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The chronological gap of roughly 160 years between the Palaikastro rhyta and the reign of Amenhotep III can be filled by the tomb paintings from the time of Thutmose III. It seems that during his reign Minoan metal vases were known in Egypt. Between Thutmose III and Amenhotep III is a gap of less than half a century. This raises the possibility that the Egyptian potter who procured this rhyton was inspired by Aegean (metal) vases. On the other hand, it has been suggested that it may be a case of Hittite inspiration. At the very least, the animal head just above the spout is not attested on Minoan rhyta. Egypt and Hatti were in contact from the time of Thutmose III. Perhaps the long-known Minoan vessels with their animal decoration and the Hittite rhyton both inspired the Egyptians to create their own variant—especially the solution of the spout, which has no counterpart in the Aegean or Hittite area. This vessel could thus be regarded as an interfusion of different foreign artistic traditions by the Egyptians.

Geoffrey Metz and Birgit Schiller

The heart scarab of King Shoshenq III (Brooklyn Museum 61.10)*

Publication of the heart scarab of King Shoshenq III, now in the collection of the Brooklyn Museum (inv. 61.10). Although its original context is unknown, the scarab was almost certainly robbed from the king’s tomb at Tanis (NR7 5), perhaps during World War II when archaeological work at the site was suspended. Another heart scarab from NR7 5, that of Shoshenq IV and likewise stolen before it could be formally published by Pierre Montet, is also discussed.

Inscribed heart scarabs associated with the rulers of the Third Intermediate Period and their immediate family are relatively common. They include: Psusennes I;* Overseer of Troops Wen-djebau-en-djed,* and Ammenemopé* (Twenty-first Dynasty); Shoshenq IIa,* Takelot I,* Osorkon II,* and Crown Prince Shoshenq D* (Twenty-second Dynasty); Divine

* The author would like to thank Edward Bleiberg and Yekaterina Barbash of the Department of Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art of the Brooklyn Museum, New York, for permission to publish the scarab and discuss the Bothmer–Montet correspondence. Brooklyn Museum photographer Kathy Zarek-Doule provided photographs of the scarab, and Richard Fazzini is to be thanked for discussing the object with the author. John Gee, as well as the two anonymous JEA referees, are to be thanked for discussing a draft of the article.

1 Two pectorals with heart scarabs (Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 85788 and JE 85799); see P. Montet, Les constructions et le tombeau de Psousennés à Tanis (Fouilles de Tanis: La nécropole royale de Tanis 2; Paris, 1951), 145 (doc. 597), 146 (doc. 516; fig. 53); E. Feucht-Putz, Die königlichen Pektonle: Motive, Stimmehr und Zweck (Bamberg, 1997), 144 (no. 41), 176 (no. 38); M. Malaise, Les scarabées de cœur dans l’Egypte ancienne, avec un appendice sur les scarabées de cœur des Musées royaux d’art et d’histoire de Bruxelles (MRE 4; Brussels, 1978), 68, Association française d’action artistique, Tanis: L’Or des pharaons (Paris, 1987), 236–7; H. Stierlin and C. Ziegler, Tanis: Trésors des pharaons (Fribourg, 1987), figs 23–5, 28, 29; K. Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften der Spätzeit, I: Die 21. Dynastie (Wiesbaden, 2007), 55 (doc. 4.61), 56 (doc. 4.64).

2 A necklace with a pendant heart scarab (JE 87711), and a pectoral set with a heart scarab (JE 87710); see Montet, Constructions et tombeau de Psousennés, 75 (doc. 718; fig. 28), 76 (doc. 719), 49; Feucht-Putz, Königlichen Pektonle, 177–8 (doc. 42), pl. 13; Malaise, Scarabées, 68, 72–73; Association française d’action artistique, Tanis, 234–5; Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften I, 66 (doc. 4.123).

Ammenenomo possessed two heart scarabs set into pectorals (JE 86041 and 86042); see Montet, Constructions et tombeau de Psousennés, 169 (docs 648 and 649; fig. 62), 36; Malaise, Scarabées, 68; Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften I, 97 (docs 7.10 and 7.11).


5 JE 86964: P. Montet, Les constructions et le tombeau d’Osorkon II à Tanis (Fouilles de Tanis: La nécropole royale de Tanis 1; Paris, 1947), 59, 65 (doc. 57, fig. 20), pl. 58; Malaise, Scarabées, 69 n. 6.

6 Osorkon II had at least two inscribed heart scarabs: Montet, Osorkon II, 58–9, 65 (doc. 57; fig. 20); Malaise, Scarabées, 69; E. Horning and E. Staehein (eds), Skanabäen und andere Siegelamulette aus Basler Sammlungen (Ägyptische Denkmäler in der Schweiz 1; Mainz am Rhein, 1976), 184; Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften II, 111–12 (doc. 18.11), 123 (doc. 18.46 = Brooklyn 86.226.22).

Adoratrice Amenirdis I,8 Shabaqo,9 and Tanwetamani10 (Twenty-fifth Dynasty). From the slightly later Twenty-Sixth Dynasty, the heart scarab of Nekau II was once known, but is now again lost.11 One other inscribed heart scarab, which was discovered in the tomb of Shoshenq III (NTR 5) at San al-Hagar (Tanis) by Pierre Montet in 1940, was thought to be that of Hedjkheperre Shoshenq I; unfortunately it was stolen before Montet was able to publish it (see discussion below).12

This article publishes an additional heart scarab, belonging to Shoshenq III, which has only previously been briefly noted (figs 1 and 2).13 The heart scarab of Shoshenq III is presently in the collection of the Department of Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art of the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, New York (Charles Edwin Wilbour Fund 61.10). It is carved of green stone, most probably serpentinite.14 This is typical for heart scarabs, since the directive of Spell 30B of the Book of the Dead calls for the use of green stone.15 The scarab is 80 × 50 × 18 mm, and the surface is finely polished. It is inscribed with

---

10 Boston MFA 21.302: Reisner, Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts 19, 38; Dunham, Royal Cemeteries of Kush I, 62, pl. 48d–f; Malaise, Scarabées, 69, 76; Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften III, 244 (doc. 49.16).
11 A.-C. de Caylus, Recueil d’antiquités Égyptiennes, Étrusques, Grecques, Romaines, et Gauloises 7 (supplément) (Paris, 1767), pl. 10.4.
12 P. Montet, Les constructions et le tombeau de Chechaq III à Tanis (Fouilles de Tanis: La nécropole royale de Tanis 3; Paris, 1960), 76.
15 The text of Spell 30B of the Book of the Dead specifies that nnkh stone is to be utilized; for its identification, see J. R. Harris, Lexicographical Studies in Ancient Egyptian Minerals (VIO 54; Berlin, 1961), 113–15; Malaise, Scarabées, 45–9; De Putter and Karlshausen, Les pierres, 136.
eight lines of hieroglyphic text consisting of a variant form of Spell 30B. The pronotum and elytra are divided by a single line; the elytra have lightly inscribed humeral callosities. The rectangular head is large, approximately as wide as the clypeus, and flanked by medium-sized eyes. The clypeus is large and fan shaped, and has four lobes.

Text and translation

Translation

[1] <My> heart (jb) for my balance weight (mwt), my heart (hty)

17 This is most often followed by sp-in ‘two times’; see Malaise, Scarabées, 19.
18 For discussion regarding the use of ḫpwr vs. ḫpr, see Malaise, Scarabées, 22–3; see also H. Buchberger, Transformation und Transformat (AA 52; Wiesbaden, 1993), 340–2. For the entire phrase ḫbwr n mwat jhthy jn ḫprwvs, see J. L. Gee, ‘Of Heart Scarabs and Balance Weights: A New Interpretation of Book of the Dead 30B’, JSSEA 36 (2009), 1–4.
19 If the text is taken at face value, it might be read as m ḫn ḫm n ḫt n ḫj ḫd ḫw ḫj ‘do not unite [in] strength [against me in] the tribunal of Osiris’. However the ḫh means ‘balance weight’ (Wb. II, – five./three.– five.). He observes that among the heart scarabs.
20 At first glance the q of rq strongly resembles the t loaf (Gardiner Sign List X1), but elsewhere in this text genuine t-bread loaves are much more distinct and open.
21 The text is garbled at this point, with m ḫj rṣk rṣj ‘do not oppose me’ being expected: see Malaise, Scarabées, 19–20, 23; M. C. Pérez Die and P. Vernus, Excavaciones en Elnasaya el Medina (Heracléopolis Magna), I: Introducción general y inscripciones (Informes arqueológicos, Egipto I; Madrid, 1992), 138 (doc. 46), 140 (docs 55 and 56); Teeter and Wilfong, Scarabs, Scaraboids, 124–7.
22 For ḫj ‘keeper’. This orthography is due to confusion between the hieratic ḫj and ḫj : cf. Möller, Hieratische Paläographie III: Von der Zweiundzwanzigsten Dynastie bis zum dritten Jahrhundert nach Chr. (Leipzig, 1936), nos 473 and 508; U. Verhoeven, Untersuchungen zur späthieratischen Buchschrift (OLA 95; Leuven, 2001), nos U35 and W9. This would give a more conventional reading m ḫbwr ḫj ‘do not oppose [me in] the tribunal of Osiris’; see Malaise, Scarabées, 19, 23 n. h. For further examples of the conventional text, see E. Teeter and T. G. Wilfong, Scarabs, Scaraboids, Seals, and Seal Impressions from Medinet Habu, Based on the Field Notes of Udo Hölscher and Rudolf Anthes (OIC 118; Chicago, 2003), 124–8, 131.
23 More typically ḫtוש ‘my limbs’: Malaise, Scarabées, 19; for further examples see Teeter and Wilfong, Scarabs, Scaraboids, 124–7. The writing is not entirely certain; it is possible that there is a t-bread loaf present.
24 After Malaise, Scarabées, 20, although m is also possible; cf. Oriental Institute Museum 15020: Teeter and Wilfong, Scarabs, Scaraboids, 124–5, line 10. The missing hieroglyphs may be due to homoioteleuton caused by the n of m and its determinative.
25 This orthography is likely due to contamination from ḫj in ‘tree’; Wb. IV, 498.6–499.4; P. Wilson, A Ptolemaic Lexicon: A Lexicographical Study of the Texts in the Temple of Edfu (OLA 78; Leuven, 1997), 1014.
26 Note the determinative, perhaps indicating contamination from ḫprw ‘produce’: Wilson, Ptolemaic Lexicon, 94. The sign at the beginning of line 7 is apparently a superfluous stroke.
27 Typical Late Period orthography; see Malaise, Scarabées, 27.
28 In earlier periods more commonly ḫjความสามารถ m ḫt who create mankind in (this) place’; for discussion regarding the development of the later variant used here, see Malaise, Scarabées, 26–8; Ransoms, BMMA 10, 116–17, and de Caylus, Recueil d’antiquités, pl. 10.4.
29 The text is garbled, likely due to homoioteleuton with hw-nfr, while the sign following the nfr is apparently intended for nfr. Preferably the text should read nfr m ḫm ruggested (It will be) good <for> the <Hearer>: Malaise, Scarabées, 220; cf. JE 72171 (note 4 above), and Teeter and Wilfong, Scarabs, Scaraboids, 124–7. The nfr-sign at the beginning line 8 is to be taken as either as a non-phonetic determinative of ḫm r (‘divine’) judge’ (Malaise, Scarabées, 28 n. o), or as an abbreviated form of nfr ‘divine’.
30 Conventional ‘my heart of my mother’: Malaise, Scarabées, 20. The translation here follows the suggestion of Gee, JSSEA 36, 8, that mwat means ‘balance weight’ (Wb. II, 55.3–5). He observes that among the heart scarabs
Commentary

The precise origin and history of this heart scarab are unclear, but a number of reasonable suppositions are possible. The scarab was clearly intended for use on the mummy of King Usermaatre chosen of Amun, Shoshenq. While there are two kings known as Usermaatre Shoshenq, namely Shoshenq III and Shoshenq VI,\(^3\) the epithets that each of the kings employ are distinct from one another: Shoshenq VI, an ephemeral Upper Egyptian king assigned to the Twenty-third Dynasty, exclusively used the epithet mrj-jmn ‘beloved of Amun’ in his prænomen, but never the stp.n-jmn ‘chosen of Amun’ favored by Shoshenq III.\(^3\) The scarab’s owner was, therefore, Shoshenq III.

Given this identification, it is almost certain that the scarab was originally part of the burial of Shoshenq III in NRT 5 at San al-Hagar (Tanis).\(^3\)\(^9\) Exactly when this scarab was discovered and removed from the tomb, which had been plundered before its official excavation by Pierre Montet in March 1940, is unknown. Montet made no mention of it in his publications, indicating that the scarab—assuming it was originally buried with the king—was probably removed at some period prior to his work. However, Montet was forced to suspend work on the tomb between 1940 and 1951;\(^4\) it is possible that the scarab, an object that is small and easy to transport, was removed during the war or its immediate aftermath.

Confusingly, Montet did make mention of the discovery of a different heart scarab in NRT 5. Of this, he wrote ‘j’avais cependant déjà reconnu sur le plat du scarabée le chapitre XXXB du Livre des Morts et le nom de l’Osiris-roi Hedjkheperrê Sotepenrê’;\(^4\) he also noted that the scarab, along with the bronze figurine of a cat, was stolen before a proper study could be undertaken by him.\(^4\) Based upon his recollection of the titulary present on the missing scarab, Montet and later authors have quite naturally assigned its ownership to

in the British Museum where the weight is known, four out of five correspond to units of weight in the Egyptian metrical system; a small number that do not correspond to the Egyptian system seem to be tied to the Phoenician standard of weight. In the case of Brooklyn 61.16, the scarab weighs 168.9 g, which is broadly in the range of 20 qedet-weights, where 1 qedet-weight = 8.4 g. Actual scale weights in the collection of the Egyptian Museum indicate a qedet-weight may vary from 7.92–10 g; see A. Weigall, *Weights and Balances: Nos 31271–31670* (CGC 42; Cairo, 1968), 9–56.

---

\(^3\) See n. 19 above.

\(^4\) *LGG I*, 468.

\(^5\) See n. 21 above.


3 Formerly known as Shoshenq IV. See above, n. 4.

\(^8\) Bonhème, *Les noms royaux*, 127–8; see Jansen-Winkeln, *Inschriften II*, 219–21 (docs 24.1–24.8). Both Bonhème and Jansen-Winkeln number this king as ‘Shoshenq IV’ according to the older system.

\(^9\) For which, see Montet, *Chechanq III*.


\(^11\) Montet, *Chechanq III*, 76. See also Yoyotte, *Bulletin de la Société des fouilles françaises de Tanis* 1, 47 n. 11.

\(^12\) Montet, *Chechanq III*, 76.
Hedjkheperre, chosen of Amun, Shoshenq I, and argued that the founder of the Twentieth-Dynasty had been buried (at least secondarily) in NRT.\textsuperscript{43} The identification of the heart scarab stolen from NRT with Shoshenq I was bolstered by the discovery of two canopic jar fragments that were also found in the same tomb,\textsuperscript{44} and which were put forth as evidence for the presence of a (re)burial of Shoshenq I in the tomb of Shoshenq III. However, it is now known that this is not the case, as the two canopic jar fragments are recognized as belonging to Shoshenq IV, an obscure Tanite ruler who followed Shoshenq III on the throne, ruling for at least ten, and no more than thirteen, years.\textsuperscript{46} One fragment is labeled with the name (ḥd-hpr-r\textsuperscript{r} stp n-r\textsuperscript{r}) (ššk nrtj-mjn s bšt ntr hys jmnw) (Hedjkheperre, chosen of Re), (Shoshenq, beloved of Amun, son of Bastet, god, ruler of Iunu), that is, Shoshenq IV and not Shoshenq I.\textsuperscript{47} The second fragment no longer preserves the king’s name,\textsuperscript{48} but it was found in association with the first, and certainly originated from one of the other canopic jars in the set.

Given that the canopic jar fragment refers to Hedjkheperre, chosen of Re, Shoshenq, beloved of Amun, son of Bastet, god, ruler of Iunu (= Shoshenq IV), and the stolen scarab seen by Montet naming a ‘Hedjkheperre Shoshenq’ were both discovered in NTR, the most economical conclusion is that the pillaged scarab likewise referred to Shoshenq IV, the immediate follower of Shoshenq III.\textsuperscript{49}

It is tempting to speculate that Montet might have been confused in his later recollection of the heart scarab stolen from him before he could adequately publish it, particularly since both the missing scarab from NRT and Brooklyn Museum 61.10 were made for a King Shoshenq, and each is inscribed with Spell 30B of the Book of the Dead. However, Montet was later made aware of the existence of the Brooklyn heart scarab by Bernard V. Bothmer and recognized that it was not the one he had seen in the 1940s (the museum had purchased the scarab from a New Jersey antiquities dealer in 1961). In a letter dated 12 March 1962, Bothmer, at the time an Associate Curator in the Brooklyn Museum, enquired of Montet if the scarab in the museum’s collections had come from the excavations at San al-Hagar. He specifically identified it in his letter as belonging to Shoshenq III, and provided photographs


\textsuperscript{44} Montet, Chechen III, 76; see also Montet, Osorkon II, 59.

\textsuperscript{45} Not to be confused with the ‘old’ Shoshenq IV, who is now enumerated as Shoshenq VI; see above, nn. 4 and 38.


\textsuperscript{47} For a discussion of the chronological and historical issues involved, see Montet, Osorkon II, 59; Rohl, Journal of the Ancient Chronology Forum 3, 66–7; Dodson, GM 137; A. M. Dodson, The Canopic Equipment of the Kings of Egypt (London, 1994: 93–4, 178/50:2, pl. 43b; M.-A. Bonhême, ‘Les chechenquides: Qui, combien?’, BSFE 134 (1995), 54–5; Rohl, Pharaohs and Kings, 378; Jansen-Winkeln, in Hornung et al. (eds), Ancient Egyptian Chronology, 244. As the earliest king holding this name, Shoshenq I did not have any special need to utilize the epithets s bšt ntr hys jmnw ‘son of Bastet, god, ruler of Iunu’ in his titulary, in contrast to those who followed after him.

\textsuperscript{48} Montet, Osorkon II, 59; Dodson, Canopic Equipment, 93–4, 178/50:1, pl. 43b; Jansen-Winkeln, in Hornung et al. (eds), Ancient Egyptian Chronology, 244.

\textsuperscript{49} As argued by Jansen-Winkeln, Inschriften II, 256 (doc. 26.2).
Montet replied from Paris on 10 April 1962, stating that ‘this scarab could very well have come from the tomb of [Shoshenq III] at Tanis, but I have never seen it’. He then explained how the scarab he discovered in Egypt had been stolen with ‘incredible effrontery’ while the local police did little to recover it. Clearly Montet’s memory was indeed sound and it must therefore be concluded that there were two royal heart scarabs in existence, both likely originally interred in NRT 5. The one seen by Montet but which was later stolen formed part of the intrusive burial of Shoshenq IV, while Brooklyn 61.10 was originally part of the primary burial of Shoshenq III, but stolen before or during Montet’s work on the tomb in 1940. Alternately, it might have gone unnoticed by Montet during his initial work on the tomb, and was robbed at some point during World War II when work was halted.

TROY LEILAND SAGRILLO

**Userkaf’s birds unmasked***

A pair of birds represented on a relief fragment from the Fifth Dynasty mortuary complex of Userkaf is identified as masked shrikes, a species only otherwise attested in Egyptian art from the Middle Kingdom.

In 1928, Cecil Firth uncovered a large number of relief fragments at the site of Userkaf’s funerary temple at Saqqara. Among these was a small section (c.14 cm high), now housed in the Cairo Museum (temp. 6–9–32–1), upon which is depicted a pair of birds (fig. 1). The scene is notable not only for the exceptional quality of its carving, but also for the unusual behaviour exhibited by the animals.

![Relief fragment from the mortuary complex of Userkaf, Saqqara](temp. 6–9–32–1, Cairo Museum). Drawing: Mary Hartley. Reproduced with permission.

---

50 The correspondence in question is in the archives of the Brooklyn Museum.
51 Yoyotte, *Bulletin de la Société des fouilles françaises de Tanis* 1 (1988), 42, 47 n. 11, also discusses this correspondence between Bothmer and Montet, although he believed the scarab seen by Montet to perhaps be that of Shoshenq I.

* This study was undertaken as part of a Macquarie University Research Fellowship in the Ancient Cultures Research Centre (MQACRC), Department of Ancient History, Macquarie University, Sydney. I thank the two anonymous referees for their thoughtful comments on this paper.

1 C. M. Firth, ‘Excavations of the Department of Antiquities at Saqqara (October 1928 to March 1929)’, *ASAE* 29 (1929), 65–6.