Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections

Sailing the Great Green Sea? Amenhotep III's "Aegean List" from Kom el-Hetan, Once More

Eric H. Cline
George Washington University

Steven M. Stannish
The State University of New York, Potsdam

Abstract

Amenhotep III's "Aegean List," found on a statue base at his mortuary temple at Kom el-Hetan nearly fifty years ago, is critical for the study of Egypto-Aegean relations during the Late Bronze Age. This article reconsiders the Aegean List's toponyms and possible function in light of recent archaeological discoveries made at the site as well as the publication of a recently updated version of Elmar Edel's classic volume on the subject. Among the most important insights in the latter study is the realization that three of the Aegean List's names were recarved at some point. This article weighs the possibility that the inscription reflects the itinerary of an Egyptian expedition to the Aegean region and raises questions about its proper interpretation.

This article began life far away from warm, sunny Egypt, on a cold, snowy night in early November at the 2010 SSEA Annual Symposium in Toronto, Canada. The symposium's focus was on Amenhotep III, and one of the present authors (Cline) had just presented a paper on the king's foreign relations that included material on the so-called "Aegean List" (Statue Base List E_N) from the mortuary temple at Kom el-Hetan, on which he had previously published.[1]

Over dinner, we decided to take a fresh look at the Aegean List, in part to consider the recent discoveries by Hourig Sourouzian and Rainer Stadelmann at Kom el-Hetan, and in part to double-check the readings, transliterations, and translations of its unique place names, especially given the new suggestions made by Manfred Görg in 2005. In that year, Görg published an updated edition of Elmar Edel's classic volume on the statue bases at Kom el-Hetan (hereafter referred to as Edel and Görg), forty years after its original publication, complete with Edel's previously unpublished notes as well as new readings and analyses based on new collations from photographs.[2]

In their discussion, Edel and Görg make a number of suggestions about the Aegean List's toponyms.[3] These would, if correct, impact the theory that the inscription represents an Egyptian voyage to, and around, the Aegean during Amenhotep III's reign. This "Itinerary Hypothesis" has been embraced by Cline (among others) since 1987, in part because of the correspondence between the Aegean List's place names and Bronze Age Aegean sites where archaeologists have discovered objects connected with Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye.[4] As part of this article, we will discuss their suggestions, especially those with which we find ourselves in some disagreement.[5]

The Aegean List

The Aegean List was discovered in the 1960s, inscribed on one of five statue bases found in the northern half of the West Portico of the great Peristyle Court at Kom el-Hetan.[6] Each statue base bears a different series of toponyms written within "fortified" or "crenellated" ovals and superimposed on bound captives—a standard Egyptian way of denoting foreign places.[7] Together, they represent roughly half of the known outside world:

A_N: Great Powers and key centers of the Near East
B_N: lesser states of Syria-Palestine
C_N: more Syro-Palestinian toponyms; very fragmentary
D_N: Mesopotamian places names; also very fragmentary
E_N: Aegean sites and regions

These statue bases, redesignated as PWN I–V by Sourouzian and Stadelmann (the current excavators at the site), were badly damaged by fire after their discovery.[8] Conservators "hastily and partially restored" several, including the Aegean List, but "parts once seen and photographed were now missing."[9]

As an integral part of the current excavations, a team led by M. A. López Marcos dismantled the statue bases, brought together "numerous dispersed fragments and chips," and added "new fragments . . . to the groupings."[10] In 2000, the team took apart the Aegean List, and over the next five years, cleaned and sorted some 800 fragments; in the spring of 2005, they finally reassembled it.[11]

In looking at Sourouzian and Stadelmann's work, one is struck by the number of statues of Amenhotep III that once stood at Kom el-Hetan, some of which were found reused as far away as Karnak South.[12] Twenty oversized quartzite statues probably commanded the northern parts of the great Peristyle Court alone—ten in the North Portico and five each in the northern halves of the West and East Porticos.[13] The same number in granite most likely mirrored these monuments to the south. Curiously, the five extant statue bases from the East Portico are not inscribed, leading the current excavators to conclude that there was "not enough time to complete the decoration after the enlargement of the whole Peristyle Court. We have now evidence that Amenhotep constantly enlarged his funerary temple towards the East for every new heb-sed with new Pylons and colossal statues."[14] Sourouzian and Stadelmann summarize the current situation as follows:

> As we know, the great Peristyle Court is divided by the east-west axis into North and South halves. Royal statues in this court represented the king standing, feet joined, hands crossed on the chest and holding the royal insignia. . . . In the northern half of the court the statues were sculptured in quartzite from Gebel al-Ahmar, a northern quarry, and depicted the king with the red crown of Lower Egypt. On the bases of the northern statues, northern countries are represented, Palestinians, Syrians, and Aegeans. In the southern half, all statues were in red granite from Aswan, southern quarries, and showed the king with the white crown of Upper Egypt. Their bases were decorated with southern folk, including Nubians and Sudanese. According to Rainer Stadelmann's study of the name-lists decorating the newly discovered statue bases, the lists of the funerary temple have some common features with the other known lists of the reign, but they also differ in many aspects from the latter, and above all they bring considerable new data on the geography of the neighboring lands.[15]

For the past half-century, the Aegean List has itself provided significant, but also ambiguous, information about some of Egypt's neighbors. It is inscribed on the front and left sides of Statue Base E_N (PWN V); the other two sides are empty. In all, fifteen toponyms remain, with another two now lost. In a register above the "captive ovals," a single line of text reads:

> *t3w nbw št3y* [*nw*] *pḥw nw sṯt t3w nbw* [*f*]*nḫw* [*ḫnt-ḥn*]*-nfr r rdwy nṯr pn nfr . . . H wrw ḫ3swt nbw rsywt mḥtywt ḫmw ii*[*t r*] *kmt* [*dr r*]*k* [*nṯr*] *iw ḥr pdwy iry twt m bw* [*wʿ*] *r rdt n.sn ṯ3w n ʿnḫ in*[*w.sn ḥr psḏw.sn*]
>
> "All of the difficult lands north of Asia. All of the lands of the Phoenicians and Nubia (= the north and the south) are at the feet of this good god. . . . the great ones of all of the southern and the northern foreign lands, who did not know to come to Egypt since the god's time, come on their knees united in one place, so that the breath of life may be given to them, their tribute on their backs."[16]

The order in which the toponyms are to be read is crucial. In the center of the front side (Figure 1), two bound prisoners support Amenhotep III's prenomen and nomen, *nb-m3ʿt-rʿ* and *imn-ḥtp ḥḳ3 w3st*. The two place names to the right should be read first, since they face the same direction as these cartouches; they are *kftiw*, i.e., *Keftiu*, identified as Crete, and *tny* (*ti-n3-y-w*), i.e., *Tanaja* (Danaia, the Danaoi-Land), identified as mainland Greece. Both are known from other Egyptian sources from the time of Thutmose III onward, and their identification is accepted by most scholars.[17] The empty field on the far right and the absence of captive ovals on the adjacent (right) side of the monument indicate that these toponyms and the part of the text in the register above them ("All of the difficult lands north of Asia") function as "headnames" and as a headline, respectively, for the rest of the list.[18]

The Aegean List's other toponyms are unique; not one of them appears in any other Egyptian source, either before or after Amenhotep III's reign. All scholars agree that these names denote sites and regions in the Bronze Age Aegean, but their identification is sometimes challenging. In fact, the place names are so unusual that Kenneth A. Kitchen, the first Egyptologist to publish on them in English, was initially hesitant about suggesting translations. In 1965, he remarked cautiously that "I hardly like to put the following idea on record; readers may ignore it if they wish. The two names *Amnisa* and *Kunusa* look uncomfortably like Amniso(s) and . . . Knossos, famous ancient settlements on the north coast of Crete."[19] In the years since, a number of scholars have worked on deciphering the toponyms on the list and the meaning behind their appearance. Edel was the first to publish a thorough consideration of all five statue base lists, including the Aegean List, in 1966.[20]

Edel originally transliterated the three toponyms to the left of Amenhotep III's nomina (Figure 2) as *im*[*nš*] (*i-m-*[*n-y-š*]*3*), *byšt* (*b*[*3*]*-y-š3-ti*), and *ktny* (*k3-tw-n3-y*), and translated them as Amnisos, Crete (Linear B *a-mi-ni-so*); Phaistos, Crete (Linear B *pa-i-to*); and Kydonia, Crete (Linear B *ku-do-ni-ja*). In their revised edition, however, Edel and Görg suggest that these place

Figure 1. Front of the Aegean List (Statue Base E_N [PWN V]) at Kom el-Hetan. Photograph by J. Strange, courtesy of E. H. Cline.

Figure 2. Left side of the front of the Aegean List. Photograph by J. Strange, courtesy of E. H. Cline.

Figure 3. Left side (beneath the right foot) of the Aegean List. Photograph by J. Strange, courtesy of E. H. Cline.

names are corrections, and that the initial ones were *im*[*k*]*r* (*i-m-*[*k*]*-r*), *byšy* (*b*[*ꜣ*]*-y-šꜣ-y*), and *imy*[*k*]*r* (*i-m-y-*[*k*]*-r*), possibly to be identified as Amyklai (near Sparta in Lakonia), Pisaia (near Olympia), and Amyklai (again), all located on mainland Greece. Edel and Görg hypothesize that a stonemason carved the original toponyms from a rough draft. Later, his supervisor, perhaps a scribe from the House of Life, objected to his (or the draft's) divergence from the headline, which mentions Crete first, and ordered changes. The stonemason thus recut the first Amyklai as Amnisos, a graphically similar Cretan place name, and made Pisaia and the second Amyklai into Phaistos and Kydonia, also Cretan sites.[21]

Edel and Görg maintain that Phaistos and Kydonia were, like Amnisos, copied from the statue base's adjacent (i.e., left) side, in their case from the final two captive ovals, which are now lost.[22] We will discuss this suggestion at greater length in a moment, but for now simply note that the stonemason's changes only served to produce a new asymmetry, so that the Aegean List in its present form begins with Cretan toponyms, proceeds to Greek ones, pauses at Kythera, and ends in Crete again. This has led to the suggestion that the inscription may be a record of a voyage to, and around, the Aegean, starting in Crete with a visit to Minoan sites, proceeding to mainland Greece to visit Mycenaean sites, and then returning to Egypt via Crete.[23]

The Aegean List continues (Figure 3) with *mki*[*n*] (*mw-k-i-*[*nw*]), *dḳis* (*dy-ḳꜣi-iꜣ-s*), and *mḏni* (*mi-ḏꜣ-nꜣ-i*). The first of these is almost certainly Mycenae, Greece, and the third may be Messenia, Greece (Linear B *me-za-na/ne*), although there are issues here, as Edel and Görg point out.[24] What's more, the second name, *dḳis*, is highly problematic. Over two decades ago, Edel identified it as Boeotian Thebes (= Linear B **thêgʷâis*, cf. *thêgʷans-de*, "to Thebes," Classical Greek *Thêbais*), but the question remains open.[25] Görg's tentative suggestion of Tegea, Greece, as well as other identifications with Tegeai and Dikte, both on Crete, seem unlikely given the word's final *-s*.[26]

The Aegean List next records *npry* (*nw-py-r-y*), *ktr* (*kꜣ-ty-i-r*), and *wiry* (*wꜣ-iw-r-y*). The first two are generally agreed to be Nauplion, Greece and the island of Kythera (Linear B *ku-te-ra*), lying between mainland Greece and Crete. The third place name presents difficulties, but is now thought by many to be Eleia, Crete. Nonetheless, Elos and Aulis, both in Greece, remain possibilities.[27] On the other hand, the old equation of *wiry* (*wꜣ-iw-r-y*) with Ilios (Troy) is a philological leap of faith, takes us very far afield, and probably should be discarded.[28]

If the identification of *wiry* as Eleia is correct, the presence of Kythera in the preceding captive oval would be explained. As previously suspected by advocates of the Itinerary Hypothesis, the island would serve as a transition from the mainland toponyms to the Cretan ones, which Edel and Görg believe

Figure 4. Continuation of left side (beneath the right foot) of the Aegean List. Photograph by J. Strange, courtesy of E. H. Cline.

appeared only in the second half of the original Aegean List. Hence Görg's remark: "Es ist zwar zutreffend, daß die ursprüngliche Anordnung offenbar zuerst peloponnesische, dann kretische Namen bringt und zwischen diesen Bereichen mit Kythera sozusagen eine Brücke schlägt."[29]

The next three place names in the Aegean List (Figure 4) are *knš* (*kꜣ-n-yw-šꜣ*), *imnš* (*i-m-n-y-šꜣ*), and *rkt* (*ry-kꜣ-ti*). These are generally accepted to be, respectively, Knossos (Linear B *ko-no-so*), a second occurrence of Amnisos (Linear B *a-mi-ni-so*); and Lyktos, Crete (Linear B *ru-ki-to*). The list's final extant toponym is heavily damaged but has been reconstructed as [*sꜣ*]-*i-tꜣ*-[*y*]; it has been tentatively identified as Siteia, Crete.[30] As noted above, Edel and Görg estimate two more captive ovals at the end of the inscription, and believe they contained the place names Phaistos and Kydonia, which eventually replaced Pisaia and the second occurrence of Amyklai.[31] It is, however, difficult to determine what was once here from the photographic record.

Discussion

Based on the apparent geographical sequence of the Aegean List's toponyms, one of the present authors (Cline) has argued several times that the list preserves the itinerary of an Egyptian expedition to the Bronze Age Aegean—i.e., across Crete from east to west, next to mainland Greece, then to Kythera and finally back across Crete from west to east before returning to Egypt. This idea was first advanced by William F. Albright in a personal communication to Kitchen, despite the top register's formulaic statement that foreigners, not Egyptians, were traveling to one place in order to receive "the breath of life" (i.e., diplomatic recognition).[32]

To be fair, Albright, Kitchen, and others lacked the benefit of Edel and Görg's new *Redaktionskritik*, and were not aware that part of the Aegean List was recarved and should be treated as a palimpsest.[33] It seemed reasonable to take the inscription's final sequence of names (including the double-listing of Amnisos), together with the number of Aegean objects bearing Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye's cartouches and the Mycenaean pottery in the king's realm, as evidence of at least one Egyptian voyage in the early fourteenth century BCE. The relevant Aegean finds include fragments from at least nine, and perhaps as many as eleven, faience plaques, as well as a vase and two scarabs in fourteenth- and thirteenth-century contexts at Mycenae, plus scarabs and stamp seals at Knossos, Kydonia, and Ayia Triadha on Crete and at other sites on the Greek mainland and Rhodes. Of the six Aegean sites that have yielded such objects, four are mentioned in the Aegean List—an interesting and probably not accidental correlation.[34]

However, if Edel and Görg are correct about the Aegean List's original form (with Amyklai appearing twice and Pisaia once, in place of Amnisos, Phaistos, and Kydonia), then it did

not initially trace a circuitous path around the Aegean. Rather, it adhered to the Egyptian principle of symmetry, registering seven Mycenaean and seven Minoan places names, with Kythera serving as a transition.[35] For his part, Görg insists that the close double-listing of Amyklai cannot be taken as evidence of an expedition's winding route.[36] Rather, he argues that the Aegean List's original order reflects the Mycenaean eclipse of Minoan power;[37] he stresses Amyklai's importance and concludes, with little evidence apart from speculation in private letters from other scholars such as Fritz Schachermeyr, that it was the center of a newly ascendant Greek culture.[38]

In considering Edel and Görg's suggestions, we first point out that over ten years ago, one of the present authors (Cline) already proposed that the Aegean List reflects the Mycenaeans' growth at the expense of the Minoans: "An Egyptian embassy sent to the Aegean in the reign of Amenhotep III would probably have had a dual mission: to affirm connections with an old, valued trading partner (the Minoans on Crete); and to establish relations with a new, rising power (the Mycenaeans on mainland Greece)."[39]

Second, we question the reconstruction of the first and the third toponyms after the headnames as Amyklai, for a repetition so close together makes little sense. The surviving and extrapolated double-listings on the other statue bases at Kom el-Hetan—e.g., Arzawa (A_N, PWN I), Dur-Kurigalzu (D_N, PWN IV), and Babel (D_N, PWN IV)—are never so proximate. It is possible, in fact, that one of these place names was not Amyklai in Lakonia; Duhoux notes the possibility of an identification with a site in the south of Crete.[40] In this respect, it is important to keep in mind that *im*[*k*]*r* and *imy*[*k*]*r* are especially ambiguous *hapax legomena*, and that their translation must be highly provisional. Indeed, Edel and Görg give the second Amyklai a question mark in their tables, indicating that they too were uncomfortable with the situation.[41] (Interestingly, if either the first or third captive oval on the original Aegean List contained a different Mycenaean toponym than Amyklai, then it would record seven *individual* locations from both mainland Greece and Crete, plus Kythera, thereby presenting a perfectly symmetrical geography.)

Third, pending additional archaeological evidence, we are not in favor of the claim that Amyklai was the center of a newly ascendant Greek culture. Not only does this exaggerate the site's apparent significance during the Bronze Age, but it does so at the expense of Mycenae's obvious connections with Amenhotep III and Egypt, as indicated by the archaeological evidence gathered by one of the present authors (Cline).[42] Particularly telling are the fragmentary faience plaques now in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens that bear the king's names and, in an Egyptian context, would have been part of a foundation deposit.[43] We observe, in addition, that Edel and Görg seem ambivalent about the identification of Pisaia as the place name between the two supposed occurrences of Amyklai—as are we, given its essentially hypothetical existence in this period.[44]

Finally, even if Edel and Görg are correct about the original first three post-headline toponyms, we must wonder what happened to them after the Aegean List's revision. According to Edel and Görg, the stonemason moved Phaistos and Kydonia from the end of the inscription to the beginning, while he kept Amnisos in place near the end and also repeated it at the beginning. Why the sudden repetition of Amnisos when it had only appeared once in the original Aegean List? And, more importantly, where did Amyklai and Pisaia go? In the recarved inscription, as it survives, neither place name is anywhere to be found—yet Edel and Görg say they were initially present as actual sites known to the Egyptians. Did the stonemason move them to the final two (now-missing) captive ovals, or did he leave them out of the revision altogether?

Indeed, if the problem bothering the hypothetical scribe from the House of Life was the incongruity between the inscription's headnames (which give priority to Crete) and the original first three sites (which are in Greece), why did he not simply direct the stonemason to recarve the former? Reversing the order of *kftiw* and *tny* would have been easier and more effective, especially if the inscription were intended to reflect the ascendancy of the Mycenaeans.[45] Alternatively, if the Aegean List were fundamentally flawed from the outset, why did the stonemason not recut the entire series, recording the Greek toponyms on one side, and the Cretan ones on the other?

Perhaps these questions, together with the unease about the proper translation of the original second and third toponyms after the headnames (i.e., Pisaia and the second Amyklai), justify further investigation. But regardless, it remains significant that the Aegean List was recarved, quite possibly before it went on display, and that its final version features an arrangement of place names that still looks suspiciously like an itinerary, with sites listed in order from east to west across Crete, then in mainland Greece, and then, via Kythera, back again across Crete from west to east. Amnisos appears twice—once at the beginning and once near the end—just as one would expect on a direct roundtrip voyage from Egypt to the Aegean and back again.

Additional Suggestions

Since we do not know the exact nature or date of the Aegean List's *Vorlage*, we might pause to consider the extant text as an idealistic expression of New Kingdom Egypt's worldview. The fact that its toponyms are superimposed on bound captives—over whom a statue of Amenhotep III once stood—speaks volumes about its subjective, propagandistic nature, especially since captive ovals are a well-known Egyptian convention for depicting foreign lands.[46] Regarding such evidence, David O'Connor and Stephen Quirke write: "All hieroglyphic inscriptions and all the depictions in formal Egyptian art belong not to a human geography but to a superhuman or divine cosmography within which landscapes and peoples are treated uniformly as an accompaniment to the perpetual circuit of the sun, maintained

by the king. Failure to recognize this, in literal readings of Egyptian written and pictorial sources, disables any useful reading of the past."[47]

If Edel and Görg's reconstruction is correct, then the Egyptians originally and accurately arranged the Aegean List's toponyms in two geographic groups corresponding to Crete and mainland Greece; they then, just as accurately, formulated a sequence moving from east to west and then east again in the recut list. And even if Edel and Görg are not correct about the recutting of the base, we are still left with an east-west-east sequence of unique Aegean names. Clearly, for the Egyptians, the Aegean was more than a *mare incognitum*. While Donald Redford's view that "the Egyptian court was at all times during the Mycenaean age in correspondence with the court at Mycenae"[48] seems overzealous, direct contact is more than likely, particularly given all of the archaeological evidence now available for relations between the two regions during the Late Bronze Age.

In fact, the Aegean List bears more than a passing resemblance to another idealized account of a distant voyage: Hatshepsut's record of her expedition to Punt, the "God's Land" at the opposite end of the "Great Green Sea" (*w3ḏ wr* = the Mediterranean and Red Seas), probably in modern-day Somalia. The south side of the Middle Colonnade of the queen's mortuary temple at Deir el-Bahri, just north of Kom el-Hetan, preserves the inscriptional and pictorial evidence for the mission.[49] The scenes are in fact part of a general decorative scheme that affirms Hatshepsut's divinity and legitimacy, and presents her dominion over the north and the south.[50] Using the same basic formula as found on Statue Base E_N (PWN V), the queen proclaims that Amun caused foreign chiefs to come to her with "tribute on their backs (*m3ʿw.sn ḥr psḏw.sn*) . . . so that they may be given the breath of life (*r dit n.sn t3w n ʿnḫ*)" (49.1–3), the god "placing every land beneath her feet (*rdi t3w nbw ḥr tbti.s*)" (49.4). She then relates the voyage to Punt, which, like the Aegean, was approached by "difficult ways" (*w3wt št3t*) (50.6). The word *št3*, related to *sšt3*, "obscured," "secret," or "mysterious," suggests that such places hovered "at the margin of ancient Egyptian knowledge"—distant, but not out of reach.[51] Indeed, both Hatshepsut's account and the Aegean List describe their respective regions as especially isolated. The Puntites ask, "Why have you come here to this foreign land, unknown (*ḫmt*) to mankind?" (52.4),[52] while certain (presumably Aegean) great ones "did not know (*ḫmw*) to come to Egypt since the god's time."[53]

Hatshepsut states that Punt regularly sent "exotic goods" (*grt bi3w*) to Egypt, but that an Egyptian expedition to that country was impossible without divine assistance (50.2, 50.4–5). This theme is mirrored in the fabulous *Tale of the Shipwrecked Sailor*, which incorporates elements of Punt's exotic landscape.[54] In the story, a giant serpent comforts a lost mariner with the following words: "Do not fear, do not fear, citizen, / Do not turn white, for you have reached me. / See, God has allowed you to live: / He has brought you to this island of the spirit (*k3*)" (112–15).[55] Despite the difficult route, however, other rulers, including Sahure, Pepi II, Thutmose III, and Amenhotep III himself dispatched missions to Punt.[56] Kathryn Bard and Rodolfo Fattovich have found evidence for these voyages at *Saww* (Mersa/Wadi Gawasis) on the Red Sea, which served as a port of embarkation.[57] Particularly telling is the label on a Middle Kingdom cargo box from the site: "wonderful things of Punt (*bi3wt pwnt*)."[58]

Given the parallels between the Middle Colonnade at Deir el-Bahri and Statue Base E_N (PWN V) at Kom el-Hetan, it would be irresponsible to reject out of hand the possibility that the latter is itself the product of a special expedition to the Aegean Sea. The idea seems even more compelling in light of the fact that all of the Aegean List's specific place names are otherwise unattested in the hieroglyphic record. This does not mean Amenhotep III was the only king to dispatch a mission to Minoan and Mycenaean lands, of course, but rather that rulers undertook such adventures irregularly. To accept this theory, one does not even need to insist that the Aegean List preserves an exact itinerary; as Kitchen wrote over forty years ago, it is possible that the inscription "simply contains [a] series of names loosely grouped, not all in precise sequence."[59]

Conclusions

Despite Edel and Görg's revelations, and in large part thanks to their new study, we maintain that the Aegean List remains of critical importance as a clear indication that the Egyptians had substantial knowledge of specific Minoan and Mycenaean sites during Amenhotep III's reign. Whether this knowledge was derived from a voyage to the Bronze Age Aegean or from a gathering like the one mentioned in the inscription's top register (perhaps an embassy to one of the king's jubilees?) may be debated. But the fact bears repeating that the Aegean List's specific toponyms are unique in both place and time: they are found nowhere else and in no other period in Egyptian history. When this fact is added together with the number of items bearing the names of Amenhotep III or Queen Tiye from various sites in the Aegean—some of which appear on Statue Base E_N (PWN V)—we must conclude that an encounter between Egypt and the Aegean occurred sometime during the first half of the fourteenth century BCE.[60]

In addition, we suggest that the most promising direction for future research is the close comparison of the Aegean List with other topographical inscriptions at Kom el-Hetan and elsewhere. Particularly intriguing is Statue Base D_N (PWN IV, with Mesopotamian place names), which has a similar (albeit very damaged) top register and two sets of double-listings.[61] Indeed, the lack of a fully convincing schematic explanation for the latter phenomenon raises the question of whether other Kom el-Hetan lists reflect Egyptian expeditions abroad. Conversely, it is possible that several of these inscriptions have their origin in foreign embassies to the Nile Valley. After all, when Aegeans appear in other Egyptian contexts, like the tomb of Rekhmire (TT 100) in Sheikh Abd el-Qurna,[62] they usually do so as participants in a single international event attended by other groups of foreigners.

In fact, when Aegean peoples are portrayed in Theban tomb paintings from the time of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III to that of Amenhotep III, they usually bear gifts/tribute (*inw*), as though they are distant subjects of the king. They are almost always shown together with other peoples, both independent and dependent, who bring goods from Nubia, Mesopotamia, Anatolia, and elsewhere in Egypt's geopolitical vicinity. As Diamantis Panagiotopoulos explains:

> The Aegeans appear as equal members of the international diplomatic community of the Near East. . . . From the Egyptian perspective, they serve as a document of political strategies. The foreigners' processions became a favorite theme in the 18th Dynasty not out of an Egyptian 'ethnographic' interest in exotic lands but because the performance and, at a secondary stage, the depiction of these ceremonial events were embedded in the power structures of Egyptian society.[63]

We believe that Kom el-Hetan features a similar representation of foreigners, with Statue Base E_N (PWN V) being one of numerous monuments that illustrate both the authority of Amenhotep III and the geographic understanding of his diplomatic corps.

Finally, we acknowledge that current and future excavations at Kom el-Hetan will undoubtedly shed more light on the Aegean List. For example, one new statue-base fragment unearthed by Sourouzian and Stadelmann in the South Portico represents southern peoples, "their busts surmounting crenellated cartouches inscribed with their place names," such as "the great kingdom of Kush," "the Bedouins of the desert," and smaller polities.[64] Even more relevant to the present paper is a fragment from the North Portico bearing the toponym *iwni-ꜥ* (*ii-w-ni-ꜥ*)—most likely "Great Ionia" in western Anatolia or central Greece—as well as *riwꜣnꜣ* (*r-i-wꜣ-nꜣ*) and *mdwn*[. . .] (*mꜥ-d-w-n-*[. . .]), which may be Luwia and Mitanni.[65] And we note that additional fragments from the site might record two more instances of *tny* (i.e., Tanaja), among other toponyms.[66] Given the likelihood of future discoveries, our opinions about the Aegean List's origin and implications must be flexible, even if our estimation of its value remains undiminished.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Marsia Bealby, John Bennet, Yves Duhoux, Michael Lane, Dimitri Nakassis, Kim Shelton, and John Younger for their responses to inquires about Linear B place names in the Bronze Age Aegean; John Bennet and Christopher Mee for their responses regarding Amyklai and Lakonia; and Hourig Sourouzian and Rainer Stadelmann for sending relevant offprints and responding to questions over the years.

Notes

1. Cline 1987, 1990, 1994, 1998; Phillips and Cline 2005.
2. Edel 1966; Edel and Görg 2005.
3. Edel and Görg 2005, 161–213, with new photographs and drawings.
4. Hankey 1981; Cline 1987, 1990, 1994, 1998, with previous references and bibliography. See now also Kelder 2010.
5. See now also Duhoux 2008.
6. Porter and Moss 1994, 451; Sourouzian et al. 2006, 405–06, 433–35.
7. Cline 1994, 38, citing Redford 1982, 55–56.
8. The photographs of the Aegean List included here were sent to Cline by John Strange in the mid-1980s. Reportedly taken in the mid-1970s, they may be the last pictures of the statue base in its original, intact state, and perhaps the only ones taken in color.
9. Sourouzian et al. 2006, 434.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., 434–35, shown in plates XXIIa, c.
12. Ibid., 401–07, 411–15, 433–35, plates VIII, XXVII-XXXV. See also Sourouzian and Stadelmann 2011.
13. Sourouzian et al. 2006: 434.
14. Ibid., 414.
15. Ibid., 411–12.
16. Edel and Görg 2005, 161–66; all transliterations and translations presented here have been confirmed by Stannish.
17. See de Fidio 2008, 97–99. Strangely, Duhoux (2008, 26–27) is apparently not certain that *Tanaja* refers to the Greek mainland. With regard to this article's title, we should also note that Duhoux suggests that the phrase "the Isles in the Midst of the Great Green" refers to Minoans living in the Nile Delta rather than the Aegean area. Cf. Duhoux 2008 and previously Duhoux 2003, with previous references.
18. Edel and Görg (2005, 190) refer to them as an *Überschrift*.
19. Kitchen 1965, 5–6; see also Kitchen 1966.
20. Edel 1966; now updated as Edel and Görg 2005.
21. Edel and Görg 2005: 190–91. Görg remarks in a footnote (no. 42 on p. 190) that Edel had not yet published these ideas, but that he included them in a draft he was preparing for publication. Görg also points out (p. 200) that Edel suggested the translation of Amyklai for the first toponym to G. Lehmann, who published it (1991, 109).
22. Edel and Görg 2005, 191.
23. See, e.g., the discussions by Cline and Hankey, cited above.
24. Edel and Görg 2005, 207.
25. Edel 1988, followed by Hannig 2006, 1208.
26. Tegea, Tegeai, and Dikte were originally suggested by Sergent (1977, 140–43), Faure (1968, 141–42), and Astour (1966, 313–14), respectively; see also Osing 1992 and Table 2 in Cline 1987, as well as Edel and Görg 2005, 205–06.
27. Suggested by Faure (1968: 143). Note that Duhoux 2008, 29 does not favor Eleia.
28. Edel 1966, 52; Kitchen 1966, 24; Strange 1980, 21. Sergent (1977, 152–61) suggested Elos; Goedike (1969, 10) suggested Aulis. See now the discussion in Edel and Görg (2005, 209).

29. Edel and Görg 2005, 212.
30. Faure 1968, 144; Edel and Görg 2005, 188–89.
31. Edel and Görg 2005, 190–91.
32. Kitchen 1966, 23.
33. Edel and Görg 2005, 191–94, 199. See also fig. 1 on p. 202 and the unnumbered figure on p. 203, as well as the new photographs and drawings at the back of the volume.
34. Cline 1987, 22–23; Cline 1994, 38–39; Cline 1998, 237–39, 244–48; Phillips and Cline 2005.
35. Edel and Görg 2005, 190–91, 209–10.
36. Ibid., 203.
37. Ibid., 211–13.
38. Ibid., 204.
39. Cline 1998, 248.
40. Duhoux 2008, 27, citing *Inscriptiones Creticae* IV.172 (Rome, 1950), courtesy of John Bennet.
41. Edel and Görg 2005, tables on 191 and 213. At the heart of the problem is the fact that we do not know precisely how Egyptian words were vocalized. Besides not having vowels or vowel-pointing, their precise consonantal values are often more than a little ambiguous. One can easily presume that an Egyptian word sounds like a variety of Greek words—erroneously in many cases.
42. Amyklai doesn't seem to be a site of major importance until the LH IIIC period in the twelfth century, long after the time of the Aegean List. Regarding the connections between Mycenae and Amenhotep III's Egypt, see the relevant catalogue entries in Cline 1994 and the discussions in Cline 1987, 1990, 1994, 1998, and now Phillips and Cline 2005.
43. See again Cline 1987, 1990, 1994, 1998; Phillips and Cline 2005; Phillips 2007; Kelder 2010. For previous discussions about how the plaques might have been used at Mycenae, see Helck 1979, 97 and Hankey 1981, 46.
44. On the identification of Pisaia, see Görg's comments in Edel and Görg 2005, 201–02. Doubtless the identification of *im*[*k*]*r*, *byšy*, and *imy*[*k*]*r* will continue to present difficulties, not only because of orthographic issues, but also because of the number of Aegean sites with similar or identical names. We thank Michael Lane, Dimitri Nakassis, and John Bennet for their solicited thoughts on this topic.
45. It seems at least possible that the original first three toponyms were removed because they lay (politically or geographically) outside of *kftiw* and *tny*.
46. See again Cline 1994, 38, citing Redford 1982, 55–56.
47. O'Connor and Quirke 2003, 13.
48. Redford 1992, 243.
49. See Sethe 1906, 315–55; Naville 1908, part 3; De Buck 1948, 48–53; Werbrouck 1949, 65–81. The following parenthetical citations are from De Buck.
50. Roth 2005.
51. O'Connor and Quirke 2003, 1. The word *sšt3* is merely *št3* with the causative *s*- prefix.
52. Harvey 2003, 88.
53. Interestingly, the south side of the Lower Colonnade at Deir el-Bahri features a series of captive ovals with Nubian toponyms being led by the god Dedun. Sethe 1906, 317; Naville 1908, part 6, plate 152.
54. Loprieno 2003, 38.
55. Translation from Simpson 2003, 50. See also De Buck 1948, 100–06.
56. See, e.g., Tyldesley 1998, 145–53; O'Connor 1998, 263. In fact, Punt appears among southern lands on the plinth of the North Colossus from the Second Pylon at Kom el-Hetan. See Sourouzian et al. 2006, 413.
57. Bard and Fattovich 2007, 2010.
58. Bard and Fattovich 2007, 238, figs. 99–100; 2010, 38, fig. 4.
59. Kitchen 1966, 24.
60. See Cline's previous publications, listed above.
61. Edel and Görg 2005, Tafel 2.
62. Davies 1943, vol. 1, 17ff., vol. 2, plates 16–23.
63. Panagiotopoulos 2001, 275. See also Panagiotopoulos 2005; Rehak 1996, 1998.
64. Sourouzian et al. 2006, 412 and n. 17; see also Sourouzian and Stadelmann 2005, 81–83. The fragment may come from a monument similar to the statue base that Alexandre Varille found in the early twentieth century, which is now in the Louvre; see Varille 1935.
65. Sourouzian et al. 2006, 413 and plate VIIIb–c. For a detailed discussion of these toponyms, see Haider 2008.
66. Sourouzian et al. 2006, 413–14 and plate VIIIe.

References

Astour, M. C. 1966. Aegean place-names in an Egyptian inscription. *American Journal of Archaeology* 70: 313–17.

Bard, K. A., and R. Fattovich. 2007. *Harbor of the pharaohs to the Land of Punt: Archaeological investigations at Mersa/Wadi Gawasis, Egypt, 2001–2005*. Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale."

——— . 2010. Recent excavations at the ancient harbor of *Saww* (Mersa/Wadi Gawasis) on the Red Sea. In *Offerings to the discerning eye: An Egyptological medley in honor of Jack A. Josephson*: 33–38, S. H. D'Auria, ed. Leiden: Brill.

Cline, E. H. 1987. Amenhotep III and the Aegean: A reassessment of Egypto-Aegean relations in the 14th Century B.C. *Orientalia* 56: 1–36.

———. 1990. An unpublished Amenhotep III faience plaque from Mycenae. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 110/2: 200–12.

——— . 1994. *Sailing the wine-dark sea: International trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: Tempus Reparatum.

——— . 1998. Amenhotep III, the Aegean and Anatolia. In *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on his reign*: 236–50, D. O'Connor and E. H. Cline, eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Davies, N. de G. 1943. *The tomb of Rekh-mi-re' at Thebes*. 2 Vols. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

De Buck, A. 1948. *Egyptian readingbook: Exercises and Middle Egyptian texts*. Chicago: Ares.

de Fidio, P. 2008. Mycenaean history. In *A companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek texts and their world*: 81–114, Y. Duhouz and A. Morpurgo Davies, eds. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Duhoux, Y. 2003. *Des Minoens en Égypte? «Keftiou» et «les iles au milieu du Grand Vert»*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain.

———. 2008. Les relations égypto-égéennes au Nouvel Empire: que nous apprend la toponymie? In *Altägyptische Weltsichten 68: Akten des Symposiums zur historischen Topographie und Toponymie Altäbyptens vom 12.-14. Mai 2006 in München*: 19–34, F. Adrom, K. and A. Schlüter, eds. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Edel, E. 1966. *Die Ortsnamenlisten aus dem Totentempel Amenophis III*. Bonn: Hanstein.

———. 1988. Der Name *di-q3j´-j3-s* in der minoisch-mykenischen Liste E_N li 8 gleich Θηβαίς? *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 115: 30–35.

——— and M. Görg. 2005. *Die Ortsnamenlisten im nördlichen Säulenhof des Totentempels Amenophis' III*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Faure, P. 1968. Toponymes créto-mycéniens dans une liste d'Aménophis III. *Kadmos* 7: 138–49.

Goedicke, H. 1969. Ägäische Namen in ägyptischen Inschriften. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62: 7–10.

Haider, P. W. 2008. War ein "Groß-Ionien" tatsächlich um 1360 v. Chr. in Westkleinasien existent? Eine kritische Analyse zu den Lesungen und Identifizierungen der jüngst entdeckten topographischen Namenslisten aus der Regierungszeit Amenophis' III. *Klio* 90/2: 291–306.

Hankey, V. 1981. The Aegean interest in El Amarna. *Journal of Mediterranean Anthropology and Archaeology* 1: 38–49.

Hannig, R. 2006. *Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800–950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz: Von Zabern.

Harvey, S. P. 2003. Interpreting Punt: Geographic, cultural and artistic landscapes. In *Mysterious lands*: 81–91, D. O'Connor and S. Quirke, eds. London: UCL Press.

Helck, W. 1979. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kelder, J. M. 2010. The Egyptian interest in Mycenaean Greece. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux* 42: 125–40.

Kitchen, K. A. 1965. Theban topographical lists, old and new. *Orientalia* 34: 1–9.

———. 1966. Aegean place names in a list of Amenophis III. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 191: 23–24.

Lehmann, G. A. 1991. Die 'politisch-historischen' Beziehungen der Ägäis-Welt des 15.-13. Jh.s v.Chr. zu Ägypten und Vorderasien: einige Hinweise. In *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick (Colloquium Rauricum 2)*: 105–26, J. Latacz, ed. Stuttgart-Leipzig: de Gruyter.

Loprieno, A. 2003. Travel and fiction in Egyptian literature. In *Mysterious lands*: 31–51, D. O'Connor and S. Quirke, eds. London: UCL Press.

Naville, É. H. 1908. *The temple of Deir el Bahari*. 7 Parts. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.

O'Connor, D. 1998. Amenhotep III and Nubia. In *Amenhotep III: Perspectives on his reign*: 261–70, D. O'Connor and E. H. Cline, eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

——— and S. Quirke. 2003. Introduction to *Mysterious lands*: 1–21, D. O'Connor and S. Quirke, eds. London: UCL Press.

Osing, J. 1992. La liste des toponymes égéens au temple funéraire d'Aménophis III. In *Aspects de la culture pharaonique: quatre leçons au Collège de France (février-mars 1989)*: 25–36. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.

Panagiotopoulos, D. 2001. Keftiu in context: Theban tomb-paintings as a historical source. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 20: 263–83.

———. 2005. Foreigners in Egypt in the time of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III. In *Thutmose III: A new biography*, 370–412, D. O'Connor and E. H. Cline, eds. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Phillips, J. 2007. The Amenhotep III 'plaques' from Mycenae: Comparison, contrast and a question of chronology. In *The synchronisation of civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C., III*: 479–94, M. Bietak and E. Czerny, eds. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

——— and E. H. Cline. 2005. Amenhotep III and Mycenae: New evidence. In *Autochthon: Papers presented to O. T. P. K. Dickinson on the occasion of his retirement*: 317–28, A. Dakouri-Hild and E. S. Sherratt, eds. BAR International Series 1432. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Porter, B., and R. Moss. 1994. *Topographical bibliography of Ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic texts, statues, reliefs and paintings, volume II: Theban temples*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Redford, D. B. 1982. A Bronze Age itinerary in Transjordan (Nos. 89–101 of Thutmose III's list of Asiatic toponyms). *Journal of the Society of the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 12: 55–74.

———. 1992. *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in ancient times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rehak, P. 1996. Aegean breechcloths, kilts and the Keftiu paintings. *American Journal of Archaeology* 100: 35–51.

———. 1998. Aegean natives in the Theban tomb paintings: The Keftiu revisited. In *The Aegean and the Orient in the second millennium*: 39–50, E. H. Cline and D. Harris-Cline, eds. *Aegaeum* 18. Liège: Université de Liège.

Roth, A. M. 2005. Hatshepsut's mortuary temple at Deir el-Barhri: Architecture as political statement. In *Hatshepsut: From queen to pharaoh*: 147–51, C. H. Roehrig, ed. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Sergent, B. 1977. La list de Kom el-Hetan et le Péloponnèse. *Minos* 16: 126–73.

Sethe, K. 1906. *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie, Zweiter Band*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Simpson, W. K., ed. 2003. *The literature of Ancient Egypt: An anthology of stories, instructions, stelae, autobiographies, and poetry*. 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sourouzian, H., and R. Stadelmann. 2005. Die ältesten Erwähnungen von Ioniern und Danaern: Neueste Grabungen im Totentempel

Amenophis' III. in Theben enthüllen kolossale Statuen und Sockel mit Darstellung fremder Völker. *Antike Welt* 36/6: 79–83.

——— . 2011. Theben-West: Kom el-Hettân – Totentempel Amenophis' III. *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Kairo Rundbrief* (2011) 18–20.

Sourouzian, H., R. Stadelmann, N. Hampikian, M. Seco Alvarez, I. Noureddine, M. Elesawy, M. A. López Marcos, and C. Perzlmeier. 2006. Three seasons of work at the temple of Amenhotep III at Kom El Hettan. Part III: Works in the dewatered area of the Peristyle Court and the Hypostyle Hall. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 80: 401–88.

Strange, J. 1980. *Caphtor/Keftiu: A new investigation*. Leiden: Brill.

Tyldesley, J. 1998. *Hatchepsut: The female pharaoh*. London: Penguin.

Varille, A. 1935. Fragments d'un colosse d'Aménophis III donnant une liste de pays africains. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 35: 161–71.

Werbrouck, M. 1949. *Le Temple d'Hatshepsout à Deir el Bahari*. Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.