Women, weaponry and warfare

A multidisciplinary study of the use of weapons by women in Dynastic Egypt

Number of Volumes: 2

Volume 1 of 2

Rebecca Angharad Dean

M.Phil

University of York

Archaeology

March 2013

Abstract

This thesis is a detailed study of the utilisation of weaponry by ancient Egyptian women during the Dynastic Period. This work incorporates extended literature reviews, including a detailed discussion of several examples of women utilising weaponry and taking part in warfare in societies outside of Dynastic Egypt, an analysis of feminist and gender-based approaches to the subject, an examination of women within ancient Egyptian society, and a review of the specific weapons associated with these women. Detailed experimental archaeology also forms part of the thesis research in order to test the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the specific weaponry when utilised by both men and women. In addition to the experimental work, a comparative discussion of examples of weapons' trauma on ancient Egyptian remains is carried out. The thesis concludes with the discussion of research carried out and the potential for future work, and the conclusions drawn from all aspects of the thesis research. A catalogue of unpublished ancient Egyptian weaponry in the collections of the Harrogate Royal Pump Room Museum and the Yorkshire Museum in York is also included as an Appendix to the thesis.

Contents

Volume One:

Volume Two:

Acknowledgments

First I must thank Professor Joann Fletcher and Professor Terry O'Connor for their assistance and support. Professor Fletcher inspired me to continue my research and was always ready with astute advice on my thesis. Her encouragement and her boundless enthusiasm have kept this project on track over the last four and a half years. Professor O'Connor's guidance, optimism and support have been invaluable to me during the writing of this thesis.

I am indebted to Dr Stephen Buckley for all of his advice and encouragement, and his assistance with the experimental work. I am also grateful to Kate Fletcher for her help with the khopesh experiments.

Thanks are also due to Neil Burridge, who manufactured the wonderful weaponry that was used for the experimental archaeology, and whose advice and enthusiasm for the project inspired me further. I am also indebted to Thom Richardson of the Royal Armouries Leeds for his advice on the utilisation of the weaponry.

I would also like to thank Professor Loveday Alexander of the University of Sheffield for all her advice, encouragement, and incredibly useful suggestions. Thanks also go to Lucy Wilson and Gemma Doherty for their constant support, and a belief in me and my research. They have kept me going over the last four and a half years.

Finally, a huge debt of gratitude is due to my wonderful parents and my sister, for encouraging my interest in Egyptian Archaeology all those years ago, for supporting my decision to continue my research to a doctoral level, and for always lending me their help and advice whenever it was needed. Without them, none of this would have been possible, and I am forever in their debt.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has been written by myself, and the work contained therein has not been presented anywhere else.

Introduction

There can be no argument that warfare in ancient Egypt is a well-studied subject. There has been a long fascination with the wars conducted within early societies and ancient Egypt is no exception. Research has been wide-ranging, and certain aspects of ancient Egyptian warfare have been examined comprehensively as have the potential reasons why the Egyptians went to war and the structure and composition of the ancient Egyptian military (e.g. Shaw, I. (1991) *Egyptian Warfare and Weapons*). There has also been a great deal of research undertaken into specific military encounters such as the Battle of Kadesh (e.g. Goedicke, H. (1966) 'Considerations on the Battle of Ḳadesh', *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 52, 71-80; Epstein, C. (1963) 'That Wretched Enemy of Kadesh', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 22 (4), 242-246), together with detailed studies of the various weapons in use throughout the Dynastic period. In 2009 I completed an MA dissertation (Dean 2008) which examined one type of ancient Egyptian weaponry, the mace, in relation to women in Egyptian society, the choice of weapon based on the size of an MA project and the opportunity to study the unpublished selection of ancient mace-heads within the collection of Harrogate Museums and arts.

The MA dissertation was a springboard for this doctoral thesis, in which all the arguably functional weapons associated with women in the Dynastic Period are studied. This subject has not been as thoroughly examined as other aspects of Egyptian archaeology, with previous studies of warfare mainly focussed on male society. The period selected for study begins with the Early Dynastic Period (1st Dynasty, c.3100 BC) through to the end of the Saite Period (26th Dynasty, 525 BC). A small selection of Predynastic examples are also included, mostly relating to the museum cataloguing carried out as part of this research. The Persian, Ptolemaic and Roman periods are excluded, since the many variations in weaponry present at these times range far beyond the scope of a PhD thesis.

One important point to note is that female warriors or at least women bearing arms were not necessarily prolific in ancient Egyptian society. What this thesis aims to

demonstrate is that such women did exist at various times, and although not customarily part of the Egyptian military, could adopt militaristic behaviours and styling in some circumstances. These examples are frequently linked to demonstrations of power and the display of a particular image relating to pharaonic status. This thesis also aims to highlight that women were physically able to use the weapons then available, meaning that that weapons associated with such women should not be automatically be dismissed as 'token' or 'symbolic'.

The evidence examined includes burial goods, literature and artistic portrayals supported by experimental archaeology. The experiments carried out as part of this thesis also demonstrate that women were able to wield the weapons with which they were buried, and were shown utilising in artistic portrayals and described as such in literary texts; these are assessed in detail in this thesis. Where possible, the sites and provenance of the images and statuary have been cited, although there is often a lack of provenance with several of the examples discussed, which can limit to a certain extent the discussion of possible socio-historical and cultural contexts.

Whereas the initial subject of this thesis ('Women and Weapons') may seem a little simplistic, the in-depth discussion of the women themselves and their apparent exclusion from the archaeological record provides the theoretical sections of this thesis. The examination of their omission from the discourse of Egyptology, deliberately or otherwise, raises the matter of sexual politics within archaeology which is of huge importance to this thesis. Therefore an engagement with feminist and gender theory within archaeology addresses these issues, utilising the work of Roberta Gilchrist, Griselda Pollock, Judith Butler, and Lynn Meskell. The concept and theoretical position of so-called 'Third Wave Feminism' is also considered in relation to its potential impact on the study of Egyptian archaeology.

The omission of women from the archaeological and historical record of Egyptian archaeology relates in large part to the lack of gender studies in Egyptian archaeology and the absence of gendered archaeology before the 1970s. Indeed, archaeology has long ignored those categories of individuals within the

archaeological record that "do not conform to masculine ideals" (Baker 1997, 184). This means that there are certain sections of a cultural society that become 'invisible' within the archaeological record, such as women, children, the elderly (Baker 1997, 184), and those who do not conform to what some archaeologists might regard to be 'gender norms', including those who appear to have cross-gender or third-gender roles (discussed in more detail later on in this thesis).

Work by Hjørungdal in the 1990s addresses some of these issues, particularly the archaeological tradition where biological sex of burial is determined by material means (Hjørungdal 1994, 143). As a tradition that developed in the 19th Century, when specific grave goods were defined as either "male tools" or "female tools", and no distinctions were made for 'gender' or biological sex, weapons were "male tools" and sewing needles "female tools" (Hjørungdal 1994, 144). These definitions led to examples of weapon-less interments being interpreted as female burials, and the most repeatedly used standards for the definition of male identity versus female identity apparently weaponry versus jewellery (Hjørungdal 1994, 144).

With the development of Gender Archaeology (with a particular emphasis on Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian archaeology) in the 1970s, the gender identities of various burials were re-examined in an attempt to redress the balance in the study of 'invisible' people (i.e. women, children, the elderly) in the archaeological record (Hjørungdal 1994, 144). Yet despite all of this, Hjørungdal asserts that archaeologists "like 19th-century antiquarians, interpret as well as create gender in pre-history depending on how gender is known to ourselves" (1994, 146). This is one of the key points made by feminist theory in general, as well as in relation to archaeological theory. An interpretation of gender and sexuality is more often than not likely to be subjective to the scholar's own conception of what gender is.

Foucault's (2010, 195) argument seems to be that archaeology is about examining history as a way of recognising and comprehending the processes that have led to what we are today. Archaeology does not seek to define the "thoughts, representations, images, themes, preoccupations that are concealed or revealed in

discourses; but those discourses themselves" (Foucault 2010, 138), nor does archaeology try to restore what has previously been thought "in the very moment at which they expressed it in discourse…it is the systematic description of a discourse-object" (2010, 139-140). So archaeology should not only look at history itself, but at the processes that formed (and took place in) a particular history. With regard to gender and sexuality, Foucault suggests that in archaeology, instead of simply analysing the sexual behaviour of individuals at a given period and describing what such men thought of sexuality, a form of discursive practice should take place, with archaeology looking at sexuality as a field of possible enunciations, a group of concepts, and a set of choices (2010, 193). These concepts have relevance in relation to sexuality and gender within archaeology and Egyptian archaeology specifically, as Foucault believes that such an approach would show how all the manifestations of sexuality are "linked to a particular discursive practice", revealing not an ultimate truth of sexuality, but a particular way of describing it, "a certain way of speaking" (discourse) (2010, 193).

It seems that Foucault conceives "sexuality" as referring to "a historically constructed apparatus: a dispersed system of morals, techniques of power, and discourses and procedures designed to mould sexual practices and the body-subject towards certain strategic and political ends", seeing sex as a "fictitious unity" (Henderson 2013, 236; referencing Foucault 1978, 154-155). Henderson makes one very important point about Foucault's theoretical position: that the "historical, social, and cultural construction of sex…has a fundamental role in shaping an individual's pleasures, pains, and sense of selfhood" (2013, 237). Therefore, the historical, social and cultural construction of sex and attitudes towards sex influence an individual's outlook on the subject, and therefore could possibly influence the way in which they analyse and interpret sex, sexuality and gender in the historical and archaeological record. This is certainly key to the study of certain women within Egyptian archaeology, in which those individuals (e.g. female king Hatshepsut, women portrayed fighting with weapons, biological females buried with weapons) who fail to conform to another individual's perceptions of what sex means, and of what sexuality and gender should be, then the way in which they and their actions are

interpreted could be inaccurate, particularly in relation to ancient Egyptian attitudes to sex and sexual difference at the time.

Discourse is a culturally constructed representation of reality, which constructs knowledge and regulates what is discussed and what is not discussed within a discipline (Foucault 2010). Therefore the history of archaeology, or rather the perceived history of archaeology, and archaeology itself, is a result of the perceptions of those who study it. Therefore, it could be argued that the omission of women from the archaeological record in the case of Egyptian archaeology could be due to a discourse formulated by the men (and women) who have studied Egyptian archaeology in the past, and were influenced by their own discourse in their particular societies. Their knowledge of their own history has been constructed by their own discourse, and has influenced the way in which they have constructed the discourse of Egyptian archaeology. Using Foucault's (2010) ideas of discourse, the very construction of theories and ideas in Egyptian archaeology, and in the case of this thesis the focus (or lack thereof) on ancient Egyptian women, should be questioned. For example, what is being portrayed as the norm in relation to the theories applied to Egyptian women, and how is this influenced by the attitudes of those studying them? How is this approach constructed, and what is the evidence being used by those doing the examining? What alternative explanations are being considered or, more likely, ignored?

One example of this discussed in more detail in this thesis is Joyce Filer's analysis of the evidence for trauma on the skulls of men and women from the sites of Giza and Kerma (1992). Filer suggests that the trauma observed in the case of biologically male skulls was the result of some form of military action, whereas the equivalent trauma on the biologically female skulls was the result of civil or domestic disputes (1992, 283). By following traditional ideas of the roles allocated men (masculine) and women (feminine), Filer does not acknowledge that women could also be involved in military action, even if simply caught up in an attack on their settlement and attempting to defend themselves.

Foucault suggests social bodies and realities are produced by the circulation of power. Henderson claims that "Foucault's distinction between productive and juridical notions of power, then, has proved crucial to recent feminist scholarship on identity" (2013, 236). Feminist theory has often made use of this analysis of power's productive capabilities, Henderson uses Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* as an example of feminist theory making use of Foucault's analysis of power's productive capabilities (2013, 236). Butler apparently uses Foucauldian notions of productive, disciplinary power to rethink feminism's approach to notions of identity and gender, and also uses "a Foucauldian paradigm to articulate her theory of gender performativity", with Butler arguing that "it is through the productive power of repetition that gender, and indeed sex, comes to be "naturalized" into a coherent whole". (Henderson 2013, 236).

Foucauldian theory and feminism can also combine in "recognising the importance of human experience in making sense of the world" (Burgess 2002, 19). Foucault (2010) holds that power circulates throughout any society, and that it is possible for scholars to scrutinise power regimes through the interpretation of such regimes (and various systems) as products of historical development to see how and why some sets of thinking, some arguments, have come to be commonly accepted as facts and certainties, while other ways of thinking seem to be marginalised, neglected and ignored. Again, this is of particular importance in a subject such as Egyptian archaeology (and earlier archaeology as a whole), where the study of sexual difference has been marginalised. As Burgess (2002, 19) states:

> "…feminism's power-oriented focus on the everyday direct lived-experience of individuals in their worlds—its capacity to confront dominant systems of knowledge with other knowledges *outside* of Discourse—is the key to its ability to traffic the tension between subjectivity and Discourse. Such a perspective also facilitates reflection on the complex relationship between data and theory".

Foucault and feminism can successfully work together with the increasing realisation of the multiple and fluctuating identities that exist within the group 'women' (sexual difference) in order to "better understand how people…become selves and subjects,

rather than objects and scholars' others" (Burgess 2002, 19). As Hodder and Hudson state, "Even the biological basis of sexual difference is now seen as embedded in discourse", thereby undermining claims for a continuous and consistent "essential character" for men and women, as genders and sex (Foucault 1981; in 2004, 231).

Aims and Objectives

- To address issues within Egyptian Archaeology that have previously been overlooked, with a particular emphasis on feminist and gender theory, as a whole and within archaeology and Egyptian archaeology in particular.
- To examine the occurrences of Egyptian women associated with weaponry within the archaeological record.
- To prove the effectiveness of the associated weaponry through experimental archaeology; to prove that the specific weaponry could cause debilitating or even fatal trauma when wielded by a woman.

This thesis addresses several research questions:

- What does the existence of 'women warriors' in other societies reveal when compared with ancient Egypt?
- Why is the evidence for women utilising weaponry in historical societies so often dismissed within the archaeological community?
- What can feminist and gender theory reveal about the women associated with warfare in ancient Egypt, and the attitudes of academics and scholars past and present towards such women and women in ancient Egypt in general?
- How significant are examples of politically influential women in Egypt?
- Did women warriors exist in Egypt? If so, what form did they take? What roles did they play?
- What is the evidence for Egyptian women in a warfare context?
- What can experimental archaeology reveal about the weapons associated with the Egyptian women?
- How effective could these women be when utilising the relevant weaponry?

It is the aim of this thesis to comprehensively address all these research questions, and add new evidence to the study of Egyptian archaeology. Detailed research examines the examples of 'warrior women' in societies beyond Egypt, and a feminist and gender-based approach is examined in great detail in relation to ancient Egypt and archaeology as a whole. Literature reviews examine the archaeological and historical records for evidence of women associated with weaponry and warfare, and for the various examples of weaponry associated with Egyptian women. Archaeological experiments investigate the impact that selected types of weaponry would have had, particularly when wielded by a woman, and thus sets out to demonstrate that women could utilise such weaponry effectively. There is also a detailed catalogue that inspects examples of ancient Egyptian weaponry held in North Yorkshire museums which forms an appendix to this thesis. This work is designed specifically to deal with the research questions presented in this introduction.

The two key conclusions to be drawn from this thesis are as follows:

1. Ancient Egyptian women were not generally part of the Egyptian military, but could at times adopt militaristic behaviours and styling under some circumstances. These circumstances are often linked to portrayals of power (both artistically and textually), particularly relating to displays of pharaonic status (in particular examples such as Hatshepsut, Nefertiti, Tawosret).
2. Women were physically able to wield the specific weapons then available, which might occur when women are under military threat, an occasion portrayed in art corroborated by the results of the experimental archaeology carried out in this thesis.

Chapter One - Women and Weapons Outside of Ancient Egypt

It is vitally important to note that when it comes to examining ancient Egyptian women associated with warfare or weaponry, it is first necessary to examine evidence for women warriors or women associated with weaponry or warfare in cultures, ancient and historical, beyond Egypt. Such examples can demonstrate that the occurrence of such women within Egyptian society is not an anomaly in a worldwide context, and that the application of feminist and gender theory both to these women and to women in Egypt can only improve the understanding of women and sexual difference in these ancient and historical cultures. In this chapter, the way in which feminist approaches have shed new light on questions of gender identity in Scandinavian interments are analysed, and it is suggested that although the examples (Scandinavian and other) discussed are located within different historical periods and within a variety of geographical locations, the similarities in both the archaeological remains and the biased historical interpretation allow for relevant and important comparisons with Egyptian examples, and are certainly possible and are valid areas of study in relation to this thesis. Such a feminist approach would arguably benefit Egyptian archaeology.

There are many and varied occurrences in history when biological females have fought in war and/or combat in some capacity. It is interesting to note that some of these references are historical fact, whereas others are based on mythology (which can of course be based on historical fact) and there are occasions when archaeological evidence corroborates such references. This chapter first examines direct archaeological evidence for women using/being associated with weaponry (such as burials) and the problems associated with the analyses and interpretations of such burials. Secondly, literary examples of women (biologically female or otherwise) will be examined, and the differences between archaeological and textual resources discussed. Finally, the chapter ends with a multifaceted case study of female gladiators in the Roman Empire. All of the examples discussed in this chapter contribute to the overall aims of this thesis by questioning the biases inherent in archaeological investigation. We all have heard of warrior women from brief references in history (Zenobia of Palmyra, Teuta of Illyria, Boudicca, Æthelflæd

(Ethelfleda), Margaret of Anjou, Nicola de la Haye and Joanna of Flanders (Jehanne de Montfort)) but these offer little more than tantalising glimpses. In the case of Boudicca, she has been more fully researched than others, and there is a multitude of reasons as to why this may be the case; perhaps there is more evidence available (or maybe she made for a more 'interesting' story). Yet moving beyond such named and well-known individuals are anonymous 'warrior women' such as those of the Eurasian Steppes who provide no less interesting evidence (including links with Herodotus' descriptions of the Amazons).

Burial evidence, and a feminist approach

When examining examples of possible "women warriors" in history, it is imperative to discuss the archaeological evidence of interments. There is archaeological evidence throughout history for a number of biologically female women being buried along with weaponry. In this section I will be discussing two particular examples in detail, highlighting the need for a feminist/gender approach and the biased assumptions which have previously been made. It is the contention of this author (and this thesis) that gender and feminist approaches are methodologies and theories that are applicable to Egyptian (and other) archaeology, and the subject of 'women and weapons' in Egypt in particular. With regard to this approach, it is to be argued that Scandinavian archaeology is theoretically ahead of Egyptian archaeology.

P. V. Glob (1983) discusses the occurrences of female burials containing weapons which have been found in Denmark. These burials are part of the 'The Mound People' culture and date to the Danish Bronze Age. One example from the Borum Eshøj burial-site of a family was initially discovered in 1850 and further investigated throughout the second half of the 19th century (Glob 1983, 31-38). Of particular interest is the burial of an 'old woman', whose grave goods included a ten-inch long, bronze dagger with a horn handle (fig. 1.1) (Glob 1983, 45). This 'old woman' is an example of what gender and feminist archaeologies wish to address, an individual previously 'invisible' in the archaeological record by virtue of being both biologically female and elderly. As Conkey and Spector point out, such invisibility, not limited to 'women' alone but also often including children, the elderly and

anyone who does not fit into to certain gender stereotype, is "more the result of a false notion of objectivity and of the gender paradigms archaeologists employ" (1984, 6; Baker 1997, 184). There is no attempt made by Glob to suggest that this burial contains anything other than biologically female remains; the biological sex of the body is seemingly accepted quite readily. This is perhaps because Glob was more interested in the human remains than he was in any grave goods or possible 'gender issues'.

The other burial items in the Borum Eshøj female burial, such as the belt discs, were similar to those found in another Danish female burial, at the site of Ølby, which also contained a weapon (fig. 1.2) (Glob 1983, 45; Boye 1896, pl. XXVI), specifically a long sword blade within a partially-destroyed wooden scabbard (Glob 1983, 48; Boye 1896, 137-139). Another female weaponry burial was found at Bredhøj in Western Jutland, excavated in 1885 (Glob 1983, 106). The woman's grave goods included part of a bronze dagger (Glob 1983, 106-107), while the grave goods of a male burial in the same mound included a bronze dagger and a bronze axe (Glob 1983, 107). No distinction is made here between biologically male and biologically female weapons burials, and no assumptions are made about either gender using these weapons as functional items or as votive implements; no attempt is made to dub these women 'warrior women', but neither is the concept vehemently discounted by Glob. This could be due to the subconscious assertion of learned attitudes towards women in the archaeological record by not considering the possibility of the weapons being used as functional items by the women, or could simply reflect Glob's scientific interest in the bodies alone, and not in the social structures and attitudes of the Mound People culture. Under the increasing influence of third wave feminist theories on archaeology we would hope that more such remains would be accurately recorded and that more archaeologists would allow the skeletons to speak for the sex of the interred rather than the grave goods.

These three Danish female weapons burials have discernible similarities with some of the Predynastic Egyptian burials discussed in following chapters of this thesis. As with the Predynastic female mace-head burials, it is impossible to determine if these Danish Bronze Age female weapons burials represent women who took any part in

active warfare. However, as with the mace-head burials, it is possible that these Danish women did use the daggers and swords in some form of combat. It is noticeable that there is generally no debate as to whether or not the weapons found in the Danish and Egyptian male burials were functional, the assumption being that such weapons were not 'symbolic' or 'token' but used by their owners.

The so-called 'warrior women' of the Eurasian Steppes offer another informative example of biological women associated with weaponry, arguably comparable to certain Egyptian examples discussed in later chapters of this thesis. The evidence for these "warrior women" initially came to light in the 1950s, during archaeological excavations on the steppes of southern Ukraine. The excavations revealed fourth-century BC burial mounds (kurgans) that contained female burials with swords, spears, daggers, arrowheads and armour as the grave goods (Davis-Kimball 1997, 45). These burials are discussed by Gilchrist (specifically in relation to gender theory within archaeology) who also mentions more generally that in the region there were burials where the skeletons of women (biologically female remains) actually exhibited the "physical evidence of violence, including severe head injuries resulting from blows and stabs to the head" (1999, 67). After the initial excavations there was work carried out in the 1990s which included the excavations of fifty kurgans near Pokrovka, about 1000 miles east of the sites excavated in the 1950s (Davis-Kimball 1997, 45). There were several female burials located within these fifty kurgans, which contained bronze daggers and arrowheads as grave goods (Davis-Kimball 1997, 45). Davis-Kimball, taking an arguably gender or feminist-based approach, does not sex the burials via their grave goods (unlike some archaeologists in other areas of archaeology), but instead accepts that biological females were buried with weaponry. The possibility explored here is that these remains display evidence for the potential for women being involved in active combat.

In another clear example of women being buried alongside weaponry or combat-associated grave goods, in the same region there is evidence for a group of people known as the Sauromatians (c. 5th century BC - 4th century AD) who it appears actually buried their dead near to Pokrovka, sometimes making use of the already-present Bronze Age kurgans, as well as mostly building their own (Davis-Kimball

1997, 46). These later mounds originally contained just one single burial, but "many were reused over a few centuries for as many as 25 secondary interments" (Davis-Kimball 1997, 46). Davis-Kimball states that the original burial in these mounds was that of a woman, who was "placed in a pit four to six feet deep in the center of the mound" (Davis-Kimball 1997, 46). The burial goods in these examples included bronze arrowheads held in a quiver (Davis-Kimball 1997, 46).

Sarmatian female burials from the same region included a group of seven women, interred in a cemetery known as Cemetery Pokrovka 2, and buried with "iron swords or daggers, bronze arrowheads, and whetstones to sharpen the weapons" (Davis-Kimball 1997, 47; Jordan 2009, 105). Davis-Kimball suggests that these burial goods indicate that the women were actually warriors (1997, 47), although, as is so often the case in archaeology, there has been discussion as to what role these women played. In arguments that parallel those found in Egyptian archaeology, Russian scholars disagreed with Davis-Kimball's assessment, suggesting that the weapons found in these female burials were votive items, weapons that would have been designed to be "wielded only in the afterworld" (Davis-Kimball 1997, 47). Davis-Kimball counters this with her own assertion that the skeletal evidence corroborates her theory (1997, 47). In particular, Davis-Kimball cites the remains of a young teenage girl (aged thirteen or fourteen at death) who had bowed leg-bones, indicating that she may have spent her life on horseback (1997, 47; Jordan 2009, 105). It is entirely arguable that this bone deformation may have been caused by a condition such as infantile rickets, but that can be countered by the evidence of the grave goods interred with her (a dagger, a wood and leather quiver that held dozens of arrowheads, and a bronze arrowhead amulet in a pouch around her neck), which can be argued to support the theory that she was trained as a warrior (Davis-Kimball 1997, 47-48). The same cemetery includes another burial containing the remains of a woman with a bent arrowhead in her body cavity (Davis-Kimball 1997, 48). Davis-Kimball (1997, 48) argues that this evidence indicates that the women died in battle. As with other examples discussed later in this thesis (see Chapter Six, remains from Giza and Kerma), there is no evidence to suggest that this female was found with weaponry. It is therefore not possible to say if this woman actually fought in the battle in which she apparently lost her life, although one could make an

educated guess about it. In addition to the two burials discussed above, Kurgan 8 in this cemetery had two biologically female burials that included grave goods of bronze arrowheads, whetstones, leather quivers and iron daggers (Davis-Kimball 1997, 48).

Alexis Jordan believes that this evidence from the Eurasian Steppes "is compelling and clearly supports the idea of women from the Scythian period playing an important role in the warfare of their people" (2009, 105). Certainly, Davis-Kimball is of the opinion that these Pokrovka females "held a unique position" in Early Iron Age society (1997, 48). It is suggested that in "times of stress, when their territories or possessions were threatened, they took to their saddles, bows and arrows ready, to defend their animals, pastures and clan" (Davis-Kimball 1997, 48). The archaeological evidence could be interpreted in this way, but this statement is not backed-up by any textual references other than a few references to 'Amazons' by the 5th century Greek historian Herodotus (Davis-Kimball 1997, 45; 48; Gilchrist 1999, 67). For example, Herodotus' *The Histories* make reference to a race named by Herodotus as the Sauromatae, who were Amazons that had been captured by the ancient Greeks and carried away on three boats:

> "…out at sea the Amazons attacked the crews and killed them…they were at the mercy of the waves and the winds, until they came to the Cliffs by the Maeetian lake…The Amazons landed there, and set out on their journey to the inhabited country, and seizing the first troop of horses they met, they mounted them and raided the Scythian lands" (Hdt. 4.110, Godley (ed) 1920).

Gilchrist argues that (within the context of gender theory in archaeology) these examples from the Eurasian Steppes provide a context "in which the 'warrior status' of masculinity might be attributed equally to females" (1999, 67). Gilchrist appears to suggest that these women are accepted as examples of female warriors because of the somewhat oblique and inconsistent references to 'warrior women', these 'Amazons' of the Steppes, by Herodotus, whose reliability she questions (1999, 67). Indeed, it is no coincidence that Herodotus was sometimes referred to in antiquity as the 'father of lies' because ancient [male] authors found it difficult to believe his

apparently sensationalist stories about the cultures he observed (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 126), although there have been instances when he has been proved by modern scholarship to have been right (Loveday Alexander, pers. comm.). Indeed, it has been argued that Herodotus made attempts to "maintain a sense of 'objectivity and detachment' throughout his work in order to introduce himself as both observer and commentator, at times providing first-hand accounts of what he has seen, and at others from a once-removed third party (Alexander 2005, 137-138). It does not matter how authentic or not Herodotus' account may be; this author finds it interesting that some scholars are willing to accept the possibility of 'warrior women' when the evidence of the burials is backed up by the historical writings of a male historian however questionable his reputation, but not when similar evidence is found elsewhere albeit uncorroborated by such men. It seems apparent that this is not the case when it comes to weapons burials in biologically male interments, where it seems to be generally accepted by certain elements within the discipline that the weapons were used as functional items by these 'warriors', even without substantiation from literary/textual sources. The various reasons behind such attitudes are discussed in the next chapter of this thesis, when a feminist and gender approach to archaeology is examined in detail.

In the overall discipline of Archaeology, it has long been evident that there are multiple concerns with the interpretation of gender roles and of sexuality in the archaeological record. Baker believes that there are "interpretations of the past which exclude categories of people that do not conform to masculine ideals" within the discipline (1997, 184). It would seem that as a result of this, there are certain and quite specific members of a society who become invisible within the archaeological record, such as women, children, and the elderly (Baker 1997, 184), and those who do not conform to the historically accepted 'gender norms'. Gender Archaeology has long sought to right these apparent errors in the study of archaeology, and whilst it would appear that great steps have been made in certain areas of the discipline (such as Anglo-Saxon, Medieval and Prehistoric archaeology), there are still improvements to be made, particularly within Egyptian Archaeology. Therefore an examination of Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian examples provide a template for how

corresponding Egyptian examples should be looked at, particularly in relation to the classification of biological sex and gender via material goods found in burials.

Hjørungdal (1994, 141) discusses the traditional archaeological method for classifying burials as "male" or "female", which it is argued were problematized by the development of Gender Archaeology. There is a tradition in many areas of archaeology of determining gender and/or sex of burials through an examination of the material artefacts (Hjørungdal 1994, 143). It would seem that this tradition began its development in the 19th Century, when specific grave goods were defined as either male or female tools, with weapons classified as "male tools" (Hjørungdal 1994, 144) and weapon-less burials interpreted as female burials, the most repeatedly used standards for the definition of male identity versus female identity apparently weaponry versus jewellery (Hjørungdal 1994, 144). It is so often the case that issues such as gender prejudices, ethnic concerns, and academic politics influence archaeological interpretations (Trigger 2005, 380), and not for the better, which is why the development of gender and feminist archaeologies was essential (this is something that is discussed in even more detail in the next chapter of this thesis). Although arguments made by Hjørungdal are mainly related to Scandinavian Archaeology, they are arguably relevant to many areas of archaeological study, particularly as the concept of 'weaponry versus jewellery' is prevalent in the past study of Egyptian archaeology (and again relates to the influence of the 19th century in archaeological interpretations).

It was with the arrival of the 19th Century that the ideology of the "ideal of the needle-working woman in the doll's house" developed, a concept that filtered through the thinking, made applicable to archaeological interpretations, particularly in relation to prehistoric archaeology (Hjørungdal 1994, 145). Indeed, when archaeology became increasingly popular during the 18th and 19th centuries, so too 18th and 19th century attitudes, thereby contributing to the creation of what could be described as modern genders and the concept of the secondary and subordinate role of women in society. In turn this would obviously have an impact on the ways in which some aspects of the archaeological record were interpreted. The creation of these 'genders' after the Enlightenment would in turn have an impact on the ways in

which some aspects of the archaeological record were interpreted. The work of Foucault includes the suggestion that the study of sex and desire in the 18th and 19th centuries were professionalised, which would add to the theory of 'modern' gender (1981; in Gilchrist 1999, 55). It is argued by this author that that creation of 'modern genders' had a wide-ranging impact on the study of material remains for much of the 19th and 20th centuries, making a particular impact within Egyptian archaeology.

As the area of Gender Archaeology developed in the 1970s, the gender identities of Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian burials began to be re-examined (Hjørungdal 1994, 144). Hjørungdal makes the point that "we [archaeologists], like 19th-century antiquarians, interpret as well as create gender in pre-history depending on how gender is known to ourselves" (1994, 146). Although Gender Archaeology has been relatively effective in pointing out these issues, it can be argued it has been ineffective at developing alternative paradigms that are not equally but oppositely biased. This interpretation of gender in pre-history "depending on how gender is known to ourselves" (Hjørungdal 1994, 146) can certainly be compared to similar issues in Egyptian Archaeology; there has long been an issue with archaeologists examining and interpreting material remains from a modern Western perspective, or any other perspective other than that of the location and period to which the material remains belong. This is of course not limited to Egyptian Archaeology alone, but is still a noticeable element within the discipline. This brings up wider issues within archaeology, for example within the example of Anglo-Saxon archaeology.

The early study of Anglo-Saxon burials certainly had equivalent problems as seen in the study of certain ancient Egyptian burials. S. J. Lucy states that up until the 1990s, in the study of Anglo-Saxon burials, "jewellery and ornaments have traditionally been attributed to female graves, and the weapons and tools to male ones, and these two assemblages have been uncritically accepted as true indicators of biological sex" (1997, 150). The suggestion is that this arrangement prevented "critical enquiry into the historical reality of sexual roles and relations in the Anglo-Saxon period" (Lucy 1997, 150). This is arguably the case for many sub-disciplines within archaeology, and can certainly be argued to be the case with some examples

of ancient Egyptian burials, including some of the Predynastic examples from Naqada (as discussed in the following chapters). A pertinent comparative example from Egypt is from a cemetery at the site of Abydos, where a biologically female burial is assessed by T. E. Peet (1914a, 15). Peet describes the contents of the female burial as including a "spherical object of poor limestone…pierced through the centre, and, though found in a woman's tomb, looks like a macehead" (1914a, 15). It is argued here that Peet is unconsciously exhibiting the out-dated attitudes towards gender roles and sexual difference that are the result of long-held social practices and institutions, particularly given the time period (early 20th century) in which he was operating (Pollock 1994, 9). This thesis is particularly aimed at a re-examination of burials which have had such biased analyses.

It is apparent that in earlier Anglo-Saxon archaeology, burial goods were used to develop "artefactual chronologies and typologies", as there was seemingly little interest in what the burial goods could tell archaeologists about Anglo-Saxon social relations, particularly in relation to gender relations (Lucy 1997, 151). This is epitomised in M. J. Swanton's book, *The Spearheads of the Anglo-Saxon Settlements* (1973), in which spear-head typologies and variations are examined in detail, with little analysis of social implications (something that is also reflected in the work by Davies on Egyptian axes, discussed at a later stage in this thesis). This could be comparable with the early study of Egyptian Predynastic burials, the ceramic grave goods of which Petrie used to create his Sequence Dating technique (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 64).

It seems to this author that the early attitudes towards sex and gender in Anglo-Saxon burials were defined by the fact that archaeologists preferred to base the gender determination of the skeleton on the associated burial goods rather than the biological sexing of the remains (Lucy 1997, 154). Whilst the examination of skeletal remains generally gives a confident result for biological sex, the examination of the associated finds and context can only ever give an estimate of the gender. Whilst sex and gender do often coincide, there are noticeable occasions on which they do not, and therefore it is right to base gender determination on the artefacts that exemplify the social role of the individual, and not to confuse that with the biological

sex based on the skeleton. What is astonishing is that ~~that~~ such skewed determinations are known to have occurred at several sites, even as recently as the late 1980s. For example, at the site of Sewerby in East Yorkshire, the sex determinations were made based on "an amalgamation of the biological and cultural data. Where these data disagree… the cultural determination has usually been preferred" (Hirst 1986, 33-34, cited in Lucy 1997, 154). It is argued that this approach is outdated, but is all too often evident in older and modern archaeology. It is also problematic that the possibility of gender reversals, cross-gender roles or the third-gender roles are not considered, or even discussed in passing as a possibility by many of the archaeologists studying them, despite there being an historical precedent for such individuals (such as the Native American 'two-spirit', discussed in the next chapter). It reflects some of the early (and not so early) scholarly attitudes towards burials in Egypt, and an unwillingness to consider options with which the scholars perhaps feel uncomfortable or prefer not to acknowledge at all. This is one of the key aspects of archaeology that feminist and gender approaches aim to tackle, and that this thesis also aims to address.

Another example where the scientific findings are yet again dismissed in favour of the stereotypical grave goods is from the cemetery at Buckland, Dover, "When… a skeleton is provided with grave goods exclusively attributable to one sex… it is regarded as reasonable here to assume that the grave goods are a true indication of sex" (Evison 1987, 123, cited in Lucy 1997, 155). This is an arguably inaccurate method of sexing human remains, not taking into account the biological remains, and is not a scientific approach. In addition to using the interment artefacts to sex a skeleton, Evison "preferred to interpret a double weapon burial as evidence for homosexuality, rather than accept the sexing of one of the skeletons as possibly female" (Lucy 1997, 161). There are any number of reasons as to why, if both male, these two skeletons would have been interred together, such as a familial relationship (Stoodley 1999, 30). A feminist/gender approach would suggest that perhaps that one of the skeletons is biologically female; whilst this is not certain, it would be strange if such a theory was completely discounted simply because of the grave goods, particularly when biological sexing could perhaps provide more accurate results. Such grave goods should not be taken at face value: "the relationship

between grave goods, gender and sex must be investigated, not assumed" (Lucy 1997, 155). Such an argument (as we shall see) is certainly applicable in Egyptian archaeology.

Stoodley (1999) suggests that when weapons are found in Anglo-Saxon burials, "questioning the sexing and burial context of these individuals in not only acceptable, but necessary" (1999, 29). As with discussions on 'anomalous' female weapons burials in ancient Egypt, the aim of this thesis is not to suggest that such burials were very common, but that there is archaeological evidence for them, and so such examples should not be ignored when seen in the archaeological record. Stoodley also states that the skeletons that have been only possibly sexed (i.e. without a full determination of biological sex, so noted as either 'possibly male' or 'possibly female'), and are outside of the so-called 'gender norms', are "rarely high enough to alter the associations given by the probable sex determinations" (1999, 29). This does not mean that these 'anomalies' should be discarded out of hand when examining the archaeology of Anglo-Saxon burials. The contention made by Stoodley is that the burials which apparently contain items opposite to the occupant's biological sex should not be dismissed as simply being the result of inaccurate sexing (1999, 29). It is immediately noticeable that Stoodley (1999) persists in stating that there are such things as artefacts that are opposite to the biological sex of the deceased. Gender and feminist archaeologies have developed in many fields of archaeological study, and were crucial to the development of the study of Anglo-Saxon archaeology, particularly in relation to the sexing of skeletons with 'anomalous' burial goods. It is essential that the difference between 'biological sex' and 'gender' be addressed when investigating archaeological burials, something that would be worth utilising when examining comparable examples in Egyptian archaeology.

Lucy's examination of the archaeological results from two Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in Yorkshire (West Heslerton and Sewerby) reveals that the grave assemblages could be broken down into four groups: graves containing jewellery or ornamentation; graves containing weapons; graves containing other items not belonging to the previous two categories (such as knives, buckles, vessels etc.); and graves that did

not contain any surviving artefacts at all (1997, 157). Assemblages at Sewerby show that, according to the biological sexing of the skeletons, there were no biologically female weapons burials, but 15% of the jewellery burials were possibly male (Lucy 1997, 161). The site of Heslerton had no male graves containing jewellery, but 12.5% of the weapons burials at the site were sexed as either definitely or possibly female (Lucy 1997, 159). Lucy points out that at both of these Yorkshire sites, only an "extremely small percentage of burials could be shown to conform with the traditional gender stereotype of males buried with weapons and females with jewellery" (1997, 162). The factual basis for the "traditional stereotype of males with weapons and females with jewellery" was small, and is not reflected in large proportions in the archaeological record (Lucy 1997, 164). Apparently earlier studies of Anglo-Saxon burials saw the symbolism associated with specific assemblages as more important than the ability of these items to "supply information about the 'sex' of the person buried" (Lucy 1997, 164). As we shall see, there are definite parallels with early Egyptian archaeology, where female weapons burials were either ignored or described as more likely to be male because of the grave goods.

Dover excavations include an interesting example in grave 348, which is that of a female who not only was interred with weaponry, but also had evidence of a cranial weapon injury (Stoodley 1999, 30). Stoodley questioned whether or not this female was buried with the weaponry because she was involved with weapons and/or fighting during her life, or if it was the case that the violent manner in which she died was responsible for the burial goods (1999, 30). Stoodley maintains a great deal of scepticism with regard to "cross-sex gender" due to the lack of such cases in the Dover cemetery, and possibly in other Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (1999, 30). However, it is argued by this author that a lack of cases does not mean that the concept should be dismissed entirely. Once again, this can be a problem within Egyptian archaeology (early and current), when the concept of cross-sex gender is ignored due to what some academics deem to be a lack of cases (either a genuine lack of cases, or potentially relevant examples being neglected).

Some extremely important work to be examined in relation to the aims of this thesis is that of Heinrich Härke, and his work on Anglo-Saxon weapons burials. Härke addresses the meaning behind such grave goods, discussing some archaeological interpretations that if the buried weapons were indeed complete, and personal to the deceased warrior with whom they were buried, "their quantity and quality must reflect not only types of military equipment, but also the social, economic and even legal status of the individual" (Härke 1990, 22). If this theory is correct, it could indicate that the weapons found in female Anglo-Saxon weapons interments possibly represented social status rather than occupation, thereby confirming that the weapons were votive and not functional objects for these women. However, to this author it would appear that the indication is this would also be the case for male Anglo-Saxon weapons burials. The argument made by Härke is that the premise of the "warrior graves" is "simplistic and even misleading, and that the conventional view of weapon burials as the graves of warriors needs to be revised" (1990, 24). Härke's argument is that the Anglo-Saxon weapon burial rite was "independent of the intensity of warfare; it did not always reflect functional fighting equipment; it was not determined by the individual ability to fight, nor by the actual participation in combat" (1990, 42). Indeed, it would appear that according to Härke, Anglo-Saxon weapons burials were "positively correlated with burial wealth, with labour investment into the burial, and with stature; and it was, in some places at least, determined by descent" (1990, 42).

Härke argues that the early Anglo-Saxon social elite families were those "which buried their men with axes, swords or seaxes: these men had the tallest stature and the strongest physique, and their burials saw the greatest investment in grave-goods and labour" (1990, 43). Whilst these burials could indicate men who were possibly warriors, in his conclusions, Härke believes that these Anglo-Saxon weapons burial rites were actually "a symbolic act: weapon burial was not the reflection of a real warrior function, but the ritual expression of an ethnically, socially and perhaps ideologically-based "warrior status" " (1990, 43). This thesis absolutely and completely advocates such a more balanced approach to interpretations made from weaponry as grave goods, arguing that male burials as well as female ones should be

given more thought rather than being assumed to be warriors (or non-warriors) entirely on the basis of biological sex.

Another of Härke's articles addresses one of the most common Anglo-Saxon burial goods: the iron knife. Härke's research included the analysis of 925 knife burials from 47 Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, with complete and detailed data being available for between 300 and 400 burials (1989, 144). The majority of these knife burials were those of biologically male adults and juvenile, but 80 of them were recorded as biologically female adult knife burials (Härke 1989, 144). There is no suggestion that these knives were active combat weapons, but these examples do demonstrate that it is imprudent to determine the gender of interred remains from the burial goods alone. As with Lucy's suggestions, it would surely be more sensible to use scientific methods to biologically sex human remains (e.g. osteology). The same methods would be useful when examining Egyptian weapons burials, particularly in relation to the preliterate Predynastic period.

The continued use of 'weapons versus jewellery' to sex archaeological remains did not just result in the wrong gender being ascribed to some remains, it also meant that some buried remains, such as individuals from the Iron Age buried with only a simple tool or pottery, were actually given no gender identity (Hjørungdal 1994, 147). Hjørungdal believes that this results in not only discrimination against gender, but also discrimination against social class, as with the 'weapons versus jewellery' method of gender definition only "people given an elaborate burial were given a gender identity" (Hjørungdal 1994, 147). The assumption is that only the upper social classes would have these elaborate burials. Therefore it can be argued that the development of Gender Archaeology not only addresses the 'lost' women, children and elderly within the archaeological record, but also gives an archaeological voice to the remains of those from the 'lower' social classes that had been ignored in the archaeological record due to a lack of the traditional gender-defining burial goods. However, it could also be argued that Gender Archaeology may highlight some under-represented groups, but does little to extract their signal in the archaeological record. This is where a feminist approach to archaeology can assist, as it aims to represent all 'invisible' individuals within the archaeological record.

Literary evidence

Before examining the literary evidence for Egyptian female leaders involved in some form of military activity (see Chapter Three of this thesis), textual and literary examples from other ancient and historical societies provide some useful comparative evidence. This allows us to then look at the Egyptian evidence as part of a wider context, with a more critical and broader mind. The literary examples for women involved in warfare relating to the Roman Empire are far better attested than others, in large part due to the prolific output of Roman writers. One such example is Teuta, Queen of Illyria, who ruled alone after the death of her husband Agron (230BC) (Fine 1936, 29; Dell 1967, 352; Hammond 1968, 4). Controlling an "entire coast from Dubrovnik to the mouth of the Corinthian Gulf" (Hammond 1968, 4), Teuta apparently encouraged piratical raids, eventually causing Rome to send ambassadors to Illyria to speak with Teuta. With the assassination of these ambassadors (Hammond 1968, 4-5), the Romans sent forces out to tackle Teuta's fleet in 229 BC, and the Illyrians surrendered (Hammond 1968, 6). Whilst there is no suggestion that Teuta was physically present in the conflict, she was certainly a ruler unafraid to clash with Rome (similarities can be seen particularly with Egyptian Queen Ahhotep as will be discussed in more detail below).

Described by some as "the most famous of all Arab queens" (Abbott 1941, 12), Queen Zenobia of Palmyra was another female ruler who came into conflict with the Roman Empire. After the death of her husband Odainath, Zenobia acted as regent for her son and "ruled Palmyra and most of the East with the vigor of a man" (Abbott 1941, 12). In the first years of her reign, she strengthened her rule in Palmyra by expanding her borders "eastward toward Mesopotamia and northwest into eastern Asia Minor", whilst leaving her borders with the Roman Empire untouched (Abbott 1941, 13-14). However, after the death of the Roman emperor Quintillus, Zenobia expanded her borders further still in 270 AD, advancing her army into Syria and Egypt, her territories eventually extending from Egypt to Mesopotamia, from the Hellespont to North Arabia (Abbott 1941, 14).

Although she and her armies were ultimately defeated by the Romans under the command of Aurelian (Downey 1950), Zenobia became renowned for the manner in which she led her armies. It is unknown if Zenobia actually took any part in physical combat, but the way in which she apparently led her troops is reminiscent of the literary sources describing the actions of the Egyptian queen Ahhotep who led troops against the Hyksos. Although Zenobia's reign was almost two thousand years after Ahhotep's time, the similarities between the two women are evident: both women had to take charge of armies at the death of their husbands, and both women were successful in this endeavour to some extent. Admittedly, Zenobia had rather less success, being ultimately defeated, and taken back to Rome in chains to be paraded through the city as part of Aurelian's Triumph (Abbott 1941, 14), although this demonstrated her status as a defeated military leader rather than simply a captured woman. It is all too often the case that women such as Teuta and Zenobia are seen as anomalies, based on the stereotypes still applied to the roles of women in historical societies which are "a product of a patriarchal culture which constructs male dominance through the significance it attaches to sexual differences" (Ellmann 1968; in Parker and Pollock 1981, 8). While this author argues that women's involvement in warfare was not in regular practice, such women should not be viewed as simply 'anomalies' but rather in conjunction with their social position and cultural beliefs of their time.

Any discussion of 'women warriors' in history must make mention of the well-known English Boudicca, one of the best known instances of a woman personally leading troops into battle, and a useful comparison with similar examples from ancient Egypt. While the archaeological evidence for Boudicca is admittedly sparse, both Tacitus and Cassius Dio wrote about her (Hingley and Unwin 2005, 41-43), and while giving her story more credence by virtue of both being male such Roman sources are highly likely to have been biased against a woman who fought in opposition to the Romans. Hingley and Unwin insist that Roman writers would often relate "interesting stories rather than necessarily attempting to recount an accurate description of historical events" (2005, 42). This is of course by no means restricted to Roman writers alone, and could arguably be the case with some Egyptian literary sources, the writings praising the military prowess of Hatshepsut or

Ahhotep for example (as discussed in subsequent chapters of this thesis) featuring similar bias and issues to those evident in the literary descriptions of Boudicca's actions.

Hingley and Unwin are very clear on the need for caution when using these sources for the study of Boudicca, as they "are not straight-forward historical accounts and, perhaps, tell us more about the attitudes of classical authors to powerful women in non-Roman societies than they do about the events of the rebellion" (2005, 42). In both his *Agricola* and *Annales*, Tacitus portrays Boudicca as ruthless and exemplifying his concept of the barbarian *dux femina* (L'Hoir 1994, 7). The *Agricola* was completed around 98 AD, and the *Annales* around 115-117 AD, some years after the 'Boudiccan Revolts' of 60-61 AD (Hingley and Unwin 2005, 43). What must be taken into account, as with so many aspects of archaeology, is that these sources will have been analysed and interpreted from a male-dominated historian point of view, using the standard practice of invoking of contemporary gender stereotypes that occurred in the 1960s and 1970s in particular (Gilchrist 1999, 17). Approaching these sources from a feminist slant could enable readers to see that the patriarchal attitudes of the male Roman writers could have had a detrimental impact on how Boudicca was viewed, both by her contemporaries and later readers. It could be reasoned that for the Roman writers, Boudicca was not only a savage Celtic Briton, but an impudent woman who dared to challenge the mighty Roman Empire. Perhaps if Boudicca had been a man, she would have still been seen as a savage Celt, but there might also have been some admiration of her nerve, her courage and what she accomplished in her determination. It is argued in the course of this thesis that such judgements are a common thread in writings about powerful women throughout history and can be seen from Ancient Egypt right the way through history to the 20th (and 21st) century.

In *Agricola*, Tacitus discusses Boudicca's leadership of the rebellion: "Goaded by such mutual encouragements, the whole island rose under the leadership of Boudicca, a lady of royal descent – for Britons make no distinction of sex in their leaders" (Hingley and Unwin 2005, 45). The implication here could be that Tacitus is trying to suggest that Iron Age Britain had more than just the one female warrior

leader, and other than Cartimandua of the Northern Brigantes tribe, evidently less well-known than Boudicca (Hingley and Unwin 2005, 45). There is some suggestion that in Iron Age Celtic society women could "transcend more modern gender roles in taking their people to war" (Collingridge 2006, 179). Women in Iron Age Britain could potentially play certain roles in warfare; whilst some women would be the spectators on the edge of the battlefield, others could be warrior instructors, and some were warriors themselves (Collingridge 2006, 179). Iron Age culture also featured war-goddesses (Collingridge 2006, 179). In light of this, the idea that Boudicca herself led Iceni warriors in a rebellion against the Romans is not so unlikely. A feminist approach to history and archaeology would examine not just Boudicca's role alone, but also how the male-dominated approach to the study of Boudicca affect how she was interpreted both archaeologically and historically, looking at "the social systems and ideological schemata which sustain the domination of men over women within the other mutually inflecting regimes of power in the world" (Pollock 1994, 1). Examining examples such as Boudicca from a feminist approach would address more realistically how these women were viewed by their contemporaries, and what sort of roles their contemporary societies expect them to take, and how they were expected to behave. As Collingridge states, it is apparent that in Iron Age Britain "There was no dishonour in being led by a woman" (2006, 194). The parallels with similar Egyptian examples are striking; as with some Iron Age examples, two of the Egyptian deities associated with warfare and weaponry were female: Neith and Sekhmet, and subsequent chapters will discuss in some detail the possible examples of women warriors in Egyptian society.

The catalyst for Boudicca's rebellion was her treatment at the hands of the Romans. Her husband had been a "client king", allowed to retain his kingdom as long as "he maintained a pro-Roman stance and paid his dues to his conquerors" (Collingridge 2006, 170). He named as his joint heirs the Roman Emperor Nero and his own daughters, rather than his wife Boudicca, possibly intending to ensure his daughters' right to inherit and rule the kingdom upon the death of Boudicca (Collingridge 2006, 174; Bulst 1961, 496). Collingridge believes this indicates a "certain degree of sexual equality in the indigenous culture" (2006, 174). A feminist approach looks beyond Boudicca's gender or biological sex, to her station within her society as the

wife of the tribe leader, and as tribe leader herself, perhaps the main reason as to why she was able to rally the tribes as she did. Third wave feminism offers a much wider-ranging look at the issues and individuals within a society bringing to the forefront issues of race, sexuality, ethnicity and class, meaning that all aspects of Boudicca's life should be taken into account when studying her life and actions, not just her sex and/or gender: "Gender intersects with many other kinds of social identities and cannot be studied in isolation" (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 100). It is just such an approach that this thesis intends to take with the Egyptian subjects discussed later on.

When Boudicca's husband died, the Romans apparently expected to be sole inheritors of his kingdom and according to Tacitus in the *Annales*, the Iceni tribe, now under the command of Boudicca, were deprived of their estates and territories, Boudicca and her family treated as slaves (Hingley and Unwin 2005, 47). Whilst it may be that Boudicca's rebellion was born of necessity (such as the perceived grievances against the Romans in Britain), it seems evident that Boudicca must have had military training, and was able to draw the Britons to her cause, whether through persuasion, force, or by right of birth. Once again, the parallels with Egyptian examples are evident: Queen Ahhotep apparently led soldiers into battle after the death of her husband, actions born of necessity, but not diminishing her accomplishments on the field of battle. The same could be said of the activities carried out by Boudicca and her soldiers. Boudicca perhaps felt she had no choice but to rebel against the Romans and, as the wife of the late King and mother of the heirs to the kingdom, may have been seen by the Iceni and other tribes as the most suitable leader against the Romans. Such attitudes reveal the ancient Britons were not averse to female leaders, in common with the ancient Egyptians who similarly had female political leaders capable of wielding military powers when necessary.

Early English and Medieval literary examples

In contrast with a great deal of Egyptian history there is a wealth of literary and textual information dealing with early English and Medieval examples of women involved in combat or warfare. Of course, this begs the question: were these medieval women more readily accepted by scholars perhaps due to the fact that they

come from literary sources rather than from archaeological/burial sources such as the Anglo-Saxon female weapons burials?

An early English example of a woman involved in combat from exclusively literary sources is the 9th Century AD Ethelfleda. Daughter of Alfred the Great and wife of the king of Mercia, she actively governed Mercia during her husband's life and for some time after his death (McNamara and Wemple 1973, 135), her various exploits mentioned in both the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the *Mercian Register* (McLaughlin 1990, 198). Her achievements include her fortification of the borough of Warwick, to "protect the Roman road from Bath to Lincoln" (Armitage 1904, 438), and it has also been suggested that Ethelfleda fortified the town of Shrewsbury (Armitage 1904, 429). Whilst the 1904 text makes no suggestion of actual physical combat by Ethelfleda, the described fortifications demonstrate that she did to some extent lead the defence of certain towns in Mercia. However, the much later text written by McLaughlin does suggest that Ethelfleda did take part, alongside her brother Edward, in attacks on Scandinavians who were settled in the north of the country (1990, 198). She is said to have "fought the Danes in her own name until her death" (McLaughlin 1990, 198). This apparent change in how Ethelfleda was viewed with regard to her activities in warfare is likely due to the changing attitudes towards women of those composing the historical records, or of those studying it; the influence of a feminist approach to studying such cases being more likely to find greater detail.

Whilst certainly no anomaly, Ethelfleda is one of several women credited with playing an active role in medieval warfare. Of those directly engaging in active combat, Nicholson's "Women on the Third Crusade" mentions several such women taking up arms during crusading expeditions (1997, 335). As is often the case (particularly when it comes to the application ~~if~~ of gender and feminist theory), scholars "disagree profoundly over the extent and nature of women's involvement" (Nicholson 1997, 336). Ronald Finucane, for example, observes that "there are clear indications that women sometimes took a more active part in the fighting" (1983, 177), whereas fellow historian Maureen Purcell "denied emphatically that they were true crusaders … except for a brief period in the second half of the thirteenth

century. When they accompanied a crusade, they did so as pilgrims rather than as crusaders, and they certainly did not fight" (1979, 57-64, cited in Nicholson 1997, 336). Nonetheless, McLaughlin mentions a number of women who "fought alongside male crusaders – and sometimes in male disguise – on the battlefields of the Middle East" (1990, 199). Again, changes in attitudes in academia, with the advent of feminist theory and changing societal views, could be responsible for the changing viewpoints of the people studying these women. Finucane is only writing four years after Purcell, and McLaughlin seven years after Finucane, but the application of feminist and gender theory had already made an arguably significant impact during that period. That is not to suggest that Finucane and McLaughlin were feminist scholars, but that the increased prominence of feminist theory may have contributed to the ways in which they viewed and interpreted the known and new examples of 'Crusader women'.

This author argues that evidence from the Crusades is of relevance in this chapter and this thesis because of the sheer wealth of evidence relating to women involved in warfare at a more active level, providing an applicable comparison with ancient Egyptian examples (such as the aforementioned Ahhotep, and Hatsehpsut). Nicholson's paper addresses some of the issues with the assertions made by Finucane. One of the main problems with the evidence for women fighting in the Crusades cited by Finucane is that "it all comes from Muslim sources, who had their own reasons for depicting Christian women fighting" (Nicholson 1997, 336). Nicholson and Finucane are referring to the works of Crusade-era Muslim historians and writers, something that some earlier academics were often unwilling to do, with an arguably blinkered and Western-orientated way of viewing the world and the past. A lot of information on women being involved more actively in the Crusades does come from Muslim scholars of the time. Certainly, when Finucane references any of the examples of women actively fighting in Crusade battles, they are exclusively from Muslim sources (1983, 177-178). Nicholson is of the opinion that it is likely that women did sometimes fight during the crusades, but she believes that it is necessary that evidence for women fighting in the crusade "must be supplemented by evidence elsewhere of European women fighting" (1997, 336). A lack of contemporary, reliable and/or plausible sources is a common problem with assessing

women associated with warfare in Egypt and other ancient societies. There is also the possibility that there are more non-Western sources that could refer to women fighting in the Crusades, neglected by academics not necessarily using a feminist approach to the subject.

When examining examples of women fighting in the Crusades, an important source is that of contemporary Muslim historian ‘Imād al-Dīn, who records the arrival by sea of “a woman of high rank … in late autumn 1189, with an escort of 500 knights with their forces, squires, pages and valets” (Nicholson 1997, 337). This woman apparently paid all the knights’ expenses and she also apparently led them in raids against the Muslims (Nicholson 1997, 337). ‘Imād al-Dīn went on to say that there were also “many female knights among the Christians, who wore armour like the men and fought like men in battle, and could not be told apart from the men until they were killed and the armour was stripped from their bodies” (Nicholson 1997, 337-338). Nicholson points out that there are no contemporary Christian sources that mention either this noblewoman knight, or any other female knights (1997, 338), so it could be argued that that either ‘Imād al-Dīn fabricated the story, or that no Christian scholar would willingly document it. The bias that is possibly demonstrates here is one which needs to be kept in mind when also examining literary or written sources relating to Egyptian women.

Another contemporary Muslim historian, Bahā’ al-Dīn, after riding out to a battlefield with ‘Imād al-Dīn, wrote that: “ ‘I noticed the bodies of two women. Someone told me that he had seen four women engaged in the fight, of whom two were made prisoners’ ” (Nicholson 1997, 338, also mentioned in Finucane 1983, 177). Both ‘Imād al-Dīn and Bahā’ al-Dīn chronicle the occurrence of a female archer who was apparently present at Acre with the Christian besiegers (Nicholson 1997, 338). Of the two Muslim historians, Bahā’ al-Dīn gives the most detailed account of the woman:

> “One very intelligent old man… was amongst those who forced their way into the enemy's trenches that day. ‘Behind their rampart’, he told me, ‘was a women, wrapped in a green *mellûta’* [a kind of mantle] ‘who kept on shooting arrows from wooden bow, with which she wounded several

> of our men. She was at last overpowered by numbers; we killed her, and brought the bow she had been using to the Sultan, who was greatly astonished' " (Nicholson 1997, 338).

'Imād al-Dīn's account is briefer, but both recorders clearly refer to the same woman. "There was a woman on one of the points of the defence holding a bow of wood, firing well and drawing blood; she did not stop fighting until she was killed" (Nicholson 1997, 338). Her bow was apparently taken to Saladin, "who was greatly astonished" by this female archer (Finucane 1983, 177). Saladin's apparent surprise at a female archer has similarities with scholars' surprise at the portrayal of an Egyptian royal woman, quite possibly the female pharaoh Tawosret, firing arrows from her moving chariot (discussed in Chapters Two, Three, and Four). As ever, questions are raised as to why it is only these Muslim historians chronicling these fighting women. Maier has suggested that Muslim scholars over-emphasised the "importance and numbers in an attempt to underline the allegedly immoral or even perverted attitude of Christian soldiers towards their own women" (2004, 69).

So why would Muslim writers chronicle instances of Christian women fighting in the Crusades when contemporary Christian writers did not? Nicholson suggests that "in both the European Christian and the Muslim culture, it was expected that good, virtuous women would not normally fight, for it was believed that in a civilised, godly society women should not have to fight. Conversely, women were regarded as being particularly susceptible to evil" (1997, 340). So it could be that the Muslim writers were trying to portray the Christian crusaders as barbaric and ungodly by suggesting that their women took part in the fighting. It could also be that contemporary Christian historians and writers would not willingly write about women fighting in battles, as this would seemingly discredit the Christian crusaders (Nicholson 1997, 341). The medieval Christian attitude towards women could also be a factor here, as the Crusades were, from the Christian perspective, a Holy War and therefore a religious act. Analysis of the New Testament, particularly in relation to the Epistles of St Paul, had led to interpretations that showed that women could not be priests or apostles, merely handmaidens and mothers (Bullough 1973, 486). Women were also seen as inferior to men, and as being inherently sinful and evil

(Bullough 1973, 486; 487). This concept of women being inferior to men is one that has continued well into the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and is something that a feminist approach would seek to redress. It could be that this view actually permeated the Christian accounts of the Crusades. These 'fighting Crusader women' could have existed but been unacknowledged by Christian writers of the time (again with distinct parallels with Anglo-Saxon and ancient Egyptian examples of possible female fighters), or they could be an invention of contemporary Muslim writers made in an attempt to discredit the Christian crusaders. Certainly such Medieval Christian views infiltrated much of early scholarship, particularly Victorian writers who so influenced the early development of academic archaeology and who disapproved of women behaving 'inappropriately' and out of their preordained place in life and society, according to their Christian-inspired attitudes towards sex, gender, and women's rights, a view that can certainly be seen throughout much previous work in Egyptian archaeology.

There are some Christian sources for a woman being caught up in the fighting in the Crusades, but there is no analysis of the potential roles outside the 'gender norms' that such women would have played. The tale of Margaret of Beverley was recounted by the lady herself to her brother, a monk of Froimont (Beauvais) (Finucane 1983, 178; Maier 2004, 64-47). Much of the account relates to Margaret's time in captivity in the Holy Land (Finucane 1983, 178; Maier 2004, 64-47). However, it does begin when Margaret was in Jerusalem as it was under attack by the forces of Saladin (Finucane 1983, 178). Margaret apparently "defended the city like a man, putting a cooking-pot on her head as a helmet and carrying water to the men on the walls; she was injured by fragments from a boulder big as a millstone fired by Saracen engines" (Finucane 1983, 178). Although this source makes no mention of Margaret taking up arms to fight the Saracens, it does show that Christian women were willing to take part in the defence of cities in which they were residing, mirroring the evidence seen from a wall scene at Deshasheh depicting ancient Egyptian women defending their town from invaders (discussed in further detail later in Chapter Three). It could be the case that examples of such women in the historical and archaeological records are neglected because it is simply assumed that they do not possess the skills to use weaponry and take part in combat.

There were also occasions when a medieval wife could act on her husband's behalf, for example Countess Sybilla of Flanders in 1148, who "led her troops to meet an invasion by Count Baldwin of Hainault; her husband, Count Thierry of Flanders, was absent on crusade" (Phillips 1996, 276, cited in Nicholson 1997, 344). Additionally, the case of the early thirteenth-century Matilda de Braose, of whom much was apparently said in medieval chronicles, includes the statement that "nothing about her husband compared to what they said about her. She was responsible for keeping up the war against the Welsh and conquered much from them" (Nicholson 1997, 345), implying that she perhaps took part in active combat.

Another problem within the study of history and archaeology that is addressed by a feminist approach is the fact that so often non-elite individual or groups are ~~often~~ neglected within the archaeological record. There is evidence that not only elite women of medieval society took up arms in order to defend themselves. Nicholson cites the 1285 example of Na Mercadera from Peralada in Aragon, who "went out of her house armed with a lance and shield so that she could defend herself if necessary against the troops of King Philip III of France, who were besieging the town. She encountered a French knight, whom she captured" (1997, 343-344). Here is a clear example of an 'ordinary' medieval woman who is actively defending herself against an army, and even managed to capture a knight, with distinct parallels with the townswomen of Sati portrayed in an Egyptian tomb taking up arms when their settlement was under threat from invaders, as discussed in detail in Chapter Three

There is of course a stark difference between the women who took up arms as a matter of necessity and defence, and the women who fought in the Crusades as female knights. There is definitely more literary evidence for the medieval European women who took an active role in fighting, through either siege defence, border skirmishes, or personal defence, than there is for the supposed female Crusaders, about whom little is written beyond brief descriptions by medieval Muslim historians. Certainly, most of the cases that are cited do relate to so-called emergency situations, such as "wives of nobles who defended castles temporarily while their husbands were absent, women who snatched up weapons in defence of their homes when invaders threatened, nuns who, at a moment of crisis used force to

defend their convent's property rights" (McLaughlin 1990, 196-197). McLaughlin believes that these cases actually demonstrate the "military preparedness" of medieval European women (1990, 197). Again, comparisons can certainly be made between these examples of medieval and Crusading women taking part in fighting, and the examples of Egyptian women examined for this thesis. There are examples of women fighting to defend themselves and their town from attack and women who led troops in active battle, in each case fighting as a matter of necessary defence than actively seeking combat.

There are several examples of noble widows who took part in warfare in medieval Europe, regarded by contemporaries as less inappropriate than other medieval women who took part in warfare, as the widows were "obliged to fight to protect their children's interests" in the absence of a suitable male protector (McLaughlin 1990, 198). This is an attitude that was largely carried from the (Western/European) medieval period throughout the Enlightenment and into the 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly with regard to how some scholars viewed such women: i.e. women involving themselves in combat are only acceptable if they are doing so in their children's interests. The Countess Blanche of Champagne campaigned on behalf of her son for years during the early thirteenth century, triumphing over her enemies "in a manly and energetic fashion" (McLaughlin 1990, 198-199). The widow of Count Philip of Flanders, Therasia of Portugal, raised and led armies taken from her dower lands in order to "further her own territorial ambitions" (McLaughlin 1990, 199). Some women even fought against close family for their own ambitions, such as the widow of Arnoul II of Guines, who fought wars against her own son from 1220 to 1222 over the control of her widow's portion (McLaughlin 1990, 199).

As with 19th and 20th century scholarly attitudes, one of the issues surrounding examples of medieval women being involved in warfare or combat involves the changing attitudes toward such women found in contemporary sources. According to McLaughlin, in the eleventh century "chroniclers generally noted the activities of women warriors with little comment" (1990, 194). For example, in 1071 Richilde of Hainaut was apparently captured whilst she was fighting in the battle of Cassel against her brother-in-law, an occurrence that was recorded "in the barest terms" by

her contemporaries (McLaughlin 1990, 194; 199; Nicholas 1999, 115-116). Richilde is also described as wearing armour whilst she was fighting, her behaviour having a wide-ranging influence with Richilde perhaps becoming the "prototype for the warrior maidens found in numerous late French romances" (Davidson 1997, 60).

At the time of Richilde's capture, contemporary sources record her involvement in battle with little to no comment (McLaughlin 1990, 200), suggesting that perhaps their attitudes towards such women were not as closed-minded as later on in history. However, by the thirteenth century, this attitude has disappeared, with one chronicler explaining her presence on the battlefield by charging her "with sorcery, with attempting to throw "magic powder" on the opposing army" (McLaughlin 1990, 200). Two hundred years after Richilde's exploits, she is seen as an anomaly, and as "evidence of dark powers and intent" (McLaughlin 1990, 200), thereby a parallel with scholarly attitude towards Egyptian women who supposedly took part in warfare – they are suggested to be mythological figures, such as the sketch of a woman who may be Tawosret in battle, or perhaps committing an arguably criminal act of revenge, such as Nitocris, in each case women regarded as anomalous as the medieval 'warrior women'.

Another example, some ten years after the capture of Richilde, is that of Sichelgaita, a princess of Lombard, who "was said to present a "fearsome" sight when dressed in full armor" (McLaughlin 1990, 198). Sichelgaita was also credited at the siege of Durazzo in 1081 with the rallying of her husband's men, "chasing after them on horseback and threatening them with her spear" (McLaughlin 1990, 198). One the other hand, Sichelgaita is accused by Orderic Vitalis of killing her husband by administering him with poison, Orderic describing her as 'shifty and cunning' (Loud 2003, 546). So Sichelgaita is either a strong and impressive woman who rallied her husband's troops, or a shifty and cunning murderess, or perhaps she is both?

Moving away from early Medieval Europe, and examining some Scandinavian literary examples of women associated with combat, in the early thirteenth century

the *History of the Danes*, composed by Saxo Grammaticus, contains a passage that is of interest to the aims of this thesis:

> "There were once women in Denmark who dressed themselves to look like men and spent almost every minute cultivating soldiers' skills, they did not want the sinews of their valour to lose tautness and be infected by self-indulgence. Loathing a dainty style of living, they would harden body and mind with toil and endurance…" (McLaughlin 1990, 194; Gilchrist 1999, 67).

These women are described as having 'unsexed' themselves through their courting of military celebrity, and apparently appeared to be forgetful of their true selves as:

> "they put toughness before allure, aimed at conflicts instead of kisses, tasted blood, not lips, sought the clash of arms rather than the arm's embrace, fitted to weapons hands which should have been weaving, desired not the couch but the kill, and those they could have appeased with looks they attacked with lances" (McLaughlin 1990, 194; Gilchrist 1999, 69).

Saxo Grammaticus' attitude towards these women does not necessarily reflect the attitude taken by the Scandinavian culture, and academics should be wary of taking his views at face value, particularly in relation to the concept of the women 'unsexing' themselves in order to live a military existence. A feminist stance in this topic would look at possibilities such as these women leading military lives but retaining their 'femininity' with little opposition from their peers, or perhaps 'inhabiting' a third gender. Gilchrist describes one of these women as having been potentially identified from the burial of a proposed Viking raider at Queenhithe Harbour in London's Saxon foreshore (1999, 69). This woman had sustained trauma to the head from a "wedge-shaped implement, possibly an axe or sword" (Gilchrist 1999, 69). Gilchrist suggests that there is an unwillingness by archaeologists to suggest that the woman might have held warrior status when there is not a textual reference in existence (1999, 69). It could be argued that this would not be the case if the body had been that of a biological male, when he was have almost immediately had warrior status bestowed upon him at his discovery. This thirteenth century attitude to these apparent "warrior women" is markedly different to some of the

attitudes towards such women in earlier centuries, and some approaches even in modern academia.

The evidence from the Scandinavian examples is feasibly comparative with similar burials in ancient Egypt, such as the Predynastic mace burials from Abydos, and Dynastic female weaponry burials such as Senebtisi and Ahhotep, as discussed later in this thesis. The idea that the Danish women were using weapons when they should have been weaving has some similarities with the thirteenth century scholar who accused Richilde of using sorcery when fighting. McLaughlin believe that these two sources simply show the attitudes towards "women warriors" in the thirteenth century, when in previous centuries they had not been seen as quite as anomalous as they now were. Once more, the parallels with the study of women fighting in ancient Egypt are evident – at the time, when women such as Hatshepsut were possibly leading troops into battle, there is no indication that they were seen as carrying out activities that were wrong for a woman of their status. Indeed, it would be those in later Dynasties and in the 19th and 20th centuries who ultimately decided that these women were anomalous and had gone against supposed social norms.

In striking parallels with Egyptian archaeology, serious scholarly study of the participation of women in medieval European warfare has not been widely disseminated (Nicholson 1997, 342). According to Nicholson, this study "has also been hampered by the prohibition in the modern western world on women's participation in active warfare; it seems to have been assumed that as women do not fight now, they did not fight in the past" (1997, 342). As with many subjects within the discipline of archaeology, problems with the study of warfare in the past have often stemmed from approaching the subject from a modern Western point of view, as well as making assumptions about, for instance, a contemporary Islamic point of view. McLaughlin (1990) discusses the concept of the medieval woman warrior, through the examination of several examples of women involved in fighting, and the contemporary attitudes towards them. McLaughlin is of the opinion that "women warriors" were "more common in the middle ages than in the classical world or in modern Europe, and certainly more common than has been usually assumed" (1990, 196). The last statement could be held true for several societies, including ancient

Egypt. While 'women warriors' were not the norm in Egypt, it is possible that more existed than have been noted in either literary sources or identified in the archaeological record. As discussed in chapters further on, several examples of weapons found in female burials have been dismissed as votive, without even considering the potential of the weapons actually being functional. So by using a feminist approach to history, archaeology and Egyptian archaeology, the balance can be redressed, and these women's voices more clearly heard in the historical and archaeological record.

Female gladiators: a multifaceted case study

Returning to the Roman Empire, but studied separately from the literary examples discussed above, one relevant example of women taking part in fighting is corroborated by literary, artistic (visual), and archaeological evidence: female gladiators. This ties in with many parallel examples from Egyptian archaeology (such as Ahhotep, both the subject of a literary source and supported by burial evidence). Michael Massey claims that women in ancient Rome were "encouraged to develop their skills not for their own sake, but for the sake of men" (1988, 30). This statement regarding women in ancient Rome could be an interesting point regarding the possible reasons for the existence of female gladiators. However, Massey's next line undermines some of what he says: "In fact, women's roles in most cultures and societies throughout history has been, and is, to serve men" (1988, 30), a statement which is not only not conducive to archaeological accuracy but seems to have its basis in outmoded Victorian-based values, present all too often in archaeology even into the 1990s despite the counter efforts of gender and feminist archaeology at the time. Massey goes on to describe Roman women's roles as "bearing children, providing sex, looking after the household…or providing entertainment" (1988, 30). As an accurate statement about the status of most Roman women, he is presumably counting female gladiators as part of his latter category, but is this in fact the case? Examples of female gladiators are worth examining because they are a well-documented example of women, albeit in small numbers, actively engaging in physical combat, therefore providing evidence of women wielding weapons, as well as a good way to look at the biases of both the people

writing ‘history’ and the archaeologists interpreting it (and therefore has distinct parallels with similar examples in Egyptian archaeology).

According to Anna McCullough, the scale of the presence of female gladiators “in frequency and number is unknown” (2008, 197). She goes on:

> “Classical scholarship has traditionally been less interested in the topic than pop culture; major works usually include only a brief mention of women gladiators, with the consensus that the phenomenon was a marginal practice within the arena, a novelty without much to say about Roman culture or the games themselves” (McCullough 2008, 197).

Brunet certainly claims that “the motivation and rationale for having women fight in the arena have not been fully appreciated” (2004, 145), perhaps referring to the lack of interest from classical scholarship mentioned by McCullough. As for the development of the female gladiators, McCullough argues that there was a link between the increase in the number of literary mentions of female gladiators and the “increase in imperial displays of luxury” (2008, 197). It is made clear from the start of the article that McCullough believes that examples of female gladiators could be defined as “true” gladiators, “that their numbers were most likely low; and that the type and circumstances of their training and actions in the arena did not differ from men's” (2008, 197).

Although the term gladiatrix can be used to describe a female gladiator, there was no specific Latin word for a female gladiator, nor was a feminine form of the word ‘gladiator’ in use during the imperial Roman period (McCullough 2008, 198). This could indicate the rarity of female gladiators – perhaps there were insufficient numbers to warrant the creation and use of an official title, or maybe their role in the arena was not equivalent to that of male gladiators. It is also possible that the modern usage of the term ‘gladiator’ is wider than its original meaning; so whatever roles the ‘female gladiators’ played, they were not strictly speaking ‘gladiators’ even though they were fighting in the arena.

With regard to the first appearances of female gladiators, it is "likely that their emergence coincided with the growth in popularity of the games in general in the late Republican and Augustan eras" (McCullough 2008, 198). After the reign of Augustus (27 BC-AD 14) the evidence for female gladiators increases, but is apparently "almost exclusively literary" (McCullough 2008, 199). Yet there are rare exceptions, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

In looking at contemporary Roman opinions on female gladiators, Coleman suggests that any negative attitudes toward female gladiators is mainly due to issues with their rank or class rather than their gender, as the same opprobrium was apparently attached to men engaged in gladiatorial combat (2000, 497). This is something that a third wave feminist approach would look at in particular, concentrating on the class of the gladiators rather than their gender, and examining general Roman attitudes towards class and gender. The negative viewpoints regarding female gladiators are shown by various decrees:

> "As early as A.D. 11 a *senatus consultum* had forbidden freeborn males under twenty-five and freeborn females under twenty from appearing on the stage or in the arena. In A.D. 19 it was replaced by the *senatus consultum* from Larinum, which prescribed penalties additional to the opprobrium of *infamia*, should any men and women of senatorial or equestrian rank perform as actors or gladiators. Dio's concession regarding the women who performed at the dedication of the Flavian amphitheatre implies that female participation is tolerable, so long as it does not involve the upper classes" (Coleman 2000, 497).

This is a fascinating series of decrees, as it certainly demonstrates that there were few or no objections to female gladiators on the basis of gender alone. Whilst female gladiators may have been rare, their existence was by no means impossible in Imperial Rome. It is mentioned that there was a ban brought out in 200 AD by Septimius Severus on female gladiators, although it appears that this was not necessarily a global ban, nor was it adhered to by everyone since a 3rd century inscription states that "a local magnate at Ostia named Hostilianus … boasts that he was the first person there to display women in combat" (Coleman 2000, 497-498;

McCullough 2008, 200; Vesley 1998, 91; Brunet 2004, 156; Manas 2011, 2729). It should be noted here that whilst these women were displayed in combat, it does not necessarily mean that they were officially 'gladiators'. This inscription relating to Hostilianus is from Ostia, and apparently suggests a connection between the female gladiators and the local *collegium iuvenum* (Vesley 1998, 91). Vesley believes that the female gladiators who participated in the games run by Hostilianus were actually trained in the Ostian *collegium* (1998, 91).

According to McCullough (2008, 200; Vesley 1998, 90; Manas 2011, 2729), while Septimius Severus "identifies the offending event which provoked the ban as a gymnastic competition, and the participants as athletes, he states the ban was against women appearing in single combat … a clear reference to the arena" (McCullough 2008, 200). So this definite reference to gladiatorial activities by women shows that they were still on-going as late as 200 AD, even if such displays were still fairly rare. The literary sources available for the appearances of female gladiators are varied yet nearly always involve the city of Rome (McCullough 2008, 199). For example, "Tacitus and Cassius Dio record female gladiators appearing under Nero on one and possibly two occasions, and Petronius mentions a female charioteer in the *Satyricon*" (McCullough 2008, 199) (This record is also noted by Vesley 1998, 90-92, Brunet 2004, 154, and Manas 2011, 2729). McCullough also makes mention of literary evidence from Martial and Dio, who make mention of "female beast-hunters under Titus at the games inaugurating the Flavian amphitheatre, and Statius, Suetonius, and Dio have female gladiators appearing under Domitian on at least two occasions" (2008, 199; Brunet 2004, 147). It can be assumed that the 'female beast-hunters' were a staged reference to the goddess Diana, goddess of the hunt. Suetonius apparently commented that Domitian had "held hunts and gladiatorial contests, some of which took place at night and some of which included not just men but also women" (Brunet 2004, 148).

McCullough mentions that after 96AD the evidence for female gladiators is limited (2008, 200). However, McCullough states that this may actually have been due to what was a "decreased literary production after the death of Trajan", rather than a decrease in the occurrences of female gladiators (2008, 200). Coleman (2000)

makes no mention of a decrease in literary production after Trajan's death, but this is perhaps not surprising, as Coleman's work focuses on a relief scene depicting female gladiators 'Amazon' and 'Achillia', rather than female gladiators as a whole in Imperial Rome. Brunet briefly discusses a couple of references to women fighting in the arena. One reference is by Martial, who believed that the games held by Titus were remarkable due to the fact that "women were now capable of deeds similar to those for which Hercules had been celebrated in the past" (Brunet 2004, 147). Martial apparently observed that while Titus was initially served by Mars, through these events he was now also served by Venus (Brunet 2004, 147). Martial's praise was apparently triggered by the events described by Cassius Dio, who had stated that women were employed by Titus to "kill animals during the extravagant games held at the inauguration of the Colosseum" (Brunet 2004, 147). It is argued by some that Martial's reference to Venus symbolises the women who fought in the arena in these games (Brunet 2004, 147; Weinreich 1928, 34-36).

Mark Vesley's paper examines the possible occurrences of 'Gladiatorial training for girls in the *Collegia Iuvenum* of the Roman Empire' (1998). Vesley mentions many of the literary sources that have been cited by McCullough, Coleman, and Brunet, such as Tacitus, Statius and Dio Cassius (1998, 90). Vesley states that Tacitus was not the only writer to express disgust at the "spectacle of noble women degrading themselves in the arena" (1998, 90). In this view, Tacitus was joined by Juvenal, similarly unimpressed with these gladiatorial women (Vesley 1998, 90). Vesley suggests that the women studied at these *collegia* institutions, where youths would study "riding, fencing and other martial arts" (1998, 87), perhaps instead of in the gladiatorial schools which may not have been seen as appropriate places for young Roman women to study. Vesley also mentions "a small body of Latin funerary inscriptions which reveal female participation at some level in the *collegia iuvenum*", of which three seemingly indicate that there were occurrences of direct female membership in the *collegia* (1998, 88).

A text from Ficulea, located northwest of Rome in the Via Nomentana, suggests that the *collegium* at this site included both male and female members, the inscription appearing to refer to both genders when mentioning the members of the *collegium*

(Vesley 1998, 88). Another equally brief text from Thevestis in Numidia also makes mention of female iuvenes, with a reference to both males and females (Vesley 1998, 88). These are just two brief references to the possible inclusion of girls in these *collegia*. Vesley, however, provides evidence of a more comprehensive example of a female member of one of these *collegia*. The site of Reate, northeast of Rome, had a funerary inscription that mentions by name one Valeria Iucunda "who belonged to the body of the *iuvenes*" (Vesley 1998, 88). Valeria apparently died when she was 17 years old, and the inscription was seemingly set up by Flavius Sabinus, who was "*sevir* of Augustus and magister *iuvenum*" (Vesley 1998, 89). Out of the three inscriptions, the one from Reate is the only one to mention a female member of a collegium by name (Vesley 1998, 89).

These *collegia* may have had a wider impact than has been displayed by these brief inscriptions discussed above. Vesley believes that the presence of female gladiators and female athletes in various spectacles in the Roman Empire implies "the existence of some type of training system, and the most convenient place to look for ready-made training facilities for girls around the empire is in the form of the *collegia*" (1998, 90). Vesley suggests that the gladiatorial training of girls may have been more widespread than is apparent, and that the current epigraphic record may not account for all the examples of this training (1998, 90). Vesley believes that a "significant number of free Roman young women were in training for spectator sports" (1998, 93), basing this argument on the *senatus consulatum* of 19AD, a decree known as the Tabula Larinas which stipulated that "the gladiatorial recruitment of daughters, granddaughters and great-granddaughters of senators or of knights, under the age of 20" was prohibited (1998, 91). Vesley is of the opinion that if this decree reflects a real and contemporary concern, then it is possible that the training of girls in gladiatorial arts was more widespread than has been previously thought (1998, 93).

One other unusual aspect of the study of female gladiators is brought up by Brunet in his 2004 article. This paper examines the idea that some scholars suggest that female gladiators were at times set against dwarfs in the arena. From the outset, Brunet states that the study will "show that no grounds exist for believing that

women ever fought dwarfs in the arena" (2004, 145). Brunet argues that the concept of female gladiators fighting dwarfs would not have appealed to the Roman way of thinking, and therefore is unlikely to have occurred (2004, 145). Brunet apparently supports the theory that female gladiators did exist, and believes that "the Romans would have found female gladiators … to be interesting in and of themselves" (2004, 145).

When looking at the non-literary visual arts evidence for female gladiators, much has been made of a marble relief (fig. 1.3) held in the British Museum (McCullough 2008, 199; Brunet 2004, 163). This relief, originally from Halicarnassus, is estimated to date from the second century AD, and depicts what is described as a "unique representation of women attired as gladiators" (Coleman 2000, 487). "Each of them is wearing a *subligaculum* (loin-cloth), greaves, and a protector on the exposed arm extending from the wrist to the armpit. Each is carrying a curved oblong shield" (Coleman 2000, 487; Brunet 2004, 163; Manas 2011, 2729). There are definite parallels between these female gladiators and their male counterparts, with these women fighting under *noms de guerre*, as did male gladiators (Coleman 2000, 487). These women fought under the names of "Amazon" and "Achillia", which Coleman believes are "singularly appropriate to female combatants" (2000, 487).

Questions asked about this relief include "what sort of monument was the relief from Halicarnassus, why was it put up, and does it reveal anything about attitudes towards female gladiators?" (Coleman 2000, 495). The fight being depicted was clearly worthy of commemoration in this way (Coleman 2000, 495; Brunet 2004, 163), and is possibly an advertisement for the event. Or it could be that the relief was "displayed inside the *ludus* in which Amazon and Achillia did their training, and formed part of a series that recorded memorable occasions involving gladiators from the school" (Coleman 2000, 496). This relief also appears to represent an unusual event: a draw in a gladiatorial match that is seemingly indicated by the positioning of the two combatants (Brunet 2004, 163; Coleman 2000, 493-495). Brunet suggests that "spectacles in which women fought each other … were attractive to the Romans because they provided an opportunity to see individuals who would not normally be

considered capable of bravery demonstrate their valor as warriors" (2004, 145). If a fight between two women was a rare enough occurrence, then it could have been something worthy of recording for posterity, a similar argument perhaps to be made for the rare depictions of Egyptian women fighting or using weaponry, such as the smiting scene featuring Nefertiti.

Another non-literary "artistic" potential reference to female gladiators is discussed by Alphonso Manas in his 2011 paper. Manas is of the opinion that a certain bronze statuette held in the *Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe* of Hamburg, actually portrays a female gladiator (2011, 2726) (fig. 1.4). This same statuette has been previously thought to represent "a female athlete holding a strigil" (Manas 2011 2726). The statuette is dated to the 1st century AD, and of Roman manufacture (Manas 2011, 2740) "depicts a woman who is wearing only a brief loincloth and who has her left arm raised, holding in that hand a small curved object" (Manas 2011, 2740). Manas points out that the earlier assumptions that this statuette was that of an athlete are due to the object that is in her left hand: "The shape and size of the object could correspond to that of a typical strigil (*strigilis*) of the 1st century" (2011, 2740). However, Manas suggests another possibility for this item; it could also represent a *sica*, "the curved dagger that the gladiatorial type *thraex* used", which has been seen on other depictions of gladiators (2011, 2741) (fig. 1.5). Manas also presents other evidence to support his theory that this statuette represents a female gladiator rather than an athlete. The position of the object held by the figure "makes sense if the object is a *sica*, but not a strigil (nobody raised a strigil in sign of victory). Besides, the woman is looking downwards, to the floor, as if she were watching her defeated rival" (Manas 2011, 2742), the pose of the statue not dissimilar to the traditional 'smiting' stance of the pharaohs, including Nefertiti.

The attire worn by the woman in the statuette could also be seen to support the theory that this figure represents a female gladiator. The woman is naked except for a loincloth, which is similar to the clothing worn by the women in the Halicarnassus relief (Manas 2011, 2742). Manas also mentions that female athletes would traditionally wear either a tunic or a bikini-type outfit, but would not have their breasts exposed (2011, 2742). The statuette figure is also wearing a bandage around

one knee, which Manas theorises to be *fasciae* (2011, 2742). These *fasciae* were strips of leather or fabric that gladiators would wrap around their legs and arms for protection, and Manas claims that these appear "in almost any depiction of gladiators", whereas there is no evidence of athletes wearing fasciae, either in artistic (visual) representations or in literary references (2011, 2742).

It is of course entirely possible that the Hamburg statuette represents an athlete. However, if the conclusions in favour of this theory were made based purely on the gender of the figure and the shape of the object she is holding, then they bear striking similarities to past arguments made in Egyptian archaeology in relation to women associated with weaponry and/or combat. The more recent theory that the statuette actually portrays a female gladiator shows that sometimes theories need to be critiqued and alternatives considered. This is something that should be applied to Egyptian archaeology, in particular the Nefertiti smiting scene, which can be analysed as being a symbolic display, or an historical account of a co-ruler doing her pharaonic duty by executing a prisoner.

In examining the rare material archaeological evidence for female gladiators, McCullough makes mention of the possible burial of a female gladiator, found in a Roman cemetery in Southwark by a team from the Museum of London (2008, 200). The grave apparently contained the cremated bones of a woman, along with "plant and animal remnants, pine cones, melted glass, and eight ceramic lamps, three with Anubis and one with a fallen gladiator" (McCullough 2008, 200), but interestingly no weaponry. As with certain Egyptian burials, there is of course much debate as to whether or not this is actually the grave of a woman. The arguments in favour of this burial being that of a female gladiator include "the presence of the lamps with a gladiator and Anubis, whom the Romans associated with Mercury, a representation of whom sometimes removed bodies from the arena floor", the fact that there were pinecones from a stone pine, a species native to Italy, and according to McCullough, apparently only found next to the London amphitheatre in Britain (McCullough 2008, 200). However, McCullough appears not to have consulted George Willcox's 1977 'Exotic Plants from Roman Waterlogged Sites in London', which mentions Roman-era stone pine found in several sites throughout London and far beyond, at

Chew Park, Somerset, at Verulamium in Hertfordshire, at the Northumberland temple of Mithras at Carrawburgh (1977, 273), and in York (Hall and Kenward 1990, Table 129a, 405). McCullough also mentions that the presence of the grave being on the outskirts of the cemetery which possibly indicates "a person of outsider status, but a wealthy one, given the remains of a feast in the grave and evidence of cremation" (2008, 200).

However, there are also several arguments against this grave being that of a female gladiator. It was common for images of gladiators to be found in graves, with such items apparently popular throughout the Roman Empire (McCullough 2008, 201). McCullough also points out that the conclusion that this woman was an outsider was based only on the location of her burial, with no other evidence provided to confirm this assumption (2008, 201). It is also pointed out that her apparent wealth "does not necessarily exclude her from being anything but a gladiator" (McCullough 2008, 201). It is equally possible that the woman could have been a "wealthy freedwoman who was a big fan of gladiatorial games" (McCullough 2008, 201).

This particular grave highlights the on-going issues with analysing such archaeological finds, although at least there was no attempt to sex the remains based on the grave goods alone. Indeed, similar arguments could be made for some of the female weapons burials in ancient Egypt and other ancient societies. It must be appreciated that much of the insight gained from non-literary archaeological evidence is educated conjecture, unless tested and validated by reference to other forms of evidence, such as literary sources. It is important to note that the evidence for Roman female fighters is much more comprehensive than it is for Egyptian female fighters. There are more literary sources and seems to be more archaeological evidence. There seems little doubt that these female gladiators did fight in the arena, whereas with the examples of Egyptian women associated with weaponry or warfare, it is not always certain if they definitely took part in active combat. This could be due to the seeming ambiguity of the evidence for some of the examples of Egyptian women associated with weapons. Alternatively it could also be due to the differences in the study of Roman and Egyptian archaeology.

It is also worth noting that the writers such as Martial, Tacitus, and Cassius Dio show distinct attitudes towards females in the arena. These writers are not supportive of the concept of women fighting in the arena, and they stress that such activity is certainly not for high-born women. These attitudes influenced Enlightenment England, when a lot of social attitudes were developed from supposed Classical examples, so it could be argued that the modern reluctance to recognise such fighting women stems from the same origins as the attitudes exemplified in some of the Roman sources discussed earlier. This also led to those re-invented Classical attitudes being applied, quite inappropriately, to ancient Egyptian examples.

Conclusions

For further investigation beyond the remit of this thesis, it would be worth examining any obvious differences in the studies of Roman and Egyptian archaeology in order see if variances in the methods of study for these two sub-disciplines could explain the reason behind the differences in how 'women warriors' are examined and analysed within the separate archaeological records. A detailed statistical and comparative study of these possible variances could provide answers to this debate.

This thesis instead will focus on other reasons why women utilising weaponry in ancient Egypt have been so neglected within the archaeological record. The examples from other societies discussed in this chapter provide the foundation for this dialogue, giving a basis for the potential reasons for these issues within Egyptian archaeology. The development of gender and feminist archaeologies has been crucial in initiating the progress of a more complex and comprehensive examination of women in the archaeological record. Having seen how effective a gender and feminist approach has been within Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian archaeology, it would make sense to apply such theoretical approaches to Egyptian archaeology.

The examples discussed above show that in various societies there were not complete restrictions on women being involved in warfare or in combat of some

form, whether it be in the arena or on the battlefield. Although some of the medieval sources (particularly for the Crusades) are questionable at times, the evidence for the female gladiators in the Roman Empire and the so-called 'Warrior Women' of the Eurasian Steppes is compelling. As with the occurrences of Egyptian women involved in warfare, the suggestion here is not that they were prolific, but that they did actually exist. At the very least, the sources show that these various 'societies' were not averse to the concept of a woman fighting, even if any 'real-life' examples were very rare; the very same could be said of the ancient Egyptians.

Several of the examples examined above do demonstrate that in certain aspects of archaeology lines of argument similar to those seen in Egyptian archaeology have been used to dismiss the concept of 'women warriors', despite the archaeological and/or literary evidence available. It therefore seems that dismissing 'women warriors' within a society is not limited to Egyptian archaeology, and is in fact more widespread in archaeology in general. This is possibly due to the pre-feminist approaches to archaeology taken by early academics. Most archaeological interpretations are "versions of the past created by archaeologists trying under specific historical circumstances to promote or defend preferred social interests" (Trigger 2005, 380). It is often the case that inherent biases can influence the study of Prehistoric archaeology in particular (Trigger 2005, 345), but they can also influence classical and historical archaeology, despite the addition of textual and literary sources which can provide some insight into the outlooks of the time period under consideration. A great deal of early study of Roman and Egyptian archaeology was carried out at a time when the social circumstances of the period (in the 19th and early 20th centuries) were not always favourable for women, and meant that it was often the case that women in the archaeological record were neglected by scholars who were predominantly male. A critical feminist approach would look at the reasons why the women in the examples considered above were discussed as they were by the writers, as well as looking at the wider historical and spatial fields that these women inhabited. Next, feminist and gender theories will be examined, and their potential applications in Egyptian archaeology will be explored.

Chapter Two - A Feminist Approach in Egyptian Archaeology

"Feminism is a politics, not a methodology" (Tickner 1988, 92). What does this mean, and what relevance does this statement have in archaeological theory, and in Egyptian archaeology in particular? According to Robinson, it is worth looking at "*feminism*, as a set of politics; *art*, as a set of cultural practices; and *theory* as a set of ideas and knowledge that can be used in analysis" (2001, 1). Substitute *art* with *archaeology* and the point becomes even more relevant. Once a good understanding of feminist theory has been developed, it can be applied to many academic subjects, the particular interest here being its relevance to Egyptian archaeology.

It is also apparent that a great deal of work done on the subject of a feminist theoretical approach to the History of Art has parallels with the feminist study of archaeology. "With the rise of the modern women's movement, feminist artists, critics and art historians have begun to question the neglect of women artists and the stereotyped dismissal of women's art" (Parker and Pollock 1981, 45). This particular quote, although written in relation to the discipline of History of Art, has resonance within the subject of this thesis. It is interesting to note that, according to Parker and Pollock (1981), the existence of female artists was fully acknowledged by their contemporaries until the 19th century, with modern writers seemingly choosing to ignore and deny their presence within art history.

The similarities here with the study of women in ancient Egypt are striking, with the disregarding of almost every female king for example. The application of feminist theory to the subject of this thesis, women utilizing weaponry in ancient Egypt, has led to a questioning of the traditional analyses of such women and the various (and supposedly non-stereotypical) roles they played in their ancient society. As discussed in this thesis, some women in Egyptian history have been neglected and dismissed by many academics within what has traditionally been a male-dominated discipline. As discussed by Mary Ellmann (and mentioned in the previous chapter), the stereotype applied to the roles of women in societies such as ancient Egypt is "a product of a patriarchal culture which constructs male dominance through the

significance it attaches to sexual differences" (1968; in Parker and Pollock 1981, 8). For example, Charles Darwin's model had males as the aggressive, meat-seeking hunters, and women as passive and home-bound, a concept that was valued by Darwin's Victorian contemporaries (Gilchrist 1999, 20). The application of feminist theory to this subject is a way of combating the failings and neglect that have occurred in the past due to this male dominance, bringing the subject of Egyptian archaeology into the 21st century.

The legacy of Victorian views on women in history mirrors that of the views of women and art, where history has collapsed into nature, and sociology has collapsed into biology, preparing the way for "current beliefs about women's innate lack of talent and 'natural predisposition for 'feminine' subjects" (Parker and Pollock 1981, 13). This is one reason why the predominantly male Egyptologists of the past (and to some extent of the present) view female pharaohs as complete anomalies within the archaeological record, together with those women considered to be not behaving in a way they deem appropriate.

There are many theoretical positions that could potentially be relevant to this thesis, but one that bears closer scrutiny is Feminist Archaeology. So what place, if any, does Feminism and Feminist Archaeology have in the study of ancient Egypt? How, more specifically, does it relate to the subject of this particular research? The answer may seem obvious - the thesis subject involves women in ancient Egypt. Yet in academia, and archaeology in particular, nothing is ever quite that simple. In order to examine this aspect of Egyptian archaeology, it is not enough to look at Feminist Archaeology alone, Feminism itself must be scrutinised in order to inform the development of the thesis argument. Why does this particular subject need to be examined in such detail? Was it previously ignored to such an extent that new work must be done to address the gap in the current research? Why are some roles in ancient Egyptian society seen by some scholars (both past and present) as 'non-stereotypical' when carried out by women? Which of these non-stereotypical roles did some ancient Egyptian women undertake?

An interesting point with relevance to this thesis is Pollock's comment that Women's Studies are not just about women alone, but are also "about the social systems and ideological schemata which sustain the domination of men over women within the other mutually inflecting regimes of power in the world, namely those of class and those of race" (1994, 1). This is relevant not just to the study of certain Egyptian women within this thesis, but also to the examination of the scholars and academics who studied ancient Egypt both in the past and present day. Was ancient Egypt a male-dominated society (a question that is far more complicated than it may initially seem)? Was Egyptology a male-dominated subject within academia (a question that is somewhat less complicated)? What impact has this male domination had on the study of ancient Egyptian archaeology?

In the case of this thesis, some aspects of the research done can be best used to reveal the "mechanisms of male power, the social construction of sexual difference and the role of cultural representations in that construction" (Pollock 1994, 9), both within ancient Egyptian society, and in the 'society' of those scholars who studied (and continue to study) it. Pollock (1994, 9) suggests that gender divides and sexual difference are the result of long-held social practices and institutions to which some societies, families, and even education systems (from very early on in primary schools and all the way into university education) are subject. This was certainly the case in the 19th and early to mid-20th centuries, but is it still the case in the present day? Have these issues been visible in all university departments, and not just within the discipline of Archaeology?

Archaeological theory has in the past been dominated by Western ideologies (both 'historical' and 'modern'), and this is something that gender and feminist archaeologies in particular seek to address. Feminist theory is a multi-faceted theoretical position that has developed and changed hugely in the decades (and arguably centuries) since its inception. The argument could be made for the feminist movement beginning in the 19th century, particularly with the establishment of the Suffragette movement, but modern feminist theory, particularly looking at the advent of third wave feminism, is a more recent construction. Now obviously the entirety of feminist theory is too far-reaching to be covered by this thesis (and by many a thesis

in fact), but there are some aspects that are certainly relevant to the research presented here, and will prove particularly useful in critiquing the subject.

Gender and feminist theory

In order to apply feminist and gender theory to archaeology, and Egyptian archaeology in particular, feminist theory (or at least the parts of it that would be specifically relevant to the research carried out in this thesis) itself must be examined to some extent. One of the most important names in recent feminist theory is Judith Butler, whose *Gender Trouble* is of critical importance in the assessment of problems within academia and feminist theory itself, as well as archaeology specifically. Appearing to be a daunting task at first, the text makes for a fascinating read, and provides many relevant and salient points with regard to modern feminist theory, as well as in relation to archaeological theory and the subject of this particular thesis. One of the key points referred to by Judith Butler comes from the well-known *The Second Sex* by Simone de Beauvoir: "one is not born a woman, but, rather, becomes one" (de Beauvoir 1973, 301; in Butler 2007, 11). This quote relates to the sometimes tricky concept of gender, something that is particularly relevant to some sections of the research carried out in this thesis.

In relation to art theory, and therefore to archaeological theory as well, the goal of feminism was "to transform culture in sweeping and permanent ways by introducing into it the heretofore suppressed perspective of women" (Broude and Garrard 1994, 10; in Robinson 2001, 4). It could be argued that this conforms to the concepts of second wave feminism, particularly in relation to examining women who are missing from the archaeological record due to neglect by scholars and academics: "What's most difficult to understand in History are the different contributions men and women make to civilization" (Irigaray 1993, interview published in Robinson 2001, 45).

The criticisms of Feminism, as with any theoretical stance, are varied, and whilst some are simply criticism for criticism's sake (such as what could be described as some of the 'usual' outdated attitudes towards Feminism); some of them are based

on genuine academic critiques. One important point that Butler makes is that there are endemic problems in how feminism is viewed by many people (academics and lay people alike): "there is the political problem that feminism encounters in the assumption that the term *women* denotes a common identity" (2007, 4). It has seemingly got to the stage that the 'simple' word "*woman*, even in the plural, has become a troublesome term, a site of contest, a cause for anxiety" (Butler 2007, 4). Such attitudes can permeate and infiltrate academic subjects (such as archaeology and history of art) at all levels, and can influence attitudes towards women within the academic (archaeological, historical or artistic) record, such as the misrepresentation or neglect of women within these records. As with Archaeology and other academic disciplines, there is some conflict amongst Feminist scholars, usually related to the differing attitudes and theories, particularly with the emergence of 'Third Wave' Feminism. Third wave feminism emerged in the 1980s, and was led by various scholarly factions, some of which at the time (and potentially even today) were seen as minorities, both in the feminist movement and society as a whole: "women of colour, lesbian feminists, queer theorist and postcolonial feminists" (Meskell 2004, 55). Third wave feminism offers a much wider-ranging look at the issues and individuals within a society, for example the construction of masculinity, 'queer theory', and the non-Western world (as discussed in Meskell 2004, 105), bringing to our notice issues of race, sexuality, ethnicity and class. This has relevance within feminist and gender theory in archaeology in particular, as "Gender intersects with many other kinds of social identities and cannot be studied in isolation" (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 100).

At first glance, it could initially be argued that the objectives of this thesis could be covered by the views of second wave feminism. According to Meskell, the primary concern of second wave feminism was to attempt to find women's voices, and find and reinstate the position of women in long-term history (2004, 55). Second wave theory certainly seems to be the feminist position used most in archaeological feminist theory, starting in the 1980s and continuing into the 1990s. According to Meskell, this is a failing on the part of archaeology, a view that is perhaps a little unfair. Meskell's (2004, 53) view that the fields of feminist theory, gender studies, and sexuality should all be studied together to inform archaeological theory is an

interesting one, and certainly the idea of ensuring that all the necessary options are explored in order to best inform archaeological study is an effective one. Although second wave feminism would at first glance appear to be relevant to the work of this thesis, the third wave is invaluable to the research carried out here, through addressing the class and the fluidity of gender and sex with regard to some examples of women from ancient Egypt.

This fluidity of gender and sex can be demonstrated historically by examples of gender reversals, cross-gender roles or the third-gender role. There are multiple and varied reasons for people taking on cross-gender roles, such as women wearing male apparel in order to take part in what were historically male-only vocations (as soldiers perhaps), and social adaptation in the Balkans, where biological females were raised as gendered males when there were no male heirs (Gilchrist 1999, 58). The third-gender role blurs the boundaries of sex, gender and sexuality, and is exemplified by the Native American two-spirit, where there is a distinct gender that disintegrates the traditional binary categories of 'female' and 'male' (Gilchrist 1999, 58). The Native American two-spirit occurred when an individual "would assume the sex, sexuality, roles, gestures and dress of their biological opposite. The two-spirit formed his or her own identity through the very choice of transition" (Gilchrist 1999, 61). It was also not necessarily linked to physicality, but seems rather to depend on tribal attitudes or supernatural endorsement (Gilchrist 1999, 62). The term 'two-spirit' would suggest that the individual could retain both genders (sexes), whilst choosing their own unique identity, which is yet another intriguing example of the fluidity of gender, sex, and sexuality of some past cultures. Indeed, it would seem that two-spirits could marry a member of the opposite gender, or have same-sex marriages with no stigma attached to either choice (Gilchrist 1999, 61). As Gilchrist mentions, cross-gender roles are vitally important in an archaeological context, and must be put into consideration when necessary (1999, 58). Cross-gender roles will be discussed further below.

The study of academic feminism varies from the more simplistic overview (such as the introductory chapters or sections on feminist archaeology in Johnson 2005 and Trigger 2005), to the extremely complicated (such as work by Judith Butler,

Shoshana Felman, and Lynn Meskell). Sometimes wading through the more intricate works can seem a daunting task, and it can at times be difficult to weed out the information that is relevant to the specific research being carried out. In some of the more recent, third wave feminism works, there seems to be a lot of anger towards the feminist theorists who do not conform to what the scholars think they should. Meskell sums the situation up aptly: "There is not one feminist viewpoint, but many, depending on sexuality, class, ethnicity, religious affiliation and geopolitical locale. The third wave does not seek to be a unified coherent front and has been known to attack other feminist positions…" (2004, 55). There is a supposed fragmentation within feminism itself, which is only exacerbated by claims that some of the women that feminism professes to be representing actually oppose the concept and politics of the feminist movement, feeling excluded by some of the practices of certain factions within the movement, suggestive of what can be the limiting identity of feminism, with exclusionary practices that could potentially severely undercut many feminist goals. (Butler 2007, 6-7). For example:

> "…Judith Butler attacks Catherine MacKinnon over queer politics…black feminists point to the racism of white feminists…women from developing countries…argue that feminism itself is a Western construction. Post-structuralist feminists would suggest that there is no such thing as 'woman' at all…" (Meskell 2004, 55).

Suggestions of perhaps moving towards a post-feminist movement have been mooted (Butler 2007, 7), something that would involve an introspective look at the development and the future progression of feminism both as a theoretical position, and as a political and cultural entity. Of course feminist theory should explore the "totalizing claims" of a masculine-dominated society, but it should always remain very much aware of itself, and should always level pertinent criticisms at some of the "totalizing gestures" that can emanate from some aspects of feminism (Butler 2007, 18). Sometimes, as with most theoretical positions and political movements, academics and scholars can become blinkered, and trapped in a set mentality, to the detriment of theoretical debate and development. Theoretical movements such as feminism (particularly in relation to archaeology and Egyptian archaeology) must

accept what Butler describes as "divergence, breakage, splinter, and fragmentation as part of the often tortuous process of democratization" (2007, 20).

Butler believes that one of the key issues historically in feminism (and arguably in modern feminism to some extent as well) is the general political assumption that there must be a universal basis for feminism, one based around an assumed cross-cultural identity, along with the notion that a universal patriarchy and male domination is almost solely responsible for historical and current oppression of women (2007, 5). Although this concept of universal patriarchy is no longer as credible as it once was, it is still a theme that some feminist scholars have argued over, especially as the concept of a patriarchy and male domination is certainly not a universal occurrence, and in fact varies between cultures and historic periods. This is an important point that is worth bearing in mind when examining the history, development and influence of feminism within any academic framework. As feminism has changed so much since its inception (if 'inception' is even the most appropriate term to use in reference to this), it has to be taken into account whenever looking at the influences of feminism in academia, in this case in relation to archaeology in particular.

Another issue again relates to the universality of a particular concept, this time in relation to a 'commonality' among 'women' (Butler 2007, 5). The problem with this is again the fact that no two 'societies' (historical and/or contemporary) are identical, and have different developments of sex and gender structures and divides. Whilst in some countries and civilisations there is a history and a continuance of a patriarchy and male domination, it is certainly not the case worldwide. Once again, the example of ancient Egypt is one that is particularly relevant here. Although gender divides varied throughout the Dynastic periods, there did not seem to be an overall, over-reaching manifestation of male domination. For example, some of the most important deities were female, and hugely respected by the population. Of course, in other ancient societies female deities were also important (for example Athena, Hera, Aphrodite, Artemis in ancient Greece; Minerva, Juno, Venus, Diana in ancient Rome), and to varying degrees, but the ancient Egyptians had at least two female deities who were associated with conflict and weaponry, areas usually associated

with male deities. These two deities were Neith, represented by a shield and two crossed arrows and a creator goddess capable of great destruction, typical of the way in which the Egyptians regarded all things as made up of opposing dualities. The other deity was Sekhmet the bloodthirsty lioness, 'Mistress of Blood' and 'Bringer of Destruction', a key figure in Egyptian warfare.

Some feminists claim that gender is culturally constructed; a cultural interpretation of biological sex perhaps (Butler 2007, 11; Kessler and McKenna 1985; Flax 1990; Conkey and Gero 1997, 417). Gilchrist claims that gender is conditional, "a phantom constructed, selected and applied through cultural notions such as beauty, chastity, virility, and warriorhood" (1999, 77). According to Butler, the distinction between sex and gender certainly aids the argument that "whatever biological intractability sex appears to have, gender is culturally constructed: hence, gender is neither the casual result of sex, nor as seemingly fixed as sex" (2007, 8). The suggestion is that the distinction between sex and gender represents a fundamental discontinuity between biological sex and culturally constructed genders (Butler 2007, 8). Gender can be argued to be in the body, but is not able to be reduced down to the mere differences of biological sex between males and females (Gilchrist 1999, 77). If this is the case, then what implications does this have for the study of women involved in warfare in ancient Egypt? Specific examples worth examining are those of Sobekneferu, Hatshepsut, Nefertiti, and Tawosret, among others, all of which will be discussed later on in this chapter. De Beauvoir seems to suggest that the gender of 'female' is something that is constructed both socially and mentally by women and other contributing forces. It would seem that the social influences can have an effect on the development of an individual's 'gender'. Gender can therefore mean different things in different societies, particularly past historical societies. Again, this is why scholars should not examine past societies using their own modern, and often Western, perspective.

"…if gender is culturally determined, then we must realize that culture is made up of an ensemble of gender determinations" (Elam 1994, 43; in Meskell 2004, 71). As Meskell (2004, 71) writes, is culture to blame for gender stereotypes, or should we be blaming gender for the creation of cultural stereotypes? And is it the case that

where sex is understood to be a fact of bodies, gender is simply a socialised addition to sex? (Gatens 1996, 51; in Meskell 2004, 71). Sex, apparently, is "something which differentiates between bodies, while *gender* has been defined as the set of variable social constructions placed upon those differentiated bodies" (Meskell 2004, 72). A more simplistic view would be that sex is biological, whereas gender is mental, psychological, and even philosophical. This is where the examination of ancient and historical societies can prove to very interesting and useful. Are what we see as gender stereotypes or cultural stereotypes merely perpetuated by modern attitudes and ideologies, or have they developed from specific historical societies and their societal rules? How does this impact the way in which scholars and academics investigate past societies?

It would seem that prior to the Enlightenment, it was a one-sex model that held prominence in society and culture, with scholars such as Plato and Aristotle asserting that "female biology was merely a variation on the male", with no separate word for 'ovary' being developed for over two thousand years, the word used instead being the term for male testes: 'orcheis' (Meskell 2004, 71). This lack of a separate word for ovary highlights the one-sex model. This also hold parallels with the story of creation found in the Bible, where Eve is created out of Adam's body, perhaps suggesting that 'woman' is merely an extension, or a variation, of 'man'. To what extent was this part of the Bible used to justify the demotion of women within not just the Church hierarchy, but within the daily life of the laity? And what influence do such things have on the approaches towards sex and gender displayed by academics and scholars influenced by the Western-Victorian-Christian attitudes that have so dominated academic subjects such as archaeology and history of art?

Moving along from Classical Greece and early Christianity, prior to the 17th Century, sex was still seen as a sociological construct, and it was only later on, heading into the 1700s and 1800s, when a more ontological (metaphysical) approach was taken, questioning the very nature of being, and along with it the nature of sex and gender, where fundamental differences between male and female sexes were discussed and argued (Meskell 2004, 71). This was a period when sex became clandestine and policed, with a more coded discourse, becoming a taboo subject within many

Western societies (Foucault 1978; in Meskell 2004, 103), and perhaps even influencing the attitudes of the contemporary scholars examining history and archaeology. As discussed in the previous chapter, it could be argued that 18th and 19th century attitudes contributed to the 'construction' of more modern gender(s), thus informing the attitudes of the scholars of the time. Foucault certainly suggests that it was in the 18th and 19th centuries that the study of sex, procreation and desire was professionalised, through pedagogy, and through medicine, psychiatry in particular (1981; in Gilchrist 1999, 55). Therefore it could be argued that this developing study of sexuality during the Enlightenment added to the construction of 'gender' (in the modern sense of the term), and is where modern fixations with gender contrasts can be perhaps traced back to.

The 19th century is also when modern observations of sexuality actually emerged, with the discussion of heterosexuality and homosexuality only being discussed as distinct sexual natures from around 1870 onwards (Herdt 1994, 28; in Gilchrist 1999, 56), as well as the formation of the subjects of the biology and psychology of sexuality (Foucault 2010, 193). This in particular highlights some of the problems of looking at past cultures from a modern perspective. The perceptions of eroticism and sexuality demonstrated by some ancient societies, particularly ancient Egypt, ancient Greece, and ancient Rome, were very different to the corresponding perceptions of sexuality in the Victorian/Edwardian, and even modern, Western world, particularly within the sphere of academia, so long influenced by older and stricter approaches and outlooks. To the ancient societies, sex was a practice, not a discourse (Meskell 2004, 103), so attempting to examine sex and sexuality from a post-17th century world is an approach that is liable to fail from both a theoretical and historical accuracy point of view.

Michel Foucault was key in influencing an historical appreciation of sexuality, with the proposition that sexuality was the "pivotal transfer point for relations of power" (1981, 103; in Gilchrist 1999, 55). Foucault also contributed to the renewed and increased interest in how attitudes to sex, the body, sexuality, and gender developed in the past, and how these attitudes could inform current interpretations of the subjects (Foucault 2010; Gilchrist 1999, 55). An in-depth study of the very history

and development of sexuality in past cultures is of importance to feminist theory (and in archaeological theory, feminist/gender-based approach or not) when dealing with gender and sex relations in history, and Foucault recognised that fact (although Foucault is as guilty as other scholars and academics for using the word 'man' to denote all of humankind, which would suggest less of a 'feminist' approach to theories of sexuality and gender). These attitudes to sex, sexuality and gender are all of interest to the study of social interactions within a past culture, and subjects such as archaeology should take them into account when making interpretations about social exchanges in the past.

"How and where does the construction of gender take place?" (Butler 2007, 11). This is an important question, and is applicable to both modern and historical/ancient societies. Once again there are question raised as to how the construction of gender varies between these societies, and what implications this would have for the way in which gender and sex in the historical record is studied. So how is the 'construction' of gender addressed in modern feminist theory (outside of archaeology)? Shoshana Felman discusses this in terms of the social- and sex-role assigned to a female, from "her initial family upbringing throughout her subsequent development" (1993, 21), where the role assigned is a subservient one, one that serves authoritative 'man'. In many traditional and historical societies, a girl is educated from a young age to be docile and submissive, an education that was, for example, of particular importance in Victorian Britain (Gilbert and Gubar 1984, 54). Anyone seen to be acting outside of the accepted 'norm' could be accused of madness, and historically any women who departed from the more subservient role were seen as being mad, or displaying 'hysteria' (as discussed by Chesler (1973, 56) and Felman (1993, 21)). The argument has been made by some feminist scholars that the act of patriarchal socialisation is responsible for some of this 'hysteria', for making women physically and psychologically ill (Gilbert and Gubar 1984, 53). One of the most important things that feminist theory has always done is to hold up to scrutiny the "patriarchal structures of culture, existing cultural practices and women's potential for making culture" (Robinson 2001, 2-3).

How does this concept of the subservient norm for women relate to the research carried out in this thesis? The examination of ancient Egyptian women behaving outside of what was assumed to be the norm is a crucially important part of this. When a great deal of the initial research into ancient Egyptian archaeology was taking place, many of the scholars were unconsciously bound by the social (Victorian and Edwardian) attitudes of the time, meaning that they often attributed their contemporary British and European social norms to an ancient society. As Gilbert and Gubar state, "It is debilitating to be *any* women in a society where women are warned that if they do not behave like angels they must be monsters" (1984, 53). Therefore women such as Hatshepsut and Nefertiti were seen as anomalies that went against the accepted order of things, and women such as Meritneit and Sobekneferu (and many others) were demoted and/or neglected in the scholarly and archaeological record. Hatshepsut, Sobekneferu, and Nefertiti are women who could be seen as examples of what Butler calls "those "incoherent" or "discontinuous" gendered beings" (2007, 23), who do not conform to the so-called cultural gender norms by which individuals are usually defined. Their own personal identities are tied to the fact that their gender does not conform to what was expected of them (mainly by modern academics, and possibly by their contemporaries), and that there does not seem to be a definitive link between their biological sex and their assumed, personal gender.

This is something that is mirrored in a lot of academic subjects, for example, in the discipline of Art History. Parker and Pollock mention that the "existence of women artists was fully acknowledged until the nineteenth century, but it has only been virtually denied by modern writers" (1981, 3). Pollock certainly agrees that women have always participated in producing works of art, something that is seemingly not in doubt, but that modern culture would not admit such a thing happening (1994, 23). This has striking parallels with ancient Egyptian archaeology (and in fact archaeology in general), where the ancient Egyptians seemed willing to acknowledge women in prominent or non-stereotypical positions (according to modern ideas of what is typical), but more modern scholars have chosen to ignore or neglect examples of such women. As has been pointed out, such stereotypes are seen as the product of the traditional patriarchal culture (Parker and Pollock 1981, 8). This is

quite possibly a reason why women seen to be in non-stereotypical roles (i.e. women artists, women utilising weaponry in ancient Egypt) are at times ignored within the historical record.

The representation of ancient Egyptian women in the artefacts and visual portrayals discussed in this thesis can be compared to the way in which the history of art erased the contribution of women artists from historical record in the nineteenth and early to mid-twentieth centuries. Pollock's 1999 analysis of Gentilieschi's *Judith Slaying Holofernes* is particularly interesting in this respect, as it addresses the way in which the actions of a female, in this case Judith decapitating Holofernes, are misread and misrepresented by male viewers of such work, something that is often reflected in women found in the Egyptian archaeological record. Both paintings by Gentilieschi, painted only seven years apart, are a fascinating study of cross-sex murder, and is also interesting is the various different interpretations of such work, for example, it has been read (in conjunction with the cross-sex murders chronicled in the biblical book of *Judges*) as both 'women as victims' (Judith getting revenge after an assault) and 'women as executioners' (Judith decapitating Holofernes for political reasons) (Pollock 1999, 115-116).

As is so often the case, across the male and female genders the interpretations of such tales could vary wildly (see the differences between Artemisia Gentileschi's portrayal of Judith, 1612 and 1620, and her father Orazio Gentilieschi's 1610 painting, and the version by Caravaggio in 1599). Artemisia Gentileschi portrays Judith as determined and exacting in her active decapitating of Holofernes, whereas Orazio (a follower of Caravaggio) prefers to portray the aftermath, with Judith cradling the severed head in her arms, but still clutching the (remarkably clean) sword (Pollock 1999, 121). This is a juxtaposition of phallic symbolism (the sword) and maternal instincts (the cradled head), but there is nothing particularly active about the scene, unlike the painting by Artemisia. It is very interesting that the male artist portrays the quieter, more maternal Judith, reflecting after the act, staring off into the distance, perhaps looking a little lost, somehow removed from the act itself, her clothing spotless, just as the sword is clean. Contrast this with the painting by his daughter, who concentrates on the act itself, with no maternal signs from either

Judith or her servant Abra, with copious amounts of blood spraying over the bed and, in the 1620 version, in the direction of Judith herself, suggesting that Judith was not afraid to get her hands dirty. The 1612 version by Artemisia Gentileschi is a more intimate portrayal than the 1620 version (being a closer image, with more immediately visible drama), but they are still an interesting portrayal of Judith's execution of Holofernes, and do not shy away from showing the act of decapitation itself in all its gory and disturbing horror. Caravaggio's version of the tale also shows the decapitation itself, but whilst Judith apparently has a look of concentration on her face (Pollock 1999, 120), she is placing herself at a distance to the act, and none of the blood spurting from Holofernes' neck is spraying in her direction. In this image, Judith is distanced and removed not only from the act but also from the consequences. She could be read by some as appearing cold and indifferent, whereas the sympathy of the viewer is seemingly meant to be with Holofernes, his face twisted in an agonised grimace (Pollock 1999, 120). Artemisia Gentileschi's version of Judith does not look like a woman afraid and out for revenge, but rather has the appearance of someone concentrating on the job in hand. Artemisia Gentileschi's reading of the story of Judith is one of someone, who just happens to be a woman, carrying out a set task with grim determination. There are noticeable differences between the tale of Judith as told by a male artist, and the same tale being told by a female artist. These variations of the paintings highlight the differences in Classical, and later 19th and 20th century, attitudes towards women in history, in biblical stories, and in history. This patriarchal reading, and then portraying, of women and their actions is something that has influenced academia since the 19th century at the earliest.

Certainly, the argument would seem to be that this patriarchal society and culture is responsible for many of the issues feminist theory is attempting to address, such as the imbalances in the study of women within the historical, archaeological, and artistic, records:

> "Our society… is a patriarchy. The fact is evident at once if one recalls that the military, industry, technology, universities, science, political offices, finances – in short every avenue of power within society,

> including the coercive force of the police, is in entirely male hands" (Millet 1971, 25).

Although a lot of these sectors of society are improving in relation to the gender divide/balance, there is still a lack of feminine influence in many of them, particularly in relation to the sciences (especially in physics). Hartman insists that the various sections of a patriarchy, although subject to a hierarchy of class, race or ethnicity, are united in their "shared relationship of dominance over their women; they are dependent on each other to maintain that domination" (1979, 11). Until this dominance ends, and the balance of genders improves, the patriarchal influence will continue many sections of society and the study of women and gender in history (including archaeology and history of art).

The concept of the patriarchal society goes back a long way in history, but of particular relevance to this research is the patriarchy of the Victorian era, when a great deal of archaeological research was being carried out (with Egyptology being of particular interest). The Victorian attitudes towards sex and gender are responsible for some the problems feminist theory is trying to counteract even today. Clear statements of Victorian ideals and the established division of roles for men and women were set out by scholars such as John Ruskin in his work *Sesame and Lilies* (1867), where it was decreed that "men work in the outside world and women adorn the home, where they protect traditional, moral and spiritual values…" (Parker and Pollock 1981, 9). This is why examples of ancient Egyptian women, seen as going against the natural order of things, were perceived as abnormalities, as an aspect of the historical record that was at times best ignored and forgotten about (demonstrated once again by the very specific example of the pharaoh Meritneit, subtly demoted from pharaoh to queen when her female gender was discovered by certain scholars).

Feminism and gender in archaeology

A similar revolution has taken place in archaeology in the recent past, and is seemingly starting in Egyptian archaeology, where scholars such as Lynn Meskell are looking to examine neglected aspects of the subject through the use of feminist

theory (something that this thesis also seeks to address). One of the first (and perhaps most 'simplistic') concerns of the feminist movement within archaeology was to render women of the past visible, especially in light of the androcentric approach that archaeology had taken in the past (Conkey 2003, 869; Hays-Gilpin 2000, 94). Gilchrist mentions that there with regard to women, there were "inequalities in the language, visual representation and practice of archaeology" that were revealed by the advent of a feminist critique of the subject (1999, 17). The position of women in archaeology has been argued to mirror to a certain extent the inferior status that has been given to the study of material goods that have been associated with female activities in the archaeological record; this is an important point that gender and feminist archaeologies should aim to address (Wright 2000, 19). In relation to this, one question is, of course, just how much of the omission of certain women from the archaeological record is due to deliberate prejudice, and how much is actually due to the "structural sexism" inherent in most academic subjects (Pollock 1994, 1)? In one particularly pertinent example from the study of ancient Egypt, Lesko bemoans the "biases of male researchers in the 1930s" when discussing a publication of Prince Mererka's Sixth Dynasty tomb that completely neglected the rooms devoted to his wife, concentrating only on the parts of the tomb dedicated to the man (1991, 10). This is a shame, because burial goods and tomb design can tell us a great deal about an individual's life experience, as well as providing information on the "complex web of social negotiations between men, women and children" (Meskell 1998, 364). Academics and scholars ignoring the areas of a tomb allocated to a woman will mean a disheartening loss of potential information.

As Gilchrist (1999, 17) states, in early archaeology, even into the 1960s and 1970s, it was standard practice to simply invoke contemporary gender stereotypes when examining the social differences between men and women. Just how early does this structural sexism begin in education (and in daily social life)? It also doesn't just relate to women in the archaeological record, but to a male bias within the discipline of archaeology itself. One particularly tasteless example comes from 1992, with Michael Shanks describing archaeological excavations as a "strip-tease", a phrase that is as coarse as it is inappropriate (1992; in Wright 2000, 18). The fact that such

a phrase was not seen as unsuitable by Shanks, along with the fact that it got through the editing process intact, says an awful lot about attitudes within some areas of postprocessual archaeology and to some extent within the realms of academic publishing (even as late on as the 1990s), and showed that there was still a lot of work to be done on what could only be described as institutionalised chauvinism. Pollock claims that a society is structured by its sexual divisions and inequalities (1994, 19). Just how much do these divisions and inequalities impact on the development of a society, and its education system (both at school and university)? It a great hope of many feminist scholars that a feminist approach to archaeology would mean that a more "detailed study of material remains from past societies will provide evidence of the origins of women's oppression today and will perhaps demonstrate that oppression is not inevitable" (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 98). The origins of "women's inferior position" is a debate that in more recent years has begun to focus not just on the oppression of women in past societies, but also on the kinds of power that *were* held by women at times, and on intersections of gender with age and class (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 98). Thus, feminist scholars are keen on the idea of archaeology investigating whether or not there were "any prehistoric societies [that could] serve as gender-egalitarian societies for society" (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 98) (something that could certainly be argued for some periods of ancient Egyptian history perhaps?). It is also the job of feminist archaeology to critique the Western assumed views of historical gender associations that have ever been present in archaeological theory (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 98).

At the present, it is considered by many academics that feminist resources are vital to comprehending the construction of archaeological knowledge, and are important not only within gender archaeology, but archaeology as a discipline as a whole (Conkey and Gero 1997, 426). Gender archaeology has successfully moved neglected questions about women and gender in the archaeological record onto the research agenda for the field, and the feminist perspective adds to this by bringing a "critical, theoretically and empirically informed, *standpoint on* knowledge production" to the discipline (Wylie 2007, 213). So in order for archaeologists to study gender, they must do more than simply "finding women" in the past; studying gender in archaeology should inform and improve our understanding of the past as a whole,

not just in relation to 'women' (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 94). Certainly, gender research is not limited only to women, and men have been involved from the outset, with questions raised about the multiple and varied masculine identities seen in past cultures (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 101). It should be noted, however, that the research carried out in this particular thesis does concentrate on women in the archaeological record, so the emphasis will naturally be on the 'woman'/'female' aspects of Egyptian archaeology.

There are differences between 'gender archaeology' and 'feminist archaeology', but many academics, such as Alison Wylie, have suggested that a gender-focused archaeology is definitely within the bounds of feminist theory (Conkey 2003, 870). It may be very important now, but research on gender in the human past in archaeology only really caught on in the 1980s, somewhat behind the development of feminist theory in other academic subjects (Conkey and Gero 1997, 411; Wylie 2007, 209). Gilchrist has contended that archaeology being behind in this subject is due in part to archaeologists resisting the idea of gender having a social definition, preferring instead to look at gender as a biological construction (1999, 26). It has also been argued that archaeology's positivist nature, concentrating on empirical testing of data and over-emphasising the significance of methodology, has seen gender as a more abstract concept, and therefore has also been responsible for the delay in the adoption of a feminist approach to archaeology (Wylie 1991; in Gilchrist 1999, 26). Gero believes that archaeology's early resistance to feminism comes from the domination of the subject by white, middle-class males (1985, 344; in Hays-Gilpin 2000, 93), with Wylie adding that feminism could not have an impact until there were more women in the discipline (1997; in Hays-Gilpin 2000, 93). Conkey and Spector apparently attributed the resistance to archaeology's ecosystem paradigm that was dominant from the 1950s through to the 1980s, the time period when feminist theory was developing in the academic world (1984; in Hays-Gilpin 2000, 93).

Whilst the study of gender in archaeology continued to develop into the 1990s, there was no single methodology for studying it, and there are many contradictions within the publications surrounding this topic, with some academics insisting that for the

subject of gender and feminism in archaeology to move forward, there must be a more "self-conscious positioning of perspectives" (Conkey and Gero 1997, 412). Every scholar examining gender in archaeology must be aware of their own inherited or learned attitudes and biases, and must be able to critique their own thinking. It seems that there is always going to be some resistance to the study of gender and/or feminism in archaeology from some parties, particularly from some of the more dominant and traditional groups within the discipline.

When looking at feminism in archaeology, the ideologies of specific dominant groups within the study of archaeology must be examined. For example, the 'traditional' academic archaeology of the 19th and early 20th centuries was influenced by the attitudes and beliefs of the time, and thus in turn influenced the development of many archaeological theories. For example, as stated by Trigger, "archaeological interpretations are influenced directly by gender prejudices, ethnic concerns, the political control of research and publishing, the financing of archaeological activities, generational conflicts among researchers, and the idiosyncratic influences of charismatic archaeologists" (2005, 380). What makes this quote from Trigger so interesting is that it comes from a book that is a seminal text used in the majority of archaeology first year undergraduates' theory courses. Trigger makes it very clear that these various issues have been present in archaeological theory for some time, but the warning has not always been heeded (whether through lack of understanding, or perhaps through students' perhaps simply skimming over the required reading text, something that many first year students are guilty of). Some of these students are the future of archaeology, and a lack of understanding of the development of, and influences on, archaeological theory can prove damaging to the way in which archaeology is studied in the future.

One of the reasons why undergraduate students may not pick up on the problems with the older attitudes within archaeology (or rather may struggle to let go of such attitudes) is that these beliefs have been instilled since early childhood. Johnson (who along with Trigger wrote another text that is of vital importance to first year archaeological theory students) uses an example from a children's book, where the word 'Man' was used to denote humans, and 'he' was used when 'she or he' was

meant, an example of the androcentrism that has dominated archaeological theory in the past (2005, 119). One specific example is from 1953, where a children's book quotes: "Early man made a home in a cave….He made scrapers and bones….His wife used the scraper to clean the underside of animal skins" (Unstead 1953, quoted in Johnson 2005, 119). Not only is 'man' used to represent the entire human race, and therefore seen as dominant, but assumptions are also automatically made about the specific roles men and women played in ancient societies.

Of course, it could be argued that this is the result of 1950s attitudes, but thirty years later things had seemingly not improved, if the example Johnson uses is anything to go by: "The favourite subjects of prehistoric artists seem to have been animals and women. This is quite logical as both were indispensable to prehistoric man (just as they are both indispensable to 20th century men)" (Mitchell 1981, 31; in Johnson 2005, 119). It is hard to know where to begin with this passage. For one thing, animals and women are lumped together, with the implicit assumption being that the artists can only have been men. Then to add insult to injury, it seems that linguistically, in this passage at least, animals actually take precedence over women according to Mitchell, and that this precedence continues into the 20th century. The assumption that 20th century values and attitudes are relevant to prehistoric society (and vice versa) is also a ridiculous one. Johnson's book may be addressing what could be seen as the very basics in relation to gender and feminist archaeological theory, but it is an important and relatively straightforward place to start, and makes some very valid points.

It could be argued, to a certain extent, that these early (and sometimes not-so-early) attitudes do still influence archaeology and some archaeological theory today. Trigger certainly describes this, the influence of older, and out-dated, attitudes in archaeology as appearing to "remain one of archaeology's permanent features" (2005, 380), a thought that is somewhat disheartening if true. Trigger is under the impression that the out-moded character of the established archaeological explanations has yet to become apparent within the subject in general (2005, 380), but it is perhaps the case that in fact some archaeologists are perfectly aware of the out-moded theoretical positions, but as they suit their own theories they are happy to

continue along the same out-dated path. This is something that gender archaeology and feminist archaeology (as well as other theoretical positions within the discipline) both seek to address.

Other out-moded attitudes to sex and gender within archaeology are often found in relation to human burials. Early archaeologists often assigned biological sex to skeletons based on the grave goods alone, in conjunction with the archaeologist's own philosophies on gender: for example, a skeleton found buried with weaponry must be male, and a skeleton found buried with jewellery and adornments must be female, with contradictions between "skeletal metrics" and burial goods being deemed simply "problematic" (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 99). This was a particular problem at times in the study of pre-Dynastic burials in Egypt, particularly in (but not limited to) the early 19th century (see below).

When archaeologists look at sex and gender, often sex is seen as being a "complex constellation of expressions and experiences", with the social construction of biological sex being examined on one level, along with, on another level, just how an individual within the archaeological record decides to exhibit that defined sex (this is the individual's 'gender') (Knapp and Meskell 1997, 187). The 'gender' is apparently developed according to "experience, embodiment and socio-cultural factors" (Knapp and Meskell 1997, 187), suggesting that gender is perhaps a combination of 'nature and nurture'; being brought about/developed through both biological and environmental factors. Conkey and Gero (1997, 418) bring up a very important question with regard to the development of 'gender': when did the concept of 'gender' as a social construction even come into play in human life? Certainly it has been argued that even the construction of the very term 'gender' is embedded in and influenced by the historical, sociological, ideological and material contexts of the subject (Conkey and Gero 1997, 417), but how early on in the history of the world did it actually become the concept that it is today? It could be argued that it was in the 16th and 17th centuries that 'gender' as we know it (or try to know it/understand it) today was really developed (as per Meskell 2004, as discussed above). Knapp and Meskell were attempting to theorise an answer to the question of sex and gender that would have a substantial bearing on archaeology, dealing with

"the materiality of dead bodies as well as the cultural dimension of sex, gender, sexuality and embodiment" (1997; in Meskell 2004, 75). This could only inform and improve an archaeological approach to investigating sex and gender in the historical and archaeological record.

Academia, and archaeology in particular, should recognise that sexuality (and the construction of gender and sexuality) is a multi-faceted issue. Foucault argued that archaeology should not simply study the sexual behaviour of men in the past, or their thoughts of sexuality, but should instead look at how the "prohibitions, exclusions, limitations, values, freedoms, and transgressions of sexuality, all its manifestations, verbal or otherwise, are linked to a particular discursive practice" (2010, 193). As Foucault (2010, 193) is quick to point out, this would not lead to the discovery of an ultimate truth about sexuality (or indeed gender), the subject is far too complex and may never be 'solved' in the conventional way. Foucault's archaeology is not a science, nor does it have a future as a science, and its subjects of study are not there to be 'solved', but to be analysed and interpreted via methods that owe something to scientific method (2010, 206). Archaeology should not set out to restore previous, historical thoughts (including those relating to gender and sexuality), but seeks instead to interpret, analyse and discuss the discourses of past practices (2010, 138-139).

Both gender and feminist archaeologies address the 'androcentric assumptions' within some areas of archaeology; the fact that the sexist biases of certain archaeologists have informed their archaeological interpretations of past societies (Johnson 2005, 119; Trigger 2005, 345; Gilchrist 1999, 22). But in order for this to have the necessary impact, the understanding of theoretical development and influences in archaeology must begin as early as possible in an archaeologist's career (i.e. in the first year of their undergraduate degree). The study of the theory of feminist archaeology, certainly from this author's own experience, is only briefly touched upon in undergraduate archaeology courses, mixed in with the rest of archaeological history and theory, in a ten-week course that only skims the surface of any theoretical position.

Meskell's suggestion that "archaeology might contribute to the contemporary interest in issues of identity and alterity by providing swathes of evidence from long-term historical settings" is an important one, and is essential in the use of feminist theory in archaeology (2004, 53). It seems that an important view is that the past can inform the present and the future, something that is crucial in the study of archaeology as a whole and not just within feminist and gender archaeology. The use of gender and feminist archaeologies has meant that some aspects of archaeology, such as early state development in Mesopotamia and among the Maya, are studied from "a more totalistic framework", with the men, women and children of these cultures now being recognised as contributors in their own right to the development of social, political and economic life in these societies (Wright 2000, 18). This is an important step forward in the development of archaeology as a discipline, with more rounded and comprehensive analyses of past cultures being carried out, something that would only benefit Egyptian archaeology.

Gender and feminist studies have taken off in the sub-discipline of prehistory in particular, as it enables academics to identify and study in depth the presence of women at prehistoric sites, as well as the activities that they would have carried out, including some activities that were traditionally seen as male territories (Conkey and Gero 1997, 415). These include Paleolithic cave art, Maya animal husbandry, and pre-Columbian Moche mortuary rituals, and various studies carried out the 1990s, which revealed that women showed up in political and economic activities at various prehistoric sites worldwide (Conkey and Gero 1997, 415). Brumfiel in particular demonstrated that when gender, class, and faction were all considered within in the study of the prehistoric, then it became apparent that there were certain aspects of the prehistoric record that could be explained by this, aspects that could not be explained from the ecosystem perspective (1992; in Conkey and Gero 1997, 422). Recognising gender, class, and factions has huge theoretical implications for archaeology, enabling the development of new cross-cultural frameworks, and placing gender archaeology within wider theoretical frameworks, including feminist theory (Brumfiel 1992; Conkey and Gero 1997, 422). Of course, one of the main problems with prehistoric archaeology is that there is rarely any contemporary prehistoric literary evidence to inform the physical archaeological remains, and

therefore theories can vary wildly. It has always been the case that archaeology, and prehistoric archaeology in particular, have always been necessarily interpretive (Roberts 1993; in Conkey and Gero 1997, 423), which must be taken into account when examining gender within the archaeological record. This is particularly noticeable in the examination of gender in prehistory, when "Males and females are interpreted as accepting and reproducing, or as resisting and redefining, their gendered social positions" (Conkey and Gero 1997, 415). Of course, this will vary between sites and cultures, but it is a problem that interpretations do not always agree, and can lead to some confusion within the subject. This is why the consideration of gender, class, and factions is so important within the subject, for making a detailed and multifaceted consideration of gender improves an archaeologist's interpretation of past cultures and human evolutions (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 101).

What is important is that these debates over the construction and meaning of gender are occurring at all, and all debate is healthy to some extent. For too long did archaeology restrict visible and invisible gender in the archaeological record to pre-determined boundaries that were a result of Victorian attitudes, and the development of gender and feminist archaeology at all was a positive step forward for the subject. Not only does it mean that 'invisible' women in the archaeological record can be brought to the fore, but also that important yet ignored women from the history of archaeology can also be studied and recognised for the work they did. Along the same vein, how did the absence of women from archaeological practice at times influence the way in which knowledge was constructed? (Gilchrist 1999, 19). A feminist approach is important because it makes current archaeologists pose questions about past (and to some extent contemporary) societies' very central operating concepts, and critique the past interpretations (that have all too often been taken for granted) of those concepts, something which should lead to the improvement of an archaeological understanding of a past culture (Conkey 2003, 872-873). Whilst it is clear that there is no "simple technique [that] will unlock the complexities of gender", the study of gender in archaeology, and the way in which gender is studied, are of the utmost importance (Gilchrist 1999, 28). Archaeologists cannot really ever know for sure exactly how a past individual constructed their own

gender identities (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 102). Therefore, archaeological theories should always be open to ever-changing analysis, to challenge, and to strong critiquing, and a feminist approach is a vitally important way of doing so. There certainly needs to be much more dialogue between archaeology and feminist theory in order to inform our interpretations of the past as much and a successfully as possible. For example, third wave feminism could be used to make a bigger impact in archaeology, where a feminist approach to race, class, ethnicity and sexuality combined could impress upon academics the importance of archaeology in interpreting gender and sex in the past (Conkey 2003, 876). Certainly, in the past science and technology, including archaeology, had been used to serve "sexist, racist or homophobic aims", with androcentrism skewing topics of study, and sexual language being used to make sex and gender stereotypes seem natural (Gilchrist 1999, 19). There is also the concern that there is all too often the exclusion of "working class women and women of color from the practice of archaeology", with archaeology remaining a mainly white and middle-class discipline (Hays-Gilpin 2000, 102). Such exclusions are of great importance to third wave feminism, and something that a third wave approach in archaeology should unquestionably address.

When looking at gender and sex in the archaeological record, a gender- and feminist-based approach is crucial in relation to cross-gender roles, such as the institutionalised third-gender role. Examples of cross-gender roles and individuals are present and have physical manifestations in the archaeological record; for example, often enough skeletal remains are encountered that have the traits of one sex (biological), but are buried with material goods that are culturally linked with the opposite sex (gender) (Gilchrist 1999, 59) (see also Chapter One). Examples could include biological females buried with weaponry, and biological males buried with weaving equipment, with cases being seen from Iron Age Italy to Anglo-Saxon England (Gilchrist 1999, 59). More examples could be said to include some Predynastic burials in ancient Egypt where biological women were buried with weapons (traditionally seen as male objects), and biological men were buried with jewellery and cosmetic palettes (traditionally seen as the domain of women). Of course, questions could arise here as to whether or not these were examples of third-gender or cross-gender roles, or if they are in fact simply seen as unusual from a

modern Western perspective, and that there was nothing unusual in the minds of the ancient Egyptians about a woman using weaponry, and a man using cosmetics which is very obviously the case when looking at the most famous Egyptian artefact ever found, the death mask of Tutankhamen with its copious amounts of eye paint. In some contexts it can apparently simply be boiled down to the fact that, "women ascribe to masculinity, while men borrow feminine traits for their counter-hegemonic masculinities" (Gilchrist 1999, 59). However, is gender and sex in past (and present) cultures ever really that simple?

It is obvious that gender and feminist archaeologies are crucial in understanding all facets of a past culture through its material remains. Gender archaeology is important because it contributes "important insights about the complexity of the cultural past", and this works best in conjunction with a feminist approach, which frames research practice at a deeper level, taking into account the epistemic and political aspects that it seems inevitably inform research practice (Wylie 2007, 214-215). By using both gender archaeology and feminist archaeology approaches combined, a greater understanding can be gained not only of a past culture, but also of the processes by which said culture may have been studied in the past, and how it may be studied in the future. If we can understand the limitations and biases of a discipline such as archaeology, we can better inform our own interpretations of the past.

Feminism in Egyptology

It could be argued that a form of feminist theory in Egyptian archaeology began with Amelia Edwards, one of the most prominent women in early Egyptology. Edwards was an active member of the National Union for Women's Suffrage, and had even joined in the 1887 petition drive to get Parliament to consider women's enfranchisement, although she tended to position herself as a scholar rather than a feminist, and even implied that "too many rights for women leads inevitably to social instability", suggesting that the increased rights of ancient Egyptian women had led to the decreased rights of her modern Egyptian contemporaries (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 845). In a fantastic (very useful for this chapter and the thesis) first-hand source, a lecture given during a series of lectures in 1889-1890, Edwards

addressed the roles of royal and non-royal women in ancient Egypt, making the case that they enjoyed a "greater status and personal rights" than women in Victorian era Britain (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 843). As Patricia O'Neill states, this particular lecture provides "evidence for some of the social and political contradictions that link issues of feminism and imperialism to the scholarly and aesthetic concerns of science and literature in the nineteenth century" (2005, 843). Egyptology was seen by Edwards as a way for unmarried middle-class women to engage in scientific endeavours, particularly at a time when class distinctions were still very important, and when women were not awarded university degrees or permitted to join scientific organisations (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 844). Edwards was a trailblazer, a woman who not only played an important role in the development of Egyptology as a discipline, but also made a study of women in this ancient society, women being an archaeological category so often neglected or misrepresented by academics and scholars of the Victorian era (and continuing to some extent into the more modern era of archaeology).

Edwards was working at a time when women's suffrage was starting to gain momentum, but before the onset of militancy within the movement. It must have been obvious to scholars such as Amelia Edwards that there were parallels between the (supposed or not) rights and equalities of ancient Egyptian women, and those of Victorian Era British and American women. What is also interesting is that Edwards was lecturing at a time when there was the initial development of 'Arab feminism', completely separate from so-called 'Western feminism'. There calls for the education of women made by some male scholars such as Qasim Amin, and women's feminist struggles were sited mainly in literature, along with the founding of literary salons, women's clubs and women's journals (El-Hassan Golley 2004, 532). At this time, it was mainly middle- and upper-class women who began fighting for what they saw as basic rights for women, such as access to education and amendments to marriage and divorce laws, but they were later joined by women of all classes in a more politically militant feminisim, contributing to challenging and changing the political situation in early 20th century Egypt (El-Hassan Golley 2004, 532).

There was plenty of evidence in the research Edwards did that showed that ancient Egyptian women played roles in the governance of the land and people, and had the rights to inherit, own and control property (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 844), at a time when her female contemporaries in both the Western world and in Egypt at the time had little political power, very little rights and were seen, more often than not, as someone else's property. Perhaps knowledge and a greater understanding of the rights women had in ancient Egypt could have gone some way to influencing the development of both Western and Arab feminism.

Edwards begins her lecture by immediately stating that women were "always free, respected, and in the full exercise of personal rights as extensively and as widely recognized as the personal rights of man" (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 847). Note that here, the word 'man' is used to denote the males of ancient Egyptian society, and not humankind in general, as is so often common in academia. There is some debate as to whether or not these equal rights continued completely unabated for the entirety of Dynastic Egypt's history, but the point is that this 'equality' was apparently present from very early on, according to Edwards demonstrated by the earliest sculptured monuments such as those found at Giza (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 847). These monuments, taking the form of either statues or carved tablets, when dedicated to a husband and wife, generally show the couple as seated or standing side by side, equal in size and stature (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 847), which to Edward's (and many other scholars') mind suggests an equality within the marriage, and within the 'society' of the time.

Edward's theory that ancient Egyptian women were equal to their male counterparts is seemingly true to some extent, but it was not consistent throughout Dynastic Egyptian history. As discussed by Lesko, in the Old Kingdom there were many titles denoting positions of responsibility that were held by (usually elite) women, but these included examples such as one woman who was the overseer of female physicians, and another who held the titles of judge and vizier (1991, 5). Lesko believes that in the Old Kingdom there were few restrictions placed on women, particularly those of high status and ability (1991, 5). So far, the examples provided by Lesko tally with much of what Edwards stated. However, this does seem to

change by the advent of the Middle Kingdom, after the unrest and turmoil of the First Intermediate Period. It would appear that women in the Middle Kingdom rarely held titles of authority, instead holding titles more associated with service, such as hairdresser or gardener, which is perhaps suggestive of the socio-political and economic changes that Egypt went through (Lesko 1991, 6).

Once we reach the New Kingdom, there is evidence that women served in major and minor cults and temples, and even held administrative roles such as controlling the temple stores, whilst outside of such service roles women "were heads of households, testified in court, witnessed documents, acted as executors of their estates and assumed the obligations of a citizen vis-à-vis the State" (Lesko 1991, 6). Here once more are examples of the 'equality' that Edwards had previously discussed. These variations in 'equality' between men and women are also visible in some of the artwork from each Kingdom period. Lesko provides examples such as the statue of King Menkaure and Queen Khamerernebty (no provenance provided), their equal size and stance perhaps being indicative of a duality of rulership (1991, 10) (fig. 2.1). Another such example would be that of the statue of Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye (later mentioned in this thesis), where the husband and wife are portrayed as equal in size and stature, again perhaps emphasising a 'duality of rulership' (fig. 3.24, see chapter 3). This contrasts strongly with the depictions of Ramesses II and his wives at Abu Simbel (also discussed in Chapter Three), where there are stark differences between the sizes of Ramesses and his wives, suggesting that there possibly wasn't that much rulership duality during Ramesses' reign.

One particularly interesting passage in Butler's work tackles one of the major concerns that are addressed in this thesis:

> "For feminist theory, the development of a language that fully or adequately represents women has seemed necessary to foster the political visibility of women. This has seemed obviously important considering the pervasive cultural condition in which women's lives were either misrepresented or not represented at all." (Butler 2007, 2).

This is one of the points that this thesis has made with regard to women in the ancient Egyptian historical record. This "pervasive cultural condition" is demonstrated by a text by the children's books and a text by Cooper discussed by Johnson (2005) (see below), and by many of the examples considered in this thesis. This cultural conditioning is personified by Western archaeologists who have long had the ability to "ignore the confrontation with indigenous archaeologies which emphasizes the importance of a feminist perspective in archaeology" (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 228). It could be argued that insight into the construction of gender in the archaeological record by scholars is provided by the absence of women "from certain domains of representation" (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 229), and this is certainly something that gender and feminist archaeology seeks to address. However, the subject of feminist theory within archaeology is possibly one that cannot be ignored as easily as some non-Western indigenous archaeologies have been (and continue to be to some extent), due to the feminist theory initially developing 'modern' Western world (although the advent of third wave feminism, developed from non-Western sources, changes the Western perspective of modern feminist theory).

The feminist perspective partly came into being in order to combat some of those masculine-dominated, traditional Western ideologies within the field of archaeology. For example, the 'traditional' view of sexual division of labour in the past has always been that it was similar, if not the same, as the sexual division of labour currently (although of course there are some questions as to just how the sexual division of labour actually stands in practice today) (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 228). In turn, however, linking labour divisions in the past by sex and/or gender legitimises present sexual relations (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 228), which ensures the relevance of feminist and gender theory in relation to both the past and the present. In relation to this, Hodder and Hudson use the example of hunting and trade being seen as traditionally male roles, while gathering and weaving are the domain of females (2004, 228). This is a point that is extremely relevant to the research addressed by this particular thesis, where feminist theory can help to examine not only the roles that certain ancient Egyptian women took in warfare and combat situations, but also the various attitudes and theoretical positions assigned to these

women by scholars and academics over the last one hundred years or so. For example, the female weapons burials discussed in this thesis (votive weapons versus functional weapons), and the depictions of women using weaponry (smiting scenes, the scene from Deshasheh). These case studies will be discussed in more detail below. These are examples that seem to challenge the 'traditional' view of the roles played by women in the past, but have still been ignored and/or misrepresented by scholars. Although it is claimed by some that "greater interest is shown in the 'dominant' male activities" (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 228), this does not seem to be the case when there are occasions when women take part in these so-called 'male activities'.

In relation to the ancient Egyptian research carried out in this thesis, this author has on several occasions been told by some people (mostly non-archaeologists and non-academics) that the chosen subject (i.e. weaponry and warfare) is one that is 'unusual' for a woman to do. Surprise has also been expressed by several people at this author's interest in experimental archaeology using replica ancient Egyptian weapons. Aside from being vaguely insulted by the assumption that it was unusual for a woman to have an interest in weaponry, it made the author consider the processes that had led to these kinds of attitudes. To this day some of the Victorian attitudes about what a woman should and shouldn't do persevere, and do sometimes influence the way in which research is carried out. For example, work done by Gero (1991; in Gilchrist 1999, 23) on the study of lithics showed that experimental flint-knapping was carried out solely by men, while women dominated the analysis of how tasks were actually carried out. This disparity was even demonstrated by the types of tool worked with; with women studying flake tools and nutting stones while men studied tools such arrow-heads, axes, and adzes (Gero 1991; in Gilchrist 1999, 24). It has also apparently been traditionally the case that female archaeologists were more likely to study subjects conventionally linked with domesticity, such as textile, pottery and jewellery (Gero 1991; in Gilchrist 1999, 24). Are these archaeologists simply following the same gendered patterns that have for so long been a part of the construction of archaeological knowledge, and therefore what is traditionally expected of female archaeologists by society and/or academic archaeology? (Claassen 1994; in Gilchrist 1999, 24).

Looking at the way in which the past has been investigated, according to Hodder and Hudson, "the past is written in terms of leadership, power, warfare, the exchange of women, men the hunter, rights of inheritance, control over resources, and so on" (2004, 228). This particular quote is very interesting in relation to the research covered by this thesis. In ancient Egyptian society, as discussed previously in this thesis, with their particular emphasis on balance and duality in areas of life, the concept of 'gender' is more fluid and complicated than gender is usually assumed to be (by some sections of academia at least). Indeed, Meskell proposes that "Egyptian sexualities were fluid and multiple" (2004, 106), something that becomes very much apparent when a more thorough study of the ancient Egyptian sexuality and gender is carried out. Butler (2007, 4) also points out that within various historical contexts there is little-to-no coherency or consistency in the construction and development of 'gender', with the concepts and constructions of 'gender' and 'sex' in ancient Egypt being prime examples of this. Certainly, there is a way of viewing sex and sexuality (and therefore gender) as "fluid over the trajectories of time, context, culture, age and so on" (Meskell 2004, 73). As a result, the theory is that the sex and sexuality of an individual would not have to follow to an already established definition, nor would it have to result in gender- or sex-specific behaviours (Meskell 2004, 73). Butler also addresses the question of how "a history of the duality of sex was established, [how] a genealogy that might expose the binary options as a variable construction?" (2007, 9). The concept of duality in ancient Egypt (which is not just limited to sex and gender) would be an excellent place to start. As has been pointed out previously in this work, it is a mistake to assign modern, Western values to a society such as ancient Egypt, just as it is would be an error to assume that divisions of labour and the sex-linking of activities are generally comparable (as discussed in Hodder and Hudson 2004, 229).

The more 'traditional' way of looking at gender relations in the archaeological record means that an accurate analysis of some material culture can be ostensibly unachievable. Gender relations are often estimated based on grave goods alone, such as the weapons burials and burials containing cosmetics in ancient Egypt, as discussed in another chapter in this thesis. Certainly the attitudes of some ancient Egyptian scholars could be revealed by the way in which they choose to represent of

gender relations, and using burial goods (by looking at the stereotypical gender/sex associations with particular grave good, i.e. weapons being seen as male objects, cosmetics as female) to do so could very well "tell us more about the attempts made to value or devalue men and women than it tells us about the 'real' power of men and women in the control of resources" (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 230). The argument of feminist archaeologists is that women can play an active role in any past (and current) society, and this is something that is addressed here, particularly in relation to the many and varied roles played by women in ancient Egypt.

"Feminism has had a very late impact in archaeology in comparison with related disciplines" (Hodder and Hudson 2004, 231). There are several possible reasons for this, including a lack of interest in feminist theory within the subject, and a lack of knowledge of such theory. It is also the case that in some sub-disciplines of archaeology, there is a lack of methodological data that would enable/assist in the application of complex feminist theory to the subject under discussion (Meskell 2004, 107). For some reason, the impact of feminist theory has occurred even later in Egyptian archaeology than in archaeology in general, despite the rich material archaeological record that is available to archaeologists studying ancient Egypt in the form of bodily preservation, and material and burial goods, along with well-known and well-defined religious and social ideologies (Meskell 2004, 107).

Johnson brings up some parallels with Hatshepsut. For example, with Johnson's critique of a passage from a text by Cooper on the move from medieval castle to Renaissance country house in England: "In the late Middle Ages…the individual was left by default to establish his own position and maintain his own security by means of a personal affinity of retainers and a public display of strength…" (Cooper 1997, 120; in Johnson 2005, 119). As Johnson points out, a minority of housebuilders in the period were women, such as Bess of Hardwicke, although they are generally thought to be 'the exception that proves the rule'. This has an interesting parallel with Hatshepsut, one of Egypt's female pharaohs, who was also thought to be 'the exception that proves the rule'. In an amusing reversal, Hatshepsut is generally thought of as a master builder in ancient Egyptian history, and her warfare activities have generally been ignored or reduced by ancient

Egyptian scholars (see previous/later chapter). As with the women builders of medieval and Renaissance England, the female pharaohs of ancient Egypt are often neglected or ignored within academia.

Another parallel with the pharaoh Hatshepsut is Butler's point that when potentially constructed gender is hypothesised as fundamentally independent of sex, "gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one" (2007, 9). Beauvoir posited such an idea when suggesting that gender is variable and volitional, with individuals only becoming "woman" (or any gender, in fact) through cultural obligation, not the compulsion of biological sex (Beauvoir 1973, 391; in Butler 2007, 11). Meskell also uses recent research to support this, where it has been suggested that chromosomal males can develop fully as females, and vice versa (2004, 73). This is visible when Hatshepsut is praised in the rock inscription at Sehēl, being referred to by her throne name, and also being referred to as 'he'. The use of this masculine pronoun is fascinating, particularly as it is used in relation to Hatshepsut's involvement (however extensive) in warfare. Could it be that Hatshepsut (and other ancient Egyptian women) were not subject to a cultural compulsion to become "women" or "female", and therefore manifested as more than one gender within their lifetime? Other examples such as the female pharaohs Nefertiti (shown wearing the male-style war kilt in the traditionally masculine-dominated smiting pose) and Sobekneferu (dressed in a combination of male and female royal robes) would seem to potentially support this theory. As stated by Knapp and Meskell, archaeology (and Egyptian archaeology in this instance) "needs to account for the range of discourses on offer, encompassing biology, socio-cultural studies, feminist and masculinist philosophy, and sexual difference" (1997, 187). Sex and gender are not as clear-cut as they were once thought to be, and this is something that could certainly be applied to the example of Hatshepsut, where her gender and sex seemed to be a bit more fluid than perhaps others from her time, and certainly more complex and fluid than past scholars and academics realised.

Amelia Edwards provides another example of when a male term was used to denote an ancient Egyptian woman, this time in relation to a 'princess' (again, a more modern translation of the term used to describe this individual's position) called Nesikhonsu, who held a wide range of titles including:

> "The Osirian – The Chief Pallacide of Amen Ra, King of the Gods –
> The Prophetess of Knum Lord of Elephantine
> The Royal Son of Kush –
> Governor of the Southern Lands
> The Prophetess of Nebhotep of Nesert,
> The chief Princess, Nesikhonsu. Justified" (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 851).

This is an interesting set of titles because Nesikhonsu, as with Hatshepsut, is referred to by both male and female terms (*Governor* of the Southern Lands, *Royal Son*), especially within the same passage of text. Edwards believes that the reason for this is that the Egyptians did not wish to tamper with a "title of long and honorable standing" (2005, 851), but it can also suggest that the ancient Egyptians were not too concerned with rigid gender definitions, and that it was not so unusual for an individual to have, or be referred to by, more than one gender. Edwards does not discuss the implications for the flexibility of gender in ancient Egypt (perhaps not a subject that was generally examined in the 19th century); she only uses the example of Nesikhonsu to support her opinion that women were equal to men during this period.

Edwards also spent a section of the lecture discussing Hatshepsut, describing her as "the Queen Elizabeth of Egyptian history" (2005, 849). Edwards does not shy away from discussing the various aspects of Hatshepsut's time as pharaoh, addressing the times when Hatshepsut was dressed in male attire, particularly when Hatshepsut wore the war-helmet that was customarily worn by pharaohs on the battlefield, or when she was portrayed as wearing a false beard (although Edwards suggests that this may have been a "touch of delicate flattery on the part of the artist") (2005, 849). Edwards also presents an intriguing example of a portrait of Hatshepsut where she is displayed as being nourished by the Divine Cow form of Hathor, a typical scene for

a ruler to be represented in (2005, 851). What is most interesting here, however, is that in this particular scene Hatshepsut is portrayed as a young man (Edwards and O'Neill 2005, 851), having interesting implications for the concepts of gender and duality in ancient Egypt, and in the 18th Dynasty in particular. Could it be that Hatshepsut shared similarities with the cross-gender and third-gender roles seen in other past cultures (such as the Native American two-spirits)? It could be argued that her representation as both male and female on different occasions could demonstrate that the binary categories of female and male were not so rigid, either during the 18th Dynasty or ancient Egyptian history in general. Perhaps to the ancient Egyptians it was not so out of the ordinary to have a ruler who was both male and female, and this could apply to several examples of pharaohs.

Although Edwards is open in her discussion of Hatshepsut as a pharaoh, she continues to refer to Hatshepsut as "Queen Hatshepsut" throughout the lecture, thereby subtly demoting her without necessarily realising it. This could be a product of the time period, when most scholars (the majority of which were men) were unable to, or refused to, see even the most obvious example of a ruling woman as anything but a Queen (in the ancient Egyptian sense). Although it was very common at the time to not refer to Hatshepsut by the official title of 'Pharaoh' (a term that was introduced in Hatshepsut's reign as a way to refer to 'the one from the palace' (Wilkinson 2010, 231)) and Edwards is only following the academic conventions, it is a shame to see Hatshepsut being subconsciously devalued (with regard to ancient Egyptian conventions) by one of her staunchest admirers.

Meskell demonstrates that sexuality suffused the daily life of ancient Egyptians, through using the example of the worker-village site of Deir el-Medina, where sexuality permeated everything from religious activities to the household in general, even extending to child-rearing (2004, 106). Sexuality to the ancient Egyptians was a key element of their everyday lives, present at the very start of the development of their beliefs (theology) and state (Meskell 2004, 103). Sexuality plays an overt role in a version of the ancient Egyptian creation myth, as part of the Memphite Theology (Meskell 2004, 103), meaning that the infusion of sexuality in everyday life would not have been unusual or extraordinary to the ancient Egyptians, instead seemingly a

necessary part of daily life, not as it seems to some present-day academics (perhaps originally stemming from Victorian attitudes towards sex and sexuality).

Feminism and Egyptian 'art'

Feminist theories could easily be applied to the subject of ancient Egyptian 'art', particularly in relation to specific artistic styles that were apparent in the wall paintings and carvings in tombs, temples and monuments. The study of visual representation within the archaeological record is one that has benefitted from a feminism-based theoretical approach. This is an area where 'women' are more obviously visible in the archaeological record (thorough depictions in various forms art, whether it be paintings or statues, for example), but where a feminist/gender approach can analyse not only 'women' and 'females', but 'men' and 'males' as well, and could even potentially be used to examine social interactions between sexes and genders (Conkey 2003, 871). A feminist approach can also be used to critique the attitudes and theories presented by academics in the past study of such images.

There are some very interesting examples of ancient Egyptian art that can provide information on the possible gender roles of some of ancient Egypt's female pharaohs. The pharaoh Sobekneferu, the last ruler of the 12th Dynasty, is an example that has been briefly mentioned before in this chapter (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 273). As stated previously, Sobekneferu is shown on one particular statue as wearing an intriguing combination of male and female dress; she is wearing the royal striped nemes headcloth and male kilt, but this is all worn over her otherwise female dress (fig. 2.2). In this way she is seen to be blending male and female in an innovative way. This could be suggestive of a third-gender or cross-gender role, or it could simply be Sobekneferu's way of showing her power as pharaoh as well as her innate femininity. She did not seem to shy away from wearing traditionally male or female clothes, but it is interesting that in this instance she chose to combine to two, whilst also emphasising her pharaonic power via the use of the (conventionally male) nemes headcloth.

Hatshepsut is also portrayed in male garb on several occasions, one example being found on the east face of one of her Karnak obelisks (fig. 2.3). As discussed previously, Hatshepsut is portrayed wearing the outfit normally worn by male pharaohs, possibly as a way of displaying her pharaonic power (especially as Hatshepsut is holding a mace, one of the most potent symbols of pharaonic authority), but also possibly as way of displaying her third-gender role, her gender duality, the fact that she was both man and woman (perfectly in keeping with the concepts of balance and duality that suffused most aspects of ancient Egyptian life). There is no war-like situation involved here (unlike images of Nefertiti and Tawosret that will be discussed below), but the fact that she is in male dress may suggest more than simply trying to dress like a conventional pharaoh.

Another female pharaoh worth examining further in relation to sex and gender is Nefertiti, the wife and co-ruler of the pharaoh Akhenaten. When examining the temples devoted to the Aten deity at Amarna, it was discovered that the principal royal figure was in fact Nefertiti, not Akhenaten, and that her daughters also played prominent roles in the portrayal of Aten worship at Amarna (Lesko 1991, 12-13). Nefertiti was also depicted combining male and female royal dress in the smiting scene discussed in great detail in this thesis (fig. 2.4, apparently found at Hermopolis [originally el-Amarna], but with no mention of the structure type it was part of; anon nd [e]). The act of Nefertiti taking part in a male-dominated scene is discussed at length in Chapter Three, but under consideration at this stage is the wearing of a combination of male (the war kilt) and female (the crown) garb (Fletcher 2004). It could easily be the case that Nefertiti is shown wearing her distinctive crown as a means of definitely identifying her as the subject of the scene. It is interesting to note, however, that the crown is not the only demonstration of Nefertiti's feminine attributes: her breasts are also very clearly shown, with no attempt to hide them beneath the sort of female dress that Sobekneferu is wearing on the statue where she combines male and female clothing.

There is a very interesting depiction (discussed elsewhere in this thesis) of what is most likely to be the 19th Dynasty pharaoh Tawosret which has interesting implications for gender and femininity in 19th Dynasty Egypt. The image, a sketch

on a small ostracon, is that female pharaoh (thought to most likely be Tawosret) who is riding in a chariot and firing arrows from a compound bow at an enemy who is riding straight towards her (fig. 2.5). What is interesting here is that there is no attempt to portray Tawosret with any male attributes (unlike Sobekneferu in male and female garb, Hatshepsut depicted dressed in male clothing, and Nefertiti in a male war kilt). In fact, there is a rather noticeable emphasis on the uraeus at the figure's brow, something that emphasises not only her pharaonic status, but also her femininity. It is fascinating that at this time, the artistic aesthetics were willing to show someone so obviously female participating in what could be seen by some as a traditionally male activity (although as usual this is dependent on the viewpoint/attitudes of those not only creating the image but viewing it), but to not make any concessions to male styling in her look and dress.

It is the case that in ancient Egyptian art, whilst women are usually portrayed as young and beautiful, with any depictions of older women being very rare indeed, aging men are depicted with much more frequency and in greater detail (Sweeney 2004, 67). By the same token, there are examples of ancient Egyptian elite men shown with partial baldness, as well as folds of fat on the lower torso, both of which may well be ways of portraying aging (Sweeney 2004, 82). What is particularly interesting here is that Sweeney asserts that baldness is "never used to denote female ageing", and that folds of fat are rarely used to demonstrate aging in women (2004, 82).

Victorian and early 20th Century attitudes towards art from the Amarna period of ancient Egyptian history are very telling. One particularly revealing example is that of the art style and depictions of Akhenaten and Nefertiti from the Amarna period, often dubbed as 'grotesque'. This 'artistic'/visual style was so named due to the depicted physical appearance of Nefertiti and Akhenaten that was so at odds with what the Victorians held to be beautiful. In the 19th century, there was the "desire to be beautiful and "frail" [which] led to tight-lacing and vinegar-drinking" (Gilbert and Gubar 1984, 54). As the 'grotesque' wall carvings, paintings, and statues were not frail and slender, in actuality being seemingly honest representations of bodies (with what could be argued to be realistic lumps, bumps, and rolls of fat), they did

not conform to the Victorian and 20th century (male) ideals of beauty, and were therefore designated as 'grotesque' and 'exaggerated'. There was no thought given to the artistic merits of the art style, only the aesthetic ideals applied by the scholars who studied them. Even today, in modern books and on modern websites, such portrayals are still being described as 'grotesque', 'exaggerated' and even unattractive (figs. 2.6 and 2.7). The label of 'grotesque' seems to some to be much more applicable in relation to depictions of women, as though it is unseemly for women to be portrayed as what could be described more realistically, with imperfections, going against the generally accepted standards of beauty for the aesthetics of ancient Egyptian art.

The Amarna Period was a time when the royal women were depicted in ways that went against what some academics saw as 'gender norms', smiting enemies, driving chariots solo, and offering sacrifices to the Aten in their own right (Sweeney 2004, 83). These were also viewed by scholars with typical Victorian ideals towards women as being inappropriate ways for women to behave and to be portrayed. These Amarna royals were some of the most powerful people in Egypt at that time, but they were too often reduced, both by some of those that ruled after them and academics, to being seen as novelties or anomalies to be forgotten. This sort of indifferent, not to mention unfair and incorrect, attitude is something that a feminist approach (such as that taken in this thesis) aims to address and eliminate.

It is also interesting that in art of the Amarna Period, there were more depictions of women aging than there were in more conventional ancient Egyptian art. For example, depictions of Nefertiti and her daughters included "certain signs usually associated with aging in Egyptian art…such as lines at the corner of the mouth" (Sweeney 2004, 69). Nefertiti in particular was portrayed with aging of both her body and her face, something that was very unusual for elite ancient Egyptian women (Sweeney 2004, 72), and no doubt contributed to the objectionable labels of 'grotesque' and 'unattractive' that have been used to describe the Amarna art. This aging of Nefertiti on visual representations has been described as an attempt by Nefertiti to provide a parallel between her and "the image of the venerable and experienced older male" (usually the pharaoh) (Arnold 1996, 30; in Sweeney 2004,

72), perhaps providing another piece of evidence that would suggest Nefertiti ruled as pharaoh in her own right as well as being Akhenaten's co-ruler whilst he lived.

There are several examples of elite women aging in ancient Egyptian art, one of the most important being a statue of Queen Tuya, a queen from the 19th Dynasty, and wife of the pharaoh Seti I (fig. 2.8). The statue, held in the Vatican, shows Queen Tuya as having a youthful body, but a deeply lined face (Sweeney 2004, 68). It has been argued that this statue is an ideological version of the queen (at this stage the queen mother to Ramesses II), rather than a direct, accurate representation, in order to show the queen mother as the "major mother figure upon earth", with an obvious and feminine sexuality despite her apparent age (Lesko 1998, 158; in Sweeney 2004, 68). Another important example is a portrayal of Queen Tiy (the wife of Amenhotep III), who is shown wearing a Hathor crown, and with definite signs of aging on her face (Sweeney 2004, 72) (fig. 2.9). This could be a way of simply displaying her age, or as with Tuya it could be a way of showing some other aspect, such as her stateliness, wisdom, or experience, as is possibly the case with many examples of ancient Egyptian elite women portrayed as aging (Sweeney 2004, 83). Sweeney makes a point of writing that these women were in what she calls a "double-bind", where the fact that they wanted to show themselves as having wisdom and experience conflicted with the ancient Egyptian ideals of women being youthful and beautiful, whereby they risked being seen as strange (2004, 83). As Sweeney (2004, 83) pertinently points out, this is a problem that continues to trouble women even to this day; when it would, perhaps too optimistically, be hoped and assumed that societies and cultures would have moved beyond such nonsense.

The 'artistic' values of ancient Egyptian visual portrayals also tie in quite neatly with a feminist approach to Egyptian archaeology. As Sweeney states, in relation to aging in Egyptian art we cannot look at gender alone, and instead must examine how gender and aging "intersect with class and race, and what type of representation the Egyptians considered appropriate for which social group" (2004, 69). This is key component of third wave feminism as well, where class, race and ethnicity must be considered alongside sex and gender. In the examination of class and race, it is evident that it was unusual for royal and elite women to display signs of aging on

their bodies and faces, whereas servants and other non-elite women were routinely depicted with drooping breasts and lined faces (Sweeney 2004, 69). In an examination of the portrayals of different races, the Egyptians did not always shy away from unflattering depictions. One such example is that of Eti, the queen of Punt, who is portrayed at Hatshepsut's mortuary temple at Deir el-Bahri. The queen is shown with strange proportions, perhaps as a result of a medical condition, or it may even be the case that the queen was obese (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 231-232). Eti is shown next to her husband, who is portrayed in the same style as elite Egyptians (fig. 2.10). The question here is, if Eti had been the wife of an ancient Egyptian, rather than an envoy from Punt, would her unusual proportions have been depicted so plainly, or would the artist have fashioned her in the traditional ancient Egyptian artistic style? The viewers of these images would be the temple priests

The question is raised as to just how much the Victorian ideals of beauty inform and influence the modern ideals of the same (in Western culture at least)? With regard to Egyptian art, particularly in relation to the artistic endeavours of the Amarna period, Pollock brings up a very interesting point, with regard to how a work of art is viewed by different people: "will it be read differently if the viewer is a woman or a man? Will the representation be different if the producer is a woman or a man?" (1994, 10). Note here also that Pollock very obviously places 'woman' ahead of 'man' in the text. A probable explanation for this is that the work is on feminism in the History of Art, but it is in stark contrast to many non-feminist reference books and texts, where 'man' is usually placed automatically before 'woman' in the composition of a sentence. It could also be a subtle way of redressing the balance between the representations of men and women in the academic text.

Zainab Bahrani (1996) carried out some very interesting work with relation to the approaches and attitudes towards ancient art, concentrating mainly on statuary and figurines in Mesopotamia and Hellenistic Greece. In her work, Bahrani highlighted the differences in the visibility of sexuality between these two societies, as well as the "differences in contemporary scholarly readings of Eastern and Western scholars" (1996; in Meskell 2004, 90). Bahrani carried out work that could easily be applicable in relation to the study of sexuality and masculine and feminine forms in

ancient Egyptian art, particularly analysis of the art from a modern Western viewpoint. In particular, Bahrani's work asserted that there were stark differences between portrayals of the female form in Mesopotamia and Hellenistic Greece, where Mesopotamian statues and figurines are unashamed in their portrayal of the female form and female sexuality, prominently displaying female body parts, such as the vulva, that would be seen as taboo in artistic displays from other societies (1996, 11; in Meskell 2004, 90). Bahrani also asserts that in Mesopotamia, "the female body was a sign and index of sexuality throughout the first and second millennia BC" (1996; in Meskell 2004, 90).

A sharp contrast to the depiction of the female form in Mesopotamia is the equivalent statuary from Hellenistic Greece, where although female nudity is portrayed, there seems to have been considerable difficulty in the rendering of female genitalia (1996, 5-6). In Hellenistic Greece, "Women's bodies become simultaneously the object of fear and desire" (Meskell 2004, 91), something that does not seem to be the case in ancient Egyptian art, where the depiction of women's bodies is not something that the ancient Egyptians appeared to shy away from. This denial of the female genitalia in Hellenistic Greece is apparently very telling with regard to the Classical Greek outlook on sexuality, perhaps suggestive of a distancing of the viewer, no matter what the time period, from the female sexuality of the statues' subjects, or denying their female sexuality altogether (Bahrani 1996; in Meskell 2004, 91). The traditionally Greek representation of the feminine form through the Aphrodites both "denied and represented female sexuality simultaneously, in order to provide an aesthetic ideal of femininity to Greek (male) culture" (Bahrani 1996, 7; in Meskell 2004, 91).

This concept of an aesthetic ideal in the Grecian statuary plays nicely into Victorian, Edwardian, and 20th century art critiques and ideals. The phrase 'Classical Nude' is often used versus the term 'naked Near Eastern figures', with 'Classical Nude' being seen (predominantly by Victorian and early 20th century art historians) as suggestive of "classical beauty and purity", displaying a natural ideal, a purified image within high art, whereas the naked Near Eastern figures suggest raw sexuality and barbarism, a negative and sexual image without any form of aesthetic ideal (Bahrani

1996; in Meskell 2004, 91). This concept of an aesthetic ideal that has proved to be a popular within certain circles of art history and archaeology is what could be responsible for the traditional reaction to the artistic style of the Amarna Period – because the more realistic style of the depiction of human bodies, particularly the Amarna Royal Family members, does not appeal to what is traditionally seen as aesthetically pleasing, particularly in relation to the art of the Classical World. During the surge in popularity of the ancient and Classical world in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, scholars and travellers were obsessed with collecting prime examples of the artistic endeavours of the period, and the art of the Amarna Period did not necessarily fit into what the collectors were after. A more realistic depiction of a middle-aged female (and male) form did not tie into the pure feminine ideals of the male-dominated 19th and 20th centuries.

Another interesting aspect of ancient Egyptian art is the aesthetic style, where the illustration of the naked form was often limited to depictions of the lower class workers, whereas those of a higher status were shown with young aesthetic bodies, generally clothed (Meskell 2004, 62). In ancient Egypt as well, the concept of 'beauty' was not limited to women alone: burial goods and artistic portrayals show that men equally wore jewellery (Meskell 2004, 63; Joann Fletcher, pers. comm.). Meskell suggests that the artistic depiction of sexual sex in the Mayan culture was represented by the men (Joyce 1996b), whereas in Egypt it was the opposite, with women being the predominant focus of the sexual gaze (Meskell 2004, 64). As discussed by Meskell, "Too often we assume that women are sexualized objects in a given society, as a result of our own cultural milieu, rather than identifying the varied levels of difference which operate between individuals in the past and between specific societies" (2004, 64).

Men's 'inevitable greatness' is often backed-up by biological claims, as men are said to create art, while women merely have children, a spurious claim that has repeatedly been used to justify the exclusion of women from cultural recognition (Pollock 1994, 21). Pollock claims that these issues, here examined within the study of art, often spread out into social issues as a whole:

> "The sexual divisions embedded in concepts of art and the artist are part of the cultural myth and ideologies peculiar to art history. But they contribute to the wide context of social definitions of masculinity and femininity and thus participate at the ideological level in reproducing the hierarchy between the sexes" (1994, 21-22).

This is an interesting point, and is also arguably applicable to archaeology and the study of artistic production in ancient societies. It is particularly relevant in relation to the research carried out in this thesis, where examples of women going against the social and biological supposed 'norm' are excluded from recognition by many archaeological scholars. There needs to be action taken against the concept of 'man's (so-called) inevitable greatness' and over-dominance within academia, and within subjects such as archaeology and Egyptian archaeology.

Conclusions

The archaeology of ancient Egypt is filled with a wealth of complex and intriguing information some of which has been neglected for far too long. It seems obvious that a gender-based and feminist approach to archaeology and to Egyptian archaeology (in particular in relation to this thesis), can only improve upon the interpretation and analysis of men, women and gender relations in the archaeological record. This chapter has taken a look at not only feminist and gender theory itself (particularly the work done by Judith Butler in relation to gender in the historical record), but also at the past and potential applications within the discipline of archaeology, showing just how useful and interesting feminist theory within archaeology can be. Through the application of feminist and gender theories, not only can we compile plausible theories and interpretations with regard to ancient Egyptian women within the archaeological record but we can also examine the attitudes and approaches taken by those academics who have studied (or not, as the case may be in some instances) these remarkable women. The neglect of some examples, such as several of Egypt's lesser known (and lesser known for a reason) can be explained by past (and some current) scholars and academics complying with an institutionalised lack of appreciation and recognition of the advantages of a feminist-based approach, and of women in the archaeological record.

The application of feminist theory to art and art history is one that can be seen to have parallels with, and be applied to, Egyptian archaeology, and archaeology as a whole. Feminist theory has also been applied to ancient Egyptian 'art' (visual portrayal), providing a reading not only of the images themselves, but also of the way in which they were viewed both by past scholars and current viewers (such as the descriptions of the Amarna 'art' as 'grotesque', and unfair label that has been sustained well into the 20th (and even 21st) century. Through throwing out the out-dated patriarchal, Classical, 19th and 20th century attitudes and approaches to archaeology, and how sexual difference was viewed by many academics and scholars, a new understanding of the topic at hand can be reached. The aim of this thesis is to go some way to combining the incredible archaeology of ancient Egypt with the relevant archaeological (gender and feminist) theory, in way that seems to be seldom done in Egyptian archaeology (rare examples being those such as Lynn Meskell, Callender, Troy and Lesko, sources that are discussed in the next chapter).

The rich examples of feminist and gender archaeologies provide some optimism for the future of Egyptian archaeology. If more scholars of Egyptology are willing to take a feminist-based approach, then a whole plethora of new questions, analyses, theories and ideas could flood Egyptology. There are of course still some old-fashioned and dismissive attitudes towards taking a feminist approach (and towards the study of sexual difference, generally related to the Classical, 19th and 20th century attitudes to sex and gender), but taking such a theoretical position, with a good understanding of feminist principles such as those discussed by Butler and Pollock as well as feminist-based archaeology, can only inform and enrich our knowledge and understanding of Egyptian archaeology.

The examples from ancient and historical cultures outside of ancient Egypt discussed in the previous chapter have shown how the application of gender and feminist archaeologies can improve the analyses of material cultures, and the theories discussed in this chapter have provided a grounding in the theoretical positions that would have an impact on the study of women and warfare in ancient Egypt. The next chapter will briefly address the history and development of warfare in Dynastic Egypt, before examining the occurrences of women utilising weaponry and involved

with combat/warfare, as well as examining examples of ancient Egyptian women in positions of power. The application of feminist theory to these aspects of the research should prove fruitful, and will be explored in more detail in the following chapters.

Chapter Three - Literature Review: Warfare and Women in ancient Egypt

This chapter of the thesis begins the more in-depth examination of the ancient Egyptian examples at the centre of the thesis remit: warfare and women in ancient Egypt. In order to look at women involved in warfare, ancient Egyptian warfare itself must be at least briefly assessed in order to gain and understanding of the background of the subject. First this chapter briefly assesses warfare in dynastic Egypt, giving a basic overview of the development of warfare in the state and the advances and changes of the ancient Egyptian army in its various forms. This chapter then examines the examples of not only women utilising weaponry or being involved in warfare, but also those women in Egypt who held political power. Women in positions of power may not have seemed unusual to the Egyptians, but some academics and archaeologists struggled to accept to concept of a female pharaoh, something that will be discussed in detail in this chapter (such as the example of Merneit). Taking a more gender and/or feminist-based approach, particularly a third wave feminist approach as discussed in the previous chapter, would allow for a more comprehensive examination of such examples. As Lynn Meskell states, "If archaeology recognizes the importance of this new, complex picture … it will finally do justice to ancient social lives" (2004, 56).

An important part of this thesis is to link the interpretational work - concerned with social identity, in particular gender identity - more closely with the empirical work. This is to link the social history of women in ancient Egypt, particularly the cases of female royalty, with the physical objects, i.e. the weapons with which they were associated. The question of women involved in warfare in ancient Egypt is one that has previously been somewhat neglected within the discipline of Egyptian archaeology, with several examples of human remains being sexed according to the specific grave goods that they were buried with, particularly in Predynastic Egypt. The issue of the "gender equality" or that is sometimes apparent in Egyptian history is a subject that should be addressed, with modern Western (Victorian-influenced) viewpoints being projected onto an ancient culture's material remains, something that gender and feminist archaeology approaches would address. Although the modern term "gender equality" perhaps should not be used in relation to ancient

Egyptian society, there was nonetheless a great emphasis in ancient Egyptian society on balance and duality within the universe (Fletcher 2004, 187).

One key example of this emphasis on balance is the female deity Ma'at, who was the "symbol of cosmic order" and as such maintained order to prevent chaos taking over (Fletcher 2004, 187). Ma'at personifies "truth, justice and the essential harmony of the universe" (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 166). The goddess held the power that regulated "the seasons, the movement of the stars and the relations between men and gods" (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 166). Ma'at was key in judging the pharaoh in the afterlife; she "laid down the rules by which each king must govern" (Fletcher 2004, 187) and the pharaohs' "were considered to rule through her authority" (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 166). As Shaw and Nicholson also point out, the vizier, the official who controlled the ancient Egyptian law courts, held the title "priest of Ma'at" (1997, 166). The fact that Ma'at was female was not something that was alarming to the ancient Egyptians; she was simply the deity of balance and order and therefore of the utmost importance. Her biological sex and/or her gender was not important, and had little to do with the role she played within Egyptian mythology.

If a female deity held so much power within the ancient Egyptian belief system, it is possible to postulate that this could have at least some effect upon society. The parallels with Iron Age Britain and its war-goddesses (Collingridge 2006, 179), as discussed in a previous chapter, are obvious, and if one culture, although very different in a multitude of ways, can have female war deities and "women warriors", then it is not so difficult to suggest that another culture could have had similar examples. There is certainly a wealth of evidence in ancient Egypt for female pharaohs and, as is discussed in this chapter, women who had some association with warfare. If women in warfare are to be discussed, then the larger military context has to be set. Therefore, it is worth examining the development of the military in ancient Egypt, before looking at the women who are in some way associated with weaponry or warfare in Dynastic history.

The extent to which women were part of the Egyptian military is a subject rarely tackled. It is particularly noticeable that previous works covering Egyptian warfare fail to make any mention of women in a military context. Nevertheless, together with the position of women within Egyptian society as a whole, the roles of New Kingdom female monarchs such as Ahhotep, Hatshepsut, Nefertiti and Tawosret need to be scrutinized far more closely, given the apparent warrior-like sensibilities of earlier women rulers such as Nitocris of the Old Kingdom. If such women could hold positions of political power, it is a possibility that some may also have held positions of military power, for "it is no coincidence that one of the most important deities in ancient Egyptian religion, Sekhmet, the goddess of warfare, was female, while some of the highest offices of state normally held by men could also be held by women" (Dean 2009, 42).

Warfare and the military in Dynastic Egypt

Reasons for Warfare

This chapter briefly examines the social context of warfare in Egypt; for example, the reasons for conflict in the 2nd Dynasty are different to those in the late 18th Dynasty, when the Egyptians were fighting to maintain their empire. Curto takes the "opportunity to describe first of all the warlike activities of Ancient Egypt, classifying in time according to the relative political aims..." (Curto 1971, 3). He then provides four specific reasons as to why the Egyptians went to war:

> "1) Wars of unification, which aim at converting the country's geographic unity into a political unity, with the ultimate advantage of greater welfare for the peoples and of a greater opportunity to build higher forms of civilisation..." (Curto 1971, 3).
>
> "2) Wars of liberation from foreign domination: such as the war against the Hyksos" (Curto 1971, 3).
>
> "3) Colonial wars, that is aimed at securing the vital space, i.e. territories which can offer raw materials or at least roads leading to areas where raw materials are available. These wars had two aims: Nubia and the Near East..." (Curto 1971, 3-4).

> "4) Imperial wars, conducted against other large competing states and often aimed at occupying frontier zones with a power vacuum so as to turn them into ramparts for the strategic defence of their country. Also the already mentioned wars of the Tuthmoside and Ramesside kings show this characteristic" (Curto 1971, 4).

This somewhat simplistic view examining the reasons for ancient Egyptian warfare ignores other aspects of warfare that are not an ideology but a practice. Examples of these could be slavery, looting missions, civil war, or assimilations. Curto (1971) seems largely concerned with examining pictorial depictions of the military rather than the reasons behind why the ancient Egyptians went to war. Therefore, his brief and simple explanations of the reasons for warfare really only suffice for those wishing to concentrate on the visual-portrayal examples of the military.

Importantly, however, Curto's four examples of warfare aims do describe some of the political influences on Egyptian warfare, and it might be possible that similar political influences could be applied to the study of those women known to have been involved in such warfare. Fighting networks were closely linked to identity within ancient Egyptian society. For example, there was a certain level of prestige attached to membership of a chariot squadron. The ancient Egyptian archer battalions were said to be highly feared, mainly due to the powerful composite bows they used (Redford 1997, 51). Part of this thesis examines the different types of soldier that were found in the ancient Egyptian military, along with their roles within the ancient Egyptian army and any military campaigns that were carried out.

Hoffmeier declares that "one of the main responsibilities of the kings of ancient Egypt was to uphold ma'at; truth, justice, and right order" (1983, 53). He describes this responsibility as entailing "the protection of Egypt's borders from foreign invasion" (1983, 53) and describes numerous campaigns to prevent neighbouring countries from attacking Egypt or interfering in "territorial interests" (1983, 53). According to Hoffmeier, there was a considerable amount of this kind of military activity during the New Kingdom (1983, 53), with literature of the time providing evidence of the ancient Egyptians' hatred of their foreign neighbours (Hoffmeier 1983, 53). This correlates with Curto's third and fourth reasons for Egyptian warfare

(1971, 3-4), whereas his first and second reasons are not relevant to Hoffmeier's suggestions since the New Kingdom immediately followed liberation from Hyksos occupation (Hoffmeier 1983; Curto 1971, 3). Hoffmeier's article deals with warfare and enemy motifs in ancient Egyptian history, and also examines their Old Testament counterparts. Whilst Hoffmeier's work is interesting, it is now thirty years old and there have been considerable re-interpretations of Old Testament texts since the early 1980s. Nor are similarities between the two regions perhaps unsurprising, due to the geographical relationship between ancient Egypt and some of the Old Testament nations. The term "nations" is perhaps inappropriate to use, as it is a modern term that may not apply to the situation at the time. In this region during this period, concepts of "states" and "nations" were not contemporary terms.

Hoffmeier then discusses the recurrent smiting motif which he describes as "head-smashing scenes", the longest-standing form of the portrayal of Egyptian enemies (1983, 54) which is also discussed in some detail in the author's MA thesis (Dean 2009). Well known examples include those smiting scenes depicting Narmer on the Narmer Palette (see fig. 4.27) where the audience was a newly-united Egyptian state being shown their new pharaoh's power and dominion over them, and a reminder of how he was victorious in battle; Montuhotep II smiting a Libyan (fig. 3.1), originally located at Gebelein in Upper Egypt, where the intended audience would have been the clergy in a re-united Egyptian state after the First Intermediate Period as well as being a reminder of his strength against his enemies; and Tutmosis III at Karnak (fig. 3.2), where the audience of ancient Egyptian clergy would be reminded of their pharaoh's power and dominance whenever they visited the temples.

Such smiting scenes have been described as a "'timeless statement' showing that 'Pharaoh is conqueror'" (Groenewegen-Frankfort and Ashmole 1967, 24; cited in Hoffmeier 1983, 54), the Sphinx Stela of Amenhotep II clearly describing the way in which the king "has bound the heads of the Nine Bows... He gathers all of them into his fist, his mace has smashed upon their heads" (Hoffmeier 1983, 54; Shaw 1991, 9). This vivid description suggests that the Egyptians believed they would appear powerful as a nation through depictions of their leader in this particular position of strength. Another such account from the Gebel Barkal stela of Tuthmosis III

describes the king as "The good god" who "seizes with his strong arm, while smiting the southerner and beheading the northerner, who smashes the head of those of bad character..." (De Buck 1970, 56.11; cited in Hoffmeier 1983, 54), the accompanying pictorial portrayals presumably making the point to a population which was 99% illiterate (Baines and Eyre 1983).

Such graphic depictions could also be accompanied by specific phrases, particularly the expression *hr tb(w)t* (Hoffmeier 1983, 59). According to Hoffmeier, this translates to "under the feet, or sandals", which means "(to be) subject to" (1983, 56). If an enemy of Egypt was described as being under the sandals, or feet, of the Pharaoh, they were understood to be completely defeated and subjugated by the victorious ruler. In fact Hoffmeier describes the concept as "much like a man crushing an insect or snake under foot" (1983, 56), a powerful representation of the Egyptians' dominion over their enemies. This phrase is found in varying forms, with Tuthmosis I claiming that "All foreign lands are trodden...under my feet" on the Tombos Stela, while in the case of his daughter Hatshepsut, it was said that all lands were "under her sandals" (Hoffmeier 1983, 69; De Buck 1970, 49.4), displaying Hatshepsut's pharaonic status as much as any of her male counterparts.

This idea of enemies being "under the feet" (Hoffmeier 1983, 56) of the pharaoh was frequently used in the Ramesside period, and the pharaohs "often depicted treading upon their enemies in battle" (Hoffmeier 1983, 60). This variation, with the enemy under the feet of the pharaoh in active combat is an even more powerful image, which would presumably have had the maximum psychological effect on both enemies and the Egyptian populace. This 'enemy under the feet' motif, in whatever form it takes, is related to Curto's third and fourth motives for warfare (1971, 3-4) (fig. 3.3). It could be argued that this concept of the 'enemy under the feet' developed into, or might be related to, the modern Middle Eastern gesture of hitting someone with the sole of the shoe to show absolute contempt.

Organisation of the military

The evidence for the composition and the organisation of the ancient Egyptian army during the Old Kingdom is generally gained from the detailed battle descriptions that are found on the walls of temples, along with lists of titles found on the walls of soldiers' tombs (Shaw 1991, 25). It is worth looking at the organisation of the military because it not only reflects the nature of warfare in a changing Egyptian state, but also shows how the military became more powerful under certain Dynastic periods and pharaohs. It also shows that there are no known examples of women in the regular military, and that the circumstances often had to be extraordinary for women to take part in active warfare. Shaw is of the opinion that in the early stages of the Old Kingdom, the bureaucracy and the priesthood were far more powerful (and therefore possibly more important) than the military (1991, 25). At this time, the apparent lack of need for a full-time, permanent standing army resulted in there being only a small royal bodyguard in existence, which was supplemented by the conscription of young men on what is described as "a relatively *ad hoc* basis for a variety of labour-intensive purposes from quarrying and trading expeditions to military campaigns and the policing of civil disturbances" (Shaw 1991, 25). This structuring of the army perhaps reflects the nature of warfare in ancient Egypt during this particular period. The lack of unification, liberation, colonial or imperial warfare (as set out by Curto 1971) perhaps meant that there was little need for a permanent army, and that a conscripted supplement was enough to run the military as required.

This apparent lack of "overall military hierarchy or organisation" in the Old Kingdom military is accompanied by the only occasional use of the title 'overseer of the soldiers' (Shaw 1991, 25). There was also the title 'overseer of desert blockhouses and royal fortresses', the possessor of which apparently controlled the fortresses on Egypt's borders (Shaw 1991, 25). Other than these two overseer titles, Shaw states that the only other military title to appear at this particular time is the word *ṯst*, used to describe units of soldiers during this period and roughly corresponding to the term 'battalion' (Shaw 1991, 25). However, does this paucity of titles really indicate a lack of military organisation?

Further evidence for the Old Kingdom military presented by Shaw is that of the autobiography of Weni, a nobleman from Abydos (1991, 25). Weni describes a campaign in Palestine, during the reign of Pepi I (2332-2283 BC), which led to a large-scale conscription of men from Egypt and Nubia (Shaw 1991, 25). According to Weni, the army was composed of 'tens of thousands' of soldiers that came from local corps that were provided by provincial officials (Shaw 1991, 25). By the time of the First Intermediate Period, there had been such a devolution of power from central government to the provinces that "each local governor was entitled to recruit his own private army" (1991, 25).

Shaw (1991, 25) argues that by the time of the Middle Kingdom the military organisation was more ambitious and systematic. This is displayed by Amenemhat I's Nubian policy, as continued by his successors, where the royal army campaigns into the region were initially supported by provincial governors' troops, perhaps the same provincial governors who were supported by private armies during the First Intermediate Period (Shaw 1991, 25). However, by the reign of Sesostris III (also known as Senusret or Senwosret), the fifth pharaoh of the Twelfth Dynasty, the governors' power had been greatly reduced (Shaw 1991, 25). Shaw suggests that this reduction in power is perhaps due to the existence of a more professional and organised royal army in Nubia (1991, 25). Nubia was certainly important in the development of the ancient Egyptian army, particularly during this period, the need to control Nubia leading to the establishment of what is described as "a string of fortresses", which then required permanent garrisons of soldiers (Shaw 1991, 25) (fig. 3.4).

These Nubian garrisons required a complex network of command, which would increase the organisation of the ancient Egyptian military (Shaw 1991, 25). This organisation is further evidenced by a cache of papyri discovered at the later Theban mortuary temple of Ramesses II by James Quibell (Shaw 1991, 26). This cache included the 'Semna Dispatches', hieratic communiqués between Nubian forts sent during the reign of Amenemhat III (Shaw 1991, 26; Smither 1945; Gardiner 1955). One of the letters in this cache deals with the military surveillance of the regions around the Nubian forts, and apparently demonstrates two elements of military

organisation during the Middle Kingdom, describing the transmission of a precise attention to detail from Egyptian bureaucracy to the army, and the presence of an intricate chain of command through the ranks (Shaw 1991, 26).

During the Middle Kingdom, the military titles for infantry companies seemed to refer to the troops of a city, naming the city itself at times, with the forces being made up from several local garrisons (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 62-63). Shaw describes titles that were used in Egypt for individual soldiers, which included 'head commander of the town regiment', 'soldier of the town regiment', 'commander of the leaders of dog patrols', and 'scribe of the army' (1991, 26). By the time of the New Kingdom, whilst there were still local garrisons, the company names tended not to have local identities, and instead the titles came from either the place they were stationed, or from "the deity whose temples provisioned the force" (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). Darnell and Manassa suggest that the regional loyalties that gave names to the companies in the First Intermediate Period (such as the provincial governors' armies mentioned by Shaw 1991) and the Middle Kingdom gave way to a more nationally-based military by the early New Kingdom (2007, 63). This perhaps originated from the need for Egypt to unite as a nation to dispel the Hyksos, which also resulted in more overt expressions of patriotic feelings. It is therefore clear that the organisation of the ancient Egyptian military differed between the earlier periods (the First Intermediate Period and the Middle Kingdom) and the later period (the New Kingdom).

In the New Kingdom, particularly by the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty when Egypt had imperialistic concerns, there was the establishment of a large and professional army, with an organised hierarchy (fig. 3.5) (Shaw 1991, 26). This hierarchy seemingly created alternative routes to power which were even open to uneducated men (Shaw 1991, 26). This meant that the traditional clerical administrators, scribally trained, had to share military power with a new military class (Shaw 1991, 26-27). This new development supposedly played an important role in the rise of the so-called 'warrior pharaohs' who emerged during the Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasties (Shaw 1991, 27).

In terms of the Egyptian army, Redford states that the New Kingdom army was made up of a "core of full-time soldiers distributed in peacetime among garrisons in Upper and Lower Egypt, Nubia and Asia" (1997, 51). He also states that these full-time soldiers would be supplemented by conscripted men, from "the able-bodies of the temple communities" when there were larger-scale operations against such enemies as the Mitanni and the Hittites (1997, 51). The archery units are described as "most feared", due to their use of the composite bow, a weapon that was more powerful than its predecessor, the simple bow (Redford 1997, 51). These archery units were apparently either "grouped in battalion under their own commanders, or seconded to infantry units" (Redford 1997, 51).

Recruitment into the Egyptian military for the core soldiers, in the New Kingdom at least, began early in a boy's life (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). There was no suggestion at any stage that women were ever considered in military recruitment. Generally, boys coming from military families would tend to serve in the same units as their fathers (Darnell 2003; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). The techniques that the young recruits would learn were part of a rigorous training course: marching techniques, proficiency with weapons and military discipline were the order of the day for these young soldiers (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). Some of the New Kingdom literary texts seemed to be designed to discourage young men from joining the army, Papyrus Anastasi III for example suggesting that for young recruits the training was brutal:

> "...the lot of the infantryman, the much exerted one: he is brought as a child of *nbi* and confined to a barrack. A painful blow is dealt to his body, a savage blow to his eye and a splitting blow to his brow. His head is split open with a wound. He is laid down and beaten like a piece of papyrus. He is lambasted with beatings" (Shaw 1991, 29).

Yet in contrast to Papyrus Anastasi III's somewhat cynical view of army life, other evidence suggests that military life could be "relatively congenial" (Shaw 1991, 29). For example, Ramesses II's Battle of Kadesh reliefs at the temples of Luxor and Abu Simbel portray army life, including the setting-up of a temporary camp (Shaw 1991, 29). The encamped soldiers are surrounded by "a rectangular barricade of shields",

along with stabling for horses and cattle (Shaw 1991, 29). Right in the centre of the encampment is the royal pavilion and the tents of the military hierarchy (Shaw 1991, 29). Whether or not this is a realistic portrayal, it is certainly, as Shaw (1991, 29) describes it, a vivid one. It does not, however, portray the training of the recruits. Another such example is found in the Memphite tomb of Horemheb, and depicts a military camp at rest (fig. 3.6). Earlier in the Eighteenth Dynasty, Akhenaten's training of young soldiers is described in one of the hymns in a tomb at Amarna: "He trains thousands of recruits, being chief of eternity like the Aten" (de Garis Davies 1906, pls. 17 and 19; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63).

Whilst the training during the New Kingdom, and indeed during any period of Dynastic Egypt, could be brutal, resulting in a great deal of physical pain and hardship, there were also great rewards to be had from a life in the military (Shaw 1991, 30). During service, there was the possibility of advancement through the army ranks, and the ever-present chance of spoils of war from combat victories (Shaw 1991, 30). Those soldiers who survived the military and active service through to their retirement were gifted with land and livestock upon their retirement, as evidenced by the Wilbour Papyrus, dated to the reign of Ramesses V, which includes veteran soldiers (including Sherden mercenaries) in the lists the people renting land in Middle Egypt (Shaw 1991, 30).

During the New Kingdom, an edict issued by Horemheb states that within the country of Egypt itself, there were two army corps which corresponded to the north and south (Lower and Upper Egypt respectively) of the country (Shaw 1991, 27). The royal bodyguard positions were apparently served in ten day cycles, with provincial soldiers serving the ten day shifts (Shaw 1991, 27-28). For an actual campaign, there were apparently three or four principal divisions of around five-thousand soldiers, a combination of conscripted men and professional full-time soldiers (Shaw 1991, 28). These divisions took their names from a deity, and followed it with a suitable epithet, for example 'Amun, Rich of Bows' (Shaw 1991, 28). Similar to Darnell and Manassa's suggestion above, Shaw posits that the deity names for the divisions were taken from the local deity of the area from which the soldiers had been recruited (Shaw 1991, 28).

The ancient Egyptian infantry apparently had a hierarchical structure that resembled the armies of most developing civilisations, including the highest rank in the Middle Kingdom (the "great overseer of the army") which could be said to be the equivalent of the Western rank of general (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 61). The title of 'general' (not actually an ancient Egyptian term but a modern English translation of the equivalent ancient Egyptian title) itself appears rarely until the reign of Amenhotep III, when there was a major reorganisation of the Egyptian military, and a more comprehensive division of the infantry and the chariotry (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 61). As stated above, there was possibly a core group of full-time soldiers, supplemented by conscripted men in times of war (Redford 1997, 51), Darnell and Manassa describing later Eighteenth Dynasty soldiers who did spend their whole working lives in the army (2007, 61). However, it would seem that careers combining both military administrative service and work in civil administration were more common (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 61).

The infantry was generally divided into units known as companies, which comprised several groups of fifty men which were then divided further still into platoons of ten (Darnella and Manassa 2007, 62; Shaw 1991, 27-28). Companies could comprise different armaments, some made up only of archers whereas others were infantry armed with such weapons as spears and axes designed primarily for close-combat situations (fig. 3.7) (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 62). These companies would take their names from their pharaoh, sometimes referring to the monarch's battle-prowess (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 62). During the reign of Akhenaten, the company names changed from the norm, their names being associated with the Aten as well as their pharaoh e.g. the "Pacifier of the Aten" and "the Aten shines" (Schulman 1964; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 62).

The extent of the military innovations achieved by the ancient Egyptians is open to debate. The development of armour was seemingly restricted to "padded caps, elliptical raw-hide shields and triangular sporrans", with the chariots apparently designed for speed rather than protection and force (Redford 1997, 51). The chariot driver did wear some protective clothing, with some body armour and a helmet of either leather or bronze, whilst the other chariot passenger would be armed with a

bow and javelins (Redford 1997, 51). This armour and chariot design would suggest that the Egyptian soldiers were perhaps not strong in defence, and relied mainly on their weapons and mode of attack. This suggestion is conjecture on the part of Redford based on the lack of armour development in Egypt. Shaw and Nicholson state that the chariot was used by the *maryannu*, "an elite corps of the Egyptian army in the New Kingdom" (1997, 64), Shaw further describing the Egyptian *maryannu* as 'young heroes', an aristocratic warrior class modelled on an Asiatic military elite also named *maryannu* (1991, 41). A. F. Rainey refers to "the well-known maryannu, 'chariot warrior' " (1967, 58), while Aldred describes them as "an aristocracy of chariot-using warriors, dedicated to the service of their leaders" (1988b, 154). The general consensus is that the *maryannu* were elite soldiers and charioteers, and for Darnell and Manassa the *maryannu* were the "most flamboyant" chariot warriors of the ancient world, specifically in the New Kingdom (2007, 64). The chariotry was apparently organised into groups of fifty, and had a very important administrative infrastructure (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64). During, and after, the Eighteenth Dynasty, the administrative titles were not limited to non-combatants alone; chariot warriors could also hold these titles (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64).

By the New Kingdom, warfare between Egypt and enemies from the Near East apparently became a battle between the elite units, with a definite emphasis on the chariotry (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). Being part of a chariot unit required not only a great deal of wealth but great skill and specialisation (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63), the skills needed to control a chariot moving at speed as well as firing arrows when travelling at such speeds requiring considerable practice, and enhancing the status of those who were involved in the chariotry (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 63). The two soldiers associated with the chariot are described as "the chariot warrior and the shield-bearer/driver" (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64).

There is mention of the term *maryannu* at the Late Bronze Age city of Ugarit: "The rich and powerful maryannu (a special class of elites) treated the royal family as equals and frequently acted as representatives to foreign princes" (Yon 2000, 201). According to Rainey, "Amenophis [Amenhotep] II boasted of capturing "six maryannu together with their chariots and their horses" " (1965, 19). To have

captured six of the enemy *maryannu* was obviously an achievement to be proud of in military terms. Clearly the term *maryannu* was not exclusive to the ancient Egyptian military, as "Maryannu, a term designating a military aristocrat, appears in Mitanni, Canaan, and Egypt" (Ward 1961, 39). The *maryannu* were originally charioteers who fought for the Mitanni against Egypt, but their mode of dress and styling were adopted by the Egyptians, perhaps hoping to emulate these warriors in battle (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64-65).

According to Zorn, "The bow ... is the weapon par excellence of the maryannu/chariot-warrior" (1991, 136). Apparently the *maryannu* were "devoted to such military sports as shooting with the composite bow, hurling the javelin, taming horses and fighting from the chariot" (Aldred 1988b, 154). The construction of the chariot itself, and the form its crew took, ensured the creation of an effective "fast-moving platform for projectile weapons" (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64). The power of the composite bow meant that it was used a great deal in chariot-fighting, and as it was appreciably shorter than a self-bow for the same or greater power, it was therefore more manageable in a chariot (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 64). This would certainly seem to suggest that the *maryannu* were seen as elite soldiers, particularly in ancient Egypt (fig. 3.8).

The Egyptian army at times also had troops known as 'auxiliaries'; foreign troops that "served in each branch of the Egyptian army" (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). These foreign troops would use specific weapons that differed from those used by the native Egyptian troops, as well as carrying out tasks that were specific to them and their skills (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). These auxiliaries were either integrated into existing Egyptian units or would form "separate units of non-Egyptian troops" (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67) (figs. 3.9 and 3.10). Some auxiliaries seemingly became members of Egyptian society, having served in the Egyptian military for a sufficient length of time (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). Acculturation, such as instruction in the Egyptian language, and rewards, such as the provision of land upon retirement, would be used at times by the Egyptians to ensure the loyalty of their foreign troops (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). This could be an effective technique; if a foreign soldier spent enough time away from his home, and

acclimatised himself to his new surroundings, then he might well begin to display some loyalty to his new 'home'. The promise of a worthwhile reward at the end of his service would only increase loyalty to the Egyptian army, since land was a highly valuable commodity. There are obvious parallels here with the design and procedures of the Roman army.

The first recorded auxiliary troops were apparently the Nubians, recruited to fight for the Upper Egyptians during the First Intermediate Period in their campaign against the Heracleopolitans in Lower Egypt (Fischer 1961; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). These Nubian recruits, called the Medjoy (or Medjay), were later renowned for their roles in the ancient Egyptian military, as "archers, scouts and policemen" (Schneider 2003, 92-93; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67; Shaw 1991, 30). The Medjoy continued to be in use in the Middle Kingdom, apparently playing a crucial role in pharaoh Kamose's re-conquest of Egypt towards the end of the Second Intermediate Period, and during the New Kingdom. Indeed, by the time of the Eighteenth Dynasty the term Medjoy no longer referred to just Nubian soldiers, but was used in reference to policemen and patrolmen in general (Černy 1973; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). These Nubian troops were very much in demand, with examples of Egyptian vassals in Syria-Palestine requesting the aid of these soldiers in order to successfully defend their cities during the Amarna period (Moran 1992, 139 and 169; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 67). There were also other foreign troops that served in the ancient Egyptian military, with instances of Asiatics serving in the ancient Egyptian army, though in the Old Kingdom at least they were rarer than the Nubian auxiliaries (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 68). By the Middle Kingdom, "Asiatic military units could be settled within the confines of Egypt itself" (Darnell *et al.* 2005, 87; cited in Darnell and Manassa 2007, 68), which again has parallels with the structure of the Roman army.

Another interesting type of soldier that was also part of the New Kingdom army was known as the *mhr*. It has been stated that:

> "Papyrus Anastasi I provides us with most of our information on the mhr. A mhr is trained as a scribe ... and is able to give reports on his travels. He is also a soldier equipped with a bow (the weapon of the chariotry),

> quiver, and knife... It seems that he could also lead troops ... and was found at the forefront of the army ... He is directly equated with the maryannu/chariot-warriors ... and, as such, had a second man with him in his chariot...” (Zorn 1991, 134-135).

This *mhr* soldier is particularly interesting due to a position requiring not only military skills but the expertise of a scribe. It is likely that with these skills, the position of the *mhr* soldier was a highly prestigious one, similar to that of the *maryannu* perhaps.

This review of the military in ancient Egypt helps to understand the development and the structure of the ancient Egyptian military, which is useful when looking at women involved with warfare in ancient Egypt. It has also allowed us to see that women did not typically have roles in the military, but, as shall be seen later on in this chapter (and discussed briefly in the previous chapter) could assume militaristic behaviours and styling in a set of very specific circumstances, such as female pharaohs with displays of pharaonic power, in times of extraordinary struggle and circumstances (such as Queen Ahhotep), and occurrences of defensive behaviour (such as the image of Deshasheh, also discussed below).

Women in Ancient Egypt: Warfare and Power

Burial evidence

Moving on from the more traditional examples of figures involved in ancient Egyptian warfare (e.g. examples of male soldiers), it is important that the roles some women played within warfare are examined. When studying the involvement of women in ancient Egyptian warfare, certain Predynastic female weapons burials are a key part of this argument. The fact that women were buried with maces cannot simply be dismissed as evidence of votive deposits, with burials such as grave 1488 at Naqada revealing that women could buried with functional weapons. Petrie and Quibell state that the burial is definitely that of a female, and that it contained two mace-heads: one piriform mace-head of alabaster and one conical mace-head of syenite (1896, 28), with no suggestion that either weapon was a votive object. Similarly, Predynastic Naqada grave 1401 contained the body of an adult female

accompanied by three stone mace-heads and a flint knife (Mallory-Greenough 2002, 89). These women could well have been important within Naqada society, indicated by the fact that they were buried with functional rather than votive weapons.

Another female weapons burial is that of Senebtisi, from the 12th Dynasty, which contained an array of weaponry, including an alabaster piriform mace with a gold-mounted wooden shaft, a conical rock crystal mace head, ceremonial non-combat staves, and a dagger which had a wooden sheath, partially overlaid with gold foil with a tapered copper blade, an elaborate short and wide hilt, and a characteristic crescent-shaped pommel (Hayes 1978, 283; Mace and Winlock 1916b, 102-106). Also from the 12th Dynasty interment is the burial of two middle-aged queens, discovered within the pyramid of Amenemhat III at Dashur, who were buried with granite and alabaster mace-heads similar to the ones found in Senebtisi's burial (Fletcher 2004, 206). Both of these burials are discussed further in Chapter Four, when various ancient Egyptian weapons themselves are examined in greater detail.

One very important female weapons burial is that of Queen Ahhotep, who was queen at the end of the 17th Dynasty and the start of the 18th Dynasty. The weapons found in Ahhotep's burial are very significant (figs. 3.15 and 3.16). She was buried with three daggers and thirteen axes (Lesko 1996, 13) bearing both the names of Ahmose I and his elder brother Kamose (Jánosi 1992, 101). Although the weapons, which also included a javelin head and an archer's brace, could be construed as purely votive objects, their discovery alongside the golden 'Flies of Valour' military decorations emphasises "the military character of the burial deposit associated with Queen Ahhotep", since the Flies were only awarded to someone who personally excelled in battle (Lesko 1996, 13). Ahhotep's military action will be discussed below.

Although not a weapons burial, there is evidence for a female guard buried in the Sixth Dynasty necropolis of Teti at Saqqara (Kanawati 2001; Dean 2009, 42). With three women granted their own tombs in this cemetery (Kanawati 2001, 66-67), the third has particular relevance for this study. Known by three names, Merinebti,

Merinebti-ankhteti and Semut (Kanawati 2001, 66; cited in Dean 2009, 42), she also bore several titles, including that of 'acquaintance of the king' and 'tenant landholder' (Kanawati 2001, 66; cited in Dean 2009, 42), the role of a 'tenant landholder' usually responsible for the provisioning of the palace or temple (Kanawati 2001, 66; cited in Dean 2009, 42). This title, *ḫntj-š*, traditionally translated as 'tenant', has more recent translations that have suggested that the term means 'employee' or 'attendant' (Kanawati 2001, 66). However, as pointed out by Kanawati (2001, 66), this title is held by those who are described as providing protection for the king, and when portrayed they are carrying batons. As Kanawati (2001, 66) states, the tasks carried out by the *ḫntj-š* "clearly have no relationship to the work of a land tenant; they are those of a guard or specifically a bodyguard". In the case of Merinebti, the term *ḫntj-š* does not have the feminine determinative *t*, with the hieroglyphic text simply translating as 'guard', so Kanawati determines that the title held by Merinebti was 'female guard' (2001, 67; cited in Dean 2009, 42).

The exact duties and responsibilities of the female holders of this title are unfortunately unclear, and although Kanawati suggests that they may have served in the most restricted parts of the royal harem (2001, 67; cited in Dean 2009, 42) this theory is only speculative. He also expresses surprise at the lack of other evidence for this title 'female guard', even though there is no disputing its existence (2001, 67). In general, guards did not have individual tombs (Kanawati 2001, 67), so this woman presumably held a position of some power to have been granted her own tomb in the royal cemetery. So far, this is the only occurrence of a 'female guard' having an independent tomb, but it is possible that further evidence may be found in the future (Dean 2009, 43). Whilst there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that this woman took part in active combat, it is interesting that she was granted what could be seen as a quasi-military title.

In her analysis of burials of the pre-unification period, Baumgartel concluded that some of the tombs belonging to women were larger than those provided for male remains (1970, 6; cited in Callender 1992, 18). Baumgartel therefore suggested that in these centres, the women may well have been community leaders, as generally the largest graves in these cemeteries were reserved for rulers (1960, 122, 142; cited in

Callender 1992, 18). Whilst perhaps conjecture, this is a significant observation since traditionally "the graves of known rulers from all epochs in Egyptian history are larger than those of their subjects" (Callender 1992, 19). So although these women would not have held sole power as pharaoh at this time, they may have been rulers of their local area, with women clearly in some position of power before the unification and subsequent Dynastic period. These women could also have been the widows of the men who held power in the area before their death. These female burials are also contemporaneous with those female Predynastic burials containing mace-heads discussed above, both suggesting that women had some political or military importance within their societies. If this was indeed the case, the notion of a female leader would not have been new to the Egyptians, and if a woman could hold a position of power in Predynastic times, they may equally have held comparable status in Dynastic times.

Visual portrayals of women using weaponry

One of the most famous occurrences of women involved in warfare was discussed by Petrie in his 1898 work, *Deshasheh* (fig. 3.11). Clear evidence that women could be involved in combat in some form (Dean 2009, 41), the east wall of the Fourth Dynasty tomb of Anta at Deshasheh "reveals epigraphic evidence for women fighting to defend a town" (Dean 2009, 41), the women of the town of Sati "fighting Egyptian invaders and Bedawi auxiliaries" (Petrie 1898, 6; cited in Dean 2009, 41). In the uppermost register of the scene, a Sati woman stabs the chest of an invading Bedawi who had made his way up a siege ladder into the town enclosure (Dean 2009, 41). A second woman, accompanied by a child, has forced a Bedawi to surrender and break his bow (Petrie 1898, 6; cited in Dean 2009, 41).

In the next register down, the chief of the settlement is seemingly "tearing his hair out in despair at the loss of the town, whilst a woman is driving back a Bedawi who is trying to force his way into the enclosure" (Dean 2009, 41; citing Petrie 1898, 6). So as the male leader apparently bemoans his fate, it is left to a woman to defend her town. The middle scene in the third row down depicts two groups of two women each bringing down an invader, whilst the fourth register features another Sati woman who has overpowered a Bedawi, and "lugged him over by the armpits"

(Petrie 1898, 6; cited in Dean 2009, 41). The fifth and final row of the wall scene portrays two men and one woman who seem to be listening for enemy sappers mining the bases of the walls of the town enclosure, whilst "behind the woman is the dead body of a Bedawi invader" (Petrie 1898, 6; cited in Dean 2009, 41). It has therefore been suggested that these striking scenes "show that women could engage in combat if necessary, and could be reasonably adept both with and without the aid of weaponry" (Dean 2009, 42). So although women did not necessarily take part in combat or warfare on a regular basis, there is evidence that they did so at least occasionally (Dean 2009, 42). This image would not have been viewed by the 'general public' of ancient Egypt, but would have been seen by the deceased's spirit, possibly the deceased's family, and maybe by the ancient Egyptian deities.

One of the most interesting depictions of an ancient Egyptian woman using weaponry portrays Nefertiti in the guise of a reigning monarch, standing on the royal barge and wielding a khopesh against a female foreign prisoner in what can only be described as a typical 'smiting scene' (figs. 3.19 and 3.20) (Fletcher 2004, 74; 192; 282). As the 'smiting scene' motif (also discussed above) was traditionally limited to a reigning pharaoh, it is most revealing that Nefertiti was depicted in this way, and is another piece of evidence supporting the theory that Nefertiti reigned as pharaoh, certainly as co-regent with her husband, and, possibly after his death, as sole ruler.

Another vivid portrayal of an Egyptian woman using weaponry and taking part in active combat is found on a 19th Dynasty ostracon sketch, and likely shows the female pharaoh Tawosret firing arrows from a moving chariot in battle (fig. 3.25) (Peck 1978, 205). Her royal status is symbolised by the uraeus, quite clearly and deliberately drawn on an otherwise sketchy illustration, shown on her brow as she rides into battle in her chariot, wielding a large bow and firing a hail of arrows against a male opponent (Peck 1978, 159).

Women in power

Now it is worth turning to look at examples of women in positions of power, including women such as Neithotep, Meritneit, Sobekneferu, Hatshepsut and

Nefertiti. Certainly there are a considerable number of women in positions of political power throughout Egyptian history, some of whom were pharaohs in their own right even if this is not always acknowledged in modern sources. As Lesko points out, "disappointingly little is known of most of these female pharaohs" (1996, 10). This lack of knowledge may be due to a lack of evidence, or may be a result of these women being studied less than their more familiar male counterparts. In the Third Century BC the Egyptian historian Manetho "recorded the passing of a law in the Second Dynasty permitting women to rule as king", apparently during the reign of Nynetjer (Lesko 1996, 8; Troy 1989, 139; Callender 1992, 24). If this is indeed the case, then it is an extremely important piece of legislation dating to the formative years of Dynastic Egypt and perhaps enacted as a means to retain power within the royal family.

Yet even before the Second Dynasty, there is evidence of a woman ruling as at least a queen-regnant (Lesko 1996, 7-8). The name of Neithotep ('Neit is pleased') "is associated with an elaborate tomb of twenty-one chambers near...Naqada" (Lesko 1996, 7). Neithotep was apparently the northern princess bride of Aha, the son of the first pharaoh of a united Egypt, Narmer, and seems to have become regent after her husband's death (Fletcher 2004, 197). Her name honours the goddess Neit (also spelled Neith), the great creator-goddess, who was represented with a warlike motif of a shield and crossed arrows (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 200; Lesko 1996, 7).

According to Lesko, Neithotep's name also appears written within what was an "exclusively kingly serekh design" (fig. 3.12) (1996, 8), the serekh being a rectangular frame in which the pharaoh's 'Horus name' was written (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 261), and a precursor to the cartouche. Callender (1992, 19) writes that, "Throughout the whole course of Egyptian iconographical history there is no instance of a serekh being used for anyone other than a monarch". Though some scholars may claim that certain women in positions of power were allowed to use the serekh as regents or consorts, others would say that the "consorts of kings in any period of Egyptian history never possessed serekhs, no matter how high their status was among their contemporaries" (Callender 1992, 19). The writing of Neithotep's name in a serekh is very significant, as it confirms her importance in early Dynastic

Egypt. Only someone with a great deal of power and control, such as a ruling pharaoh, could have their name written in a serekh. Therefore, the simplest interpretation is that Neithotep held the powers of pharaoh, although most scholars seem to prefer to assume an exception by designating Neithotep a queen (i.e. the wife of a king/pharaoh only), or regent at best.

Only one other woman is known to have had her name written in the serekh during this First Dynasty period. Meritneit, who was the mother of King Den, used the serekh to display her name (fig. 3.12), and also owned two large tombs, one in the north (at Saqqara) and one in the south (at Abydos), a practice also carried out for male pharaohs at this time (Edwards 1971, 18-25; cited in Lesko 1996, 8; Callender 1992, 19). This concept of the double tomb was one usually reserved for a full ruler, and Meritneit's tombs were both located at sites that hold the tombs of other full rulers, other 'kings' (Callender 1992, 19). Indeed, Meritneit's tomb at Abydos was marked with two stelae, which were published by Petrie as the stele of "King Merneith" (Fletcher 2004, 198; Petrie 1900, pl. LXIV.6) (fig. 3.13). One of Petrie's colleagues, Griffith, even went so far as to say that "it can hardly be doubted that Mer-neit [sic] was a king", until it was discovered that Meritneit was in fact a woman, after which scholars demoted her to the role of regent rather than full ruler and king of Egypt (Fletcher 2004, 198). It is interesting that Petrie does not seem to care about the 'gender' of the king, whereas some of his contemporaries most definitely do. The case of Meritneit is an important example that demonstrates the times when some scholars have either ignored or 'demoted' potential examples of female pharaohs. This is something that this chapter will examine in some detail below.

Wilkinson (1999, 66) claims that the "original identification of Merneith as a king ... caused some confusion". Even recent works prefer to see Meritneit's identification as a king as a mistake that was fortunately rectified once it was discovered that she was a woman, perpetuating the 19th and 20th century stereotypes with regard to the status of women in history. Despite the fact that Callender illustrates Meritneit's name within a serekh (Callendar 1992, 22; see also fig. 3.12), Wilkinson claims Meritneit's name was never written in serekh and that Petrie was wrong when he

described the Abydos stelae as naming "King Merneith" (1999, 74; Petrie 1900). Nor does Wilkinson make any mention of Griffith's statement on Meritneit's kingship, but describes the 'regency' of Meritneit as being "the first attested occasion in Egyptian history when a woman held the reins of power" (1999, 75). Although he does mention Neithotep, he describes her as "Queen Neith-hotep" (not king), the mother of Aha, the second pharaoh of the First Dynasty (1999, 69-70). In Wilkinson's work, Neithotep is not even granted the position of regent (as speculated by Lesko 1996), but is simply a queen, the wife of one king, Narmer, and the mother of another (Wilkinson 1999, 70). Lesko (1996, 7-8) does concede that Neithotep could have been "either the wife or mother of King Aha", whereas Fletcher states that she was the wife of Aha, so there is some confusion as to her exact identity (2004, 197).

Shaw and Nicholson (1997, 18) describe Meritneit as "a female ruler who may have been a regent" in one part of their joint work, later in the same publication describing her as 'almost certainly' being a regent only, not a pharaoh in her own right (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 84; 89). Like other scholars, they do not consider the work of Petrie and Griffiths which inferred she was a King rather than a Queen. Other scholars suggest that Meritneit was only given the privileges of kingship in her capacity as regent for her son Den (Troy 1986, 139). Wilkinson (1999, 62) describes Meritneit as a "queen mother (and probable regent during Den's minority", citing this as the only reason why her name was included on the First Dynasty king list found on the necropolis seal of Den. Is this the only reason why she had kingly titles and her name placed in a serekh? Troy does point out that there is a need to make the distinction between the women who "functioned as de facto monarchs while retaining their status as one of the women of the royal family, and those who assumed the formal rank and titles of the king" (1986, 139). However, the use of the serekh and the Abydos stelae would perhaps indicate that Meritneit indeed had what have been described as "the formal rank and titles of the king" (Troy 1986, 139). As stated above, the serekh could only be used by a monarch; it could not be used by a consort or a regent (Callender 1992, 19).

It would seem that the default position by many academics on women such as Merneit is to assume that they could not possibly have been pharaohs in their own right, perhaps because they were women. Examples such as Hatshepsut are often seen to be the 'exception that proves the rule', with women generally not being acceptable as pharaohs outside of truly exceptional circumstances. This is, again, the problem with academics and scholars attempting to assess the ancient Egyptian culture with their modern, Western perspectives. This is one reason why examining gender-bias in the study of archaeology and history, and its "effects in the history of interpretation" itself is a very important part of a feminist critique of such a subject (Exum 1998, 223). Why do certain academics, within archaeology and aspects of history in particular, read sexual stereotypes the way they do? To what extent do scholars "reinscribe the gender ideology of texts" and material remains (Exum 1998, 223)? Does the gender of the reader/scholar have an impact on how they view and analyse sexual difference in an ancient or historical culture? Many of the academics, such as Wilkinson, Shaw and Nicholson are men, but Troy is a woman. As Exum suggests, there is a need to look not only at gender bias in ancient and historical representations, but also at gender bias in interpretation, and how "readers' assumptions about sex and sexual difference shape their understanding". Exum is writing in relation to biblical texts, but the questions certainly apply to most other academic subjects, and archaeology and Egyptian archaeology in particular.

In her discussion of the serekh, Callender (1992, 19) states that there is only one way in which Neithotep and Meritneit's serekhs differ from those of the male kings: the goddess Neith is represented above the women's serekhs, whereas the men would have a male patron god (e.g. the serekh of Djer was surmounted by the symbol of Horus). As Neith was apparently the patron goddess of these women, she was therefore the appropriate symbol to have above their serekh (Callender 1992, 19). The question of how much power these two 'queens' had is an important one, and has been debated since the discovery of their existence. Helck (1968), Emery (1954) and Petrie (1900) have apparently suggested that Neithotep and Meritneit had "political control over Egypt's population" (Callender 1992, 19). However, there has been the suggestion that their names were only portrayed in the serekh in order

for the Lower Egypt population to believe that, in what was a turbulent time, there was a successful joint rule (Callender 1992, 19).

There is no mention of either Neithotep or Meritneit in more general text-books such as Silverman's *Ancient Egypt* (1997) or even (and perhaps more surprisingly) in Robins' *Women in Ancient Egypt* (2004). These women are clearly ignored by some scholars, and when discussed at all simply described as queens or regents rather than rulers or pharaohs in their own right. In 1961, Gardiner did draw attention to the fact that Neithotep and Meritneit had their names enclosed within serekhs but goes no further than simply saying that their names were "written in a most interesting way" (Gardiner 1961, 411; cited in Callender 1992, 23). Callender displays some frustration at this, as the information available to Gardiner was very important, and it is therefore "very disappointing that more prominence and discussion are not given to these early queens in Egyptian histories" (1992, 23), a statement echoed by Lesko in her 1996 work (1996, 10). In works from the earlier 20th century, this lack of discussion surrounding these two 'queens' in perhaps to be expected, but by the 1960s, and certainly by the 1990s and into the 21st century, it is extremely disappointing to find that their status appears to have been downplayed despite the evidence available, especially within text books considered as standard works in the teaching of ancient Egyptian history and archaeology.

One other important woman in the First Dynasty is mentioned in Callender's 1992 paper. This woman, Herneit, might well be a queen of the First Dynasty. However, it would seem to be unlikely that she was a full ruler, as no evidence has been found to suggest that her name was portrayed in a serekh (Callender 1992, 23). Whilst Herneit had an elaborate tomb at Saqqara (Callender 1992, 23), unlike Meritneit there was no evidence of a double tomb. There is no doubting that Herneit had great status; she possessed two very important titles: *hntjj*, "one who is in charge of the cellar", and *sm3 nbwjj*, "one who unites the Two Lords" (Callender 1992, 23). The first of these titles is one that is linked with all of the First Dynasty monarchs, and it refers to the provisioning of the royal palace (Kaplony 1963/4, 442; cited in Callender 1992, 23). The second title refers to the gods of both Upper and Lower Egypt, and was possessed only by queens (wives of the king rather than rulers or

monarch in their own right) from the First to Sixth Dynasties, which stressed the role that these queens had to play in the unification of ancient Egypt at this time (Callender 1992, 23). There is a slight variation on this latter title: *sm3yt nbwy*, "the one who is united with the Two Lords", is interpreted by some as being comparable to the word 'consort', and therefore a way to support the identification of someone as a royal (Troy 1986, 106). This would perhaps suggest that, rather than a reigning monarch, it is more likely that Herneit was in fact an important queen (as wife of the king), though it is also possible that she may have been regent at some stage. The lack of a serekh associated with her name means it is unlikely that she was a reigning pharaoh.

As discussed above, and as is unfortunately often the case, other examples of women who were possibly female pharaohs are often ignored by scholars or demoted to 'queen', 'consort', or 'regent' by others. One such example occurs at the end of the Fourth Dynasty/beginning of the Fifth Dynasty. Khentkawes I was a very important figure at this time, to the extent that an impressive mastaba tomb was built for her at Giza of sufficient dimensions to be sometimes referred to as the "Fourth Pyramid" (fig. 3.14) (Callender 1992, 24; Fletcher 2004, 201). As Callender suggests, the sheer size of the tomb, along with the prominent location, displays the prestigious position that this woman must have held, whether she was a 'queen' or a pharaoh (1992, 25). One thing that makes the status of Khentkawes I so significant is the fact that she had her own *hm ntr* priest to serve her mortuary cult (Callender 1992, 24-25). This is unusual because only the ruling pharaoh could have a *hm ntr* ("Priest of the God"), as only a pharaoh was considered divine after death (Callender 1992, 25). The suggestion is that Khentkawes I had this elite status either because she was a reigning monarch (i.e. a pharaoh), or because she gave birth to two sons who both became pharaohs (Callender 1992, 25). The theory that Khentkawes I was pharaoh is supported by Fletcher (2004). Khentkawes' impressive tomb is cited as evidence for her kingship, an inscription on the granite gateway to this tomb naming her as "Khentkawes, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Mother of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Daughter of the god, Every good thing which she orders is done for her" (Fletcher 2004, 204). Yet despite such evidence, Gardiner claimed that alternative translations are "philologically tenable" (Gardiner 1961, 83; cited in

Fletcher 2004, 204), and regularly downplays any evidence of female pharaohs even in his examination of the reign of the female pharaoh Hatshepsut (discussed below).

Nevertheless, further evidence suggesting Khentkawes I did indeed reign as pharaoh can be found in the form of the figure accompanying the tomb inscription. Representing Khentkawes, it shows her wearing "the false beard of a king and the royal cobra at her brow" (Fletcher 2004, 201), something that was not commented on by Gardiner or other scholars at the time and has been ignored by some scholars ever since. Lesko (1996, 9) describes Khentkawes I as a 'queen' rather than a pharaoh, and suggests that she was regent for her sons. Described as "Mother of the Two Kings of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Verner 1980; cited in Lesko 1996, 9), it has been suggested that she was the dynastic link between the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties (Lesko 1996, 9). Troy also describes Khentkawes in this way, referring to "the royal mother Khentkaues", notable as the earliest royal woman associated with the vulture crown which is "outlined on the determinative of the name" of Khentkawes (1986, 117). This vulture crown is often seen as the symbol for queenship in ancient Egypt, and by the Sixth Dynasty, around the time of Pepi I, it is "an accepted element of the iconography of the royal women" (Troy 1986, 117).

Although Lesko points out there may well have been earlier female rulers (1996, 9), the first woman generally agreed to have ruled as pharaoh is Nitocris (also known as Neithikret, Nitokerty, or Nitiqret). She reigned at the end of the 6th Dynasty (Lesko 1996, 10) between c.2148 BC - 2144 BC (Fletcher 2004, 203), and is definitely named in the ancient Egyptian king list the Turin Canon, the pieces of which have now been rearranged by Ryholt (2000). Described as the "first known queen to rule Egypt" (Gera 1997, 101), sources for Nitocris are the works of Herodotus and Manetho and the *Tractatus de Mulieribus Claris in Bello* (1997, 101), translated as "Women Intelligent and Courageous in Warfare" (Fletcher 2004, 204). According to Gera, "Her existence is attested in Egyptian records – the Turin papyrus – as well as in the surviving fragments of Manetho" (1997, 101), although a lack of archaeological evidence for her reign (Gera 1997, 101) has led scholars like Lesko (1996, 10) to "question her reality" (Gera 1997, 101), and there are no known inscribed monuments nor tomb yet known for Nitocris. However, more recent

research by K Ryholt (2000) suggests Nitocris may not have existed, and may even have been an amalgam of previous female rulers.

Whether or not she sctually existed, or was simply a conflation of previous female rulers, she is the first female ruler claimed by Classical writers to have behaved in a warrior-like manner. The defining moment of Nitocris' reign for later commentators was the dramatic act of vengeance she is said to have initiated in order to punish those who had assassinated her brother and predecessor (Gera 1997, 102). This plan involved the construction of an elaborate underground chamber, with water brought into it through a subterranean channel (Gera 1997, 103). Her enemies were then invited to a feast to celebrate the opening of this chamber, during which it was flooded with river water (Gera 1997, 103-104). Yet instead of drowning alongside them, Nitocris apparently flung herself "into a room filled with ashes" (Gera 1997, 104). Gera points out the contrasts between the method of death used for the assassins and the method chosen by Nitocris to end her own life, the use of opposing elements of water and fire somewhat symbolic (Gera 1997, 104).

According to Herodotus, Nitocris committed suicide in order to avoid punishment, giving her actions an almost cowardly intent (Gera 1997, 104). This seems to be a somewhat harsh assessment, and some believe that Herodotus is "prejudiced against women who assert themselves in public and that the historian censures the queen for her savage behavior [sic]" (Gera 1997, 104). However, Gera believes this not to necessarily be the case, as Herodotus' comment on Nitocris' death is relatively neutral compared to his remarks on the deaths of other women, such as Pheretime (or Pheretima) (1997, 104).

Although the level of detail attributed to Nitocris in the planning and execution of her elaborate strategy suggests a woman of strong will and patience, there is certainly debate as to whether or not these events took place. Callender describes the tale of Nitocris as "another diverting anecdote about Egypt that Herodotus delights in telling" (1992, 29), citing comparable tales in Egyptian papyri (Callender 1992, 29). Herodotus may well be simply repeating general legends when telling this story,

although he is nevertheless accurate in his description of the background of the period during which Nitocris ruled (Callender 1992, 29); the Old Kingdom did come to an end relatively soon after Nitocris' reign, indicating a chaotic period caused by climate change (Hassan 2011) after which the centralised government entirely collapsed (Callender 1992, 29). So does this evidence enable us to imbue Nitocris with a warrior-like nature - can she really be described as a 'warrior woman'? There is no evidence to suggest that Nitocris took an active role in warfare or in any type of combat, and even when carrying out the execution of her enemies, albeit successfully, she uses water to kill them rather than her own hand. Although Ryholt's work suggests that perhaps Nitocris did not actually exist as an individual monarch, she is still worth examining as a possible female ruler who displayed war-like tendancies and was accepted as having held power by Classical writers.

There is relatively little information about the rulers of Egypt during the First Intermediate Period, as the country was divided and in a state of disarray. The re-unification of Egypt by Montuhotep II ('Montu is pleased') led to the rule of the 12th Dynasty, during which time another female pharaoh took power. With a significant amount of information available for the reign of Sobekneferu (Sebekneferu; 'the Beauty of Sobek'), most scholars accept she ruled Egypt at the end of the 12th Dynasty (Callender 1992, 29; Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 273; Lesko 1996, 11; Fletcher 2004, 207; Murnane 1997, 28). The daughter of pharaoh Amenemhat III, her reign (1799-1795 BC) was apparently brief although she achieved a considerable amount (Callender 1992, 30; Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 273; Lesko 1996, 11; Fletcher 2004, 207). Sobekneferu was instrumental in completing the construction of the Classically-named 'Labyrinth' (Callender 1992, 29; Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 28, 121, and 273), a multi-roomed mortuary temple which made up part of Amenemhat III's pyramid complex at Hawara (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 28). Herodotus visited the site and described it as the most amazing building that he had ever seen; a structure that apparently exceeded the grandeur of the pyramids (Callender 1992, 29; Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 121). Whilst Amenemhat III started the construction, it was Sobekneferu who ensured it was completed to its full glory (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 273). When Petrie excavated the ruins of the 'Labyrinth' in the early 20th Century, he found evidence that Sobekneferu was indeed responsible

for much of its construction, presumably completing the work once she inherited the throne from her father (Petrie 1912, 50-53; cited in Lesko 1996, 11). However, according to Callender, Petrie is the only historian to acknowledge Sobekneferu's contribution to the construction (1992, 29).

Sobekneferu is also associated with Amenemhat III on several other monuments, although this has been interpreted by some as representing a co-regency (Murnane 1977, 229; cited in Troy 1986, 140). One example is a block from Kantir, which shows the names of Amenemhat III and Sobekneferu represented with the Male Horus and the Female Horus respectively (Habachi 1954, Pl. 15A; cited in Troy 1986, 140). This may indeed suggest that there was a co-regency between Sobekneferu and Amenemhat III, or alternatively may indicate that Sobekneferu again completed work her father left unfinished at his death. Sobekneferu was also responsible for the construction of several other monuments during her short reign, including several statues in the eastern Delta, a temple at Herakleopolis, and the Nile register at Semnah in Nubia (Callender 1992, 30; Lesko 1996, 11). Yet although Sobeknefru may have made her mark, later ruler Ramesses II omitted her name from his king list at Abydos (Callender 1992, 30). Indeed, the reign of Sobekneferu is a classic example of the way in which both ancient Egyptian and modern historians refuse to allow female pharaohs "their due place in the history of Egypt" (Callender 1992, 30), either by failing to study them in any detail, or refusing to acknowledge they were pharaohs, or even by ignoring them entirely.

One very important example of powerful ancient Egyptian woman, who also happened to have some involvement with warfare, is Queen Ahhotep, mentioned earlier. Whilst not a reigning pharaoh, Queen Ahhotep is a highly significant figure in the events of this period. The burial goods found in her tomb included a considerable quantity of weaponry, and there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Ahhotep was actively engaged in the planning of military engagements, if not in the leading of troops herself. It is certainly possible that the queen went into battle herself; the Karnak Stela is very direct in its description of Ahhotep, claiming that "She cared for her soldiers…she brought back her fugitives and gathered up her deserters. She has pacified Egypt and expelled her rebels" (Breasted 1906, 29-32).

Ahhotep supposedly rallied her soldiers to continue fighting the enemy when her first-born son Kamose fell in battle, which apparently led the way to the re-unification of Egypt (Redford 1967, 69). The actions of Ahhotep described in the Karnak stele, leading soldiers victoriously into battle, would justify her right to be buried with the Golden Flies of Valour discussed above. And with Ahhotep a critically important figure in the examination of women associated with weapons and warfare in ancient Egypt, the Eighteenth Dynasty itself is sufficiently important to be rightly dubbed by Lesko "A Dynasty of Formidable Females" (1996, 13). It could also be said that the Eighteenth Dynasty was a Dynasty of formidable males, with pharaohs such as Amenhotep II and Tuthmosis III. However, the fact that there were so many examples of 'formidable females' in the Eighteenth Dynasty (compared to some of the other Dynasties) does highlight the importance of the Eighteenth Dynasty in the study of women and power, and women and warfare in ancient Egypt.

The best known of Egypt's female pharaohs is the Eighteenth Dynasty Hatshepsut, and with widespread evidence for her reign she is obviously an extremely significant figure in this study. Having come to the throne as regent for her young stepson after the death of her husband Tuthmosis II (Callender 1988, 86), it is possible that Hatshepsut took on some pharaonic duties during the reign of her husband, before she became regent, due to her husband's suggested illness (Callender 1988, 86). According to Callender, in a critical examination of Hatshepsut's reign, this is something Queen Ahhotep had done for her son Ahmose on a regular basis (1988, 86). So whilst Hatshepsut undertaking duties for her husband may not have been the most unusual of occurrences, it would have proven her capabilities and perhaps given her a taste for power (Callendar 1988, 87).

Whilst Hatshepsut initially became regent for her stepson, she then took the role of reigning pharaoh for herself (c. 1479 BC). She apparently did not give up her regency at the agreed time, and attempted to establish her own legitimacy as pharaoh by discrediting her husband's reign and claiming that her father, Tuthmosis I, had presented her to his court as his chosen heiress to his throne (Callender 1988, 87). It seems highly likely that Hatshepsut would have been aware of the Second Dynasty edict that stated that a woman might legitimately rule Egypt as pharaoh (Callender

1988, 87), and there had been at least two female pharaohs before her, suggesting her biological sex was no great impediment to her rule (Callender 1988, 87). Indeed, while Hatshepsut did often have herself portrayed as a male pharaoh, there was no attempt made to conceal her biological sex, suggesting that sex was indeed no obstacle to the holding of power in ancient Egypt, despite the fact that the potential trappings of such a role might be gendered (as suggested by Hatshepsut wearing 'male' clothing) (Dougherty 2004, 203). Though this bid for power displays Hatshepsut's intelligence and ambition, her reign also demonstrates some military expertise, particularly as she conducted or at least ordered five different military campaigns during her time as pharaoh (Callender 1988, 93).

Initially scholars such as John Wilson believed that Hatshepsut carried out no military campaigns during her reign, comparing her unfavourably with her successor Tuthmosis III:

> "She records no military campaigns or conquests, he became the great conqueror and organizer of empire. Her pride was in the internal development of Egypt and in commercial enterprise; his pride was in the external expansion of Egypt and in military enterprise... Hatshepsut seems to make a break with ... spasmodic activity by eschewing military endeavour and concentrating on peaceful goals. Tuthmosis III rejected the pattern of the past by making military activity regular and purposeful" (1951, 175; cited in Callender 1988, 93).

Although this opinion was proven incorrect by Redford in a 1967 publication discussing the five military campaigns organised by Hatshepsut (1967; cited in Callender 1988, 93), Wilson's view was repeated by others even after Redford's work was published. Leonard Cottrell, writing in 1968, states that Hatshepsut: "...was not interested in warfare. Perhaps she had enough of it, having been brought up in the warlike atmosphere of the Theban court by her father, and then married to another military man..." (1968, 73; cited in Callender 1988, 95). Cottrell also dismisses Hatshepsut's achievements by claiming that she had no part in them: "Hatshepsut enjoyed sixteen years of peace, but they had been won for her by her

fighting ancestors" (1968, 74). As Callender points out, Cottrell's basic facts are wrong: for example, Hatshepsut ruled for over twenty years (1988, 95). If Cottrell makes such basic errors, he may have been mistaken in other areas of his publication. Certainly, the work done by Redford would seem to disprove this idea that Hatshepsut had no interest in military campaigns.

Callender (1988) also discusses examples of evidence for the military campaigns organised by Hatshepsut, citing Habachi's 1957 paper 'Two Graffiti at Sehēl from the Reign of Queen Hatshepsut' which includes examples relevant to Hatshepsut's military campaigns taken from the island of Sehēl. The first example involves two limestone blocks found at Karnak (fig. 3.17), dated to Hatshepsut's reign, which describes her as:

> "... the protectress of Kamutef, the beneficent seed who came forth from ... (2) ... eternity, who makes excellent laws and divine plans, who comes forth from the god, who commands what happens... (3)... (the Asiatic) being in fear and the land of Nubia in submission, the excellent prow of the South and the excellent stern of (the North)" (Habachi 1957, 102).

Callender certainly believes this inscription refers to a military campaign of Hatshepsut (1988, 93), the reference to "(the Asiatic) being in fear and the land of Nubia in submission" (Habachi 1957, 102) suggesting a policy of active warfare rather than one of "commercial enterprise" and "peaceful goals" suggested by Wilson (1951, 175).

More comprehensive evidence of military campaigns during Hatshepsut's reign comes from her funerary temple at Deir el-Bahri, where a description of a campaign into Nubia states that the defeat of the Nubians was comprehensive, "the number of dead being unknown; their hands were cut off ... she overthrew ... the gods ... likewise; all foreign lands spoke of the rage of their hearts, but they turned back on account of the greatness" (Callender 1988, 93). Callender makes the assumption that the "greatness" refers to the greatness of Hatshepsut. There is also another reference to Hatshepsut's military campaigns at Deir el-Bahri. One part of a text states that

"her arrow is among the Northerners", which according to Callender means that Hatshepsut "fought a war in the north against the Asiatics" (1988, 93). This northern war is said to be corroborated by an official's stele (Callender 1988, 93). This official campaigned in Sinai, and claimed that he was on military service during Hatshepsut's co-regency with Tuthmosis III (1988, 93).

One of the most convincing pieces of evidence for Hatshepsut's involvement in military campaigns comes from Sehēl again (fig. 3.18), and takes the form of a rock inscription written by her royal treasurer:

> "'I followed the good god, the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ka-(ma)-re, given life. I saw him overthrowing the (Nubian) nomads, their chiefs being brought to him as prisoners. I saw him destroying the land of Nubia, while I was in the following of his Majesty. Behold I am a king's messenger, doing what is said.' Made by the draughtsman of Amun, Amenmose" (Habachi 1957, 99-100; also partially cited in Callender 1988, 94).

As the 'king' is named as Maat-kare (Ka-(ma)-re), this is a very significant piece of text, as Maat-kare was the throne name of Hatshepsut. She also alternated between referring to herself as 'she' and 'he' in official inscriptions, and here the military nature of this passage apparently called for the use of the masculine pronoun (Callender 1988, 94). As this text shows that masculine pronouns were used for females in military contexts, it is possible argue that other documentary records will not unambiguously demonstrate the use of feminine pronouns for women going into battle. This may explain what some scholars argue is a 'lack' of women in a military context in the historical record; it could be that they were simply represented in textual sources by the use of male pronouns. This text is also important because it shows Hatshepsut to have been leading campaigns herself, taking an active role in warfare and military campaigns. Of course, this may simply be exaggeration on the part of Hatshepsut, overstating her bravado before her subjects. Yet the same may be said about any of Egypt's pharaohs, male or female, who proclaimed to the world their prowess in battle and success in war, a good example being Ramesses II and his

version of the Battle of Kadesh when compared to the example of his Hittite opponents – an exercise in blatant embellishment and hyperbole.

According to Habachi, the two aforementioned blocks from Karnak fit together exactly, and contain a further inscription beyond that of the possible military campaigns. This inscription reads: "(the king of Upper and Lower Egypt) Ka-ma-re, she says: 'I am the daughter of Amun, one who came forth from him, who made (great) monuments for him, who built ... six shrines(?) and(?) temples. .. .'" (Habachi 1957, 102). This description of Hatshepsut describes her, through her throne name (Ka-ma-re also written as Maat-kare, as mentioned above), as the absolute king of a united Upper and Lower Egypt.

Another account used by Callender to suggest that Hatshepsut ran military campaigns during her reign (1988, 94) is a tomb inscription from Dra Abu el-Naga, near Deir el-Bahri. Written by a scribe called Djehuty (Callender 1988, 94), the inscription states "I saw the collection of booty by this mighty ruler from the vile Kush, who are deemed cowards. The female sovereign, given life, prosperity and health forever" (Callender 1988, 94). Callender believes that this inscription indisputably proves that Hatshepsut led her troops into battle on at least one occasion against Nubia, that the inscription suggests that Hatshepsut herself took the "booty" from the defeated Nubians (1988, 94). Whilst it is possible that this was indeed the case, it may also be possible that this is merely a fictional account, designed to create a particular image for a female pharaoh trying to display her power and might. Yet on the other hand, why would a scribe feel the need to be creative with the truth on his own monument, unless perhaps he wanted to curry favour with his pharaoh by portraying her as a great leader of armies, which is indeed a good reason for writing such an account.

Although there may be no way of knowing for certain if Hatshepsut did lead her army into battle, it should certainly not be discounted simply because Hatshepsut was a woman. Callender points out that while it is not always known who ran the other campaigns of her reign, Hatshepsut was a very active monarch who could very

easily have led campaigns herself (1988, 94), The inscriptions discussed above certainly seeming to contradict the opinions of Cottrell and Wilson. Of course, Callender was writing over thirty years after Wilson and twenty years after Cottrell, but since Habachi published his findings in 1957, his evidence suggesting Hatshepsut's active role in military campaigns was certainly available to Cottrell, who was either unaware of this evidence or chose to ignore it.

Callender's work certainly draws attention to the bias directed at women pharaohs that was a fairly common one at the time, particularly with regard to Hatshepsut. Writing in 1957, Steindorff and Seele found a hero in Tuthmosis III and an autocratic woman in Hatshepsut: "It must have been very much against his will that the energetic young Thutmose III watched from the side-lines the high-handed rule of the 'pharaoh' Hatshepsut and the chancellorship of the upstart Senenmut" (1957, 46; cited in Callender 1988, 96). The way that the word pharaoh is written in quotation marks when referring to Hatshepsut is somewhat demeaning, suggesting she was in some way not regarded as a proper pharaoh in her own right. Steindorff and Seele then go on to state that Tuthmosis III successfully overthrew and banished Senenmet and Hatshepsut's "galaxy of satellites" (1957, 46; cited in Callender 1988, 96).

Callender also highlights the work of Sir Alan Gardiner in what she sees as a level of bitterness towards this most famous of female pharaohs. Apparently Gardiner did not admire any of Egypt's female pharaohs, but he seemed to have had a particular dislike of Hatshepsut. One statement in particular displays Gardiner's attitude: "Twice before in Egypt's earlier history a queen had usurped the kingship, but it was a wholly new departure for a female to pose and dress as a man" (Gardiner 1961, 184p; cited in Callender 1988, 96; Callender 1992, 30). There is one seemingly glaring error in this statement: the two queens (and ruling female pharaohs) mentioned by Gardiner are Nitocris and Sobekneferu, neither of whom are known to have usurped the kingships, unless Gardiner believed that 'kingship' was an explicitly masculine concept, and therefore any woman who took on that role was effectively usurping it.

Gardiner also claims that it was "not to be imagined, however, that even a woman of the most virile character could have attained such a pinnacle of power without masculine support" (1961, 184). Even Callender (1988, 97) points out that Hatshepsut would have required some help from male officials in order to maintain power, but this would have been due in part to the lack of public office for women at this time; according to Callender (1988, 97), ninety percent of the court consisted of men, which, if indeed the case, would have meant that Hatshepsut inevitably had to rely on a network of male officials. These attitudes flagged up by Callender (1988) are unfortunately typical of many scholars' attitudes towards female pharaohs, and despite a significant amount of evidence, Hatshepsut's warlike deeds are rarely acknowledged. Hatshepsut had been recognised somewhat reluctantly as a female pharaoh, but as Fletcher says, she has too often been seen as "an aberration, a fluke, the exception that proves the rule" (2004, 186). As a result, the other female pharaohs in Egypt's history were at times explained away or simply ignored by many scholars.

Nefertiti was yet another powerful 18th Dynasty ruler, her 'smiting scene' having been discussed earlier. However, the idea of Nefertiti as pharaoh is still not generally accepted. Relegated to the role of meddling wife, one source claims that while Akhenaten "seems to have been willing to compromise [with the priests of Amun], Nefertiti, his wife, was not" (White 1948, 99). Nefertiti is described as having fallen "into disgrace, or was estranged from her husband, and retired with some powerful followers to the north end of the city where she built a palace for herself. The political structure was disintegrating at home and abroad" (White 1948, 99). Then when examining Akhenaten's relationships, Nefertiti may have been his chief wife, but he also had his "'beloved' coregent Smenkhkere" (White 1948, 108) of whom "nothing whatever is definitely known" (P. E. Newberry 1932, 50; cited in White 1948, 108). This statement about the mysterious Smenkhkare (Smenkhkara/Smenkhkere) who briefly succeeded Akhenaten as pharaoh demonstrates how scholars long refused to even consider the possibility that Smenkhkare was simply the throne name of Nefertiti (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 21).

One of the most useful and comprehensive sources for information on Nefertiti as pharaoh is Samson's (2002) *Nefertiti and Cleopatra: Queen-Monarchs of Ancient Egypt*, in which the collation of information is wide-ranging and includes a lot of information that has been overlooked by other scholars. Samson's work supports the theory that Nefertiti ruled with her husband (2002, 2). From early in Akhenaten's reign, Nefertiti was given the title of 'Heiress', even though there is no evidence that her father was a king (Samson 2002, 12). Samson (2002, 12-13) postulates that the title was given to her by Akhenaten who wished to designate her as his heiress, his successor in fact. This theory certainly seems to be supported by the tomb and temple wall scenes that were carved during the reign of Akhenaten, where apparently the carvings illustrate "just how he [Akhenaten] viewed her [Nefertiti] and how he meant the people of the country to view her as his Regnant Queen" (Samson 2002, 13). The carvings portray Akhenaten and Nefertiti sharing their state and their home lives, the commemoration of which suggests a true partnership and a sharing of the throne (Samson 2002, 13).

The tomb of Vizier Ramose contains the earliest known scene of Akhenaten and Nefertiti together (fig. 3.21) (Samson 2002, 13; Fletcher 2004, 92), Nefertiti wearing the uraeus at her brow as the royal sign of power worn only by kings and their chief wives or 'great queens' (Samson 2002, 14). In this particular scene, the uraeus and Nefertiti herself are being blessed by the hands of the sun disc god, the Aten (Samson 2002, 14), which also bless Akhenaten's crown and body, a close association between King, Queen and god which continues throughout the reign (Samson 2002, 14).

Nefertiti's full name Neferneferuaten Nefertiti was often written as one name in a cartouche, the later version of the serekh which took the form of a ring surrounding the name of every king and their chief queen (Samson 2002, 16). Samson believes that Egyptologists' use of the shortened version of her name (Nefertiti) led to her full name being disassociated from her and instead attached to Akhenaten's female-looking co-regent, initially assumed to have been some mysterious young man 'beloved' of the pharaoh (2002, 16; Fletcher 2004, 36). It can be inferred from the writings of some previous scholars that the belief in such a male character stemmed

from the assumption that only a man could have ruled as co-regent, explaining the creation of a mysterious royal youth who nonetheless shared Nefertiti's name as well as her feminine appearance. Yet there is much evidence to suggest that Nefertiti at least ruled alongside her husband, her figure represented with Akhenaten in a series of colossal statues from Karnak, something which was generally "unique except for queen monarchs" (Samson 2002, 17). Nefertiti is also depicted in relief scenes at Karnak which show her worshipping the Aten disc in what is described as a "kingly style" (Samsom 2002, 17). This "kingly style" of worship is repeated many times throughout Akhenaten's reign, with Nefertiti depicted worshipping the Aten both with Akhenaten and alone (Samson 2002, 17). The fact that Nefertiti was shown alone in such scenes suggests she held a great deal of power (Lesko 1996, 20), and as Samson points out, even the most powerful 'Great Queen' did not play such an important role, often shown as much smaller than the male pharaoh in statues and wall scenes, even in the Eighteenth Dynasty at times (2002, 17).

One particularly important scene at Thebes depicts Nefertiti worshipping the Aten at a fully-laden altar, the hands of the Aten coming down to bless Nefertiti with the ankh (fig. 3.22) (Samson 2002, 18). This scene is so important because whilst one of Nefertiti's daughters holds a sistrum in the traditional female role within worship, Nefertiti herself raises her arms to the Aten, as Akhenaten and countless other pharaohs did, to offer a figure of Ma'at in the traditional pose of a pharaoh (Samson 2002, 19). Inscriptions describe Nefertiti, along with the Aten, as a ruler with the phrase "adoration by all the people of the Aten and Nefernefruaten-Nefertiti" (Samson 2002, 20). As Samson points out, the word 'adoration' is usually reserved for a god or pharaoh (and therefore a god incarnate) (2002, 20).

Further relief scenes on stone pillars at Karnak only corroborate Nefertiti's importance as she is depicted raising her arms in adoration to the Aten (fig. 3.23) (Samson 2002, 20), accompanied by a "very remarkable inscription" (Samson 2002, 20). In parallel to those referencing Akhenaten as pharaoh and worded "He who Found the Aten", it is here feminised as "She who Found the Aten" in reference to Nefertiti (Samson 2002, 20). This shows that both Akhenaten and Nefertiti were equally connected to the deity, as illustrated by later inscriptions of prayers

addressed to both of them equally (Samson 2002, 20; Lesko 1996, 21). Of course, the case has been argued in the past that Akhenaten displayed an integration of both the male and female genders, as supposedly displayed by some of his statuary. Therefore it could be postulated that the title "She who Found the Aten" could certainly refer to Akhenaten. However, this is a highly contested theory, as some of the more 'feminine' Akhenaten statury is actually thought to represent Nefertiti (Fletcher 2004, 72). As mentioned by Samson, there are no other occurrences of a queen being described as the equal of a pharaoh, unless she was a pharaoh herself (2002, 20). These images would have been viewed by the temple clergy who would have been responsible for worshipping the gods and the monarchs.

Samson also mentions "the final seal of Nefertiti's regality" (2002, 25), a limestone block from Amarna showing Nefertiti as a reigning monarch, wielding a khopesh against a female foreign prisoner who she holds in place by grasping her hair (figs. 3.19 and 3.20) (Fletcher 2004, 74; 192; 282). In this scene, Nefertiti takes a pharaonic 'warrior' role, wearing her distinctive blue crown and stripped to the waist, wearing the ceremonial male-style kilt of a pharaoh. This corresponds to the act that she is about to carry out, an act traditionally the domain of the pharaoh (Fletcher 2004, 282; Samson 2002, 25; Lesko 1996, 21). As Samson says, Nefertiti was normally depicted as being "essentially feminine in her ways and dress except in this wholly symbolic scene of her kingship" (2002, 25). Smiting scenes were expressions of power, especially important at times of unification (Dean 2009, 15). A pharaoh wishing to display strength and authority would be portrayed in smiting pose to display dominance, so it is extremely interesting that Nefertiti herself is portrayed in such a scene, suggesting she was a reigning monarch in her own right. In addition, although women were rarely depicted driving their own chariots, Nefertiti is depicted driving her own vehicle and in charge of her own horses (fig. 3.24) (Samson 2002, 64-65).

Nefertiti appears to have been elevated to co-ruler with Akhenaten in the twelfth year of his reign, when she added the name Ankhkheperura to become Ankhkheperura-Neferneferuaten (Fletcher 2004, 72). After Akhenaten's death, it is believed she then took the throne name Ankhkheperura Smenkhkara, this traditional

use of multiple royal names nonetheless proving somewhat confusing to some scholars and leading to the assumption that a mysterious male, 'Smenkhkara', must have ruled after Akhenaten's death (Fletcher 2004, 72). Yet a small statue, now in Berlin, shows an aging female monarch wearing a pharaoh's crown (Samson 2002, 98-99), a portrait of someone whom Samson describes as "King Ankhkheprure-Nefernefruaten alias Ankhkheprure-Smenkhkare", a pharaoh ruling alone (Samson 2002, 99). As Lesko states, even Manetho writing a thousand years after the reign of Akhenaten recalled the "presence of a woman monarch in the Eighteenth Dynasty", specifically at the end of the 18th Dynasty and who is most likely Nefertiti (1996, 22).

In this study of female pharaohs, the final pharaoh to be briefly examined here is Tawosret (Tauseret, Tewosret), mentioned above (see Chapter Two), who reigned as pharaoh at the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty under the throne name Sit-Re (Fletcher 2004, 186; Murnane 1997, 35; Lesko 1996, 25; Robins 2004, 50). Although evidence for the reign of Tawosret appears in the ancient king lists and she is mentioned by Manetho (Lesko 1996, 25), she is rarely mentioned in standard text books such as Shaw and Nicholson's *British Museum Dictionary of Ancient Egypt* (1997). Troy believes that Tawosret's kingship was presented in such a way to suggest an "equivalent balance between masculine and feminine elements" (1986, 143). Tawosret adopted the "masculine attribute of the blue helmet", but ensured her nomen and prenomen underlined her status as a female pharaoh: she is named as the "daughter of Re, Lady of Ta-merit, Tauseret, chosen of Mut" (Troy 1986, 143), and her name Tawosret means 'the Mighty One', and her full kingly titles were "Strong Bull beloved of Maat, Daughter of Ra, beloved of Amun, Tawosret" (Fletcher 2008, 84). This fits in well with the ancient Egyptian concept of gender duality.

As the last legitimate member of the royal dynastic family of the Nineteenth Dynasty (Lesko 1996, 25), Gardiner describes "Queen Twosre" as "one of the four women of the dynastic period who for a brief space held the rank of Pharaoh" (1954, 40). As discussed above, for all his reluctance to acknowledge female pharaohs, Gardiner does admit that "the importance of Twosre herself cannot be over-estimated" (1954, 43). As he states, she is "the sole queen of the Ramesside period to have possessed a

tomb in the Valley of the Kings, and the sole queen who caused to be built for herself a temple at the edge of the western desert" (1954, 44). He even goes so far as to admit that "at some moment or other in her life she exercised undoubted power as an actual Pharaoh" (1954, 44). There is also evidence that she reigned long enough to send expeditions into Sinai and Palestine, as well as initiating building projects, including a large mortuary temple and a royal tomb for herself in the Valley of the Kings (Lesko 1996, 25).

So the question must be asked, if there is so much evidence for women pharaohs, why is there such resistance to the suggestion of women holding the position of pharaoh? It is certainly worth examining the evidence of women in positions of power in Egypt, whether royal or not. By taking a feminist approach to this subject of women in ancient Egypt (as discusses in the Chapter Two, and below), scholars can learn more about the women themselves, and can also use such an approach to analyse and critique past interpretations of such examples of women, taking into account attitudes at the time of writing (see below).

Taking a feminist approach

A great deal of the feminist approach has been discussed in the previous chapter. However, there are some other aspects that can be discussed in relation to the information discussed in this particular chapter. As discussed earlier, one theory is that gender is culturally constructed (Butler 2007, 11; Kessler and McKenna 1985; Flax 1990; Conkey and Gero 1997, 417). This post-Enlightenment construction of gender no doubt influenced how scholars and academics viewed women and sexual difference in past cultures. The social influences of the Victorian era in particular, when Egyptian archaeology was becoming popular both as an academic subject and is popular culture, had an effect on the development modern attitudes to 'gender'. Something that many scholars failed to realise is that 'gender' can mean different things in different societies, particularly past historical societies. This is why academics, and archaeologists in particular, should not analyse past societies using their own modern, and often Western, perspective.

As mentioned before, Ellmann believes attitudes and approaches to women in ancient and historical cultures are mainly "a product of a patriarchal culture which constructs male dominance through the significance it attaches to sexual differences" (1968; in Parker and Pollock 1981, 8). The value of Darwin's model to his Victorian contemporaries had an impact on how sexual difference in past cultures was viewed by those studying them (Gilchrist 1999, 20). This Victorian legacy is one reason why the predominantly male Egyptian archaeology scholars of the past (and again to some extent in the present) view female pharaohs as complete anomalies within the archaeological and historical record of ancient Egypt, and even go as far as to neglect and ignore further examples of female pharaohs beyond the accepted examples such as Hatshepsut. The Victorian attitudes continued well into the 20th century.

As early as 1921, Blackman addressed the issue of "the Position of Women in the Ancient Egyptian Hierarchy". The very first sentence of the article proceeds: "The pieces of information that I have gathered together in this article indicate, I think, that scholars have hitherto laid too much stress upon the inferiority of the part played by women in the worship of Egyptian divinities" (Blackman 1921, 8). According to Blackman, earlier scholars relied overly on the work of the Greek traveller Herodotus, who stated that "No woman exercises the priestly office either for a god or a goddess, but men in all cases" (Blackman 1921, 8). Yet Herodotus himself contradicted this statement in the same work, where he speaks of "two women, priestesses, being carried away from Thebes by Phoenicians ... and again ... he designates the same women ... "the consecrated (i.e. priestly) women"" (Blackman 1921, 8).

Looking at early 20th century Western approaches to women in the historical and archaeological record, this article was written after the First World War, when British women had carried out tasks traditionally seen as 'man's work', ('man's work' being a concept that has generally been created by modern Western cultures) and had, in 1918, been granted the vote in Britain, albeit with serious limitations (Przeworski 2009, 298). Perhaps the timing of this article was related to the political situation of the time, when women were seen as more than 'just home-makers' for

example, and therefore their role in history and archaeology might have been re-examined by certain scholars. For example, female scholars such as Gertrude Bell and Amelia Edwards contributed a great deal to the development of Egyptian and Middle Eastern archaeology (Amelia Edwards being one example discussed in the previous chapter).

Before 1918, women had relatively little political influence or power despite the fact that a female monarch had ruled for most of the 19th Century, and this would have had an impact on how women in earlier history were usually viewed. For example, an article of 1909 on Suffrage describes how "Society" viewed women in relation to the vote:

> "If Society has not given the ballot to woman, it is because it conceives her duty perfect without functions of public government - functions too hempen for those indoor tapestries that require silk floss of soul. Her finer being has thus far refined Society by keeping out of its turmoil. To mix in that turmoil is to be coarsened by it without gaining the strength of coarseness" (Holland 1909, 273).

This kind of attitude towards women at the time could go some way to explaining why the role of women in an ancient society was widely ignored or undervalued:

> "Excepting mother hood, she [woman] has born no burden beneath which his [man] shoulders did not touch hers, and take the heavier part of the pressure. If she cooked the food, he had to fetch it from long and arduous chase. When she hoed the fields, he wielded the sword, the spear, the battle-ax [sic], in their defense, or fell bleeding before the robber-bands that pillaged them" (Holland 1909, 274).

This statement displays a lot of similarity with the statement made by Michael Massey in his 1988 work ("In fact, women's roles in most cultures and societies throughout history has been, and is, to serve men" (1988, 30)), showing that some mind-sets and opinions about women in ancient cultures had not necessarily moved on all that much by the 1980s.

According to Holland, women have historically always been protected by men, and have not had to deal with as heavy a burden as man has. Men have the power, and therefore the greater burden. One particularly astonishing passage (astonishing for the 21st century, but perhaps not for 1909) from this work describes perfectly the view that:

> "Women are wholly unaware of the extent to which the fineness of their natures unfits them for political life. Their delicacy and sensitiveness would render them headlong where man's tougher fibre holds back his impulses. They feel every thing quickly, intensely - know no half-measures" (Holland 1909, 277-278).

Women were therefore regarded as far too weak to understand politics or deal properly with their impulses in the way men could, an appalling generalisation reflecting a fairly common attitude of the time. Little wonder then that the role of women in ancient Egyptian society was largely ignored, misjudged, or underrated prior to the later 20th Century, particularly by male scholars at the time. Sheldon L. Gosline states that in spite of the growth of feminism in Europe and the US post-1880s, "anthropological observations ignored and discredited even the clearest indications that women in other societies held considerable power ... conservative Jewish and Christian theology has greatly shaped the notion of womanhood in the West, and identified all variants in non-Western cultures as the exotic "other" to be tamed and/or ridiculed" (1996, 29). Whilst in the past, certainly for much of the study of ancient Egypt, this may have been the case, it is by no means a widespread issue in the 21st century. In one example of misjudgement:

> "T. E. Peet (1914a, 15) notes a female burial (Tomb Group E. 381) in the mixed cemetery at Abydos, in Upper Egypt across the Nile to the west of Qina … in which he describes a "spherical object of poor limestone…pierced through the centre, and, though found in a woman's tomb, looks like a macehead" " (Dean 2009, 7).

As Dean points out, "The tendency of the thoughts of Egyptologists at the time is illustrated perfectly with this example [from Peet 1914] ... which is indicative of contemporary attitudes towards female burials containing weaponry" (2009, 7).

An important source here, and one of the few to have directly tackled the topic, is Gosline's 1996 paper, published in the *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion.* Blackman's 1921 article is referred to in Gosline's article, and according to Gosline, Blackman's article "was one of the first to seriously consider the evidence that women served as priests" (Gosline 1996, 25). If, as according to Gosline, "Historically, and not surprisingly, the field of Egyptology has been less than fully willing to embrace the concept that women in ancient Egypt held significant positions and status in any aspect of the religious vocation" (1996, 25), then it is equally likely that the field of Egyptology was similarly unwilling to consider that women might be associated with active warfare or indeed political office. That is not to say that women were commonly involved in active warfare, and certainly there is no evidence of a female *maryannu* or *mhr* for example. The argument here is that it was nonetheless possible for some ancient Egyptian women to have some form of association with warfare.

Gosline also addresses the fact that Egyptology often takes a contemporary Western point of view which can have little relevance to ancient Egyptian society:

> "it has been assumed that the type of priesthood in which the women were involved was not professional, and when religion became more organized by the New Kingdom there was an effort to exclude women. This perspective is in part based on our Western notions of the priesthood and the Jewish and Christian exclusion of women from sacerdotal activity" (Gosline 1996, 25).

Gosline argues that Egyptian men and women held the same general "priestly title 'servant of the god'", and only English and German translations make the "gendered distinction" between priest and priestess, imposing their own cultural distinctions on the matter (1996, 27). As Gosline points out, this creates gender-based assumptions about job distinctions, which are not necessarily relevant to ancient Egyptian society (1996, 27). Gosline makes the point that the role of 'servant of the god' was not necessarily gender-specific, the gender distinctive translations "a relic of our own Western gender construct and fails to represent the actual ancient meaning" (1996,

27). As stated above, this is something that can be applied to areas of ancient Egyptian life beyond religious structure and titles.

Gosline also states that the reluctance of some scholars to recognise that women could hold priestly offices in ancient Egypt "stems from a conservative patriarchal precedent that is strongly entrenched in our society; it has affected our philosophy, psychological models, and anthropological investigations" (1996, 29). However, Gosline has also recognised that whilst there may have been some levels of gender balance in ancient Egypt, it is also the case that "sexual prejudice was also found in Egyptian literature" (1996, 29). The levels of equality also seemed to vary from dynasty to dynasty. For example, it is interesting to compare examples of 18th Dynasty statues of husband and wife, such as Amenhotep III and Queen Tiye, with those of the 19th Dynasty, such as the statues of Ramesses II and his wives at Abu Simbel. The large statue of Amenhotep III and his Great Royal Wife Queen Tiye, held in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo (Fletcher 2004, 10, 22), depicts the couple as the same size; in fact, Tiye's modius headdress actually makes her slightly taller than her pharaoh husband, with Tiye's arm supporting her husband's back (fig. 3.26). Similarly in depictions of Nefertiti and Akhenaten, Nefertiti's headdress makes her taller than her husband (fig. 3.27) (Samson 2002, 34-35). In stark contrast, the statues of Ramesses II at the temple of Abu Simbel are at least four to five times larger than the accompanying statues of his wives, who are tucked in next to Ramesses' legs (fig. 3.28). The 18th Dynasty was a particularly interesting period when the role of women, particularly royal and elite women, was at times equal to that of the equivalent men. Women such as Ahhotep, Hatshepsut, Tiye, and Nefertiti mentioned above are some of the best examples of this.

Contemporary attitudes towards Victorian women in the 19th and early 20th centuries is just one possible explanation for the way in which ancient Egyptian women were viewed, studied and represented by scholars of the time. As suggested above, the change in attitude towards women after 1918 may have contributed to the change in attitude towards ancient Egyptian women, as demonstrated by Blackman's 1921 paper. This change in attitude, however, was not necessarily widespread, as demonstrated by the articles by White (1948) and Newberry (1932) for example.

Even today the subject of women in positions of power, including those related to warfare, are far less studied when compared to other aspects of ancient Egyptian history.

In 1992, V. G. Callender stated that "It is generally thought that Egyptian men had a most egalitarian attitude toward women during the pharaonic period" (1992, 11; see also Wrobel 2004, discussed later in the thesis). She points out the number of ancient texts that "stress that women should be treated well and mothers should be honoured" (Callender 1992, 11). Yet she is unconvinced that this 'egalitarian attitude' extended to women who became officials (1992, 11). A popular ancient Egyptian text, The Instruction of Ptahhotep, contains advice given by an old man to his son, and includes the lines:

> "Do not contend with her [your wife] in court,
> Keep her from power; restrain her.
> Her eye is her storm when she gazes.
> Thus will you make her stay in your house"
> (Lichtheim 1974, 69; cited in Callender 1992, 11).

These are hardly the words of a man with an egalitarian point of view, but it is also more of a vernacular anecdote that does not necessarily reflect the laws of the time. However, the line 'Do not contend with her in court' does nonetheless reveal that women did attend court, took part in legal cases and indeed are also known to have sat on juries. Similarly, another text shows that for an ancient Egyptian woman, rank did not indicate ability or worth; rather it was simply a result of marriage to a man with rank:

> "Rank creates its rules:
> A woman is asked about her husband,
> A man is asked about his rank"
> (Lichtheim 1974, 69; cited in Callender 1992, 12).

In this way, a princess who married an official ended up having the social rank of that official, rather than retaining the rank of princess (Callender 1992, 12). This

could indicate that at times ancient Egypt had an egalitarian society, as it demonstrates that social mobility works both ways. Of course, as discussed above, the levels of equality in ancient Egyptian society are known to have fluctuated from dynasty to dynasty. Furthermore, levels of equality certainly varied between the different social classes.

Prior to the Fifth Dynasty, there is evidence that the early ruling families were keeping power within the family. For instance, a queen could fulfil an important role within the government, as in the case of Queen Hetepheres II who was the "controller of the affairs of the kilt-wearers", the high-ranking male government officials (Callender 1992, 24; Lesko 1996, 8). Though this seeming gender equality did not necessarily occur consistently throughout the entirety of Dynastic history, it still reveals that women could wield considerable power at this time at least. It is known that some of the queens officiated as high priestesses (Lesko 1996, 9), a fairly common occurrence as royal women were often given important roles within the government, as discussed above. Again, it may be assumed that the assigning of such important roles to the royal women displays some level of gender equality in ancient Egyptian society.

What is less apparent is whether or not this equality also applied to the lower echelons of ancient Egyptian society. Did all classes of society have some form of gender equality? Blackman makes mention of the appearance from the Fourth Dynasty onwards of "a musician-priestess, whom the temple reliefs depict standing to receive the king, as he approaches a temple, with hand-clapping and welcoming cries ... or as making music in the presence of divinities ... [she] seems to be especially connected with the Sed-festival" (1921, 8). Blackman does not specify how high-ranking this "musician-priestess" was in ancient Egyptian society, but it is unlikely that she would have been from the 'lower classes'. She could have been a high-status woman, even possibly a member of the ruling royal family (fig. 3.29).

Blackman states that the role of the "musician-priestess" continued into the Middle and New Kingdoms, Middle Kingdom examples being found at the Temple of Osiris

in Abydos, and the Temple of Hathor in Cusae (1921, 9). In the New Kingdom however, the numbers seemed to increase somewhat: "there were musician-priestesses ... of Osiris, Isis, Mut, Hapi, Horus of Anibeh in Nubia, Hathor of Denderah, the Great Ennead of Karnak, Upwawet, and above all of Amenre', whom, judging from surviving monuments, almost every woman who dwelt in or near Thebes during the New Kingdom seems to have served as musician- priestess" (Blackman 1921, 9). No reason is given for this seeming increase in the numbers of 'musician-priestesses' in the New Kingdom. By the 25-26th Dynasties, Gods Wives were effectively high priestesses of the god amun and were second only to the king in power (Ayad 2007). These Gods Wives are depicted using weaponry at the the Building of Taharqa, by the sacred lake at Karnak, protecting "the cenotaph by engaging in acts of aggression: shooting arrows and batting balls" (Ayad 2007, 3).

There is some evidence of this equality a little further down the social scale. A Third Dynasty biographical inscription for an official called Metjen describes how he "inherited fifty arouras of land from his mother Nebsenet" (Robins 2004, 125). An aroura is equal to approximately two-thirds of an acre (Robins 2004, 125). As Robins' points out, the early Dynastic legal documents that describe these occurrences are limited to the upper elite only, and there is little evidence to show that this level of equality filtered down through to the lower status men and women, at least in the Old Kingdom (2004, 127). Surviving Old Kingdom documents confirm that wives could inherit from husbands, and daughters could inherit from fathers (Robins 2004, 127). It is to be assumed that the social elite wanted to keep all the wealth in the family, and were therefore more willing to have women inherit than let the assets go outside of the immediate family. They were also more likely to have been able to ensure that this happened via their access to literacy, whereas the lower classes of society owning relatively little wealth would also have been unable to afford the services of a scribe to write down any such transaction.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this chapter's review of the ancient Egyptian military makes it clear that there was a very obvious development and structure throughout the Dynastic period of ancient Egyptian history. It is also obvious that there were no incidences

of women being officially part of the military, and they certainly did not appear to ever be 'soldiers' or 'troops' in any military endeavours. However, what is apparent is that there are several examples of women holding power in ancient Egypt, and also assuming military behaviour and styling in particular circumstances, such as the women depicted at Deshasheh, and Queen Ahhotep leading her husband's troops into battle. There are also occasions when some women such as pharaohs Hatshepsut and Nefertiti are portrayed using weaponry in a display of power, in order to display to their courtiers and subjects their pharaonic power and status (for example by Hatshepsut shown holding a mace or by Nefertiti being shown taking part in a smiting scene).

By examining these ancient Egyptian women, whether royal or not, a series of interesting points have been raised. It is clear that many women throughout the ancient society have not been as thoroughly studied as they perhaps should have been, and there remains relatively little information available for the female pharaohs Neithotep, Sobekneferu, and Tawosret for example. This appears to be mainly due to the lack of a gender or feminist-based approach to the subject. The essentialist approach towards sex roles and gender divisions of labour taken by some archaeologists has long been a problem in archaeology and in Egyptian archaeology in particular (Meskell 2004, 85). All too often it has been assumed that women in ancient cultures could not take on the roles that are, by 'modern' standards, traditionally the domain of men. Women are also all too often reduced to a "visual spectacle", with little consideration by many academics and scholars of the social construction of the body, gender and sexuality (Meskell 2004, 97). Meskell is accurate in her assessment, that ancient sexuality "has been largely avoided or treated as an extension of normative Western categories" (2004, 97). This is obviously not an appropriate approach to take with regard to sexuality and gender, and therefore by default gender roles, in ancient cultures. Western cultural constructions would not reflect those of ancient Egypt; by using a gender and feminist approach, as suggested by scholars such as Meskell and Exum, the warfare/combat orientated roles certain examples of biologically and gendered females played in certain periods of ancient Egyptian culture can be brought to the notice of more people within the discipline.

The study of gender can be used to balance the biases in previous historical and archaeological theory (Meskell 2004, 85), such as those displayed by those Victorian and early 20th century writers discussed above (e.g. Holland), and even more modern writers such as Newberry (1932), White (1948), Mitchell (1981), Massey (1988) (discussed above and in previous chapters). One more modern academic who is rightly critiqued for the approach taken to ancient Egyptian women potentially involved in warfare is Joyce Filer, but her work is discussed in detail in a later chapter when applied to a comparative discussion of the experimental archaeology carried out in this thesis. Examining ancient Egyptian warfare in relation to women has certainly proved frustrating at times, due to the previous lack of studies on the subject and the lack of a sensible gendered approach. It is absolutely necessary for a feminist approach to be taken in order for a reasonably accurate analysis and interpretation of the evidence available in the archaeological and historical record. Nonetheless, there is evidence of women involved in warfare in some way (e.g. the Predynastic mace-head female burials, the 6th Dynasty female guard attested in her tomb at Saqqara, the scene of the siege of Sati in the tomb at Deshasheh, depictions of Nefertiti and other women rulers bearing arms), all of which have yet to be explored to their full potential. Having examined ancient Egyptian warfare and the women associated with it, along with ancient Egyptian women in power, it is now possible to study the specific weaponry associated with ancient Egyptian women in greater detail.

Chapter Four - Literature Review: Ancient Egyptian Weaponry

Now that the specific examples of women who were involved with weapons have been examined, it is possible to look at those specific weapons themselves, and the research that has been carried out on them. Of the numerous types of weaponry employed in Dynastic Egypt, considerable amounts of research have been carried out in connection with each and every one of them. As mentioned, a select few of these weapons can be directly related to women in a number of specific examples. Therefore this literature review will deal with a selection of weapons that have been associated with ancient Egyptian women in one way or another, either in the form of burial goods or in visual depictions. The aim of this chapter is to look at the materiality of the weapons themselves, examining the various forms they were found in throughout Dynastic Egyptian history, and looking at their specific developments during this period. This chapter will then lead into the experimental archaeology section of this thesis.

A gender/feminist-based approach is still appropriate in this chapter, but is not at the absolute forefront of the examinations of these weapons as material objects by themselves. It is when these artefacts are examined in relation to their use (for example, what individuals were they portrayed with? What burials were they found in?) that a feminist approach is most appropriate. It is worth noting that the codes of femininity and codes of masculinity applied to the study of these weapons (ones associated with ancient Egyptian women) in the past by academics and archaeologists were being sustained by the conventions of womanhood endorsed by the male-dominant Western European society (a patriarchy?) during the 19th and early 20th centuries, and therefore not necessarily fair or particularly accurate. Examining these weapons from a modern Westernised (and in the not-too-distant past a patriarchal-dominated) approach would not do justice to how these weapons (and those who used them) were seen and utilised in the ancient Egyptian culture.

This chapter is also directly connected to the Catalogue of weaponry that is in the Appendix section of this thesis, and is referred to throughout this chapter. The

descriptions of certain weapons in the Catalogue tie in directly with the discussions of the weapon types seen in this review chapter. In this review chapter, the weapon-types associated with ancient Egyptian women will be examined one-by-one (first in alphabetical order, and then in chronological order within the weapon-type itself), with more specific examples referenced and displayed in the chapter figures and in the appendix (comprising of a catalogue of weapons from local museum collections, with examples from the Petrie museum, from Davies' catalogue of British Museum axes, and from other sources). The materiality of the weapons studied here in this particular chapter is relevant to this thesis because each category of weapon will be discussed with regard to its possible meaning and utility within ancient Egyptian historical culture, with the aim of providing a context for the grave goods and visual portrayals of the specific weapon types discussed in previous chapters. It should be noted that the majority of artefact examples discussed in this chapter do not have a known provenance, and therefore the significance of a find-site, and therefor the socio-historical and cultural context of such finds, are not always available for consideration, meaning that analysis can be limited to some extent. However, the materiality of the artefacts is considered here both in relation to the potential use by ancient Egyptians, and in relation to the functionality of the weapons in their use in experimental archaeology.

Axe (see also Appendix pp: 273-280)

The axe was an important weapon in ancient Egypt, having some prominence in ancient Egyptian mythology. The Egyptian deity Anat, introduced into Egypt from Syria-Palestine, first appeared in the late Middle Kingdom and was primarily a goddess of warfare (similar to Neith and Sekhmet), often depicted with a shield, an axe, and a lance (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 32). The axe was therefore seen as symbolically important, at least in the late Middle Kingdom period. The associations with an important Middle Kingdom Egyptian deity would only increase the significance of the axe both as a weapon and as a symbol of power in battle, via association with Anat.

The axe was present as an artefact and in visual representations throughout the Dynastic Period, with early examples dating to the Old Kingdom, though it can be

difficult to distinguish axes used in battle from the non-combat tools of the period (McDermott 2004, 34). By the late Predynastic period there was already a highly developed knowledge of copper-smelting, and large axe-heads were being produced (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 71). Axes were represented in the Old Kingdom tomb of Khamehesit at Saqqara (where the intended viewer would be the spirit of the deceased), where they were depicted with crescent blades and curved hafts, tucked into the kilts of soldiers on siege ladders (McDermott 2004, 34). According to McDermott (2004, 34), socket axes were manufactured in the Old Kingdom, although no remains of these particular axes have been found from this time and McDermott provides no evidence to support this statement. McDermott is useful, however, as a source that has collated data on ancient Egyptian weaponry into one single source, although there is no analysis or examination of the weapons outside of their simple materiality and types.

By the Middle Kingdom, there were occurrences of votive and functional axes placed in the burials of men, women and children (McDermott 2004, 72). This would seem to indicate that the axe was not a particularly gendered artefact, as it was found in the burials of men and women. Of course, these axes took different forms, and they were often interred as individual objects, although axes could also be included in weapon groups, and were used as amulets, miniature hatchets sometimes being worn around the neck (McDermott 2004, 72). This reflects the late Middle Kingdom associations of the axe with the war goddess Anat; the axe amulets could have been worn as signs of tribute to the goddess, and could also have been as a form of protection (as so many amulets in ancient Egypt were). By invoking Anat through the wearing of an axe amulet, these ancient Egyptians could have been trying to protect themselves potentially from any harm in war, whether active combatants or unlucky bystanders caught up in conflict (see also Chapter 6 re: the remains found at Giza and Kerma; although later than the Middle Kingdom, they are still potential examples of the sort of innocent bystanders caught up in warfare who would perhaps wear axe amulets as a form of protection).

As well as being composed of stone, Middle Kingdom axes could also have been made of bronze and copper, although some precious metals, such as silver, were used

when decorating some ceremonial weapons (McDermott 2004, 74). The materials used on the haft of the axes varied from linen to plant material, which may have been in place to ensure that there was an efficient grip for the soldier wielding the axe (McDermott 2004, 76). In addition to the haft covering, the haft was also usually curved allowing for an expert swing and the prevention of slippage during use (McDermott 2004, 76) (fig. 4.1). In addition to this, during the Middle Kingdom some axe handles had straps attached to them, perhaps allowing for them to be attached to the body whilst being carried outside of combat (McDermott 2004, 76).

The physical appearance of the axe as a weapon changed somewhat over time, with several different varieties being manufactured in the Middle Kingdom. Apparently, the traditional battle-axe of the Middle Kingdom was the tanged, crescentic hatchet (McDermott 2004, 74). The earlier, detailed typology of ancient Egyptian axes by Davies (1987) is referenced here by McDermott (2004):

> "The first has a thin, fully rounded blade and was designed with lugs or protrusions. In most examples, the hatchet blade has been manufactured with three perforations. The second axe is similar to the first, designed with hooked lugs and with a segmented, crescent shaped blade. The third variation is designed as a slashing axe, with both symmetrical and asymmetrical blades. All of these axes have shallow, wide cutting edges. A further variant is designed with a concave butt. A raised central rib often strengthened the blade. Only those that are symmetrical in form have lugs" (McDermott 2004, 74; Davies 1987, 23).

There was another variation of Middle Kingdom axe, one which was designed with tangs, usually three of them, with each tang being perforated with one or more holes (McDermott 2004, 74) (fig. 4.2). This enabled this type of axe-head to be fastened to the haft using either cord or small nails (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). According to Spalinger, this tanged, flat cutting axe was not used outside of Egypt during the Middle Kingdom (2005, 16).

Based on the composition of the copper alloys, Davies arrived at the conclusion that specific types of axe were designed for military purposes (Davies 1987) (see also the Appendix). Davies noticed that the battle-axe blades contained high percentages of tin-bronze and arsenic, whereas the blades of tools of this type had relatively low percentages of arsenic-copper, ensuring that the battle-axes were fairly lightweight (McDermott 2004, 74). The examination of certain axes found in biologically male and female burials could tell us a lot about whether or not a specific axe had the potential to be a votive or functional weapon. Unfortunately, Davies' work, so excellent when it comes to chemical compositions of the axes, includes nothing on the biological sex of the remains in the burials in which the axes were found (see Appendix). Davies was writing in the late 1980s, a time when a gender/feminist approach in archaeology was becoming more visible. However, as Davies was writing a catalogue of the axes in the British Museum, it is possible that the concept of mentioning which axes were found in male or female burials never occurred to him; perhaps he simply wanted a catalogued and scientific record of the axes. This would be an interesting future project, examining the chemical and metallic compositions of axes to see if any of those examples found in biologically female burials were potentially functional weapons (i.e. they had a higher percentage of tin-bronze and arsenic in their structure).

The slashing axe was dated, by Davies, to the First Intermediate Period, or the early Middle Kingdom (McDermott 2004, 74; Davies 1987). During the Middle Kingdom, 'duck-bill' axes (fig. 4.3) were also relatively common, remaining in use during the Second Intermediate Period, even when more rounded axe forms were developed (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). There were also apparently some outside influences on the axe during the Middle Kingdom. Asiatic, or eye, fenestrated axes were supposedly brought into Egypt by foreign couriers, although they did not seem to be adopted by the Egyptian army on any large scale (McDermott 200, 74-76). Indeed, this tanged cutting axe was much preferred by the Egyptians than the socketed axe that was a favourite in western Asia (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). The socketed axe depended on their sharp blades for cutting into unprotected flesh (Spalinger 2005, 16). It is possible that the different axe types had varied uses. McDermott (2004, 77) puts forward the view that it was "most probable that the

soldiers employed to protect river vessels were armed with hatchets while soldiers equipped with axes were also employed to accompany hunting parties".

During the upheaval of the Second Intermediate Period, when Egypt was controlled by the Hyksos (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 255), visual representations of soldiers and their weaponry are few and far between (McDermott 2004, 77). However, remains examined by Davies indicated that the axes in this period were generally lugged with either splayed blades or curved sides (Davies 1987). There was one example, a battle-axe with a wooden handle and the cartouche of a King named Nebmaatra engraved on the blade, found in a pan grave at Mostagedda that was dated to the Second Intermediate Period (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 219) (fig. 4.4).

The overthrow of the Hyksos led to the formation of the New Kingdom period, the first dynasty of which was the 18th Dynasty. The design and use of the axe as a weapon went through significant changes during the New Kingdom. During this time there were examples of hatchets and model/votive axes that were found in foundation and funerary deposits, including small toy-like axes amongst goods in child burials (McDermott 2004, 162). With regard to the functional axes of the period, it would seem that new axes were "designed to counteract the developments in enemy armour" (McDermott 2004, 162). These new design axes had shorter lugs and narrower blades, seemingly replacing the epsilon axe that was so popular during the Old and Middle Kingdoms, and first appeared in excavated remains at Deir el-Ballas (McDermott 2004, 162).

The beginning of the 18th Dynasty also saw the manufacture of symmetrical axes which had elongated lugs, with bronze pins securing the blade while hide thongs bound the handle in order to prevent the wood from splitting (McDermott 2004, 162), though this could also possibly have been a method of increasing the grip of the person using the weapon, along with protecting the wood. Later in the same dynasty, the major battle-axe was the asymmetrical axe, the narrow axe-head designed to pierce scale-armour as well as skin, the blade being held in the wound upon impact (McDermott 2004, 162). Earlier axe-heads had a wider cutting edge,

and were very effective against exposed and lightly clothed skin, but would have been less so against armour (McDermott 2004, 162). The 'duck-bill' axe mentioned above was the style that was replaced in the New Kingdom by this splayed-type axe-head with straight sides (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). The latter's penetration capability is most likely responsible for the change in axe styles, due to the development of body armour in the New Kingdom period (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40).

One of the most important occurrences of an axe in a burial was the burial of Queen Ahhotep (also discussed in detail in previous chapters). This Queen of the late 17th Dynasty was possibly the wife of the Pharaoh Seqenenre Tao II (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 18). After Seqenenre was killed in battle, Ahhotep was said to have led troops in battle and was rewarded for her valour. A stele set up at Karnak temple states that "She cared for her soldiers…she brought back her fugitives and gathered up her deserters. She has pacified Egypt and expelled her rebels" (Breasted 1906, 29-32). Apparently, Ahhotep rallied the Upper Egyptian soldiers to continue fighting the enemy when her first-born son Kamose fell in battle, thus leading the way to the re-unification of Egypt (Redford 1967, 69).

There is some confusion as to the number of queens named Ahhotep, and with conflicting accounts of the burials associated with this name, there are few surviving records relating to them (Jánosi 1992, 99). At least one Ahhotep had significant amounts of weaponry buried with her, including three daggers and thirteen axes (Lesko 1996, 13). These axes bear the names of both Ahmose I or Kamose (Jánosi 1992, 101). This Ahhotep is likely to have been the queen described on the stela set up at Karnak temple. This woman could have been Seqenenre's wife, or she could have been the wife of Kamose. There has certainly been some debate over the last century as to whether or not Ahhotep I and Ahhotep II are in fact the same woman.

As discussed earlier, in addition to the items of weaponry, this Ahhotep was also buried with the golden 'Flies of Valour' military awards. These objects "emphasise the military character of the burial deposit associated with Queen Ahhotep", since

the Flies of Valour were only awarded to someone who personally excelled in battle (Lesko 1996, 13). Such reasoning would also support the military exploits of the woman described in the Karnak stele which may well have merited the 'Flies of Valour' awards. This is a hugely significant occurrence that is all too often dismissed as being purely symbolic in nature, usually influenced by the old-fashioned views with regard to the abilities and strengths of women. Yet again there is the issue of applying modern Western codes of femininity to an ancient culture. The ancient Egyptians would not necessarily have viewed it as particularly appalling that a biological female could take up arms and lead troops should the circumstances call for it.

Anthony Spalinger makes mention of the Ahhotep axes when discussing the move from axes to sickle swords in the New Kingdom (2005, 17). At the time when sickle swords were adapting to the developing armour technology, axes were also converted to types that were better suited to piercing attacks, two of the best examples those found in Queen Ahhotep's burial (Spalinger 2005, 17). Both these axes were short, with wide edges which would provide a "swift and steady blow that caused a thick cut" (Spalinger 2005, 17). These two axes of Ahhotep are excellent indicators of changing weapons technology during this early New Kingdom period. However, Spalinger makes no attempt to examine the weapons found in Ahhotep's tomb from any view other than a simply materialistic one, and there is certainly no attempt to read the axes from a feminist approach. Viewing these particular axes as functional weapons used by a woman (a biologically and gendered female, as there seems to be no attempt to view Ahhotep as having any gender or sex other than 'female') would be very interesting from the point of view of Ahhotep as someone who took an active role in combat and warfare. Of course, visually the axes do appear to be non-functional weapons, but that is not the point. Yes, they could be symbolic in a sense, but the axes, however 'pretty' (they are indeed aesthetically pleasing), could be a symbol of Ahhotep's battle abilities, and potentially a link to the late Middle Kingdom goddess of warfare Anat. This linking of Ahhotep and Anat, especially in conjunction with the inclusion of the Golden Flies of Valour in her burial goods, would only impress upon people (and the gods in the afterlife where her burial goods would accompany her) just how strong and powerful this

queen was, this being the same queen that arguably contributed a lot to the saving of the ancient Egyptian state.

In the later New Kingdom, it would seem that some axe-heads were cast in two-piece closed moulds and were then hafted onto the shaft of the axe (McDermott 2004, 162). These New Kingdom axes were generally less ornamental than the axes used in earlier periods (McDermott 2004, 162). There were, however, examples of axes with engravings, such as royal cartouches or other identification marks engraved on the axe-blade or on the shaft of the base (McDermott 2004, 162). As many axes during this period were clearly pierced, it would seem that there was a strap attached to the handle, securing the axe to the shoulder, a practice that was apparently only used in the New Kingdom (McDermott 2004, 162). According to Shaw and Boatright, while the axe remained an important weapon throughout the 18th Dynasty, it was then gradually replaced with the sickle sword (2008, 40).

By the New Kingdom, an axe was introduced which was often displayed in the possession of royalty: the cast socket hatchet (McDermott 2004, 164). These axes, foreign in origin, were found at various New Kingdom sites, and were cast in a two-piece closed mould, compared to the Egyptian method of casting axes in a one-piece open mould (McDermott 2004, 164). It would appear that very rarely were double-headed axes used by ancient Egyptian soldiers (McDermott 2004, 164). Even in these later periods (c.1549BC – 945Bc) iron weapons were relatively rare, although there was an example of an iron halberd found at a 20th Dynasty site in Abydos, which is thought to be an early example of an iron weapon (McDermott 2004, 164), although an iron dagger found in Tutankhamun's tomb is earlier (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 39). There were some examples of iron axes found at Soleb, in the Meroitic cemetery, along with a very similar axe discovered in a disturbed site at the Ramesseum (McDermott 2004, 164). Model axes found at Deir el-Bahri were made of iron, all of which had hooked lugs (McDermott 2004, 164). The use of iron in ancient Egypt began later than in other early societies, for example Shaw and Boatright (2008, 39) mention that ancient Anatolia is supposedly one of the first places where iron production occurred, but iron was increasingly used in the later periods (from the later New Kingdom onwards) (Price 1885, 58).

In terms of depictions of the axe in ancient Egyptian 'art', McDermott claims such portrayals are "highly accurate in execution" (2004, 162) because of the large quantity of comparable axe remains. Yet in terms of how the axe was utilised, this may not necessarily be the case given the conventions and restrictions inherent within Egyptian art. The standard striking or smiting stance taken by armed figures portrayed, which lasted throughout the entire Dynastic and post-Dynastic period relatively unchanged, is not a pose that the human body is able to comfortably maintain. Therefore, it should not necessarily be assumed that the axe as a weapon would have been wielded exactly in the manner depicted on tomb or temple scenes. There will likely have been distinct similarities, but the depictions will have been severely limited by the visual and pictorial styles and conventions of the period.

In the Middle Kingdom, tanged axes depicted in hieroglyphic texts were common, as were depictions of soldiers bearing axes (McDermott 2004, 76) (figs. 4.6 and 4.7). During the 18th Dynasty, a scene from the side of the king's chariot from the tomb of Tuthmosis IV (fig. 4.8), in the Valley of the Kings, shows the pharaoh advancing from right side, preparing to smite the Asiatic foes with a battle-axe held in his right hand, reflecting the stereotypical pose held in the smiting scene throughout Dynastic Egypt (Spalinger 2005, 120). Another 18th Dynasty wall scene fragment, from a temple of Tuthmosis II at Thebes, depicts Tuthmosis II in battle (fig. 4.9). At least one of the Asiatic enemies is carrying a duck-billed axe, a weapon that, according to Spalinger, was more typical to the Middle Kingdom, and by the New Kingdom Period had mostly been replaced by more sophisticated axe types (Spalinger 2005, 123). Spalinger's explanation is that the Palestinians were perhaps not as technologically advanced as the Syrians, Babylonians or Egyptians (Spalinger 2005, 123), although this could also be a matter of visual propaganda from the Egyptians, displaying their apparent superiority and technological sophistication over their enemies.

In relation to the 19th and 20th Dynasties, it seems that there has been an increased reliance on graphic representations of axes, and the physical evidence is somewhat lacking (McDermott 2004, 164). In the 19th Dynasty, the axe developed elongated lugs, producing thick and heavy axes, although few soldiers bore axes of this type in

Ramesses II's army (McDermott 2004, 164). Representations of thick- and wide-bladed axes are in siege scenes wielded by sappers (McDermott 2004, 164). Soldiers were also portrayed in ceremonial and martial situations, pressing the axe flat against the breast to salute a superior (McDermott 2004, 163).

The axe is a weapon that visually and compositionally underwent multiple changes, both in form and design, throughout Dynastic Egyptian history. Whilst depictions of the axe in ancient Egyptian visual portrayals (such as wall scenes in temples and tombs) appear to be mainly related to men, the axes that have been discovered in female burials, the most famous of which is that of Ahhotep, show that the axe was a weapon which could also be associated with women. Yet little work has as yet been done on this specific subject, and there remains a tendency to suggest that such weapons found in female burials were merely votive objects. Again, a more in-depth examination of the chemical and metallic composition could tell us a lot more about the potential for some of these axes to be used as functional weapons, something that would be particularly interesting in relation to the context in which they were found (i.e. as grave goods in biologically female or male burials).

Bow and Arrow (see also Appendix pp: 266-270)

The bow and arrow is one of the most recognisable weapons from the history of warfare in general as well as from ancient Egyptian warfare (fig. 4.10). This basic long-range weapon was in use in ancient Egypt from the outset of the Dynastic period, and had also been used in the late Predynastic period (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). Predynastic tombs have produced evidence of the earliest bows and arrows, the remains of quivers having been excavated from archaic tombs (McDermott 2004, 31) (figs. 4.11 and 4.12). These quivers were made from several panels of stitched leather, and contained differing numbers of arrows, from five up to seventy-nine (McDermott 2004, 31). In the Predynastic period, pictorial representations of bows and arrows are relatively uncommon, although the Hunter's Palette does depict the hunter-warrior figures with quivers carried on their backs (McDermott 2004, 31).

The first bow in use in Dynastic Egypt was the simple, or self, bow, which was fashioned from a stave of almost straight wood, trimmed at both ends in order to create a tapered effect (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). The wood needed to be long enough to be bendable without breaking, which may have been achieved through steaming the wood in order to make it more pliable for manufacturing the bow (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). According to Shaw and Boatright, the production techniques for the bow changed relatively little throughout the Dynastic period (2008, 40). Some of the types of wood used for the manufacture of bows are discussed in the Appendix of this thesis. As few as the examples of bows and arrows are in the Predynastic period, they appear to be even fewer in number in the Old Kingdom. Old Kingdom visual representations and material remains are rare (McDermott 2004, 31). However, this does not necessarily imply that the bow and arrow was not utilised in the Old Kingdom. Instead, it is more likely that the Old Kingdom evidence simply has not survived as well as evidence from later periods. One example from the Old Kingdom is a dyed leather quiver, whose opening was drawn together by knotted cords still in place (McDermott 2004, 31).

The simple bow was employed well into the New Kingdom, as shown by the examples from the tomb of Tutankhamun, which still had some animal-gut strings in place when found (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). Though the simple bow remained in use in the New Kingdom, the composite bow was introduced at the start of this period (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43) (fig. 4.13). This was much stronger than the simple bow, and was much more effective as a weapon (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43). One of the major changes which revolutionised and modernised the Egyptian military in the New Kingdom, the composite bow was essentially a wooden core, with a layer of sinew applied to the back, and a layer of horn applied to the face (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43; Shaw 1991, 42). This was then enclosed with a protective covering of ash- or birch-bark (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43).

Prior to the use of swords and spears in the ancient Egyptian military, Spalinger (2005, 6) believes that the bow and arrow was the main weapon of choice, for long-range combat at least, and remained a popular weapon for warfare. As the composite bow was introduced, the effectiveness of the power of the bow as a weapon was

increased. By the time of the composite bow, bronze arrowheads on reed shafts were also in use. Due to the strengthened wood of the composite bow (fig. 4.13), the bowstring was tauter and the arrows could therefore inflict greater damage than when fired from previous simple bows (Spalinger 2005, 17). Yet Spalinger (2005) cites no specific sources for this inference, nor does he make mention of any experimental archaeology that would demonstrate the effectiveness of such bows and arrows. He does not refer to any archaeological evidence, for example evidence of trauma seen on mummified human remains would provide a useful visual aid for investigating the effectiveness of the bow and arrow (see Chapter Six).

The bows used in ancient Egypt have in fact been the subject of experimental archaeology, when Miller *et al.* (1986) carried out a study entitled 'Experimental Approaches to Ancient Near Eastern Archery' which included an examination of ancient Egyptian bows and arrows. Miller *et al.* (1986, 178) looked at the reliability, accuracy and power of such weapons by evaluating the comparative performances of a spear, a modern African simple bow, and two replica ancient Egyptian angular composite bows. The weapons were replicated and the velocities of the projectiles appropriate to each type of weapon recorded (Miller *et al.* 1986, 178). The results of this experiment showed a clear linear trend in the improved performance of the weapons (Miller *et al.* 1986, 178) (Fig. 4.14).

As mentioned previously, composite bows could be reinforced with the compressive strength of horn and the tensile strength of sinew (Miller *et al.* 1986, 183; Alexander and Bennet-Clark 1977). It would seem that in relation to the composite bow, it was not the thin wooden core that was important for the power of the bow, but the horn and sinew, and it is "essential to keep the sinew and horn accurately aligned for maximum energy storage and release" (Miller *et al.* 1986, 183; McEwen 1979, 91). The horn and sinew were bonded onto the wooden core, which could be made of "any non-resinous wood which takes glue well; poplar, maple and ash were used by Persian, Turkish and ancient Egyptian bowyers" (Miller *et al.* 1986, 183; McLeod 1970).

According to Shaw and Boatright (2008, 43), all of the composite bow examples that have been found in Egypt were discovered in tombs. They do not appear to have been particularly rare or costly, as many of them were found in non-royal tombs (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43). However, Shaw and Boatright (2008) do not specify if these tombs belonged to the elite or working sections of society. Therefore, it is difficult to infer that the bows were available to all or were too costly for all but the wealthy. Nor do Shaw and Boatright (2008) discuss if any of these bows were votive objects bought specifically for the burial, or were functional bows used by the owner in life, before being placed in the tomb with them in death.

Along with the introduction of other military developments such as the chariot, the appearence of the composite bow has generally been seen as a result of Egypt's need to keep up with the military advances of neighbouring countries, (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43). These developments were often influenced by Egypt's enemies, such as the idea that the chariot came from the Hyksos and the khopesh from Canaan (the region that encompasses modern Israel, Lebanon and the Palestinian territories) (McDermott 2004, 129; Curto 1971, 11; Aldred 1988a, 142-143; Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40; Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 61). Egypt's monarchs were particularly concerned with preventing any reoccurrences of the Hyksos infiltration that led to the Second Intermediate Period (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 43).

There are many depictions of the bow and arrow in Egyptian 'art' throughout the entire Dynastic period. One of the most popular depictions of the pharaoh was to portray him controlling a chariot single-handedly while simultaneously firing arrows, either at his enemies in battle, or an enemy fortress, stronghold or city under siege. One such example is Seti I, represented on the exterior north wall of the Hypostyle Court at Karnak, firing arrows at the Hittites whilst driving his own chariot without assistance (Spalinger 2005, 196) (fig. 4.15). As Spalinger (2005, 121) states, the pharaoh in this sort of depiction was shown victorious, with the chariot reins tied behind his back, something Spalinger believes resembles the hunting imagery involving the pharaoh in other such wall scenes. Theses scenes would have been viewed almost exclusively by the temple priests, in a display of their monach's power over the enemy, perhaps influencing their prayers and tributes.

One particularly interesting example (briefly discussed in a previous chapter) of a scene in which a royal figure fires the bow and arrow from a moving chariot in battle was found near tomb KV.9 in the Valley of the Kings (Peck 1978, 205). Dated to the end of the 19th Dynasty (the end of the Ramesside Period), it is a sketch in red and black ink on limestone (Peck 1978, 205) (fig. 4.16). Yet it is unusual because the monarch depicted is female, riding into battle in her chariot and wielding a large bow with which she fires a hail of arrows against a male opponent (Peck 1978, 159). Peck (1978, 159) states that what he describes as the crudity of the drawing reflects the fact that it must depict a legend. Peck also argues that because the horses appear to have more than four legs each, this must be a 'parody of the standard iconography (1978, 159). Yet this is simply not the case, since this same multiplication of horses' legs is employed in the formal 19th Dynasty temple scenes of both Seti I and his son Ramses II. It seems that this was either the craftsman's way of depicting the movement of the horse (i.e. the horse galloping), or a second horse behind the first and thereby taking into account the appearance of what is assumed by some (i.e. Peck) to be a more-than-four-legged horse. In a war scene of Seti I at Karnak, found on the exterior north wall of the Hypostyle Court (Spalinger 2005, 194), Seti is riding his chariot into battle against the Libyans (fig. 4.17). At first glance, it appears that there is one horse which has eight legs, yet on closer inspection it appears that this is in fact the craftsman's way of portraying the two horses pulling the chariot, as it is just about possible to make out the second horse's head behind the horse in front. As the Seti war scene is a relief carved into stone, it would be easier to show this more clearly, likewise the scenes of Ramses II in the interior of his temple at Abu Simbel which again show horses with multiple legs in carved relief. Therefore an ink sketch on limestone, such as this one of the woman in the chariot, might not be as clear as it is far more likely to have faded over time than a carved relief. Yet it may still illustrate an historical rather than mythological figure, i.e. it need not represent anything other than an historical figure. Peck is attempting to read a piece of ancient Egyptian visual representation from modern standards of Realism, which is not an appropriate stance to take, as it would only provide a viewpoint that is not in keeping with ancient Egyptian design.

When examining the date of this sketch, and looking at the history of this particular period in Egypt, it is possible to suggest that this drawing in fact portrays the female pharaoh Tawosret, who was the last ruling pharaoh of the 19th Dynasty, and as such used full pharaonic titles (Clayton 1995, 159; Fletcher 2004, 186). She also appears to have entered into some form of political if not military conflict with her male successor Sethnakht who also usurped her tomb. The image clearly shows a royal woman taking part in active warfare rather than simply playing a symbolic role in the proceedings, as has been suggested by some academics. Although it may well be that this is simply a depiction of a goddess, it still suggests that the Egyptians did at times have some appreciation of the female capacity for combat and violence.

Chariot (see also Appendix pp: 292-293)

The chariot was a crucial development in ancient Egyptian warfare. It can be seen as a weapon of sorts, as well as a method of transport (fig. 4.18). The chariot only came into use in Egypt at the beginning of the New Kingdom, and was part of the military modernisation that took place during this period (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 38). For a look at the physical attributes of the chariots themselves, see the Appendix.

Chariots are said to have been introduced into Egypt from a variety of different sources. According to Spalinger (2005, 8), they were introduced from Western Asia, leading to Egyptian warfare to become more dependent upon the "acquisition of equids". Horses were introduced into Egypt for pulling chariots in between the end of the Middle Kingdom and the start of the New Kingdom, with the domesticated horse reaching Nubia by the end of the Seventeenth Dynasty (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 77). McDermott (2004, 88) suggests that the idea for the chariot first came from the Hyksos, who were "masters of the horse and chariot". Likewise, Aldred (1988a, 142) also states that the horse-drawn chariot was introduced to Egypt from Asia, during the war of liberation between the Thebans and the Hyksos, and Säve-Söderbergh (1951, 61) too believes the first horse-drawn chariot was imported from Asia, by the Hyksos. This is a theory that the majority of ancient Egyptian scholars have agreed with. However, McDermott (2004, 129) also thinks it is possible that the Egyptians were familiar with the chariot before the New Kingdom, suggesting

that chariots may have been introduced to Egypt, along with the horse, from the Levant.

Curto (1971, 11) agrees that the Egyptians became familiar with the chariot during the Hyksos occupation of the Second Intermediate Period. However, he adds that the Egyptians adapted the chariot design for their own use, making it lighter and more suitable for first attack and chase, equipped to carry just two men (Curto 1971, 11) (fig. 4.19), whereas Hittite chariots, for example, carried three men (McDermott 2004, 101). Cotterell (2004, 90) mentions that the Hyksos are indeed credited with introducing the chariot into Egypt, although he does not believe that they can take credit for introducing the horse. Shaw and Boatright (2008, 28) suggest that the Egyptians' knowledge of the chariot was indeed gained from Canaan, as according to them, the early 18th Dynasty chariots were "exactly the same as contemporary Canaanite vehicles". In Aldred's (1988a, 142) opinion, the Asiatic origin of the chariot in Egypt is revealed by several things, including the different woods used in its construction and by the Canaanite names that were given to the different parts. There are also examples of Asiatics being employed by the Egyptians to drive and maintain chariots, although this does not necessarily demonstrate that the chariot was solely an Asiatic invention (Aldred 1988a, 143).

The chariot was introduced at a time when Egyptian warfare was being completely revolutionised, the introduction of both the chariot and the composite bow a key step in transforming the way in which the Egyptians fought in battle (fig. 4.20). As Spalinger (2005, 15) points out, chariotry and foot-soldiers who were archers had increasingly important roles in warfare. Archers were also essential for the success of the chariotry, as this combination was extremely effective. According to Spalinger (2005, 12), once the chariot was slow or stationary, the chariot-driver could take up his bow and shoot the enemy, whilst the second man in the chariot could either throw a spear, or provide protection for the driver by wielding a shield. As various sources state, the main function of the chariot in Egypt was to provide a mobile firing platform for the archers loosing arrows against infantry (rather than against other chariots), along with the means for transporting military equipment to particular sections of the battlefield (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 38).

The advancement of the chariot in Egyptian warfare also brought about innovations in arms and armour, from the aforementioned composite bow to the bronze falchion (another term for a sickle-shaped sword or scimitar, also known as a khopesh), the bronze battle-axe and the light javelin or spear, all of which also led to new methods of warfare (Aldred 1988a, 190). Furthermore, there was the development of a "military aristocracy" associated with the growth of the professional organisation of the chariot squadrons (Aldred 1988a, 190). Indeed, one contemporary source composed by a master scribe states that the aristocratic charioteer:

> "…squanders his patrimony on an expensive chariot which he drives furiously. When he has acquired a fine span of horses he is overjoyed and tears madly around his home town with them. But he does not know what is in store for him. When he reaches the mountains he has to cast his expensive chariot into a thicket and go on foot. When he reports back he is beaten with a hundred blows" (Erman 1978, 194-197; Aldred 1988a, 192).

Clearly only a certain section of society was eligible to become charioteers in the New Kingdom army. They required sufficient wealth to be able to afford both a chariot and a replacement should that be necessary. As the source seems to suggest, a wealthy family would possibly be willing to sponsor a son in the chariotry. The introduction of the chariot fostered this new social order within the ancient Egyptian military, one which had its own rules and disciplines distinct from the rest of the army (Aldred 1988a, 190). The prestige of the chariotry is reflected in the status of the men who held positions in the chariot divisions. Yuya, the father of Queen Tiy, was a commander of chariotry for his son-in-law Amenhotep III, with Tiy herself described as 'rich in horses' (anon 2003). The third son of Ramesses II was a charioteer, and Ramesses II himself stated that his father had been chief of infantry and chariotry during his lifetime (Spalinger 2005, 178).

The chariot certainly seems to have become a prestigious element of the Egyptian military. It also had a significant role in royal iconography, one example of which is the stele of Amenhotep II, which praises him as a trainer of his own chariot horses (McDermott 2004, 129). During the reign of Tuthmosis I, the chariot divisions were

elite organised military units within the army (McDermott 2004, 129). Each chariot division had a commander co-ordinating with the 'Major-General' equivalent of the Egyptian army (Curto 1971, 18). Each division was also administered by three scribes: one in charge of the soldiers, one in charge of the horses, and the third in charge of the stables (Curto 1971, 18). The 'major' would be in charge of a group of fifty chariots, with the larger groups under the control of colonels (Redford 1997, 51). Shaw and Boatright (2008, 38) argue that the ancient Egyptian chariot was "the most technically effective chariot ever made", because of its speed, lightness and stability. Shaw (1991, 41) also states that the chariot was quickly absorbed into New Kingdom royal regalia, and it became a representation of Pharaoh's dominance, developing into as powerful a symbol as the mace in that respect. According to McDermott (2004, 129), the chariot made its first appearance in ancient Egyptian literature on the stele of Kamose, though this is in reference to the chariots of the Hyksos rather than the Egyptians' own chariots.

As an elite section of the military, the chariot has survived better in the visual record than other aspects of ancient Egyptian warfare (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 38). One of the most common depictions of a pharaoh shows the ruler riding in a chariot, either into battle or hunting, controlling the chariot with the reins tied behind his back (Spalinger 2005, 18) whilst simultaneously firing a bow or wielding a spear or khopesh (figs. 4.15, 4.17 and 4.20). Similar to the ubiquitous smiting scene, this scene of the pharaoh in the chariot is one which displays his power: not only is the pharaoh in complete control of this dangerous vehicle, he is also able to fight off his enemies with relative ease. This is clearly shown in one of the aforementioned war scenes of Seti I at Karnak, located on the Hypostyle Court north wall exterior and portraying Seti I in battle against the Libyans (Spalinger 2005, 194). Shown on a much larger scale than his Libyan foes to emphasise his status (fig. 4.17), Seti is controlling the chariot, with reins tied behind his back, and is wielding a khopesh in one hand, and grasping a composite bow in the other (Spalinger 2005, 194). The scores of dead Libyans being trampled by his chariot horses are testament to Seti's power and skill in battle.

In another part of this scene, Seti I is shown in battle with the Hittites, though in this he is slightly less ambitious (Spalinger 2005, 196). Here (fig. 4.15), he again controls the chariot with the reins tied behind his back, but in this scene he is firing arrows into his enemies (Spalinger 2005, 196). Countless Libyan enemies, identified by the feathers in their hair, are struck down with the arrows fired by the king. The point of these scenes was to demonstrate visually the king's might and supremacy, his size in comparison to his enemies meant to illustrate his superiority over them in both status and skill.

It is also in visual representations where most evidence exists linking women with chariots. It has already been stated that Nefertiti is portrayed driving her own chariot in tomb scenes at Amarna (fig. 3.24) (Samson 2002, 64-65). In such scenes she wields a whip to encourage her horses to speed up. Yet on the aforementioned ostracon sketch of a 19th Dynasty female ruler riding into battle in her chariot (Peck 1978), she in turn is using a bow to fire arrows at her male opponent in a most unusual piece of Egyptian art (fig. 4.16). Even if this sketch does depict a myth (Peck 1978, 159; McDermott 2004, 93), it nonetheless depicts a woman utilising a chariot from which to brandish weaponry in the same way in which men are portrayed. If indeed it depicts the female pharaoh Tawosret, it would carry tremendous importance within the bounds of this particular thesis.

The chariot was clearly a vehicle that required some strength, but mainly a great deal of skill from the person controlling it:

> "He [the king] also came to do the following . . . Entering his northern garden, he found erected for him four targets of Asiatic copper, of one palm in thickness, with a distance of twenty cubits between one post and the next. Then his Majesty appeared on the chariot like Mont [the god of war] in his might. He drew his bow while holding four arrows together in his fist. Thus he rode northward shooting at them, like Mont in his panoply, each arrow coming out at the back of its target while he attacked the next post. It was a deed never yet done, never yet heard reported: shooting an arrow at a target if copper, so that it

> came out of it and dropped to the ground [*Great Sphinx Stela* of Amenhotep II]" (Gnirs 1999, 84; Lichtheim 1976, 41-42).

This somewhat embellished passage nonetheless suggests the skill required to control a chariot successfully. Gnirs (1999, 87) states that the chariot was used as either a "shock weapon or a vehicle of prestige and speed", unlike the heavier chariot counterparts that were used by the Hittites and Assyrians. It therefore seems unlikely that there was a completely insurmountable barrier preventing a woman from being able to physically drive a relatively light Egyptian chariot. It may not have happened on a regular basis, but as already stated, it is represented in multiple visual representations, with examples of Nefertiti driving a chariot: "In a relief scene from the tomb of Merya, Nefertiti appears ... while driving a chariot behind that of her royal husband" (Ertman 1976, 63; de Garis Davies 1903, pls X and XVII; Samson 2002, 64-65). The light design and extensive use of binding in chariot assembly also meant that they could be constructed, dismantled, rebuilt, and repaired very easily, which could have been crucial in battle.

Mace (see also Appendix pp: 288-292)

The mace is a very important weapon in ancient Egyptian history, and its form appears to have changed relatively little over the course of over three thousand years (fig. 4.21). David Wengrow (2006, 52-53) believes that the ground and polished stone mace-heads first made their appearances as burial goods in Neolithic graves in the Khartoum region, and from then went on to become a very common and important feature of ancient Egyptian culture. The mace was a weapon "associated with the healthy eye of the god Horus, whose epithets include the phrase 'lord of the mace, smiting down his foes' " (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 167). The mace could also be an important piece of regalia that was at times closely connected with royal authority. There are several variations of mace design, including piriform, conical, hatchet-shaped and noduled. These different mace-head shapes presumably caused different forms of trauma to the human body, a possibility discussed in relation to experimental archaeology below.

McDermott (2004, 37) suggests that the mace was a clumsy weapon, liable to fracturing upon impact, and was possibly used as a subsidiary crushing weapon for finishing off enemy soldiers. In this role, the mace became a "symbol of absolute dominance" (McDermott 2004, 35), something that is easily shown by the smiting scenes in which the mace is portrayed as the weapon of choice. Experimental archaeology carried out at the University of York in 2009 made use of replica mace-heads originally created for a pilot study carried out in 2007 by Prof Joann Fletcher and Dr Stephen Buckley, where they were tested on pig heads and carcasses. In the 2009 experiment, though the conical mace-head was chipped slightly upon impact with the pig's head, it did not fracture or shatter the whole way through (Dean 2009, 38). In fact, this chip on the edge of the mace-head is consistent with the chipping visible on mace heads in the Harrogate Museum collection, suggesting that perhaps some of the damage observed on the original mace-heads was not depositional or post-depositional, but possibly due to the active use of the mace-head pre-deposition (Dean 2009, 38) (figs. 4.22 and 4.23).

In excavations by Petrie and Quibell (1896) at the predynastic site of Naqada on the west bank of the Nile, some female burials included mace heads as part of the grave goods. This brief mention of a Predynastic site is relevant to this current thesis as it demonstrates the early appearance of the mace, the weapon that went on to become such a significant part of Dynastic Egyptian iconography. Naqada burial No.1401, as discussed by Mallory-Greenough (2002, 89), held the body of an adult female and the remains of up to six children, interred with no less than three stone mace-heads and a flint knife. Another significant female burial at the same site is No.1417, and although not mentioned at all in Petrie and Quibell's (1896) publication, it does appear in Baumgartel's supplement (1970, Pl. XLII; Mallory-Greenough 2002, 89). This grave is particularly important, as it contained flint knives and a painted limestone conical mace-head together with an ivory comb, a bone comb, a bird top and a Hathor head top (Baumgartel 1970, Pl. XLII). It is possible to hypothesize on the basis of these burial goods that 1417 was the burial of a woman with some degree of importance within Predynastic Naqada society, the mace-head buried with her possibly serving at least a partly votive purpose, as it is so highly decorated.

Yet one female burial at Naqada in which the mace-heads were unlikely to have been votive is grave No.1488. Petrie and Quibell (1896, 28) do not hesitate in stating that the burial is definitely that of a female, though they give no indication of her age. Her burial contained two mace-heads: one piriform mace-head of alabaster (which was placed in front of the forehead of the deceased), and one conical mace-head of syenite (which was found placed behind the back of the body) (Petrie and Quibell 1896, 28). Not only was this particular woman buried with two mace-heads, neither weapon appeared to be votive. Plenty of examples of clay, wood or ivory mace-heads were found in such burials, but in grave No.1488 the two mace-heads were certainly potentially functional, even if it is impossible to prove beyond all doubt that they were used as such by this particular woman (fig. 4.24).

The 12th Dynasty burial of Senebtisi at Lisht (mentioned briefly in Chapter Three) contained an array of weaponry, including an alabaster piriform mace with a gold-mounted wooden shaft (Hayes 1978, 282-283; Mace and Winlock 1916b, 102-103; 106). Hayes admits that it would have been possible for this mace to have been actively used as a weapon (1978, 282), even though this has yet to be proven. The same burial also contained a conical rock crystal mace head (Hayes 1978, 283; Mace and Winlock 1916b, 102-103; 106), an unusual choice of material which would also benefit from experimental archaeology at some point in the future to test its durability as a possible weapon. Another significant 12th Dynasty interment, discovered within the pyramid of Amenemhat III at Dashur, is that of two middle-aged queens from the reign of this king. Both were buried with granite and alabaster mace-heads, along with jewellery and perfume pots (Fletcher 2004, 206); their mace-heads, like the ones found in Senebtisi's burial, could possibly have been used as functional weapons although this has not yet been proven.

Not only were mace-heads found in female burials, but there are also examples of women portrayed with a mace. One 18th Dynasty depiction of Hatshepsut when still a queen, before she became Pharaoh, is found on an obelisk from Abu Tig, and forms the lowest register of figures (Stevenson Smith 1942, 47). As Stevenson Smith (1942, 47) states, "the figure of the queen appears on each face wearing the tunic with bead girdle pendants and carrying staff, mace and 'emblem of life' ".

Although this is not a smiting scene (the importance of which will be discussed below), the mace is still an important symbol of power. Therefore it is vital that it is recognised that Hatshepsut was notable and influential even before becoming Pharaoh. Another scene portraying Hatshepsut carrying a mace was carved when she was Pharaoh, and is found on the north obelisk at Karnak (fig. 4.25) (Stevenson Smith 1942, 47). This is a very important example, as it depicts Hatshepsut as Pharaoh of Egypt, her power symbolised by the mace, wearing the typically male pharaonic garb. This could be argued by some scholars as simply being indicative of how the role of pharaoh was ostensibly a male one (gender-wise), with Hatshepsut merely conforming to the (male) standards required of the pharaoh. However, Hatshepsut is also portrayed as being very obviously female in other images of her as pharaoh, and examples such as Sobekneferu (discussed previously) and Nefertiti combined both male and female garb when portrayed as pharaohs, and the depiction of Tawosret (the ostracon discussed above and in an earlier chapter) emphasises the subject's femininity by making the uraeus at her brow extremely prominent.

Furthermore, Hatshepsut's daughter Neferure is also depicted with a mace when still a princess in scenes in her mother's funerary temple at Deir el-Bahari (fig. 4.26) (Roehrig *et al.* 2005, 202). Here the young girl is portrayed with the sidelock of hair denoting her youthful status, and she also carries a mace (which is not commented upon in the publication in which it appears, J. Fletcher Pers. Comm). This is seemingly in contrast to Neferure's portraits once she had taken on the role of queen to accompany her mother as king, when instead of a mace Neferure is depicted holding "the queenly sceptre proudly to denote her status" in her left hand (Fletcher 2004, 214). With the depiction from Deir el-Bahri, there is no attempt to deny Neferure's femininity here, and there is no concession made to show any so-called 'male' trappings of power in this portrayal. There are several ways to 'read' this portrayal of Neferure. This particular image could be used to support the theory that biological sex was no impediment to holding power in ancient Egypt, or in the 18th Dynasty at least (which is interesting that the main 'viewers of the image would have been the temple clergy, making prayers and offerings to the gods and their pharaoh). It could be also argued that Neferure's depiction in this image is a reflection of her mother's attitudes and beliefs, and an attempt by Hatshepsut to show to the viewers

of the image that her line, her dynasty, was going to continue well after Hatshepsut's reign had ended. This image, when examined in relation to what the various elements in the composition mean (such as the mace in particular), certainly supports the theory that Hatshepsut was preparing her daughter to be pharaoh after Hatshepsut. When looked at in relation to the meaning of the mace as a symbol of power and domination in ancient Egypt, this image of Neferure is quite a significant one within the 18th Dynasty and Dynastic Egypt in general, especially in relation to the concepts of inheritance of pharaonic power.

The importance of the mace as both a votive and functional weapon is shown in its predominance in the numerous smiting scenes which appear throughout dynastic Egyptian history. One of the first such scenes is found on the Narmer Palette, a vitally important object dating to the very beginning of dynastic rule in Egypt (fig. 4.27). The particular style of the depiction of a smiting scene continues with very little alteration or variation through to the era of Roman rule in Egypt, over three and a half millennia after the creation of the Narmer Palette. The palette depicts the pharaoh Narmer on the reverse side, where he is using a piriform mace to smite a Libyan prisoner (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 197). As Whitney Davies (1992, 194) points out, the mace is pointing up, and the specific position of Narmer's arm, wrist and hand leads Davies to believe that the imminent blow would hit the side of the enemy's head, possibly either knocking it off or, perhaps more likely, caving it in. As observed in an unpublished MA thesis (Dean 2009, 14) this interpretation, unfortunately, does not take into account the "highly stylised nature of Egyptian art, which was specifically designed to enhance the clarity of the things represented rather than providing any kind of 'snapshot' of reality". There are other issues with Davies' interpretation, similar to those made by Peck regarding the Tawosret image, as the purpose of ancient Egyptian Art should not, and cannot, be judged by the standards of 'modern' Realism. The concepts of Realism are not applicable to ancient Egypt, as it is an artistic concept that stylistically could be argued to have been seen in some 15th century works of art, and was also an important 19th century art movement. Therefore, modern Realist standards would not provide us with any relevant readings of ancient Egyptian 'art' or visual representations.

Although other weapons were used (such as the khopesh), the mace, the piriform in particular, certainly appears to have been the preferred weapon in many portrayals of smiting. This standard scene is a portrayal of ultimate royal supremacy and subjugation of the enemy awaiting imminent execution (Silverman 1997, 107; Teeter 1997, 155; McDermott 2004, 35; Dean 2009, 17). However, there appear to be few, if any, examples of the mace depicted in Egyptian portrayals of equal hand-to-hand combat as opposed to the execution style of the smiting scene (McDermott 2004, 37). In Egyptian visual representations, the mace was included in religious iconography from an early date, portrayed in scenes of siege warfare held in the talons of a falcon, overseeing the demolition of walled towns or fortifications (McDermott 2004, 36-37). In later religious iconography, the mace was linked with divine fortifications and was even portrayed as the deity 'The Great White' in the Temple of Edfu texts (McDermott 2004, 36). It is clear from the examples discussed in this chapter that the mace was a vitally important weapon in relation to a display of power by a pharaoh (i.e. Narmer), which shows that it is highly significant that women were either portrayed holding/using the mace (i.e. Hatshepsut), or were buried with it (i.e. the Naqada burials, Senebtisi). The combination of biologically female remains being buried with weapons that symbolise power is very important in relation to the subject of this thesis, as it provides evidence that would support the aims of this thesis, and the theory that ancient Egyptian women were able to, and did, utilise weaponry at times.

Sword and Dagger (see also Appendix pp: 280-288)

Sword

There were several types of swords in ancient Egypt. As mentioned before, McDermott's work (2004) is one of the best resources for basic and descriptive information on ancient Egyptian weapons, despite the lack of in-depth examination or analysis. The khopesh (or khepesh) is the best-known of these swords, and perhaps the most famous of all ancient Egyptian weapons, having been featured a great deal in some examples of popular culture (fig. 4.28). However, the khopesh was quite a late development in ancient Egyptian weaponry, so other types of swords must be looked at first (see also Appendix for specific examples of the various sword forms).

Examining the other types of sword, the true sword in ancient Egypt was primarily a New Kingdom development, one made possible by the technological advances influenced by the period of Hyksos rule in the Second Intermediate Period (Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 61). At the start of the New Kingdom, a new dagger type began to be manufactured, one where the narrow blade and tang were cast all in one, which then went on to develop into what could almost be described as a short sword (Shaw 1991, 42-43) (fig. 4.29). Early on in the New Kingdom, charioteers and infantry seemingly made use of short swords which were less than 70cm in total length (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 76). Hyksos influence meant that the lenticular pommel of the earlier Egyptian dagger was replaced with a straight grip that was cast in one piece along with the blade (unlike Middle Kingdom swords and daggers that were cast in separate units (fig. 4.30)), which therefore allowed the blade to be lengthened (Hayes 1990, 68).

The long tangs cast with the blade ensured that the sword blades had reasonable levels of stability, as during combat the stress points were predominantly focussed on the hilt (McDermott 2004, 164) (fig. 4.31). When straight swords were created for elite soldiers, they would often be inscribed with the cartouche of the reigning pharaoh, meaning that when the sword pierced an enemy, the "iconographical presence of the ruler could be felt" (McDermott 2004, 166; Hayes 1990, 77). This point also has considerable relevance for the weapons found in the tomb of Ahhotep. Although inscribed with the names of her sons, kings Kamose and Ahmose, this is not necessarily indicative that the weapons belonged to these men rather than Ahhotep herself as is sometimes suggested. It could be argued that the swords were simply inscribed with the names of the pharaohs in tribute to their rule and pharaonic power or, if one were to be more emotionally-minded, perhaps simply in tribute to Ahhotep's sons.

Moving on from the straight sword form, the khopesh was a weapon that resembled a scimitar, with a curved blade generally believed to have been modelled on an Asiatic weapon first seen in the Second Intermediate Period under Hyksos rule (Shaw 1991, 43; Säve-Söderbergh 1951, 61) (figs. 4.32 and 4.33). It is possibly that its name derives from the *khopesh* joint, specifically the right foreleg of an ox that

was cut off and used for meat offerings to deities in Egyptian rituals (Hayes 1978, 96). It was the Hyksos who supposedly introduced the khopesh into Egypt, along with the relevant body armour and helmets (and the previously mentioned chariot), thereby, quite possibly, unwittingly providing the Egyptians with the means by which they eventually defeated the Hyksos rulers (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 137). Shaw and Boatright (2008, 40) suggest that the khopesh manufacturing techniques came from Canaan, although there may also have been direct imports through either trade or tribute. Examples of this are shown in reliefs in early Theban tombs, in which foreigners are depicted with the khopesh and the straight sword as objects of tribute (McDermott 2004, 167).

The khopesh blade is wedge-shaped (widening at the back), with the cutting edge on the outer edge of the blade, as in the case of the scimitar blade (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 76). The khopesh functioned as a long and thin, almost axe-like weapon (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 76; Spalinger 2005, 17). Indeed, by the end of the 18th Dynasty, the khopesh had replaced the axe as one of the most important weapons in the Egyptian military (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 40). The Egyptian army used different sizes of khopesh swords for different purposes on the battlefield, as shown by the khopesh swords found in the tomb of Tutankhamun (Darnell and Manassa 2007, 76) (see also Appendix).

Depictions of these different sword types varied. Both deities and pharaohs are often portrayed armed with swords (McDermott 2004, 167). The long-sword tended to be portrayed in active combat scenes, particularly in reliefs of siege operations (McDermott 2004, 170). Further scenes, particularly from the reign of Ramesses II, show the soldiers executing prisoners by "forcing a straight sword into the breast or throat" (McDermott 2004, 170), examples of which can be found in the reliefs portraying both the siege at Ashkelon and the Battle of Kadesh (McDermott 2004, 170). There are also examples of the pharaoh driving a chariot whilst simultaneously wielding a khopesh sword. One of these mentioned twice previously depicts Seti I in battle with the Libyans, in which he holds his chariot reins in his left hand and the khopesh in his right as he prepares to decapitate the Libyan chief (Spalinger 2005, 194, 198 and 236) (fig. 4.17).

One of the earliest examples of the portrayal of soldiers using swords is found at Deir el-Bahri, in Hatshepsut's mortuary temple (McDermott 2004, 167). Here, duelling soldiers are depicted using short khopesh swords (McDermott 2004, 167) (fig. 4.34). These weapons, however, were most likely carved from wood rather than made from bronze, as they would have been used in a ceremonial context, such as sword-play during the funeral rites of a pharaoh (McDermott 2004, 167). These ceremonial swords often had looped handle attached, enabling them to be held on the wrist when necessary (McDermott 2004, 167). The khopesh, however, seemed to be reserved for "non-combatant formations", being used more in processional or ceremonial scenes rather than those which depict violent contact (McDermott 2004, 170). For example, the pharaoh's bowmen and bodyguards are often depicted as being armed with the khopesh (McDermott 2004, 170) (fig. 4.35). The khopesh often features in the most important symbolic scenes such as smiting, pharaoh driving a chariot into battle, hunting scenes, and scenes portraying the dismemberment of enemy prisoners (McDermott 2004, 170). McDermott (2004, 170) suggests that the limited variation in portrayal of the khopesh is due to the fact that it is a slashing weapon, and did not fit into Egyptian visual and graphical conventions where depicting movement was generally avoided.

An interesting albeit late representation of the khopesh is a 30th Dynasty (360–343 B.C.) meta-greywacke statue originally from the temple of the sun god Ra at Heliopolis (Ain Shams) (anon, nd [c]) and now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (MMA Accession Number 34.4.1) (anon, nd [c]) (figs. 4.36 and 4.37). It portrays the god Horus and Nectanebo II, with Nectanebo holding a curved sword, possibly a khopesh, in his left hand. Here, the khopesh is not being used in a battle or smiting scene, but is simply held up to the left-hand side of his chest by the pharaoh, much in the way the crook and flail are often depicted on ancient Egyptian sarcophagi. Here, perhaps, the khopesh is being used as a symbol of Nectanebo's pharaonic power and dominance, particularly as he is standing at the feet of Horus, son of Osiris, and one of the most important deities in ancient Egyptian mythology.

Yet the most crucial representation of the khopesh in relation to this thesis is an example of the khopesh wielded by a woman (discussed briefly in the previous

chapter). This particular depiction was found on a limestone block that was originally part of a temple scene from Amarna (Fletcher 2004, 74). The relief represents a traditional ancient Egyptian smiting scene (fig. 4.38) and shows Nefertiti as reigning monarch, standing on a royal barge, wielding a khopesh against a female foreign prisoner (Fletcher 2004, 74; 192; 282). In this scene, Nefertiti is stripped to the waist, and is wearing the ceremonial male-style kilt of the pharaoh. This is an outfit appropriate for the act that she is about to carry out, an act that is traditionally the domain of the pharaoh (Fletcher 2004, 282; Samson 2002, 25). However, does this mean that the role of pharaoh was a traditionally male one? Or is it simply the style of clothing that denotes pharaonic status, and has nothing to do with gender or biological sex? Perhaps the fact that the outfit is seen as traditionally male is simply due to the fact that the majority of Egypt's pharaoh's were male (an inarguable fact). It is interesting that in this particular smiting scene there is no attempt made to disguise Nefertiti's identity (the distinctive crown favoured by Nefertiti is very much in evidence) or her sex. Her gender in this depiction is perhaps more ambiguous, due to the wearing of the 'traditionally male' war kilt, but this could simply be a way of showing Nefertiti's gender duality and balance, concepts that were important to the ancient Egyptians (going back to the goddess of balance and order, Ma'at, as discussed in an earlier chapter).

Dagger

The dagger was a hugely important weapon for the ancient Egyptians, during both the Predynastic and Dynastic periods. The dagger is often depicted in tomb and temple wall scenes, and many examples have been found in archaeological contexts (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 31). The design for the dagger appears to have remained fairly consistent throughout the Bronze Age, as did the copper alloys from which daggers were manufactured (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 31). Flint knives and dagger-style blades have been found in many Predynastic burials, both biologically male and female graves. The dagger appears to have become more widely used as a weapon for stabbing and crushing the enemy at close quarters from the Middle Kingdom onwards (Shaw 1991, 37). The Hyksos introduced a type of dagger, one which had two-edged blade, with a midrib (Cline 1948, 16). This then led on to the introduction of new weapons production techniques during the New Kingdom,

which enabled the production of narrower and sharper dagger blades (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 31) (fig. 4.39). This also enabled the dagger to evolve into a weapon that resembled a short sword at the beginning of the New Kingdom, when the narrow blade and tang were cast in one go (Shaw 1991, 43).

A Middle Kingdom dagger was found in the 12th Dynasty burial of Senebtisi, whose mummy was "equipped with a set of magic weapons ... to serve as talismans protecting her against the supernatural" (Mace and Winlock 1916a, 259; Mace and Winlock 1916b, 76-103; 104-105). This is a reference to ceremonial, non-combat staves and somewhat the less ceremonial dagger which had a wooden sheath, partially overlaid with gold foil (Hayes 1978, 283; Mace and Winlock 1916b, 104). Senebtisi's dagger conforms to the general design of the majority of Middle Kingdom daggers which often had a tapered copper blade, an elaborate short and wide hilt, and a characteristic crescent-shaped pommel (Hayes 1978, 283) (fig. 4.30). Her dagger could have been used as a functioning weapon, although this has not been archaeologically proven.

In relation to the dagger within the army, the Egyptians classified their military according to the arms the different 'regiments carried' (Tirard 1915, 232). There were Archer regiments, Lancer regiments, and the Spearmen, some of the Lancers also carrying a dagger tucked in their belts in addition to their lances (or pikes) (Tirard 1915, 232). It is possible that most soldiers also carried a dagger, possibly as a weapon of last resort. The dagger could have been a weapon to be used when all other options had been exhausted, for instance when other weapons had been wrenched from them by the enemy or damaged beyond all use.

One particularly elaborate dagger often suggested to be a ceremonial weapon was found in the tomb of Seqenenre's chief wife Queen Ahhotep, along with the axes previously mentioned (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 37) (fig. 4.39). This dagger was decorated with the name of the pharaoh Ahmose I (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 37), second son of Ahhotep. The dagger blade is decorated with an image of a lion hunting a calf, the lion in the so-called 'flying gallop' pose (Jánosi 1992, 104). The

blade is also decorated on the same side with four grasshoppers or locusts, and although the significance of this is not generally understood (Jánosi 1992, 104). Malek suggests the insects represent the Egyptian people (Malek 1997, 207-219). Jánosi (1992, 104) also believes the dagger design incorporates Aegean elements, particularly in the simplified design of the landscape above the animals. The dagger has other features that make it stand out compared to other contemporary examples. The joint between the blade and the hilt is fashioned from a bull's head fashioned from gold (Jánosi 1992, 104). Then there is the hilt itself, at the top of which is the pommel that displays "one female head on each of its four sides" (Jánosi 1992, 104).

As daggers were not a major combat weapon in battle, their depiction is perhaps not as prevalent as those of other weapons. Generally, there are just brief glimpses of the dagger in reliefs etc. For example, the portrayal of a battle-scene at Deshasheh depicts an officer watching the sappers at work, whilst he leans on a staff and appears to have a dagger stuck in his belt (Faulkner 1953, 35) (fig. 4.40). One of the few royal depictions of battle dated to the Old Kingdom and found in the reliefs on the 5th Dynasty funerary causeway of Unas, portrays a clash between an Asiatic soldier and several Egyptians armed with daggers, bows and arrows (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 29).

Nonetheless, the dagger was often depicted attached to the kilt of the pharaoh, and presumably placed there for use as a weapon of last resort (as mentioned above) when all other means had failed (Shaw and Boatright 2008, 31-40). One depiction of the dagger in this form comes from one of two relief fragments acquired for the British Museum (Edwards 1960, 9) (fig. 4.41). The smaller of these fragments depicts a king most likely to be identified as Montuhotep II and his princess daughter, Ioh, priestess of Hathor (Edwards 1960, 9). The king is identified through his costume, which consists of "the white crown of Upper Egypt, a short tunic, and a girdle supporting, at the back, a pendent tail of an animal and, at the front, a dagger" (Edwards 1960, 9). As the pharaoh carried other weapons (a mace and a long sceptre), albeit possibly ceremonial ones, this shows how the dagger was not a primary weapon but a secondary, or even tertiary, one (Edwards 1960, 9). The practice of wearing the dagger at the waist is also found in the case of women; the

princess Ita buried wearing her "bronze dagger with inlaid hilt" at her waist (Fletcher 2004, 206).

It is evident that the dagger was an important weapon in ancient Egypt, for various different reasons. First there are the obvious practical applications, for use against enemies in battle or in any combat situation, but daggers could also be ceremonial weapons, something to aid the wearer in the afterlife, or perhaps as a gift from other states/nations (see Appendix for example from Tutankhamun's burial). These weapons can also tell an interesting tale, particularly in the case of the dagger found in the burial of Ahhotep, where potential ties with Aegean states are hinted at in the dagger's design. When examined in conjunction with other archaeological artefacts from the era, a bigger picture of trade links with other states can be gained; for example, other items such as bowls or jewellery with Aegean artistic elements could be analysed in conjunction with Ahhotep's dagger to provide us with information as to when trade links potentially began, and how much of an impact such links had on ancient Egypt at the time.

Conclusions

Although a great deal of research has been carried out on ancient Egyptian weaponry and indeed the Egyptian military in general, there are still areas where the subject is lacking. One problem with work previously done on weaponry and warfare is a lack of analysis into the weapons and the soldiers who wielded them. As discussed above, initial work done by Bridget McDermott (2004) is an excellent resource for information on weapons (particularly on the history of their development in form and style), but there is little or no in-depth examination or analysis. The section in McDermott's (2004) book dealing with the so-called 'Slain Soldiers of Montuhotep' is largely a duplication of H. E. Winlock's *The slain soldiers of Neb-ḥep-et-Rē' Mentu-ḥopte* originally published in 1945 and reprinted in 2007, although the failure to undertake any further analysis regarding either the soldier's remains or the wounds that they had sustained is presumably due to the fact that their remains were reburied following Winlock's study and are now unavailable.

Nonetheless, there remains a distinct lack of scientific application in the study of ancient Egyptian warfare, which is perplexing when scientific analysis plays such a major role in other aspects of Egyptian archaeology. There has been little experimental archaeology carried out, one notable example undertaken by Thomas Hulit and Thom Richardson (2007) examining scale armour, archery and chariots from the New Kingdom. Yet what has been done is rarely mentioned in any of the resources available on the subject of ancient Egyptian weaponry. Most scholars seem to prefer to rely on written sources and/or visual evidence, with little attempt to combine these resources with the practical aspects of archaeology. Therefore, this thesis includes specific experimental archaeology that has been carried out with the weapons associated with ancient Egyptian women, along with an appendix of a catalogue of a weapons assemblage to demonstrate an explicitly archaeological approach to the subject.

As we have seen, a significant problem encountered within Egyptian archaeology is the issue of women associated with warfare. This has been a somewhat controversial subject in the past, and there are times when the fact that women were at all associated with combat in any way, shape, or form, is completely ignored. Spalinger (2005) for example makes few references to Hatshepsut other than oblique references to her military campaigns, but his work overwhelmingly focuses on male pharaohs. Indeed, the title of this work '*War in Ancient Egypt'* is not completely accurate, as it concentrates almost exclusively on the 18th Dynasty. Spalinger (2005) also makes no mention whatsoever of Nefertiti except for a brief reference to the marriage of Horemheb to a woman some believe to have been Nefertiti's sister (Spalinger 2005, 172)), despite the clear pictorial evidence she participated in some form of military activity, i.e. the smiting scene relief from Amarna. Nor is there any reference to Ahhotep, despite the significant written and artefactual evidence pointing to the queen's participation in active warfare. This is a clear case of an academic ignoring/neglecting the role played by a woman in what is seen by the scholar as a traditionally male-dominated activity. No attempt has been made to take a gender or feminist approach to the subject, and therefore certain examples have been missed out from the work. Perhaps these examples of women participating in combat were deemed either unimportant by the scholar, or perhaps examples that

had been fabricated for whatever reason. The fact that examples such as Ahhotep, Hatshepsut and Nefertiti were completely neglected in the work, with not even an attempt to argue that they were not important or were maybe fictional, speaks to the ingrained and old-fashioned attitudes towards 'women' and sexual difference in the archaeological (specifically Egyptian archaeology) record.

Yet by no means is Spalinger the only academic guilty of this tendency to omit such information. Many scholars fail to acknowledge that women were involved with warfare and weapons within Egyptian society unless to dismiss any such involvement as a 'symbolic' occurrence. Although this thesis does in no way wish to suggest that women were frequently involved in warfare, it can be demonstrated that it did occur from time to time, and often with startling, albeit rare, examples. Wilfully ignoring this fact is unproductive, and means that an important element is lacking in the study of ancient Egyptian practices. The aim of this thesis is to address this gap in the research, supported by experimental archaeology carried out, and further complemented by a catalogue of previously unpublished weaponry in local North Yorkshire museum collections which provides further insight into the specific weapon types discussed in this chapter (see Appendix). The understanding of the weaponry gained through this chapter proves vital in the execution of the experimental archaeology. The more understanding there is of the specific weapons (how they developed and how they may have been used), the more potentially accurately they can be wielded.

Chapter Five - Experimental Archaeology

Aims

The aims of this experimental archaeology were to assess the effectiveness and functionality of certain weapons that have been associated with ancient Egyptian women, either in the discovery of burial goods or in pictorial representations. These experiments are designed to show that women were (and are) physically able to utilise the weapons available to the ancient Egyptians, and link directly to the previous chapters of this thesis (combining the studies of women and weapons in the experiments, and also relating to the catalogue discussed in the Appendix). These experiments were carried out in order to prove definitively that these weapons were functional weapons of combat, an idea that has sometimes been contested in the past. As discussed earlier in this thesis, the applications of old-fashioned concepts and theories in what has been a traditionally male-dominated discipline (both archaeology and Egyptian archaeology), have resulted in what could be described as inaccurate analyses of ancient Egyptian women linked with weaponry. Through the application of gender and feminist theory (discussed in detail in previous chapters), an interrogation of the traditional approach to such examples of women and the various (supposedly non-stereotypical) roles they played in ancient Egyptian history is carried out. This neglect and dismissal of certain examples of ancient Egyptian women within the archaeological record has been addressed a great deal in this thesis, and the experiments in this chapter are part of the attempts to challenge the issues.

The purpose of these experiments was to answer the following research questions:

- Could any or all of these weapons have inflicted significant injury when used by men or women, showing that they were genuine weaponry and not simply symbolic or token items of no practical use?
- How effective were the axe, the dagger and the mace as battle weapons? (The khopesh will be discussed later).
- What impact would the weapons have/what damage would they cause to flesh and bone?

- How effective were these weapons when wielded by both men and women, on the basis that men and women would differ in the force they were able to apply in the case of each weapon?
- Did the damage caused by the weapons wielded by women differ from the damage caused by weapons when wielded by men? If so, what differences were there?

A null hypothesis, based on what has been suggested in the past, has been designed for these experiments: **none of the weapons, when wielded by untrained people, could cause any significant or disabling damage in combat.**

The criteria for success in these experiments would be very clear and obvious results that disprove the null hypothesis. The criteria for failure in these experiments would be that no discernible damage beyond superficial cuts and bruising was done by any of the weapons. In order to explore and feasibly answer these questions, the appropriate weapons were manufactured and then tested on suitable human proxies. Galloway *et al.* discuss the use of human proxies: "Non-human animal models are frequently used in order to overcome the problems of sample size ... Here, however, the difficulty of extrapolation from one species to another arises … In all events, animals of approximately the same body size as the victim or potential victims should be used" (1999, 25-26).

Experiment Background

This experimental archaeology is a continuation and expansion of experiments carried out as part of the author's previous MA thesis. The MA work had been in order to test the "effectiveness of the mace as a weapon, in particular when wielded by a woman" (Dean 2009, 36). The mace-heads that were used for the original experimental archaeology were replicas of two of the mace-heads held in the Harrogate Museum collection (two different mace-head styles: one conical and one piriform) (fig. 5.1), and were created for Prof Joann Fletcher by professional stonemason Matthias Garn of York in 2007 (Dean 2009, 36). As discussed, one aspect of the MA thesis was examining the use of maces by women, so "it was felt

most appropriate if their effectiveness was tested by an adult female (the writer)" (Dean 2009, 36).

For the MA research, the experiments were carried out using pig heads as human proxies (Dean 2009, 36). The head was chosen as the area of the body to test, because the experiments were attempting to replicate the smiting scene from Dynastic Egyptian history, in which the blow of the mace was aimed at the victim's head (Dean 2009, 37). One important problem noted in the MA thesis is that the experiment had to take into account the differences between pig skulls and human skulls (Dean 2009, 36). The author points out that "A pig skull is approximately two to three times thicker than that of a human, so any damage sustained by a human skull with a blow from a mace would be greater than the damage incurred by the pig skull" (Dean 2009, 36).

The experiments carried out for the MA were relatively simple. Approximations and estimates were used in order to produce a relevant environment for the tests. For example, "A metal stand was used to raise the pigs' heads to a height roughly comparable with the height of a kneeling prisoner prior to execution" (Dean 2009, 37) (fig. 5.2). Obviously, as people differ in height, there was no exact reference for the height that the pig head should be at, so the estimate was the most appropriate option for the test. The author describes the evaluation of various styles of blows with both of the maces on a test pig head, and how the chosen optimum method of striking with the mace (wielding the mace with two hands) differed from the style portrayed in a typical smiting scene (using a one-handed blow) (Dean 2009, 37). Once the initial test was completed and a blow style selected, the individual maces were then assessed, and the entire experiment documented through photography and video (Dean 2009, 37).

The results produced by this set of experiments were extremely interesting. Prior to the experiment, the author had posited that the globular mace-head would be the most effective, expecting the blunt force trauma of such a weapon to break the bones of the skull with relative ease. The globular mace is also the one that is most

commonly depicted in the ancient Egyptian smiting scenes, so this also seemed to suggest that this was the style of mace that was preferred by the ancient Egyptians, perhaps due to its success.

Yet this turned out not to be the case. The conical mace-head actually split the skin of the pig head, whilst the globular mace caused no visible damage to the skin (Dean 2009, 38) (fig. 5.3). Subsequent X-rays of the two main test skulls revelaed the impact of each mace even more clearly. The X-ray of the pig head hit with the globular mace showed "some slight cracking and damage to the skull of the pig, though not as much as was perhaps expected" (Dean 2009, 38) (fig. 5.4). The X-ray of the pig head hit by the conical mace, however, showed damage that was "more extensive than the damage caused by the globular mace…. there is evidence of damage to the skull, where there is a sizeable crack, almost a 'step', in the bone" (Dean 2009, 38) (fig. 5.5). It may be that the globular mace was the style of mace portrayed with more frequency in smiting scenes due to it having a shape and style that simply represented the 'mace' in a generic sense, rather than it being an exact depiction.

After the experiments and X-rays had been carried out in 2009, the pig heads were buried in soil at a depth of approximately four feet, at the archaeological excavation site of Heslington East in North Yorkshire. The pig skull struck with the conical mace-head was exhumed two years later in July of 2011, when the skull had become completely de-fleshed and therefore the damage caused by the conical mace clearly visible (fig. 5.6). This de-fleshing made it far easier to assess the damage caused by the conical mace-head than assessment through the use of the X-ray alone. The sizeable hole created by the mace-head was impressive, and provided yet further evidence for its effectiveness.

The conclusions drawn from this MA experiment were that the "conical macehead was the more effective of the two weapon shapes, causing the most amount of damage on the individual macehead tests" (Dean 2009, 38). It was further acknowledged that the globular mace-head would also cause substantial damage to a

human skull if wielded with sufficient force (Dean 2009, 38). However, the sharp edge of the conical mace-head gave it the advantage over the globular form when it came to damaging both the skin and the skull (Dean 2009, 38).

One key point addressed was the amount of damage that such a relatively small weapon could cause, "as shown on the remains of victims with battle wounds that include those made by maces" (Dean 2009, 46). The use of a different animal head, such as a sheep, would likely have given different results in these experiments, since the thickness of a sheep skull is more similar to the thickness of a human skull (Dean 2009, 36; 39). Yet the fact that sheeps' heads are not available to the public whereas pigs heads are in plentiful supply directly influenced choice. Furthermore, "Even the damage done to a pig skull up to three times thicker than that of a human by a female completely untrained in the art of warfare was reasonably impressive" (Dean 2009, 46), displaying just how effective the mace could be in combat especially in the case of a less substantial human skull. This MA experiment was the preliminary experiment for further research, leading the way to this current thesis research.

Weaponry Choice

The weapons chosen for the experimental archaeology were a mace, a khopesh, a dagger and an axe. These are all weapons which can be associated with ancient Egyptian women, either as burial goods or in visual portrayals. Three of the weapons used in the experimental archaeology (the axe, the khopesh and the dagger) were cast by Neil Burridge, who is an experienced bronze swordsmith based in Cornwall. Specialising in ancient bronze swords and other ancient bronze weapons, he has worked with archaeologists in the past (Burridge, nd [a]) and was extremely interested in this particular project, taking a considerable amount of time to cast the three 18th Dynasty replica weapons required for this experimental archaeology.

The axe-head commissioned for this is a replica of an axe-head featured in Davies' *Catalogue of Ancient Antiquities in the British Museum. VIII. Tools and Weapons I. Axes* (1987). This was axe 123, number EA.67589, an 18th Dynasty axe-head found at Amarna (Davies 1987, 45; Pl. 22) (fig. 5.7). The bronze alloy for the axe contained 9% tin to the copper, which is generally consistent with the bronze weapon

alloys of the period (Neil Burridge, pers. comm. February 2011). Davies' metallurgic analysis of the original axe-head (123) revealed that it contained 90.6% copper, and 7.9% tin, with trace amounts of other metals (1987, 45). Therefore, it was decided that the 9% tin content of the axe-head made by Neil Burridge was an appropriate amount.

The replica axe-head was then hafted by Neil Raval of Macclesfield, using a hickory axe-handle (fig. 5.8). Whilst axe hafts in ancient Egypt would not be made of hickory wood (which is predominantly found in North America, India, and China), it was felt that hickory was an appropriate substitute for native Egyptian woods such as acacia, which is not easily obtainable in Britain. The haft was cut to length of 44.1cm, a length based on another 18th Dynasty axe handle from Davies' catalogue, axe 117 (1987, 44; Pl. 20 and 32) (fig. 5.9). The replica axe haft was then finished with Danish oil, and the head attached to the haft by slotting it into a groove cut into the wood (exactly as seen with axe 117 in Davies' 1987 catalogue). This was then secured with leather ties. The axe head itself was later treated with ballistol oil, designed for the maintenance of metal (along with many other materials as well) and helping to prevent corrosion (anon 2010) (fig. 5.10).

The dagger commissioned is a replica of an 18th Dynasty (c.1560BC) dagger of Ahmose I, the founder of the 18th Dynasty (fig. 5.11). This dagger, held in the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, Canada, was found at Abydos by Charles Currelly, the founder of this museum (Needler 1962, 173). The dagger was composed of bronze, with a limestone pommel (Needler 1962, 174). At the top of the pommel was a cartouche bearing the name of Ahmose I in gold (Needler 1962, 174) (fig. 5.12). Neil Burridge had made this replica previously, so was therefore experienced in casting another such weapon, the bronze alloy for which contained 9% tin, and again consistent with the bronze weapon alloys of the period (Neil Burridge, pers. comm. February 2011). This was completed with the wooden hilt (fig. 5.13), and the pommel likewise made of wood rather than limestone. The gold nails and detailing were felt unnecessary for a replica to be used for experimental archaeology, so the hilt was simply sanded down and treated with ballistol oil.

Previous Experiments

Two of these replica weapons were first used in archaeological experiments as part of a 2011 MA thesis by William Stonborough at the University of York. For these experiments, the replica axe and khopesh were tested against a replica Egyptian shield made of rawhide (Stonborough 2011). In Stonborough's experiments, the shield was "subjected to a series of simple blows delivered with both the axe and the khopesh, in order to test its resilience to these two very different weapons" (2011, 55) (figs. 5.14 and 15).

The results of this experiment provided a great deal of information about both the shield and the weapons. For instance, the impact of each weapon on the shield differed greatly. Stonborough describes the stout, thick blade of the axe-head as "indicative of a design suited for penetration rather than cutting" (2011, 54). When an axe blow was directed to the edge of the shield, the result was "such a minimal trace of impact that it was initially assumed to have missed" (Stonborough 2011, 60). Stonborough then proceeded to strike the same spot with two more blows, the result of which produced "only a slight indentation and flattening of the shield edge" (Stonborough 2011, 60) (fig. 5.16). The khopesh, however, when tested in the same area of the shield, but on a section untouched by the axe, produced a very different result: "The khopesh sliced effortlessly through 6.8 cm of the shield before stopping ... its capacity to cut cleanly through rawhide had been established beyond doubt (Stonborough 2011, 60) (fig. 5.17).

The Experiments – Methodology

Stonborough's (2011) experiments demonstrated the effectiveness, or lack thereof, of the khopesh and axe against a rawhide shield. The experiments for this thesis research, however, examined a very different test subject for the weaponry. As with Dean's 2009 MA thesis, it was decided that sections of pig carcass would provide the best human proxy for weapons testing. After consultation with Prof Joann Fletcher, Dr Stephen Buckley and Professor Terry O'Connor, it was decided that sections of belly pork with the ribs still attached would be the best option for testing. These sections of belly pork retained the pig skin, fat, and muscle on top of the ribs

(fig. 5.18), the layer of skin, fat, and muscle approximately one to two inches in depth, varying slightly for each section. This was felt to reflect human chest anatomy sufficiently to show whether the weapons had the capacity to fracture ribs or to penetrate to underlying organs.

Three individuals (the author, Prof Joann Fletcher and Dr Stephen Buckley) were selected to carry out a test of each weapon, producing twelve results in total. The experiments for the khopesh differed from the experiments designed for the axe, dagger and mace. For the initial tests of the axe, dagger and mace, nine sections of belly pork, three ribs wide, were procured from the butcher G. A. Swains of York and the experiments took place in the garden of a private residence. A consultation with Thom Richardson, Keeper of Armour and Oriental Collections at the Royal Armouries Museum in Leeds, helped assess how the weapons could best be wielded in the experiments, based on the characteristics of each weapon, and in the opinion of an experienced armourer.

The sections of pig were placed on a sheet of plastazote to provide support and this in turn placed on the flat top of a raised plastic stand to a height of approximately one metre. Each pig section was struck with three blows from each weapon. The experiments all took place outdoors, with plenty of natural light, along with electrical light when the natural light faded due to adverse weather conditions, and each experiment photographed and filmed for the record. The main risks (i.e. flying bone fragments, shattering metal from the weapons) were assessed prior to the experiments being carried out, and the necessary measures were taken. Only experiment participants were allowed in the testing area, and these participants all wore safety glasses and protective gloves when carrying out the experiments.

The axe strikes carried out by each participant were all two-handed, and targeted at the pig sections both parallel with the ribs, and also across the ribs. Each participant struck the ribs three times. A two-handed strike was employed rather than a one-handed strike, as this was felt to be a style of blow that was easier to control, and produced more power than a one-handed blow (figs. 5.19-21).

The mace blows carried out by each participant, as with the axe blows, were again all two-handed and targeted at the pig sections parallel to the ribs and across the ribs. Each person struck the pig section three times with the mace, again using a two-handed strike rather than one-handed strike, because, as with the axe, this style of striking is easier to control, and produced more power than a one-handed strike (figs. 5.22-24). This had been tested and confirmed with the mace tests carried out for the previous MA thesis experiments (Dean 2009).

The dagger experiments were slightly different from the axe and mace experiments. Although each participant again produced three strikes at the pig sections, the aim of the dagger testing was to examine its effectiveness as a close-quarters weapon. Therefore, two of the tests simply slid the dagger gently between the ribs three times. The final test, however, also included a more forceful strike, diagonally across the ribs, in order to compare what damage would result if the dagger were used with more force (figs. 5.25-27).

Following two days' refrigeration, the pig sections were X-rayed at the Archaeology Department of the University of York, at the King's Manor in York (fig. 5.28). The X-ray equipment was a Hewlett Packard Faxitron Cabinet X-ray System, the settings used were 60kv 1mA(3) 40ms, and the digital images produced by an NTB Digital X-ray scanner EZ40.

The Experiments – The Observations and Results

The Axe

The axe when tested by Rebecca Dean (RDA) produced immediately observable results (fig. 5.29). On two of the strikes that hit across the ribs, the axe sliced through the layers of skin, fat, and muscle with relative ease when striking towards the edge of the pig section closest to the tester. The third strike, hitting parallel to the ribs, did not actually break the skin or pierce the pig flesh in any way. The X-ray of ribs with the RDA strikes produced some very interesting results (fig. 5.30). Not only was some soft tissue damage visible on the X-ray, but the middle rib had a

distinct transverse fracture (Mays 2010, 239, fig. 4.9.20) running across the width of the rib (fig. 5.31, fig. 5.32). Another rib bone, at the bottom of the X-ray, closest to where the tester had been standing when delivering the blows, had a section that had shattered vertically along the edge of the bone, in what appears to be a comminuted fracture (Mays 2010, 239, fig. 5.9.20) (fig. 5.33).

The axe when tested by Dr Stephen Buckley (SBA) also produced immediately observable results (fig. 5.34). Two of the strikes had cut into the skin and flesh, one strike parallel to the ribs and the other diagonally across the ribs. A third strike, as with test RDA, did not break or pierce the soft tissue in any way. The X-ray of the ribs with SBA'S strikes produced some perhaps unexpected results, particularly when considering the X-ray of RDA – there was no visible damage to the rib bones at all (fig. 5.35).

The axe when tested by Prof Joann Fletcher (JFA), contrary to the two other axe tests, produced no immediately observable results (fig. 5.36). None of the strikes, either parallel or across the ribs, either broke the skin or pierced the flesh, only indentations where the axe-head had hit. However, the X-ray of the JFA tests produced an interesting result; the middle rib bone alone clearly displayed a distinct transverse fracture (Mays 2010, 239, fig. 4.9.20) horizontally across the rib bone (figs. 5.37 and 38, fig. 5.31).

The Mace

The mace when tested by Rebecca Dean (RDM), contrary to two of the axe tests, produced no immediately observable results (fig. 5.39). None of the three strikes, parallel to the ribs or hitting across the ribs, broke the skin or pierced the flesh, though there were a couple of indentations on the skin from where the mace hit. The X-ray of the RDM tests showed no sign of damage to any of the rib bones whatsoever (fig. 5.40). While this result may have been, at first, disappointing, it did provide evidence as to the effect of the mace when struck against a body part with much thicker soft tissue (muscle and fat) than the skull.

The mace tested by Dr Stephen Buckley (SBM) produced similar results to test RDM. Again, none of the three strikes, whether parallel to the ribs or hitting across the ribs, broke the skin or pierced the flesh, although, as with RDM, there were a couple of indentations on the skin where the mace hit (fig. 5.41). The X-ray of the SBM tests, as with RDM, showed no sign of damage to any of the rib bones whatsoever (fig. 5.42).

The mace tested by Prof Joann Fletcher (JFM) produced similar results to samples RDM and SBM. Once again, none of the three strikes, whether parallel to the ribs or hitting across the ribs, broke the skin or pierced the flesh, although, as with tests RDM and SBM, there were a couple of indentations on the skin from the impact (fig. 5.43). None of the ribs in the X-ray of the JFM tests, as with RDM and SBM tests, showed any visible signs of damage (fig. 5.44).

The Dagger

The dagger when tested by Rebecca Dean (RDD) produced immediately observable results (fig. 5.45). The three 'hits' with the dagger, parallel to the rib bones, were extremely effective. The dagger blade cut through six centimetres of pig skin, fat and, muscle, and straight through between the ribs, with no discernible resistance (fig. 5.46). The underside of the pig section even displayed damage, demonstrating that the dagger would have penetrated the body cavity, damaging underlying organs (fig. 5.47). Although the X-ray of the RDD tests showed no sign of significant damage to any of the rib bones, the tip of the dagger blade had scratched the top of one rib (fig. 5.48). The X-ray also showed the wound tract for at least one of the dagger blows.

The dagger when tested by Dr Stephen Buckley (SBD), as with test RDD, produced immediately observable results (fig. 5.49). The two 'hits' with the dagger, both parallel to the rib bones, had again been extremely effective. As with test RDD, the dagger blade cut through over six centimetres of skin, fat and muscle, and straight through between the ribs, with no discernible resistance (fig. 5.50). The X-ray of the

SBD tests showed no evidence of damage to any of the rib bones, but did show the wound tract for at least one of the dagger blows (fig. 5.51).

The dagger when tested by Prof Joann Fletcher (JFD), as with tests RDD and SBD, produced immediately observable results (fig. 5.52). The first two relatively gentle 'hits' with the dagger, one of which was parallel to the ribs whilst the other was diagonal, were again extremely effective. As with the two other dagger tests, the dagger blade cut through at least six centimetres of skin, fat and muscle, and straight through between the ribs, with no discernible resistance (figs. 5.53 and 54). The third dagger blow was done with much more force and from a greater height than the other two tests. The X-ray of test JFD showed the wound tracts for the two initial blows, including where the tip of the dagger blade had scratched the top of the rib bone (fig. 5.55). Yet the most interesting result from the X-ray of JFD was the result of the third, more forceful blow. Not only was a much larger wound tract clearly visible, but the dagger blow which had fallen diagonally between two rib bones, had damaged the rib bones on either side of the wound tract, chipping the bone (fig. 5.56).

Analysis

According to Mays, "Despite the evidence we have for some soft tissue injuries, the most frequent indication of injury seen in skeletons is bone fracture" (2010, 238). This may indeed be the case for most archaeological examples, but in the case of Egyptian remains which were often intentionally mummified or preserved in the arid environment, the soft tissue is also preserved. This of course allows for any damage to this tissue to be observed, and comparisons made between experimental archaeology results and examples of damage found on the relevant mummified remains (e.g. Seqenenre, the Slain Soldiers of Montuhotep etc).

When examining the damage caused by the different weapon tests, certain factors have to be taken into account. In terms of bones, Galloway describes how "blunt force trauma is seen as a wide range of fracture patterns. These depend, in part, upon the biomechanical properties of bone tissue and the nature of the applied forces

… The shape, mass and velocity of the instrument through which forces are applied also affect the fracturing" (1999, 35). Another aspect that must be taken into account is the fact that for this thesis research the test subjects were pig rather than human bone, and as Galloway points out, "The morphology, structural integrity, mineralization and density of skeletal elements adds another level of factors which help shape the fracture pathway" (1999, 35). Galloway *et al.* accept that, especially in forensic anthropology trauma analysis, "Such studies are extremely difficult to develop due to the availability of a suitable sample of study material and the ability to reproduce a sample that closely matches the characteristics of the decedent (age, ancestry, sex, robusticity)" (1999, 23).

As is necessary in experiments such as these, "Matching of the nature of the bone must be as exact as possible in order to construct a model from which to calculate the forces needed to produce specific injuries. Obviously use of live human material is entirely unethical, despite any secret desires on the part of the researcher" (Galloway *et al.* 1999, 23). As discussed previously, pig flesh and bone were considered the best human proxy of the options available. Of course, in this 1999 work, Galloway *et al.* are discussing experimental work relation to forensics, and presenting forensic tests and results in a court case. However, this is something that must be appreciated when assessing and analysing the results of the thesis experiments.

<u>The Axe</u>

The photographs and X-rays of the pig sections hit by the axe show some varied results. At times, the axe worked as a both cutting and a clubbing impact weapon (see example RDA), cutting the flesh easily and producing a shock load sufficient to break bone with its impact on the ribs. This caused both a transverse fracture on one rib and a comminuted fracture on another. The occurrence of a comminuted fracture is interesting, as Mays states that this type of fracture is created by the "Application of greater force or a crushing injury [which] may lead to bone fragmentation" (2010, 238). Therefore, the presence of a comminuted fracture in the X-ray of a pig section hit with a blow from an axe suggests that the weapon indeed has crushing capabilities, and was perhaps hit with more force by the participant testing the weapon.

RDA is the only test example where both some soft tissue trauma and a bone break occurred. Example JFA broke a rib bone with a transverse fracture, but did not cut through the flesh of the pig at all, therefore there was no apparent soft tissue damage. Example SBA was the opposite – there was plenty of soft tissue damage from the cutting axe blade, but no damage at all to the rib bones. These diverse results would suggest that the impact and effectiveness of the axe as a weapon is subject to the individual wielding the weapon. It is possible that the results vary according to how closely to a 90 degree angle the axe-edge hits the skin. If the axe is tilted slightly, it may cut in obliquely, thereby rapidly dissipating the force of the blow. It is also possible that in the case of test RDA, the soft tissue damage was so extensive due to the axe blade striking at the edge of the pig section rather than in the centre. This could have meant that the axe blade would cut through the soft tissue more easily, with less resistance than if it had struck the centre. In each case, however, it is apparent that the axe is extremely effective as a weapon, whether it is wielded by a man or a woman.

The axe, even when tested by untrained individuals, either caused serious soft tissue damage through large slashes through the skin and muscle (which could potentially cause fatal blood loss if the right area was struck), or had enough impact to break bone. Either way, it could cause a debilitating injury to the individual receiving such a blow. On one occasion (RDA) it did both, suggesting that this style of axe would have been a formidable weapon in 18th Dynasty warfare.

The Mace

As the results of the experiments with the mace reveal, there was no evidence of any bone damage in any of the three tests carried out. This is not necessarily an unexpected occurrence. As discussed in Galloway *et al.*, "In addition to the resistance provided by bone itself, other tissues may increase the dispersal of force from blunt trauma" (1999, 23). There is such a notable difference between the initial 2009 tests on the pig skull and the 2011 tests on the rib cage sections precisely because of the difference in depth of the soft tissue:

> "on the head there is ¼ - ½ inch of soft material overlying the vault (McElhaney *et al*. 1976) that acts as a cushion and diffuses the force applied. The tissues that form the scalp provided tensile strength of varying degrees. This resistance is less than found in the skin over much of the rest of the body since there is less underlying soft tissue to cushion the blow and allow deformation (Gurdjian 1975)" (Galloway *et al.* 1999, 23-24).

This would certainly seem to be demonstrated by the X-ray images of the three pig sections struck with the mace. In the 2009 experiment, the depth of the soft tissue on the pig skull was sufficiently minimal to allow the conical mace to not only split the skin, but provide enough force to penetrate the soft tissue and cause substantial damage to the skull itself. The conical mace would appear to combine blunt- and sharp-force trauma in one weapon. This is not to say that the lack of bone damage to the rib section meant that the mace had no effect at all. The impact of such blunt force trauma would have caused a great deal of muscle damage, a potentially incapacitating injury. The layer of muscle and fat overlaying a human ribcage can be less than that of the pig ribcage, so the damage caused to a human by a mace blow could be more extensive than these experiments showed.

Neither the gender of the test participant nor the force with which the mace struck the pig section appears to have any effect on the damage caused, or lack thereof. These initial experiments suggest that the mace may not always have been a particularly useful weapon in a battlefield situation, when both the axe and the mace would be equally effective as a clubbing weapon but the axe having the added advantage of the sharp edge. The mace is a weapon that would have more impact when striking a skull, therefore making it an ideal choice for executions. This may be one reason as to why the mace is represented so prolifically in ancient Egyptian smiting scenes.

The Dagger

In the experiments with the dagger, X-ray images of the tests RDD and SBD showed little more than the wound tracts created by the dagger blade, and an example of a

scrape mark across the surface of one of the ribs in RDD of the type identified by White and Folkens (2005, 60-62). The experiments revealed that the dagger can easily pierce skin, fat and muscle and would easily penetrate vital organs with little effort required. Simply sliding the dagger gently between the ribs was enough to cause a large amount of soft tissue damage. The most fascinating result, however, came from test JFD, where the third dagger strike using more force than the first two strikes produced significant bone damage, thereby demonstrating the potential of even the lightest and most delicate of bronze blades.

This damage to the rib bones caused by the dagger reflects the occurrence of bone damage as described by Mays: "In archaeological material an additional type of injury, which is probably best classified as a fracture, is sometimes found: cuts due to slicing of bone by a sharp weapon or other implement. These may be found on the cranium and elsewhere in the skeleton, and are indicative of violent assault" (2010, 238). This 'slicing of the bone' is definitely evident in the X-rays of the JFD tests, the way in which the bone was damaged related to the fact that the pig remains were extremely fresh, having been butchered the day before the experiments. Mays mentions how injuries caused by a sharp blade can be easily distinguished from post-depositional bone damage: "When weapons such as these strike bone in a living individual (or, indeed, in a fresh corpse) they tend to slice rather than shatter it. This is due to the slight 'give' or resilience conferred on bone by its organic component" (2010, 244). So the 'freshness' of the pig remains ensured that the damage caused by the blows of the dagger and the other weapons were relatively similar to the peri-mortem damage sustained by humans in combat situations.

Again, there are differences in rib bone densities between pigs and humans (although they are a good match in size), but it is reasonable to postulate that the dagger would cause very similar damage to a human rib bone, if used with enough force and speed. The ease with which damage was caused to the thicker soft tissue of the pig sections only highlights how the damage to human soft tissue of lesser thickness could be more extensive.

Conclusions

In reviewing the research questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, the experiments would appear to have provided comprehensive answers to the questions. The results of these experiments were most enlightening. The axe and the dagger certainly inflicted significant injury to the pig remains. The results did differ between the participants, but it would be difficult to argue that this was due to gender. It seems rather more likely to be due to the differences in the techniques each one employed. Whilst the mace may not have been particularly effective in this set of experiments, it had already been proved to be an effective weapon in the 2009 MA experiments. As discussed above, whilst the mace may not have been a battle-appropriate weapon, the axe and dagger could potentially have been most useful in combat; the axe as both a clubbing and hacking weapon, and the dagger as a last-resort, close-quarters combat weapon. It would also be very difficult to argue that these weapons were purely votive items rather than functional weapons.

Photographs of the axe and dagger trauma display the soft tissue injuries very clearly. The dagger trauma does not appear to differ in relation to the gender or experience of the participant. The extent of the damage suggests it would be easy for the dagger blade to pierce skin and muscle and seriously injure vital organs, making it a dangerous weapon in anyone's hands and very effective in combat. It is evident that little to no training would be required to use such a blade successfully; the skill in using the dagger in a battlefield situation would lie in getting close enough to an enemy to be able to stick it in. The axe had less success in cutting through the soft tissue, but was still effective in cutting skin and muscle in two of the experiments. As discussed above, the angle at which the axe blade struck the pig skin appears to have had an effect on the amount of damage done. The mace is a different prospect. The photographs of the mace tests show no soft tissue damage other than a few dents in the pig skin. The mace would certainly inflict some damage, but not necessarily sufficient damage to completely incapacitate a victim.

The X-rays nonetheless demonstrate the damage which was caused to the bones by the other weapons. The effectiveness of the axe in experiment RDA is reflected in the shattered bone and transverse fractures which clearly demonstrate the clubbing

ability of the axe, even when wielded by an untrained person. The same type of transverse fracture seen in the X-rays of experiment JFA demonstrates that the axe damage to bone is consistent. As the X-rays of the mace experiments showed no bone damage, little can be assessed other than the fact that the mace was ineffective against bone when used on a specific part of the body (the thicker soft tissue of the sections of pig). The X-rays of the dagger experiments, as discussed previously, were very different from the results of both the axe and mace experiments. The bone scratches on the X-ray of experiment RDD suggest that the dagger blade could damage bone but only to a small extent, and would not be a debilitating injury in itself. Yet the X-ray of experiment JFD shows that the dagger blade could in fact damage bone rather more significantly, and while the slicing of the bone in this instance may not represent the most incapacitating of injuries, it nonetheless suggests that the dagger does have the potential to do serious damage to bone as well as soft tissue.

The experiments carried out demonstrate that these weapons, which were associated with women in some form, were indeed very effective as functional items. The effectiveness of the mace was initially displayed in the 2009 MA research, but it has now been demonstrated that such effectiveness can be limited, depending on which part of the body it strikes. The axe and the dagger were the two weapons that displayed the most interesting and informative results. It is evident from the results gained that it is possible to argue that the null hypothesis put forward has been clearly disproved for the dagger, arguably disproved for the axe, and has in fact not been disproved in relation to the mace (although this could be due to the way in which the mace was utilised in the experiments in this thesis in particular, as the results were more visible in the MA experiments from 2009). These experiments were designed to show that ancient Egyptian women were physically able to employ the weapons available associated with them throughout ancient Egyptian history (for example the Nagada mace burials and the Ahhotep burial), such as the weapons found in various burials, and the blades seen in visual representations (such as Deshasheh and the Nefertiti smiting scene). As considered previously, gender or biological sex appears not to have been a factor in the damage the weapons caused; there is no reason to think that the supposedly lesser muscularity of women would

have rendered them unable to use these weapons to lethal or disabling effect. The scenes depicted at Deshasheh demonstrate that ancient Egyptian women might well utilise weaponry (and to great effect, visually at least) when under threat, and the experiments carried out here show that they would be able to wield weapons. This is a vitally important point to reflect upon in relation to this research.

Experimental Archaeology – the Khopesh

Although the experiments testing the replica khopesh differed from those employed for the axe, mace and dagger in order to reflect the way in which the khopesh was used, the research questions for the khopesh were similar to those posed for the other weapons, i.e.:

- Could the khopesh have inflicted significant injury when used by either sex, thereby demonstrating its use as a genuine combat weapon rather than a symbolic or token object?
- How effective would the khopesh be in battle?
- What is the impact of the khopesh on both the soft tissue and bone of the neck and spinal column?
- How effective was the khopesh when wielded by both sexes, on the basis that the amount of force employed by each would differ?
- How variable was the damage inflicted by the khopesh when wielded by women as opposed to men? If so, what differences were there?

Based on what has been hypothesised in the past, a null hypothesis has been designed for these experiments: i.e. **the khopesh, when wielded by untrained people, could not cause sufficient disabling or fatal damage.**

The Weapon

In order to undertake the experimental archaeology, the khopesh selected for replication was the 'Greater Khopesh' found among the burial goods of

Tutankhamun (fig. 5.57). Although Carter (2004, 76; 137) found two of these swords in Tutankhamun's tomb, only one was suitable for the experimental research, namely the larger, heavier example found amongst single sticks (Carter 2004, 137). As described earlier in this thesis, both swords had the blade, the shaft and the handle cast in one single piece (Carter 2004, 77; Reeves 1992, 177). Carter describes the larger of these two weapons as having been designed for crushing rather than cutting, and this larger khopesh could have inflicted significant wounds due to the sheer weight of the blade (Carter 2004, 77; Reeves 1992, 177).

Experienced in producing such weapons, metalworker and weapons expert Neil Burridge has been casting replicas of this larger khopesh for several years (Burridge nd [b]). The khopesh commissioned for this research was cast from a bronze alloy containing 12% tin, thereby replicating the type of metal employed in New Kingdom weaponry (Burridge, pers. comm. February 2011). The weapon was also supplied with a wooden hilt (fig. 5.58), subsequently sanded down and treated with shellac in order to protect the wood and make it easier to handle, a treatment not inconsistent with New Kingdom practices although different substances may have been used. Both the blade and the hilt have also been treated with ballistol oil, as in the case with the weaponry used in the previous experiments.

Methodology

After consultation with Thom Richardson of the Royal Armouries Leeds, it was decided to design a slightly different experiment for testing the khopesh. The experiment is based on the well-known 18th Dynasty representation of a woman using a khopesh, i.e. the smiting scene involving Nefertiti and a prisoner. It is postulated here that the khopesh would have been used to sever vital arteries or even decapitate the prisoner rather than simply strike them about the head. Therefore using the same style of experiment as employed for the axe, dagger and mace was not appropriate for the testing of the khopesh, which instead was designed around the concept of partial or full decapitation. The most suitable proxies for this experiment were piglet carcasses of approximately 35-40cm in length, in this case supplied by Shedden Farm, York. The same three participants from the previous experiments were chosen to carry out the tests with the khopesh.

The experiments took place in the grounds of a private residence. As discussed above, Thom Richardson of the Royal Armouries helped assess how the khopesh could best be wielded in the experiments carried out by the same three participants who carried out the previous set of experiments. However, on the first day of the experiment the farm were only able to provide two of the three piglets requested (fig. 5.59). Therefore it was decided that only the two female participants should carry out the experiments at this time and the third and final khopesh test carried out by a male participant slightly postponed until further carcasses became available.

As with the previous experiments, the khopesh experiment took place outdoors with plenty of natural light, and each stage of the experiment photographed. The piglets were raised on a plastic stand to a height of approximately one metre (fig. 5.60), thereby replicating the approximate height of the neck of a kneeling human adult. Again, as with the previous experiments, the main risks (i.e. flying bone fragments, shattering metal from the weapons) were again assessed prior to the experiments being carried out and the necessary measures were taken. Safety glasses and protective gloves were worn by all of the participants when carrying out the experiments, and only participants were allowed in the testing area. Each piglet was then struck with three blows from the khopesh. The strikes carried out by each participant were a combination of one-handed and two-handed, and struck the piglets on the area of the neck and the shoulder as highlighted in the images (see figs. 5.61, 5.65, and 5.69).

Results

The khopesh tested by Rebecca Dean (RDK) produced immediately observable results. In experiment RDK, the piglet corpse was struck three times with the khopesh, twice with a one-handed strike, and once with a two-handed strike (fig. 5.61). The first blow to the shoulder area easily cut through skin, fat and muscle in order to produce a large, clean, straight-edged wound (fig. 5.62). The second blow hit the neck area at the jawline, and caused significant damage to the neck while also

cutting into the piglet's ear (fig. 5.63). The third blow (the one-handed blow) caught the shoulder and the top of the front leg (fig. 5.64).

The khopesh tested by Prof Joann Fletcher (JFK) also produced immediately observable results. In experiment JFK, the piglet corpse was struck three times with the khopesh, twice with a one-handed strike, and once with a two-handed strike (fig. 5.65). The first blow to the shoulder area, as with experiment RDK, easily cut through skin, fat and muscle in order to produce a large, clean, straight-edged wound in the area where the top section of the blade had struck. There was also a smaller cut a little further down the area where the blade had hit (fig. 5.66). The second blow hit the neck area behind the ear, and caused some damage to the neck, cutting away the skin to an extent of approximately 2 square centimetres (fig. 5.67). The third blow (again, as with RDK, this was the one-handed blow) hit the neck area again, and caused significant damage, cutting deeply into the neck (fig. 5.68).

The khopesh tested by Dr Stephen Buckley (SBK) also produced immediately observable results. In experiment SBK, the piglet corpse was struck three times with the khopesh, twice with a one-handed strike, and once with a two-handed strike (fig. 5.69). The first blow was to the neck area, and as with the first two experiments, it cut through skin, fat and muscle in order to produce a large, straight-edged wound, which produced a significant amount of blood, in the area where the middle section of the blade had struck (figs. 5.70 and 5.71). The second blow hit the shoulder area and caused extensive damage, cutting into the body by several centimetres (fig. 5.72). The third blow (again, as with RDK and JFK, this was the one-handed blow) hit the shoulder area again, and caused significant damage, cutting deeply into the shoulder area, and cutting almost all the way through the animal's body (fig. 5.73).

Analysis and Conclusions

As highlighted in the photographs, the khopesh sword is capable of inflicting a great deal of trauma to soft tissue, even when wielded by inexperienced participants. Only a very small exertion of force was required to produce the trauma results observed. Even without the use of X-Rays, it was obvious that the damage caused at the neck

area would have proved fatal, the severing of key arteries leading to serious blood loss. Piglets were used as a proxy because they have a similar neck diameter and thickness of skin to a human. It is therefore possible to extrapolate that the damage sustained by a human neck on the receiving end of such a strike would have been very similar, if not the same. Although complete decapitation did not result, the depth of the cuts to the neck would have severed the common carotid or external carotid artery, and cuts to the shoulder are likely to have cut the subclavian artery. An adult human victim would be unconscious within one minute and dead from loss of blood within about three minutes (T. O'Connor, pers. comm. February 2013).

The trauma sustained by the piglets was most severe at the neck area, suggesting that aiming a strike at a human neck would be the most efficient and effective way to employ the khopesh. As a weapon, the khopesh, with its remarkably sharp-edged and curved blade, seems designed for slashing rather than clubbing. It was also quite tricky to handle, even cumbersome at times due to the curved nature and the weight of the blade, suggesting it would not have been a particularly practical weapon for large-scale battle encounters. Therefore, it could be postulated that the khopesh was not a weapon fashioned for the battlefield, but rather more for close-combat situations e.g. 'one-on-one' combat prowess displays or formal executions, as characterised in the aforementioned Nefertiti smiting scene discussed in previous chapters. The graceful form and shape of the khopesh would also appear impressive when used in such executions, adding a somewhat aesthetic, as well as injurious, characteristic to the weapon.

The results gained make it possible to argue that the null hypothesis put forward has been disproved for the khopesh. As discussed earlier, the gender of the user does not seem to affect the damage that the weapons can cause. These experiments showed conclusively that the khopesh can have a lethal impact even in the hands of untrained individuals regardless of sex or gender. As with the three previous experiments, the effect (or lack thereof) of gender on the use of the khopesh is an important point in relation to this research.

The results achieved in this set of experiments augment the concepts and theories related to a gender and feminist approach to Egyptian archaeology put forward in this piece of research. As mentioned in previous chapters, the cultural conditioning that has been seen in the work of many Western archaeologists who have long ignored the importance of take a feminist approach is something that this thesis sets out to challenge, and the experimental archaeology carried out here is one important element of that. Many academics in past, and at times not too distant past, made the assumption that women could not have possibly used such weapons effectively in real life because that was not the sort of role that should be assigned to their 'gender', regardless of the fact that ancient Egyptian culture would not have the same social roles and customs as a modern Western culture. As stated above, these experiments set out to prove (and it is argued here that it has been proven successfully) that ancient Egyptian women had the physical abilities to use certain weapons effectively and with relative ease, even with a lack of training. It should not have been necessary to have to carry out such experiments, but a point had to be made in order to counteract the outmoded assumptions made by certain academics with regard to women within the archaeological and historical record.

The next chapter will examine comparative archaeological evidence for the trauma that these specific weapons can cause, looking at well-known examples such as the Slain Soldiers of Montu-hotep, and including examples of women who display evidence of having sustained trauma from the types of weaponry examined in this thesis, and in this chapter, and the one before, in particular. This comparative discussion will also include a scrutiny of the way in which those examples of women were evaluated by the archaeologist who studied them.

Chapter Six - Experimental Archaeology: Comparative Discussion

This chapter of the thesis deals with known archaeological evidence for weapons trauma on ancient Egyptian remains. This is important for a direct comparison with the experiments carried out in the previous chapter, and for the specific examples of female remains exhibiting signs of weapons injuries, with the analyses by scholars of the potential reasons for how and why the trauma was sustained. When examining the occurrences of weapons trauma in ancient Egyptian remains, it is important to recognise that people killed in battle seem rarely to have been intentionally mummified, and so examples of such trauma are rarely encountered. Evidence of weapon damage is seemingly relatively rare in the case of mummies examined in the past. It is also apparent that the majority of those examples which do exist take the form of head wounds, and therefore the comparison with the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis is somewhat constrained. Nonetheless, examples of trauma in Egyptian remains are worth examination in some detail in relation to this research. This chapter also addresses examples of arcaheologists making stereotypical and out-dated gender-based assumptions about some occurences of trauma on male and female remains (see below), demonstrating the need for a more gender/feminist-based approach to the subject.

One of the most extensive source for weapons trauma in Egypt are the so-called "Slain Soldiers of Montu-hotep", a group of soldiers generally believed to have been slain in battle and then buried near the temple of Montuhotep at Deir el-Bahri (Winlock 2007, 1). As a rare example of a mass-burial of fatally injured soldiers, displaying several examples of weapons trauma, the "Slain Soldiers" provide a useful case study for comparison with the weapons trauma observed both in the experimental archaeology carried out for this research, and in other examples of weapons trauma in Egyptian remains.

The Slain Soldiers of Montuhotep

Discovered in 1923, the bodies of the "Slain Soldiers" had never been placed in coffins, only wrapped in linen and simply placed one on top of the other (Winlock

2007, 5). This meant that "the backs and limbs of those put on top were contorted by the uneven surfaces of the bodies on which they lay" (Winlock 2007, 5). This comprehensive damage to the bodies, reportedly due to tomb robber activity, meant that of all the remains, there were only ten cases in which there were complete bodies (Winlock 2007, 7). Due to their precise findspot, Winlock does not hesitate in stating that these remains were those of "sixty soldiers of the army of King Neb-hepet-Re', slain in battle" (2007, 7) (NB: Neb-hepet-Re' is another name for the pharaoh Montuhotep II, first ruler of the re-united Middle Kingdom Egypt in the 11th Dynasty, Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 183). The "Slain Soldiers" remains have been described as robust, both in general and in relation to the local Predynastic examples, the skulls in particular apparently displaying the differences (Winlock 2007, 8).

Some of the bodies had evidence of old and long-healed wounds from previous conflicts, which might suggest that these were not untested troops, but experienced warriors and veterans of previous battles. At least four of the soldiers had previously broken pates (Winlock 2007, 9). Three of these fractures were on the left side, which Winlock suggests indicates that they resulted from blows by (presumably right-handed) enemies that would have been facing the soldiers during combat (2007, 9). These injuries described, although showing signs of healing, seem to be serious ones, including a couple of examples of what appears to be blunt-force trauma. Winlock describes one man's skull as having a "shallow circular depression in his skull, 1.5cm in diameter", whilst the skull of another man had "an oval depression which measured 2.5 by 1cm" (2007, 9). Could this trauma (apparently survived by the two men) have been caused by a blow from a mace? The size of the depression is not that dissimilar to the approximate size of some of the globular maces that were discussed in the catalogue chapter of this thesis. However, as discussed later by Winlock, and McDermott (2004, 50), this injury could also have been caused by rocks being thrown, or perhaps as suggested by Prof Joann Fletcher (pers. comm. March 2013) even slingshots, examples of which were discovered by Petrie at Lahun, one now in the Petrie Museum reconstructed by Thom Richardson (Richardson nd), and a second one in Manchester (Price 2012).

Winlock (2007) goes into some detail about the trauma suffered by some of the soldiers. Described in his obituary as an "imaginative archaeologist" (Lansing 1950, 7), Lansing also describes Winlock as "a romanticist … he has so long been saturated in the tradition of what is, after all, the most romantic of professions" (Lansing 1950, 7). Whilst this idea of archaeology being a particularly romantic profession might seem a curious one, Winlock's work on the "Slain Soldiers" certainly does contain some moments of dramatic romanticism with regard to the soldiers in battle. This is one of the problems that did occur in early Egyptian archaeology, with too much romanticising of the ancient Egyptians, particularly from a 19th/20th century Western point of view, meaning that any hope of objectivity was lost, and the ancient Egyptians could be misrepresented by those who studied them. This has distinct parallels with the issues that arose when women in ancient Egypt were studied by academics from the same era.

Of the approximately sixty soldiers that were found in the tomb, Winlock states that there were "forty-five recognizable [sic] ante-mortem wounds" (2007, 11). This includes possible damage by either carrion birds (i.e. vultures) or by other mammalian scavengers (i.e. jackal, desert fox). Here, Winlock presents one of his somewhat overly dramatic descriptions as he discusses the possible scene: "Outside no one was left to disturb the carrion birds which had come flocking to feast on the silent field" (2007, 18). One of the problems with identifying soft tissue trauma was the fact that many of the bodies had lost skin, and all were shrunken, meaning that the identification of small and fatal surface wounds was difficult (Winlock 2007, 11).

One apparently frequent cause of wound damage to the "Slain Soldiers" was the damage caused by ebony-tipped reed arrows, apparently characteristic of the 11th Dynasty (Winlock 2007, 11). The arrow damage done to some of the "Slain Soldiers" is presented in Winlock's work. Body D (No. 6) had a 2.5cm long gash in the right arm, running from the "brachio-radialis muscle on the outside of the biceps to the front of the … arm at the hollow of the elbow" (Winlock 2007, 12). This wound still had the tip of the arrow in situ (fig. 6.1), and the total penetration of the arrow was from 21-22cm parallel to the forearm at the moment of impact (Winlock 2007, 12). There was also an "open skin wound 2 by 1cm existing on the outside of

the elbow near the point of entry" (Winlock 2007, 12). Winlock mentions the fact that when the arrow initially hit the arm, the arm must have been "hanging naturally", but the damage was made worse when, after impact, the forearm was turned over and the arrow, lodged in muscle, was "dragged with the rotating radius and broken off 8cm from the tip" (Winlock 2007, 12). It is not stated as to whether or not the arm was moved ante- or post-mortem.

In another brief example, body J (No. 36) (fig. 6.2) had the actual blunt point of the arrow, along with 15.5cm of the tip of the arrow, lodged in the soft tissue connected to the top of the left lung, level with the second rib (Winlock 2007, 13). Perhaps unsurprisingly, there was "evidence of extensive haemorrhage in the left side of the chest" (Winlock 2007, 13). It is possible that this arrow wound could have been a fatal, debilitating injury, causing the lung to collapse, which is very painful and seriously compromises breathing and movement (T. O'Connor, pers. comm. March 2013). Whilst these arrow injuries are extremely interesting, they can tell us little in relation to the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis research. Arrows were not among the weapons tested in the experiments, and the arrow-heads here were made of wood, not metal, so there can be no comparison of wounds caused by metallic weaponry. The same can be said of those bodies that displayed evidence of wounds and damage caused by the throwing of other missiles, such as rocks and stones, during a siege battle.

Body Q (No. 14) (figs. 6.3, 6.4 and 6.5) had substantial head injuries, which Winlock believed to have been caused by a rock being thrown from above the soldier (2007, 14). This missile caused a large cut in the scalp, measuring 6cm long by 1 cm wide, which cut right through the scalp and to the surface of the right frontal bone (Winlock 2007, 14). This resulted in a scratch on the right frontal bone that stretched from the coronal suture to the crown, curving slightly to the left, having nicked small pieces of bone out of the serrations at the coronal suture (Winlock 2007, 14). The cut then "shallows out to nothing about 6cm above the right eyebrow" (Winlock 2007, 14). Winlock posits that this wound was made by "the glancing blow of a sharp missile striking the crown of the head from above and behind", giving credence to Winlock's theory that the "Slain Soldiers" died during a

siege battle (2007, 14). Again, whilst damage caused to the skull by a rocky missile has little to do with the testing of the metallic weapons on other sections of the body, it is still useful for general comparative purposes when examining soft tissue and bone trauma in ancient Egyptian history. Where it is particularly useful is in comparison with the damage that was caused by the two different maces in the 2009 MA experimental archaeology (Dean 2009). It is also possible that such injuries were caused by a glancing blow from a mace, as suggested by McDermott (2004, 51), although it is unfortunately not possible to ascertain for certain if this was the case or not.

In total, Winlock noted eighteen such missile injuries on fourteen of the "Slain Soldiers", and that all of the wounds "were caused by blows from above and in front, making gashes in the scalp and depressions in the skull of various sizes" (2007, 15; McDermott 2004, 50). Again, this reinforced his theory that the "Slain Soldiers" died during a siege, Winlock points out that there are wounds that were caused by blunt force trauma, which damaged the bone in circular areas of approximately 2cm in diameter (2007, 15). There were also other injuries that caused larger areas of damage in bone, or "involved a whole eye or a man's entire nose" (Winlock 2007, 15). Winlock posits that these injuries were caused by stones that would have been thrown at the besieging soldiers in defence of the site (2007, 15). Whilst this is a valid theory, again it is interesting to compare the damage caused by small stones with the damage caused by the relatively small, globular mace that was tested in 2009 (Dean 2009). McDermott also suggests that either a mace or a stave could have been used to cause this trauma (2004, 51). As pointed out, these wounds were not always fatal, and indeed some of the soldiers had previously recovered from such injuries (Winlock 2007, 15). However, these wounds could certainly be disabling, knocking a soldier unconscious (Winlock 2007, 15), and perhaps could have been more lethal had greater accuracy and power been possible (such as with a blow from a mace). There is also the possibility that the aforementioned slings were used to project the stones further and with more power than simply throwing them by hand.

Moving on to those of the "Slain Soldiers" that were not killed by either arrows or rocks, Winlock discusses the possibility of injured soldiers who were killed in a

sortie by the defenders of the site under siege, coming out from the site in order to dispatch the wounded (2007, 16). Winlock mentions fifteen such soldiers, "presumably unable to defend themselves when the defenders made their supposed sortie" (2007, 16). Although not all of the accounts of wounded soldiers are accompanied by images of the damage, the descriptions are nevertheless useful. For example, the trauma inflicted on body HH (No. 6) is described in great detail:

> "The face was crushed in from the left, and the nose, left orbit, zygomatic arch, and the upper part of the maxilla were completely smashed. At least twenty fragments of bone were counted, all of them and the surrounding parts of the skull being stained with blood" (Winlock 2007, 16).

This description tells us a great deal about the attacker and the wounds that were caused. All of the damage being on the left side of the face tells us that the attacker was most likely right-handed, and the amount of damage produced would suggest that someone who wielded whatever weapon they used did so with some strength. The description of the damage itself could indicate any suitable weapon, but the axe is a definite possibility. As discovered during the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis, the axe proved useful as both a cutting and clubbing weapon. The crushing and shattering of the facial bones indicate a perhaps clubbing action as being the primary cause of injury, whilst the copious blood staining could indicate that soft tissue may have been cut. This may indicate the use of an axe. However, there is no way to be certain of this, especially as no images of this soldier have been included in Winlock's work.

There are two examples of possible axe damage discussed by Winlock that are accompanied by images. Body KK (No. 23) had the left side of the face crushed (again, suggesting a right-handed opponent), "and all the bones from the nose and the lower margins of the orbits … were broken free and driven to the right. The suture between the left parietal and the temporal bone was opened" (Winlock 2007, 16) (fig. 6.6). Winlock states that all of the fractured surfaces and the suture that had been opened were stained with the soldier's blood (2007, 16). As with body HH (No. 6), the damage discussed and shown here on body KK could potentially be

consistent with a blow to the head by an axe. Looking at the image of the head provided by Winlock, there is a hole in the skull that is not dissimilar to the damage observed on the pig skull that had been struck with the conical mace-head (fig. 6.7). It is therefore plausible that a conical mace could have caused this damage to soldier KK, especially if it had a particularly sharp edge, as had some of the examples of conical mace-heads. The 2009 MA experiments showed that the conical mace-head edge could split skin and break bone in a pig head and skull, so it is easy enough to theorise that the damage caused by the same weapon but to a human head and skull would be more extensive (Dean 2009, 38, 46). McDermott suggests that some of the wounds were inflicted post-mortem, and these instances were evidence of "soldiers… making sure their enemies were truly dead" (2004, 51).

Although the "Slain Soldiers" display various weapon wounds from active combat making them worthy of discussion, they are a rare occurrence: large groups of wounded mummified bodies are not a common find in Egypt. Yet they are a tremendously useful source with which to study ancient Egyptian weapons trauma, but beyond Winlock's work (and McDermott's chapter) not much else has been done on them. Most other work is usually a regurgitation of Winlock's original book, with little attempt to analyse the remains any further. Potential work for the future could involve a more in-depth analysis of the remains, with better quality photographs, depending on the current condition of the remains, of course. Nonetheless, there are occurrences of single mummies bearing evidence of weapons trauma. As is perhaps unsurprising, some of the best examples are royal mummies, which were not only subject to the best mummification techniques, but are also the ones who have, in the past, been studied the most extensively. One of these royal mummies will now be discussed.

Trauma evident on the royal mummy of Seqenere

One of the best known examples is the mummified body of Seqenenre (Seqenenra, Saqnounri) Tao II, a pharaoh from the end of the Second Intermediate Period 17th Dynasty. Seqenenre also has an interesting connection with subjects discussed earlier in this thesis. Seqenenre was the husband of Queen Ahhotep, the queen who led troops into battle against the Hyksos, and was found buried with an impressive

selection of weaponry and the Golden Flies of Valour. The mummy of Seqenenre was found in 1881 in a cache of royal bodies buried in Tomb DB.320 at Deir el-Bahri, (Smith 2000, 1; Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 260). Seqenenre was a Theban ruler, who started the series of campaigns against the Hyksos that eventually led to the Hyksos being expelled from Egypt by Ahmose I, Seqenenre's son (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 260). Taken to the Cairo Museum, Seqenenre's mummy was unwrapped by Gaston Maspero (1886) and examined by the anatomist Grafton Elliot Smith (Smith 2000, 1 [facsimile reprint of 1912 edition]). Whilst Smith bemoans the damaged state of the mummy, he does point out that:

> "no attempt was made to put the body into the customary mummy-position; the head had not been straightened on the trunk, the legs were not fully extended, and the arms and hands were left in the agonised attitude … into which they had been thrown in the death spasms following the murderous attack…" (2000, 1-2) (fig. 6.8).

Whilst this description may perhaps seem overly-dramatic (with shades of Winlock's florid descriptions of the Slain Soldiers), it does indicate the state of the body before what may have been a hasty and indeed minimal mummification. Indeed, Smith refers to Maspero's theory that the state in which the mummy was found was due to the fact that "it was hurriedly mummified far away from the laboratories of the embalmers – he suggests the field of battle as the probable scene of Saqnounri's death and embalming" (2000, 2; Winlock 1924, 249). Smith was inclined to accept Maspero's theory (2000, 2). The general style of the mummification of Seqenenre was one that was in use at the end of the 17th Dynasty and the beginning of the 18th Dynasty, but was in this case carried out in a "rough and hasty manner", perhaps indicative of a hurried battlefield mummification (Smith 2000, 2). Certainly, ten Berge and van de Goot state that "Contrary to the embalming customs, the pharaoh's brain was left inside the skull", suggesting that it was indeed a hurried procedure (2002, 232).

Another explanation, provided by Dr Daniel Fouquet, suggests that whilst Seqenenre was killed on the battlefield, his corpse was taken back to Thebes for mummification, and following several days' travelling in hot temperatures was in a

state of decomposition by the time the embalmers received it (Smith 2000, 2). Yet Smith quickly dismisses this in favour of Maspero's theory; if the body had indeed been taken to embalmers in Thebes, they surely would have laid it out in a traditional mummification pose, and would not embalm it as hastily as they appear to have done (Smith 2000, 2).

Smith then details the specifics of the mummy of Seqenenre, providing the measurements of various bones, and supplying details of the state of the embalming and the mummification process used (2000, 2-4). He also describes the wounds evident on the body (Smith 2000, 4; ten Berge and van de Goot 2002, 232), several distinctive wounds being visibly present on the pharaoh's head (fig. 6.9). The first wound Smith discusses is "placed transversely in the frontal bone" (2000, 4) (fig. 6.9, 'arrow 1'). This measures 63mm across, and runs from the middle line towards the right of the skull (Smith 2000, 4). The scalp was cut by this blow, and was "retracted from the edges of the fissure in the skull" (Smith 2000, 4). The edges of the retracted scalp damage apparently provide evidence that this blow was inflicted whilst Seqenenre was still alive (Smith 2000, 4). More evidence to support this theory is the fact that to the right extremity of this wound is a crescent-shaped mass of hair, which appears to be soaked in blood (Smith 2000, 5). The presence of blood directly related to the wound certainly could indicate that the wound was most likely to have been inflicted peri-mortem.

A crack in the skull, caused by the fracture created by this same blow, extended along the left half of the frontal bone (Smith 2000, 4). 32mm along this crack was a patch of bare bone, which Smith suggests was "stripped from the bone either by a second blow or by some projection on the instrument with which the blow … was inflicted" (2000, 4-5). Smith suggests that this wound, and the other damage extending from this wound, was caused by a blow from an axe (2000, 5). It is postulated that the axe had an edge 5cm-6cm long (Smith 2000, 5). The scalp damage, along with the fracturing and cracking of the bone would seem to support this theory, particularly when compared to some of the soft tissue and bone damage that was caused by the axe when tested in the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis.

The second head wound discussed by Smith is located below the blood-soaked crescent-shaped mass of hair (2000, 5) (fig. 6.9, 'arrow 2'). This is a fusiform scalp wound, which reveals a coextensive second fracture of the frontal bone (Smith 2000, 5). This fracture is 31mm long, and is also hypothesised to have been inflicted by an axe (Smith 2000, 5). It has been suggested in the past that this particular wound bears a significant resemblance to pig skull damage that had been caused by a blow from a conical mace during experimental archaeology tests (fig. 6.7; Dean 2009, 39). However, as is pointed out, "the other wounds on the head were caused by clubs and axes, it is at times difficult to distinguish between them all" (Dean 2009, 39; Adams 1988, 35).

This second wound appears to have caused extensive damage outside of the initial skull fracture:

> "This part of the supraorbital margin, including the right external angular process and the whole of the right malar bone, is depressed more than 0 m. 010 mill. below its original level, the zygomatic arch being broken at the articulation between the temporal and malar bones and the supraciliary margin of the frontal bone near its end" (Smith 2000, 5).

The damage also included the dislocation of the two extremities of the orbital margin of the right malar bone, which has resulted in holes being made in the facial skin (Smith 2000, 5) (fig. 6.9, 'arrow 2''). This damage, highlighted by 'arrow 2'', looks as though it could also have been caused by a weapon, such as an arrow-head. However, there is no other evidence to suggest that this is the case.

The next wound discussed by Smith (2000, 5) (Fig. 6.9, 'arrow 3') is "across the bony part of the nose" and fractured both of the nasal bones (Smith 2000, 5). Smith suggests this blow also seems to have destroyed Seqenenre's right eye, as well as the damage to the malar bone and supraorbital margin described above (2000, 5). Smith hypothesises that this damage was caused by a blunt instrument such as "a stick or the handle of an axe", with the skin wounds seemingly caused by the projection of broken bone fragments through the skin (2000, 5). Barbara Adams mentions that

Seqenenre was hit with "clubs, maces and axes" (1988, 35). It is therefore possible that the damage labelled by 'arrow 3' was in fact inflicted by a club rather than the handle of an axe. It has been suggested by ten Berge and van de Goot that a mace may have been used to cause this damage (2002, 232).

There is another possible axe wound on the left cheek on Seqenenre's face which cut through the skin, severing the malar from the superior maxilla (Smith 2000, 5) (fig. 6.9, 'arrow 4'). There is also what appears to be damage that has been caused by a pointed weapon, such as a spear, which was apparently "driven into the left side of the head immediately below the ear" (Smith 2000, 5) (fig. 6.10). This blow "smashed off the left mastoid process, the left occipital condyle and part of the margin of the foramen magnum" (Smith 2000, 5). Winlock, however, believes that this wound was in fact caused by a dagger, which would have been more in keeping with the weaponry of the period (1924, 249). Winlock also states that "A knife can be driven with terrific force – so as to transfix a man's vertebral column in fact – making a wound not to be distinguished from a spear stab" (1924, 249). Whichever weapon was used to create this damage, it was certainly a debilitating, and probably fatal, injury: possibly a partially-successful attempt at decapitation.

It is very obvious that Seqenenre died due to wounds caused by some form of armed combat. There was extensive damage to the head, but none to the arms or torso, or any other parts of the body, which Smith suggests indicates that Seqenenre did not fight back (2000, 6). Certainly, there is no evidence of any defensive wounds at all (Smith 2000, 6). Two of the wounds were inflicted to the left side of Seqenenre's head (Smith 2000, 6), suggesting that the attacker (or attackers) who inflicted this wound was right-handed. Smith also suggests that these wounds were inflicted whilst Seqenenre was lying on his right-hand side, perhaps asleep, which would go some way to explaining why there were no defensive injuries (2000, 6; ten Berge and van de Goot 2002, 232).

Adams discusses briefly the fact that X-rays carried out long after Smith's examination (Bockenheimer *et al.* 1978; ten Berge and van de Goot 2002, 232)

suggested that one of the axe wounds on the forehead displayed a partial regrowth of bone (1988, 35). This regrowth indicates that this was a blow Seqenenre had possibly survived, although it caused some paralysis in one of his arms (1988, 35). Forensic examination of Seqenenre's mummy in the 1970s also indicated a match between the wounds on Seqenenre's head and the "typical dimensions of a Palestinian axe-head of the correct date" (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 260). This would seem to corroborate the theory that Seqenenre did in fact die in combat against the Hyksos rulers (Shaw and Nicholson 1997, 260).

The theory about Seqenenre being attacked whilst lying down would also seem to be supported by the location of some of the wounds. It is apparently not likely that a man of his height (1.70m) would have received two horizontal wounds on the top of his head, from both the left side and from the front had he been standing up (Smith 2000, 6). Even if Seqenenre had been attacked a man of similar height or taller, or by a man on horseback, the blows are more likely to have been vertical, resulting in matching vertical wounds (Smith 2000, 6). Smith firmly believes that the evidence supports the theory that Seqenenre was wounded whilst lying down on the ground or on a low bed (2000, 6). However, there is also the possibility that Seqenenre was first felled by a blow from a spear, after which he lay on the ground unconscious whilst the rest of the blows were inflicted (Smith 2000, 6). Either of these theories is highly plausible, as the angles of some the wounds certainly do seem to suggest that Seqenenre was not standing up when the blows were dealt.

Winlock puts forward an alternative to Smith's theory of Seqenenre's death in combat (1924). Winlock suggests the possibility of an assassination, potentially a palace murder, using the locations and angles of the wounds (referred to by Smith, described above) to back this up (1924, 250). Winlock argues that "the position of Seqenenre's body is a further argument against the theory that he was prepared for burial, either in the field or at home, by anyone who desired to do all the usual honours" (1924, 250). Winlock recognises that it was possible that a fleeing, defeated Egyptian army had only time to hurriedly mummify their fallen leader, having no time to lay out the body in the traditional position (1924, 250). However, displaying once again his more dramatic tendencies, Winlock suggests that "equally

well we can imagine a more sinister drama, and see here a body hastily bundled up while still in rigor mortis, preserving the attitude of the death agony, and with every look of the victim of an assassination, hurriedly got out of the way" (1924, 250).

Garry Shaw, however, suggests that Seqenenre as a result of a "ceremonial execution at the hands of an enemy commander, following a Theban defeat on the battlefield" (Shaw 2009, Abstract). Shaw reached this conclusion through a combination of physical, textual and statistical evidence, re-examining Maspero's orginal unwrapping of the mummy, recent analysis by medical experts, and some experimental archaeology (Shaw 2009, Abstract). Whichever theory is chosen, it is obvious that Seqenenre died a violent death, with injuries inflicted by multiple weapons, and possibly multiple assailants. What matters here is that there is clear evidence of weapons trauma on Seqenenre's body, which is extremely useful for comparison with the experimental archaeology carried out for both this thesis and the 2009 MA thesis (Dean 2009).

Other ancient Egyptian examples of weapons trauma

There are other occurrences of injuries in ancient Egyptian remains. Whilst they may not be as spectacular or as well-documented as the "Slain Soldiers" or the mummy of Seqenenre, they are nevertheless informative and noteworthy, in particular for this thesis work. One example comes from the site of Dra Abu el Naga, on the west bank of the Nile (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326). This particular paper addresses what is described as a possible case of homicide in an Egyptian mummy head (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326). This mummy head was found in tomb K93.11, along with the remains of several other mummies (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326). The mummy head has been dated to the late Egyptian period (between 22nd and 26th dynasties) (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326), and identified as a male individual probably 20- 40 years old (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326). There is some evidence of post-mortem grave-robbing damage that is particularly severe on the left side of the face, with similar damage also evident on other mummy heads from the same site (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326) (fig. 6.11).

The authors of this paper justify this theory of post-mortem damage by providing evidence that the "extensive face destruction affected not only the bone and soft tissue, but also linen bindings" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 326). There was also evidence of further remnants of linen bindings soaked with resin on the skull, along with a "resin impregnated external sheath of soft tissue" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327). This could all indicate that the damage on the left side of the head was done after the mummification and wrapping of the body, and was therefore post-mortem.

However, the most interesting aspect of this mummy head is the possible evidence of homicide. There is the presence of "a round to oval, slight depression of the skin over the left posterior skull, with a small crescent-shaped skin defect with irregular margins" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327) (fig. 6.12). The soft tissue around the wound remained intact, though the tissue had turned brown (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327). Following the removal of the soft tissue, there was a "well demarcated round to oval hole of the underlying occipitotemporal bone", which had the appearance of being 'punched out' (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327) (figs. 6.13 and 6.14). This is something that is apparently "typically observed in depressed skull fractures" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327). The external diameter of this hole measured 38.5 x 30.4mm, with an internal diameter of 48.8 x 45.4 mm (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327). There were no other defects present in the skull, nor were there any defects observable on the preserved right-side of the face (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327). The missing fragment from the observable, non-post-mortem skull damage was not found (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 327-328). In addition to removing the soft tissue from the damaged area, a radiological examination of the damage was carried out (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 328) (fig. 6.15). This examination "revealed a fine secondary fracture line running from the specimen's border and at a right-angle to the defect" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 328).

The brown colouring of the soft tissue mentioned above could be the result of bleeding, which would support the view that this particular damage was either peri-mortem, or very early post-mortem (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 329). The authors are generally in favour of this trauma being peri-mortem (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 331). The paper also supports the idea that "the observed sharply demarcated lesion of the occipitotemporal bone argues in favour of a violent attack to the individual, with his

head lying on firm ground, e.g. while sleeping or already being unconscious" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 331). It is believed that the blow that caused this trauma must have been "exerted with great mechanical force, very probably with a round instrument having a plane surface" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 331). This weapon hit the head of the victim so severely that it produced on the skull a "round and typically inwardly widened hole resulted, with a diameter similar to that of the weapon used" (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 331). Whilst it is not certain if this blow caused the death of the individual, it is possible that it at least caused unconsciousness (Parsche *et al.* 1996, 331).

It is possible that this trauma was caused by weapon such as a mace, or even a club. The injury certainly seemed to be indicative of blunt force trauma, which would reflect a blow from a mace or a club, though it could equally be caused by a blow from a rock (perhaps being used as a weapon of opportunity). Whilst this example cannot be directly compared to the trauma demonstrated by experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis, it is nevertheless an interesting example of the possible impact of blunt force trauma on an ancient Egyptian skull, and is perhaps more comparable with the results seen in the experimental archaeology carried out in the 2009 MA thesis research.

Other late period examples dated to the 26th to 30th Dynasties come from Giza (Filer 1992, 282). At the site excavated by Petrie there were a total of 1,726 skulls, 21 of which displayed evidence of head injuries (1.2%) (Filer 1992, 282). These skulls now form part of the Duckworth Collection, in the Department of Biological Anthropology at the University of Cambridge (Filer 1992, 282). Filer aged the twenty-one skulls, and found that fifteen of them (71.4 per cent) fell into the mature (35-45) to old (45+) age groups and six (28.6 per cent) fell into the young adult (21-35) age group (1992, 283). There was no evidence of skulls belonging in the sub-adult (up to 21) age group (Filer 1992, 283).

In the Giza skulls, the most common type of injury was a severe gash: "a long and deep cleft, which may be of uniform depth or undulating" (Filer 1992, 283). There

were five skulls that displayed this type of lesion, four of the skulls being male or probably male (Filer 1992, 283) (fig. 6.16). Filer suggests that these gashes were "made by axes or swords smashing down onto the head", making it unlikely that anything other military action, or perhaps a non-military assault, could have caused this trauma (1992, 283). What is very interesting here is that the fifth skull is that of a female displaying a mid-frontal gash to the skull (Filer 1992, 283). Filer believes that this trauma "was sustained during a civil or domestic dispute" (1992, 283). This seems to be a strange theory to apply in this situation, considering the context of the skull finds. If the male skulls gained their trauma during military action, why should the reason for the female skull damage be any different? It is certainly possible for women to become involved in military or combat situations, even if they are not directly connected to the fighting. Gender is rarely taken into account in warfare, and it is just as likely that women would be injured or killed as a result of military action as male non-combatants. As Wrobel states, the conclusions Filer comes to are inconsistent, her theory that the injuries sustained by women were a result of domestic violence due to the "lack of ethnographic evidence for women in formal armies" (2004, 172). Filer's conclusions seem to be based on the usual "model-based assumptions about human behaviour" that so often plague archaeology and anthropology (Wrobel 2004, 172). As discussed on numerous occasions earlier in this thesis, this has been a constant problem in archaeology and Egyptian archaeology in particular.

Three skulls from Giza presented with regularly-shaped pierced lesions "a hole of small to medium size made right through the outer and inner tables of the skull" (Filer 1992, 283) (fig. 6.17). One of these lesions, on skull of a mature adult of indeterminate sex, most likely caused the death of the individual: "The lesion shows no healing, retaining its sharp edges, and it is likely that the displaced fragments of bone entered the brain causing fatal damage" (Filer 1992, 283). The third skull had irregularly-shaped lesions, none of which showed any signs of healing (Filer 1992, 283). Filer believes that, as with the other skull above, "bony fragments entered the brain, causing infection and death" (1992, 283). Again, it has been suggested that military activities, the example provided here being spear attacks, may have been responsible for causing these two types of pierced lesions (Filer 1992, 283).

Filer moves on to also discuss skulls found at Kerma, two of which also displayed evidence of irregular-shaped lesions (Filer 1992, 283). Whilst it is agreed that military actions were most likely responsible for these lesions, Filer states that this is not the case for "one of the two Kerma skulls, which was from an elderly female" (1992, 283). As discussed above, it is puzzling as to why gender should have anything to do with the method by which they died, and perhaps Filer is continuing with the "model-based assumptions about human behaviour" with regard to gender and sex (Wrobel 2004, 172). It is possible that even an elderly woman could have been directly affected by military action. It is also equally possible that this elderly woman died due to domestic or civil abuse. However, Filer does not suggest that any of the male skull injuries were due to domestic dispute, and while women are certainly injured or killed as a result of domestic disputes or civil abuse, this could also be true in relation to men. Making these assumptions about gender and biological sex within the archaeology record (in Egyptian archaeology in particular) means that the analysis of such remains could potentially be described as inaccurate. Preconceived notions of what the social categories in ancient Egyptian were (and what they meant), particularly in relation to sex and gender, mean that any study of social interactions supposedly seen in human remains is going to be flawed. As discussed earlier in this thesis, this has long been a problem in Egyptian archaeology, a subject that has been historically dominated by men, and all too readily influenced by the Western Victorian attitudes to sexual difference in a period when modern Egyptian archaeology was initially developing into an academic discipline.

In relation to depression injuries, only one skull from the Giza set exhibited signs of such trauma (Filer 1992, 283). As with some of the injuries to the "Slain Soldiers" discussed above, it is possible that such injuries were caused by rocks or clubs (Filer 1992, 283). As for cut injuries, three of the Giza skulls presented with linear cuts (Filer 1992, 284). These cuts are apparently consistent with "a glancing sword action" (Filer 1992, 284). There was one other skull from Giza which had a cut: "a nicked cut which may have been made by daggers, arrows or knives" (Filer 1992, 284). These skulls also had two examples exhibiting signs of two complete sliced lesions (Filer 1992, 284). On one of the skulls (fig. 6.18), there is a "clearly defined porous area of non-healing, suggesting that fragments of bone entered the brain,

causing the death of this young adult male" (Filer 1992, 284). The suggestion is that the lesion was most probably caused by a strike from a sword (Filer 1992, 284). Given the time period, the use of a sword to cause this trauma is a reasonable hypothesis. There were also seven skulls that displayed incomplete sliced injuries, where either "sections of bone are lifted up from the skull and upon replacement leave a sheared effect… [or] where deep fracturing occurs" (Filer 1992, 284).

Filer does make some interesting points regarding these skulls excavated at Giza; the suggestion is that the wide range of head injuries are indicative of militaristic behaviour, as the "injuries are consistent with attack from swords, axes and crushing weapons and suggest a more advanced technology (Filer 1992, 285). For the weapons used to cause these injuries, Filer points out that iron, which was necessary in order to produce more durable weapons, was a metal more available during the 26th to the 30th Dynasties than earlier in Egyptian history (Filer 1992, 285). However, it is still possible that bronze was used in weaponry manufacture, as it continued to be a widely used metal in Egypt during the later period (Filer 1992, 285).

Whilst Filer makes highly informative observations about the physical weapons trauma present on the skulls featured in the study (important for comparison with the experimental archaeology carried out both in this thesis and the 2009 MA), she insists throughout the paper that female skull injuries must have been due to domestic or civil disputes, as there is a "lack of evidence for women in military activity in ancient Egypt" (1992, 285), an conjecture that is, at the very least, questionable. This thesis has substantiated the theory that there were no known examples of women who played an active role in the ancient Egyptian military as soldiers, but that should not, and does not, discount the possibility that they could have been caught up in warfare somehow (i.e. victims to invaders who attacked whomever they could), or that they were capable of taking up arms in defence of themselves and their settlements. As Wrobel states, "many of the assumptions made about social organization have little corroborative evidence in the archaeological record" (2004, 173). This is certainly the case in most of archaeology, particularly in relation to Prehistoric archaeology, when there is little in the way of written sources

to supplement the material remains studied. In Egyptian archaeology there is more in the way of textual sources available, but they are not also used correctly, and many scholars chose to (and still do to some extent) to continue using their own modern, Western assumptions about social constructions and interactions in ancient Egypt, particularly in relation to sex and gender.

Another useful example of trauma is found on a mummy held at the Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery (Pahor and Cole 1995, 273). Although dated to the Graeco-Roman period, so later in date than the focus of this thesis, it is far too informative an example to ignore. The mummy is dated to c.300 AD partly on the basis of the outer linen wrappings, elaborately arranged in a diagonal pattern as practised during the Graeco-Roman period (Pahor and Cole 1995, 273). The mummy is identified as a male high-ranking soldier, tentatively aged at 25-35 years old at his death (Pahor and Cole 1995, 273). It is not possible to gain a more detailed identification, as the mummy had neither an inscribed coffin nor inscribed wrappings (Pahor and Cole 1995, 273).

Yet what is fascinating about this mummy is the injury sustained (figs. 6.19-6.22). When the mummy was X-rayed in order to examine the condition of the bones (Pahor and Cole 1995, 273), it was noted that the head was rotated to the right and whilst there was no evidence of arthritis in any of the joints, the X-rays did confirm a definite torticollis to the right (Pahor and Cole 1995, 274-275). Torticollis is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as "A rheumatic or other affection of the muscles of the neck, in which it is so twisted as to keep the head turned to one side" (anon 2012 [a]). The X-rays also revealed that "There was an arrowhead lodged in the right infratemporal fossa" (Pahor and Cole 1995, 275). This arrowhead had apparently "penetrated the soft tissues and, looked at from the side, overlay the anterior portion of the body of cervical vertebra C2" (Pahor and Cole 1995, 275). The arrowhead itself is thought to be made of either bronze or iron, and matches a 1st Century AD arrow-head from the Lower Nile region held in the British Museum (Pahor and Cole 1995, 275).

Pahor and Cole suggest that the arrow was fired from a short range in front of the warrior by a right-sided opponent (1995, 275). It is suggested that this wound caused by the arrow-head resulted in an infection which then led to a "unilateral muscle spasm, including the sternomastoid presumably involved in the portal of entry, caused the torticollis" (Pahor and Cole 1995, 275). In order for these pathologies to have developed, the patient had to have survived the arrow wound for at least a short period of time (Pahor and Cole 1995, 175), after which it is theorised that the infection was the cause of death (Pahor and Cole 1995, 175). "After rigor mortis had set in, it would have been difficult for the embalmer to put the head straight again" (Pahor and Cole 1995, 275). Whilst there are other examples of Egyptian mummies displaying evidence of trauma, Pahor and Cole believe that this Birmingham mummy is the "first case of torticollis discovered" (1995, 276).

This example of ancient Egyptian trauma is extremely interesting as it not only demonstrates the immediate result of a wound from an arrow, but provides information on the possible damage that later stems from such an injury, where infection has possibly set in. As the mummy remains wrapped, and has so far only been X-rayed, it is not possible to examine in detail the damage sustained by the soft tissue. However, it is only conjecture that the arrow wound definitely caused the torticollis. It is possible that there is some other idiopathic cause behind the development of the torticollis. The X-rays, however, do provide evidence for the extent of the torticollis and the penetration of the arrowhead (see figs. 6.19-6.22). They could potentially provide a useful resource for examining the impact of weaponry outside the immediate aftermath of combat.

Another example of trauma inflicted during the Graeco-Roman period comes from a group of remains found at the Bahriyah Oasis, located in the Libyan Desert, 360 km southwest of Cairo (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). This study included the skulls of 160 ancient Egyptian adults, with generally excellent levels of preservation (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). All of the crania were examined for injuries, and ante-mortem, post-mortem and peri-mortem fractures (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). "Antemortem trauma was distinguished from perimortem trauma by the appearance of new bone deposits, resulting in callus formation or beveled edges" (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). Any crania

that displayed clear post-mortem breakage were omitted from the study (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79).

The remains were those of both males and females; out of the 160 samples, there were 92 males and 68 females (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). Out of the crania examined in this study, "31 individuals (19.4 %) had antemortem injuries, males exhibited a cranial trauma rate of 18.5 % (17/92) of and females showed a rate of 20.6% (14/68)" (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). According to Erfan *et al.*, "The difference in antemortem injuries between the sexes is not statistically significant" (2009, 79). This is very different to the analysis carried out by Filer on the remains from Giza and Kerma, where much was made of what the writer thought were the different explanations for the similar trauma observed on male and female remains. Erfan *et al.* seem to make no attempt to apply so-called modern gender conventions to the remains found at the Bahriyah Oasis. The only mention of gender roles comes from a brief mention of the fact that some the fractures seen in some skulls may have been to the environment in which the individuals existed. The possible example that Erfan *et al.* is that of recent gender roles in Egypt, where carrying "water from river to household was typically a female…and it may have been so in ancient Egyptian populations as well and this may explain the high frequency of trauma observed in the old adult females" (2009, 82). This is a mere suggestion, and is somewhat indicative of the problem within anthropology of applying modern concepts to an ancient civilisation, but the paper does not go beyond saying that it may be a possibility, and certainly does not state it as being an absolute fact. Of course, the paper is not about gender relations in ancient Egypt but about a scientific and medical study of cranial trauma. It does however seem that there is no theoretical agenda in the paper other than a scientific study of the cranial injuries, and some discussion as to how they may have been sustained.

The total number of bones with evidence of trauma were "44 (29 parietal bones, 12 frontal bones and 3 occipital bones)" (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). All of the lesions apparently displayed signs of healing (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79). There was evidence of both depressed fracture trauma and blade injuries on the crania (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 79) (figs. 6.23-6.26). Detailed measurements of the injuries were taken as part of the

study: “The depressed fracture injuries range in size from 20 mm to 56 mm in length and the blade injuries range from 19 mm to 86 mm in length” (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 80). Erfan *et al.* suggest that the depressed fractures could be the result of blunt force weaponry, and that the blade injuries could have been due to sharp force trauma from edged weapons (2009, 81). The blunt force weaponry could potentially be a mace (possibly globular), or a club, whereas the edged weaponry could be a sword or an axe.

The authors of this study state that the cranial trauma rate among the skulls from the Bahriyah Oasis was 19.4%, which is apparently high in comparison to other ancient Egyptian population groups. For example, a sample excavated from Giza, dating to the Old Kingdom, the total percentage of skull fractures was 5.5 % (11/199) (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). One suggestion for the high numbers of cranial trauma at Bahriyah is “the association between Roman imperial expansion and high levels of interpersonal violence” (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). As Efran *et al.* say:

> “It is possible that the Roman Empire altered social, political, and economic relationships that created a climate of violence and causing conflict between subject groups. Militarism and the use of force have often played a key role in the persistence and expansion of ancient empires” (2009, 82).

As discussed above, the Bahriyah crania displayed depressed fractures and blade injuries. Efran *et al.* suggest that these depressed fractures might due to blunt force blows, and that “Blunt force trauma to the cranium is unlikely to occur accidentally, and is usually associated with interpersonal violence” (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). One particularly interesting aspect of the study of the Bahriyah Oasis crania is the difference in the rate of trauma between the three anatomical areas of the cranium: “The parietal bones show the highest rate of trauma followed by the frontal and then the occipital bones” (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82).

Injuries located on the frontal bones of the skull could indicate that the wounds were gained from face-to-face fighting (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). The traumas that were

focussed on the left side of the skull could indicate that they were inflicted during hand-to-hand combat by right-handed individuals (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). However, the trauma that was concentrated on the back of the skulls may "indicate that the individuals were struck from behind while running away" (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). This does appear to support the theory that the human remains found at Bahriyah were a result of violence due to Roman imperial expansion, particularly when compared with the examples of the "Slain Soldiers", where the left-side fractures on the bodies were also interpreted as battle injuries (Winlock 2007, 9). Unlike Filer's work at Giza and Kerma, there is no real suggestion that any of these injuries are the result of domestic violence, with only a brief mention of the fact that "Blunt force trauma to the cranium is unlikely to occur accidentally, and is usually associated with interpersonal violence" (Erfan *et al.* 2009, 82). However, there is no suggestion that the injuries sustained at Bahriyah were absolutely and definitively due to 'interpersonal violence', and it is certainly not proposed by Erfan *et al.* that only the women would have been affected by this 'interpersonal violence' if it were the case that it were responsible for the injuries seen on the skulls, and it would seem that the main theory put forward by Erfan *et al.* is that the trauma sustained on the Bahriyah Oasis skulls is due to warfare/battle injuries. This is, however, just one possible reason behind the trauma uncovered at Bahriyah, and the remains will always be open to interpretation, both by archaeologists and other scientists. The potential for medical and archaeological study in these sorts of remains is huge, and there is always scope for further study.

Conclusions

As mentioned above, the majority of examples of weapons trauma do appear to involve the skull, and there is little work available on equivalent damage to other parts of the body, such as the ribcage. Whilst this does pose some problems for direct comparison with the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis, the examples presented above are nevertheless extremely useful for the examination of weapons trauma. The injuries seen on Seqenenre in particular are fascinating in relation to this, with multiple types of weapons trauma seen on his skull, some of which correspond to the trauma produced in the experimental archaeology carried out in both this thesis and the 2009 MA thesis. The images provided by Smith

(2000) are also useful, particularly the image that shows the frontal view of Seqenenre's face (fig. 6.9), where each different weapon-delivered wound is labelled clearly by Smith, allowing for comparison with the experimental archaeology carried out by this author. This comparative example also shows the potential for future work that could be carried out within this subject. For example, it would be an interesting option to test out multiple, period-accurate weapons on a human head proxy, complete with digital modelling, to gain insight into exactly what weapons were used and exactly what impact they would have had beyond the visual.

Certainly the theories relating to the weapons that may have caused the trauma are thought provoking and very relevant to this research. This includes the reasons suggested for the weapons trauma suffered by females, with Filer's hypotheses interesting to say the least (1992). Whilst it is of course possible that the females found at Giza had suffered in domestic or civil disputes, it is curious that the author completely disregards the possibility of the women being caught up in military action. Another point to consider is why Filer makes these assumptions about the female skulls, but at no stage does she suggest that the corresponding injuries on the biologically male skulls were the result of domestic violence. The automatic supposition made is that the men were caught up in warfare and combat of some description. Filer is openly following modern, Western-constructed gender roles in her interpretation of the Giza and Kerma remains, and she is not alone in such assumptions. The views put forward by Filer reflect the Victorian ideals (discussed in detail in previous chapters) with their established division of roles for men and women, where men worked in the outside world and it was decreed that women should "adorn the home, where they protect traditional, moral and spiritual values" (Ruskin 1867, cited in Parker and Pollock 1981, 9). Filer is directly linking the female remains from Giza and Kerma with Ruskin's (and most Victorian and early 20th century scholars') views, by automatically connecting them with the domestic sphere, through the assumption of death domestic violence over death by invading forces. These attitudes and approaches are one of the main reasons why examples of women being involved in warfare (such as these trauma-ridden remains from Giza and Kerma, and the women depicted at Deshasheh) are seen to be either abnormalities, neglected in the archaeological and historical record, or

misinterpreted and dismissed as a result of domestic violence. Being caught up in warfare situations need not mean that the women took up arms themselves, only that they had been caught up in the kind of violence comparable to that portrayed in the wall scene at Deshasheh, as discussed in more detail in previous chapters (Petrie 1898). This could also be the case in the examples from the Bahriyah Oasis, although again there is no way to be absolutely certain whether or not this was indeed the case.

Whilst this chapter deals with physical comparisons between the experimental archaeology carried out for this thesis and the archaeological examples of trauma on ancient Egyptian remains, it has also raised some very serious points with regard to how such examples are interpreted by the academics studying them. The case of Filer's work is just one example of the problems within an archaeology that lacks a gender or feminist-based approach to the subject, particularly in relation to an archaeological examination of sexual difference within an ancient culture. On the other hand, though, there is the work done by Erfan *et al.*, which seems to take no overtly theoretical position, preferring to concentrate on the scientific aspect of things instead. The next chapter will comprise of a discussion of the work carried out in this thesis, and will address whether or not the aims and objectives put forward in the Introduction chapter, have been met by the research carried out and discussed in this thesis.

Chapter Seven – Discussion

This thesis has examined in some detail aspects of ancient Egyptian warfare, concentrating specifically on the involvement of women. This discussion chapter initially deals with the specific research questions posed in relation to ancient Egyptian women which were comprehensively addressed previously in the text. Secondly, it examines the wider issues surrounding the research topic. The main areas of evidence produced in this thesis research all complement each other, in that they all address the same basic theme: the utilisation of weaponry by ancient Egyptian women, and the use of a feminist-based approach in Egyptian archaeology and the discipline of archaeology in general. The literature reviews and the experimental archaeology chapters all add to this main research questions, and are connected by the common research themes of ancient Egyptian women, and feminist archaeologies.

Why has the research for this thesis been carried out?

This thesis was designed to address specific questions within the discipline of Egyptian archaeology, specifically the relationship between women, weaponry and warfare in Dynastic Egypt. Since this aspect of Egyptian weapons use had not previously been addressed in any significant detail, this thesis seeks to remedy such neglectful omissions. This thesis has also been carried out in order to examine the examples of these women using a gender/feminist approach to archaeology, examining both the so-called 'unusual' roles these women played, as well as looking at the reasons as to why these women were neglected despite them being highly visible within the archaeological record.

What does the existence of 'women warriors' in other societies reveal when compared with ancient Egypt?

The occurrences of so-called "women warriors" in historical societies outside ancient Egypt reveal that the concept of women employing weaponry is not a particularly unusual one. If such examples occurred in other societies, it suggests that armed women were not anomalies within ancient Egypt, nor were they limited to such an

ancient time period. As discussed in Chapter One of this thesis, female burials with weapons from the Eurasian Steppes (fourth century BC) and the grave goods accompanying elite women of the Danish Mound People (Danish Bronze Age, c.1600–500 BC) do bear some similarities with the Predynastic female weapons burials and the burial of Senebtisi for example. The same element of display inherent in examples of female gladiators from Imperial Rome (c.70BC - c.470AD) could also be compared to certain ceremonial examples of Dynastic Egyptian women employing weaponry discussed above. In both cases the element of display may also have constituted a form of entertainment for the viewer, certainly for the spectators of gladiatorial contests and perhaps for those who witnessed ceremonial executions in Egypt.

Such occurrences of women involved in combat in societies beyond Egypt indicate that the idea of a 'woman warrior' is not such an unusual one. Indeed, as discussed in this thesis, Iron Age Britain had the concept of the warrior goddess, and showed that the Britons were not averse to following a female war-leader (Boudicca). Ancient Egypt had its own female warlike deities in the forms of Neith, Sekhmet and Anat. So while 'warrior women' may not have been a very common occurrence, they are nonetheless present in the archaeological record, however consistently under-represented in the archaeological literature, both in Archaeology as a whole and in Egyptian archaeology in particular.

Why is the evidence for women utilising weaponry in historical societies so often dismissed within the archaeological community?

There are several reasons why some examples of "women warriors" have been dismissed, overlooked and/or ignored when they occur in the archaeological record. There are cases where a body in a weapons burial is acknowledged as female, but the weapons found are often defined as purely votive instruments (such as the burial of Senebtisi, where some of the weapons were immediately designated as votive without any form of testing). As discussed in a previous chapter, the development of Gender and Feminist Archaeology has made some inroads into addressing some of the issues evident in the past study of women within the archaeological record.

As mentioned by Lena Mortensen, the "ideas about the role of women have been misunderstood by androcentric…scholars" (2004, 95), and Mortensen cites Scandinavia as being a prime example of how the romanticised image of the Viking past influences the assumptions made about the past. The problem with this romanticising of the past is that not only does it make an impression in popular interest, but it can also have an influence on the "scientific paradigms for investigating the past, limiting our views of the possible and guiding our interpretations of the probable" (Bond and Gilliam 1994, in Mortensen 2004, 95). The use of gender and feminist archaeology has revealed these issues within Scandinavian archaeology and within archaeology as a discipline in general.

Egyptian Archaeology is one of the sub-disciplines that has been particularly slow to incorporate gender perspectives, and has suffered from a significant lack of study into the roles available to women, until relatively recently focussing largely on a male elite of kings, priests and scribes, i.e. the literate 1% of ancient Egyptian society (Baines and Eyre 1983). Work by feminist scholars such as Meskell, Wrobel, Callendar, Troy and Lesko do address some of these issues within Egyptian archaeology, critiquing past work that has neglected the roles played by women, and applying their own analyses to the archaeological evidence available, but more work still needs to be done. Aspects of Egyptian archaeology do seem to lag behind Archaeology as an overall discipline, and this is certainly the case when it comes to taking a gender or feminist-based approach to the subject.

What can feminist and gender theory reveal about the women associated with warfare in ancient Egypt, and the attitudes of academics and scholars past and present towards such women and women in ancient Egypt in general?

The application of a gender and/or feminist approach to Egyptian archaeology has been shown both in this thesis and in other works (such as Meskell, Wrobel, Callendar, Troy, Lesko) to have a positive impact on the study of the subject, particularly in relation to the study of women in ancient Egyptian history. It is through the use of Gender and Feminist archaeology that some of the roles played by ancient Egyptian women have been examined and analysed from a new perspective, particularly in reference to their participation in different forms of combat and/or

their associations with specific weaponry. Through the use of feminist and gender theories, the attitudes of past (and some current) scholars and academics towards certain subjects can be critiqued as well. By gaining awareness and understanding of past views, and how they developed, feminist archaeologists can gain insight into how certain viewpoints and theories developed in the past and were, to some extent, carried on into modern and current archaeologies. One particular example of this is the critique of the work done by Joyce Filer on the remains found at Giza and Kerma. Filer's approach does not take feminist scholarship into account, and leaves her work open to gender/feminist-based critique. Filer's interpretation of the female remains that displayed trauma as having sustained such wounds through solely domestic violence is limiting. As discussed previously, there is absolutely no reason as to why the women could not have been caught up in fighting as a result of warfare and conflict, much as there is no reason as to why the trauma observed in the case of male remains could not have been a result of domestic violence. Fortunately, significant strides have been made in remedying this, to which this thesis aims to add.

How significant are examples of politically influential women in Egypt?

The examples of Egyptian women wielding military/political power discussed in this thesis are predominantly female pharaohs and queens, whose roles are obviously significant within the subject covered by this research project. However, it is also important to recognise that even non-royal or non-noble ancient Egyptian women had roles of power within society. For example, they had legal and economic independence, they had control of certain economic and religious institutions (such as responsibility for all linen manufacturing), and could also hold administrative positions, with several instances of women throughout Dynastic Egypt holding powerful political offices (Wrobel 2004, 159). If there was such "equality" in non-royal society, why should it be a surprise that some women held the highest office of the land, such as regent of pharaoh? In relation to the examples of the female monarchs Hatshepsut and Nefertiti, it is possible to argue that there is a direct relationship between the political power they held and their interaction with warfare and/or weaponry. For example, the Nefertiti smiting scene could be regarded as a direct representation of Nefertiti's power as a co-ruling pharaoh alongside her

husband Akhenaten, as one of the most effective ways to confirm pharaonic authority was to be portrayed as the active participant in a smiting scene. Indeed, since only ruling pharaohs were portrayed in this manner, her execution of this prisoner could be regarded as confirming Nefertiti's position in a "pharaonic 'warrior' role" (Samson 2002, 25).

In similar fashion, textual references to Hatshepsut's military powers, particularly the two inscriptions from Sehēl discussed in a previous chapter, demonstrate the political power she too wielded. Such texts reveal that this female pharaoh led troops into battle, or at the very least was regarded as sufficiently powerful to be described in such terms. Of course, as discussed in a previous chapter, the Sehēl texts could simply be hyperbole, exaggerated descriptions of Hatshepsut's power as pharaoh. Yet at the very least, it shows that Hatshepsut was described in the same manner as the male pharaohs described in such terms, and furthermore, that the general population seem to have accepted a woman in the role of pharaoh.

Other elite women who did not rule as pharaoh yet still held significant political power are of equal importance within the context of this thesis. Queens such as Neithhotep, Merneith and Ahhotep each wielded power as regents on behalf of their infant sons, with Ahhotep perhaps the best example of this. In her capacity as royal wife ('queen') and then regent, she actively took part in warfare and is credited with playing a key role in the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. The overthrow of the Hyksos at the end of the Second Intermediate Period was a crucial event in Egypt's history, leading to the creation of the Egyptian empire and ushering in the New Kingdom. Ahhotep's involvement in these events demonstrates her importance at this time and in subsequent Egyptian history.

Did women warriors exist in Egypt? If so, what form did they take? What roles did they play?

This thesis contains an examination of possible examples of so-called 'women warriors' in Dynastic Egypt. This takes the form of a multi-part study comprising textual, artistic and archaeological evidence brought together to provide a comprehensive examination of women associated with weaponry or warfare. This

combined evidence would certainly suggest that there were some occurrences of women bearing weapons during Egyptian history, with roles ranging from the functional to the ritual or indeed a combination thereof. For example, the image of Nefertiti executing a prisoner can be viewed either as an image of an actual historical event or simply as a way to represent the power she held as co-ruler alongside Akhenaten. Either way, this image which once adorned temple walls at Amarna demonstrates the formal acceptance of a woman wielding power over life and death, whether in principle or in fact. In terms of archaeological evidence, mace-heads buried in Predynastic female graves could certainly be argued to be functional objects, and could represent evidence that such women did utilise such items in life. Nonetheless, the mace held by Hatshepsut on the northern obelisk at Karnak (Stevenson Smith 1942, 47) would appear to serve a ritual purpose since the pharaoh is dressed ceremonially as she stands before the god Amun and holds the mace in a non-combative fashion. As an important counter-example to the smiting scene featuring Nefertiti, this representation of Hatshepsut holding the mace is very different in composition, but both scenes are a way to display the power of the subject to those who view them even if limited to priests, royalty and presumably the gods for whose benefit they were ultimately produced.

As per the initial research questions, there are several examples of female burials with weapons in the Egyptian archaeological record. There are also examples of these "women warriors", or at the very least women who were somehow associated with weaponry or warfare, found in both artistic representations and textual sources. There were representations of women actively using weapons in a functional manner (such as the Nefertiti execution scene (Fletcher 2004; Samson 2002) and the women of Sati (Petrie 1898)), and employing weapons in a ritual context (the depiction of Hatshepsut holding a mace (Stevenson Smith 1942)), as discussed and cited in earlier chapters.

While the research carried out for this thesis reveals no evidence whatsoever that women were active members of the Egyptian army at any time in Dynastic history, it is equally clear that women did bear weaponry. This could be as a means to defend themselves (as at Sati), or when taking part in ceremonial activities in the case of

female pharaohs, or as a means of demonstrating their status within society (e.g. Senebtisi). One of the most intriguing examples of such a woman is Merinebti of the 6th Dynasty. Not only provided with her own independent tomb within the Saqqara necropolis of King Teti, which in itself demonstrates her elite status, Merinebti's tomb inscriptions give her title as 'female guard'. Although the role of 'female guard' is uncertain and may have been purely ceremonial, its very existence is a most important factor in the study of women bearing arms, whether she held a ceremonial or active position within Sixth Dynasty society. This thesis has addressed the occurrences of potential "women warriors" within the ancient Egyptian archaeological record. Each example is analysed and discussed in detail, particularly in Chapter Three of this thesis, and contributes to the research questions posed. One particular detail highlighted by this research is the great potential for future research on this topic.

What is the evidence for Egyptian women in a warfare context?

Any problems experienced with the evidence available is not necessarily due to the actual evidence itself, but more with the biased and inaccurate interpretations carried out by scholars influenced by the Classical, 19th and early 20th century 'codes of femininity' within academia (as discussed previously). Much of the evidence examined in this thesis is based on visual portrayals and archaeological finds together with textual sources. While the evidence for women associated with weaponry in ancient Egypt is not as sparse as the author initially assumed, it is by no means as extensive as the evidence available for Egyptian men involved in warfare, as would of course be expected. In terms of the visual depictions, particularly the previously discussed Nefertiti smiting scene and the Sati siege scene from Deshasheh, it could be argued that whilst the Nefertiti scene represents a ceremonial action or is a means to convey status, the Deshasheh scene may represent an actual historical event. There seems to be no attempt to display the 'heroic' status of the women doing the fighting; they are simply trying to defend their town, their children and themselves. They would also appear to be quite successful in this endeavour, certainly more successful than the male mayor of the town who is shown sitting passively by, tearing out his hair to convey his distress and apparent helplessness.

The majority of available evidence from burials dates from the Predynastic period and predominantly takes the form of the mace-heads discussed in previous chapters. Mace-heads were also found in the 12th Dynasty tomb of Senebtisi, placed alongside ceremonial staves which Mace and Winlock (1916b) argued were staffs of office; it could similarly be argued that the accompanying maces and daggers also served a ceremonial purpose. This seems likely in the case of the rock-crystal mace-head, which whilst no doubt heavy and perhaps technically effective as a weapon, was maybe too ornamental in style to have been designed for combat. As Hayes (1978, 282) accepts, the alabaster piriform mace could certainly have been used as an effective weapon.

What did the experimental archaeology reveal about the weapons associated with ancient Egyptian women? How effective could these women be when utilising the relevant weaponry?

The experiments carried out for this piece of research have straightforward arguments as their basis, but such experiments would not have been required had the weapons found amongst the grave goods of female remains not been designated 'votive' items. This was mainly due to scholars and academics applying Classical, 19th and 20th century codes of femininity to women of ancient Egypt, a big problem in the discipline of archaeology as a whole and Egyptian archaeology in particular (as discussed in much detail in previous chapters). The experiments carried out for this thesis demonstrate how specific weapons are equally effective whether wielded by a man or a woman. The aim of the experiments was also to prove definitively that the weapons studied could serve a functional purpose in combat when utilised by women, a theory that has been contested in the past, for example by Filer (1992) and Gardiner (1966). The experiments demonstrated that ancient Egyptian women were physically able successfully use the specific set of weapons used in experiments. The wall scene from Deshahsheh shows that this might occur when the women are under some form of military threat, with their ability to wield weapons verified by the results of the experimental archaeology.

This was also highlighted by the assertion made by Filer that any injuries found on female human remains from ancient Egypt must be the result of domestic abuse

rather than reflecting any female involvement in warfare of any kind: there is a "lack of evidence for women in military activity in ancient Egypt" (Filer 1992, 285, cited in Graves-Brown 2010). This is certainly the case with regard to the official, structured ancient Egyptian military/army, but does not take into account examples such as female pharaohs or women defending themselves. Whilst it may seem obvious that a weapon such as the khopesh is a dangerous and indeed lethal instrument, it historically seems to have been regarded as having a purely symbolic purpose when held in the hands of a woman (i.e. Nefertiti), whereas the same weapon wielded by a man is automatically regarded as functional. It has therefore been the case that certain weapons have been categorised as either votive or functional objects based solely on the gender of the individual involved, for example, the burial of Queen Ahhotep is described as having been "surrounded by ornamented weapons" (El-Shahawy and Atiya 2005) while the famous stela description of her battle prowess dismissed as merely "curious" (Gardiner 1966, 173). One exception to this is the mace (Dean 2009), which appears to have had both a functional and a symbolic role, certainly in smiting scenes. The mace held by Hatshepsut on the obelisk depiction is employed as a symbol of her power, as is the example of Neferure, Hatshepsut's daughter, discussed in an earlier chapter, while actual examples such as the huge Scorpion mace-head is a purely ceremonial object. Yet the maces found in the Predynastic burials are most likely to be functional weapons, the chipped edges of many evidence of their active use.

The experiments designed for this thesis deal specifically with the weapons associated with women in ancient Egypt, whether in artistic portrayals or weapons found in female burials. The mace had already been shown to be an effective weapon in previous MA research (Dean 2009) based on experiments carried out by the author using pigs' heads as a human proxy. Although the subsequent mace experiments undertaken for the current PhD research demonstrated the mace was less effective in damaging sections of pig ribcage, invaluable information was nonetheless obtained on how this particular weapon would be best employed against a human being. As discussed in a previous chapter, the mace, especially the piriform mace head, was a blunt-force trauma weapon, as highlighted by the damage to the skulls in 2009 and the bruising and muscle-damage seen on the ribcage sections in

the 2012 experiments. The experiments with the axe were also most illuminating. The trauma to the pig ribcage sections was significant, particularly in experiment RDA, where the skin, muscle and fat tissues were extensively damaged, two rib-bones demonstrating a simple transverse fracture and comminuted fracture. As discussed previously, the axe is both a cutting and clubbing weapon, capable of causing both blunt and sharp force trauma. These experiments demonstrate that ancient Egyptian women could have been effective when utilising this weaponry.

What is the significance/importance of this project? What does this project add to the field of Archaeology?

This project addresses issues within Egyptian archaeology that have been overlooked, misinterpreted or ignored in the past. Indeed, the examination of women in Egypt's archaeological record has generally been limited to their roles within the domestic sphere, beyond which attention has been largely focussed on female royals and aristocracy. Examples of women with weaponry has been noted but not necessarily examined in any great detail by previous scholars. This thesis also interlinked gender archaeology theory with a re-examination of the published literary and archaeological evidence, along with a new investigation of artefact groups with experimental work. By connecting gender theory with Egyptian archaeology, a more detailed study of women involved in warfare emerges. The new angle, incorporating the catalogue and the experimental archaeology produces a multidisciplinary thesis that addresses the subject of ancient Egyptian women utilising weaponry in some form. It could therefore be argued that this thesis creates a bridge between Egyptology and the rest of archaeology, particularly in the use of archaeological theory to examine occurrences of women utilising weaponry in both ancient Egypt and societies beyond.

What relevance does this project have within Egyptian Archaeology?

This project has several areas of relevance within the field of Egyptian Archaeology; the research and experiments carried out address an area of Egyptian Archaeology previously little-studied and neglected in comparison to other areas. The specific set of experiments designed around Egyptian women and associated weaponry also adds

to previous experimental work carried out by other archaeologists (i.e. Hulit and Richardson 2007), thereby aiding the further investigation of weaponry and warfare in ancient Egypt. It also has huge relevance within the feminist approach to Egyptian archaeology, using feminist and gender theory to address the important topic of women in power and women using weapons/involved in warfare in ancient Egypt.

Does this research project address the aims and objectives that were put forward in the Introduction?

The aims and objectives for this project were:

- To address issues within Egyptian archaeology that have previously been overlooked, ignored, or received only the minimal amount of attention in terms of academic research.
- To examine the occurrences of ancient Egyptian women associated with weaponry found within the archaeological record.
- To prove the effectiveness of the associated weaponry through experimental archaeology; to prove that the specific weaponry could cause debilitating and indeed fatal trauma when wielded by either a woman or a man.

It can certainly be argued that these aims and objectives have been met within this thesis. The subject of women associated with weaponry has been comprehensively addressed, with a significant amount of archaeological evidence and all available previous work being collated into this single research project. Many examples of Egyptian women portrayed or described using weaponry or taking part in warfare have been discussed within this research, together with known examples of female weapons burials.

As discussed above, it can also be argued that the experimental archaeology certainly proved the hypotheses put forward in regard to the effectiveness of the dagger, the axe and the khopesh, when wielded by both male and female test subjects. It showed that women were (and are) more than capable of utilising the specific weaponry with great effect, even without formal training (for example, the women portrayed using

daggers in the scene from Deshasheh). Although the mace did not appear to be as effective a weapon as the others, the experiments, combined with the results from the 2009 MA experiments, were enlightening as to the effectiveness of the Egyptian mace as a weapon.

Some of the wider issues raised and addressed by this thesis concern the study of mummified human remains which reveal weapons' trauma. Mummified remains can prove particularly enlightening since they provide the opportunity to examine soft tissue trauma as well as skeletal damage, any future research concentrating on specific examples of trauma and the weapons which may have been employed. Some of the examples of trauma revealed by mummified remains have been discussed in some detail in previous chapters of this thesis. This type of research was successfully demonstrated by Bietak and Strouhal in a re-examination of the mummy of Seqenenre, previously examined by Maspero and Grafton Elliot Smith (Maspero 1886, and Smith 2000 [facsimile reprint]). With Bietak and Strouhal able to identify the specific weaponry that caused some of the wounds to Seqenere's body (Bietak and Strouhal 1974, cited in ten Berge and van de Goot 2002, 232, and Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998, 42), the bronze-blade weapon of Hyksos design was revealed by the type of skin lacerations and skull fractures (Bietak and Strouhal 1974, cited in Aufderheide and Rodriguez-Martin 1998, 42).

Further examples discussed in a previous chapter and which are also useful to mention in this context are the so-called 'Slain Soldiers of Montuhotep'. In Winlock's initial investigation their remains retained much of their soft tissue, making it possible to estimate what kind of weaponry had caused the trauma sustained by these men. Yet Winlock had the benefit of working from the bodies themselves, whereas this thesis only had the photographs in his publication, any future study unfortunately curtailed by the de-fleshing of these remains following Winlock's initial study.

As with the "Slain Soldiers", the mummy of adult female 'Bakhtenhor' proved most interesting when examined between 2006 and 2007 (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). Earlier

examinations, including a radiological exam in 1964, and an X-ray and a CT scan in 1991, did reveal significant information but were unable to determine a cause of death (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). Yet when another CT scan was carried out in 2006, in conjunction with more detailed X-rays in 2007, a very intriguing feature was identified by Dr Stephen Buckley: an unusual wound approximately 2cm wide was clearly visible on the right side of the lower abdomen (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). This was unconnected to the smaller embalming incision visible on the left side of the abdomen.

As this larger wound was not a standard part of the mummification process (Fletcher *et al.* 2007), Surgeon Commander Mike Edwards was consulted and following his examination of the CT scans he confirmed there was indeed a "large, irregular wound in the right hypocostal region" (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). Edwards believed that the wound was most likely caused by a knife, which would have "penetrated the small bowel, large bowel and possibly extending as far as the liver" (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). Edwards also believed that penetrating this area would have caused the maximum damage to key vital organs, the damage to the liver resulting in extreme blood loss (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). According to Edwards, this trauma may be evidence of an intentional killing or assassination, "based on the size and location of the wound" (Fletcher *et al.* 2007). As in the case of most other mummified remains, previous research on Bakhtnenhor had largely concentrated on the mummification techniques employed and the wound had gone unnoticed. Therefore any future study utilising new developments in CT scanning could be combined with experimental archaeology in order to determine the exact type and form of the blade which had caused the wound.

More recent evidence for a similar type of wound was found on the Predynastic body of a male adult known as 'The Gebelein Man' from the British Museum when recently X-rayed at the BUPA Cromwell Hospital in London (anon 2012 [b]). The resulting images and 3D models revealed that this individual had died as a result of being stabbed in the back, a single penetrating wound causing trauma to the underlying shoulder-blade and rib (anon 2012 [b]). Future research could involve

establishing exactly what form and type of weapon had been employed, either using further 3D modelling or experimental archaeology, or a combination of the two.

A final example of a mummified body revealing significant and intentional damage is that of the mummy of a royal female from tomb KV35 in the Valley of the Kings, now in Cairo Museum (fig. 7.1). Examination of severe facial damage was carried out by Professor Don Brothwell and Prof Joann Fletcher in 2003 (Fletcher 2004, 365-366 and 371-374). This was followed up by experimental archaeology on pig carcasses at the YAT laboratories (figs. 7.2-7.4), revealing the nature of the dagger-like blade employed, and the fact that the damage had been inflicted to the face when unwrapped rather than being the result of random tomb robber damage involving cutting through the original linen mummy wrappings. This is clearly an area for future research, with the mummy of this royal female now the subject of collaborative study between members of the York Mummy Research Group and The Instituto de Estudios Científicos en Momias in Madrid. There are also other dynamics around the remains of the Young Woman from KV35; if this mummy is indeed that of Nefertiti, then other aspects of her life and reign must be taken into account, including the feminist approach taken in this thesis when looking at both Nefertiti's life and the depiction of her using weaponry in a smiting scene. A multi-faceted project about the remains from KV35 taking into account the circumstances of the burial, experimental archaeology to study the wounds and trauma seen on the mummy, and a feminist and gender-based approach to representations of and texts regarding Nefertiti could prove to be a very interesting future research project.

This thesis research has also opened up the possibility of examining mummified remains beyond Egypt. In most cases the examination of such bodies tends to concentrate on embalming techniques, with any evidence of trauma considered as almost an afterthought; this explains why such well-known bodies as the 'Gebelein Man' have only recently been identified as having some form of trauma. These more recent examples demonstrate the wider themes within mummification studies, and the possible future path that such research can take. These are just a few examples of mummies displaying evidence of weapons trauma, and it could well be that there are several more potential mummies with such trauma out there, waiting for investigation and analysis.

Among those studies which have been carried out, Conrado Rodriguez-Martin (2000) examined examples of cranial trauma among Guanche remains from the Canary Islands. The study he presented at the Fourth EMN Congress in Tenerife concentrates on "cranial fractures produced by interpersonal violence" rather that the apparently rarer examples of accidental injury (Rodriguez-Martin 2000, 5). Another interesting factor is that of the 408 skulls used in the study, 259 were male and 149 were female (Rodriguez-Martin 2000, 5). As with the skull examples from Giza examined by Filer (1992) (discussed in a previous chapter), this shows that women were just as likely as men to be caught-up in incidences of warfare. Rodriguez-Martin makes the point that, although the males were 60% more affected than females by weapons trauma, "as stated by the early chroniclers and historians of the Canary Islands, it is important to note that women could take part in these conflicts because the frequency in that sex is also important (more than 5%)" (2000, 7-8). This acknowledgment is in stark contrast with the approach taken by Filer, with Rodriguez-Martin seemingly recognising that gender and biological sex often have no meaning in warfare and many combat situations; civilian women are just as likely to be injured or killed as civilian men.

There were five recognised types of fractures observed in this investigation: "small crushing injuries, simple linear fractures, penetrating injuries, gross crushing injuries, and incised wounds" (Rodriguez-Martin 2000, 6). The small crushing injuries are the most interesting in relation to the research carried out for this thesis. These injuries were the most common type found in the sample of skulls, and were divided into two subgroups. The first subgroup encompassed circular injuries, which Rodriguez-Martin attributes to a "special weapon, similar to the typical Argentinian Gaucho bolas, used as a mace in face-to-face fighting and made of rounded and polished stones and leather" (Rodriguez-Martin 2000, 6). The second subgroup is comprised of irregular fractures that would have been produced by the throwing of stones (possibly from slingshots) (Rodriguez-Martin 2000, 6). This is the sort of work that would prove extremely useful in the study of ancient Egyptian remains, the identification of specific weapons trauma on mummies and skeletal remains enhancing the understanding of the manner in which these people died.

In addition to the examples from the Canary Islands, it is also worth mentioning certain examples from Peru. In his 1931 publication, Ron L. Moodie undertook the radiological examination of both Peruvian and Egyptian mummies. One particular (unwrapped) example from Peru clearly displayed a "cranial lesion due to a blow from a star-shaped mace" (figs. 7.5 and 7.6) (Moodie 1931, 14), a type of lesion commonly found on other Peruvian mummies he examined (Moodie 1931, 14). Although Moodie does comment on the embalming materials employed in the mummification process, he also examines occurrences of trauma that can be examined via both visual assessment and scans (1931, 14). He also mentions another such mace injury to an unwrapped mummy head, a Pre-Columbian Peruvian example, where the scans showed that along with silver cheek-discs, the mummy displayed an obvious mace injury which had resulted in "a considerable loss of skull material" (fig. 7.7) (Moodie 1931, 28).

A further Peruvian skull displays not only significant trauma from a star-shaped mace, but injuries from slingshot strikes while the zygomatic arch has been "broken by a blow from a club" (fig. 7.8) (Moodie 1931, 30). Possible comparisons with the remains of the unfortunate pharaoh Seqenenre and some of the "Slain Soldiers" are evident. Further investigation of these occurrences of multiple injuries form multiple weapons could only enhance the understanding of the impact of warfare and weaponry in such ancient societies, and could draw on the significant number of Peruvian remains in museum collections around the UK.

The work carried out by Moodie (1931) on Peruvian remains could easily be carried out in any future studies of Egyptian mummies. As an area of potential study that this thesis research has arguably opened up, the questions and research possibilities opened up by this thesis are fascinating, and could prove important within the fields of both Egyptian archaeology and mummification studies. This thesis has also opened up a realm of possibilities with relation to the application of feminist theories (third wave feminism in particular) to many aspects of Egyptian archaeology. The study of women associated with warfare is a subject that was neglected for too long, and the examination of the evidence available through the use of gender and feminist

theory means that one particularly large gap in knowledge in Egyptian archaeology has been addressed, with some important and useful answers hopefully provided.

Conclusion

The very first line of this thesis, in the Introduction, states: "Warfare in ancient Egypt is a well-studied subject" (p. 1). This simple statement is inescapably true (see the multitude of works on warfare in ancient Egypt, some of which have been referenced and discussed in this thesis), but it is the opinion of this writer that this thesis has uncovered and examined specific aspects of warfare in ancient Egypt that have not been so well-studied. This thesis project has concentrated on an aspect of Egyptian archaeology that has been largely overlooked in previous studies of ancient Egyptian warfare. The occasional participation of women within the context of combat has sometimes been viewed as a novelty occurrence, or dismissed as an example of myth or folklore (such as the sketch of a royal female postulated to be Tawosret in battle), or as something which is purely symbolic, an exaggeration in order to demonstrate political power (such as the Sehēl inscriptions of Hatshepsut). All too often, scholars and academics in the past (and even in current research) were influenced by outdated 19th and 20th century Westernised codes of femininity, resulting in biased and inaccurate readings and interpretations of such examples of women. This is something that has been very much in evidence in past interpretations within Egyptian archaeology, particularly in relation to women in ancient Egyptian culture. examples of particular note are the demotion of Merneith from Pharaoh to Queen once her biological sex was discovered; Peet's incredulity at the possibility of a mace-head being found in a burial with biologically female remains; the absence in Spalinger's work on warfare in ancient Egypt of any mention of women such as Ahhotep and Hatshepsut, despite their military activities (as discussed in this thesis); and the assumptions made by Filer, applying outdated modes of femininity to the trauma-laden remains from Giza and Kerma. Many more such examples have been discussed and analysed in this piece of research, and one vitally important aspect of this thesis is the incorporation of a feminist and gender-based approach to the subject.

This thesis has comprehensively addressed the discussion of potential "warrior women" in ancient Egypt, including a detailed examination of comparative examples from societies beyond Egypt. Through looking at examples from outside of ancient

Egypt it has been possible to look at the gender based archaeological analyses carried out in other sub-disciplines of archaeology, such as Scandinavian and Medieval archaeologies (including the differences between such disciplines, i.e. the use/availability of textual and literary sources versus archaeological material remains). These gender and feminist approaches can then be applied to comparative examples in the ancient Egyptian archaeological record. The main research theme of Egyptian women utilising weaponry and having some involvement in warfare, along with the feminist-based approach to such a subject, is the specific thread running through each chapter of this thesis, all of which focus on that very clear point, and are there for the specific purpose of examining the utilisation of weaponry by ancient Egyptian women, along with the incorporation of feminist and gender archaeologies.

The examination of certain examples of women in power in ancient Egypt, as well as those women who took part in combat or were associated with weaponry, means that there is a detailed application of feminist theory in order to analyse such women from another perspective. This thesis has covered many aspects of a feminist approach, beginning with the work of academics such as Butler, Pollock and Parker, looking at gender theory and feminism, and moving on to look at feminist theory within Egyptian archaeology, with Callendar, Troy, Wrobel, and Meskell providing some of the best applications of feminist theory to the subject. As mentioned in previous chapters, the role of current feminism seems to concentrate not on 'women' as a subject, but on sexual difference, so-called 'gender relations' perhaps. All of these various feminist scholars have contributed to the structure and development of this particular thesis. The research done in this thesis has relevance within feminist scholarship as a whole as well. For example, the seemingly impressive levels of 'gender equality' (to give it its more modern term) in ancient Egyptian society (whilst varying between time periods and Dynasties of course), reflect the points made by Lila Abu-Lughod in her edited volume "Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East" (particularly relevant to Egypt as it is located in the Middle East). The pertinent points made by Abu-Lughod are that modernity should not be "so easily equated with the progress, emancipation, and empowerment of women" (1998, vii). Certainly, the evidence from ancient Egypt (e.g. as discussed by Callendar, Troy, Lesko, Meskell, Wrobel etc) and from some of the other cultures

(e.g. Iron Age Britain) discussed in this thesis would seem to reflect Abu-Lughod's view. Abu-Lughod also addresses the issue of feminism and the Western world, something that this thesis has also done, although Abu-Lughod is looking at feminism in the Middle East from a more current point of view, rather than explicitly from an ancient Egyptian point of view.

The experimental archaeology chapters demonstrate the capabilities of the various weapons shown in contemporary accounts and images as having been utilised by Egyptian women in some form or another, and proved the effectiveness of such weapons when wielded by both male and female participants. The impressive results from the khopesh experiments in particular established the abilities of this weapon, even when employed by a person lacking the full and correct training in the use of this particular weapon. The evidence from the Slain Soldiers and Seqenenre along with the remains from Giza, Kerma and the Bahriyah Oasis proved to be very interesting; both in relation to comparative work with the experiments carried out for this thesis, and in relation to the 'codes of femininity' ascribed to by some of the scholars studying the remains.

The catalogue of the ancient Egyptian weaponry collections of the Yorkshire Museum and Harrogate Museums and Arts (see Appendix) was undertaken in order to ground the discussion in an artefact assemblage, associated with the weapons review chapter, and to ensure the author's familiarity with the primary evidence. By cataloguing the objects, it has also ensured that artefacts held in storage have been placed further into the public domain. Some of this research has already been presented to academic audiences and discussed as part of an outreach project for school children from Key Stages 2 and 3. It is arguable that part of the purpose of this research is to educate, in which case it could be reasoned that the thesis is successful in that regard. The catalogue also meant that a detailed study of actual artefacts representing the weapon typologies examined in the literature was added to the research, linking them to the women who are known to have utilised them.

This thesis has discussed the key women who wielded military and political power within Dynastic Egyptian society, although further research into the royal females, Merneith, Neithhotep and Khentkawes for example, would certainly enhance

existing knowledge of their roles within Egyptian society and indeed its attitudes to women in general. Whilst Dynastic Egypt could be described as generally having a patriarchal society, research has shown that women were certainly able to hold the same roles as men (including the role of pharaoh) (Wrobel 2004, 169). However, this 'gender movement' does not extend to men, as they are "not represented in traditional women's roles, such as child rearing" (Wrobel 2004, 169). A review of previous literature on the subject provides some understanding of the specific weapons themselves associated with ancient Egyptian women, and the use of feminist theory provides new readings on the weapons, and their possible meanings and usage, particularly when found, or depicted, with women. There is, too, more research to be done exploring the various images and interpretations that have been placed upon prominent women in ancient Egypt in the social and personal contexts of previous archaeologists and biographers (for example, the work of Amelia Edwards discussed in previous chapters). To critique earlier research in simple terms of 'men under-rating women' may be too simplistic to reveal more subtle historical and social influences. This is when a detailed feminist and gender-based approach to the subject can provide the best possible answers to many of the queries surrounding gender and sex in ancient Egypt.

The research carried out here has proven to be an interesting case-study in gender archaeology, particularly in relation to burial assemblages. Parallels have certainly been seen between ancient Egypt and, for example, Anglo-Saxon burials in the discussion of biological sex versus artefact-attributed gender. This thesis has shown that there have been problems in the past (and to some extent still in the present) in archaeology with the application of the modern codes of femininity, which in essence shaped the early (i.e. 19th and 20th century) understanding of the burial goods found in women's tombs in Egypt. This has defininte parallels with the problems seen in the Anglo-Saxon archaeology discussed in Chapter One of this thesis (i.e. the work done by Hjørungdal, Hirst, Stoodley, and Lucy). By having comparisons with other sub-disciplines of archaeology, it has been possible to see where Egyptian archaeology has been in error in the past, and how such research can be carried out in the future.

The chapters of this thesis all focus on a clear point, and are in place for a specific purpose – to examine the utilisation of weaponry by Egyptian women, be they royal females or ordinary women who found themselves in extreme situations. It is the contention of this author that this thesis has definitely dealt with the specific research questions initially put forward, and that in doing so this thesis adds original and relevant material to the study of Egyptian archaeology. From the research accumulated and discussed in this thesis, it possible to state that there were indeed women in ancient Egypt who utilised weaponry, and in certain circumstances would actively take part in combat (e.g. the siege at Sati, displayed at Deshasheh). Although they may not have been very common, and certainly no evidence has so far been found to suggest women ever played an active role within the Egyptian military, the evidence examined in this thesis proves that women could and did take part in various forms of combat at various times in Egyptian history.

So should this thesis be of interest beyond Egyptian archaeology? This thesis has raised some interesting gender-based issues, some of which haven't gone away, especially not in Egyptian archaeology. The research approach that has been taken in this thesis could be used in other areas of archaeology, particularly those with a large archaeological record available. For example, this approach could prove useful within Roman or Mayan archaeology, where epigraphic and documentary archives are available. These are areas of archaeology that have archaeological sites with large monuments and a lot of written evidence especially. There is certainly a case for revisiting these examples, and this thesis is a good study for this. The application of feminist and gender archaeology as seen in this thesis would also be extremely relevant to other cultures outside ancient Egypt (indeed, such an application in Mayan archaeology was mentioned briefly in Chapter Two of this thesis). In terms of the present learning from the past, re-investigation of our assumptions about some earlier societies through a paradigm informed by feminist and gender theory may also be beneficial to the development of inferential methods within archaeology as a whole. As discussed in the previous chapter, future research could also go into looking at weapons trauma on mummies within Egyptian archaeology, and this could of course be extended to weapons trauma found on mummies in other ancient societies as well.

In conclusion, the author believes that this thesis comprehensively addresses the questions that were posed at the beginning of this research project. Furthermore, there is definite potential for fruitful, future research within this same subject area and beyond; the examination of weapons trauma on ancient mummified remains perhaps the most potentially valuable of all, along with the gender and feminist-based approaches to Egyptian archaeology. Through undertaking this study, a better understanding has developed of women utilising weaponry in ancient Egypt, the attitudes toward examples of women involved in warfare, and gender and feminist archaeology issues surrounding both Egyptian archaeology and Archaeology as a subject as a whole. Re-examining aspects of Egyptian archaeology through a feminist approach can provide new readings of artefacts, visual representations, and any rare textual sources regarding women in ancient Egypt, particularly women in power, women in warfare, and women associated with/utilising weaponry. For too long this has been a neglected subject within Egyptian archaeology (and to some extent within archaeology as a discipline as a whole, although more work has been done on this, as discussed in this thesis), and it is hoped that this thesis goes some way to redressing the balance with regard to the study of these remarkable women.