same time: cf. Luc Gabolde, "Une troisième Stèle de Kamosis?," *Khyphi* 4 (2005): 35-42; and Charles C. Van Siclen III, "Conservation of the Third Kamose Stela at Karnak (Phase 1)," in *Bulletin ARCE* 188 (Fall 2005): 21-23. Cf. a recent translation of the fragments and a general evaluation of the source in: Charles C. Van Siclen III, "The Third Stela of Kamose," in *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, ed. Marcel Marée (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 355-65, and bibliography cited there. Despite the damaged state of the source, Van Siclen III considers that probably K3 was the beginning of K2 – although the later was found under the Second Pylon, probably reused as a foundation for a colossus of Ramesses II – but in this scenario, K1 would not be

the Second Intermediate Period (c. 1560-1530 BC, phase D/2 at Tell el Dab^{ca}).⁴ Unfortunately, it is not possible to obtain a whole picture of the situation because the only contemporary texts to reconstruct this specific period came from the Egyptian core located in the Theban area. There is no textual evidence of the Hyksos or the Nubians that enables us to reconstruct the relationships between them and the Egyptian ruler from their perspective.

From the point of view of the literary analysis, K2 is usually categorized as an example of *Königsnovelle*, where the king is presented “as the hero of a (real or fictional) historical episode in which a state of uncertainty or deficiency is overcome by his word or his decision.”⁵ Besides, K2 is usually described as a piece of Egyptian propaganda depicting the *topos* of the “always triumphant” Egyptian king, the one who must destroy the enemies of the land. Commonly, “propaganda” is defined as “a message, communication, or statement addressed by its author on behalf of an individual or group (a god, king, official, class) or ideology (cult, kingship, personal ambition, special interest group) to a specific or general audience” with “an overt or implicit attempt to persuade an audience to follow the author’s desire, to promote or publicize a cause, or to influence its attitude.”⁶ I prefer not to define the text in that way, but as an expression of the complex way Egyptians understood the world and their relationships. In fact, “propaganda” is a concept strongly biased by modern and western conceptions, while the ancient Egyptians’ beliefs were connected to the idea that it was possible to obtain a certain result by putting action into words (i.e. the Execration Texts). Hans Goedicke considered that the stela of Kamose “instead of narrating accomplishments, it consists for the majority of episodes in statements or intentions and it is never certain what was achieved and what remained intention.”⁷ As a matter of fact, it is difficult to

related neither to K2 nor K3. Cf. Van Siclen III, “Third Stela of Kamose,” 358. “The Quarrel of Apophis and Seqenenre” is another text which refers to the relationships between the Hyksos and the Egyptians. It is dated to the reign of Merenptah (Nineteenth Dynasty) and recent approaches consider the influences that the Hyksos and Amarna traumas had on its narrative (cf. Anthony Spalinger, “Two Screen Plays: ‘Kamose’ and ‘Apophis and Seqenenre,’” *JEH* 3 (2010): 115-135).

⁴ Manfred Bietak, “Houses, Palaces and Development of Social Structures in Avaris,” in *Cities and Urbanism in Ancient Egypt. Papers from a Workshop in November 2006 at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (AAS)*, eds. Manfred Bietak, Ernst Czerny and Irene Forstner-Müller (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), 33, fig. 7.

⁵ Antonio Loprieno, “The ‘King’s Novel,’” in *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History & Forms*, ed. Antonio Loprieno (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 280; Hans Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose*, 33; see also Anthony Spalinger, “Chauvinism in the First Intermediate Period,” in *Chronology and Archaeology in Ancient Egypt (The Third Millennium BC)*, eds. Hana Vymazalová and Miroslav Barta (New Haven/London: MMA & Yale University Press, 2008), 240-241.

⁶ William Kelly Simpson, “*Belles lettres* and Propaganda,” in *Ancient Egyptian Literature. History & Forms*, ed. Antonio Loprieno (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 436.





⁷ Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose*, 185.






establish conclusive differences between those actions which respond to historical facts and those which can be understood as linked to ideological practices.

Despite these particularities, in the saga of Kamose the Hyksos and the Nubian rulers are presented as foreigners and enemies who deserved to be defeated by the strong arm of the legitimate Egyptian ruler.


This paper is centered on the use and particularities of the title *hq3* in K2, and includes a discussion on the conception of the social bonds sustained by the Hyksos ruler as reflected in the source.

The Title *hq3* in K2






Commonly, the noun *hq3* designs a person who rules over a territory, an independent ruler (*Wb.* III, 170: “*Herrscher, Herrscher von...*”; and *CD*, 178: “*ruler*”).⁸ The common classifiers for the noun are  (A1);  (A40) and  (G7). The verb (*Wb.* III, 172: “*herrschen, beherrschen, in Besitz nehmen*”; and *CD*, 178: “*to rule, to govern*”) is classified by  (Y1), “papyrus roll.”

The word *hq3* appears six times in K2; twice, it is classified with  (Y1) “papyrus roll” and the other four times is followed by an unusual classifier for this word,  (A43) “ruler wearing the crown of Upper Egypt,” the White Crown (*hdt*).⁹ It is revealing that in the fragments of the First Stela (K1, line 11) the title – addressed to Kamose – also has  as classifier. In K2 the word appears as a noun followed by an indirect genitive when classified by ; and as a noun without any kind of complement when classified by . Then, the use of *hq3* in K2 is rather original.

⁸Aminata Sackho, “Le pouvoir politique des pays nubiens. Analyse du terme *hq3* et ses applications archéologiques,” *CRIPEL* 17/3 (1998): 206; Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose*, 62. *Wb.*= Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow (hrsg.), *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1926–1961); *CD*= Raymond Faulkner, *Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford: Griffith Institute, 1962).

⁹ Alan H. Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Griffith Institute, 1982), 446. In the Stela of Emhab from Tell Edfu (Cairo JE 49566) the title *hq3* also appears with an unusual classifier. The sentence in question is “*I (Emhab) emulated my lord in every affair of his. He is a god while I am a ruler (hq3); when he kills I keep alive.*” (cf. John Baines, “The Stela of Emhab: Innovation, Tradition, Hierarchy,” *JEA* 72 (1986): 42; also Jaroslav Černý, “The Stela of Emhab from Tell Edfu,” *MDAIK* 24 (1969): 87–92). The classifier is not very clear, it should be  (A47); which should give a sense of “guard” or “protect” to the word (Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 447). Goedicke translates it as “*while he is a henchman, I am a ruler*,” sustaining that the sign commonly read as *ntr* is a different one with the sense of “henchman,” cf. Goedicke, *Studies about Kamose and Ahmose*, 19. In a recent translation David Klotz’s rendering of the passage keeps the sense of the statement: “*He is as a god, while I am a ruler*” (David Klotz, “Emhab versus the *tmrhtn*: Monomachy and the Expulsion of the Hyksos,” *SAK* 39 (2010): 211–241, plates 20–22). Klotz (p. 234) also states that “the use of *hq3* to describe a private citizen is unexpected by the Second Intermediate Period” and “it appears that Emhab used the word *hq3* in its basic sense of ‘administrator of an agricultural district.’”

Recently, Thomas Schneider emphasized the difficulties of translating Egyptian and gave crucial importance “to making semantic information provided at the level of the script (but not linguistically!) explicit in the translation.”¹⁰ In a similar way, Orly Goldwasser considered the Egyptian hieroglyphic system as the most detailed system of classification known, where “determinatives never stand in arbitrary relation to the word they classify.”¹¹

For that reason, I would prefer to make the semantic meaning of the classifier explicit in the translation of  by adding to the term “ruler” the expression “of Upper Egypt.” I consider that the classifier contains the locative by the depiction of a ruler wearing the White Crown, in the same sense that *nswt* (“king of Upper Egypt”) is classified by  while *biti* (“king of Lower Egypt”) by  (A45). Following these statements, I highlight the semantic differences of the title *hq3* in K2 by writing *Hq3* when it appears with  and *hq3* with , as follows:

a) Lines 1-2

← LINE 1

 (...)

← LINE 2



(...) 


Transliteration: (1) (...) *r.k hns m*¹² *ir.k wi m wr iw.k m Hq3 r dbh* (2) *n.k t3 nmt hrt.k n.s* (...)

Translation: (...) *your mouth is narrowed*¹³ *when you make me a chief and yourself a ruler of Upper Egypt; in order to demand for yourself the robbery because of which you shall fall* (...) ¹⁴

¹⁰ Thomas Schneider, “Three Histories of Translation: Translating in Egypt, Translating Egypt, Translating Egyptian,” in *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*, eds. Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino (Manchester: St. Jerome Publ., 2011), 187.

¹¹ Orly Goldwasser, “A Comparison between Classifier Languages and Classifier Script: The Case of Ancient Egyptian,” in *A Festschrift for Hans Jakob Polotsky*, ed. Gideon Goldenberg (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2006), 17.

¹² Habachi and Helck read  (Aa13), cf. Habachi, *Second Stela of Kamose*, 32; Helck, *Historisch-biographische Texte*, 91. Anyway, the sign is dubious and can be read as  (D21).


¹³ I translated *hns* as “is narrowed” in the sense of diminishing in size (a physical condition), which would impede a correct pronunciation of the words (also expressed as “speaking nonsense”) by taking into account the meaning of the classifier  (G36). This classifier possesses “the meanings of “inferior,” “socially inferior” and at the end of

Discussion

a) This sentence has received several different translations proving the difficulty of the passage.¹⁵ Anyway, there is a consensus among the scholars regarding the general sense of the sentence: it sustains the rejection of Kamose to the intention of Apophis of subduing him, implicit in the Apophis' claim of being recognized as a ruler of higher status.


I propose the following translation for the passage keeping the comparative statement of the sentence and providing the word *Hq3* with the explicit meaning suggested by the classifier: "(...) *your mouth is narrowed when you make me a chief and yourself a ruler of Upper Egypt; in order to demand for yourself the robbery because of which you shall fall* (...)"

Naturally, the particular use of the words *wr* and *hq3* in K2 called the attention of the scholars. Harry and Alexandrina Smith sustained that "Apophis and Kamose use the word *hq3* of themselves as being in their own eyes the legitimate Pharaoh, while Apophis uses the word *wr* of Kamose and Kamose uses it of both Apophis and the Ruler of Kush. It is evident then at this time *hq3* meant 'legitimate ruler,' while *wr* was used of foreign princes or subordinate rulers."¹⁶ Despite the translation of *hq3* in K2 as "legitimate ruler" is acceptable, if the semantic meaning of the classifiers becomes

¹⁵ "Dein Mund war zu eng, als Du mich zum Fürsten machtest, während Du Herrscher sein willst, nur um Dir die Richtstelle auszubitten, auf welcher Du fallen wirst" cf. Rainer Stadelmann, "Ein Beitrag zum Brief des Hyksos Apophis," *MDAIK* 20 (1965): 69; "your speech is mean, when you make me as 'a chieftain', while you are a 'ruler'; so as to want for yourself what is wrongly seized, through which you shall fall," cf. Habachi, Second Stela of Kamose, 32; "your boast, making me out a vassal while you are the sovereign, is so mean as to demand for you the chopping block to which you will (surely) fall" cf. Smith and Smith, "A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts," *ZÄS* 103: 60; "Deine törichte Rede, mich 'Häuptling' zu nennen, und du selbst seist Herrscher, wird für dich den Richtblock erfordern, durch den du fällst" cf. Ursula Kaplony-Heckel, "Ägyptische historische Texte," in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, I. Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden, Historisch-chronologische Texte*, ed. Otto Kaiser, (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1984), 530; "your miserable proposal that you make me a chief, while you a Ruler, will ask for yourself the slaughtering block to which you will fall" cf. Goedicke, Studies about Kamose and Ahmose, 60; "your authority is restricted inasmuch as you, in your capacity as suzerain, have made me a chief – so that (now) you must (even) beg for the block where you shall fall" cf. Donald B. Redford, "Textual Sources for the Hyksos Period," in *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*, ed. Eliezer Oren (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1997), 14; "your mouth is narrow when you make me a chieftain, while you are a ruler, in order to request for yourself that which is stolen (nmt) on account of which you shall fall" cf. Kim Ryholt, *The Political Situation in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period, c.1800–1550 B.C.* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1997), 325; "your speech is despicable in making me out to be (only) an official while you are a ruler, only to beg for yourself the chopping block by which you will fall" cf. Kelly Simpson, Literature of Ancient Egypt, 348. The different translations of the second part of the sentence are related to the fact that *nmt* could be the perfective passive participle (fem) of *nm* ("go wrong," "rob," "steal," cf. *CD*, 133; "vergreifen," *Wb.* I., 264) or a noun ("slaughter-house," *CD*, 132; "Schlachtbank," "Richtstätte," *Wb.* II, 264). I opted for the first option because I consider *nmt* as a participle of "to steal," "to rob." Besides it lacks the classifier  to be considered the noun *nmt*.

¹⁶ Smith and Smith, "A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts," *ZÄS* 103: 68-9.

explicit the translation would be more accurate because the differences between *Hq3* and *hq3* could be distinguished.

The other title mentioned in these lines is *wr* (“chief”). It appears twice, firstly, in the aforementioned sentence and secondly in line 4, referring to Apophis as *wr* (, A19) *n Rtnw*, “chief of Retjenu.”¹⁷ The title also appears in CT (line 3) related to the two foreign rulers who disputed the rulership with Kamose: *wr m Hwt-W^crt ky m Kši*, “a chief (who) is in Avaris and another (who) is in Kush.” It seems the term *wr* possesses a quite contemptuous bias in the Kamose texts: the comparative statement in lines 1-2 of K2 is clear in this sense. Kamose rejects the claim of Apophis, who considers Kamose a chief (*wr*) while claiming for himself the legitimate rulership over Upper Egypt (as *Hq3*).

b) *Hq3* appears again in K2 in the lines 19 to 21, once addressed to the ruler of Kush by Apophis and the other to Kamose, while *hq3* also appears twice, in relation to the *hq3 n Kši* and the *hq3 n Hwt-W^crt*. It is the relevant excerpt which relates the interception of the message sent by Apophis to the ruler of Kush in the oasis. Kamose declares he intercepted the letter written “by (the hand of) the ruler (*hq3*) of Avaris.” The passage reads as follows: “*Auserre, son of Re, Apophis, greets my son, the ruler of Kush. Why did you raise yourself as ruler of Upper Egypt without letting me know? Have you seen what Egypt has done against me? The ruler of Upper Egypt who is there, <Kamose, the victorious> given life, is attacking me in my territory (...)*”

Here another difficult passage of K2 is revealed. Instead of *z3.i hq3 n Kši*, “my son, the ruler of Kush,” Harry and Alexandrina Smith, Kim Ryholt and William Kelly Simpson among others, read “the son of the ruler of Kush;”¹⁸ while others, like Labib Habachi, Hans Goedicke, Donald Redford and James P. Allen translated “my son, the ruler of Kush.”¹⁹ Allen clearly stated that the stroke on the sign for *z3* denotes it as a noun followed by the possessive suffix for the first person of the singular.²⁰ This passage allows making two observations. Firstly, the ruler of Avaris called the ruler of Kush his



¹⁷ The Amada Stela of Amenhotep II refers to the *hq3w h3swt* (foreign rulers, “Hyksos”) and to the *wrw nw Rtnw* (chiefs of Retjenu) making a clear differentiation between those titles. Anyway, since this stela is posterior to the one of Kamose, the term *hq3w h3swt* could be used to differentiate the Hyksos rulers from the rest of the rulers of the Northern Levant (the *wrw nw Rtnw*). See Ryholt, Political Situation in Egypt, 131; Carl Richard Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien, nach den Zeichnungen der von Seiner Majestät dem Könige von Preussen Friedrich Wilhelm IV nach diesen Ländern gesendeten und in den Jahren 1842-1845 ausgeführten wissenschaftlichen Expedition*. Ab. III Band V, (Berlin, 1849-1859), plate 65, 66; Peter der Manuelian, *Studies in the Reign of Amenophis II* (Hildesheim: Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge 26, 1987), 47-51.

¹⁸ Smith and Smith, “A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts,” *ZÄS* 103: 66; Ryholt, Political Situation in Egypt, 326-27; Kelly Simpson, Literature of Ancient Egypt, 349.


¹⁹ Habachi, Second Stela of Kamose, 39; Goedicke, Studies about Kamose and Ahmose, 79; Redford, “Textual Sources,” 14; James P. Allen in Daphna Ben-Tor, Susan J. Allen and James P. Allen, “Review: Seals and Kings,” *BASOR* 315 (1999): 68 n. 16.

²⁰ James P. Allen in Ben-Tor, Allen and Allen, “Seals and Kings,” *BASOR* 315: 68 n.16.

“son.” Naturally, it deserves further explanation about the possible sense of the expression “*my son*” in this context. I shall return on this specific point below.

Secondly, it is possible that in the context of this source, the Egyptian rendering of the letter of the Hyksos ruler had inserted the expression  as well as the classifier  (A14*) “enemy” in the name of Apophis,²¹ which it is not encircled in the cartouche despite the fact the title of *z3 R*^c addressed to him is maintained. It seems unlikely that a statement referring to Kamose as a victorious ruler with his name encircled in the royal cartouche would have been written in the original message sent by Apophis.²² Furthermore, the preceding title (*Hq3*) used to qualify Kamose’s status in Apophis’ message seems to have also been a concession to the Egyptian ideology. It seems unlikely that Apophis called Kamose with a title he claimed for himself.

Thus, it should mean that rulership was disputed in Upper Egypt and the competitors defied the local ruler – stressing the fact that rulership over Lower Egypt was not under discussion. Other evidence helps to shed light on this matter. In discussing the stela of Antef (BM 1645), probably erected by one of the Seventeenth Dynasty kings with that name, Pascal Vernus pointed out that an essential fact was that the power of the Egyptian ruler was explicitly limited to Upper Egypt.²³


The use of the  “papyrus roll” to classify the word *hq3* when it is addressed to the ruler of Kush and the ruler of Avaris is intriguing. In fact, this classifier stands in a very low position on the information scale during the Second Intermediate Period, hardly giving any semantic information, and becomes a “default classifier” in the New Kingdom and certainly in the Ramesside Period.²⁴ Taking into account that such classifier has a meaning related to “something written in papers, but not in reality,”²⁵ and that the stela was the Egyptian rendering of the facts, the scribe explicitly reinforced the idea – to the eyes of the readers of the text – that those “rulers” were *illegitimate* occupiers of the Egyptian territory. The process by which the usual classifiers of a word (in this case A1, A40, G7) are substituted because of discourse-pragmatic reasons by a

²¹ On negative classifiers cf. Goldwasser, “A Comparison between Classifier Languages,” 30.

²² Cf. Smith and Smith, “A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts,” *ZÄS* 103: 68, n. 51.

²³ Pascal Vernus, “Réfections et adaptations de l’idéologie monarchique à la Deuxième Période Intermédiaire: La stèle d’Antef-le-victorieux,” in *Studies in Honor of William Kelly Simpson*, eds. Peter der Manuelian and Rita Freed (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1996), 840.

²⁴ Orly Golwasser, *pers. comm.*, Dec 31st, 2011.

²⁵ “The  “papyrus roll,” which originally encompassed the category “belonging to papyrus” or “belonging to writing” (Wiesmann *Determinative*) has acquired an extended meaning like “what is written on papyrus” or “in words, not in reality,” to the modern mind a definition of [“ABSTRACT”] or the like.” Cf. Goldwasser, “A Comparison between Classifier Languages,” 32.

different classifier was described by Orly Goldwasser as a process of *reference tracking*.²⁶ Following this idea, it is probable that the expression “ruler of Kush” *ḥq3 n Kši*, with the “papyrus roll” classifier, could also be an intervention of the scribe in the Egyptian version of the letter.

To sum up, several points of view are intertwined in this famous passage of K2: it is the Egyptian rendering of a letter sent by one ruler to another, both “enemies” of the one who intercepted the message. The motif of the dispute was the rulership of Upper Egypt, the land where the only legitimate ruler (to the Egyptian eyes) inhabited. The translation of the letter received several adjustments to make it fit the ideological parameters of an Egyptian monument to be displayed in a local temple.

c) The title appears again addressed to Kamose in lines 30-31:

(30) (...) *ḥy p3 ḥnt nfr n p3* (31) *Ḥq3 ʿnh(.w) (w)d3(.w) s(nb.w) ḥr mšʿfr ḥ3t.f(...)*
 “(...) What a happy sailing upstream for the ruler of Upper Egypt (l.p.h.) with his army ahead of him! (...)”

In this passage, it is Kamose who is granted with the title “ruler of Upper Egypt.” And, despite the fact it is a triumphal acclamation, it confirms that rulership was limited to Upper Egypt.

Furthermore, the word *ḥq3* “ruler,” which was employed not only to name the ruler of Upper Egypt (*Ḥq3*), and the rulers of Avaris (*ḥq3 n Ḥwt-Wʿrt*), and Kush (*ḥq3 n Kši*) in K2, but to name the Hyksos (*ḥq3 ḥ3swt*) as well, acquired a particular significance during the Second Intermediate Period. Undoubtedly, it influenced its utilization during later times. In other words, the use of *ḥq3* exceeded the Second Intermediate Period, and it is possible that a change in royal ideology had taken place during that period and had impacted on the earlier reigns of the Eighteenth Dynasty. Following the statement of Herbert Winlock, who sustained that Kamose changed his birth name for epithets like *p3 ḥq3 ʿ3*, “this great ruler,” in royal cartouches, Stephen Harvey considers that Ahmose could have also altered his names introducing the title *ḥq3*. The unusual royal name found in the Ahmose monuments at Abydos, *Ḥq3t3wy* “ruler of the Two Lands” appears in the construction *Ḥq3t3wy mry Wsir* “the ruler of the Two Lands, beloved of Osiris.” The conclusion of Harvey is sustained by other evidence in the same line: a scarab in Turin with the inscription *z3 Rʿ Ḥq3t3wy Tʿhms*, “the son of Re, *Heqatawy* Ahmose” and another one in the Grenfell collection which bears the

²⁶ Orly Goldwasser and Colette Grinevald, “What are “Determinatives” good for?” *LingAeg-StudMon* 9 (2012): 25-26.

inscription *Nbphȝtyrꜥ Hqꜣtꜣwy*, “Nebpehtyre Heqatawy.”²⁷ In the same way, epithets of other kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty (Tuthmose III, Amenhotep II, Amenhotep III, Tutankhamen and Ay, among others) included “Ruler of Heliopolis,” “Ruler of Thebes” and “Ruler of Ma’at.”²⁸ Thus, the use of *hqꜣ* in early New Kingdom Egyptian royal names reveals the importance the title acquired, probably as opposite to the use of *hqꜣ hꜣswt* by the Hyksos rulers.²⁹

Naturally, the intentional use of different classifiers in the text raises the question of who were the addressees of the text. As the stela of king Kamose (K1, K2 and K3) were set up in the temple of Amun at Karnak,³⁰ Goedicke suggested that the prime addressee could have been the god himself. However, the clear distinction between the meaning of *hqꜣ* and *Hqꜣ* was such, that the readers of the stela could not have overlooked it. Thus, it is probable that the stela was addressed not only to the god, but to the direct followers of the ruler, the priesthood of Amun and his closest officials. They should be convinced that the legitimate ruler of Upper Egypt was Kamose, the Theban ruler, and not another one.³¹

In general terms, the stela and its message – as well as those contained in K1 and K3 – were an expression of the legitimization practices held by the Theban ruler Kamose during the final phase of the Second Intermediate Period.

Disputed Rulership: A Consideration of the Inter-elite Relationships as Reflected in K2

While the diverse terms related to rulership appearing in K2 are relevant for the understanding of the socio-historical context of Upper Egypt in the final phase of the Second Intermediate Period, the discourse implicit in the text can also shed light on the way inter-elite relationships were established. The Second Intermediate Period was characterized by the emergence of three polities located along the Nile – the Hyksos in the Eastern Delta, the Egyptians in Upper Egypt and the Kushites in Nubia – which interacted in political, social, economic and ideological levels, sharing as well as

²⁷ Stephen Harvey, “King Heqatawy: Notes on a Forgotten Eighteenth Dynasty Royal Name,” in *The Archaeology and Art of Ancient Egypt: Essays in Honor of David B. O’Connor*, eds. Zahi Hawass and Janet Richards (Cairo: Conseil Suprême des Antiquités de l’Égypte, 2007), 343 ff.

²⁸ Harvey, “King Heqatawy,” 353 n. 5.

²⁹ Harvey, “King Heqatawy,” 345.

³⁰ K3 was found to the south of the Eighth Pylon in the Temple of Amun at Karnak, as the photographs taken by Georges Legrain in 1900 revealed. Cf. Van Siclen III, “Third Stela of Kamose,” 355.

³¹ On the concept of “victorious Thebes,” and the link between the city and the rulers, cf. Spalinger, “Chauvinism in the First Intermediate Period,” 240-260.

disputing among them the control over the former territory of the unified Egyptian state. This is the socio-political frame in which K2 should be contextualized.³²

K2 begins by recognizing the interest of the Hyksos ruler in subduing Kamose, who rejected being considered a lower status ruler in relation to Apophis, when he states “*your mouth is narrowed when you make me a chief and yourself a ruler of Upper Egypt.*” The entire text maintains the idea of Apophis claiming the rulership over a land he does not deserve, because he is a usurper, an enemy, considered a “chief of Retjenu” (*wr n Rtnw*, K2, line 4), a “ruler of Avaris” (*hq3 n Hwt-Wrt*, K2, line 19) or a “chief (who) is in Avaris” (*wr m Hwt-Wrt*, K1, line 3).

These titles addressed to the Hyksos ruler relate him to the commonly named “Canaanite” inhabitants of Tell el Dabʿa, installed there from the late Middle Kingdom onwards.³³ In fact, these people were bearers of a Levantine Middle Bronze material culture, and were probably linked to different economic activities that were accomplished with the permission and even supervision of the Egyptian state, at least during the late Middle Kingdom. These activities could be related to several and different spheres of interaction: maritime and exchange activities with the Northern Levantine coastal cities as well as participation in the expeditions carried out by the Egyptians to the mines of turquoise and copper located at Serabit el-Khadim.³⁴ The acculturated elite of Tell el Dabʿa constituted a political entity able to challenge the Egyptians mainly after the collapse of the Thirteenth Dynasty centralized authority.³⁵

Unfortunately, only scanty epigraphic evidence coming from a doorjamb and several fragmentary reliefs provide information about the rulers of this new polity emerged in the Eastern Delta.³⁶ In fact, Tell el Dabʿa has not provided longer narrative inscriptions

³² An analysis of the changes in the administrative structures from the Middle Kingdom to the Second Intermediate Period, through a comparative study of the titles held by the officials in Avaris and Thebes, in Stephen Quirke, “Identifying the Officials of the Fifteenth Dynasty,” in *Scarabs of the Second Millennium BC from Egypt, Nubia, Crete and the Levant: Chronological and Historical Implications. Papers of a Symposium, Vienna 10th-13th January 2002*, eds. Manfred Bietak and Ernst Czerny (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 171-193.

³³ They are also named “Asiatic,” a term “used in Egyptology for non-Egyptian people of Near-Eastern origin,” commonly as a rendering of the Egyptian word ʿ3mw (Robert Schiestl, “Tomb Types and Layout of a Middle Bronze IIA Cemetery at Tell el-Dabʿa, Area F/I. Egyptian and Non-Egyptian Features,” in *The Bronze Age in the Lebanon. Studies on the Archaeology and Chronology of Lebanon, Syria and Egypt*, eds. Manfred Bietak and Ernst Czerny (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2008), 243 n. 1.

³⁴ Ezra Marcus, “The Southern Levant and Maritime Trade during the Middle Bronze IIA Period,” in *Aharon Kempinski Memorial Volume. Studies in Archaeology and Related Disciplines*, eds. Eliezer Oren and Shmuel Ahituv (Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2002), 243.

³⁵ Thomas Schneider, “Foreigners in Egypt: Archaeological Evidence and Cultural Context,” in *Egyptian Archaeology*, ed. Willeke Wendrich (Oxford: Blackwell, 2010), 158.

³⁶ Manfred Bietak, *Avaris, the Capital of the Hyksos. Recent Excavations at Tell el-Dabʿa* (London: British Museum Press, 1996), 65-67 and figs. 52-54.

to analyze the way the Hyksos understood inter-elite relationships, and in some way K2 mirrors their conception and helps to have a more complete picture of the situation, at least for the final phase of the Second Intermediate Period.

Other evidence should be brought into the discussion. The impressive amount of scarabs with royal names bearing Egyptian epithets and titles (“good god,” “son of Re”) as well as the title *ḥqꜣ ḥꜣswt*, were generally associated with foreign dynasties ruling northern Egypt in the Second Intermediate Period. However, this evidence remains problematic: the number of kings exceeds the six Hyksos rulers mentioned in Manetho (III century BC) and in the Turin king-list. Nevertheless, they were considered as evidence for the existence not only of the Hyksos dynasty (the Fifteenth Dynasty) but of their vassal rulers,³⁷ commonly defined as the “lesser Hyksos rulers” of the Sixteenth Dynasty. This idea was dismissed by Kim Ryholt, who attributed these scarabs to the kings of the Fourteenth or of the Fifteenth Dynasties.³⁸ In fact, Ryholt considered that the Sixteenth Dynasty resided at Thebes and was related to – and possibly predated – the Seventeenth Dynasty.³⁹ Another interpretation on the significance of the scarabs, sustained by Janine Bourriau, attributes them to “officials with a purely local authority abrogating to themselves royal epithets on their seals at a time and place where normally rigid protocols were no longer enforceable.”⁴⁰ In short, this evidence remains too controversial to obtain a clear picture of the socio-political ordering of the period.

However, while evaluating “the impact of new rulers on old administrations and vice-versa,” Stephen Quirke analyzed the way the Hyksos rule influenced the ancient Egyptian administrative sphere. By comparing the titles in seal-amulets held by the Hyksos and the Egyptian officials during the Second Intermediate Period, he concluded that the Egyptians followed the traditional administration headed by a vizier, a “king’s son” (*zꜣ-nsu*) and officials in the commodity, labour and palace administration, while the Hyksos had no vizier attested nor officials in the administration, except for an “overseer of what is sealed.” The only well-attested title is “king’s son.” Quirke suggested that “perhaps the recurrence of the title “king’s son” indicates the use of

³⁷ “It would appear to me that the persons named here carry us back to the very generation of the conquest, and quite likely reflect the federated chiefs attending Shesy/Salitis on the morrow of his victory.” Donald B. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 111.

³⁸ Ryholt, *Political Situation in Egypt*, 40-52 (*contra* Ryholt cf. Daphna Ben-Tor, “Sequence and Chronology of Second Intermediate Period Royal-Name Scarabs,” in *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, ed. Marcel Marée, (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 91-108; cf. also Kim Ryholt, “The Date of Kings Sheshi and Yakubhar and the Rise of the Fourteenth Dynasty,” in *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, ed. Marcel Marée (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 109-126.

³⁹ Ryholt, *Political Situation in Egypt*, 151-159 and 167-171.

⁴⁰ Janine Bourriau, “The Second Intermediate Period,” in *The Oxford History of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Ian Shaw (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 180.

kinship structure to cover areas of authority, notably military control.”⁴¹ I consider this possibility a positive approximation to the description of the administration held by the Hyksos. However, other variables should be taken into account.

Some features that appeared in Tell el Dab^a are closely related to the northern Levantine Middle Bronze cultural background. Not only pottery and weapons but also religious and funerary beliefs were related to that cultural tradition. Some religious buildings, like the sacred precinct found in Area A/II (Fourteenth Dynasty, Tell el Dab^a phases F-E2) were also of northern Levantine character.⁴² The introduction of the god Baal during the reign of Nehesy and its later assimilation to the Egyptian god Seth also reveals the foreign origin of the inhabitants of the settlement and the process of cultural interaction which took place at Avaris.⁴³ Manfred Bietak considered Byblos a strong candidate to be their possible homeland, and the close bonds established between the Egyptian and the Byblian elite from the reign of Amenemhet III onwards, make this hypothesis reliable.⁴⁴

Thus, it is plausible that these foreigners located at Tell el Dab^a not only maintained several cultural features of the northern Levantine Middle Bronze – which were reflected in the material culture – but could have also carried with them specific traits of socio-political interaction originated in their homeland.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Stephen Quirke, “The Hyksos in Egypt 1600 BCE. New Rulers without an Administration,” in *The Ancient Near East and Egypt. From Sargon of Agade to Saddam Hussein*, ed. Harriet Crawford (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 133. See also the discussion on the evidences for the title during the final phase of the Second Intermediate Period in the Theban area in Marcel Marée, “Edfu under the Twelfth to Seventeenth Dynasties: The monuments in the National Museum of Warsaw,” *BMSAES* 12 (2009): 31-92, esp. 57-66 when analyzing the stela Warsaw 141281.

⁴² Manfred Bietak, “The Center of Hyksos Rule: Avaris (Tell el-Dab^a),” in *The Hyksos: New Historical and Archaeological Perspectives*, ed. Eliezer Oren (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1997), 108.

⁴³ Niv Allon states that “evidently, Baal was known in Egypt as early as the 13th Dynasty, although possibly by his “former” name as Hadad. Moreover, the Seth-Baal cult in Avaris continued to exist throughout the Hyksos Period into the New Kingdom, as the temple of Seth of Avaris was functioning continuously until the Ramesside period. According to the 400 Year Stela, it began to function already some 70 years before the Hyksos Period.” Niv Allon, “Seth is Baal – Evidence from the Egyptian Script,” *Ä&L* 17 (2007): 19.

⁴⁴ Manfred Bietak, “From where came the Hyksos and where did they go?” in *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, ed. Marcel Marée (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 163; Roxana Flammini, “Elite Emulation and Patronage Relationships in the Middle Bronze: The Egyptianized Dynasty of Byblos,” *Tel Aviv* 37/2 (2010): 154-168.

⁴⁵ In a recent paper, Bietak sustained that some features of the settlement allow perceiving the existence of patronage relationships: “as big and small houses can be found side-by-side, it seems that there was not one district for the rich and another for the poor, but that both parts of society lived side-by-side – which could be explained by a provider–client relationship leading to the formation of discrete groups within the settlement”. Cf. Bietak, “Houses, Palaces and Development of Social Structures in Avaris,” 19. The relationship between the spatial distribution of tombs as well as houses is also a way to understand ancient social relationships. In this way, the appearance of collective tombs in Egyptian cemeteries between the Old and the Middle Kingdom, with a main burial and several subsidiary tombs was explained as mirroring patronage relationships (cf. Stephan Seidlmayer, *Gräberfelder aus dem*

The categorization of the Hyksos as foreign rulers is sustained by the Turin king-list. It preserves six entries but only one name of a foreign ruler, Khamudi. This name is not encircled in the royal cartouche. It is the ruler's *nomen* (ꜥꜣ Rꜥ, "Son of Re" name) and not the usual *prenomen* (*nswt bitī*, "King of Upper and Lower Egypt" or "Dual King" name) that is used to enlist the rulers. Probably, the scribe avoided writing the name of the god Re (which appears in the *nswt bitī* name) in the name of a foreign ruler. The entry following the name states: "*six foreign [rulers] ruling for 108 years.*"⁴⁶ Manetho also preserved the name of six Hyksos kings.⁴⁷

In sum, this society established in Tell el Dab'a adopted several Egyptian cultural features but maintained funerary and religious beliefs which were clearly related to a Levantine Middle Bronze cultural background. The Hyksos were enlisted like foreign rulers in the Turin king-list and remembered as such by the Manethonian tradition. As Bietak stated, Tell el Dab'a "was occupied by a Near Eastern population which to some extent acculturated but, on the other hand, kept its distinctive cultural identity in their burial customs, in the construction of their temples and at the outset of their settlement also in the introduction of their own types of house."⁴⁸ Is it possible, then, that they also maintained a different conception of inter-elite bonds?

Following several of Joan Munn-Rankin's core ideas on the structure of diplomacy in Western Asia based on information provided by the Royal Archive of Mari, John Van Seters has yielded penetrating insights in his seminal study on the Hyksos published in 1966.⁴⁹ He clearly stated that the Hyksos shared a common culture with the Levant (Syria-Palestine) which extended from the Old Babylonian period to the Egyptian conquest during the New Kingdom. He also sustained that the Hyksos "could be expected to reflect the political structure and international diplomacy which is now so fully documented from the Mari Age," while the language of this diplomacy was

Übergang vom Alten zum Mittleren Reich (Heidelberg, 1990); Jan Assmann, *The Mind of Egypt. History and Meaning in the Time of the Pharaohs* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 91). In a similar way, the spatial distribution of houses in Amarna was assimilated to "symbiotic relationships of service in return from patronage" (cf. Kate Spence, "Settlement Structure and Social Interaction at Amarna," in *Cities and Urbanism in Ancient Egypt. Papers from a Workshop in November 2006 at the Austrian Academy of Sciences*, eds. Manfred Bietak, Ernst Czerny and Irene Förstner-Müller (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2010), 297).

⁴⁶ Ryholt, *Political Situation in Egypt*, 118. Cf. also Jaromir Málek, "The Original Version of the Royal Canon of Turin," *JEA* 68 (1982): 101.

⁴⁷ William G. Waddell, *Manetho* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: Heinemann, 1964), 83.

⁴⁸ Bietak, "Houses, Palaces and Development," 24. For an anthropological approach to foreigners in Egypt and a discussion on the concepts of ethnicity, acculturation, assimilation, borders and identities, cf. Schneider, "Foreigners in Egypt," 143-63.

⁴⁹ Joan Munn-Rankin, "Diplomacy in Western Asia in the Early Second Millennium BC" *Iraq* 18/1 (1956): 68-110; John Van Seters, *The Hyksos. A New Investigation* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 164.

expressed in terms of kinship (“brother,” “father,” “son”) and explained as *vassalage*. In his own words, the “Amurrite world.”⁵⁰

In fact, Munn-Rankin’s conclusions rested in conceiving the relationships expressed in the Mari letters as a submissive bond between an “overlord” and his “vassals,” probably through the establishment of treaties – as in the case of the Hittites and their subordinates. But, as she herself recognized, no treaty was found in the Mari archive. She found it difficult to explain the inexistence of political submission between a “vassal” and his “overlord” in another two cases.⁵¹ She solved the apparent contradiction by considering the relationship as one between an “older” ruler and a “younger” one, without any kind of political implications. Van Seters, on his side, used the same concept to explain the expression “my son” addressed to the ruler of Kush by Apophis in K2.⁵²

The terminology of *vassalage*, applied by Munn-Rankin and followed by Van Seters has been used until recent times to describe the relationships sustained by the Hyksos with the supposedly kinglets of the Sixteenth Dynasty (the “lesser Hyksos rulers”), the Seventeenth Dynasty rulers, and the ruler of Kush, without any critical approach.⁵³

Egyptian texts from the late Second Intermediate Period possess an undeniable bias related to socio-political relationships established among the different rulers who were disputing the same territory. However, *vassalage*, the main concept chosen to describe those bonds, seems inadequate since it is usually understood as an asymmetrical relationship of domination evidenced through a contractual form.⁵⁴ Thus, a revision of the concepts used to describe those relationships becomes necessary.

In a recent article, the late Robert Westbrook called attention to *patronage* in the Ancient Near East: he described it as a topic which deserved serious investigation and

⁵⁰ Van Seters, *The Hyksos*, 162.

⁵¹ Cf. Munn-Rankin, “Diplomacy,” *Iraq* 18/1: 89, 81.

⁵² Van Seters, *The Hyksos*, 168.

⁵³ I.e. Jürgen von Beckerath, review of “John Van Seters, *The Hyksos. A New Investigation* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1966), *JAOs* 90/2 (1970): 309-310; Janine Bourriau, “Second Intermediate Period,” 183. Kim Ryholt went a step further in denying the existence of vassals of the Hyksos rulers during the Second Intermediate Period but he did not discuss the concept; cf. Appendix III “The Supposed Existence of Vassal Kings during the Second Intermediate Period,” in Ryholt, *Political Situation in Egypt*, 323-327.

⁵⁴ This inadequacy was perceived by Munn-Rankin when she stated: “The nature of the political relationship between the leading power and the other members of a confederation is illustrated by the correspondence of Zimri-lim with the kingdoms forming his coalition. While some may have been independent states allied to him by parity treaty, the majority were vassal kingdoms acknowledging him as suzerain. In the treaties concluded by the Hittite kings with their vassals the principal obligations imposed on subject princes were the subordination of their foreign policy to that of the overlord, military cooperation in his defensive and offensive wars and the annual rendering of homage and payment of tribute. *There can be little doubt that similar duties were imposed in the eighteenth century B.C., though it is possible that they were less rigid.*” Munn-Rankin, “Diplomacy,” *Iraq* 18/1: 75. My emphasis.

proposed a close review of it.⁵⁵ He summarized the main attributes of this kind of social bond in a narrow definition of the concept, differentiating it from vassalage – generally distinguishable from patronage by its formality, permanence and the existence of formal treaties⁵⁶ – in the following terms: it is an asymmetrical but personal relationship, often referred to as a “friendship” based on the mutual exchange of goods and services; the relationship must be of some duration and; the relationship must be voluntary, or at least purport to be voluntary.⁵⁷ It is a highly personal link rather than a collective one. Usually, texts displayed the language of kinship or household (“son,” “father,” “brother,” “servant,” “lord”) to establish the place an individual possessed in the network of relationships. Patronage can be a system and not only act on an individual level due to its symbiotic capacity, which result “in parallel formal and informal systems of governance within the same state.”⁵⁸ In other words, it operates as “a set of relationships which are ‘interstitial’ between the main institutions of any society.”⁵⁹ Patrons can be “primary” – a sovereign who benefits certain of his subordinates – or “intermediary” – “a noble or official who has access to higher levels of government and can act as a broker to give clients the benefit of his influence. Depending on which function he is exercising, the same patron could be primary and intermediary.”⁶⁰

Patronage linkages are attested in a society – among different social strata – where legal-coercive institutions are weak. But they also are attested in the relationships among rulers of different political entities, as it seems to be our case. Nevertheless, there is no *explicit* discourse related to patronage – the texts only reflect its existence. It is the hypercritical work of the researcher which reveals it through a careful reading of the sources.

Therefore, the discourse of the local rulers in the Alalakh and Mari letters reveals the fluctuation in the political links, conflicts over hegemony, disputes about the status of allies and the use of the language of kinship during the first half of the Second Millennium BC, all of which can be explained through the concept of patronage. These features are present in the letter AT/39/83 from Alalakh level VII. It mentions that a rebellion of the allies (“brothers”) of the “lord” Abbael, ruler of Aleppo, was suffocated

⁵⁵ Raymond Westbrook, “Patronage in the Ancient Near East,” *JESHO* 48/2 (2005): 210-233.

⁵⁶ Westbrook, “Patronage,” *JESHO* 48/2: 223-224; Jacques Vauchez, *Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Moyen Age* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1997), 1570-1571.

⁵⁷ Westbrook, “Patronage,” *JESHO* 48/2: 211-212.

⁵⁸ Westbrook, “Patronage,” *JESHO* 48/2: 212.

⁵⁹ Nicholas Abercrombie and Stephen Hill, “Paternalism and Patronage,” *BJS* 27/4 (1976): 415.

⁶⁰ Westbrook, “Patronage,” *JESHO* 48/2: 212.

and that his “servant” Yarim-lim was rewarded for his loyalty to Abbael with the city of Alalakh.⁶¹

A letter (ARM 26-384) of the Royal Archive of Mari is the one which most clearly shows the practice of patronage. The messengers of Ishme-Dagan, the ruler of Ekallatum, and of Zimri-lim of Mari, went to an audience with Hammurabi of Babylon. The text reveals the hierarchical order of the rulers, the competition to gain the favour of the most prestigious one and the reproaches the partners made to each other. Ishme-Dagan tells Hammurabi: “*You made me write Zimri-lim as son. Is not [that man] my servant? He is not seated on a throne of his [own] majesty*”. Hammurabi’s answer to the messengers of Ishme-Dagan reveals his upset mood to a minor status ruler: “*The kings of the land of Šubartum have pointed their finger at your lord, and I wrote him as follows: I [said], ‘To those kings that write me as sons you [write] as brother. To Zimri-lim who writes me as brother, you write as son’. Is what I wrote to him wrong?*”⁶² Translated into the language of patronage, his answer can be understood as a solution found by a higher status ruler (the ‘patron’) to the competitive fights among his lower-level allies (the ‘clients’) in the search for upgrades in the pyramidal scale of relationships. The remainder of the text provides additional evidence in the same sense: Ishme-Dagan continued recriminating Hammurabi for his preferential treatment of Zimri-lim.⁶³

A passage of an Egyptian text also sheds light on this kind of social bond.⁶⁴ In the Tale of Sinuhe, the Egyptian official exiliated in the Retjenu was adopted and protected by the local ruler Aamunenshi.⁶⁵ Sinuhe states: “I won his heart and he loved me, for he recognized my valor.”⁶⁶ The asymmetry in the relationship between Sinuhe and Aamunenshi is revealed in the passage where a local “champion” defies Sinuhe, who

⁶¹ “When his brothers rebelled against Abbael, their lord, king Abbael, with the help of the gods Hadad, Hebat and the spear [of Ishtar] went to Irride, conquered Irride and captured his enemy. (5) At that time Abbael, in exchange for Irride which his father granted, gave Alalakh of his free will. (8) And at that time, Yarimlim s[on of Hammu]rapi and servant of Abbael, brought up [his statue to the temple] of Ishtar. (11) [If(?) the off-spring(?) of Ab]bael shall take what he (Abbael) gave to Yarim-lim – he will give him city for city. (13) Whoever shall change the settlement that Abbael has made and will do evil against Yarim-lim and his descendants – may the god Hadad dash him into pieces with the weapon which is in his hand; may Hebat-Ishtar shatter his spear; may Ishtar deliver him into the hands of those who pursue him; may Ishtar...impress feminine parts into his male parts.” Nadav Na’aman, “The Ishtar Temple at Alalakh,” *JNES* 39 (1980): 210.

⁶² Wolfgang Heimpel, *Letters to the King of Mari: A New Translation with Historical Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 333. My emphasis.

⁶³ Flammini, “Elite Emulation,” *Tel Aviv* 37/2: 164.

⁶⁴ I shall not analyze here the possible existence of patronage in Egypt during the First Intermediate Period, but Jan Assmann clearly considers the possibility that patronage could have emerged in Upper Egypt during that time. Cf. Assmann, *Mind of Egypt*, 91.

⁶⁵ A brief discussion on the probable location on the Retjenu during the Middle Kingdom, in Bietak, “From where came the Hyksos,” 147.

⁶⁶ Miriam Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature. A Book of Readings. Vol. I. The Old and Middle Kingdoms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 227.

expresses his concerns to his “protector,” Aamunenshi, in these terms: “... [T]he ruler [Aamunenshi] conferred with me and I said: ‘I do not know him; I am not his ally, (15) that I could walk about in his camp. Have I ever opened his back rooms or climbed over his fence? It is envy, because he sees me doing your commissions.... [I]s an inferior beloved when he becomes a superior?’”⁶⁷ Probably, these lines exemplify the competition among lower-status rulers in the Retjenu, which can be understood as rivalry among ‘clients’ for the favour of a patron.

With regard to K2, two passages elucidate the kind of bond that the Hyksos ruler tried to impose over the other two rulers. As I stated above, these passages were usually understood as reflecting *vassallatic* bonds. Nevertheless, I consider they should reflect the way the Hyksos ruler understood inter-elite relationships, probably based on patronage. The first passage contains the claim Apophis made to Kamose to become his subordinate followed by the rejection of Kamose. In fact, Apophis *claimed* his right to rule over Upper Egypt, as the higher status ruler he considered he was. Probably in earlier times Theban rulers recognized the superiority of the Hyksos, while Kamose rejected to be subdued by Apophis.⁶⁸

The second one refers to the relationship between Apophis and the ruler of Kush. Both statements show Apophis considering himself as a higher status ruler, while Kamose and the ruler of Kush tried to defend their own positions, not recognizing the supposed authority of the Hyksos ruler.

As I mentioned above, the second passage has received different renderings. The problem is to determine whether Apophis addressed the letter to “*the son of the ruler of Kush*” or if he called the ruler of Kush “*my son*.” Van Seters explained his rendering as “my son” through the idea of an “older” ruler addressing a “younger” one because there is no proof of the political submission of Kush to the ruler of Avaris. However, the implicit idea of the inexistence of political implications in this relationship should be revised.

⁶⁷ Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*, 227. My emphasis.

⁶⁸ It is probable that during the early Second Intermediate Period contacts were maintained between Upper Egypt and Avaris, as the sealings of the Hyksos Khayan and of the Thirteenth Dynasty King Sobekhotep IV found at Tell Edfu revealed, cf. Nadine Moeller and Gregory Marouard (with a contribution by N. Ayers), “Discussion of Late Middle Kingdom and Early Second Intermediate Period History and Chronology in Relation to the Khayan Sealings from Tell Edfu,” *Ä&L* 21 (2011): 87-121. For a discussion on chronological issues related to the Thirteenth to Seventeenth Dynasties (among others), cf. Thomas Schneider, “Das Ende der kurzen Chronologie: Eine kritische Bilanz der Debatte zur absoluten Datierung des Mittleren Reiches und der Zweiten Zwischenzeit,” *Ä&L* 18 (2008): 275-313; Ryholt, “The Date of Kings Sheshi and Yaqubhar,” 109-126 (on the importance of the archaeological contexts of Uronarti and Shiqmona for attributing kings Sheshi and Yaqubhar to the Fourteenth Dynasty); Irene Forstner-Müller, Manfred Bietak, Manuela Lehmann and Chiara Reali, “Report on the Excavations at Tell el-Dab’a 2011,” *ASAE Reports* (2012): 1-19 and Irene Forstner-Müller and Pamela Rose, “Grabungen des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo in Tell el-Dab’a/Avaris, Das Areal R/III,” *Ä&L* 22 (in press), on the recent findings at Tell el-Dab’a area R/III related to the Hyksos Khayan.

In the explanation for their rendering as “*the son of the ruler of Kush*,” Harry and Alexandrina Smith had some interesting insights on the subject although they finally dismissed them in the end. They stated that if the translation of Habachi of the passage *z3.i ḥq3 n Kši*, “my son, the ruler of Kush” is correct, it “conveys that Apophis regarded the Ruler of Kush as a prince of lower rank than himself, for in the diplomatic protocol of the Near Eastern states at this time the term “brother” was used to express the relationship of rulers of equal status, while the terms “father/son” described the relationship of great kings to client kings.”⁶⁹ But they dismissed this possible interpretation based on the claim that Apophis made to the ruler of Kush: *ḥr-m ḥ̣.k m ḥq3 nn rdit rh.i*, which they translated “Why do you ascend as Ruler (*ḥq3*) without letting me know?” In fact, they considered that Apophis called himself *and* the ruler of Kush “rulers” (*ḥq3*), without taking into account the semantic meaning given by the different classifiers. Therefore, they concluded that Apophis “is flatteringly treating him as an equal in order to cajole him into attacking Kamose’s rear. If so Apophis is unlikely to have addressed him as “my son,” implying inferior rank; in addressing him as “the son of the Ruler” Apophis is stating his formal ignorance of his accession.”⁷⁰

A closer look to the classifiers of the word “ruler” in the passage can shed light on this matter, showing a subtle difference to the meaning of the whole paragraph. Apophis’ claim was directed to the *position* the ruler of Kush granted himself: “*Auserre, son of Re, Apophis, greets my son, the ruler of Kush. Why did you raise yourself as ruler of Upper Egypt without letting me know?*” As a matter of fact, Apophis neither considered the ruler of Kush nor Kamose as equals. He considered himself of superior rank, and that he deserved to rule not only over Lower Egypt but to make the rulers of Kush and Upper Egypt his subordinates.

The right to reproach the actions of those the “patron” considered his subordinates (“clients”) is also reflected in the passage under discussion, as exemplified in the aforementioned letter of the Royal Archive of Mari, where Hammurabi reproached Ishme-Dagan and clarified his position in the hierarchy of “clients.” In fact, Apophis’ claim to the ruler of Kush probably reveals that an “alliance” between them was broken, and that the ruler of Kush was able to grant himself the rulership over Upper Egypt, challenging Apophis’ self-proclaimed rights.

I consider it relevant to mention the absence of treaties or legal references with regard to this situation. Thus, the “independent” action of the ruler of Kush, the subsequent reproach of Apophis and the specific language of kinship he used can be brought as proof of the existence of a probable previous patronage linkage between them.

⁶⁹ Smith and Smith, “A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts,” *ZÄS* 103: 68.

⁷⁰ Smith and Smith, “A Reconsideration of the Kamose Texts,” *ZÄS* 103: 66.

An additional statement made by Kamose on Apophis' political status can be brought in to support our argument. In the line 16 of K2, Kamose states: *ʿ3m hz wn hr dd ink nb nn snnw.i* ... "vile Asiatic, who used to say: "I am a lord without equal..." A dagger (Cairo JE 32735 [CG 52768])⁷¹ found in Saqqara inside the coffin of a certain Abed seems to confirm Kamose's statement. The dagger was undoubtedly a prestige good. On one side it reads: "Good god, Lord of the Two Lands, Nebkhepeshre, Son of Re, Apophis, given life"; on the other, there is a hunting scene and another inscription which identifies the owner of the weapon as "the follower of his lord, Nehemen." This last statement could be related to Kamose's expression mentioned above. In her analysis of the imagery of the object, Dorothea Arnold pointed out that "judging from the deposition of Nehemen's dagger – surely a gift from the Hyksos ruler named upon it – in the coffin of another Hyksos follower, called Abed, and from the gift of a scribal palette by the same king to a man called Atju, a picture of mutual loyalty emerges that bound members of the Hyksos ruling class together."⁷² Thus, expressions like "my son," "his lord" and "follower" in the sources and the probable exchange of gifts for loyalty reinforce the description of these relationships as patronage.

To conclude, the words of the late Raymond Westbrook clearly show the essence of patronage in the Ancient Near East: "patronage is bound to remain a shadowy phenomenon, reflected in the sources rather than displayed by them."⁷³ Therefore, the ancient texts just mirror different socio-political practices without analyzing or explaining them. That is our task.


Conclusions

K2 is an Egyptian text which reveals the disputes over the rulership of Upper Egypt among the rulers located in the Eastern Delta (Hyksos), the Theban area (Egyptians) and Nubia (Kushites). Naturally, it contains the Egyptian point of view on the final phase of the Second Intermediate Period, and taking into account that it was erected in the Temple of Amun in Karnak, together with K1 and K3, it should be considered an expression of the legitimation practices held by king Kamose. A closer look at the classifiers attributed to the title *hq3*, "ruler," clearly show this feature. On the one side, the three rulers disputed the rulership over Upper Egypt by claiming to be the *Hq3*

⁷¹ Georges Daressy, "Un poignard du temps des rois pasteurs" *ASAE* 7 (1906): 115-120; Thomas Schneider, *Ausländer in Ägypten. Während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit*. Teil 2, "Die ausländische Bevölkerung" (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003): 148-149; Joan Aruz, Kim Benzel and Jean Evans, eds. *Beyond Babylon: Art, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Second Millennium BC* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2009), 116-117; Dorothea Arnold, "Image and Identity: Egypt's Eastern Neighbours, East Delta People and the Hyksos," in *The Second Intermediate Period (Thirteenth-Seventeenth Dynasties). Current Research, Future Prospects*, ed. Marcel Marée (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 210.

⁷² Arnold, "Image and Identity," 213. My emphasis.

⁷³ Westbrook, "Patronage," *JESHO* 48/2: 231.

(“ruler of Upper Egypt”); Lower Egypt was out of discussion at the time. On the other, by calling Kamose as *Hq3*, the scribe legitimized him as ruler while at the same time delegitimized the rulers of Avaris and Kush by using the  “papyrus roll” to classify the word *hq3* (“ruler”) when addressed to them. In addition, the text clarifies the different ways in which at least the Egyptian and the Hyksos rulers conceived rulership and inter-elite bonds. Kamose claimed the rulership over Upper Egypt from the Egyptian point of view, while Apophis claimed it by considering Kamose and the ruler of Kush lower status rulers, probably acting as a result of the existence of previous patronage-based inter-elite bonds.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to Stephen Quirke, Perla Fuscaldo and Graciela Gestoso Singer for reading earlier drafts of this paper and making insightful comments and suggestions, as well as James P. Allen with regard to specific aspects of my analysis of the source. I am especially grateful to Thomas Schneider and Orly Goldwasser for calling my attention to relevant features regarding the use of classifiers, as well as Alicia Daneri Rodrigo for discussing with me the appropriate meaning of the hieroglyphs in K2. Last but not least, I wish to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers provided by the journal. Of course, all errors and omissions are my sole responsibility.

