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Abstract

This thesis is an examination of the goals and methods of social archaeology. This is accomplished by examining the history of archaeological thought and the factors which gave rise to the need for a social archaeology. Then, the social archaeological method is explained and finally is applied in a case study which seeks to understand social power structures from wall art which decorated the walls of the private tombs of the tomb builders in during the New Kingdom of ancient Egypt. The purpose of this case study is to demonstrate how a social archaeological study would work. The thesis concludes with some remarks on the positive and negative points of the social archaeological method.
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Introduction

This thesis is the result of an interest in three areas: archaeological theory, Egyptology, and power relations and is the result of extensive reading, research and analysis in each of the different areas.

Archaeology as a discipline has evolved in several different ways throughout its history as an academic discipline. From speculation to an attempt to apply archaeology as a kind of earth science, archaeology has gone from one extreme to the other. In recent years however, it is being carefully scrutinized and its status as a unified discipline is in question due to the persistent raising of issues about the validity of its interpretations and the nature of its theory and methods. Are the results of past archaeological finds based on externally verifiable facts? Do they really reflect the past, or are they a reflection of both the past and the author’s view of the present? Are these findings a static record or may they be considered more as a text which can be reread and reinterpreted in several ways? These questions have resulted in a subdiscipline, generally known as social archaeology. Its goal is to seek a much closer connection between social theory, ethnography and archaeological practices in order to bring social science and archaeological insights into much closer contact. Social archaeology generates multiple possible readings of archaeological, social and ethnographic constructions.

In this thesis, I have chosen to undertake a social archaeological analysis which involves the use of theory (especially power and state formation), ethnographic analysis
(regarding the tomb builders of late Dynastic Egypt), and archaeological assemblages (from the private tomb chapels of the tomb builders) in order to create a reading of the data that is not static, but may be reinterpreted by different readers. It is also an analysis which draws insights from other disciplines (such as political science) and as a result may appear to be acceptable to those who have difficulties with the ‘stones and bones’ approach of conventional archaeology. Since social archaeological analysis is a fairly new perspective, I have decided to explore its formulations and to attempt to apply it to topics of long-standing interest to me. In doing so, I have divided this thesis into three sections, which essentially focus on issues of theory, methodology and application, in that order.

The purpose of the theory section is to review the recent history of archaeological thought, especially as it applies to social archaeology. This provides a basis for strategic decisions about conceptual applications to my case material.

The second section, discusses which analytic choices may be employed and it examines what kinds of information can be a useful basis for my case analysis.

Finally the third section comprises the actual case analysis. It takes issues of theory and method and applies them to specific case materials from late Dynastic Egypt. This section concludes with an evaluation of the advantages as well as the disadvantages of the social archaeological approach.

In structuring the thesis in this way, I have left room for the explication of several topical areas where I have deemed this to be necessary. The reason for this option is that I speak to several different audiences. First of all I speak to
anthropologists, who may know little or nothing about the practices of Egyptology or of social archaeological formulations concerning state formation and Power. Secondly I speak to Egyptologists, whom are knowledgeable in the area of ancient Egyptian art and custom, but will not necessarily be familiar with the history of archaeological thought and of the theories of state formation and power. Thirdly I address archaeologists who may be unfamiliar with ancient Egypt unless that is their area of specialty, and who may not be familiar with issues in the analysis of state formations and power. Finally I address social theorists who may be familiar with analyses of power and state formation, but may be much less familiar with archaeological theory or Egyptology. As a result, certain matters in this thesis are dealt with in much more detail than they would be if I were addressing a homogeneous audience of, say, archaeologists, or social theorists, or Egyptologists.

Chapter one deals primarily with archaeological theory and method in historical overview. The goal of the chapter is to demonstrate key developments in archaeological theory and method in order to assist in an understanding of the need for further analyses in the area of social archaeology. The chapter begins with a summary detailing what the term ‘social archaeology’ means. It examines issues of theory and methodology and certain issues in the ethics and politics of research, which have in part stimulated the development of social archaeology. As far as the ethics and politics are concerned, issues such as ownership and conservation of archaeological remains have been important stimuli. The chapter then goes on to examine issues in the history of archaeological theory and method, tracing these issues from about the 1960s to the
present and it serves to further illustrate the need for continuing review of practices within the discipline of archaeology. It identifies and draws insights from such schools of thought as Marxist archaeology, historical archaeology, ethnoarchaeology, contextual archaeology and post-processual archaeology, among others. Finally, the chapter returns to the idea of the desirability of a social archaeology and outlines the actual issues in theory and methodology that have developed for the conduct of social archaeological analysis.

Chapter two deals with the kinds of materials needed for social archaeological analysis, and indicates how I arrived at the identification of materials that I have decided to examine in my thesis. This includes an examination of issues in several theoretical formulations of state formation and power. It examines problems in the analysis of ethnographic materials based on the Ramesside period of ancient Egyptian history, and identifies similar studies applying similar methods elsewhere.

The more theoretical parts of this chapter include an overview of the key theoretical alternatives of state formation, and of the analysis of power relations by archaeologists. The intention of this section is to bring readers of differing backgrounds to a reasonably common understanding of where I stand on the theoretical formulations to be employed in my case analysis and to see something of how I have arrived at them. In the third chapter, the case analysis, I will examine social and power relations among a village of tomb builders in late Dynastic Egypt. In order to do this I have to assume some knowledge of the concept of power so, I have decided to include a substantial review of the issues in order to show my readers the paths that I have taken. I have
tried to provide readers with sufficient background without burdening them with a surfeit of details. Included in this section is an examination of the "integration theories", the "conflict theories" and the "irrigation theories". Finally I examine definitions of power relations specifically as they may pertain to my case analysis, based primarily on the definition of power developed by Jonathan Haas (1982) the particular formulation which I find most acceptable for my purposes.

The second part of chapter two provides an overview of archaeological accounts which have employed similar approaches to mine. This includes such works as Richard Bradley's (1984) *The Social Foundations of Prehistoric Britain: Themes and Variations in the Archaeology of Power*, Rosemary Joyce's (1991) *Cerro Palenque: Power and Identity on the Maya Periphery*, Hodder's (1982) *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, Renfrew & Cherry's (1986) *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, Smith's (1992) "Social Archaeology and The Early State", and finally Haas' (1982) *The Evolution of the Prehistoric State*. In doing this, I examine the work of other authors in order to assess what were their successes and failures, what "tools" they have used, and how they have used them. I also identify which indicators they have drawn from archaeological assemblages which signified to them the nature of social power structures and relations. These should prove to be useful in my case analysis, in that they provide ideas as to what to look for in my archaeological materials, and how to proceed with the analysis of power relations from archaeological data.
The third part of the second chapter examines ethnographic analyses which pertain to the tomb builders from the town of Deir el-Medina in Egypt during the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. These ethnographies include analyses of the daily lives of the tomb builders. Works such as Ancient Lives: The Story of the Pharaoh's Tombmakers by John Romer (1984), and Morris Bierbrier's (1982) The Tomb Builders of the Pharaohs reconstruct the day-to-day events in the lives of these people. They cover everything from the jobs that they did and the training that they underwent in order to do the job, to matters of recreation and legal justice. As far as our study is concerned, these studies provide valuable information as to how society may have been constituted as well as what items may serve as indicators of power in doing our case analysis. While I do not take these accounts to be definitive records of the lives of these people, I will use their information as I construct my representation of their social and power relations.

Just as I have summarized recent archaeological thought and analyses of state formation and power theories to share with my readers the conceptual frameworks that I favour, I have also included a section on state formation in Egypt and a brief glimpse the lives of the tomb builders at Deir el-Medina. While some may find this an excessive recounting, in my judgment it provides important background information for my analysis. First of all, I dealt at length with theories of state formation and origins, but as far as Egypt at the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty was concerned, it was already a fully formed state. In the final chapter, I examine power relations specifically as they are portrayed in the art that adorned the walls of the tomb chapels of the workers of Deir
el-Medina. In doing so, it is necessary to know something of the life of the workers. To that end, I have included a brief summary of social life in the town at that time.

The third chapter is an application of social archaeological insights to my case materials. This chapter establishes connections between perspectives and issues addressed in the preceding chapters. The particular case study involves an attempt to represent the power relations of the tomb builders of the Ramesside period of ancient Egypt. I have chosen the case of Deir el-Medina for several reasons. First of all, my personal love of and fascination with the ancient Egyptians may not be set aside. They lived a life which has always held my attention and kept me wanting to know more about them, about their lifestyles, their culture and most importantly, their art. I chose the tomb builders because of their relative anonymity as far as general knowledge is concerned. Today, most people in the western world are at least familiar with the untouched tomb of King Tutankhamen which was discovered in 1922 by Howard Carter. King Tutankhamen and the riches of his tomb are household knowledge, and people have come to understand, however falsely, that in Egyptian society there were pharaohs, and then there were peasants or slaves; that there was no middle ground. As our analysis shows there were crafts people and others who occupied a middle social strata. Amongst themselves, the tomb builders had their own distinctive social hierarchy. Foremen at the top were followed by deputies, scribes, draughtsmen and so on in a somewhat complex array. They had their own village, which was located near the main pyramid building sites. Initially, I wanted to focus on the Old Kingdom, or the very beginning of Dynastic Egypt (approximately 2700-2300 B.C.). A problem
proved to be a lack of archaeological evidence directly pertaining to the tomb builders of that period, a problem which would only hinder my analysis, if not make it impossible. It was then decided to move to the period of the New Kingdom (1575-1085 B.C.), and to the town now known as Deir el-Medina (Thebes of late Dynastic Egypt). It is here that the most extensive archaeological information about the pharaohs' tomb builders has been found. Several monographs have been written about these people. The most notable are John Romer's (1984) *Ancient Lives: The Story of The Pharaohs Tomb Builders* and Morris Bierbrier's (1982) *The Tomb-builders of the Pharaohs*. They are ethnographic attempts to bring life back to people that have long since gone. They describe such things as occupations, living arrangements, social relations and details of clothing and methods of subsistence. Furthermore, while they are academic works, they speak to a more general audience as well, and so they deserve our attention.

In the case analysis, our goal is to look for representations of power relations as depicted in the wall art of the Deir el-Medina tombs. As previously stated, this art covers most of the walls of the tomb chapels that the workmen built, not for others, but for themselves. The art is rich in detail about the daily lives of the people and about how they were placed within the greater scheme of social life, including their relation to the gods. The goal of our analysis is to determine what the power structures may have looked like, this is only the goal of the analysis and not the overall goal of the thesis itself. The goal of the *thesis* is to examine the relative value of social archaeology and to find out where some of its strengths and weaknesses lie. To put this into
perspective, if the case analysis is at best only a partial success, that is not a major problem for this thesis. The real point is to evaluate and attempt to apply the methods of social archaeology, and while Egypt provides a case study here, there is no intention to produce a definitive study of power in Deir el-Medina. First of all, the subject is far too large to deal with here, and secondly that is not the primary goal.

With all of this said, I now begin the thesis. A quick recapitulation is necessary. The subject of this thesis is social archaeology; what is it and how does it work? In accomplishing this goal I examine diverse subjects in a fair amount of depth. First of all, I examine the development of archaeological thought within the past thirty years. Secondly, I present the discussion of early state formation theory, which leads to an examination of the development of power relations. Finally, I examine materials on the lives and power relations of the tomb builders in Deir el-Medina during the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties of ancient Egypt. Throughout, I attempt to remain close to the common thread that runs through all of these subjects, and that thread is social archaeology. All of these diverse components are linked to it in some way. Our examination of archaeological theory helps to show why a social archaeology is desirable or necessary and suggests where it has come from as an analytical perspective. The state and power theories form the basis of the theoretical perspective to be employed in our case analysis. I do not provide definitive summaries of these areas, for they all include voluminous information. It is my hope that through my presentation of these different subjects, the primary goal of this thesis will remain clear;
the value and applicability of social archaeology to analyses of social and power structures.
Chapter One

What is Social Archaeology

There is no definitive response to the question, 'what is social archaeology?,' for it means quite different things to different scholars. As previously indicated, social archaeology has evolved over some time (principally since the 1960's) and has developed in a variety of different ways. Its diverse theoretical formulations cover a broad spectrum, although the real differences between them may be small. The most notable theorists include Ian Hodder (1982a, b, c, d, 1986), Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley (1987a & b), Charles Redman (1978), Colin Renfrew (1986) and Lewis Binford (1962, 1983, 1989). Each has written extensively in social archaeology and has applied its methods and insights to quite different sorts of data. There are four main categories of issues, but this chapter will deal only with two of them and how they pertain to social archaeology. These issues are theory and method. The other two issues, ethics and politics can be found in detail in Appendix B at the end of this thesis.

The reason for this is simple. Ethics and politics are issues which relate directly to the excavation and conservation of archaeological artifacts and no discussion of archaeology would be complete without including them. The theorists mentioned above have all devoted significant sections of their monographs to these subjects. In addition, these are issues that I have strong personal views on. However, since they are not directly related to what social archaeology is and how it can be used to reinterpret archaeological remains, I have chosen to keep my discussion of these issues separate from the main body of the text.
Theory and Methodology

This section will include an overview of the theoretical and methodological emergence of social archaeology. The purpose is to establish a basis of understanding with perspective readers who may come from other disciplines. It will also provide the basis for the issues in theory and methodology to be employed in the case analysis presented later in this thesis.

Schools of Archaeological Thought

It is important to note that schools of archaeological thought are divided into two general types: materialist and idealist (Hodder, 1986:18). Materialist approaches pay more attention to the behavior of a society than to the cultural justifications and legitimations for such behavior. On the other hand, idealist approaches admit and understand that part of human action is materially related, but that the important human issues stem from variations in culture and or in the structure of the human mind (Hodder, 1986:19). The following schools of archaeological thought have been significant to all areas of archaeology and as such, it is important to mention them.

Systemic Adaptive Theory

The systems approach, or the systemic adaptive theory was materialist in perspective and its goal is to identify law like relationships. In this view, everything from symbolism to culture is considered as a mechanism for adaptation or more simply
a matter of survival (Hodder, 1986:20-22). While this approach seeks to explain the use
and function of objects, it can not account for the production of culture.

**Structuralist Approach**

The structuralist approach is quite similar to the systems approach in that they
both seek to provide a framework within which to locate the components. (Hodder,
1986:34-35) The significant difference though is that this approach attempts to relate
the obvious structures to those that are more abstract. In doing this, it provides
structures through which the systems take form. (Hodder, 1986:53)

**Marxist Archaeology**

Marxist archaeology asserts that while there are social structures, they may exist
on several different levels. Social structures involve dialectical relationships and so
highlight social contradiction and conflict. This contradiction exists between the
dominant group who controlled the means of production and the subordinate group (in
opposition as the expansion of one group is at the expense of the other), and the
second, between the forces and relations of production (contradictions arise when the
forces and relations of production are changed and these changes lead to changes in
style and ideology). Through Marxism, archaeology has developed to include studies
of the structure of meaning as well as the involvement of these structures in the realm
of social change. While the approach to examining material culture now includes the
examination of structure and function of material symbols, it still fails to deal well
enough with the content of historical meanings and contexts (Hodder, 1986:75-76).
Approaches Specifically Related to Social Archaeology

There are several approaches to consider which are adjacent to social archaeology or which pose significant alternatives to it. Because of this, I will examine them in greater detail than the theories mentioned in the preceding section.

Historical Archaeology

Historical archaeology, involves a return to the ideas of the pre-New Archaeology, to bring back the culture-historical view, as well as a coherent philosophical approach. This is claimed to be a necessary step since it is clear that the approaches previously discussed lack important elements, namely cultural meaning, the individual and history. Historical archaeology is an attempt to combine the old and the new, a sort of compromise between past and present archaeological method. The historical archaeologist’s goal is to study the recent past by combining the analysis of historical documents with the analysis of archaeological materials. In combining the methods of history with those of archaeology, we obtain the potential to create a more comprehensive view of past events. We can see more than just the documented historical event, according to historical archaeologists, for in a sense, we can look at the internal dynamics of events, thereby providing us with a better understanding of societal change, the role of the individual, and the relations between structure, idea and practice. In return, archaeology can contribute much to contemporary questions and arguments concerning society and social change.
Ethnoarchaeology

In the same vein, the ethnoarchaeological approach, investigates aspects of ethnographically documented behavior and tries to demonstrate how similar patterns of behavior may be reflected in archaeological material. It studies the behavior of living people in order to obtain an idea of how similar behavior might have influenced the deposits of a site. It provides archaeologists with working models for identifying the functions of artifacts and facilities. This type of research is not only relevant to the interpretation of data, but also to its collection and analysis (Kramer, 1979:1-2). The goals of ethnoarchaeology are simple. It is an approach designed to compensate for the fact that archaeologists cannot question, interview, or observe informants. As a matter of fact, the only informants they have are cultural artifacts. Ethnoarchaeologists often use participant observation and interviewing in much the same ways as ethnographers. They attempt to incorporate ethnographic data into ethnohistorical data to serve as a supplement to the already published 'record'. However the goals of fieldwork differ between ethnographers and ethnoarchaeologists. Ethnoarchaeologists place an emphasis on material culture as it relates to behavior. As a result, special attention is given to the systematic documentation of material culture (Kramer, 1979:4-5). The result of this type of approach is that it serves not simply to fill in historical gaps, but it adds new dimensions to the interpretation of conventional techniques such as typology, spatial analysis, chronological control and stratigraphy. While this approach may present the archaeologist with a broader view of what past events may
have looked like, critics argue that it relies too heavily on interpretations of the present, in other words, that more traditional methods of analyzing the past (i.e. the analysis of things such as ancient iconography) are cast aside in favor of analysis of the present, which may or may not be similar to events in the past (Kramer, 1979:8-10).

**Contextual Archaeology**

Contextual archaeology, involves placing objects in their proper contexts rather than immediately placing them into highly subjective, analytical categories. As the name implies, contextual archaeology strives to study objects within the “bigger picture” and not as isolated, separate artifacts or features. This involves addressing the meaning of objects. The word “meaning” can be defined in two different ways: the structured system of functional inter-relationships; and the structured content of ideas and symbols. The first type of meaning is established by examining how an object functions in relation to economic and social structures as well as to human and physical environments. To ascertain the first type of meaning is to examine its relation to such things as the exchanges of matter, energy and information, settlement size, the physical and human relationship and so on.

The second type of meaning is less simple to establish. It involves making

Abstractions from the symbolic functions of the objects [we] excavate in order to identify the meaning content behind them and this involves examining how the ideas denoted by material symbols themselves play a part in structuring society (Hodder, 1986:121)
In addition, similarities and differences in objects are analyzed, and these are built up into contextual associations. These similarities and differences are examined on several different levels and dimensions, such as the temporal, the spatial, the topological and finally the depositional unit. "Temporal" refers to objects that are close in time. The "spatial" dimension refers to location and arrangement of the objects. The "typological" dimension is really a variant of the two previous dimensions and refers to objects that have similar arrangements or forms in space (1986:131-132). Finally the "depositional unit" (which is also a derivative of the first two) refers to objects such as those found in pits, graves, or between closed layers, and so on. While this dimension is just as subjective as the other dimensions, it is distinct in that it is believed or assumed that the actual physical boundaries are themselves part of the development of meaning (Hodder, 1986:130-131). The contextual approach to archaeology, "the study of contextual data using contextual methods of analysis in order to arrive at contextual meaning (Hodder, 1986:146)" leads us to the final theoretical approach to be examined, that of post-processual archaeology.

**Post-processual Archaeology**

Post-processual archaeology developed as a response to processual archaeology, and holds that it is difficult if not impossible to be objective in studying past cultures due to conscious or unconscious biases of archaeologists. It is characterized by three different issues involved with the breaking down of dichotomies, between the individual and the norm, the ideal and material, as well as between structure and
process. There is also one other possible dichotomy, that of subject and object (Hodder, 1986:147). The argument associated with the individual and the norm is that their relations must be examined more closely. It seeks to generate discussion of the processual relationship between individuals and social norms (Hodder, 1986:148-152). The ideal and the material is a response to the increasing readiness from the archaeological profession to address issues such as meaning structures, ideology, and ideational sub-systems. The break from traditional archaeology here is the concern with meaning content (1986:153-154). The third break, process and structure refers to the idea that there "might be structures, codes of presences and absences, that lie behind historical and adaptive processes" (Hodder, 1986:152). Which in itself is a radical notion. The final dichotomy to be broken by post processualists is that of object and subject, or better yet, archaeology and society. This can be briefly summarized by saying that there has been increased attention paid to the "subjectivity of the pasts we reconstruct in relation to contemporary power strategies" (Hodder, 1986:156)."

Two ideas that relate to this dichotomy or lack thereof are: that the past is constructed in the present in a highly subjective manner; and that the subjective past is not removed from the power relations of the present. As a response to these issues, several alternative archaeologies have developed and included among them are indigenous and feminist archaeologies. Indigenous archaeologies are a product of the realization that the pasts being reconstructed by western archaeologists were western pasts, that is to say politically and ideologically motivated by western thought (Hodder, 1986: 157-159). It should be noted though that western archaeology has tended to be
based more on scientific fact than some of the indigenous archaeology. It is therefore essential that the different types of archaeological studies be examined and evaluated before either is discounted. Feminist archaeology has developed in order to present a viewpoint from the position of women. The two main features of feminist alternative archaeology are: first, that archaeologists have tended to treat the division of labor of the past as a mirror of the sexual division of labor of today. This link, whether it is valid or not, serves to make gender relations of the present seem universal and inevitable. Secondly, in most archaeological analysis, the emphasis appears to be on "Dominant male activities" (Hodder, 1986:159) such as warfare, leadership, power etc. In light of this, feminist archaeologists argue that it is wrong to assume that universal divisions of labor and sex linking of activities exist. The term "woman" should not therefore refer to characteristics that are seen as universal, but rather an emphasis should be placed on the analysis of gender construction and its variations in specific historical contexts. (Hodder, 1986:159-60).

In the context of the preceding discussion of schools of archaeological thought we may now highlight some of the distinctive theoretical issues of social archeology.

Social Archaeology: Theoretical Issues Concerning Method

Theoretically speaking, the goal of social archaeology is to replace conventional archaeological analysis with a sort of text which can be read and reinterpreted in a variety of ways depending on which theory is applied (Willey & Sabloff, 1980; Shanks & Tilley, 1987b). This is however highly problematic
theoretically and methodologically, as the following discussion will suggest. One central idea here is the notion of time, which is highly problematic: “It constitutes the major problem of interpretation and yet it is the reason for the discipline’s existence (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b:7).” The archaeological record has conventionally assigned cultural remains to static time-horizons but, the “past can not be present and yet the traces of the past surround us (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b:7).” Because of this, one of the main foci of social archaeology is to revalue the gap between the past and its relation to the present: “We attempt to emphasize archaeology as event and experience in the present as social practice which can not escape the present (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b:7).” This is an attempt to change the notion that archaeology deals only with practices of the past. The approach of social archaeology is to show that archaeology is very much an event in the present. Who we are now and the background we have is deeply reflected in our representations of the past.

In close conjunction with the issue of time is the issue of ‘archaeology as text’ and not ‘archaeology as record’. The term ‘record’ implies a sort of definitive, timeless reality. It implies that ‘the record’ is an exact account of events which transpired, and is therefore not open to further interpretation. A text however, is indeed open to alternative interpretations of further meaning, unlike a static, definitive ‘record’. This is the second main concern; to produce a text which is ‘open’, which can be interpreted in several ways, (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b). Although archaeological remains will always in a sense be ‘in the past’, through this type of interpretation, they will also be timeless in that there is no end to the opportunity for reanalyses. New theoretical
frameworks (developed in the present, reflecting present ideas and beliefs) will always provide the opportunity for alternate analysis of the material which will constantly have ties to the present. This is not an easy thing to do. The notion of the ‘text’ is problematic in that it implies several possible readings. This means that it is still not bias-free, and it may continue to lead people to think of the past as a static period which will never change. As we will see in the next section, the application of theory to archaeological material is seldom easy.

Social Archaeology: Methodology

The goal of social archaeology is to develop archaeological texts which can be seen as a blend of past practices and products as well as conceptual practices of the present. But there must be some methodical way of doing this (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b:7). Applying theoretical frameworks to archaeological arrangements is not a simple process, since there is little agreement regarding issues of method. Each theory and each set of archaeological data will offer distinctive methodological challenges.

In order to attempt this kind of study, three areas of analysis must be considered, which involve going beyond the borders of archaeology into other areas of the social sciences (Smith, 1992:120). First of all, one must draw from social theory, whether from anthropology, political science or sociology (Smith, 1992:120). Which theoretical frameworks exist that are pertinent to one's research? What do they offer the analysis in terms of definitions and or possible answers to research questions? Secondly, reference to ethnographic analyses is essential. Ethnographic sources must be
considered in order to determine what sorts of materials may be used as indicators of social relations, and of what materials are likely to have been left behind, by analogy to ethnographically similar situations. The goal is to examine ethnographic sources which deal with the same general types of social structures or cultural dynamics which are likely to be analogous to archaeological situations. By analogy to ethnographic accounts, which tools or materials are likely to have been left behind? (Smith, 1992:120). This may serve as indicators for the types of things, and the types of relations, uncovered in archaeological materials. Thirdly, it is essential to examine other archaeological accounts of analogous situations— in this case archaeological analysis as distinct from ‘ethnographic analogies’. Which theoretical and methodological frameworks were used in analogous archaeological situations? Which types of indicators were useful in these analyses? Are there any similarities between your study and remains and theirs? What possible conclusions can be drawn from such analogies? (Smith, 1992:120).

Conclusion

In our brief overview of approaches to archaeological analysis, we have seen that there is no single theory or method that prevails. Furthermore, as the discipline matures and develops, its methodological and theoretical needs will evolve, necessitating new methods of analysis. Archaeology is the study of cultural remains from the past, but that does not mean that their interpretations are not also deeply rooted in the present. There is a need for the discipline to understand the political and ideological issues of analyses in present social contexts. There can be no theory which
applies to all situations, and there is no set list of things to look for or procedures to follow. As a result, social archaeology is methodologically challenging, and deeply contested, and “we must always be alert to the unexpected and always ready to reassess our previous theoretical formulations” (Smith, 1992:120). This is where social archaeology plays a role. In this type of analysis, theoretical formulations from other disciplines and findings from archaeological studies dealing with analogous subjects are important parts of any analysis. This approach makes for more deeply nuanced analysis by locating archaeological analyses within the broader context of social analysis. As far as the similar archaeological assemblages are concerned, they add insight to the study in terms of the information revealed in other studies. In other words, it helps to show how other cultures used objects, or what other archaeologists have found to be the uses and meanings of objects.

In the next chapter we examine specific theoretical formations and identify archaeological assemblages which are relevant to this attempt at a social archaeological analysis.
Chapter Two

Identification of Conceptual Tools Drawn From Social Archaeology to be Applied in the Case Analysis.
Introduction

This thesis consists of two main interrelated matters: conceptual issues (both of theory and method), and their applications to a case. This chapter attempts to identify those issues which are to be applied to a brief case analysis. In chapter three, I will attempt to apply these issues to making inferences about power relations from 'prehistoric' art. In this chapter, I also outline the steps that I have taken in order to arrive at the conceptualizing of social and power relations as they may be observed in archaeological materials. I provide, in particular, a definition of social power for application in my case analysis. I begin with a discussion of state formation. While Egypt in the period that I will be dealing with was a fully formed state, I feel that it is necessary to discuss how such power relations came about during the early stages of state formation in general. In essence, this discussion of state formation is an examination of conceptual issues that I have employed in the case analysis. Once again, I seek to familiarize the reader with my approach, especially those from other academic backgrounds.

The second main section in this chapter is an examination of archaeological accounts analogous to the case I analyze. I examine similar kinds of archaeological studies, not necessarily within the same geographical area, but studies that deal with comparable subject matter (i.e. concerning power relations and the state). This does not provide an exact framework, because situations may be different in important
respects from my own, but the common link is the identification of power relations and their recognition in archaeological remains.

The third section of this chapter is a review of analogous ethnographic analyses. In this case, the works deal mainly with the tomb builders of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. These are extremely useful in that they provide us with ideas of what we might be looking for, and also what we might find, in archaeological contexts. They discuss the routines and circumstances of living for these people, with what sets them apart from each other and with what draws them together.

All three of these sections are an important basis for proceeding to my final chapter. The theoretical base derived from the discussion on state formation and power provides a general theoretical framework in which to work.

The main issue in the present chapter must therefore be a discussion of the concept of power in general.

**Theories of Power and State Formation**

What is meant by the term power? The term has alternative meanings in social theories, so it is important to spell out the sense I have accepted here. Power refers to "power over" (others) and "power to" (control and change) (McGuire, 1992:132). When the idea of power is mentioned, it is often assumed that it necessarily means a study of the top and the bottom strata of a social structure and of their relations. In this thesis, this is not the case.
The reasons for choosing to focus on the issue of power are fairly simple. First of all, power is a concept not widely used in archaeological discourse, although there are notable exceptions. The reasons for reluctance to employ it may vary, but it is my conclusion that power is rarely dealt with because it entails analysis of vast amounts of information drawn from several disciplines. To attempt to understand the power structures of a particular group is to understand the intricate workings of core relations in the society and among its people, and power is confined to one area of social life. It is woven throughout society as a whole. This is an area with which conventional archaeologists feel ill at ease. It is a common enough sentiment among archaeologists that the evidence provided by archaeology is not extensive enough to support analysis of complex social structures, especially of the “abstract” or invisible ones such as power. As a result, the issue is a key one for this type of study. It is relatively new to the archaeological discipline, and its analysis must draw from several related social sciences.

Two general types of theories (i.e. conflict, integration), have generally provided the groundwork for an analysis of power. What is meant by the concept of power? Ethnographic analogy may suggest indicators of power relations for social archaeology, for example visible differences in clothing, hairstyle, jewelry, make-up or coloring, and possibly in tools used on the job or in private life. Finally, other archaeologists have provided insights into power relations in broadly analogous cultures to the case I analyze and into the application of social-theoretical concepts to archaeological data. Secondly, to use power as an integral variable in any study
implies a comprehensive knowledge of a whole way of life. While such an approach may not appeal to some, it does appeal to me since one of my personal goals of this research is to learn about the fabric of social life ancient Egypt.

**State Formation**

I will now summarize alternative theoretical formulations surrounding state formation, with an emphasis on power relations, and at the end of the chapter I have include a brief overview of the process of state formation as far as Egypt is concerned. State formation and power can not be treated as separate entities. As one developed, so did the other. In addition, there have been several notable attempts at analyzing state formations from archaeological material. I have included this overview in my thesis for similar reasons that I included such an extensive summary of archaeological theory in the previous chapter, that being to establish some common conceptual language between myself as an anthropologist and my potential readers who come from diverse scholarly traditions.

I wish to examine the power relations among the pharaoh's tomb builders of ancient Egypt. I have chosen to examine data on the tomb builders of the Ramified period (the late New Kingdom of ancient Egypt) from an area now known as Deir el-Medina. The tomb builders were neither at the top nor the bottom of the social structure. Rather, they formed a group in the upper middle strata of the social structure with its own distinctive social and power relations. Among them there are jobs and
positions that are considered to be more ‘upper class’ as well as those that are considered to be lower on the social scale.

Political scientists, anthropologists, sociologists, archaeologists and other social scientists have considered the nature of power relations extensively, and now that archaeology has opened itself up to this new form of interpretation, social science formulations are giving new meaning to archaeological studies of social relations and vice versa (see Haas, 1982; Service, 1975).

Theoretical treatments of state formation from the other disciplines of the social sciences are now being applied to various archaeological problems trying to answer the question how states came into being (Smith, 1992:118). Works such as Haas’ The Evolution of the Prehistoric State (1982) and Smith’s “Social Archaeology and the Early State” (1992) are prime examples of the recent increase in interest in state formations within the framework of social archaeology. There is however one area of state formation and development that is often by-passed by archaeologists and that is the concept of power. Haas, (1982) admits:

The concept of power is widely recognized in Political Science and Anthropology as a critical element in understanding political processes and evolution... but is has rarely been used by archaeologists. It is not that archaeologists have failed to recognize the importance of power as a central variable in state evolution... but they have not attempted to use it in their theoretical and empirical research (Haas, 1982:155).

Power is, however, assuming an increased importance in archaeology, and particular analyses based on archaeological situations has produced such works as Joyce’s Cerro

Social Theory Surrounding State Formation and Power

Theoretical frameworks surrounding early state formation extend as far back as the Enlightenment, and ways of thinking about power were split into two groups, which have been called the ‘conflict theorists’ and the ‘integration theorists’ (Haas, 1982). While the theoretical debates extend well back in history, I shall forgo them and concentrate instead on the more contemporary viewpoints.

Integration Theorists

Moret & Davy (1926) were specifically concerned with the evolution of the state in ancient Egypt, however their monograph From Tribe to Empire: Social Organization among Primitives in the Ancient East deals with a few groups other than the Egyptians in the ancient East. Their examination of state formation, does however specifically center around Egypt.

1st Dynasty, which marked the foundation of a centralized State, had been preceded by a long preparatory period in which the Egyptians had sought for an effective social organization to ensure the security and regularity of social labor in the valley (Moret & Davy, 1926:128).
From this, we see that Moret & Davy follow what has been called the ‘integrationist theory’ which holds that states evolved from a sort of general, collective will, but they do also take into account interpretations of the roles of material items in terms of state formations. In their view, irrigation and the need for an organized, centralized work force brought about the state, whose principal mandate was to provide economic administration of irrigation systems as well as services in the areas of trade, military protection, and the mediation of disputes. While the state provided all of these services, people easily and voluntarily agreed to be ruled by the state (Haas, 1982: 70-71).

In his book Origins of the State and Civilization: The Process of cultural Evolution (1975) Elman Service gives his views on state origins, and he clearly asserts that he disagrees with the conflict theorists:

The present research provides no evidence for the class-conflict theory of the origin of either the state or civilization nor does it support any other of the many versions of conflict and conquest theory. But so prevalent have these been in our intellectual history that a complete chapter of “negative conclusions” seems necessary in order to adequately rebut them. The final chapter however states my findings in positive terms: The origins of government lay essentially in the institutionalization of centralized leadership, which in developing its further administrative functions grew into an aristocracy as well (Service, 1975:xii).

Service bases his rejection of conflict theories on an interpretation of both ethnographic and archaeological data and presents the counter argument that central governments evolve in more complex societies due to increased need for integrative systems (Haas, 1982:73; Service, 1975:8). He explains the development of the system as a progression
from chiefdoms either into the primitive state (which results when there is contact between a developed state system and a chiefdom), or into an archaic civilization (which is the "natural evolution" from a chiefdom) (Haas, 1982: 75; Service, 1975:289, 302,304). He claims that chiefdoms are methods of social organization which develop out of large groups involved in large scale or extensive activities for the purpose of exploiting resources. This requires co-ordination, which was taken on by a leader or chief who was deemed to be the best person for the job. Once a chiefdom was established, the logical progression was to an authority network, as institutions used the leader or chief as their central point. Gradually, the position of chief expanded to that of a ruling body (of several persons) which assumed all of the leadership or organizational roles (warfare, trade, irrigation and water management and mediation of intrasocietal conflict) (Haas: 1982:74; Service, 1975: 290-308). Service then goes on to discuss the archaic civilization which is, by his definition, not a state but rather a larger and more developed chiefdom.

The state, he feels, developed only with the secularization of government (a much later feature of early civilizations), and was not an answer to class conflict, but rather a product of military expansion and the conquest of other societies (Service, 1974: 190-194, 223-224, 285,286; Haas, 1982:76).

On the subject of power, Service (1975:12-14) outlines its uses, politically speaking, as "consent", "decision-making" and "judgment".
“Consent”, he says is a means of guarding and increasing power for the holder and consent is gained usually through what he refers to as reinforcement, whether it positive or negative (1975: 12-13).

In his discussion of “decision making”, Service states that the term is really too broad. An alternate term, “administration”, is too formal. The best label for this context, he decides, is “leadership,” which comes about when a “concerted action is a response to some form of leadership and is guided and accomplished by that leadership (1975: 13).”

The third use can be referred to as” judging”, “adjudication”, “arbitration”, or “mediation,” all of which may be used in reference to a person or group of persons who have the power to deal with disputes. He goes on to discuss each term and arrives at “mediation” as the best one (judging and adjudication are too formal and restrictive, while arbitration refers to a special kind of agreement in which both parties agree to co-operate with the decision arrived at by the third party) since it is general enough to apply to “the various institutional forms that we may be able to arrange in an evolutionary series” (1975:14).

Although he has striven to arrive at general concepts for defining power, this is the downfall to his discussion. In his delineations, his general terms are far too broad, and the broadness which is designed to facilitate analysis will no doubt hinder it.
**Conflict Theorists**

Among recent and contemporary "conflict" theorists on state formations there are several which have been deeply influential in political anthropology, those of Karl Marx and Freidrich Engels (as one position), V.Gordon Childe and Morton Fried.

For Marx and Engels, the rise to statehood began with increased technology and efficiency in the area of food production (agriculture). This entailed three things: a division of labor, centralized power over the means of production, and consequently the majority of wealth concentrated in hands of a few (Engels, 1891:228; Haas, 1982:36-37). In this view, the state evolved as a means of regulating inevitable conflicts which arose between the rich and the poor. In order to effectively suppress these conflicts, armies, prisons and coercive institutions evolved as means of physical control. Instead of mediating between opposing interests, the state ended up catering to the rich at considerable cost to the poor (Engels, 1891:31; Haas, 1982: 36-37).

From a Marxist perspective, power would be defined as "the ability to do or accomplish something. It is this ability to act, to do work that makes social labor possible" (Marx, 1906: 197-198). In his discussion of power, McGuire (1992) discusses power in terms of two types, "power to" and "power over". "Power over" is essentially seen as a negative force (drawn from Weber, 1978) that some hold over others which serves to distance them from society. This divides society into those who hold power and those who are subject to it. Power holders have the ability to make others carry out their wishes. "Power to" refers to those who have the ability or the
social means to change a situation by altering the events which is a phenomenon that is very much a part of society as a whole (McGuire, 1992: 132).

Archaeologist V.Gordon Childe (working in the Marxian tradition), was concerned primarily with processes which led to the formation of old world civilizations, not specifically state formations. He advocated a view which was a combination of features of integrationist and conflict positions. In his view, advances in the area of agriculture led the way to radical changes in the areas of the economy and politics primarily because of the capacity to produce large surplus, eg. food and other economic commodities which were initially designed to ensure food for years of bad crops and to ensure food for non-producers. However, he considers this to be only part of the significance of these surpluses. He also maintains that they arose in response to the need to acquire objects and materials through trade. This resulted in a specialized division of labor in terms of food producers, and administrators, soldiers, merchants and craftsmen needed to facilitate the trading (Childe, 1936:115; 1942; Haas, 1982: 40). To develop such large scale surplus, irrigation was required, which further increased the amount of social control, since the need for control and organization of the labor force and its administration increased with the development of trade and irrigation. Small communities were joined together not only to control and organize, but also for the purpose of creating large scale work forces necessary for canal maintenance and construction. The overwhelming need for governmental control gave rise to the state, whose mandate was to control production, trade, and warfare (Childe, 1936:115-125, 107-110; 1942; Haas, 1982: 41).
Morton Fried maintained another position: that the rise to statehood developed through the evolutionary development of ranked societies from egalitarian ones. This, he maintained, happened in response to matters such as population increase and the development of technology resulting in more efficient means of agricultural production, and the need to develop ways of production and distribution of resources. Fried maintained that ruling classes developed when select individuals realized the needs and responded to them (Fried, 1967:183-184; Haas, 1982:47). He conformed to the conflict theory in that he maintained that the state, whose characteristics are both physical and ideological methods of control, developed in response to the need to maintain order in the face of severe conflict. Finally, the control (in terms of coercion, communication, information, legal and judicial systems) possessed by the state combined with the power it already possessed due to stratification put it in a very powerful position (Fried, 1967:230-238; Haas, 1982:49).

In the introduction to *Evolution of Political Society*, Fried (1967) defines power in a general way: "Power is the ability to channel the behavior of others by threat or use of sanctions" (Fried, 1967: 13). In this definition he emphasizes negative rather than positive sanctions, or the role of both. Also, by this definition he has left the concept of power open to a wide range of possible situations to which this could apply. He does, however, make the distinction between power and authority, which is an important distinction. The difference, he says is that authority is the ability to control the actions of others without threats or sanctions (1967:13). This is an
important distinction, because such a concept of authority implies control through peaceful means.

Irrigation Theory

Karl Wittfogel's theory of irrigation and its organization is discussed in his (1957) *Oriental Despotism*. This formulation is innovative in that it relies on neither integration nor conflict theory. In his view, the state is a "government by professionals" (Wittfogel, 1957:239) which arises (to some extent. He does not maintain that this was the exact situation for all societies but does maintain that irrigation did play a role in all of them) from the intense form of agriculture known as canal irrigation. He identified conditions necessary for the development of irrigation systems, and stated that when this distinctive system developed there were necessary organizational changes throughout society in order to manage the kind of necessary social mobilization. One of these organizational changes was the need for an extensive, properly managed labor force. Managerial forces developed into a highly specialized hierarchy in response to the need for increased planning, organization, maintenance and conflict resolution. As this force developed it took on certain responsibilities such as communication, military organization, construction, etc. This, Wittfogel said, was the group of leaders who formed the government of the state. He identifies these as the "professionals."

The problem with this theory is that Wittfogel tried to make a multilinear model of social development into a unilinear one. This it to say that his theory could
have accounted for differences in evolution between despotic and non-despotic states, as well as for reasons why there could be differences in the states that were based on irrigation. Instead, he tried to make the argument unilinear by claiming that all states developed from irrigation despotic states, and that this came about through diffusion. There are states that have developed without any evidence of canal irrigation in their past, (as well as non-state intensive irrigation societies which for example appeared in East Africa) so there is no possible generality to the theory. Finally, further archaeological evidence has brought the strong correlation that Wittfogel maintained existed between political centralization and irrigation into considerable doubt.

**Final Remarks on Power**

Finally, I have chosen to summarize the concept of power following Jonathan Haas (1982), who deals in depth with the concept of power as a major factor in the evolution of states. (It should be noted that Haas has developed his views on power by drawing, in part from the works of Bierstedt such as his *Power and Progress: Essays on Sociological Theory* (1974)). I have chosen to do so because of the well articulated nature of his definition, its supportive data and conceptual argument. He deals with power as a social phenomenon, only exerted and operational in social situations.
Drawing from the works of several other people Haas has constructed a definition of power which he briefly defines as:

The ability of an actor, A, to get another actor(s), b, to do something that b would not otherwise do, through the application, threat, or promise of sanctions... This definition is not radically different from other power definitions used in recent anthropological studies of the state, but I believe it is somewhat more explicit. As defined, power can be seen as playing a role in only certain types of social situations involving a distinct vertical relation between two or more social actors (Haas, 1982: 157-158).

He goes on to add that his definition excludes three different power situations: (a). when sanctions are not manifest in some way or another; (b). situations of egalitarian relations and (c). situations in which another is induced to perform through the use of methods other than sanctions, threats or promises (Haas, 1982:158). While these exclusions serve to narrow down the field and the definition can still be applied to a wide variety of situations. Haas then goes on to discuss the basic elements of power relationships, to outline a means for its analysis. These include such elements as base, means, scope, amount, extension, power costs, compliance costs, refusal costs and finally, gains (Haas, 1982: 158-170).

The "base" of power is defined as all of the exploitable resources that a power holder has which can be used to control the behavior of others (1982:159). This base may consist of economic, ideological and/or physical elements, but Haas admits that it is very difficult to identify base elements from archaeological remains (1982:161). As a substitute, he suggests looking for the presence of centralized systems; i.e. religious,
military, or economic organizations whose leaders can be seen as having their power bases in personnel, resources or symbols (1982:161). By symbols, he means religious or spiritual matters, as was the case in ancient Egypt.

The “means” of power are defined as the sanctions that power holders promise, apply, or threaten in order to exploit the power base. Perhaps its only manifestation in archaeological remains lies in art forms which depict the application of sanctions either as their threats (possibly resulting in physical violence which may indeed be present in the archaeological record through physical deformities), or as promises (1982:162).

The third variable, the “scope” of power is defined as “the types of responses a power holder is able to elicit from a respondent” (1982:163). Simply put, this term refers to the kinds of things that a respondent would not normally do, but which the power holder is able to make them do. Haas suggests that evidence of the “scope” of power could be found in such things as labor projects commissioned by the holder and executed by the respondent.

The “amount” of power is defined as the “probability that a respondent will comply with the demands of a power holder” (Haas, 1982:164) and is largely dependent upon the “means” and the “scope”. The “amount” of power is difficult if not impossible, to detect in the archaeological remains, however when understood in relation to the “scope”, it is possible to draw some conclusions about it. The frequency of the projects mentioned in relation to the scope, for example, may indicate a high degree of compliance, or a high degree of power (1982:165). It is important however
to remember that each site produces different evidence and therefore produces different results about power and its contributing variables.

The "extension" of power refers to the number of respondents over which the power holder has power. This may be interpersonal power, or power over a whole population, and depends largely upon the nature of the power base that the holder has. From archaeological remains, it is possible to examine two areas of "power extension"; the "potential extension" and the "actual extension". Of the two, the potential is much easier to examine, since it is exercised over an entire population believed to be living in the particular geographical area (1982:166). The "actual extension" of power must be assessed in terms of the time and labor that went into a particular labor project (1982:166), which is much more difficult to calculate.

"Power costs" refer to the effort and wealth that a power holder must expend in order to obtain the desired results from the intended respondents. Usually, the "power costs" are dependent upon the nature of "power bases" (1982: 166-167).

"Compliance costs" are a quantification of the scope of power and, in theory can be assessed easily, but with much more difficulty in practice. In theory, calculating the amount of labor and time contributed to a communal project divided by the number of respondents will give an estimate of "compliance costs". In order to do this, the question of population size as well as the amount of time involved in building a given structure must be considered, neither of which may be an easy thing to do (Haas, 1982:168).
“Refusal costs” in the analysis of power are defined as assessments of the impact of negative sanctions or, quite simply, what will happen if the respondents refuse to comply (1982:168-169). In order to examine “refusal costs” on the basis of archaeological evidence, the power base must first be estimated. Often, refusal to comply will result in people being cut off from particular resources and depending on the base, the implications could be quite serious, not only for the person(s) in question, but possibly for the entire community or even for subsequent generations (1982: 169).

Haas’ final variable is the “power gains”, which are a reflection of the impact of favorable sanctions to the respondent. For example, “gains” may be reflected in community projects which stand to be lucrative. In other words if the project has an economic function, then respondents stand to gain from the energy expended. The gains can also be had from religious ceremonies (eg. social or symbolic gains) or from the military (protection or defense from enemies) (1982: 170).

While I choose to use Haas’ definition as the core for my own, I must add to it in order to focus it more towards my own research. Haas’ exclusion of the areas of egalitarian relations, when sanctions may not be manifest, and in cases in which compliance is extracted without the use of sanctions, threats or promises--none of which Haas deals with--is to exclude substantial parts of the power relations to be examined.
Archaeological Analyses Similar to the Case Study

We have considered various theoretical formulations concerning power, but the lingering question remains: is it really possible to infer things about power relations from the past? I am not alone in agreeing that this is in some sense a possibility. The following works constitute what I recognize to be archaeological accounts similar to the Egyptian case I deal with, or analyze archaeological evidence that has dealt with the union of state formation and power. While I do not refer specifically to them in the case analysis, I feel that it is necessary to mention their contributions to the developing field of social archaeology and the analysis of power relations.

In Renfrew and Cherry’s (1986) *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change* there is an exploration of the feasibility (theoretically, methodologically, etc.), and extent to which prehistoric polities may be analyzed and understood on archaeological and historical evidence.

Hodder’s (1982) *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology* deals with theoretical issues surrounding the inference of meaning from archaeological assemblages and its relationship to social structure.

Bradley (1984), in his *The Social Foundations of Prehistoric Britain: Themes and Variations in the Archaeology of Power* analyses power relations in prehistoric Britain. In his introduction he goes to some length to address the critics who do not believe that social structures can be determined by examining archaeological material. His book “tries to answer the complaint that ‘by avoiding the social meaning of their
material, archaeologists are choosing a rather narrow personal mythology” (Bradley 1978:3)” (Bradley 1984:4). He then breaks the time frame of prehistoric Britain into five segments and draws patterns of power relations from archaeological data thereby confirming that issues of social power and social structure can be examined through archaeological methods referring to a period of about three thousand years ago.

Joyce’s (1991) Cerro Palenque: Power and Identity on the Maya Periphery is an informative work which deals with Cerro Palenque a settlement of the prehispanic Ulua Valley of northwest Honduras. Her goal is to construct a context for the interpretation of the meaning of patterned material remains, in order to address a series of anthropological questions about the social organization of the people of this site (Joyce, 1991:3).

She too addresses critics who say that social structures can not be examined through archaeological evidence, and focuses on the concept of social power as the issue to be examined in the archaeological data she analyses.

In Smith’s (1992) “Social Archaeology and the Early State”, he begins with a discussion of social archaeology and the idea of a prehistoric sociology. He then goes on to discuss the idea of studying the “prehistoric sociology” and the problems that these studies would have with method and definitions. Finally, he undertakes the analysis of the prehistoric state in terms of the Scythian state, the Hawaiian state and finally the Inca empire.

Mayan art and social structures are the subject of Schele and Miller’s (1986) Dynasty and Ritual in Maya Art. In this book, they reexamine Mayan art using
advancements that have been made in the interpretation of Maya hieroglyphs. They provide the reader with a fascinating look at how one might infer social structures from archaeological material.

Finally Jonathan Haas’ (1982) The Evolution of the Prehistoric State examines theories on power and state formation and applies them to archaeological material in order to draw conclusions about early states which are known only from archaeological evidence. In this case, pre-European, Mesoamerican and South American states.

Ethnographic and Historical Analyses

Ethnographic and historical analyses which have proved to be useful for my work include John Romer’s (1984) Ancient lives: The Story of the Pharaoh’s Tombmakers; Bruce Trigger’s Ancient Egypt: A Social History; Rosemary David’s The Pyramid builders of Ancient Egypt; Morris Bierbrier’s The Tomb Builders of the Pharaohs and The Late New Kingdom in Egypt, and finally Jaroslav Cerny’s A Community of Workmen at Thebes in the Ramesside Period. These works have, through archaeological analysis, assembled representations of the lives of the tomb builders of ancient Egypt, and serve to provide my work with the everyday yet very significant details of these lives. In the foreword to John Romer’s Ancient Lives he states: “I have aimed to make these ancient villagers walk through their own landscape once again” (1984:xi) It is works of this nature which enable us to understand which items were perceived as items of power to the ancient Egyptians.
I have used several other works in my examination of the cultural life of the tomb builders of Deir el-Medina, but I have found that the works I have mentioned to be most fruitful. Other sources all address specific areas of Egyptian culture. For example, Gay Robins (1993) *Women in Ancient Egypt* deals specifically with women. It covers subjects from power, to childbirth, to the legal status of women. What is really of interest in this work is that it deals with the archaeological remains interpreted from a female viewpoint, and deals only with women and women's issues. In addition I have used sources that deal specifically with mythology (Rundel Clarke, 1959), religion, (Sellers, 1992), and clothing (Watson, 1987) each of which details a specific aspect of life, and I will draw extensively on their insights during my case analysis.

Romer's (1984) *Ancient lives, The Story of the Pharaoh's Tombbuilders* is the story of the workmen. Not only does he speak about the general aspects of their lives (occupation, religion, justice, etc), but he also tells about their whole lives. He speaks about specific workers by name and treats them as individuals, dealing with issues such as emotions and personal matters. Romer adds an ethnographic dimension which allows the reader to identify with the tomb builders people as real human beings rather than as faceless entities, or with collective descriptions of broad issues of social structure.

Bierbrier's *Tomb Builders of the Pharaohs* is a much more general study of the workers of Deir el-Medina. While he does occasionally speak of individual persons, (eg. scribe Ramose, who figures prominently in the photographs considered in the
third chapter of this thesis, appears sporadically through the book), his discussion is on
a more general level. In the second chapter entitled Men of the Gang (27-43), Bierbrier
gives a detailed account of the men, their occupations, and the rank that these
occupations held in the power structure. I have drawn heavily from Bierbrier's
discussion in my section on Deir el-Medina, and his work will be invaluable in the
analysis presented in the third chapter.

The second work of Bierbrier's that I have used, The Late New Kingdom in
Ancient Egypt is a genealogical study of the figures of the New Kingdom. His second
chapter (19-44) deals only with the genealogy of the workers from Deir el-Medina.
Again some of the names he discusses appear (Sennedjem, Ramose, etc), in the
illustrations represented in our photographs. While this work does not provide specific
details of daily activities, it provides important information on kinship matters and how
occupations passed on in succession. Another interesting issue consists of an
examination of marriage patterns--who married who, and where they came from. Did
women only marry into families of comparable wealth and status, or were they free to
marry anyone?

Jaroslav Cerny's A Community of Workmen at Thebes is again a completely
different type of study. In the book, one of the earliest full studies of the workmen at
Deir el-Medina, Cerny pieces together the worker's lives and activities through a
reading of hieroglyphic texts. He studies each conceptual term and traces the
differences of interpretation of in its meaning. He then goes on to discuss what he
personally believes it to mean. What is really interesting is that instead of simply telling
the story, he shows the reader exactly why he believes it to be that way. With this study being so specific, he provides important information on what objects denote different levels of power and so has, provided me with an idea of what to look for in the analysis of tomb art.

Trigger et al.’s (1983) *A Social History of Ancient Egypt* provides an interesting account of the development of the state of Egypt, from the days of the egalitarian Neolithic farmers, to Egypt’s glory days, to the demise of the kingship, it traces in detail the government and the power structures of the state. However, while he deals with the concept of power, it is power at the highest political levels and there is no mention of the tomb builders. In this sense, he has dealt with power over and not power amongst the real population. As interesting as it may be to trace this evolution, it has no real consequence for my analysis as I’m not dealing with power on that sort of level.

*Everyday Life in Ancient Egypt,* (White, 1963) has two chapters of real importance to this study. One is on dress and the other on professions. As the title implies, it does not deal with the tomb builders alone, but with the lives of all in Egypt. His treatment of dress gives information on clothing, hair, and personal adornment, three very important indicators of differences in status and power. His material on professions provides information on power relations as they apply to occupations. It does so, not only for the artisans, but also for administrators, peasants and even the pharaoh himself.
Finally, White's *Ancient Egypt: It's Culture and History* (1970) devotes a full chapter to each of the following power positions: the pharaoh, the priest, the aristocrat, the architect, the craftsman and the commoner. This serves to give details about the position of craftsmen and places them within the context of all of the occupations in Egypt.

**Conclusion**

Throughout the preceding chapter, despite the wide range of materials considered, all there is a common thread, and that is that all usefully contribute to a social archaeological analysis. We began with an examination of theoretical formulations surrounding state formation and power. Although this was lengthy, it was necessary not only to fully understand the concept of power and its origins, but to show the reader where I began and how I arrived at the definition of power that I chose to apply in my analysis. Following that, a discussion of similar archaeological accounts served to illustrate how and where other archaeologists have dealt with the concept of power. Finally, there was a discussion of ethnographic material that was relevant to the subject of power in ancient Egypt.

In the next chapter, I begin by providing background information on the emergence of the Egyptian state and on the town of Deir el-Medina, the focal point of our social archaeological investigation and conclude it with an examination of wall art from tombs of the builders of the pyramid complex at ancient Thebes.
Chapter Three

The Tombbuilders of Deir el-Medina: A Social Archaeological Analysis
Introduction

So far we have surveyed key developments in social archaeology and what they entail for archaeology in general. I have outlined the general terms of my methodology and how I came to develop it. At this point, before beginning the analysis of the case I have chosen to examine, I think that it is necessary to give the reader some insight into late Dynastic Egyptian life and the development of the early state. To do this, I have put together a brief discussion of how the state arose in Egypt as well as a brief examination of Deir el-Medina during the period relevant to the case analysis. The second part of this chapter is the case analysis.

Part One

By the Eighteenth Dynasty (dates vary according to the source 1552-1295 B.C., Bierbrier, 1982:146; 1567-1320 B.C., David, 1975:8) Egypt was already a fully formed state, and so I have included some discussion of how this came to be. I begin with the small pre-state settlements of late Neolithic farmers and I end at around the Third Dynasty, because by that time the Egyptians had already successfully built complex systems of irrigation as well as the first step pyramid in Saqqara, both of them evidence of complex social relations. A large mobilization of labor would have been necessary to accomplish these feats and it implies that there was enough of a formal government structure to constitute a fairly strong state system.
We then move forward fifteen dynasties (according to Bierbrier roughly 1000 years) to the days of Deir el-Medina. I feel that seeing the development of power structures in the early period of state formation and then moving to the time period to be used in the case study will assist in outlining the broad dynamics of state formation relevant to our purposes.

In my discussion of Deir el-Medina, I briefly outline the way of life there with a particular emphasis on issues relating to power relations. It is in a sense a summary of the ethnographic and ethnohistoric analyses (of the preceding chapter) and provides elements of social and historical background on the village and its inhabitants. This will set the stage for the analysis of the tomb art and enable the reader to see to what extent these representations of the lives of real people may be read.

**State Formation in Early Dynastic Egypt**

The state in Egypt did not develop quickly. It was a long slow process that took centuries to evolve (Janssen, 1978:216; Krader, 1968:53). It was not well documented, and the written materials referring to it that remain from the earliest times are fragmentary at best. As a result, the materials from which we derive our information consist principally of the remaining wall paintings and decorations on clay pots (Moret and Davey, 1926:123).

The first of the early agricultural communities began to appear in Lower Egypt around 7000-6500 BC, and in Upper Egypt around 5000 BC (Spencer, 1993:20-23). These communities consisted of small villages located along the Nile river, which
provided both the necessary water and the very fertile land for farming. The water also provided an easy means of transportation (Service, 1975:228).

It is of interest to this study that the Neolithic farmers who occupied these villages were social equals from birth to death (Krader, 1968:53). Eventually, the population of these villages began to grow and they formed larger polities (Krader, 1968:54). As production grew more and more highly specialized, the gap between the upper and lower class widened. As the polities grew, they began to trade amongst each other, and the once separate groups formed an interdependent whole (Krader, 1968:55). Political centers emerged as centers of control in trade, commerce and state functions. (Krader, 1968:55) Eventually, Upper and Lower Egypt formed as distinct domains and were later united under one king, King Menes. This unification happened in two separate stages. First of all, there was the sharing of generalized material culture which was realized before the second stage, the emergence of centralized political control. The dominance of Upper Egypt in this union was apparent, and the cultural patterns of the unified region from the Naquada culture of Upper Egypt were far superior to those of Lower Egypt (Spencer, 1993:48). Lower Egypt in fact did produce its own material, but it proved to be no match for the superior Naquada culture (Spencer, 1993:49), most likely because it was politically stronger and more developed.

Political unification was a slow process, and here most historians rely on the information provided by the Narmer palette. This particular palette depicts the defeat of the north (Lower Egypt) at the hands of the south (Upper Egypt). Although it appears that domination by Upper Egypt was a sudden occurrence, it is more likely that
the transition spanned several decades, if not centuries, (according to Spencer possibly as much as 200 years) as the cultural and political unification took hold. (Spencer, 1993:53)

About the same time, an earlier form of hieroglyphic writing appeared, as did a common spoken language. The writing most probably developed as a response to the need for proper political and commercial records and grew more complex, as did the society itself. However, the writing appears abruptly. It is possible that the earliest forms of hieroglyphic writing were the result of infiltrations from Mesopotamian culture (Spencer, 1993:62).

Just prior to and during the First Dynasty Upper Egypt (3100-2890 B.C. Bierbrier and A.R. David) continued to increase the amount of power it held over Lower Egypt. At the same time, a capital city in Lower Egypt was formed at Memphis by King Menes (Spencer, 1993:63).

In conjunction with specialization’s of social and political organization, increased specialization in culture and manufacturing developed. The Egyptians were beginning to become proficient in areas such as carving, painting and sculpting. Artisans learned their crafts from their fathers, and together formed craft guilds (Service, 1975:234).

The king, whose power and authority were rooted in supernatural and secular bases, ruled the land on his own, which constituted a highly centralized form of political power. The king delegated power to certain offices which originated both from within the “royal family” and from among the royal servants (Janssen, 1978:223,224). Relatives were granted a certain amount of power, and over time these
positions developed as political offices until they in turn had to delegate more people to help them and so on. Perhaps the oldest known high office was the seal keeper of the king, who probably controlled the workshops and had oversight of the wealth of the pharaoh (Janssen, 1978:223). By the Fourth Dynasty, among personnel in the king’s service, there developed a greater network of state officials, including viziers, officers of the military, and members of the priesthood.

The office of vizier was an administrative post designed to represent the pharaoh in matters of economics and provincial administration. In the early stages of the Dynastic period, these posts were held by princes, but were later given to commoners (Janssen, 1978:224). The viziers controlled such other offices as the treasury, the ‘chief of fields’ (agriculture), and the ‘master of largesse’ (livestock), all of which were intended to be acquired on the basis of personal merit (Service, 1975:230).

Military leaders had no ties to other state affairs, and were not very powerful in general political matters. The Old Kingdom, as a result of Egypt’s geographic location, never really had to worry about the threat of enemy attack. This meant that only a very small army was necessary to serve Egypt’s interests. They had little power, and were responsible for controlling only a few designated towns (Janssen, 1978: 225; Service, 1975:233).

Likewise, the priesthood did not hold any secular political power. It is believed that this office (or group of offices) originated from the private household functions of the royal family. The pharaoh, being both divine as well as human, was the high priest in every Egyptian house of worship and temple (Janssen, 1978:225).
Throughout, the pharaoh retained ultimate power as a result of his supernatural powers (bestowed upon him by the deeply rooted religious beliefs of the Egyptian population) as well as his actual political and material powers. The pharaoh was the ultimate source of law and order, and was in complete control of all written records (Krader, 1968:58). Products of the pharaoh’s ultimate control lie in the complex system of irrigation and in the complexes of pyramids themselves. By the Third Dynasty, such significant advancements had been made in the areas of technology and political organization that Egypt had become a major trading power within the ancient Near East, and had established firm control over Nubia. In addition, Egyptians mobilized with such force and organization that they were able to construct the first step-pyramid at Saqqara belonging to King Djoser (Both Bierbrier, 1982:145 and A.R. David, 1975:8 used the dates 2686-2613 B.C.). Only someone with the kind of power held by the pharaoh, the God King, would have been able to orchestrate a move of this magnitude. The state was progressively unified under the pharaoh (Service, 1975:233), and Egypt as a result was a well-organized, strong social and political unit.

The People of Deir el-Medina

The town of Deir el-Medina was located at Thebes during the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (approximately five hundred years. Different authors provide different dates. Bierbrier, 1982:146-7 has it from 1552-1295 B.C. while David, 1975:8 has it as 1567-1085 B.C.) of ancient Egypt and emerged as a place to live for the workers constructing pyramids and other structures in the Valley of the
Kings. These were workers of a distinct caliber. They were not slaves, for some of them actually had slaves of their own, but were highly skilled craftsmen who spent perhaps their entire lives working on a single royal tomb. They were able to enjoy some protection from the government, and appear to have been excused from corvée labor (mandatory labor for the state). Their crafts were passed down from father to son with the sons learning like apprentices. But becoming a royal tomb builder was not easy, and being the son of a worker did not guarantee a position. If a son was likely to succeed, he was apprenticed to a gang (the term for a group of workers) to watch, learn and perform odd jobs. If a son failed in his apprenticeship, he was forced to leave the village (Stead, 1986:20-21).

The town has served as a great source of information for scholars interested in daily life in ancient Egypt. In their spare time, workers at Deir el-Medina constructed their own tombs. These were small, simple tombs carved into the rock, but elaborate wall paintings on the walls of tomb chapels provide considerable insight into their daily lives. These paintings chronicle the day-to-day events of the workers, which is not a feature of paintings in the more elaborate royal tombs. Furthermore, the owners’ places in society, their position in the hierarchy of power, was reflected in the paintings (James, 1984:21).

Deir el-Medina was walled, and not very large (according to Stead, 1986:8) the village measured 50m x 75m and grew to 50m x 140m during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties). When the village was at its largest there were about seventy homes within the walls, and there was a main street which ran down the middle,
separating it into east and west sections. Outside the walls there were another fifty or so residences. The layout of all of the homes (both inside and outside the walls), was simple. Entrance to a house was made through a chapel with several niches for offerings and for busts of religious figures. This chapel led into the main room of the house, which had high ceilings supported by columns. Off this room, there were one or two other small rooms which may have served as areas for storage or possibly for sleeping. Below the main room there was often a cellar, and at the back of the house was a kitchen. This was an unroofed area with walls. It contained the oven, grain silo, and the equipment necessary for grinding grain. From the kitchen, there were stairs to the roof and there was often a second cellar below the kitchen (Stead, 1986:7-8).

Just as the greater society had a hierarchical power structure, so did Deir el-Medina. At the top of the structure of both the state and village was, as always, the pharaoh. Below him was the vizier who was a representative of the pharaoh. He was in charge of certain aspects of life and attended functions that the pharaoh himself could not attend (James, 1984:56).

The scribe could be considered as the highest ranking among the workers, and scribes were considered to be members of the upper class. It was a position which was exempt from manual labor, it was high paying, and it was free from the fear of unemployment. A scribe could also rise to the position of vizier (Bierbrier, 1982:40; White, 1963:151-2). Scribes could read and write and had a formal education. In the early days at Deir el-Medina, there was one chief scribe who had several scribes ranked under him. By the Twentieth Dynasty there were two chief scribes, one for each gang
(Bierbrier, 1982:32). They were in charge of keeping records of everything that took place on the job, recording absences, wages, materials from the storerooms that were distributed amongst the workers, and so on (Stead, 1986: 21).

The workers themselves were divided into two groups or gangs referred to as the "left" and the "right". Each gang was headed by a foreman (known in the Eighteenth Dynasty as "overseer of construction in the great place" and later as "the chief of the gang in the Place of Truth") (Bierbrier, 1982: 27). The foreman worked closely with a scribe. The holders of these positions were seen as captains of the village and they acted as the liaison between the inhabitants of the village and higher government officials. Often this power was abused, principally to get other workers to do personal jobs for them for free. They did, however, live in the village in a way which differed little from the others and they did intermarry with other workers (Bierbrier, 1982:36). The position of foreman was originally appointed by the vizier, but in time it too was a job that was passed from father to son. The fact that there were two foremen and two gangs made for tighter control over the workers and also prevented the concentration of power in the hands of one person (Bierbrier, 1982:28-29). Each foreman had a deputy as an assistant and this post was usually filled by a son or other close relation. It is also fair to say that the deputy usually became the foreman when the post became available (Bierbrier, 1982:37).

Ranking below the scribe and the foreman was the 'guardian' who was in charge of overseeing official stores. This person handed out materials for work, but
the allocation had to be done in the presence of both the scribe and the foreman (Bierbrier, 1982:38).

Ranking below the guardian was the doorkeeper, and there were as few as one or as many as three doorkeepers at various times. Their job was to guard the entrance to the royal tomb and this was done in shifts so that there was someone on guard at all times. They acted as bailiffs and debt collectors when necessary (Bierbrier, 1982:39).

Ranking below the doorkeepers were the police or the Medjay. They were under direct control of the mayor of Thebes and their job was to maintain order in the community. They had chiefs, and there were perhaps two chiefs of police for the village of Deir el-Medina. They had close ties to all community affairs and had numerous commercial dealings with the workmen (Bierbrier, 1982:39).

Ranking below the foremen were those who worked as stone masons, plasterers, sculptors, draughtsmen, painters, and carpenters. They were not individual artists but rather workers who functioned as an intricately connected group with a mandate to serve the pharaoh and the wider community (White, 1963:153). This mandate was taken very seriously, and their duties were performed with painstaking exactness.

The quarrymen had no metal tools except for soft copper chisels, but with the help of their expert knowledge concerning types of stone, they were able to quarry pieces of large dimensions (White, 1963:153).

Professional painters and sculptors were considered to be middle class artisans. They had spent years being trained, and were considered to occupy the top of the
production scale. They were not only well paid, but were also well-respected and had to maintain a high degree of focus and objectivity in order to meet the demand. Sculptors were required to undergo long apprenticeships, during which they performed simple tasks. The restrictions were great and there was little imagination involved. They had some latitude in the making of statues of gods, but the statues of living people, especially of the pharaoh himself, had to be exact likenesses. Sculptures were meant to serve a purpose. They were to be like snapshot photographs, not idealized images (White, 1963:155-156).

Painters also had a similar goal. The paintings were meant to be records or catalogs, but there was more artistic freedom here, and it is often the case that painters added some form of humor or a personal touch to their work. There was a sort of formula to painting, however which had been continuous since the beginning of Egyptian civilization. Important people were always painted larger than those people who were considered to be socially less important. Their training, like that of sculptors, was long and intense. During the years of training, painters were taught a range of skills from making brushes, to drawing, to the mixing of pigments. Their training also involved learning the spiritual as well as practical aspects of their trade (White, 1963:160-161).

Among the metal workers, jewelry makers and goldsmiths enjoyed highest rank, while makers of metal vessels occupied middle ranks and tinkers were located at the bottom of the social scale (James, 1984:189).
Workers' schedules were such that they worked eight hours a day, with a break at mid-day. They worked for eight days in a row, meanwhile staying in huts closer to their workplace, and then returned to the village for two days off. With all of the religious holidays and festivals however, workers really only worked an average of six months in every year. In addition, absenteeism was common. Workers often stayed at home for reasons such as brewing beer and building houses (Stead, 1986:45). They were well-paid, and payment came in the form of food and materials such as linen. There were also frequent bonuses, which came in the form of wine, salt, meat, and oil. Wages were delivered erratically, or sometimes not at all, and as a result strikes were frequent occurrences (Stead 1986:45).

Below the workers were the servants of the tomb who were sent to the village by the government and did certain jobs for the workers. These were workers such as wood cutters, water carriers, fishermen, gardeners, washers, and sometimes potters. They would also provide delivery of wages if requested. While in the village, they came under direct control of the scribes and the doorkeepers (Bierbrier, 1982: 39)

Ranking below the workers were the peasants. They were simple people who were tied to serving their masters and their lands. Peasants could possess land as well as livestock, and as a result could become wealthy. Mainly, however, their lives revolved around crops and good harvests. There was usually enough of a food surplus to hold them over during a bad season, but they did work hard, and they had a lot of faith in the powers of the gods. Finally, and probably most importantly, there was
usually mutual respect between master and peasant, which resulted in the fact that the peasants were generally peaceful people.

Female slaves, who were to assist with food preparation and cooking were assigned to the village (Stead, 1986:45-46). They belonged to the government and were attached to one side of the work gang or the other (“left” or “right”). Each family had a certain number of days during which they could use the services of female slaves, but it was often the practice for people to sell these days to others (Bierbrier, 1982: 39). As far as their wages were concerned, slaves were given just enough food to survive (Bierbrier, 1982:40).

Private enterprise also had its place among the workers. Often one of the rooms in a person’s house was converted into a store for selling goods to other villagers. Workers spent much of their spare time doing work on each other’s tombs or in making grave goods and funerary equipment for upper class occupants of Thebes (Stead, 1986:8, 45-46)

It is also important to say a little more about the status of women. Although women did not fill any of the roles described above (except for the female slaves), women did enjoy a fair amount of respect and status. The importance of the role of wife and mother was recognized, and under Egyptian law women were recognized as their husbands’ equals. They had full control of property acquired before and during marriage and, in the event of divorce, women had the right to one-third of all marital property. While details concerning the act of divorce are sketchy, we know that it was
allowed, that alimony and palimony did exist, but it is unclear what happened to the children.

Part Two

The purpose of this section is to attempt to apply some of the insights of social archaeology to the interpretation of power relations in a case from ancient Egypt, particularly issues of method discussed in chapter one and issues in theory from chapter two. This attempt may also help to illustrate some of the strengths and weaknesses in the social archaeological approach, although a single smaller-scale case can only provide a limited assessment of this theory and method.

The case, as previously mentioned, concerns a group of people from the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties (1552-1069 B.C. according to Bierbrier, 1982:146-147 and 1567-1085 B.C. according to A.R. David, 1975:8) of ancient Egypt known as the "tomb builders". To a certain extent the study must go beyond this particular group, and consider the gods and the pharaoh as well as the slaves that served the artisans. I say this because the lives of each and every Egyptian were so shaped by the powers of the gods and the pharaoh that one group can not be examined without some consideration of larger and external relations. In addition it must be understood that in the case of ancient Egypt power can be both political and mystical in nature. Given the fact that the lives of these people were so driven by their belief in the pharaoh and the gods, the power demonstrated here in these photographs is necessarily political and mystical in nature. In a sense, the power of the state (or
political power) was drawn from and made stronger by the mystical power of the gods.
In many instances, one type may be more evident than the other, but in most cases, both are present. I have drawn my study materials from paintings and carvings that appeared on the walls of the tombs of the people who built the tombs. These tombs were not great, elaborate pyramids but rather small, private tombs that were built in the builders' spare time to ensure their place in the afterlife. As always, when dealing with material that is as old as 3500 years, what is available for analysis is not complete. Some of the paintings have been destroyed, while others have been lost to museums and private collections and to poor excavation techniques in the 19th and 20th centuries. It is also important to say that what I will end up with is a personal interpretation of the data. First of all, it is impossible to go back in time and see the tomb builders and their social dynamics in action and therefore what is offered is only one possible reading of the data. Secondly, I am not an Egyptologist, although I have had a long standing interest and pleasure in materials relating to ancient Egypt. This is not in the first place a thesis on ancient Egypt, but an examination of the broader field of social archaeology. The goal of this chapter is really to explore how social archaeology might work in a limited case.

In order to do this, I take the information shown in several photographs of wall art and, following the discussion of power relations in chapter two, I attempt to demonstrate how the power/social relations of the day may have operated. I do this by examining images of personal differences in such things as clothing, hair, jewelry, occupation, activity and so on in an attempt to show that these visible differences may
have signified differences in power relations that are visible in art from the walls of the tombs. Not only will I attempt to illustrate the relationships between people, but also the relationship between people and the gods.

In reference to the photographs, it is important to note that many have been included in more than one monograph on ancient Egypt. I indicate the various sources from which I draw relevant information on such things as dates, locations of the tombs and the names of those pictured in them. There are inconsistencies in various sources regarding exact dates and locations. One thing that is certain is that all of the photographs came from tombs excavated in Deir el-Medina and belong to the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties of ancient Egypt.

This section of the thesis is necessarily a mixture of description and analysis. I begin the discussion of each photograph with a description of the contents of the photographs. The fairly general description is followed by a discussion of the issues relating to social and power structures. The later part of this section takes our earlier discussion of theories of state formation (in chapter two) and examines the photographs from this vantage point. I begin with what integration theory might have to say about the photographs followed by conflict theory. This serves to demonstrate not only how social archaeological analysis might work, but also just how the idea of ‘archaeological evidence as text’ (not as ‘record’) is operationalized. I do this by examining the same material from two different perspectives. While the analyses presented here are not intensive, they are sufficient enough to indicate some of the usefulness, and some of the limits, of a social archaeological analysis.
Description and Analysis of the Photographs.

Plate One

Description

Plate 1 is a black and white drawing of a woman who is breast-feeding an infant. The woman is seated on a stool surrounded by tall trees. She is wearing a head band, necklaces and anklets. Her hair is long, she has heavy eye makeup and is wearing earrings.

Analysis

First of all, before going into my own analysis of the plate, let us discuss what has been said about it in ethnographic literature.

In her *Women in Ancient Egypt* (1993:82) Gay Robins indicates that breast feeding (or suckling as she refers to it) of infants is not a common subject in ancient Egyptian art. It is however well known from various written sources (as an example she cites “The Instruction of Any”) that wetnurses were occasionally used especially by royalty and the elite such as the families of scribes and viziers.

In reference to this particular drawing Robins says only that it depicts a mother suckling her new born baby in the special birth bower. In his *The Tomb-Builders of the Pharaohs* (1982) Bierbrier suggests in reference to this photograph that the woman appears “too elaborately dressed to have been an ordinary villager.” Bierbrier goes on
to suggest that perhaps the drawing or ostracon is an illustration of a mythological or historical scene. (Bierbrier, 1982:74)

While it is difficult to discuss relations of social power in this image, we can reflect on the role of women and their importance to society.

First of all, the woman is seated out in the open and is surrounded by tall plants and trees, possibly papyrus. The fact that she is in the open points to the idea that the act of breast-feeding was not something to be ashamed of. This also suggests that breast-feeding was considered to be a normal act, or that the role of mother and nurturer was held in very high regard, or perhaps both. In addition, the woman appears to be well adorned. While she is naked, (she wears only a belt or girdle around her waist, which according to Robins (1993:83) is consistent with new mothers), she is wearing several necklaces and anklets and fairly large earrings. Furthermore, her hair is done in an elaborate way, gathered on the top of her head and held together with a head band while it falls in bunches around her face (this is again consistent with new mothers as noted by Robins, 1993:83). She has heavy makeup (kohl) around her eyes.

While the fact that she is breast feeding tells us nothing about her status in life, her jewelry might. Although lower class women did have jewelry, it was usually simple and there was rarely a lot of it (Waterson, 1991: 104-105). As we have already mentioned above, Bierbrier (1982) believes that she is far too well ‘dressed’ to be an ordinary villager and the fact that this woman has several necklaces and anklets implies that she is indeed a member of the wealthier classes in Deir el-Medina. What we can not ascertain is whether or not she is the mother, or simply a wetnurse.
The stool may also have implications for status. While there does not seem to be any evidence for this in the ethnographic literature relating to ancient Egypt there is a reference to stools and chairs as a status indicator in Wason’s study of Catal Huyuk. According to Wason (1994:105) seats or stools although also used by the general public may imply status when found (or in this case pictured) in combination with other items. In this particular case, we do have the stool combined with luxury items (jewelry) discussed above.

Placing her in the broader context of social relations we may infer that women and children were held in fairly high regard and played a significant part in society. This notion is reinforced by the mere existence of the drawing.

The same things can be said of gender relations. Had women and children not played an important and somewhat egalitarian role, there would not have been a painting or a scene totally dedicated to a woman as this one is. If women were not important it seems more likely that they would be included in crowds or not pictured at all.

Plate Two
Description

Plate 2 is a remarkable example of a wall carving. It is located on the entrance wall to the House of Pillars in the vizier (it is interesting to note that in Lange & Hirmer, (1968), Ramose is referred to as vizier, but Bierbrier, (1982) and Romer (1982) refer to him as a scribe. I have been unable to find proof of his exact profession
or if they are in reference to two different people so I will refer to them as the authors refer to them. In this case, Lange and Hirmer refer to him as vizier) Ramose’s tomb at Thebes (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:449). Depicted in the carving is a festive scene. On the left is the chief huntsman Keshy and the identity of the person beside him is unknown they are most probably related. The couple to the right are May and his wife Werel who is shown sitting just slightly behind him (Lange 1968:448-9). In this photograph of the original wall carving, the most striking details are the finely stylized hair and clothing in addition to the great necklaces that all four people are wearing. Two of the men are holding bunches of flowers or possibly scepters and Werel, the only woman in the scene has a headband (possibly a crown). It is also interesting to note that while Keshy and the unknown man appear to be seated side by side, there is a marked difference between May and his wife; she is clearly seated behind him.

Analysis

Two of the figures (Keshy and May) are both holding what I take to be bouquets of lotus flowers in their left hands. Although the lotus traditionally represents rebirth, in this case the bouquets could be a sort of scepter which acts as a status indicator. I feel safe in saying this, because the bouquet turns up in several other photographs in the hands of men who are clearly powerful and important. It is interesting to note that Werel holds a single lotus flower (not a bouquet) in her right hand. Although there does not appear to be any documentation to back up this fact it is possible that due to the shortage of fertile land in Egypt, having flowers or plants of any kind was a sign of wealth and power. The lack of fertile land would have made plants
and flowers items of luxury especially when used for such non-essential purposes like decoration at a banquet. From this notion alone it can be inferred that these are surely people of wealth and power.

In addition, both Kesby and the unknown person at his side are both holding what looks to be a folded piece of rope. This is in Kesby's right hand and in the unknown man's left. While it is not certain what this object is, it is clearly visible in several of the photographs in the hands of people who are clearly in positions of power.

All four figures are wearing full-length robes which according to Watson, (1987:18-19) are a sign of nobility in the New Kingdom. In addition, all are wearing elaborate beaded collars which would have been too expensive for the average person to afford (Waterson, 1991: 104-105). Finally, all four are wearing elaborate wigs that are long and braided. These wigs resemble those of the upper classes from the New Kingdom (White, 1963:89). Furthermore, Werel has an elaborate headband with a lotus flower on the front of it encircling her wig.

In his The Archaeology of Rank (1994) Wason makes reference to the idea of people being in possession of non-essential items (items not essential for survival) as being related to status. In Wason's case he is referring to crafts, but I contend that in this case the non-essential items are long pleated robes, wigs, jewelry and in this particular case the lotus flower which while important spiritually is not an essential item.

While we can not clearly distinguish differences in individual power in this image (except perhaps where the bouquets are concerned), we may conclude that
these are very wealthy people and that wealth is shared and transmitted through families. All are well-dressed and have elaborate and expensive jewelry and wigs which are clearly a sign of wealth and power.

Apart from the individual status indicators, there are indicators of more complicated relations. Most important is the issue of gender. Being seated at a banquet beside her husband indicated a great deal of status for women in that they are pictured together, at an important function. If women were not afforded great respect by their male counterparts they would not be pictured together, and would either be seated apart, or the woman would not be pictured at all. Obviously men valued and respected the important role played by women.

Socially the four people in this wall painting enjoyed a reasonably high position assigned by their clothes, jewelry and hair. If the titles of ‘cavalry officer’ and ‘chief huntsman’ (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:448-9) are indeed correct, then at least two of the men had high ranking occupations which possibly included power or control over other lower-ranking workers. As such, these men would control portions of labor, and the power and status afforded to them by virtue of this control would be fairly high.

Plate Three A.

Plate 3a. is quite similar to plate 2 in that the scene depicted here is also of a festive gathering and was found on the entrance wall of the House of Pillars in Ramose’s tomb. Since this painting is photographed in two sections in 3a&b, I will discuss it in the sections as they are presented.
Description

Plate 3a., a detail of the festival relief shows two people, both of whom are extremely well dressed and adorned. Both people wear full length robes with elaborate multi-tiered, beaded collars or necklaces. In addition, both of the figures are wearing elaborately braided wigs. The woman (shown on the left of the plate) holds a flower in her right hand and also has a wide headband encircling her wig. The man (on the right) holds what looks to be a folded over piece of rope in his left hand.

Analysis

The fact that both people are so well dressed and adorned is a status indicator. From the existing literature we can conclude several things. First of all, the two people pictured here are Neby and Apuya the parents of the scribe Ramose (Lange and Hirmer, 1968:449). Secondly the elaborate clothing that they wear would have been expensive and according to Waterson (1991:104-5) would have been too costly for anyone other that members of the upper classes. The stylized braided wigs also lead to the same conclusion. Again these wigs indicate upper class status (White, 1963:89)

Plate Three B.

Description

Plate 3b. is another section as the same festival relief as 3a. Again we have two people both of whom are dressed in long robes with finely stylized braided wigs. Also, as we have already seen in plate 3a. the woman is seated just behind the man. The difference though is that this time the woman has her hands on his shoulders. In 3a
there is no contact that is evident to us. Finally in the man’s left hand he holds a long, narrow object.

Analysis

According to Lange & Hirmer (1968:449) these people are Amenhotep the brother of Ramose the scribe, and his wife May. Again the fine robes and the elaborately braided wigs are status indicators. Not only would these items have been too expensive for members of the lower classes to afford, but also too impractical in terms of the normal activities of their daily lives. Wigs and long robes would have been cumbersome and impractical for those who were forced to do hard labor such as farming and construction. These outfits are far more in keeping with the members of the upper classes who engaged in much less strenuous activities. Also, according to White (1963:89) the wig that May wears is characteristic of the style worn by the upper class during the period of the New Kingdom.

Perhaps the most important status indicator in this photograph is the instrument in Amenhotep’s left hand. According to Wilkinson (1992:183) this is the Sekhem scepter and is symbolic of power and might. From its presence here, we can conclude that Amenhotep must have been, in some way, a person of power and authority.

Plates 3a&b both speak to the same larger issues represented in plate 2. In both, there are women pictured at important functions with their men. This further reinforces the importance of the role of women in relation to men. However, we do begin to see a trend here that may indicate just how important they really are, since the women are
always seated behind the men they are pictured with. This could indicate that while they are of relative importance that their status is not equal to that of men.

There is also the idea of the presence of the non-essential items (Wason, 1994:107) pictured in both plates 3a&b. The wigs, robes and jewelry are all items of luxury which were unaffordable to the lower classes.

**Plate Four**

Plate 4 is divided into two separate images. The top image is a photograph of a wall painting which extends the entire length of the wall.

The bottom image is a close-up of the wall painting which we can see is divided into both an upper and lower register which read as follows:

bearers of offerings, men marching with ceremonial solemnity, draught oxen being led before a symbol which is being carried on a sledge, the funerary shrines with the signs of Osiris and Isis also drawn on sledges and with projecting parts of funerary barks on which stand the goddesses of death Isis and Nephthys, with priests and mourners behind them. Bottom L-R the rites at the moment that the mummy is placed erect at the entrance to the tomb, standing and crouching female mourners, bearers of offerings with papyrus stems, a group of standing women whose laments rise to the funerary shrine, men carrying tomb accessories, symbols of rank and jugs and lastly a number of distinguished mourners in white robes reaching below their knees. (Lange, 1968:447)

During the course of my study, I came across several photographs which are details of the scenes depicted in plate 4. For the purposes of this thesis I have only chosen two of them so as not to be repetitive.
Description

Plate 4a. (again a detail of plate 4) depicts men bringing offerings, mostly all of which are furniture. One of the men has blonde hair (or is perhaps bald) and some of them appear to have slight differences in skin color. The offerings are grouped together, but some of the men are carrying gifts individually. All of the people are dressed the same (topless, with knee length loin cloths).

Analysis

From this photograph, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions about power relations. All of the men are depicted as the same size; all are wearing similar lengths and styles of kilts; and finally, all have short, black hair. The only difference that can be seen here is based on the objects that the men carry with them into the tomb. This may mean that they have made the objects that they carry, or it may simply mean that they have just picked up the article or been handed it to carry. While the differences noted in the coloring may be significant we are unable to conclude if this was done by the artist on purpose or is it the result of damage to the painting or simply a fading of the pigment.

If we look at this photograph in reference to plates 3a&b we can draw a conclusion about social power. First of all there is a marked difference in the way the figures are dressed and adorned. Secondly there is a difference in the activities that they are engaged in.

The figures in plate 4a. are dressed in short simple loincloths with short hair, and no jewelry while the figures in plates 2, 3a&b are all in long pleated robes with wigs
and lots of jewelry. If we are to assume that the possession of non-essential items (in this case related to dress and personal adornment) are an indication of power then we can conclude that the figures in plates 2, 3a&b are higher in status than the people in plate 4.

The second thing that we notice when we compare activities, we see that the figures in plates 2, 3a&b are all at a banquet while those in plate 4a. are workers transporting offerings to a tomb. The fact that some are working while others are enjoying a banquet serves to reinforce the idea of upper and lower class.

**Description**

The wall painting shown in plate 4b. can be divided into two sections. One half shows men and the other half shows women. The women are clearly in mourning, but there are other things of note here. One woman, possibly a child and not a woman at all, is naked. Some of the women are bare-breasted while others are fully clothed. All of the women are facing one way (looking towards the sky) but one is facing in the opposite direction and another is looking down instead of up. Some of the smaller women (possibly children) are clinging to the taller women. Finally, all of the women have the same hairstyle. In short there are very few differences in the images of the women. Almost all of the women are wearing long, braided wigs and long sheath dresses with three-quarter-length sleeves. In addition they are standing straight up with their arms in the air and their faces tilted up towards the sky. There are some differences, but it is difficult to tell exactly what they mean. One child is naked, while
another is dressed but is holding the waist of a woman who wears only a full length skirt with no top. Another woman faces in the opposite direction from all of the others.

The second half of the photograph shows men carrying flowers, lanterns, and in some cases, urns. All of them have short loin cloths of equal length. Of the five men, two are blonde, one is bald (or shaved) and the other two have the characteristic long dark Egyptian hair. Also as a point of interest, the blonde men have short hair while the dark hared men wear theirs long.

**Analysis**

While we can be certain that the women are all there to express their grief (Wilkinson, 1983:33-34), there is no way of being certain of what the differences signify, or whether they are indicators of power relations. Ethnographic material has provided little insight except for the fact that they are female mourners. (Wilkinson, 1983:33-34; Mekhitarian, 1954:114-115)

With the men there is again no certain way of differentiating between the people. All of the men are dressed in short, simple kilts indicative of working men (Watson, 1987:48-49). All are carrying the same types of objects: tall flowers, jars of incense and baskets filled with what look like flowers. The only difference here is the hair. Some are bald while others have short, black hair, both of which are common for ancient Egyptians (Watson, 1987:61). The others all appear to have short blonde hair which is uncharacteristic, but without further context, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about power relations and differences in status.
The information gathered from this series of photographs is an interesting comment on the value that society places in funeral rituals. Pictured here are everyone from child mourners, to noblemen, to priests and regular laborers who are pictured carrying grave goods to the tomb. What we can draw from this is that in death, to ensure a smooth transition to the afterlife, all must play a role. Here we see the entire social scale regardless of gender or age involved in one activity. While they may all be playing different roles, each role is of importance in ensuring the successful completion of the ritual.

Plate Five

Description

Plate 5 comes from the tomb of Sennedjem. Pictured here are Sennedjem and his wife receiving a libation from their son Bunakhtef who is acting as a funeral priest. Underneath their chairs are their children (Bierbrier, 1982: 59; Desroches-Noblecourt, 1962: 23; L'Hote, 1954:38) According to one source (L'Hote, 1954:#38) the principal figures are (from left to right) Tcharo and his wife Taia, Bunakhtef (different authors use different spellings for this particular name so I have chosen that of Bierbrier, 1982:59) son of Sennedjem, Sennedjem and finally his wife Ignefert. Both of the women are fully clothed in long, flowing, full-length robes while both men (not the priest) have long loin cloths but are bare chested. All four main figures have headpieces with cones of pomade on their heads and both men have something in their right hand. Sennedjem appears to have a scepter while Tcharo holds a lotus flower. As in all
representations of seated men and women, both women appear to be sitting just behind their husbands. Both Sennedjem and his son the priest have small beards on their chins, but it is unknown whether the third does, since the part of the painting containing his face has been destroyed. Finally, the priest is draped in a leopard skin and is pouring something.

**Analysis**

The power indicators here are clear. First of all, the son wears the leopard skin and the small, usually artificial beard indicative of a priest (Watson, 1987:39-40, 61). (It is also interesting to note that the leopard skin also appears among the Nuer of Africa as a religious symbol. For more see Meeker, 1989:88-90) He also wears a braided wig, usually indicative of upper class status (White, 1963:89). In his hand he holds a water jar (or Heset) which is pouring water or wine (indicated by the wavy lines coming out of the spout) (Wilkinson, 1992: 205).

Sennedjem wears a long, pleated skirt, a braided wig and a beaded headband. Furthermore, in his right hand he holds the Sekhem scepter, the symbol of power and might (Wilkinson, 1992: 183).

Sennedjem’s wife is also well-dressed. She is wearing long pleated robes, a long braided wig and a beaded headband. Under her chair are her two children with their characteristic sidelocks (Watson, 1987: 61).

What is interesting here is the inclusion of small children who are pictured under their mother’s chair. This shows the strength of the family unit, which is not seen in
other wall paintings. Again we have the presence of women with their husbands, and the women are seated just behind the men.

Another feature of this photograph that we have not yet seen is religion. It is hard to tell from this photograph just how important religion is to the people pictured here but we can assume that it must have played a significant role or it would not appear so clearly in a tomb wall painting. We do however see that the priest is well-dressed and is draped in a leopard skin. The use of fur through the ages has been used to denote importance or power and in several societies, priests or other religious figures are set apart from the rest by wearing leopard skins.

Plate Six

Description

While plate 6 seems similar to plate 5, it is, in fact, not that similar. This comes from the tomb of Ipuy, the sculptor from Thebes, and depicts Ipuy and his wife receiving offerings from their children (Freed, 1987: 93; Wilkinson, 1983:34-35). The color in this photograph (it is a restored copy of the original, since the original painting has been very badly damaged (Wilkinson, 1983: 34-35), helps to demonstrate just how elegantly the sculptor, his wife and children are dressed. Both husband and wife are wearing full-length robes, hair pieces, great necklaces (eight tiers) and bracelets. Both are seated on well-crafted and painted chairs with their feet resting on raised platforms or stools. Ipuy and his son wear sandals on their feet and Ipuy has a scepter in his
right hand. The other children bear numerous gifts and appear to be adorned in the same manner as their parents.

Analysis

One would think that as the family of a sculptor, they would not be as well dressed as they are, however all four persons are extremely well-dressed. Mother, father and daughter wear long, flowing robes, elaborate beaded collars, long braided wigs, and beaded headbands. The son is dressed in a long, pleated skirt with a leopard skin draped around his shoulders. This leopard skin is typical of clothing worn by priests throughout Dynastic Egypt (Watson, 1987: 39-40,61) (and as seen before the leopard skin appears as a religious symbol in other cultures) He also wears a wig with a headband, and like his father, sandals on his feet.

The way the family are dressed, the furniture that they sit on and the amount of offerings that they receive all indicate relatively high status in local society. In addition, there is the appearance of the leopard skin which denotes a priest and the presence of children. Two things regarding power can be drawn from this picture. First of all, there is the considerable importance given to the family unit and its relationships as we see in the children's interactions with their parents. They are presenting them with offerings which denotes respect, it also shows that adults held their children and family relationships in high regard. Secondly, the importance of religion appears again in this photograph (as in plate 5) for we see the sons acting as priests. Not only does this show the general significance of religion, but it highlights its importance within the family.
Plate Seven

Description

Plate 7 comes from tomb number 359, the tomb of a foreman. We are sure that he is a foreman, but three different sources (L'Hote, 1954:39; Bierbrier, 1982:74; Westendorf, 1986:186) have assigned three different names for him. I will therefore leave the identification of the photograph by tomb number alone.

Plate 7 shows the foreman, his wife and his children receiving offerings. Both the man and his wife are well-dressed in long, pleated robes characteristic of the court dress of the upper nobility (Watson, 1987: 18-19; White, 1963:90). Both are also wearing elaborate, braided wigs, also a sign of higher status (White, 1963: 89).

Analysis

The smaller figures are clearly meant to depict children because of the way their hair is dressed. "Children usually have very short hair or shaved heads except for a single long 'sidelock of youth' which hangs down on one side of their head and curls over at the end (Watson, 1987:61)." In addition, three of the four children are wearing a lot of jewelry: earrings, necklaces, armlets, bracelets and anklets.

The man on the extreme right wears a wig and a long pleated skirt. In the original painting there is probably another man behind him, because according to Westendorf (1968: 186), "surrounded by his family the lord of the tomb receives offerings from the priests of Osiris and Ptah." Among these offerings, there is a box filled with Ushabti figures (figures which were meant to act as slaves in the Fields of
Osiris in the afterlife (David, 1975:149), libations of water and incense and a small statue of Osiris (shown in the priest's left hand) (Westendorf, 1968:186).

The long pleated robes that we have seen so often in these photographs are without a doubt a sign of nobility or upper class status (Watson, 1987:18-19). According to White (1963:90) the nobility kept these robes for important functions, but in the privacy of their own dwellings wore loincloths just like everyone else. He also notes that the peasants or lower classes did not even posses such garments.

In this painting we see issues that have arisen before. Here the emphasis on family relationships appears again with the inclusion of the man's wife and child in the painting. The recurring presence of wives and children serves to reinforce their importance in the lives of these tomb builders.

Plate Eight

Plate 8 shows Sennedjem and his wife at work in the Fields of Paradise. The top of plate 8 shows Ra the Sun God sitting in his boat between a shrine (at the back) and a follower sign. (According to Wilkinson (1992:187) this sign means two different things to different archaeologists. The first possible meaning is that it is an instrument of execution and the second meaning is a bundle of equipment that attendants to the chieftains used to carry thus coming to symbolize 'follower') Shemset (at the front) (Wilkinson, 1992: 187).

In the bottom half of plate 8 Sennedjem and his wife are depicted at work in The Fields of Paradise. The thick blue lines which surround the painting, and at points
run through it, are representative of canals used for irrigation. (Wilkinson, 1983:60-61)
The drawing shows gardens and orchards filled with fresh fruits and colorful flowers, palms and sycamores (Wilkinson, 1983:60-61). Sennedjem and his wife are both well-dressed in long flowing robes which indicate that the scene represents an artistic transformation of reality. (Westendorf, 1968:190) In all probability, they would never have performed the kind of work they are shown doing and secondly workers in the fields would not have been dressed in this manner.

Analysis

Plate 8 depicts Sennedjem and his wife at work in the Fields of Paradise. The gardens are watered by means of irrigation canals, and the vegetation shown here is lush. The only power relation that is clearly evident here is that between human and god and is a prime example of what was earlier referred to as mystical power. There is no evidence of the state, but clear evidence of the power held by the divine. The top line in the garden shows Sennedjem and his wife praying to the gods. Both of them are kneeling with their hands raised, palms turned towards the gods. Facing them are several seated deities, including Ra and Osiris, “whose collaboration maintains the eternal cycle of life” (Westendorf, 1968:188). This shows the higher status and power of the gods and the necessity for people to pray to them for help and guidance. People must also work for the gods in the Fields of Paradise in the afterlife and in this case must perform duties that they were never required to do on earth. This demonstrates just how superior the gods were.
Plate Nine

Description

Plate 9 again features Sennedjem and his wife. This time, they approach a shrine filled with seated deities. These particular deities are "members of the divine tribunal which oversees the judgment of the deceased" (Wilkinson, 1992:30). As for Sennedjem, he is wearing a loin cloth of fine pleated linen which extends from his waist to below his knees. On his head he wears a headband and his hands are raised in front of him with the palms facing towards the gods. His wife is standing just behind him with one hand raised like her husband, and the other hand holds a lotus flower. She is clothed in the same fine pleated linen, except that her clothing is full-length with sleeves to the elbow. Finally, she is wearing a headband, but on the front of hers is a lotus flower.

Analysis

This photograph shows Sennedjem and his wife, well-dressed, praying towards an area in which are depicted several seated gods (Wilkinson, 1992: 30) Sennedjem’s wife is dressed in long pleated robes with long sleeves, and on her head she wears a long braided wig, which is characteristic of the wigs worn by the upper classes in the New Kingdom (White, 1963:89). Her husband wears a long pleated kilt and he too wears a wig in the style of which was typical for the New Kingdom upper class (White, 1963: 89).
Sennedjem's hands are raised with his palms facing outwards towards the deities. His wife has one hand raised in the same manner while in her other hand she holds a flower. This is a prayer stance (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:516) and can be seen again in plate 10. As for the deities, they are said to be "members of the divine tribunal which oversees the judgment of the deceased (Wilkinson, 1992:30)." The two deities of note are Osiris (top left) and Ra (bottom left), "whose collaboration maintains the eternal cycle of life" (Westendorf, 1968:188).

This picture provides a good example of the relations between humans and the gods, (and is another perfect example of mystical power) and of the importance that religion has in Egyptian society. We see how humans are viewed in relation to the gods and it is obvious that the people see themselves as subordinate.

Plate Ten

Description

Plate 10 is an interesting view of the relationship between the gods and humans. On the left is a man with long, braided hair (probably a wig), heavy eye make-up, and long pleated robes. He is positioned in such a way that he has one foot forward and his hands are raised with his palms facing outward. In the middle of the photograph, there is a table on top of which there are three objects. On the right side of the picture is the phoenix, a large, long-legged bird with a long, narrow beak. On his head, the bird wears the crown of Osiris.

Analysis
Plate 10 comes from the tomb of Anhurkhawi, who we know was a foreman in the Place of Truth (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:516).

From existing literature (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:516; Desroches-Noblecourt, 1962:#24) we know that the man is deceased. He is shown here standing in front of the phoenix of Heliopolis. The man is well-dressed in long pleated robes characteristic of the New Kingdom upper class (Watson, 1987:18-19). He also wears a long braided wig. He is positioned here with his hands raised in front of him with his palms facing outward, which is a prayer stance (Lange & Hirmer, 1968:516). In between the two is a table on top of which there are three loaves of bread as offerings.

Finally there is the phoenix itself. Traditionally, the phoenix represented the creation of the world and also renewal (perhaps connected to the afterlife). As such, the phoenix was a very important figure to the ancient Egyptians. In this particular scene, the phoenix is wearing the crown of Osiris (Lange and Hirmer, 1968:516) and faces the deceased.

The power relations represented here extend beyond the group of workers connected to tomb construction and again demonstrate mystical power. This photograph shows the power differential between humans (even high ranking ones), and the gods despite the fact that there is no evidence of political or state power. The gods held a position higher than any human, and they were to be praised and respected.
Plate Eleven

Description

In plate 11 we have a sculptor’s workshop with the foreman and two other workers helping with inventory. At first glance it is the foreman who stands out for he is portrayed three times larger than any of the other workers. He is dressed in full-length, pleated robes and is shown writing. The second thing of note is that the two workers, who are shown directly addressing the foreman are larger than their co-workers but smaller than the foreman himself. The workers shown addressing the foreman are dressed like their co-workers (but not like the foreman), in loin cloths extending from waist to knee. A notable difference is that they wear pleated loin cloths while those on their co-workers appear to be plain. Although the painting in plate 11 has not survived very well, we are still able to make some fairly concrete conclusions.

Analysis

On the far left of the picture is a man dressed in very elaborately pleated, long clothing. This is known to be court dress for a noble or an official in the later part of the New Kingdom (Watson, 1987: 18-19). The same man holds a scribal kit and appears to be writing down (recording) something.

In addition to the clothes he wears and the utensils he is using, he has been drawn at twice the size of the other workers, in itself, a sign of his superiority (Laing, 1993:145).
Of the other workers, two are handing or showing piles of goods to the foreman/scribe while the others are all engaged in some form of craft-making. The two in direct contact with the foreman are in short pleated skirts while all of the others have short but unpleated skirts. This may also be an indicator of power difference, but with the artwork as damaged as it is, it is hard to tell.

Here we have some indication of the relationship between artisans, but it is difficult if not impossible to draw conclusions about individual power. All of those working on objects are drawn at the same size and are similarly clothed. There does not seem to be anything in the depiction to indicate differences among them. While we have seen from the ethnographic literature that there were indeed differences, we can not see these differences in this painting.

Plate Twelve

Description

Plate 12 comes to us from the tomb of the vizier Rekhmiré and depicts three different registers. The top register shows goldsmiths and the bottom register shows brick-makers. In this picture, one or possibly as many as three of the workers are blonde haired and not the usual black hair in Egyptian paintings. As far as dress is concerned, they all appear to be wearing loin cloths of the same length except for the man in the bottom left-hand corner. He, unlike the others, seems to be carrying a whip instead of being engaged in some artistic or construction activity. There is one person
shown who seems to be different from the others. He is the man on the far left-hand side of the middle section. He is shown larger than the others in his row, if not larger than all of the others in the picture. He, like the man with the whip, does not appear to be involved in craft-work and he is shown looking away from the scene. It is possible that he is responding to a person of higher authority, but since the picture in the photograph is cut off there, there is no way of knowing.

Analysis

In this photograph we have few evidences of power relations. Apart from differences in activity, there is little else that sets the workers apart. All have short hair and simple short kilts. While it may seem as though those shown in the top register have longer kilts, it is very difficult to tell if this is in fact the case and if so, whether it was intentional.

Some men in this picture are shown to be bald, and some with short dark hair and three or four with short blonde hair. Since short hair and even baldness were common in ancient Egypt (Watson, 1987: 61) we can not draw any conclusions based on this visible difference. Furthermore, we cannot draw any conclusions about the significance of the blonde-haired men either. This may simply be a result of aging paint, or it may indicate that these men were not Egyptian.

Finally, the man standing to the extreme left of the middle register seems to be slightly larger than the others. However, since we are unable to see what he is doing and since he is as plainly dressed as the others, with short hair and no jewelry we
would have great difficulty drawing conclusions about significances for power relations.

**Plate Thirteen**

**Description**

Plate 13 shows the Lord of the Tomb supervising work (Westendorf, 1968:120). As in previous photographs it is possible to draw distinctions between three different groups of people shown. First of all, there is the Lord of the Tomb with his scepter of power in one hand and what looks to be a staff in the other. He is much larger in size than the other people in the painting and is wearing full-length robes with sleeves. The second distinguishable group are the men in the top left-hand corner who appear to be soiled and are being “washed” by the blonde man. Like the Lord of the Tomb, these men have long hair and full-length robes. The act of being washed by someone may imply higher status for the one being washed.

The three men at the bottom of the picture may form a class with the blonde man, or may in fact form a different one. Although dressed the same with short hair and loin-cloths, one is carrying out punishment while one is being punished and the other is begging for forgiveness. Unfortunately it is difficult to see a distinction here other than the actions they are involved in. However their actions demonstrate that the man on the left inflicting punishment is superior to the man being punished and the one begging for mercy.
Analysis

Plate 13 is a fascinating example of power and rank. It is also a perfect example of political or state power as opposed to mystical power. To the extreme right of the picture there appears to be a man who is larger than the others and who, according to Westendorf (1968:120), is the Lord of the Tomb. As we have seen, image size can be an indicator of power and status (Laing, 1993:145) This issue of image size relating to authority is echoed by Wason in his *The Archaeology of Rank* (1994:165) He is shown wearing a short kilt with an overshirt. This was customary clothing for officials of the New Kingdom (Watson, 1987:18-19). He is also holding two very important power indicators: in his left hand he holds the Sekhem scepter signifying such things as controller, commander (or person of power in general) and denotes concepts such as power and might (Wilkinson, 1992:183); in his other hand he holds a sort of staff, (perhaps the Was Scepter which denotes power and dominion (Wilkinson, 1992:183) but it lacks the forked base typical of the Was scepter).

To his left there are two registers, an upper and a lower one. In the top register, there are four men shown, all of whom appear to be dressed in the same manner as the Lord of the Tomb (Westendorf, 1968:120), but they seem to be dirty or soiled. The fifth man stands in front of a basin of some sort and may be engaged in washing the first man. He is not as well dressed (he wears only a short kilt and very short hair with no wig), and he looks to be rubbing the first man's shoulders. Since the short kilt is representative of the New Kingdom laborers or peasants (Watson, 1987:48-49) we
may assume that he is a subordinate who is helping the better dressed and more powerful men with their toilet.

The lower register shows a man beating another while a third seems to be begging. Of the entire scene, Westendorf, (1968:120) says “Subordinates and peasants are being led before the lord of the tomb, standing in a bower. One peasant is being beaten for having failed to deliver grain or not having delivered enough. Another is on his knees imploring to be spared punishment.” In both registers, there is evidence of political power or the power of one person over another, but the mystical power that is evident in photographs which were discussed earlier does not appear to be present.

Plate Fourteen

Description

Plate 14 shows a worker on his knees in front of two scribes (Westendorf, 1968:120). Here the clothing discrepancies are clear. The worker is dressed in a short plain loin-cloth. On the other hand, the scribes appear to be quite well dressed in short skirts and sleeved shirts. Their outfits are also pleated. Both are holding a staff in one hand and writing instruments in the other. (Westendorf, 1968:120)

In plate 14 there is a clear contrast in social rank. The two men standing are well dressed in clothing typical of nobles and officials (Watson, 1987:18-19) — knee length tunics worn over kilts and overskirts (1987:18-19). Furthermore, they carry writing tablets with them which indicates that they were scribes.
In addition to this, there is a man kneeling or bowing while on his knees to them. He wears only a simple, short kilt and he is most probably a peasant. As Westendorf (1968:120) says, "in contrast to the rural population, simply clothed and crouching on the ground, the tax and land-registry officials carrying their writing tablets are dressed as fashionably adorned city dwellers."

**Analysis**

What we have here is an interesting example of the social difference between rural and urban persons. We know from ethnographic information that officials generally came from the city. They were both well dressed in pleated robes, while country dwellers were simply dressed with short unadorned hair. There is a difference in occupation to be noted. The two men from the city carry scribe's palettes while the man on his knees is most probably a farmer or slave. Differences in education and skills are other important distinctions between people from the city and the country.

**Plate Fifteen**

**Description**

Plate 15 depicts people weighing gold. Once again there is difficulty in distinguishing between differences in status. What is obvious in this picture is that the man weighing the gold is much smaller than the others, and that he has short blonde hair. This may be simply because the artist wanted him under the scale in order to show him in the picture, but it could also imply lower status. The rest of the men all appear to be the same size with the same length loin cloths and hair. There is a second blonde
man, but he is the same height as the others. There is a bald man at the far left, but despite not being able to see his body we can assume (due to the size of his head and the length of his arms), that he is the same size as the others.

Analysis

It is impossible to distinguish any form of rank in this depiction. There is a man on the extreme right who may be recording the events, which would make him a scribe or at least a foreman. However, he does not appear to have any distinguishing features from what we can see.

The man in charge of weighing the gold does appear to be smaller in size than the other men, but that in itself does not appear to denote a difference in rank or status. It could simply be that the artist wanted the figure to fit under the scale.

The remainder of the men are all the same size in bodily stature. They have kilts of a similar length and all are shown with short hair or bald heads (not uncommon for Egyptians (Watson, 1987:61). The one interesting factor is that two of the men are blonde, uncharacteristic for Egyptians. This could indicate that they are foreigners or that quite simply that pigments in the image have been chipped or altered in some way over the centuries.

While we can not distinguish social rank in this image, it is possible for us to locate the men as a group in society. The men have no jewelry or wigs. They are without elaborate clothing or identifying items, (scepters, scribal kits) which would
indicate power or high ranking occupations. Finally, their simple kilts resemble those of the New Kingdom workers (Watson, 1987:48-49).

Plate Sixteen

Plate 16 is an extraordinary example of a royal workshop. The foreman, who is almost certainly the man at the far left, wears full-length robes and in his right hand he holds a bouquet of lotus flowers. He also has long hair with braids in it. He is shown inspecting a number of finished crafts which are being presented by two of the craftsmen. What distinguishes the craftsmen here are the activities in which they are engaged. At the left side of the top section of the picture is a worker weighing gold rings. Beside him are carpenters and woodworkers. The first three are engaged in making Djed columns, and the next few are making Isis knots. The last few are making a catalfalque and decorating it with the Djed columns and Isis knots. The second row shows jewelry makers, sculptors and metalworkers involved in making crafts ranging from jewelry to metal vases. The bottom row shows people involved in making bronze lamp stands and on the far right, others making stone vessels and beads. (Stead, 1986:36-41)

Analysis

When looking for hints as to power relations in this photograph we are immediately struck by the size of the foreman in relation to the others. According to Laing (1993:145), figures in Egyptian art are arranged in hierarchical order. The more important the person in status, the larger in size he is portrayed.
His clothing is representative of someone who holds a high status. First of all, he wears a short kilt which is covered by a long overskirt with short sleeves. If he were a worker, this clothing would be cumbersome and impractical. It is also in keeping with the outfits of the officials in the New Kingdom (Watson, 1987:18-19).

On his head he wears a wig with elaborate braids, while the others are either bald or have very short hair. Men of the upper classes often wore wigs, since these provided protection from the sun. In addition, wigs were cooler than their own hair (White, 1963:89). He also has a multi-tiered bead collar around his neck, which would have been cumbersome for a worker. Finally, in his right hand he holds a stylized bouquet of what I believe to be lotuses. To the ancient Egyptians, the lotus was the symbol of the sun and of creation (Wilkinson, 1992:121).

In terms of actions, he is being presented with finished articles (including necklaces and furniture) for final inspection. This would imply that he had the authority to reject or approve any of the articles that were made by his workmen.

As for the workmen themselves, it is difficult to distinguish any form of rank or status. All are wearing approximately the same length of kilt and their bodies are shown the same size.

The fact that there are two people who present finished articles to the foreman could be an indication of difference of power, for they appear to be intermediaries between craftsmen and the foremen.

Finally, it is easy to distinguish between occupations simply by looking at what activity they are engaged in, but rank or seniority are very difficult to determine.
In terms of mystical versus political power, this is a perfect example of just how interconnected the two really were. First of all, we see evidence of the state. There is clearly a supervisor and those being supervised which indicates state control. However, the activities that they are engaged in clearly speak to the presence of mystical power. The craftsmen are not busily making items essential for human survival but are instead creating items of religious significance, items which the living will offer the dead so that they are prepared for the afterlife. These are items of religious significance which will not be used by the craftsmen themselves, but rather by the nobles and the pharaohs and is strong evidence of the mystical power which controlled all even the pharaoh himself.

Insights into power structures from similar archaeological accounts

For the most part I have chosen to leave the input from various other sources to the end of the section for one reason. The studies that were similar to mine were done on a much larger scale and compared the remains found in various settlements or even a region to draw their conclusions about power. They also used different types of information like settlement patterns, mortuary practices, actual material that the remains were originally made of and so on. In my particular case study which was done on a much smaller scale, I have not used issues such as settlement patterns, grave distribution, chronological records and so on. While these issues would have provided valuable insight they were just not feasible for a study of this size.

In Jonathan Haas’ *The Evolution of the Prehistoric State* (1982) analyses both an area in Peru and an area in Mesoamerica. In both he looks for the presence of
manifestations of power in such ways as communal building projects, imported resources and the existence of major monuments which would have required a significant mobilization of the workforce in order to construct (Haas, 1982:188-189). While we know from general knowledge that these existed in ancient Egypt it comes as a challenge to see any evidence in the photographs.

In Haas’ study of Mesoamerica he cites salt and obsidian as two materials found in the region that were not native to the area as evidence of trading. (1982:185) From the photographs we can not draw any conclusions based on this idea. In terms of major monuments Haas’ cites the Olmec heads as evidence of the manifestation of personal power in a communal labor project. Again we have no evidence of such massive undertakings, however what we do see in the photographs are the workshops. In plates 11, 12, 15 and 16 we see workers busy at work in workshops. While these are small scale work projects they do show workers crafting items that have no personal value. For the most part the value of the crafts is ideological and their use was for the nobles only. As Haas says “these projects had no direct benefit to the population other than to demonstrate to them the power of religion... (1982:189)” In addition these workshops offer a glimpse at centralized direction. Because the workers are not making anything that will benefit them directly, we must conclude that they are working for someone who has power over them. In the case of plates 11 and 16 that we see direct evidence of this power with the presence of the foreman overseeing the workers.

In his The Archaeology of Rank, (1994) Wason offers many interesting ideas for inferring power particularly in reference to iconography and art. First of all he says that
the relative size of figures and the elaborateness of their costumes tends to be related to one's political importance. (Trigger, 1978:165-166; Wason, 1994:118). Another point he makes is that defeated enemies are usually simply dressed or not dressed at all while the elaborately dressed conqueror stands over them. (Trigger, 1978:165-166; Wason, 1994:118) He also notes that being able to demonstrate the unequal distribution of luxury items would be a power indicator. (Trigger, 1978:165-166; Wason, 1994:118).

Wason goes on to study Catal Huyuk a town in Anatolia during the Neolithic era. Again as previously mentioned, Wason's study is much more comprehensive than mine in that he covers everything from mortuary practices to artifact distribution throughout the whole town. He does include a section on art and it is that section which is of most interest to my purposes here.

First of all he notices no obvious representations of power in the art, but there are small things that might suggest power when combined with other issues. First of all, there is the issue of size. In a hunting scene he noted that one figure is larger than the rest (Wason, 1994:168-169). In the case of our photographs, we have evidence of this as well. In plates 11, 13 and 16 there are figures that are clearly much larger than the others. In addition, they are also better dressed in more elaborate clothing. In plate 13 the large figure is also in possession of the Sekhem scepter which as we have already seen is a power indicator (Wilkinson, 1992:183). In plate 11, the large figure to the left happens to be writing, a skill which we know from ethnographic material noted in this chapter was a skill perfected by certain members of the elite only.
While we have no real displays of the conqueror standing over the conquered, we do have an example of a large, elaborately dressed figure standing over someone being beaten. Plate 13 serves as a perfect, (albeit smaller scale), example of that type of power relation. There is the large power figure standing watch while the smaller simply dressed peasant is being punished.

Finally, in reference to the unequal distribution of luxury items, the evidence for that is plentiful. In the photographs where people are working, (plates 11, 12, 15 and 16 and also plate 4a in which men are transporting offerings to a tomb) the workers are always simply clad in simple loin cloths, short or no hair and no jewelry while those that watch over them are dressed in long, pleated robes with long hair (or wigs, it is at times hard to tell) and occasionally jewelry. In the festive scenes and family scenes (plates 2, 3a&b, 5, 6 and 7) the people are all well dressed with fancy robes, elaborate wigs and lots of jewelry. As we know from White, (1963:90) members of the lower classes did not even posses such items.

Unfortunately due to the subject that I have chosen to study (wall art) there are few studies similar enough to draw exact indicators that others have used to indicate power structures. This is because the other studies are actually studying the structures themselves whereas I am studying the method through which to study the structure. As a result, they have drawn from all types of archaeological information (settlement patterns, mortuary practices, grave distribution etc.) whereas I have drawn from the wall art only. Had the subject of this thesis been power structures among the tomb builders in the Ramesside period of ancient Egypt I would have had to draw on more
types of information just as they did. It is my opinion though that this section serves to
demonstrate the importance of using studies of a similar nature to draw from.

**Analyses from Different Theoretical Frameworks**

In the preceding section of this chapter I have provided the reader with my
analysis of the material based on my chosen tools and including my biases. To further
illustrate the idea of the material as text I will view the tomb art materials in relation to
two of the three main formulations concerning the dynamics of state formation that
were reviewed in chapter two. The three general formulations discussed were the
‘integration’, ‘conflict’ and ‘irrigation’ hypotheses and now we will look at the
photographs of tomb art using ‘integration’ and ‘conflict’ formulations as bases. I have
chosen not to use the irrigation theory as there is no real information in the photographs
that we can draw from and it would not be worthwhile. I first briefly review the main
points of these formulations and then examine the photographs looking for evidence of
these points. The examination may not be done in great depth for such an approach
would be repetitious. Most of the small details visible in the photographs were
discussed in the preceding section. The following section will be much more general in
scope but the conclusions drawn from it are at least adequate to demonstrate how
social archaeology is able to produce a variety of kinds of conclusions depending upon
the specific commitments of the basic formulations employed in analysis.
Integration Theory

Integration theorists (for example Moret & Davy, and Elman Service) are committed to the view that the state developed through a collective will. (Moret & Davy, 1926:128; Haas 1982:70-71) Integration theorists maintain that there is a need for strong organizational and administrative leadership in the areas of irrigation, labor and military in order to unite (integrate) the people. This allowed for peaceful formation of administrative bodies who had the mandate to rule most aspects of the society. This mandate was willingly given by all and the result was a society that acknowledged the need for an administrative body and this acceptance made for a relatively peaceful society. (For more information on this subject please see chapter two.)

If we were to look at the photographs of Egyptian tomb art from the point of view of integrationist theorists we would find sufficient evidence to support the idea that the state rose out of the collective will and need for strong organizational leadership and administration where irrigation, labor and military were concerned.

In plate 4a. we see a funeral procession in which everyone is working together towards a common goal. All figures are helping to transport offerings to the tomb of the deceased and are not working for their own personal gain, but to help others. There appears to be no supervisor nor threat of sanction from any person who has more control than anyone else. Each figure is aware of the task to be done and what s/he
must do in order to make it happen. This in itself is a good example of the idea of the collective will.

In plates 11 and 16 we see royal workshops. While in each of these photographs there is clearly one figure who holds more authority than the others, neither one appears to be taking a threatening stance, nor do they hold any type of weapons or implements which would indicate that they are using coercion, violence or any other forms of sanction as a means of control. Again the workers (as we have seen in plate 7) know what they have to do and are going about it peacefully.

Similar observations may be made regarding the servants in the festive scenes in plates 5, 6 and 7. All servants appear to be doing their jobs peacefully and without fear or contempt. All seem to know what they have to do and they seem secure in the knowledge that, while supervisors are present their role is a positive one rather than a negative one and that they are there merely to facilitate and control in a positive productive way as opposed to a negative one. What this means is that the supervisor's presence is not perceived as threatening nor is he perceived as being there to punish. Instead the workers see the supervisors as people who are there to see that each craftsman can do his job effectively and to the best of his ability by making sure that they have all of the materials they need and that the workshop stays orderly so that they can all work without interruption.

The role of the gods is interesting and obviously very important to the people. In several of the photographs we see people standing in deference and making offerings to the gods. Two excellent examples are plates 9 and 10. In both of them, the humans
are clearly praising the gods in a respectful manner. The people are aware that the gods control all that happens on earth, and they respect and recognize this power in a positive way.

**Conflict Theorists**

Conflict theorists (for example Marx & Engels, Gordon Childe and Morton Fried.) who believe that the state came about as a response to increased technology where food production was concerned. The general argument is that increased technology created a surplus of food, which in turn created a class structure in which a few individuals or groups controlled the means of production, surplus commodities and wealth. Control over production gave them control over others. It is the contention of the conflict theorists that as the technology developed and the wealth and resources became concentrated in the hands of a few, the state developed as a means of controlling the resulting conflicts between classes. (For more information on this subject see chapter two.)

In looking for evidence of this in the photographs of Egyptian tomb art, we do find a fair amount of evidence which supports the fact that the wealth and resources are concentrated in the hands of a few who control the rest.

In plate 13 we see evidence that there were specific officers who had control over the activities of the workers. In the lower register of the top plate we see a man who is being beaten, while another is begging for mercy in front of the owner of the tomb. Here we clearly see an example of officers controlling members of the lower
class. This power or control is also seen in plate 14, in which the peasant or worker crouches before officials who hold writing palettes, usually indicative of a scribe or some other learned person. Here the well-educated and well-trained have control over laborers and it is clear from both images that the peasants feared the power and control that the officials had over them and probably dreaded and the punishments or the sanctions that may be imposed on them.

If we examine plates 11 and 16, which are scenes of royal workshops we see that one figure is supervising while several others who are not as well dressed or groomed are working. The differences in their appearance (clothing, jewelry, hair etc.) signify that the supervisors clearly have more access to and control over resources and wealth. This access over resources also enables them to have control over labor, the laborers being of a lower class.

The same sort of idea may be applied to plates 5, 6 and 7, in all of which well dressed noblemen and their wives are being tended to by servants. Class differential based on control of resources and production of food is evident. Upper class people are well dressed, adorned with elaborate jewels and hair styles, and often hold flowers (which due to access to water and suitable land for growing such items would be a real luxury), while the lower classes who do not control production, but rather produce are simply clothed with no jewels or other items of luxury.

Egyptian religion also supplies us with some valuable information here. In plates 9 and 10 we see human figures worshipping the gods, which may be read as another display of control or hierarchy in power. Humans believed that the gods were all
powerful, certainly more powerful than any human, and as a result, humans must worship them and provide them with offerings to keep them from being angered.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter we have demonstrated the method of social archaeology. Using a series of photographs from the private tombs of the royal artisans at Deir el-Medina in Thebes, we have attempted to describe what the power and social relations of the day might have looked like. Again I would like to remind the reader that this is not a thesis in Egyptology nor do I profess to be an expert in the area of powers structures in ancient Egypt. This chapter was to serve as a forum through which to illustrate the methods employed in a social archaeological study and it has done just that. It is not an in depth analysis of social and power structures in ancient Egypt but rather an operationalization of social archaeology.

The first section was a discussion of how the state arose in Egypt. It also included a look at the town of Deir el-Medina as it may have looked during the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties of ancient Egypt.

In the second section of the chapter I provided the reader with my analysis of what the social and power structures of the day might have looked like. In doing so, I used my definition of power which is outlined in detail in chapter two and combined this with the knowledge that I had acquired through other ethnographic studies of ancient Egypt. I applied that information to the photographs and conducted a social archaeological study. The result of this study was an understanding of everything from
gender and familial relations to relations between laborer and supervisor to relations between gods and humans. It provides the reader with, (in my opinion), a relatively comprehensive feel for how these relations may actually have looked.

The third section served as an example of how social archaeology strives to see the material as text rather than record. It takes the same photographs that I have used, but changes the theoretical base ever so slightly to produce different conclusions. The integrationist sees the relation between the state and the people as a calm one while the conflict theorist sees supervisors and more powerful people exercising their power over others in a negative way.

While the conclusions here are different, there are still similarities. While one side sees the power of the state as calm and peaceful, while the other sees it as negative and violent the fact remains that both analyses see the distinction between state and worker, between human and god etc.

In the conclusion to this thesis these similarities and differences as well as the positive and the negative points of social archaeology will be discussed.
Some Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this thesis was to explore the theories and methods used by social archaeology and was written in two sections. It is useful at this point to review the course of our discussions before we attempt to assess the more general merits of social archaeology. The first section included chapters one and two and was an exploration of social archaeology. The second section, chapter three, was the case study which involved the application of theory and method to tomb art of Deir el-Medina.

Chapter one was a review of all the existing literature surrounding the subject of social archaeology. It began with a history of archaeological method which provided an illustration of how social archeology came into being and the trends in both theory and method that brought about it’s development.

The literature surrounding social archaeology itself was then discussed under the following headings of theory and method.

The theory section discussed the need for a social archaeology. It is the need to see objects as a text that can be read and reread depending on the perspective from which the text is studied and the material and the tools that they use in the study. The most important issue to come out of our discussion is that studies such as social archaeology should not be so easily accepted or dismissed. Any study is not necessarily all positive or negative and good points can be extracted from every analysis. As such, the material does not remain static and frozen in time, but rather continues to grow and
develop over time as it is read and re-read from various historical positions or theoretical perspectives. Furthermore, one of the goals of social archaeology is to put objects into their broader social contexts rather than just basing their interpretation on the object's appearance or singular use. This approach would give objects greater significance and provide those who study them with a greater appreciation for the item, its uses, its meanings, and roles in society. More particularly, it could provide readers with a greater understanding of how the society itself worked.

Finally, there was a discussion of methodology or how social archaeological analysis might be conducted. While it was a 'how to' discussion of how these studies should be done, it, like the goals of this movement, are purely theoretical. The study should involve some type of archaeological material and a question or issue to be analyzed. Some type of theoretical material should be applied and conclusions should be formed. In addition, the researcher should consult and borrow from studies of a similar nature (not necessarily of the same culture or geographical area) to see how other social archaeologists have conducted their analyses. What tools did they use? What types of things did they look for and what did they find? What conclusions did they draw? The researcher should use this knowledge as a tool for studying his/her own materials and use it as a valuable source to draw from. In social archaeology there is always something to be learned from other studies and other researchers. This results in the studies, like the material itself, being viewed as interconnected to other studies and not as a separate entity. In addition, knowledge should be drawn from archaeological accounts of the particular culture or others similar to it. In theory, this would provide a
well-rounded analysis which draws information from several sources and places archaeological material within its broader social contexts.

Chapter two was a discussion of the ‘tools’ to be used in the analysis in chapter three. As discussed in the first chapter, in doing a social archaeological analysis, one should take a theory (or theories) and apply that theory to the archaeological remains. In addition, one should also examine the ethnographic material that already exists on the subject as well as studies of the same nature that have been conducted using other bodies of archaeological material. In this chapter we examined the theories which surround state formation, namely integration, conflict and irrigation. We also looked at other archaeological studies that involved social power. Finally, we went on to discuss ethnographic accounts which dealt with the tomb builders of Deir el-Medina and the lives that they led.

The beginning of chapter three is a brief history of the rise of the state in ancient Egypt. While we used state formation theories at length in the second chapter and used them again in the third, it must be acknowledged that Egypt was already a state at the time of our case study. Chapter three therefore serves to orient the reader as to who the tomb builders were and where they came from. It provides the reader with a brief history of the rise of the Egyptian state. It also draws heavily from the ethnographic material concerning the tomb builders and provides the reader with some insights as to the kinds of occupations these people held and the ways in which they lived their daily lives. It discusses issues of job training and benefits, day-to-day tasks and briefly explains the social hierarchy.
In the second part of chapter three, I attempted to construct an image of the social power relations of the workers in Deir el-Medina in ancient Egypt. Not only were workers’ power relations examined in relation to each other, but also in relation to the spiritual world. I began by conducting my own study of the materials and by drawing my own conclusions. In doing so, I drew from key theoretical formulations on social power, the information derived from similar archaeological studies and from ethnographic material on the workers to interpret some of the art found on the walls of the workers’ private tombs at Deir el-Medina. I also included a section which focused solely on the similar archaeological accounts to further emphasize their importance to the study. I then went on to reanalyze the material from the perspectives of both conflict and integration theorists. This in itself constitutes a social archaeological analysis. I took the same series of photographs of wall art and simply by changing the theoretical slant of the analysis came out with three slightly different interpretations of these images. The question as to whether or not this type of analysis has anything to offer remains open at the end of chapter three.

First of all, it is important to remember that the subject of this thesis was not ancient Egypt, it is the history and value of social archaeology. To that end it is of no significant consequence whether the study worked or not. All I was looking for was a means through which to employ the method of social archaeology. Ancient Egypt and the social power relations of the workers at Deir el-Medina were somewhat secondary to the main goals of this analysis. In relation to the discussion of Deir el-Medina from chapter three, it is clear that the photographs did not provide us with the same
elaborate structure of social power that was discussed in the ethnographic sources of that chapter. There are possible reasons for that. First of all, the remains that we were dealing with are over three thousand years old. Much of it has been destroyed completely or damaged beyond recognition and it is certain that we are not dealing with the full situation. Second of all, due to the time constraints of a thesis of this nature, my photograph search has been limited to the number of monographs on ancient Egyptian art which were readily available, and I have relied on a relatively small number of books. Finally, it was found that the monographs available to me tended to all use the same photographs. This is probably due to the fact that so few have remained and even fewer remain in good condition. As a result, those are the ones that have been used frequently. With that said, we can now look at the method.

The purpose of social archaeological analysis is to bring several elements together in order to study archaeological remains from different perspectives. This has happened here and it is my opinion that it worked well. The art on the walls of the private funerary chapels of the workers at Deir el-Medina is no longer an image of the activities of the social life and the afterlife.

In our analysis the art provides important information regarding the social structures of the community. By drawing on theoretical formulations of the concept of power we have a constructed framework or optic through which to examine a social situation. Power provides the framework, the context in which to examine material remains in order to represent what the power relations may have been. What is most interesting here is that our analysis is far from being a fixed text. This is well
demonstrated by the three different approaches taken to the material in chapter three. While there are issues that remain constant throughout the analyses there are also marked differences. While integration theory would see the power relations demonstrated in plate 14 as a calm display of workers being willingly submissive to superiors for the greater good, the conflict theorist views the same scene from a different angle. While s/he sees that there is an obvious display of social power with the supervisor watching over the craftsmen in the workshop, s/he sees this supervisory presence as threatening and one that the workers fear. Fundamentally, the two view points stem from the same idea. The photo of the wall painting shows a supervisor, pictured as much larger than the others, watching over the workers. They are smaller, not as well-dressed, their hair is short and simple and they wear no jewelry. Obviously, there is a show of social power here, but the meaning, the nature of this social power is understood quite differently depending on the theoretical approach that is taken. This is not to say that any one of them is wrong (or right) but they are different. The flexibility of the method is without a doubt a strong point of the whole notion of social archaeology. Any components can be used in combination with a group of material remains to examine any archaeologically known social system. The resulting similarities and differences in analytical findings serve to further our understanding of the past and the social structures that operated in it. Both approaches acknowledge the centrality of power, but they formulate it differently.

Returning to the analysis in chapter three there are several issues regarding social power that can be identified. First of all there is the issue of gender. From the
photographs that were studied, there is a strong female presence. It is clear that women
played a strong role in the lives of these Egyptians and that idea is reinforced by the
frequency with which they appear alongside their husbands, at ceremonial gatherings.

Along the same line, there is the role of the family which again is well
represented in these photographs. Children appear with their parents on a regular basis
indicating that the family and children were a valued part of Egyptian life. There is also
one incidence of a woman breast-feeding (plate 1). In these tombs designed specifically
to portray their daily lives and serve as a monument to their lives, the fact that women
and children appear so regularly is highly significant.

The next area of life that we can draw conclusions about is religion. The
difference between humans and the gods is a very prevalent idea in these paintings. We
often see humans praying to the gods and or making offerings to them. Clearly, the
gods played a significant role in the daily lives of these workers. Take for example plate
15, which depicts Sennedjem and his wife praying to what Wilkinson (1992:30) referred
to as "members of the divine tribunal." The two people stand facing the tribunal with
their palms raised in worship. We see this again in plate 16 with Anhurkhawi, also in a
typical prayer stance, with palms raised in front of him. He is making offerings in the
form of the three loaves of bread which appear on the table between himself and the
phoenix.

We may conclude that in Deir el-Medina there were different social classes of
people, some more powerful than others. Unfortunately though, we are unable to
conclude precisely how powerful or powerless these individuals are based only on the
conceptual tools that have been utilized here. As was evident in the analysis section and reiterated above, there are certain issues on which all sides would agree. It is my contention that the threads that are common in all of these analyses can be accepted as at least highly probable understandings of the social structure of Deir el-Medina. The value of social archaeology is that while one can accept its findings as provisional, it is always open to new ideas and interpretations, and as such the interpretations continue to grow as new ideas and understandings that people have of their world develop.

As far as our analysis of the social power relations of the tomb builders is concerned, I would have liked to have explored other facets of their lives and other sources of documentation (i.e. other than the wall art) that exists concerning them. For the purposes of this study it was necessary to limit myself to what I will call mainstream literature regarding Deir el-Medina. The information on which I drew is that generally accessible to the interested public. Now, with the general knowledge that I have acquired on the wall art it would be very interesting to delve into other aspects of the peoples’ lives-- for example, household patterns and spatial analysis of the community. Who lived where in the town and why. Was there any connection to where their houses were and their status in life? Were some dwellings larger than others, and if so why? Another interesting area would be chronological records. Was status inherited or earned? Was it a combination of both? Was there a correlation between family size and status? A more in-depth examination of the role of women in society would provide fascinating insights to this examination, as would a better understanding of religion. These are but a few examples. My fascination with the people of Egypt does not end
here, and the better understanding I have of the aspects of society, the more insightful this study would become. Any social archaeological study would be better served by a more complete understanding of the structure of the society in question. However, despite the fact that I would have enjoyed delving much further into this subject, time constraints have limited the pool of material that I have been able to draw from.

Let us now return to the principle issues of this thesis and those are the history and value of social archaeology. What is important is that there are four components. First of all, a strong theoretical framework. This should draw upon theoretical ideas from other disciplines in order to try to understand the multi-dimensionality of archaeological objects. The theory combines disciplines in order to show that objects were not just objects, but rather that they were items which had extensive and often diverse social meanings attached to them. Secondly, there is the examination of similar archaeological analyses. In this case, what was looked for here was power and the examination of social structures. Who was looking for these types of social structures? Were they successful in finding them? What items served as indicators of power relations (or other social relations) for their studies? With this information we can see what the structures may have looked like in other cultures and if those studying them were successful in identifying them. Thirdly, there is the willingness to draw upon ethnographic analysis. This information provides the examiner with working models of what past social structures might have looked like. In this case, not only did they serve to provide models for the functioning of society, but they also provided information as to what items may have served as power indicators. Finally, there is the archaeological
material to be examined. By this I mean the actual materials or archaeological assemblages that are going to be the base of the analysis. In this case my material was the wall art, but other might use grave goods, settlement patterns, religious monuments (or any monuments for that matter) or, as we have seen in chapter three many people use a combination of materials.

Theoretically, the idea of a social archaeology is not only feasible, but a positive step for the practice of archaeology. It does away with the idea that an object or a historical event or situation is static and fixed in time which, in my opinion, is a very refreshing idea. It also does away with the idea of an absolute truth in archaeological analysis and again I am in total agreement. Objects from the past are meant to be studied and observed, but it is a terrible mistake ever to assign them one meaning that will define them permanently. Just as is the case now, different objects or events mean different things to different people. All is dependent upon one's experiences, biases and place in society and the same notion should be applied to objects from the past. First of all the idea of a 'real past' is problematic. As previously discussed, an object by virtue of being discovered is now in the present, and the meaning applied to it in some way reflects the examiner's reality. Secondly, the object in its own situation meant different things to different people. Therefore, the idea of a real and immutable past is deeply problematic and allowing for the systematic reexamination of objects is a very positive development.

Methodologically speaking, the guidelines are fairly loose. This gives the examiner the leeway to proceed the way s/he sees fit while still having a framework in
which to work. All that is needed is the archaeological material, the theory, the similar archaeological studies and the ethnographic material. Within that framework anything can be used. This allows for great flexibility and provides us with the diversity of analyses that the movement strives for.

The practice of social archaeology should be viewed as a positive trend in archaeology. It strives to see archaeology as a subject that has no fixed answers, but rather 'possible ideas that may have been true'. It does away with the idea that objects have one meaning and purpose and places them within broad social systems. This gives readers a better understanding of how objects and events were connected to each other as well as to the people in the past. What this does is provide a greater understanding of how events in the past took place rather than a view of objects and events as independent of one another. This is a very positive trend in archaeology and will continue to prove very useful in furthering our understanding of historical process.
Appendix A

Plates
Plate 1

Plate 2

Entrance wall to the hall of pillars in the tomb of Ramose at Thebes. A festive gathering. Left part of the relief. Pictured here are Keshy and an unknown person as well as May and his wife Werel.

Copyright Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, 1968:#173
Plate 3A
From the entrance wall in the Hall of Pillars in the tomb of Ramose. Pictured here are the parents of Ramose, Neby and Apuya.
Copyright Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, 1968:#173.
Plate 3B
From the entrance wall in the Hall of Pillars in the tomb of Ramose. Pictured here are
the brother of Ramose, Amenhotep, and his wife, May.
Copyright Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, 1968:#175.
Plate 3b

Copyright Kurt Lange & Max Hirmer, 1968:#175
Plate 4
XIX Dynasty. From the tomb of Ramose at Thebes. Scenes from a funeral procession. Top half depicts a funerary register extending the length of the wall while the bottom is a detail of it.
Copyright Kurt Lange and Max Hirmer, 1968: #171.
Plate 4

Copyright Kurt Lange & Max Hirmer, 1968:#171
Plate 4A

c. 1375 BC. Detail of plate 4 which depicts servants bringing furnishings to the tomb of Ramose at Thebes.
Copyright Arpag Mekhitarian, 1954:114.
Plate 4B

C. 1375 BC. This detail of plate 4 depicts servants taking goods to the tomb, while women express their grief.

Plate 5
XIX Dynasty. Tomb of Sennedjem at Thebes. Pictured here are the tomb owner and his wife on the right while on the left are Tcharo and his wife Taia. Pictured in the center is Bounakhtef, son of Sennedjem, a funeral priest.
Copyright Andre L’Hote, 1954:#38.
Plate 6

c. 1275 BC. Deir el-Medina. This substantially restored painting comes from the tomb of the sculptor Ipy. Ipy and his wife receive offerings from their children who are pictured here at right.

Copyright Rita E. Freed, 1987:93.
Plate 7
XIX Dynasty. Deir el-Medina. The typical family at Deir el-Medina. Pictured here is the foreman Anherkhau, his wife and their children.
Copyright Andre L'Hote, 1954:#39.
Plate 8
XIX Dynasty, Thebes. From the tomb of Sennedjem. Sennedjem and his wife appear at work in the fields of paradise.
Copyright, Andre L'Hote, 1954:#69.
Plate 9
XIX Dynasty. Thebes. From the tomb of Sennedjem. Pictured here are Sennedjem and wife standing before Osiris and the other members of the divine tribunal.
Copyright Andre L’Hote, 1954:#149.
Plate 10
XIX-XX Dynasty, Thebes. From the tomb of Anhurkhawi. Pictured here is the deceased standing before the Phoenix of Heliopolis.
Copyright Andre L'Hote, 1954:#155.
Plate 11
Thebes. From the Tomb of Neferompet. A scribe takes inventory while artisans are at work on their crafts.
Copyright Andre L’Hote, 1954:#108.
Plate 12
XVIII Dynasty. Thebes. From the tomb of the vizier Rekhmire. Pictured here at the top are goldsmiths and on the bottom, brick-making.
Copyright Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt, 1962:#5.
Plate 13
XVIII Dynasty. From the tomb of Menna at Thebes. The Lord of the Tomb supervises the workers in the field.
Copyright Wolfhart Westendorf, 1968:120.
Plate 14
XVIII Dynasty. From the tomb of Menna at Thebes. Government officials.
Copyright Wolfhart Westendorf, 1968:120.
Plate 15
XVIII Dynasty. From the tomb of Rekhmara at Thebes. Workers weighing the gold.
Copyright Andre L'Hote, 1954:#105.
Plate 15

Copyright Andre L'Hote, 1954: #105
Plate 16

C. 1380. Thebes. From the tomb of Nebamun and Ipuky. A royal workshop.
Appendix B

Ethics and Politics in Archaeological Research
Research ethics, and the politics of conservation and heritage are issues of great concern. Unfortunately, a price has been placed on the past, which in terms of artifacts is a non-renewable resource (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b). There has been an urgency to excavate as much as possible in order to preserve it, to learn from it, and to place it on display so that people can view it. However, ideas about how best to conserve and learn from archaeological remains are highly problematic. People often agree that there are problems, but frequently there is neither the money nor the time to address them. There is also the problem of creating representations of culture and heritage for people, which may contribute to alienating them from their own history and their place in it. Questions exist about the purposes of the excavation of materials simply in order for museums to acquire them where only a select few may have access to them. Over the past few years I have discussed this issue with several archaeologists and anthropologists who are in agreement that, unfortunately, most artifacts in museums are not on display and are stored in warehouses where the conditions for preservation are less than adequate. Furthermore, the systems of cataloguing may tend to be so inadequate that departments of a museum may never know what other departments have. Due to admission costs and location of museums, relatively few people have ready access to exhibits. This restricts the viewing of the remains to those who have the financial means to access them (usually the middle and upper classes) and cuts
everyone else off from the past that is theirs. What is the justification for practices such as these? Whose history is it and who can justifiably do what with it? (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b).

The problem of the 'past as the past' as opposed to the 'past as a practice in the present' (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b:7) must also be noted. When the past (represented by archaeological remains) is unearthed, it loses its initial context as it is brought into the present. The material becomes subjected to modern technologies, and modern academic discourses which may radically alter and indeed reconstitute the significations and meanings of the objects. In the interpretation of objects, labels from the western world are applied and in this way, interpreters become included in the construction of the identity of the object(s).

The issue the issue of alternative constructions of history, are addressed in Kuper's The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion (1988) and Said’s Orientalism (1979). Through archaeology, essentially a western discipline, the archaeologists in effect 'create the past', or at least create potent representations of the past. Western academics have done more than just study objects and write reports. Their studies have not been free from political ramifications and effects on society as a whole. We have given history to cultures which did not previously "have" one (what I refer to here is the fact that archaeologically known histories are "prehistoric", which implies that they didn't exist before conventional methods of recording history, a conception that many are now trying to criticize). In our efforts to gain knowledge and
learn from the past, we have created colorful representations, and in a sense the results of our studies have ‘become history’. They have not become ‘footnotes to history’, but rather the history itself. To the Egyptians we have given a rich ‘history’, of a time when the pharaohs ruled Pharaonic Egypt. This power to give or withhold history is essentially a product of western academic discourse (see Kuper, 1988).

To illustrate the ‘creation of history’ I cite Edward Said:

On a visit to Beirut during the terrible civil war of 1975-1976 a French journalist wrote regretfully of the gutted downtown area that ‘it had once seemed to belong to ... the Orient of Chateaubriand and Nerval’ he was right about the place, of course especially so far as a European was concerned. The Orient was almost a European invention and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences... The Orient has helped to define Europe or at least as its contrasting image, idea, personality experience. Yet none of the orient is merely imaginative. The Orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture (Said, 1979: 1-2).

In the actions of academics which have recreated the past they have ‘given a past’ to so-called ‘prehistoric societies’ and at the same time have ‘taken’ this history and appropriated it by incorporating it into our own. The ‘history’ of the Orient is as much a part of European history as European history is itself. We must understand western analyses of ancient Egypt in this context. Those who live in the Orient, have little exposure to the romantic or mysterious ideas that Westerners have about the Orient, but the majority of western people know nothing else. What they are exposed to are the political consequences of oriental representations. They lack the first-hand
experience necessary to understand what history, beyond what has been written by western academics might really have been like. In a sense academics have created what they have wanted to see not always consciously or intentionally, and not only do the people of the world continue on with these notions, they have become a part of our own past, part of what makes the western world what it is (Said, 1979). In other words, the studying of material remains from “prehistoric” cultures opens the door for colorful representations of what the past may have looked like; representations which are not politically neutral or benign. The findings from these academic studies have been embraced by people who live in the particular area and even more so by the people who have never had a chance to visit the area to study it for themselves. In a sense, the studies of western academics give a life to people who may only have appeared to them on a clay pot, a life rooted in western concepts. In the process, the academics themselves have become a part of the history-making process. Just by recording their interpretations, they incorporate who they are into their findings and as a result the history that they have created belongs also to them.

Furthermore, to whom do archaeological remains belong? Once they are excavated, to whom do the remains belong? Where should they be displayed? Who has jurisdiction over them and who conducts the analysis? (Shanks & Tilley, 1987b). It can be argued that the majority of the archaeological remains belong to the western world as a part of our colonial history, and since the past is in part a western academic creation, then these objects and the values and meanings assigned to them belong just
as much to us as to the country in which they were found. But just how far can we go as claiming this material as our own? Is it justifiable to have a large Egyptian collection of artifacts in a field museum in Europe or America, or should the collection be returned to Egypt, the land where it was excavated?

Archaeology is closely linked to ethical/political concerns in terms of cultural jurisdiction and representation. To whom does the past or images and its remains belong? Who should be entitled to the revenue which this material generates? Archaeology has been dominated and practiced mostly by westerners. Because of this, it seemed only logical that artifacts which they discovered rightly be returned to the archaeologist’s country to be kept as personal belongings, to be sold to collectors, or to be donated or sold to museums. As a result, many of the excavated artifacts are far from their places of origin. For example, the majority of Egyptian artifacts are located in Britain, the U.S.A., Canada and Europe. With the exception of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo, there are relatively few left in Egypt itself. This poses a problem not only for current museum holdings, but for artifacts not yet excavated. The question remains: to whom should they belong? Should artifacts that have long been considered the property of museums in foreign countries be returned to their places of origin? Should the country in question be permitted to buy the artifacts back? What is to become of artifacts excavated in the future? These issues are closely tied to the political and ethical concerns we have raised. Does anyone own the past? Is anyone really in a position to pass judgment on how the past may have appeared? What is a
museum and how far do museum property rights extend? It is all too easy to ask radical questions, but if one were to attempt to make archaeology completely ethical, the discipline would be placed in serious jeopardy.

After all, the practice of archaeology is based primarily on excavation and the analysis of whatever is discovered. While the intention is to study and learn from this material, the issue of excavating remains is problematic in itself. Immediately the issue of who owns the remains must arise. While most archaeologists probably do their best to remain ethical, there will probably always be issues that are of concern. What is necessary here is the adherence to codes of ethics that are acceptable to all concerned, from the academics to the politicians. In other words, a middle-of-the-road type of ethical conduct code, not inflexible, but understood and malleable enough to fit any situation that may arise.

In Reconstructing Archaeology, Shanks and Tilley (1992) present the reader with a few points which deserve careful consideration. Ethics should not simply be left as an issue to be considered after the research is complete (1992:XVIII). Ethical concerns should be ingrained and serve as an equal part of the process. Further, this is not just a study of the past, but rather a study of the past within the present (1992:XVIII). We must all be aware how current opinions and thoughts exist within the discipline. As for museums, they must illustrate differences and influences. A homogeneous ethical formulation serves only to hide and ignore the wider context of items (1992:97). In the opinion of Shanks and Tilley (1992:98), it is also of the utmost
importance to recognize authorship and its location in a school of interpretation.

Interpretations and analyses must remain open ended so that those viewing archaeological representations may formulate their own opinions. Finally, artifacts must be examined in terms of use and function so as not to freeze them into a state of unidimensionality and uniformity (1992: 98).
Bibliography

Bierbrier, Morris

1975 The Late New Kingdom in Ancient Egypt. Warminster: Aris & Philips Ltd.

Bierstedt, Robert


Binford, Lewis L.


1983 In Pursuit of the Past: Decoding the Archaeological Record. London: Thames and Hudson.


Binford, S.R. & L.R. Binford

Bothmer, Bernard V. & Jean L. Keith

Boulanger, Robert

Bourdieu, P.
Bradley, Richard

Brown, James A., ed.


Cerny, Jaroslav.

Champollion, Jacques

Childe, V. Gordon


Chapman, Robert, Ian Kinnes, and Klavs Randsborg, eds.

Claessen, Henri J.M. and Peter Skalnik

Clayson, Rodman R.
1971 Egypt’s Ancient Heritage. San Jose, California: Supreme Grand Lodge of Amorc, Inc.

Cleere, Henry
Cohen, Ronald and Elman Service

Cox, Bruce A., Jacques Chevalier and Valda Blundell, eds.

David, A.R.
1975 The Egyptian Kingdoms. Lausanne: Elsevier Publishing Projects

Desroches-Noblecourt, Christiane

Edwards, I.E.S.

Emery, W.B.


Engels, Friedrich

Freed, Rita E.

Fried, M.H.

Gardiner, Alan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Hodder, Ian.


1986  *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hume, David

James, T.G.H.


Joyce, R. A.

Kradler, Lawerence

Kramer, Carol (ed.),

Kuper, Adam
Lamberg Karlovsky, C.C. & Jeremy A. Sabloff


Lange, Kurt & Max Hirmer

L’Hote, André

Locke, John

Manniche, Lise

Marx, Karl

McGuire, R.H.

Meeker, Michael E.
1989 The Pastoral Son and the Spirit of Patriarchy. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press

Mekhitarian, Arpag

Miller, Daniel & Christopher Tilley, eds.
Moret, A. & G. Davy
1926 From Tribe To Empire: Social Organisation Among Primitives And in the Ancient East. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd.

Patterson, Thomas C. & Christine W. Gailey eds.

Peck, William H.
1978 Drawings From Ancient Egypt. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Pinsky, Valerie & Alison Wylie

Poulsen, Vagn

Quirke, Stephen & Jeffery Spencer, eds.

Redman, Charles L.


Renfrew, Colin and John F. Cherry

Renfrew, Colin and Stephen Shennan, eds.
R homer, John

Robins, Gay
1990 “Problems in Interpreting Egyptian Art” in Discussions in Egyptology 17: 45-58.


Rousseau, Jean-Jacques

Rundle Clark, R.T.
1959 Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Sabloff, Jeremy

Said, Edward W.

Sahlins, M.D.

Saxe, A.A.

Schelle, Linda & Mary Ellen Miller

Service, Elman D.
Shanks, Michael & Christopher Tilley


Smith, Derek G.

Smith, W. Stevenson

Spencer, A.J.

Spriggs, Matthew, ed.

Stead, Miriam

Trigger, Bruce


Trigger, Bruce, B.J. Kemp, D O’Connor & A.B. Lloyd

Wason, Paul K.

Watson, Philip J.
Weber, Max
1978  
*Economy and Society.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Westendorf, Wolfhart
1968  

White, J.E.
1963  

White, J.E. Manchip
1970  

Wilkinson, Charles K.
1983  

Wilkinson, Richard H.
1992  
*Reading Egyptian Art. A Hieroglyphic Guide To Ancient Egyptian Painting and Sculpture.* London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Willey, Gordon & Jeremy A. Sabloff
1980  

Willey, Gordon, Evon Vogt & Richard Lewenthal
1983  

Wittfogel, Karl A.
1957  