

## THE CANAANITE GOD HAURON AND HIS CULT IN EGYPT

*By* Jacobus van Dijk

The Canaanite god Hauron is a relative newcomer to the field of Egyptian religion. Although his name has been familiar to Egyptologists since 1860, when Chabas published his masterly edition of the Harris Magical Papyrus<sup>1</sup>, it was not until the middle of the 1930's that he was recognized as a Canaanite deity worshipped in New Kingdom Egypt. At that time Montet had found a large statue at Tanis showing a falcon-god Hauron protecting Ramesses II, depicted as a child-god. Montet's publication of the statue in 1935<sup>2</sup> was immediately followed by an important article by Albright<sup>3</sup> who was the first to try to make a synthesis of what was at that time known about the god from both North-West Semitic and Egyptian sources. Unfortunately, this was very little indeed and, although Albright's theories were as brilliant as their spiritual father, they were nevertheless conjectural and speculative. Since then the material has been increased considerably, notably by Selim Hassan's work around the Great Sphinx at Giza, and by the prolonged French excavations at Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Despite all this, however, Stadelmann, in his important monograph *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten*, had to conclude that "if one makes an attempt to characterize the god Hauron on the basis of the extant material, it becomes apparent that very few certain conclusions can be drawn"<sup>4</sup>. It is impossible to review even briefly all of the Semitic and Egyptian evidence on Hauron here. Instead, I shall enumerate, in the briefest possible way, the evidence that was available when Stadelmann wrote his book (1960), and then concentrate on the more recent discoveries.

Our sources for Hauron begin in the second millennium when two petty kings of Canaanite cities, mentioned in the Middle Kingdom *Ächtungstexte* from Saqqara studied by Posener, bear the name *Hw3ny-ibwm*<sup>5</sup>. In both cases

<sup>1</sup> F. Chabas, *Le Papyrus Magique Harris* (Châlon-sur-Saône, 1860).

<sup>2</sup> P. Montet, "Les fouilles de Tanis en 1933 et 1934", *Kâmi* 5 (1935), 11-14, Pls. X-XI; P. Montet and P. Bucher, "Un dieu cananéen à Tanis : Houroun de Ramsès", *RB* 44 (1935), 153-165, Pls. V-VI.

<sup>3</sup> W. F. Albright, "The Canaanite God Haurôn (Hôrôn)", *ASL* 53 (1936), 1-12.

<sup>4</sup> R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-Palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten* (Leiden, 1967), 80.

<sup>5</sup> G. Posener, *Princes et pays de l'Asie et de la Nubie* (Bruxelles, 1940), 74 (E17) & 92 (E59).

the reading of the name is not quite certain, but among contemporary names from Mari the name *Ḥawranabi* ("Ḥauron is father") occurs<sup>6</sup>, which increases the probability of Posener's reading. Other sources from outside Egypt include a few personal names like *Bn-Hrn*<sup>7</sup> and *ʿbd-Ḥwrn*<sup>8</sup> and the toponym *בית הדרן* attested in the OT<sup>9</sup>, in a Hebrew ostrakon from Tell Qasile<sup>10</sup>, and in Shoshenk's topographical list at Karnak<sup>11</sup>. More important is a 7th century amulet from Arslan Taş<sup>12</sup> near the present day Syrian-Turkish border, the ancient Assyrian colony Ḥadattu; it is inscribed with an incantation against evil demons who are dispelled by Baʿal and by Ḥauron and his seven wives. Then there is an execration formula, found twice in the mythological texts from Ugarit<sup>13</sup>, in which Ḥauron is called upon to smash the skull of an enemy who tries to dethrone the legitimate king. Finally, there is a Greek votive inscription of ca.100 B.C. found on the island of Delos<sup>14</sup>; seafarers from the harbour of Iamnia on the Palestinian coast express in this inscription their gratefulness to their native gods Herakles (Melqart) and *Αύρανας* (Hauron), possibly for a safe journey.

In 1961 a new pair of texts was found at Ras Shamra. One of these<sup>15</sup> is very fragmentary, and if only this tablet had been found it would not tell us

<sup>6</sup> Cf. H. B. Huffmon, *Amarite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study* (Baltimore, 1956), 32 & 192.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Rom, 1967), 424.

<sup>8</sup> On a seal formerly in the Schlumberger collection, see Ch. Clermont-Ganneau, *Journal Asiatique*, VIII<sup>e</sup> Série, t.1 (1983), 141 (No. 17); the seal is of Israelite origin, despite F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Rome, 1972), 155 & 199, who considers this name as the sole example (!) of a Phoenician name with *mater lectiones* (*w*).

<sup>9</sup> L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, 1958), 124; cf. Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible: a Historical Geography* (London, 1966), 55.

<sup>10</sup> J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions I* (Oxford, 1973<sup>2</sup>), 15-17 (with bibliography).

<sup>11</sup> *Reliefs and Inscriptions at Karnak*, III : *The Bubastite Portal*, by the Epigraphic Survey of the University of Chicago (Chicago, 1954), Pls. 2-3 (No. 24).

<sup>12</sup> R. du Mesnil du Buisson, "Une tablette magique de la région du Moyen Euphrate", in : *Mélanges offerts à M. René Dussaud I* (Paris, 1939), 421-434; cf. Gibson, *o.c.*, III (Oxford, 1982), 78ff.

<sup>13</sup> *KTU* 1. 16 : vi, 54-57 and 1. 2 : i, 7-8 (damaged).

<sup>14</sup> A. Plassart, *Les sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe*, *Exploration archéologique de Délos XI* (Paris, 1928), 279.

<sup>15</sup> *KTU* 1. 107 (RS 24. 251).

very much. The matching tablet, however, is one of the most beautifully preserved Ugaritic texts<sup>16</sup>. Even so, it is, alas, a very difficult text indeed, as may be indicated by the fact that since its first publication in 1968<sup>17</sup> more than twenty commentaries have appeared, and this stream of publications is still going on<sup>18</sup>. The text is usually interpreted as an incantation against snake-bite, although some scholars would rather view it as a mythological poem, an interpretation which I myself think is more likely<sup>19</sup>. The poem relates how the goddess of love and fertility, who is called Menītu (*Mnt*)<sup>20</sup> "the Beloved One" in the text and who is probably identical with Athiratu, the great mother-goddess of the Ugaritic pantheon, is bitten by a vigorous snake which has just renewed its skin and is hungry and full of poison<sup>21</sup>. Menītu calls upon the sun-goddess Shapshu, the messenger of the gods, to ask them to cure her. Ten different divinities are invoked, but none of them is able to remove the poison of the snake. In the end Shapshu turns to Hauron (Hōranu in Ugaritic) and this god succeeds. In return for a "harlot's fee", consisting of snakes and vipers, he is finally allowed to make love to Menītu. Without going into detail concerning the interpretation of this text, it is clear that Hauron appears here as the magician among the gods who has power over snakes and other dangerous animals. In addition to this, we learn something about the god's abode : Hauron is said to dwell in a *mṣd*, a term used both in Biblical Hebrew (מַסְדָּ) and in Akkadian (*maṣadu*) for a hiding place, usually in the desert or in the mountains, used by hunters, robbers or refugees. In the OT the term is used for the caves in which David hid from Saul before he became king<sup>22</sup>. Hauron's *mṣd* is situated in the "City of the East" (\*r d qdm), an

<sup>16</sup> KTU 1. 100 (RŠ 24. 244).

<sup>17</sup> Ch. Vroilleaud, in *Ugaritica* V (Paris, 1968), 564-580 (No. 7).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 12 (1980), 153 n.1 for bibliographical references.

<sup>19</sup> A detailed account of the various interpretations of the text, including my own views, will appear in my forthcoming book (see postscript). The latest translation and discussion of the text is the one in J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Leiden, 1987), 146-156.

<sup>20</sup> In taking *mnt* as the name of a goddess and not as a word meaning "incantation" (Akk. *minūtu*), as most commentators do, I follow a suggestion of Y. Avishur, *UF* 4 (1972), 3 n.16, although this author still derives the name of the goddess from Akk. *manū* "count", "recite". *Menītu* occurs in Mesopotamian religion as an epithet of Ištar (from *menū/manū* "love"), cf. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, 1938), 373 - and CAD M/ii, 98.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. P. Bordueuil, *UF* 15 (1983), 299-300.

<sup>22</sup> 1 Sam. 23, 14, 19; 24, 1. Cf. Koehler/Baumgartner, *a.c.*, 555.

unmistakable reference to the Underworld, the realm of the dead<sup>23</sup>. It seems likely, therefore, that Ḥauron is primarily a chthonic deity who dwells in the caverns of the mountains and the desert and who has power over the evil forces lurking in these dangerous places, snakes and other noxious animals, but also over the demons and evil spirits of the Underworld, and indeed enemies in general, who represent the powers of chaos that threaten to overthrow the ordered world. This interpretation is supported by the Ugaritic execration formula already mentioned, as well as by the Arslan Taş amulet. Moreover, a fragmentary Hittite text<sup>24</sup> also mentions Ḥauron (*Ḥuranus*) in a context dealing with noxious animals, and he appears again in a recently discovered Ugaritic incantation against "flying demons" from Ras Ibn Hanī<sup>25</sup>. Another inscription, found in the Punic settlement at Antas on Sardinia<sup>26</sup> shows that Ḥauron was associated with the Punic god Šid, whose name means "Hunter" (derived from the same root as *msd*) and who is equated with Herakles-Melqart, the god of the Underworld. In Palestine Ḥauron was worshipped at Bet-Ḥoron, a place situated in a mountainous area well-known for its many caves and caverns. Indeed, Ḥauron's name is almost certainly related to the root *ḥwr*, as was already surmised by Albright, a root meaning "depth", "bottom", attested, for example, in Hebrew חֹר / חוֹר "cave", "hole (of a snake)".

The Egyptian sources concerning Ḥauron can be divided into three categories. The first of these consists of material from Upper Egypt, i.e. mainly from the Theban West Bank. Here Ḥauron was identified with the god Shed, "the Saviour", a hypostatization of an aspect of Horus. Amulets from Deir el-Medīna show both Ḥauron and Shed, who are given the double names of Ḥauron-Shed and Shed-Ḥauron, respectively<sup>27</sup>. Ḥauron is depicted as a falcon holding snakes under its talons. Comparison with iconographical parallels reveals that both Ḥauron and Shed were related to one particular

<sup>23</sup> Cf. e.g. W. Sladek, *Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1974), 61-63.

<sup>24</sup> *KUB* xxxvi, 39-40.

<sup>25</sup> P. Bordreuil and A. Caquot, *Syria* 56 (1980), 346-350 & 368 fig. 3; cf. J. C. de Moor, *UF* 12 (1980), 429-432 and id., *JÉOL* 27 (1981-1982), 114-115.

<sup>26</sup> M. Fantar, in: E. Acquaro, *Ricerche puniche ad Antas*, *Studi semitici* 30 (Roma, 1969), 76-77 (Nos. VI + XIII); cf. M. Szymer, *Karthago* 15 (1969-1970), 67-74; M. L. Uberti, *AION* 38 (1978), 315-319.

<sup>27</sup> B. Bruyère, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el-Médineh (1933/34-1935)* II, *FIFAO* 15 (Le Caire, 1937), 18, fig. 7: 2-3.

form of Horus, viz. Horus-Lord of the Desert (*nb ḥst, ḥqj ḥst*), who appears to have been a member of a triad consisting of Horus-Lord of the Desert (sometimes replaced by Harsiese), Isis and Shed<sup>28</sup>. Shed too is a god of the desert who has power over the dangerous animals living there; he "comes from the desert with the sound Udjat-Eye to protect this house", as a stela from Deir el-Medīna says<sup>29</sup>. In the Harris Magical Papyrus, likewise from the Theban West Bank, Ḥauron is invoked in two spells to protect cattle against predators "who eat flesh and drink blood" and who are summoned back to the desert where they belong<sup>30</sup>. These spells have an unmistakable Asiatic flavour, as is apparent from the fact that in addition to Ḥauron, 'Anat and Resheph<sup>31</sup> are mentioned, and that one of the voracious animals cursed in the spells is the Syrian bear (*ḥtm*) which did not occur in Egypt<sup>32</sup>. Clearly then, the Upper Egyptian material agrees perfectly with the evidence from sources outside Egypt; again Ḥauron is shown to be a god of the desert who affords protection against its inhabitants.

Another group of material comes from various sources in the Delta, where Ḥauron appears to have been associated with the military outposts controlling the desert routes. Thus a fragment of a votive sphinx with the inscription "Ḥauron of the Lebanon" was found at Tell el-Maskhuta<sup>33</sup>, which means that, like the other Ramesside remains there, it may originally have come from Tell er-Retabe in the Wādī Tumilat. At the other end of the Delta a granite column inscribed with the names of Ramesses II "beloved of Ḥauron" was found in the military outpost at El-Gharbanyat to the west of Alexandria<sup>34</sup>. In view of what has been said so far, I would be inclined to believe that here too Ḥauron was worshipped as a desert-god, protecting not only against snakes and scorpions, but also against the enemies coming from the desert to raid Egypt. This may be the reason why a statue of Ḥauron was erected at Pi-Ramesses, which was later removed to Tanis,

<sup>28</sup> Bruyère, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el-Médīneh (1935-1940)* III, FIFAO 20 (Le Caire, 1952), 165 ff.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 142, fig. 18.

<sup>30</sup> mag. pHarris vs. 10, 1-11, 9.

<sup>31</sup> At least when one accepts the emendation proposed by Grdseloff and Leibovitch (*ASAE* 44, 170) who read *Ršp* for *Hry-š.f.*

<sup>32</sup> Cf. G. Posener, *OrNS* 13 (1944), 193-204.

<sup>33</sup> Unpublished, see for the text J. Leibovitch, *ASAE* 44 (1944), 171 and *KRI* II, 405.

<sup>34</sup> L. Habachi, *BIFAO* 80 (1980), 23-25, fig. 6.

where it was found by Montet. In a recent article Stadelmann has suggested that the original provenance of this statue was Gîza<sup>35</sup>. He connects it with several monuments of Ramesses II in the *temenos* of the Great Sphinx and thinks the statue might originally have been erected in a chapel between the paws of the Sphinx. This does not seem very likely, however, since all of Ramesses' II monuments from Gîza<sup>36</sup> can be assigned to his Year 1, either from an actual year-date or from the early form of the nomen (*R'-ms-s(w)*), without the addition of *stp.n R'*, whereas the cartouches on the Hauron statue not only add this epithet, but also display the change from *R'-ms-s(w)* to *R'-ms-sw* which took place in the second decade of Ramesses' reign as sole king<sup>37</sup>. It is therefore of a later date than the monuments of that king at Gîza and it seems much more likely that it came from Pi-Ramesse like the majority of the Ramesside remains found at Tanis. That this falcon statue of Hauron was not just worshipped as a royal god ("Königsgott") but also as a "Volksgott", to use the distinction made by Stadelmann, may perhaps be derived from a votive stela of unknown provenance in the Kestner Museum in Hannover<sup>38</sup>. It shows Hauron as a falcon on a shrine-shaped pedestal, holding a uraeus under its talons; in front of the god stands the "bee-keeper of Amun of *ḥ-ḥt-w*, Khonsu" and his wife Iuy. Since *ḥ-ḥt-w*, "Great-of-Victories", is a name of Pi-Ramesse in its function as a military settlement controlling the ways to Syria-Palestine, I would suggest that this stela comes from Pi-Ramesse and that the statue of Hauron adored by the bee-keeper Khonsu is none other than the statue found by Montet at Tanis. Another testimony of the cult of Hauron at Pi-Ramesse is a votive stela from Qantîr dedicated by the officer Tjener-Ra'messu<sup>39</sup>, which shows Hauron in the company of Amun and Resheph.

<sup>35</sup> R. Stadelmann, "Ramses II., Hermachis und Hauron", in: *Form und Mass. Beiträge zur Literatur, Sprache und Kunst des alten Ägypten. Festschrift für Gerhard Fecht (...)*, ÄAT 12 (Wiesbaden, 1987), 436-449.

<sup>36</sup> *KRI* II, 337-338 and Chr. M. Zivie, *Gîza au deuxième millénaire* (Le Caire, 1976), 192-201 (NE 53-55; in my opinion the unprovenanced NE 56 is not necessarily from Gîza; it looks more like part of a funerary monument [the falcon-headed sphinx is called "Horus Son of Osiris, Lord of Rosetau"], perhaps from Saqqâra).

<sup>37</sup> See K. A. Kitchen, in: *Ägypten und Kusch. [Fs. F. Hintze]* (Berlin, 1977), 220 and A. J. Spalinger, *JEA* 66 (1980), 95-97.

<sup>38</sup> Inv. No. 1935.200.218. Unpublished, but cf. P. Munro, in: *Städteleil Jahrbuch* NF 3 (1971), 34 (No. 31).

<sup>39</sup> Leibovitch, *o.c.*, 163-172, Pl. XIV; *KRI* III, 266. The name is damaged but it appears to read *Inr-R'mssw* rather than *Inr-hr*-[...].

The third, and by far the largest, group of documents regarding Ḥauron originates from Gīza, where he was identified with the god Harmakhis, the Great Sphinx<sup>40</sup>. I will not dwell too long on this material, but rather concentrate on the problem of the reason for this identification. Many different explanations have been given for it, the most common one being that there was a phonetic similarity between the names of Ḥauron and Horus<sup>41</sup>. Attractive as this theory may sound, it is in fact difficult to accept, for the Great Sphinx is never simply called Horus but always Harmakhis, as is testified by numerous votive stelae and other monuments from Gīza. According to another theory, Ḥauron as a god of the dead was connected with the Sphinx as an image of Atum, the Sun-god going to rest in the western horizon<sup>42</sup>. But the Sphinx is not just a representation of Atum; he is called Rē'-Ḥarakhty as well, and the famous Dream-Stela of Tuthmosis IV calls him Harmakhis-Khepri-Rē'-Atum, i.e. Harmakhis as the Sun-god in all his phases<sup>43</sup>.

In the light of the evidence from Near-Eastern and Egyptian sources outlined so far, I think the reason for the identification of Ḥauron with the Great Sphinx lies in the simple fact that the Sphinx was situated in the desert. We should not forget that during its long history the sphinx was buried time and again by the sands of the desert. Moreover, the New Kingdom settlement at Gīza was situated at a much higher level than that of the location of the Sphinx. Thus Asiatic immigrants visiting Giza were confronted with a large divine statue situated in a depression in the desert, perhaps partly buried in the sand, which was worshipped by Egyptian pilgrims, and this sight reminded them of their own god Ḥauron, whose abode they knew was the desert. Already Selim Hassan, who did not yet know of the Ugaritic evidence, mentioned Albright's derivation of Ḥauron's name from *hwr* "depth" and then remarked that "this leads us once more to the Sphinx in its depression in the Libyan Plateau"<sup>44</sup>. That the Egyptians themselves were aware of this aspect of the Sphinx is evident from a number of stelae which

<sup>40</sup> The material has been published in S. Hassan, *The Great Sphinx and its Secrets*, Excavations at Giza VIII (Cairo, 1953); see also Zivie, *o.c.*

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Albright, *AUSL* 53 (1936), 3; A. H. Gardiner, *The Wilbour Papyrus* II (Oxford, 1948), 216.

<sup>42</sup> W. Helck, *OrAnt* 5 (1966), 12.

<sup>43</sup> *Urk.* IV 1542, 17.

<sup>44</sup> Hassan, *o.c.*, 253.

call Harmakhis *nb ḥst* "Lord of the Desert" or *ḥry-ib ḥst* "who dwells in the desert"<sup>45</sup>.

An intriguing problem connected with Ḥauron at Giza concerns the date of his introduction into Egypt. It is certainly difficult not to retain the generally accepted date for this event, the reign of Amenhotep II. During the reign of this king the first personal name containing the name of Ḥauron appears in an Egyptian document<sup>46</sup>, and the first attestations of Resheph and Astarte in Egypt also date from this time. Moreover, Amenhotep II is associated with Ḥauron-Harmakhis on a set of plaques from a foundation deposit said to originate from Giza<sup>47</sup>. And yet these plaques, which are now in the Brooklyn Museum, confront us with a curious problem. Two foundation deposits associated with the small temple dedicated to the Sphinx by Amenhotep II were excavated by Baraize in 1928 and 1931 respectively<sup>48</sup>. Among the objects contained in these deposits, 10 were inscribed, and all of these bear the text: "The Good God, 'Aa-kheperu-Rē', beloved of Harmakhis". The Brooklyn plaques, however, seem to come from yet another deposit, apparently from a clandestine excavation. They appeared on the New York antiquities market in 1936. The lot consisted of six model jars, three semi-circular alabaster plaques, and twelve rectangular blue fayence plaques, twenty-one objects altogether. All of these were inscribed with the same text mentioning Amenhotep II as "beloved of Harmakhis" except six of the rectangular plaques, which call the king "beloved of Ḥauron-Harmakhis". Albright<sup>49</sup>, Stadelmann<sup>50</sup> and Weinstein<sup>51</sup> have commented on the very conspicuous differences between the plaques mentioning Harmakhis and those mentioning Ḥauron-Harmakhis, in fact, the two sets differ in almost every respect, both palaeographically

<sup>45</sup> Zivie, *o.c.*, Nos. NE 85, NE 97A: 16, NE 97B: 31

<sup>46</sup> W. Golénisheff, *Les papyrus hiératiques Nos. 1115, 1116A et 1116B de l'Ermitage Impérial à St. Pétersbourg* (St. Pétersbourg, 1913), Pl. 17, 1 86

<sup>47</sup> Zivie, *o.c.*, 122. Photographs have been published by Albright, *BASOR* 84 (1941), 7-12, figs. 1-2, and by J. Capart, *CdE* 21 (1946), 46-47, figs. 4-5, but the worst example has never been published in photographic form. The name of the god is written *ḥwy-ḥr-rw* on this plaque.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Hassan, *o.c.*, 21-22 and 53, where a small additional find by Hassan himself is described.

<sup>49</sup> *o.c.*, 8-9.

<sup>50</sup> *SPGA*, 82-84.

<sup>51</sup> J. M. Weinstein, *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Egypt* diss. University of Pennsylvania 1973 (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1980), 130-132.



and in the arrangement of the text. Apart from this, there is also a sharp contrast *within* the group of six plaques which mention Hauron-Harmakhis. Of these, four have been inscribed most carefully with almost calligraphical hieroglyphs, whereas the other two are inscribed so roughly, and with so many mistakes, that had they been offered to the Museum on their own they might easily have been dismissed as forgeries. Furthermore, it is very odd, to say the least, that Hauron is nowhere mentioned in the temple itself. Every single inscription of Amenhotep II in the temple refers to the Sphinx as Harmakhis, and Hauron's name appears only in inscriptions on a door-jamb and a stela added by Seti I<sup>52</sup>. Similarly, the stelae dedicated to the Sphinx by several princes of the time of Amenhotep II invariably call the Sphinx Harmakhis, not Hauron<sup>53</sup>. Of the many private votive stelae found at Gîza, 19 mention Hauron, but none of these can be dated with certainty before the Amarna Period; in fact most of these stelae date to the 19th Dynasty<sup>54</sup>. Apart from the plaques, Hauron's name appears for the first time at Gîza on a small door-frame of Tutankhamen which had nothing to do with the temple of Amenhotep II<sup>55</sup>. Thus it would appear that Amenhotep II included in a foundation deposit, laid down before the foundation of a temple, six items mentioning a god of whom neither he nor his contemporaries left a single trace in or around the temple itself. One might suggest that the plaques mentioning Hauron derive from a deposit for another structure of Amenhotep II, or perhaps a later addition to the temple of Harmakhis. No traces of either of these buildings have so far been found, however. Alternatively, one might propose that the plaques had been deposited in the course of post-Amarna restorations. But surely one would, in that case, expect to find the name of the then reigning king on the plaques, not that of Amenhotep II<sup>56</sup>; moreover, the surviving inscriptions in the temple have not suffered from any attack under Akhenaten's iconoclastic activities. Finally, one might consider the possibility that the

<sup>52</sup> Zivie, *o.c.*, Nos. NE 11 ("Porte 4") and NE 50.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. NE 8-10.

<sup>54</sup> In this respect my conclusions differ considerably from those reached by Mme. Zivie.

<sup>55</sup> Zivie, *o.c.*, No. NE 45; cf. J. van Dijk and M. Eaton-Krauss, *MDAIK* 42 (1986), 39-41, pl. 4.

<sup>56</sup> It seems, though, that inscriptions of Amenhotep II in his Festival Temple between the IXth and Xth Pylon at Karnak were restored by Seti I without replacing the cartouches of his predecessor with those of his own, as was pointed out to me by Dr. William J. Murnane while at Karnak.

six plaques mentioning Hauron are forgeries, added to the other objects from the deposit to make the collection more interesting, a possibility enhanced by the two plaques which show a number of inexplicable mistakes in the hieroglyphic inscription. On the other hand, the remaining four plaques, though displaying some curious writings, have been beautifully executed and the *h* of Hauron (with closed bottom line), which puzzled Stadelmann, is paralleled in the texts written on the walls of the tomb of Tuthmosis III in the Valley of the Kings<sup>57</sup>. If the Hauron-Harmakhis plaques are forgeries, it is obvious that only someone who was quite familiar with this kind of detail, and with the material from Selim Hassan's excavations at Giza could have made them. Without further evidence I would be reluctant to dismiss the plaques as forgeries, but the occurrence of the name of Hauron on them is difficult to explain in the light of the total absence of the god in sources dating from the period before the close of the 18th Dynasty.

POSTSCRIPT. The text of this article is a slightly emended version of a paper presented at the Fourth International Congress of Egyptology, held in Munich, 26 August - 1 September 1985. A full treatment of the subject will be given in the author's forthcoming doctoral thesis, to be published in the series *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*. The research was financed by the State University of Groningen and by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z. W. O.). To the latter institution I am also indebted for an additional grant enabling me to participate in the Munich congress.

---

<sup>57</sup> See P. Bucher, *Les textes des tombes de Thoutmosis III et d'Aménaphis II*, MIFAO 60 (Le Caire, 1932), Pls. XIV-XVI & XXIV. The reversal of the group *mry* on the Hauron-Harmakhis plaques is also found on some of the pillars in the tomb of Amenhotep II, see *o.c.*, Pls. XLI-XLII. See for this type of reversal H. G. Fischer, *Egyptian Studies II: The Orientation of Hieroglyphs, Part I: Reversals* (New York, 1977), 86-89 (S32).