

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF ANCIENT EGYPT

Egyptologists, art historians, philologists, and anthropological archaeologists have long worked side by side in Egypt, but they often fail to understand one another's approaches. This book aims to introduce students to the archaeological side of the study of ancient Egypt and to bridge the gap between disciplines by explaining how archaeologists tackle a variety of problems. Douglas J. Brewer introduces the theoretical reasoning for each approach, as well as the methods and techniques applied to support it. This book is essential reading for any student considering further study of ancient Egypt.

Douglas J. Brewer is professor of anthropology at the University of Illinois. He is the author (with Emily Teeter) of *Egypt and the Egyptians*, as well as of numerous other books and articles on Egypt, covering topics from domestication to cultural change and the environment. He has more than thirty years of fieldwork experience in Egypt; currently he is researching the cultures and environment of Egypt's deserts.





THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF ANCIENT EGYPT

Beyond Pharaohs

DOUGLAS J. BREWER

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521707343

© Cambridge University Press 2012

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2012

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Brewer, Douglas J.

The archaeology of ancient Egypt : beyond pharaohs / Douglas J. Brewer.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-88091-6 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-521-70734-3 (pbk.)

1. Egypt – Antiquities. 2. Archaeology – Egypt – Methodology. 3. Egyptology. I. Title.

DT60.B745 2012

932-dc23 2012012069

ISBN 978-0-521-88091-6 Hardback ISBN 978-0-521-70734-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLS for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



TO MY WIFE ANN, AND THE BREWER AND PÉREZ FAMILIES, THANK YOU





CONTENTS

List of Illustrations	page ix
List of Tables	xiii
Preface	XV
1 introduction: history and development	
OF ARCHAEOLOGY	1
Archaeology and Egyptology	1
Development of a Discipline	2
Archaeological Theories or Paradigms	5
Culture History	5
Processualism	6
Post-Processualism	7
Archaeological Terms	9
Archaeology in Egypt	11
2 the first egyptians: the art and science	
OF DATING	13
Relative Dating Techniques	14
"Absolute" Dating Methods	16
Dating the Paleolithic Period: Stone Tool Typologies	18
Lower Paleolithic Typologies	20
Middle Paleolithic Typologies	24
Upper Paleolithic Typologies	28
3 AGRICULTURE AND THE NILE VALLEY: BIOLOGY,	
THE ENVIRONMENT, AND SAMPLING	36
Egypt and the Early Neolithic	38
Egypt's Agricultural Origins	43
Archaeology and Sampling	45
Sampling in Practice	48
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7~

vii



viii	*	Contents
4	' A CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION: EXPLAINING	
	OR DESCRIBING THE PAST	• • • • 54
	Culture in Transition	54
	Pottery and Egypt's Formative Period	56
	Pottery and Culture	65
	Archaeology, Predynastic Egypt, and Social Complexity	77
5	Unification and the king: the limits of archaeology .	79
	Excavation	82
	Rectifying the Error: The Main Deposit	84
	Addressing the Archaeological Question	97
6	THE FIRST GREAT CYCLE: HYPOTHESES AND MODELS	101
	Archaeological Questions, Theories, and Hypotheses	102
	Giza	108
	Kom el-Hisn	112
	Elephantine Model Building	115
	Evaluating the Model: Predicting Settlement Patterns	118 120
_		120
7	STABILITY AND PROVINCIALISM: ARCHAEOLOGY AND	
	THE ENVIRONMENT	124
	Geoarchaeology, Archaeobotany, and Zooarchaeology	127
	Egyptians and Their Environment	132
	The First Intermediate Period	133
	The Cultural Evidence	134
	The Environmental Evidence Correlation or Causation	139
	Correlation of Causation	140
8	The desert frontiers: archaeology of the "other"	143
	Nomads and Archaeology	150
9	FROM ARTIFACTS TO CULTURE: BACK TO BASICS	159
	The Temple as Monument	161
	Akhetaten and the Aten Temple	164
	What Is in a Name?	169
	Reconsidering an Accepted Label	172
	Reconstructing Akhetaten	177
10	ARCHAEOLOGY IN PERSPECTIVE	181
Refe	rences	183
Inde	x	193



LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

2.1	Stratigraphic sequence showing overlaying units at an	
	excavation of an Early Dynastic Delta site.	page 15
2.2	Predynastic and Early Dynastic vessels illustrating the	
	evolution of wavy-handle decoration through time.	17
2.3	An Acheulian hand axe – a core tool (a) and a Mousterian core	
	(b) from which flakes were created to make the smaller, more	
	refined tools of the Levallois technique.	19
2.4	A simple pebble tool of the type associated with <i>Homo habilis</i> .	21
2.5	At times in the geologic past, today's desert offered savanna-	
	like conditions and was inhabited by numerous cultures.	22
2.6	The approximate site location of the Paleolithic cultures	
	discussed in the text.	23
2.7	Acheulean tools were made by chipping flakes off a stone, the	
	remaining stone core becoming the tool (see Fig. 2.3a). In the	
	later Levallois technique, the stone core provided the raw	
	material and the flakes became the tool with many tools made	
	from one stone (see Fig. 2.3b). Because the core was specially	
	prepared for flaking, each flake could be made thin and	
	symmetrical, which meant more and different types of tools	
	could be made from a single stone than by using the previous	
	Acheulean technique.	25
	Classic "tanged" Aterian point.	26
2.9	Aterian technology: The dart, a stone point affixed to a light	
	shaft, is propelled with greater force when aided by a specially	
	designed throwing stick.	27
2.10	The burin, thought to be an engraving type tool that could be	
	re-sharpened with a skillfully placed blow directed behind the	
	point (arrow).	29
2.11	Kubbaniyans moved seasonally between the border area of the	
	Nile's fertile black soil and desert to the desert swales (small	
	dunes).	31
		ix



x * List of Illustrations

2.12	Qadan burials as they were unearthed by archaeologists during	
	the UNESCO-sponsored Nubian Monuments campaign.	33
	Epi-paleolithic "backed" microblades.	34
	The connective stem or rachis (right) for wheat grains.	39
3.2	The easterly path of domestication as defined by the earliest	
	known C-14 date for the respective site.	41
3.3	The graph represents sampling to redundancy: as the curve	
	levels, continued sampling adds only types already collected.	49
3.4	Ancient Fayum lake shoreline where Epi-paleolitc tools have	
	been recovered.	50
3.5	The Fayum region as defined by the Fayum Archaeological	
	Project showing sites (a), transects and collection units (b).	51
	(a) and (b) Examples of classic Naqada Period artifacts.	57
4.2	Petrie's ceramic sequence dating system and their associated	
	"sequence date." He purposely left space at the beginning and	
	end of his chronology (0–30 and 80–100) for future	
	discoveries.	60
4.3	Unimodal or battleship curves reflect the lifespan of a type	
	where after its introduction it increases in popularity and then	
	declines as it is replaced by another type.	61
4.4	The hallmark "rippled pottery" of the Badarian culture. The	
	ripple effect is made by dragging a serrated catfish spine or	
	comb across the unfired clay vessel, then smoothing the marks	
	with well-watered hands and firing the pot.	65
4.5	Typical Badarian artifacts for procuring and producing food,	
	adorning their bodies, and expressing their creativity and	
	craftsmanship.	67
4.6	The approximate extent of the Badari and Naqada I and II	
	cultural regions.	68
4.7	Naqada I redware (a) and the hallmark Naqada ceramic,	
	(b) black-topped redware.	68
4.8	(a) Example of a Naqada I pot-mark and an abbreviated list of	
	pot-marks (b) recorded on early Naqada vessels.	69
4.9	Naqada I white cross-lined pottery with geometric designs	
	(a) and (b) dancing (?) human figures.	70
4.1 0	Interesting artifacts of the Naqada I period are animal relief	
	pots. Figures are molded on the side of the vessel.	71
4.11	Naqada II pottery: pink ware with geometric (a) and (b) scenic	
	designs.	72
4.12	Clay female figurine positioned in a pose very similar to those	
	found on Naqada II pottery.	73



List of Illu	ustrations	*	xi
4.13	The sites of Ma'adi, Buto, and Heliopolis, core cultural areas of		
	the Ma'adi-Buto culture of the Delta.		74
4.14	Ma'adian pottery vessels.		75
4.15	Clay cone temple reconstruction, showing use of cones in		
	decorative motif along a column.		76
4.16	The wall mural from the famous Lost Tomb (Tomb 100) of		
	Hierakonpolis.		77
5.1	Part of the artifact cache from the "Main Deposit" as recorded		
	by the excavators.		83
5.2	An excavation horizontal plan (a) and excavation profile		
	(b) from the Delta site of Kom el-Hisn.		85
5.3	An example of Ranke's chronological placement of palettes		
	based on style and internal arrangement.		87
5.4	(a) and (b) The Narmer Palette.		88
5.5	Serekhs in chronological order (top to bottom).		89
5.6	Artist's reproduction of the ivory label of Narmer, showing his		
	triumph over a northern (Delta?) enemy.		90
5.7	The Scorpion Macehead.		91
	An early Naqada Period cylinder seal.		92
5.9	Impression on a cylinder seal listing the first five kings of Egypt.		92
5.10	Example of a well-preserved Dynasty 1 ivory from the reign of		
	Djet.		93
5.11	Tomb U-j where a cache of tags and labels was found.		93
	Location of Delta sites mentioned in this discussion.		97
6.1	Modern villages, like ancient ones, are often situated atop delta		
	geziras. The distant village rising above the lowlands is situated		
	on an ancient <i>gezira</i> .		108
6.2	Location of the three settlements, Giza, Kom el-Hisn, and		
	Elephantine, discussed in the text.		109
6.3	A typical carinated bowl (a) and a bread mold (b) recovered		
	from Giza excavations.		110
6.4	Horizontal plan of the Gallery Excavations (left) and a close-up		
	plan of one gallery (right).		111
6.5	The archaeologists' topographic map of the Kom el-Hisn study		
	area.		113
6.6	Horizontal excavation plan of the central area of the Kom		
	el-Hisn excavations.		115
6.7	Horizontal plan of Elephantine.		119
6.8	SPOT Satellite image of delta showing Predynastic sites.		121
6.9	Map of sites identified by SPOT Satellite and corroborated by		
	archaeological survey.		122



xii * List of Illustrations

7.1	Natural motifs in day-to-day Egyptian objects: (a) hieroglyphs,	
	(b) papyrus columns, (c) temple pylon entrance.	125
7.2	The Nile inundation (ca. AD 1900) before the construction of	
	the Aswan Dam.	126
7.3	Archaeologically recovered pollen sample of a typical arid	
	environment with Artemisia (upper left), grass (upper right),	
	and a composite.	128
7.4	Faunal remains embedded in ancient lakeshore mud.	129
	Schematic diagram of a Nile perch vertebra showing growth rings.	131
	Examples of First Intermediate Period coffins: (a) Dynasty 11,	J
,	(b) Late Dynasty 11 or Early Dynasty 12.	137
8.1	A Byzantine/Early Arab period Bedouin campsite.	147
	An example of Egypt's vast desert regions.	151
	Distribution of calcareous fluvisols (or Jc soils) in Egypt. When	
J	located in desert environs, these soils would have offered	
	pasturage after periodic rains.	154
8.4	Example of rock art from the Eastern Desert showing more	
·	than one time period represented.	158
9.1	A typical temple plan of the New Kingdom.	161
	Location of Tell el-Amarna.	164
9.3	An example of a boundary Stele at Tell el-Amarna.	165
	Map of the city of Akhetaten.	166
9.5	Diagram of the Aten Temple showing main features presented	
	in the text.	168
9.6	A diagramed temple (the Aten Temple?) found in a nearby	
	Amarna period tomb.	170
9.7	An Egyptian bakery.	173
	Graphic representation of animal use from three house sites at	, ,
	Amarna.	175
9.9	Example of reporting fauna from three theoretical house	
	structures.	176
2.10	House-size distribution at Amarna.	179



LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Nile evolution and geologic time.	page 14
2.2	Upper, Middle, Lower Paleolithic industries of Egypt.	19
4.1	Petrie's SD dates and the derivation of the Predynastic	
	Sequence.	62
7.1	Levels of measurement and associated assumptions.	130
9.1	Abbreviated list of some named features from Amarna.	171
9.2	Numerical values for a hypothetical faunal assemblage	
	recovered from three house structures.	176

xiii





PREFACE

My original vision for this book was that it would be a review of archaeology's contribution to the study of ancient Egypt. The content was to be a simple enumeration of those sites and artifacts that in some profound way influenced our understanding of Egyptian culture. In my discussions with Egyptologists over the various sites to include, it became clear to me that there was a deep frustration with archaeologists, in particular those of us with an anthropological background. As one close friend and colleague said to me, "It is almost as if you archaeologists speak a different language." Obviously, we as archaeologists have done a poor job in explaining our position and goals to our Egyptology colleagues, even when they have worked literally side by side with us in a mosquito-infested excavation pit.

I for one have asked many questions of my Egyptology friends, and they have patiently answered them, and by extending that courtesy have allowed me to have a deeper appreciation and understanding of ancient Egypt. It struck me that perhaps I have not returned the favor. How could my Egyptology-oriented friends be expected to teach archaeology, its methods, and goals to their students, without some support from me (us)? I certainly could not teach subjects in Egyptology without strong support and guidance from them.

I thus changed the focus of the book – away from sites and lists of artifacts to the discipline of archaeology and the method, theory, and techniques commonly applied to retrieve and interpret those artifacts – the idea being that a good Egyptologist, professional or student, will already know the sites and what was found there (or could easily look it up), but might need help in understanding the reasoning behind a particular archaeological question or approach to the data. This difference revolves around the distinctive paradigms followed by the respective fields; that is, whereas the Egyptologist is looking for historical facts, the archaeologist is trying to view a process through time, which requires a different approach – one often not realized by those following a history-bound paradigm (and vice versa). To use an analogy, if a child has misbehaved, one approach would be to look at what that misstep was

ΧV



xvi * Preface

and how it might be corrected. A different approach might be to look at the long-term path that led to the misbehavior to try and understand why it came to be in the first place. Although the child is the subject of both inquiries, very different approaches and types of data are required to answer the respective questions. Both approaches are certainly valid, and both may solve the immediate problem, but the paths taken are different. So in this text, my goal is to try and explain to students how the archaeological approach (particularly anthropological archaeology) differs from the more historical, Egyptological approach. Thus, the chapters introduce some of the theoretical reasoning for a given approach, as well as the methods and techniques applied to support that approach. Although a number of topics might seem rudimentary to some of my Egyptology colleagues, to others they may not. I am reminded of a statement made by a reviewer of an earlier work of mine, who questioned the need for a chapter on the Nile Valley's environment when discussing Egyptian culture, something this reviewer clearly felt was superfluous. To me, an archaeologist, this was an incredible statement. How could I discuss a culture and its evolution without knowledge of the environment within which it had evolved?

The greatest difficulty in completing this work was to find a series of sites that through a natural progression in time and subject matter would adequately tell the archaeological story. In some instances, this was easy, and in others, it was something of a stretch, but my hope is that the message, the manner in which we as archaeologists approach a problem, has transcended my choice of sites as well as their place in time.

For seasoned Egyptologists who are reading this text for some enlightenment, I do hope you find something here of interest, but the book was not written specifically for you. I envision the audience to be undergraduate students who have already taken an introductory Egyptology course and now need to think about what direction they might want to pursue next: philology, art history, or archaeology, which, of course, are not necessarily mutually exclusive. My hope is that this text might serve as that next step: introducing the student to the archaeological side of the study of ancient Egypt. Ultimately, it would be nice to see this work as part of a trilogy, with an introductory art history and philology text bundled together to assist the interested neophyte at the beginning of his or her scholarly journey.

As is traditional of such books, I have refrained as much as possible from incorporating citations within the text in the hope of making it an easier read for the intended audience. The references on which I have so heavily depended are listed at the end of the text. Although a seemingly simple book,



Preface * xvii

I am surprised at how long it took me to write it. Throughout the course of this endeavor, there have been many to whom I owe thanks. Beatrice Rehl deserves special thanks for her numerous pep talks and for keeping me focused on the project, especially after I tossed the third completed draft in the trash, vowing never to return to it. Thanks go, too, to Robert Wenke for the innumerable discussions we have had on archaeology throughout the many years of our partnership, which more often than not occurred while we were sitting in a dusty, hot, and miserably uncomfortable vehicle riding to or from our excavation site. Emily Teeter, Donald Redford, Ron Leprohon, Edwin Brock, and a host of other Egyptologists deserve thanks for their frank discussion of archaeology and archaeologists. Finally, a thank you to the National Geographic Society, the Bioanthropology Foundation, and the University of Illinois Research Board, for funding many seasons of fieldwork, with a special thanks to the university for honoring me with a Beckman Award, which allowed me the opportunity to study the Bedouin and to record the ancient rock art in the Eastern Desert.