
The World's Oldest
ALPHABET

ALPHABETIC CHART OF PROTO-CONSONANTAL HEBREW

Hebrew Block-Letter	Projected Proto-Hebrew Original Letter	Middle-Egyptian Hieroglyphic Exemplar (Sign-List Number)	Original Hebrew Alphabetic Name (NIVEC Number)	Hebrew Consonantals of Middle Kingdom (ca. 1842–1760 BC)	Hebrew Consonantals of New Kingdom (ca. 1560–1307 BC)	Hebrew Consonantals of Iron Age - Canaan (ca. 1150–587 BC)
א		(F1)	'elef cattle אֵלֶף (477)			
ב	Sinai 92, 405		bayit, house בַּיִת (1074)			
ג	Sinai 112		gāhar, bend גָּהָר (1566)			
ד			delet, door דֶּלֶת (1946)			
ה	Sinai 92		hālal, praise הָלַל (2146)			
ו			wāv, pillar-support וָו (2260)			
ז			zē'āh, sweat (brows) זַעֲהָ (2399)			
ח	Sinai 405		hāsēr, enclosure חָצֵר (2958) hūt, thread חוּט (2562)			
ט	Sinai 112		tōv, good טוֹב (3201)			
י	Sinai 405, Sinai 92		yād, hand יָד (3338)			
כ	Sinai 92		kap, palm כַּף (4090)			
ל	Sinai 92		lāmad, teach לָמַד (4340) לִמְדָה (4913)			
מ	Sinai 405		mayim, water מַיִם (4784)			
נ	Sinai 87		nāhās, snake נָחָשׁ (5729)			
ס	Sinai 90		sē'ār, hair שֵׁעָר (8482) sārah, stink סָרַח (6244)			
ע	Sinai 92		ayin, eye עַיִן (6523)			
פ	Sinai 92		peh, mouth פֶּה (7023)			
צ			ṣarōr, sack צָרוּר (7655)	© 2015 Douglas Petrovich		
ק	Sinai 405		qūr, spun-fiber קוּר (7770)			
ר	Sinai 405		roš, head רֹאשׁ (8031)			
ש	Sinai 92		šālayim, breasts שְׂדַיִם (8716)			
ת	Sinai 92		tayiš, male goat תַּיִשׁ (9411)			

Fig. 1.

DOUGLAS PETROVICH

The World's Oldest
ALPHABET

HEBREW AS THE LANGUAGE OF THE
PROTO-CONSONANTAL SCRIPT

WITH A CONTRIBUTION BY

SARAH K. DOHERTY

&

INTRODUCTION BY

EUGENE H. MERRILL

First published in 2016 by
CARTA Jerusalem

Cover illustration: Drawing of Sinai 351 inscription
Frontispiece: Alphabetic Chart of Proto-Consonantal Hebrew (Fig. 1), and all inscription
drawings © Douglas Petrovich
Copyright has been registered with the Library of Congress, Registration No. VAu 1-250-615.
Effective Date of Registration: Dec. 20, 2015.

Maps & plans on pp. x, 21, 37, 76 © Carta Jerusalem
Sketch maps on pp. 78–79 and 142–143 courtesy of the Harvard Sinai Expedition, 1935

Photo sources:

The Egyptian Exploration Society: p. 16
Photographs by Bruce Zuckerman and Marilyn Lundberg, West Semitic Research. Courtesy
Department of Antiquities, Egypt: pp. 39, 47
Courtesy of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology, UCL: p. 54
Courtesy of Todd Bolen/BiblePlaces.com: pp. 62, 80
The British Museum, London: pp. 83, 85
Douglas Petrovich: p. 175

Copyright © 2016 by Carta Jerusalem

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or
by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any other
information storage and retrieval system existing now or in future, without permission in
writing from the publisher.

ISBN: 978-965-220-884-2

Printed in Israel

INTRODUCTION

The origin of the alphabet has been a matter of intense interest from time immemorial. The primitive pictographic and cumbersome syllabic forms of written communication that originated in the latter case at least as early as 3200 BC gave way at some point to the incredibly facile and flexible development of alphabets, an advancement dated and attributed to a variety of times and places. The search for the beginnings of alphabetic scripts has borne fruit in the past century or so with focus particularly on the ancient Eastern Mediterranean world. Biblical scholars have been at the forefront of these endeavors since the texts of sacred scriptures have never been evinced, except in alphabetic form, though the assumption is well-nigh universal that the existing exemplars likely sprang from both oral and written traditions, perhaps, in the latter case, non-alphabetically.

The assumption just made must remain somewhat tentative to this point, given the dearth of archaeological support. However, if one grants the antiquity of the written Hebrew tradition in line with that of cultures surrounding the Levant, nothing should stand in the way of positing analogously the existence of Hebrew writings also composed in pre-alphabetic form. Putting this line of thought to the side, the focus of Professor Petrovich's work is not so much on theories about Hebrew pre-alphabetic literature as on the antiquity of the Hebrew alphabetic tradition itself. Indeed, his thesis is that the Hebrew alphabet was not only early, but the earliest of all, the progenitor of all alphabets and alphabetic writing!

Important to his thesis is the irrefutable fact that the use by scribes of alphabetic notations is attested to from a number of sites, exclusively so far to the ancient Near East. Very early movements along this line are seen in both cuneiform syllabic and Egyptian proto-alphabetic signs as visual precursors to the consonants. In the former instance, Denise Schmandt-Besserat brilliantly decoded the so-called "tokens" and "envelopes" of the Sumerian site of Uruk IV B (ca. 3200 BC) and ascribed phonetic value to these varied shaped objects, prototypes inevitably leading to alphabetic systems, if not in Mesopotamia itself, at least elsewhere.¹ As for Egypt, the turquoise mines of Serâbit

1 Denise Schmandt-Besserat, "An Archaic Recording System in the Uruk-Jemdet Nasr Period," *AJA* 83/1 (1979), p. 25; *Before Writing, Volume I: From Counting to Cuneiform*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992; *Before Writing, Volume II: A Catalog of Near Eastern Tokens*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992; *How Writing Came About*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1996. Sumerian and Akkadian never achieved a true alphabetic scheme, but through a process of phoneticism>syllabification>alphabeticism, it prepared the way for such a development in NW Semitic (e.g., Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, and eventually Hebrew). See I. J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974, pp. 204–205.

el Khadîm² (ca. 1850 BC) in the Sinai and Wadi el-Ḥîl³ (ca. 1800) yielded inscriptions whose characters were modified so as to result in a practicable alphabet. No one has done more to recognize this fact and to present its scholarly defense than Douglas Petrovich.

Ras Shamra (Ugarit, ca. 1350 BC) on the northern Mediterranean coast of modern Syria is another example of an alphabetic script and discrete Semitic dialect, but this is a late-comer compared to those just listed. The adaptability of the “shorthand” of alphabets soon became evident to civilizations near and far, and by 1100 had become utilized and exported by the Phoenicians to Greece and Crete and over time to Italy and Rome, in which places the great Greek and Latin classics came to be composed.

The breakthrough as to the question of the origins of the alphabet represented in this volume is the fruit of the author’s intensive and extensive research and fastidious attention to detail. His acclaimed expertise in epigraphy, palaeography, lexicography, and comparative linguistics and literature has led him to the conviction that of all options one can currently advance as to the ultimate origins of the alphabet, the identification of proto-Hebrew is the very best candidate. Careful perusal of this volume will almost certainly persuade the reader of the validity of Petrovich’s methods and conclusions. One can anticipate the objection that Hebrew works best for the author because of his ideological and/or theological predilections regarding the Bible and all things religious, but such an objection is undermined by the disciplined way in which, by process of elimination, he discredits other contenders, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, builds a solid case for Hebrew as the only alternative by virtue of all the criteria necessary to its certification as the pioneer, as it were, in the long and convoluted train of Semitic cognate and non-Semitic heirs to the alphabetic tradition.

Eugene H. Merrill, PhD
Distinguished Professor of Old
Testament Studies (Emeritus)
Dallas Theological Seminary
November 2016

-
- 2 The mines are ca. 50 km NW of Mount Sinai. See W. F. Albright, “The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment,” *BASOR* 110 (1948): 6–22; I. J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*. Rev. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, pp. 122–128; Joseph Naveh, *Origins of the Alphabets*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Publishing House, 1994, pp. 14–17. James K. Hoffmeier, *Ancient Israel in Sinai: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Wilderness Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- 3 This site is ca. 40 km NW of Luxor / Karnak, 55 km SE of Abydos, and 15 km west of the Nile River. See John C. Darnell, F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, Marilyn J. Lundberg, P. Kyle McCarter, Bruce Zuckerman, and Colleen Manassa, “Two Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from the Wadi el-Ḥîl: New Evidence for the Origin of the Alphabet from the Western Desert of Egypt,” *AASOR* 59 (2005): 90.

CONTENTS

Introduction by Eugene H. Merrill, Ph.D.	v
Preface.....	xi
Acknowledgments	xiv
List of Maps and Figures.....	xvi

1—BACKGROUND MATTERS TO THE PROTO-CONSONANTAL INSCRIPTIONS

The Place of the First Alphabet among the Earliest Writing Scripts.....	1
The Proper Semitic Language of the Proto-Consonantal Script.....	6
The Path that Led to Identifying Hebrew as the Proto-Consonantal Script	10
The Thesis and Structure of the Present Work on Early Alphabetic Inscriptions.....	11
The Conventions Used for the Study of the Following 16 Inscriptions.....	13

2—THE INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PERIOD OF EGYPT'S MIDDLE KINGDOM

The Caption on Sinai 115	
Background to the Inscription	15
Paleographic Decipherment.....	17
Translation and Orthography.....	21
Potential Historical Value.....	28

Sinai 377

Background to the Inscription	29
Paleographic Decipherment.....	31
Translation and Orthography.....	32
Potential Historical Value.....	34

Wadi el-Ḥôl 1

Background to the Inscription	36
Paleographic Decipherment.....	40
Translation and Orthography.....	43
Potential Historical Value.....	45

Wadi el-Ḥôl 2

Background to the Inscription	45
Paleographic Decipherment.....	46
Translation and Orthography.....	50
Potential Historical Value.....	51

Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon	
Background to the Inscription	51
Ceramic Evaluation (Contribution by Sarah K. Doherty).....	53
Paleographic Decipherment.....	57
Translation and Orthography	60
Potential Historical Value.....	63
Sinai 376	
Background to the Inscription	65
Paleographic Decipherment.....	66
Translation and Orthography	69
Potential Historical Value.....	71
3—THE INSCRIPTIONS OF THE PERIOD OF EGYPT'S NEW KINGDOM	
Turquoise Mines at Serâbîṭ el-Khâdim.....	75
Sinai 345a and Sinai 345b	
Background to the Inscriptions.....	80
Paleographic Decipherment.....	82
Translation and Orthography	88
Potential Historical Value.....	90
Sinai 346a and Sinai 346b	
Background to the Inscriptions.....	90
Paleographic Decipherment.....	91
Translation and Orthography	97
Potential Historical Value.....	100
Sinai 349	
Background to the Inscription	101
Paleographic Decipherment.....	102
Translation and Orthography	111
Potential Historical Value.....	115
Sinai 351	
Background to the Inscription	117
Paleographic Decipherment.....	118
Translation and Orthography	123
Potential Historical Value.....	125
Sinai 353	
Background to the Inscription	127
Paleographic Decipherment.....	127
Translation and Orthography	135
Potential Historical Value.....	138
Sinai 357	
Background to the Inscription	140
Paleographic Decipherment.....	141
Translation and Orthography	149
Potential Historical Value.....	151

Sinai 360	
Background to the Inscription	153
Paleographic Decipherment.....	154
Translation and Orthography	156
Potential Historical Value.....	158
Sinai 361	
Background to the Inscription	158
Paleographic Decipherment.....	159
Translation and Orthography	165
Potential Historical Value.....	169
Sinai 375a	
Background to the Inscription	172
Paleographic Decipherment.....	174
Translation and Orthography	179
Potential Historical Value.....	180
Sinai 378	
Background to the Inscription	182
Paleographic Decipherment.....	183
Translation and Orthography	184
Potential Historical Value.....	185
4—CONCLUDING THOUGHTS	
The Historical Credibility of the Account of Israelites in Egypt.....	186
The Dating of the Corpus of Proto-Consonantal Hebrew Texts.....	188
General Findings of the Present Study	191
The Inventors of the Proto-Consonantal Hebrew Script.....	193
The Value of the Proto-Consonantal Hebrew Corpus to Biblical History	195
The Identification of the Golden Calf/Heifer in Exodus 32.....	199
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1: The Original 22 Letters of the PCH Alphabet.....	201
Appendix 2: The Additional (Non-Original) Five Proto-Alphabetic Letters	226
Appendix 3: Declining and Parsing Guide for ME and PCH Words	230
Appendix 4: Chronology of Relevant Ancient Egyptian Dynasties	234
ABBREVIATIONS.....	236
REFERENCES	238
INDEX	257

PREFACE

This book is dedicated to Hubert Grimme, who first and correctly proposed that Hebrew is the language of the proto-consonantal script, and to every scholar who came before me in the study of this amazing field, without whose underappreciated contributions I certainly could not have made mine.

“Truth is unkillable!” – Balthasar Hübmaier

This volume represents the culmination of an enormous amount of research and the unlikely but groundbreaking discovery of the language behind the world’s oldest alphabet, which by no means was a goal that I had set out to accomplish. Since at least the third quarter of the nineteenth century, scholars in the field of both Egyptology and Western Semitic languages have attempted to isolate the proper Semitic language of the elusive proto-consonantal script, which is attested at Egyptian sites such as Wadi el-Ḥôl, Lahun, and—with the most voluminous amount of witnesses—Sinai’s Serâbîṭ el-Khâdim. The earliest texts discussed in scholarly literature of the nineteenth century are those from the turquoise mines at Serâbîṭ.

The challenge not only was to identify the correct language of the script, which primarily was written only with consonants (i.e. without vowels), but to decipher each pictographic letter correctly. As a result, the consonantal value of some letters has been agreed upon by scholars from early on, while that of other letters has remained in dispute. The matter is complicated by a number of factors, including the poorly preserved surfaces of many of the inscriptions, the often-times poorly executed forms of letters that cannot always be identified as to the specific pictograph (i.e. “images depicting words, syllables, or letters”; see [Yardeni 2014: 3](#)) that the ancient writer intended to inscribe, and the variety of ways in which letters were drawn by the authors of the PCH (proto-consonantal Hebrew) inscriptions of antiquity.

As a result of the unmet challenges presented by the daunting task of deciphering the world’s oldest alphabet, many radical thoughts have been expressed within this narrow field of study. While the reader will be spared from exposure to this checkered past, one set of comments is worth noting. A recent author wrongly remarked that the writings of the proto-consonantal script *were not language in a formal sense*, because the alphabet did not yet belong to an institution with the will to formalize it ([Sanders 2009: 49](#)). He also misdeclared that compared to the corpus of Sumero-Akkadian texts, the Wadi el-Ḥôl inscriptions are typical graffiti. Instead, they are highly poetical, represent advanced grammatical structure, and are dripping with profound meaning. The reality is that the study of the proto-consonantal writings has advanced greatly over the decades, and now that its language and script have been deciphered—perhaps fully, though only time will tell—unwarranted derogatory statements such as those of Sanders now can be laid to rest forever. The PCH texts *absolutely* are language in a formal sense.

To date, the most important work in the field has been Gordon Hamilton’s 2006 book, *The Origins of the West Semitic Alphabet in Egyptian Scripts*, which is an expanded and updated version of his dissertation. Before that, the standard work was Benjamin Sass’s

The Genesis of the Alphabet and Its Development in the Second Millennium B.C. of 1988, also the fruit of this scholar's doctoral dissertation. The most glaring weakness with both books, to which I nonetheless am deeply indebted on many levels, is the lack of virtually any attempt to translate the inscriptions that were documented. This lamentable situation obviously begins with their lack of knowledge of the proper Semitic language of the script, which reflects the greater criticism that few scholars, with the possible but doubtful exception of Hubert Grimme in the 1920s, have attempted to follow the archaeological trail that would have led them to the correct language.

This criticism reflects the virtual chasm that divides epigraphers from archaeologists. Progress will come only with interdisciplinary training and greater interaction with those of the opposite specialization. The criticism about the failure to identify the proper Semitic language of the script can be tempered by the difficulty with correctly identifying all of the intended pictographs in the various inscriptions, the lack of agreement as to the phonetic value of each pictograph, and the damaged state of many of the inscriptions. Yet despite all of these disclaimers, the fact remains that over recent decades, scholarly drawings and publications of many of the inscriptions have worsened—rather than improved—from those drawn by an earlier generation of scholars, such as with the published drawings of Sinai 349, Sinai 351, and Sinai 375a.

Therefore, the lack of energy that has been exerted to identify the language of the script and translate the inscriptions has been rivaled by the recent lack of effort to provide accurate drawings of all of the pictographs on many of the inscriptions, and thus to render all of the inscriptions in a state that actually can be useful to scholarship. This represents more of a problem with effort than with skill or ability, as the technology has been available for many years. As a result, I have seen the need to re-draw—by hand, electronically—every one of the inscriptions included here, using as many photographs as possible to achieve this goal. Whenever possible, inscriptions themselves were viewed and photographed in person.

Whenever profitable, the drawings were created in composite form, implying the tracing of various photographs for one inscription. The program of choice was Microsoft's PowerPoint, both because of the versatility of its component features and the ability to vary the view of any photo with magnification up to 400%. As a result, letters were drawn at varying magnification, depending on variables such as resolution, brightness, clarity in the writing of pictographs, anomalous markings on the stone surrounding or encountering the strokes of the pictographs, and damage due to weathering. Only such an investment of time, effort, and technology can lead to an accurate representation of what the ancient authors originally executed onto their preferred writing surfaces.

The intention here was not to compile an exhaustive study of every PCH inscription in existence, which could not be achieved in one volume even if desired. Instead, effort was made to limit the study to the vast majority of inscriptions that are complete or long enough to render a comprehensible and coherent message, one that can be derived with relative or great confidence. A work such as this has never been attempted, so there is no guarantee that I have rendered every pictograph accurately, transliterated every letter into Hebrew correctly, divided letters into words properly, or translated every word/clause/sentence/inscription optimally.

However, great caution was exercised to complete the task of drawing inscriptions fully and accurately, transcribing letters faithfully, and translating confidently before completing the writing of this volume, so as not to rush to press prematurely. As a result of this exacting approach to the task, the hope is that this work will withstand both the necessary rigors of scholarly scrutiny and the annals of time. Final judgment as to the accuracy of its findings should be reserved for three, four, or five decades after publication, not determined hastily. In the words of the German philosopher, Arthur Schopenhauer, “All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.” The assurance that I can provide regarding the inscriptions and their translations is that I had no horse in this race. However the text was found to read, that is how it was translated, with no attempt whatsoever at undue embellishment or incorporation of personal bias.

Due to the polarizing nature of the ramifications of this book, especially in relation to its impact on various aspects of biblical historicity, the expectation—though certainly not my desire—is that this volume will not lack for controversy. For this reason, it would have been far simpler to forego publication and leave this burden to some other brave soul who also is an interdisciplinarian, with training in Western Semitic languages, biblical Hebrew grammar and exegesis, Syro-Palestinian archaeology, Middle Egyptian language, Egyptian archaeology, iconography, and epigraphy (“the study of ancient texts and inscriptions”; see [Yardeni 2014: 3](#)). However, choosing this route would do a great disservice both to the ancient Hebrew writers who intended to communicate their thoughts and sentiments for posterity, to all of the professors and scholars (in various fields) who have invested so much in me, and to all of those who can and will benefit personally from the book’s publication. In short, it would be unforgivably self-centered and short-sighted to shirk the responsibility that has been placed on my shoulders, despite the impending controversy.

Douglas N. Petrovich,
Ph.D., M.A., Th.M., M.Div.
Toronto, Canada
September 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author who wrote all but the section entitled “Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon: Ceramic Evaluation,” ultimately is indebted to a large number of people, not all of whom can be recognized here. To begin, thanks go to David C. Deuel, my former Hebrew professor who has remained a mentor and dear friend for many years since imparting my deep love for the ancient Hebrew language and people. Ronald J. Leprohon, my former Middle and Late Egyptian professor, laid the foundation needed for me to understand this beautiful and picturesque language, from which the Hebrews borrowed 22 of their hieroglyphs to form a script of their own.

I also am indebted to Brian Colless, who deeply stimulated my thinking in the area of Western Semitics, syllabics, and the proto-consonantal script, even though agreement with him on all matters was not always achieved. Without many of the eye-opening insights that Brian freely offered, the discoveries recorded in this book may never have been spawned. Brian’s own translation of the Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon provided the foundation on which its translation here was built. Profound thanks go to all of the students whom I have taught over the years, from at least 30 different courses taught in three countries. Perhaps unbeknownst to them, their hunger for learning and the application of it to what they have learned has been a motivating factor for me.

With modern technology, scholars can interact with one another instantaneously from all over the world. On account of this, thanks go to numerous scholars on the ANE-2 and EEF online lists who provided insights and bibliographic resources, gave feedback about various readings and hypotheses, and helped to clarify areas of uncertainty. They filled this role without even knowing the great benefit that they would be providing for the present volume. Thanks also go to my family members, friends, and acquaintances who shared in the joy of the pioneering discoveries that were made along the way during the research phase, which kept the creative juices flowing and helped me focus on the final goal of comprehensive understanding and publication for the world to experience the ancient treasures into which this journey has led me.

An enormous debt of gratitude goes to Craig Petrovich, my brother, whose eye for detail with the nuances of Hebrew language and grammar have eliminated dozens of errors that otherwise would plague me relentlessly after publication. Craig graciously offered to check the translation, transcription, and grammatical soundness of every Hebrew construction. “A friend loves at all times, but a brother is born for adversity” (*Prov 17:17*). Any mistakes that remain are fully my responsibility, and hopefully will be removed from the second edition, should the need for one arise in the future.

In addition to the technical work that went into the preparation of this volume, tangible resources also were invested, without which its publication would not have come to fruition. I would like to express sincere thanks to all of the following individuals who made substantial contributions to ensure that publication would be achieved: Gerald & Marge Petrovich, Kristin Haines, Corey Linquist, Del Brunning, Jacquie Williams, Robert Adourian, G. M. Grena, and Peggy & George Consolver. Their belief in me and in the importance of this work means more than words can express.

Thanks must be conveyed to the publishers, Carta Jerusalem, namely Emanuel and

Shay Hausman, who from the beginning were impressed with the research involved and by the documentation provided for this project and the wide gamut of my interests. Thanks also go to Barbara Ball, whose diligent editing of the text and unending patience with me have ensured that the manuscript is much more presentable to the reader, and to Lorraine Kessel for the map work. Due to the controversial nature of the material and conclusions in this book, and to the potentially antithetical response that may come from those whose published views and stated convictions may be compromised by the veracity of the book's contents, the publishers have respected my right to present my case freely, and so face the inevitable opposition that will ensue.

In addition to the acknowledgment of the individuals named above, I am truly grateful to Sarah Doherty for her vitally important contribution, which firmly dates the proto-consonantal script's usage to a time late in Egypt's Dynasty 12 (nineteenth century BC). Her expertise in the area of Egyptian ceramics has proven to be an invaluable asset to the present work, complementing the epigraphical contributions in a way that I cannot rival.

D. N. P.

The contributing author is grateful to Douglas Petrovich for inviting me to contribute to this volume, while extending many thanks to Dr. Alice Stevenson and Tracey Golding of the Petrie Museum of Egyptian Archaeology for allowing me to view, study, and photograph Ostrakon UC59712. Sincere thanks to Ms. Janine Bourriau and Anna Wodzińska for inspiring the work with their helpful advice.

S. K. D.

LIST OF MAPS & PLANS

Sinai and Egypt	x
The Adventures of Sinuhe	21
Wadi el-Ḥôl and Surroundings.....	37
Serâbîṭ el-Khâdim.....	76
Harvard Sinai Expedition—Serâbîṭ, 1935.....	78–79
Sketch Map Showing Terrain above Mine M, and Its Relation to the Entrances of Mines L & M.....	142–143

LIST OF FIGURES

1. The Proto-Hebrew Alphabet	frontispiece
2. Caption on Sinai 115 (the Renefsheri Stele).....	16
2a. Photo of caption on Sinai 115 (the Renefsheri Stele).....	16
3. Sinai 377, at right of Sinai 46.....	30
4. Wadi el-Ḥôl 1	39
4a. Photo of Wadi el-Ḥôl 1	39
5. Wadi el-Ḥôl 2	47
5a. Photo of Wadi el-Ḥôl 2	47
6. The Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon.....	52
6a. Photo of the Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon (obverse)	54
6b. Photo of the Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon (reverse)	54
6c. Diagnostic rimsherd of the Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon and possible parallel vessels	57
6d. Parallel crescents on the Lahun Bilingual Ostrakon and Wadi el-Ḥôl 3	59
6e. The pyramid of Sesostris II at Lahun, looking north	62
7. Sinai 376.....	65
7a. Language of Sinai 376 and the First Temple—a comparison.....	72
7b. <i>B</i> -house as possible exemplar for <i>p</i> -stool in Apiru.....	73
8. Remains of Hathor’s temple at Serâbîṭ el-Khâdim, looking east.....	80
9. Sinai 345a.....	83
9a. Photo of the right side of the sphinx (Sinai 345a).....	83
10. Sinai 345b.....	85
10a. Photo of the left side of the sphinx (Sinai 345b).....	85
11. Sinai 346a.....	92
12. Sinai 346b.....	96
13. Sinai 349.....	103
13a. Sinai 349.....	103
14. Sinai 351.....	118
15. Sinai 353.....	129
16. Sinai 357.....	145
17. Sinai 360.....	155
18. Sinai 361.....	160
19. Sinai 375a.....	175
19a. Photo of Sinai 375a.....	175
20. Sinai 378.....	183
21. Hamilton’s faulty “bunch of papyrus” letter on Sinai 358 and Sinai 364	229