not used with reference to a certain region or a certain state. The Sinuhe story already speaks of an *Upper* and a *Lower Rṯnw*. Sinuhe's patron is the lord of *Upper Rṯnw*, but in his land there are various smaller state units and districts, independent or semi-independent, quite apart from the hostile nomads and the lords of the hill country whom the story expressly mentions.

There is no doubt that the name *Rṯnw* is Westsemitic, which is in the first instance confirmed by the characteristic "Amoritic" ending *-ânu*. *Alt* assumed that it was originally the name of a state derived from a place-name, *Lydda*[1]. Albright, on the other hand, has referred its meaning to the Arabic root لوذ (*to take refuge*), associating it with the town of *Luz*, the old name of *Bethel*[2]. However, these interpretations can hardly do justice to the territorially comprehensive name *Rṯnw*, especially as there can be no question of a large state with Lydda or Luz as capital[3]. Perhaps *Rṯnw* should be connected with the archaic Hebrew word רְזוֹן (*Pr.*, 14, 28, otherwise רִזֵּן, *Jud.*, 5, 3 etc.)—*prince*[4], *lord*, as a collective form in the sense of [*land of*] *the lords, rulers*, perhaps a Semitic equivalent for the Egyptian *ḥqʾw ḫʾśw·t, rulers of foreign lands*, an appelative denotation of the peoples of Asia, occuring already at the time of the XIIth Dynasty and frequently used in the Hyksos period. The name *Hyksos* in Manetho is probably derived from it[5].

---

(1) Alt, *Z.D.P.V.*, 1924, p. 169 ff.

(2) Albright, *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography*, p. 9, note 23.

(3) Alt bases himself mainly on *Rṯn*, the name of Lydda in the list of Thutmosis III. Semitic *d*, however, is never represented by *ṯ* in the *execration texts*. In addition to that the archaeological situation in Lydda is absolutely unknown. As to Luz, this town, too, can hardly be considered as the centre of a large federation, quite apart from the fact that the hypothesis maintained by Albright describing Luz as the original name of *Haʿai* (*et-Tell*) is hardly plausible.

(4) The form suggests the Arabic root رزى *to receive a present* (ارتزى *to rely upon someone*). The form רְזוֹן seems to be more primitive than רִזֵּן, and a root רזן can hardly be considered. Hebrew רְזוֹן corresponds to Westsemitic *Razânu* which in the Egyptian of the Middle Kingdom could only be represented by *Rṯnw*.

(5) On this term see Engberg, *The Hyksos Reconsidered* (1939), p. 6 ff. A similar case is perhaps the name *Kʿnaʿan*. In a newly discovered historical stela of Amenophis II, about which Mr. B. Grdseloff kindly informed me, we find the following