More than people and pots: identity and regionalization in Ancient Egypt during the second intermediate period, ca. 1775-1550 BC
Sacco, A.

Cover Page

The handle https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3192232 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Sacco, A.
Title: More than people and pots: identity and regionalization in Ancient Egypt during the second intermediate period, ca. 1775-1550 BC
Issue Date: 2021-06-23

3

REGIONALIZATION

The main feature that characterizes the Second Intermediate Period, distinguishing it from both the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom, is the political division. Next to this division, also in the material culture there are differences detectable, especially in the pottery and already since the Late Middle Kingdom.[1] From this, there are some questions that arise. Were connections between different areas in Egypt so problematic during the Second Intermediate Period, that these areas become secluded from each other? Did the political changes taking place in the Second Intermediate Period actively contribute to the regionalization of the material culture, and how? Which other reasons could cause the regionalization of material culture?

These questions constitute the main topic of this chapter, exploring which regions are so far thought to be detectable, what are the main reasons for this process, the way in which regionalization phenomena happening during the intermediate periods have been or can be analysed, and how the present work is going to contribute to the debates related to this topic. Firstly, this chapter will discuss the definition of region and regional identity, as well as the methods used in previous studies to examine the process of regionalization in both the First Intermediate Period and the Second Intermediate Period, and it will define what in the present work is considered to be a region. Successively, it will discuss the causes that initiated the process of regionalization in the Second Intermediate Period. Afterwards, it will describe the sites examined in the present work and the regions which, according to previous studies, can be detected during the Second Intermediate Period. Lastly, this chapter will illustrate the method used in the present work to study regionalization phenomena, and its contribution to the topic.

---

1   Bourriau 2010, 11-12; Bourriau et al. 2005, 123; Op de Beeck, Hendrickx, and Willems 2004, 254-55.

DEFINING A REGION

A region can be defined as a unit that can be distinguished from other units, both in time and space.[2] Inside these units, so inside their boundaries, the quantity of information and goods moving around is greater than across those boundaries, so to other units. Thus, the areas along the boundaries are peripheral, though they can serve as meeting points between the groups divided by the same boarder.[3]

In archaeological analysis, regions are areas where meaningful relationships can be detected between past human activities and the material culture produced by them, as well as the physical and social contexts in which these activities occurred.[4] The boundaries of these past regions do not necessarily correspond to prominent geographic features, nor follow criteria similar to ours; they were also constantly changing.[5]

While a region can be characterized by physical proximity of its elements,[6] it is actually important to select which other features are considered important to define both its identity and its relationships with similar units, namely with other regions.[7] It is also important to select the scale for the analysis. To do so, it is useful to search for a scale where the considered area shows more interactions in its inside than with adjacent areas, and where boundaries detected through different criteria overlap.[8]

In disciplines such as human geography it is possible to observe and measure these interactions in a direct way, as for example by measuring the number of telephone calls or of bus passengers. However, in archaeology interactions are assumed to be witnessed by similarity in object types or groups, as long as artefacts' features are not used by a group to distinguish itself from other groups:[9] therefore, interactions remain elusive in archaeology.[10]

Nevertheless, considering the type and quantity of persons, thus the segments of population based on status or on gender or on age or on ethnicity, that are expected to be involved in interaction can help explain both the type of interaction itself and its visibility in the archaeological record.[11] For exam-

---

2   Crumley and Marquardt 1990, 74.
3   Crumley and Marquardt 1990, 74–75.
4   Kantner 2008, 41.
5   Kantner 2008, 42.
6   Mansfield and Solingen 2010, 146.
7   Crumley and Marquardt 1990, 76.
8   Crumley and Marquardt 1990, 77.
9   Johnson 1977, 481.
10   Johnson 1977, 482.
11   Johnson 1977, 482–84.

ple, interactions have been analysed to study and explain, beyond ethnic differences, regions in pre-Roman Italy.[12]

Regional identity can be better understood if the focus is on the role that society-space and the individual/collective play in shaping each other.[13] This also implies that regional identity is formed on one side from "above", through territorial control or governance, on the other side from "below", through territorial identification and resistance on part of the population.[14]

Connected to regional identity is regionalism, which can be defined as an interpretation of the process that leads to the institutionalization of a region.[15] This process constructs, and is at the same time conditioned by, practices related to different factors.[16] One of these factors is the spatialisation of the region, namely the recognition of a geographical territory with specific social and cultural practices.[17] Another factor is the temporalisation of the region, namely the creation of stories concerning its past, present, and future.[18] Other factors include a shared symbolic significance not only of the landscape and the history of the region, but also in the way of interactions with other groups.[19] The last factors concern shared values and norms, which are safeguarded and enforced by communal institutions, which also guarantee security and order inside the region..[20]

REGIONAL DIVERSIFICATION IN EGYPT

While Egypt can appear as a monolithic unity, especially in the periods of political unity, such as the Middle Kingdom, the reality is more nuanced. Small regional variations are visible in the archaeological record even in times when the central power is still strong.[21] This has been detected in the present work as far as the Late Middle Kingdom is concerned, therefore also during the second half of the Twelfth Dynasty and will be elaborated on in the conclusions. Apart from the results deriving from the analysis of small finds, as in the present work, pottery is especially useful in detecting regional variation, because it

12   Roth 2012.
13   Paasi 2003, 476.
14   Paasi 2003, 476.
15   Paasi 2003, 478; Paasi 2012; Söderbaum 2011.
16   Paasi 2003, 478; Söderbaum 2011.
17   Paasi 2012.
18   Paasi 2012.
19   Paasi 2003, 478; Paasi 2012.
20   Paasi 2003, 478; Paasi 2012.
21   These are addressed especially in Schiestl and Seiler 2012, where pottery form different areas of Egypt during the Middle Kingdom is examined, revealing differences between them.

concerns objects that are used in everyday life (i.e. cooking, consuming food, drinking, storing cosmetics, and as burial goods).

From the analysis of the pottery, it is possible to reveal regional variation, and find precursors of types of pottery of the Second Intermediate Period, already in the late Twelfth Dynasty, after the reign of Senwosret III.[22] Specific types of pottery are particularly diagnostic from this point of view, first of all the hemispherical round-bottomed bowls or cups,[23] and the beer jars.[24] These vessels were very common already in the early phase of the Middle Kingdom, and they continued to be common also during the Second Intermediate Period, but they became progressively more slender, and their profile became less rounded, with the widest diameter progressively switching to a lower point in the height of the vessels.[25]

Similar developments are visible also in the dipper juglets,[26] which were used to collect and pour liquids from storage vessels and were at first imported from the Levant, becoming then locally produced. The dipper juglets became progressively slender and with a more pointed base during the Late Middle Kingdom and the early phase of the Second Intermediate Period, and successively returned to the earlier shape, less slender and with a more rounded base.[27] Also the juglets of Levantine Painted ware were at first imported and them became locally produced, especially in Lower Egypt.[28] The last type of pottery to be mentioned is the hole-mouth cooking pot,[29] which became progressively slender and with a curvier profile.

What makes these types of pottery useful for regional studies is not only the presence of imports, which characterizes specific areas like Lower Egypt, but also the fact that the described developments of their shape did not happen at the same time in all Egypt, but different places feature different stages.[30] Their development has also been used for chronological purposes, to

22   Schiestl and Seiler 2012 offer an overview of the pottery during the Middle Kingdom, highlighting the regional variations.
23   Aston et al. 2004, 62–63, 196–97; Bader 2007, 249–58; Bader 2009, 200–15; Czerny 2002, 133–34; Forstner-Müller 2007, 83; Kopetzky 2008, 211–17.
24   Bader 2007, 258–65; Bader 2009, 160–83, 215–24; Bietak 2002, 32–34.
25   Arnold, Arnold, and Dorman 1988, 135–39; Bader 2007, 249–65; Kopetzky 2008, 211–17.
26   D.A. Aston 2002, 49–50; Aston et al. 2004, 183, 238; Bietak 2002, 37; Forstner-Müller 2008, 79; Kopetzky 2002; Kopetzky 2008, 207–11.
27   Kopetzky 2002, 2008, 207–11.
28   Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995; D.A. Aston 2002; Bagh 2002; Bagh 2013; Bietak 1997; Bietak 2002; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004; Czerny 2002.
29   Aston et al. 2004, 81, 244; Bader 2001; Forstner-Müller 2007, 89; Holladay Jr. 1982, 50.
30   Especially the hemispherical bowls: Aston et al. 2004, 62–63, 196–97; Bader 2007, 249–58; Bader 2009, 200–15; Czerny 2002, 133–34; Forstner-Müller 2007, 83; Kopetzky 2008, 211–17.

date the strata of sites like Tell el-Dab'a, Dahshur, and Memphis.[31] For Tell el-Dab'a the relevant strata correspond to what the excavators have called phases H-G,[32] while for Dahshur they correspond to what the excavators have called complexes 6-7,[33] and for Memphis correspond to what the excavators have called levels VIII-VII.[34]

ANALYSIS OF REGIONS AND REGIONALIZATION IN EGYPTOLOGY

For the Second Intermediate Period, political institutions, in the form of the royal dynasties, have been one of the parameters used to detect regional identities. In other words, the attestations on monuments and on scarabs of royal names have been used to distinguish the areas over which each dynasty would have ruled.[35] Given our incomplete state of knowledge about the political developments of the Second Intermediate Period, identifying the political areas in which Egypt was divided is complicated (see Chapter 2). Therefore, in the present work the regions are not delineated based on political divisions.

Another parameter used to define regions has been the ritual and symbolic practices, in the form of burial customs. Seiler has analysed how the Theban area acquired its own identity in the Late Second Intermediate Period. She has shown that, while at first the funerary cults were mainly in the care of the family of the deceased, successively they became connected to the entire community, and their aim was to reintegrate the dead and his/her family into the community.[36] At the same time, while at first the funerary equipment was constituted by items used in everyday life, to materially make the deceased able to carry on a bodily existence in the afterlife, later these items included objects created especially for the tombs and intended to magically provide the deceased with what was needed in the afterlife.[37] As suggested also by the architecture and layout of the cemeteries, this change was likely due to the rise of a more conscious sense of community and togetherness, with also the need of defence against outsiders that might trespass into the community's territory.[38] It is possible that this evolution was due to the rise of the Seventeenth

---

31   Dorothea Arnold was the first one to trace the development of hemispherical bowls and use it for chronological purposes, based on the vessels found in Dahshur: Arnold, Arnold, and Dorman 1988, 135–39.
32   For the dating of these strata: Bietak 1984a, 474–82; Bietak 1985, 318–20; Bietak 1989b, 93–96; Bietak 1991; Bietak 2002, 32–37; Weinstein 1995, 87.
33   Do. Arnold 1982; Bader 2002; Bietak 1984a, 272–74; Bietak 2002, 32–34.
34   Bader 2007, 253-55; Bader 2009, 187–99.
35   See for the example: Ryholt 1997.
36   Seiler 2005, 191-92 and 198-98; Seiler 2010, 51-52.
37   Seiler 2005, 190-92 and 198-99; Seiler 2010, 40 and 49.
38   Seiler 2010, 51-52.

Dynasty, in the Late Second Intermediate Period, and by its need to create a unifying identity for the Theban area, over which it had power.[39]

A similar method to the one just discussed has been used by Miniaci,[40] who has examined the religious beliefs as shown by the iconography and shape of the Rishi coffins, and by the burial equipment found with them. He has demonstrated that already in the Late Middle Kingdom there was a mixing of two main religious beliefs concerning the afterlife. One of them was the concept of Osirification, namely identifying the deceased as the god Osiris, which was a concept common in Lower Egypt. The other concept conceived the afterlife as new life on the solar boat with the god Ra, and as part of the solar cycle, and was more common in Upper Egypt. While this mixture of religious beliefs is visible in the material culture of both the Late Middle Kingdom and the Early Second Intermediate Period, in the Late Second Intermediate Period the second one became the main religious belief concerning the afterlife. As suggested also in Seiler's studies, this change was probably caused by the wish of the kings ruling over the Theban area to affirm a new unifying identity. Keeping the changing burial customs in mind can be useful also for the present work, to get a more complete picture of the period.

Further studies on regionalism have been conducted by Seidlmayer,[41] who has used practices visible in material culture, as well as archaeological seriation, to detect regions and order the examined tombs in a chronological sequence. The starting assumption is that the popularity of object types grows steadily until it reaches its peak at a certain point in time. From this, with the help of digital tools and based on the popularity of types chosen as significant, the archaeological contexts are grouped in succeeding phases. Seidlmayer has applied this method to the cemeteries dated to the First Intermediate Period, to examine the development of regionalism during this period, using mostly pottery. The sites analysed include Edfu,[42] Tarif,[43] the southern Theban cemeteries,[44] Denderah,[45] Qau el-Kebir, Matmar, and Mostagedda,[46] Rifeh,[47] Beni

---

39   Seiler 2005, 197-200.
40   Miniaci 2007a; Miniaci 2007b; Miniaci 2011.
41   Seidlmayer 1990.
42   Seidlmayer 1990, 40–68.
43   Seidlmayer 1990, 69–99.
44   Including Deir el-Bahri, Asasif, Qurneh, Birabi, Scheick Abd el-Qurna: Seidlmayer 1990, 100–4.
45   Seidlmayer 1990, 105–23.
46   For these three sites: Seidlmayer 1990, 123–210.
47   Seidlmayer 1990, 210–16.

Hassan,[48] Harageh,[49] Sedment,[50] Gurob.[51] Furthermore, for sites like Qau el-Kebir, Mostagedda, and Matmar, also scarabs, stone vessels, and faience vessels have been examined. Moreover, when royal names could be linked to a specific phase, absolute dates have been provided as well. On the one hand, this has supplied a possible dating for contexts that had not been dated before, while on the other hand a comparison of the sites has shown the regional developments of the material culture of the First Intermediate Period. Despite having different questions and a different methodology, this study is useful to the present work because it examines the regionalization process based on quantitative analysis of the material culture, in the same way as the present work does.

Another approach to studying regionalism, again used for the First Intermediate Period, can be found in Morenz.[52] He has focused on Gebelein and has analysed historical documents, especially the ones related to the local history and persons, and the products of the upper classes. Morenz has tried to reconstruct the regional system, with its communal symbols, narratives, socio-economic and cultural practices. He has adopted Geertz's concept of "thick description",[53] according to which human behaviours are not only mechanically described by the scholar, but also put into context and interpreted, so that they become meaningful also to an outside viewer. The ultimate aim of the "thick description" is to interpret the guiding symbols, which, in Geertz's opinion, are the main elements that constitute a culture and allow it to develop and perpetuate.[54] Despite the scarcity of written documents for the Second Intermediate Period, which differentiates it from the First Intermediate Period (see Chapter 2), the approach here described is surely insightful.

WHAT IS A REGION? A MATTER OF STYLE

In the present work, the sites are first grouped according to geographical parameters, forming what in the present work are referred to as areas. Thus, an area is a group of sites close to each other by a geographical point of view. From this, a region is considered an area whose sites share similar developments in the material culture during the period under consideration, namely the Second Intermediate Period. More in detail, sites are considered part of the same region according to two conditions. The first condition is that the

48   Seidlmayer 1990, 216–33.
49   Seidlmayer 1990, 234–46.
50   Seidlmayer 1990, 247–341.
51   Seidlmayer 1990, 341–47.
52   Morenz 2010.
53   Geertz 1973.
54   Geertz 1973.

strata dated to the Second Intermediate Period contain objects with a similar style, distinguishable from the styles of the Middle Kingdom and of the New Kingdom. The other condition is that the style of the New Kingdom appears in archaeological strata whose dating is contemporary.

Style can be seen as a part of those behaviours and practices that participate in, and enhance, the process of exchanges of information, energy, and matter of the group producing them.[55] Style is important as a means of sending messages between socially distant individuals,[56] so that is not found in all objects, but only in those that display visibility.[57] However, especially in archaeology, detecting which objects or aspect of style are used to convey these messages can be difficult.[58] Because of this difficulty, style has also been defined as those features that are not consciously selected and are, thus, random, while only the functions of the objects determine if they fit the needs of a group and are, therefore, kept and developed.[59]

Despite this utilitarian definition, style can be considered also as the symbolic aspect of the variability in material culture. Nevertheless, it is important to put objects and their style in perspective, examining how they could function as symbols and understanding them in relations to other aspects of material culture in a particular society.[60] Therefore, style can be better defined as the manner an activity is realized, thus as an omnipresent aspect of an activity, especially of a repeated one:[61] style is the way something is done.[62] This means also that style is the manner materials are interpreted and transformed into social form and identity, and are part of the way a group constructs its reality[63] and roles in the group are performed.[64] Hence, style derives from a choice, made to produce a certain effect.[65]

The fact that objects of specific forms and designs are associated with a particular group in a particular space and time, despite the fact that the same group would have a greatly wider range to choose from, derives from the fact that those forms and designs fit the unique historical conditions of that particular group in that space and time.[66] This implies that groups close in time

---

55   Wobst 1977, 319–24.
56   Wobst 1977, 324–34.
57   Wobst 1977, 334–37.
58   Hodder 1982, 204–5; McGuire 1981, 19–22.
59   Dunnell 1978, 199–200.
60   McGuire 1981, 22–26.
61   Renfrew and Bahn 2016, 423.
62   Hodder 1982, 204–7; Renfrew and Bahn 2016, 423; Shanks 2004, 18.
63   Hodder 1982, 204–7; Shanks 2004, 14–19.
64   Sackett 1977, 370–71.
65   Deetz 1965, 2.
66   Sackett 1977, 370–74; Wobst 1977, 321.

and space and sharing social relations will share similarities in style.[67] Consequently, style can be used, as in the present work, to indicate the shapes, surface decorations and treatments, and techniques that characterize objects in a specific space and period.[68] The Middle Kingdom[69] and the New Kingdom[70] have each distinguishable styles and, while the former was fabricated in workshops in the Memphis area, the latter was first and mainly produced in Upper Egypt, especially in the Theban area.[71]

Often, as it can be seen at sites such as Tell el-Dab'a and Memphis, this style looks more like a transition between the styles of the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom. In other words, while it mainly uses features typical of the Middle Kingdom, it also mixes it with new ones.[72] Furthermore, especially in the Eastern Delta, the style common in the material culture of Syria and Palestine in the Middle Bronze Age, referred to as Levantine style, is also found. This style was characterized by features that make it distinguishable from the Egyptian material culture, though often it was finally imitated in Egypt using local fabrics, like it happened for the dipper juglets[73] and the juglets of Levantine Painted ware.[74] Lastly, mostly in Upper Egypt, in tombs of the so-called Pan-grave group a style common in Nubian material culture is found.

THE CAUSES OF REGIONALIZATION

This regionalization process is believed to have been, at least partially, generated by the fact that access to primary sources was made more difficult by the political division. Because of this division, each area had to rely on its local workshops, while during the Middle Kingdom the production of material goods was regulated by the central government and was localized in specific places, from where it was distributed to the other areas in Egypt.[75] However, how far does the division go and was the production really so differentiated and localized?

---

67   Sackett 1977, 371.
68   Renfrew and Bahn 2016, 133.
69   For the style of the Middle Kingdom: Wodzińska 2009.
70   For the style of the New Kingdom: Wodzińska 2010.
71   For an overview of pottery styles in the Middle Kingdom and New Kingdom: Arnold and Bourriau 1993; Bourriau 1981b; Eggebrecht 1975; Wodzińska 2009, 2010.
72   As discussed in: Bader 2009, 38–42; Bietak, Forstner-Müller, and Mlinar 2001; Bourriau 1997, 165; Bourriau 2010, 13; Forstner-Müller 2003.
73   Dipper juglets are discussed in: Kopetzky 2002.
74   The Levantine Painted Ware is discussed in: Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995; D.A. Aston 2002; Bagh 2002; Bagh 2013; Bietak 1997; Bietak 2002; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004; Czerny 2002.
75   Bietak 2010, 151-52; Bourriau 1997, 159.

There is also the possibility that the presence of groups of foreign origins contributed to the development of different regional styles,[76] as it appears to be the case for example in the Eastern Delta. Nonetheless, it has been mentioned how examining ethnic identity is problematic, and how in the present work the features that are thought to be of foreign origins are analysed not as ethnic markers, but as elements of the regional styles in Egypt. This means that imported objects, or the objects inspired by them or even imitating them and produced in Egypt, will not be treated separately from the other objects produced in Egypt.

Lastly, according to studies such as the ones by Seiler and Miniaci, the development of regional styles could be due to the political changes, namely the rise of new dynasties, happening in the Second Intermediate Period.[77] In other words, the new dynasty could wish to introduce new styles or new customs, or re-appropriate old ones, to create an identity of their own, distinguished from the ones of the other regions and the other dynasties. This would have the aim to create a sense of community and unity in the area, ultimately to enhance protection against threats from other areas. This could be, for example, one of the causes of the changes visible in the Theban region in contexts dated to the late Second Intermediate Period.[78] Though the political situation and the history of the Second Intermediate Period are not completely clear yet, it is not possible to separate these from the regionalization of the material culture. Therefore, while the focus of this work is on the material culture, historical implications will be made to explain its development, when enough evidence is available to back it up.

POSSIBLE REGIONS IN EGYPT DURING THE SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

The first region is the Delta. Tell el-Dab'a, identified with Avaris, the capital of the Fifteenth Dynasty[79] and probably also of the Fourteenth Dynasty,[80] is the largest and the most extensively excavated and studied site of the Second Intermediate Period. However, the site was already inhabited during the Middle Kingdom, as can be seen in the strata corresponding to what the excavators have called phases H and G.[81] At Tell el-Dab'a one can notice an increase

---

76   Bader 2012a, 217–22; Bader 2017, 27–28; Bourriau 1981b, 55; Holladay Jr. 1997, 201–4.
77   Miniaci 2007a; Miniaci 2007b; Miniaci 2011; Seiler 2005; Seiler 2010.
78   Seiler 2005, 185-200; Seiler 2010, 51-52.
79   See the description of the site in: Bietak 1975; Bietak 1981; Bietak 1996.
80   According to Ryholt: Ryholt 1997.
81   Bietak 1984a, 474–82; Bietak 1985, 318–21 and 324–40; Bietak 1989b, 93–96; Bietak 1991, 31-38; Bietak 2002, 32–37.

in objects of Levantine style, first imported from the Levant and later local-ly imitated, in the strata corresponding to the second half of the Thirteenth Dynasty,[82] namely phases F and E/3.[83] Despite this trend, the overall material culture of the time still followed the style of the Middle Kingdom,[84] while the Levantine elements were still at a minority, and are found especially in the funerary equipment.[85] In the strata corresponding to the Fifteenth Dynasty, namely phases E/2, E/1, D/3 and D/2,[86] these Levantine imports decrease and their imitations in local materials increase,[87] while a different style can be detected, which mixed Egyptian and Levantine features and became typical of Tell el-Dab'a during the Second Intermediate Period.[88] Nevertheless, this change is not dramatic and the differences between the style of the Middle Kingdom and the one of the Second Intermediate Period are actually subtle.[89] Lastly, the style typical of the New Kingdom arrived in Tell el-Dab'a at the very end of the Second Intermediate Period.[90]

A similar process can be detected in the material culture in Tell el-Maskhuta, also located in the Eastern Delta, in the Wadi Tumilat. The site was occupied during the First Intermediate Period and the Late Middle Kingdom, and in the New Kingdom and Late Period as well,[91] but became more important in the Second Intermediate Period as point of communication between the Le-vant and Egypt.[92] More in detail, the phases belonging to the Second Interme-diate Period are dated to the later part[93] and show that, like in Tell el-Dab'a, Levantine objects were first imported and then imitated in local materials,[94] while at the same time the main style of material culture became a mixture of Egyptian and Levantine styles,[95] in the same way described for Tell el-Dab'a.

---

82   D.A. Aston 2002; Aston et al. 2004, 324-351; Bietak 1985, 333-40; Bietak 1996, 29-31; Bietak 1997, 30; Forstner-Müller 2008.
83   Bietak 1984a, 474–82; Bietak 1985, 318–20, 340–43; Bietak 1989b, 93–96; Bietak 1991, 38-41; Bietak 2002, 37–38.
84   As shown in: Aston et al. 2004 , 324-51; Bietak 1997 45; Bietak 2010; Forstner-Müller 2007, 86-93; Schiestl 2008b; Schiestl 2009.
85   Described in: Schiestl 2008b; Schiestl 2009; Schiestl 2012a.
86   Bietak 1984a, 474–82; Bietak 1985; Bietak 1991; Bietak 2002; Weinstein 1995.
87   Aston et al. 2004; Bietak 2010; Forstner-Müller 2008.
88   Aston et al. 2004; Bader 2013; Bader 2017, 27–28; Bietak 2002; Forstner-Müller 2003; Forstner-Müller 2010.
89   Bietak, Forstner-Müller, and Mlinar 2001; Forstner-Müller 2003.
90   D.A. Aston 1998; Bietak 2010; Bietak, Forstner-Müller, and Mlinar 2001; Fuscaldo 2000.
91   Holladay Jr. 1982; Holladay Jr. 1997.
92   Holladay Jr. 1982; Holladay Jr. 1997; MacDonald 1980; Redmount 1993; Redmount 1995a; Redmount 1995b.
93   Holladay Jr. 1997; Redmount 1993.
94   Holladay Jr. 1982; Holladay Jr. 1997; Redmount 1993; Redmount 1995a.
95   Holladay Jr. 1997; Redmount 1993; Redmount 1995a.

Still in the Wadi Tumilat, Tell el-Retaba was inhabited between the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom, as well as during the Late Period.[96] In particular, tombs and parts of a settlement dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period have been unearthed there. The material culture found in these contexts shows similarities with the other sites of the Eastern Delta described above, with mixtures of Egyptian and Levantine style.[97]

A similar mixing of Levantine and Egyptian styles is displayed also in the material culture of the Second Intermediate Period in Tell el-Yahudiyah.[98] This site is located on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, like Tell el-Dab'a, and was occupied also during the New Kingdom and the Late Period.[99] This site is mostly known because it has given the name to a pottery ware typical of the Eastern Mediterranean in the Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period.[100]

Still on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, in Tell Farasha tombs dated to the Second Intermediate Period were found. All in all, the material culture at this site is like the one found at Tell el-Dab'a.[101]

Lastly, in the Eastern Delta the site of Kom el-Khilgan was occupied in Prehistory and the Early Dynastic times. Other remains include an occupation layer and graves dated to the Second Intermediate Period, as well as a few graves dated to the Roman Period.[102]

To conclude, the sites in the Eastern Delta have the longest and clearest phases datable to the Second Intermediate Period in their material culture, with a very gradual change from the Middle Kingdom style to the New Kingdom styles, which seem to appear at the end of the Second Intermediate Period. The material culture of the Second Intermediate Period of these sites also displays common features, namely a similar mixing of Egyptian and Levantine styles. Because of this, in the present work the Eastern Delta is considered a region on its own.

---

96   Excavation report: Rzepka et al. 2014.
97   Excavation report: Rzepka et al. 2014.
98   For more information: Adam 1958; Ashmawy Ali 2010; Petrie, Griffith, and Newberry 1890; Petrie and Duncan 1906.
99   For more information: Adam 1955; Ashmawy Ali 2010; Buisson 1929; Petrie and Duncan 1906; Tufnell 1978.
100 For the main publications on this type of pottery: D.A. Aston 2008; Aston and Bietak 2012; Bietak 1989a; Kaplan 1980; Merrillees 1974a.
101 For more information: Yacoub 1983.
102 Buchez and Midant-Reynes 2007; Buchez and Midant-Reynes 2011; Pantalacci 2005; Pantalacci and Denoix 2006; Tristant, De Dapper, and Midant-Reynes 2007; Tristant, De Dapper, and Midant-Reynes 2008.

The Memphis-Fayyum region

At the site of Kom Rabi'a, part of ancient Memphis, located in Lower Egypt at the entrance of the Nile Delta, there seems to be a noticeable change in material culture between the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom.[103] In detail, one can notice a break between the strata that can be dated to the Middle Kingdom, strata that correspond to what the excavators have called levels VIII-VII,[104] and the strata that can be dated to the beginning of the New Kingdom, strata that correspond to what the excavators have called level V.[105] It can be noticed that the style found in the strata of levels VIII-VII is the typical one of the Middle Kingdom, even if local variations are visible,[106] while in the strata of level V the style typical of the New Kingdom is found.[107] Nevertheless, there seem to be intermediary strata, corresponding to what the excavators have called level VI,[108] with a short transitional phase, where both styles are found and which probably corresponds to the Late Second Intermediate Period.[109] In the strata of level VI, the material culture found in Kom Rabi'a seems to follow a different development from the one of Tell el-Dab'a.[110] This divergence seems to indicate that Memphis did not belong to the same region to which the Eastern Delta belonged, but that the site was part of a different region during the Second Intermediate Period.[111]

Another important site in the Memphis-Fayyum area is Lisht, which is located on the west side of the Nile, to the south of Memphis and to north of the Fayyum. This site was especially important during the Middle Kingdom because it was in the area of the capital town of the time. While the capital town has not been identified, the cemetery has been found at the modern site of Lisht, where were built the royal pyramids and tombs of the time.[112] However, against what was previously thought, the site was probably still occupied after the Thirteenth Dynasty had lost power over the whole country, so during

---

103 Bader 2009, 38–42; Bourriau 1997, 163–65; Bourriau 2010, 13.
104 Bader 2007, 253-54; Bader 2009, 52–3. A detailed description of the strata can be found in: Giddy 2012; Giddy, Bourriau and Gallorini 2016, 39-71 and 101-16.
105 Bader 2007, 253-54; Bader 2009, 55–56.
106 Bourriau and Gallorini 2012, 107-30; Giddy, Bourriau and Gallorini 2016, 207-11.
107 Bader 2009, 50-57; Bourriau 1997, 161-65.
108 Bader 2007, 253-54; Bader 2009, 53–55. Detailed description of stratum VI can be found in: Giddy 2012; Giddy, Bourriau and Gallorini 2016, 77-100 and 117-96.
109 Bader 2009, 53-55; Bourriau 1997, 161-65; Bourriau 2010; Giddy, Bourriau and Gallorini 2016, 207-11.
110 Bader 2007, 258-65; Bader 2008, 213-16; Bader 2009, 159.
111 Bader 2007, 258-65; Bader 2008, 216-17.
112 For more information: S.J. Allen 1998; Arnold, Arnold, and Dorman 1988; Di. Arnold et al. 1992; Lansing 1920; Lansing 1924; Lansing 1926; Lansing 1933a; Lansing 1933b; Lansing and Hayes 1934.

the early part of the Second Intermediate Period.[113] In particular, tombs of the Late Middle Kingdom and of the Second Intermediate Period are found in the cemetery of Lisht North,[114] where it can be noticed that the material culture still followed the style of the Middle Kingdom.[115] Despite this, also in Lisht there seems to be a conspicuous change from the style of the Middle Kingdom to the one of the New Kingdom, as in Memphis but in archaeological contexts of a slightly later dating.[116]

At the entrance of the Fayyum, the cemeteries of Harageh are dated from the Early Dynastic Period to the Coptic Period, including the Late Middle Kingdom.[117] A few of the tombs can possibly be dated to the Early Second Intermediate Period, though they do not show conspicuous differences with the ones of the Late Middle Kingdom.[118] Still at the entrance of the Fayyum, south of Harageh, Sedment has cemeteries dated also to the Old Kingdom, to the First Intermediate Period,[119] and the early part of the Middle Kingdom[120] to the Second Intermediate Period. In particular, the cemetery K in the Mayana district of Sedment[121] is dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period,[122] on the basis of parallels with material from Gurob.[123] It can be noticed that the material culture from this cemetery shows a detectable switch from the style of the Middle Kingdom to the one of the New Kingdom.[124]

Tarkhan is another burial site in the same area, dated mostly to the Early Dynastic Period. It is included in this study because one tomb found there has been dated by Petrie to the Second Intermediate Period.[125] While the sample from Tarkhan is not representative for the analysis conducted in the present work, it is taken into consideration to gain a more complete picture. Abusir el-Meleq is known mostly for the tombs and pyramids of the Old Kingdom,

113   Bourriau 2010, 16-17.
114   For more information: Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995; Arnold, Arnold, and Dorman 1988; Di. Arnold et al. 1992; Bourriau 1996; Lansing 1926; Lansing 1933a; Lansing 1933b; Lansing and Hayes 1934; Martin 2004; Merrillees 1978b.
115   Bourriau 1997, 165–66; Bourriau 2010, 13–17; Williams 1975, 132–38.
116   Bourriau 1997, 168; Bourriau 2010, 35.
117   For more information: Bourriau 1991a; Engelbach and Gunn 1923; Grajetzki 2004; Kemp, Merrillees, and Edel 1980; Williams 1975, 120–27.
118   Williams 1975, 120–27.
119   For more information: Petrie and Brunton 1924; Seidlmayer 1990.
120   As shown by the pottery discussed in: Bader 2012b.
121   For more information: Petrie and Brunton 1924.
122   Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 20–22; Williams 1975, 217–18.
123   Bourriau 2010, 20; Williams 1975, 217–19.
124   Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 17–20.
125   For more information: Bourriau 1981b, 127; Petrie 1914, 12.

though material of the Second Intermediate Period has been retrieved from tombs.[126]

The last settlement mentioned for the area is Qasr el-Sagha, located in the Fayyum. There, parts of a settlement have been uncovered. This settlement was inhabited by the workers connected to the functioning of the nearby temple and cemetery during the Middle Kingdom.[127] Furthermore, pottery dated to the Second Intermediate Period, including Pan-Grave pottery and Levantine imports, has been discovered near the temple.[128]

To conclude, it can be noted that the sites described in this section follow the same pattern, namely keeping the Middle Kingdom style until the Late Second Intermediate Period. Because of this trend, they could be considered to form an independent region in the Memphis-Fayyum area.[129]

Sites of the Late Middle Kingdom from the Memphis-Fayyum area

Aside from sites containing strata dated to the Middle Kingdom and to the Second Intermediate Period, there are several sites in the Memphis-Fayyum area that were occupied only during the Middle Kingdom and not during the Second Intermediate Period. These sites are described in this chapter because they have material dated to the Late Middle Kingdom, which is included in the analysis conducted in the present work.

The first site of this group is Dahshur, which is located just south of Memphis, on the West bank of the Nile. The site is mostly known for its pyramids and tombs, dated to both the Old Kingdom and the Late Middle Kingdom.[130] In particular, the strata dated to the Late Middle Kingdom correspond to what the excavators have called complexes 6-7.[131]

More to the south, at the entrance of the Fayyum, at the site of Lahun tombs of the late Middle Kingdom have been excavated, mostly belonging to members of the royal family and the royal court.[132] Furthermore, cemeteries

---

126 For more information: Möller and Scharff 1926.
127 For more information: Śliwa 1983; Śliwa 1986; Śliwa 1988; Śliwa 1992a; Śliwa 1992b.
128 For more information: Arnold, Arnold, and Brodbeck 1979; Śliwa 1983; Śliwa 1986; Śliwa 1988; Śliwa 1992a; Śliwa 1992b.
129 Bourriau 1997, 168; Bourriau 2010, 35.
130 For more information: S.J. Allen 1998; S.J. Allen 2000; S.J. Allen 2011; S.J. Allen 2014; Di. Arnold 1980; Di. Arnold 1981; Di. Arnold 1982; Di. Arnold 1996; Arnold and Stadelmann 1975; Arnold and Stadelmann 1977; Do. Arnold 1976; Do. Arnold 1977; Do. Arnold 1982; Bourriau 1997; De Morgan, Legrain, and Jéquier 1903; De Morgan et al. 1895; Oppenheim 1996; Schiestl 2008a; Schiestl 2012b; Stadelmann and Alexanian 1998.
131 Do. Arnold 1982; Bader 2002, 36-38; Bietak 1984a, 472–74; Bietak 2002, 32-34.
132 For more information: Brunton 1920; Kemp, Merrillees, and Edel 1980; Petrie, Brunton, and Murray 1923; Petrie et al. 1891; Quirke 1998; Quirke 2005; Winlock 1934.

of the Early Dynastic and of the Third Intermediate Period have also been discovered there.[133] Lastly, the site is connected to a well-preserved settlement of the Late Middle Kingdom, which gives a good glimpse in the daily life of an Egyptian town of that time and is known as Kahun, after the name Petrie used when he published his excavations there.[134]

Still in the area of the Fayyum, tombs dating from the Middle Kingdom to the Roman Period have been discovered at Hawara.[135] Of these tombs, of interest to the present work are the ones dated the Late Middle Kingdom, which include royal tombs.[136] Lastly, in the Fayyum area, tombs dated to the Late Middle Kingdom have been unearthed at the site of Riqqeh.[137]

Middle and southern Upper Egypt

Dishasha is a site in Middle Egypt, where tombs mostly of the Old Kingdom, and of the Second Intermediate Period, as well as material of very early New Kingdom have been excavated.[138] At Rifeh, known also as Deir Rifeh, in Middle Egypt on the West bank of the Nile, cemeteries dating from the First Intermediate Period to the Roman period have been found.[139] Tombs dated to the Middle Kingdom have been also uncovered there,[140] as well as tombs of the Second Intermediate Period and of the Pan-grave culture, in particular in cemetery S.[141] The tombs of this cemetery show a noticeable change from the style of the Middle Kingdom to the one of the Second Intermediate Period, but in archaeological contexts of an earlier dating than the sites of the Memphis-Fayyum area and in the last part of the Thirteenth Dynasty.[142] Giving a more precise dating to each tomb is difficult,[143] though a tentative dating towards the Late Second Intermediate Period has been provided for a few of

---

133   For more information: Petrie, Brunton, and Murray 1923.
134   For more information: Bourriau 1981b; Burton-Brown 1959; Gallorini 1998; Gallorini 2009; Gallorini 2011; Kemp 1977; Merrillees 1973; Petrie, Griffith, and Newberry 1890, 21–31; Petrie et al. 1891; Quirke 2005; Tufnell 1975.
135   For more information: Petrie, Griffith, and Newberry 1890; Petrie, Wainwright, and Mackay 1912.
136   For more information: Bourriau 1981b; Farağ and Iskandar 1971; Petrie, Griffith, and Newberry 1890, 12–21; Petrie, Wainwright, and Mackay 1912.
137   For more information: Bourriau 1981b; Eggebrecht 1975; Engelbach et al. 1915; Williams 1975, 115–20.
138   For more information: Bednarski 2007; Petrie and Griffith 1898.
139   See the excavation reports: Petrie, Thompson, and Crum 1907.
140   Petrie, Thompson, and Crum 1907, 11–20.
141   Petrie, Thompson, and Crum 1907, 20–21.
142   Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 22-23; De Souza 2019, 56-57.
143   Bourriau 1997, 167-68; De Souza 2019, 56-57.

these tombs, based on parallels with the material culture and the burial customs of other sites.[144]

At the site of Matmar, remains dated from Prehistory to the Coptic period have been excavated. These remains include mostly cemeteries, but also a temple.[145] The tombs of the Second Intermediate Period are found in cemetery 5000[146] and have been dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period:[147] their material culture is similar to the one of sites such as Mostagedda and Qau el-Kebir, described in the following paragraphs.

The cemeteries at Mostagedda, south of Matmar and on the West bank of the Nile, are dated to several periods of ancient Egyptian history.[148] More in particular, the tombs of the Second Intermediate Period are found mostly in cemetery 3000, but also in cemeteries 1000 and 5000.[149] The development of the material culture found in these tombs is similar to the one displayed in cemetery S of Rifeh.[150] Furthermore, these tombs show Nubian connections and include Pan-grave tombs.[151] Though in this cemetery a precise dating has not been determined for many of the tombs, for a few of them a tentative dating has been given through parallels in the material culture and burial customs, and places them in the Late Second Intermediate Period.[152] The Late Second Intermediate Period is also the dating of the archaeological contexts where the style of the New Kingdom appears, though these contexts precede the ones in the Memphis-Fayyum area, in the same way that it can be noticed in Rifeh.[153]

At Qau el-Kebir, south of Mostagedda and on the East bank of the Nile, have been unearthed cemeteries and villages dated from the Early Dynastic to the Coptic period.[154] Concerning the cemeteries dated to the Second Intermediate Period,[155] they are dated to both the Early and the Late Second Intermediate Period[156] and, though a precise dating for part of these tombs has not been reached yet, a tentative dating has been proposed for a few of them, on the basis of the burial customs and of parallels with the material culture of other

---

144   De Souza 2019, 57; Williams 1975, 199–203.
145   For more information: Brunton 1948.
146   Brunton 1948, 56–58.
147   Brunton 1948, 56–58; Williams 1975, 191, 211.
148   For more information: Brunton and Morant 1937.
149   See the excavation reports in: Brunton and Morant 1937.
150   As discussed in: Bourriau 1981a; Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 22-23.
151   For these Pan-grave tombs: Brunton and Morant 1937.
152   De Souza 2019, 57-58; Williams 1975, 194–99.
153   Bourriau 1997, 167-68; Bourriau 2010, 22-23 and 35.
154   For more information: Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1927; Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1928; Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1930.
155   See the excavation reports in: Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1930.
156   Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 25-28.

sites.[157] As in Mostagedda, the cemeteries of the Second Intermediate Period have also links with Nubia and include the so-called Pan-grave tombs,[158] which have been divided into three phases on the basis of the Egyptianization of the funerary equipment (see Chapter 4). Of these phases, it is between the first and the second one that a change from the style of the Middle Kingdom to the one of the New Kingdom is visible.[159] All in all, the style of the New Kingdom seems to appear in Qau el-Kebir when it appears also in Mostagedda.[160]

Going to southern Upper Egypt, on the East bank of the Nile, at Balabish tombs dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period have been discovered,[161] which belong to the Pan-grave culture.[162] Moreover, tombs of the New Kingdom are present there.[163]

Moving further south, on the East bank of the Nile, Abydos is one of the most important sites throughout the history of ancient Egypt. As far as the Second Intermediate Period is concerned, Abydos has a story comparable to the one of the other sites in Middle Egypt.[164] Tombs of the Second Intermediate Period, including Pan-grave tombs, are present at this site,[165] in cemeteries C and W,[166] D,[167] and E.[168] Nevertheless, also in this case a precise dating is missing for many of the tombs, while for a few of them a tentative dating has been given on the basis of parallels in the material culture and burial customs.[169]

In Hu, south of Abydos and on the West bank of the Nile, remains dated from Prehistory to the Roman Period have been uncovered.[170] In particular, the tombs dated to the Second Intermediate Period span its entire length and are found in cemeteries X and Y/YS, which also contain Pan-grave tombs.[171] Here, a development similar to the one detected in the cemeteries of Qau

157   De Souza 2019, 59-61; Williams 1975, 188–91, 205–10.
158   For these Pan-grave tombs: Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1930; Bourriau 1981a.
159   Bourriau 1991a, 5; Bourriau 2001, 11-14; Bourriau 2010, 25-29.
160   Bourriau 1997, 167; Bourriau 2010, 22–25.
161   For the dating: De Souza 2019, 61-62; Williams 1975, 204.
162   For more information: Wainwright 1915; Wainwright and Whittemore 1920, 8–52.
163   For more information: Wainwright and Whittemore 1920.
164   Bourriau 2010, 29-32.
165   Bourriau 1981a, 32-33.
166   For both groups: Peet 1914, 54–63.
167   Ayrton et al. 1904, 47–54; Randall-MacIver, Mace, and Griffith 1902, 67–69, 97–101.
168   See the excavation report: Garstang, Newberry, and Milte 1901.
169   For the tentative dating of some of these tombs: Bourriau 1981a; Bourriau 2010; Williams 1975, 166–72, 211–12.
170   For more information: Petrie and Mace 1901.
171   Described in: Bourriau 2009; Bourriau 2010, 29-32; De Souza 2019, 62-64; Petrie and Mace 1901, 45–53; Williams 1975, 212-16.

el-Kebir and of Mostagedda is visible.[172] As at these sites, the tombs have not been precisely dated,[173] although cemetery Y could be dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period.[174] Further south, at Ballas, on the West bank of the Nile, a cemetery of the Early Dynastic Period was excavated, as well as tombs of the Middle Kingdom. Near this site, at Deir el-Ballas, parts of a settlement dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period has been discovered,[175] which included Nubian pottery.[176] Lastly, at Nubt a town and tombs of the Late Middle Kingdom have been excavated,[177] though the site to which it is connected, Naqada, is mostly known for the prehistorical cemeteries and for the temple dedicated to Seth in the New Kingdom. Naqada was occupied also during the New Kingdom.[178]

To conclude, though it cannot be said if these sites in Middle Egypt and in the area of Abydos where united in an independent region, it is meaningful that they seem to follow a similar path in their material culture between the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom, adopting the style of the New Kingdom at the same time, and that they show contacts with Nubia. These features seem to meet the conditions to consider these sites part of the same region. Lastly, the cemeteries of Denderah have to be mentioned here, which are located between Hu and Ballas and are mostly dated to the Old Kingdom and the First Intermediate Period.[179] No material properly dated to the Second Intermediate Period has been unearthed, but material from the Middle Kingdom has been discovered near the temple and in a tomb.[180]

Thebes

Moving further south, in the Theban area, excavations at the temple of Amun and at the Ramesseum in Karnak have also uncovered material of the Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period, mostly composed of small finds and located in the northern part of the site.[181] Furthermore, among the finds uncovered in Qurneh, of interest to this work is a tomb dated to the Late

---

172   Bourriau 2010, 29-32.
173   For the tentative dating of some of these tombs: Bourriau 1981a; Williams 1975, 212–16.
174   Bourriau 2010, 29-32; De Souza 2019, 62-64; Williams 1975, 212-16.
175   Petrie, Quibell, and Spurrell 1896.
176   Bourriau 1987a; Bourriau 1990; Bourriau and Lacovara 1984, 32-33; Bourriau 2009; De Souza 2019, 62-63.
177   Petrie, Quibell, and Spurrell 1896, 66–67.
178   See the excavation report: Petrie, Quibell, and Spurrell 1896.
179   For more information: Petrie and Griffith 1900, 3–22.
180   Bourriau 1981b, 21; Eggebrecht 1975, 335–36; Petrie and Griffith 1900, 23–26.
181   For more information: Bohec and Millet 2012; Graham and Bunbury 2004; Jacquet-Gordon 1977; Jacquet-Gordon 1990; Jacquet-Gordon 1991; Loyrette, Nasr, and Bassiouni 1994; Millet 2007.

Second Intermediate Period and famous because of the Rishi coffin present in it.[182] Lastly, cemeteries dated between the Middle Kingdom and the New Kingdom have been excavated at Dra' Abu el-Naga. The present work analyses the ones of the Late Middle Kingdom[183] and the ones of the Second Intermediate Period, most of which are dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period.[184]

All in all, the area of Thebes follows a trajectory different from the ones noticed in the Memphis-Fayyum area and in Middle Egypt.[185] In the Theban area, the style of the New Kingdom makes its earliest appearance in Egypt.[186] Especially in the tombs of the Late Second Intermediate Period, the pottery appears to use new shapes and materials very soon.[187] Given the geographical proximity and the homogeneity of the material culture, in the analysis conducted in the present work the Theban area is considered one site and no distinction is made between the different cemeteries, in the same way followed for other sites such as Qau el-Kebir.

South of Thebes

South of the Thebes, at Armant parts of a settlement dated to the Second Intermediate Period have been unearthed, as well as tombs and parts of a settlement dated to the Middle Kingdom.[188] Tombs dated to the Second Intermediate Period and belonging to the Pan-grave culture have been discovered also at Tod,[189] located south of Armant and on the East bank of the Nile. The site has a long history and is mostly known for its temple of the Middle Kingdom, where also material of the Early Second Intermediate Period has been found.[190] At Esna, south of Tod and on the West bank of the Nile, groups of tombs dated from the Middle Kingdom to the Late Period have been excavated, including tombs dated to the Second Intermediate Period and of the Pangrave culture.[191] At El-Kab, south of Esna and on the East bank of the Nile, ma-

---

182 For more information: Bourriau 1981a, 34; Petrie and Walker 1909, 6–11; Tate et al. 2009; Troalen et al. 2009.
183 Discussed in: Miniaci and Quirke 2008; Miniaci and Quirke 2009; Seiler 1995.
184 Discussed in: Polz et al. 1999; Seiler 1995; Seiler 2005; Seiler 2010.
185 The evolution of the style in the Theban area, already from the Middle Kingdom is shown in: Seiler 2012
186 Bourriau 1997, 168; Bourriau 2010, 32-35; Polz and Seiler 2003, 58-68.
187 As discussed in: Seiler 2005; Seiler 2010.
188 See the excavation reports: Mond and Myers 1937; Mond and Myers 1940.
189 For more information: Barguet 1952.
190 For more information: Do. Arnold 1975; Barguet 1952; De Souza 2019, 64-65; Pierrat et al. 1995.
191 For more information: Downes 1974; Kemp 1978.

terial of the Late Middle Kingdom has been recovered from tombs,[192] as well as some material probably dated to the Early Second Intermediate Period.[193]

More south and on the West bank of the Nile, Edfu is mostly known for the temple of Horus, though material from the Late Middle Kingdom[194] and material probably dated to the Early Second Intermediate Period[195] has been retrieved there, mostly in tombs that were probably reused also in the New Kingdom.[196] Lastly, on the island of Elephantine a settlement[197] occupied for many periods of Egyptian history, including the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period,[198] has been unearthed. In particular, the strata dated to the Late Middle Kingdom are the ones corresponding to what the excavators have called building level 13 and building level XIII[199], while the strata dated to the Early Second Intermediate Period correspond to what the excavators have called building level 12,[200] and the strata dated to the Late Second Intermediate Period correspond to what the excavators have called building level 11 and building level XI.[201] The material culture uncovered in these strata seems to have had similarities with the area of Kahun and with the area of Abydos.[202] Though the area of Elephantine could constitute a region,[203] no studies have dealt in detail with how the regionalization of material culture developed in Elephantine.

In general, from the data retrieved on the evolution of the material culture it cannot yet be said whether the sites south of Thebes formed an independent region.

192   For more information: Bourriau 1981b; Hendrickx and Huyge 1997; Kemp, Merrillees, and Edel 1980; Quibell, Clarke, and Tylor. 1898; Redford 1997.
193   Williams 1975, 187–88.
194   For more information: Bruyère et al. 1937; El-Sayed 1979; Michałowski et al. 1939; Michałowski et al. 1950; Moeller 2009; Moeller 2010; Moeller, Marouard, and Ayers 2011; Redford 1997; Rzeuska 1999; Vernus 1996.
195   Williams 1975, 182–86.
196   For more information: Rzeuska 1999.
197   Though also tombs have been excavated, they have not been published yet and, thus, could not be included in the analysis.
198   See the excavation reports: Do. Arnold 1976; Bayerlein 1984; Dreyer et al. 2005; Kaiser et al. 1999; Rzeuska 2012; Von Pilgrim 1996.
199   Von Pilgrim 1996, 336–50.
200   Von Pilgrim 1996, 332–36.
201   Von Pilgrim 1996, 328–32.
202   As shown by the finds reported in: Bayerlein 1984; Dreyer et al. 2005; Kaiser et al. 1999; Von Pilgrim 1996.
203   Bourriau 1997, 159; Bourriau 2010, 12.

The oases

The occupation of the oasis of Dakhla, in the Western Desert, spans the entire length of Egyptian history and includes settlements, cemeteries and temples. The material dated to the Late Middle Kingdom and the Early Second Intermediate Period comes mostly from the tombs in Qilaʿ el-Dabba and ʿEin Tirghi, and from the settlement of Ain Asil, which includes dwellings and areas for production and storage of food.[204] It can be seen that in the sites in the Dakhla Oasis, the material culture follows the style of the Middle Kingdom until the end of the Thirteenth Dynasty, with only slight variations and sometimes with mixtures of shapes and materials already in use.[205] This style seems to be produced also locally until the Late Second Intermediate Period, when the style of the New Kingdom appears.[206]

A similar development is visible also in another oasis of the Western Desert, Bahariya, where material of the Second Intermediate Period has been recovered from the cemetery of Qaret el-Toub. The style of the material found there follows in general the one of the sites in the Nile Valley. There is a transition from the style of the Middle Kingdom to the one of the New Kingdom in the Late Second Intermediate Period.[207]

Lastly, the oases show connections also with Nubia and were probably used as corridors by the Hyksos and by Kerma to communicate, thus surpassing the obstacle constituted by the kingdom in the Theban area.[208]

The Sinai

Lastly, going to the Sinai, in Tell Hebua material of the Late Second Intermediate Period and the Early New kingdom has been found.[209] This site cannot be placed in any precise region on the basis of its material culture, but it is included in the analysis in the present work because of the relevant material there discovered.

---

204 See the excavation reports: Aufrère and Ballet 1990; Ballet 1987; Ballet 1988; Ballet 1990; Baud 1997; Hope 1980; Hope 1983; Hope 1987a; Hope 1987b; Hope 1987c; Hope 1999; Marchand 2003; Marchand, Soukiassian, and Bourriau 2010.

205 As discussed and shown in detail in: Ballet 1990; Marchand 2012; Marchand, Soukiassian, and Bourriau 2010.

206 As discussed and shown in detail in: Marchand 2003; Marchand, Soukiassian, and Bourriau 2010.

207 As discussed in: Colin, Laisney, and Marchand 2000.

208 As discussed in: Agut and Moreno-García 2016, 292–94; Baud 1997; Colin 2005.

209 For more information: Maksoud 1998; Seiler 1997.

The regions

From the situation described, it seems that the following regions can be distinguished in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period: the Eastern Delta, the Memphis–Fayyum, Middle Egypt up to the area of Abydos, southern Upper Egypt in the area around Thebes.[210] Unfortunately, as of today there are not enough data from the central and western parts of the Delta to know if they shared the culture of the Eastern Delta and could be included in the same region. Furthermore, Elephantine and the other sites of southern Upper Egypt cannot be placed in any precise region, based on the development of their material culture, nor it can be said if they formed an independent region. The same situation stands for the oases and for Tell Hebua.

Nevertheless, from the data available it can be concluded that the process of regionalization started already during the Late Middle Kingdom,[211] so before the Hyksos rose to power, and that the innovations happening during the Second Intermediate Period, or even right before it, set the foundations for the development of the culture of the New Kingdom.[212] Moreover, it can be noticed that the burial customs and the style of the Late Middle Kingdom were kept longer in Upper than in Lower Egypt, and that changes occurring to them in Lower Egypt during the same period never reached the south. This was maybe a sign that the dynasties ruling over Upper Egypt wished to keep their ties to the culture of the Middle Kingdom, until a new identity emerged in the Late Second Intermediate Period.[213]

CONTRIBUTION

The main goal of the present work is to examine the regionalization process that happened during the Second Intermediate Period, concerning the material culture. So far, this process has been analysed mostly through the shapes, the techniques and the material used in the production of pottery.[214] To add to the contributions of these studies, in the present work the regionalization process is examined through objects other than pottery. These objects include beads, weapons, scarabs, and stone vessels. The objects are put in context and studied through the relations they show.

Thus, the focus is on the objects used, while at the same time the geographical and archaeological contexts are used to interpret the regionalization of material culture during the Second Intermediate Period. In other words, in

---

210   Bourriau 1997, 159; Bourriau 2010, 12.
211   As shown by the local variations in pottery discussed in: Schiestl and Seiler 2012.
212   As discussed in: Polz and Seiler 2003; Seiler 2005; Seiler 2010; Williams 1975, 144–65.
213   Seiler 2010, 43.
214   The works cited in this chapter are examples of this.

the present work the types of objects produced in each place and found in contexts dated to the relevant period are taken into consideration and compared. The relevant period includes both the Late Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period; for the reasons for including the Middle Kingdom, refer to Chapter 2. This comparison is conducted through the methods of network analysis, used in the present work to examine the contacts between places and on how these contacts are shown through the types of objects shared. Therefore, one of the main contributions of the present work is the use of network analysis to further the understanding of the regionalization process.

Furthermore, to better understand the evolution of these contacts and of the regionalization process, the period analysed is divided into three phases: Late Middle Kingdom, Early Second Intermediate Period and Late Second Intermediate Period (see Chapter 2). For the sites which span the entire Second Intermediate Period and for whose contexts a precise dating is not always possible, such as Qau el-Kebir, Hu, and Abydos, only the contexts that can be more securely dated are taken into consideration for the analysis.