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CHAPTER 1. DEIR EL-MEDINA DURING THE 18TH DYNASTY AND THE
EARLIEST USAGE OF WORKMEN’S MARKS FROM THE THEBAN
NECROPOLIS

1.1 INTRODUCTION
Before we will direct our attention to the ostraca with identity marks from the Theban
Necropolis, we shall explore the usage of non-textual marks elsewhere. It is a well-known fact
that marking systems were employed at different locations and different times in ancient
Egypt, and an assessment of the use of marks at other sites is necessary to understand the
context of the identity marks of the Theban Necropolis workmen. The second part of this
chapter is a study of the history of the 18th Dynasty community of necropolis workmen at Deir
el-Medina, and the organisation of their labour. Such an examination is required in order to
better comprehend the role of the ostraca with marks at the time the marking system of the
Theban Necropolis was introduced.

1.2 MARKS ELSEWHERE IN NEW KINGDOM EGYPT: A BRIEF OVERVIEW
Non-textual marking systems have been around since before the invention of writing. In
Egypt various marking systems with different purposes existed during to the Old Kingdom up
to the Roman period (and probably much later). The topic of the present dissertation are the
identity marks that were used by the workmen of Deir el-Medina during the 18th, 19th and 20th
Dynasties, but this system of marks is definitely not the only one of its time. Notable
examples of marking systems of the New Kingdom are attested at Thebes but also at Amarna.

Marks used in building
Blocks and unhewn filling stones from the causeway of the temple of Thutmosis III at Deir el-
Bahari demonstrate that marks were used during different phases of the construction of the
complex. These marks, called “mason’s marks” by Julia Budka, were painted in red ink.
Many marks are signs borrowed from hieroglyphic script, and sometimes a single mark
consisting of two hieroglyphic signs. Similar marks, but in much smaller numbers, were
attested on blocks from the Ramesside temple of Deir el-Bahari, situated at the entrance of the
Asasif valley. The mason’s marks were interpreted as team marks, referring to a cohort of
workmen.1 The marks appear to attest to a division of labour, as some marks were mostly
found in certain areas of the edifice on either casing stones or rough stones.2 Comparing the
marks with information gained from 18th Dynasty ostraca excavated near the temple of Deir
el-Bahari, Budka proposed that some marks might refer to the institutions or towns that
contributed to the building process.3 Other marks may well be references to individual
contributions by high-ranking priests and officials.4 From a different perspective Budka
suggested that some marked stones could represent the identity of individual masons, and that
they were deposited in the construction as a means to symbolically tie oneself permanently to
a significant structure. This would be in accord with a practice among high officials from the

1 Julia Budka, ‘Benchmarks, team marks and pot marks from the Asasif (Western Thebes)’ in: Haring and Kaper
(eds.), Pictograms or Pseudo script?, 78-81.
2 Julia Budka, ‘Non-textual marks from the Asasif (Western-Thebes). Remarks on function and practical use
based on external textual evidence’ in: Andrassy, Budka and Kammerzell (eds.), Non-textual marking systems,
186-187.
18th Dynasty to leave name stones and privately stamped bricks in temples and tombs.\(^5\) Interestingly, the marks from the causeway of the temple of Thutmosis III are very similar to painted marks from the temple proper at Deir el-Bahari. Their meaning is not yet clear, but Budka noted that “[i]t is very likely that individual marks relate to specific parts of the royal building complex and to different teams and institutions.”

On the taffl stone foundations of the Ramesside temple hieratic benchmarks were inscribed. They consist of control notes and data concerning the levelling of the plateau, as well as records of the work of specific stonemason’s gangs under the name of a supervisor. Some of these notes are combined with a mark. Budka differentiated between two types of benchmarks: those that were inscribed before the work, serving as instructions for supervisors, and those that were added after completing the building activity mentioned in the inscription that may have served as a reference point for further work. The meaning of the marks is as yet unclear, but they could well be team marks (or “builders’ marks”) or control marks.\(^6\)

Mason’s marks from the end of the 18th Dynasty are found on the building blocks used in the Small Aten Temple. We will look into this corpus with more detail in Excursus I below.\(^7\)

**Quarry marks**

Well attested in ancient Egypt are so-called quarry marks, signs left in stone quarries during the process of extracting stone blocks for building material. Some quarry marks can be dated to the New Kingdom. In the granite quarry of Aswan just above the unfinished Thutmoside obelisk one can still see marks, which have been interpreted as control marks of supervisors.\(^8\)

At Gebel el-Silsila, marks are attested in quarries that have been dated to the reigns of Seti I and Ramesses II on the basis of archaeological evidence and inscriptions on stelae. The marks themselves might date to the same time. Perhaps even earlier marks were tentatively dated to the reigns of Amenhotep III and/or Amenhotep IV.\(^9\) The marks attested in the quarry of Deir Abu Hinnis date to reign of Akhenaten.\(^10\) Finally, a small number of marks are inscribed in the quarry of Dra‘ Abu el-Naga\(^11\) and will be dealt with in more detail below.\(^12\)

**Marks on the sphinxes of the alley of Karnak**

Marks are also attested on ram-headed sphinxes along a dromos west of the temple of Karnak. The date of these marks is uncertain. The sphinxes were probably sculpted under Amenhotep III or slightly earlier, but they were later reused and perhaps adjusted under Ramesses II, Pinodjem I, and/or Taharqa.\(^13\) All sphinxes display an isolated sign on the lower part of the left flank. They do not seem to be interpretable as cryptographic writing. Several marks were
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\(^6\) Budka, ‘Benchmarks, team marks and pot marks from the Asasif’, 73-78.
\(^7\) See below, p. 49-63.
\(^8\) Dieter Arnold, Building in Egypt. Pharaonic Stone Masonry (New York 1991), 37-38 and fig. 2.15.
\(^10\) Athena van der Perre, ‘De vergeten steengroeven van Achnaton’ Ta-Mery 4 (2011), 117-118 and fig. 5a
\(^12\) See below, p. 63-64, Excursus II.
later covered with plaster. Different possible interpretations have been offered. Firstly, the sphinxes could have been marked in the quarry and the signs might correspond to a certain order in which the sphinxes had to be installed along the dromos. This order could be connected with the texts that had to be inscribed on the sphinxes, or with which they had already been inscribed. Secondly, the marks may have been added in the time of Pinodjem when the dromos was reorganised. The sphinxes may perhaps have been supplemented with other elements that have now disappeared, such as inscribed pedestals or offerings that each corresponded with a particular sphinx.14

Marks used in branding
As is the practice in modern times, cattle were branded in ancient Egypt using branding irons.15 Two brands in the Eton College Myers Museum consist of hieroglyphic sign groups,16 and the branding marks (sbw) mentioned in Papyrus de Varzy have been interpreted as textual signs as well. The later document actually describes the mark as consisting of the sign ⱱ rwD with inside of it the sign Ⱡ iwn, forming a mark that need not necessarily be read as a textual message.17

Assembly marks
Another category of signs may be called (re-)assembly marks.18 The cornices of the rectangular outer sarcophagus of Maiherperi from his tomb KV 36 are marked with signs incised in the wood.19 The ends of the longer and shorter panels that form the sarcophagus were marked in such a way that when properly re-assembled, the same marks would face each other. The edge of the footboard was only marked in one corner, but had an additional single mark in the middle. Apart from perhaps sign ⱱ nb and four strokes, the marks appear to be abstract signs. Similar assembly marks are recorded on the edges of the sarcophagus of Meryt from the tomb of her husband Kha (TT 8).20 Here marks are added to all four corners of the sarcophagus. The marks are all signs borrowed from hieroglyphic script, and they are all different from the marks on the coffin of Maiherperi.

Weaver’s marks
On items of linen marks have been attested as well. A number of marks come from the tomb of Hatnefer (TT 71), mother of the famous Senenmut. Rosalind Janssen mentioned that the cloths of linen bear “weaver’s marks” which were inwoven. Moreover, 26 sheets displayed “identifications marks in black ink, reportedly “demonstrating that the pieces came from governmental and temple stores”.21 Marks occur on royal linen too. From the embalmers

15 Kathrin Gabler kindly provides the following references to the marking of cattle (lh) with brands (sbw) in Theban administrative documents of the Ramesside Period: P. Turin Cat. 1880 vso. IV, 7; P. DeM 26, frag. B, 2; O. Berlin P 10645+ rev., 3.
18 For textual assembly marks from the end of the 18th Dynasty see Martha R. Bell, ‘Notes on the exterior construction signs from Tutankhamun’s shrines’ JEA 76 (1990), 107-124.
19 O. Cairo CG 24001, see Daressy, Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois, 1-2.
20 Turin S. 8517 RCGE 19440, see Silvio Curto and Maurizio Mancini, ‘News of Kha‘ and Meryt’ JEA 54 (1968), 77 and fig. 1.
cache of Tutankhamun (KV 54) a sheet of cloth was recovered bearing several marks, both woven into the material as well as inscribed in ink. Their meaning is obscure. Winlock interpreted the woven marks as an inscription which he translated as “Long live the Good King Nofer”. The significance of the other signs was unclear to him, although one was described as “a private mark of some sort”. Interestingly, very similar marks are found on textile objects that have been called pillows discovered in the embalmers cache of KV 63.23

Potmarks and potter’s marks
Another common category of marks is well attested in the New Kingdom: potmarks. Marks occur on blue-painted pottery from a large deposit, found out of context in the Treasury of Thutmosis I at Karnak North. The pottery was dated to the late 18th Dynasty and may have come from temples and estates of Akhenaten in Karnak East. The marks were all applied in paint before firing. Colin Hope provided a tentative explanation for the purpose of the marks. Since they were added before firing of the vessel, the marks must have been added in the workshops where the vessels were manufactured and could have conveyed the ownership of a temple or royal estate. Alternatively the marks may have been added to keep track of the output of the different painters decorating the vessels, or to indicate the content of the vessels. Hope remarked that within the Karnak North corpus, the practice of marking was limited to only two types of vessels and that each type displayed a rather restricted variety of marks.24

The blue-painted pottery from the palace of Amenhotep III at Malqata had been marked too. The marks appear on five or six types of vessels, mostly large undecorated storage vessels, and were added in different ways: marks were impressed, painted or incised before firing, or incised after firing. According to Hope, the vessels had contained commodities that were used during the celebrations of the jubilee festivals of Amenhotep III. In his opinion the purpose of the marks was not to follow the output of potters or workshops or to indicate ownership, because some marks were attested with a very high frequency and others with a very low one. Instead, he tentatively connected the marks with the festivals at the palace: “They would have been commissioned locally by the administration and thus might have been marked to indicate this. If this were the case then the marks might indicate at which workshop specific numbers of vessels from a commission were made, or possibly indicate to which order the vessels belonged, and several such would surely have been placed during the period covered by the use of the palace during the last decade of Amenhotep III’s reign.”25

Among the ceramic fragments excavated at Amarna several marked examples are found as well. They are discussed in Excursus I below.26
1.3 ORIGIN OF THE MARKING SYSTEM AND THE COMMUNITY OF WORKMEN DURING THE 18th DYNASTY

A considerable number of ostraca, objects and pottery inscribed with marks dates to the 18th Dynasty. The ostraca from this period will be discussed at length in chapter 2, but in order to understand their meaning and purpose we shall here first examine the organisation, administration and social lives of the community of workmen that lived during the 18th Dynasty. Such an assessment is necessitated due to the large gap in our knowledge of such matters, caused by the paucity of epigraphic sources from that time. Whereas the Ramesside Period is wonderfully well documented, we possess virtually no written texts from the 18th Dynasty that inform us about the organisation of labour on the royal tombs or the provision and the private lives of the workmen. It is therefore mandatory to review and analyse the little available evidence for the administration of the community during this period, which will enable us to propose a model of the organisational structure of the workforce and their superiors. Simultaneously we shall attempt to elucidate certain aspects of the social lives of the 18th Dynasty workmen.

1.3.1 THE FORMATION OF THE COMMUNITY OF WORKMEN

The popularity of the cult of the deified Amenhotep I at Deir el-Medina during the Ramesside Period is no longer seen as evidence that this ruler had founded the workmen’s village. Instead, it is now generally accepted that the mudbricks from certain parts of the enclosure wall of the village that are impressed with the cartouche of Thutmosis I indicate that the settlement was constructed under that king. A date for the establishment of the village in the reign of Thutmosis I is corroborated by the fact that no remains can be dated to prior to his reign. The earliest settlement is believed to have been rather small, containing only 20 houses. Although it is clear that during the Ramesside Period the village was permanently inhabited by the workmen of the royal necropolis and their families it cannot be assumed a priori that this was also the case for the earliest settlement. In fact, it has been argued that the village may have been only intermittently inhabited during the actual construction of the royal tomb, and that the workmen lived at the village without their families. The question as to the purpose of the 18th Dynasty village is complicated by several factors. First of all, the earliest structures of the settlement have mostly been altered and reused if not destroyed by later generations of workmen. In part these events may have caused a second problem, which is the scarcity of inscribed material – stelae, statuary, domestic objects, ostraca, etc. – from this period.

Furthermore, the location of the tombs of many of the first kings of the 18th Dynasty is shrouded in mystery. Supposing that royal tomb builders lived at Deir el-Medina from the reign of Thutmosis I onwards, where would they have worked? There has been quite some controversy about the question as to exactly which kingly tomb was the first to be constructed

27 Valbelle, Les ouvriers, 2 and n. 1.
31 Bruyère remarks on this fact in several of his excavation reports, see Bernard Bruyère, Rapport sur les Fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1926). FIFAO 4.3 (Cairo 1927), 10; 43; Bernard Bruyère, Rapport sur les Fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1928) II. FIFAO 6.2 (Cairo 1929), 3-4; Bernard Bruyère, Rapport sur les Fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1931-1932). FIFAO 10.1 (Cairo 1934), 6-7.
32 See below, 1.3.2; 1.4.1; 1.5.
in the Valley of the Kings. Much of this debate is summarised by Daniel Polz and by David Aston. Polz himself contributed to the discussion by identifying tombs K93.11 and K93.12 at Dra’ Abu el-Naga as graves of respectively Amenhotep I and his mother queen Ahmes-Nefertari. Moreover, he tentatively attributed K94.1 at Dra’ Abu el-Naga to Kamose. Thutmosis I has often been accredited with building the first tomb in the Valley of the Kings, which has been identified as KV 20 or as KV 38. The grave of Thutmosis II, supposedly the second tomb in the Valley of the Kings, has been identified as KV 42 or as KV 20. Yet, it has been pointed out by several authors that there is no textual or archaeological evidence at all that these two rulers were the first to have a tomb constructed at the Valley of the Kings. For that reason, and because of the assumed location of Amenhotep I’s tomb at Dra’ Abu el-Naga, Polz argued that both Thutmosis I and Thutmosis II were originally buried at the location of the latter necropolis as well. Indeed, pottery fragments inscribed with the name of Thutmosis I have been found at this site. According to Polz, Thutmosis I would then have been reburied in KV 20 by Hatshepsut, and subsequently in KV 38 by Thutmosis III. Hence, KV 20, the kingly tomb of Hatshepsut, would have been the first tomb in the Valley of the Kings. Dorn, basing himself on the work of Polz, formulated the hypothesis that during the early New Kingdom, the mortuary temple ideally lay on a single axis with the entrance to the royal tomb, as evidenced by the topographical relation between mortuary temples and tombs of Amenhotep I and Hatshepsut. Hence he postulated that the (original) tomb of Thutmosis II must have been located in the area of the Valley of the Queens. If this suggestion is accepted the tomb of Hatshepsut could well have been the first one in the Valley of the Kings, as suggested by Polz. The original tomb of Thutmosis I could then have been situated elsewhere. In the opinion of Dorn, the Valley of the Queens was again a good candidate. Despite the fact that the location of the mortuary temple of Thutmosis I is unknown, Dorn argued that the site of the village of Deir el-Medina, constructed under his reign, is not far from the area of the Valley of the Queens.

Aston presented arguments in favour of the scenario as reconstructed by Polz in which the tombs of the first kings of the 18th Dynasty were located at Dra’ Abu el-Naga. He remarked that the royal cachette (DB 320) included many kings and queens of the 17th Dynasty, as well as several from the early 18th Dynasty, such as Ahmose Henttimehu, Ahmose-Inhapi, Ahmose-Merytamun, Ahmose-Sipair, Ahmose-Sitkamose, Amenhotep I, Ahmose, and Thutmosis II. The tombs of several of these individuals have been identified in Dra’ Abu el-Naga, which would in the opinion of Aston imply that the tomb of Thutmosis II must have been situated in the same location. The fact that Amenhotep I and presumably also

---

34 David Aston, *Pottery recovered near the tombs of Seti I (KV 17) and Siptah (KV 47) in the Valley of the Kings*. AH 24 (Basel 2014), 85.
37 Among others by John Romer, who thought the tomb had later been enlarged by Hatshepsut, see John Romer, ‘Thutmosis I and the Bibân el-Molûk: some problems of attribution’ JEA 60 (1974), 121-127.
39 For an overview see Polz, *Der Beginn*, 217, n. 874.
40 E.g. Roehrig, ‘The two tombs’, 186.
42 Polz, *Der Beginn*, 219-220.
43 Dorn, ‘Hatschepsuts Jenseitsarchitektur’, 35.
Thutmosis II were buried at Draʿ Abu el-Naga in turn suggests that Thutmosis I’s original tomb must have been constructed there as well.\(^{44}\)

In summary, there are several indications that royal tombs were not constructed in the Valley of the Kings before the reign of Hatshepsut. The tombs of 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty kings before her reign should then have been located elsewhere. A number of arguments favour Draʿ Abu el-Naga as the site of these tombs. There is no evidence that the workmen of that necropolis were connected with the village of Deir el-Medina. The distance between the settlement and Draʿ Abu el-Naga is about the same as the distance between the settlement and several tombs in the Valley of the Kings, so it is theoretically possible that workmen from Deir el-Medina came to Draʿ Abu el-Naga to labour. However, the question why the workmen’s village was founded during the reign of Thutmosis I, when tomb building at Draʿ Abu el-Naga had taken place since the 17\(^{th}\) Dynasty, remains unanswered. The same question would not apply to the Valley of the Queens as the location of the original tombs of Thutmosis I and Thutmosis II, because no construction activity before the 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty is attested in this part of the Theban Valley. Moreover, as Dorn stated, this area is considerably closer to the village of Deir el-Medina. If the tombs of these two kings were indeed cut out in this area, that could explain the decision to establish the settlement at a nearby location. Yet, no archaeological evidence corroborates the assumption that the tombs of Thutmosis I and Thutmosis II are to be found in the Valley of the Queens.

The matter of the location of the first royal tombs of the 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty will not be solved here. In fact, apart from the mudbricks from the enclosure wall of the village stamped with the name of Thutmosis I, there is not much material from the village of Deir el-Medina that can be dated to the time before the reign of Hatshepsut. Perhaps the most important indication to connect the early 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty settlement with a group of workmen is the tomb of Amenemhat (TT 340) located in the Western Cemetery of Deir el-Medina. The tomb was dated to the time of Ahmose - Amenhotep I by Cherpion,\(^{45}\) which would make it older than the settlement of Deir el-Medina itself.\(^{46}\) However, a great number of the parallels for certain stylistic elements date back as far as the reign of Amenhotep II. Therefore TT 340 may have been constructed at a time when the earliest phase of the village had already been built.\(^{47}\) The tomb owner is only described as sgm-ꜣꜣ, ‘servant’, without further specification. In itself that title does not tie this individual to the workmen of Deir el-Medina. However, the title sgm-ꜣꜣ makes it very tempting to see this Amenemhat as someone occupied with work on the royal tomb, someone like the 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty necropolis workmen bearing the title sgm-ꜣꜣ m s.t ꜣꜣ.t.\(^{48}\) This suggestion is upheld by the inscription of Amenemhat’s son on the west wall of TT 340, where he makes claim to having been personally responsible for the tomb’s decoration.\(^{49}\) He himself does not bear a title in that inscription, but the fact that he possessed the skills to decorate a tomb and had access to material necessary to do so do suggest that he was involved in the decoration of tombs in Thebes. The connection with work on the royal tomb is thus never explicitly mentioned, but may be inferred from TT 340’s close vicinity to Deir el-Medina.

A clue about the first permanent occupation of the village is provided by the oldest chapels and sanctuaries north of the village. Foundation deposits inscribed with the cartouche

---

44 Aston, \textit{Pottery recovered}, 86.
47 Cf. Dimitri Laboury who dates the tomb more broadly to the beginning of the 18\(^{th}\) Dynasty, personal communication, 2012.
48 More on this title below, 1.4.1.
49 Cherpion, \textit{Deux tombes}, 44, 50-51, pl. 11.
of Thutmose III suggest that such edifices were first erected during his reign. For other elements datable to the early 18th Dynasty we are mostly dependent on the reports of Bruyère. A burial pit in the Western Cemetery, DM 1042, was said to be contemporaneous with TT 340. In two other tombs from the West Cemetery, DM 1163 and 1164, both anonymous but dated to the 18th Dynasty by Bruyère, mudbricks stamped with the cartouche of Thutmose I were discovered. The same cartouche was found impressed on the shard of a jar found in a trench just south of the village. Reportedly, pottery from the Eastern Cemetery was dated by Pamela Rose to the early to mid-18th Dynasty. Finally, a stela excavated by Schiaparelli in Deir el-Medina, Turin CG 50005, was attributed to the beginning of the 18th Dynasty. It is dedicated to a Mekymontu and his wife Nebuemweskhet by their son Semenkh, and all three individuals do not bear a title. According to Bruyère the oldest part of the sanctuary of Hathor to the north of the settlement was datable to the beginning of the 18th Dynasty, because several architectural elements from this site were inscribed with the names of kings such as Amenhotep I. Later, however, these parts of the building have been understood as belonging to younger structures that were dedicated to kings of the early 18th Dynasty. Nevertheless, a statue of the 18th Dynasty official Amenmes indicates that the temple existed already in the middle of the 18th Dynasty.

In conclusion, none of the remnants discussed in this section is unequivocally related to workmen of the royal tomb. All that can be said at this point is that the construction of the village occurred by royal degree, and that the earliest phase of the settlement was rather small. Contemporary tombs surround the early houses (TT 340, DM 1042, DM 1163, DM 1164, and perhaps some tombs in the Eastern Cemetery) and if they were built for the inhabitants of the village, TT 340 may serve as an indication that the villagers were tomb builders. Which tombs they may have constructed remains highly uncertain, and there is no direct evidence that they were permanently settled at the village.

### 1.3.2 Hieratic Administration of the 18th Dynasty

It has often been stated that very little of the textual administration of Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty has survived. Haring offered a useful survey of this situation. Discussing only hieratic documents, Haring signalled “the absence of Eighteenth Dynasty records explicitly related to the royal necropolis and its employees” and suggested that this was due...
to the absence of local scribes. This state of affairs stands in stark contrast with that of the nearby construction site of Deir el-Bahari during the reigns of Hatshepsut and Thutmose III, which has yielded a great number of hieratic documentary texts written on ostraca. A group of ostraca said to have been found by Baraize at Deir el-Medina (O. Cairo CG 25662 – 25669) was discussed by Haring, as well as an ostracon found by the excavations of Davis in the Valley of the Kings (O. Cairo CG 25501). These ostraca have all been dated to the 18th Dynasty and mention a number of individuals that clearly belong together. However, as it is not entirely certain whether O. Cairo CG 25662 – 25669 were actually found at Deir el-Medina, Haring wondered if the ostraca had in fact come from Deir el-Bahari. This would be plausible because a) a number of names mentioned in this group are also attested on the Deir el-Bahari ostraca, and b) some of the ostraca actually seem to refer to work on the temples of Deir el-Bahari.

Two further ostraca, allegedly dating to the 18th Dynasty and said to have been discovered by Schiaparelli at Deir el-Medina (O. Turin N. 57279 and O. Turin N. 57438) were dismissed by Haring as documents of that time, the former on palaeographic grounds. Haring concluded that “[t]here is, in fact, not a single ostracon dating from the Eighteenth Dynasty and clearly related to the royal necropolis or its workmen.”

Regarding the discrepancy between the number of hieratic administrative documents from Deir el-Bahari and Deir el-Medina, Haring offered four hypotheses:

1. The 18th Dynasty ostraca referring to the construction of the royal tomb have not been found yet.
2. During the 18th Dynasty no records were ever made of the work at the royal tomb and the supplies to the necropolis workmen.
3. The 18th Dynasty administrative records of royal tomb construction were not left, perhaps not even composed, at the construction site or in the workmen’s village; administration of the work was based elsewhere.
4. During the 18th Dynasty the construction of the royal tomb was so secret that all records were carefully stored elsewhere or destroyed afterwards; they were not kept or discarded at the construction site or the village.

Taking option 3 and 4 as the most plausible ones, Haring concluded that administration of the construction of the royal tomb must have been ‘of a totally different character from that of the building activity at Deir el-Bahari’. Elsewhere Haring suggested that the absence of hieratic administration is no coincidence, and that the fact that the oldest known administrative documents of the tomb refer to the reign of Horemheb is due to the reorganisation of the workforce that took place during the reign of this king.

---

64 Haring, ‘Scribes and scribal activity’, 108.
65 Haring, ‘Scribes and scribal activity’, 108. It must be noted, however, that since the publication of Haring’s article one ostracon has been found close to the tomb of Amenhotep III (WV 22) which displays semi-hieratic words, probably reading “heights 6 el”, see Sakuji Yoshimura (ed.), *Research in the Western Valley of the Kings Egypt II. KV A and the Neighboring Areas of the Tomb of Amenophis III (KV 22)* (Tokyo 2011), 88, fig. 52, object nr. 427.
68 Haring, ‘Workmen’s Marks and the Early History of the Theban Necropolis’, 88-89. On this reorganisation, see chapter 6, 6.2.3.
Nevertheless, the 18th Dynasty ostraca that might have come from Deir el-Medina or the Valley of the Kings deserve some scrutiny here. In the following overview ostraca O. DeM 10001 and O. DeM 10002, not discussed by Haring as they were not fully published at the time his article was written, are added. It should be noted that the prefix “O. DeM” in the accession numbers of these two ostraca is somewhat misleading, because they are of uncertain provenance: it is unknown how O. DeM 10001 ended up in the French Institute for Oriental Archaeology, while O. DeM 10002 was a gift from Černý. The ostraca in question are:

**O. Cairo CG 25501**
Provenance: Valley of the Kings, Davis excavation.
Mention is made of work at a tomb, for which the word ‘ḥr.t’ is used. It seems unlikely that this is a reference to a royal tomb.⁶⁹ The individuals that are named are Maya, Iwy, Amenemhat, Amen-[…], Nakh-[…], Pa-[…], and Min. A Maya is attested at Deir el-Medina in TT 338, dated to the Amarna Period.⁷⁰ It might just be possible that Maya was an adult during the reign of Thutmose III. An Amenemhat is known from TT 340,⁷¹ but this individual must have been active during an earlier period.

**O. Cairo CG 25662**
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
Mention is made of sealbearers, a baker, a brewer, a measurer (?) and a woodcutter (?) who are connected with unspecified items. The individuals mentioned are: ‘Aba, Tjenen, Nebiry, (Per-?)erau, Hori, Iahmes, Panehsy-[…], Tery and Amenemope. From Deir el-Medina two 18th Dynasty individuals with the name Amenemope are known, one of whom was a scribe⁷² and the other a workman.⁷³ The Amenemope mentioned in this ostracon is perhaps a woodcutter and probably a different person.

**O. Cairo CG 25663**
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
A list of 18 or 19 different men: Mahu (twice), Iry, Nay, Nebnetjeru, Neferhotep, Djehutyre, Qed, Iwy, Maani, Pererau, Herhuy, Ahaemweskhet, Nebwashery, Pary (?), Tjuy, Huy, Ru (?) and Qen. The name of Iry resembles that of Iryky, who is attested at tomb DM 1390.⁷⁴ However, it is extremely unlikely that Iryky is mentioned on this ostracon, as he died as a child.

**O. Cairo CG 25664**
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
A note from an Amenemhat to a Senu ordering the latter to unload the boat of a Nebiry. As mentioned above, an Amenemhat is known from TT 340, but this cannot be the same individual.

**O. Cairo CG 25665**
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.

---

⁷¹ Cherpion, Deux tombes.
⁷² Name inscribed on a scribal palette (Louvre N 3023) of unknown provenance, see Guillemette Andreu (ed.), Les artistes de Pharaon. Deir el-Médineh et la Vallée des Rois (Paris 2002), 226, nr. 179.
⁷³ Tomb of Kha (TT 8), wall B, see Vandier d‘Abbadie, Deux tombes, 12.
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Mention is made of taking persons to Gebel el-Silsila and the issue of stone blocks. The individuals recorded are: Iahmes (an official), Amenmes, Masha, Amenemone, Hotep, Pewer, Senu, [K[...]], Yn (?), Weserhat and Amenqen. Note that a Weserhat is attested in tomb DM 1386,\textsuperscript{75} datable to the reigns of Hatshepsut or Thutmosis III by association with other burials in the Eastern Cemetery.\textsuperscript{76} An Amennes is recorded on a painted 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty stela from Deir el-Medina.\textsuperscript{77} Amennes is called a scribe there, but it is unknown whether he was involved in work on the royal tomb.

\textbf{O. Cairo CG 25666}
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
A short note mentioning a date and three individuals: Miny, Weserkhepsh and Twa.

\textbf{O. Cairo CG 256667}
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
A letter of instruction about a statue, an apportionment, divine offerings which have to be taken to Deir el-Bahari, and work that has to be kept up.

\textbf{O. Cairo CG 25668}
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
An account of bricks activities connected with working stone (a hall, a stonecutter).

\textbf{O. Cairo CG 25669}
Provenance: Deir el-Medina, excavation of temple by Baraize in 1912.
Mentions the title and name of the scribe Neferhotep.

\textbf{O. DeM 10001}
Provenance: unknown
A list of workmen and foremen (\textit{hr.y}): Mahu, Tener, Teku, Ifed, Baknefer, Nebenta, Pawoneshy, Benermerut, Penra, Nebnefer, Nebnetjeru, Senwosret, Kapu, Pentamit, Peky, Pyia, Djeserka, Hay, Amen-[...], Maaniheqau, Bakenamun, Maaniamun, R[...], Nebamun and Khaut. A draughtsman of Amun called Tener is attested at Deir el-Medina and must have lived during the reign of Thutmosis III.\textsuperscript{78} A “praised-of-Amun” Benermerut, son of Neferhebef is attested in the tomb of Kha,\textsuperscript{79} and it is possible that he already was an adult in the reign of Thutmosis III. It is however unclear if this individual was a workman. A coffin from tomb DM 1371 displays a name which ends in a female determinative and which is tentatively read as Nebytawy.\textsuperscript{80} This name is reminiscent of the Nebenta mentioned in this ostracon, although this person clearly is a male.

\textbf{O. DeM 10002}
Provenance: unknown

\textsuperscript{75} Bruyère, \textit{Rapport 1934-1935} II, 190.
\textsuperscript{76} This date is not entirely secure, see below, 1.5.
\textsuperscript{77} Turin CG 50006, Tosi and Roccati, \textit{Stele}, 37, 263; see below, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{78} As the son of royal scribe of the Great Place Amenemope on stela Turin CG 50004.
\textsuperscript{79} On \textit{senet}-board game from the tomb of Kha (TT 8), Turin S. 8451, see Barbara Russo, \textit{Kha (TT 8) and his colleagues: the gifts in his funerary equipment and related artefacts from Western Thebes}. GHPE 18 (London 2012), 14; 18 and pl. 1.
A list of workmen: Iuna, Khaut, Djeduemai, Kary, Nakhtmin, Nebnetjeru, Hery-hermaat, Amenhotep (twice), Maani and S-aa. A workman called Nakhtmin is attested at Deir el-Medina in TT 291, who might just have been an adult under the reign of Thutmosis III. Moreover, a Deir el-Medina workman called Amenhotep is known from a stela dated to the reign of Thutmosis III.

O. Turin N. 57279
Provenance: Deir el-Medina; Schiaparelli’s excavations of 1905
This ostraca only mentions the name Setau. Although it was dismissed as an ostraca of the 18th Dynasty for palaeographic reasons, a person of that name is known from tomb DM 1352. The tomb was dated to the late 18th Dynasty, so it is very doubtful whether Setau could have been an adult during the reign of Thutmosis III. Haring remarked moreover that Setau could be an abbreviation for Nebsetau, a name attested for workmen from Deir el-Medina during the Ramesside Period.

O. Turin N. 57438
Provenance: Deir el-Medina; Schiaparelli’s excavations of 1905
Mention is made of a singer called Maya. As noted above, a Maya is attested in TT 338, but this individual is a draughtsman.

As postulated by Haring, the ostraca seem to concern building activities at the temples of Hatshepsut or Thutmosis III. Some of the ostraca may have been found at Deir el-Medina, others could have come from Deir el-Bahari. Together the texts include the names of 77 different individuals. The names of four individuals (Weserhat, Benermerut, Tener, and Amenhotep) and perhaps three more (Maya, Amenmes, and Nakhtmin; much less likely Nebenta and Setau) are also attested at Deir el-Medina. Whether these individuals had been active during the time of Hatshepsut and/or Thutmosis III is uncertain.

Ostraca connected with work at Deir el-Bahari and discovered near the tomb of Senenmut provide further names that are found in the 18th Dynasty community of Deir el-Medina. A Sennefer is mentioned in an ostraca with field nr. 27057.1, while at Deir el-Medina a Sennefer is attested in tomb DM 1159. Objects from this tomb have, however, been dated to the reign of Akhenaten and Tutankhamun, making it very unlikely that Sennefer was a workman under Thutmosis III. The same ostraca mentions a Na[...], which may be restored to Nakhy. This name is also found in tomb DM 1138, similarly dated to the end of the 18th Dynasty, rendering it improbable that this Nakhy was active under Thutmosis III. A Nakhtmin and a Weserhat reappear in ostraca field nr. 27057.5 and 27057.6 respectively. The name of Iriky is mentioned in field nr. 27057.5 in a spelling that corresponds to that of

81 Tomb of Nakhtmin (TT 291), ceiling, central band; west wall, third and fourth register, see Bernard Bruyère and Charles Kuentz, Tombes Thébaines. La Nécropole de Deir el-Médiineh. La tombe de Nakht-min et la tombe d’Art-nefer. MIFAO 54 (Cairo 1926), 40; 46.
82 Stela Strasbourg 347, dated on stylistic grounds, see Wilhem Spiegelberg, Balthasar Pörtner, Karl Dryoff et al. (eds.), Aegyptische Grabsteine und Denksteine aus süd-deutschen Sammlungen. I Karlsruhe, Mühlhausen, Strassburg, Stuttgart (Strasbourg 1902), 15, pl. XIV.
84 Haring, ‘Scribes and scribal activity’, 108.
85 Counting unique names only, and including incomplete names.
87 Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 40-73.
89 Dorman, The tombs of Senenmut, 89-90 and pls. 48c, e and 49c, cat. 26.c.
90 Dorman, The tombs of Senenmut, 89 and pls. 48a, b and 49c, cat. 26.b.
an individual by the same name at Deir el-Medina, but as mentioned, this person passed away as a child.

Considering the number of individuals mentioned on all these ostraca (77 different names in the group of “Deir el-Medina ostraca”, 89 different names in the group of “Senenmut ostraca”), the names that are also attested at Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty (Weserhat, Benermerut, Tener, and Amenhotep; perhaps Maya, Amenmes, and Nakhtmin) constitute a very small percentage: c. 4% to 5% or c. 8% to 9%. It could be merely coincidence that a few names of individuals connected with work at Deir el-Bahari coincide with those of men attested at Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty. The names might have been popular during that period at that locality. One only has to look at Ramesside Deir el-Medina for the ubiquity of contemporaneous individuals with the same name to realise that homonymity was a common phenomenon.

In conclusion, there is very little evidence to relate the names found in the 18th Dynasty ostraca from Deir el-Medina, the Valley of the Kings or Deir el-Bahari to the small number of individuals attested on other sources from Deir el-Medina. Similarly, as Haring stated, the ostraca do not make reference to the construction of a royal tomb and there is no mention of any of the titles connected with the 18th Dynasty workforce. This would indeed mean, as argued by Haring, that we do not possess any hieratic documentary ostraca of that period. The lack of hieratic documentation is odd, because, as had as already been pointed out by other authors, scribes were in fact attached to the work on the royal tomb in the 18th Dynasty.

At the time of Haring’s exposé on the lack of hieratic administrative ostraca, the existence of 18th Dynasty ostraca from the Theban Necropolis inscribed with marks was not yet taken into account, but these documents represent an important source of information. A considerable amount of limestone flints and ceramic shards from the Valley of the Kings and from the village of Deir el-Medina are inscribed with series of identity marks that belonged to the 18th Dynasty necropolis workmen. The ostraca are datable to this period on the basis of their provenance, as well as the repertory of marks. The corpus of 18th Dynasty ostraca with workmen’s marks will be the subject of chapter 2 and we will briefly come back to them below, but it is essential to emphasise the existence of these documents at this point.

The ostraca with marks were discussed by Haring in a later article in which they played an essential role. The documents, some of which certainly are of an administrative character, offer a new perspective on the absence of hieratic administration. They demonstrate that the first hypothesis, which states that the hieratic ostraca are yet to be found in the Valley of the Kings or the village of Deir el-Medina, is rather improbable because considerable numbers of 18th Dynasty ostraca with marks have been found at these sites. The same argument can be used to partially bring into question the fourth hypothesis. If hieratic documents were of such a discrete nature that they could not be discarded near the royal tomb or in the village, then perhaps the ostraca with marks – as incomprehensible as they may be – should not have been left there either. It is Haring’s third hypothesis that appears most probable. Hieratic documentation must have been produced by the scribes who came to the worksite to assess the progress in the construction works, but their administration was probably kept elsewhere than in the Valley of the Kings or at the village.

---

91 See below, 1.4.
92 See below, 1.4; cf. Haring, ‘Scribes and scribal activity’, 109; Haring, ‘Workmen’s Marks and the Early History of the Theban Necropolis’ 89; Russo, Kha, 76.
93 Haring, ‘Workmen’s Marks and the Early History of the Theban Necropolis’.
This idea ties in with a fragmentary 18th Dynasty letter written on papyrus that was found in the Valley of the Queens. The fragment has only very recently come to light in the collection of the Egyptian Museum of Turin and was unknown at the time of Haring’s articles.96 The letter mentions Ineni (TT 81), mayor of Thebes, and Djehutynefer (TT 80), overseer of the treasury,97 both high-ranking officials who lived around the middle of the 18th Dynasty. The fragment is not preserved well enough to fully comprehend the content of the letter, but revealing is the occurrence of a sDm ʾṣ, a ‘servant’. The servant is not explicitly connected with any institution, yet it is plausible that he may have been a sDm ʾṣ m s.t ʾṣ.t, ‘servant in the great place’, the designation used for the workmen of the Royal Necropolis during the 18th Dynasty.98 Regardless of the identity of this servant, the papyrus represents rare but secure proof of the presence of scribes in the Theban valleys before the Ramesside Period. As will be discussed below, the occurrence of Ineni in this letter suggests that it was concerned with the preparation of tombs in this area,99 which in turn lends credence to the theory that administrative scribes came to the valleys to inspect the construction project. All available evidence is therefore in favour of the essence of Haring’s third hypothesis: during the 18th Dynasty the organisation and progress of work on the royal tomb was probably documented by hieratic scribes, but these records were not archived at Deir el-Medina or the Valley of the Kings. It is very plausible that these records were never written on ostraca but on papyrus, which was taken with the scribe to his offices in Thebes.

1.4 THE ORGANISATION OF WORK IN THE COMMUNITY OF WORKMEN DURING THE 18TH DYNASTY

While we lack hieratic documentary texts, we do possess numerous ostraca with marks from the 18th Dynasty. In order to place these documents, which assumingly played a role in the administration, into context, an assessment of the organisation of work on the royal tomb is required. However, in the absence of written administrative documentation from the 18th Dynasty this is quite a challenge. It has often been pointed out that very little about this epoch in the history of the Royal Necropolis can be determined,100 but there is enough information to provide a rough sketch of the administration of the crew during the 18th Dynasty.

1.4.1 INTERNAL ORGANISATION

Scholars have stated that the organisation of the workforce in the 18th Dynasty must have been similar to that of Ramesside times,101 while other authors emphasised that the organisation must have been rather different from what we know of the 19th and 20th Dynasties.102 It has also been suggested that labour on the 18th Dynasty royal tombs could have been directed along the lines of the organisation the Thutmoside building site of Deir el-Bahari, with several different crews of workmen that fell under the responsibility of a Theban supervisor of royal construction works connected with the Amun Temple of Karnak.103

---

96 It was identified by Rob Demarée, who most kindly provided the details of the content of the letter.
98 This title will be discussed below, 1.4.1.
99 See below, p. 38.
100 E.g. Valbelle, Les ouvriers, 1; Davies, Who’s who, xviii; 1; Sofia Häggman, Directing Deir el-Medina. The External Administration of the Necropolis. USE 4 (Uppsala 2002), 57.
101 E.g. Valbelle, Les ouvriers, 1.
102 E.g. Häggman, Directing Deir el-Medina, 57.
103 Andreas Dorn, ‘Ostraka’, 36.
During the time of Thutmosis I such an official was Ineni, mayor of Thebes (TT 81). Later in the 18th Dynasty dignitaries like Amenmes, who bore the title Overseer of all Construction Works of the King, must have directed the preparation of the royal burial. We will concentrate on these officials and their administrative duties in section 1.4.2 below.

Before we turn to such Theban authorities, let us summarise what evidence there is of the 18th Dynasty workforce itself. Particularly the objects from the tomb of Kha (TT 8) in the northern part of the Western Cemetery of Deir el-Medina are informative about the management of the workforce prior to the Amarna Period. Kha is believed to have lived under Amenhotep II, Thutmosis IV and Amenhotep III. Apart from the objects in his tomb Kha is known from two stelae from Deir el-Medina. His most descriptive titles are:

- **sšt n(y)-sw.t**: Royal Scribe
- **hry n / m s.t ʿs.t <.t>**: Chief of/in the Great Place
- **imy-r kš.t m / n s.t ʿs.t <.t>**: Overseer of the construction works in/of the Great Place
- **imy-r kš.t pr-ʿs**: Overseer of the construction works of Pharaoh

The meaning of the designation s.t ʿs.t, Great Place, has been the subject of a number of studies. It seems to have been used during the 18th Dynasty in a similar way as the term s.t msʿ.t was in Ramesside times, as a reference to the royal necropolis of Thebes. In fact, the term s.t ʿs.t appears to have been replaced by s.t msʿ.t during the reign of Akhenaten. Because of the location of Kha’s tomb at Deir el-Medina and the fact that his titles connect him with royal building activities, we deduce that Kha had supervised the work on the tomb of the king as indicated by the titles hry and imy-r. This view is supported by the titles of Neferhebef, a contemporary of Kha. This Neferhebef is depicted in scenes in Kha’s funerary chapel and his name features on a senet-board game and a wooden cane from the

---

104 Eberhard Dziobek, *Das Grab des Ineni. Theben Nr. 81*. AV 68 (Mainz am Rhein 1992), 122, 135-139. Ineni’s role in the construction of the tomb will be discussed in more detail below, 1.4.2.

105 Significant discussions of this material are provided by Černý, *Community*, 72-73; 299; and Russo, *Kha*, passim.


108 Two wooden canes from TT 8, Turin S. 8417 RCGE 45724 and S. 8418 RCGE 45725, see Schiaparelli, *La tomba*, 87, fig. 55; Russo, *Kha*, 67.

109 Tomb of Kha (TT 8), ceiling, central band; wall B; wall A, see Jeanne Vandier d’Abbadie and Geneviève Gourdain, *Deux tombes de Deir el-Médi neh. I. La chapelle de Khâ. II. La tombe du scribe royal Amenemopet*. MIFAO 73 (Cairo 1939), 9, 10, 11; stela BM 1515; numerous objects from TT 8.

110 Scene in TT 8 but uncertain if referring to Kha; stela Turin CG 50007; several objects from TT 8.


113 See e.g. Černý, *Community*, 74; Dodson, ‘The Late Eighteenth Dynasty Necropolis’, 97; Haring, ‘Saqqara – A Place of Truth?’ (forthcoming).

114 Tomb of Kha (TT 8), wall A, see Vandier d’Abbadie and Gourdain, *Deux tombes*, 5, pls. II-III, XV.
1. DEIR EL-MEDINA DURING THE 18TH DYNASTY

The latter title is the same as borne by Kha, while Neferhebef’s second title explicitly ties him to the construction of the Royal Tomb in the Valley of the Kings. Indirectly we may see Kha in a similar position.

Another individual with the title ḫry n s.t ʿs.t borne by Kha is attested in TT 8 as well: a man called Khaemwaset is described as such on a cane that also seems to have been given to Kha as a present. Khaemwaset is therefore generally seen as a contemporary and colleague of Kha.

If we are correct in dating titles with the element s.t aA.t at Deir el-Medina to the 18th Dynasty, then we can add two professional scribes to the administration of workmen during that time: stela Turin CG 50004 from Deir el-Medina records a sS n(y)-sw.t n s.t ʿs.t named Amenemope, while a scribal palette of unknown provenance, Louvre N 3023, records a Pay with the slightly different title sS n s.t aA.t. The element s.t ʿs.t is otherwise attested in the title sDr-taş n s.t aA.t, seemingly referring to Deir el-Medina workmen in analogy with the title sDr-taş m s.t mAa.t in the period after the reign of Akhenaten. No more than six individuals with this title sDr-taş n s.t ʿs.t are known to us:

- Amenemope, son of Kha
- Teti
- Amenhotep

---

115 Turin S. 8451 RCGE 19376, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, 175-179, figs. 159-162; Russo, Kha, 13-14 and pl. I.
116 Turin S. 8591 RCGE 45794, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, 179-180, fig. 163; Russo, Kha, 19 and pl. II.
117 Vandier d’Abbadie and Gourdain, Deux tombes, 17; Russo, Kha, passim.
118 Cane from the tomb of Kha (TT 8), Turin S. 8591, see Russo, Kha, 19 and pl. II. This title is not only used by military officials, see Russo, Kha, 19-20; also William J. Murnane, ‘Overseer of the Northern Foreign Countries’: Reflections on the Upper Administration of Egypt’s Empire in Western Asia’ in: Jacobus van Dijk (ed.), Essays on Ancient Egypt in Honour of Herman te Velde. Egyptological Memoirs 1 (Groningen 1997), 251-258.
119 Senet-board game from the tomb of Kha (TT 8), Turin S. 8451, see Russo, Kha, 13-14 and pl. I.
120 Tomb of Kha (TT 8), wall A, see Vandier d’Abbadie and Gourdain, Deux tombes, 11.
121 Turin S. 8625 RCGE 45798, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, 179-180, fig. 163; Russo, Kha, 48.
122 Černý, Community, 73; Russo, Kha, 48. A possible third colleague of Kha is a man named Hormes, attested in tomb DM 1159 A, but the evidence is very meagre. According to Bruyère and Černý at least one door jamb from the tomb describes Hormes as a ḫry n s.t ʿs.t. Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 37 gives both ḫry n s.t ʿs.t and ḫry n mṣṭ.t, fig. 25 or Bruyère’s notes (see http://www.ifao.egnet.net/bases/archives/bruylere/?id=MS_2004_0149_011) are not helpful. Černý, Community, 73, n. 10 explicitly states that the reading ḫry n mṣṭ.t is incorrect. However, Davies, Who’s who, 28 identifies this individual as the chief workman Hormes (ii) who lived in the 20th Dynasty, thus opting for the reading of ḫry n mṣṭ.t. Indeed, the title ḫry n is.t m mṣṭ.t is attested during the Ramesside Period, see Černý, Community, 121-122.
125 Černý, Community, 45; 74.
126 Tomb of Kha (TT 8), wall B, see Vandier d’Abbadie and Gourdain, Deux tombes, 12.
127 On coffin BMFA 37.14 E, see Dodson, ‘The Late Eighteenth Dynasty Necropolis’, 92-93.
Perhaps the Wadjetshemes mentioned on stela CG Turin 50002 belongs in this list as well, because this monument, dated to the 18th Dynasty, was found at Deir el-Medina. On the stela Wadjetshemes bears the incomplete title sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t ṣt.t Amenhotep with the same name, mentioned without a title on stela Strasbourg 347.

According to Bruyère an individual by the name of Amenemhat bears the title sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t ṣt.t on a rather damaged stela dedicated to Rehorakhty, but the element after s.t is damaged and ṣt cannot be discerned with certainty in the published photograph. The damage is caused by the erasure of the element Amun in the name of the dedicatee, which does point to a pre-Amarna date for the stela. Bruyère also published a stela fragment of a Sia or Semy and transcribed his title as ḏ nb mw ḥm-f m s.t ṣt.t although the published drawing displays $\text{ šy n nb f m s.t ṣt.t}$. The father of the sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t ṣt.t Nakhtmin, Minhotep, mentioned in TT 291 is there attested with the title ḥṣ.y n nb f m s.t ṣt.t. His title suggests he was associated with the Deir el-Medina workforce as well, but it is unclear in what capacity. Noteworthy is furthermore that the Setau who is called sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t nfr t on a head rest from his tomb (DM 1352) and the title sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t ms.t on a shabti with the same provenance. The former title should probably be amended to read sḏm-ꜣ’s m s.t
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nfr<.w>, referring to the Place of Beauty, a designation for the Valley of the Queens. Apart from the papyrus fragment mentioned above, this would be yet another indication that the men who worked on the tomb of the king were also active in the adjacent valley, preparing tombs of the royal wives.

So far the basis for identifying individuals who belonged to the crew that constructed the royal tomb before the reign of Horemheb has been the element s.t ʿs.t in their title. To this group of individuals more men may perhaps be added, even when this element is not attested in combination with their name. It is conceivable that (some of the) owners of the 18th Dynasty tombs in the cemeteries to the east and west of the village were workmen, but these burials yielded very few names, let alone titles. It is a matter of debate whether the individuals that were interred there belonged to the crew of Deir el-Medina or not. This question will be addressed below.

The use of the common title sDm-ʾs without any affiliation to an institute may have been used for other crew members. As mentioned above, the sDm-ʾs recorded in the fragment of a letter from the Valley of the Queens could well have been a necropolis workman. It has similarly been pointed out above that the earliest mention of a sDm-ʾs at Deir el-Medina is found in the tomb of Amenemhat (TT 340). Although his title is not directly connected with the s.t ʿs.t, he could have been one of the first royal necropolis workmen of Thebes. Perhaps another title used by workmen of the royal tomb in the 18th Dynasty is sDm-ʾs n ʾImn. This title is attested on a shabti inscribed for a Samut, bought by Bruyère in Cairo. Bruyère believed the shabti to have been stolen from his excavation of tomb DM 1352 (attributed to Setau). The shabti closely resembles that of Setau and it appeared on the art market in the year he worked on DM 1352. If Bruyère’s supposition is correct, then this Samut must be dated to the very end of the 18th Dynasty and based on the association with Setau he might have been involved in work on the royal tomb during that period.

The stela of the sS n(y)-sw.t n s.t ʿs.t Amenemope found at Deir el-Medina also records his son Tener, a draughtsman who bears the title sS-ʾqd n ʾImn. The element n ʾImn is also found on the shabti of the sDm-ʾs Samut discussed above. Because the title sS-ʾqd n ʾImn is attested at Deir el-Medina in the early 19th Dynasty, it is plausible that Tener was involved in work on the royal tomb along with his father Amenemope.

In support of the identification of sS-ʾqd (n ʾImn) Tener as a draughtsman of the royal tomb is the attestation of Maya on stela Turin CG 50009 from Deir el-Medina and in his tomb in the Western Cemetery, TT 338. On Maya’s stela, dated to the first half of the reign of Akhenaten, he bears the title sS-ʾqd, whereas in his tomb, dated to the time of

---

142 Černý, Community, 88-89.
143 See also below, p. 40-41 and n. 183.
146 Stela Turin CG 50004, Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 35-36, 263; Evgeni S. Bogoslovsky, review of Tosi and Roccati, Stele, in: VDI 132.2 (1975), 154, 158.
147 E.g. Graffito nr. 817 records a draughtsman of Amun Pay below the names of Horemheb, Ramesses I and Seti I, see Wilhelm Spiegelberg, Aegyptische und andere Graffiti (Inschriften und Zeichnungen) aus der thebanischen Necropolis. Text und Atlas (Heidelberg 1921), 66; same individual also on a stela from Deir el-Medina, Turin CG 50048, Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 82-83, 281; draughtsman of Amun Pashedu on a stela from the Western Cemetery, Bruyère, Rapport 1923-1924, 86, fig. 15. See also chapter 6, 6.2.3.
148 More on Tener, see below, p. 48.
149 Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 41-42, 264.
150 Tosi, La cappella di Maia.
151 Grimm and Schlögl, Das thebanische Grab Nr. 136, 14.
Tutankhamun – Horemheb, he is described as šš-qd n †m n s.t mšr.t. The two inscriptions demonstrate that šš-qd could be used as an abbreviation for šš-qd n †m n. Furthermore, the addition of the element m s.t mšr.t proves that as early as the end of the 18th Dynasty there was a draughtsman of Amun attached to the work on the royal tomb.

A scribe (šš) named Amenmes is recorded on a simple painted stela found at Deir el-Medina and dated to the 18th Dynasty. Its inscriptions display two peculiarities: the name of the depicted king Amenhotep is not written within a cartouche, and the determinative of the kneeling man after the name of Amenmes is orientated in the wrong direction. These scribal errors cast some doubt on Amenmes’ claim to the title ‘scribe’. With nothing else but the title šš it cannot be proven that Amenmes was involved in the work on the royal tomb, but the provenance of the stela in Deir el-Medina does make it plausible. However, the palaeography of the inscription on his stela renders it very improbable that he operated as an administrative scribe.

In addition to the persons who are attested with a title, there is evidence of few individuals who must have lived at Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty but who do not bear a title. The lack of titles makes it very difficult to determine if these persons were involved in work on the royal tomb or not, and if so, what their function was. As we shall see below, a number of names of men without title have survived from the 18th Dynasty burials of the Eastern Cemetery. There has been some controversy regarding the question if they were necropolis workmen or not, and this matter will be addressed below. Other men are named without titles on 18th Dynasty monuments from Deir el-Medina. Stela Turin CG 50003 from the Drovetti collection is thought to have come from the village and was attributed to the reign of Thutmose III. The monument records a man named Pakhen. Another stela, Turin CG 50005, is dated to the beginning of the 18th Dynasty and was excavated by Schiaparelli in Deir el-Medina. It is dedicated to a Mekymontu and his wife Nebuemweskhet by their son Semenk, and all three individuals are title-less.

Dated to the Amarna-period and the very end of the 18th Dynasty is a Hapy-‘a who is mentioned on the stela of Setau (Hermitage 3937) without title. A shabti from Setau’s tomb DM 1352 is inscribed for him as well, again without a title, suggesting that Hapy-‘a was buried there. Hapy-‘a may thus have been a family member of Setau. There is however no direct evidence that he was active as a workman in the Valley of the Kings. Another mysterious individual is Hesymeref. This name is attested on six shabtis made of different materials bearing different inscriptions, but they are all believed to belong to the same individual. On the basis of its inscription and the style of the sculpture Hesymeref’s shabtis were dated to the reign of Tutankhamun. Unfortunately the provenance of these shabtis is unknown, but since three shabtis record the title šdm 牝 after the name of the deceased they are thought to have come from Deir el-Medina. This can, however, not be proven. Dated to the post-Amarna Period as well is the tomb of Maya, TT 338. Maya himself is recorded with

---

153 Stela Turin 50006, Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 37, 263.
154 See below, 1.5.
155 Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 34-35, 262.
156 Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 36-37, 263.
158 Cf. Demarée, šš ibr n Rš-Stelae, 83.
159 Jacques-F. Aubert, ‘Les statuettes funéraires de la collection Omar Pacha’ CdE 50 (1976), 60-63; Hermann A. Schlögl and Andreas Brodbeck, Ägyptische Totenfiguren aus öffentlichen und privaten Sammlungen der Schweiz. OBOSA 7 (Freiburg and Göttingen 1990), 83; Maria Helena Assam, Arte Egípcia. Museu Calouste Gulbenkian (Lisbon 1991), 54, n. 11.
the title $s\text{-}qd n \text{'lmn m s.t ns'.t}$, which associates him with work on the royal tomb. The tomb of Maya also records his sons. Most of them do not bear a title, but four of his sons do. There are a Parennefer and a Khonsu, both with the title $s\text{-}qd$ (draughtsman), a Sekhereufmen who is $sdm$-$s'$ (workman) and an Amenemwesekhet who is a $t\text{ly}$ (sculptor.) Yet, all these titles are given without further specification, and so it remains speculative whether they worked in the Valley of Kings as their father did.

1.4.2 EXTERNAL ORGANISATION

It is clear that during the 19th and 20th Dynasties the work on the royal tomb was a responsibility of the vizier, who represented Pharaoh as acting chief executive of the operation. This situation might have been slightly different in the 18th Dynasty, as the few scant pieces of information we possess seem to indicate. Direct evidence is found in the famous inscriptions in the tomb of Ineni (TT 81), mayor of Thebes and overseer of building activities in the temple of Karnak during the reign of Thutmosis I. One of his titles describes him as $hrp k3.t hr hr.t n.t n(y)-sw.t$, Controller of construction works on the rock tomb of the King. On a stela from his tomb Ineni articulates the secrecy that seems to have accompanied this work. Unfortunately it is not safe to say at what exact location the construction took place, since the original tomb of Thutmosis I is not securely identified in the Valley of Kings. However, the fragmentary letter from the Valley of the Queens that mentions Ineni signals his presence in the Theban valleys and suggests a connection with the preparations of royal burials in that area.

Another person that seems to have been responsible for the organisation of the construction of the royal tomb is a man called Amenmes. His name and titles are attested on a scribal palette included in the tomb of Kha (TT 8) and generally interpreted as a gift of Amenmes to Kha. The cartouche of Thutmosis IV on this scribal palette indicates that Amenmes was active during that reign. The titles of Amenmes recorded on the palette show him to have been a very high official. Amongst other functions, Amenmes was Overseer of the Treasury, Fan-bearer at the right of the King, Overseer of the internal Palace, and $imy-r k3.t nb.t n(y)-sw.t$: Overseer of all construction works of the King. The presence of the palette in TT 8 indicates that Amenmes, a Theban official with important positions in the higher ranks of the administration, had contact with Kha, a contemporary official responsible for the construction works at the royal tomb. Amenmes’ ties to the work on the royal tomb and to the community of workmen are also materialised in the form of a seated statue he had erected at the temple site of Deir el-Medina. A fragment of his statue was discovered in the foundations of the north-eastern corner of the external Ptolemaic wall of the Hathor temple. Its inscriptions indicate that it was dedicated to Hathor, so it is probably that already in the 18th Dynasty there was sanctuary of Hathor at the village. As Russo pointed out,
Amenmes probably dealt with Kha in the capacity of overseer of all construction works. Being the overseer of the treasury he would have answered to the vizier.\textsuperscript{170}

Whereas in the Ramesside Period an external service personnel called the \textit{smd.t} was burdened with the task of providing the crew of workmen with commodities, such an ‘institution’ is not attested for the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty.\textsuperscript{171} According to a theory of Bruyère, the large number of baskets as well as silos attested in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty houses north of the village enclosure wall and east of the temple indicates the workmen were not kept on government rations. Bruyère did not attempt to explain in what way grain and other items would have reached the village.\textsuperscript{172}

\textbf{1.4.3 CONCLUSIONS}

On the basis of the available data we are able to reconstruct to some extent an outline of the organisation of the workforce from the time of about Thutmose III up to Horemheb. It differs little from the overview presented by Barbara Russo.\textsuperscript{173} Outside of Deir el-Medina, a high-ranking official other than the vizier seems to have been primarily responsible for the realisation of the royal tomb. At the beginning of the New Kingdom this may well have been the mayor of Thebes, who was also involved in the building activities at Karnak. The connection with the temple of Amun in Karnak may be reflected by the element \textit{n ḫnn} in some of the titles attested at 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty Deir el-Medina. Around the middle of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, the final responsibility for the construction projects seems to have laid with the Overseer of all construction works of the King. Both this official and the mayor were high-ranking administrators but were subordinates to the vizier, who is not mentioned at Deir el-Medina in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty. In contrast, during the Ramesside Period it is the vizier who is attested in Deir el-Medina correspondence, whereas the mayor of Thebes or other high officials are mostly absent.\textsuperscript{174}

At Deir el-Medina itself, the crew was directed by a foreman, who, among other titles, was referred to as

- Chief in/of the Great Place
- Overseer of the construction works in/of the Great Place
- Overseer of the constructions works in the rock tomb of the King

At least three individuals from the middle of the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty are attested in this position. Since Neferhebef and Kha must have been contemporaries at a certain time, Russo suggested that they directed the work on the tomb together, in a construction similar to that of the Ramesside Period where the workforce was divided into halves, a right side and a left side, each with their own foreman.\textsuperscript{175} There are however no indications for such an organisation other than the fact that Kha and Neferhebef were probably both alive during a particular period. Russo hypothesised furthermore that one could only become a Chief of the Great Place after having been an Overseer of the Great Place.\textsuperscript{176} Again, there is no direct evidence for this assumption and both titles may well have been interchangeable, just as the titles \textit{s n is.t}, Great one of the Crew, and \textit{ḥr.y is.t}, Chief of the Crew, were during the Ramesside Period.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{170} Betsy M. Bryan, \textit{The reign of Thutmose IV} (London 1991), 248.
\textsuperscript{171} Cf. Dorn, “Ostraka”, 38.
\textsuperscript{172} Bruyère, \textit{Rapport 1948 à 1951}, 90.
\textsuperscript{173} Russo, \textit{Kha}, 71-76.
\textsuperscript{174} Häggman, \textit{Directing Deir el-Medina}, 132-133, 135.
\textsuperscript{175} Russo, \textit{Kha}, 73.
\textsuperscript{176} Russo, \textit{Kha}, 73-74, 78.
\textsuperscript{177} Černý, \textit{Community}, 121.
In fact, one could make the case that during the 18th Dynasty titles for members of the workforce were in general not very significant. Two professional scribes are attested in relation to the work on the royal tomb, one as ss n(y)-sw.t n s.t ṣ3.t and one as ss n s.t ṣ3.t. Workmen are indicated as sdm-ṣ$ m s.t ṣ3.t, sdm-ṣ$ m s.t mṣ3.t, sdm-ṣ$ m s.t nfr.t n n(y)-sw.t and sdm-ṣ$ n ʾlmn. This inconsistency in titles during the 18th Dynasty can be interpreted as an indication that the organisation at Deir el-Medina was of a more fluid nature compared to the situation in the Ramesside Period. This ties in well with the observation that many individuals of the 18th Dynasty are attested without title at Deir el-Medina. Similarly, a number of individuals are attested from the village with a title that describes a function but does not include an affiliation to the royal tomb or the s.t ṣ3.t / s.t mṣ3.t. The few attested titles that have come down to us include servants (sdm-ṣ$) and draughtsmen (sṣ-qa).

It can be argued that this inconsistency in, or absence of titles is indicative of a workforce that was less formally organised than during most of the Ramesside Period. In part this may have been a consequence of the lack of a local scribal tradition and the standardisation scribal practice it tends to bring about. As suggested above, the necropolis scribes did not hold office within the community itself. That is an important observation. The presence of local scribes at Deir el-Medina during the Ramesside Period has been seen as the main reason behind the scribal culture at the village resulting in the large number of hieratic documentary texts from the site. This argument can also be reversed: the absence of local scribes accounts for the lack of hieratic documentation during the 18th Dynasty.

The general lack of hieratic texts from the 18th Dynasty agrees with the subsequent increase in the number of hieratic ostraca from Deir el-Medina as observed by Haring. Dividing the Ramesside Period in quarters, there are rather few hieratic ostraca from the first half of the 19th Dynasty, much more from the second half of the 19th Dynasty, and even more from the first half of the 20th Dynasty. This increase in hieratic ostraca has been argued to be not a reflection of the archaeological record, but of the development of scribal practices in the community during the Ramesside Period. Not only did the scribal output increase over time, Haring demonstrated that the village community also evolved from a predominantly oral society to one in which texts played an important role as supplements to oral practices. As a consequence, more documentary texts were produced, which became increasingly more standardised with fixed formulas and scribal conventions. One may speculate that data from the 18th Dynasty support these observations. The increase in the local production of hieratic texts at Deir el-Medina from the early 19th Dynasty onwards is preceded by a period during which such documents were not composed locally. Whereas the rising importance of scribal practices eventually led to standardisation of texts and to the development of fixed formulae, the opposite is true for the 18th Dynasty. During this period the absence of a local scribal culture did not contribute to a standardisation of nomenclature for particular occupations, as evidenced by the rare use of titles and the great variety among titles that are attested.

---

178 With the exception of the early 19th Dynasty, see chapter 6, 6.2.3.
180 Ben J.J. Haring, ‘From Oral Practice to Written Record in Ramesside Deir El-Medina’ JESHO 46.3 (2003), 254-255. The decrease of hieratic ostraca from the second half of the 20th Dynasty is explained by the scribes’ decision to use papyrus as a medium instead of limestone chips and ceramic fragments, see Eyre, Employment and Labour Relations, 44-47; Haring, ‘Scribes and scribal activity’, 111.
181 Eyre, Employment and Labour Relations, 4-5; Haring, ‘From Oral Practice to Written Record’, 255.
182 Haring, ‘From Oral Practice to Written Record’, 256-267.
1.5 The Earliest Identity Marks in Deir el-Medina: the 18th Dynasty

Identity marks of the 18th Dynasty workmen are found on domestic objects, pottery and ostraca from the Valley of the Kings as well as at the village of Deir el-Medina, clearly linking them to the necropolis workmen. Interestingly, a group of pottery fragments discovered near tomb 34 in the Valley of the Queens are also incised with workmen’s marks that date to the 18th Dynasty. 183 It will be demonstrated in the next chapters that the repertory of marks from this period is easily distinguished from that of the Ramesside Period. The 18th Dynasty corpus of workmen’s marks can be identified because numerous specimens have been discovered in archaeological contexts stemming from that time, including private tombs at Deir el-Medina and sites located close to 18th Dynasty royal tombs. Ostraca inscribed with marks from this period will be analysed in chapter 2. There it will be shown that these ostraca are readily identifiable on the basis of their layout as well as the aforementioned repertory of marks. 184 This section will be concerned with the provenance of these documents in an attempt to establish when identity marks were used by the necropolis workmen for the first time. Unfortunately the archaeological record is not accurate enough to pinpoint the moment that marks were introduced, because often the exact provenance of the ostracon or object has not been recorded. In some instances the provenance is indicative of a date around the early to mid-18th Dynasty.

Remains of a group of houses where discovered in the area east of the temple enclosure and north of the hill of Qurnet Murai. The houses were dated to the 18th Dynasty on account of the great number of pottery fragments found at the lowest stratum of the site. More precisely, Bruyère associated the houses with the earliest part of the village within the enclosure wall from the time of Thutmosis I. This northern part of the village was thought to have been the site where the first workmen settled at the beginning of the 18th Dynasty. This section of the village must have been removed when the temple dedicated to Amun was built under the reign of Ramesses II. 185 Numerous objects dating to the 18th Dynasty were found in this area, some of which were inscribed with workmen’s marks of the same period. These objects comprise of wooden tools and ceramic vessels and vessel fragments.186

A significant number of ostraca with marks in the large collection of unpublished marks ostraca currently kept at the French Institute for Oriental Archaeology dates to the 18th Dynasty as well. 187 The provenance of the greater majority of these pieces is unknown, and we have to assume that they were recovered in or near the village of Deir el-Medina during the excavations led by Bruyère. In some cases the findspot has been indicated, but that information does not always offer a clear date. Ostraca ONL 6214, ONL 6216, ONL 6293, ONL 6558 and ONL 6788 all date to the 18th Dynasty and were found north of the village in the Grand Puits or in the rubbish heaps surrounding it, 188 and cannot be dated with any more precision. Ostracon ONL 6298 was discovered during the excavations of 1922. In this season, the area of the tomb of Kha (TT 8), the tomb of Amenwahsu (DM 1138) and the tomb of Nu and Nakhtmin (TT 291) were among the sites that were cleared. These tombs all date to the timeframe covered by the reigns of Thutmosis IV, Amenhotep III and Akhenaten, so the ostracon is perhaps attributable to the same period. The provenance of ostracon ONL 6340

183 Magdi M. Fekri and Anne-Marie Loyrette, ‘Vallée des Reines: la tombe VdR 34 d’une reine inconnue et les puits VdR 87’ Memnonia 9 (1998), fig. 4, nrs. 1-5. Together with the fragmentary 18th Dynasty letter (see above, p. 32; p. 38) and the title of Setau (see above p. 35-36), the workmen’s marks from the Valley of the Queens represent strong evidence for the presence of the Royal Necropolis workmen in this part of the Theban valleys.
186 Bruyère, Rapport 1948-1951, 88-89, 91, pl. XXII.
187 They are discussed in chapter 2.
188 The same is true for ONL 6457 and ONL 6589 but an 18th Dynasty date is not certain.
was marked by the excavators as “K 215”, a designation for the kom to the south of TT 215 north of the village, a tomb which had been turned into a chapel during the Ramesside Period. Material from the site came from mixed contexts date to the 18th and 19th Dynasties, which does not allow for a precise dating of the ostracon. ONL 6210 had been found to the southeast of TT 290, which belongs to Irynefer (i) and should date to the early 19th Dynasty. Once again the provenance of the ostracon is not very informative. Similarly elusive is the findspot of ONL 6514. The ostracon had been marked by its excavators as “S3”, which according to Rob Demarée might indicate that it was found in room III of house SO IV. This house is situated in a section of the village that was built as part of an extension during the reign of Horemheb or later and it seems very improbable that the ostracon stems from this time. Ostracon ONL 6789 was probably discovered during the clearance of TT 291, the tomb of Nu and Nakhtmin. If the ostracon dates to the same time as this tomb, it must stem from the late 18th Dynasty. Ostraca ONL 6266 and ONL 6305 were both recovered in the vicinity of DM 1360 in the Western Cemetery. According to Bruyère the tomb dates to the late 18th Dynasty but was incorporated into a house during the Ramesside Period.

Regarding their provenance some of the ostraca with marks discovered in the Valley of the Kings are more telling of their date. A group of five ostraca was discovered in the vicinity of the tomb of Thutmose III (KV 34), and are attributable to his reign. The ostracon will be examined in chapter 2 (2.2.1), but for now we can state that these documents constitute the earliest dated ostracon with marks, and there are no grounds to ascribe ostracon with marks to a time prior to Thutmose III.

Other marks are found on objects from burials of 18th Dynasty individuals. In general such burials are poorly preserved. Most 18th Dynasty tombs were disturbed in the Ramesside Period, in the Graeco-Roman period, and/or in modern times. Fortunately, a small number of tombs can be dated to some extent. A good example is the tomb of Kha (TT 8), which was intact when discovered. It has already been noted above that workmen’s marks were discovered on the objects from his funerary equipment. In total, seven different marks from Kha’s tomb are published. A single mark is ubiquitous: . It had been added to objects made of bronze, an adze, items of pottery and a large number of linen clothing items. The same mark thus occurs on different categories of objects, and several authors have already pointed out that this can only mean that the mark represents the identity of Kha himself. Interestingly, Kha’s identity mark is not only attested on objects from his tomb, but also on ostraca found in the Valley of the Kings and from the village, as well as on pottery fragments found at several locations at Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings.

---

189 Bruyère, Rapport 1931-1932, 55.
190 It is also possible that the description “south-east of 290” designates the Kom 2, a rubbish heap that yielded many Ramesside ostraca inscribed with literary works, see Annie Gasse, ‘Le K2, un cas d’école?’ in: Demarée and Egberts (eds.), Deir el-Medina in the third millennium AD, 109-120.
191 See a remark by Rob Demarée in the record of O. IFAO 696 in the Deir el-Medina Database.
192 See chapter 2, p. 69-71.
195 E.g. O. Cairo JE 72490.
196 ONL 6298; ONL 6330; ONL 6369; and ONL 6424.
197 The Grand Puits (two instances, see Bruyère, Rapport 1948-1951, pl. XVII); the area of the 18th Dynasty houses that were removed during the construction of the temple of Deir el-Medina (one instance, see Bruyère, Rapport 1948-1951, 91, pl. XXII); the 18th Dynasty burials DM 1172 – 1174 (two instances, see Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 123, nr. 7; 125, fig. 69, nr. 7; 126, fig. 70, nr. 14; 127, nr. 14; and 124, nr. 19; 125, fig. 69, nr.
fact that Kha’s mark occurs among other marks on these ostraca proves that these documents deal with the 18th Dynasty necropolis workmen, and that they record the presence of these individuals in the Valley of the Kings as well as at the village.

But Kha’s mark is not the only identity mark attested elsewhere. The other six workmen’s marks on objects from his tomb are likewise found on ostraca and objects from the Valley of the Kings and from the village. In the tomb of Kha they are found on a drill (mark $\times$), a plant-shaped altar holder (mark $\mathsf{R}$), a bronze bowl (mark $\mathsf{H}$) and several ceramic vessels (marks $\mathsf{T}$, $\mathsf{D}$, $\mathsf{R}$ and $\mathsf{S}$). These identity marks must represent contemporaries of Kha, workmen with whom Kha was in close contact during the construction of the royal tomb. Objects with marks of these men are probably objects given by them to Kha, either in life or posthumously, to be included in his funerary equipment. This interpretation would be analogous to several other objects from TT 8 that are inscribed for individuals other than Kha and his wife, which are seen as gifts. The practice of gift-giving is also attested in the 18th Dynasty tombs of the Eastern Cemetery. In several of these burials a number of ceramic vessels were found, all with very similar content consisting of bread, pieces of fruit, other small ceramic vessels, pieces of linen etc. These vessels have been interpreted as gifts to the deceased, and among other indications they suggest a strong communal involvement in the composition of the funerary equipment of the burials.

Apart from the tomb of Kha, workmen’s marks are attested in several other tombs in the Western Cemetery that were dated to the 18th Dynasty by Bruyère. With a few exceptions, none of tomb owners can be identified because of the disturbed nature of the burials and as such the tombs have received little attention after their initial publication. Bruyère himself was often very brief in his descriptions of the graves. Nevertheless, these tombs are numerous and comprise an important portion of the Western Cemetery. Going through the excavation reports of Bruyère one comes to a total of about 180 burials.

---

19; 126, fig. 70, nr. 11; 127, nr. 11); also in the 19th Dynasty burial TT 9 (see Bruyère, Rapport 1924-1925, 106, nr. 11; perhaps reused from the 18th Dynasty? The tomb is situated c. 30 meters east of DM 1172). The mark of Kha is also inscribed on a limestone seat discovered in TT 323 (see Bruyère, Rapport 1923-1924, 89, pl. XXV, nrs. 11-12), the tomb of Pashedu (vii) who was active during the early 19th Dynasty. His tomb is located in close vicinity to TT 8, the tomb of Kha, and it is plausible that Pashedu had reused Kha’s seat. Pashedu is unlikely to have inherited the mark from Kha because the two men were no relatives, see Davies, Who’s who, 155-156.

---

198 Perhaps on a bowl discovered in front of the tomb of Siptah (KV 47), see Aston, Pottery recovered, 69, pl. 62, nr. 532.

199 Turin S. 8363 RCGE 19414, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, fig. 48, 1; Anna Maria Donadoni, Enrichetta Leospo, Elvira D’Amico et al., Il Museo Egizio di Torino. Guida alla lettura di una civiltà. Nuova Edizione (Turin 1993), 152.

200 Cairo JE 38642, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, 144, fig. 128.

201 Turin S. 8218 RCGE 19799, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, fig. 118, 4.

202 Turin S. 8375 RCGE 19421, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, fig. 52, 2; Turin S. 8250 RCGE 19766, see http://collezioni.museoegizio.it/eMuseumPlus?service=ExternalInterface&module=collection&objectId=102449&viewType=detailView; Turin S. 8349 RCGE 19392, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, fig. 147, 2; Turin S. 8436 RCGE 19788, see Schiaparelli, La tomba, fig. 121, 3.

203 See also chapter 2, 2.6.5.

204 Cf. e.g. Russo, Kha, passim; Trappani, ‘Behind the mirror’, passim.


no more precision than to the 18th Dynasty, but in some cases there were indications of a more specific date:

DM 1042: contemporaneous with TT 340 (Amenemhat), beginning of the 18th Dynasty²⁰⁸
DM 1163: contained mudbricks with seal impressions with the name of Thutmose I²⁰⁹
DM 1164: contained mudbricks with seal impressions with the name of Thutmose III²¹¹
DM 1109: contained seal impressions with the name of Amenhotep II²¹²
DM 1130: contained a mudbrick with seal impression with the name of Thutmose III or IV²¹³
DM 1150: contained a mudbrick with a seal impression with the name of Thutmose IV²¹⁴
DM 1041: contained mudbricks with seal impressions with the name of Amenhotep III²¹⁶
DM 1089: contained seal impressions with the name of Amenhotep III²¹⁷
DM 1300: end of the 18th or early 19th Dynasty, on basis of shape of pit and bricks²¹⁸
DM 1347: end of the 18th Dynasty, on basis of architectural elements²¹⁹
DM 1348: end of the 18th Dynasty, on basis of architectural elements²²⁰
DM 1403: end of the 18th Dynasty, on basis of architectural elements and location²²¹

As most tombs in the Western Cemetery remain anonymous to us, the number of graves that can be securely attributed to necropolis workmen from the time prior to the Amarna Period is very small.²²² Nevertheless, the workmen are attested in a great number of these tombs through the identity marks that have been discovered in them. The marks found in graves of the Western Cemetery dated to the 18th Dynasty by Bruyère will be discussed in more detail in the chapter 2, but here they are already presented in the table below (TABLE 1).

²⁰⁹ This tomb was used in the 18th as well as in the 19th Dynasty, see Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 74.
²¹⁰ This tomb was used in the 18th as well as in the 19th Dynasty, see Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 77, 100.
²¹¹ Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 77, 93.
²¹² Bruyère, Rapport 1927, 98.
²¹³ Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 6.
²¹⁴ Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 27.
²¹⁵ Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 77, 111.
²¹⁶ Bruyère, Rapport 1926 I, 48.
²¹⁸ Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 9.
²¹⁹ Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 93.
²²⁰ Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 110.
²²¹ Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 141.
²²² Cf. Dodson, ‘The Late Eighteenth Dynasty Necropolis’, 97, n. 65; Dorn, ‘Ostraka’, 35. The tombs mentioned by both authors are TT 8, the tomb of Kha, see Schiaparelli, La tomba; Russo, Kha, and TT 325 = DM 1089 belonging to Smen, see Bruyère, Rapport 1923-1234, 100-104; Bruyère, Rapport 1926 I, 50-56. The inclusion of the latter seems somewhat random, because Smen is not attested with a title that ties him to the royal tomb. Likewise, both tombs DM 1166 and TT 354 were included by Dodson and Dorn, although no name or title survives, see respectively Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 119-120; Cherpion, Deux tombes, 59-90. From the reign of Amenhotep III onwards there are more tombs of which the owners are known and securely related to the crew of necropolis workmen on account of their titles. These are tombs TT 291 belonging to Nakhtmin and Nu, see Bruyère and Kuentz, La tombe de Nakht-min, 1-65; TT 338, the tomb of Maya, see Tosi, La cappella di Maia; DM 1138, the tomb of Nakhy and his son Amenwahsu; the former is also attested with his title on a stela from Deir el-Medina, see Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 12-20; Tosi and Roccati, Stele, 43-44; DM 1159, the tomb of Senefer, see Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 40-73; and DM 1352, the tomb of Setau, see Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 95-109. The tomb of Amenemhat, TT 340, see Cherpion, Deux tombes, 5-55, can tentatively be included if a date in or after the reign of Thutmose I is accepted. Mention should also be made of tomb DM 1099, see Bruyère, Rapport 1927, 11-13, which was attributed to Nekhunefer on the basis of a hieroglyphic inscription with this name on a ceramic vessel. No title is mentioned and therefore this man is not evidently connected with the crew of necropolis workmen. Moreover the tomb could not be dated any more precise than to the 18th Dynasty. Very similarly, 18th Dynasty tomb DM 1350 yielded the name Heqanefer but no titles, see Bruyère, Rapport 1933-1934 I, 117.
Also included here are some pottery fragments from burial shaft DM 1164. This shaft is situated in the court of Ramesside tomb TT 356, and was dated by Bruyère to the 18th and 19th Dynasties. A breakthrough exists between this burial and DM 1165, dated to the 18th Dynasty. Whether DM 1164 was originally an 18th Dynasty burial is not precisely clear, but it is evident that at some point the shaft was used for the burial for Amek (i) who lived during the early 19th Dynasty. The ceramic fragments from DM 1164 indicate that the content is obviously mixed, as they display both workmen’s marks datable to the 18th Dynasty as well as marks of the Ramesside Period. Only those marks that date to the 18th Dynasty are incorporated in this overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM tomb</th>
<th>Attested name</th>
<th>Indication of date</th>
<th>Attested marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty; seal impression with name of Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court 1056; from TT 210</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>name Kakheperre on bandage of mummy</td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Smen?</td>
<td>18th Dynasty; seal impression with name of Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>Nekhunefer; Senneferhotep?</td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th Dynasty; seal impression with name of Amenhotep III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

223 Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 76-77.
224 Bruyère, Rapport 1928 II, 95-100.
225 Omitted is a vessel from TT 291 (Nakhtmin and Nu), which is dated to the very end of the 18th Dynasty and which contained three marks: one is datable to the 19th Dynasty, one is unclear, and the third could date to the 18th Dynasty or the Ramesside Period. Because the latter mark is of an uncertain date it is here excluded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Impression with name of Amenhotep II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Seal impressions with name of Thutmosis IV (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Ipu, son of Akhy (?)</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Large amphora with inscription in hieratic: a year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>Jar with name of Amun [...]</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Seal impression with name of Thutmosis IV; hieratic inscription on pottery dated to the 18th Dynasty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153-55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Fragment of an amphora with hieratic inscription: a year 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Seal impression with name of Thutmosis III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>reused (?) by Amek (i)</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Mudbrick with a seal impression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

TABLE 1. OVERVIEW OF MARKS ATTESTED IN 18TH DYNASTY TOMBS IN THE WESTERN CEMETERY

In at least 49 tombs in the Western Cemetery dated to the 18th Dynasty, workmen’s marks were found that are also attested elsewhere on ostraca and on objects. In total, these 49 tombs contained 162 objects – mostly pottery fragments – with workmen’s marks, displaying 58 different marks and four damaged, unclear marks. The greater majority of these marks dates to the 18th Dynasty,\(^\text{227}\) which supports Bruyère’s date of these tombs in the 18th Dynasty.

Apart from the Western Cemetery, workmen’s marks were discovered in tombs of the Eastern Cemetery as well. All of the cemetery’s tombs were dated to the timeframe of the beginning of the 18th Dynasty until the reign of Akhenaten by Bruyère, on the basis of the architecture of the burials, the names of the deceased, the pottery and the royal names found on scarabs from the tombs.\(^\text{228}\) Moreover, he noted that apart from a sector for the exclusive burial of adults, the necropolis comprised of a zone for the interments of both children and adults and one for placentae, infants and children.\(^\text{229}\) The burials of the Eastern Cemetery typically consist of a pit or small shaft leading to one small and irregularly cut room. None of the tombs were decorated and Bruyère’s team did not find traces of any superstructures. As a

\(^{227}\) The date of these marks will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2, 2.5.


consequence, these burials are often said to be “poor” or “simple”. Reportedly, a large number of the burials were not published, and in his excavation reports Bruyère seems to have focused only on his tombs DM 1365 – 1390.\textsuperscript{230} The location of the Eastern Cemetery would suggest a connection with the village of Deir el-Medina and hence with the necropolis workmen, but such an assumption was contested by several authors. Bernadette Letellier was the first to question whether the individuals buried in the Eastern Cemetery were at all associated with work on the royal tomb.\textsuperscript{231} Similarly, Aidan Dodson pointed out that because of the absence in the Eastern Cemetery of titles linking the deceased to necropolis workmen, the buried individuals could not be securely identified as (family members of) necropolis workmen.\textsuperscript{232} Geneviève Pierrat-Bonnefois shared this point of view and proposed to see the Eastern Cemetery in a different light. According to her theory, the burials belonged to members of the household personnel of the Theban elite or to persons who were responsible for their entertainment, since some music instruments were found in the tombs. The absence of titles and the small number of inscribed objects was seen as an indication that they must have been of an “illiterate class”\textsuperscript{233} Regarding the same matter Claudia Näser noted that on the basis of the few finds alone it could not be ascertained if the burials were of musicians,\textsuperscript{234} but for the same reason it was impossible to say if they belonged to members of the crew of workmen.\textsuperscript{235} Näser, in her analysis of the tomb inventories, was however able to point out that the burials contained few so-called “elite objects”\textsuperscript{236} and that the buried individuals were situated at the fringe of the social elite, with limited access to textuality.\textsuperscript{237}

In summary, a solid basis to identify the tomb owners as workmen of the royal necropolis is lacking. Yet, a hypothesis of Hermann Schlögl based on indirect evidence proposes that the ‘draughtsman of Amun’ Tener had been buried in tomb DM 1370 in the Eastern Cemetery. This Tener has already been mentioned above in the discussion of stela Turin CG 50004. This stela is dedicated to the Royal Scribe of the Great Place Amenemope and his son the draughtsman of Amun Tener. The monument forms the ground for the assumption that Tener was a necropolis workman during the 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty, and it was dated by Schlögl to the time of Thutmosis III. The same author remarked that a shabti of unknown provenance is inscribed for a draughtsman of the name of Tener. The addition $n\textit{ Imn}$ is lacking there, but since the shabti was attributable to the period of Thutmosis I – Thutmosis III, Schlögl proposed to identify the shabti’s owner with the draughtsman Tener of stela Turin CG 50004.\textsuperscript{238} Moreover, Schlögl suggested that the shabti must have come from tomb DM 1370 in the Eastern Cemetery. In this tomb a coffin belonging to a lady called Madja, as well as the coffin of an anonymous male were discovered. Since the dating, the painting technique, the shape of the wig, the ductus of the signs, and the colours of the paint on the coffin of Madja are very similar to the shabti of Tener, Schlögl suggested that they could have come from the same burial.\textsuperscript{239} If this proposition is accepted, there would be – through the association of Tener’s father – indirect evidence to connect at least one burial in the Eastern Cemetery of Deir el-Medina with the work on 18\textsuperscript{th} Dynasty royal tombs.

\textsuperscript{230} Näser, ‘Zur Interpretation’, 373.
\textsuperscript{232} Dodson, ‘The Late Eighteenth Dynasty Necropolis’, 97; Dorn, ‘Ostraka’, 35 and n. 30.
\textsuperscript{233} Pierrat-Bonnefois, ‘Cimetière est du village’, 60-61.
\textsuperscript{235} Näser, ‘Zur Interpretation’, 391.
\textsuperscript{236} Näser, ‘Zur Interpretation’, 380.
\textsuperscript{237} Näser, ‘Zur Interpretation’, 391.
\textsuperscript{238} Schlögl, ‘Ein Beitrag’, 432-438.
\textsuperscript{239} Schlögl, ‘Ein Beitrag’, 442.
There is however another important reason to associate the burials of the Eastern Cemetery with the Deir el-Medina workmen: the objects found in these tombs that display workmen’s marks. These marks are discussed in chapter 2 (2.5), but they are presented here in the table below (TABLE 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DM tomb</th>
<th>Attested name</th>
<th>Indication of date</th>
<th>Attested marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hatshepsut – Thutmosis III</td>
<td>x; †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>m; m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>; ; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>- Nebu Ibenattan Nehemtu (?)</td>
<td>Hatshepsut – Thutmosis III</td>
<td>; ; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x; ; ; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388</td>
<td>Satre</td>
<td>Thutmosis III; “year 26”</td>
<td>; 240 ; ; ; m ;  ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Thutmosis III</td>
<td>; ; ; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Tomb of a child</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>; ; ; ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Tomb of a child</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. OVERVIEW OF MARKS ATTESTED IN 18TH DYNASTY TOMBS IN THE EASTERN CEMETERY

In 12 of the 26 published tombs – seven of which were virtually empty when discovered – objects with marks on them were found. In total, the necropolis contained 28 or 29 marked objects, displaying 14 different marks. With two exceptions, all these marks are attested on 18th Dynasty ostraca and objects from other locations. In fact, the majority of these marks is attested exclusively in the 18th Dynasty and do not occur in Ramesside contexts. The marks are therefore an important indication of the presence of 18th Dynasty necropolis workmen in the Eastern Cemetery. There is no direct evidence that workmen were buried in this necropolis, but the workmen’s marks do make this idea attractive and even probable. If we assume that this was indeed the case, we are offered a rare view into the community of the 18th Dynasty workmen. The women and children buried in the Eastern Cemetery must have been family members of the necropolis workmen, and must have lived with them at the village of Deir el-Medina. That would imply that the village was, at some point before the Amarna Period, permanently occupied by the workmen and their families as it was during the Ramesside Period.242

240 Bruyère’s publication is unclear regarding this mark, found on an amphora with the cartouches of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III. The same mark may have been attested on a similar amphora, but the passage in Bruyère’s report could also be dealing with the same vessel, see Bruyère, Rapport 1934-1935 II, 93 and 194.
241 See Bruyère’s notebooks for the last two marks:
EXCURSUS I. MARKS AT AMARNA
During year 6 of his reign, Akhenaten, moved the capital of Egypt to a new location. His new city, Akhetaten, is located at the site nowadays known as Tell el-Amarna. The residence included quarters for civilians, palaces and temples, while a royal tomb was prepared in a wadi opening onto of the central city. In between the Royal Wadi and the main city of Amarna lies an isolated site called the Workmen’s Village, which was constructed to house the workmen responsible for the construction and decoration of the tomb of the king in the Royal Wadi and perhaps of some of the tombs of officials at Amarna.\(^{243}\)

It has occasionally been postulated that among these workmen must have been members of the crew of Theban necropolis workmen, who were regarded as specialists and were sent to Amarna where they were needed in the work on the tombs that had to be prepared there. This idea is based on a number of arguments. One concerns an inscription on a seat of which the location is currently unknown. A copy of this inscription was published by Brugsch who stated that the seat was found at Thebes.\(^{244}\) The text mentions a *sdm*-\(^{2}\) \(m\) \(st\) \(ms\)-\(^{3}\) \(t\) \(hr\) \(inn\)-\(^{t}\) \(t\) \(sh\)-\(^{t}\) \(n\)-\(^{t}\) \(in\) \(n\)\(shy\), ‘servant in the Place of Truth on the West of Akhetaten, Nakhy’. Černý remarked that here the term *st* \(ms\)-\(^{3}\) \(t\) – well attested at Deir el-Medina from the end of the 18\(th\) Dynasty to the 20\(th\) Dynasty – was used to designate a location in Akhetaten, referring to the place of the burial of the royal tomb. Hence, Nakhy must have been a workmen involved in the construction of the royal tomb at Amarna. Since the seat was said to have come from Thebes, Černý believed that Nakhy brought his valuables to Deir el-Medina “when Ekhnaton’s residence was abandoned and the workmen of the king’s Tomb transferred back to Dêr el-Medîna.”\(^{245}\) However, later research argued this reasoning to be incorrect, because this particular spelling of the toponym Akhetaten was never used for Amarna itself, but for Thebes during the early reign of Akhenaten.\(^{246}\)

Valbelle believed that the sheer existence of the Amarna workmen’s village, its houses, and the nearby chapels were enough to prove a connection between the workmen’s community of Deir el-Medina and Amarna. The instances of titles at Deir el-Medina that include the element *itn*, were interpreted by her as evidence that some of workmen had returned from Amarna, while mudbricks with seal impressions of Amenhotep IV found at Deir el-Medina were seen as evidence that a few workmen had stayed. Moreover, Valbelle thought it probable that the reorganisation of the village under the reign of Horemheb was a consequence of the departure of a large portion of the workmen, after which parts of the village must have crumbled away.\(^{247}\) Kemp concurred that the two villages of Amarna and Deir el-Medina were similar but nevertheless doubted if the workmen at Amarna had come from Deir el-Medina. He remarked that certain areas such as the animal pens and an area for \(z\)\(ir\) jars had no counterparts at Deir el-Medina.\(^{248}\) According to Samuel’s analysis of the archaeological evidence at the Workmen’s Village of Amarna, there are indications of side-by-side cooperation between households in the different stages of the production of bread at the site. This insight was interpreted by her as an argument in favour of the idea that the inhabitants of the village were members of a previously established community that had moved to Amarna, since a different pattern of pairing of households would have emerged if

---


\(^{245}\) Černý, *Community*, 51-52.


the households had built inter-relationships from scratch at Amarna. In turn, Miriam Müller used this notion as an argument for the shift of the Theban workmen to the new site of Amarna. She agreed with Valbelle’s suggestions and argued furthermore that through a re-evaluation of the archaeological data as well as an assessment of textual evidence dating to the Ramesside Period, Kemp’s missing elements could be located at Deir el-Medina as well.

Kemp himself appears to have altered his views and in a later work, siding with Valbelle regarding the idea that the Royal Necropolis workmen from Thebes might have been transferred to Amarna. In support of this hypothesis he cited the inscription on a wooden statue base from chapel 529 at Amarna, which, he pointed out, mentions an individual with a title that was also used at Deir el-Medina. The inscription is however incomplete at a crucial point. It reads: \textit{\textit{ir(i).n sDm-aS m s.t [sic] nHm-mAa.t.y.w}}, and it is uncertain if we may amend it understand to mean ‘the servant in the Place [of Truth]’, as Kemp did. Additional proof of a move to the Workmen’s Village of Amarna was found in the apparent lack at Deir el-Medina material datable to the Amarna Period. That this is incorrect can be surmised from our previous discussion of tombs and funerary objects from this time. In addition, activity in the Valley of the Kings during the reign of Akhenaten is evidenced by a recently discovered and as of yet unpublished limestone block with a head carved unmistakably in the Amarna style from the site of the workmen’s huts at the so-called Station de la Repos du Col.

In order to contribute to the question of a possible move of Deir el-Medina workmen to Amarna and back, the following overview is an analysis of marks that were recorded at different sites at Amarna, in comparison to workmen’s marks from Deir el-Medina. The motivation behind this analysis is the idea that if Deir el-Medina workmen truly were transferred to the workmen’s village at Amarna, they must have continued the habit of using identity marks. From the onset we can report that no ostraca with series of identity marks have been discovered at the site of Amarna as a whole. One could take this fact as an argument against a transfer from Thebes to Amarna, but it is of course possible that with a move the administrative practices of the workforce had changed. Yet, identity marks could then still be expected on objects where they would function as property markers. Indeed, non-textual marks occur at various sites at Amarna. Marks are mostly attested on ceramic vessels and they have often been described as potmarks. Potmarks may be applied before or after firing of the vessel. At Deir el-Medina, virtually all post-firing marks on ceramics are identity marks of workmen. Post-firing potmarks from other localities could well have served the same purpose. Therefore, the following overview will deal mostly with post-firing potmarks.

253 Kemp, The city of Akhenaten, 191.
254 WHTM 372. This block is kindly brought to our attention by Rob Damare. Related to the hypothesis that the Theban necropolis workmen were sent to work in Amarna is the case of Thutmose, the Chief Draughtsman of Place of Truth who was buried at Saqqara in tomb Bubasteion I.19. According to a theory of Alain Zivie Thutmose’s career had begun in the Theban Necropolis, and during the end of the 18th Dynasty he was sent to work on construction projects in Memphis as well as in Akhetaten, see Alain Zivie, La tombe de Thoutmose, directeur des peintres dans la Place de Maât (Bub. I. 19). Les Tombes du Bubasteion à Saqqara II (Toulouse 2013), 107-108; 128-136. The evidence for this supposition is however very meagre, cf. Haring, ‘Saqqara – A Place of Truth?’ (forthcoming).
An exception is made for the pre-firing symbols painted in black ink, so-called ‘painter’s marks’, found particularly on blue-painted medium-sized closed form jars with a restriction at the base of the neck. The exact provenance of the few published examples is very often unknown, although they are said to have come from the North Palace, the Small Aten Temple, the Central City, the Workmen’s Village and the North Suburb. The function of the ‘painter’s marks’ remains unclear, but Hope concluded that the marks are not connected with storage or transport of commodities.

A total of 134 potmarks (pre-firing and post-firing) were found at the Workmen’s Village during the excavations of the Egypt Exploration Society of 1979-1986. Excavations at the site of the so-called Stone Village have brought to light 13 post-firing incised potmarks. The Stone Village is situated at an even more distant location to the south-east of the Workmen’s village and presumably predates it by some years. The first occupants of the Stone Village have been described as “a small desert-based labour force” that early in the history of the settlement at Amarna could have been “involved in activities connected with the founding of the city, such as the laying out of the city borders and cutting of the Boundary Stelae.” At a later stage the Stone Village expanded into the direction of the Workmen’s Village. Anna Stevens reconstructed that development as follows:

“The impetus was possibly a growing need for desert-based labourers to supplement the workforce at the Workmen’s Village, and particularly to take on less skilled tasks such as stone cutting. Why was this community not simply added to the Workmen’s Village? Conceivably, it was so as not to interrupt the existing social order at this site. We can question similarly why the Stone Village was not laid out at this stage in the same way as the Workmen’s Village. The answer may lie in the reduced social status of the community in comparison to the Workmen’s Village. In part, it could also reflect a community that was newly established – drawn perhaps from the riverside city, and continuing an already established pattern of living.”

A small number of published marks – all potmarks – comes from Kom el-Nana. This is a site immediately south of the Main City of Amarna, which contained bakeries, breweries and gardens. The complex could have accommodated the production of religious and institutional provisions of temples in Amarna.

Another group of marks is found on architectural elements from the Main City. The majority comes from the Small Aten Temple, where marks incised in the building blocks left impressions in the layers of plaster that formed the foundation of the main gateway of the edifice. An unpublished mark (not included here) was applied to the gypsum foundation of an altar in the Altar Court at the North Palace, and a single six-pointed star features in the foundation of one of the stone buildings at Maru-Aten. The marks were called “masons’
marks” by Kemp, who quoted Haeny’s idea that by such signs individual masters would acknowledge their work on a block. Roeder noted furthermore that the fact that the blocks did not bear any relief indicates that they must have been marked already at the stone quarry and were connected with the delivery of building material.

Finally, several talatat blocks discovered at Hermopolis were roughly engraved with a mark. These blocks were stripped from various buildings in Amarna during the reigns of Seti I and Ramesses II, to be reused as building material at Hermopolis. Generally, the marks are not signs borrowed from script or depictions of objects or organisms, but geometric figures. Therefore, Roeder believed they could not have been made by the same artists who cut the reliefs. Instead he presumed they were cut by the stone masons in the quarries. He interpreted them as transaction marks of “Firmen oder Unternehmern” who would have marked the blocks at the moment of delivery to the recipient. A total of 81 different marks are attested on the talatat blocks. The marks would have been invisible to the spectator once the blocks were put in place. Roeder noticed that 10 of the marks were also attested in the corpus of marks from the Small Aten Temple of Amarna, indicating that the blocks had come from this city.

The table below (TABLE 3) includes all relevant marks attested at the sites of Amarna. Shards with potmarks are often very fragmentary, particularly from the Stone Village, and can hardly be compared to marks from other localities. Mason’s marks and painter’s marks include several marks that are attested in more than one instance, such as . That is less often the case with the marks from the Workmen’s Village, the Stone Village and the Main City of Amarna. Based on the accessible material that is preserved well enough to be compared, there appears to be very little overlap between the five marking systems with the clear exception of the marks on the temple blocks. The masons’ marks from the Small Aten Temple and from the Hermopolis talatat blocks are very similar and overlap to a great extent. Obviously both sets of marks come from the same context of building material, and as Roeder suggested it seems likely that the marks were incised at the stone quarry. We may assume these two groups of marks belonged to the same system. The other groups of marks seem to exist separately from each other. The only marks that are found in other systems are those that are very common marks that appear outside of Amarna as well: the cross, the mn-sign, and the lotus flower. There are only four marks from the Workmen’s Village that are also found in the set of masons’ marks. The few marks from the Stone Village are too fragmentary to compare them to marks from the Workmen’s Village. The conclusion that the marks from the various sites offer no evidence that workmen from the Workmen’s Village were connected with construction of the Small Aten Temple, or that they were in contact with the population of the Stone Village, is inevitable.

Similarly there is hardly any agreement between the corpus of marks from the Amarna Workmen’s Village and the corpus of 18th Dynasty identity marks from Deir el-Medina. There a few marks which bear some similarity to specimen in the Deir el-Medina corpus but the resemblance is not convincing enough to identify the marks as the identity marks of the Deir el-Medina workmen. The cross is present on ostraca from the late 18th Dynasty, but it

---

270 Roeder, *Amarna-reliefs* II, 8.
271 Compare e.g. the various corpora of non-textual marks documented in Haring and Kaper (eds.), *Pictograms or Pseudo Script?*.
is a mark that is attested at many other localities and in many other periods.²⁷² The sign is attested on ostraca from the reign of Amenhotep III,²⁷³ but it is also attested on a ceramic vessel found near the tomb of Amenhotep III. It is however a very common potmark as well, which is attested at many other localities.²⁷⁴ The mark occurs in Deir el-Medina in the 18th Dynasty but is not attested after the reign of Amenhotep II. The two marks from the wooden handle at the Workmen’s Village of Amarna are found in the Theban workmen’s community as well, although not necessarily together. If it is possible to interpret the mark as a variant of , both marks are attested at Deir el-Medina in the late 18th Dynasty. That is also true for , if it indeed is a mark and if it represents a circle. The other marks from the Workmen’s Village of Amarna are not securely attested in Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings during the 18th Dynasty. The marks are hardly reminiscent of the Deir el-Medina identity marks of the early 19th Dynasty either, with the exception of and .²⁷⁵ Yet, other marks such as , , and are not attested in this period. More importantly, the marks of the Amarna Workmen’s Village are attested in rather small numbers, suggesting they are not as frequent as in the Theban necropolis. It can only be concluded that the marks from Amarna do not offer any hard evidence that allows for an identification of the workmen at Amarna with the Theban necropolis workmen of the end of the 18th Dynasty or from the early 19th Dynasty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workmen’s Village</th>
<th>Stone Village</th>
<th>Amarna Main City</th>
<th>Painter’s marks</th>
<th>Mason’s marks</th>
<th>Talatat blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 111</td>
<td>Post-firing, painted</td>
<td>Workmen’s Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 112</td>
<td>Incised post firing</td>
<td>Workmen’s Village, Gate street 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 426</td>
<td>Incised post-firing</td>
<td>Workmen’s Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 599</td>
<td>Incised, post-firing</td>
<td>Workmen’s Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 136</td>
<td>Incised (post-firing?)</td>
<td>Unknown provenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁷² Ibidem.
²⁷³ See below, chapter 2, p. 119-120.
²⁷⁴ Cf. above, p. 53, n. 271.
²⁷⁵ See below, chapter 5, 5.2.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Image](image1.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 139  
Workmen’s Village  
Incised, post-firing |
| ![Image](image2.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 391  
Technique unknown  
Workmen’s Village |
| ![Image](image3.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 450  
Technique unknown  
Provenance unknown |
| ![Image](image4.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 472  
Incised, post-firing  
Workmen’s Village |
| ![Image](image5.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 582  
Workmen’s Village  
Incised, post-firing |
| ![Image](image6.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 598  
Workmen’s Village  
Incised, post-firing |
| ![Image](image7.png)  | Obj nr. 61154  
Incised, post firing  
Gate street, Workmen’s Village |
| ![Image](image8.png)  | Peet and Wooley, *City City* I, pl. XXII, Obj nr. 21/342  
wooden handle  
Incised  
Gate street, Workmen’s Village |
| ![Image](image9.png)  | Stevens, *Stone Village II*, obj. nr. 39035  
Incised, post firing |
| ![Image](image10.png)  | Rose, *Pottery*, vessel 35  
Traced in gypsum  
From Kom el-Nana |
| ![Image](image11.png)  | Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4; Rose, *Pottery*, fig. 3.4c |
| ![Image](image12.png)  | Small Aten Temple  
Incised  
22 instances |

276 So according to Roeder, *Amarna-reliefs* II, 8, but not included in Kemp (ed.), *Amarna Reports* V; unclear in Pendlebury, *The city III*. 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 38088</th>
<th>Incised, post firing</th>
<th>8 instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 37752</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td>At least 1 instance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 37751</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 39068</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 39083</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 39144</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 39199</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 37349</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 38243</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 38244</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Stone Village II, obj. nr. 39196</td>
<td>Incised, post firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, vessel 41</td>
<td>Painted? Main City North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, <em>Pottery</em>, fig. 3.4a</td>
<td>Painted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five instances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Palace; Q42.1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41.14; Coronation Hall;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rose, <em>Pottery</em>, fig. 3.4b</th>
<th>Painted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery area behind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tomb painted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rose, <em>Pottery</em>, vessel 454</th>
<th>Incised, post-firing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main City North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rose, <em>Pottery</em>, vessel 690</th>
<th>Incised, post-firing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kom el-Nana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rose, <em>Pottery</em>, fig. 3.4d</th>
<th>Painted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kom el-Nana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Aten Temple</th>
<th>Incised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 instances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Aten Temple</th>
<th>Incised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 instances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Aten Temple</th>
<th>Incised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 instance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1. Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>6 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>7 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>3 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Small Aten Temple" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Maru-Aten" /></td>
<td>Incised</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rose, 'Some remarks', fig. 4; Rose, *Pottery*, fig. 3-4c*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4c</th>
<th>3 instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4; 2 instances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, ‘Some remarks’, fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. DEIR EL-MEDINA DURING THE 18TH DYNASTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Pottery, fig. 3.4c</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance, 2 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance, 2 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance, 6 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 instance</td>
<td>2 instances</td>
<td>1 instance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. DEIR EL-MEDINA DURING THE 18\textsuperscript{th} DYNASTY

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. OVERVIEW OF MARKS ATTESTED AT AMARNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at least 1 instance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 instances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excursus II. The Marks of the Quarry of Qurna**

A number of non-textual marks are recorded in the limestone quarry at Qurna situated in the vicinity of the beginning of the path leading to the Valley of the Kings. Stone blocks that were extracted from the quarry were used in the memorial temples of Hatshepsut and Amenhotep III. Reportedly galleries A – D were exploited under Amenhotep III and it is in these locations that the marks are found. The marks have been compared to the identity marks of the 18th Dynasty found on ostraca from the Valley of the Kings.

In gallery D an instance of the sign Σ was found, and signs Σ and Φ are inscribed in gallery A. As an identity mark, the sign Σ is attested in the 18th, 19th and 20th Dynasties at Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings. On the east wall of gallery A a group of marks is painted in red. Depicted above a horizontal line of marks is a recumbent dog or jackal. It is slightly larger than the other signs and drawn with much more detail than the other signs. Two similar dogs are found in gallery B with a small circle but no other marks or signs. The painted dog in gallery A might therefore not be a mark, but a representation of an animal or a divinity.

The other marks, presented in the table below (Table 4), do indeed have much in common with the 18th Dynasty identity marks of the Deir el-Medina workmen. Mark Μ occurs in the Ramesside Period but is not securely attested on ostraca of the 18th Dynasty. The mark is however found on a pottery fragment from tomb DM 1153-1155 in the Western Cemetery, dated to the 18th Dynasty, and perhaps also in the neighboring tomb DM 1150. Similarly, mark Φ is not attested on ostraca from the 18th Dynasty but does closely resemble Φ, amply attested at Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings in the 18th Dynasty. Mark Φ is not recorded at Deir el-Medina and the Theban Necropolis. Mark Φ is probably identifiable as a bird and could be the duck or goose that is often encountered on ostraca from the 18th Dynasty, whereas mark Φ is attested on ostraca in a horizontal variant. Marks Φ and Φ are well attested at Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings, but usually in a form that is rotated 180 degrees. The mark Φ is probably not completely preserved and cannot be clearly identified. The remaining marks are all known from the 18th Dynasty workmen’s community. While the majority of these marks are found throughout several reigns, marks Σ and Φ are typical for ostraca dated to the reign of Thutmose III rather than the reign of Amenhotep III. They are not securely attested after the reign of Amenhotep II. Conversely, mark Φ is associated with ostraca and contexts from the period after the reign of

---

279 Nishimoto, Yoshimura and Kondo, ‘Hieratic inscriptions’, 21 and fig. 6.
280 Nishimoto, Yoshimura and Kondo, ‘Hieratic inscriptions’, 21 and fig. 9.
281 Compare the depiction of divinities in combination with non-textual marks in the stone quarries of Gebel el-Silsila, see Nilsson, ‘Pseudo Script in Gebel el Silsila’, 136-138.
282 See chapters 3 and 4.
283 The orientation of the 18th Dynasty workmen’s marks on ostraca does not appear to have been very important to their users, see chapter 2, 2.2.2 and 2.4.
Amenhotep II. Ostraca with sets of marks comparable to that of the Qurna graffito are dated to the reign of Amenhotep III. O. Stockholm MM 14130\(^{284}\) displays seven of the same marks (דוד, ג, ה, י, ו, ז, ח) as does ONL 6788\(^{285}\) (ל, מ, נ, ג, ו, ז, ח). Related is probably also ONL 6465,\(^{286}\) also associated with the reign of Amenhotep III, which displays five similar marks (ל, מ, נ, ג, ו). These similarities aside, it cannot be proven that the marks in the quarry of Qurna are the same identity marks of the Deir el-Medina workmen. It is nevertheless evident that gallery A contains 12 out of 14 marks that are attested in the Deir el-Medina corpus if one allows the identification of certain variants.\(^{287}\) If these marks were indeed left at the quarry of Qurna by Deir el-Medina workmen, they should date to the reign of Amenhotep III rather than to the reign of Thutmosis III. Theoretically it would seem more than plausible that the workmen were able to visit the quarry of Qurna and leave their identity marks. One could even speculate that Deir el-Medina workmen were involved in the quarrying process. Those marks that are not attested at the Theban Necropolis could then be explained as the identity marks of quarrymen who were primarily assigned to work in Qurna, and who were occasionally assisted by Royal Necropolis workmen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Attestation at Deir el-Medina and the Valley of the Kings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>Objects: tomb DM 1153-1155; perhaps DM 1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>If a variant of ס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>If a variant of ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>If a variant of י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>Ostraca and objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>If a variant of ק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>Unattested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4. OVERVIEW OF MARKS ATTESTED IN THE QUARRY OF QURNA**

### 1.6 CONCLUSIONS

How can we explain the emergence of the practice of using identity marks in the workmen’s community?\(^{288}\) As has been shown, the marks of Deir el-Medina are far from unique. It may be due to a bias in the archaeological record, but several different types of marking systems are attested in Egypt during the 18th Dynasty, particularly in the Theban region. Marks used in the construction of the funerary temples of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III at Deir el-Bahari may belong to various locally employed systems. Some marks may be control marks, others may refer to specific elements of the building, or to institutions, teams of workmen, or individuals. The (re-)assembly marks on the sarcophagi of Maiherperi and of Meryt date to the second half of the 18th Dynasty, as do the weavers’ marks on the linen of the tomb of

---

\(^{284}\) See chapter 2, p. 98-99.

\(^{285}\) See chapter 2, p. 97-98.

\(^{286}\) See chapter 2, p. 106.

\(^{287}\) Excluding the drawing of the canine; including mark אדר.

\(^{288}\) The emergence of the Deir el-Medina marking system in will be discussed in chapter 2, 2.6 and passim, taking into account the function(s) of the 18th Dynasty documents as well as a survey of literacy in the community of 18th Dynasty workmen.
Hatnefer and the burial of Tutankhamun. The quarry marks at Aswan are probably of a Thutmose III date, those at Dra’ Abu el-Naga, Gebel el-Silsila and Deir Abu Hinnis date to the reigns of Amenhotep III and Akhenaten. A similar date is given to the potmarks from Karnak North and from Malqata. The marks on objects and pottery from different sites at Amarna date to the reign of Akhenaten as well. Outside of Deir el-Medina, 18th Dynasty marking systems are thus known from the time of Hatshepsut onwards, and seem to be in vogue around the time of Amenhotep III and his successor Akhenaten. Based on these records, and keeping in mind that much less archaeological records are available for settlements, it appears that marking systems occur mostly in the context of labour. Surfaces are marked by and/or for individuals working in construction, stone quarrying, carpentry, or pottery production. The marks found on linen and those on domestic objects from Amarna may be examples of identity marks used to designate property in the private sphere. At Deir el-Medina both contexts are combined. We find the marks applied by workmen, a great number of whom were essentially occupied with cutting away the rock in order to create a tomb. At the same time the workmen’s marks are used in a private sphere.

The marks in Deir el-Medina can demonstrably be classified as identity marks used by workmen from the 18th Dynasty onwards. The marks from the tomb of Kha prove that the marks refer to the identity of individuals, since they were found on a large variety of different objects. The identity marks of the necropolis workmen are attested in the contexts of labour (at the Valley of the Kings), funerary equipment (in the tombs of the Western and Eastern Cemeteries) and of households (in huts in the West Valley; on domestic objects from tombs, and in houses north of the village of Deir el-Medina). They are found in the poorest burials in the Eastern Cemetery, as well as in the rich tomb of Kha, a Royal Scribe who possessed royal gifts in his funerary equipment and who had his identity mark imprinted on precious bronze objects. The presence of a great number of workmen’s marks on objects from the poorly preserved tombs of both the Western and the Eastern Cemeteries is best explained by postulating that the workmen themselves were buried in these necropoleis. The variety of marks within a single burial represents the gifts of various members of the community that were included in the tomb inventory. Graves of women and children in the Eastern Cemetery contained objects with workmen’s marks as well, and suggest that the 18th Dynasty workmen lived at the village together with their families.289

The village of Deir el-Medina itself was established in the reign of Thutmosis I. At this time the community seems to have been relatively small, as the archaeological record indicates that only 20 houses had been built. Very few structures at Deir el-Medina date to this early period. Silos and baskets found at the northern sector of Deir el-Medina may belong to the earliest phase of the settlement, and could indicate a (semi-)permanent occupation of the village. Three tombs in the Western Cemetery, TT 340, DM 1163 and DM 1164 may be tentatively associated with the earliest phase of the village. Other tombs in the Western Cemetery are dated to the reign of Thutmosis III up to the reign of Tutankhamun. The tombs in the Eastern Cemetery predate the Amarna Period. Several tombs are attributable to the reigns of Hatshepsut and Thutmosis III, while some may be slightly older.

The earliest securely dated evidence for the presence of the necropolis workmen in the village thus stem from the reign of Hatshepsut. It is around this time that the earliest marking systems of the 18th Dynasty are attested outside of Deir el-Medina. It is also remarkable that the earliest tomb in the Valley of the Kings seems to have been constructed during the reign of Hatshepsut. This date coincides with the earliest securely attested workmen’s marks as well. In the current state of affairs, not a single workmen’s mark is irrefutably associated with the earliest phases of the settlement of Deir el-Medina. The remains of houses north of the

289 This suggestion is supported by the 18th Dynasty burial of a child at the south-west corner of the secondary enclosure wall of the village, see Bonnet and Valbelle, ‘Le village (suite)’, 328-331, figs. 3-5.
1. Deir el-Medina during the 18th Dynasty

Village and the pottery fragments with workmen’s marks were associated with the reign of Thutmose I by Bruyère, but his reports remain vague as to the arguments for such a date. Similarly, tomb DM 1164 in the Western Cemetery contained several 18th Dynasty marks and may be tentatively connected with the earliest phase of the village, but the burial was disturbed and the marks could also have come from the neighbouring tomb DM 1165. Unfortunately, ostraca with marks from the village are often difficult to date on the basis of their provenance as a large group was found in dumps around the enclosure wall. In contrast, ostraca from the Valley of the Kings are sometimes datable on the basis of their provenance and the earliest identity marks from this area are ascribed to the reign of Thutmose III. Other groups of ostraca and pottery fragments are dated to the time of Amenhotep II, Amenhotep III and Tutankhamun.

None of this seems incidental, and we may envisage a change in the community of the village of Deir el-Medina around the reign of Hatshepsut or slightly later, under Thutmose III. More and more tombs are prepared around the village in this period, and for the first time the workmen’s marks emerge clearly from the archaeological record. If the tomb of Hatshepsut was indeed the first tomb in the Valley of the Kings, the workmen seem to have settled in the village permanently during her reign or that of Thutmose III. That is supported by the construction of the first chapels to the north of the village in the time of the latter ruler. The mark of Kha is found on pottery from the Grand Puits, which could be an indication that the overseer of the workmen himself resided at the village around the middle of the 18th Dynasty. Only few structures at the village can at this point be dated to an earlier period, suggesting that before the reign of Thutmose III the settlement was not continuously inhabited by the workmen, regardless of where exactly they would have been employed.

Hence the postulated permanent occupation of Deir el-Medina would have taken place around the time of the construction of the 18th Dynasty temples of Deir el-Bahari. Whereas significant numbers of hieratic administrative ostraca had been produced at this site, no such documents are known for the work on the royal tomb, despite the occasional presence of professional scribes at the site. It seems unlikely that ostraca dealing with construction activities at Deir el-Bahari mention individuals who are also attested at Deir el-Medina. In the light of 18th Dynasty administrative ostraca composed with marks that have been recovered in the village and in the Valley of the Kings, the absence of hieratic documentation of work on the royal tomb is best explained by arguing that professional scribes stored or submitted their records elsewhere than at the worksite or at the village. The necropolis scribes of the 18th Dynasty were therefore probably not permanently present with the workmen’s crew and resided somewhere outside of Deir el-Medina.

The work on the royal tomb was the final responsibility of the mayor of Thebes, and later probably of the Overseer of all construction works of the King. Both offices were based in Thebes, and therefore we may conjecture that the necropolis scribes of the 18th Dynasty submitted their written records at that location. As far as the internal organisation of the workforce can be reconstructed, it does not seem to differ much from its Ramesside counterpart, including a foreman, a scribe, workmen and some specialists such as draughtsmen and sculptors. There is however no hard proof for a division of the crew into two ‘sides’. Some instances of a father and a son who were both involved in work on the royal tomb as evidenced by their titles, such as Kha and his son Amenemope and Minhotep and his son Nakhtmin, provide further evidence for a permanent occupation of the village during the 18th Dynasty. The attestation of workmen’s marks in the tombs of women and children who were buried in the Eastern Cemetery may add to this idea. Remarkably, just over a dozen members of the 18th Dynasty workforce are identified by name and title. Several contemporaries are attested at Deir el-Medina with the title of ‘servant’, without an indication of an institution, whereas other individuals are attested without a title at all. Notable is also
the inconsistency in the titles attested for the 18th Dynasty. All of this may be explained in part by the absence of the influence of scribes, who it seems only visited the workmen on occasion.290

The workmen’s marks from the Valley of the Queens present for the first time hard evidence that the Theban necropolis workmen of the 18th Dynasty were responsible for the construction of tombs in the former area as well. In seems also at least plausible that prior to the reign of Hatshepsut the individuals who were accommodated at the village and the small number of them who are known to have been buried there, were employed in the preparation of the royal tomb either at Dra‘ Abu el-Naga or perhaps the Valley of the Queens, but there is no real evidence to substantiate this suggestion. The painted marks of the graffito in the quarry of Qurna may be another indication that the Theban necropolis workmen were active outside of the Valley of the Kings. These marks could be evidence of the workmen at work in a quarry alongside other quarrymen.

The circumstances regarding the crew of workmen during the Amarna Period and its aftermath remain unclear for now.291 The marks recorded at different sites at Amarna do not provide unambiguous proof of the transfer of Theban workmen to the new capital and back again. There are several tombs and monuments belonging to necropolis workmen that are dated to the reigns of Akhenaten and Tutankhamun, demonstrating that some crew members had remained at Thebes. The workmen’s marks from (the vicinity of) KV 63 and those from the tomb of Sennefer (DM 1159) are datable to the reign of the latter king and indicate that the practice of marking continued after the Amarna Period. The latest 18th Dynasty marks appear to be those found in the tomb of Nakhtmin and Nu (TT 291), attributed to the reign of Horemheb.

290 For more on this assumption, see chapter 2, 2.6.1.
291 On this matter, see also chapter 2, 2.2.14; chapter 6, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3.