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The main events of the transition period from the Second Intermediate Period to the New Kingdom are the expulsion of the Hyksos, the reunification of the country, and the reestablishment of a Nubian province. During, and following this process of reunification, the Ahmosids reorganized the administration and started restoration projects. The cultural history is marked by a diverging orientation backward and forward, a view into the past and into the future. In art, architecture, and literature, we can observe archaistic features and a collecting of old knowledge; but at the same time the Egyptians opened up for new ideas, technologies, and concepts. Altogether, this time is regarded as a turning point in history by both the ancient Egyptians and modern Egyptologists; and it is one of the most analyzed periods of ancient Egypt's history.

The time of transition from the Second Intermediate Period (SIP) to the New Kingdom (NK) is not a clearly defined period. Its pivotal point is the reign of Ahmose (II; cf. Biston-Moulin 2012), who, since the Rameside Period, is regarded as the founder of a new dynasty (e.g., Redford 1986: 52)—the 18th Dynasty according to the Manethonian tradition. The main reason for remembering Ahmose seems to be his reunification of Egypt, a result of his expelling the Hyksos. Thus we can characterize his reign as the time of the conflict between Thebes and Avaris. In a broader sense, frictions between the Egyptians and the Hyksos are to be expected since the division of Egypt and the forming of a Hyksos kingdom in the Delta, and they still influenced the mid-Thutmosid policy towards Asia. The propagandistic offshoots of these frictions are still traceable in the early Rameside Period, they were revitalized in the Prolemaic Period (Manetho), and they influenced even the modern perspective on this period: for the occasionally used term “war of liberation,” see

إن من أهم الأحداث التي جرت في الفترة الإنتقالية من عصر الإنتقال الثاني حتى عصر الدولة الحديثة هي طرد الهيكسوس وتوحيد البلاد وإعادة تأسيس الإقليم النوبى. وخلال مرحلة التوحيد وبعدما أعادت عائلة أحمس إعادة هيكلة المنظومة الإدارية، بدأت في مشروع الترميم. إن الثقافة التاريخية لهذه الفترة تتميز بأنها ذات توجهات متباينة ومثيرة بين المستقبل والماضي، فمثلاً نلاحظ في الفن والعمارة والأدب ظهور عناصر قديمة وجمع من المعرفة القديمة، وفي نفس الوقت إفتتاح المصريين على أفكار وتقنيات ومعاهيم جديدة. في المجمل، إعتبر كل من المصريين القدماء وعلماء المصريات في الوقت الحدیث هذه الفترة كنقطة تحول في التاريخ المصري، وهي من أكثر الفترات التي درست بتاريخ مصر القديم.
below; and the potentially misdirecting concurrence of “Apophis” as name of both the penultimate Hyksos ruler and the chaos snake only exists in our modern transcription (Gardiner 1935: 30, n. 4; the Greek spellings are compiled by Parthey 1864: 14 - 16). In a narrower sense, the scope of this article will be limited to the period of conflict itself, a period that corresponds roughly to the rule of Ahmose’s family, and which is thus sometimes called the “Ahmosid period.”

History of Research

The Ahmosid era played an important role in regard to how Egypt's past was viewed: the Ramessides alluded to it after the Amarna Age; Flavius Josephus connected it with the Exodus as playing an essential role for the Jewish culture; in modern Egyptology, it is often emphasized since it is the initial phase of the NK, when Egypt advanced to one of the superpowers of the Near East.

Ahmose was treated as a dynastic founder, while his predecessors were ignored in the monumental Ramesside king-lists and later in Manetho (for exceptions in non-royal lists, see Redford 1986: 39, 43, 45, 48, 51). Therefore they were included in the preceding 17th Dynasty, when they were rediscovered in modern times. This different allocation became important, when the Egyptian history was (re-)structured during the last two centuries: while Lepsius began his NK with the 17th Dynasty, a procedure still followed by Gauthier (1912), it was placed before the start of the NK at the beginning of the twentieth century. Consequently the kings of this historical phase, and the events and phenomena thereof, are not only divided between two different dynasties, but also between two different epochs: the SIP (17th Dynasty) and the NK (18th Dynasty).

Based on a few archeological remains, on some written sources, and on the much later Manethonian records, early Egyptologists painted the picture of a sudden invasion at the end of the Middle Kingdom by the Hyksos, who nearly ruled the entire Near East and who were expelled from Egypt through a war of liberation. Over the years, this picture has changed:

(1) The formerly obscure origin of the Hyksos is now better known: there are cultural connections to the northern Levant (e.g., Bietak 2011). The theory of the sudden invasion is debated, because of the evidence for a long-term immigration of Asiatic people into Egypt, starting in the Middle Kingdom.

(2) The Hyksos scarabs from Palestine, a lion statuette found in Baghdad, as well as vessel fragments from Knossos and Bogazköy, bearing the name of Khian, previously led to the assumption that a huge Hyksos empire existed (e.g., Meyer 2000: 36 - 37, a reprint of the 1952 - 1958 edition). Although this theory was perceived as an over-interpretation already in the first half of the twentieth century, its impact can still be seen half a century later (for Egypt as the legal heir of the Hyksos in Palestine and Syria, see Helck 1971: 114; Hoffmeier 2004: 133; Schmitz 1978: 186). In reality, the Hyksos dominion ranged from Middle Egypt to Southern Palestine.

(3) The modern perspective on the conflict between Thebes and Avaris is primarily based on pro-Theban sources (cf. e.g., Polz 1998), principally on Thutmoseid ones, who held the Hyksos responsible for the destruction (Sethe Urk. IV: 390.7-9), and generally for all “evil” (Helck 1969: 302), and who created a buffer zone in the Levant to prevent a new invasion (Panagiotopoulos 2000). For that reason, the Hyksos conflict was often seen as a “war of liberation” in modern times. However, only once in the Carnarvon tablet, Kamose spoke about rescuing Egypt (Helck 1983a: 84, l. 4-5). Apart from this propagandistic text, we do not know if contemporaries regarded the conflict as a “liberation” or even as a single “war.” A more positive view on the Hyksos can be seen in Schneider (1998). Morenz (1996: 163 - 167) pointed out the Hyksos’ pursuit of acceptance as Egyptian rulers.

The late nineteenth and early twentieth century mainly concentrated on reconstructing the political history; the last important discoveries were that of the second Stela of Kamose in 1954 (Habachi 1972) and that of the Tempest Stela between 1947 and 1959. The later twentieth and early twenty-first century have been focusing on the social history and on the material culture. The amount of discoveries in the last decades is far better: since 1966, the Hyksos capital Avaris, the most important
settlement of the non-Egyptians of this time, has been excavated at Tell el-Dabaa by the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (ÖAW, for literature, see Bibliographic Notes below); and there is also increasing research into various aspects of life and death of the Egyptians (e.g., Kubisch 2008; Seiler 2005). The royal cemetery of the 17th Dynasty is now located at Dra Abu el-Naga (e.g., Polz 2007; for the history of research at this site, cf. furthermore Miniaci 2009). In 1993, Stephen Harvey restarted earlier excavations of the Ahmosid temple complexes at Abydos (Harvey 1998).

**State of Chronology**

The Ahmosid era is of considerable relevance for the absolute chronology of the second millennium. Papyrus Ebers mentions for year 9 of Amenhotep I one of the few known Sothic dates, but it is disputed whether the rising was observed or calculated, and if the former is the case, from which place it was observed. The “Minoan eruption” of the Thera volcano can be dated by dendrochronology to 1613 ± 13 BCE (Friedrich et al. 2006). But neither the events described on Ahmose’s Tempest Stela nor the Theran pumice in Thutmosid layers of Tell el-Dabaa can be used to synchronize the chronology, because the former’s interpretation is controversial (see below), and the latter can only give a terminus ante quem.

Ceramology offers possibilities of linking the Egyptian chronology to the Levantine one (Bietak 2002), but since the absolute chronology of the Levant depends on the Egyptian, the possible chronological conclusions are limited. Helck (1971: 114) connected Ahmose’s later campaign to Asia with the Hittite raid on Babylon, but this hypothesis is rather an implication based on previous chronological calculations than a basis for the synchronization of Egyptian and Near Eastern history.

We have only little data to establish a relative chronology. The length of the reigns of most kings of the 17th Dynasty is unknown. Kamose’s highest known regnal date is year 3. Ahmose ascended the throne around 1550 BCE, at the age of about 10, based on the age at death of the mummy ascribed to him—but Wente (1995) brought forward doubts concerning its identity. His wife Ahmose-Nefertari is called “king’s mother” in his 22nd year (Sethe Urk. IV: 25.5), which implies that Amenhotep I had already been enthroned as a coregent at this time (Murnane 1977: 114 - 115). This year is Ahmose’s last documented regnal date; generally Manetho is followed in ascribing to him 25 years. According to the “chronographer” Amenemhat, Amenhotep I reigned for 21 years (Helck 1983a: 111, l. 1).

**Political and Military Events**

The political history of this period is completely dominated by the conflict between Thebes and Avaris. The main sources for reconstructing the events are: Seqenenra’s mummy, the first and the second Kamose Stela, a “historical” notice on the recto of Papyrus Rhind (Helck 1983a: 78, no. 113), the biographies of Emhab (Klotz 2010), Tjau (Kubisch 2008: 232 - 234), Ahmose son of Ihaba, and of Ahmose Pennekhbet, the lance-head Moscow Inv.-No. 1.1.a.1762 (Hodjache and Berlev 1977: 24), and the non-existent destruction layer of Avaris. A third Kamose Stela as well as the military relief of Ahmose in Abydos are too damaged to provide a good basis for interpretations; and it is still disputed whether or not the Tempest Stela (Helck 1983a: 104 - 110, no. 124), Ahmose’s Karnak Stela (Sethe Urk. IV: 14.1 - 24.6), and the Maasara inscription (Sethe Urk. IV: 24.8 - 24.15) can be connected to some events of this conflict.

Some sources could be interpreted as evidence for a Hyksos presence in Upper Egypt, namely sealings of Khian at Tell Edfu (Moeller and Marouard 2011) or some Hyksos “monuments” in Upper Egypt, e.g., Apep’s inscription in Gebelein (von Beckerath 1965: 148 - 150; and Polz 2006). However, we do not know what they actually prove: a long-term domination, short-term raids, Theban booties of war, or pure economic and diplomatic relations. Neferhotep III mentions some trouble with “foreigners” on a stela (Vernus 1982), which could be related to the Hyksos, but also to Nubians (Redford 1981: 253 - 255). The same uncertainty applies to an ash layer in East Karnak (cf. Redford 1981: 253 - 255, and 1995: 103). At least at the end of the SIP, Thebes formed an independent state.
A conflict broke out during Seqenenra’s reign, who died in battle judging by his mummy’s condition (Bietak and Strouhal 1974). The causes are unknown; and the historical romance of the “Quarrel between Apep and Seqenenra” (Papyrus Sallier I, Gardiner 1931: 85 - 89) is often cited to fill this gap, because it apparently reflects its beginning. However, the story is only a literary fiction, composed around 200 years later not to renegotiate the casus belli, but to exploit this period as background for a satire on the “king’s novel,” a specific type of text.

About three years after Seqenenra’s death, his successor Kamose conquered and dismantled the town of Neferusi, and destroyed other Middle Egyptian cities loyal to the Hyksos (Helck 1983a: 90; CT l. 14-15; 95, l. 28; cf. Polz 1998: 230, n. 75). He also raided Avaris according to l. 7-18 (Helck 1983a: 92 - 94) of his second stela, an event which is alluded to by Emhab and Tjau. In the Bahariya oasis the Egyptians intercepted a message from the Hyksos Apep to the Nubian king. This could be the reason for Kamose’s return to Thebes, which is described on his stela as being “triumphal” (Helck 1983a: 96, l. 30-35), but which was perhaps a mere tactical retreat to prevent a war on two fronts—the biographical inscription of Sobeknakht of Elkab documents a Nubian invasion, which reached at least Elkab some decades earlier (Davies 2003a, 2003b), so a potential Nubian threat might have played a role in the policy of Kamose’s days. A possible Nubian campaign before or after the Hyksos campaign is refuted by Krauss (1993), but cannot be ruled out altogether.

Ahmose, the son of Seqenenra, ascended the throne at a very young age; and his grandmother Tetisheri and later his mother Ahhotep acted as regents for him at the beginning. Remarkably, we hear nothing about Nubian or Hyksos counterstrikes in his early days, which might be due to these powerful women (especially Ahhotep, who was deeply involved in politics, cf. Sethe Urk. IV: 21). Memphis and Heliopolis must have been conquered before or during Ahmose’s first regnal phase. Both events apparently predate the military career of Ahmose, son of Ihana, in whose biography the former is merely alluded to in the ship’s name “Appearing in Memphis.” The conquests of Heliopolis and Tjaru are mentioned in day-book-like entries on the verso of Papyrus Rhind in a year 11, which most likely is the regnal year of a Hyksos king, because his Theban adversary is simply called “prince of the south.”

The following conquest of Avaris is briefly described in the biography of Ahmose, son of Iban (Sethe Urk. IV: 3.7 - 4.13), which is nevertheless our main source for this event. The besieged city of Ahmose II’s battle relief might have also been the Hyksos capital. The inscription on the above mentioned lance-head, identifying it as booty from Avaris, is paleographically dated to year 18 of Ahmose or later (for the date, compare Vandersleyen 1971: 205 - 228). The conquest itself did not involve large-scale destruction, as was concluded by the absence of extensive destruction layers (Bietak 1994: 29, 2011: 164, 169 - 170).

Ahmose’s conquest of Sharuhen in Southern Palestine (i.e., Tell el-Ajjul, Morris 2005: 51 - 52, 60 - 67) is regarded as the end point of the Hyksos period; further Asiatic campaigns of Ahmose are rejected by Vandersleyen (1971: 89 - 127), but accepted by Helck (1971: 114, cf. Morris 2005: 29 - 30). Thereafter, Ahmose turned towards Nubia, and he reached the second cataract (Sethe Urk. IV: 5.4 - 14). Immediately after this campaign, he had to fight back a Nubian revolt, led by a certain “Aata” (perhaps a title and not a name), who invaded Upper Egypt (Vandersleyen 1971: 64 - 81)—perhaps a Nubian counterstrike.

The last challenge he had to face was the revolt led by Tetian, who might have held the office of a city commander (gzw) and who opposed the abolition of this office (see below and Helck 1986). Ahmose left to his successors a reunified country with a small Nubian province and a bridgehead in Asia. Within a few decades the Theban state was transformed from a territorially limited principality to one of the leading empires of the ancient Near East. At the beginning, the Egyptian policy concentrated on the Nubian stage (Hoffmeier 2004; Morris 2005: 68 - 77; Schmitz 1978: 194 - 200). There were some raids into Asia (for Amenhotep I, see Morris 2005: 30 - 31; for Thutmose I, see Helck 1983a: no. 125, l. 1; Sethe Urk. IV: 9.8 - 10.3,
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697.5), but in general, the time of the great wars in the Levant did not begin before the reign of Thutmose III (Hoffmeier 2004: especially 134).

Commerce and Diplomacy

Due to its geographical location, the Hyksos state connected the Fertile Crescent with the Nile Valley. Numerous ceramics from the Levant in Avaris are evidence for a bustling trade with this region (e.g., Aston 2002; Bietak 2002). Additionally there are very few, but widespread findings for interconnections with the Aegean world (Bietak 2007; Helck 1995: 37 - 41), Cyprus (Karageorghis 1995), Mesopotamia (for the first piece of diplomatic correspondence, see van Koppen and Radner 2009), and perhaps Anatolia (see the vessel fragment from Bogazköy mentioned above). After the expulsion of the Hyksos, Thebes maintained the contacts with the Levant and Cyprus, and—perhaps not coincidental—with the Aegean world (Helck 1978, 1995) with its excellent weaponry. The Theban connections to the south were twofold: on the one hand, there are some indications for conflicts between Egyptians and Nubians in the SIP, a prime example of which being the recently discovered biography of Sobeknakht (see above). On the other hand, Nubians (i.e., Kerma and pan-grave people) were living in Egypt (Bourriau 1981; Meurer 1996: 83 - 89), and likewise Egyptians were living in Lower Nubia (e.g., Kubisch 2008: 87 - 88 for the case of Buhen). They had been trading partners, settlers, and they even served in the armies of their respective rulers.

Administration

Very few details are known about the administration of both the Hyksos and the Theban kingdom. Seemingly the Hyksos' "homeland" consisted of a small, directly-ruled territory in the Eastern Delta and in southern Palestine. The most important official was apparently the “treasurer” (Helck 1958b: 79 - 80). Parts of Lower and Middle Egypt were controlled through satellite states.

The administration of the Theban state was primarily a heritage of the Middle Kingdom. The “Duties of the Vizier,” written down in the tomb of Rekhmira and in other Theban tombs, were composed in the reign of Ahmose according to van den Boorn (1988: 334 - 371); but there is no vizier attested before the reign of Thutmose I (Imhotep). The most important titles and offices of the late SIP Theban state were the treasurer (e.g., Neshi in Kamose’s time), the sealers of the king, the mayors (ḥnty-ḥ), the city commanders (ḥtw), and the “king’s sons” (z3 nsw). Altogether, the administration is characterized by decentralization (Grajetzki 2011); but contrary to the First Intermediate Period, this did not cause a political regionalism, since the king remained an important figure in biographies of this time (Kubisch 2008: 30 - 39). In fact, prominent non-royal families (for a hypothetical “Tety-clan,” see Helck 1986, for the large family of Ahmose-Turo and Ahmose-Aametju, see Shirley 2010) may have exerted influence over royal decisions, according to Helck (1994, though sometimes over-interpreting). Phenomena can be observed at this time, which were occasionally interpreted as efforts to strengthen the position of the king: an excessive brother-sister marriage system, the reactivation of coregency, the cancellation of the inheritability of offices, and the abolition of the institution of “king’s sons.” One of the few remaining titular princes was the commander of Buhen, and this combination of offices is the origin of the “king’s son (of Kush) and overseer of the southern foreign countries,” i.e., the viceroy of Kush (Schmitz 1976: 268).

The sacerdotal administration likewise underwent reforms in the reign of Ahmose, especially a hierarchization of the priesthood (Barbotin 2008: 106 - 107). The office of the “god’s wife of Amun” was created, which was held by a female member of the royal family during the following generations. It is highly problematic to define its functions, and to trace its evolution, because the sources are dispersed over centuries. The office holder had important priestly functions in the cult of Amun (e.g., Gitton 1984: 39 - 42), but she was also partly involved—at least in later times—in the secular administration (cf. Graefe 1981, esp. the diagram at the end of vol. 2). It was often assumed that she, being a princess, conferred legitimacy on the future king by marrying him (e.g., Schmitz 1976: 306), but this theory is highly speculative (cf. Robins 1983).
Building activity

The building activity of the Hyksos was mainly concentrated on Avaris and its hinterland. Prior to the Hyksos conflict, the building activity of the Theban state was concentrated self-evidently on Upper Egypt, i.e., mainly on the area between Abydos and Edfu (Polz 2007: 113). Other prominent cities of this time were Koptos and Elkab, but there is a clear focus on the Theban area.

While there are also important non-royal SIP cemeteries in Edfu and Elkab, the most important cemeteries of the early NK can be found in Western Thebes. The continued use of the royal cemetery in Dra Abu el-Naga until the reign of Amenhotep I (Polz 2007) is proof of a real, or at least a propagated, continuity of the royal line. The Thutmosids moved to the Valley of the Kings (Thutmose I, according to Roehrig 2006), thus separating the burial place from the cult place, and abandoning the artificial pyramid as tomb type (the last Egyptian royal pyramid was built by Ahmose in Abydos; see Wegner 2009 for its place in the development of royal tombs).

Starting in this period, the temple of Karnak and the estate of Amun-Ra were gradually enlarged according to the god’s growing prominence; however, this picture would be different if other important cult centers, e.g., Heliopolis, were better known. Memphis again became an important political center after the reunification, and we know of a palace of Thutmose I (Helck Urk. IV: 2028.7).

Besides this, the Ahmosid building activity displays two features: on the one hand, securing strategic points (Polz 1998) and (re-)erecting military bases at the southern and northern frontiers (Morris 2005: 101 - 108; for Avaris as a military base, see Bietak 1994: 44); on the other hand, restoration activity. An eloquent testimony for the latter is Ahmose’s Tempest Stela (Helck 1983a: 104 - 110; Klug 2002: 35 - 46)—irrespective of the question whether the mentioned destruction is to be located in the Delta (Goedicke 1992: 60 - 61), in Thebes (Klug 2002: 45; Vandersleyen 1967: 155 - 156), in the Ahmosid territory (Wiener and Allen 1998: 19), or in the whole of Egypt (Foster and Ritner 1996: 5 - 7), and irrespective of the question whether it was caused by the eruption of the Thera volcano and calamities connected to it (Foster and Ritner 1996: 7; Goedicke 1992: 60 - 61), a severe tempest (Klug 2002: 45; Wiener and Allen 1998: 18 - 19), or by the Hyksos (Morenz 1996: 160; Ryholt 1997: 144; Wiener and Allen 1998: 20).

Social and Cultural History

In the SIP, the Egyptians experienced not only a new division of the country similar to what happened in the First Intermediate Period, but also foreign rule. According to the grave goods and the architectural features of Theban non-royal tombs (e.g., shared cult places), important care was taken for integration into the community and for defense against enemies (Seiler 2005: 193 - 199). The biographies from this time focused among other things on public welfare and patronage (Kubisch 2008: 23 - 29) and on closeness to a god, which can be interpreted as a first glimpse of the “personal piety” of the NK (Kubisch 2008: 42 - 46), and which in some later cases provoked even secular sightseeing of sacred places (Helck 1969: 296).

The late SIP/early NK is characterized by a sense of a new era. Contrary to the Third Intermediate Period, the foreign domination did not result in self-isolation, but in an opening up to new ideas and new technologies in the fields of art (Bietak 2007; Helck 1978), literature (Helck 1983b), craftsmanship (the fast potter’s wheel, Bietak 1986: 335), and weaponry (Spalinger 2005: 1 - 31; Wolf 1926: passim). Alien specialists were appreciated for their skills and abilities (e.g., Minoan wall painters in Tell el-Dabaa or Aegaean and Syrian ship-builders). The upper class emphasized the achievements of their own career, and they proudly announced the invention of new chronometers (Amenemhat; Helck 1983a: 110 - 112, no. 125), plastering techniques (Ineni; Sethe Urk. IV: 57.9-10), and hieroglyphs (Senenmut; Sethe Urk. IV: 406.1-11).

In contrast, at the same time archaizing features in art and the copying of older literary texts can be observed. It is a period of collecting and sorting the old knowledge, and of writing compendia and similar compositions on medicine (Papyrus Ebers, Papyrus Smith, Papyrus Hearst), mathematics (Papyrus Rhind), literature/narrative mythology (Papyrus Westcar), (mythical) topography (Amduat),
and administration (“Duties of the Vizier”). The so-called Book of the Dead (not being a canonical compendium, this title was invented by Lepsius for his publication of Papyrus Turin Cat. 1791 = P. Turin CG 17449) was likewise created in the time of the SIP/early NK.

A type of “knighthood” evolved, whose members (often connected with the designation maryannu) were loyal “retainers of the lord” on the battlefield, who even report self-confidently that they rescued the king (Bolshakov and Soushechevski 1998; Helck 1971: 482 - 486). One of these “knights” was the king himself, who, according to Helck (1969: 288) “steht in dieser Welt und nicht über ihr” (stands in this world and not above it)—but as a result of this new concept, he actually had to “demonstrate his credibility through action” (for this need, see Redford 2006: 338 - 342).

Somewhat contradicting this aspect of the human king, the old concept of the divine king still existed and is even emphasized. Some members of the royal family were later even revered as deified humans or as gods themselves, e.g., Ahmose Sapaïr (Vandersleyen 2005), Amenhotep I, and Ahmose-Nefertari (Černý 1927; Hollender 2009). In particular the king’s relation to Amun-Ra is pointed out: the god fathered the king and thus preselected him, and he chose him as ruler through oracles (in doing so, he intervened directly in history for the first time, Assmann 1984: 226). Amun-Ra became the lord of the world order, the good shepherd for mankind, and the patron for those who follow him. The latter implies that one has deliberately turned to him—a relationship between the human and divine spheres, which is an integral part of personal piety (Assmann 1984: 231, 265).

**Significance and Main Phenomena**

As can be seen from the previous paragraphs, the Ahmosid period is of great importance both for Egyptian culture and for Egyptological historiography. The experience of a foreign rule resulted in a highly militaristic and sometimes imperialistic policy. But there are also other outcomes: new ideas and new technologies were adopted, while at the same time past wisdom and achievements were recollected and revived. Amun-Ra became, on the one hand, an object of personal piety, and on the other hand, the Lord of All. The world was more complicated and the perception of one’s own position in it, as well as the behavior towards neighboring cultures, had changed. Besides war, the NK also became a period of diplomacy; and besides the Egyptian claim on superiority over the world, at least since the late Thutmosid period, the pharaohs accepted foreign rulers as “brothers” (perhaps not coincidentally Ahmose is the first Egyptian ruler who bore the epithet “king of kings,” which connected both concepts), and foreign specialists lived and worked in Egypt.

This period is considered a new, glorious era according to the view of posterity, and as an important turning point in Egyptian history by most Egyptologists. Especially the wars of this time and of the later NK were the focus of research since the early days of Egyptology—doubtless due to the militaristic perspective of the nineteenth century’s historiography, perhaps also due to the positive connotation evoked by the concept of “liberation,” which is connected to the Hyksos conflict.

**Bibliographic Notes**

The reconstruction of the events of the early NK is a favored subject of research, a part of every analysis of the NK and of every overview of Egyptian history in general. Vandersleyen (1995) is a comprehensive outline of the history of the Middle and New Kingdom, as well as a discussion of the relevant sources (the 17th and early 18th Dynasties are treated in Vandersleyen 1995: 163 - 270). Von Beckerath (1965) and Ryholt (1997) are contributions to the reconstruction of the chronological framework and events of the SIP; see furthermore
Schneider (1998). Important results of cultural and social developments, based on archaeological data, can be found in Polz (2007). For overarching features of the characteristics of the SIP and a comparison with the First Intermediate Period, see Franke (1999). Vandersleyen (1971, mainly focusing on the political history), Barbotin (2008), and Schnitz (1978) are rather biographical analyses of the times of Ahmose and Amenhotep I. For military and non-military interconnections of Egypt with the Levant (thus of course also reconstructing parts of the history of this epoch), see Heck (1971) and Redford (1995). The complicated genealogy of the royal family is reconstructed in Grimm (1999) and Stasser (2002); for the disputed links to the previous Intef-kings, see the remarks in Ryholt (1997: 289) and Dodson and Hilton (2004: 122).

The written sources of this period are collected in Urkunden IV, Heck (1983a), and Kubisch (2008). The translations of Breasted, commonly used in Anglo-American analyses, should be amended by more recent editions and translations. For that, see the translation volumes of Urkunden IV, the editio princeps of the Kamose texts in Habachi (1972; furthermore Smith and Smith 1976, and Biston-Moulin 2011 for its original location and function), the already mentioned edition of Kubisch (which includes a historical and sociocultural analysis), and—for Ahmose’s and Amenhotep I’s stelae—Klug (2002). A collection of relevant written sources, translated by Redford, as well as a discussion of archaeological sources and various aspects of the SIP, can be found in Oren (1997). For the latter, see more recently also Marée (2011).

The excavation results of Avaris are to be published in the book series Tell el-Dab’a I-XX, published by various authors in the series Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften der Gesamtakademie. For Abydos, see Harvey (1998), but the results of the excavation will be published in the near future; for pre-Thutmosid Karnak, see, e.g., Graindorge and Martinez (1989), Gabolde et al. (1999), Graindorge (2002), and most recently Charloux and Mensan (2012). Biston-Moulin (2012) published door fragments from Karnak, which are inscribed with the protocol of Senakhtenra and a brief building inscription, thus proving his historicity, and revealing that his formerly debated nomen was likewise Ahmose. Therefore Nebpehtyra Ahmose (I) has to be renumbered as Ahmose II.
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