



## REEVALUATION OF CONNECTIONS BETWEEN EGYPT AND THE SOUTHERN LEVANT IN THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE IN LIGHT OF THE NEW HIGHER CHRONOLOGY

Susan L. Cohen  
Montana State University

### ABSTRACT

*The Middle Bronze Age in the southern Levant has long been a period subject to chronological debate, discussion, and dissension. Despite the common use of conventional dates and correlations, there is in reality little consensus regarding the dates for either the beginning or the end of the period, with the result that its duration also remains in flux. Such chronological imprecision also results in an equal lack of clarity regarding the synchronisms and connections between the southern Levant and the regions and cultures around it, particularly in regard to ancient Egypt. The increasing availability of radiocarbon dates from secure stratigraphic locations, as well as the absolute chronology that results from them, however, now emphasizes the need to reevaluate the traditional and conventional synchronisms, contacts, and connections between these cultures and highlights the importance of understanding the significance of these changes in chronology for examining development in the southern Levant.*

### INTRODUCTION

Historically, scholarship and general knowledge regarding the Middle Bronze Age in the southern Levant has been plagued by problems with terminology, nomenclature, and historical and archaeological interpretation, many of which fundamentally derive from the difficulties of establishing either a sound absolute or relative chronology for the period.<sup>1</sup> Despite the common use of conventional dates and correlations, there is in reality little consensus regarding the dates for either the beginning or the end of the period, or for the transitions between sub-periods, with the result that the duration of phases and the era as a whole also remains unclear. Such chronological imprecision also results in an equal lack of clarity regarding the synchronisms and connections between the southern Levant and the regions and cultures around it, particularly in regard to relationships with ancient Egypt. Simply put, if we do not know *when* we are talking about, then we cannot possibly say *what* we ought to be comparing, or *why* it might be important. From that, we cannot establish archaeological synchronisms or an historical understanding of the period and the contacts between cultures that took

place during that era. The increasing availability of radiocarbon data from secure stratigraphic locations, and the dates they provide, however, now emphasizes the need to re-evaluate the chronology of the southern Levant in the Middle Bronze Age in current use, and to use these most recent data to re-assess and re-examine the synchronisms and interconnections between the southern Levant and Egypt during this time.

General works such as textbooks and encyclopedia entries still routinely assign conventional dates of 2000–1550 BCE to the Middle Bronze Age, with the transition from MB I to MB II placed at 1750 BCE.<sup>2</sup> However, it has been apparent for decades that these are merely dates of convenience, as these are nice, round numbers that mark millennia, quarter-millennia, and half-millennia, thereby creating an ease of understanding while simultaneously reinforcing a simplicity of interpretation. The use of nice, round numbers makes it remarkably easy to make correlations between eras and dynasties; such convenience then encourages ease and facility of accompanying interpretations regarding interregional and intercultural interaction. This frequently has proven to over-simplify vastly more

complex issues of internal developments, patterns of settlement, and inter-regional relationships and influences.

The reevaluation of chronological correlations is also necessitated by the shifts in dates recently established for the absolute chronology of the Early Bronze Age. Radiocarbon evidence for this era has resulted in a much higher end date for EB III, ca. 2500 BCE, than previously has been thought.<sup>3</sup> This high chronology for EBA accordingly results in an earlier start for the Intermediate Bronze Age and lengthens that period from a mere 250 years to over half a millennium, as much as 600 years.<sup>4</sup> This significant change in scope and duration necessitates a reassessment of the way in which the Intermediate Bronze Age historically has been viewed, from being a mere “interlude” between urban periods to an era with a longer and more complex formative history in its own right.<sup>5</sup>

This clearly then has repercussions for the beginning, scope, and duration of MBA. If the preceding era begins earlier, is of longer duration, and possesses more complexity of human activity, development, organization and growth, the transition to the Middle Bronze Age must take this information into account. Already considerable evidence exists that indicates that the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age is both more complicated and more variable than the traditional view of the period as a sudden, disjunctive, and externally imposed urbanizing event. Likewise, the rise in dates for all preceding eras, together with radiocarbon data that produce higher dates for the Middle Bronze Age itself, points to the need to raise Middle Bronze Age dates, which then necessitates reexamination of relationships between the southern Levant and other cultures and regions.

#### RAISING THE DATES?—THE SOUTHERN LEVANT

The first problem to be addressed here is the date for the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age in the southern Levant and the synchronisms for the early MB I with Egypt. For decades, data from the excavations at Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a in the Egyptian Delta have provided the basic correlations with and grounds for all comparative stratigraphy and chronology for southern Levantine Middle Bronze Age sites. This has resulted in the suggestion of a low date, ca. 1900, for the beginning of the MB I.<sup>6</sup> This low chronology then correlates MB I with the late 12th and early 13th Dynasties.<sup>7</sup>

This particular chronological interpretation and

low chronology has dominated discourse regarding interrelationships between the regions for several decades of scholarship, causing all subsequent finds and interpretations to be “fit” into this framework. With the continued excavation of Middle Bronze Age sites in the southern Levant and additional radiocarbon data, however, this low date has proved increasingly problematic, leading to difficulties in establishing correlations between sites and strata, which then affects the ensuing historical analyses based on these data. As noted above, however, new evidence suggests that these dates should be raised.

In particular, the radiocarbon evidence from Tell Abu en-Ni<sup>c</sup>aj,<sup>8</sup> suggests an absolute chronology higher by as much as fifty to one hundred years for the beginning of MB I than the current low chronology, while evidence from Tell el-Burak,<sup>9</sup> Tel Ifshar,<sup>10</sup> indicate that the date of the transition from MB I to MB II must also be raised. This has led some scholars to suggest that the material from Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a should not be used as the primary data set for establishing southern Levantine and Egyptian chronological synchronisms and correlations.<sup>11</sup> This claim is based largely on radiocarbon dating; it may, however, be augmented by other interpretative issues associated with data regarding the beginning of MB I in the southern Levant overall.

The primary southern Levantine material used to provide correlations with Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a comes from the Middle Bronze Age strata excavated at the southern coastal site of Ashkelon, specifically from the gate and fortifications located on the northern tel. The basic sequence that establishes the lower chronology is as follows. A small corpus of Egyptian ceramics and clay sealings (most probably used to seal commodities for exchange) excavated from the Phase 14 moat (the Moat Deposit) in the first phase of the MB I gate complex at Ashkelon have been equated by the excavators with Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a Str. G/4, and perhaps late Tell el-Dab<sup>c</sup>a Str. H.<sup>12</sup> The local ceramics found in association with the sealings have parallels with Aphek Phase 3,<sup>13</sup> while the sealings themselves have been dated on stylistic grounds to the late 12th–early 13th Dynasties.<sup>14</sup> These connections place the transition from the early to middle phases of MB I in the later part of the 12th Dynasty, with the final, transitional, phase of MB I to MB II then being contemporary with the end of the 12th Dynasty and the beginning of the 13th.

Challenged by the high dates produced by the radiocarbon data from other sites and regions, this correlation needs re-examination. However, this

remains difficult, as to date, the vast majority of the material relevant to this chronological argument remains unpublished, as do the Middle Bronze Age strata from which it comes and from the site overall. In particular, the mud sealings are not yet fully published and no photo of the cache *in situ* is available, which does not allow for further analysis of their chronological locus or assessment of their excavation context in the MB I gate area.

This last point—the context of the sealings—is of some importance. The original description of the findspot was an “ashy fill” from Phase 13 in the Phase 14 moat.<sup>15</sup> This would imply their context as a deposit in a mixed-fill locus that post-dates the construction of the moat itself, and thus the sealings could be from not only anywhere, but from almost any-when prior to filling in the moat during the Phase 13 activity in this area of the site. The provenance for the sealings has since been re-described as an “ashy lining” for the Phase 14 moat,<sup>16</sup> and thus they must be associated with the earlier construction itself. This decreases the chronological flexibility of interpretation, as the sealings must pre-date the construction of the moat in order to have been built into the lining of it, and they, together with the commodities they sealed, must then have been traded earlier and arrived at the site earlier. This change of findspot then also lowers the chronological synchronisms between Egypt and the southern Levant even further, placing almost the entire 12th Dynasty prior to the middle of MB I in the southern Levant.

This low correlation, however, as noted above, does not fit well with the higher radiocarbon dates provided by Tel Burak, Tel Ifshar, and perhaps even from Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup> itself.<sup>17</sup> Thus it is important to attempt to reconcile these apparently contradictory pieces of evidence. How can the low dates provided by the Ashkelon sealings, correlated with the Dab<sup>a</sup> material, be understood in light of the higher dates provided from other sites? Two primary points must be considered in order to begin to answer this question: 1) the date, nature, and scope of the Middle Bronze Age remains from Ashkelon, and, to a lesser extent, Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup>, and 2) the archaeological evidence and settlement patterns from the beginning of MB I in the southern Levant.

#### *Ashkelon and Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup>*

Neither Ashkelon nor Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup> have—to date—produced material dating to the earliest phases of the Middle Bronze Age as found elsewhere in other

regions of the southern Levant.<sup>18</sup> In both cases, the southern Levantine ceramic material from these sites and the relevant strata fits most comfortably in the middle phases of Middle Bronze Age development, established initially by the Aphek excavations<sup>19</sup> and applied to other sites throughout the region.<sup>20</sup> The implications of this are clear—the lower dates indicated by the correlation of evidence between the sites may in part be attributed to the simple fact that they do in fact date later in the Middle Bronze Age sequence of development.

The Ashkelon sealings and the dates provided by them speak only to the construction of the gate and the associated phases at Ashkelon. They do not provide any information regarding any earlier MB I occupation and activity at the site or in the surrounding region, which therefore remains an unknown quantity in terms of scope, location, and most importantly, beginning date and subsequent duration.<sup>21</sup> In short, the evidence from Ashkelon cannot inform regarding either the beginning of MB I or the length of development of the early phases of the era. Furthermore, the survey data from the surrounding area also indicate that there is little MBA settlement in the Ashkelon region overall, and, in general, what little there is dates to the later/middle phases of MB I.<sup>22</sup> Tell el-Dab<sup>a</sup> also lacks material dating to the earliest MB I phases found in the southern Levant. In sum, the correlations between Ashkelon and Dab<sup>a</sup> based on ceramics and the Moat Deposit more properly represent the middle phases of MB I, and thus can be used only to provide correlations for those phases.

#### *MB I development*

These points regarding chronology and correlations then in turn necessitate a discussion of early MB I development and settlement in the southern Levant, as this clearly affects the dates assigned to its beginning. The settlement patterns and material culture that mark the transition from the Intermediate Bronze Age to the Middle Bronze Age vary significantly regionally throughout the southern Levant. Given this regional variation in transition between periods, the obvious corollary to this is that MB I developed regionally as well, in different ways, at different times.

Initial broad assessment of Middle Bronze Age growth and settlement indicated that settlement began in the north and on the coast and from there moved inland and southwards.<sup>23</sup> However, additional examination also has revealed that

simultaneously there was considerable continuity with the IBA in the inland regions.<sup>24</sup> Further, MB I culture in those areas appears to have developed differently from that in the coastal areas.<sup>25</sup>

For example, the material excavated from the Gesher cemetery located in the central Jordan Valley exhibits a clear mix of Intermediate Bronze Age traditions together with material culture typologies associated with MB I.<sup>26</sup> In addition to showing continuity, these traits clearly illustrate a different trajectory of development from that seen at coastal sites. In the same general region of the inland southern Levant, the material found at Tell el-Hayyat also shows early MB I characteristics together with subsistence patterns that clearly possess affinities with and antecedents from earlier strategies.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, it has been noted that early MB I in the Hula Valley is virtually indistinguishable from the previous Intermediate Bronze Age in terms of both settlement and subsistence.<sup>28</sup> Finally, results from the survey of the area around Kabri produced no material culture equivalent with the earliest MB I phases found elsewhere in the southern Levant.<sup>29</sup> This strongly suggests that this early phase is a regional development unique to certain areas rather than a universal phase of MB I throughout the southern Levant.

In short, all evidence indicates that the southern Levant at the beginning of MB I shows a strong regionalism. In particular, it seems that the inland regions of the southern Levant developed from the preceding Intermediate Bronze Age in ways that appear quite different from the more obvious and disjunctive MB I material culture charted on the coast. Further, it is quite likely that this indigenous development was chronologically earlier than the more visible development on the coast, especially given the high radiocarbon dates from Tell Abu en-Ni'aj.<sup>30</sup> Taken together, this presents a view of early MB I development as one that varied regionally and can be identified geographically, and that most probably differed chronologically as well.

The longer duration of the Intermediate Bronze Age and the regionalism that has always marked this period strongly support this supposition. The regional variation of the Intermediate Bronze Age effectively also means that different areas experienced change differently and at different times, producing chronological shifts that vary over time and space—defined as “sloping horizons.”<sup>31</sup> This creates a range of dates that may be assigned to the end of the Intermediate Bronze Age, as well as

the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age, rather than one single “absolute” date, as “sloping horizons” that mark the end of one era logically must result in sloping beginnings for the next. It is both perfectly possible and generally reasonable to suppose that the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age, and thus the dates to be assigned to those beginnings, vary as regionally as do the material culture and patterns of settlement. Further, it may then be expected northern and coastal sites may produce different dates than do southern and/or inland ones, reflecting both regional variation and different development.

This acknowledgement of the variability, regionalism, and differential nature of MB I development in the southern Levant, together with the high dates produced by recent radiocarbon evidence suggest that the start of MB I, at least in some areas, should be raised to begin above the current absolute low date. For some regions, such as inland areas that show strong continuity with the Intermediate Bronze Age, based on the high chronology provided by the radiocarbon data from Tell Abu en-Ni'aj, these dates may perhaps be as high as 1975/1950.<sup>32</sup> This creates a fifty year or more range in start date for MB I, which, with the noted regional development, may still be compatible with lower dates produced elsewhere.

#### RAISING THE DATES?—EGYPTIAN CONNECTIONS

The implication of higher dates and sloping beginnings regarding the relationship between the southern Levant and Egypt is that the beginning of MB I was contemporary with the early pharaohs of the 12th Dynasty. This places the earliest range of MB I in some regions coeval with the reign of Senwosret I, rather than Amenemhet II as suggested in previous analyses.<sup>33</sup> This shift then requires a re-examination of the Egyptian evidence relevant to contact and interaction with the southern Levant dating to these early 12th Dynasty pharaohs.

Past debates regarding chronology, periodization, and Egyptian-southern Levantine interrelations focused—frequently acrimoniously—on contextualization of the *Tale of Sinuhe* from the reign of Senwosret I.<sup>34</sup> Using the famous description of the Land of Yaa found in Sinuhe's story, chronological arguments cited the presumed nature of the society it supposedly described to argue for or against an MB I context for the story.<sup>35</sup> Under the lower chronology, this story is clearly contemporary with the Intermediate Bronze Age; raising the chronology places it squarely in early MB I. However, given the



increased understandings of the regionalism of the beginning of MB I, evidence for considerable continuity with the Intermediate Bronze Age in many regions, together with the realization that MB I began later in some regions than in others, it is clear that this debate is irrelevant. The chronological locus of the text could be either Intermediate Bronze Age or Middle Bronze Age—the story and its description of the land and its inhabitants fits comfortably in the social and political milieu of either era. While the ultimate determination does rest on establishing final absolute dates, the importance and value of the story for its descriptive presentation of the southern Levant, its peoples, and the ways in which both were viewed by Egypt remains unchanged regardless of whether it describes a late Intermediate Bronze Age or early MB I context. Should the proposed higher chronology prove to be correct, then the proper chronological locus for this text would be early MB I, and there is nothing in the story that would contradict this.

The second piece of primary Egyptian evidence cited in connection with MB I and the associated chronological debate is the famous scene of Asiatics entering Egypt during the reign of Senwosret II portrayed as part of the elaborate mortuary decoration in the tomb of Khnumhotep II at Beni Hasan.<sup>36</sup> It remains uncertain whether this representation is meant to show a specific event, or a type of event, or even an iterative event;<sup>37</sup> caution must be used in basing chronological determination on a single representation of a single object in a single tomb. If the object in question is indeed a duckbilled axe,<sup>38</sup> it still is essential to note that any use of this representation for elucidating chronological connections must first take into account the question of antecedence and transfer of knowledge. In other words, the amount of time necessary for knowledge of an object commonly used in the southern Levant to produce a representation of that object in a tomb is unknown. If the caravan arrived in year 6 of Senwosret II, then the origins of the axe in the southern Levant must be earlier than that date. This time lag may increase even further if the individuals come from the eastern desert, rather than from the southern Levant proper, as seems highly likely,<sup>39</sup> as the axe would need time to have been first developed in the southern Levant, and transmitted to the eastern desert. Therefore, while the image of the duckbilled axe corroborates that the reign of Senwosret II was coeval with early MB I, the image cannot be used to established when

the MB I began; it merely suggests that MB I began prior to the reign of Senwosret II.<sup>40</sup> Again, there is nothing in this image or text that does not allow for a compatibility with the higher dates being proposed.

Finally, the suggested higher dates still permit the claim that maritime trade during the reign of Amenemhet II helped instigate Middle Bronze Age growth in the southern Levant.<sup>41</sup> While previous assessment has suggested that MB I may have begun during this time,<sup>42</sup> the proposed shift would indicate that the reign of Amenemhet II is instead contemporary with the middle to late phases of MB I. Again, this remains compatible with the archaeological data, as it is during these phases that an increase in settlement development is clearly visible in the southern Levant.<sup>43</sup>

Overall, the proposed raise in dates does not present significant interpretative problems for the Egyptian material regarding the southern Levant or Egyptian-southern Levantine relations in MB I for the first part of the 12th Dynasty. It does, however, affect understandings of this relationship for the latter part of the Middle Kingdom. The high radiocarbon dates result in raising the transition between MB I and MB II from its conventional date of 1750 BCE by at least fifty years and perhaps as much as a century to ca. 1800/1850. This then results in MB II being roughly contemporary with the reigns of Senwosret III and Amenemhet III of the 12th Dynasty. If this is correct, then this has the effect of placing the Khu-Sobek account of Senwosret III's invasion of the southern Levant and even more importantly, the Execration Texts, into an MB II context.

For the Khu-Sobek inscription, this proposed chronological shift does not affect interpretation of this text in any significant way. Regardless of chronological locus, the account still reflects an isolated campaign that established neither hegemony nor lasting political change in the southern Levant, nor is there any significant archaeological data to augment any further interpretation of the text and its historicity.<sup>44</sup> In light of the late MB I settlement at Shechem, which continues strongly into MB II, however, the re-location of this text within the later period presents few problems of interpretation. As with the *Tale of Sinuhe*, the determination will rest on the establishment of final dates for the period, while the interpretative value of this text for southern Levantine-Egyptian relations remains unchanged.

The effects of the proposed shifts on the Execration Texts present a far more significant change in interpretation, as the Texts have traditionally always been associated with an MB I context. One issue with the Texts has often been that they name locations that did not have significant MB I occupation, such as Jerusalem, which has presented problems of interpretation. From this, the potential shift to the Texts being coeval with MB II may in fact be easier to reconcile with the lists of sites presented within them. Regardless, the Execration Texts' use in examining the geo-political landscape of the southern Levant still must be tempered by consideration of the original contexts of the texts themselves and their primary purpose as magical objects, designed to help establish an ideal reality. Their utility for establishing understandings of an actual southern Levantine social and political reality remains unclear, which provides interpretative difficulties beyond simple chronological re-adjustment. If their temporal locus is to be changed, this will require considerable re-examination and further study, beyond which is possible here.<sup>45</sup>

#### CONCLUSIONS

At present, the proposed raise for the dates of the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age produces little substantive change regarding the perceived relationships and interconnections with Egypt during this period. This is especially apparent once this chronological shift is evaluated in light of the regionalism and variability apparent in the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age itself. Instead of viewing this era as a disjunctive break from the Intermediate Bronze Age, which itself is both longer and more complex than previously understood, the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age should instead be viewed as comprised of regional developments that exhibit considerable chronological and geographic diversity. This accordingly produces the so-called "sloping horizons" between the Intermediate Bronze Age and the Middle Bronze Age, with the transition between the two occurring earlier in some regions and later in others, and exhibiting different degrees of continuity as well.

In many ways the chronological problem of the Middle Bronze Age is an epistemological one—it reflects a great deal about how we view and have been accustomed to view the period, how we have created knowledge about it, and how we have incorporated new information into that knowledge, whereas it reveals rather less about the changes

themselves. This chronological discussion historically has been hampered by the tendency to adhere to old perceptions of the era (e.g., its distinction from the Intermediate Bronze Age) and has become entrenched in specific interpretations derived from previous knowledge (e.g., rapid development of urban culture).

Broader application of this knowledge itself is needed as well—despite the intensity and occasional virulence of the debates regarding Middle Bronze Age chronology in the past decades, most standard works on southern Levantine archaeology and history have rarely either acknowledged them or changed chronologies and dates from the standard nice round numbers discussed at the outset of this article. This of course, highlights this problem as epistemological: there is no point in having new data, new chronologies, or new interpretations if that information, and more importantly, the significance it holds, does not reach the broader field and its general practitioners, much less the informed public, and the knowledge they have of the subject. Historically, this debate has not done so, although it may be hoped with increased resolution of the chronology of the era, this knowledge will then move beyond the bounds of the few who discuss it.

The proposed shift in chronology for the Middle Bronze Age represents neither an insurmountable obstacle nor a product of irrational interpretation, but instead may allow for new analysis and synthesis that may be expected to produce additional information and lead to further study that reaches beyond the narrow scope of its immediate practitioners. A use of higher dates does not represent a return to the older views of the MBA previously associated with higher chronology but is instead proposed in tandem with a new understanding of the Middle Bronze Age and the ways in which it developed throughout the southern Levant. Chronology merely provides a tool with which to examine cultures, their developments in context, and their connections; on its own, absolute dates simply are numbers that help to place human development in sequential context. Here, it is clear that the issue of raising and lowering Middle Bronze Age chronology may best be approached by viewing absolute chronology as a impetus for further study, rather than an absolute end to itself. The "problem" of Middle Bronze Age chronology in the southern Levant thus again represents as much an epistemological issue regarding our perception of the era as it is an archaeological one.

- <sup>1</sup> See S. Cohen, *Canaanites, Chronology, and Connections: The Relationship of Middle Bronze Age IIA Canaan to Middle Kingdom Egypt*, Harvard Semitic Museum Publications, Studies in the History and Archaeology of the Levant 3 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002) for an overview of scholarship regarding nomenclature and terminology for the Middle Bronze Age. This paper utilizes the following terminology: Intermediate Bronze Age, Middle Bronze Age I (MB I), Middle Bronze Age II (MB II), and Middle Bronze Age III (MB III).
- <sup>2</sup> The chronology adopted for the Middle Bronze Age in the recent *Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant* is a notable exception to this; see I. Sharon, "Levantine Chronology," in A. Killebrew and M. Steiner (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of the Levant* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2014), 44–65, as it adheres to the more recently established low chronology. These lower dates, however, are now being challenged by the newer radiocarbon dates under discussion in this article and others in this volume.
- <sup>3</sup> J. Regev, P. d. Miroschedji, R. Greenberg, E. Braun, Z. Greenhut, and E. Boaretto, "Chronology of the Early Bronze Age in the Southern Levant: New Analysis for a High Chronology," *Radiocarbon* 54 (2012): 526–566; F. Höflmayer, "Egypt and the Southern Levant in the late Early Bronze Age," in F. Höflmayer and R. Eichmann (eds.), *Egypt and the Southern Levant in the Early Bronze Age*, *Orient-Archäologie* 31 (Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2014), 135–148; J. Regev, I. Finkelstein, M.J. Adams, and E. Boaretto, "Wiggle-matched 14C Chronology of Early Bronze Megiddo and the Synchronization of Egyptian and Levantine Chronologies," *Egypt and Levant* 24 (2014): 243–266; F. Höflmayer, "Introduction: The Late Third Millennium BC in the Ancient Near East and Eastern Mediterranean—A Time of Collapse and Transformation," in F. Höflmayer (ed.), *The Late Third Millennium in the Ancient Near East: Chronology, C14 and Climate Change: Papers from the Oriental Institute Seminar Held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago 7–8 March 2014*, *Oriental Institute Seminars* 11 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, forthcoming).
- <sup>4</sup> S. Cohen, "Continuity, Innovation, and Change: The Intermediate Bronze Age in the Southern Levant," in E. Cline, A. Yasur-Landau, and Y. Rowan (eds.), *Cambridge Social Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean: Israel, Palestine, and Jordan*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, forthcoming); see also M. J. Adams, "Response: Egypt and the Levant in the Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition," in F. Höflmayer (ed.) *The Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition in the Ancient Near East. Chronology, C14, and Climate Change*, *The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars* 11 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 2017), 447–469.
- <sup>5</sup> M. D'Andrea, *The Southern Levant in Early Bronze IV: Issues and Perspectives in the Pottery Evidence*, (Rome: Contributi e Materiali di Archeologia Orientale XVII, 2014); Cohen, forthcoming.
- <sup>6</sup> M. Bietak, "Antagonisms in Historical and Radiocarbon Chronology," in A.J. Shortland and C. Bronk-Ramsey (eds.), *Radiocarbon and the Chronologies of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013), 79–109.
- <sup>7</sup> L. Stager, J. Schloen, D. Master, M. Press, and A. Aja, "Stratigraphic Overview. 14. The North Slope," in L. Stager, J. Schloen, and D. Master (eds.), *Ashkelon I: Introduction and Overview (1985–2006)* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), fig. 14.4.
- <sup>8</sup> S. Falconer and P. Fall, "A Radiocarbon Sequence from Tell Abu en-Ni`aj, Jordan and Its Implications for Early Bronze Age IV Chronology in the Southern Levant," *Radiocarbon* (2016), doi:10.1017/RDC.2016.26; also see S. Falconer and P. Fall, this volume.
- <sup>9</sup> F. Höflmayer, J. Kamlah, H. Sader, M. Dee, W. Kutschera, E. M. Wild, and S. Riehl, "Radiocarbon Dates from Tell el-Burak (Lebanon): New Evidence for Middle Bronze Age Chronology and Synchronisms," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 375 (2016): 53–76.
- <sup>10</sup> E. Marcus, "Correlating and Combining Egyptian Historical and Southern Levantine Radiocarbon Chronologies at Middle Bronze Age IIA Tel Ifshar, Israel," in A.J. Shortland and C. Bronk-Ramsey (eds.), *Radiocarbon and the Chronologies of Ancient Egypt* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2013), 182–208; F. Höflmayer, A. Yasur-Landau, E.H. Cline, M.W. Dee, B. Lorentzen, and S. Riehl,



- “New Radiocarbon Dates from Tel Kabri Support a High Middle Bronze Age Chronology,” *Radiocarbon* 58.3 (2016): 599–613.
- 11 Höflmayer et al. 2016.
- 12 Stager et al. 2008, 224; M. Bietak, K. Kopetzky, L. Stager, and R. Voss, “Synchronisation of Stratigraphies: Ashkelon and Tell el-Dab‘a,” *Ägypten und Levante* 18 (2008): 49–60.
- 13 Stager et al. 2008, 224; L. Stager and R. Voss, “Egyptian Pottery in Middle Bronze Age Ashkelon,” *Eretz-Israel* 30 (2011): 119\*–26\*.
- 14 Stager et al. 2008, 224; D. Ben-Tor, *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections: Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis Series Archaeologica 27 (Fribourg, Göttingen: Academic Press; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 117–118.
- 15 Stager et al. 2008, 224.
- 16 Stager and Voss 2011, 120\* and fn. 1.
- 17 Höflmayer et al. 2016.
- 18 S. Cohen, “Synchronisms and Significance: Reevaluating Interconnections between Middle Kingdom Egypt and the Southern Levant,” *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 4.3 (2012): 1–8; S. Cohen, “Periphery and Core: The Relationship between the Southern Levant and Egypt in the Early Middle Bronze Age (MB I),” in J. Mynářová, P. Onderka, and P. Pavúk, (eds.), *There and Back Again—The Crossroads II: Proceedings of an International Conference Held in Prague, September 15–18, 2014* (Prague: Charles University, 2015), 247–263.
- 19 P. Beck, “Area A: Middle Bronze Age IIA Pottery” and “The Middle Bronze Age IIA Pottery Repertoire: A Comparative Study” in M. Kochavi, P. Beck, and E. Yadin (eds.), *Aphek-Antipatris I: Excavation of Areas A and B. The 1972–1976 Seasons*, Monograph Series No. 19 (Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University. Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology, 2000), 173–254.
- 20 Cohen 2002.
- 21 Cohen 2015.
- 22 Y. Huster, *Ashkelon 5: The Land behind Ashkelon* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015).
- 23 Cohen, 2002.
- 24 S. Cohen, “Continuities and Discontinuities: A Re-Examination of the Intermediate Bronze Age– Middle Bronze Age Transition in Palestine,” *The Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 354 (2009): 1–13.
- 25 Cohen 2009.
- 26 Y. Garfinkel and S. Cohen (eds.), *The Middle Bronze Age Cemetery at Gesher: Final Report*, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 62 (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007); S. Cohen and R. Bonfil, “The Pottery,” in Y. Garfinkel and S. Cohen (eds.), *The Middle Bronze Age IIA Cemetery at Gesher: Final Report*, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 62 (Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 77–99; S. Cohen, “Gesher in MB IIA Context,” in Y. Garfinkel and S. Cohen (eds.), *The Excavations at the MB IIA Cemetery at Gesher: Final Report*, Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research 62 (Boston, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 131–137.
- 27 S. Falconer, “Village Economy and Society in the Jordan Valley: A Study of Bronze Age Rural Complexity,” in G.M. Schwartz and S. Falconer (eds.), *Archaeological Views from the Countryside*, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994), 121–142; S. Falconer and P. Fall, *Bronze Age Rural Ecology and Village Life at Tell el-Hayyat, Jordan*, BAR International Series 1586 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006).
- 28 R. Greenberg, *Early Urbanizations in the Levant* (London and New York: Leicester, 2002).
- 29 A. Yasur-Landau, E. Cline, and G. Pierce, “Middle Bronze Age Settlement Patterns in the Western Galilee, Israel,” *Journal of Field Archaeology* 33 (2008): 59–83.
- 30 Falconer and Fall 2016.
- 31 D’Andrea 2014.
- 32 Falconer and Fall 2016.
- 33 Cohen 2012.
- 34 A. Rainey, “Remarks on Donald Redford’s *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times*,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 29 (1994): 81–85; D. Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1992); “A Response to Anson Rainey’s ‘Remarks on Donald Redford’s *Egypt*,



- Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times*," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 301 (1996): 77–81.
- <sup>35</sup> See discussion in Cohen, 2002, 18–19; Adams 2017, 454, and note 3.
- <sup>36</sup> P. Newberry, *Beni Hasan I* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1893), pls. 28, 30–31.
- <sup>37</sup> S. Cohen, "Interpretative Uses and Abuses of the Beni Hasan Tomb Oainting," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 74 (2015): 19–38.
- <sup>38</sup> M. Bietak, "Relative and Absolute Chronology of the Middle Bronze Age: Comments on the Present State of Research," in M. Bietak (ed.), *The Middle Bronze Age in the Levant: Proceedings of an International Conference on MB IIA Ceramic Material, Vienna, 24th–26th of January 2001* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002), 29–42; J. Weinstein, "Reflections on the Chronology of Tell el-Dab'a," in W. V. Davies and L. Schofield (eds.), *Egypt, the Aegean, and the Levant*, (London: British Museum, 1995), 84–90; Cohen 2015.
- <sup>39</sup> Cohen 2015.
- <sup>40</sup> Nor, as with the description of the land provided in the *Tale of Sinuhe*, can any conclusions about the type of society in MB I or the universal nature of southern Levantine-Egyptian relationships be derived from this particular representation; the painting merely shows a group of Asiatic individuals arriving in Middle Egypt; see discussion in Cohen 2015.
- <sup>41</sup> E. Marcus, "Amenemhet II and the Sea: Maritime Aspects of the Mit Rahina (Memphis) Inscription," *Ägypten und Levante* 17 (2007): 137–190.
- <sup>42</sup> Cohen 2012.
- <sup>43</sup> Cohen 2002.
- <sup>44</sup> J. Baines, "The Stela of Khusobek: Private and Royal Military Narrative and Values," in J. Osing and G. Dreyer (eds.), *Form und Mass* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), 43–61.
- <sup>45</sup> For a preliminary discussion of this issue, see contribution by Katharina Streit, this volume.