

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

by ALEXANDER H. JOFFE

© COPYRIGHT 2000 University of Chicago Press

Egyptian contacts with Uruk Mesopotamia have been an outstanding question for most of this century (Frankfort 1924, 1951; Baumgartel 1955; Kantor 1992:14-17; Smith 1992; Mark 1998). The revised 4th-millennium Syro-Mesopotamian chronology generated at the recent School of American Research Advanced Seminar "Mesopotamia in the Era of State Formation" makes possible an answer to this question.(2) A clearer understanding of the relationship between the two earliest Old World societies also permits review of the role of intersocietal interaction in the evolution of complex societies.

CHRONOLOGY

Efforts at harmonizing Egyptian and Mesopotamian chronologies have been hampered by the lack of radiocarbon dates from both areas, difficulties in coordinating Egyptian historical chronologies with radiocarbon dates, and, more recently, the impression of a single Uruk "expansion" episode toward the middle of the 4th millennium (Hassan and Robinson 1987; Boehmer 1991; Boehmer, Dreyer, and Kromer 1993. cf. Algaze 1993a:56-57). Efforts to discuss the phases of Egypt-to-Mesopotamian contact have been hampered by cumbersome terminology (Kantor 1992) and poor understanding of chronology and the impact of contacts in Egypt (Mark 1998). Further, there is a "minimalist-maximalist" divide between scholars inclined to see more local development (e.g., Hendrickx and Bavay n.d.) or more foreign contact. Egyptian chronology has improved somewhat because of improved radiocarbon dates, supported by synchronisms with the Southern Levant, and artifact seriations (e.g., Kaiser 1990, Bard 1994a, Hendrickx 1996, Wilkinson 1996). While difficulties, especially terminological, remain, these efforts have all served to lengthen the Egyptian predynastic and early dynastic periods.

The recent SAR seminar, using stratigraphic and hitherto unpublished radiocarbon data, generated a new chronology for the Uruk period (Wright and Rupley n.d.). This chronology provisionally renames the Late (here, Terminal) Ubaid through Late Uruk horizons as "Late Chalcolithic 1-5" and indicates dates from ca. 4200 to 3000 B.C. inclusively. Even more significant, it regards the "Uruk expansion" as a process of minimally 400 years, perhaps as much as 600 years, in length, consisting of at least two and possibly more phases.

The longer chronology and the suggestion of several phases of expansion, each presumably with its own political and economic characteristics and spatial extent, are key for understanding Egyptian contacts (figure 1). First, given the longer Egyptian predynastic chronology, it is simply not possible for all contacts with Uruk settlements in Syria to have taken place ca. 3400 B.C., the approximate horizon for the earlier phase of expansion. Egypt at that time, Naqada IIC-d, was "unified" by the expansion of the southern Naqada culture, but it remains doubtful that large portions of the Nile Valley were politically integrated under a single polity. Indeed, it appears that a small number of Upper Egyptian sites--Abydos, Hierakonpolis, and Naqada being the best-known--were major settlements with significant sociopolitical integration. Some Mesopotamian-inspired objects, such as decorative motifs,(3) have been dated to this earlier horizon. The most visible Uruk-inspired feature is the use of niched brick facades in mortuary architecture, primarily in the later Dynasty One and Two. A single expansion phase demanded the improbable scenario that late predynastic Egyptian society was exposed to Uruk influences in Syria which then became manifest in the Nile Valley some three to four centuries later.(4)

[Figure 1 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

A second phase of Uruk expansion, however, dated ca. 3100 B.C. correlates much better with Egyptian chronology and, most important, the adoption of Uruk styles and material culture in the Naqada IIIb by the emerging Egyptian national state. Dynasty Zero is understood as a period of competing southern regional leaders, from IrjHor to Narmer, vying for territorial, social, and ideological control. Various techniques were used for integration, including deployment of settlements ("colonies") in the Southern Levant, notation, craft production, and use of Levantine and Mesopotamian imagery (Joffe 1991; Algaze 1993b; Brink 1992, 1996, 1998). Narmer of Dynasty One, once considered the "unifier" of Egypt, may be dated approximately 3050 B.C. and represents the culmination of the spread of southern Naqada culture into Lower Egypt. The second major phase of Egyptian contacts with Uruk settlements in Syria thus took place when a national authority both in theory and in practice was emerging in Egypt. No uncomfortable lag between the period of contact and the period of Egyptian emulation must be posited, since Uruk influence appears immediately and is most clearly manifest within the next 200 years of pharaonic rule.

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

IMPACT

Two basic contact horizons, ca. 3400 and 3100 B.C., make it possible to explain the nature and significance of Uruk influence on Egypt. In the first phase of contact, as noted above, only a few large settlement sites are visible in Upper Egypt, although a number of wealthy cemeteries are known. While there is increasing evidence for large sites in Lower Egypt during Naqada II, such as Buto, these do not yet appear to have been of the same scale or complexity as their southern counterparts (Brink 1993). The earlier Uruk expansion horizon in Syria is known primarily from excavations at Tell Sheikh Hassan (Boese 1995), as well as from Qraya, Brak, and Hacinebi (Pollock and Coursey 1995), but it is not yet characterized by the complex network of sites which develops with the second phase. Thus, both partners in the earlier phase of contacts are much smaller and less integrated, and this is reflected in the eclectic finds of Uruk materials in Egypt and in the apparently total lack of reciprocal Egyptian influence on Uruk sites or on intervening regions.

A long tradition existed in Egypt of cultural contact and the integration of new styles, technologies, and symbols. Neolithic contacts between Western Asia and Egypt include the transmission of lithic technologies such as the Helwan retouch (Gopher 1993), domesticated plants and animals sometime after 6000 B.C. (Wetterstrom-1993), and maceheads (Cialowicz 1989). Chalcolithic contacts include the transfer of metallurgical technology and raw materials through the trading entrepot at Maadi (Rizkana and Seeher 1989, Seeher 1990). Uruk-related material in Egypt which may be dated to the middle Naqada II horizon includes the introduction of cylinder seals, lapis lazuli, and stylistic influences on locally produced knife handles (Crowfoot-Payne 1968; Boehmer 1974a, b; Midant-Reyes 1987; Smith 1992; Sievertsen 1992; Pittman 1996; Bavay 1997). Contacts should therefore be understood as very small-scale, probably conducted by sea via northern Levantine sites such as Byblos and possibly Ugarit (Prag 1986; cf. Contenson 1982). These were to be the vectors in the next phase of contacts as well.(5)

Given that there are still only inchoate polities in Egypt, integration of Uruk influences is selective. Cylinder seals, a quintessential Western Asia administrative device of Mesopotamian origin, have limited impact in late Naqada II Egypt. Simple seals with abstract motifs are adopted first in mid-Naqada II as display pieces (Kantor 1952, Williams 1977, Teissier 1987, Podzorski 1988; see also Kaplony 1963, Brink 1995). The late Naqada II and early Naqada III impressions from Abydos Cemetery U also illustrate the process of integrating local Egyptian motifs into cylinder seals (Hartung 1998). Access to small objects from the

Northern Levant and better-established metallurgical and technological resources in the Southern Levant and the trading entrepot at Maadi were equally important impetuses for the northward expansion of Upper Egyptian polities during the late Naqada II (Seeher 1991).

Ceramic evidence also suggests an eclectic approach to integrating local and foreign motifs. Southern Levantine features such as the unassuming ledge handle appear as the "wavy" handle on Egyptian vessels. Similarly, Uruk-style triangular lug handles and bent-spouted vessels (Petrie's "Fancy Ware," Amiran 1992) begin to appear. Some of the four-lugged vessels are decorated with boat and "mourning" motifs, both attested much earlier in Egypt (Needler 1984:pl.16). Acquisition of foreign motifs and technologies served Egyptian elites as sumptuary items, as goods for differential distribution, and also as a symbolic indication of their ritual-religious prowess (cf. M. Helms 1988, 1992). The original context and content of motifs appear to have been unimportant, and recombination of elements appears frequently, such as the appearance of boat and "mourning" motifs on vessels with both wavy and local pierced horizontal handles (Spencer 1993: fig. 22). The fusion of local pressure-flaked lithic technology with carved knife handles is another example. Finally, Naqada II witnesses the increasing elaboration of mortuary rituals, including the removal of increasing amounts of wealth from circulation as grave goods (Endesfelder 1984, Bard 1994b, Wilkinson 1996). Overall these illustrate the expansion of craft production and its connection with local elite ideology.

Other probable Syro-Mesopotamian elements in mid-to-late Naqada II art include the "master of animals" motif, winged griffins, serpent-headed panthers, and intertwined beasts (Kantor 1992:15, fig. 6; Smith 1992). All figure prominently in Uruk-period glyptic, especially from Susa, and appear in Egypt individually and in clusters in contexts such as the Painted Tomb at Hierakonpolis and the Gebel el-Arak knife handle. The incorporation of these motifs further illustrates the impact of Egypto-Mesopotamian interaction--not simply emulation by Egypt but reinterpretation of foreign iconography to fit existing and developing ideological needs (see generally Bard 1992a, Hassan 1992). Egyptian concern, for example, for the "containment of unruly" in the highly dynamic and potentially threatening social and natural environments of the Nile Valley (Kemp 1990; Baines 1995 a: 13-14) contextualizes the adoption of a heroic figure such as the master of animals by Egyptian elites. The figure in Egypt becomes invested with the social and religious role of protector of the natural and social orders, a step toward the concept of ma'at and the royal ideology of the later Early Dynastic period.(6) But adoption of

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

foreign motifs and concepts in the earlier phase remains unstructured and opportunistic rather than systematic, without indication of the transmission of serious conceptual or organizational influences. Uruk iconography supplemented existing imagery and did not provide key technologies. If anything, relations with the Southern Levant were more important during this period.

The second Uruk expansion came at a most propitious time for Egypt. With increasing unification under Upper Egyptian elites, new administrative and integrative techniques became necessary (Baines 1995b). Among these were continued expansion of now canonical craft and art production in the visual environment (Davis 1989), with the addition of inscriptions and architecture. Egyptian settlements in the Southern Levant are clearly under official control, as is demonstrated by the serekhs bearing the name of Narmer found in Israel (Brink 1996, 1998). The appearance of a greater number of Uruk settlements in Syria and Anatolia brought a larger repertoire of power iconography to the attention of Egyptian elites anxious for symbols and integrative devices. The vector of Egypto-Mesopotamian contact has been at issue, with suggestions including seaborne trade via the Red Sea (Zarins 1989, Majer 1992), overland contacts via the Southern Levant (Amiran 1970), and seaborne contacts along the Levantine coast (Joffe 1993). Given the new chronology and the attribution of the bulk of settlement at Habuba Kabira to the latter phase of expansion (Vallet 1997; see also Surenhagen 1974/75), the Levantine coastal option remains the more probable.

A number of stylistic and processual similarities between Egypt and Uruk Mesopotamia may be noted in this later period. These show the deliberate process by which Uruk features were applied in Egypt. The influence of Mesopotamia on the origins of writing in Egypt remains a question best left to specialists (Ray 1986, Fischer 1989, Bard 1992b, Postgate, Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, Trigger 1998). Similarities in Egyptian and Mesopotamian ceramics for baking and brewing and the earliest written symbols representing the same have been noted by several scholars (Millard 1988, Chazan and Lehner 1990). Similar use of alcoholic beverages by elites as rations and rewards has also been suggested (Joffe 1998).

As noted above, the use of cylinder seals with figurative motifs as administrative devices is fully established during Dynasty One. In contrast to the Southern Levantine practice of sealing ceramic vessels themselves, the Mesopotamian practice of sealing clay stoppers and bullae is imitated (Joffe n.d.). The decoration of stone palettes, a local Egyptian device which began in Naqada I, reflects Uruk influences by Naqada II-III; the best-known examples

are the rosette on the Scorpion macehead (Smith 1992, Cialowicz 1997) and the intertwined beasts on the obverse of the Narmer Palette (Davis 1989:159-63, figs. 6.14-15). Egyptian imitations of Uruk-style bent-spout vessels appear in ceramic, stone, and eventually copper, as do stone imitations of four-lugged jars. These are in addition to Egyptian stone imitations of Southern Levantine ceramic forms such as one-handed pitchers and the feature of the ledge handle (Kantor 1992; el-Khouli 1978:pl. 83). The placement of local smithing scenes on palettes and maceheads and the imitation of pressure-flaked knives in copper also demonstrate expanding court control over the visual environment and craft production (Radwan 1983; Williams and Logan 1987; Davis 1992; Baines 1995b:97, 110-12).

Perhaps the most significant manifestations of this second wave of contacts are the various Egyptian adaptations of Uruk architectural features. Frankfort long ago noted the similarity between Mesopotamian and Egyptian niched brickwork (Frankfort 1924). While there has been extensive discussion of the issue, two problems have impeded a solution. The first problem has been chronological, since niched brickwork is one of the latest Uruk-like features in Egypt, appearing primarily in Dynasty One. Previously this had been regarded as at the very end of any Uruk contacts or even an Uruk presence in Syria (Kantor 1992:18). A second contact horizon ca. 3100 B.C. addresses this problem easily, since late Dynasty Zero and Dynasty One are contemporary with the major settlement horizon at Habuba Kabira, Jebel Aruda, and Hassek Hoyuk. The second problem has been more difficult: understanding the Egyptian reinterpretation of Mesopotamian temple and civic architecture as royal and, most conspicuously, funerary architecture and motifs. As noted earlier, however, Egyptian practice was to adapt foreign motifs to fit local ideological and organizational patterns. Architecture is simply the most visible manifestation of this process.

The direct origins of niched brickwork are found in the `Ubaid period in structures such as the Eridu "temples" (Safar, Mustafa, and Lloyd 1981). The style continues to be used for monumental structures into the Uruk period, the best-known being at Warka, and on a larger scale the insets and offsets of the fortification wall of Habuba Kabira may be regarded as a variant (Strommenger 1979: fig. 1) (fig. 2). Niched brickwork also appears on Uruk-period seals, especially in processional motifs (Smith 1992). In Syria the technique is imitated on the exterior of a public building at Hamman et-Turkman, a local Late Chalcolithic site and not an Uruk settlement (Algaze 1993a:100-101).

[Figure 2 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

In Egypt the niched brick motif appears already in Dynasty Zero or late Naqada III on the serekh, a heraldic device depicting a facade or doorway with the Horus name of the king in a box above (Brink 1996) (fig. 3). The motif is also found on ivory boxes and inlays dated to early Dynasty One (e.g., Kroeper and Krzyzaniak 1992), as well as on royal tombstones, in the layout of palatial or temple structures (e.g., Weeks 1972), and in the superstructures of elite mortuary installations of Dynasties One and Two (e.g., Emery 1949, 1954, 1958; O'Connor 1989) (fig. 4). Niched brick motifs are employed on architecture into the Old Kingdom.

[Figures 3-4 ILLUSTRATION OMITTED]

The use of niched brickwork in palaces, tombs and funerary enclosures, and royal insignia indicates that the style was incorporated into a multifaceted series of display devices advertising royal power. As Baines notes, mudbrick was itself a prestige material (1995b:123). Temples and palaces housed and embodied the interlinked royal-religious authorities in life, as did mortuary monuments in death. Uruk architectural imagery was appreciated for its powerful visual impact and possibly for its foreign connotations. The message of the imagery, however, was Egyptian.

MECHANISMS AND SCALES OF CONTACT

What mechanisms of intersocietal contact account for the appearance of Uruk features in Egypt? At what scales did contact take place? It may be suggested that all the Uruk influences cited above could be accounted for by minimal contacts. A literal handful of individuals bringing back to Egypt a few bags of items and detailed descriptions may have been all that was necessary to inspire a highly receptive group of elites and their craftsmen. No itinerant craftsmen or diplomatic missions need be posited.(7) Reciprocal influence of Egypt on Syro-Mesopotamia as yet cannot be detected; indeed, only invisible exports may be postulated.

Both phases of Egyptian contacts with Uruk settlements in Syria likely took place via sea trade with the Northern Levant. Only isolated objects at Byblos support this suggestion (Prag 1986), but Uruk material is difficult to isolate because of the extremely poor excavation and publication techniques. The later Old Kingdom contacts with the site, however, point to the importance of the connection (Ward 1963). Southern Levantine evidence also indicates the tempo and scale of Egyptian contacts with the outside world. There is a complex progression of direct Egyptian contacts with the Southern Levant during the 4th millennium; from sporadic interaction in Naqada I

to entrepreneurs with royal affiliations similar to Babylonian *dam.gar* (Leemans 1960) or Aztec *pochteca* (Sanders 1992.) in Naqada II and early Naqada III (complemented by the appearance of Southern Levantine traders and craftsmen at Maadi) to an extensive network of royal outposts in Naqada III, which evaporated rapidly at the end of Dynasty One (Dessel and Joffe n.d.). It may be that a similar pattern held for the Northern Levant--sporadic contacts followed by entrepreneurial relationships but giving way to a small direct presence.

The Egyptian experience could be usefully contrasted with that of the various western Asian societies which came into sustained or attenuated contact with the Uruk world. While the impact of the Uruk expansions on northern Syria and Anatolia has been discussed extensively, the effect on intervening western Syrian and Levantine cultures has been difficult to gauge. Few late-4th-millennium strata have been excavated in modern times, but results of earlier deep soundings, primarily at Hama, indicate quantitatively little Uruk material, as does more recent work at sites such as Tell Nebi Mend (Thuesen 1988:112, 187; Matthias and Parr 1989; cf. Jamieson 1993). Western and southern Syria may have been outside the range of substantive contacts during either phase of Uruk expansion, a curious finding given the deep penetration of 'Ubaid culture into at least the former (Thuesen 1989).(8) The occurrence of Uruk-like pottery at desert outposts such as Jawa and el-Kowm has made little sense within the context of a single expansion phase which culminated in an apparently logical array of settlements and stations (S. Helms 1987, Betts 1991, Cauvin and Stordeur 1985). Much of this arid-zone material should be dated to the second phase of Uruk expansion or even to the succeeding centuries (McClellan and Porter 1995) and regarded as part of tenuous contacts with pastoralists rather than long-distance trade.

In the Southern Levant, contacts are reflected only by the local imitation of the Uruk bent-spout vessel and perhaps in some glyptic styles (Hennessy 1967, Amiran 1992). One tomb excavated recently at Tell Asawir contains pottery similar in style to Ninevite V and determined petrographically to originate outside of the Southern Levant alongside Naqada III and Amuq F vessels (Yannai 1995). It has recently been proposed that the spatial and demographic changes at the end of the Early Bronze I should be seen as a result or reflex of changes in the Uruk world system (Portugali and Gophna 1993), but there is no direct evidence for contacts with the Uruk world.

The lack of evidence from the Levant in particular indicates that the scale of Uruk contacts with Egypt could not have been great, since the direct presence of

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

appreciable numbers of traders, craftsmen, or officials would be expected to have left some mark. International interaction during the Late Bronze Age, including trade, diplomacy, and warfare, took place overland and apparently enmeshed all Syrian and Levantine city-states (Liverani 1990). The mid-3d-millennium example of reciprocal "proto-diplomatic" contacts between late Old Kingdom Egypt and Ebla is also informative. Egyptian objects appear at Ebla Palace G, almost certainly having been transported from Byblos, and Egyptian metrology is employed, but neither the relationship nor Byblos itself is mentioned in any Eblaite text (Scandone-Matthiae 1981, 1982; Redford 1986; Archi 1987; Astour 1992).

EVOLUTIONARY CONTEXT AND CONCLUSIONS

The evolution of complex societies can no longer be studied in isolation but must be approached in an integrated fashion.(9) The relationship between Uruk Mesopotamia and late predynastic and Early Dynastic Egypt was lengthy, complex, and almost completely one-sided. Critical symbols and technologies were transmitted at times when first incipient and then developed Egyptian elites could adapt and apply them effectively. Theoretical approaches to the origins of states and civilizations have allowed for similar structural and even expansionary dynamics (Algaze 1993b), but there is little to account for highly contingent relationships between core civilizations. The above does not suggest that Mesopotamia originated or inspired Egypt. Rather, it was able to provide a contribution to a local evolutionary trajectory already under way. While that contribution was symbolically critical, it did not initiate or fundamentally redirect local patterns, such as the emphasis on mortuary behavior, elaborate animal iconography, and of course kingship ideologies, in an organizational or cultural sense. These are distinctively Egyptian.

Addressing cross-cultural linkages remains a developing area for evolutionary theory. Several categories of intersocietal interaction have been employed by archaeologists: diffusion/migration models (which may include warfare), economic models, including colonial, imperial, and "world-systems" approaches, and symbolic/ideological models (e.g., Schortman and Urban 1992, Cusick 1998). While other categories are possible, it is apparent that the study of relationships between cultures or societies mirrors basic theoretical divisions found in other areas of archaeology privileging spatial and demographic, economic, and ideational factors, respectively. An overarching question is whether any one framework is capable of characterizing accurately the variety of ancient intersocietal relationships and whether it can adequately incorporate these data into larger theories

of sociocultural evolution. Similarly, the questions of modeling interaction primarily as elite instrument or as an emergent property of social and economic systems and explaining household compliance with new sociopolitical ideological structures reflect long-standing issues of agency and process and of coercions and benefits.

No new theory of intersocietal interaction and social evolution is offered here; indeed, it may be argued that no single theory is possible. Several features of a more inclusive approach may be at least outlined. The first is the broad geographic and temporal perspective, explicit in the world-systems and Annales approaches, that will allow us to capture such far-flung, long-term, and/or evanescent relationships as are described here. At issue are the contexts and units of analysis appropriate for addressing social evolution, and the case discussed here indicates that the net should be cast widely,(10.)

A second feature is an appreciation of core civilizations as open systems whose development was contingent on inputs from both small and large neighbors (e.g., Cohen 1983). The suggestion that intersocietal relations have distinct patterns of directionality, in this case from Mesopotamia to Egypt, does not, however, indicate a hidden diffusionist agenda. Nor does it suggest a single process of world-system growth around a concept of "accumulation" (e.g., Frank and Gill 1993) or, indeed, any measurable economic motive or mechanism. Distance was an insurmountable barrier to bulk trade in the Bronze Age and in prehistory, but regimes of value were generated around the movement of specialized commodities and luxury goods whose impact and "meaning" were highly varied (Edens and Kohl 1993). Finally, a sense of directionality in the development of core civilizations and their intersocietal contacts does not necessarily entail distance thresholds with varying levels of exchange symmetry or uniform patterns of radiation into surrounding areas (cf. Renfrew 1975, Stein 1988).

Directional processes are also implicit in "civilizationist" approaches, macrohistorical and sociological studies which often regard civilizations as equivalent to world systems or posit a single or a limited number of world systems (e.g., Sanderson 1995). While such approaches may offer comparative insights, they are incapable of explaining specific patterns or relationships because they lack an archaeological or materialist orientation. As the example discussed here shows, the vectors of intersocietal contacts may be slight and sporadic but still have great resonance. Similarly, even relationships between core and periphery can have unexpected and counterintuitive elements (Joffe 1993).

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

Third, in any new approach to social evolution, technologies, styles, and symbolism must be examined along with luxury and bulk goods. The renewed attention being given by archaeologists to symbolism is a valuable complement to materialist approaches, which have dominated intersocietal studies in particular (Robb 1998). A number of studies by M. Helms (1988, 1992, 1993) and Sherratt (1993, 1994, 1997) are valuable examples in these respects.

Finally, any new theoretical approach must include and account for what archaeologists do best, contending with space-time systematics and material culture. If the example of the Egyptian-Uruk relationship indicates anything it is that renewed attention to chronologies can unlock a variety of doors.

(1.) [C] 2000 by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. All rights reserved 0011-3204/2000/4101-0006\$1.00. I thank Guillermo Algaze, Norman Yoffee, John Baines, Stan Hedrickx, Toby Wilkinson, Henry Wright, Mitchell Rothman, and P. R. S. Moorey for their helpful comments. The figures were redrafted by Kurt Lupinsky.

(2.) See the abstracts and chronological chart at <http://www.science.widener.edu/ssci/mesopotamia/>.

(3) Several different types of conical clay objects from Tell el-Fara'in/ Buto called by the excavator (after the Mesopotamian terms) Mosaikstifte, Grubenkopfnagel, and Tonflaschen have been proposed as reflecting Mesopotamian inspiration (von der Way 1992, 1993, 1997; Kohler 1998; see also Moorey 1987, 1990, 1995). The suggestion that the small terracotta "cones" represent any Mesopotamian connection has been rejected by Faltings and Kohler (1996: 98-99; Faltings 1998:374-75), who sees them instead as miniature vessels imitating a Levantine Chalcolithic form called the cornet. This is highly unlikely from the Levantine perspective. Toby Wilkinson (1998, personal communication; cf. Faltings 1998:375) points out that the objects in question are distributed across 4th- and 3rd-millennium strata at the site and that most have plausible local derivation. Only the Mosaikstifte may be Mesopotamia-derived via Syria. See, for example, the use of the technique at Hassek Huyuk (Behm-Blancke 1989)

(4.) Radiocarbon dates from Abydos Tomb U-j have been used to suggest a still higher chronology for Naqada IIIa2, ca. 3300 B.c. and for the earliest hieroglyphic writing and the appearance of niched brick architecture. The two assays are Hd-12953 (4,470 [+ or -] 30 B.P.) and Hd-12954 (4,595 [+ or -] 25 B.P.), both on samples of *Acacia nilotica* (Boehmer, Dreyer, and Kromer 1993;

Gorsdorf, Dreyer, and Hartung 1998a, b). No tree-ring count could be established (since acacia is a ring-porous wood and does not form regular annual growth rings), but it is claimed that the wood used for tomb construction was typically 10-20 years old and that reuse of wood for important tombs was unlikely. All these claims are problematic, and a date between 3100 and 3200 for Tomb U-j, as initially suggested in Boehmer, Dreyer, and Kromer (1993), is to be preferred.

(5.) Von der Way and Kohler interpreted several sherds at Tell el-Fara'in/Buto as atypical examples of Amuq F "spiral reserve ware" (Kohler 1992:21-22; 1998:37-39) and regarded them as evidence of seaborne contacts with the northern Levant. More recent excavations revealed complete vessels which Faltings plausibly interprets as deriving from the southern Levantine Chalcolithic culture (Faltings 1998:366-71).

(6.) In a personal communication, John Baines notes that the level of environmental risk inherent in the flood regime of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley parallels that of Egypt, suggesting a similar conceptual foundation for the master of animals motif.

(7.) In a personal communication, Henry Wright points out that bricklaying is typically learned through apprenticeship and the repetition of motor skills. He therefore suggests the presence of Syrian craftsmen in the Nile Valley, but the possibility that such skills were learned by Egyptians resident in Syria should also be considered.

(8.) One possibility is that the pastoral and dry-farming economies in western Syria were largely redundant with those found closer to the primary Tigris and Euphrates trade routes and settlements. That Uruk settlement had some general catalytic effect on the emergence of urbanism there, however, can hardly be doubted (see, generally, Mazzoni 1991).

(9.) For an important comparative study of Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilizations, see Baines and Yoffee (1998).

(10.) Note, for example, the discovery of Uruk-like (or Proto-Elamite) bevel-rim bowls in Baluchistan and the implications for the origins of Harappan civilization (Benseval 1994).

References Cited

ALGAZE, GUILLERMO. 1993a. The Uruk world system: The dynamics of expansion of early Mesopotamian civilization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

--. 1993b. Expansionary dynamics of some early pristine states. *American Anthropologist* 95:304-33.

ALGAZE, GUILLERMO, T. D'ALTROY, M. FRANGIPANE, H. NISSEN, H. PITTMAN, S. POLLOCK, M. ROTHMAN, G. SCHWARTZ, G. STEIN, AND H. WRIGHT. 1998. Mesopotamia in the era of state formation. *Precis of an advanced seminar held at the School of American Research, March 5.*
<http://www.science.widener.edu/ssci/mesopotamia/>.

AMIRAN, RUTH. 1970. "The beginnings of urbanization in Canaan," in *Near Eastern archaeology in the twentieth century: Essays in honor of Nelson Glueck*. Edited by J. A. Sanders, pp. 83-100. Garden City: Doubleday

--. 1992. "Petrie's F-Ware," in *The Nile Delta in transition: 4th-3rd millennium B.c.* Edited by E. C. M. van den Brink, pp. 427-32. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

ARCHI, ALPHONSO. 1987. "Reflections on the systems of weights from Ebla," in *Eblaitica: Essays on the Ebla archives and Eblaite language*, vol. 3 Edited by C. H. Gordon, G. A. Rendsburg, and N. H. Winter, pp. 47-89. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

ASTOUR, MICHAEL C. 1992 "An outline of the history of Ebla (part I)," in *Eblaitica: Essays on the Ebla archives and Eblaite language*, vol. 3. Edited by C. H. Gordon and G. A. Rendsberg, pp. 3-82. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

BAINES, JOHN. 1995a. "Kingship, definition of culture, and legitimation," in *Ancient Egyptian kingship: New investigations*. Edited by D. O'Connor and D. P. Silverman, pp. 3-47. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

--. 1995b. "The origins of kingship in Egypt," in *Ancient Egyptian kingship: New investigations*. Edited by D. O'Connor and D. P. Silverman, pp. 95-156. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

BAINES, JOHN AND NORMAN YOFFEE. 1998. "Order, legitimacy, and wealth in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia," in *Archaic states*. Edited by G. M. Feinman and J. Marcus, pp. 199-260. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

BARD, KATHRYN A. 1992a. Toward an interpretation of the role of ideology in the evolution of complex society in Egypt. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 11:1-24.

--. 1992b. "Origins of Egyptian writing," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 297-306. Oxford:

Oxbow Books.

--. 1994a. The Egyptian Predynastic: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 21:265-88.

--. 1994b. From farmers to pharaohs: Mortuary evidence for the rise of complex society in Egypt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

BAUMGARTEL, ELISE J. 1955. 2d revised edition. The cultures of prehistoric Egypt, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BAVAY, LAURENT. 1997. *Matiere premiere et commerce a longue distance: Le lapis-lazuli et l'Egypte predynastique*. *Archeo-Nil* 7:79-100.

BEHM-BLANKE, MANFRED R. 1989. Mosaikstifte aus der Uruk-Zeit am Oberen Euphrat. *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 39: 79-83.

BENSEVAL, R. 1994. "The 1992-1993 field season at Miri-Qalat: New contributions to the chronology of protohistoric settlement in Pakistani Makran," in *South Asian archaeology 1993*. Edited by A. Parpola and P. Koskikallio, pp. 81-91. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

BETTS, ALISON V. G. Editor. 1991. *Excavations at Jawa 1972-86: Stratigraphy, pottery, and other finds*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

BOEHMER, RAINER M. 1974a. Das Rollsiegel im prädynastischen Ägypten. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 4:495-514.

--. 1974b. Orientalische Einfluss auf verzeigten Messergriffen aus dem prädynastische Ägypten. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran* 7:15-40.

--. 1991. [sup.14]C-daten aus Uruk und Abydos: Ägyptisches (?) im frühen Nordsyrien, Sumer und Elam. *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 22:223-30.

BOEHMER, RAINER M., G. DREYER, AND B. KROMER. 1993. Einige frühzeitliche [sup.14]C-Datierungen aus Abydos und Uruk. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 49:63-68.

BOESE, JOHANNES. 1995. *Ausgrabungen in Tell Sheikh Hassan*. Vol. 1. Vorbericht über die Kampagnen 1984-1990 und 1992-94. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücken Druckerei und Verlag.

BRINK, EDWIN C. M. VAN DEN. 1992. "Corpus and

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

numerical evaluation of the Thinite potmarks," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 265-96. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

--. 1993. "Settlement patterns in the northeastern Nile Delta during the fourth-second millennia B.C.," in *Environmental change and human culture in the Nile Basin and Northern Africa until the 2nd millennium B.C.* Edited by L. Krzyzaniak, M. Kobusiewicz, and J. Alexander, pp. 279-304. Poznan: Polish Academy of Sciences.

--. 1995. "The 'En Besor cylinder seal impressions in retrospect," in *Excavations at 'En Besor*. Edited by R. Gophna, pp. 201-14. Tel Aviv: Ramot Publishing.

--. 1996. "The incised serekh-signs of Dynasties 0-1, part 1: Complete vessels," in *Aspects of early Egypt*. Edited by A. J. Spencer, pp. 140-58. London: British Museum Press.

--. 1998. "Late Protodynastic-early First Dynasty Egyptian finds in late Early Bronze Age I Canaan: An update," in *Proceedings 7th International Congress of Egyptologists*. Edited by C. J. Eyre, pp. 215-25. Leuven: Peeters.

CAUVIN, JACQUES, AND D. STORDEUR. 85. Une occupation d'époque Uruk en Palmyrene: Le niveau supérieur d'el-Kown 2-Caracol. *Cahiers de l'Euphrate* 4:191-205.

CHAZAN, MICHAEL, AND M. LEHNER. 1990. An ancient analogy: Pot-baked bread in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. *Paleorient* 16:21-35.

CIALOWICZ, K. M. 1989. Les têtes de massues des périodes Prédynastique et Archaique dans la Vallée du Nil. (*Prace Archeologiczne Zeszyt 41.*) Kracow: Nakladem Uniwersytetu Jagiellonskiego.

--. 1997. Remarques sur la tête de massue du roi Scorpion *Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization*, Krakow 8:11-27.

COHEN, YEHUDI A. 1983. A theory and a model of social change and evolution. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 2:164-207.

CONTENSON, HENRI DE. 1982. Les phases préhistoriques de Ras Shamra et de l'Amuq. *Paleorient* 8:95-98.

CROWFOOT-PAYNE, JOAN. 1968. Lapis lazuli in early Egypt. *Iraq* 10:58-61.

CUSICK, J. G. Editor. 1998. *Studies in culture contact:*

Interaction, culture change, and archaeology. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

DAVIS, WHITNEY. 1989. *The canonical tradition in ancient Egyptian art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--. 1992. *Masking the blow: The scene of representation in late prehistoric Egyptian art*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

DESSEL, J. P., AND A. H. JOFFE. n.d. Intersocietal interaction and the emergence of social complexity in "core" and "periphery": Egypt and the Southern Levant in the fourth and third millennia B.C. MS.

DREYER, GUNTER. 1992. "Recent discoveries in the U-cemetery at Abydos," in *The Nile Delta in transition: 4th-3rd millennium B.C.* Edited by E. C. M. v. d. Brink, pp. 293-300. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

EDENS, CHRISTOPHER M., AND PHILIP L. KOHL. 1993. "Trade and world systems in Early Bronze Age Western Asia," in *Trade and exchange in prehistoric Europe: Proceedings of a conference held at the University of Bristol, April 1992*. Edited by C. Scarre and F. Healy, pp. 17-34. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

EMERY, WALTER B. 1949. *Great Tombs of the First Dynasty*. Vol. 1. Cairo: Government Press.

--. 1954. *Great Tombs of the First Dynasty*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Egyptian Exploration Society.

--. 1958. *Great Tombs of the First Dynasty*. Vol. 3. Oxford: Egyptian Exploration Society.

--. 1961. *Archaic Egypt*. New York: Penguin.

ENDESFELDER, ERIKA. 1984. "Social and economic development towards the end of the Predynastic period in Egypt," in *Origins and early development of food-producing cultures in northeastern Africa*. Edited by L. Krzyzaniak and M. Kobusiewicz, pp. 95-100. Poznan: Polish Academy of Sciences.

FALTINGS, D. 1998. "Recent excavations in Tell el-Fara'in/ Buto: New finds and their chronological implications," in *Proceedings, 7th International Congress of Egyptologists*. Edited by C. J. Eyre, pp. 365-75. Leuven: Peeters.

FALTINGS, D., AND E. C. KOHLER. 1996. *Vorbericht über die Ausgrabungen des DAI in Tell el-Fara'in/Buto*

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

1993 bis 1995. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo 52:87-114.

FISCHER, HENRY G. 1989. "The origin of Egyptian hieroglyphics," in *The origins of writing*. Edited by W. M. Senner, pp. 59-76. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

FRANK, ANDRE G., AND B. K. GILL. Editors. 1993. *The world system, five hundred years or five thousand?* London: Routledge.

FRANKFORT, HENRI. 1924. *Studies in early pottery of the Near East*. Vol. 1. London: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.

--. 1951. *The rise of civilization in the Near East*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

GOPHER, AVI. 1993. *Arrowheads of the Neolithic Levant*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

GORSODORF, J., G. DREYER, AND U. HARTUNG. 1998a. [sup.14]C dating of the Archaic royal necropolis Umm el-Qaab at Abydos. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo* 54:169-75.

--. 1998b. New [sup.14]C dating of the Archaic royal necropolis Umm el-Qaab at Abydos (Egypt). *Radiocarbon* 40:641-48.

HARTUNG, ULRICH. 1998. *Prädynastische Siegelabrollungen aus dem Friedhof U in Abydos (Umm el-Qaab)*. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo* 54: 187-217.

HASSAN, FEKRI A. 1992. "Primeval goddess to divine king: The mythogenesis of power in the early Egyptian state," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 307-21. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

HASSAN, FEKRI A., AND S. W. ROBINSON. 1987. High-precision radiocarbon chronometry of ancient Egypt and comparisons with Nubia, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. *Antiquity* 61:119-35.

HELMS, M. W. 1988. *Ulysses' sail: An ethnographic Odyssey of power, knowledge, and geographic distance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

--. 1992. "Long-distance contacts, elite aspirations, and the Age of Discovery in cosmological context," in *Resources, power, and interregional interaction*. Edited by E. M. Schortman and P. A. Urban, pp. 157-74. New York:

Plenum.

--. 1993. *Craft and the kingly ideal: Art, trade, and power*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

HELMS, SVEND W. 1987. Jawa, Tell Um Hammad, and the EBI/Late Chalcolithic landscape. *Levant* 19:49-81.

HENDRICKX, STAN. 1996. "The relative chronology of the Naqada culture: Problems and possibilities," in *Aspects of early Egypt*. Edited by A. J. Spencer, pp. 36-69. London: British Museum Press.

HENRICKX, STAN, AND L. BAVAY. n.d. *The relative chronological position of Egyptian Predynastic and Early Dynasty tombs with imported objects from the Near East and the nature of interregional contacts*. MS.

HENNESSY, J. B. 1967. *The foreign relations of Palestine during the Early Bronze Age*. London: Quaritch.

JAMIESON, ANDREW S. 1993. *The Euphrates Valley and Early Bronze Age ceramic traditions*. *Abr-Nahrain* 31:36-92.

JOFFE, ALEXANDER H. 1991. *Early Bronze I and the evolution of social complexity in the Southern Levant*. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 4:3-58.

--. 1993. *Settlement and society in the Early Bronze I and II of the Southern Levant: Complementarity and contradiction in a small-scale complex society*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

--. 1998. *Alcohol and social complexity in ancient Western Asia*. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 39:297-322.

--. n.d. "Early Bronze Age seal impressions from the Jezreel Valley and the problem of sealing in the Southern Levant," in *Studies in the archaeology of Israel and neighbouring lands in memory of Douglas L. Esse*. Edited by S. Wolff. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

KAISER, WERNER. 1990. *Zur Entstehung des gesamtägyptischen Staates*. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo* 46:287-99.

KANTOR, HELENE J. 1952. *Further evidence for early Mesopotamian relations with Egypt*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 11:239-50.

--. 1992. "The relative chronology of Egypt and its foreign correlations before the First Intermediate period," in *Chronologies in Old World archaeology*, 3d edition. Edited

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

by R. W. Ehrich, pp. 3-21. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

KAPLONY, PETER. 1963. Die Inschriften der ägyptischen Frühzeit. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

KEMP, BARRY J. 1990. Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a civilization. London: Routledge.

EL-KHOULI, A. 1978. Egyptian stone vessels, Predynastic period to Dynasty III. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

KOHLER, CHRISTIANA E. 1992. "The Pre- and Early Dynastic pottery of Tell el-Fara'in/Buto," in *The Nile Delta in transition: 4th-3rd millennium B.C.* Edited by E. C. M. van den Brink, pp. 11-22. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

--. 1998. Tell el-Fara'in, Buto III: Die keramik von der frühen Naqada-Kultur bis zum frühen Alten Reich (Schichten III-VI). Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

KROEPER, K., AND L. KRZYZANIAK. 1992. "Two ivory boxes from Early Dynastic graves in Minshat Abu Omar," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 207-14. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

LEEMANS, W. F. 1960. Foreign trade in the Old Babylonian period. Leiden: Brill.

LEVY, T. E., D. ALON, P. SMITH, Y. YEKUTIELI, Y. ROWAN, P. GOLDBERG, N. PORAT, E. C. M. VAN DEN BRINK, A. J. WITTEN, J. GOLDEN, C. GRIGSON, E. KANSA, L. DAWSON, A. HOLL, J. MORENO, AND M. KERSEL. 1997. Egyptian-Canaanite interaction at Nahal Tillah, Israel (ca. 4500-3000 B.C.E.): An interim report on the 1994-1995 excavations. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 307:1-51.

LIVERANI, MARIO. 1990. Prestige and interest: International relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C. Padua: Sargon.

MCCLELLAN, THOMAS L., AND A. PORTER. 1995. "Jawa and North Syria," in *Studies in the history and archaeology of Jordan 5: Art and technology throughout the ages*. Edited by K. 'Amr, F. Zayadine, and M. Zaghloul, pp. 49-65. Amman: Department of Antiquities.

MAJER, J. 1992. "The Eastern Desert and Egyptian prehistory," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 227-34. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

MARK, S. 1998. From Egypt to Mesopotamia: A study of Predynastic trade routes. College Station, Tex.: Chatham Publishing/Texas A&M University Press.

MATTHEWS, DONALD M. 1997. The early glyptic of Tell Brak: Cylinder seals of third-millennium Syria. (*Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Series Archaeologica* 15.) Fribourg and Göttingen: University Press/Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

MATTHIAS, V. T., AND P. J. PARR. 1989. The early phases at Tell Nebi Mend: A preliminary account. *Levant* 21:13-32.

MAZZONI, STEFANIA. 1991. Ebla e la formazione della cultura urbana in Siria. *La Parola del Passato* 46:163-94.

MIDANT-REYES, BEATRIX. 1987. Contribution a l'etude de la societe predynastique: Le cas du couteau "ripple-flake." *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 14:185-224.

MILLARD, ALAN R. 1988. The bevelled-rim bowls: Their purpose and significance. *Iraq* 50:49-58.

MOOREY, P. R. S. 1987. "On tracking cultural transfers in prehistory: The case of Egypt and lower Mesopotamia in the fourth millennium B.C.," in *Centre and periphery in the ancient world*. Edited by M. Rowlands, M. Larsen, and K. Kristiansen, pp. 36-46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--. 1990. From Gulf to Delta in the fourth millennium: The Syrian connection. *Eretz-Israel* 21:62*-69*.

--. 1995. From Gulf to Delta and beyond. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University Press.

NEEDLER, WINIFRED. 1984. Predynastic and Archaic Egypt in the Brooklyn Museum. (*Wilbour Monograph* 9.) New York: Brooklyn Museum.

O'CONNOR, DAVID. 1989. New funerary enclosures (Talbezirke) of the Early Dynastic period at Abydos. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 26:51-86.

PITTMAN, H. 1996. "Constructing context: The Gebel el-Arak knife, greater Mesopotamian and Egyptian interaction in the late fourth millennium B.C.E.," in *The study of the ancient Near East in the 21st Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference*. Edited by J. S. Cooper and G. M. Schwartz, pp. 9-32. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

- PODZORSKI, P. V. 1988. Predynastic Egyptian seals of known provenience in the R. H. Lowie Museum of Anthropology. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 47:259-68.
- POLLOCK, SUSAN, AND CHERYL COURSEY. 1995. Ceramics from Hacinebi Tepe: Chronology and connections. *Anatolica* 21:101-41.
- PORTUGALI, JUVAL, AND RAM GOPHNA. 1993. Crisis, progress, and urbanization: The transition from Early Bronze I to Early Bronze II in Palestine. *Tel Aviv* 20:164-86.
- POSTGATE, NICHOLAS, T. WANG, AND T. WILKINSON. 1995. The evidence for early writing: Utilitarian or ceremonial? *Antiquity* 69:459-80.
- PRAG, KAY. 1986. Byblos and Egypt in the fourth millennium B.C. *Levant* 18:59-74.
- RADWAN, A. 1983. Die Kupfer- und Bronzegefasse Agyptens, von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Spätzeit. *Prahistorische Bronzefunde* 2(2). Munich.
- RAY, J. D. 1986. The emergence of writing in Egypt. *World Archaeology* 17:307-16.
- REDFORD, DONALD B. 1986. Egypt and western Asia in the Old Kingdom. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 23:125-43.
- RENFREW, A. C. 1975. "Trade as action at a distance," in *Ancient civilization and trade*. Edited by J. A. Sabloff and C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky, pp. 3-59. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- RIZKANA, I., AND J. SEEHER. 1989. Maadi III: The nonlithic small finds and the structural remains of the Predynastic settlement. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- ROBB, JOHN A. 1998. The archaeology of symbols. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27:326-46.
- SAFAR, FUAD, M. A. MUSTAFA, AND S. LLOYD. 1981. Eridu. Baghdad: State Organization of Antiquities and Heritage.
- SANDERS, WILLIAM T. 1992. "Ranking and stratification in Prehispanic Mesoamerica," in *Mesoamerican elites: An archaeological perspective*. Edited by D. Z. Chase and A. F. Chase, pp. 278-91. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- SANDERSON, STEPHEN K. Editor. 1995. *Civilizations and world systems: Studying world-historical change*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press.
- SCANDONE-MATTHIAE, GABRIELLA. 1981. I vasi egiziani in pietra del Palazzo Reale G. *Studi Eblaiti* 4:99-127.
- . 1982. "Inscriptions royales égyptiennes de l'ancien empire a Ebla," in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*. Edited by H-J. Nissen and J. Renger, pp. 125-30. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- SCHORTMAN, E. M., AND P. A. URBAN. Editors. 1992. *Resources, power, and interregional interaction*. New York: Plenum.
- SEEHER, J. 1990. Maadi, eine prädynastische kulturgruppe zwischen Oberägypten und Palästina. *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 65:123-56.
- . 1991. Gedanken zur Rolle Unterägyptens bei der Herausbildung des Pharaonenreiches. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Kairo* 47:313-18.
- SHERRATT, ANDREW. 1993. What would a Bronze-Age world system look like? Relations between temperate Europe and the Mediterranean in later prehistory. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1:1-57.
- . 1994. "Core, periphery, and margin: Perspectives on the Bronze Age," in *Development and decline in the Mediterranean Bronze Age: Perspectives on the Bronze Age*. Edited by C. Mathers and S. Stoddart, pp. 335-45. Sheffield: J. R. Collis.
- . 1997. "Changing perspectives on European prehistory," in *Economy and society in prehistoric Europe: Changing perspectives*. Edited by A. Sherratt, pp. 1-37. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- SIEVERTSEN, U. 1992. Das Messer vom Gebel el-Arak. *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 23:1-75
- SMITH, H. S. 1992. "The making of Egypt: A review of the influence of Susa and Sumer on Upper Egypt and Lower Nubia in the fourth millennium B.C.," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 235-46. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- SPENCER, A. J. 1993. *Early Egypt: The rise of civilisation in the Nile Valley*. London: British Museum Press.

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

STEIN, GIL. 1998. "World systems theory and alternative modes of interaction in the archaeology of culture contact," in *Studies in culture contact: Interaction, culture change, and archaeology*. Edited by J. Cusick, pp. 220-55. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

STROMMINGER, EVA. 1979. "Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Habuba Kabira," in *Excavation reports from the Tabqa Dam Project--Euphrates Valley, Syria*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 44.

SURENHAGEN, D. 1974/75. Untersuchungen zur Keramikproduktion innerhalb der Spät-Urukzeitlichen Siedlung Habuba Kabira-Süd in Nordsyrien. *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 5/6:43-164.

TEISSIER, BEATRICE. 1987. Glyptic evidence for a connection between Iran, Syro-Palestine, and Egypt in the fourth and third millennia. *Iran* 25:27-53.

THUESEN, INGOLF. 1988. Hama I: The pre- and protohistoric periods. Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet.

--. 1989. "Diffusion of 'Ubaid pottery into Western Syria," in *Upon this foundation: The 'Ubaid reconsidered*. Edited by E. F. Henrickson and I. Thuesen, pp. 419-37. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

TRIGGER, BRUCE G. 1998. Writing systems: A case study in cultural evolution. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 31: 39-62.

VALLET, R. 1997. Habuba Kabira, ou La naissance de l'urbanisme. *Paleorient* 22:45-76.

VON DER WAY, THOMAS. 1992. "Indication of architecture with niches at Buto," in *The followers of Horus: Studies dedicated to Michael Allen Hoffman*. Edited by R. Friedman and B. Adams, pp. 217-26. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

--. 1993. *Untersuchungen zur Spätvor- und Frühgeschichte Unteragyptens*. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag.

--. Editor. 1997. *Tell el-Fara'in, Buto I: Ergebnisse zum frühen Kontext Kampagnen der Jahre 1983-1989*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

WARD, WILLIAM A. 1963. Egypt and the East Mediterranean from predynastic times to the end of the Old Kingdom. *Journal of the Social and Economic History*

of the Orient 6:1-57.

WEEKS, KENT R. 1972. Preliminary report on the first two seasons of excavations at Hierakonpolis. Part 2. The Early Dynastic palace. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 9:29-33.

WETTERSTROM, W. 1993. "Foraging and farming in Egypt: The transition from hunting and gathering to horticulture in the Nile Valley," in *The archaeology of Africa: Food, metals, and towns*. Edited by T. Shaw, P. Sinclair, B. Andah, and A. Okpoko, pp. 165-226. London: Routledge.

WILKINSON, TOBY A. H. 1996. *State formation in Egypt: Chronology and society* (Cambridge Monographs in African Archaeology 40.) Oxford: Tempus Reparatum.

--. 1998. Review of: *Untersuchungen zur Spätvor- und Frühgeschichte Unteragyptens*, by T. von de Way (Heidelberg: Heidelberg Orientverlag, 1993). *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 55:109-13.

WILLIAMS, BRUCE B. 1977. "Aspects of sealing and glyptic in Egypt before the New Kingdom," in *Seals and sealings in the ancient Near East*. Edited by M. Gibson and R. D. Biggs, pp. 135-40. Malibu: Undena.

WILLIAMS, BRUCE B., AND T. J. LOGAN. 1987. The Metropolitan Museum knife handle and aspects of Pharaonic imagery before Narmer. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 46: 245-82.

WRIGHT, HENRY, AND ERIC RUPLEY. n.d. "Calibrated radiocarbon age determinations of Uruk-related assemblages," in *Uruk Mesopotamia and its neighbors: Cross-cultural interactions and their consequences in the era of state formation*. Edited by M. Rothman. Santa Fe: SAR Press.

YANNAI, ELI. 1995. Preliminary summary of EB strata and burials at 'Ein Assawir, and observations pertaining to EBA pottery. Paper presented at the Workshop on Early Bronze Age Pottery in the Southern Levant, University of Durham, July.

ZARINS, JURIS. 1989. "Ancient Egypt and the Red Sea trade: The case for obsidian in the Predynastic and Archaic periods," in *Essays in ancient civilizations presented to Helene J. Kantor*. Edited by B. B. Williams and J. A. Leonard, pp. 339-68. Chicago: Oriental Institute.

ALEXANDER H. JOFFE Department of Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa. 16802,

Egypt and Syro-Mesopotamia in the 4th Millennium: Implications of the New Chronology(1).

U.S.A. (axj10@psu.edu). 14 IV 99