Double Review

The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East, by J. David Schloen, 2001. (Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant 2.) Cambridge (MA): Harvard Semitic Museum in assoc. with Eisenbrauns; ISBN 1-57506-907-5 hardback, US$57.50, xv + 414 pp., ills.

A Mesopotamian Perspective

Elizabeth C. Stone

David Schloen has written a large, and perhaps important book, but that importance is marred by its length. Schloen's central thesis is two-fold. First, he presents a spirited defence of a hermeneutic interpretation of the past and attacks all other approaches, especially those based on materialism. His second argument is that Max Weber's idealized societal type, his patrimonial household model, was the basis of society in the Bronze Age Near Eastern and Mediterranean worlds. He therefore concentrates much of his ammunition on attacking competing models of the bureaucratic state and the Asiatic mode of production. As this brief synopsis should make clear, this book is highly polemic and many archaeologists and epigraphers will find his approach, and perhaps especially his tone, offensive. It is not only those who pursue Marxist approaches to history or materialist approaches to archaeology who are criticized, but post-processualists like Ian Hodder are also castigated when they attempt to use hermeneutics to understand material culture. Indeed, Schloen, an archaeologist by training, rejects archaeology in favour of history — or the analysis of texts — as the only valid approach to understanding the past (p. 38), in spite of the fact that post-modernism itself was founded on the thesis that the same text is interpreted differently by every reader. The result of this position is that his book focuses on discussions of philosophy and interpretations of texts, and gives short shrift to archaeological data.

The book is divided into two more or less equal parts. Part I is largely theoretical and philosophical, and indeed, had I not agreed to review this volume, I would have skipped much of the first hundred pages. His lengthy treatise on Heidegger, Dilthy and especially Ricoeur will probably only enchant those who are already enamoured of philosophical discourse. I feel somewhat differently about his discussion of Max Weber, whom I read with great interest more than two decades ago. Admittedly my introduction to Weber took place at a time when archaeology was dominated by the positivist paradigm, but I did not see him as quite the anti-materialist that he is described by Ricoeur and thus by Schloen. Moreover, I always took quite seriously Weber's description of his patrimonial household model — and indeed his other suggested models — as 'ideal types' rather than literal descriptions of the workings of actual societies. Although this is acknowledged by Schloen, he is so much of an advocate for this model that he tends to apply it more broadly than is always appropriate. Schloen is also strongly influenced by Eisenstadt's approach to axial age society, in which he argues for significant differences in the organization of state society between Bronze and Iron Ages in Israel. Schloen explicitly equates Eisenstadt's congruent state model with Weber's patrimonialism, although his bibliography suggests that he has not looked at Eisenstadt's exploration of this model in areas beyond the Near East (Eisenstadt *et al.* 1988).

The last section of the first part comes as a breath of fresh air, as Schloen begins to explore the nature of houses and households in the Mediterranean world. Here he presents the key issues which he wishes to pursue in the rest of the volume: that ancient Ugarit, and by extension the rest of the Bronze Age Near East, is better described as patrimonial than as examples of bureaucratic states or Asiatic modes of production. By patrimonial, he means a society based on an extension of traditional kinship formations into a series of nested households with the king at the apex, leading families in the middle, and the poor as their clients at the base. For proof of the existence of this form of organization he seeks evidence for a lack of differentiation between urban and rural sectors as demonstrated by the practice of

Cambridge Archaeological Journal 13:1, 121–8
DOI: 10.1017/S0959774303000088 Printed in the United Kingdom

agriculture by urban residents, the presence of joint or extended households within urban contexts, and the absence of individual ownership of arable land.

I cannot comment on his discussion of Greek and Roman cities, but do take some exception to his interpretation of their Islamic counterparts, especially the late medieval cities of Syria. He is correct to stress the importance of extended households and their groupings into distinct neighbourhoods — the basic unit of cohesion in Islamic cities — but the latter were not only cemented by ties of kinship or clientage but also by occupation, religion, ethnicity or common village origin. He is also correct to connect this structure with the tribalism prevalent in the Middle East, but he completely misses the dynamic aspect of political relations when he refers to neighbourhood leaders as hereditary (p. 129). This could not be farther from the truth. What drove the Islamic system was the struggle for political leadership that took place at all levels of society, where the means for advancement were a combination of kinsmen, clients and a reputation for learning and piety — the latter demonstrated by generosity in the establishment of *waqf*s, or religious endowments to support schools, hospitals, neighbourhood fountains and the like. Combine this with a system of partitive inheritance, and the position of *'ulema* or membership of the Islamic élite could not be supported within one family for more than a couple of generations (Abdel-Nour 1982; Lapidus 1967). Moreover, although family structures differed little between the rural and urban areas, the cities with their merchants and craftspeople offered a wider political and economic arena. He also misses the importance of the high levels of mobility that exist today and existed in the past in the Middle East, both geographically and between lifestyles. This mobility is well-documented for the Ottoman period in Syria (Abdel-Nour 1982, 288–363) — and for numerous earlier periods in the Near East — and was made possible by the flexibility of the patrimonial household, and not by the unrealistic rigidity that Schloen emphasizes.

In the final chapter of this first section, Schloen tries to demonstrate that the joint or extended family was the preferred type in Levantine urban landscapes. His approach necessitates determining the number of square metres per person within households, as well as the overall density of settlement within their urban centres. Many would take issue with the high density of 300 persons per hectare that he proposes for these ancient cities. Moreover, although he acknowledges that house size likely reflected an admixture of construction techniques (whether or not a second storey is present), household size, wealth and status, this understanding does not play a role in his analysis of household composition in ancient Israel. If we compare his data with our knowledge of houses and households from Mesopotamia — where urban crowding was certainly present — the houses that he discusses seem remarkably small. The typical Mesopotamian courtyard houses which have been interpreted as accommodating extended families are almost all over 100 m^2 in size, whereas the smaller houses which are thought to house only nuclear families differ not only in size but also in plan (Veenhof 1997; Stone 2001). By contrast, the data that Schloen presents in Chapter 8 to argue that joint families were common in Iron Age Israel — and indeed in Chapter 13 for Ugarit — evidence houses which all have similar plans and where the majority are less than 100 m^2 in size.

The second half of the book is entitled *The Patrimonial Household in Ugarit and the Bronze Age Near East*. It begins with a survey of the various models used to describe Near Eastern complex society, but confines its discussion primarily to the application of feudal and Marxist approaches to ancient society by scholars specializing in textual sources, giving short shrift to the more varied approaches advocated by anthropologically-trained archaeologists. Schloen spends three chapters discussing the background to these models, and then delineates their weaknesses as applied to the written evidence from Ugarit. Here he is especially critical of the two-sector model, or the application of the Asiatic mode of production first outlined by Diakanov and later applied to Ugarit and other areas in the Levant by Liverani, Heltzer and Zaccagnini. The validity of his argument is best left to those specializing in the data from Ugarit, but some of his key points resonate with our knowledge of other parts of the Near East, and it is here that the significance of this work becomes clear. Schloen states that 'The same man could be a master or overseer with respect to one group of people and a subordinate or dependent with respect to someone else' (p. 282). Here, although not sufficiently stressed in the book, he makes clear that the same individual may occur in one role in one document, and in a quite different role in a text of another genre. This is a fundamental point without which we will continue to misinterpret ancient written records. He is less convincing in his assumption that the hierarchy of households and principles of heredity were absolute. Is it really true that once a family was in the business of producing ceramics, all their

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

male descendants were destined to be potters themselves? The data are, of course, amenable to differing interpretations, but evidence that sons followed in their father's footsteps — a tendency attested at all times and places — is not necessarily proof that professions were solely hereditary. In addition, the recurrent references to councils of elders in the documents suggest that royal power and prerogatives may not have been as absolute as Schloen suggests. Indeed, it is difficult to understand how those perpetually at the bottom rung of the patrimonial hierarchy were kept within the urban system given that other, more heterarchically-organized modes of subsistence, such as pastoralism, existed nearby. Thus in his absolutist application of the patrimonial household model, Schloen falls into the same trap of placing theory before data as the Marxist historians whom he excoriates.

His last three chapters provide, first, a quick tour of the ancient Near East in search of evidence for patrimonial organization, then a surprisingly short chapter on his own archaeological analysis of the data from Urgarit and, finally, an even shorter examination of the degree to which Ugaritic mythology reflects the patrimonial system. His tour of the ancient Near East is necessarily selective, but his ability to choose only those sources which can be grist to his mill, and to dismiss, as non-existent, data which does not conform, is stunning. While he is correct in his stress on the importance of kinship relations within ancient Near Eastern urban societies, this does not mean that a hierarchical nesting of households and lack of outside exchange systems were also in place. There is nothing, for example, in the Mesopotamian data that would be compatible with his view that the enormous amount of professionally-manufactured ceramics, terracottas and even bronze implements excavated in domestic contexts were obtained only through dependency relationships with larger institutions. Moreover, the stress that he places on the lack of evidence for private ownership of agricultural land is only partially supported by the Mesopotamian data. While it is certainly true that little or none of the grain fields were privately owned — and indeed private ownership of such property has long been shown to be economically inefficient — this is not the case for date orchards, almost all of which were in private hands. Thus, although the data are clear that a significant percentage of urban residents in southern Mesopotamia lived in extended families and practised agriculture — and indeed, if the data from Tell Harmel and Haradum are typical, that there was little differentiation between large and small settlements — these data do not correlate well with his assumption that everything from land rights to manufactured goods flowed through a hierarchically-nested household system with the king at its apex.

These data undermine the argument that he makes in Chapter 13 that if he can demonstrate that some houses in Ugarit sheltered extended families, that most households practised agriculture, and that some facilities were shared between neighbouring households, these data will serve as a confirmation of his overall patrimonial household model. Indeed, in his last chapter, where he considers the content of Ugaritic myths, his description rather than upholding the hierarchy of households that he proposes, stresses more the competition between father and son, between brother and brother, a pattern which is much more consistent with the rough and tumble of political relations in Ottoman Syrian cities than with the more static model which he is advocating.

In conclusion, Schloen is correct in his emphasis on the importance of extended families and farming in ancient Near Eastern urban societies. This is an important point and one which I hope will be picked up by scholars in the field. His extensive philosophical musing, however, and the polemics of his criticism of most other authors may deny him the audience which he deserves. Also a deterrent is the degree to which he seems to force a single hierarchical model on all parts of Bronze Age society in the ancient Near East. An alternate approach would see the significance of the patrimonial (to use his and Weber's terminology) means of social organization in its flexibility, its ability to adapt to largely independent pastoralist societies, to highly flexible urban systems with high levels of social mobility and multiple sources of authority, as well as to those where royal power was more absolute like ancient Egypt and perhaps Ugarit.

There also exist two suspect theoretical leaps. The first is the argument that the use of kinship terminology, such as 'father' and 'son', as metaphors in non-kinship situations necessarily mean that Weber's patrimonial household mode was the sole means of socio-political organization. Indeed, these terms are used in exactly the same way within today's Catholic Church, but this does not mean that modern Catholic societies are patrimonial in organization. In addition, no structural link has been made between the presence of extended family residence, agricultural activities by urban residents and the patrimonial mode of production. For example, Eisenstadt's (Eisenstadt *et al.* 1988) examination of

the prevalence of congruent (a.k.a. patrimonial) and non-congruent early states in Africa does not exhibit correspondence between any one of these forms of socio-political organization and the presence of urban societies characterized by extended family residence and reliance on agricultural activities. In the end, ironically, the weakest part of his work is his archaeological research. Potentially the rich textual and archaeological data from the Near East — especially in those instances, as at Ugarit, where the cunieform texts are found within archaeological contexts — should allow the development of models based on one source and their testing against the other. This Schloen set out to do, but the theoretical linkage between what he sought in the archaeological record and his model was never made. This does not mean, however, that significant aspects of his model do not deserve a more thorough examination by archaeologists and epigraphers alike. I only hope that the excessive length and the repetitiveness of this book does not deny him the readership he deserves.

Elizabeth C. Stone
State University of New York
Department of Anthropology
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4364
USA
Email: estone@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

An Egyptian Perspective

Barry J. Kemp

When we write about the past we unavoidably make certain assumptions as to how it was organized. Or to put it another way, we organize our own thoughts about the past along certain predetermined lines. Mostly we do this intuitively, and either through inclination or lack of time we avoid the difficult task of defining our assumptions explicitly and, an even greater challenge, of relating them to the history of sociology. At the heart of this immensely erudite book is one author's intellectual journey to satisfy himself that he has done the right thing, and properly located the philosophical underpinning for his study of one specific society, that of ancient Israel. Indeed, the whole book serves as an introduction since the main object of his study is reserved for a second volume, yet to appear. Schloen builds his discussion around certain organizing principles that societies have displayed, namely, patrimonialism, feudalism and rational bureaucracy. These are ideal types and he accepts that in reality they do not necessarily exist in their pure state. I came away, nevertheless, with a sense that we are being urged to make social typology our own organizing principle for undertaking the study of the past.

An image crept into my mind as I read. It arose from a visit made a few years ago to the Bankfield Museum in Halifax, in the county of Yorkshire. The museum occupies what was once the house of Colonel Edward Akroyd, a nineteenth-century textile industrialist and philanthropist (Bretton 1948; Webster 1987). It sits in the side of a hill overlooking Akroydon, a model village which he built for his workforce, much admired at the time to the extent that a bird's-eye view appeared in the 1863 number of *The Builder* (Caffyn 1986, 58–64). Between the house and the village, and actually in Colonel Akroyd's large garden, stands a fine church in the English 'Decorated' style of mock Gothic architecture, complete with spire, upon which Colonel Akroyd spent a great deal of money (he died a virtual bankrupt). In the kind of appreciation which archaeologists relish Akroydon illustrates nineteenth-century industrial paternalism, the big house and its cultic adjunct looming over the dependent community mapped in street and architecture on the slope below, with one of the Colonel's mills standing on the hillside opposite. It can make Colonel Akroyd look like the latter-day head of an extended patrimonial household of the kind which Schloen urges us to see as the fundamental model for the society of the ancient Near East.

Akroydon reminded me, in turn, of Port Sunlight at Birkenhead, another and slightly later model village built by William Hesketh Lever (the first Lord Leverhulme) for the workers employed in his great soap factory. Mr Lever played quite seriously the role of the patrimonial head, expressing the view that workmen or their wives who had 'objectionable habits' should be excluded from his model village, and having his staff vet the male partners whom his unmarried female staff invited to the weekly Company dances (Jolly 1976, 81). The architecture and layout of Port Sunlight can likewise be 'read' as an expression of the owner's wish to dominate his community (as in Bell & Bell 1969, 208–13). By outside appearances patrimonialism was flourishing in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain, surviving in the larger farms of the English countryside into the 1950s. It was, and remains, a seductive aspiration for men who have great authority over others

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to regard their charges as if they were their children. The patrimonial household model is as much a state of mind as a shape that society adopts.

But so often the image has been part illusion, encouraged by the deference, sincere or pretended, of those in receipt of the great man's favours. Although Akroydon and Port Sunlight do express tellingly the fundamental dependence of workforce upon employer, nonetheless the society of those who worked in the mills and factories was criss-crossed with allegiances and ties to varying degrees independent of the owner. This was, after all, the age of rapid growth amongst the trades unions. Mr Lever's workforce, despite his profit-sharing scheme and subsidized housing, went on strike in 1922, provoking the owner to vigorous responses which the workforce saw as victimization. Over to the east, in Halifax, a rich variety of societies, clubs, self-help associations, institutes and places of worship (some actually promoted by Akroyd) gave to the employees scope for local loyalties and opportunities for self-improvement that might take them beyond the mills (Webster 1989). These well-documented almost-modern local societies turn out not to conform to a single sociological type. They belong in the modern age of the bureaucratic society, locally they exemplify patrimonialism, and their architecture even provides hints of feudal dreaming. They were composites of layers of association of varied kinds, rather like the layers which stack up to create computer-generated maps and electronically-edited photographs, in which each distinctive category of information is separate until, at the end, they are merged or 'flattened' to form the finished picture. Schloen encourages us to ask of a society, is it feudal, or bureaucratic, or of the patrimonial household variety? The unasked question is whether all these modes co-exist in complex societies, giving the historian and archaeologist the task of teasing out the circumstances in which each occurred and how people adapted their behaviour and language as they encountered first one and then another, perhaps in the course of a single day.

I do not expect the society that I study, that of ancient Egypt, to be like nineteenth- and early twentieth-century England. But I am also reluctant to believe that it was of a different kind altogether, as distinct from being a different mix of basically the same ingredients, with patrimonialism heaped up in far greater measure. For the ancient Near East Schloen draws his criteria strictly, creating a special typological division:

> The term 'patrimonial household model', as opposed to 'patrimonialism' in general, thus serves to distinguish societies that exhibit the 'household' understanding of the social order in a relatively pure form . . . (p. 52).

I have no doubt that it flourished with great vigour, and Schloen's book helps me to see it with sharper definition. For one thing, he gives it a name. His research area is the ancient Levant and so neighbouring areas, including Egypt, are not explored very far. Much more illustrative evidence is there to be used, enough to form the basis for a separate book. The theme has already been taken up by Lehner (2000) on the basis of Schloen's original 1995 doctoral dissertation. The grand and extensive households of the nomarchs of the Middle Kingdom, represented in the two-class cemetery at Beni Hasan, for example, are fine examples, the nomarchs themselves, despite their pretensions, expressing with loyal language their dependence on the king. They perfectly illustrate the nesting of patrimonial households within the largest one of all, that of the king's realm, the household of households. At a lower level still the letters of the contemporary farmer Hekanakht of Thebes reveal the mind of a minor patriarch, who lays down the precise amounts of food to which each member of his household is entitled (Wente 1990, 58–63). In one letter he puts into his own words the theme of Schloen's book: 'the entire household is just like [my] children, and I am responsible for everything'. In their way, the self-help 'Instruction' texts, sometimes called 'Wisdom Literature' (at least the earlier ones), can be brought in as evidence, through their lack of demarcation between the responsibilities of household and official position. They are, in effect, manuals of instruction on how to fit in to a society organized in just the way that Schloen proposes. Schloen's own example from Egypt is more archaeological, namely the inferred household basis of a significant manufacturing sector at the city of Tell el-Amarna, an interpretation now strengthened by the recent study of its textile industry (Kemp & Vogelsang-Eastwood 2001). I have no difficulty in accepting that the patrimonial household model flourished in ancient Egypt. But if this is all there was to society then future research will consist only of identifying further examples and exploring them in more detail.

The ancient past was a lot simpler than the present, but was it so to such a degree that it can be represented by this one type or model? I see the value of Schloen's book in its ring-fencing of a great deal of familiar evidence which undoubtedly illustrates his theme, whilst leaving a more clearly defined field for investigating the extent to which other

kinds of association and organization might have existed contemporaneously. Since the patrimonial household model was evidently something that the Egyptians themselves felt comfortable with, those others are not easy to identify but they are not entirely hidden. The most intriguing and probably best documented are the units of organization to which Egyptology has long applied the Greek word 'phyle'. In the earlier periods they were to be found providing part-time service for temples, for work crews and for the mortuary cults of kings and high officials. A major study of the evidence has made a strong case that originally, in late prehistory, phyles were units of essentially social organization, clan groups, perhaps exclusively male, entry to which was marked by ceremony, namely, that of circumcision (Roth 1991). Each phyle had a name and possessed a ceremonial standard. Certain of them came to supply service to the king, and then for many centuries provided the pattern for the organization of a broad sector of work and service both for royalty and for high officials. Although we know little about the relationship between phyles and families, it would go against Schloen's careful definitions to sweep them all up into the same bag and to see what was perhaps a guild-like organization as yet another example of a household.

The phyle system itself changed its character in later periods. By the Middle Kingdom it appears to have been transformed into a more formal administrative mechanism though we know less about how it functioned. In the New Kingdom the term came to be used for small army units. The extent to which the original concept had changed is made clear by the fact that the term was not used by the one group in the New Kingdom which was supplying the kind of service which phyles had earlier provided, and is also very well-documented. This is the much studied village community of Deir el-Medina, whose members created the royal tombs in the Valley of Kings. Instead what we find is a community of around sixty-eight often small households allowed a surprising degree of autonomy by the king and his officials. It largely ran its own affairs, settling frequent internal disputes by its own court and sacred oracle and, when slighted by outside authority, responding with assertive group behaviour which attracts the modern term 'strike'. Whether or not the members of the community, who called themselves 'Servants of the Place of Truth', saw themselves as a guild, they seem to have behaved like one. A guild-like organization, of which the earlier phyles might have been examples, is something different from a patrimonial household if one follows Schloen's strict definition. To what extent there were other comparable communities in New Kingdom Egypt we just do not know; the documentation for Deir el-Medina remains unique. By five centuries later (the reign of Amasis of the 26th Dynasty) there is evidence for priestly guilds whose members bound themselves with a strict code of conduct and agreed also to provide assistance to members and their families (de Cenival 1972). They in turn provide a possible model for how the much earlier phyles were run, and suggest that bodies of this kind were a feature of Egyptian society throughout its history.

Did other groups in Egypt see themselves in like manner? Schloen argues, in the case of those who administered the 'bureaucratic' side to society, that they too were performing their tasks as members of the ultimate patrimonial household, that of the king, and it is wrong to see them as part of a separate line of authority. I agree that this is basically true, yet it is also true that the administrators themselves, the 'scribes', saw themselves as an elite group (in respect not only to peasants and craftsmen but also to ordinary priests and soldiers and their officers) and expressed this in self-satisfied terms which make little reference to the king (this is the tone of the 'Miscellanies': Caminos 1954). They expressed their sense of a special calling through deference to the cults of Maat and Thoth.

A stronger case can be made for the army although it remains relatively poorly-documented. The fighting hero did not become a literary archetype in Egypt. Nevertheless, such sources as we have imply that from the New Kingdom onwards the army became a permanent, more professional institution in Egypt, though probably also used as a convenient pool of labour in addition to its military function. One of its best-known characteristics was the constant supplementing of its numbers by foreign groups, either captives from previous campaigns or, in the first millennium BC, mercenaries from the Aegean. The army was seen at the time as one of the larger groups in society. This is apparent from royal addresses to the country in the later New Kingdom, more especially that of Rameses III, who categorizes his audience as 'the dignitaries, the leaders of the land, the infantry, chariotry, Sherden (foreign soldiers), ordinary troops, and every citizen of the land of Egypt'. He talks of his reorganization of society into 'numerous groups: butlers of the palace, great chiefs, infantry and chariotry, Sherden and Qeheq (also foreign soldiers), and retainers' (Peden 1994, 212–15). I am not sure that the image of the patri-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

monial household was in anyone's mind here; the picture is more of a country under a home-grown army of occupation. Later still, we have the testimony of an outsider. Herodotus had much to say on Egypt's warrior-class (*machimoi*): how they formed two separate groups and were spread in lesser groups through the districts of the country; and how they had certain privileges (shared with the priests), namely grants of land held free of tax, and an entitlement to food rations (Book II, 164–8). He gives a total for both warrior groups of 410,000. As a factual statement it would amount to one tenth of Egypt's estimated total population, but perhaps he was trying to say simply 'a great many'. The social life and the attitudes of the soldiers and their families are not documented. With their plots of land they might, when at home, have merged into the general background of agrarian society and each been the head of a tiny patrimonial household looking loyally upwards to that of the king. But when on duty they are surely likely to have felt a different first allegiance, to themselves as members of units bonded by common experience and dangers, perhaps seeing the king as primarily their paymaster. Here we have a significant sector of society whose changing circumstances through the year are likely to have meant moving between two different modes of organization, one of them not necessarily representative of the patrimonial household model.

I can see that it is possible, if one loosens the definition, to turn the argument around and to say that Egyptian phyles, for example, might themselves have been a kind of household and are not, after all, an exception. This would illustrate the author's sweeping claim (p. 69) that the patrimonial household model 'applies, quite directly, to all known sociopolitical groups of the third and second millennia B.C. in the Near East'. But it then seems to me that the term is being used as a synonym for any body of people with a shared sense of identity. Since they are a common feature of the modern world, too, the original point of making the definition is lost and an endlessly circular path of argument opens up.

Ancient Egyptian texts paid much deference to hierarchy, and so too do modern attempts to model societies. The approach of constructing typologies and models does tend to make populations seem docile, accepting or acquiescing in the parts they play in the large design. Is this more of the illusion which controllers, patriarchs and others, carry around in their heads? The idea that a cosily-structured hierarchical society could provoke a degree of resistance and rejection certainly occurred to people in ancient Egypt. The reflective literature of the Middle Kingdom envisaged social mobility in both a good and a bad form. Under the control of the king and through loyal attitude and behaviour — through the workings of the patrimonial household model — the poor man could become rich, and no one who was worthy would suffer as a consequence. But the same reversal of fortune occurring outside these orderly limits, when the poor became rich at the expense of the system, that was a sign of a chaotic society, when kingship was not functioning properly and natural calamities could be expected as well. The value of these texts here is that they reveal that people of the early third millennium BC could imagine a society which did not fit into the comfortable patrimonial household model. 'Every town says, "Let us expel our rulers"' (Lichtheim 1973, 151). Those who did imagine it in the reflective literature did not like what they portrayed and expressed it in fearful terms. How far those fears were realized we still cannot tell. We have no rejectionist literature for comparison.

Typologies of society serve to get one started. They provide a rough and ready way of making an initial sorting of the evidence. An equal challenge follows. That is to discover the contrary examples and all the myriad ways in which the broad generalizations have to be qualified. Schloen's book could well become the starting point for many a thesis which takes the form of 'yes, but . . .'.

Barry J. Kemp
McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research
Downing Street
Cambridge
CB2 3ER
UK
Email: bjk2@cus.cam.ac.uk

References

Abdel-Nour, A., 1982. *Introduction a l'Histoire urbaine de la Syria ottomane (XVIe–XVIIIe siecle).* (Publications de l'Université Libanaise section des Etudes historiques XXV.) Beirut: Librarie Orientale.

Bell, R. & C. Bell, 1969. *City Fathers: the Early History of Town Planning in Britain*. London: Design Yearbook Ltd.

Bretton, R., 1948. Colonel Edward Akroyd. *Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society* June 1948, 60–100.

Caffyn, L., 1986. *Workers' Housing in West Yorkshire 1750–1920*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Caminos, R.A., 1954. *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*. London: Oxford University Press.

de Cenival, F., 1972. *Les associations religieuses en Égypte*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774303000088 Published online by Cambridge University Press

d'après les documents démotiques. (Bibliothèque d'Étude 46.) Cairo: Institut français d'Archéologie orientale du Caire

Eisenstadt, S.N., M. Abitbol & N. Chazan, 1988. *Early State in African Perspective.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Jolly, W.P., 1976. *Lord Leverhulme: a Biography*. London: Constable.

Kemp, B.J. & G. Vogelsang-Eastwood, 2001. *The Ancient Textile Industry at Amarna.* London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Lapidus, I., 1967. *Muslim Cities in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Lehner, M., 2000. Fractal house of Pharaoh: ancient Egypt as a complex adaptive system, a trial formulation, in *Dynamics in Human and Primate Societies: Agent-based Modeling of Social and Spatial Processes*, eds. T.A. Kohler & G.J. Gumerman. (Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 275–353.

Lichtheim, M., 1973. *Ancient Egyptian Literature: a Book of Readings*, vol 1: *The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press.

Peden, A.J., 1994. *Egyptian Historical Texts of the Twentieth Dynasty*. (Documenta mundi. Aegyptiaca 3.) Jonsered: Paul Åströms.

Roth, A.M., 1991. *Egyptian Phyles in the Old Kingdom: the Evolution of a System of Social Organization*. Chicago (IL): The Oriental Institute.

Stone, E.C., 2001. Approaching the Mesopotamian City. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Society, Washington, D.C., November 2001.

Veenhof, K.R. (ed.), 1997. *Houses and Households in Ancient Mesopotamia*. (Publications de l'Institut Historique Archéologique Neérlandais de Istanbul.) Istanbul: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Webster, E., 1987. Edward Akroyd (1810–1887). Also a brief history of James Akroyd & Son. *Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society* 1987, 19–45.

Webster, E., 1989. Leisure and pleasure in 19th century Halifax. *Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society* 1989, 23–46.

Wente, E., 1990. *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. Atlanta (GA): Scholars Press.