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As you probably know, the galleries of the Oriental Institute Museum of the University of Chicago are presently closed to allow for the first major renovation of the building in more than 60 years. In the last several decades, it was recognized that lack of climate control and the crowding of the storage areas presented serious problems. Finally, in 1993 we inaugurated the Legacy Campaign to raise 10.4 million dollars for renovation.

The project, which is now well under way, includes the installation of state-of-the-art climate control systems and the building of a modest wing (15,000 s/f) to alleviate the storage problems as well as to accommodate the climate control handler systems. The project also called for entirely new fire abatement systems throughout the entire building, and for new lighting systems for the galleries. All of this necessitated closing the museum.

The logistics of museum closures are a nightmare. We started packing the collections in the basement in June 1994. The decision was made to keep the objects on site to ensure that we could maintain proper security over them. Within a year, the packed objects had consumed all the room in basement, meaning that either packing had to stop, or the museum galleries had to be closed and used for storage. The Persian gallery was closed in 1995 to be used for storage. Finally, on April 1, 1996, the rest of the galleries were closed and the exhibits dismantled and packed.

Packing a collection is no small task. The collections were packed in various ways, depending upon the type of object. Pottery and small stone objects were slipped into inert plastic bags with a new inventory number affixed; they were then wrapped in bubble wrap and another inventory sticker was used to close the bubble wrap. Limestone objects were first wrapped in acid-free tissue and placed in ventilated bags. These wrapped objects were then loosely packed in cardboard boxes of various sizes, and carefully inventoried. Each box was then weighed and the temporary location of the box noted. Larger objects, such as stele and statues, were crated. The largest objects, such as the colossal statue of king Tutankhamun, were wrapped in inert plastic and foam and then barricaded off to prevent any damage from objects being moved around them. More than 5,000 boxes and crates have been packed. Although the packing process was tedious, it gave me the opportunity to see what objects were in storage, and throughout the process I made notes of objects that should be exhibited in the new galleries.

What happens when a museum is closed? We are now working on the planning of the new galleries. This means working with designers Vinci-Hamp of Chicago to give them an idea of what we want in the new galleries, and how we think the objects should be grouped. The first step is for the curators to develop the overall concept. For example, will the objects be grouped
thematically, or chronologically, or a combination? If thematic, what topics will be addressed? In the case of the Egyptian gallery, the main concern was how to redistribute the large stone objects around the gallery. In the old arrangement, they were all grouped on one wall, regardless of their theme. We are working with the designers to develop some sort of dividers upon which the large stone can be displayed throughout the gallery, place them in proximity to smaller thematically related objects. Not only will this contextualize the objects more fully, but it will give more visual appeal to the gallery.

The plan for the Egyptian gallery calls for a dramatic change in the arrangement. First of all, the collection will move from its former location in the northern gallery to the southern gallery. The colossal statue of Tutankhamun which was excavated at Medinet Habu will be moved to a free-standing location in the front of the hall to form a dramatic focus for the gallery. This will also allow the statue to be viewed from all sides, and in particular to allow the recut back pillar to be seen - it was recut for Horemheb from Aye.

The gallery will be arranged both chronologically and thematically. The entrance to the gallery will be given over to a brief introduction to Egyptian history illustrated by objects characteristic of each time period, forming an object-related time line. The rest of the gallery will be thematic, addressing daily life clothing, jewelry, cosmetics, furniture, food and drink, women and family, occupations, music, games, tools and technology, writing, pottery, art and kingship and popular religion.

A special section will focus on the God’s Wives of Amun, illustrated by objects excavated from their tomb chapels at Medinet Habu. A large section of the gallery will be devoted to death and the afterlife (subdivided into funerary reliefs, judgment of the dead, the tomb and the afterlife, and mummies and mummification).

The installation of climate control means that a wide range of objects which previously could not be displayed will be exhibited, such as a beautiful example of a New Kingdom linen tunic, sandals, votive shirts from Deir el Bahari, animal mummies, and more examples of papyri, both funerary and those which refer to the economy and administration.

The mummification section (which of course, is among the most popular in any Egyptian exhibit) will feature some of the objects used for the mummification of king Tutankhamun, as well as a much fuller range of items for standard mummification such as embalmers’ ropes, embalmers’ tags (used to identify mummies), canopic jars and examples of their contents.

New wall panels highlighting specific excavations of the Oriental Institute will be installed in the galleries to give background on how the objects came to Chicago and why certain objects are especially important.

As of August 1997, the basic construction (termed Phase 1) is almost complete. This phase includes the construction of the new wing, the installation of the air handler systems, new wiring, and the renovation of the east, south and west galleries and basements. In the next few months, the crated and boxed objects which are stored in the northern galleries will be transferred to the new wing and Phase 2 work to refit the northern gallery and basement will begin.

We hope to move Tutankhamun at the end of 1997. This will, in keeping with the scale of the statue itself, be a monumental project. The statue was reconstructed in situ and there are only a few inches between the top of the statue and the gallery ceiling. Metal struts protrude from the reconstructed base through the terrazzo floor downward onto supports tied into the foundation one floor below. In other words, the statue can not simply be tipped over and moved. We are finalizing the engineering program for the move. This will probably necessitate cutting a section through the reconstructed legs and moving the statue in two parts.

The installation of the galleries gives us an incredible opportunity to rethink and carefully plan the exhibits. We hope that you will visit Chicago to see the new galleries when they reopen in late 1998. And you will have our sympathy and support as you move the Egyptian collection at the DMNH!

Editor’s Notes:
The latest news on the renovation can be found at the Oriental Institute’s Web site at:

http://www-oi.uchicago.edu/OI/default.html

Also, see p. 13 for a report on Dr. Teeter’s April lecture to the ESS, “Ma’at and Wisdom.”
The Mysterious King in Dynasty IV
by Bonnie Sampsell

About the Author: Bonnie Sampsell is a member of ESS and her most recent submission to the Ostracon was "Meresankh III", Vol. 7 No. 3, Fall 1996. She is a retired professor and a many-times traveler to study in Egypt. During two visits to Abu Rawash with special permission, she developed a curiosity about Djedefre, which led to the writing of this article.

Djedefre's Tomb

The site of Abu Rawash is not open to the casual tourist, who in any case would be disappointed by the remains that are still visible there. Yet it is an imposing location, set on a high bluff above the cultivation, with a view of the Giza pyramids to the southeast. A tomb located in this place would have been an impressive monument. From a practical standpoint, the site also afforded abundance of limestone. Today there are still many stone and gravel quarries in the vicinity. We should also remember that until Khafre built his pyramid at Giza, the practice among kings of the late third and early fourth dynasties had been to select a new tomb-site, rather than building next to their predecessors. Thus, Huni moved from the traditional necropolis at Saqqara to Meidum, Sneferu constructed his two pyramids at Dahshur, and Khufu moved to the open site of Giza. Why, therefore, should Djedefre not have selected a new site for his own tomb?

Very little remains of Djedefre's tomb, thanks to millennia of quarrying and perhaps also to deliberate destruction during the First Intermediate Period following the Old Kingdom. Thus, we cannot be sure whether Djedefre had time to complete his tomb during his short reign, but there are several indications that he did so.

The pyramid utilized a large knoll of natural limestone, which was shaped to receive additional quarried core blocks. The substructure was entirely subterranean. A large vertical pit was dug into the knoll, at least 75 feet deep and measuring 70 feet from east to west and 30 feet from north to south. A burial chamber was constructed at the bottom of this pit, probably from limestone or granite blocks. It may have had a pent roof like that in the Khafre pyramid, or it may have been equipped with flat beams and relieving chambers like those in the Great Pyramid. The burial chamber was accessed via a passageway built in an open trench cut into the knoll from the north side. The passageway would have been lined with fine stone blocks and roofed over. Then the pit and trench would have been filled to ground level with additional stone blocks, and the superstructure of the pyramid built above them. Pieces of

have been unfinished at his death. This hypothesis has been repeated by other authors - for example Mendelsohn (1974 pp. 52-3), raising it almost to the status of tradition.

But Ahmed Fakhry (1974, pp. 127, 129) notes that there is no archaeological basis for the accusations against Djedefre, and suggests that the dilapidated state of the tomb at Abu Rawash is due to later stone quarrying rather than to Djedefre's failure to complete it before his death. The extent of the "quarrying" can be appreciated by Flinders Petrie's remark in 1883 that 300 camelloads of stone a day were being taken from the site. In fact, there is substantial evidence to support Fakhry's view, and the purpose of this article is to present it in detail.

The grandeur of the Great Pyramid at Giza has ensured that the name of Khufu, the king for whom it was built, will never be lost to history. The second pyramid at Giza, built by Khufu's son Khafre, is an equally permanent monument. But only the most ardent students of Egypt's Old Kingdom know that a king ruled between Khufu and Khafre. And we will look in vain for a pyramid for him at Giza.

Khufu's immediate successor was another son, by the name of Djedefre (Dedef-ra, Tetefra or Ra'zedef in some older works). In 1954, Djedefre's cartouche was discovered on the limestone blocks sealing the boat pit south of the Great Pyramid. Within the pit was the magnificent solar boat that was part of Khufu's funerary equipment. This indicates that Djedefre carefully performed the duties owed to his father. Why, then, did Djedefre not commission a pyramid for himself at Giza, as Khafre was soon to do? Instead, he ordered his tomb to be built at a site about five miles northwest of Giza, near the modern town of Abu Rawash (Abu Ruash or Abu Rouash in some sources).

Along with some other pieces of information, Djedefre's decision not to build his funerary complex at Giza inspired the famous archaeologist George A. Reisner to one of his more fanciful and sinister hypotheses (Reisner & Smith 1955, pp. 7-9). He suggested that Djedefre had been responsible for the death of Khufu's eldest son, Kawab, who would otherwise have been the natural successor. Having caused the death of the Crown Prince - as well, perhaps, as those of some other heirs - and seized the throne, Djedefre was at odds with the rest of Khufu's family. Djedefre died after a reign of only eight years, and Reisner proposed that Khafre took revenge on Djedefre by destroying his pyramid, which may
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Djedefre's Family

Almost all our information about Djedefre's immediate family comes from inscriptions on fragments of statues discovered during the excavation of the mortuary temple in the early 1900s. For example, one fragment that appears to come from a statue of the king shows a small woman crouched near his leg: her name is given as Khentetenka (Smith 1946).

There is also evidence that Djedefre married crown prince Kawab's widow, Hetepheres II, who happened to be Khufu's eldest daughter (for a detailed genealogy of the royal family of the fourth dynasty, see Sampsell 1996). This evidence includes the fact that Hetepheres did acquire the titles of a queen and that in the offering chapel of her daughter, Meresankh III, one of the offering bearers comes from an estate that belonged to Djedefre (Dunham and Simpson 1974). We believe that Hetepheres was the one who prepared the tomb for her daughter because the sarcophagus in the tomb was first inscribed for Hetepheres herself; later it was re-inscribed, stating that she had given it to her daughter. Thus, Reisner's suggestion about this may not be so far-fetched. He said "it is also likely that Dedet-ra [Djedefre], who already had a chief queen named Khentet-n-ka, married Hetepheres, in order to strengthen his claim to the throne by an alliance with a princess of the direct line." (Reisner and Smith 1955, p. 7) Marriage to the eldest daughter of the preceding king has been alleged to confer legitimacy on the successor during regal transitions in the Old Kingdom, even if the practice waned later in dynastic history.

Inscriptions on statues or fragments thereof have also provided information about Djedefre's children and their titles (all the titles cited in this article are from Porter & Moss, 1974 and 1978). Three sons are known: Setka, "king's eldest son of his body;" Baka, "king's eldest son and priest of Ra'zedef [i.e. Djedefre];" and Hamit, "king's son." Fragments of two other statues provide the names of daughters: Neferhetepes, "king's daughter of his body and a priestess of Ra'zedef" and another Hetepheres, "king's daughter of his body." It is unknown whether the latter daughter was born to Hetepheres II after her marriage to Djedefre, or merely named in her honor. Hetepheres I was Khufu's mother, and hence Djedefre's grandmother. It was a common practice at this time to use the names of queens for other royal daughters, and we find many girls named Hetepheres, Meresankh and Metiotes at this time. By contrast, the name Neferhetepes was not common in the fourth dynasty, and Porter and Moss list only one other example of the name during this period, which will be discussed below.

It is interesting to find that two of Djedefre's children had been appointed as priest and priestess of Ra'zedef, to serve in their father's mortuary cult. Although it was more common in that period to appoint non-royals to these positions, we do see some children and grandchildren of kings serving in their mortuary cults. The positions may have been mostly honorary, however. The continuing presence of such titles into the fifth and sixth dynasties indicates that the cult of Djedefre continued without interruption during the changes in reigns and dynasties, which further suggests that there was no posthumous revenge taken against him.

Little is known for certain about the tombs of Djedefre's family members. Khentetenka would presumably have been buried at Abu Rawash, and there are still unexcavated mastabas in the area. We have already mentioned that Hetepheres was preparing a tomb for herself at Giza, which she relinquished to her daughter Meresankh. She did not share that tomb, however, and her final resting-place is unknown. There are two small groups of mastabas dating to the Old Kingdom to the east of the pyramid at Abu Rawash, and in one of them (F13) an offering-table was found bearing the name of Hamit - probably Djedefre's son.
The tombs of Djedefre's other sons and daughters have not been discovered, but there is a mystery surrounding a pair of mastaba tombs at Giza. Since the name Neferhetepes was not common in the fourth dynasty, the identity of a woman named Neferhetepes, buried in tomb G4714 and bearing the title "king's daughter of his body," naturally arouses curiosity. The tomb has been dated to the first half of the fourth dynasty, as has the adjacent tomb G4712, in which was buried one Nima'ethap who bore the queenly titles "seer of Horus and Seth and great favorite." As usual with inscriptions of this type, the king with whom the tomb owner claims relationship as "king's wife," "king's daughter" or "king's son" is not explicitly named. These two small mastabas seem very modest for the burial of a queen and a princess. Perhaps there is some connection between them and the adjacent mastaba.

The two tombs were built at the southwest corner or G4710, a much more elaborate mastaba dating to the fifth dynasty and belonging to a man named Sethu. He bore the titles "director of the palace, secretary of the toilet house, master of largesse in the mansion of life," among others. His wife, Nubhotep, had the titles "priestess of Hathor, priestess of Neith, and king's acquaintance," as did the wives of many court officials of that period. It was common for individuals to build their tombs near those of their relatives, and mastabas G4712 and G4714 seem to have been built in close proximity to that of Sethu. Perhaps Sethu was a relative of Neferhetepes or Nima'ethap, or maybe he simply used his position to secure a burial for the two women. There is a great temptation to imagine that this Neferhetepes is the daughter of Djedefre, and that Nima'ethap was her mother or some minor queen of that king. But there is a crucial title missing from this Neferhetepes' tomb that would confirm this suggestion.

The picture that emerges from the fragmentary record is perhaps best described as "benign neglect" of the family of Djedefre by Khufu's other descendants during the remaining years of the fourth dynasty, rather than outright persecution. But the story is not over. After the reigns of Menkaure and his son Shepseskaf, there were apparently no more male heirs in that branch of the family. Instead, for some reason the crown passed to a man named Userkaf, who was married to Khentkawes, a daughter of Menkaure. There are a number of versions of the genealogy at this point - see Vermer and Callender 1997. Userkaf may have been a high priest of Heliopolis before his accession to the throne. His mother was one Neferhetepes; thus, Djedefre's daughter became a king's mother, and the fifth dynasty was to see a rise in her family's fortunes.

Djedefre's Mortuary Cult

At this point we continue the search for anyone who might have been a descendant of Djedefre, or have held a position within his mortuary cult. Fortunately, the names and titles of many officials have been preserved in their tombs, even though the monuments of the kings they served may have been completely demolished.

Returning to the small fields of mastabas at Abu Rawash, we find mastaba F15 which has been dated to the end of the fifth dynasty or later. It was the burial-place of a man named Ni-kau-razedef (notice the last element, which is a version of Djedefre's name), and he claimed to be a "king's son of his body, sole companion of
hypothesis that Khafre had taken revenge on Djedefre, for surely one man would not have been able to serve in all three capacities under such circumstances.

Seneb, who lived in the sixth dynasty, provides another similar example of a person who served the cults of more than one king. Seneb, a dwarf, is familiar to many tourists and students of Egyptology from the charming statuette showing him with his family. A seated Seneb is embraced by his (normal-sized) wife, while his two children stand in front of him, where the legs of a normal-sized man would be. Few people who see this statuette in the Cairo Museum are able to read the inscriptions or learn the rest of Seneb’s story. Like many other dwarfs in ancient Egypt, he had achieved many responsible offices. His titles indicate that he was "director of dwarfs in charge of dressing, tutor of the king’s sons, priest of Khufu, and a priest of Djedefre.” Again, we see a dual appointment with a priesthood in the mortuary cults of both Khufu and Djedefre.

Seneb’s name, found in his tomb in the western cemetery at Giza, was actually Khufu-seneb, commemorating the king. His wife, Sentobes, was a priestess of Hathor and Neith. His son’s name was Ankh-ma-razaeder. Can we imagine a couple, obviously in great favor at court, choosing to name their only son after an usurper, if that was what Djedefre had been considered? Of course not.

Kings endowed their mortuary cults with estates to provide for their continuing needs. They could also deed these domains to their children or to other officials who were charges with the performance of certain duties in exchange. The estates belonging to each king carries his name (Jecquet-Gordon 1962). If Khafre had wished to seek revenge on Djedefre, he could have seized his endowed estates and directed their produce to other ends. Conceivably, he might also have changed the names of those estates, to expunge all references to Djedefre’s name. Yet, late in the Old Kingdom, we find officials whose tombs contain the names of estates formed with the name of Djedefre. We have no assurance, of course, that the possession of these estates carried with it duties to that long-dead king, but it may have been so. At least, it shows that the names were not changed.

Ptahhotep was buried in mastaba D64 at Saqqara. He also achieved the position of chief justice and vizier, and served as overseer of the pyramid towns and inspector of the pyramids of Niuserre, Menkauhor and Zadkare-Issi. Thirty-five domains are listed in his tomb, of which two carry the name of Djedefre (though both estates have the same name) and twenty-five carry the names of other kings.

Persen, an “overseer of oils of the king’s adorners and overseer of the two is-chambers of the king’s adorners of the great house,” was buried at Saqqara in mastaba D45. His tomb lists ten domains, including one from Sneferu, one from Djedefre and one from Neferhetepes, who is called the “king’s mother.”

Seshemnefer I was buried at Giza (G4940) in the early part of the fifth dynasty. Her titles are of great interest, for they include “royal chamberlain, one belonging to the estate ‘Mansion of Har-Khephers’ (the name of the pyramid village at Abu Rawash), priest of Hekat, judge and boundary official, overseer of works of the king.” Here is clear evidence that the pyramid village housing the personnel of Djedefre’s cult was still functioning in the fifth dynasty. Seshemnefer was probably an administrator for village affairs.

As mentioned before, Neferhetepes was not a common name in the fourth dynasty, and only the one buried at Giza in G4714 is known. In the fifth and sixth dynasties, however, the name appears among the wives of various court officials. Perhaps the name became more popular after Neferhetepes became the “king’s mother.” All the examples that could be found in tombs at Giza and Saqqara are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence of the name Neferhetepes among noble women in dynasties V and VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynasty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saqqara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-end V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Porter & Moss, Vol. III, pages listed*
Conclusions

Taken as a whole, the evidence suggests that Djedefre, in spite of his short reign of only eight years, did manage to build an imposing tomb at Abu Rawash, in which he was interred. There is proof from inscriptions in the tombs of private individuals that Djedefre's mortuary cult was functioning in the fifth and sixth dynasties, that estates bearing his name were still in existence and perhaps providing rewards to those charged with duties to him or his family, that high officials carried dual appointments in the cults of Djedefre and those of other fourth-dynasty kings, and that some officials even named their children after him. Perhaps the idea that Djedefre's memory began to be particularly revered when his daughter's son became king is not too unreasonable.

The current sad state of Djedefre's "house of eternity" is most likely the result of many generations of stone-robbers quarrying its blocks of limestone and granite. Deliberate destruction may also have played a role, but there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that this defilement was ordered by any fourth dynasty or later Old Kingdom pharaohs. The battered fragments of a granite sarcophagus and diorite statuary that Petrie (1883) reported finding in the debris around the pyramids are very similar to those he found at Giza, and which he attributes to deliberate effacement of many fourth dynasty monuments during the First Intermediate Period.

We have so much evidence that Egyptian kings did usurp the monuments, statues and building materials of former kings that we cannot deny that the practice occurred. But we have no evidence of such actions within dynasties. Middle Kingdom rulers re-used blocks from the Old Kingdom temples at Giza in their pyramid complexes, but there is evidence that these earlier temples were already in ruins. Certainly, New Kingdom pharaohs showed little compunction about helping themselves to items from earlier eras.

It must have been essential, however, for kings to maintain the monuments and cults of their immediate predecessors with some reverence, given their religious beliefs concerning the need to preserve the body for eternity. Certainly, it would have set a bad example and boded ill for their own funerary needs if they had ignored or desecrated the tombs of any but the basest murderer, usurper or traitor. Evidently, then, Djedefre was none of these.

Dynasty IV

1. Seneferu.
2. Khufu (Cheops).
3. Tetefrâ.
5. Menkaurâ.

The Pharaohs of the Fourth Dynasty
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“The Most Uncomfortable Place Imaginable”

Excerpts from letters by T.E. Lawrence at Kafr Ammar, Upper Egypt, 1912

Transcribed by Randall T. Nishiyama

About the author: Randall Nishiyama has degrees in the engineering sciences and is employed at the University of Colorado at Boulder. He is a member of the ESS, a member of the Boulder Society of the Archaeological Institute of America, and excavates under the Mamertum Foundation at Oppido Mamertina (Contrada Mella) in Calabria, Italy.

In March 1911, T.E. Lawrence began his association with the British Museum excavation of the great mound at Jerablus (Carchemish) on the River Euphrates in Syria, then a part of the aging Ottoman Empire. D.G. Hogarth, who had worked with Arthur Evans at Knossos, was the ‘first head’ of the excavation and a mentor to Lawrence. He had arranged for Lawrence to learn archaeological method and technique from Professor W.M. Flinders Petrie, who was currently excavating in Upper Egypt under the British School and Egyptian Research Account. The young Lawrence, who was in his early twenties, had hoped to work with Professor Petrie at Heliopolis, but the excavation at that site was not to begin until March 1912. Therefore, he decided to join Petrie at Kafr Ammar, 60 km. south of Cairo on the west side of the Nile.

Petrie’s students that winter included C. Elverson, Reginald Englebach, Ernest J.H. MacKay, and Gerald A. Wainwright in addition to Lawrence. Some of these men went on to become eminent in their field (refer to Who Was Who in Egyptology, 1972). Lawrence, known for his contributions in archaeology was also later known, because of his exploits in the Near East during the Great War, as Lawrence of Arabia.

Lawrence recounts in a letter to his family the excavation of Prehistoric tombs of the Harka Period (Third Intermediate Period) under G.A. Wainwright, who was supervising during Petrie’s medical stay in Cairo. The work day began at 8:00 a.m.

“About 15 men and 20 boys are digging for them: they find them [tombs] in sand and flint soil, the edge of the great desert of Africa, where it dips down in flats to the cultivated lands bordering on the Nile. They scrape this soft sand with hoes -- one’s feet sink in it each step -- and where they do not feel rotten stone at the tool depth, they hollow out. In a few minutes, if they disclose a rectangular form of 4’ by 3’6” they know they are at the top of a well-tomb. They then dig down from 8 to 15 feet in the same soft sand, filling of the shaft, and at the bottom find a room, or two rooms, still clear of debris, unless the roof has fallen.

In these rooms are piled up three or four mummy-bodies, in rotting coffins with great store of bead-nets along their length, and amulets, and sometimes pottery." (1)

Lawrence, unaccustomed to burial archaeology, found the archaeological methods adopted by Petrie’s team to be very different from those used at Carchemish. He describes these methods in the following passage:

“It is a strange sight to see the men forcing open a square wooden coffin, and taking out the painted anthropoid envelope within, and splitting this up also to drag out a mummy, not glorious in bright wrappings, but dark brown, fibrous, visibly rotting -- and then the thing begins to come to pieces, and the men tear off its head, and bare the skull, and the vertebrae drop out, and the ribs, and legs and perhaps only one poor amulet is the result: the smell and sights are horrible." (1)

The environment and day-to-day routine encountered at an archaeological site during the early part of the century are described. They are not unlike circumstances encountered today:

“Our house [laboratory] would make you laugh. We spend our days stringing beads, or copying painted texts of the book of the dead, until the little room is more ancient than modern, and until you cannot go in or out without brushing past mummies or statuettes, or tomb pottery. Even our very firewood comes from 24th dynasty coffins, and our charcoal brazier first performed that office in the days of the fall of Carchemish. At night jerboas perform triumphal dances over my body, and mosquitoes are the orchestra." (1)

“Am quite well but very dirty: people in this camp wash only twice a week and never change their clothes. It is certainly the most uncomfortable place imaginable." (1)

Petrie finally arrived at Kafr Ammar on 18 January after a six week lay-up in Cairo. Lawrence took the opportunity to write to Hogarth about the Petries, and especially Wainwright, who two years previously had done notable work at El Gerzeh.

“About this place, Mrs. P. [Hilda Petie] is here, which is a novelty in camp. He [Petrie] is enormous fun, with systems of opening tins and ... all else. Wainwright [is] a good man who loves the Hittite nation and is writing a book upon them apparently -- or proving that they are not the Cypriotes. He is painfully anxious to get you to talk and can’t: digs better than anyone else here. It seems to me very carelessly done compared with Carchemish:
however there are lots of little things with wax and suchlike tools to be picked up; only it seems to me that Wainwright is better than the Professor just now.”[3]

Lawrence profiles the venerable Professor in another letter home. He also reflects on the differences of digging at Kafr Ammar:

“He is interesting -- but so intensely self-centered and self-standing. Argument etc. is ludicrous between them [Petrie and his wife], for either's opinion is rooted against all winds that blow. I like him exceedingly, but rather as one thinks of a cathedral or something immovable but by earthquake. He is a quite inspired archaeologist -- and I am picking up hints of sorts all day long. Very little of his methods applies to Syria as yet. The styles of digging are so utterly dissimilar and the things dug and the earth you dig them in. This here is ghastly work -- too easy, too monotonous, and mostly body-snatching -- not one tenth the joy of ruin exploration.”[1]

He writes again about Petrie and his Victorian manner. This time to a friend:

“He's about 5'11" high, white haired, grey bearded, broad and active, with a voice that splits when excited, and a constant feverish speed of speech: he is a man of ideas and systems, from the right way to dig a temple to the only way to clean one's teeth. Also he only is right in all things: all his subordinates have to take his number of sugar lumps in their tea, his species of jam with potted tongue, or be dismissed as official bound unprogressists. Further he is easy-tempered, full of humour, and fickle to a degree that makes him delightfully quaint, and a constant source of joy and amusement in his camp.”[3]

At Carchemish, Lawrence was keen on photography, pottery, sculpture, and inscriptions, and he got on very well with the North Syrian Arab labourers. Things were probably no different at Kafr Ammar; in other words, Lawrence probably dressed in his French grey blazer with pink trim, tennis shirt, football shorts, tasseled Arab belt, grey stockings, and red Arab slippers. C.L. Woolley, who was later to gain immortality for his work at Ur, knew Lawrence from the latter's schooldays in Oxford, and would later work with him at Carchemish (1912-1914) and in southern Palestine (1914). He wrote the following description of Lawrence.

"In the actual work he was curiously erratic. It all depended on how far he was interested, and not everything in field archaeology did interest him or appeal to his sense of values. He could take very full and careful notes, not always in a form easy for others to follow ... and at other times he would take no notes at all. Once I asked him to write a detailed description of a row of sculptured slabs and he duly handed in a notebook which he said contained all that was wanted; long afterwards when I came to look at it I found that each slab was dismissed with a sentence or two which merely made a few of it ... His impatience of the written record might have been due in part to his prodigious memory. He would look at a small fragment of a Hittite inscription which had just come to light and remark that it fitted on to an equally small piece found twelve months before, and although there were many hundreds of such in our store-room he was always right;
or he would quote from memory a particular potsherd that had been found in a former season and could describe its stratum and associations, although I and not he had excavated the piece and written the notes about it. His mind was indeed entirely set on the work he was doing, but he did it in his own way. He would make brilliant suggestions but would seldom argue in support of them; they were based on sound enough arguments, but he expected you to see those for yourself, and if you did not agree he would relapse into silence and smile." [2]

The Egyptian fellaha would refer to Lawrence as Es Shami - The Syrian - and although he longed for his adopted homeland, Lawrence became entranced by his Egyptian surroundings.

"I shall be glad to be back in Syria -- and should be now, only for the present beauty of the weather and the misty sunlight, magnifying the palm-trees, and making the pyramid of Illahun, our neighbour, greater than many mountains. Also we see the Nile two miles away, with the brown sails of boats passing up and down its sluggish length."[1]

"I am digging on the [sagas of] Laxdale and Burnt Nial, Orderv Vitalis, Canterbury tales, Daudet, and Richard Yea & Nay: -- a very tolerable selection of the light sort: we start at 7 and stop at 5 and do some night-work, mostly development [of film] -- the weather is warm and sunny without a drop of rain and nearly windless -- which is as well with all the Sahara unbroken lying W. [west] of us. " [1]

In his autobiography, Petrie wrote about the excavation at Kafr Tarkan - which is specifically where the early remains were found, whereas Kafr Ammar is the name given to the general area and where the remains after the 1st-2nd dynasties were found. He describes the cemetery, which proved to be of the 1st-6th dynasty, where there were also burials of the late 23rd dynasty. The most interesting finds were of the 1st dynasty, and included beds, bas-kets, and timbers, as well as sealings of Nar-mer, copper tools, weapons and items of alabaster. A linen shirt from one of the 1st dynasty burials, perhaps the oldest linen garment in Egypt, is on display at the Petrie Museum in University College. Petrie describes Lawrence as the "brightest of companions". [3]

Lawrence and Petrie discussed the influence of the Near East on Egyptian art. In a letter home he writes:

"I find very distinct influences of Mesopotamian art in the carvings of this cemetery: not in the pottery. Prof. Petrie agrees, and has suggested that he pay for a tentative dig in Bahrein ... or any other point on the Arabian coast I settle for. It appears to me that Bahrein ... is the most likely half-way house between Mesopotamia or Elam and Egypt." [4]

This illustrates the confidence Petrie had in Lawrence, although it would not be until 1925 that E.J.H. MacKay excavated tumuli on the island of Bahrein which possibly dated to 2000 B.C. As for Lawrence, he decided to resume his work at Carchemish but returned to Upper Egypt the following year to visit Petrie and Englebach.

Studying with Petrie at Kafr Ammar was an important period in Lawrence’s early archaeological career. He was given the opportunity to experience a different type of excavation, but more importantly he probably learned the technique that Petrie was developing of sequence dating using pottery.

Each man had a deep respect for one another, and although they seldom kept in contact after their days at Kafr Ammar, Petrie was very saddened when he heard of Lawrence’s death in 1935.

Lawrence’s experience with Petrie is summarized in the following passage.

"What P. [Petrie] wants is a pedestrian intelligence to do the hackwork for him, while he does the fine things. Am awfully glad I went to him. But what a life!" [5]

Excavation Reports:
Petrie, W.M.F. "Tarkan II", BSAE 25 (1914).

Editor’s Notes:
The current issue of *Biblical Archaeology Review* features an article on Lawrence’s archaeological career:

Readers who want to know more about Lawrence and his life will be interested in *T. E. Notes: A T. E. Lawrence Newsletter*. It is edited by Denis W. McDonnell & Suellen J. Miller, Editors and can be ordered from 653 Park Street, Honesdale, Pennsylvania 18431-1421, Tel: (717) 253-6706, Fax: (717) 253-6786, email dmd@ptd.net. *T. E. Notes* also has a Web site at http://www.denismcd.com.

Another Web site of interest is the Lawrence of Arabia Factfile at http://www.press.u-net.com/teweb/home.htm. This informative site is maintained by the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, and edited by Jeremy Wilson, Lawrence’s authorized biographer. If you have any trouble connecting to this site, try the Bodleian Library’s more slightly less up-to-date version at:
http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/users/if/teweb/home.htm.
In 1988, the Ramses II and his Times exhibit at DMNH closed after a successful 8-month run. Having worked closely together for that length of time, a dozen docent volunteers met in a home and decided to form an organization of people interested in further study of ancient Egypt. Since then, the Egyptian Study Society has blossomed, becoming a very large and viable organization within the Denver Museum of Natural History.

Several sub-groups have formed within the ESS to study specific subjects. You will be familiar with their names from the short announcements made during the business portion of ESS meetings, but until now the details of their work have not been presented to the ESS membership at large.

The Mummy Study Group meets once a month in members’ homes, and after a business meeting, there is a short social gathering prior to informative videos and at times a “mummy movie”.

The group has accomplished several things so far, and has plans for the future. In 1987, for example, the museum allowed space on the main floor for us to build an anthropoid coffin, reproducing the ancient coffin that is now in the permanent exhibit. Exact measurements were taken and lofted onto formers for the cutting and shaping of the wood, down to the last quarter inch. The tools used in the project were replicas of those that would have been used by the coffin’s original makers.

Space does not permit naming all of the members who worked on the project, but two in particular were instrumental in its success. Jack Kullman took all of the measurements, drew up the plans, and made full size formers. He also made all of the copper and wood tools. John McGann was able to obtain full measurement 4 x 16 inch 125-year-old floor joists to cut and shape for the coffin. His skill with tools and woodworking produced the rough assembly, using a small amount of glue but fastening it all together with pegs. Then other members carved and smoothed to shape.

The construction of the coffin took place right in the public gaze, where museum visitors and school children could watch the work in progress. Several members acted as costumed docents, answering questions and demonstrating the use of the ancient tools.

When the construction of the coffin was complete, it was painted by the Art Study Group under the direction of Alice Gemmell, who did most of the gessoing and painting - but that is her story for a later edition.

The completed coffin will soon be on display again, in the new Egyptian exhibit that will be opened at the museum next year. Its fine construction and brilliant colors will certainly make it the envy of the mummies on display!

Although the coffin project is the Mummy Study Group’s most notable achievement, the group remains very active. Members have made reproduction funerary amulets from steatite and faience for educational purposes, and this is just the beginning of the things we hope to accomplish!

We would love to bring the activities and achievements of your study group to the whole of the ESS membership! Please contact any member of the editorial committee and let us spread your fame!
LECTURE REPORTS

MA’AT AND WISDOM:
BASIC THINKING ABOUT SALVATION IN ANCIENT EGYPT
Presented by Dr. Emily Teeter
ESS Meeting, April 7th

Dr. Emily Teeter of the Oriental Institute in Chicago treated the ESS to a fascinating lecture on the complex and often contradictory subject of salvation and damnation in ancient Egyptian thinking. This is a subject which Dr. Teeter has been researching for some time, and her conclusions will be published more fully in an academic journal at some time in the future.

To the ancient Egyptians, the idea of damnation consisted of exclusion from good things - the afterlife, the company of the gods (signified by the name of the deceased being compounded with that of Osiris), and eternal youth and beauty.

The word Ma’at - the personification of ethical standards against which the deceased’s heart was weighed in the Hall of Judgment, - is commonly translated into English as “truth”, but to the ancient Egyptians, the concept of ma’at was much more complex.

Ma’at was the force that maintained order in the universe by preserving the cosmic balance. Without ma’at, chaos - isfet - would overwhelm all creation. By extension, then, individuals who transgressed against ma’at by not behaving correctly did more than endanger their own afterlives: they jeopardized the established order of the universe, which manifested itself in the regularity of the Nile floods, the constancy of the stars, and in many other ways. Transgressors put the whole of society at risk, not just themselves.

The king was the source of ma’at to the people, just as he was the source of ka (see the report on Bob Hanawalt’s lecture The Ka, the Ba and the Akh in Vol. 8 No. 1, Summer 1997), making political obedience a divine duty, and as important as personal moral rectitude.

The negative confessions in The Book of the Dead hint at the nature of the virtues that constituted ma’at. Though it is a New Kingdom document, it is corroborated by other, earlier sources. But Ma’at - righteousness - alone was not sufficient to ensure a favorable judgment. The material trappings of burial were also important, and the living had a duty to care for the well-being of their dead.

Although it is widely assumed that strict adherence to the ethical concepts embodied by Ma’at was sufficient to ensure a favorable judgment, one could attain justification through knowledge rather than correct behavior. As attested by texts as early as the Middle Kingdom Coffin Texts, knowing certain magical spells - the names of guardians, even the names of objects - was, in some contexts, as important as, or even a substitute for, living life according to Ma’at. This emphasis upon wisdom rather than action for salvation has interesting implications for Egyptian society. Correct action according to the precepts of Ma’at was considered to have been passed down from the beginning of time and hence was part of the overall tradition of society. Such means were assessable to all. In contrast, justification on the basis of wisdom was limited to the literate elite.

THE SECRETS OF ASWAN
Presented by Alice Gemmel
ESS Meeting, June 17th

From the earliest times, Aswan played a major role in the north-south trade between Egypt and Nubia. The earliest known text from Nubia is located at Gibe1 Shelique, the second cataract area, and records the victory of first-dynasty King Djar over Nubia. This is the first real record of the Pharaoh being in the southern part of Egypt.

Nubia was a wealthy area, producing gold, copper, the highly prized pink granite for monuments, diorite for great statues, quartzite, malachite, and best quality sandstone. Many Old Kingdom pharaohs sent trading expeditions southward, including Khufu, Pepi I and Merenra, who had a canal cut around the first cataract to ease the passage of goods downstream. Pepi II was also active in the southern trade, and perhaps the best-known instance of this is when the 8-year-old pharaoh was presented with a dwarf by a nobleman from the Aswan area, and replied with a letter commanding that the dwarf should be brought to court immediately and with the greatest care.

In the First Intermediate Period, the southern border shifted north to Luxor, then to Abydos. To hold the frontier established in the Middle Kingdom, a chain of thirteen forts was built, starting at the first cataract and reaching to just past the second cataract. The goods that flowed northwards included exotic animals, incense and gold.

Egypt controlled Nubia until the 13th Dynasty, but the local army became increasingly independent and settled. When the Kushite kings offered the soldiers land, many joined them. This heralded the Second Intermediate Period.

In the early years of the New Kingdom, Thutmose I conquered the Nubians, and claimed the fifth cataract as a colonial land to be administered by an Egyptian viceroy.

Because of its position close to the first cataract, Aswan brought goods and tribute into Egypt from Nubia and the African hinterland. These goods were vital to maintaining the wealth and power of ancient Egypt.
MUSIC OF ANCIENT EGYPT

Presented by Robert Litterell
ESS Meeting, July 15th

Philosophers say music and stories were the first ordering of chaos. With this thought, on July 15th Robert Litterell presented an outstanding multi-media tour of the music of ancient Egypt.

Music has been used universally for dancing, marching, moving, singing and telling stories. The ancient Egyptians were similar to other early peoples who believed that music was magical, and could carry messages to the world of the dead.

Using taped musical examples, slides of temple art and artifacts, Robert entranced the listeners and brought the ancient arts to life. Details such as the directors of the musicians in carvings gave a fascinating connection to existing Coptic practices. Tapes and the playing of actual instruments brought a welcome dimension to the presentation, as did stories ranging from ancient folklore to a real-life search for a glue gun in Cairo.

The evening ended with a harp duet demonstrating the 19th-century European conception of ancient Egyptian music - which needlessly to say was very different from Robert's reconstructions!

Report by Norma J. Livo

CHANGING MYTHOLOGY IN EGYPTIAN HISTORY

Presented by Linda Engle
ESS Meeting, September 16th

Linda introduced us to a colorful cast of divine characters and followed their careers from Predynastic times through the New Kingdom.

Horus, we learned, was already a potent figure in the predynastic period, and his power never dims throughout the history of ancient Egypt. The Horus cult arose in the north and the god came to be "the perfect metaphor for majesty" and the protector of the pharaoh. Horus is often paired with Set who, in early times, is depicted as "chaos" or as Horus' "worthy opponent." In the early dynasties, Set is not vilified to the degree that he is in later dynasties. It is only when the Osirian myths are firmly entrenched that Set becomes entirely evil. At first he is portrayed as an odd-looking dog-anteater hybrid or crocodile or hippo and later he comes to be represented as an ass-headed snake.

Anubis dates from the predynastic period, and was important in the Pyramid Age for his role in the deceased's journey to the Underworld. But beginning in the 5th Dynasty Osiris begins to be the principal figure presiding over the transition to the afterlife. Pharaohs start taking an Osirian name once they die.

One female deity, Neith, the "Mistress of the Bow" and "Ruler of the Arrow," was very popular in predynastic times. Her popularity outweighed even that of Isis in this early time. In the Pyramid Age, Neith is sometimes depicted wearing the red crown of upper Egypt. With the rise of the Osiris cult, however, Isis' status is elevated to "Divine Mother" and she becomes one of the most important deities. Her early bovine reference, "Divine Cow Who Gives Birth to the Sacred Bull of Memphis," is retained and she later wears Hathor-like cow horns along with the solar disk. Neith's popularity wanes, and she is relegated to adorning canopic jars to guard royal innards.

Ptah rises to power during the power struggle between the two cult centers of Heliopolis and Memphis. The priests of Memphis proclaimed him the supreme god to help legitimize the importance of their city. His consort, the lion-headed Sekmet, is also a very powerful goddess who conceives kings, causes plagues and dispels illness.

Amon, the "Hidden One" of the conquering Hyksos, was worshipped near Thebes and credited with the Hyksos' military victories. Eventually, he became a national deity, and combined with Ra. His consort, Mut, is a lion-headed goddess who sometimes wears the crowns of upper and lower Egypt.

Through the examination of these and several other deities, Linda's point was clearly made: the ancient Egyptians were a thrifty people who rarely discarded a deity. Perhaps Horus is unique in that he maintained a steady, high popularity from early dynastic through New Kingdom times.

Report by Judy Greenfield

Volunteers Wanted!

We need people to help with this section of the Ostracon. The publications committee would love to hear from anyone who is interested in writing brief reports on ESS lectures and other activities. You don't have to commit yourself to covering every single lecture - once or twice a year would be fine. If you are interested, please contact any member of the publications committee.
Ostraccon Back Issues

Announcing an exciting Egyptological discovery, right here in Denver! No, it's not the long-awaited Egypto-Mayan pyramid that finally proves the validity of the Children of the Sun theory, it's a document cache of international significance - or to be more precise, it's a couple of hundred back issues of the Ostraccon, recently unearthed in the Pettees' basement and full of all kinds of articles, reviews and reports.

These priceless documents can be yours for only $1.52 each, including postage. Contact Frank Pettee at 777-5494, or at ESS monthly meetings. Act now as stocks are limited!

Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 1989
The Ostraccon's premiere issue. Mountains of Stone Symposium, Bennu Bird, ESS First Anniversary.

Vol. 1, No. 3, May 1990
Ostraccon inscriptions, Egyptian Science, Studying the Pyramids, The Calendar.

Vol. 2, No. 1, October 1991
The Environment and Culture of the Nile, The Obelisk, CT scanning DMHN Mummy.

Pyramid Construction, Pre-Dynastic Egypt, New Kingdom Army.

Vol. 3, No. 1, February 1992 (falsely marked as Vol. 2, No. 1)
Professionals and Amateurs in Egyptology, Don Ryan Interview, Giovanni Belzoni, Natron, Medicines, DMNH Egypt Exhibit, Valley of the Kings Walking Tour.

Vol. 3, No. 2, May 1992
Cleopatra, Hatshepsut, T.G.H. James, Nile River Pollution, Animals in Ancient Egypt.

The Ancient Egyptians: A Popular Introduction to Life in the Pyramid Age

I can't recall if it was the slimness of the volume, the title promising glimpses into everyday life in ancient Egypt or the wallpainting on the cover, showing a line of youths performing some high-stepping aerobics, prompted me to choose this book from the library shelves.

Kamil establishes her unabashed preference for the Old Kingdom early in the book. "The Old Kingdom, the Pyramid Age, is considered by many historians as the high-water mark of achievement." She proclaims it "an aristocratic age," one characterized by "vigorous and able monarchs," a strong centralized government, high productivity and refinement. The author places the Pyramid Age in context, beginning the book with an overview of Egyptian prehistory and an explanation of how landscape and climate molded ancient Egypt both materially and spiritually. A large section is devoted to mythology, which somewhat illuminated this rather elusive topic for me. Kamil rounds out the picture of ancient Egyptian life with chapters entitled "How They Travelled," "How They Lived," "How They Worked" and "How They Spent Their Leisure Time."

Vol. 3, No. 3, August 1992
Predynastic Burials, Dwarf Tomb, Faiyum Portraits.

Vol. 3, No. 4, November 1992
Tutankhamun special issue

Vol. 4, No. 1, February 1993
Rameses II, Oriental Institute Museum, Book of Am-Duat.

Vol. 4, No. 2, July 1993
Wood Coffins, Egypt Reborn?, Traveler's Impressions, Travel Diary.

Vol. 5, No. 2, Summer/Winter 1994
Conservation, Mentuhotep II part I.

Vol. 6, No. 5, Summer 1995
Mentuhotep II part II, Did Tutankhamun Lie in State?, Egyptian Literature.

Vol. 6, No. 3, Winter 1995
The Oldest Paved Road, The Impact of Geography, Reconstructed Boardgame.

Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1996
Hatshepsut's Recarved Sarcophagus, Murder in Memphis, Sneferu, Set.

Vol. 7, No. 2, Summer 1996
Metals, Civil Law, Granville Mummy, Senusert III, Neith.

Vol. 7, No. 3, Fall 1996
Meretaten's Bathroom, New Insights About Old Pyramids, Meresankh III, Feline Deities.

Vol. 8, No. 1, Summer 1997
ARCE 1997 Annual Meeting, Egypt and Mesopotamia, Nefertiti and Akhenaten.

The chapters promised information on everyday life in Egyptian times - and delivered. The last chapter in the book highlights, in brief, the existing ruins from Old Kingdom to Ptolemaic times and would be a good introduction for those in the early stages of planning a trip to Egypt.

Kamil has lived in Egypt for many years and has written a series of guidebooks to Luxor, Sakkara and Memphis, and Upper Egypt. The Ancient Egyptians is well written and highly readable. Since I am no Egyptian scholar, not even an amateur one, I can't vouch for the accuracy of the information between the pale blue covers of the book. Kamil has embellished her book with nice line drawings, maps and good black & white photographs. It is a concise primer on ancient Egypt and would serve as a good introduction for the neophyte or as a good refresher for those wishing to brush up on the essentials of ancient Egypt. For those already in the know, try something more in-depth.


Review by Judy Greenfield
The Electric Papyrus

EGYPTOLOGY RESOURCES PAGE
http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/

This Web site is the source of our "Egyptian Computing" image, and a lot more besides. Although it is not an official publication of the University of Cambridge, it does carry the latest news on the University's field project at Theban tomb 99. For philologists, the Beinlich word list is presented in the form of a searchable online database.

The rest of the site consists of links to other sites; while not as exhaustive as the Oriental Institute's Abzu Regional Index (reviewed in the last issue), it is easy to use, and offers useful links to the Web pages of museums, institutions and journals, as well as other Egyptological resources at Cambridge and elsewhere. There is also a good amount of timely material, such as news, announcements of conferences and publications, and so forth. This site is well worth bookmarking and returning to, to see what's new.

EGYPTOLOGY RESOURCES PAGE
http://www.newton.cam.ac.uk/egypt/

ARCE HOME PAGE
http://www.arce.org

On a very slick-looking Web site, the American Research Center in Egypt offers a wealth of information about the organization and what it does.

The Events section covers not only the programs on offer in New York and Cairo, but also the activities of ARCE's local chapters across the nation. There is also a preview of the 1998 Annual Meeting (see last issue for Dick Harwood's report on the 1997 meeting), and a call for papers.

There are also reports on ARCE's projects in Egypt - both completed and still in progress - and an exhaustive list of research opportunities in forthcoming expeditions and projects. The site is rounded out by pages of membership information (including the ability to join ARCE online), a list of ARCE's publications and links to other online Egyptology resources.

For ESS members who are already members of ARCE, the site offers a convenient source of information to supplement ARCE's journals and newsletters; for those who are thinking of joining, it is an impressive advertisement for ARCE and the things that membership offers.

HIEROGLYPHS FOR MAC & PC
http://www.deniart.com/

Deniart Systems offers "over 920 unique Phonogram and Ideograph Hieroglyphic symbols", which you can use to dress up your documents or - if you know how - to compose entire documents in hieroglyphs!

Available for both Mac and PC, the hieroglyphs may be purchased as a bundle for $140, or as four separate volumes with prices ranging from $30-$50. They can be ordered online (for instant download) as well as by mail, phone or fax.

From the samples on Deniart's Web site, the hieroglyphs are decorative rather than utilitarian, which might be a good thing for some users and a bad thing for others. Also, there is no listing on the site of exactly which 920 symbols are supplied, apart from set titles such as "HIEROGLYPH A: Men, Women, Deities", "HIEROGLYPH B: Parts Of Human Body, Mammals", "HIEROGLYPH C: Mammals (Cont'd), Parts Of Mammals, Birds", and so on.

A wide range of other fonts types is advertised on the Web sites, including Aztec and Maya symbols, Coptic, Sanskrit, various mystical symbols and alphabets, and fonts based on the works of J.R.R. Tolkien.
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