

VOLUME X

PARTS I-II

APRIL-JULY 1924

**THE JOURNAL**  
OF  
**EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY**

PUBLISHED BY  
**THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY**

REPRINTED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, 1979

ISSN 0307-5133

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
A STATUE OF HOREMHAB BEFORE HIS ACCESSION ... H. E. Winlock ... ..	1
THE TOWN OF SELLE (ZARU) IN THE 'AMARNAH TABLETS ... ..	Professor W. F. Albright ... 6
A PECULIAR FORM OF NEW KINGDOM LAMP ...	N. de Garis Davies ... .. 9
A NEW VIZIER OF THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY ...	Ludlow S. Bull, Ph.D. ... .. 15
UNPUBLISHED HEBREW, ARAMAIC AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM EGYPT, JERUSALEM AND CARCHEMISH ... ..	Rev. Professor A. H. Sayce ... 16
THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS ... ..	Edouard Naville ... .. 18
A RARE VIGNETTE FROM THE BOOK OF THE DEAD	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 40
THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAWLS WITH A RIPPLED STRIPE IN THE THEBAN TOMBS... ..	Ernest Mackay ... .. 41
THE STORY OF THE ELOQUENT PEASANT— A SUGGESTION ... ..	G. D. Hornblower, B.A. ... 44
NOTE ON THE EGYPTIAN PAPYRUS BOAT ... ..	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 46
THE RITE OF OPENING THE MOUTH IN ANCIENT EGYPT AND BABYLONIA ... ..	Aylward M. Blackman, D.Litt. 47
NOTES AND NEWS ... ..	... .. 60
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS :	
W. J. PERRY, <i>The Origin of Magic and Religion</i>	Reviewed by T. Eric Peet ... 63
A. T. OLMSTEAD, <i>History of Assyria</i> ... ..	„ „ Sidney Smith 70
WALTER WRESZINSKI, <i>Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte</i> ... ..	„ „ T. Eric Peet ... 75
W. E. CRUM and H. I. BELL, <i>Wadi Sarga: Coptic and Greek Texts from the Excavations undertaken by the Byzantine Research Account</i>	„ „ H. G. E. White 75
JEAN CAPART, <i>The Tomb of Tutankhamen</i> ...	„ „ T. Eric Peet ... 76
JEAN CAPART, <i>Egyptian Art. Introductory Studies</i> ... ..	„ „ T. Eric Peet ... 77

Contents continued on inside back cover


# A STATUE OF HOREMHAB BEFORE HIS ACCESSION

By H. E. WINLOCK

With Plates I—IV

THE Metropolitan Museum of New York has recently acquired, through the generosity of Mr. and Mrs. V. Everit Macy, a life-sized statue of the General Horemhab (Pls. I and II). It is an object of such remarkable beauty and of such historical interest that a few brief notes on it cannot fail to be of interest.

Including its pedestal, the statue is 117 cm. high. The material is a grey granite. The injuries which it has suffered are surprisingly small. At some time in antiquity it has received a blow, or a series of blows, on its right side, from which it has lost the nose, the right hand and wrist, and a corner of the pedestal. However, the resulting lacunae in the inscription on the base do not obscure its sense, and the missing hand is still recognizable as having held the pen just as the right hands do on the statues of Amenhotp son of Hapi and Paramessu son of Seti found by Legrain at Karnak<sup>1</sup>. That the disfigurement of the nose was more to be deplored was felt in ancient times, just as it was felt in the case of the famous Amenophis in Cairo<sup>2</sup>. In this latter case a new nose was carved in antiquity by depressing the cheeks on either side, with most unpleasing results. In the case of the Horemhab the stump of the nose was chiselled away to inset a new piece of stone, but whether or not this was ever actually done it is now impossible to say. In any case, after due consideration it has been felt in the Metropolitan Museum that the mutilated profile prevented many from doing full justice to the statue and therefore the ancient restoration has been completed in plaster (Pl. III).

The accompanying photographs show adequately the position and costume of the figure, but there are certain smaller details which are not evident. Both on the chest and back there is carved in very low relief the archaic scribe's palette in its hieroglyphic form , ostensibly suspended by a cord over the shoulder. This is clearly nothing but an ideogram defining Horemhab's clerky position. Being drawn in conventional form there is no pretence of showing it either on a reasonable scale or as hanging naturally, and furthermore the real palette in use is a shell resting on the statue's left knee with two circular cakes of ink in it—evidently the usual red and black. Another detail not visible in the photographs is a figure of Amūn carved on the right forearm in sunken relief. This may be explained as something entirely sportive—a whim of the artist or of some later sculptor—but the writer has an impression—not susceptible of clear proof—that it represents tattooing.

The facsimile copies of the inscriptions here given were made by the writer and his colleague Ambrose Lansing, and were collated with the original in New York by Professor James H. Breasted. The translations, however, must not be regarded as in any sense

<sup>1</sup> LEGRAIN, *Annales*, 1914, 15 ff. and plates.

<sup>2</sup> LEGRAIN, *Statues et Statuettes* (42127), Pl. LXXVI.

final. They embody suggestions from several scholars, none of whom, however, can at present spare the time for such a detailed and rigorous study as the dull but extremely difficult Hymn to Thoth demands.

Around the pedestal are two horizontal lines of inscription. On the front, in the middle of the top line, there is an  $\text{𓄏}$ , and to right and left start prayers which are to be read to the middle of the back, and then continued from the middle of the second line in front once more to the back, where both end with the name "Horemhab justified" sharing in common the  $\text{𓄏}$  of the last word.

*Inscription on Base. Pl. IV, top.*

An offering which the King gives (and) Thoth, Lord of the Hieroglyphs, Lord of Hermopolis, who administers justice, who embarks the Sun-god in the Ship of the Evening; mayest thou answer words which are true<sup>1</sup> for the *ka* of the Prince, the Royal Scribe Horemhab, justified<sup>2</sup>:

I was one accurate towards the courtiers: when any crime was reported to me I was ready of tongue in rectifying it: one who enforced the laws for the King and gave regulation to the courtiers: one skilled of speech, and there was nothing which I did not know. I was a leader for everyone, seeing that every man knew his course, and not forgetting that which was entrusted to me. I was adviser (?) to the Lord of the Two Lands: the mentor (?) of all the forgetful, not unmindful of the words of the Lord. I was one who reported to the Council: nor did I neglect the designs of His Majesty.

An offering which the King gives (and) Ptah South-of-his-Wall, Sekhmet Beloved-of-Ptah, Ptah-Sokaris Lord of Shethît<sup>3</sup> and Osiris Lord of Rostau<sup>4</sup>: May ye grant that my *ba* may come forth by day in order to see the Sun's disk, and may ye hearken to his requests every day, as ye do for the spirits of those whom you glorify. Mayest thou<sup>5</sup> command me to follow thee by day and night as thou dost all of thy favourites, because I was a just one of God while I was upon earth. I satisfied them<sup>6</sup> with truth every day and turned my back upon evils before him. I have never [committed sin?] since I was born. Indeed I was one steadfast before God, understanding and content when he hears truth. May ye grant that I be among the crew of the Neshmet Ship in its festival of the District of Peker. For the *ka* of the Prince, Sole Companion, King's Deputy before the Two Lands, the Royal Scribe Horemhab, justified.

Horemhab is portrayed to us in a reverie at the completion of a composition on a scroll of papyrus which is rolled out across his lap. As a touch of realism his writing is carved the right way up to him, and thus upside down to one facing the statue—but with total disregard for reality the hand lying upon the columns covers nothing. The sculptor has had a difficult task. The signs are small; to him they were upside down, and the corners beside the hand and the rolls at either end were hard to reach. Hence many of the signs

<sup>1</sup> Literally "words on account of their correctness."

<sup>2</sup> From the end of the prayer.

<sup>3</sup> The Sanctuary of Ptah-Sokaris in Gîzah (ERMAN, *Glossar*).


<sup>4</sup> A name of the Gîzah Necropolis (*ibid.*).

<sup>5</sup> The change to 2nd Pers. Sing. shows that the following sentences are addressed to "Osiris" or to "God," alone.


<sup>6</sup> The favourites.




Statue of Horemhab.



Statue of Horemhab.



Statue of Horemhab.



Inscriptions from the statue of Horemhab.



are malformed, and worse for us, the lap having been the repository for offerings or having been frequently touched by ancient devotees, the columns 2-9 have become badly worn. Nevertheless it is possible to copy most of the Hymn to Toth there given.

*Inscription on the Scroll.* Pl. IV, bottom.

Praise to Toth, son of Rē<sup>c</sup>, the moon, beautiful in its rising, lord of bright appearings, who illumines the gods,—by the Prince, Count, Fan-Bearer on the King's Right, (2) Great Army Commander, King's Scribe, Horemhab, the justified. He saith:—Hail to thee, Toth, Bull in Hermopolis, in the midst of (3) Ḥesret, who openest the place of the gods, who knowest the mysteries, who establishest their utterances, who distinguishest (one) report from (4) another, who judgest for all men. Skilful in the boat of Millions of Years, waiting for (?) mankind, knowing a man (? reading  $\langle \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{ 1} \rangle$  or  $\langle \overline{\text{1}} \rangle$ ) by his (5) utterance; making the evil deed rise up against the doer; contenting Rē<sup>c</sup>, reporting to the Sole Lord (?) (reading  $\left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{—} \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{—} \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{—} \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{—} \\ \text{—} \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{—} \overline{\text{𓄏}} \text{—} \end{array} \right]$  ?), and causing him to know all that happens. Day dawns when he summons (it) in heaven; he is not forgetful of the report of yesterday; .....of the Evening Ship, contenting the Morning Ship; outstretched of hands (?) in the forepart of the ship of the Pure of Face; who takes the log (?) -book of the Morning Ship, rejoicing with the joy of the Evening Ship at the Feast of Traversing Heaven, overthrowing the fiend, seizing the Western Horizon. The ennead of gods that is in the Evening Ship give praise to Toth, they say to him, 'Praise [to.....], praised of Rē<sup>c</sup>,' when (?) he recites praises to the gods, and they repeat what thy *ka* loves. Thou leadest the way to the place of the ship and thou art active against this fiend. Thou cuttest off his head; thou destroyest his *ba*; thou takest his.....to the fire. Thou art the God who slaughtered him. Nothing is done that thou knowest not, in thy capacity of Great One (?), son of the Great One (?), who issued from her body, Protector of Harakhti, wise enterer into On; who maketh the place for the gods; who knoweth the mysteries and explaineth their words. Let us praise Toth, the exact plummet in the midst of the balance, who passeth by (?) sin, who accepteth him that inclineth (?) not to do evil; the vizier who giveth judgment, who allayeth clamour in peace; scribe of the mat (?); who establisheth the book, who vanquisheth crime; who accepteth what (?) is under the arms (?); sound of shoulder; learned within the ennead; who recalls all that is forgotten; wise for him who is in error; the remembrancer of the moment and of infinity; who proclaims the hour(s) of the night; whose words abide for ever. Who enters into the Tēi, and knows what is therein. They (the gods) shall set (him) down in the list.

There are two points of interest in connection with this statue which are worth working out—first its provenance and second its exact date.

So far as the provenance of the statue is concerned a reasonable case can be made out. The dealer from whom the statue was bought was never asked and never gave any information on its finding-place. However, when it was rumoured in Cairo that the writer had seen this statue, another dealer and an Arab from the Pyramids gave him the hint that it had come from privately owned lands in the date palm groves of Mitraḥīnah. Unsupported this information might be contested did we not know that Horemhab, at a stage in his career when he bore the titles found on this statue, resided in Memphis and there built his

tomb. Furthermore the statue itself bears clear enough indication of its Memphite origin with its invocation of Ptah South-of-his-Wall, Sekhmet Beloved-of-Ptah, Ptah-Sokaris Lord of his Sanctuary in Gîzah (*š'it*) and Osiris Lord of Gîzah Necropolis (*R-š'w*). In spite of these references to the cemetery gods of Memphis, we can safely eliminate the tomb as the place for which this statue was made and class it with the well known statues of Amenhotp son of Hapi and the Vizier Paramessu, son of Seti, found by Legrain inside the gateway of Horemhab at Karnak. We thus return to the dealers' gossip in Cairo, for the palms of Mitrahînah cover the great temple of Ptah, in the heart of Memphis, and we are on fairly safe ground if we conclude that this statue was made for and set up in a court of the Ptah temple by Horemhab at the time when he was residing in Memphis.

The question of the exact date of the statue is intimately involved with our reconstruction of the career of Horemhab. It has often been assumed that he came into prominence in the reign of Akhenaten. The foundation for this idea rests solely on the style of the draughtsmanship of the portraits of Horemhab's sovereign in the tomb which he built in his Memphite days, and of a portrait of himself on a stele in Leyden from the same source. The cartouche of this sovereign has been erased, and regardless of the historical absurdity, Horemhab's own later royal name has been substituted in its place. The original cartouche could hardly have been Akhenaten's, however. All of the inscriptions of Horemhab's Memphite tomb—as of the present, contemporary statue—are frankly pantheistic, and the sovereign there portrayed is even assured that the kingdom is his for all time because "Amûn has decreed it to him." Admittedly, then, the decorations of the tomb are subsequent to the apostasy under Tutankhamûn, and the probability is strong that Tutankhamûn, or his successor, must be the king shown in them. The draughtsmanship of Tell el-'Amarnah did not disappear overnight.

So much for the probabilities. There exists, fortunately, evidence of a more conclusive sort that this statue—and hence the tomb—belongs to the period of Horemhab's service under Tutankhamûn. In 1899, in the passages south of the sanctuary at Karnak, Legrain found a battered fragment of a duplicate of the Metropolitan Museum's statue<sup>1</sup>. From his description of it, the position, costume and size of the Karnak statue appear to be identical with the Memphis one. The material differs in a most interesting way. The Karnak statue is of the same red quartzite as the fragments of the magnificent contemporary group of Amûn and Amenit found near by. Now Horemhab was "Overseer of works in the Mountain of Gritstone"—the Gebel el-Aḥmar, opposite Memphis, where this red quartzite was quarried<sup>2</sup>. Hence it is perfectly fair to suppose that it was under his direction that the Amûn and Amenit were carved, and that he took advantage of the occasion to fashion for himself a statue destined for the same temple.

On both the Karnak and the Memphis statues Horemhab bears identical titles—Fan-bearer on the King's Right Hand, Generalissimo, Prince and Royal Scribe. The inscriptions, however, are different. The two-lined inscription on the base of the Karnak statue gives a double prayer to Amenrê begging for Horemhab honours before the king throughout a long life and a daily entry into the palace and audience with the affection and praise of His Majesty. From the god himself he prays for happiness and contentment

<sup>1</sup> Evidently this is the monument referred to vaguely by Sayce in a letter of about this period in *P.S.B.A.*, **xxi**, 141. The fragment, now in Cairo, is described (but not illustrated) by Legrain in *Statues de rois et de particuliers*, No. 42129.

<sup>2</sup> *B.*, *A.R.*, **iii**, § 17.

and—most remarkable—“life, power, and health!”<sup>1</sup> On the scroll on the lap of the Karnak statue there is an almost obliterated hymn to be sung “from the front of eternity to the back of perpetuity, to the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Lord of the Two Lands, Nebkheperurē [bodily son of Rē] Tutankhamūn, endowed with life.” Unfortunately the words of this courtier-like composition are lost except for fleeting phrases lauding Tutankhamūn because “the laws of the Temple of Amūn are given by him” again, and because “he founds anew the city” of Thebes. Evidently this statue was destined from the first for the temple of Amūn in the king’s residence city, where a pretence of loyalty was advisable. In the Ptah temple in distant Memphis, for which the New York statue was intended, this was scarcely so necessary and Thoth is given credit there for Horemhab’s unparalleled success.

That Horemhab was general of the army under Tutankhamūn is thus incontrovertible, and fortunately so, for it makes it possible to connect him with one of the most dramatic incidents of Egyptian history.

In 1915 Hrozny gave a tentative translation of the opening lines of a Boghazköi cuneiform tablet in the Hittite tongue written with Babylonian words employed as ideograms<sup>2</sup>. In lines 7 and 8 mention is made of the death of the King of Egypt Bib-khuru-riyas who was identified by Eduard Meyer and Schaefer as Nebkheperurē Tutankhamūn<sup>3</sup>. King, two years later, accepted and approved this identification<sup>4</sup>. Recently Sayce has continued the translation through most of the 68 lines of the tablet, again endorsing the identification<sup>5</sup>. The story unfolded is probably familiar to the reader—how the widow of Tutankhamūn was suitor for the hand of a Hittite prince and how the Hittite king hesitated to favour the suit because “my son to the kingship the general of the army has not promoted,” or rather supported.

Taking Sayce’s translation at its face value, we evidently have here a mention of Horemhab. He was great general of the army of Tutankhamūn, and a man whose other titles show him to have had practically dictatorial power. Without his support the Hittites believed that the chances of one of their princes succeeding to the Egyptian throne were highly dubious. In fact, while the tablet closes with the statement that the Hittite king eventually “selected one of the sons” for the venture, we know that he never became king of Egypt. The Divine Father Ay did, and the conclusion therefore follows logically that Ay had the support of Horemhab which the Hittite prince lacked.

Briefly the outline of Horemhab’s career as thus developed is somewhat as follows: (1) We know nothing of Horemhab under Akhenaten, except by inference; (2) he was general of the army and virtually dictator of Egypt under Tutankhamūn; (3) he was instrumental in placing Ay upon the throne at Tutankhamūn’s death, and (4) of course, he succeeded Ay as king. It is from the second of these periods that the Metropolitan Museum statue comes—the best portrait of Horemhab as a private person which has so far come to light.

<sup>1</sup> MASPERO, *The Tombs of Harmhabi and Touatankhamanou*, 11, points out much the same breach of royal etiquette in Horemhab’s biographical inscription in Turin.

<sup>2</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, 56, Dec 1915, 35.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal*, IV, 193.

<sup>5</sup> *Ancient Egypt*, 1922, 66, based on *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, v, 41.

## THE TOWN OF SELLE (ZARU) IN THE 'AMARNAH TABLETS

BY PROFESSOR W. F. ALBRIGHT

EVER since Kùthmann showed in 1911 that the time-honoured reading "Zaru" should be corrected to Sile or Sele, and that the town bearing this name was situated at Tell Abu Šéfah, just east of Kaṅṅarah<sup>1</sup>, historians have been particularly interested in it. While the syllabic orthography of the name, *Ṭ3-ru*, shows that it is of late, presumably foreign origin, a fact not contradicted by the appearance of Selle in late nome-lists as capital of the fourteenth nome, the town certainly attained considerable importance during the New Empire. At this time it was the frontier post of Egypt Proper on the caravan road to Syria<sup>2</sup>, and in this rôle witnessed the march of countless Egyptian hosts, bound for spoil and glory in Syria, or returning with due measure of both. Hitherto, strange to say, the name of our fortress has never been found in any ancient Asiatic document. The lacuna we wish to fill in this note.

In the fourth letter of *ARAD-Ĝepa*<sup>3</sup> of Jerusalem (Knudtzon edition, no. 288), this prince warns the Pharaoh of the shaky condition of Egyptian power in Asia. After some preliminary remarks he goes on to say: "As sure as there is a ship in the midst of the sea, the mighty arm of the king will seize Naharim and Kapasi<sup>4</sup>, but now (meanwhile) the Hebrews are seizing the towns of the king. There is no prefect (left) to the king my lord; all have perished. Behold, Turbazu has been slain in the very gate of Zilû, yet the king holds back. As for Zimrida of Lachish, his (own) servants, become Hebrews, have butchered (lit. slaughtered as a sacrifice) him. Yaptih-Hadad has been slain in the very gate of Zilû—yet the king holds back<sup>5</sup>." In another letter ('Amarnah, no. 335) the chief of Zuhru,

<sup>1</sup> See KÜTHMANN, *Die Ostgrenze Aegyptens*, 38 ff.; GARDINER, *Journal*, v, 242-4.

<sup>2</sup> See especially GARDINER, *Journal*, vi, 99 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This name is usually read 'Abdi-Ĝeba, but the ideogram for "servant" should be doubtless read as a Cappadocian (Naši) word (*Journ. Pal. Or. Soc.*, II, 127). The Egyptian transcription *Krgp* for *Gilu-Ĝepa*, shows that the name of the goddess should be read with a *gh*; cf. Eg. *Sngr* = cun. *Šanḥar* = Heb. *Šin'ar* (i.e. *Šinḡar*), *Ngs* = *Nuḡašši* = *Lčš-Lḡš* of the *Zkr* Stele.

<sup>4</sup> *Kapasi* is usually explained as a mistake for *Kašši* (cf. WEBER, *Notes on the Amarna Tablets*, 1340 f.), but this explanation is most unsatisfactory. I would suggest that the worthy *ARAD-Ĝepa* mixed his foreign names, creating a new blend formation of a very common type by fusing *Kaptara* (Caphtor; cf. *Journ. Pal. Or. Soc.*, I, 191 ff.) and *Alasi-Alašiya*. *Kapasi* is then a vague term for "Mediterranean lands." There is no *š* in Naši.

<sup>5</sup> Text: *enâma elippu ina libbi tâmti, qât (zuruh = Heb. zero') šarri dannatu tiliqqî mât Nahrîma u mât Kapasi—u inanna âlâni šarri tiliqî'u awlât Habîru. yânu-mi îštên ḡazînu ana šarri belîya—ḡalqu gabbu. âmur, Turbazu dêka ina abul âl Zilû (Zi-tu-u)—kâl šarri. âmur, Zimrida Lakisi iqqiûšu ardûtu ipšû ana awlât Habîri. Yaptih-Adad dêka ina abul Zilû—kâl.* The translation offered by Knudtzon is wrong; *šaknati* = *šaknat* and belongs with the previous sentence; *enâma* introduces an oath or asseveration, like the corresponding Hebrew conditional *im*. The reason for my other changes in rendering will be obvious to any Assyriologist.

## THE TOWN OF SELLE (ZARU) IN THE 'AMARNAH TABLETS 7

probably Zoar, in southern Palestine, also mentions the deaths of Turbazu and Yaptih-Hadad, but without any particulars to assist us. Previous writers on the topography of the 'Amarnah letters have made various suggestions in regard to the identification of Zilû, each worse than the preceding. The favourites have been Zelah, an insignificant village of Benjamin, just north of Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>, and Selah in Edom<sup>2</sup>, not to mention Conder's idea that Zilû was Shiloh<sup>3</sup>. Of course, Zilû must have been an important place with gates and walls, which none of the towns suggested, except perhaps the otherwise impossible Selah, possessed.

The point of ARAD-Gēpa's remarks obviously consists in his emphasis on the serious character of the rebellion afoot in southern Palestine. A few lines above, in this same letter, he states that the whole land has slipped from the control of the Egyptian prefects—as far as Seir (*Še-e-ri*) and Gath-Carmel (Ginti-kirmil), the Carmel south of Hebron, near the southern edge of the Judæan hills<sup>4</sup>. If, then, we identify Zilû with Selle, the meaning of the prince of Jerusalem becomes immediately clear: the two Egyptian governors are slain at the threshold of Egypt, at the very gate of Selle itself—yet the Pharaoh takes no steps to restore the impaired Egyptian prestige in Palestine. Whether the words "at the gate of Zilû" are hyperbole or not is indifferent to our interpretation of the passage, which merely implies that the royal authority is no longer secure anywhere beyond the frontier of Egypt Proper, and that it is high time for the king to bestir himself if he wishes to save anything from the wreck.

From the writing *Zilû* alone, the identification would be at least plausible; the syllable *zi* in the 'Amarnah Tablets corresponds regularly to Egyptian syllabic *ḏ*, as in *Hazi* = *Hḏ-ḏ-y*, as well as to *d* (*Ziduna* = *Ddn*; *Ziri-bašani* = *Drbsn*). The reason for these equivalences is that the *zi* of Anatolian cuneiform orthography, employed also in the 'Amarnah Tablets, corresponds to Semitic *zi*, *si* (with *samek*)<sup>5</sup> and *ši*. The form *Zilû* is of considerable value in restoring the original vocalization of the name, pronounced in the Roman period *Selê*, *Sellê*, and *Silê*. *Zilû* is not, as might be thought off-hand, a nominative form, but represents an actual pronunciation \**Silû*, or the like; the nominative in *u* is no longer used in place-names at the time of the 'Amarnah Tablets. \**Silû-Si(e)lê* is another illustration of the change of *û* to *ê* between 1300 B.C. and the Coptic age; see the writer's remarks in *Rec. de Trav.* XL, 66, 68<sup>6</sup>. In view of the spelling *Sellê*, I have no hesitation in reading the name *Sillû*; but the Egyptians never stressed consonantal doubling, and only preserved it in isolated cases or secondary formations, so the doubling is not important, and was disregarded by foreign scribes for the most part, as it would seem.

In concluding we may throw out a hint regarding the origin of the name, which is, as noted above, not Egyptian, in all probability. I would suggest that \**Sillû* comes from a

<sup>1</sup> This village, the home of Saul's clan, originally bore the name *Šela' ha-Elef*, "Ox-rib," a fuller form preserved in one passage.

<sup>2</sup> CLAUS, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1907, 73.

<sup>3</sup> *Tell Amarna Tablets*, 146, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> The combination with Getta, some distance south of Carmel, mentioned by Pliny, is quite impossible because of the context, which demands a town in the extreme south of Judæa.

<sup>5</sup> The Hebrew *samek* was not then pronounced like *s* (*šin*), but the exact nuance escapes us; the most probable pronunciations are the affricative *ts* or the spirant (not aspirate!) *th*.

<sup>6</sup> In a letter to the writer Sethe has endorsed this phonetic law, citing also *Šateh* > *Sêth* > *Sêth*—a very happy parallel.

Semitic \**Sillô*—a normal development, since there was no *ô* in Egyptian before about 1300 B.C. or later. The name *Sillô* belongs etymologically with *Sillâ*, probably pronounced also *Sillô*, the name of a town near Jerusalem<sup>1</sup>, and with Heb. *solelah*, “wall, rampart,” borrowed by the Egyptians as *trrt* (BURCHARDT, no. 1166). We have thus another Semitic name in the north-eastern corner of Egypt, along with *Succoth* (corrupted by the Egyptians to \**Sekû* = *Tkw*, by dropping the final *t*, as regularly), *Migdol*, etc. There can be little or no doubt that these names are relics of Semitic influence during the period of Hyksos occupation—of which more elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> II Kings xii, 20.

## A PECULIAR FORM OF NEW KINGDOM LAMP

By N. DE GARIS DAVIES

With Plates V-VII

*(The figure numbers 1-15 refer to the figures on these plates)*

IN preparing two Ramesside tombs (Nos. 51 and 217) for publication by the Metropolitan Museum of New York I came upon a peculiar object which was new to me, but to which I have since found numerous parallels. This ignorance is not surprising in view of the other astonishing discovery that no Ramesside tomb has yet been completely published, though the centenary year of Champollion is now behind us.

The strange objects which were the starting-point of this investigation are shown in Fig. 1 from Tomb 51, where they are set beside an altar of offerings between the owner and his wife on the one hand and a priest officiating with censer and libation-vase on the other. They consist of two white cones decorated with red and yellow bands, set on short poles stuck in the ground and flanked by three burning tapers, each of which is formed of three white strands twisted like a rope and lashed in the middle and at the end with red twine. Each strand seems to form, or to contain, its own wick; for there are three separate flames.


The association with burning candles will lead to the correct conclusion that these pyramidal objects are themselves a form of lamp. One is reminded at once of the similar cone shaped like a white loaf which I have already interpreted as a pastille of incense mixed with fat for burning<sup>1</sup>. This identification becomes certain, I think, when in other tombs of the Ramesside era one finds the pyramidal candle blazing at the tip (*e.g.*, Figs. 6 to 14). What is, and may remain, indecisive is whether these cones, which henceforth become frequent, are primarily for illumination, like the candles with which they are almost always associated, or for fumigation, or are a convenient combination of the two. Although they are connected with "making a light" or even "striking a light," the means and process of ignition are never indicated, nor within the Eighteenth Dynasty, unless at its very close, is the candle ever seen lighted, whether because this was supposed to be done by the dead at night-time or at evening festivals, or for some ritual or superstitious reason.

The taper, especially when lighted, must have been unpleasant to hold in the hand and would not last very long<sup>2</sup>. It was natural to seek improvement in both directions, particularly if as seems probable, it became more customary for the friends of the dead to present them personally. The pyramidal candle of larger dimensions and set upon a pole may have been the result. The later tapers too are larger and sometimes triple in form, and are set upright in stands or on the ground.

<sup>1</sup> DAVIES, *Tomb of Nakht*, 52.

<sup>2</sup> In Tomb 181 the lady carrying it has been wise enough to lash it to a cane, or perhaps insert it in one; for the latter seems to be the case with a candle of unusual form shown in the papyrus of Hatshepsut, Cairo.

During the Eighteenth Dynasty the presentation of the pair of ritual tapers was generally made by the priest (*e.g.*, in Tombs 39, 40, 54; 90<sup>1</sup>, 93, 176), though on the occasion of a festival friends might present them in pairs along with a cruse of fat for their replenishment<sup>2</sup>. This was a performance of the rite of affording light to the dead in the dark necropolis<sup>3</sup>. Logically, though not, as it seems, in practice, this rite is to be differentiated from the presentation of a cup of incense for fumigation, where a wick stands upright in the cup<sup>4</sup>. The less frequent representation of this simple censer might be explained if it is only another form of the bowl containing the white cone of fat, which now has melted down into the cup and left the embedded wick visible. On the west walls of the Nineteenth Dynasty tombs of Dêr el-Medînah we often see one, two, or three wicks standing in a cup which the god of flame, Sejti, presents to Osiris or Anubis as the sun sets in the western hills, the personified eye of Horus sometimes providing a similar lamp. In Tomb 218 this is labelled "kindling a light for thee." The candles in these cases take the shape either of tapers or of conical pastilles and are lighted at the tip.

We seem here to have a conjunction or confusion of the ideas of illumination and fumigation. The primitive lamp  too is probably a censer rather than a lamp, its drooping wick (?) indicating either the direction of its products towards the offerings among which it is placed or the slow burning of the gums by the help of commingled charcoal, the smoking wick or flame being so heavily charged with unconsumed material that it distils on to the offerings below<sup>5</sup>. The candlestick recently found in the tomb of Tutankhamûn is very similar to the cups described above. Here a thick length of rope-like wick stands in a handled cup and calls apparently for a repeated supply of oil or fat to be poured upon it or into its cup. Whether this candlestick, which so closely resembles our own in appearance, was intended primarily for light or fumigation is scarcely to be determined; if the former, it does not promise to be smokeless.

The taper however was not the only form of candle used, even in the Eighteenth Dynasty. The scenes also occasionally show a pyramidal light being brought for the service of the dead, though it takes a form which, but for later representations, would scarcely have received its proper interpretation. It is rhomboidal in shape, and one might suspect it to consist of a cone of fat inverted on a conical holder; but, as no division is ever marked, it is more likely to be a single lump of tallow, one end being pointed for ignition, the other elongated by being pressed round the stick on which it is carried. No wick is yet seen, nor is there a flame to betray its use. Its first appearance is in Tomb 75<sup>6</sup> (Fig. 2) where three or more are being carried behind bearers of libation-vases to be used at the meal of the dead. In the succeeding reign of Amenophis III we have further examples—a very rough one (white, Fig. 3) set in the midst of a pile of offerings in Tomb 54, and two carried in

<sup>1</sup> *Theban Tombs Series*, III, Pl. XXXV.

<sup>2</sup> GARDINER, *Tomb of Amenemhât*, Pl. XXIII; DAVIES, *Tomb of Nakht*, Pl. XIII. Note in the former case that the phrases "Ointment is given" and "Receiving illumination" alternate in the legends, as if one was the result of the other.


<sup>3</sup> Chapter 137B of the *Book of the Dead*; MORET, *Rituel*, 9; GARDINER, *op. cit.*, 97 (in Pl. XLVI the text shows that it is being used in a rite of fumigation purely).

<sup>4</sup> *Theban Tombs Series*, III, Pl. XV.


<sup>5</sup> In Tombs 85 and 93 the hieroglyph ends in a stream of red drops. The actual distillation is seen in SCHAEFFER, *Priestergräber*, 72.

<sup>6</sup> *Theban Tombs Series*, III, Pl. XVII.







I




2



4







3



7

Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers.



Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers.

procession towards the table of the dead in Tomb 69, again behind four bearers of libation-vases (Fig. 4). In the latter case they are red (the material being no doubt stained, as votive candles often are in Christian churches) and the lower part decorated with a coloured ribbon (?), as the pile of ointment for the head often is at El-'Amarnah.

The crude method of clapping the lump of tallow or wax on the end of a stick was soon bettered by resting it on a flat base fastened to the handle. At least I infer this from the straight line of the base as it appears in Tomb 247 (Fig. 5). This cresset-like object is here carried along with ointment and offerings as "the gift of a *h̄tp n̄tr*," while in the opposite direction come three men bringing offerings, candle and fat, and bags of eye-paint, or, in words, "making a [*h̄tp d̄l n̄swt*]," "giving fat and kindling the daily lamp," and "giving *msdmt* to...." The two processions meet at a little niche in the back wall of the little chamber which may have been made to hold the candle<sup>1</sup>. Finally in Tomb 254, which is probably still within the limits of the dynasty but beyond the revolution, we have (Fig. 6) a roughly drawn scene in which red incense or fragrant fat is being thrown by a man on one of three candles set on an altar, two being ordinary tapers (but burning this time) and the third a pyramidal cone of the rhomboidal shape flaming at the apex. Behind this figure another man censens and libates a pile of offerings. The scene is close to the entrance, taking the place of the usual offerings to the gods. Thus there appears to be a confusion between the offerings to the god and to the dead, as also between the purposes of the candle and the brazier—light in darkness and acceptable odour. As the conical candle here takes the place of the open bowl of fragrant fat on which new incense might be poured, the direction of the stream on the tapers is an error, due perhaps to the practice of soaking them anew with oil at intervals. But we see here already an approach to the drawings of the Nineteenth Dynasty in (1) the association of cones and tapers, (2) their position on an altar, (3) their ignition, (4) the conical shape of the large candle or cresset.

The representation in Tomb 51 which started our inquiry brings us to the new era and the strange drawing for which we have now found earlier parallels. In this case the tapers are burning, but not the cones. These latter, though now, as henceforth, flat in the base, are still decorated with horizontal bands of colour, formed perhaps of layers of tinted fat. But, besides this, we see looped bands thrown round the cones. Apparently it was found that the cone when lighted tended to collapse; hence the coloured bands were replaced by ribbons (?) which bound it round and lashed it down to the plate on which it rested. Since one might suppose that the ribbons too would ignite and make the candle gutter still more, one might postulate thin copper bands which would form an indestructible support for the fat. But, as no remains of such cressets have been found, it is more likely that the bands were perishable too, but so constructed as not to cause this obvious inconvenience. The rite is here entitled "kindling a light" (*irt tk̄*) and is accompanied by the censuring and libation of offerings and by the mourning of women for the dead—the latter a thoroughly characteristic Ramesside addition in contrast with the earlier jovial participation in the meal of the resuscitated dead.

Apparently this more durable form of candle became popular and it was the custom for friends to bring them in pairs already lighted and plant them by their handles in the ground or on an altar. This latter often takes the form of the tubs of earth in which trees were planted (Figs. 11, 14), and this would certainly form a convenient stand in which to

<sup>1</sup> It is ten inches deep, twelve high, sixteen long, and, though apparently sealed by a slab, was not concealed, as the frieze above was narrowed to admit of it.

plant the stems of the cressets. The latter had moreover by chance the shape of trees, and this suggestiveness would much appeal to the childish imagination of the Egyptians. If, moreover, these presentation candles served the purpose of fumigation, even secondarily, the reflection of the incense-bearing sycamores in the similarly-shaped and incense-carrying cones was not so far-fetched as it seems.

The actual presentation of conical candles is only depicted in Tomb 10 of the reign of Ramesses II, but there on two walls; for the tomb belongs both to one Kasa and his son Penby (Figs. 7, 8). From the smoke and flame which can still be seen in Fig. 7 in front of the lamps carried, it appears that two cones or tapers were fixed upon or beside the offerings as well. Whether they are set as lights on the table or take the place of the sprinkled incense which converts the sacrifice into a burnt-offering with pleasant odour is not clear, but the customary presence of both cones and tapers on the table of offering suggests that the taper is to give light, the cone to give odour, though both may have been made to serve both ends. In the example cited the white staff by which the cone is carried is seen running up through the cone and blazing at the tip. It may have been itself therefore an inflammable reed or stiffer candle which served as a wick<sup>1</sup>, the surrounding mass of fat merely prolonging its life or adding odour of incense to it. The candles are presented here, not by priests, but by the children of the dead pair; nor merely as a rite, but as an addition to other gifts.


All the remaining presentations of conical candles that I know of show them set upright on a stand, table, or tree-tub near the offerings and accompanied by two to five tapers, all being already ignited<sup>2</sup>. The cone, like the tapers, has a red tip, indicating potential flame. The stem is usually twisted like a taper, suggesting that it was a stiffened wick of some sort. The red or yellow bands show that they are no longer a mere ornament by taking the form of a lashing.

Although indirect evidence has been given that the cones, and perhaps the tapers too, had powers of fumigation, this rite was not completed by their ignition alone: a priest, or a son acting as such, censes and libates the offerings as well. Hence the presentation of the candles is not generally accompanied by a text. In the court of Tomb 23, however, a long inscription is added to the scene which sets forth the beneficent qualities of the burning cresset, and gives it the same name (*tki*) as the tapers. In this scene also a priest (on the right) censes and libates the offerings before the deceased pair. Between the offerings and the recipients is set the stand of candles shown in Fig. 14, and also (but separated from the last by a column of the text) another stand of offerings accompanied by a jar of ointment or fat and a burning bowl (censer?) set on a papyrus-headed staff<sup>3</sup>. The text runs:


<sup>1</sup> There is an interesting account of the use of rushlights in WHITE, *Natural History of Selborne*, Letter xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Figs. 9 (Tomb 159), 10 (Tomb 31), 11 (Tomb 283), 12 (Tomb 259), 13 (hall of Tomb 23), 14 (court of Tomb 23). Tomb 277 also contains a rough picture of four tapers and a blunted conical candle. Tomb 278 shows a burning pyramidal candle between two tapers. The lights are set on a solid altar in both cases, and a priest performs the rite.


<sup>3</sup> This is important, as it is in this form exactly that Ranke describes the "lamp" from the tomb of Kha (*Aegypten*, 217). The difficulty of drawing a distinction between the use of flaming bowls as censers and as lamps is extreme. I do not think that any examples of the flaming bowl on its stand can be claimed indubitably as a lamp, whereas it is often certain that it is a censer (LACAU, *Sarcophages*, No. 28083; BLACKMAN, *Meir II*, Pl. X, III, Pl. XVII; NEWBERRY, *Beni Hasan*, I, Pl. XXXV; DAVIES, *Puyemré*, Pls. LIII, LI V, and perhaps also Pl. XLVI from the funeral rites). Either it is so stated, or their position




10




12



13



15



14

Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers.

"...of the new year, making [*htp di niswt to*] Osiris To, scribe of the archives of the Lord of the two Lands, on the said day, anointing with *mḏt* oil, kindling a light, and depositing offerings to Osiris To.

Hail to thee O good candle of Osiris To! Hail to thee, Eye of Horus, who guidest the gods in darkness and guidest Osiris To from any resting-place of his to the place wherein his spirit desires to be! [I supply] this good lamp of Osiris To with fresh fat...thy father Geb, thy mother Nut, Osiris, Isis, Set, and Nephthys, that they may brighten thy face... that they may open thy mouth with those five<sup>1</sup> (?) fingers (?) of the olive ("five tapers of olive oil"?) by which the mouth of the gods is opened. There is given to thee.... It is given on earth; it is given in the fields of Ialu, in the night of this propitious day of the New Year (?) to.... There is given to thee fresh water of the god; there are given to thee likewise the gods (of) fresh water ("fresh water of these gods"?), the...stars, the tireless, the pure, the indestructible stars. May this good candle of Osiris To be eternal. May this good candle of Osiris To thrive as thrives Atum, lord of...in On. May this good candle of Osiris To thrive as thrives the name of Shu (similarly Tefnut, Geb, Nut, Isis, Nephthys, Horus, Wazyt, ..., and Thot). May this good lamp of Osiris Thoy thrive in the Sektet bark and in the Adet bark<sup>2</sup>; may it not fail or be destroyed ever. Twice pure is Osiris To. Heaven is open to thee; earth is open to thee; the roads in the necropolis are open to thee. Thou goest out and in with Rē<sup>c</sup> and strollest like the lords of Eternity—Hapi, namely, who shall give thee water; Nepera, bread; Hathor, beer; Hesat, milk; O twice-pure Osiris Thoy!"

It is to be remarked on this text that the reference in it is to a single "good candle" (by which the conical lamp must be meant) and to illumination as its purpose; yet what has been said before of its secondary powers of fumigation finds an echo at the end of the text where the end served is seen to be the all-important ritual purity of the dead. In Tomb 82 and also here it is the festival of the five epagomenal days at the end of the year that is being celebrated, because on that occasion, as if it was the evening of the year, lighted candles were made a special feature. In Tomb 82 five candles are being provided for these days, reckoned as the birthdays of Osiris, Horus, Set, Isis, and Nephthys, as well as two others for the New Year and the feast of "Uniting the *kas*," and also the daily candle<sup>3</sup>. These same five tapers have also been provided in Tomb 23, being ranged on the table, and accordingly we find a special reference to the four children of Geb and Nut in the text. The great cone is perhaps the candle for New Year's day itself.

Should I be right in my restoration "five fingers," there is also a fanciful perception by the scribe of the resemblance of the five tapers to five fingers, and, by another stretch of imagination, he likens them to the pale yellow finger of electrum which was used in the ceremony of opening the mouth. Moreover he has evidently seized the likeness to a tree,

close to or under the table of offering (*cf.* WRESZINSKI, *Atlas*, 143) points to this conclusion. In *El Amarna*, III, Pl. VII, and II, Pl. XXXII, they seem to be lamps set by water-jars, but might be interpreted as censers with jars of oil, as at Beni Hasan. In Tomb 89 four tapers stand before the dead man in a rack, and a wick or taper in a bowl on a high stand (Fig. 15). The general evidence for the Eighteenth Dynasty, then, seems to be that the taper is for light, and the burning wick or taper set in a bowl or embedded in a cone of fat is primarily for burning incense. Hence a larger "lamp-stand" is quite properly used as a brazier for aromatic burnt offerings.

<sup>1</sup> This "five" is guess-work, since only the last  $\int$  and a trace of another before it are preserved.

<sup>2</sup> For the candle in the bark of the dead, see GARDINER, *Tomb of Amenemhēt*, Pl. XI.

<sup>3</sup> Mention of the candle of Set (lost from the wall) has been omitted by GARDINER, *op. cit.*, 97.





and, as the candles are compounded or fed with olive oil, he makes it an olive instead of an incense-bearing tree. The same tendency to picture-punning may possibly also be reflected in the blunted apex of the cone, by which he has made it closely approximate to that of the fetish of Osiris of Abydos<sup>1</sup>, and in so doing rendered it easier to personify the candle as he has done in the text and make it equivalent to the person of Osiris Thoy.


Primitive man in lands of short night, such as reigns in Egypt, uses artificial lights but little, and the rite of setting the evening lamp for the use of the dead in his tomb does not seem to have been popularly practised except on rare festivals, such as, falling in winter time, would call for it also in the houses of the living. But, so soon as the home of the dead was pictured as lying in the dark underworld, sympathetic relatives might well be more ready to dedicate the daily candle to the dead and make it of larger proportions. So that the change that I have indicated may not be a mere whim of the period, but reflect beliefs and feelings which are not negligible.

<sup>1</sup> WINLOCK, *Bas-reliefs from the temple of Rameses I*, Pl. III. It will be seen from the illustrations that the conical candle is more than once blunted in this way. So also in Tomb 277.

## A NEW VIZIER OF THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY

BY LUDLOW S. BULL, PH.D.





MR. WINLOCK has lately cleared for the Metropolitan Museum of New York a number of the Eleventh Dynasty rock-tombs in the great bay in the cliffs at Dêr el-Bahrî. One of these which lies high in the northern cliff belonged to an official of the name of <sup>1</sup>. The poor quality of the limestone of the cliff and the ruthless hand of later ancient intruders have caused the disappearance of almost all the inscriptions with which the tomb was adorned by its owner. Some interesting traces are visible, however, upon the interior of the magnificent rectangular outer sarcophagus of fine limestone which remains *in situ* in the burial chamber. The exterior of the sarcophagus is uninscribed, while the interior is decorated, in the manner common to many pre- and early-Middle Kingdom coffins. There is a horizontal line of inscription in large hieroglyphs near the top of each side, while mortuary texts in vertical columns of small rather cursively-made characters occupy the space below. The horizontal inscription in large hieroglyphs on the interior of the "front"<sup>2</sup> of the coffin is the usual *hṭp dy nišw·t* formula, largely lost. Fortunately, however, enough remains of the titles preceding the name at the end of the line to make their restoration certain as follows: . The leg of  is clearly visible, the following space is exactly right for , and the legs and tail of the quadruped are certain.

The reading of these two titles is borne out by the presence of the following titles in the horizontal inscription in large hieroglyphs on the interior of the "head"<sup>3</sup>: , the last of these being associated as it is so closely with the vizierate.

We have here then a new name to be added to the slowly growing list of chief ministers of ancient Egypt.

<sup>1</sup> The evidence indicates that this tomb belongs to the reign of Mentuhotp III. It was in its forecourt that Mr. Winlock discovered the remarkable private letters of which he has published a preliminary report in *Bull. M.M.A.*, xvii, No. 12, Pt. 2, 33-48.

<sup>2</sup> Front; head. These are the terms adopted by Professor Breasted in transcribing texts from the rectangular coffins of the period preceding the Twelfth Dynasty. The "front" is that side of the coffin toward which the dead faced as he lay on his left side and which was often decorated with a "false door" and with a pair of eyes. The term "head" is self-explanatory.

<sup>3</sup> The signs ,  and  are slightly damaged. Of  the head and tail are clear.



## UNPUBLISHED HEBREW, ARAMAIC AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM EGYPT, JERUSALEM AND CARCHEMISH

BY REV. PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE

IN 1896 M. Legrain uncovered a graffito inscription in Phœnician letters on the quay-wall of Karnak. Only a portion of it was legible and this I copied shortly after its discovery (Fig. 1, No. 1). When I was at Karnak again a few months later even this portion had




Fig. 1.

ceased to be decipherable. What there is, however, is interesting as, unlike most of the Egyptian *graffiti* of the kind, it is in Hebrew and not Aramaic. It reads :

אֲנִי בַעַל אִמָּר הַחֶפֶשׁ בֶּן שֵׁרָן

“I am Baal[i]amar the freedman, son of...”

The *samech*, which I have queried in my copy, must evidently be a *yod*, the name being either Baali-amar or Baal-yomar. In the name of the father the penultimate character could be *daleth* as well as *rêsh*. The title of the writer is especially interesting.

I copied No. 2 in one of the quarries at Ma'sârah in the spring of 1886. The letters were well cut and very clear. As the wall of rock on which it was engraved was quarried away shortly afterwards I add two demotic graffiti (3 and 4) which were cut close to it, though

my ignorance of demotic prevents me from being able to guarantee the correctness of my copies. The Aramaic text reads:

פּוּטִי בֶר שַׁמֶל בְּנִי

“Phuṭi the son of Shamañ the Babylonian.”

The interest of this graffito lies in the fact that the Babel referred to in it must be the Egyptian Babylon which is consequently mentioned here for the first time. The name *Phuṭi* “He of Phut” is also interesting. A fragment of the annals of Nebuchadrezzar, first published by STRASSMAIER (*Babylonische Texte*, Pl. 6, No. 329) tells us that in his 37th year he marched against “Egypt to make war [and battle with Ama]sis king of Egypt,” and that in the course of his invasion he defeated “the soldiers of the city of Puṭu-Yâvan (Phut of the Ionians), a distant land which is within the sea.”

The two cuneiform inscriptions (5 and 6) were on Babylonian seal-cylinders of the early Kassite period which were shown to me at Jerusalem, where I copied them. I was told they had been found in the neighbourhood.

No. 5 reads:

*Puśu-mari TUR-SAL Ya-sum-muk-AN-Adadu*  
ARAD D.P. *Khamu-ŠA-ZI sarri.*

“Puśu-mari, daughter of Yasummuk-Hadad,  
servant of Khamu-Marduk the king.”

The names are Amorite or West Semitic and consequently the statement that the seal was found in Jerusalem or its neighbourhood is probably correct. The second element in the royal name I would read ideographically, ŠA-ZI representing Marduk or Merodach. The first element is the Heb. עַם.

No. 6 reads:

*Ubarrum*  
TUR *Ili-maliki*  
ARAD ILANI *Mar-rá*

“Ubarrum  
son of Elimelech  
servant of the Amorite god.”

This, again, is a Canaanite seal, the use of the plural *iláni* for the singular *ilu* (as in the Old Testament) being, as we learn from the Tell el-‘Amarnah tablets, a Canaanitish custom. Elimelech is also a Canaanitish name; Ubarrum, however, is Babylonian and testifies to the Babylonian occupation of Palestine.

George Smith, after his return from his first expedition to Assyria, gave me a transliterated copy of a fragment of cuneiform text that he had made at Jerablûs, a site which the British consul Skene had recently identified with Carchemish. The fragment belonged to a clay cylinder which Smith had either discovered or bought at Jerablûs, and contains a date. The copy is as follows:



...[7] *i ne ra bi...*  
...*arhu apin gal mu na...*  
...*an ka ar ris (?)...*

This is clearly: “Ibil-rabi (or Ibi-rabi) [the king of]...[day of] the month of the Great Plough, the year when [the king made an image of?] the god Karka[mis]...” Ibil-rabi was probably king of Khana (Tell ‘Ishâra) like [Isar]lim son of [Bi]n-Ami king of Carchemish and “the land of the Amorites” whose fragmentary texts have been discovered at Jerablûs. There was a period when Carchemish formed part of that West-Semitic kingdom.

*Ris* (?) is evidently *ka* which closely resembles it in form. “The divine Carchemish” with the determinative of “god” is frequent in the Hittite (Kaskian) hieroglyphic texts, where “the god Carchemish” is identified with the god Tarku or Hadad.

## THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS

BY EDOUARD NAVILLE

RECENTLY Dr. Alan Gardiner, supported by Professor Peet, has endeavoured to upset the results at which Brugsch, Professor Petrie and myself arrived, either by philology or by excavation, as to the geography of the Exodus, and which had generally been adopted<sup>1</sup>. Goshen is not  nor Phacusa, as Brugsch had been the first to propose. Professor Peet says: Dr. Gardiner has for ever destroyed this illusion.  is no longer Sukkoth; the sea did not extend as far as Lake Timsâh. Tell el-Maskhûtah is not Pithom but Theku. Tell Retâbah is not Raamses, for Professor Petrie did not find any monument confirming this identification. As, I believe, nobody has made excavations in these two places since Professor Petrie and myself, we must take for ourselves what Professor Peet says. Our excavations and the conclusions we have derived from them are only "guesses of early explorers bent on finding biblical sites at any cost, as against Gardiner's irresistible combination of philological reasoning and inquiry into what the Egyptians themselves have to say on the matter (a detail only too frequently ignored by Egyptologists<sup>2</sup>)."

I shall now consider what this "irresistible combination" is worth; whether it rests on truly scholarly arguments, and whether, when I translated from the first line to the last the inscriptions I discovered and drew my conclusions from their contents, I ignored what the Egyptians themselves had to say on the matter, which was revealed to me by Dr. Gardiner.

But before entering into these discussions, I must state that Dr. Gardiner and myself belong to opposite historical schools. For me, the leading principle is that the texts are to be taken as they were written, in their proper and literal sense, and interpreted as simply as possible. We have to admit them ingenuously, without mixing them with our personal views. We have to listen to the texts and accept what they say, though perhaps they do not agree with modern ideas, or with the logical rules which scholars of the present day do not hesitate to enforce upon them. These are the principles which are followed now by a numerous French school of historians, and which are also those of several German scholars.

Dr. Gardiner starts from the *a priori* view of the critical school and from certain religious tendencies. "All the story of the Exodus ought to be regarded as no less mythical than the details of creation as recorded in Genesis. At all events our first task must be to attempt to interpret those details on the supposition that they are a legend. Instead therefore of comparing each place-name as it occurs with some supposed corresponding site in Egypt or the desert, I shall first survey the legend as a whole, and attempt to discover the general movement underlying it<sup>3</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> This was written before I saw in the papers that Professor Peet had published a book on Egypt and Israel. I tried at once to get it, but did not succeed. I know it only from a review in the *Expository Times*. But the quotations which I make here will show sufficiently the tendency of the book.

<sup>2</sup> *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, IX, 58.

<sup>3</sup> *The Geography of the Exodus*, in *Études Champollion*, 205.

I must protest most emphatically against this way of treating ancient documents like the books of Moses. It is the denial of the elementary principles of sound historical research. Supposing the author of these texts were Herodotus or Livy, would you say from the first: all he relates is a mere legend, and I shall interpret his narratives as statements having this character? Would that be "tolerated in historical fields uncompromised by religious conservatism"? For it is Dr. Gardiner who introduces the religious element, which should be entirely left aside. He is strongly biassed, not by religious conservatism, but by the opposite tendency and its conclusions which, as some theologians say, are the truth and "are sure of the everlasting future" (Briggs). The sound historical method is this: the books of the Old Testament and especially the books of Moses must be studied, as a German scholar says about Homer, on the same principles which we are bound to employ for all other authors. Theology is not to rule our views. There are some great historical principles which apply to all ancient documents, whatever be their origin and the language in which they were written. These are the principles which I have endeavoured to follow in my books, whether on Egyptology or on the Old Testament. I have treated the inscriptions I found at Pithom exactly like those of Dêr el-Baħrî or Bubastis. In my books on the Old Testament I have never departed from the strictly scientific ground. I made no incursion whatever into the religious domain. I even abstained completely from what might make the readers understand to what religious school or party I belong. But since my results, which are merely scientific, are often in contradiction with the favourite theories of the critical school, which are constantly represented as being indisputable, and which are the basis of their religious tendencies, my adversaries like Dr. Gardiner cannot admit that they are not fancies of religious conservatism. The questions concerning the authenticity of the books of the Old Testament, the interpretation to be given to what they say, depend merely on scholarship like any other document; theologians therefore are not the authorities whose voice is decisive, more than historians or in many cases a man of common sense. We have to consider what these texts say, irrespective of the influence which our conclusions may exert on the religious belief. Science, sound historical principles are our guide. We entirely banish theology, which has its own domain, we move exclusively in the domain of scholarship. I do not know what religious conservatism means.

Let us now revert to the subject of this article: the geography of the Exodus.


#### Goshen.


Dr. Gardiner assumes beforehand that what is related in the first chapter of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus is mere legend. He starts from this preconceived idea, on which he bases the geography of the Exodus. The narrative is not historical. Therefore the Egyptian documents which we may find are to be interpreted in that light and adapted to that conception. This is what Professor Peet calls "inquiring into what the Egyptians themselves have to say on the matter," a detail which we Egyptologists have ignored.




Dr. Gardiner begins with an elaborate discussion about the towns called Ramesses or House of Ramesses, of which he finds a great number, which he tries to locate. We cannot but admire the fulness of his information. No place, however small, has been forgotten, and we are sometimes at loss to find our way in this labyrinth of names. However, we can follow the leading idea, *viz.* finding which of these towns of Ramesses was the Delta residence of the king and his capital. The conclusion at which Dr. Gardiner has arrived is that it is Pelusium. Another conclusion to which he attaches great importance is that there was no

Ramesses in the Wâdî Tumulât, and that Tell Retâbah, where Professor Petrie made excavations, is not Ramesses, for Professor Petrie's claim "was uncorroborated by any inscriptional testimony whatsoever<sup>1</sup>."

Now let us consider how far these conclusions are defensible and by what evidence they are supported; we shall begin with the second one. At Tell Retâbah or Tell Rotab, Sir Flinders Petrie was more fortunate in his excavations than I was. The result of his work, especially a temple of Ramesses II, is described in the following words: "All of these discoveries exactly accord with the requirements of the city of Ramesses, where both the second and third kings of that name are stated to have worked, and where another city was built by the Israelites along with that of Pithom, which is only eight miles distant. The absence of any other Egyptian site suitable to these conditions, which are fulfilled here, makes it practically certain that this was the city of Ramesses named in Exodus<sup>2</sup>."

The most important monument is a granite stele of Ramesses II, of which unfortunately only the lower part is preserved. Evidently this stele related the most glorious events, the leading features of his reign, his victorious campaigns in various countries. He began with the South, the country of the  which, as Dr. Junker has shown, must mean not the country of the negroes only, but of the populations south of Egypt, which were at first Hamites and Kushites. The following line begins with these words: "...crushed, the whole country is under him (in his power) for ever..."; the rest is lacking, except the name of the king. The third line reads: "inspiring great terror, the hero of bravery in all lands... in distant countries." The last two lines speak of a campaign in the neighbourhood in the

land of the Shâsu, the nomads of the Sinaitic peninsula  Professor Petrie translates: "(of the) great enemies in the land of the Bedawyn he plundered their hill fortresses, slaughtering their faces and building in cities upon which his name is to eternity," and he adds this commentary: "This allusion to building in the various cities called after Ramessu suggests that this city was one of such, that is Ramesses." On this translation and commentary, Dr. Gardiner says: The first phrases are simple, but are misunderstood by Professor Petrie: at the end it seems necessary to bring the words *kd m dmîw* somehow into connection with the Asiatics (Shōsu) and it is therefore likely that *sn*, "their," has been omitted. Accordingly I translate "making a great massacre in the land of the Shōsu he plunders their hills and slaughters upon them building in (their) cities in his own name for ever." The reference, then, would be to the annexation of towns in Palestine, not to the building of towns of Ramesses in Egypt.


We have several objections to make to Dr. Gardiner's translation.  does not mean plunder, but seize, make prisoner. This does not agree with the following word  height, mountain. I believe we have here the word  of the Anastasi papyrus, which I do not hesitate to translate with Chabas<sup>3</sup> and Budge<sup>4</sup> soldiers, levies from districts.

<sup>1</sup> *The Delta Residence of the Ramessides*, in *Journal*, v, 127 ff., 179 ff., 242 ff.


<sup>2</sup> *Hyksos and Israelite cities*, 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Recherches pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte au temps de l'Exode*, 96.

<sup>4</sup> *Dict.*, 860.

Afterwards we find  which cannot be translated otherwise than slaying, cutting off their face. It is the same idea which we find twice in the temple of Dêr el-Baḥrî (Pl. LVII, 10), "Thou smitest with thy mace the Nubians, thou cuttest off the heads of the soldiers," and also Pl. CLII, "I bind for thee all the rebels of the Anu of Nubia. I grant thee to cut off their heads." To cut off the head or, as here, the face, is to achieve the destruction, making corpses which cannot be recognized, and thus destroying the characteristic appearance of the people. There ends what Ramesses has to say concerning his military campaigns, the last of which was in the neighbourhood in the country of the Shāsu, the nomads of Sinai.

The following is a great deed of the king, "building cities in his name for ever." We know that he built many cities bearing his name; but what reason would he have to say, so here, if this place was not one of them? Why should he have said in an inscription of the Wādî Tumulât that he built many cities bearing his name, which might be in the Delta and Upper Egypt, if the city where he engraved this inscription was not one of them? As Professor Petrie said, it seems evident that the place where this text was found must have been one of the various cities built by Ramesses.

But Dr. Gardiner cannot admit this, and he contradicts this statement in changing the sense of the passage, and in correcting the text where there has been an omission, the pron. , so that it should be *their* cities, that of the Shōsu. "At the end it seems necessary to bring the words *kd m dmw* somehow into connection with the Asiatics (Shōsu)." I do not see the necessity of this connection; it is a mere assumption of Dr. Gardiner, not at all justified by the text, which he has to adapt to his idea. The Shōsu or Shāsu are the Asiatics and *their towns* should mean towns in Palestine. This is in contradiction with what we know of the Shōsu. They are nomads living in the Sinaitic peninsula who had sometimes threatened Egypt, for instance under Seti I; we read that in the first year of his reign he defeated them from the fortress of Zar (Zoar) as far as Kanâna; that is, from the frontier of Egypt to the most southerly point of Palestine<sup>1</sup>. The following victories of Seti in Palestine are not over the Shōsu, but over Retenu, and to call the cities of Palestine cities of the Shōsu is to go against all the information we have on the geography of Palestine. Besides, if Ramesses says that he built all the cities he conquered, it would be a rather curious way of speaking of annexations. This, I suppose, I must consider as an example of what Professor Peet calls "Dr. Gardiner's irresistible combination of philological reasoning and inquiry." Following the principle which is at the base of our method, taking the texts in their literal sense and admitting them ingenuously, without mixing our personal views, I conclude that this stele contains a clear statement that Tell Reḥâbah is the site of Raamses.


Let us now revert to the first of Dr. Gardiner's conclusions. The city of Ramesses, which was built on the site of Avaris, is Pelusium. Since the city of Ramesses and Avaris are at the same place, what is said of one may refer to the other. The city of Ramesses could not be Pelusium, which did not exist at the time of the Hyksos nor at the time of the Nineteenth Dynasty. It was built by the Greeks of Psammetichus I when the king assigned to his Ionian and Carian mercenaries places which lay near the sea below the city of Bubastis on the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile<sup>2</sup>. The city was 20 stades distant from the sea<sup>3</sup> and sur-







<sup>1</sup> LEPSIUS, *Denkmäler*, III, 126 A.







<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, II, 154.






















<sup>3</sup> MANNERT, *Geographie von Afrika*, 489.

rounded by marshes, lakes and ditches, so much so that it could not be approached either by a fleet or by a troop of horsemen or infantry; on the north side the desert towards the Heroopolitan gulf was impassable for an army. This, according to Dr. Gardiner, was the country the admirable fertility of which was described by the Papyrus Anastasi and which was the centre of a great wine-growing region. There Ramesses built his capital, the town of Ramesses, where he made long stays, and where "the Vizier and high officials of the land will have thronged together with the high priests of the provinces and their sacred barks bearing the shrine of the gods."

Dr. Gardiner has told us that Ramesses the capital and Avaris are the same place. The question is therefore: where was Avaris? Here I have no hesitation in agreeing with M. Clédat<sup>1</sup> that it was the region and the city called  the present *Ḳanṯarah*, and its neighbourhood. I transcribe this name Zoar, which Dr. Gardiner says is phonetically impossible. I maintain that my transcription is absolutely correct and much more in accordance with philology than that of Dr. Gardiner, *Thel*. I often protested against the pedantic principle which submits all transcriptions to the rules of philology. Transcriptions are made from the ear, not from written texts, and not from rules established by professors. They are the approximate way of reproducing a foreign word with the letters of a certain language, and of imitating its sound with those to which he who speaks the foreign language is accustomed. Therefore there is not one single transcription for a name: it will be very different if it is made by a man who speaks a Semitic language, or Greek, or Latin. Take in our time the pronunciation and the transcription of a geographical name; it is quite different if it is written by an Englishman, a German, or a Frenchman.






Dr. Gardiner reads *thel*. , *t* appears as  $\sigma$  in Greek; cf. *Tbntr* Σεβέννυτος. This is rather an extraordinary proof of the reading, considering that Σεβέννυτος  is never written with a  but always with  and  is not once written with .


, as Rougé says, becomes a frequent homophone of  or  after the Nineteenth Dynasty. The two signs  and  vary with the syllabic , and they correspond to  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ . The Greeks were somewhat embarrassed when they had to render this special consonant, for which they used *T*,  $\delta$  or  $\sigma$ .



, says Brugsch<sup>2</sup>, appears as a variant for , , though there are words in which  is constantly employed.  corresponds exactly to the Semitic  $\delta$  and in Coptic is generally rendered by  $\alpha$ .  appears in geographical names chiefly from Semitic countries. Its equivalence to  appears clearly in a name like , , , and in words like , , , . It may also be a variant of , e.g. , , . That  was  $\delta$  we see in Semitic words like ,  Tyre,










<sup>1</sup> *Le site d'Avaris*, in *Études Champollion*, 185 ff.




<sup>2</sup> *Wörterbuch*, 1702, 1690. *Dict. Géog.*, 988.


, צפון, and several others.  is a ז in the name , עציץ. Maspero<sup>1</sup> also says that the Egyptian scribes often gave  as equivalent for the Semitic ז. Therefore when I transcribe  by ז I follow what the Egyptian scribes often do.

 is the name of a territory with a city of that name. It is a border land, the place where Egypt ends. It is therefore quite possible that it may be a foreign name, the Egyptian transcription of a name which may be Semitic or perhaps more ancient, since Semites were not the original population of the Sinaitic peninsula. Nevertheless we shall consider the name as Egyptian and see how it is to be transcribed in a Semitic language.


It is clear from what we saw that  is a ז, as the examples quoted above sufficiently prove, and it is a flagrant error to look for the value of these letters in a language which possesses none of them, and which fills up the deficiency as best it can. For instance, in Greek there is no ז; in Semitic names we find for it four substitutes; צירון is Σιδών, צור is Τύρος, זעיר of Moab is always Σήγωρ, while זעיר on the frontier of Egypt is Ζογόρα. It would be just as erroneous to say that ז has the value of one of these three letters only; as when Dr. Gardiner transcribes  or ז by a *th* or an *s*.

The reading of the lion  is <sup>2</sup>; we have a considerable number of examples of it  a lion.  or with the complementary sign ,  a door. For the Berlin school,  is always an ז (ERMAN, *Grammar*, 3rd ed., p. 10). Those who do not accept the German classification of Egyptian among Semitic languages, Rougé, Renouf, Montet, Maspero and others, observe that Semitic languages, especially Hebrew, usually express the  by ז, without  being a consonant like the Hebrew letter.




Therefore in the name  we find, according to the usual transcription of Egyptian into Hebrew, ז, ז, and ז, and even in one instance the vowel *o* is marked. In the stele of the year 400 of the time of Ramesses II, the name, which occurs three times, is written once , where @ is clearly the point written over ז, so that my transcription Zoar, far from being a "phonetic impossibility," is much more correct than those of Dr. Gardiner, *Theh* or *Sile*, in the alphabet of languages which do not know either  or ז.

We have interesting information about , Zoar. We know that in ancient times it was the north-eastern limit of the country. In a text which neither Dr. Gardiner nor M. Clédat has quoted, the conquest of Egypt over Set and his companions for Harmachis





<sup>1</sup> *Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne*, 21.

<sup>2</sup> See *sub voce* , BRUGSCH, *Wörterbuch*, 205 and foll., v, 258 and ff. BUDGE, *Dict.*, 129.



by his son Horus<sup>1</sup>, we see that the last battle is fought at  which is said to be east. There Horus is said to have taken the form of a lion with the head of a man, wearing the *atef*-crown; he tore the enemies with his claws, standing on his *mesen* , which is here represented as a kind of huge box. Zoar is called  or often *Mesen of the East*, for there were several *Mesen* in Egypt, which seem to have been in the temples the special part dedicated to Horus. At Zoar the campaign is finished, the whole country is conquered, and the enemies pursued by the gods go back to Nubia, so that Zoar may well be called, like the city of Ramesses, "the end of Egypt."

We know that it was an important military point, that there was a fortress there, and that it was the starting-point of the armies marching against Palestine. It was the key of Egypt, even in modern times, when *Ḳanṭarah* was a bridge on the road to Syria; for all the region before the Suez Canal was a marshy region which was reached by the inundation through a kind of ravine over which the bridge was built. Beyond it was the desert<sup>2</sup>.

 is not Tanis, as Brugsch maintains. The few ruins still extant and the excavations have shown what I stated more than thirty years ago: that it was *Ḳanṭarah*, the capital of the nome of  "the first eastern." The representations we have of the city in the first campaign of Seti I, when he marches against the *Shōsu*<sup>3</sup>, and the narrative which *Aḥmōse* has left of the capture of  Avaris, has shown M. Clédat<sup>4</sup> that Zoar was Avaris, the city of the Hyksos, which according to Manetho was on the eastern side of the Bubastis branch; it was an ancient city, rebuilt and fortified by King Salatis.  was not only a city, it was also the territory which surrounded the city.

When we speak of cities, we must consider what the word meant before the country was constituted into an united kingdom. Let us see what Canaan was at the time of the conquest. We see that Joshua and the Israelites defeated the kings of thirty-one cities, each of which had villages which depended on it, a certain territory which belonged to it, as is said of the cities of the Philistines: Ashdod had towns and villages, Gaza had towns and villages: Ashdod and Gaza were not mere towns, they were cantons which depended upon them. It was the same with Egypt before Menes; there were various tribes or clans gathered round a city which afterwards, when the kingdom was constituted, became the nomes with their capitals.




A great many states in the Middle Ages and even in modern times have been formed in this way. Florence in the Middle Ages was the name of a powerful republic with an extensive territory, which became Tuscany and a province of the Kingdom of Italy. In my country, Switzerland, you see it at the present day. Berne and Zurich are not only the names of cities, but of cantons which up to the end of the eighteenth century were independent states with large territories with cities not so important as the capital, and where, as at Berne, armies could be raised.






<sup>1</sup> NAVILLE, *Textes relatifs au mythe d'Horus*, Pl. XVIII.


<sup>2</sup> See the description of the place by Linant de Bellefonds, who visited it between 1820 and 1830. *Mémoires sur les principaux travaux d'utilité publique exécutés en Égypte*, 175.

<sup>3</sup> LEPSIUS, *Denk.*, III, 128.



<sup>4</sup> *Le site d'Avaris*, in *Études Champollion*, 185.

It is so with  and, as we see further, with . It is the oldest name of the territory, which is derived from that of the capital, or which perhaps gave its name to the capital. The capital itself could have several names; as we saw, it could be called  or Mesen of the East. The territories could contain other cities. We read

of    |  the fortress of **Ramesses**<sup>1</sup>, which is in Zoar, but there was not a fort only, there was the habitation  of Ramesses, so that we can well conclude that Zoar also was one of the numerous cities to which Ramesses has given his name. The fortress was much older than Ramesses, since Tuthmosis III took it as the starting-point of his first campaign in Palestine. The same with Seti I, who, remembering that the god of Zoar has the form of a lion, says that he was like a lion against the Shōsu. Ramesses himself says that in his fifth year, when he was marching against Kadesh, he passed the fortress of Zoar.

This city of Ramesses seems to have been a favourite resort of this king, who like Salatis probably came there in the time of summer to distribute corn and to train his soldiers, in order to inspire terror in his enemies. It was the centre of the revenue administration<sup>2</sup>. Its importance in every respect made it what Dr. Gardiner calls "the Delta residence of the Ramessides." It seems to me probable that it is the  Ramesses, where the messenger of the king of Kheta brought the silver tablet containing the peace treaty.

Since the city of Ramesses or the fortress of Ramesses had been the starting-point for campaigns in Palestine, it is impossible that it should have been Pelusium. This city was the key of Egypt for invaders having the command of the sea, like the Persians or the Greeks; but the populations of Palestine had no fleets, knew nothing of navigation; they communicated with Egypt through the desert, and entered the country either in the Wādī Tumulât or at Zoar, the first point where they reached the Nile. Having passed the fortress of Zoar, they had access to the most fertile part of the country, and were not distant from the great cities of the Delta, Bubastis, Heliopolis, Memphis, what may be called the heart of the country. We cannot suppose the great kings of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties concentrating their armies at Pelusium, so as to leave their eastern frontier defenceless, for thus the best part of the country would be open to the attacks of invaders coming from Palestine or Sinai.

It is said of the city of Ramesses that it is the forefront of every foreign land, the end of Egypt. The nome of Zoar is the  "the first eastern," and we know from the narrative of the Conquest of Horus that he fights there his last battle, which completes the subjugation of the country. The dwelling of Ramesses is also called  "the dwelling of the lion<sup>3</sup>," for at Zoar Horus took the form of that animal<sup>4</sup>.

The papyri give lyrical descriptions of the country in which Ramesses was built<sup>5</sup>: It is

<sup>1</sup> Pap. Anastasi, v, 24, 7 and 8.

<sup>3</sup> LEPSIUS, *Denkm.*, III, 128 a.

<sup>6</sup> Pap. Anastasi, III, l. 11. Gardiner in *Journal*, v, 185.


<sup>2</sup> CLÉDAT, *Notes sur l'isthme de Suez*, 162 ff.



<sup>4</sup> NAVILLE, *op. cit.*, Pl. XVIII.



a fair spot, there is not the like of it...The residence is agreeable to live in, its fields are full of all good things; it is furnished with abundant provisions every day...its meads are verdant with herbage...the fruit is like the taste of honey in the cultivated fields; its granaries are full of wheat and spelt; they draw near to the sky, onions and leeks in the... clusters of flowers in the grove, pomegranates, apples and olives, figs from the orchard; sweet wine of Kenkeme surpassing honey...Abundance of food is in it every day.

A similar description is found in the Papyrus Harris of the country around the city of Ramesses III, which is evidently the same as that of Ramesses II. When the author of Genesis wants to quote a country of surpassing beauty, he quotes "the land of Egypt as thou goest unto Zoar."

This beauty was still striking at the end of the fourth century A.D. when the pious pilgrim Silvia visited Egypt. Going from the city of Arabia in the Wâdî Tumilât, to Tanis, and going through what she believed to be the land of Goshen, she is carried away by her admiration; she says: "We went all day through vineyards producing wine, and others producing balsam, orchards very well cultivated, fields and gardens...What more? I do not think I ever saw a more beautiful territory." Linant de Bellefonds, in his description of the country near Kānṭarah, at the beginning of last century, says it still bears traces of cultivation and of many villages.


We may safely conclude, as we did before, that  is Kānṭarah and, as M. Clédat maintains, that it was the city of Ramesses, the Delta residence of the king, where he prepared an expedition to the East, or where he had some communications with the East, for he may have resided elsewhere, for instance at Bubastis, where he made important constructions usurping those of the Twelfth Dynasty, and where he introduced the worship of Set.

Now we pass to another of Dr. Gardiner's contentions, in which he is strongly supported by Professor Peet<sup>1</sup>. It is an error of Brugsch to pretend that Goshen is  and that the Greek name of Goshen is Phacusa. We shall follow Dr. Gardiner. "The comparison of the name  with Γεσέμ of the LXX is, in point of fact, unsuitable both topographically and phonetically. The topographical difficulty is the less important, but it will clear the ground to deal with it first."

The first argument of Dr. Gardiner is a statement which I cannot consider otherwise than as absolutely wrong: "Gesem was a town (Heroopolis)." It is impossible to admit this interpretation of the text of the LXX. It rests on the following passage (Gen. xlii, 28, 29): Τὸν δὲ Ἰούδαν ἀπέστειλεν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰωσήφ συναντῆσαι αὐτῷ καθ' Ἡρώων πόλιν εἰς γῆν Ῥαμεσσή. "And he sent Judah before him unto Joseph to meet him at Heroopolis towards the land of Ramesses." Here we have εἰς, which is the equivalent of the  "towards," after a substantive<sup>2</sup>. The Hebrew does not mention Heroopolis and has only  "towards" Goshen. The same in the following verse, where the Greek has "to Heroopolis," and the Hebrew "towards Goshen." This is easy to understand. Heroopolis was the first city reached by travellers who came from Beersheba by the road which was still used by the caravans before the Suez Canal, at the entrance of the Wâdî Tumilât, near what is now

<sup>1</sup> *The supposed Egyptian equivalent of the land of Goshen*, in *Journal*, v, 218.

<sup>2</sup> GESENIUS, *Hebrew Grammar*, 148.

Isma'ilyah. It was the border-land of . Joseph goes to meet his father and to show the tribe which followed him where was the part of the country allotted to them. It was not a city; the text says the contrary; it was the *land* of Goshen γῆ Γεσέμ (Gen. xlvii, 1, 6, 27), the same word γῆ as for the *land* of Canaan. It is never called otherwise in all the passages where it is mentioned.



Twice Goshen is called Γεσέμ Ἀραβίας (xlv, 10; xlvi, 34) where the Hebrew has only "the land of Goshen." It is the king who calls it so, in both cases, in reference to the Hebrews being shepherds and having much cattle. This mention of Ἀραβία is only in the LXX. This translation was made for the Jews in Egypt, and it is natural that the translator who writes for them should add a word indicating exactly which part of the country was allotted to Jacob and his family; it was the land which at that time was in the nome of Arabia.











I cannot understand the interpretation Dr. Gardiner gives of the passage of Judith (i, 7). Nebuchadrezzar sends messengers "to Persia and to the West to Cilicia, to Palestine...and beyond the river of Egypt, to Tahpanes and to Ramesses and to the whole land of Goshen until thou comest above Tanis and Memphis, and to all that dwelt in Egypt until thou comest to the borders of Ethiopia." This is said to mean that in this passage "Goshen appears to signify the whole Delta or at least the whole Eastern Delta as opposed to Egypt or Upper Egypt." Here the only interpretation possible is that of common sense: the messengers of the king are said to have visited the cities of Palestine, then to have gone beyond, πέραν...τοῦ ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου the river of Egypt, which was considered as its limit, and to have gone to the first places which were reached coming from Palestine, places well known to the Israelites and which were in the Eastern Delta, Τάφναι called דֵּפְנָה by Jeremiah, Δαφναί by Herodotus and now Tell Defennah, a place of refuge for the Jews in the time of Jeremiah, about 12 kilometres west of Zoar and one of the first places reached by the fugitives. Raamses was either the city or the land from which the Israelites started going to Sukkoth. Every reader of the book knew that these places were in Egypt without being obliged to say so. It is clear that the writer does not pretend to geographical correctness; afterwards he mentions the whole land of Goshen, to which he gives a too large extent: it is between Tanis and Memphis; that does not mean the whole Eastern Delta, since Daphnae and Ramesses would not belong to it. Having mentioned the first places reached in Egypt, which were well known to the Jews, the author cannot go over all the other places where the king sent his messengers, and speaks of all that dwelt in Egypt as far as Ethiopia. Thus, says Dr. Gardiner, the land of Goshen, being the whole Eastern Delta, is in opposition to Egypt, *i.e.* Upper Egypt. Let us translate that in language of the present day. When I say that the king sent messengers to Dover and Canterbury, and to the whole of Sussex as far as London, and to all that dwelt in Great Britain as far as the Trent, it is clear that this does not mean that Sussex is the whole of the south-eastern part of England and that it does not belong to Great Britain to which it is opposed. That is how Dr. Gardiner interprets the passage of Judith.

Let us consider now how we are to understand a later Christian document, the pilgrimage to Palestine and Egypt of the pious lady whom, following the first editor Gamurrini, I shall still call Silvia Aquitana, who travelled between the years 385 and 388 A.D. The pilgrim who is, according to Dr. Gardiner's standpoint, the abbess Aetheria, was evidently the interpreter of her own time, and her language is clearly based upon the LXX gloss (*sic*) Γεσέμ


'*Αραβίας*. Aetheria speaks of arriving "ad civitatem quae appellatur Arabia quae est in terra Jesse." That, says Dr. Gardiner, "reversing the view of the LXX itself, where as we have seen Gesem was a town (Heroopolis) while Arabia was a land." Now I have only to say that this is just the contrary of what the LXX says. I am not going to discuss whether it is a gloss, but in the two cases when Γεσέμ is connected with 'Αραβία, we have γῆ Γεσέμ 'Αραβίας (xlv, 10; xlvi, 34), showing clearly that Gesem is a land and not a city. Silvia says once that the civitas Arabia is a city in the land of Jesse. The name of the capital of the province became that of the province. If Dr. Gardiner had quoted a little further he would have found this: "ad civitatem quae appellatur Arabia, quae civitas in terra Gesse est; nam inde ipsum territorium sic appellatur; id est terra Arabia terra Gesse." Hero, Heroopolis. Heroopolis is sixteen miles distant from Gesse, for it is "in finibus Aegypti"; there Joseph met his father Jacob. Sixteen Roman miles from the site of Ero would carry us not far from Tell el-Kebîr, which must have been very near the land of Goshen. As Dr. Gardiner says, the pilgrim identifies Goshen with the district round Saft el-Ḥennah. This agrees entirely with the text of the LXX, which Dr. Gardiner calls a gloss.






Another objection of Dr. Gardiner is that Saft el-Ḥennah is in Egypt, while the Wâdî Tumulât is officially outside it, for the purpose of the Bible narrative. This again is an error: the Wâdî Tumulât is not outside Egypt: the Râs el-Wâdî, the beginning of it, is near the lake of Mahsamah and extends west nearly as far as Zakâzîk<sup>1</sup>. Tell el-Kebîr, Abu Ḥammâd are in the Wâdî, all the land of Goshen is in Egypt, and when Joseph had his family there he established them in Egypt.

Let us now pass to the philological objections to identifying  with Goshen, "which are vastly more serious."  cannot be read Γεσέμ, it has to be read šsm<sup>2</sup>.

A survey of the cases in which the sign  $\gamma$  is employed has led us to the opposite conclusion. In this case  $\gamma$  is not to be read šs.  $\gamma$  is a polyphonous sign which may be read *gs* or *ks* and šs. The sign may sometimes take this form  $\gamma$  and the two forms may often interchange. They are not distinguished in hieratic, but in hieroglyphic  $\gamma$  is never used except when the first consonant is a *g* or a *k*, while  $\delta$  may often be a *g*, for instance  or   
var.  (Erman)  (Brugsch),  var.   
 var. , ,  (Twenty-first Dynasty), *Todt*.

<sup>1</sup> See the maps of Linant de Bellefonds and of Col. Ardagh.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Gardiner quotes a passage from the Petrie Papyri, Pl. II, 4, 3, where Mr. Griffith reads 

 which he translates: walls and sharp stones of Kesem (Goshen). Dr. Gardiner says he can give a better sense.  "even as a wall of copper of Shesem," Shesem being the country from which the copper comes, therefore not Goshen. I cannot admit this restoration of the text. I can quote here two examples from the Myth of Horus (Pl. V). It is said that the god is  a wall of iron or metal behind his sanctuary  behind Mesen. I should read  the iron wall of Kesem which at that time was the most easterly part of the land.

64, 46. We see the value of both signs in the name of the town of Kous  $\delta \delta \overline{\Delta} \delta \delta \overline{\Delta}$ ,  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  (Champollion) and  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  which I found twice on the spot on the ruins of a pylon. As I said,  $\delta$  is never found in hieroglyphic when it has not the value of a *g* or *k*, as in the name of Koptos  $\delta \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  which may be found written  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  or  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$ .

Therefore the fact that we find  $\delta \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  settles the question of the reading Gesem or Kesem. This occurs in an inscription of one of the upper chambers of Denderah. It has been published twice by Duemichen (*Geographische Inschriften*, I, LXVIII and III, Pl. XXV). The first publication is only a reproduction of the few signs which Duemichen could see and is therefore very fragmentary. The later one is as complete a copy as he could make of the inscription in its present state. Of these publications, Dr. Gardiner says: In the later publication Duemichen gives the first sign as  $\delta$ , "which, if correct, would be a strong argument in favour of the reading Gesen; but the earlier edition shows the sign cross-hatched as though indistinct, and the subsequent reading is probably mere interpretation."




Now let us listen to what Duemichen says of this inscription: "In my first sojourn in the beautiful sanctuary of the Hathor of Denderah I had succeeded in getting a few words, and here and there a sentence from these representations and explanations. Mariette and Brugsch after me could not recover more from this wall blackened by smoke and covered by dung of bats.... During my last stay at Denderah, I succeeded in taking complete possession of these valuable inscriptions by attacking the wall with hot water so vigorously that the inscriptions showed themselves in their full clearness, so far as they had been preserved in the course of centuries." In this publication, where this inscription covers 24 plates instead of 2 of the first,  $\delta \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  is perfectly clear; I see no reason not to trust Duemichen's copy, and still less to argue from his first edition. This disposes of the serious philological objections of Dr. Gardiner. The reading of the name is *Gesem* or *Kesem*.



As for the  $\mu$  (*m*) at the end of the word, we have other examples of the *m* and *n* being used indifferently in the Semitic transcriptions, for instance  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  or  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  Naharaim, and at Tell el-'Amarnah Nahrima, or the reverse  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  at Tell el-'Amarnah *narkabtu*<sup>1</sup>. There we find also Mimmuria and Nimmuria for the name of Seti I.












$\overline{\Delta}$  and  $\overline{\Delta}$  in the lists of Tuthmosis III and later often correspond to the Semitic  $\psi$  or  $\psi$ ,  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  עִשְׁתָּרַת,  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  אִשְׁקֵלֹן. Thus we have found in Egyptian the  $\delta$ , the  $\psi$  and the  $\lambda$ . We have even the vowel  $\sigma$ . We have seen that the variant of  $\delta$  is  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$ . It is well known that the vowel-sign  $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$  has often the value of  $\omega$  which we find in the name *K $\omega$ s*, the Kous of the present day, and Koptos. We could not have a better transcription of  $\delta \psi \lambda$ .


According to Dr. Gardiner, Saft el-Hennah cannot be Phacusa. It is certain that the

<sup>1</sup> WINCKLER, *Tell el-Amarna Letters*, vocabulary, 25. Γέσεμ itself is also read by the Greeks Γέσειν, Κασσάν, Κεσσάν.

god of the nome was  or  *Sopt*. This name must perhaps be read *Soptakhem*. Some of the coins which represent this god, a hawk with two feathers, call him 'Επτακωμ, the Greek transcription of the Egyptian name. These coins, as M. J. de Rougé says<sup>1</sup>, are clearly to be attributed to the nome of Arabia. It is to this god that the fine naos of Nectanebo was dedicated. The inscriptions give us a great deal of information about the gods of the place which had various names. The most usual which we find in the lists is 

the house of Sopt, with many variants, one of which, often met with, is . It had a sacred tree  a sycamore. Curiously, this tradition of the sycamore had persisted as late as the journey of the pilgrim; but then a Christian origin was attributed to it.

In the list of nomes speaking of  we find:  or  which we also find written . It was the name of a territory with a capital of the same name, containing a sacred city, the house of Sopt, just as the territory of  had a sacred city, Pithom. It is very interesting that, speaking of the dedication of the shrine to the gods of the locality, the place is called . This shows that already in Nectanebo's time the final  had fallen off in the pronunciation; it was already the *Kωs* of the Copts, and with the article Phacusa. There are other examples of the final  not being written, such as the goddess  where the  is very seldom written, and  if this name is to be read as *Sesemt*.

It seems to me that we have sufficient evidence showing that  was *Γεσέμ* and that *Γεσέμ* was the nome, the capital of which was on the site of Saft el-Ḥennah.

That this place was Phacusa, *Kωs* with the article, is stated by Ptolemy, who, as Sir Flinders Petrie has shown, points exactly to Saft el-Ḥennah<sup>2</sup>, and could not be *Fakḳûs*. Strabo says that the canal which runs from the Nile to the Red Sea branches off from the river at Phacusa. It cannot be *Fakḳûs*, since no canal started from there towards the Red Sea, and there are no traces of any such canal in the desert, the land of which would have been an insuperable obstacle. But, according to Dr. Gardiner, Strabo's statement is of no value; it is a mistake of the geographer who confused the earlier and later capitals of the nome. That there has been a change in the capitals seems certain. We have other examples of names being shifted from one place to another; we know two Beni Ḥasan, two Korein and others. But we have no proof whatever that the change in capitals had already taken place in Strabo's time. One does not see any reason for it in the time of Augustus. But if *Fakḳûs* became the seat of a bishopric, it is natural that in Christian times its importance should have been greater than the residence of the god Sopt, it became the religious capital of the region and the name of the old capital was applied to it.




<sup>1</sup> *Monnaies des nomes de l'Égypte*, 40


<sup>2</sup> DUEMICHEN, *Geogr. Inscr.*, IV, 126.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, III, 25.

<sup>4</sup> *Naucratis*, I, 91.

Here is another point in which Dr. Gardiner's view is in disagreement with the texts. "The conception of the land of Goshen revealed by the biblical narrative is that of a region near Egypt, suitable for grazing cattle, but not inhabited by the Egyptians themselves (Gen. xlvi, 34; Ex. ix, 26). Now this description would evidently not apply to the district round about Saft el-Ḥennah." The land of Goshen as described by the biblical narrative is not a region near Egypt, it is part of Egypt. Such passages seem clear enough: (Gen. xlvi, 6) "Pharaoh spake unto Joseph.....the land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and thy brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell"; and this: (Ex. ix, 26) "And the hail smote throughout all the land of Egypt...only in the land of Goshen, where the children of Israel were, was there no hail"; "And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen" (Gen. xlvi, 27).

What the Egyptian texts tell us of the nature of the land is quite in harmony with what we hear from Genesis or Exodus. If we look at the oldest list of nomes which we have, of the time of Seti I, we find that there are only fifteen nomes of Lower Egypt, and that those of Athribis (Benha) Bubastis and Septakhem (Saft el-Ḥennah) are absent. This part of the country was therefore not yet organized in provinces with a settled administration, each nome having its government and administration. Instead of nomes we find branches of the Nile and marshlands, such as  the water of Rēc, in which there was the locality called  Bailos, or, according to other texts: . Brugsch (*Dict. Géog.*, 77 and 197) recognizes there Φελβες, Belbeis<sup>1</sup>, which Arab authors say was the land of Goshen. The water of Rēc seems to have been the continuance of the canal *Ati* of Heliopolis, the 'En esh-Shems. Dr. Gardiner objects to Brugsch's identification, "which has received a quite unmerited degree of acceptance, for it rests on nothing more than a superficial consonantal resemblance." Having no monuments found on the spot, we are obliged to rely on the transcription, which is much better than many others. As to there being no evidence that the Bubastis branch ran so far east as Belbeis, we read in Herodotus that the canal to the Red Sea starts a little above the city of Bubastis. Belbeis is only 12 miles above Bubastis, so that the canal must have started very near. It is hardly more east of Bubastis than Heliopolis, and the canal of Heliopolis, the Bubastis branch, must have gone through it.

We have most interesting information about the country round Belbeis in the great triumphal inscription of King Menepthah relating his victory over the peoples of the sea. He tells us that the enemies had pitched their tents in the front of Pi Bailos, in the tract(?) of *Ati* (the canal of Heliopolis).....(the country) was not cared for, it was left as pasture for cattle because of the strangers (). "It was left waste from the time of the ancestors." We could not have a more accurate description of the land of Goshen, a country not cultivated, but left for cattle, where probably the king had his, a region which for cattle-driving was the best of the country.

Summing up this long discussion and taking each of the statements of Dr. Gardiner, and of answers, we find that:

Raamses is not the city of Tell Retâbah, for Professor Petrie did not find there any





<sup>1</sup> "Macrizy, dans sa description des villes d'Égypte, s'exprime ainsi: La ville de Belbeis est la même que la terre de Gessen dont il est fait mention dans le Pentateuque, et où habita Jacob après qu'il se fut rendu auprès de son fils Joseph." QUATREMÈRE, *Mémoires sur l'Égypte*, I, 52.



inscriptional testimony whatsoever.—On the contrary, we maintain that if the inscription is not corrected, if it is taken as it is, translated simply and not interpreted in a fanciful way, it corroborates absolutely Professor Petrie's discovery that Tell Retâbah is the site of Raamses.

Avaris is Pelusium and the city of Ramesses. It could not be Pelusium, which did not exist at the time of the Hyksos. Besides, Pelusium could not be the city of Ramesses, the starting-point of campaigns against the populations of Palestine and the Sinaitic peninsula, and the defence against such invaders who came across the desert to the Wâdî Tumulât or the region of Kanţarah, and who did not attack Egypt from the sea.

Γεσέμ of the LXX was a town.—This is the contrary of what we read in the text where, without a single exception, we always read γῆ Γεσέμ the land of Gesem.

 cannot be read *Gesem*, it must be read Šsm.—In the inscription of Denderah the word is written with the sign  which has always as variant a  or a .

The land of Goshen was a region near Egypt, and not a part of the country.—This is in contradiction with what we read in Genesis xlvi, 6 and Exodus ix, 26, especially Gen. xlvi, 27, where it is said: “And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the land of Goshen.”

The country around Saft el-Ḥennah could not be Goshen, which was a region suitable for grazing cattle, but not inhabited by the Egyptians themselves.—This is exactly what the Egyptian inscriptions say of that part of the country; it was not cared for, it was left for pasture for cattle because of the strangers.

Phacusa was not Saft el-Ḥennah, but Faḳḳûs, and Strabo made a mistake when he says that the canal from the Nile to the Red Sea branches off at Phacusa. He made a confusion between the two capitals of the nome.—We are not inclined to attribute such a grave mistake to a geographer giving the description of the country he visited. It seems probable that Faḳḳûs superseded the old capital when it became a bishopric, long after Strabo's time.



Such is, as Professor Peet calls it, Dr. Gardiner's *irresistible combination* of philological reasoning and inquiry into what the Egyptians themselves had to say, by which *he destroyed for ever the illusion* that Goshen equals Gesem or Saft el-Ḥennah.



### Pithom and Sukkoth.




In a note which Dr. Gardiner adds to the fifth chapter of his article on the Delta Residence of the Ramessides, he asserts that all the inscriptions, Egyptian and Latin, which I found in my excavations at Tell el-Maskhûtah and on which I based the proof that this place was the site of Pithom-Heroopolis, apply much better to Tell Retâbah, and that Tell el-Maskhûtah is not Pithom, but Theku.

Dr. Gardiner begins with a statement which is no longer correct. He says the only scholar who appears to disagree with me is M. Daressy. This is no longer the case; on the contrary. When M. Daressy wrote the paper which Dr. Gardiner quotes, he had not read my memoir on the result of my excavations. I was in Cairo at that time. Having found that my memoir on “The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus” was not in the library of the museum, I had it sent at once, and the result was that in a paper which he read before the Société de Géographie, M. Daressy stated that Tell el-Maskhûtah was Pithom-Heroopolis, and on his map it can be seen that he places the passage of the Red Sea exactly at the same spot which I indicated, which implies the extent of the Red Sea






as far as Lake Timsâh, the view which I advocated also with the nearly unanimous testimony of geologists.

Another scholar whose views on another point Dr. Gardiner fully endorses, Dr. Kùthmann, says at the beginning of an article on the eastern limits of Egypt<sup>1</sup>, that my excavations at Tell el-Maskhûṭah have established decisively (endgùltig) that it was the site of Heroopolis Hero, and that the Egyptian name was  and .





We have now to go over the results of my excavations, and to substantiate again the conclusions which I derived from them.  or  means the house or the temple of

Tum or Atum, of which the variant is  or . At Tell el-Maskhûṭah have been found all the characteristics of a temple of Tum. At the entrance in the dromos leading to it were found two or more sphinxes, such as can be seen at the entrance of the temple of Tum Harmachis, at Heliopolis and also in Nubia at Es-Sebû', where there is a temple of the same god. Before I went to Tell el-Maskhûṭah, M. Paponot, an engineer of the Freshwater Canal, who had a villa there, had made excavations, found the dromos of the temple and two great sphinxes, one on each side. The best preserved of those monuments has been carried to Isma'îliyah, where it adorns the public square. These two sphinxes alone would have been sufficient to show that the avenue on the sides of which they were found led to a temple of Tum. For the sphinx is one of the forms of Tum Harmachis, as we know from the gigantic figure which is near the pyramids. The name of the sphinx is  which does not mean the double lion, but the lion-like, in German der Löwengestaltete or Löwenartige, in French le lionard ou lionesque, le faux lion. The animal, which is masculine, is the body of a lion with a human head, and that the sphinx was considered as a lion is proved by the name Es-Sebû' given to the temple of Tum in Nubia, the entrance of which is an avenue of sphinxes.



But whatever be its name, it is certain that the sphinx is a form of Tum, and that it was worshipped at Tell el-Maskhûṭah. Besides the sphinxes, M. Paponot has found also the naos of the temple in red sandstone, the inner part of which is not empty, but contains a recumbent sphinx with a human head, not detached from the floor. It is usual for the emblems of the gods to be deposited in a naos in the temple. At Edfu the naos contained a hawk, the emblem of Horus. Here it contains the emblem of Tum, showing again that it is the temple of Tum. According to Dr. Gardiner, this naos should have been at Tell Reṭâbah.



Before going on with the inscriptions referring especially to Pithom, I should like to speak of another name which is found more frequently: it is the name of . This is clearly a border land, which is mentioned in the papyri. It had a governor, a *wakîl* . It contained a fortification , the wall which was the fence of the region. There was also probably, at the entrance, a fort  which defended it, and where there was a guard. In all these instances,  is always indicated as being a border land.

<sup>1</sup> *Die Ostgrenze Aegyptens.*

Brugsch has been the first to show that the  was not a *t* but a letter pronounced like the English *th* and often transcribed by the Hebrew  $\text{ד}$  so that in Hebrew it was Sukkoth<sup>1</sup>. This is an example of a popular etymology which is usually found in the transcription of foreign names.  often spelt  had a sound similar to the Hebrew word "tents." This does not mean that it is a Semitic word. The first population of the Sinaitic peninsula was not Semitic, it was African, and the word may be the African *thukka*, which means pasture, and  is the pasture land, the country where the Beduins ask to be allowed to go in order to feed their cattle.

The land of Sukkoth contained several cities: the first which was reached coming from the desert was Pithom, as we learn from this passage of the Pap. Anastasi, VI: "We have allowed the Beduin tribes of Etham<sup>2</sup> to pass the fortress of Meneptah belonging to the land of Sukkoth towards the pools of Pithom of Meneptah belonging to the land of Sukkoth in order to feed themselves, and to feed their flocks in the great estate of Pharaoh." This is clear enough. The fortress is at the entrance of the region; after having passed it, the Beduins reach the pools of Pithom.



Tum is the god of the whole region, therefore we constantly find  or . The name of the capital was the same as that of the region. We have seen that before, speaking of Zoar and Γεσέμ.



There is no doubt that the civil name of the city, the ruins of which are Tell el-Maskhûtah, is ; but as there was an important sanctuary of Tum there, the part of the city where the temple stood, which gave the city its religious name, was  Pithom.

We have already seen that the presence of two sphinxes at the entrance of the temple of Tell el-Maskhûtah, and of one in the sanctuary, proved that the temple was a temple of Tum, the house or the abode of the god. Let us now consult the monuments which have been discovered on the spot.

One is the squatting statue of *Ankh-she-ner* "the good recorder of Tum" or of Pithom, and the *kebaa* of Pithom. Two triads of gods will grant that his name may last. This man was attached to the service of Tum, was living at Pithom, and he naturally wished that his name should remain in the city and in the temple where his activity had been exerted; that is the reason why he put his statue there. That seems obvious. But Dr. Gardiner tells us it is not so. The statue was set up in a fort eight miles distant from the temple of Tum, and from the city which has the chief sanctuary of the god.




Another squatting statue shows more evidently still that Maskhûtah where it was found was Pithom. It belongs to a man called *Aak*, who, with other titles, is head of the prophets of Tum, the great living god of Sukkoth. He addresses "all the priests who go into the

<sup>1</sup> Maspero in his article on Egyptian phonetics (p. 21) says the equivalence between  and  $\text{ד}$  does not exist. This assertion seems to me too positive. Evidently neither Hebrew nor Greek had a letter corresponding exactly to  which is transcribed in various ways. It may be either  $\eta$  or  $\gamma$  but it is certainly  $\text{ד}$  in



  $\eta\gamma\text{ד}$ , just as in Greek  $\eta\gamma$    $\Sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\nu\nu\rho\varsigma$ .

<sup>2</sup> NAVILLE, *Store City of Pithom*, 4 ed., 28.

sanctuary of Tum, the great god of Sukkoth, let them say that a royal offering be made to the beloved of the great god, Aak, that ceremonies should be made to his *ka*, that his name be established in the temple." Further it is said that "all that appears on the altar of Tum is for thy *ka*, Aak." Common-sense teaches us that the inscription addressed to the prophets who enter the temple of Tum must be placed in the temple of the god. The altar of Tum is in his temple, there the *ka* of Aak will enjoy all the good things deposited on it. How could he do it if the statue of his *ka* were not in the temple of the god who has his altar there? Aak, like Ankh-she-ner, wishes also that his name may remain in the temple; that is the reason why he caused his statue to be put there.





The same wish is that of the high priest *Auhau* or *Auhawunti*, who is also an official of the house of Tum of Sukkoth. In this inscription the god is called the Lord Tum, the word  the lord being expressed by the sphinx  and Hathor is called the lady  "she grants that my name may remain with this statue in the temple of Tum, the great living god of Sukkoth." According to Dr. Gardiner, it is in a wrong place, it is not in the temple of Tum which is 8½ miles distant. Like the two other men's, his wish is not fulfilled.



The most important monument found at Maskhûtah is the great historic stele which unfortunately is very badly engraved, so that a great part of it is hardly legible. This stele relates various events at different dates, of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, especially all the king did for the Heroopolitan nome and its gods, of whom it is said that he is a worshipper, and especially for Tum the great living god of Sukkoth, who is constantly named as the ruling divinity of the nome. It mentions the construction of temples, the digging of canals, a journey of the king to Persia in order to bring back the gods, among whom were those of Pithom of Sukkoth. Later on, we see the foundation of Arsinoe, where Tum of Sukkoth would also be worshipped. On the Red Sea, the king built Ptolemais Theron. The stele ends with the lists of grants to the temples of Egypt. "These revenues which have been given to his father Tum, and to the gods of Egypt, have been inscribed on this tablet in front of his father Tum, the great living god of the land of Sukkoth." It is obvious that such an important tablet, which relates various deeds of the king and decrees referring to Tum of Sukkoth, is placed in the capital of the land of Sukkoth, in the temple of the god; as the text says, in front of Tum. A stele like this, dedicated to Tum, followed by the other gods of the province, must clearly be placed in the temple of Tum, the chief of the other divinities. I may add that I found also a big stone hawk, now in the British Museum, the other emblem of Tum Harmachis; with the sphinxes we find the same emblems as in Heliopolis.

So that at Tell el-Maskhûtah we have: hawk and sphinx, the two emblems of Tum, the sphinx being in the naos; three statues of men connected with  or , all wishing that their names may remain in the temple, and the great stele which has to be placed in front of the god. I do not imagine what better archaeological and epigraphic evidence we might have that at Tell el-Maskhûtah was the great temple of Tum, from which the city derived its name Pithom.

But Dr. Gardiner brushes off all these monuments: a much better evidence for him is that there should be no monuments at all. Pithom is Tell Reṭâbah where the land of Sukkoth is mentioned, and Tum, who is the lord of the whole region extending as far as Tell Reṭâbah, but where there is no trace whatever of a temple of Tum. Nevertheless it is Pithom, the house or abode of Tum, it may be *theoretically* considered as such.

We know the Egyptian name of Tell el-Maskhûtah, Pithom, but we know also the Greek and Latin names Eropolis, which Dr. Gardiner says was the original name of the city, and Ero Castra. These two names were found on a stone in a wall at the side of a doorway. It is clearly the name of the place reached and to which the doorway gave access. Another inscription found close by on a small and thin slab says that from Ero to Clusma there are nine miles. It is not an ordinary milestone, as Mommsen observes, either in the inscription or in the form. Milestones marking the road are not thin slabs. They are generally pillars made of hard stone. This slab was on a wall, it is an indication for the soldiers occupying the camp of the distance to the neighbouring sea-beach. When I see on a doorway the names of Eropolis and Ero Castra, it seems to me the indication that I enter the city of Eropolis and the camp of Ero. No, says Dr. Gardiner, it is a mistake; the inscription should not be there, for these two names are those of a city and a camp,  $8\frac{1}{2}$  miles distant.

Eropolis means the city of Ero, the lion, the sphinx<sup>1</sup>, the emblem of Tum. The sphinx is called a lion, the name of which, as I stated when speaking of Zoar, is , the Greek reading of which would be Hρ. The ω at the end may come from an , for the reading of final  is often . This word having no sense for a Greek, they changed it into a word which they understood 'Ηρώων πόλις, the city of the heroes, which gave its name to the gulf, the head of which was at nine Roman miles' distance. Heroopolis being a Greek name, was not used by the Copts, who wrote Egyptian, and when the LXX (Gen. xlvi, 28) says that Judah met Joseph καθ' Ηρώων πόλιν, the Copts give the city its Egyptian name ρα πεωωμ, near Pithom.

In conclusion, considering that at Tell el-Maskhûtah have been found sphinxes, naos, statues, steles which all were part of a temple of Tum called  or , or belonged to it, I say that there cannot be any doubt that Tell el-Maskhûtah is Pithom, called by the Greeks Heroopolis and by the Romans Ero, and I cannot admit this principle of research, to put aside all the monuments which are so clear, and to locate Pithom at Tell Retâbah, in a place where there are no remains of it, and where the temple exists only *theoretically*. As for the Greek and Latin names of the city, if Eropolis, Ero Castra is Tell Retâbah, then the name of the city, which should be at the entrance, is inscribed on a doorway eight miles away. This, to quote Professor Peet again, is another example of Dr. Gardiner's "irresistible combination of philological reasoning and inquiry into what the Egyptians had to say."

### The Red Sea.

As for the Red Sea not extending further north than the present Gulf of Suez, the authority of Dr. Gardiner is Dr. Kùthmann, who maintains that there are no grounds for supposing this extent. This statement is advocated in his pamphlet *Die Ostgrenze Aegyptens*, an Inaugural Dissertation for obtaining a doctor's degree. This dissertation is directed chiefly against me. I have established decisively the site of Pithom-Heroopolis, but when I took up again the idea that the Red Sea ascended as far as the Wâdî Tumulât, I revived the point of view put forward by the savants of the French expedition, and I left aside all the evidence of the contrary which we find in antiquity.

<sup>1</sup> On this subject see my articles on the sphinx in *Sphinx*, v, 130; x, 138; xxi, 12.

We shall now submit these views to a searching criticism. The starting-point is this: The savants of Napoleon's expedition have opposed the view that since antiquity there had been no change in the land of the isthmus, and they have *postulated* that in Greek times the Gulf of Suez extended much farther north, and ended at the present Lake Timsâh. Thus the labour of men like Le Père and Du Bois Aymé, who spent years in the region, who had it surveyed by engineers who explored it carefully, noting what was found on the soil, the plants, the shells, the nature of the water found by soundings, and who were led to conclude that the sea extended much further north than Suez, this, for a young German doctor, is only a "postulate."

Lately Dr. Gardiner has found another supporter to his views, M. Clédat, who says that without any doubt Tell el-Maskhûtah is *Ero Castra*, who always speaks of Theku as being Sukkoth, of Gessen as being part of the Wâdî Tumulât. The only point in which he differs from me is that he does not admit the idea of the Red Sea extending further north than at present. This is an "invention" of Le Père, who has been refuted by Rozière, whose arguments Kùthmann repeats without naming him. I took up again Le Père's invention.


I shall now consider briefly the chief arguments of Kùthmann and Clédat. The French scholar knows well that the northern part of the Red Sea was called the Heroopolitan gulf. One cannot admit that a gulf receives its name from a city 80 kilomètrés distant, and that Heroopolis, which is spoken of as a harbour, should be so far from the head of the gulf. But the very simple way of solving the difficulty is to endorse Rozière's invention and to suppose that there were two cities of Heroopolis: Tell el-Maskhûtah and another near Suez, of which there is absolutely no trace whatever, and which is just as "theoretical" as the temple which Dr. Gardiner locates at Tell Reṭâbah. It is impossible that Heroopolis should have been at Abu Kêshêd, the old name of Tell el-Maskhûtah, which was still in use not very long ago, in spite of the ruins found there, which the members of the French expedition frequently mention.

To the authority of Rozière I shall oppose that of Linant de Bellefonds, both engineer and geologist, who between 1821 and 1840 explored and studied the isthmus of Suez, especially with the view of ascertaining its nature and its formation. He checked the levels taken by the French expedition and collected a great deal of information, out of which he made a memoir which was used by M. de Lesseps for the digging of the canal. In every journey which he made to the isthmus he added to it or made some slight corrections, and it was published in its final form in 1872. He quotes all the excursions and the work he did in the isthmus, "in order that the readers may be persuaded that it is not lightly that I arrived at the conclusions I now state...for such researches it is necessary to stay in the country, to study the ground step by step; the smallest thing, the remains of a construction, a stone, a small mound, remains of a dyke may be a clue leading to a conclusion." Certainly, considering how Linant Bey worked, we can say that he is the most trustworthy authority on these questions, since he, having stayed long in the country, could check what the French expedition had done, and what was ascertained by the digging of the canal, and thus make use of what had been done before him.

Linant describes all the soundings which he made north of Suez as far as the Mediterranean, the nature of the soil in what is now the Bitter Lakes, before they were filled by the digging of the canal. This basin was very clearly limited by considerable deposits of shells and plants quite similar to those which are found on the coast of the Red Sea; they were not fossils, but in their natural state, exactly like those which might be

collected on the beach of the Red Sea, showing evidently that it was not at a very remote period that the sea occupied these places, and that this epoch does not go further back than historical times.

This may be considered as the assertion of geology, which a great number of those scientists would be ready to endorse, like Sir William Dawson or Professor Hull. Further, when locating the cities of the isthmus mentioned by the ancients, Linant says there can be no doubt that Heroopolis was Tell el-Maskhûtah, at the head of the gulf which derived its name from the city.

We have now to consider what ancient writers say about Heroopolis and about the gulf. I shall begin with Herodotus. I need not revert to the long discussion on what the Greek author says: some of my contradictors, especially the Germans like Mommsen or Dillmann, have objected that my interpretation of the text rested on a correction (emendation). I have done nothing of the kind; this favourite practice of German scholars of correcting the texts according to their views is not in my line. I have only cut the sentence at the place indicated by logic, and I may say common-sense. Herodotus speaks of the canal which goes to the Red Sea, τῆ εἰς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν φερούση. It is a matter of course that it runs into the Red Sea, but the author will tell us the names of the cities where it begins and where it ends. This is the text, according to a manuscript in Paris. Ἦκται δὲ κατύπερθε ὀλίγον Βουβάστιος πόλιος παρὰ Πάτουμον τὴν Ἀραβίην πόλιν ἐσέχει δὴ ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν. It is obvious that the old commentators Wesseling, d'Anville had already found that the sentence must be cut after πόλιος. We know with certainty that Patumos, the Greek form of Pithom, was not near Bubastis, so that it cannot mean the starting-point of the canal. Why should Patumos be mentioned if it is a city along which the canal passes? The canal skirted many other cities. It is clearly the indication of the end of the canal. Herodotus mentions the city by its complete Egyptian name  Pithom at the Eastern door: *Ro ab*, which sounds very like *Arab*.

Herodotus speaks as Ptolemy, who gives also the two ends of the canal, Babylon and Heroopolis. According to the oldest manuscript of the geographer, Heroopolis is only one-sixth of a degree distant from the head of the Heroopolitan gulf<sup>1</sup>.

What Strabo says is just as clear. He speaks of the distance between Arabia and Egypt. I quote the manuscript without making any correction: μέχρι τοῦ μυχοῦ τοῦ Ἀραβίου κόλπου, διότι ἀπὸ Ἡρώων πόλεως ἦτις ἐστὶ πρὸς τῷ Νείλῳ μυχός<sup>2</sup>. This is clear enough, "as far as the Arabian Gulf, namely from Heroopolis, which is the head of the Arabian Gulf towards the Nile." I do not see any reason for considering this text as corrupt. Strabo says that Heroopolis is the head of the side of the Arabian Gulf which is towards the Nile, and a little further he will say that Aelana is at the head of the other side, towards Gaza. But Kùthmann cannot admit that; the text has to be corrected. Heroopolis is not the head of the gulf. The Arabian Gulf has two μυχοί, two branches, one towards the Nile, and one towards Gaza, and Heroopolis is not the head of the Egyptian branch, it is only on it. It may be near Suez or further South.

Agathemerus says that the Arabian Gulf begins at Heroopolis. He adds that it is long and narrow. Surely he would not say this of the Red Sea beginning at Suez. It is not

<sup>1</sup> LANGLOIS, *Géographie de Ptolémée*, Pl. LXXXVII. Neither in the map nor in the text Pl. XLV is the latitude of Babylon the same as that of Heroopolis, which is one of the chief arguments of M. Clédat.

<sup>2</sup> Müller reads here ἦτις ἐστὶν (ὁ) πρὸς τῷ Νείλῳ μυχός, which is not a correction and does not change the sense.

difficult to get rid of such positive statements in supposing with M. Clédat that there were two Heroopolis, one which was a harbour, and the other which was the camp of Ero Castra. But the inscription which I found on the doorway gives both names, the Greek Eropolis and the Latin Ero Castra, and no trace whatever has been found of a Heroopolis near the present Suez. M. Clédat follows the method of critics of the Old Testament, who create a great number of authors who are absolutely unknown. He creates a city which is a mere fiction.

Strabo, quoting Artemidorus, says that from Heroopolis the ships started which went to the land of the Troglodytes. It is exactly what the Pithom stele states: the inscription says that in the sixteenth year the king dug a canal which went from Heliopolis as far as the *Lake of the Scorpion*, which we know by the lists to be the marshland of the Heroopolitan nome; from there he went to the lake of *Kemuer*, where he built a city to his sister Arsinoe. The lake of Kemuer we know from the story of Sinuhe to be Lake Timsâh and to be a salt lake. There the king gathered transports loaded with all the good things of Egypt. They sailed to the land of the Troglodytes, founded the city of Ptolemais Theron, brought back elephants and all sorts of good things, to the Lake of the Scorpion, to *Kemuerma* where ships after ships arrived, so that there was abundance in the land.

We must notice that we read once the lake of Kemuer, and twice Kemuerma, which Brugsch and Erman translate also the *lake* of Kemuer. It seems to me that it might be the shore or the beach of Kemuer, which would be the Egyptian name of what the Roman stone called *Clusma*, a common name meaning the sea-beach, which was nine miles distant from Ero and which in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus must have been reached by the canal going through the Lake of the Scorpion. Thus we see that the stele fully confirms what we know from Herodotus, Ptolemy and Strabo.

I have one more document to quote, the book of Exodus. Why should I not make use of it, as I did of Herodotus and Strabo? I do not consider that the fact that it disproves the views of certain theologians is a sufficient reason for putting it aside as relating mere legends. As I said at the beginning, I shall treat it as any other document of antiquity, irrespective of the theories which theologians may build upon it. The children of Israel are a large tribe which cannot make long marches since they travel on foot. "And the children of Israel journeyed from Ramesses to Sukkoth." This seems to be one day's march. Ramesses is evidently the eastern part of the land of Goshen, as far as the city of Raamses. They reach the land of Sukkoth, somewhere near Pithom; it would be a march of about ten miles. A second march brings them to Etham on the edge of the wilderness, through which they have only to push straight forward on the road to Beersheba, which evidently Jacob had followed and which was still the caravan route in our time. But there, on the edge of the wilderness, they receive the order to turn back and to encamp by the sea. Evidently the sea must be near, and another day's march will bring them to the place where they are to camp. Supposing the sea did not go further than Suez, they would have had to march fifty miles through a desert, and part of the journey would be over mountains, the Gebel Attaka, which would have presented great difficulties for a large tribe, if it were not an insuperable obstacle. The narrative of the Exodus would be absolutely incomprehensible if the Red Sea did not go further than Suez, while it agrees perfectly with Strabo, Herodotus and the inscriptions found at Tell el-Maskhûtah.

The reader who has followed me in this long discussion will judge whether, as Professor Peet maintains, in my description of the geography of the Exodus, I was bent on finding biblical sites at any cost, ignoring what the Egyptians themselves have to say on the matter.



## A RARE VIGNETTE FROM THE BOOK OF THE DEAD

By WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S.

With Plate VIII

AMONGST the numerous copies of the *Book of the Dead* preserved in the Louvre Museum, is an Eighteenth Dynasty papyrus of special interest. This papyrus (Inv. No. 3074) is remarkable in that a considerable part of the text is written with white ink<sup>1</sup>. The manuscript is one of those used by Naville in his great edition of the *Book of the Dead* and is there cited by the abbreviation *Pc.*<sup>2</sup> More remarkable however than the white script is the unique vignette to Spell 85. The usual picture accompanying this text is the human-headed bird (*bj*) usually armless (e.g., NAVILLE, *Funeral Papyrus of Iouiya*, Pl. VII; *Pap. Nebsemi* B.M. 9900 etc.) but sometimes with upraised arms in the attitude of adoration (e.g., NAVILLE, *Pa.*). Another variant is the sacred ram, its homophone (e.g., *Pap. Ani*, Pl. 27; NAVILLE, *Pb.*)<sup>3</sup>. In the papyrus we are now considering the *bj*-bird hovers with outstretched wings above the recumbent figure of a man lying on a mattress. The human figure is that of a shrunken corpse, the flesh shrivelled about the bones and the joints standing out with great prominence. Both Deveria<sup>4</sup> and Maspero<sup>5</sup> many years ago recognized that this picture of a dead body was very rare if not unique, and they both describe it in almost the same words as "un cadavre noir, décharné."

The Egyptians always represented the dead either as completed and bandaged mummies or else visualized them as living<sup>6</sup>, and this picture appeared to me of such interest that by the kind offices of M. Charles Boreux of the Louvre I obtained the photograph of the original which is here reproduced, and although very dark and not altogether distinct it shows the details of the corpse more clearly than was possible in the very small-scale reproductions published by Naville<sup>7</sup> and Renouf<sup>8</sup>. The body seems to be that of a half-made mummy in the state immediately following its immersion in the salt-bath before the anointing and bandaging had begun. The effect of the immersion was to dissolve away all fleshy and fatty matter and to leave the skin stretched over the skeleton, the articulations in which would thus be brought into prominence.

<sup>1</sup> According to DEVERIA, *Cat. des Manuscrits*, 115, another papyrus at Cairo has the same peculiarity.

<sup>2</sup> NAVILLE, *Todtenbuch*, Einleitung, 98.

<sup>3</sup> NAVILLE, *op. cit.*, I, Pl. XCVII.

<sup>4</sup> DEVERIA, *op. cit.*, 116.

<sup>5</sup> MASPERO, *Études de Mythologie, etc.*, III, 403.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. BLACKMAN, *Rec. de Trav.*, 39, 56, and *Journal*, v, 123.

<sup>7</sup> NAVILLE, *Todtenbuch*, I, Pl. XCVII.

<sup>8</sup> RENOUF, *Book of the Dead*, Pl. XXII.



Vignette from a funerary papyrus (Louvre 3074).

## THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAWLS WITH A RIPPLED STRIPE IN THE THEBAN TOMBS

By ERNEST MACKAY

With Plate IX

A PECULIAR shawl-like garment with a rippled texture is worn by important people pictured in Tombs 17, 21, 24, 79, 80, 84, 85, 86, 155, 179, 200, 251 and 262 in the Theban necropolis.

It is represented as passing over one shoulder (always the left) and brought down under the other arm. A pointed end, generally depicted at the back of the figure, suggests a tied end; the garment thus appears to have been tied or otherwise secured at the back. The selvedged upper edge of the garment is always shown, but the lower fringed edge is frequently omitted and it would seem, therefore, that the fringe was an item that could be added as desired.

The shawl was either worn alone over the bare body, as shown in Tomb 21 (Pl. IX, Fig. 1), or more usually over a vest, as in Tombs 79, 80, 85, etc. (Figs. 2 and 3). In its simplest form it hung as far as the waist or even to the knees; in rare instances, it reached to the ankles<sup>1</sup>. On one wall in Tomb 21 the owner is shown wearing a kilt of this material as his sole garment.

This rippled fabric first appears in the Theban necropolis in the time of Tuthmosis I<sup>2</sup> and Hatshepsut<sup>3</sup>. It makes its last appearance in definitely dated tombs in Nos. 80, 85 and 200, all of which are of the period of Amenophis II.

The rippled markings on the shawls must have been woven in one of two ways: (a) the warp of the material was grouped so as to give the effect of close and open, or (b) the rippled lines were produced in the cloth by special means in the course of weaving. We have definite proof in Tomb 21 that they were not an attempt to represent folds or creases, for when the garment is worn by a man those parts of the material between the lines are represented as pink to denote transparency and the red body-colour showing through. In the case of a female body in the same tomb the transparent parts are shown in yellow, the same colour as the women's skin.

The second method of weaving seems the more probable. If the warp of the material were grouped, we should certainly have the effect of a series of straight lines in the place of rippled lines, producing a fabric which was used extensively in Ramesside times, but not immediately before to the writer's knowledge, though such material has been found dating to a very early period<sup>4</sup>.


Figure 1 shows a shawl of rippled material worn over a white kilt. The lines over the upper part of the body are not continuous, it will be seen, with those of that portion of the garment which falls over the kilt. This is portrayed perfectly correctly. The transparent

<sup>1</sup> Tombs 24, 79, 80, 85.

<sup>2</sup> Tomb 21.

<sup>3</sup> Tomb 179.

<sup>4</sup> W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, *Deshasheh*, 32. A similar material has been found at Tarkhân of the period of the First Dynasty.




1



2



3



4

1-3. Representations of shawls of rippled material from Theban tombs.

4. Similar material from modern Greece.

portion of the cloth between the opaque rippled lines would be accentuated by the flesh beneath showing through over the upper part of the body, whereas the rippled lines would stand out more clearly with the backing of another material, namely the kilt, in the lower part of the body<sup>1</sup>.

An exactly identical fabric is made on hand-loom in most parts of Greece at the present day. The writer has examined a sample which agrees in every particular with the material pictured in the illustrations. It is a very fine silk gauze with rippled lines of a thicker fibre running through it in pairs. These rippled lines are introduced in the woof, and it would seem that two shuttles were employed, one for the thread forming the gauze and the other for the paired lines. The appearance of this modern material, which is produced in cotton and linen as well as in silk, agrees in the closest manner with the Egyptian examples, even to the selvedge (Pl. IX, Fig. 4).

Though now used in Greece, it does not follow that this method of weaving originated there, though a similar fabric is represented in ancient Greek painting and statuary of the Ionic period, and neither before nor after that time. In ancient Greece it was only employed for the *chiton*, and, as such, worn next to the skin.

The material of which these rippled shawls were made was probably costly. It is worn by the king in Tombs 85 and 86<sup>2</sup>, and, with very few exceptions, by no one but the owner of the tomb itself. In Tomb 179, however, garments made of the same fabric are worn by a group of dancing girls and by a few of the more important guests at the banquet, as well as by the wife of Nebamun.

A female figure making offerings to the seated vizier User in Tomb 21 is dressed in a long tight-fitting garment of the early period with a strap over each shoulder, and both garment and shoulder supports are of rippled material<sup>3</sup>.

Owing to the comparatively small number of tombs in which this rippled fabric is represented and the prominence given to it in the tombs, it is suggested that it was a royal gift and imported or brought in as tribute from abroad. Tuthmosis I, as we know, made at least one expedition to Syria and Upper Mesopotamia<sup>4</sup>, and might well have brought back tribute in the form of clothing. If the material had been made locally or in another part of Egypt, we should have found it used more extensively and down to a later period of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

It is well known that Greece in ancient as well as in modern times has borrowed much from Syria, and it is to that country that the writer would ascribe the origin of the rippled material. It may well have been exported in early times, being first adopted for a short period by Egypt and then nearly a thousand years later by Greece<sup>5</sup>. It is interesting to note in this connection that a figure of Naram-Sin, King of Akkad, appears to be wearing a very similar fabric, even to the selvedge on the edge; and it is thus possible that the method of weaving originated in Babylonia and was thence introduced into Syria<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> A clearer illustration N. DE G. DAVIES, *Five Theban Tombs*, Pls. 25, 27.

<sup>2</sup> Probably other examples of the king wearing clothing of this material have been destroyed.

<sup>3</sup> These appear to be the only two tombs in which this fabric is worn by women. For Tomb 21 see again *Five Theban Tombs*, Pls. 25 and 27.

<sup>4</sup> Biography of Ahmose, El Kab.

<sup>5</sup> About 500 B.C.

<sup>6</sup> L. W. KING, *Sumer and Akkad*, 245 and Fig. 59; see also Fig. 66. As far as the writer has been able to ascertain the fabric is not made in Mesopotamia.

The same shawl-like garment was also made in a plain material, coloured pink in some cases to denote a certain amount of transparency<sup>1</sup>. In two tombs the fabric is coloured white, showing that a more substantial material was sometimes used; the date of the earlier tomb is Amenophis II and of the later one Amenophis III. It would appear, therefore, that this shawl-like garment was, when first introduced into Egypt, made of the rippled fabric, and that when that material went out of use a different fabric was employed, but by that time the garment itself was going out of fashion.

<sup>1</sup> Tombs 52, 85, 92, 104, 261, etc.

## THE STORY OF THE ELOQUENT PEASANT— A SUGGESTION

BY G. D. HORNBLOWER, B.A.

DR. GARDINER, in *Journal*, IX, 6, has pointed out the difference in quality between the narrative part of this story, written with the simple clearness of the classic period, and the part containing the petitions, "clumsy and turgid." It is indeed disappointing to the curious reader, stimulated by the opening, so full of promise of a real insight into the people's life of those old days, to fall into a dull display of oriental eloquence in petitioning. This dulness must surely have weighed on the ancient reader as it does on us, and we wonder at the undoubted popularity of a work so bare, in its greater part, of literary charm. But, knowing the practical nature of the race, we are justified in looking for a clue to the matter in the realms of utility, and in this we shall be helped by a review of modern Egyptian practice.

In Egypt today, in spite of the extraordinary educational enlargement of recent years, petition-writing flourishes exceedingly. Public scribes sit at their tables in the streets, especially in the neighbourhood of public offices, ready to write letters for the illiterate, to prepare for them simple contracts and, above all, to frame their petitions to officials of all degrees. The predominance of petition-writing is well shown by the name applied by the populace to these scribes—"petition-men" (*ardihalghi*), their official title being "public writers" (they have for many years been subject to regulations, and cannot practise without a licence).

It is in petition-writing that eloquence is demanded and the scribe who commands it is sure of good custom. He will have in his mind a varied stock of models, graduated according to the importance of the subject-matter and the fee tendered by the client. To take an example, observed some thirty years ago: a *fellâh*, wishing to charge an enemy with an offence punishable by law, would procure a scribe to write an accusation, for the nearest police station, giving all necessary details, real or not. The scribe would ask his client, "what do you wish for your enemy? penal servitude? for life or a term? simple imprisonment, or with hard labour? for how long?" and so on, and would fix his fee in proportion to the sentence required and the amount of eloquence he has to expend. Needless to say, the eloquence, impressive enough, maybe, for the client, is florid and trite, mere stale routine for the officials at whom it is aimed.

The peasant's eloquence in this story, though running to lengths much beyond those of the modern scribe, is essentially of the same character, and we shall probably be justified in connecting the two, and in considering the peasant's nine speeches as models of eloquence for the use of petitioners.

It will be noticed that none of the speeches refers to any actual facts, they are wholly composed of general moral considerations padded flatteringly round a heightened figure of the personage addressed, though sometimes curiously tinged, it would seem, with veiled threatenings; thus they could be applied to any kind of case in which a peasant considered

himself wronged, and, in short, are mere models, hung on the peg of a story. That the peasant's eloquence was destined to succeed is made evident at once, from Pharaoh's instructions to the steward (B. 75-88); by this device the author displays the virtue of his wares.

It is probable that the models are of a professional nature. The ordinary *fellâh* of those days, as of these, would be quite incapable of framing his petitions, and, since petitions were certainly made, as this story shows, there must have been a class of men ready to put them into proper and efficacious form. To such men, perhaps even to their clients, this collection of models, with their powers duly attested, would be a document of much practical use, and it is for this reason, probably, that it gained its popularity.



## NOTE ON THE EGYPTIAN PAPYRUS BOAT

By WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S.


With Plate X

THE Science Museum at South Kensington has recently acquired a model of a type of boat used on Lake Tsana in Abyssinia (Inv. No. 1923-626). Colonel H. G. Lyons, F.R.S., Director of the Museum, drew my attention to this boat and to its resemblance to the papyrus skiffs of ancient Egypt. He kindly permitted me to examine the boat, and suggested that a note upon it might be of interest to readers of this *Journal*, providing me with the photographs which are reproduced on Pl. X.


Of the model itself but little description need be given, as an examination of the photograph (Pl. X, Fig. 2) renders this superfluous. It consists of a number of strips of palm-fibre lashed together and prolonged into a rostrum rising slightly above horizontal level at the prow, and bending sharply upwards at the stern. These single fibre units in the model represent bundles of reeds in the actual boats. There is no keel, and the vessel is flat-bottomed and fairly broad in proportion to its length. The hollow of the boat is capacious and is entirely filled with a stout rectangular bundle of fibres, closely lashed together and furnished with sling-ropes by which the whole mass can be bodily lifted out when the boat is required for cargo carrying. When the natives use these boats for fishing or for ferrying the central platform always occupies its place, for as Colonel Lyons suggests, not only does this form a firm and high deck, but it prevents the feet of the boatmen or passengers from going through the bottom of the boat, thereby flooding it and causing considerable damage and risk. The fibres which compose that part of the vessel which is normally under water tend to become soft and pulpy from prolonged immersion, hence the necessity of a firm dry platform upon which to stand.

Now on looking at a number of examples of papyrus skiffs used in the fishing scenes in Egyptian tombs of all periods, it will be noticed that in nearly all cases the central figure, in the act of using the harpoon, stands upon a flat horizontal surface which rises clear above the gunwale of the vessel (Pl. X, Fig. 1). This flat surface, therefore, is probably no mere convention of drawing, but an actual representation of the moveable deck so clearly shown in the South Kensington model. Instances of such pictures are so abundant in tombs of all periods that it would be useless to specify them, but as examples we may cite, for the Old Kingdom, that in the tomb of Ti (STEINDORFF, *Grab des Ti*, Pls. LVIII and CXIII), for the Middle Kingdom, Khnumhotp's tomb at Beni Hasan (Pl. X, Fig. 1 = *Beni Hasan I*, Pl. XXXIV) and for the New Kingdom, the scene in the tomb of Nakht (DAVIES, *The Tomb of Nakht*, Pl. XXIV).

Colonel Lyons informs me that the boats in actual use in Abyssinia, in which he himself has often travelled, are from six to seven metres in length. The present day use of this type of boat, of which the typical papyrus skiff of ancient Egypt is the prototype, is another interesting example of the survival and diffusion of Egyptian ideas similar to that recorded by Professor Breasted in connection with the primitive reed-floats which he discussed in this *Journal* some years ago (IV, 174-176).



1



2

1. Representation of papyrus canoe from Beni Hasan.
2. Model in palm-fibre of reed canoe from Abyssinia.

## THE RITE OF OPENING THE MOUTH IN ANCIENT EGYPT AND BABYLONIA<sup>1</sup>

By AYLWARD M. BLACKMAN, D.Litt.

IN Vol. VII of this *Journal*, pp. 133–153, Professor Langdon has drawn attention to what he regards as evidence of direct contact between the peoples of the Nile and Tigris valleys in predynastic times, and in Vol. VI, pp. 4–27, Professor Rostovtzeff has also pointed out that the very early Egyptian, Babylonian, and South Russian civilizations have elements in common, elements which, if not due to direct intercourse between the inhabitants of those widely separated regions, must be derived from the same source, a centre of culture situated perhaps in Northern Syria or Asia Minor, and so still waiting to be disclosed by the excavator's pick.

Possibly this article may throw a ray or two of light on what is at present a quite obscure problem.

In the course of one out of many conversations with Professor Langdon I was telling him about the Ancient Egyptian rite of Opening the Mouth, practised on mummies, statues, and figures used for magical purposes, whereupon he informed me that a similar rite was employed in Babylonia. Later he supplied me with much interesting and valuable material, which indeed forms the main part of this article.

The most important of the texts to which Professor Langdon drew my attention was published by Professor Zimmern in 1901<sup>2</sup>, and of this he has furnished me with the following translation, based upon his own carefully collated copy:—

FRAGMENT I. Beginning broken away... (2) *šadānu-stone*... (3) *mušgarru-stone, porphyry*... (4) *dušu-stone, silver, gold, copper,....-stone*... (5) *...best oil, finest oil, cedar-oil, honey, butter [...shalt thou pre]pare*; (6) *white wool, red wool, bluish wool, shalt thou bind on his (the statue's) neck*; (7) *...the door shalt thou shut, while thou shuttest it...* (8) *the incantation "...king, who dost illumine heaven and earth, who dost decree..." shalt thou thrice repeat*; (9) [*censer*], *torch, holy-water bowl shalt thou bring [unto him]*, (10) *with holy [water] shalt thou wash (him)*; *the ground shalt thou sweep, and holy water shalt thou sprinkle*; (11) *cedar and cypress shalt thou place (i.e. in the censer), sesame-wine shalt thou libate*, (12) *a heap of meal on the holy-water bowl shalt thou scatter*; (13) [*the incantation*] "*Mountain of evergreen trees and cedars*" *shalt thou thrice repeat*; (14) [*the incantation*] "*The...of Azag-šud and Nin-ḥabur-sil-du*" (15) [*before*] *the holy-water bowl shalt thou thrice repeat*; (16) *the incantation "...house (?) of Nisaba"* *shalt thou thrice repeat*; (17) *...before (?) the holy-water bowl; the cult-installation shalt thou prepare*; (18) *a lamb-offering shalt thou offer, a censer with cypress (in it) shalt thou place*; (19) *sesame-wine shalt thou libate; thine hand shalt thou*

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read before the Royal Asiatic Society during the Centenary Celebrations on July 20th, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> ZIMMERN, *Ritualtafeln*, Nos. 31–37; see also No. 38.

raise, and (20) the incantation "Holy water, water brought from the Tigris" (21) shalt thou thrice repeat before the holy-water bowl, and (then) kneel.

(22) Then to the...-house shalt thou go, a reed-altar shalt thou set up, at the river shalt thou look.

(23) In the House of the Craftsmen, where they have fashioned the god, (24) shalt thou sweep the ground and sprinkle holy water; for Ea, Marduk, and that god, (25) shalt thou place three censers with cypress (in them); sesame-wine shalt thou libate; (26) on that god Washing of the Mouth and Opening of the Mouth shalt thou perform; (27) censer and torch shalt thou bring him, in the holy-water bowl shalt thou purify him, (28) (and) to that god shalt thou speak thus:—(29) "From this hour shalt thou go before Ea, thy father. (30) May thy heart be happy, thy mind joyful. (31) May Ea, thy father, be full of joy in face of thee!" (32) Thrice shalt thou speak thus, kneel down, and grasp the hands of the god; a sheep shalt thou....

(33) The incantation "Thou art great in thy going forth, in thy going forth" shalt thou repeat, (34) as thou goest in front of the god with a torch from the House of the Craftsmen to the river.

(35) ...the craftsmen, as many of them as...purification for that god (36) ...their tools beside that god on the field(?)... (37) ...a cult-installation on the bank of the river shalt thou set up. (38) That god shalt thou place upon a reed-mat, canopies shalt thou erect, (39) ...for Ea and Marduk a reed-altar shalt thou set up; (40) ...dates, šasku-meal shalt thou scatter, (41) date-wine mingled with honey and butter shalt thou serve up; (42) ...shalt thou place, a lamb-offering shalt thou offer, (43) ...shalt thou mix, pour out, (44) and (then) kneel down; a censer with cypress shalt thou set forth, sesame-wine shalt thou libate; (45) ...an axe, a...a... (46) ...sheep... (47) ...shalt thou place....

FRAGMENT II. ... (2) ...wash his mouth, (3) ...recite to him;... (4) before Ea shalt thou remove the cult-installation; (5) ...in the midst of the canopies and the reed-spears (6) shalt thou place that god in a covering of linen upon a reed-mat<sup>1</sup>; (7) his eyes shalt thou turn towards the sunrise and beside that image (8) shalt thou place, in the midst of the canopies and reed-spears, the utensils of the god, as many as there are of them, (9) and the tools of the craftsmen; thou shalt remove(?), and then kneel down.

(10) For Anu (Heaven-god), En-lil (Earth-god), Ea (Water-god), Sin (Moon-god), Šamaš (Sun-god), (11) Adad (Thunder-god), Marduk (god of Babylon), Gu-la (goddess of medicine), Nin-si-anna (Venus), (12) shalt thou place nine censers to the evening-star, a cult-installation shalt thou prepare, (13) a lamb-offering shalt thou offer, sesame-wine shalt thou libate; (14) Washing of the Mouth and Opening of the Mouth shalt thou perform, (and) then shalt thou remove the installation.

(15) For Maḥ (Mother-goddess), Azag-šud (lustration-goddess), Nin-ḥabur-sil-du (lustration-goddess), Nin-kur-ra (quarry-goddess), (16) Nin-a-gal (smith-god), Guškin-banda (god of gold-workers), Nin-igi-nangar-gid (carpenter-god), Nin-zadim (jeweller-god), and that god, (17) shalt thou place nine censers to the gods of the night, their names shalt thou pronounce, (18) a lamb-offering shalt thou offer, Washing of the Mouth and Opening of the Mouth shalt thou perform.

(19) At dawn for Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk, in the midst of the canopies, shalt thou (20) place three seats, pease-meal shalt thou serve up, a linen cloth shalt thou draw thereover;

<sup>1</sup> Reading *burā* (LANGDON).

(21) *three banquet-tables shalt thou prepare, dates, šasku-meal shalt thou scatter thereon, (22) date-wine mixed with honey and butter shalt thou serve up, (23) an adagur-vessel shalt thou fill with beer, milk,... (24) sweet-smelling cane and...shalt thou prepare... (25) six... shalt thou fill with sesame-wine... (26)—(35) ....*

FRAGMENT III. ... (2) ...*date-palm...* (3) ...*Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk.* (4) ...*Ea, Šamaš, and [Marduk]* (5) ...*this before Šamaš [shalt thou recite].*

(6) *For Azag-šud, Nin-ḫabur-sil-du, Nin-kur-ra, (7) Nin-a-gal, Guškin-banda, Nin-iginangar-gid, (8) Nin-zadim, shalt thou place a censer with cypress, (9) a lamb-offering shalt thou offer, sesame-wine shalt thou present; (10) Washing of the Mouth and Opening of the Mouth shalt thou perform; (11) censers, and a torch shalt thou bring to him (i.e. to the statue), (12) in the holy-water bowl shalt thou wash him; thou shalt take away and then kneel down....*

FRAGMENT IV. ...*shalt thou remove, (2) ...shalt thou remove, (3) ...[Nin-]ḫabur-sil-du shalt thou remove, (4) ...shalt thou remove....*

This text shows clearly that the Washing and Opening of the Mouth of statues, as practised in Babylonia, consisted of a series of episodes, apparently ten in number, which were enacted in at least three different places, the House of the Craftsmen, *i.e.* the sculptors' workshop (see below, p. 50, Episode 3), some building on the river-bank (see *ibid.*, Episode 2), and the river-bank itself (see *ibid.*, Episodes 4, 5).

Before proceeding to discuss other Babylonian texts that deal with the Washing and Opening of the Mouth, it will be as well to give a general description, based upon the directions laid down in the foregoing document, of each of the ten episodes in the order of their occurrence. The description, which has been read and approved by Dr. Langdon, will be especially useful to us when we come to compare the Babylonian with the corresponding Egyptian rite.

EPISODE 1 (Fragment I, lines 1–21). The beginning of the text, which unfortunately is broken away, would doubtless have told us where the first episode was performed. It is obvious from line 7 that it took place in some building, that building being, so Dr. Langdon is inclined to think, in view of what follows, the House of the Craftsmen.

Judging from the statements in Fragment II, lines 12, 17, 19, the rite was begun at some time during the night and lasted until sunrise. Hence perhaps the directions about the use of a torch<sup>1</sup>.

Before he started upon the actual consecration of the statue, the priest had to see that certain objects and commodities were ready to hand. These consisted of various kinds of stones, blocks of gold, silver, and copper, unguents enumerated as "best oil," "finest oil," and "cedar oil," and lastly butter and honey. Our text does not tell us to what use the stones, metals, and oils were put. However, it seems probable that with the last mentioned the priest anointed the statue. The honey and butter were mingled with date-wine and employed as a drink-offering<sup>2</sup>, and they were also used, so another tablet informs us<sup>3</sup>, for the washing of the statue's mouth. The first act of consecration was to bind strands of white, red, and bluish wool about the statue's neck. The priest then shut the door of the room or building in which this part of the rite was taking place, and, while so doing, recited a formula. He next fumigated the statue with incense, offered it a lighted torch,

<sup>1</sup> See Episodes 1, 4 and 10.

<sup>2</sup> See Episodes 5, 9.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 51.

and sprinkled it with holy water. After that he swept the floor and sprinkled it also with holy water. Once more the priest burnt incense, placing cedar- and cypress-wood on the censer, poured out a libation of sesame-wine, and scattered meal on the holy-water bowl,—each action being performed to the accompaniment of a thrice-repeated formula.

A ceremony especially connected with the holy-water bowl was performed at this juncture. The priest having made ready the cult-installation in front of the holy-water bowl, offered a lamb, burnt incense, and poured out a libation. Then standing before the bowl with his hands raised in prayer, he recited a formula, the purpose of which, judging from the introductory words that are given, was to identify the contents of the bowl with the water of the Tigris.

EPISODE 2 (Fragment I, line 22). The priest now went to some temple or shrine, evidently situated on the river-bank, and having set up a reed-altar, looked at the river.

EPISODE 3 (Fragment I, lines 23–32). The priest returned to the House of the Craftsmen in which the statue had been fashioned, and there he once more swept the ground and sprinkled it with holy water. After this preliminary performance, he burnt incense and poured out a libation of sesame-wine to Ea, Marduk, and the statue. The priest then washed and opened the mouth of the statue, fumigating it (the statue) with incense and sprinkling it with holy water.

The episode ends with the threefold repetition of a formula which speaks of the joy of Ea and of the god, whose statue was being consecrated, in one another's presence. Having thus spoken the priest knelt down and grasped the hands of the statue.

EPISODE 4 (Fragment I, lines 33–34). The statue was now taken from the House of the Craftsmen to the river-bank, and the priest was directed to walk in front of it carrying a lighted torch and reciting as he went the words, *Thou art great in thy going forth, in thy going forth.*

EPISODE 5 (Fragment I, line 35–Fragment II, line 3). The beginning of the directions for the next part of the rite, which was enacted on the river-bank, is unhappily much mutilated. However, we learn that the craftsmen who had made the statue participated in the performance, and that their tools were laid on the ground beside the statue, which was placed on a reed-mat. Canopies or baldachins were now erected and an array of reed-spears stuck upright in the ground. Having set up a reed-altar for Ea and Marduk in the midst of the canopies and spears, the priest scattered dates and *šasḫu*-meal upon it and served up a drink-offering of date-wine mingled with honey and butter. After the sacrifice of a lamb and the pouring out of some of the above-mentioned drink-offerings, the priest knelt down. On rising from his knees he burnt incense and made a libation of sesame-wine.

In the much-broken line 45 mention is made of an axe, which suggests that the priest now approached the statue, which stood on its mat at a little distance from the canopies and reed-spears, and lightly touched its mouth to open it.

The broken lines 1–3 of Fragment II show that this episode concluded with the washing of the statue's mouth to the accompanying recitation of a formula.

EPISODE 6 (Fragment II, lines 4–9). The priest's next act was to remove the cult-installation set up in front of Ea in the midst of the canopies and reed-spears, and to replace it by the statue which, wrapped in a covering of linen, was set up on a reed-mat with its eyes turned towards the sunrise. Beside the statue were laid the utensils of the god and the tools of the craftsmen who had fashioned it. These objects the priest seems presently to have removed and then to have knelt down.

EPISODE 7 (Fragment II, lines 10–14). This episode began with the burning of incense in nine censers to nine divinities and the preparing of a cult-installation, after which the priest offered a lamb and poured out a libation of sesame-wine. Then for the third time he washed and opened the mouth of the statue, and, having so done, removed the cult-installation.

EPISODE 8 (Fragment II, lines 15–18). This episode is similar to the preceding one. Nine censers of incense were offered to nine more divinities, among whom, in this instance, was included the statue undergoing consecration. After the offering of a lamb (no mention is made of a libation) the mouth of the statue was washed and opened for the fourth time.

EPISODE 9 (Fragment II, line 19–Fragment III, line 5). At dawn the priest placed three seats for the three lustration-gods, Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk, in the midst of the canopies. Having first offered them a sort of porridge made of pease-meal, which he covered with a linen cloth, the priest made ready three tables. On these he scattered dates and *šasku*-meal, and then laid upon them a drink-offering of date-wine mixed with honey and butter. On, or beside, the tables was also placed a vessel containing beer and milk, and apparently another vessel as well containing sesame-wine.

The rest of the directions referring to this episode are too fragmentary to convey any information, except that a formula was to be recited before Šamaš.

EPISODE 10 (Fragment III, lines 6–12 and Fragment IV, lines 1–4). Having offered incense to seven divinities, presented them with a lamb, and poured out to them a libation of sesame-wine, the priest for the fifth time washed and opened the statue's mouth. This done, he fumigated it with incense, illuminated it with a torch, and sprinkled it with holy water. He then removed the various articles he had employed and knelt down.

The rest of the text is so broken as to be unintelligible, except that the surviving words of Fragment IV seem to indicate that the rite was over, and that it was now the priest's business to remove the images of the different divinities who had participated in it.

A partially preserved tablet in the British Museum<sup>1</sup>, so Professor Langdon informs me, contains the formulae by means of which the various materials employed at the celebration of the rite just described were consecrated. Thus one, which is the best preserved, consecrates the butter, which, as we have seen, figures among the food-stuffs used for ritual purposes, by relating that commodity's mystic origin and power. The formula in question which is called in the rubric *An incantation for washing the mouth of a god with butter*<sup>2</sup>, begins as follows:—*The pure butter, the clean butter, which was born from the cow of the cattle stall.*

This formula is preceded on that tablet by another formula recited at the washing of a god's mouth with honey.

“We know from another tablet<sup>3</sup>,” says Professor Langdon, “that formulae were employed to consecrate plants, woods, and similar substances, used in these washing and opening of the mouth rituals. In fact all lustration material was so consecrated.” He points out, too, that the burning of incense, the presentation of meal-offerings, animal-sacrifices, the pouring out of libations, and the use of butter and honey, “belong to the

<sup>1</sup> 79–7–8, 68 + 511.

<sup>2</sup> On the universal belief in the mystic power of milk and honey see USENER, *Milch and Honig*, in the *Rheinisches Museum* (1902), LVII, 177 ff. and the literature there cited.

<sup>3</sup> *British Museum*, K. 5412b.

ceremony of invoking the aid of the great lustration deities and of the deity whose image was being consecrated."

Professor Langdón has also supplied me with the following information, which I give in his own words:—

"A large tablet in four columns, almost entirely preserved, describes the ceremony of consecration employed for the crescent or symbol of Nusku, the god of the new moon<sup>1</sup>. Here the ritual is called the 'Opening of the Mouth.' The ritual first consists in the recitation of an exorcism to consecrate a ship which is also a symbol of the god Nusku. In the elaborate ritual of lustration which follows, a statue of Nusku is placed upon a throne and arrayed in fine linen, and then the linen is removed. Offerings and libations are made to the lustration gods Šamaš, Ea and Marduk, and to the god whose image is to be consecrated. The image is then washed in holy water. In the directions for the lustration service honey and butter are mentioned.

"Here follows the only known Sumerian incantation which was actually recited during the act of opening the mouth. The glory of the god Nusku and the moon's crescent introduce the exorcism. Then the wood from which the crescent was made is extolled. The image itself is here spoken of as the crescent, so completely is the god absorbed in his symbol:—

*The crescent will not smell incense if his mouth be not opened.  
Food he will not eat, water he will not drink.*

Thus runs the exorcism, and the holy waters in which the image and crescent are washed are extolled. The water-god himself is said to have brought the image to the river's bank where the consecration is performed. *The great god of lustration brings this image, bathed in honey and butter, and casts the waters of exorcism in its mouth.* Thus the act of opening the mouth actually consists in washing it with the magic water.

"A Semitic inscription of Nabuapaliddin, king of Babylon in the eighth century B.C., describes how that king ordered a statue of the sun-god to be made of gold and jewels. The account, which gives only an historical notice of the event, then reads:—*By the lustration-rites of Ea and Marduk in the presence of Šamaš in the 'house of the pure quay,' at the bank of the Euphrates, he washed its mouth and put garments upon it*<sup>2</sup>.

"The phrase 'washing of the mouth,' and probably also the synonymous one 'opening of the mouth,' finally lost its literal sense and became a general term for consecrating any sacred object. So in a well-preserved ritual of the consecration of a bronze tambourine as a symbol of music in the hall of the temple musicians in Babylon we have the rubric employed in this perverted sense. A liturgy of consecration is followed by the rubric, *Prayer for the washing of the mouth of a bronze tambourine*<sup>3</sup>. The term as here employed refers to a ritual of consecrating an object with holy water, incense, and other magic material, accompanied by prayers.

"Finally a tablet of rituals exists in which the ceremony of washing and opening the mouth is concerned with small images, apparently of the god of the lower world, the pest-god. The ritual is written for the expulsion of demons from the body of a sick person, and part of the magic operation consists in censuring and baptizing these little images of the

<sup>1</sup> *British Museum*, K. 63, published in IV RAWLINSON, Pl. 25. A translation in C. Fossey, *La Magie Assyrienne*, 338 ff.

<sup>2</sup> V RAWLINSON, 60–61, Col. iv, 22–28.

<sup>3</sup> IV RAWLINSON, 23, No. 1, Rev. 1, 23.



pest-god. They are then subjected to the ceremony of mouth washing and mouth opening. The object of this ritual is obviously not consecration, but to induce the pest-god to issue an order of departure to the devils. In fact the entire ceremony of mouth washing and mouth opening appears to have its *raison d'être* in the idea of 'opening the mouth' so that sacred revelation or sacred commands may be uttered."

We will now turn to the Egyptian rite of Opening the Mouth<sup>1</sup> and see what are to be found therein in the way of comparisons with the corresponding Babylonian rite.

Though in the period of the New Kingdom the rite of Opening the Mouth seems often to have been performed on the actual mummy on the day of its interment, that rite was clearly in the first instance instituted for the purpose of identifying a statue with the divinity or human being (king or private individual) whom it represented, and of imbuing it with that divinity or human being's life and personality<sup>2</sup>.

EPISODE 1. Proceedings opened with the placing of the statue upon a heap of sand with its face to the south (see Fig. 1). In respect of orientation the Egyptian and Babylonian rites are




Fig. 1. The statue standing upon a heap of sand with its face to the south.

Fig. 2. The statue being sprinkled with water from one of the four *nnst*-vessels.

not in agreement. In Episode 6 of the Babylonian rite, the only episode in which the orientation is mentioned, the priest is directed to place the statue with its face towards the sunrise. Again, whereas according to the Babylonian rite the statue was placed upon a mat, according to the Egyptian it was set upon a mound of sand. With regard to the mat, however, it might be pointed out that according to the *Papyrus Rhind*<sup>3</sup>, the body, on being brought into the embalmer's workshop, rested on a mat of green rush. As I have pointed out in this *Journal*, v, 157 ff., the rite of preparing the body for burial and that of

<sup>1</sup> See E. SCHIAPARELLI, *Libro dei Funerali*, two vols., Rome, 1882-90; E. A. W. BUDGE, *The Book of Opening the Mouth*, two vols., London, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> See A. M. BLACKMAN in *Journal*, v, 159, with note 8.

<sup>3</sup> G. MÖLLER, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, Leipzig, 1913, 16, 56.

Opening the Mouth are closely connected, both being based upon the supposed matutinal lustration and toilet of the sun-god.

EPISODE 2. A preliminary censuring of the statue. There were also other fumigations with incense at intervals during the course of the rite.

It will have been seen that in the first episode of the Babylonian rite the statue was fumigated with incense, and that there were also subsequent fumigations as in the Egyptian rite.

EPISODES 3 and 4. The statue was sprinkled with water from two sets of vessels, four to each set (see Fig. 2). The formula pronounced during the sprinklings asserts that *thy purification* (i.e. that of the divinity or person with whom the statue is being associated) is the purification of Horus, the purification of Horus is thy purification. Thy purification is the purification of Sêth, the purification of Sêth is thy purification. At the third repetition of the formula the divinity's name is Thôth, and at the fourth, Sepa. The formula, therefore,




Fig. 3. The statue being presented with a foreleg of beef.

Fig. 4. The mouth and eyes of the statue being opened with the adze called *dwt-wr*.

consecrated the water here employed by identifying it with that used by the four great Heliopolitan lustrator-gods, Horus, Sêth, Thôth, and Sepa<sup>1</sup>.

According to the Babylonian rite the statue, after being censured, was illuminated with a torch and then sprinkled with holy water, this censuring and lustral washing taking place during the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd episodes. In Episode 1 of the Babylonian rite the contents of the holy-water stoup were identified with the sacred waters of the Tigris. In the Egyptian rite the water used for lustration was, as has just been pointed out, identified with that used by the four Heliopolitan lustrator-gods, i.e. with that drawn from a pool or tank sacred to the sun-god<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See A. M. BLACKMAN, *ibid.*, 156 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* The provenance of the water is only implied in this particular lustration-formula used in the rite of Opening the Mouth, by the mention of the names of Horus, Sêth, Thôth, and Sepa. But in other

EPISODES 5-7. The statue was presented with ten balls of natron and five balls of incense for the purification of its mouth.

In the Babylonian rite the mouth of the statue was washed and opened five times (see Episodes 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10), not with natron but apparently with butter and honey.

EPISODE 8. The actual purificatory ceremonies were brought to a close with the fumigation of the statue with incense.

These eight ceremonies are followed by several (Nos. 9-24) which are peculiar to the Egyptian rite of Opening the Mouth as distinct from the other related Egyptian rites, and include the twofold slaughter of an ox, the slaying of two gazelles, and a duck or goose, the presentation of the foreleg (see Fig. 3) and heart of either ox to the statue, the touching of the mouth of the statue with various adzes (see Fig. 4) and other implements, such as a chisel (see Fig. 5), and the rubbing of the statue's mouth with milk. These acts were




Fig. 5. The mouth of the statue being opened with a chisel.

supposed to open not only the mouth of the statue, but the eyes and ears as well, indeed endow it with the faculties of a living person.

As we have seen, the tools of the workmen figure in the Babylonian rite, and Professor Langdon has suggested that they were employed in the same way as the adzes and other implements in the Egyptian rite, *i.e.* the officiant touched the lips of the statue with them. The sacrifices of the oxen, gazelles, and goose correspond, perhaps, to the offering of a lamb on three different occasions in the Babylonian rite. Again, the smearing of the lips of the statue with milk may be compared with the washing of the mouth of the Babylonian statue with butter (see the rubric quoted on p. 51).

In lustration-formulae, used in closely connected rites, it is definitely asserted that the water is that of a pool sacred to the sun-god, or is actually the god's own efflux. In Osirianized lustration-formulae, the water is identified with that which wells up from the source of the Nile at the first cataract, *i.e.* it is an exudation from the body of Osiris. See A. M. BLACKMAN, *Rec. de Trav.*, 40, 49-78.

EPISODES 25–33. The officiant now placed the white head-covering (*nms*) upon the statue and arrayed it in various coloured cloths, white, green, red, and dark red; he also hung the “broad collar” (*wšḫ*) about its neck.

These cloths may perhaps be compared with the white, blue, and red wools tied round the neck of the statue in the Babylonian rite. It will be remembered also that the statue of Nusku is described as being placed upon a throne and arrayed in fine linen, and that at the consecration of the statue of the sun-god, made by the order of King Nabuapaliddin, the officiant *washed its mouth and put garments upon it*.

EPISODE 34. The statue was anointed with various unguents and the eyes were painted with green and black cosmetic.

The mention of oils at the beginning of the text given in full on pp. 47–49, suggests that in the Babylonian rite also the statue was anointed at one stage or other in the proceedings, though we are not actually told when this anointing took place.

EPISODES 35–37. The statue was now invested with various insignia of royalty for which there seems to be no parallel in the Babylonian rite.

EPISODES 38–41. After another censuring of the statue, incense was burned to the uraeus-goddess and then to all the divinities of Egypt. This last-mentioned proceeding finds perhaps a parallel in Episodes 7 and 8 of the Babylonian rite, in each of which incense is offered to nine divinities.

After a further censuring of the statue and other preliminaries, such as the bringing in and purifying of the altar or offering-table, a meal was served. This ended, the floor was swept, and then the statue was solemnly borne away by *nine companions* or *courtiers*.

The sweeping of the floor was an important act in the Ancient Egyptian temple and funerary liturgy. At the close of the service, before he left the sanctuary or tomb-chapel, the officiant carefully obliterated all traces of footprints with a besom or cloth. In the temple liturgy the officiant also swept the floor early in the proceedings as well as at the end<sup>1</sup>.

This sweeping of the floor seems likewise to have been an important ceremony in the Babylonian rite of Opening the Mouth, occurring in Episodes 1 and 3.

The meal at the end of the Egyptian rite is to be compared with the constant presentation of food- and drink-offerings to the statue in the Babylonian rite.

It will have been observed that at the end of the Babylonian rite the priest is instructed to take away the statues. Similarly at the end of the Egyptian rite the statue was removed, not by the chief officiant however, but by the *nine courtiers*.

It will also have been observed that the Babylonian priest is directed in Episodes 1, 4 and 10 to illuminate the statue with a torch,—or is it a candle? In the Egyptian rite of Opening the Mouth the ceremonial use of the torch or candle is not enjoined. But as a matter of fact the ceremonial use of lighted candles is frequently referred to in Egyptian inscriptions. Candles were burned in tomb-chapels on the occasions of certain annual festivals<sup>2</sup>. They were also burned before the statues of divinities in the temples. Thus we find Tuthmosis III ordaining that a candle should be burned every day in the presence of both Ptaḥ and Ḥathor in the temple of Ptaḥ at Karnak<sup>3</sup>. It would seem, indeed, that a candle was regarded as the most ordinary and as the cheapest offering that could be made

<sup>1</sup> See A. M. BLACKMAN, *Rock Tombs of Meir*, IV, 50 with note 1, where full references are given.

<sup>2</sup> See NINA DE G. DAVIES and A. H. GARDINER, *The Tomb of Amenemhät*, 97 ff.

<sup>3</sup> SETHE, *Urkunden*, IV, 771 ff.

to a divinity<sup>1</sup>. This custom still survives in the cult of modern Egyptian saints, both Moslem and Christian<sup>2</sup>.

Professor Langdon has pointed out (see pp. 52 ff.) that in Babylonia the rite of Opening the Mouth was performed over small images of the pest-god, to make them efficacious for expelling demons from the body of a sick person. In Egypt the rite was employed for similar purposes. In *Pap. Turin*, 131, 1-8 = *Metternich Stele*, 3-8, quoted by Dr. Gardiner in an article by him on Egyptian magic<sup>3</sup>, there is a spell for curing a person who has been bitten by a poisonous snake. The magician is to take a hawk made of *isy*-wood crowned with two feathers, *open its mouth and offer it bread and beer* (the staple food and drink of the Egyptians) *and incense*. He is then to *place it on the face of one suffering from the bite of any snake and recite* (the prescribed spell) *from beginning to end*. The spell in question conjures the poison to leave the sufferer, and the conjuration is definitely said to be the utterance of Horus, whom, of course, the feather-crowned hawk represented. By means of the Opening of the Mouth the image was identified with the god, and mysteriously imbued with his life and power, and he thereupon became immanent in it (see above, p. 53, note 2). Accordingly when the magician recited these words of Horus in the presence of the image, it was as though Horus recited them himself. The figure was offered food, of course, because it was regarded as being endued with life and therefore requiring sustenance, the Egyptians always supposing that the gods and the dead needed food and drink no less than living men.

Again the *shawabty*-like wooden figure, which was set on a brick pedestal and placed on a hole in the north wall of the burial chamber of an Egyptian tomb, was made efficacious for the protection of that chamber by having the Opening of the Mouth performed on it<sup>4</sup>. By the same rite also the so-called heart-scarab was made efficacious for securing its possessor justification at the posthumous trial<sup>5</sup>. The purpose of the rite in both these cases was not so much to identify the object consecrated with any particular divinity or entity (though the charm engraved upon it speaks of the heart-scarab as the dead man's *ka*) as to imbue it with life. Thus mysteriously alive both wooden figure and scarab would be truly efficacious.

Professor Langdon considers that the term *Washing of the Mouth*, which is probably synonymous with *Opening of the Mouth*, is used in a "perverted sense" when referring to the ritual of consecrating a bronze tambourine, which seems to have been placed as a symbol of music in the hall of the temple musicians in Babylon (see p. 52).

But perhaps there is not quite so much perversion as Professor Langdon is inclined to suppose. Was not the tambourine thus consecrated with a view to its becoming a vital and potent object, partaking of the same mysterious power as was conferred by the performance of the rite on images of divinities?

I know of no Egyptian instance of the rite of Opening the Mouth being put to exactly such a use. The nearest approach is perhaps the Opening of the Mouth of the heart-scarab; yet the scarab represents a living thing, a beetle. But was the tambourine the symbol of a divinity? If so, then the employment of the rite in this instance is easily understandable from the Egyptian standpoint. For example, the sistrum and *mnit*-collar were not only

<sup>1</sup> See above, pp. 9 ff. Also GARDINER in *Rec. de Trav.*, 40, 79.

<sup>2</sup> See W. S. BLACKMAN in *Discovery*, IV, 11, 283, 286; V, 67, 71.

<sup>3</sup> HASTINGS, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII, 264.

<sup>4</sup> DAVIES and GARDINER, *Tomb of Amenemhät*, 117.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, 112 ff.

closely associated with the cult of the goddess Hathor and regarded as her emblems, but she was supposed to be immanent in them; Hathor appears not only as "Possessor of the *mnit*," but is actually herself the *mnit*<sup>1</sup>. It is more than likely that the image venerated in the temple of Denderah, which represents Hathor as a *mnit*<sup>2</sup>, had its mouth opened before it was installed there as an object of worship.

It might be pointed out in this connection that the separate parts of the censer used in an Egyptian temple, namely the bronze holder and the small pottery brazier in which the burning charcoal was placed, were regarded as separate entities and were addressed as such in the formulae pronounced by the priest when he laid hands upon them and proceeded to put them together<sup>3</sup>.

In Babylonia the rite of Washing and Opening the Mouth was also performed on priests at their consecration and on other occasions. Professor Langdon has supplied me with the following particulars:—

"Two classes of priests, and in fact the two most important kinds of priests, are known to have passed through this ritual, not only, apparently, at their consecration, but at any time when by inadvertence they had lost power over demons or favour with the gods. The sacramental priests who alone operated in magical ceremonies were the *ašipu* order or representatives of the water-god and ministers primarily of his cult. An incantation performed by an *ašipu* over a sick man supposed to be possessed by the demons begins:—*I am of the river-god, I am of the god* [                    ]; *the ašipu who gives life to the land; the great magician who walks in the city am I; the ašipu of Eridu<sup>4</sup> whose mouth has been washed am I<sup>5</sup>*. The priests of divination (*barā*) were submitted to the same ritual whenever they failed to obtain revelations from the gods<sup>6</sup>. It is probable that any one admitted to the order of the augurs was consecrated by washing and opening of the mouth<sup>7</sup>."

I know of no such extended use of this rite in Egypt. The nearest approaches to such a usage are the following:—

Part of the purification of a priest, before entering upon his course of service in the temple to which he was attached, was his *drinking of natron* for a certain number of days<sup>8</sup>. The purification undergone by the Pharaoh in the House of the Morning, or temple-vestry, before he officiated in the temple liturgy, included the chewing of natron for the cleansing of his mouth, this substance being spat out when sufficiently chewed<sup>9</sup>. Lastly we are informed that the wailing women who bemoaned Osiris had to purify themselves four times before they could stand within the *door of the Broad Hall*, and they also washed their mouths, chewed natron, and purified themselves with incense, in order that they and the lamentations with which they *beatified* the dead god might be pure<sup>10</sup>.

It will have been seen that the Egyptian and Babylonian rites of Opening the Mouth have several features in common. Is this just a coincidence, as is by no means impossible? If, however, there is any connection between the two rites, I personally incline to the view that they are both derived from a common ancestor, rather than that one was derived from the other. The Babylonian rite is clearly so thoroughly Babylonian and the Egyptian rite

<sup>1</sup> A. M. BLACKMAN in *Journal*, VII, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>3</sup> MORET, *Rituel du culte divin journalier en Égypte*, 16-20.

<sup>4</sup> City of the water-god Ea.

<sup>5</sup> *C.T.*, 16, 5, 170-177.

<sup>6</sup> ZIMMERN, *Ritualtafeln*, No. 1009.

<sup>7</sup> ZIMMERN, *op. cit.*, 116, 20.

<sup>8</sup> A. M. BLACKMAN in HASTINGS, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, x, 480<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 478<sup>1</sup>; A. M. BLACKMAN in *Journal*, v, 156 ff.

<sup>10</sup> JUNKER, *Stundenwachen in den Osirismysterien*, 6, 70.

so thoroughly Egyptian. In the Egyptian rite not only has every episode an Egyptian signification, but, apart from certain interpolations, the series of episodes forms a continuous whole, *viz.* the Solar-Pharaonic toilet followed by a meal. These two elements, the royal toilet and the meal, are the basis of all the other main Egyptian religious rites, namely the preparation of the body for burial, the funerary liturgy, the temple-liturgy and the purification of the Pharaoh in the temple-vestry<sup>1</sup>.

If there is any connection between Babylonia and Egypt in respect of this rite, it must date back to very early times, perhaps to times when the ancestors of certain racial elements that found their way eventually into Egypt on the one hand and Mesopotamia on the other, lived together in North Syria or Asia Minor<sup>2</sup>. Those people may have had some rite of Opening the Mouth of statues, which they carried into either country, where it underwent modifications in accordance with the ideas with which it came in contact.

One thing seems certain and that is that the Egyptians did not get the rite from the Babylonians. It is essentially Egyptian as we know it and, as already stated, is closely linked with all the main Egyptian religious rites.

It should here be pointed out that because of its close association with the Solar-Pharaonic toilet, which took place at dawn, the rite of Opening the Mouth of an Egyptian statue was also supposed to be celebrated at dawn<sup>3</sup>.

It will have been observed that the Babylonian rite was likewise celebrated in the small hours of the morning, terminating just after dawn. The question I should like to put to Assyriologists is: Was there any reason why the Babylonian ceremony should take place at that time? If not, then it is just possible that the Babylonians borrowed the rite from Egypt<sup>4</sup> and adapted it thoroughly in course of time to Babylonian ideas and mythology, meaningless incidents like the night to dawn celebration of the rite surviving. Finally, were the coloured wools of significance in Babylonian ritual, or are they survivals from, or misunderstandings of, the Egyptian coloured cloths?

<sup>1</sup> A. M. BLACKMAN in *Journal*, v, 155-164.

<sup>3</sup> A. M. BLACKMAN, *ibid.*, 155.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. LANGDON in *Journal*, vii, 137-145.

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE appearance of Vol. x, Part I of the *Journal* as a separate part does not, as might be thought, herald a return to the old system of four issues each year, but is the unavoidable result of editorial difficulties. It is probable that Part II will appear by itself in June or early July, and Parts III and IV as a combined number later in the year. Part II will contain a long and important article by Mr. Winlock on the tombs of the kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes.

Excavation was carried on at El-'Amarnah from early in October 1923 until the beginning of February 1924. The work has now closed down, the division has been made, and it is hoped that an exhibition of the finds allotted to the Society will be held in July. Digging was begun on October 9th under the direction of Mr. F. G. Newton who, fortunately for the Society, has been able to act as architect and draughtsman on all three expeditions to El-'Amarnah, and who this year commanded the expedition for the early part of the season, *i.e.* until the beginning of January. On his departure the work was carried on by Mr. F. Ll. Griffith, who had intended arriving earlier, but was prevented by a severe illness which kept him at Cairo and Helwân for a couple of months. Work was first started on the town site, many houses being cleared, and a considerable number of finds made. Among the most interesting were four bronze knives, all in excellent condition, measuring about 33 to 40 cm. in length, and a small figure of the king wearing the blue crown with a uraeus and skirt of gold leaf; the head was separate from the body, and unfortunately the feet and stand are missing, but the colour is well preserved and bright.

At the beginning of November Mr. Newton took a squad of men to the north of Et-Til, more than an hour's walk from El-Hâg Kândil, and opened up a square mound, which from its general appearance gave the impression that it might cover important ruins. It proved to be the site of a very fine palace with a large central court, probably originally containing water, surrounded on three sides by colonnades with series of rooms or cubicles behind. The outer wall of the palace forms an enclosure 144 by 115 m. On the east side of the pool were the palace buildings, on the west open courts with chambers round, and on the north the cattle stables; the south has not yet been excavated. All the rooms to the north and west side of the court had remains of plaster decoration, but in so flaky a condition that it will be impossible to remove it. Many of the walls are preserved to a height of six feet. Quantities of carved stone from the columns came to light, so that it may be possible to make accurate restorations of the rooms and colonnades. In the cattle stables were many carved stalls still *in situ*, but in a sadly damaged condition. Owing to Mr. Newton's contract to join Mr. Woolley at Ur the work on the palace has had to be held over for another season, when it is hoped that he may be able to complete it. So far rather more than half has been carefully uncovered and planned, and it is expected that the other half will correspond in architectural design.

Mr. Griffith continued the work on the town site, excavating many houses, among them a magnificent one belonging to Pnhesi, probably the owner of the tomb recorded by



Mr. N. de G. Davies. This work is tedious as the site is so extensive, but it is of great importance, and although nothing sensational has been discovered this season, yet an amount of solid work has been done, and valuable information gained.

The work was finally closed down on February 6th, Mr. Emery has gone on to join Mr. Robert Mond at Shêkh 'Abd el-Kurnah, Mr. Glanvil returned direct to England, and Mr. and Mrs. Griffith remained on till the end of February. Professor T. Whittemore, the American representative on the staff, spent most of November and December with Mr. Newton but left at the close of the year.

The five lectures given during the winter months were fairly well attended, though the change of hall does not appear to be a popular move, and many of the regular attendants are hoping for a return to the Royal Society's rooms. The first two lectures were announced in our last number. On January 16th Professor Elliot Smith, F.R.S., gave a highly interesting lecture on "Medicine and Mummies." This was succeeded by a lecture from Dr. D. G. Hogarth, C.M.G., on "The Hittites," a most able summary of practically all that is so far known about these people, and on February 26th Dr. H. R. Hall gave a similar account of "The Philistines." This concluded the series for the season, though it is sincerely hoped that we shall have an account of the season's work at El-'Amarnah when the excavators return to England.

It may not be out of place here to draw the attention of Egyptologists to the fact that the important results of the Oxford Expedition in Nubia, 1910 to 1913, are being published by Mr. F. Ll. Griffith in the *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, issued by the Liverpool University Institute of Archaeology. The first two seasons were spent at Faras and the third at Sanam, part of the site of the ancient Napata. Mr. Griffith's publication of his results, which is profusely illustrated, began in Volume VIII of the *Annals* and is still continuing in Volume XI, the current volume. His results have a particular interest for readers of the *Journal* in connection with Dr. Reisner's article on the Meroitic Kingdom of Ethiopia in our last year's issue.

The Champollion Centenaire of 1922, which has been previously referred to in these Notes, was the occasion of the publication of a series of studies by a large number of Egyptologists under the title of *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion*. The Editor had intended to have the volume reviewed by a number of reviewers, each dealing with articles affecting his own special branch. This has, however, proved impracticable and we must content ourselves with giving a very short account of the volume here.

Several articles deal with Champollion himself. L. de Blacas gives an inventory of some hitherto unpublished Champollion documents, S. de Ricci gives a most valuable bibliography from which some idea of the astounding versatility of the decipherer of the hieroglyphs may be gained, E. Naville deals with Champollion's grammar and Jean Capart writes attractively on *Champollion et l'art égyptien*.

Of the other articles the most sensational is undoubtedly that in which Breasted describes the newly re-discovered Edwin Smith Medical Papyrus, a treatise on surgery. It is to be hoped that Professor Breasted's immense commitments in other directions will not prevent him from giving the world at least a facsimile of this document in the very near

future. Another new papyrus is made known to us by Sir Ernest Budge in his article called *The precepts of life by Amen-em-Apt*: a facsimile of this has fortunately since been published by the Trustees of the British Museum.

Among so many good things it is almost invidious to pick out anything for special mention, but if this might be allowed we should fix upon A. Moret's *L'accession de la plèbe égyptienne aux droits religieux et politiques sous le Moyen Empire* and Blackman's *Study of the liturgy celebrated in the temple of the Aton at El-Amarna* as being particularly important contributions to Egyptology.

The volume is a dignified and fitting memorial to the scholar whose genius it commemorates.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*The Origin of Magic and Religion.* By W. J. PERRY, M.A. Methuen & Co., London, 1923.

I wish I could believe all that Mr. Perry tells me. Anthropology for him is such a simple science. To use a pet phrase of his "it all comes out," rather like the complicated problems in our school algebra examinations, where everything cancels in the last line leaving plain  $a$  or  $b$ : dullards like myself, however, go on covering sheet after sheet with figures and getting no result.

Mr. Perry is perfectly candid as to the value of his results. He believes that Professor Elliot Smith and he have discovered a new anthropology, and that most of the old will have to go: he is even a little irritated because some of the older anthropologists are unable to see this.

Let us admit at the outset that these two scholars have rendered an important service to anthropology in insisting on the homogeneity of early civilization in various parts of the world as opposed to its heterogeneity. It may be further reckoned to them for virtue that they can both "think black" as the anthropologists say, that is, they realize that the origin of a primitive or savage custom may be something so *outré*, so grotesque as to be outside the wildest flights of fancy of a civilized mind. Thus when we read in Mr. Perry's book that the Mikado, as high priest of the national sun-cult, "is but attending the altar of his ancestors, whose line presumably goes right back into the family of the Children of the Sun at Heliopolis in Egypt," or that the "archaic civilization" was spread by men wandering about the globe in search of cowries, pearl-oysters and other "givers of life," or of "an earthly paradise" where immortality is to be found, we must not follow our first impulse and throw the volume aside unread. We have a right, however, to ask that these somewhat astonishing statements should be substantiated, if not by a rigorous train of logical argument, at least by a concatenation of very high probabilities, based on detailed evidence of the most accurate and unassailable type. Mr. Perry admits this, for he tells us on p. 2 that he will rely "on nothing but what is patent fact, or what can directly be inferred therefrom." Two tests must therefore be applied to the immense structure which he has built up: firstly we must verify his evidence, and secondly we must examine the general principles of reasoning which he applies to this evidence. If either of these fails to stand the test the whole building must collapse.

Mr. Perry's book is called *The Origin of Magic and Religion*, but it is in point of fact simply a re-statement, with the religious aspect emphasized, of the argument of his larger volume, *The Children of the Sun*. His theory, expressed briefly, is as follows:—

In early, though not the earliest times, he believes he can trace across the world from Europe to Asia and over the Pacific to America a homogeneous culture to which he gives the name "the archaic civilization," the principal characteristics of which include the building of pyramids, mummification of rulers, sun-cult, dual organization in the state, irrigation, terraced cultivation, the use of megalithic monuments and of polished stone axes. This civilization is so uniform that Mr. Perry thinks it must have a single origin, and this he traces to Egypt of the time of about the Fifth Dynasty. Its spread is due to Egyptian "Children of the Sun," members of the ruling family, going forth to look for an "earthly paradise" and for "givers of life."

Mr. Perry sets out with three very wide assumptions. In the first place he denies any value to geographical or climatic influences in the spreading of cultures; all depends for him on the working of men's own minds. He is perhaps right in thinking that the desiccation theory of the movement of peoples has been overdone, but one cannot for that reason simply ignore geographical and climatic considerations as he does. After all, we know, to take extreme cases, that man was driven out of certain regions by the coming of ice, that a hunting tribe must follow the movements of its prey, and that a pastoral people must follow the grass. Mr. Perry may reply that none of this applies to his people, who are agriculturists, but does not all pre-industrial history show us that a fertile soil is the greatest temptation to one's neighbours? Those big movements of peoples which we can still study from contemporary records lend no support to a theory in which geographical pressure, personal ambition, religious and political prejudice have no place. That the Spanish Jews settled in Salonica in search of the earthly paradise will hardly be accepted by

those who have campaigned there, nor did the hapless Russian aristocrats who starve on the streets of London and Paris set forth in search of pearls and cowries. Yet the great forces which caused these and other vaster movements of men and culture simply do not exist for Mr. Perry.

But he would reply that such movements are all based on war, which was non-existent at the time of the "archaic civilization." It is hardly possible to discuss this assumption at length here, but there is surely an initial difficulty in supposing that man, evolved and trained up in the hard school of self-preservation against a hundred animals stronger than himself, had grown up "naturally peaceful," and that it was not until he needed human sacrifices for the tombs of his monarchs that the idea of warfare ever occurred to him (p. 114). What, in any case, will Mr. Perry do with the endless records of early wars in Sumeria and Babylonia which, whatever chronology we accept, are earlier than the spread of his archaic civilization from Egypt? Nay let us consider Egypt itself. Mr. Perry is perhaps not to be blamed for his belief that the early Egyptians were not a warlike people, for it is to be found in many a book on Egyptology, though it is based on nothing more than the fact that we hear little of standing armies or mercenaries before the New Kingdom. It suits Mr. Perry's case to accept this and to imagine the Egyptians of the early dynasties as peaceful folk<sup>1</sup>. Yet in reality there is no more monstrous error. The archaic slate palettes and knife handles depict wars, and the earliest commemorative tablets in Sinai, instead of recording the exploitation of the turquoise mines, show us scenes in which the king smites his Bedawi foes, while the gods, sad to relate, stand by in mute approval. The Narmer of the Libyan cylinder and the famous slate palette with their thousands of prisoners was hardly a man of peace, and Den of the First Dynasty named one of his regnal years after the "first time of smiting the East," while the vast archaic fortresses of Abydos were certainly not built to remedy unemployment.

So much then for Mr. Perry's second great assumption. The third is perhaps the hardest of all. It is the assumption, generally tacit, that identical customs or usages found in two separate regions are likely to have a single origin. This is of course a subject on which there will probably never be agreement, and if an anthropologist likes to assume it we can hardly disprove it, though anything which he infers from it must be regarded as theory and theory only. It leaves no place whatever for the possibility of similar customs being due to the similar working of the human mind in different places to meet similar needs. Surely this cannot be ignored. Let us take an example. I will not insist on the possibility that a primitive agriculture might gradually have arisen in more places than one through the fact that men began to protect against molestation and destruction the wild trees, shrubs and herbs which they despoiled for food. Once however agriculture had arisen, irrigation, in places where it is necessary, may surely follow as a matter of course, and terraced cultivation as a matter almost of necessity to people living in a hilly country. Yet Mr. Perry finds it necessary to ascribe both these to single Egyptian origins. Surely a strong case might be made out for the belief that in proportion as a custom or usage corresponds to a common natural need or development so there is less logical obligation to suppose a common origin.

Such then are Mr. Perry's three main assumptions. I admit none of them, but I am ready to believe that others may accept all three. I only insist that all three are essential to his theory and that none of them can be proved. I prefer to think that man even in 2500 B.C. was still to some extent at the mercy of nature, and that in so far as he moved of his own free will he was generally in search of a much more practical "giver of life" than any of Mr. Perry's, namely food. I believe too that the early world had its Alexanders and its Napoleons, men urged on by little more than a blind personal or patriotic ambition, and that they helped to mould its history and spread its culture, without any regard for "givers of life."

Mr. Perry is not squeamish about chronology. His *Children of the Sun* leave Egypt towards the end of the Old Kingdom, a date which the lowest computation places two or three centuries before 2000 B.C. He gives us but little idea of the rate at which they travel, and he is perhaps well advised here, for his archaic civilization seems to bear very variable and uncertain dates in different areas. Frequently he has no evidence whatsoever for the date of a cultural element: in such case he contents himself with telling us that the present natives recognize it as something belonging to their predecessors in the country. It may be imagined that with time and space so plastic in Mr. Perry's hands his task is an easy one, and he has little difficulty in moulding together, in spite of miles and centuries, a culture which satisfies him as being homogeneous and to which he gives the rather unexpected name of the "archaic civilization." Some of its elements seem to us somewhat fluid in content, in particular his "dual organization of the ruling class," which is by no means that defined by Rivers, as we should have expected. It would I believe

<sup>1</sup> *Children of the Sun*, p. 463.

be possible to find in almost every society a dual organization of some kind. Rome had her patricians and plebeians, Italy has her Kings and her Popes, nay, we ourselves have our Whigs and Tories, or, if these will not serve the turn, our two Houses of Parliament. Mr. Perry naturally finds such dualisms in every community in his culture circle, but it is not in each case the same kind of dualism, nor is it, as it ought to be for his purpose, the same dualism which we find in Egypt. I have always wondered, too, how, on this theory, the archaic communities came to have a ruling class in two divisions, (a) the Children of the Sun connected with the sky, and (b) a class associated with the underworld, for though Mr. Perry finds both these classes in Egypt, he expressly states that only one class, the Children of the Sun, went abroad and spread the new culture. It is curious, too, that these wanderers failed to communicate the most wonderful gift they had to give, namely the power of writing. I am also sometimes puzzled to know how the royal family provided the supply of men, and, I presume, women too, necessary to spread a civilization over half the world. But perhaps Mr. Perry will tell us this in his promised second volume.

I cannot refrain from astonishment when I see Egypt quoted as the home of the polished stone axe and the megalithic monument, the former of which is rare in Egypt and the latter absent, except for one doubtful example up on the high desert. Mr. Perry, however, is quite cheerful about these things. It is true, he says, that the polished stone axe is not an Egyptian tool, but when the Egyptians went to Nubia to get gold they found no flint, and therefore used the local Nubian stone, and so originated polished stone axes. As an example of argumentative ingenuity this is entertaining: as a piece of solid argument it is negligible. As for the Egyptian origin of the megalithic monuments Mr. Perry falls back on Professor Elliot Smith who has "finally solved" the problem of the dolmen and "shown that it is nothing more than a degenerate Egyptian mastaba tomb." Mr. Perry omits to mention that Elliot Smith's "solution" is very definitely rejected by those who have most deeply studied the megalithic monuments.

Mr. Perry makes his task too easy for himself. He wishes to establish the single origin of a vast civilization, and he starts by laying down certain features as characteristic of it. These features are very numerous, and they become more so as Mr. Perry's researches progress. They are so numerous, in fact, that it is almost impossible to find any part of the world which has not at some time or another both possessed and lacked sufficient of them to justify either its inclusion in or its exclusion from the "archaic civilization." The advantages of this for purposes of argument can easily be seen. In the same fashion Mr. Perry smooths the way before himself when he deals with "givers of life." The builders of the megalithic monuments were, he believes, looking for "givers of life." He attempts to prove this by drawing extremely small scale maps showing the distribution of the megalithic monuments and pointing out that they are often situated near a source of some particular "giver of life." But anyone can do this if his maps are as small and his list of "givers of life" as long as Mr. Perry's are. It would seem to include every substance which in any country and at any time has been regarded as a "giver of life": if it is not jade or quartz it is gold, if it is not gold it is the pearl-oyster, and if the latter is not to be found the pearl-mussel will serve his turn. Sometimes the evidence is no better than that there are old gold-workings (date unknown) near the monuments, or a river which even now contains a certain small quantity of gold. If all else fails the cowrie will do, for does not Professor Elliot Smith believe it to be a "giver of life" from its resemblance to the "portal of birth." I shall be more inclined to believe in Mr. Perry's pearl-seekers when he can show me pearls in early Mediterranean and Egyptian<sup>1</sup> tombs and settlements; at present they are conspicuously absent. I have often wondered, too, what the megalithic builders of Malta were seeking in an island totally devoid of all useful resources, and even of all the "givers of life" in Mr. Perry's long list.

We now pass on to treat of Mr. Perry's detailed evidence. This is drawn from every quarter of the globe, and naturally each section of it must be examined by a specialist in that particular area. Consequently I propose to deal here mainly with the Egyptian evidence, premising that since Egypt is the source of Mr. Perry's archaic civilization this particular body of evidence is of vital importance to his thesis, and should therefore conform to the highest standard of accuracy and reliability.

I am bound to say that I have often a difficulty in recognizing Egypt of Old Kingdom times in the garb in which Mr. Perry has dressed her up. Some of his "facts" are literally not true. Others have a kernel of truth in them, but are not true in the sense in which he presents and uses them. Sometimes it is the slight perversion of a word, sometimes the distortion of an idea, sometimes the unconscious suppression of a part of a truth, and most frequently of all the addition of a question-begging epithet. However, generalities are easy, and it is more important to give examples, and in doing so I shall occasionally take

<sup>1</sup> In *Children of the Sun*, p. 388, we are actually told that among the Egyptians pearls were "givers of life"!

the liberty of choosing them not from Egypt but from other regions which have fallen within the sphere of my studies.

Mr. Perry believes in the existence at an early stage of civilization of a "Great Mother Goddess." His sole evidence for this is the occurrence in various countries, from Aurignacian times onward, of a type of female figure in clay or stone with the hips and certain other parts of the anatomy grossly exaggerated. Both Mr. Perry and Professor Elliot Smith interpret these figures as those of a Great Mother Goddess. Mr. Perry rightly rejects Elliot Smith's suggestion that the abnormalities of the figure are an attempt to combine the figure of a woman with the form of a cowrie, a shell closely symbolical (according to E. S.) of birth, and hence connected with a Mother Goddess. Having rejected this Mr. Perry still clings to the idea that the figure is that of a Mother Goddess who "first took shape as a woman with the maternal parts greatly exaggerated." Yet everyone who has seriously studied these early steatopygous figures knows that in almost every case the traits exaggerated are not those indicative of pregnancy nor yet of maternity in the wider sense. In any case, what is to prove that these figures, particularly the Aurignacian examples, represent a goddess? Why not a human being? Yet these are among the "patent facts" on which Mr. Perry's theory is built. We may add too that the steatopygous figures of Egypt, where Mr. Perry is particularly anxious to establish a Mother Goddess, are precisely those which most obstinately resist the maternity explanation.

Mr. Perry's treatment of the Mother Goddess in Egypt is, indeed, one of the worst parts of his argument. It is essential to him, as it was to Professor Elliot Smith, that Egypt should have a "Great Mother Goddess." Hathor is selected as the victim. She is then subjected to a course of argument by Professor Elliot Smith which whirls us breathless from assumption to assumption (*Evolution of the Dragon*, 115 ff.). "Hathor was originally nothing more than an amulet to enhance fertility and vitality." The sole evidence for this appears to be that on the Narmer palette the king wears a girdle from which hang Hathor-heads "in place of the cowrie-amulets of more primitive peoples" (*op. cit.*, Fig. 18). She then becomes a moon-goddess, because of the relation of the lunar period to reproduction, next a cow because she feeds her children with milk, and finally emerges as a "Great Mother Goddess," a result achieved mainly by assuming the conclusion at the start, and a result, be it added, which would considerably have startled the Egyptians themselves, in whose early literature there is not a single reference to Hathor as a Great Mother Goddess<sup>1</sup>. In Mr. Perry's books we find this process complete, and Hathor is rarely referred to by him without the addition "The Great Mother Goddess of Egypt." But Mr. Perry believes in having two strings to his bow, and in case Hathor should fail him he has other Mother Goddesses in reserve. On p. 20 we read "Upper and Lower Egypt each had a protecting mother goddess," the reference being of course to Nekhbet and Wazyt. But in all Egyptian literature there is not the slightest hint that these were "mother goddesses." The word "mother" is Mr. Perry's own insertion and is a typical example of the question-begging epithet<sup>2</sup>.




Mr. Perry is anxious to link Hathor up as Mother Goddess with various "givers of life" (p. 19), cowries and gold for instance. The latter is easy, for Hathor bears the name "Gold" (not originally the epithet "golden" as Mr. Perry states). He is unwise, however, to quote as a "fact" Professor Elliot Smith's statement that the "earliest hieroglyphic sign for gold was a necklace of cowries." There is no evidence for it, nor is there for the statement that the Egyptians regarded the turquoise as a giver of life.

On pp. 11 and 12 we read "We find, for instance, that the Egyptian had devised the notion of a Magic Wand....It has been shown conclusively that this idea was derived from the functions of the uterus." Mr. Perry is here concerned, as the reader will have guessed, to show that the Egyptians believed in "givers of life." The connection between the instrument used by the Egyptians in the Opening of the Mouth ceremony, which Mr. Perry not unjustly calls a Magic Wand, and the uterus, a "giver of life," far from being "shown conclusively," is the merest conjecture based on its form, which might be said remotely to resemble the bicornate uterus of animals (Griffith, *Hieroglyphs*, p. 60).

On p. 22 Mr. Perry perpetuates another hypothesis of Professor Elliot Smith for which very little support is to be found in the hieroglyphs. He is anxious to prove that the Mother Goddess in Egypt became connected with irrigation, and with pottery-making, and his evidence for this belief is that "in the

<sup>1</sup> If the phrase means anything at all it must denote a goddess who is (1) the mother of mankind and (2) the goddess of fertility. In the Egyptian texts Hathor is neither.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that a goddess suckles the king does not make her a "mother goddess" in Mr. Perry's sense of the words.

earliest Egyptian hieroglyphic writing the picture of a pot of water was taken as the symbol of womanhood, the 'vessel' which received the seed." Now the sign  used in the writing of "woman" and "vulva" is probably in origin quite distinct from the sign  (perhaps a vase containing a liquid; see MÖLLER, *Paläographie*, I, 9, note 1), and even were this not the case, that is to say, even if the sign  was originally used in writing the word "woman," and even if it could be shown with certainty to be a vessel of water, this would not for a moment prove that the Egyptians conceived of woman as "the 'vessel' which received the seed," and the occasional use of this sign to determine *nk* (coïre) is equally indecisive. Mr. Perry, however, swallows this whole and on the same page goes on to speak of the many primitive vessels which show the relationship between women and pots. He might have added the hundreds of examples from Egypt alone which would show a similar relation between men and pots or geese and pots. Pots in the form of or with some of the characteristics of women, men or animals are common in nearly every civilization and do not necessarily show a relation between pottery and the particular living being imitated. Indeed this passage (pp. 21-22) is typical of Mr. Perry's method throughout. In two short pages he is able to satisfy himself of the connection between the Mother Goddess, irrigation and pottery-making. It is all so plausible as we skim lightly over it, and it crumbles so completely the moment we look into it. Here is the process:—Great Mother Goddess—womanhood—vessel which receives the seed—water-pots—water and pots—irrigation<sup>1</sup> and pottery-making. These in Mr. Perry's argument are no more connected by relations of cause and effect than our thoughts as we sit in an armchair thinking about nothing in particular: there is transition, but no true logical connection. Macaulay once said of Southey "A chain of associations is to him what a chain of reasoning is to other men."

On p. 26 there are two statements which will astonish the Egyptologist. The first is to the effect that in Egypt we can watch the unbroken march of civilization from late palaeolithic times down to the Pyramid Age. One of the most remarkable phenomena of Egypt is the fact that as far as our knowledge goes at present there is a complete break between the palaeolithic and the predynastic, the latter appearing quite suddenly with a ready-made civilization, including possibly the use of copper. Future research may fill up this gap, but at present it is a great gulf. The second statement is to the effect that "all the known evidence goes to show that the other early communities of the civilization of the Ancient East derived their culture, directly or indirectly, from Egypt of the predynastic or early dynastic age." We should like to ask Mr. Perry what is the evidence which shows that the early civilization of Elam or Sumer for instance was derived from Egypt. There are not wanting those who think precisely the contrary, and even those of us who do not go as far as that are totally unacquainted with the "known evidence" to which Mr. Perry refers.

On p. 30 we meet another instance of Mr. Perry's method of establishing connections. We are told "Inquiry shows at once that the early kings of Egypt and Sumer were especially connected with the irrigation systems of those countries." The evidence adduced for this is that an early picture shows the Egyptian king cutting the first sod of an irrigation canal. Granting that Mr. Perry's interpretation of the picture is correct we could in the same way prove that His Majesty King George V is specially connected with architecture because a picture in the newspapers records him laying the foundation-stone of a public building. There is no evidence to prove any special connection between the rulers and irrigation, though every ruler was as a matter of course interested in what was in fact the very life of his country. Mr. Perry similarly argues "The royal family was closely interested in calendrical matters: for in the early royal inscriptions, mention is made constantly of the height of the Nile." In this short sentence there is an inaccuracy on a point of fact and an unjustified inference. The inscriptions in Mr. Perry's mind are the Palermo Stone and its congeners, which are not royal inscriptions at all, but year by year records of Egyptian history. The height of the Nile is given for each year merely because it is a fact of vital importance to Egypt, and to argue from that to a close connection with the royal family is simply a *non sequitur*.

When Mr. Perry enters the field of Egyptian religion he goes badly astray. On p. 32 we are told that "Osiris was in Egypt connected with mummification." Here is a good instance of a fact which is true but not in the sense in which Mr. Perry uses it. Osiris is only connected with mummification in the sense that he is represented in art as a mummy, as were also Ptah and Min, and he is represented as a mummy merely because he is dead. The god who is specially connected with mummification is of course Anubis.

<sup>1</sup> Here, as elsewhere in the book, Mr. Perry confuses natural inundation with artificial irrigation.

On p. 33 Mr. Perry proceeds to exploit his statement about Osiris. "The coming into being of the practice of mummification...caused the king of Egypt to be regarded as Horus, the son of Osiris." Ill-gotten gains never prosper, and one false inference has here led to a second worse than itself: there is no particle of evidence in reality to show that the conception of the king as Horus, a conception older than our first known mummies, was in any way dependent on Osiris. Lower on the same page we find quoted with approval Elliot Smith's statement that "Osiris was the prototype of all gods, his ritual was the basis of all religious ceremonial." Mr. Perry elaborates this "The Egyptians claimed that all funerary cults originated with Osiris, that he gave them their religious doctrines, their rites, the rules for their sanctuaries and plans for their temples." No falsier statements were ever made about Egypt. The authors of them seem unaware of the existence of religious cults other than those of a funerary nature in which Osiris figured so prominently. They would do well to study some of Dr. Blackman's latest work, based on the Egyptian texts, in which it is shown that the temple ritual throughout Egypt was almost wholly derived primarily from the cult of the sun-god, the Osirian element being mainly secondary.

On p. 34 I must crave leave to dispute some of Mr. Perry's "patent facts." The royal tombs of the first dynasties were not mastabas, as he would have us believe, or, if they were, the mastaba portion has been so completely swept away that no archaeologist has ever claimed its existence. Mr. Perry proceeds "These (mastaba) tombs were given up in the Third Dynasty by the royal family." On the contrary it is precisely in the Third Dynasty that the first royal mastaba-tombs appear.

I do not know where Mr. Perry got the "fact" that the calendar was invented in Heliopolis. The astronomical evidence, if it is to be trusted, shows nothing more than that the calendar must have taken its rise somewhere about the 30th degree south latitude. There were doubtless several important early Egyptian towns within this limit, and Mr. Perry selects Heliopolis merely because it suits his hypothesis and then proceeds to speak of the "fact" that the solar calendar was invented there. It is no fact, but a fancy of Mr. Perry's, which may or may not be true, but which cannot be proved.

We have not space here to analyse in detail all that Mr. Perry tells us about Egyptian ideas on death and immortality. It will suffice to mention such statements as that on p. 47 that "the ghost of the dead was supposed to live in the tomb." The Egyptian texts seem quite unequivocal on the point that what lived in the tomb was no ghost but the man himself. We might also quote the statement on p. 53 to the effect that sycamore and acacia are "life-giving," for which Egypt gives no authority, that the use of libations (p. 54) was derived from ideas connected with irrigation (a pure hypothesis), and that the name Ptah "apparently means sculptor, engraver," the evidence for which statement is very flimsy and very late. The statement on p. 56 that Osiris went from Bubastis to Abydos is perhaps only a *lapsus calami*.

In the chapter entitled the Search for the Earthly Paradise considerable violence is done to the statements of the Egyptian texts. We are told that the Egyptian civilization was spread over the world by Egyptian Children of the Sun wandering about in search of two things, the earthly paradise and givers of life. The relation of the two motives to one another Mr. Perry never fully determines, though he once hints that the givers of life are to be found *in* the earthly paradise. Now it is true that Egyptians speak of a land beyond the grave, the Fields of Iaru, where the dead lived on in a paradise where the corn grew seven cubits high. But never do they speak of this as an *earthly* paradise; it is only to be reached by the dead. Mr. Perry, however, attaches the question-begging epithet "earthly," and thus endeavours to conceal the absurdity of his hypothesis of men setting out to seek on earth what was manifestly only to be reached through death. His suggestion that the Babylonian idea of the earthly paradise was a combination of the Egyptian Paradise with the God's Land of Punt is the merest surmise: he should in any case remember that Syria was also a "God's Land" to the Egyptians.

Chapter V contains some amazing logic. We learn that the beehive tombs from Crete up to New Grange in Ireland and the Orkneys are due to the "setting out from Egypt of members of the royal family of the Children of the Sun, who came to power at the beginning of the Fifth Dynasty." These graves, we are told on the authority of Professor Flinders Petrie, "are modelled on the pyramids of the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt." We scarcely notice the difficulties of chronology in our astonishment at the comparison between a beehive tomb and a pyramid, for it is not easy to conceive two types of tomb which could be less alike. But Mr. Perry has another argument in reserve. The phase of culture to which these tombs belong is characterized by "small triangular daggers of copper or bronze." Now "the dagger is a sign of noble or royal birth in early Egyptian hieroglyphs," and this is used as a step in an argument to prove that the beehive tomb phase of culture was due to Egyptians of royal birth, *i.e.* Children of the Sun. Can



cruder reasoning be imagined? Is it even worth while to point out that the statement that the dagger is a sign of noble or royal birth in early Egypt is completely void of foundation?

In Chapter VI on the Children of the Sun we find much that is already known to us from Mr. Perry's larger book. He leaves little to chance. One of the characteristics of his archaic civilization is what he calls the "dual organization" and it is necessary for his thesis that this should be shown to have originated in Egypt. The task is easy. Everybody knows that Egypt was formed by the union of the two kingdoms of Upper and Lower Egypt, and that this duality was never lost sight of. Surely Mr. Perry might have been contented with this, for he has never thought it worth while to attempt to show (a point which we should have thought to be of some importance to his argument) that the duality which he finds in various other countries is of such a nature that it might be reasonably supposed to be derived from that of the two kingdoms in Egypt. But not so. As usual he has two strings to his bow, and consequently on p. 94 we read "In addition, as the result of the coming to power of the Children of the Sun at the beginning of the Fifth Dynasty the ruling power was split into two, the king performing the sacred offices, while members of another family, usually of Memphis, or of Abydos, acted as viziers." Now this is Mr. Perry's version of a very simple fact. In the Fourth Dynasty the king's son seems frequently to have acted as vizier, while in the Fifth this custom seems to have been given up, and the viziership held, at least for some time, by members of a family whose name was Ptahhotpe and who therefore were probably Memphites. This may or may not indicate a compromise between the old noble or even ruling families<sup>1</sup> and the new kings from Heliopolis. The facts are passed through Mr. Perry's magic crucible, and what comes out? The ruling power "split into two" or "bisected," the king performing the sacred offices while "the civil administration was carried on by another family." Mr. Perry can now offer excellent parallels to this dual organization from other places in his archaic civilization area. In reality the split is of his making. The vizier was never anything more than the subordinate of the king and carried out his orders, and had Mr. Perry lived in those days and been unfortunate enough to incur the king's displeasure he would doubtless have found that his majesty wielded other powers than those of performing the sacred offices.

On pp. 95-6 the Phoenicians are quoted as "a type of the communities that were originated by the Egyptians when they went out to seek countries with stores of givers of life." The passage is too long to quote but it is a typical specimen of the kind of argument which runs through the book. Among other things I had always supposed that Phoenicia was remarkable for the absence not the presence of megalithic monuments.

There is an even worse piece of logic on p. 98 where we read "there is no trace throughout North America of the invention of a single important element of culture subsequent to the Maya civilization, which, therefore, must have been the work of strangers." In other words because a country has invented nothing in a number of centuries it never can have invented anything.

But I have already been too long. Mr. Perry has made a big incursion into Egyptology and he must therefore not be surprised if Egyptologists claim the right to test his evidence. I have done so, and I can only say that I find it wanting often on matters of fact and nearly always on exact method of presentation. Mr. Perry puts it through a process compared with which the Bed of Procrustes must have been comfortable. I cannot speak for others, but for myself I can freely say that my examination of the Egyptian evidence, which is a vital part of his argument, makes it quite impossible for me to accept Mr. Perry's results, even if I could believe in his general method of reasoning. Mr. Perry will hardly deny me the right to wonder whether his Indian and American evidence would stand specialist criticism any better than his Egyptian.

His book contains many things which are good. It is the product of much thought, and it has stirred us all up and made us think too. But that it has said the last word on the origin of civilization or even of any branch of it is to me at least not a "patent fact."

<sup>1</sup> The nature of Mr. Perry's attempt to prove intermarriage between the families of king and vizier in the late Fifth and the Sixth Dynasties may be judged from two of his assumptions, (1) that the title *rh nswt* indicates membership of the royal family and (2) that a certain Khui and Khuit were related, because of the similarity of their names.

*History of Assyria.* By A. T. OLMSTEAD. Scribner's Sons. xxxi+696. 176 illustrations and 13 maps and plans.

The English public have now for many years recognized the value of ancient histories written by American scholars. ROGERS, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, especially has been of the greatest utility to those interested in the Near East, who wished to consult a reliable authority on an obscure subject. The large amount of new material available for the study of Assyrian history has made an independent study of that country, such as was proposed by the late Dr. L. W. King, highly desirable. To meet that need Professor Olmstead has written the present volume, designed as a companion to Professor Breasted's invaluable *History of Egypt*. By that high standard it must be judged.

The merits of the book are chiefly two. The writer has an enthusiasm for his subject, and his admiration for Assyrian civilization has enabled him to give a juster estimate of the great empire which fell in 612 than previous writers had done. He has also read very widely; all the known inscriptions published and translated by other scholars have been used by him, and archaeological publications have been laid under contribution to an extent which no other writer will be likely to attempt. Above all, Dr. Waterman has put at his disposal the careful work of many years on the correspondence of the Assyrian state archives, published by Harper. This act of generosity puts Professor Olmstead in a position superior to that of any previous historian. Whether the historical conclusions he has drawn are all justified, we must await Dr. Waterman's publication to see. At first sight the practice of smoothly summarizing documents without noting that they are broken is not to be commended. The full use of all these sources will, with certain reservations, make the book very acceptable to the Bible student, the Egyptologist and the average reader.

For most readers, the essential point in a work of this kind is accuracy of detail. Certain errors in translation are therefore to be regretted since Professor Olmstead is preparing editions of the historical inscriptions for certain reigns, and was able in all cases to use previous translations. Among errors of this kind the following may be noted:—P. 28, Igurkapkapu. This name does not exist; it should probably be read Ieri-kapkapu. P. 40, "waxed strong with his servants." Read "united with" or "joined with his servants." P. 41, "Ten women." Read "a concubine." P. 233, "like malt I brewed." Read "I scattered," and see Thureau-Dangin *ad loc.* P. 346, "two talents of gold." Read "of bronze" or possibly "of copper," which invalidates the argument. P. 356, "Kudur has performed the incantation for the eclipse and sends a messenger to the king asking for many more." Kudurru actually says, "When I was 'raising' the incantation of the eclipse of the month Tammuz, he (a messenger) ran away to the king's presence. (There follow six lines of broken text.) I shall send one Median sorceress to the king my lord. Let the king examine (her)." P. 370, "There are three talents of refined gold and four of unrefined in the palace, which have been deposited and sealed by the chief of the metal workers. The gold for the statues of the kings and of the king's mother has not been given." Read, "Three talents of refined gold and four of unrefined are deposited in the *bit qatati* of the *rab danibe*; he (the *rab danibe*) will seal (them). He did not give (*i.e.* issue) the gold for the statues of the kings and the king's mother." P. 383, "On the back of the statue he has given his name not in its Assyrian form, but as Belshazzar." Belshazzar is and remains a textual corruption now immortalized. The name on the statue in the article by Lidzbarski referred to is בלסרזצר, which is a regular Aramaic rendering of the Assyrian. P. 462, this Aramaic letter, the purport of which is mysterious, is badly misrepresented. It is addressed to Pir'-Awurr by Bel-etir, not *vice versa*. A comparison of Olmstead's summary with Lidzbarski's edition, *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 38, reveals how dangerous it is to present a smooth and consecutive version of a much broken document. P. 549, "How a woman who is already once enslaved can be again enslaved because she has not lived up to her contract is one of the mysteries of the very peculiar Assyrian slave system." Why create a mystery? The document in question has always been correctly interpreted as the transfer of a slave to Sinqi-Ishtar by an unnamed person, see Johns *ad loc.* P. 584, "Let wise man tell wise man, the fool shall not behold it, for it is a mystery of the gods Anu and Enlil." Read, "Let the initiated (priest) reveal to the initiated (priest), let not the uninitiated see, it is a thing forbidden by Anu and Enlil." P. 586, is "Mount of Salvation" intended to be a translation of Mt. Nişir? P. 601, "the crown prince is my god," read "is my lord"; there is not necessarily any reference to divinity. P. 629, the first of these letters is much broken and therefore obscure. No hint of this appears in the translation.

Mistranslations from ancient languages are so difficult to avoid, especially in the case of a language of which there is no adequate dictionary, that Professor Olmstead's book should be examined on other grounds. It is the business of the historian carefully to establish the course of events, and to base thereon

a judgment of the general trend which may be deduced therefrom. In the case of ancient history it is above all necessary to admit "scientiam quamdam nesciendi." But "perhaps" and "possibly," "it may be" and "it might be" are rarely to be found in Professor Olmstead's pages. It is also to be regretted that few authorities are quoted, and no bibliography is given in so full a treatment of the subject. In the Preface the reader is referred to a list of the author's own articles in half-a-dozen different journals, and to his two books. A typical instance of Professor Olmstead's method is his treatment of chronology, which, for the period before 1700, is still in dispute. WEIDNER, *Könige von Assyrien*, has collected evidence from Assyrian inscriptions which shows that at any rate certain Assyrians dated Ilushuma and his son Erishum I about 2030 and 2000 respectively, and this he claims is in accord with his own astronomical investigations. Other scholars prefer to accept Kugler's dates, based purely on astronomical observations, and place these kings about a century and a half earlier<sup>1</sup>. Albright, in *Revue d'Assyriologie*, XVIII, and Waterman in *A.J.S.L.*, XXXIX, have objected on various sound grounds to some of Weidner's hypotheses, but unless Albright's assumption that two German scholars saw a blank space where a name was written is correct, the evidence of the king lists is all in favour of the lower dating. Olmstead does not mention the matter; he merely gives Kugler's dates. Again, in the later period, FORRER, *Zur Chronologie der neoassyrischen Zeit*, in a careful study of the *limmu* lists gave sound reasons for believing that from 785 onwards the Assyrian dates were to be set one year later than is usual, see *M.V.A.G.*, 1915. There is no mention of this in the book. And while Breasted has wisely assisted his readers with a king list, Olmstead has omitted this invaluable aid.

On matters of fact there is too often cause to question the author's statements. A few may be pointed out:—P. 9, "seashore city of Eridu." Campbell Thompson made known some time ago, *Archaeologia*, 1920, reasons for believing that Eridu was not on the shore of the Persian Gulf, but surrounded by, or on the shore of, an inland lake. P. 28, "King of the Universe, an old title formerly connected with the extreme north of Babylonia." This is an assumption of the author, wherein he follows Winckler. The theory has often been disputed, and is doubtful. P. 39, "Sharrupsha escaped with his life." Winckler (*M.V.A.G.*, 1913, 4, 87) and Weidner (*Politische Dokumente*) both think the phrase must mean "Sharrupshi was murdered" or "died." P. 52, Tukulti-Urta. Here and throughout the book it should be noted that the reading Urta for (ilu)NIN.IB is at present based on Luckenbill's views (*A.J.S.L.*, XXXIX), and neglects the Aramaic אַנְיִשְׁת; that the true reading is probably Ninurta or Inurta was finally shown by Gadd in *Cuneiform Texts*, Part 35, 5, and is the conclusion of most scholars. "Babylonia had suffered a series of minorities (*sic*)." This should be stated as an inference from scarcely sufficient evidence. P. 55, Ashurnadin-apal. It should be stated that there is a possibility that Ashur-našir-apli as given by the Babylonian chronicle in KING, *Tukulti-Ninib I*, 99, came between Tukulti-Ninurta I and Ashur-nadin-apli. See WEIDNER, *Könige von Assyrien*, Assur 4128, Col. II, 2, and compare *ibid.* 5-6. P. 56, "The very name of Enlil-kudur-usur, 'O Enlil protect the frontier,' shows the extremity into which Assyria had rapidly fallen." This is an unwarranted view. Does Nabu-kudur-ušur (Nebuchadrezzar) show anything of the sort? And note that the exact meaning of *kudur* in such names is very doubtful; it may mean "clan" or "family" or the like. P. 71, it is difficult to see the reason for the reference to ANDRAE, *M.D.O.G.*, 54, 37; this is a report on the discovery of royal graves, of which only those of Shamshi-Adad the son of Shalmaneser III and Ashurnasirpal II (or III?) contained inscribed material. It does not mention Ashur-bel-kala. P. 71, "We know not whether it was Shamshi-Adad or his brother," said of the king who erected the "Broken Obelisk." Possibly it was neither, but Adad-nirari II, see Lewy in *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1923, Nr. 5. P. 75, "the Shupuru River." Why Shupuru? The natural reading is *Ru-u-ru*. P. 76, "With the accession of Adad-nirari II (911) later scribes begin their list of eponyms." This is an argument from absence, always dangerous. The lists from Kuyunjik as we know them start so; but lists for the preceding period quite possibly existed. Pp. 130 and 163-4, the identification of נַבְרַךְ, *C.I.S.*, II, no. 76, with the Girparuda, Girparundi or Garparunda of the Assyrian inscriptions proposed by Sachau is very improbable. The Aramaic inscription appears to belong to the 7th century, while Girparuda belongs to the 9th. P. 151, "badly garbled annals edition." This view has been argued by the author in his *Historiography*; the criticism seems forced to the present writer, and it may be noted that it is rather invalidated by an epigraphical study. The text seems to have been written in three portions by different masons, presumably at some years' interval. The discrepancies in numbers on which

<sup>1</sup> Kugler himself in his *Von Moses bis Paulus* has accepted the lower dating, while Langdon in *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. II, III states that in Dr. Fotheringham's opinion the sixth year of Ammizaduga can only be 1915, so that the difference in dating is now reduced to about 100 years.

Professor Olmstead lays emphasis are common at all times in every kind of document, whether building inscription, Assyrian annals, Babylonian chronicles or paltry business document. P. 152, "The one occasion on which Shalmaneser appears on horseback, it is with the awkwardness of a man not accustomed to ride and not quite certain that he can keep a firm seat." See also p. 116, "the king, whose sad lack of horsemanship is indicated by his riding straight legged, and with huge stirrups tied to the horse-blanket." Shalmaneser's stirrups were probably a sign of his rank, as often in modern Iraq; and his horse is being led over a bridge, so that his seat (he is not "straight legged") seems perfectly natural. P. 161, Hum-hummu. Read *Humbabaia*, see CLAY, *A Hebrew Deluge Story*, 52. P. 179, "first example of the second scribe with the papyrus roll." Insert "or more probably parchment," and see p. 560. Compare MEISSNER, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, 259. P. 181, "no one could be rightfully king until he had 'seized the hands of Bel' and thus had become his 'man' in truly feudal relation." The phrase "he took the hands of Bel" simply means that the king led the statue of the god out in the festival procession. See THUREAU-DANGIN, *Rituel Accadien*, 146, note 3. There is no implication of a "truly feudal relation," suggested by Winckler and others, and here stated with conviction. P. 181, "To save the tender susceptibilities of the citizens, he even permitted them to use a separate name, Pulu." There is a tablet in the British Museum, No. 78156, which proves that the Babylonians used the name Tiglathpileser in dating documents. Older authorities suggested that Pulu was the usurper's own personal name. Olmstead does not note that Pulu and Ululai are called in the king list "dynasty of Tinu," which may point to an origin outside Assyria proper. P. 186, there is no such complete certainty about the matter of Azriau of Yaudi as would appear from this. It is not certain that Y'di of the Senjirli inscriptions was pronounced Yaudi by the Assyrians; in Shalmaneser III's time it was apparently called Yaeti, see Obelisk 90 and Bull. no. 1, 43. Tiglathpileser's inscription is badly broken, but it appears that Azriau was able to face the Assyrians with a considerable force; Hamath and the coast towns were his allies. There is nothing in the Senjirli inscriptions definitely to show that the murderer of Bar Šur was such an important character; he had little time to form alliances after his usurpation, and he can scarcely have made them previously. Winckler's ingenious suggestion is probable or possible; it should scarcely be stated, without mention of his name, as certain. P. 200, for epigraphical reasons the stele from Taima cannot be earlier than the first half of the 6th century. It is pointless to mention it in connection with events which took place in the latter half of the 8th. P. 207, Iaubi'di has been much discussed, and the meaning of names compounded with *bē'di* is not clear. The name Iakba-bieda (see *Journal*, VIII, 207) is rather against the "startling proof." P. 242, Thureau-Dangin's cautious statement of the facts about the death of Rusas in the introduction to "La huitième campagne" should be referred to. P. 245, "Name, time, place prove that this petty princeling (Daiukku) is the historical Deioeces." The name is unquestionably identical. Time and place seem to the present writer against the identification. P. 208, "the natives...reverence the hero as the prophet Hanun." Should this be stated "without a peradventure"? P. 215, does II Kings, xx, relate events of Sennacherib's time or Sargon's? The majority of scholars favour Sennacherib's, see ROGERS, *History*, II, 357. Olmstead attributes it without question to Sargon's. Pp. 221-2, the identity of Mita with the Midas of Greek stories is very uncertain. The identity of name does not lead to a conclusion on the matter, as is clear from the last paragraph on p. 222. P. 250, the wording might lead the reader to suppose that the Kaldu were a homogeneous tribe who from Merodachbaladan's time onwards only admitted one princely family. This is contrary to the historical facts. Each of the five or six Kaldu tribes had a princely family, and Bit-Amukkani especially strove for the sovereignty of Babylon. P. 284, "Sennacherib...handed over Babylon to his younger brother." Had he done so, surely some statement as to such an important event would have appeared in his annals. There may be a confusion in the Greek sources; "perhaps" or "possibly" would make the statement acceptable. P. 296, "For eight years there was no king in the land." It may be noted here that perhaps the correct translation is "No king was installed in the land," which would agree with the use of TUK in early Babylonian date-formulae. P. 302, "The army of the Egyptian and Ethiopian kings under Taharka...had taken up their position at Eltekeh." This should be stated as a very doubtful interpretation of the Biblical sources; in any case II Kings, xix, 9, is corrupt, for Tirhakah was not king of Ethiopia at the time. Pp. 308-9, most Biblical critics are united in considering that II Kings, xviii-xix includes accounts of two campaigns. Professor Olmstead neglects their arguments without a query. Why did Palestine not rise at once after the decimation of Sennacherib's army? He writes, "the treaty itself, written on papyrus, has perished, but there still remains the lump of clay on which there was impressed the seal of Shabaka" etc. This is a guess. P. 365, to speak of "the sinking Assyrian ship of state" in the reign of Esarhaddon is surely prophetic. P. 378, there are many statements about Bazu in this volume which the present writer has found it difficult to check. Thus on p. 199 it is said that Samsi

queen of the Aribi fled to Bazu. If a conjecture of Rost's be correct, Samsi fled to the city Bazil, but there is no certainty about this. On p. 378 it is stated that "Bazu proper" was "a mountain of some sort of stone." Esarhaddon's inscriptions speak of a Mt. *Ḥa-zu-u* of SAG. GIL. MUT stone, on the road to Bazu. Professor Olmstead repeats the old and at one time natural conjecture that Bazu was in Arabia as a certainty. But it is now clear from Adad-nirari II's inscription that Bazu lay east of the Tigris, see SCHROEDER, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*, II, no. 83, rev. 6-9. "Iadi, a desert Judah." There is no obvious reason for assuming that *Iadi* is a defective writing of *Iaudi*. P. 389, the installation of Ashurbanipal into the *bit riduti* seems to be dated without question in 672. The ordinary view, which at least deserves mention, is that the installation took place in 670, see STRECK, *Assurbanipal*, CCLII. Perhaps further evidence on this point might be cited. P. 407, why do the letters cited prove that Ashur-mukin-palea "survived for at least twenty years"? P. 408, "the older brother, also sickly if we may trust the evidence of his name, Shamash-meta-uballit." The name can only be used as evidence of religious beliefs. There is in general no proof that the Assyrian royal family suffered abnormally from ill-health. P. 416, "Soon after": the student will be left in some doubt as to the actual date of this important campaign of Ashurbanipal against Egypt; it certainly took place in 667. "Taharḳah died in 663." Although Tirḳah is known to have been alive in the tenth Egyptian month of 664, he must have died during the last two months of that year. See STRECK, *Assurbanipal*, CCLXXVII. P. 453, the danger of using picturesque detail in such a way as to give a disproportionate importance to certain events is illustrated by the fifteen pages devoted to the affairs of Bel-ibni, while Sin-balatsu-ikbi, a governor who ruled the Sea-Land for many years, is dismissed with a mere cursory mention. P. 495, "Harran was once the metropolis of Mitanni." This assertion is based on a very bold assumption as to the meaning of Kharri, p. 38. It is far more probable that the home of the Kharri was in that (*matu*) *Ḥa-ri-a* which in Tiglathpileser I's time lay at the foot of the northern hills. See Prism inscription, III, 36, 58. P. 507, "a historian with an Egyptian father." This statement seems to be based on the equation *Ḥarmakki* = Harmachis, which is improbable. Pp. 510, 519, "taint associated with business," "excluded shopkeepers." This view is very doubtful; there does not seem to be any evidence on the point. Note that the Syrian campaigns especially were waged to secure the caravan routes, as is obvious from the Boghaz Keui correspondence. P. 521, Ashurnasirpal's "sickle," called on p. 105 "a long rounding toothed sickle (*sic*)," is more like a shepherd's crook with metal bosses. P. 546, the late bowls with Hebrew, Mandaic and Syriac inscriptions, cannot all have been used for drinking, for the ink is in most cases quite fresh. Pognon has advanced a better speculation which will be found repeated in the *British Museum Guide*, 193. P. 579, "honesty is thrown to the winds and whole campaigns are stolen from the father." This is the view argued in the author's *Historiography*, 54, which once led him to the conclusion that two Egyptian campaigns and one against Tyre were taken over from Esarhaddon's inscriptions. In the case of Egypt, Professor Olmstead seems to have modified his conclusions, which were certainly wrong, but he still omits all reference to a siege of Tyre in Ashurbanipal's reign. It would be better to state the view with more hesitation in a general history. P. 573, "Six thousand years ago the Sumerians in Elam drew crude pictographs roughly similar to those just coming into use among their distant neighbours of Egypt." There is no explanation and no reference is given. P. 585, "Sennacherib was not satisfied." Few scholars will admit that Sennacherib differed from the orthodox Assyrian view that Ashur performed the acts attributed in the Babylonian epic to Marduk. P. 596, "Babylonian map." It should be stated that Weidner has convincingly shown that this map was intended to illustrate the campaigns of Sargon of Akkad; Professor Olmstead's interpretation of it is very doubtful. P. 600, "Ashurnasirpal's statue has actually been found with its altar before it." The altar was in fact found before a stele depicting Ashurnasirpal worshipping the symbols of Anu (or Enlil or Ea), Ashur, Sin, Adad and Ishtar, described on pp. 102-3. This is scarcely a proof of the deification of the king in Assyria, which Olmstead confidently affirms. The view that Ahaz set up an altar to the Assyrian king, and that this "must be included among the images worshipped by Manasseh," is a speculation not based on any evidence. P. 637, the view that Cyaxares is intended by the "king of the Umman-Manda" in the Nabopolassar chronicle is very unlikely. The sound analysis of the historical statements and traditions, and the exposition of the text itself in GADD, *Fall of Nineveh*, show that the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the view that "Umman-Manda" here refers to the Scythians.

Apart from these details it will be understood that there must necessarily be many points on larger issues which cannot be raised here. Especially in matters of art, the views of Professor Olmstead are not in accord with accepted opinion. Thus on p. 373 he sees Egyptian influence in the alabaster winged

"sphinx" in the British Museum; but the winged "sphinx" is the human-headed winged bull, a type which seems indigenous in Asia. On p. 165 he states that "the eyes and eyebrows" of the Nabu statue "are most primitive"; the condition of the original in the British Museum is so bad that more reserve would be in place. On p. 151 the Black Obelisk "makes little appeal to the artist," on p. 567, "Early Shumerian art is simply hopeless." These judgments will not be generally endorsed; Léon Heuzey, the most acute student of Assyrian and Babylonian art, thought otherwise of the early Sumerian work. On p. 620 we read of "the temple tower, the large mass of solid brickwork which was the ancestor of our church steeple. Imported into the alluvium by the mountain loving Shumerians, it was rather out of place in Assyria where it was dwarfed by near-by hills (*sic*)." Many readers will desire further information. On pp. 277-8 some reflections on a relief from Sargon II's palace read, "...a little building of almost purely Greek character. On a high podium is a dystyle (*sic*) temple with antae. The columns are unfluted, but the torus and fillet which form the base and the convex necking, volute and abacus of the capital are purely Ionic....Such a building is totally un-Assyrian and it must have been borrowed from the Greeks directly and recently, so exact is its form." This contradicts the orthodox views expressed in the standard works on Architecture, and assumes the existence of the Ionic order at the end of the eighth century B.C. whereas the earliest known Ionic forms belong to the middle of the sixth century. BANNISTER FLETCHER, *History of Architecture*, p. 47, discusses this very relief, and states the generally accepted opinion that the column on its way from Egypt through Asia to Ionia was modified by Assyrian and other influences. This should at least be mentioned.

Apart from trivial printing errors, e.g. p. 37, Togormah for Togarmah, and also in Index, p. 196, scyamores for sycamores, p. 369, Pythagorus for Pythagoras, p. 499, basilicar for basilica, the English of the book is frequently careless and incorrect. Thus on p. 36 we read, "...not to be outdone by his rival, he goes him one better....Rarely can we catch two rivals in such a beautiful series of lies"; on p. 58, "Just then Ashur-dan I began his long reign in Assyria, while Babylonia could only place opposite the one-year reign of Zamama-shum-iddina"; on p. 94, "Mantles and other weaves in wool testified to a rather large industrial population"; on p. 184, "unconsciously we call to mind the contemporary Greek Danians"; on p. 354, "the annals does tell the truth"; on p. 407, "The ceremonies carried out in March include the images of Anu etc."; on p. 416, "Taharka died in 663 shortly after associating his nephew Tanutamon"; on p. 507, "Scarcely less to demand consideration are the peoples across the boundary"; on p. 625, "All in all, they (the Assyrians) seem pretty decent folks (*sic*), not so very different from the men of our block (*sic*), in spite of different clothes, different speech and a religion which never reached the Christian ideal." And further, "Sarcophagi were of stone or of clay; sometimes the last body only occupied its safety..."; on p. 645, "One must leave over the whole of the world's history" is apparently intended as a translation of De Morgan's "Il faut feuilleter l'histoire entière du monde"; on p. 647, "The majority of Biblical critics are confident that the story the poor old Chronicler tells of Manasseh's rebellion and forgiveness is made out of whole cloth." There are numerous illustrations from photographs of objects and of modern sites, with plans and maps. It may be questioned whether the tribesman in Fig. 3 should be called "more than half savage." Students will be disappointed to find no information as to where the originals of the objects photographed are to be found, except when they are in the Louvre, though there are references to casts in American museums; the greater number of the originals are of course in the British Museum. Finally, it is ungenerous of the author, after he has borrowed very freely from the works of Layard and Rassam, the founders, with Rich, Botta and Place, of Assyrian archaeology, to say, "The palace (of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh) seems to have been well preserved down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The plundering methods of so-called excavation then in vogue were applied with unusual thoroughness to this ruin. A wonderful booty of sculptured slabs was won but neither adequate plan nor description was ever attempted." Professor Olmstead has said too much or too little. If the objection is mainly to the removal of the slabs, few archaeologists who know the story of the bull related by BUDGE, *By Nile and Tigris*, II, 23, few who have been told by Sheikh 'Agil of the Shammar of the disfigurement of the sculptures at Hatrah by tribesmen who indulge in the cry *Hai sheitán*, and few of those who foresee the fate of the Ishtar gate at Babylon, which is already suffering from exposure, or who have seen the now weather-worn head of the statue at Nimrud which is continually exposed by the natives for financial reasons, will agree with Professor Olmstead. If the statement is that Layard and Rassam did not dig with all the resources of a 20th century archaeologist, it is idle. As to publication, Layard and Rassam both published their results to the best of their ability, as fully as their digs allowed, as soon as possible. A more recent excavation in Mesopotamia has never been scientifically published at all.

SIDNEY SMITH.

*Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte.* By WALTER WRESZINSKI. Lieferungen 6—17. Leipzig, completed 1923.

The first five Lieferungen of this work were reviewed in this *Journal*, III, 224—5. Much has happened since then, and those who read the Vorwort published with Lieferung 17 will have some conception of the appalling difficulties with which Dr. Wreszinski has had to grapple in completing the work. He is indeed to be congratulated on the courage, patience and industry which have enabled him to bring it despite all obstacles to a successful conclusion. The work is in every way admirable, and should its author still feel some disappointment at his inability to carry out in its entirety his original scheme he may comfort himself with the thought that even as it is he has rendered a very solid service to his science.

It is an anomaly of Egyptology that the most famous sites in Egypt are on the whole the least completely published. We may read in full detail exactly what is to be seen at Tell el-'Amarnah and what has been done there, within the limits of say a dozen volumes: but where can we get a complete or connected account of Karnak, or of Saqqârah, or of the Valley of the Tombs of the Kings at Thebes? Still more astonishing, nowhere can we find any account of the nearly 200 Theban private tombs whose sculptured or painted walls, one might have thought, would form our richest mine of information with regard to life—and death—in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties: if we except perhaps twenty tombs on which special memoirs have been written, the whole of this treasure is still available only to the fortunate Egyptologist who lives at Luxor.

It is this defect in our system of publication which Dr. Wreszinski has endeavoured to remedy, and it is precisely because his work contains such large numbers of unpublished scenes from these tombs that it is to be reckoned as one of the most important contributions yet made to Egyptology. He has seen, moreover, that for a work of this kind collotype is the only satisfactory medium of reproduction. All his plates are good, though they vary a little in quality, and some are quite excellent. Those who use the work will certainly be grateful for the sketch-plans added to assist the eye in dealing with representations which are badly damaged, and where, in the absence of colour, it is not always easy to discern without this aid what is damaged and what is not. The text has, owing to circumstances, been reduced to a minimum, but what there is is always to the point.

We cannot speak too highly of the whole work and we would only add in conclusion that it may confidently be recommended not only to the Egyptologist but also to the layman who is anxious to get some idea of Egyptian life, especially under the New Empire.

T. ERIC PEET.

*Wadi Sarga: Coptic and Greek Texts from the Excavations undertaken by the Byzantine Research Account,* edited by W. E. CRUM and H. I. BELL with an Introduction by R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON (*Coptica consilio et impensis Instituti Rask-Oerstediani edita* III), Haunia, 1922.

From the fourth to the eighth century A.D., and to some extent even later, monasticism was a very potent factor in the history of Egypt. Religious and social aspects apart, it profoundly (and adversely) affected the economic gravity of the country. This, rather than religious fanaticism, was the cause of the anti-monastic measures taken by various officials of the Muslim Government in the eighth century—measures which clearly resulted in the “dissolution” of a vast number of minor monasteries throughout Egypt.

It is surprising that so little attention has been paid by archaeologists to the material remains of monasticism in Egypt in order to arrive at a just estimate of this factor. The excavations of Quibell at Saqqârah, of Clédat at Bawît, of Kaufmann at the Shrine of St. Menas, and of Winlock at the Theban Monastery of Epiphanius are but scattered items in what should be an extensive programme. What is urgently needed is a series of excavations on monastic sites representative of all parts of Egypt. This would enable us to trace far more certainly than at present the spread and decline of monasticism, and to picture more accurately the material (as distinguished from the spiritual) life of the monks.

An important step towards this end was taken by the Byzantine Research Account in its excavations at Wâdî Sargah. We have still to wait for a full report on the archaeological results of that work; for the summary notice with sketch-plan contributed to the Introduction by Mr. Campbell Thompson leaves many matters obscure. I would here suggest that the nucleus (Church, Keep, etc.) of the “Monastery of

Apa Thomas" was situated, not in the *wādī* itself, but within the area enclosed by the so-called "vallum, which may be no other than the boulder-footing of a crude-brick enclosure wall.

The present volume, however, is essentially a publication of the Coptic and Greek texts found during the excavations, and to these we must now turn. They include a certain number of "literary" (biblical and theological) fragments, but the majority are ephemeral—letters, lists, and accounts of various kinds. While there is no single text of outstanding importance the collection as a whole is of high interest. Of their strictly philological importance, I am not qualified to judge; but every student will welcome the accession of so much material which illustrates the daily life of an Egyptian monastery. Literary texts almost ignore the material side of monastic life, suggesting that the Fathers, wrapped in devotion, were only maintained by a series of fortunate accidents. The Wādī Sargah texts constitute a useful corrective, showing that the monks by no means neglected the affairs of this world. Indeed, their attention seems to have been occupied with a multitude of material concerns. Especially interesting, when we recall Abba Poemen's dictum that monks had no business at all with wine, are the various accounts of wine (Nos. 121 ff.). Evidently wine was freely used in Egyptian monasteries, and the litter of broken wine-jars to be found on every ruined site tells the same tale as the documents. Generally, we conclude that but for the observance of religious rites and for the absence of domestic ties, life in a monastery of the sixth century did not greatly differ from life in any large household of the same period.

Mr. Crum and Mr. Bell are such proven masters in their respective subjects that it would be impertinence for a novice to do more than express envious admiration of the sure skill and profound science with which they have edited and commented on these texts. If any parts of their work are to be singled out for special mention, I would name the sections headed *The Monastic Settlement and its Inhabitants*, and *Metrology*. The latter should be of immense help to any who in the future may have to deal with suchlike documents.

In conclusion I venture to touch on a few matters of detail. No. 19, a calendar of lucky and unlucky days, shows some (accidental) coincidences with the Hesiodic list. Thus with ll. 1—2 we may compare *W. and D.* 788 f., and with l. 9 *id.* 792—4. It is regrettable that this text is not more complete. In No. 100, l. 3 occurs the word  $\mu\alpha\pi\tau\omega\nu$ [e], explained (p. 94, n. 1) as a group of monastic dwellings. The Boh.  $\mu\alpha\pi\tau\omega\nu$  was similarly used in Scetis (where it occurs in Arabic guise as *منشوبة*) to denote a "dependent cell" or unit in a *laura* (cf. *Hist. of the Patr.* ed. Evetts, p. [555], where we have, *المناشيب اعنى القلايى*). These *mansubahs*, as their remains show, were enclosures of considerable size containing within a strong outer wall, a church, *kastr*, cells for the inmates, and other buildings. The larger may have accommodated as many as twenty monks: they may be compared to the halls or hostels of the mediaeval universities. In l. 4 of the same letter  $\mu\omega\tau\omega\tau$  is rendered "window (niche)." In the present context "cupboard" might be suggested (closed cupboards used for storing books and the like were used at the Mt. of Nitria in the fourth century); though indeed the word is definitely applied to a niche or aumbry in a church (as in the *Service for the Consecration of a Church*, ed. Horner, 388, where it denotes the eastern niche in the sanctuary).

Students of the Coptic language and of Coptic monasticism cannot sufficiently thank the editors for so admirable and scholarly a publication.

H. G. EVELYN WHITE.

*The Tomb of Tutankhamen.* By JEAN CAPART; translated from the French by WARREN R. DAWSON. London, 1923.

As a writer on serious Egyptological subjects Jean Capart holds a very high place in the esteem of his colleagues, and even of his more popular work there is very little which would not be worth translating into English for the benefit of those who do not read his tongue. Yet I am not sure that the present book does not fall among that little. Not that it is a bad book; far from it, for it contains a great deal of information correctly given. The articles and letters of which it is composed were, at the moment when they appeared, of the highest interest, but was the case so strong for reprinting them? This country had already been deluged with material of this kind, of which the charm mostly passes with the romantic moment, the more so in the case of a work some of the hopes expressed in which have already proved to be unfounded (witness the mythical box of papyri). No form of literature translates less successfully from one language into another than letters, and the emotions stirred by historic moments, however well they have been expressed in the original French, are slightly tawdry when done into English.



The informative matter of the volume is accurate and thoughtful, like all M. Capart's work, and I notice only two small points to query. On p. 32 Tutankhamun is said to be a son of Amenophis III, a statement which has appeared in other books, but for which I can find no evidence, save that of the Barkal lions, which is hardly cogent. On the same page the translation of the name Akhenaten by "Servant of the Disk" would be hard to justify. To say that it seems that Tutankhamun reigned only six years (p. 53), merely because the highest year-date yet known to us from his reign is Year 6 is to fall into an old trap. But these are minute blemishes in a piece of work the accuracy of which is the more remarkable since it must mainly have been done from memory on the author's travels.

In his translation Mr. Dawson has probably come as near perfection as is possible in rendering letters into English. Here and there signs of hurry are evident, as was almost inevitable seeing the haste with which the work was got out. These lapses fortunately do not take the form of mistranslations, but merely of unconscious imitations of French constructions. Thus no fewer than three times (pp. 53, 60 and 71) we find the English Relative Pronoun preceded by that redundant "and" which French idiom demands and English rejects. Similarly on p. 70, line 2, there is a preposition "to" which is needed in French but not allowed in English, and on p. 79 we find the verb "to prevent" followed first by "from" with the Verbal Noun and secondly by "to" with the Infinitive. On the plate opposite p. 56 occurs the strange phrase to "come at" (presumably *arriver à*), and on p. 57 we find "signs of the life" for "signs of life." "Disembodied" is a better word than "disincarnated" (87), and the sun can hardly in English prose be described as "the astral god" (57). On p. 32 "workshop" is misprinted "worship." There are a few small slips in spelling: thus on p. 60 read "practised" and on p. 59 "paltriness." "Hypogæum" with diphthong œ is surely indefensible, as also is "Akenaten," the Egyptian ḥ being rendered kh in other names in the book. But these details would scarcely be worth mentioning except in so far as they may be useful to Mr. Dawson in case of a reprint.

T. ERIC PEET.

*Egyptian Art. Introductory Studies.* By JEAN CAPART; translated by WARREN R. DAWSON. London, 1923.

Although the science of Egyptology has existed for over a century the teacher has still the greatest difficulty in prescribing books for his pupils, more especially for those who have not yet mastered French and German. Breasted has solved the problem on the historical side, but we still await a general manual on archaeology, a tedious and difficult task of which Egyptologists one and all seem to fight shy, though Erman's admirable *Aegypten*, especially in the new edition by Ranke, has filled many of the gaps. Egyptian art, however, has until quite lately cried in vain for adequate treatment. Books which consist mainly of collections of actual examples of art exist in numbers, but it was not until 1921 that Schaefer with his *Ägyptische Kunst* raised the study of the subject to a new plane. Even he dealt only or chiefly with drawing, and Mr. Dawson was thus more than justified in thinking that Capart's *Leçons sur l'art égyptien* deserved translation into English. The present book contains only the introductory portion of the *Leçons*. The word introductory must, however, not be taken quite literally, for the book includes, in addition to much truly preliminary matter, a chapter on the first Pharaonic monuments, five chapters on architecture, and one on the conventions of Egyptian drawing. There is obviously a lack of proportion here which we hope Mr. Dawson will soon remedy by the translation of more of the *Leçons*. In the meantime we are duly thankful for what he has given us. The text is marked by that scholarship, thought and common sense which are characteristic of all M. Capart's work. The illustrations are excellently chosen and the more hackneyed views carefully avoided. Mr. Dawson has further provided for our comfort by refusing to place any of his pictures sideways on his plates. This in some cases involves having plates which are more than half blank, an arrangement to which we take no exception, for the advantage gained is worth it. We do, however, think that in some of these cases it would have been better to bring down the picture to the middle of the page instead of leaving it stranded at the top with its title far away below it. Plates X and XXIX are striking instances of this. If and when Mr. Dawson decides to give us more of the *Leçons* we hope he will consider the possibility of using collotypes instead of half-tones. They are now very little more expensive, they are always better, and the paper on which they are printed is far more durable.

The translation does not read like a translation, which is merely to say that it is excellent. Mr. Dawson has introduced an admirable book to the English-reading public, and he has done it in a manner worthy of it.

T. ERIC PEET.


## A HEAD OF KING RAMESSES I FROM HIS TEMPLE AT ABYDOS

With Plate XI

Plate XI, which forms the frontispiece to this number, is a reproduction from a colour-sketch by Major Benton Fletcher. In 1912, when Major Fletcher was staying at the Society's camp at Abydos, a small chapel of Ramesses I was discovered by a native of the village of 'Arâbah el-Madfûnah in his garden. The walls of this chapel were adorned with reliefs very similar in style to those of the Seti temple close by, and not inferior to them in delicacy of finish. The director of the Society's excavations at once reported this discovery to the local Inspector of Antiquities, who indeed had already heard of it from another source. Despite all efforts on his part the Service des Antiquités decided not to interfere in the matter, and we at Abydos had the melancholy spectacle of seeing these priceless reliefs carelessly sawn from their blocks, rudely packed in cases and removed by camel to be sold to a dealer presumably in Cairo.

Fate, however, partially relented, for most of the blocks fell some years later into the hands of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York, where they have received the patient and skilful treatment which that institution knows how to apply to sick antiquities. Since then they have been published in Mr. H. E. Winlock's volume, called *Bas-Reliefs from the Temple of Rameses I at Abydos (Metropolitan Museum of Art Papers, Vol. 1, Part 1)*.

The sketch shown will be of interest to readers, since it was made by Major Fletcher in the chapel itself before the removal of the reliefs, and gives a very good idea of the beauty of the work in the original. It is taken from the scene shown in Winlock's Plate V, in which the king offers calves to Osiris. The block itself was, a short time ago, still in the possession of M. Kelekian in Paris.



RAMESSES I, from his temple at Abydos.

## AEMILIANUS THE "TYRANT"

BY J. GRAFTON MILNE

THE miscellaneous collection of Roman generals, client kings, and other people of more or less eminence which is found in the *Historia Augusta* under the title of the Thirty Tyrants includes one man on whose career some light has been thrown by Egyptian papyri which may give some clue to the circumstances leading to his appearance in this connection.

The account of Aemilianus given in the *Historia Augusta* is, briefly, to the effect that he was in command of Egypt and was compelled by an outbreak of rioting at Alexandria to assume the position of emperor for his own safety. He ruled with vigour, occupied the Thebaid and the whole of the country, and drove back the barbarian tribes. He was preparing an expedition against the Indians (*i.e.* presumably the Axumites of Abyssinia) when he was overthrown and captured by Theodotus, the general sent by Gallienus.

Lucius Mussius Aemilianus and Aurelius Theodotus are both known as prefects of Egypt from papyri. The latest date for Aemilianus, who had first been vice-prefect, but was prefect by 24 Sept. 258 (P. Oxy. 1201), is Sept./Oct. 259 (P. Ryl. 110): the only recorded date for Theodotus is 14 Aug. 262 (P. Strasb. 5). In view of the statements of the *Historia Augusta*, it may safely be concluded that Theodotus was the immediate successor of Aemilianus: but the precise date at which the change was effected is left vague within a period of three years (*cf.* STEIN, *Arch. Pap.*, v, 419, n. 1).

This period however covers that during which two other "tyrants" were recognised in Egypt. Macrianus and Quietus were proclaimed as emperors in Syria in the summer of 260, and shortly afterwards were accepted by the Egyptians. The earliest recorded dating by them is on 29 Sept. 260, in a horoscope from Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. 1476): this date is expressed as in their first year, which shows that they had not been recognised in Egypt before the previous 29 Aug. Nearly two months later the inhabitants of Oxyrhynchus seem still to have been doubtful as to the legitimacy of their title, since it was necessary for the strategos on 24 Nov. to issue an order requiring the local bankers to accept and exchange their coins, which it was reported had been refused (P. Oxy. 1411). A distribution of corn in their names was announced at Hermopolis on 15 Feb. 261 (P. Lond. 955): which suggests that they were then firmly established in Middle Egypt. But nine days later an ostrakon at Thebes is dated by Valerian and Gallienus (WILCKEN, *G. O.* 1474): and there are no certain dates of Macrianus and Quietus after this. The coin in the British Museum of year 2 of Macrianus is, as pointed out by Laffranchi (*Riv. Ital. Numism.*, 1907, 381), a tooled coin of Gallienus: and the entry in a Strasburg papyrus of a date in the second year is not a safe guide, as the whole of the dating of the group in which this occurs (P. Strasb. 6-8) is hopelessly confused<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Alternatively it may be suggested that the date in the Strasburg papyrus—30 Oct. 261—is correct according to the scribe's knowledge and belief, and that though Macrianus and Quietus had lost hold on Alexandria and possibly on all Egypt before 29 Aug., the scribe in the Fayyûm had not heard or realised the news. This is possible—almost anything is possible with a Fayyûm scribe: but the eccentricity of the whole of his datings looks as if he had been trying to work out a chronological scheme of his own and got into a complete muddle.

The numismatic evidence, which was discussed in a paper on the coinage of the eighth year of Gallienus (*Anc. Egypt*, 1917, pt. IV), is in general agreement with the conclusion suggested by the papyrus dates. A few coins of Valerian, Gallienus, and Salonina, linked in style with those of previous years, were issued from the Alexandrian mint at the beginning, presumably, of their year 8—*i.e.* Aug./Sept. 260. Other coins of Gallienus alone, dated in the same year, but in style resembling those of later years, are found, which presumably belong to the end of this year. And intermediate between these two groups are the coins of Macrianus and Quietus, which are all dated in their first year.

The question arises, whether Aemilianus had any dealings with Macrianus and Quietus. Either he or Theodotus—more probably Aemilianus—was in nominal command of Egypt during the few months when Macrianus and Quietus were officially regarded as ruling at Alexandria and in Middle Egypt: what was the relation of the representative of Gallienus to the usurpers? It would not have been unprecedented for a prefect to continue in office during and after a revolt from Rome: L. Mantennius Sabinus was prefect on 6 Mar. 193 under Pertinax (*B. G. U.* 646), and still prefect under Severus on 21 Apr. 194 (*I. G. R.* 1062), though in the interval Pescennius Niger had been accepted as emperor in Egypt and had been crushed by Severus. But a more probable explanation may be suggested.

It is worth noting that the dating on the Theban ostrakon mentioned above is by Valerian and Gallienus. Now in Lower and Middle Egypt datings by Valerian and Gallienus continue up to Sept. 260—but, after the break caused by the usurpation of Macrianus and Quietus, datings are by Gallienus alone. The fact that the name of Valerian occurs at Thebes on 24 Feb. 261 suggests that there had been no break in the recognition of Valerian and Gallienus there, and that Macrianus and Quietus had not extended their authority so far south<sup>1</sup>. And, as a matter of fact, no monuments or records of Macrianus and Quietus seem to have been found above Koptos, from which place there is an inscription of Quietus (*I. G. R.* 1181).

The special mention in the *Historia Augusta* of the activities of Aemilianus in the Thebaid may give ground for supposing that he held out there for Gallienus against the representatives of Macrianus and Quietus, and from there finally recovered Egypt for his master. As Macrianus and Quietus were first proclaimed in Syria, their authority over Egypt would probably spread through Pelusium to the head of the Delta, and thence northwards to Alexandria and southwards through Middle Egypt: and it is consequently not surprising that though Gallienus was still recognised, and coins were struck for him, at Alexandria after 29 Aug. 260, Macrianus and Quietus were recognised at Oxyrhynchus as early as 29 Sept.<sup>2</sup> And the recovery of the country for Gallienus probably followed the reverse course: if Hermopolis was feasting in honour of Macrianus and Quietus on 15 Feb. 261, it is very unlikely that they could have been overthrown and the news of their overthrow have reached Thebes by 24 Feb., if the wave of recovery were proceeding southwards: it is more

<sup>1</sup> If the Roman officials in the Thebaid had been cut off from direct communication with the Mediterranean by the forces of Macrianus and Quietus on the Lower Nile, they would not have heard that Valerian had disappeared from the imperial power after his capture by the Persians, and so would continue to join his name with that of Gallienus.

<sup>2</sup> The horoscope (P. Oxy. 1476) may not have been written at Oxyrhynchus, though found there: but there is a reasonable probability that it was. The next earliest dating for Macrianus and Quietus is 25 days later (P. Grenf. I, 50): this is from the Fayyûm, which would naturally get news from outside later than Oxyrhynchus, possibly by as much as a week: so the margin of error in the argument is not wide.

probable that Hermopolis returned to its allegiance somewhat later, as Alexandria did before the end of the year.

If, however, Aemilianus had been the loyal upholder of the cause of Gallienus in Egypt against the Syrian "tyrants," how came he into the same category with them? That he was superseded and arrested by orders of Gallienus seems certain from the *Historia Augusta*: but it may be doubted whether he ever laid claim to imperial power. It is significant that no coins of his are known—the one supposed to exist in the British Museum is, as has been shown by Dattari, a tooled coin of Philip—and that no datings by his reign have been found: if he had regarded himself as emperor, and had ruled as vigorously and as long as the *Historia Augusta* suggests, it is almost certain that coins would have been struck and documents dated in his name. There may have been grounds for the supersession of Aemilianus, and he may have been suspected of a design to seize the empire: but it is almost certain that he did not call himself emperor.

After all, if he had saved Egypt for Gallienus and then been driven to revolt, he would only have been in the same position as others of his contemporaries. Odenathus of Palmyra, who had similarly upheld the cause of Rome in Syria against Macrianus and Quietus, did not himself break away from the empire: but had it not been for his early death, he would probably have taken this step, since his widow and son very shortly afterwards claimed their independence. The most remarkable shifting of parts, however, was in Greece, where Piso went to take possession of the province on behalf of Macrianus: Valens, the governor appointed by Gallienus, revolted and set himself up as "tyrant": and Piso thereupon took up the cause of Gallienus. The whole situation of the Roman empire during the seventh decade of the third century was one of kaleidoscopic changes, the meaning and purpose of which it is difficult to discover. So the degree to which the charge of disloyalty can be justly brought against Aemilianus may perhaps be left undetermined.

## THE MOUSE IN EGYPTIAN AND LATER MEDICINE<sup>1</sup>

By WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S.

THE mouse is one of the most ancient medicines used by mankind, and, as the following paragraphs will show, it has been in continuous use from very early prehistoric times to the present day. How the mouse acquired its reputation is difficult to decide. There was a belief current in Pliny's time, which also figures in the mediaeval *Bestiaries*, that the mouse was a spontaneous product of the Nile mud after each inundation. It may have acquired on this account the virtue of a "Giver of Life," a virtue which was ascribed to the Nile and to everything directly connected therewith or resulting from the inundation. The modern Egyptians, I am told, likewise believe in the spontaneous generation of mice from the Nile mud. I know of no text of the Pharaonic period expressing the idea, but the account of Pliny, obviously coloured with Egyptian ideas as was so much else in his book, is worth quoting (Lib. ix, cap. 84):

"Verum omnibus his fidem Nili inundatio affert, omnia excedente miraculo: quippe detegente eo musculi reperiuntur inchoato opere genitalis aquae terraeque; jam parte corporis viventes, novissima effigie etiamnum terrena."

Plutarch (*Symposiacs* v, 10) in accounting for the divine origin of salt suggests that this divinity may have arisen because the mineral preserves bodies from decay after the soul has taken flight, and because mice conceive by merely licking salt. Here then we have the foundation of a belief in the virtue of the mouse derived from its connection with salt, which was likewise, to primitive man, a "Giver of Life." Belief in the spontaneous generation of the mouse survived for many centuries, and turns up again and again, e.g. in Basil's Homilies (329-379 A.D.).

Many of the *materia medica* used by the ancients are of so bizarre a nature that doubts are often entertained as to whether they were ever actually used, in spite of the written prescriptions containing them. In the case of the mouse we have the most striking evidence that it was medicinally employed. In 1901 Prof. Reisner carried out excavations at Nag' ed-Dêr in Upper Egypt, in the course of which he found many human bodies belonging to the earliest pre-dynastic period. The conditions under which these bodies had been buried, in direct contact with the hot, dry, desert sand, have handed them down to us absolutely intact with the soft parts completely preserved—the skin, the hair, the muscles, the nerves and the viscera. From the alimentary canals and intestines of these bodies food-materials were recovered by Prof. Elliot Smith, who handed them on for examination to Prof. Netolitzky<sup>2</sup>. In his book *The Ancient Egyptians* (2nd ed., 1923, 50) Prof. Elliot Smith makes the following remarks:

"The occasional presence of the remains of mice in the alimentary canals of children, under circumstances which prove that the small rodent had been eaten after being skinned,

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Royal Society of Medicine (Historical Section) on Dec. 19th, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> His report is published in the *Zeitschrift für Untersuchung der Nahrungs- und Genussmittel*, xxi, 607, 1911, Part 10.

is a discovery of very great interest, for Dr. Netolitzky informs me that the body of a mouse was the last resort of medical practitioners in the East several millennia later as a remedy for children *in extremis*, as it still is in Europe."

Here we have well attested evidence of the medicinal use of the mouse in Egypt at a period which, at the lowest possible computation, is six thousand years ago, and as it is still common in England and in other parts of Europe to use the mouse as a medicine for children, it occurred to me to hunt out such references as I could find in early medical literature which might throw light on mouse-medicine in the interval which divides these widely separated periods.

In the Egyptian medical papyri the mouse occurs only three times. In the Ebers Papyrus<sup>1</sup> it figures in a prescription for some kind of rheumatoid trouble "to relax stiffness." Here equal parts of the fat of the pig, the mouse, the snake and the cat are to be mixed together and bandaged on to the affected part. In an unpublished papyrus of earlier date the fat of the mouse is used for a similar purpose, mixed with that of the lion, hippopotamus, crocodile, ass and other animals, and with olive oil to be used as an ointment daily until the patient is well<sup>2</sup>. In the Hearst Medical Papyrus<sup>3</sup>, amongst a number of recipes for the hair, the following occurs: "Cooked mouse put in fat until it is rotten: do likewise" (*i.e.* anoint the hair with it).

A more interesting mention of the mouse is to be found in a magical papyrus at Berlin<sup>4</sup> which contains a number of spells for the protection of mothers and children. Amongst these spells is an incantation to drive away *sesmi* (some infantile ailment) which ends with these words: "Make this child, or his mother, eat a cooked mouse. Put the bones upon his neck, bound with a string in which seven knots have been tied." This instance is the earliest written mention of the mouse as a medicine for children. It dates from about 1500 B.C.

Dioscorides (Lib. II, cap. 74) says, "It is well known that mice which run about houses can be very usefully cut up and applied to scorpion stings. If children eat them roasted it helps to stop dribbling at the mouth." Perhaps the unknown word *sesmi* in the Berlin papyrus means dribbling. The Algerian physician 'Abd er-Razzaq who lived at the end of the 17th century, evidently borrowed directly from Dioscorides when he wrote "grilled and eaten, it [*sc.* the mouse] stops dribbling of saliva in children....Roasted alive and placed upon the sting of a scorpion, it cures it. Applied similarly to splinters and thorns, it draws them out<sup>5</sup>."

When we examine Pliny's *Natural History* we find it literally swarming with mice. The mouse, or parts of it, or its blood or dung appear again and again. Thus mice cut open and applied are effective against serpent bites (Book XXIX, cap. 25) and scorpion-stings (XXIX, 29). The ashes of the head of a mouse, the tail of a mouse, or a mouse entire, is a cure for alopecia (XXIX, 34). For ulcerations of the head produced by the use of cantharides, apply the head, gall, and dung of mice with hellebore and pepper (XXIX, 34). The ashes of a mouse mixed with honey cure ear-ache (XXIX, 39), or, rubbed on the teeth, sweeten the

<sup>1</sup> 85, 5.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to Dr. Alan Gardiner for this information.

<sup>3</sup> 10, 10-11.

<sup>4</sup> Papyrus No. 3027. Published by Erman: *Zaubersprüche für Mutter und Kind*. Berlin 1901. 8, 2-3.

<sup>5</sup> *Kachef er-Roumoúz* (The Revelation of Enigmas). It was translated into French by Leclerc, Paris 1874.



breath (xxx, 9). Lung affections are cured by mice, and especially African mice, flayed, cooked in oil and salt and eaten. This preparation is good also for suppuration of pus or blood (xxx, 14). Cut-open mice are good for gout (xxx, 23), and for warts of all kinds the blood of a mouse, or the mouse itself cut open, is to be used (xxx, 23). To draw out foreign matter, such as thorns, from the flesh, apply a mouse cut open (xxx, 42). To cure children who cannot hold their water, make them eat cooked mice (xxx, 47). The examples are selected from amongst many.

Galen, who was well aware of such uses of the mouse, condemns them in one of his books as superstitious, whilst in another he recommends them<sup>1</sup>.

Marcellus (*De Medicamentis*, 4th cent. A.D.) employs the mouse and other ingredients much in the manner of Pliny<sup>2</sup>.

In the *Syriac Book of Medicines* published by Budge<sup>3</sup>, we have a strange medley in which ancient Egyptian, Greek and other influences are manifest. The mouse seldom occurs, however. Its dung, mixed with other ingredients, is used for scabies (*op. cit.*, 695) and is used as an external application to assist urination (p. 681).

A Coptic medical papyrus of the 9–10th cent. A.D. has an interesting prescription for “ulcers which creep, and remain open. Wax 1 ounce; santal 2 oz.; unsalted pig-lard 1 oz.; decoction of cut-open mouse 1 oz. Cook them together and use them for ulcers<sup>4</sup>.” The Arabic physician Ibn el-Bêtar (died 1248 A.D.) refers to the mouse in terms very similar to those of Dioscorides<sup>5</sup>. Unfortunately I have lacked facilities for searching the works of the mediaeval writers on medicine. In the *Collectio Salernitana* references to the mouse exist, but I have not had an opportunity of hunting them up. Dr. Rendel Harris quotes an extract from a manuscript book in his possession dated 1692 which is interesting in this connection<sup>6</sup>:

“Fry'd mice are very good to eat. And mice flea'd and dry'd to powder, and the powder mixt with sugar-candy is very good for chinn-cough. You must flea the mice when you fry them. These I know to be good.”

In Culpeper's *Pharmacopœia Londinensis*<sup>7</sup> it is stated that “a flead mouse dried and beaten into powder and given at a time helps such as cannot hold their water, or have a Diabetes if you do the like for three days together,” and a century later in the *Pharmacopœia Universalis* of Dr. R. James, M.D.<sup>8</sup>, we find the mouse once more in use for nearly all the varied purposes to which it has been applied in the ancient writers already quoted. The author states (p. 349), “The whole Animal, and its Dung are used in Medicine. The Mouse, cut up alive, and applied, draws out Splinters, Darts, and Arrows, and cures the Bites of Scorpions, extracting the Poison. The Ashes cure the involuntary or nocturnal Flux of the Urine. The Dung purges infants by stool, is used in Clysters, cures an *Alopecia*, absterges Scurf from the Head, diminishes Stones in the Kidneys, or Bladder, and removes a *Condyloma*, *Verruca*, *Ficus*, *Marisca*, and the Tumors affecting the *Anus*.”

<sup>1</sup> THORNDIKE, *Magic and Experimental Science*, I, 1923, 166 and 175.

<sup>2</sup> THORNDIKE, *op. cit.*, 587.

<sup>3</sup> 2 vols., Oxford, 1913.

<sup>4</sup> CHASSINAT, *Un papyrus médical copte*, Cairo, 1921, 297.

<sup>5</sup> LECLERC, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits*, t. xxvi, 17. Paris, 1875.

<sup>6</sup> *The Ascent of Olympus*, 83.

<sup>7</sup> Sixth edition, 1659, 46.

<sup>8</sup> Second edition, London, 1752.

To-day the mouse is chiefly used for children. I have found instances all over England and Wales. It is usually flayed, fried or boiled or made into a pie, and is given to children for incontinence of the bladder, for dribbling, and for whooping-cough.

The above illustrations (which might be increased almost indefinitely) however much they differ have many points in common. It will be noted for instance that in nearly every case the mouse must be skinned or cooked for internal use, and split-open for external application. The mouse when we first meet it is a child's medicine, and when a Lancashire mother administers a mouse to her ailing baby to-day, she is doing what the prehistoric mothers by the banks of the Nile did for their infants six thousand years ago.

## THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS: AN ANSWER TO PROFESSOR NAVILLE AND OTHERS

By ALAN H. GARDINER

By the kindness of the Editor I am given an opportunity of replying to Professor Naville<sup>1</sup> without delay, and I welcome the occasion thus offered to review the statements of some other critics. Incidentally, I have a few scraps of new evidence to put forward. By way of preface, let me protest my innocence of any claim to have said the last word on the difficult topographical problems here involved; the exact site of Pi-Ramesse has still to be found, and more satisfactory testimony is required on almost every point. But I do claim to have brought the discussion of these matters into a new phase, and to have destroyed or at least rendered extremely improbable certain hypotheses hitherto regarded as certainties. It is disconcerting to find my arguments partly ignored and partly misrepresented by my opponents; is it too much to ask to be carefully read?

Professor Naville starts with a misrepresentation of my position with regard to the Exodus which no doubt is unintentional, but which is none the less crass for that reason. He attributes to me the statement, quoted in inverted commas, that "all the story of the Exodus ought to be regarded as no less mythical than the details of creation as recorded in Genesis." On reading this, I asked myself with astonishment whether, in a moment of aberration, I could conceivably have committed myself to so rash an assertion. Reference to my article in the *Recueil Champollion* showed, to my relief, that my supposed words "all the story of the Exodus" are Professor Naville's own invention. Since my original article is likely to be inaccessible to many readers of the *Journal*, I will quote the entire passage: "It does not enter into my plan to elaborate the case for or against the historicity of the Exodus, but it will conduce to clearness if I outline the opinions which I hold upon the subject. That Israel was in Egypt under one form or another no historian could possibly doubt; a legend of such tenacity representing the early fortunes of a people under so unfavourable an aspect could not have arisen save as a reflexion, however much distorted, of real occurrences. But the Hyksos invasion and the subsequent expulsion of the Hyksos afford quite sufficient basis for the origination of the legend. Nor would it make the slightest difference to this assertion should it be proved that the Hyksos were racially quite unrelated to the Israelites, for nations inherit with all possible ease the traditions of the lands which in course of time they come to occupy. Would it not, indeed, be strange if the whole episode of the Hyksos had left no trace in Hebrew legend? When, further, it is taken into consideration that the date of Joseph, according to any reasonable computation, falls within the Hyksos period, surely little doubt can be entertained but that the fortunes of the Shepherd kings are somehow imaged in the Exodus story. But the mention of the town of Raamses-Rameses introduces an ingredient of later date, and it is not impossible that, as the quotations from Manetho and Chaeremon in Josephus suggest, some further events at the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty may have become blended with

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal*, x, 18-39.

the memory of the Hyksos. Illustrative material indicating the kind of relations existing between Egypt and the Bedâwîn tribes on its borders is found in the papyri, for example in Anastasi VI. But not a vestige of evidence points to any serious occupation of Egyptian territory such as could have resulted in a drama resembling that enacted in the book of Exodus. Until there emerges evidence of a character wholly different from that already available, I submit that the details of the story ought to be regarded as no less mythical than the details of the creation as recorded in Genesis. At all events our first task must be to attempt to interpret those details on the supposition that they are legend."


So far, then, from maintaining that "all the story of the Exodus" is mythical, I had most clearly and explicitly affirmed my conviction that the story, as a whole, reflects a definite historical event, namely the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. This, I must add, was no new hypothesis, since it had already been ably advocated by Dr. H. R. Hall in his *Ancient History of the Near East* (1st ed., pp. 408-9). To maintain that a story is false *in its entirety* and to declare the *details* to be legendary are obviously two very different things, and Professor Naville does me a wrong in neglecting the difference. I am ready to admit, however, that if I had merely assumed the details of the Exodus story to be legendary, and had left the matter there, I should have laid myself open to fair criticism. But such was not the case; the method pursued in my article was a perfectly sound one. Asking the reader to concede that the details of the story might be legendary, I surveyed the topographical movements which it records in their *ensemble* and then sought to demonstrate, point by point, that this *ensemble* is utterly at variance with the actual physical facts. In other words, what I did was to state my conclusion first and then to prove it afterwards, a very ordinary dialectical expedient.

Before passing on to details, I will allude briefly to a recent discovery which appears to me to strengthen the case against an Exodus of the traditional kind. Dr. Fisher's excavations at Beisân, the ancient Bethshean, between Jezreel and the Jordan, have brought to light an Egyptian fortress with stelae of Sethos I and Ramesses II, and what is still more important, a statue of Ramesses III. To quote Dr. Fisher's own words<sup>1</sup>, "this group of dated records found *in situ* is sufficient proof that the town had remained in Egyptian hands practically from 1313 to 1167 B.C." Now the traditional Exodus story would seem to make but little sense except on the supposition that the Egyptian control in Palestine after the Akhenaten period was, at the best, relaxed and discontinuous. Systematic excavations are beginning to show, on the contrary, that the Ramessides still retained a firm hold on the promised land. Under these circumstances, the Israelites in fleeing from Egypt would have been merely jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. However, a friend to whom I submitted this objection replied: "Quite so, and that is why the Israelites made for Sinai rather than for the promised land itself!"

### 1. The question of Rameses.

I have no quarrel with Professor Naville for omitting to discuss the remainder of my article in the *Recueil Champollion*, since the corner-stone upon which its argument is built up is my contention, disputed by him, that the Biblical Rameses was the residence-city of the Pharaohs at or near Pelusium. In opposition to that contention Professor Naville declares (1) that the Rameses of the Old Testament is Tell er-Retâbah in the Wâdî

<sup>1</sup> *The Museum Journal* (Philadelphia 1923), p. 236.

Ṭūmilât and (2) that the greater city of Rameses (Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe) was situated, not in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, but at the well-known frontier town of  = Kanṭarah.

Let us examine these two contentions in turn. (1) Professor Naville pays no attention to my demonstration (*Journal*, v, 262–6) that the Hebrew text provides little or no evidence in favour of a city of Rameses in the Wādî Ṭūmilât, so that, failing archaeological evidence to the contrary, the existence of such a city is pure conjecture; he and my other critics fail also to answer my questions as to how, on the supposition that Moses and the Israelites were separated off in the Wādî Ṭūmilât, Moses could have risen up early in the morning to stand before Pharaoh, or his cradle have been found by Pharaoh's daughter among the flags of the river. To convey any clear picture to the mind, the Biblical narrative must in many passages presuppose that Moses and his followers were resident in *the* actual capital-city of the Pharaohs, so that it naturally became the starting-point of the Exodus. But waiving this important point, is there any serious evidence that Tell er-Reṭâbah was ever called Rameses, or was *a* royal residence at all? Certainly the stela of Ramesses II, on which Professor Naville comments so lengthily (pp. 20–1), proves nothing of the kind. The crucial passage<sup>1</sup> ends with the epithet *ḳd m dmīw ḥr rn-f r dt*, which I had connected with the foregoing references to the land of the Shosu and had rendered “building in (their) cities in his (own) name for ever.” Professor Naville may possibly be right in rejecting the connection with the Shosu which I had surmised<sup>2</sup>, but his own translation “building cities in his name for ever” overlooks the preposition *m* “in” and is therefore quite impossible; whether the cities referred to were Shosu-cities or not, all that the epithet states is that the Pharaoh erected buildings in them bearing his own name, and consequently the deduction that Er-Reṭâbah was named after Ramesses II is altogether beside the mark.

A more plausible argument in favour of Er-Reṭâbah being a royal residence is advanced by Mr. Harold M. Wiener in his courteously worded and thoughtful criticism of my views published in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, pp. 75–7. This is the passage from *Pap. Anastasi V* (19, 6–20, 2) translated by me *Journal*, vi, 109, which begins as follows:—“*I was despatched from the Courts of the Royal Palace on the ninth day of the third month of summer, at eventide, in quest of those two servants. I reached the enclosure-wall of Theku (i.e. Tell el-Maskhūṭah) on the tenth day of the third month of summer; they told me that they had said in the south that they (the slaves) had passed on the tenth day of the third month of summer. And [when I] reached the fortress (scil. of Theku) they told me that the groom (?) had come from the desert [to say] that they had passed the north wall of the Migdol of Sety-Meneptah-is-beloved-like-Seth.*” Mr. Wiener, believing me to hold that “the Courts of the Royal Palace” must refer to the Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe at or near Pelusium, first refuses to accept my identification of the *migdol* here mentioned with that which lies on the great military road to Asia (Tell el-Ḥêr?), since the *détour* from Pelusium to Tell el-Ḥêr *via* Maskhūṭah is obviously an absurdity. He then continues:—“While a portion of the document is obscure, certain inferences can be drawn from the parts of it that are clear:

<sup>1</sup> Professor Naville's criticisms of my translation are mostly mistaken. It is true that *ḥṣḳ* means “to capture” “take as plunder” rather than “to plunder,” but since *dmī* “town” often occurs as its object, there is no reason for emending “capturing their hills” into “capturing their troops”—hills can be captured as easily as towns. If *ḥr-sn* means “their faces” rather than “upon them” we obtain the absurd translation “slaying their faces”; *smṣ ḥr-sn* cannot mean “cutting off their heads.”

<sup>2</sup> There is some force in Prof. Naville's argument that the Shosu were Bedāwīn and had no cities. But the reference may be to such borderline places as Raphia and Gaza.

(1) There was a royal palace situate at the distance of only one stage from Maskhûṭah, for the narrator arrived at the latter on the morrow of leaving the palace. (2) Persons seeking to go from that palace to a point beyond the Egyptian frontier would pass through or near Maskhûṭah in, at any rate, some cases.....It is thus certain that there were at least two royal residences in the Eastern Delta. Reṭâbah lies at the exact spot that would best suit this document." This reasoning is sensible, on the whole<sup>1</sup>, though an official who succeeded only in getting from Reṭâbah to the outskirts of Maskhûṭah in a day, or even half a day, would have but little chance of catching a couple of run-away slaves—the distance is a short nine miles! But the passage is full of difficulties, and I for one should be unwilling to base any important conclusion upon it. The fact that this passage was not included by me in my treatise on the towns of Rameses shows that I never thought of identifying "the Courts of the Royal Palace" with the residence-city of Pi-Raṣmesse. On the contrary, I had vaguely in mind either Heliopolis or Memphis, though both of these are too far from Maskhûṭah for a single day's journey. But the dates given in the papyrus are very suspicious: if the pursuing official really reached Maskhûṭah on the tenth, there must surely be something wrong with the further statement "they told me that they had said in the south that they (the slaves) had passed on the tenth<sup>2</sup>." One expects either that the writer should say in the latter case "earlier on the same day," or that the first date should be a date posterior to the tenth, *e.g.* either the eleventh or twelfth. Do not let us forget that we are dealing here with a schoolboy's exercise which has some very patent and indisputable corruptions<sup>3</sup>. Again, even supposing that Reṭâbah could be proved to have been an occasional royal residence—the evidence for this is exceedingly meagre—there is nothing whatsoever to indicate that it was ever called Rameses. To support the view that there was a Rameses in the Wâdî Ṭûmilât hypothesis has to be built upon hypothesis<sup>4</sup>.

(2) To turn now to Professor Naville's second thesis, namely that the residence-city of Pi-Raṣmesse was situated at Kaṇṭarah, not, as I had sought to prove, at or near Pelusium. Curiously enough, Professor Naville accepts without demur my conjecture (for it is not much more) that the Ramesside residence-city was built on the site of the Hyksos stronghold of Avaris. In both these points he is in agreement with M. Clédat, whose views, accordingly, I shall criticize at the same time. M. Clédat has the inestimable advantage, denied to myself, of knowing intimately the sites about which he writes; all the more regrettable, in my opinion, is the injudicious use which he makes of the ancient sources.

It will simplify matters if we dispose of the question of Avaris first of all. In my detailed discussion of this question (*Journal*, III, 99–101) I concluded from the rather slender evidence "that Avaris lay quite close to the caravan-route to Syria, which is now known to have started somewhere near Kaṇṭarah: and there are reasons which urge us to seek it as far north as possible, and as nearly as possible on the fringe of the desert,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wiener does not observe that his argument about "the Courts of the Royal Palace" destroys his argument about the *midol*. If the royal palace was at Reṭâbah, as he supposes, or at Memphis or Heliopolis, as I am inclined to conjecture (see below), there seems no good reason why the *midol* should not be identified with that at Tell el-Ḥêr.

<sup>2</sup> The numeral is partly destroyed, but its tail shows 10 to be the only possibility; 20 of course is excluded by the context.

<sup>3</sup> *E.g.* *sdt* for *mdt* in 19, 8; *inbt* for *inb* in 20, 1; *mi* at the end of 20, 1.


<sup>4</sup> On the door-jamb quoted by Mr. Wiener p. 77 is a title apparently rendered by Mr. Griffith "keeper of the Residency in Succoth." The title in question is *imy-r ht* and I know of no justification for the translation "Residency," if at least this means "Royal Residency."













*i.e.* anywhere between *Ḳaṅṭarah* and Pelusium." In my later article dealing with Pi-Raḥmesse I fixed the site of that city, on the strength of various kinds of evidence, either at or near Pelusium, and reinforced this argument by pointing out that, on the one hand, Josephus and his sources display a strong tendency to confound Avaris and Pelusium with one another, and that, on the other hand, Sētekh was one of the principal gods of Pi-Raḥmesse just as he was the principal deity of Avaris, suggesting an identity of Pi-Raḥmesse and Avaris. I repeat, however, that this proposed identification is little more than conjecture. In his article on the site of Avaris (*Recueil Champollion*, pp. 185–201) M. Clédat states that the Stela of the Year 400 would alone suffice to prove the identity of Avaris and *Ḳaṅṭarah-Selē*. His argumentation is very obscure, for the famous stela in question does not mention Avaris at all. Presumably M. Clédat conjectures that the Sētekh of whom the vizier Sety was high-priest was the Sētekh of Avaris. To me also this appears probable, but all that the stela itself indicates (in the scene at top) is that the Sētekh in question was the "Sētekh of Ramesses," *i.e.* in all likelihood (see *Journal*, v, 255) the Sētekh of Pi-Raḥmesse. No doubt we may use the stela of Year 400 for purposes of corroboration, but as the starting-point of a demonstration concerning either Pi-Raḥmesse or Avaris it affords but a very precarious foothold. Let us suppose for a moment, however, that the vizier Sety were explicitly described on the stela as high-priest of Sētekh of Avaris. Would the stela even in that case prove, or even hint, that Avaris was situated at *Thel-Ḳaṅṭarah*? Assuredly not, for the vizier was a very high functionary whose offices must have extended over a wide-spread area; there is no reason whatsoever for assuming that Sety was "high-priest of Sētekh" in the same place where he was "overseer of the fortress of *Thel*." On the contrary, we have good grounds for thinking that Sētekh was never worshipped at *Thel-Ḳaṅṭarah* at all, the god of that place being Horus of *Mesen*<sup>1</sup>.


The only other serious argument which M. Clédat adduces is the well-known passage about the siege of Avaris in the biography of Aḥmose of *El-Kâb*. M. Clédat ignores the translation of this passage given by Mr. Gunn and myself in *Journal*, v, 49, as well as the admirable note on the subject previously published by Professor Schäfer in the *Zeitschrift* (42, 136). Hence he wrongly emends *tš kmt rst n dmš pn* into *tš nšwt*  $\left( \begin{smallmatrix} \otimes \\ \triangle \end{smallmatrix} \right)$  *rst*, etc., and misses the meaning of *tš wšt pš dmš* lower down. Anyhow, the passage is far too vague to be used for topographical purposes. I am glad to have the opportunity of acknowledging M. Clédat's correction of the position of Pelusium as marked on my map; he informs us that Pelusium lies to the right, not to the left, of the river-mouth, and this agrees, be it noted, with what Josephus expressly states in reference to Avaris; the mistake was due to my giving insufficient instructions to the mapmaker. But whatever the position of the river in relation to Pelusium, my theory of the location of Avaris is barely affected by the data of the biography of Aḥmose, for I am not committed to the view that Avaris was actually *at* Pelusium, but only that it was either at or near that city (see *Journal*, v, 254; 270). It may well prove true that, as M. Clédat (p. 199; also *Bull. de l'Inst. franç.* 22, 170–1) and M. Naville affirm, Pelusium became an important city only in Greek times, and in this case both Pi-Raḥmesse and Avaris will have to be sought a little further up the Bubastite branch. But to state, as my opponents do, that Avaris is not Pelusium because Pelusium did not exist at the time of the Hyksos is simply begging the question. The Greek authors

<sup>1</sup> The pyramidion of *Ḳaṅṭarah*, dedicated to Horus of *Mesen*, has recently been published *in extenso* (*Annales*, 23, 176–82); the only other deity to whom it gives any prominence is Buto of *Nebesheh* (*Imt*).

quoted by M. Clédat are indifferent authorities and Herodotus, II, 154, which both he and Professor Naville cite, says nothing about Pelusium at all!

By a happy chance I am now able to make known for the first time an important piece of evidence bearing upon the position of Avaris. Last winter I purchased at Thebes a large limestone ostrakon inscribed on both sides in a bold literary hand, containing a model letter purporting to be sent by the "royal scribe...Pinehas who is in the north (ꜥ-mḥty) to Hori," an official of "[the house of] Amūn in the southern city"; the date is probably early Ramesside. The letter evidently deals with the property belonging to Amūn in the Delta, and the substantial part of the document begins as follows: □ 

 lacuna of unknown length  (3)   
  unknown length  (4)   
  unknown length  (5)   
 "It is a letter to let thee know the [property (?). . . . of] the estate

of Amūn which is here under my authority in the North, starting from the gate [of . . . , as far as] the end of the Delta, in the three streams (namely) in the Great River, [in . . . . . and] in the stream of Avaris." The importance of this passage will escape no one; it clearly implies that there were in the Delta three main branches of the Nile, in reference to which the location of the property of Amūn could aptly be described. This agrees well with the data of the great Harris papyrus, on the one hand, and of the Ramesside wine-jar sealings, on the other; the latter have recently been re-studied by Professor Spiegelberg in a valuable article (*Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 58, 25-36), where fresh references will be found for many of the topographical names here interesting us. It is a pity that the ostrakon should be broken just in such a way as to deprive us of the name of the second of the three Nile-branches. The first is "the Great River," in all probability the westernmost channel (*Journal*, v, 130)<sup>1</sup>; "the Waters of Avaris" are evidently the easternmost channel, elsewhere known as "the Waters of Prēꜥ." Now it is surely certain that "the Waters of Avaris" would not be so called unless Avaris was situated actually upon them, cf. the Greek terms "the Bubastite river" and "the Pelusiatic mouth." This disposes once and for all of the theory that Avaris is to be looked for at Thel-Ḳanṭarah, which has never been situated on the Nile<sup>2</sup>. To sum up, the position of Avaris is conditioned, so far as I can see, by the following three facts: (1) it was on the easternmost branch of the Nile, (2) it belonged to the Sethroite or northernmost nome, and (3) it was on the edge of the desert (see the determinative ) to the east of the Nile. These facts in conjunction with one another point to Pelusium or its neighbourhood. Let it be remembered that my theory does not necessarily cling to the actual site of Pelusium itself, but merely states that Avaris is to be looked for in that direction. If Pelusium itself proves to be the site, so much the better; if not, so much the worse.

The localization of Pi-Ramessē, to which we must now turn, is a related question, but one that cannot simply be interchanged with the question of Avaris. In other words, I am

<sup>1</sup> To my references must be added a pre-Akhenaten stela at Avignon commemorating a mayor (*ḥꜥty-ꜥ*) of the Great River; published *Rec. de Trav.* 32, 154.

<sup>2</sup> See M. Clédat's article *Bull. de l'Inst. franç.*, 17, 107. In the accompanying sketch-map (Pl. I) the canal of Thel is marked as separating from the Pelusiatic branch a little west of Daphnae.



in entire disagreement with Professor Naville's statement (p. 21) that "since the city of Ramesses and Avaris are at the same place, what is said of one may refer to the other." We must guard against treating a conclusion as a premiss, though, if a conclusion proves satisfactory, no doubt it reinforces the validity of the premisses. I have but little new evidence to bring forward; Professor Spiegelberg quotes a jar-sealing at Karlsruhe which mentions wine from "the great vineyard of Ra<sup>c</sup>messe-mi-Amūn which is to the west of Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe-mi-Amūn" and there is also a reference to Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe on the great stela of the 9th year of Ramesses II recently found by Dr. Fisher at Beisân. Since erroneous statements have appeared in the daily press as to the last-named document, I quote from the copy made by Dr. Albright and Mr. Rowe, to whom I am deeply indebted for permission to use it; their readings have been compared with the photograph sent to me by Dr. Fisher himself. Among the laudatory epithets applied to Ramesses II are the following:




"he causes the Asiatics to retreat, pacifying the fighting which had arisen among everyone; those who desire, they come to him all together bowing down at his castle of life and prosperity, namely Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe-Great-of-Victories."


As regards the localization of Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe neither Professor Naville nor M. Clédat adduces any serious argument in opposition to my own, contenting themselves with first affirming the identity of Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe and Avaris, and then attempting to show that Avaris was situated at Kaṅṭarah. Professor Naville writes (p. 25): "since the city of Ramesses or the fortress of Ramesses had been the starting-point for campaigns in Palestine, it is impossible that it should have been Pelusium." For my part I know of no evidence that Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe ever was the starting-point of Egyptian campaigns; Ramesses II, in his campaign against the Hittites, started from Thel-Kaṅṭarah (*Journal*, v, 179), and Professor Naville's contention is hardly proved by the epithets "the marshalling place of thy cavalry, the rallying-point of thy soldiers" applied to Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe (*Journal*, v, 187). It is only by begging the question that Professor Naville can connect "the fortress of Ra<sup>c</sup>messe-mi-Amūn which is in Thel" (*Anast.*, v, 24-7) with the residence-city of Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe. The only argument used by M. Clédat which directly affects Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe is his identification of Ši-Ḥr "the Waters of Horus," the Biblical Shihōr, with Lake Balaḥ. In support of this he quotes his article in *Bulletin de l'Institut franç.*, 18, 169-73, where I fail to find any tangible evidence in favour of his hypothesis. Indeed, he omits all reference to the two passages in the Old Testament which most convincingly show that the Biblical Shihōr was a name for the easternmost branch of the Nile, namely Isaiah xxiii, 3 and Jeremiah ii, 18. Thus, since the Egyptian Ši-Ḥr is undoubtedly the same as the Biblical Shihōr and, further, is inseparably associated with Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe, we are inevitably compelled to look for Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile. M. Clédat does, indeed, urge that Ši-Ḥr cannot have been flowing water, since it produced both salt and reeds (see *Journal*, v, 251); but, on the other hand, we possess both an Egyptian and a Biblical passage (*op. cit.*, 251-2) to prove that the water of Ši-Ḥr = Shihōr was drunk. Possibly there were stagnant pools and swamps in the neighbourhood of Shihōr which will account for the reeds and the salt.

That Pi-Ra<sup>c</sup>messe was not identical with Thel-Kaṅṭarah is indicated, again, by Professor Spiegelberg's winejar sealings, which frequently mention the latter place; at a moment

when Pi-Raḥmesse was at the height of its glory, surely the old name Thel would have been suppressed in favour of the name Pi-Raḥmesse if both referred to the same site. Furthermore, it has been noted that Horus of Mesen was the god of Thel; that god is not found among the deities of Pi-Raḥmesse. But the decisive reason for disassociating Thel and Pi-Raḥmesse is that both are mentioned separately in the Golénischeff glossary, where the names are not even next one another (*Journal*, v, 198)<sup>1</sup>.

The view that the residence-city of Pi-Raḥmesse is to be sought at or near Pelusium becomes, in my view, more and more incontestable. Like Avaris, it was on the Nile and near the desert, and the epithet "*the harbourage of thy ships' troops*," together with the descriptive phrase "*its ships fare forth, and return to port*" (*Journal*, v, 187), suggests that it was near the sea. For absolute proof, however, we must await further evidence. One argument used by me I have to retract, namely my contention (*Journal*, v, 255) that  $\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\mu\sigma\theta\eta\iota$ , the Coptic name of Pelusium, is derived from *Pr-Imn* "the house of Amūn." The real origin of the Coptic name (however it may have to be explained) turns out to be  *P3-ir-mnt*, for Pelusium is thus rendered in the hieroglyphic portion of a very important trilingual inscription recently found at Tell el-Maskhūṭah; I am indebted to M. Gauthier, who is to publish the inscription, for this information.

## 2. Goshen.


Under this head I confess myself corrected by Professor Naville upon two points. I was wrong in stating that the Septuagint regarded Gesem (Goshen) as a town, not as a land; in Genesis xlvī, 28–9 Goshen of the Hebrew text is represented by Heroopolis in the Greek, but this is substitution, not identification; and Professor Naville rightly points out that wherever Γεσεμ occurs in the Septuagint it is preceded by the word γῆ. Again, to have stated as I did that if the name Goshen is Semitic, its  $\text{𐤄}$  would have to be rendered in Egyptian by  $\text{𓆎}$   $\check{s}$  is too sweeping a statement, for several instances are known (e.g. 'Ashtoreth) where Hebrew  $\text{𐤄}$  appears in Egyptian as  $\text{𓆎}$  or  $\text{𓆏}$   $s^2$ . For the rest, however, I do not think that Professor Naville makes out a good case for  being the Egyptian equivalent of Goshen. Even if the form  $\text{𓆏}$  be actually the original reading in the Dendereh inscription, I doubt if this would be sufficient evidence to warrant the reading *Gsmt* in view of the connection with Sopd both of the *šsmt*-apron and of the land of *Šsmt*. On the topographical side, I can only repeat that to put forward an unusual name of the town of Ṣaft el-Ḥennah as the presumptive origin of the name Goshen belonging to the Wādī Ṭūmilāt appears to me to lack plausibility<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Professor Naville defends at length his identification of *T3rw* with the Zoar of Genesis xiii, 10. That something is amiss with the words "like the land of Egypt, as thou goest unto Zoar" is shown by xix, 22, where Zoar is again in close proximity to the mention of Sodom and Gomorrah, and is evidently a place near the Dead Sea. The reading "Zoar" preserved by the Syriac Peshitto may conceivably give the clue to the riddle. On the philological side, the hieroglyph of the fledgling regularly corresponds to the Hebrew  $\text{𐤄}$ , not to  $\text{𐤅}$ , and the one example which Professor Naville quotes in favour of  $\text{𐤅}$  is an impossible conjecture; that the lion should read  $\text{𐤅}$  is quite indefensible, its value in the syllabic writing being always *r* or *l*, see BURCHARDT, *Die Altkanaanäischen Fremdworte*, I 28 (§ 80). If Professor Albright is right in identifying the Zilū of the Amarna letters with Selē (*Journal*, x, 6), this lends considerable support to my transcription Thel which Professor Naville combats so energetically. I should like to transcribe Sel rather than Thel, but this innovation I have not dared.

<sup>2</sup> See BURCHARDT, *op. cit.*, I 36, § 107.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Naville criticises me for speaking of Goshen as "near" Egypt, rather than in it. Strictly

In this section of Professor Naville's article I have two further points to criticize, namely his views on Phakusa and on Belbês. That Phakusa (which certainly cannot represent Κως with the article, see *Journal*, v, 219, n. 1) is the modern Faḳûs (*Journal*, 245, n. 4) is rendered yet more probable than it hitherto was by the itinerary of an unknown functionary published in the Florentine *Papiri Greci e Latini*, vol. 5, no. 543 (third century B.C.)<sup>1</sup>. The traveller's starting-point is Pelusium and his objective Canopus, to reach which he proceeds roughly towards the apex of the Delta, then turning north-west. The first stages are Πηλούσιον, Ἡρακλέους πόλις, Καλαμίνη, Φακοῦσσαι, Ἴσιεῖον, Βούβαστος, and would seem, so far as the places are known, to be fairly evenly spaced out. Now if Herakleopolis is Tell esh-Sherîg, as is usually supposed (Tell Belîm<sup>2</sup> is one alternative name, and Tell Battik<sup>3</sup> apparently another), the distance to Faḳûs is a reasonable one to be separated by only a single stage; the distance to Şaft el-Hennah, on the contrary, would be excessive. This state of affairs would be worsened if M. Clédat's view<sup>4</sup> (supported mainly, it would appear, by an untenable etymology) that Herakleopolis is Tell Tennis were accepted, for Tell Tennis is much further north. On the other hand, the journey from Phakusa to Bubastos included a stop for lunch at Isieion, an unknown village or temple; this makes the identification of Phakusa with Faḳûs practically certain, since Şaft el-Henneh is a bare six miles from Bubastos<sup>5</sup>. The place next named after Bubastos is Ψεπταο, which is not otherwise known; it looks as though it might contain the name of the god Sopd, and thus it might even be the prototype of the name Şaft. Here our traveller stayed for the day with one Diokles, who seems to have been a friend, since he supplies his guest gratis with provender for three days.

As regards Belbês, Professor Naville says that this name provides a transcription of  "which is much better than many others." How Professor Naville accounts for the second b in Belbês passes my understanding; he does not mention, far less discuss, my arguments tending to show that *Brst* is merely a name of Bubastos.

### 3. Pithom.

It is in the section dealing with Pithom that Professor Naville shows most fully his inability to appreciate, or even to read properly, the views of those who have been bold enough to differ from him. If the reader will take the trouble to refer to my "Note on Pithom and Heroonpolis" (*Journal*, v, 267-9), he will see for himself the very tentative way in which I hazard the suggestion that Pithom is more probably Tell er-Reṭâbah than Maskhûṭah. There are strong arguments in favour of Maskhûṭah which I both enumerate and admit; but there are arguments on the other side to which Professor Naville makes no allusion. He overlooks my argument from the Antonine Itinerary, and is so prepossessed of his opinion that the sea was only 9 Roman miles distant from Maskhûṭah that he will not even discuss my view of the milestone. I suppose I could hardly have expected him to accept my translation "gods of Pithom and Theku" on the Pithom stela, where his

speaking, Goshen was conceived of as belonging to Egypt. But my meaning was clear; Goshen is, at least in a certain sense, outside Egypt proper.

<sup>1</sup> Professor Grenfell pointed out to me the importance of this document shortly after its publication.

<sup>2</sup> So Griffith in *Nebesheh*, p. 103, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> So Grenfell in *P. Oxy.* 1380, 56 n.

<sup>4</sup> *Bull. de l'Inst. franç.*, 22, 178.

<sup>5</sup> This argument, drawn from an actual journey with horses, seems to me to discredit the argument from Ptolemy's data set forth by Sir Flinders Petrie in *Naucratis* 191.

own rendering had "of" for my "and." His insistence on the fact that the temple of Maskhûtah was a temple of Tûm seems due to a notion that I deny this. On the contrary, I state unequivocally that the so-called Pithom-stela, found at Maskhûtah, was erected "in front of Tûm, the great god of Theku," and I imply the same quite clearly in reference to the statue of Aak, in connection with which Professor Naville, misunderstanding me or failing to read what I wrote, waxes ironical at my expense. I have always believed that the principal temple of the district was the temple of Tûm, lord of Theku, at Maskhûtah, and this is quite sufficient reason why 'Ankshernûfer should wish to dedicate his statue there; but it does not necessarily follow that the Pi-tûm of which he was an official was Maskhûtah. Professor Naville assures us that there was no temple of Tûm at Retâbah; the temple-sculpture published by PETRIE, *Tell er-Retâbeh*, pl. 30, proves the contrary, though I am ready to admit that the temple which has been found is very small, barely more than a shrine. In Professor Peet's admirable book *Egypt and the Old Testament*—perhaps it is something of a *petitio principii* for me to call the book admirable, since it speaks with so much approval of my own researches—I find the following note (p. 86):—"Naville's description of the ruins (of Maskhûtah) as those of a 'store-city'.....is incorrect. The 'store-chambers' which he unearthed, and which he assumed, on no evidence whatever, to extend 'over the greater part of the space surrounded by the enclosure,' are probably nothing more than the foundation-walls of a fortress, precisely similar to those found at Naukratis and Daphnae. These late Egyptian fortresses were built up on massive brick platforms containing hollow compartments. No one who examines Naville's plan can remain in doubt as to the real nature of what he found. Observe, too, that he discovered no evidence of the Ramesside date of this structure." This is a matter upon which I am incompetent to express an opinion, but one would have thought that so important a fortress as that of Theku would leave some visible traces, and I therefore incline to recognize that fortress in Maskhûtah. Accordingly "the pools of Pithom" mentioned by *Pap. Anastasi VI* would fall somewhere westward of Maskhûtah. Professor Naville, if I understand him rightly, locates the fortress of Theku towards the eastern end of the wâdî, so that the "pools of Pithom" would be near Maskhûtah; can he point to any ruins of a fortress in the direction supposed by him?

Mr. Wiener rightly objects to my view that, according to Sir Flinders Petrie, *Tell er-Retâbah* shows no signs of a Roman occupation, and therefore cannot be Heronopolis<sup>1</sup>. This is, of course, an important argument on the side of Professor Naville. There seems, in fact, to be a conflict of evidence, but I still lean to my preference for Retâbah. Possibly I have misjudged in weighing the evidence, and Professor Naville may be right after all. Let us hope that new evidence will bring a final decision.

The question of the northward extension of the Red Sea is no affair of mine, and I must here leave Professor Naville to settle his difference with Dr. Kùthmann. In conclusion, let me again say that I welcome Professor Naville's criticisms as having given me an opportunity to review my former conclusions. I am grateful to him for the few minor points in which he has corrected me. For the rest, I do not feel that my position has been weakened.

<sup>1</sup> In this connection it must be mentioned that M. Lefebvre has adduced serious reasons for thinking that Heronopolis was the oldest Greek name of the city in question, so that my view that the proper form should be Heropolis and that this was a mere translation of *Pr-Tm* will probably have to be abandoned; see *Annales du Service*, 30, 237-49.

## THE "CANNIBAL HYMN" FROM THE PYRAMID TEXTS

By R. O. FAULKNER

THE Pyramid Texts contain a mass of information with regard to early Egyptian religion and society the value of which cannot be fully appraised until they have been much more deeply studied. While much that is in them is still totally obscure there are however portions the bearing of which cannot be mistaken. Among these one of the most interesting is the so-called Cannibal Hymn, which is found in the pyramids of Wenis and Tety. The following translation is based on the text published by SETHE, *Die Altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte*, Sprüche 273-4, =§§ 393-414.

The previous translations of Maspero<sup>1</sup>, Breasted<sup>2</sup>, and Erman<sup>3</sup>, which have provided many valuable suggestions, are referred to in the commentary under the names of their authors. The paragraph numbering is that of Sethe.

### TRANSLATION.

- 393a. The sky pours water, the stars darken (?),  
 393b. The Bows rush about, the bones of the Earth-gods tremble,  
 393c. They are still (?), the Pleiades (?)  
 394a. When they see Wenis<sup>4</sup> appearing, animated,  
 394b. As a god who lives on his fathers and feeds on his mothers.  
 394c. Wenis is the Lord of Wisdom, whose mother knows not his name,  
 395a. The glory of Wenis is in the sky, his power is in the horizon  
 395b. Like Atum his father who begat him; when he begat Wenis, he (Wenis) was  
     mightier than he.  
 396a. The *kas* of Wenis are about him, his attributes are under his feet;  
 396b. His gods are upon him, his uraei are on his brow,  
 396c. The guiding-serpent of Wenis is on his forehead, and (his) soul beholds the serpent  
     of flame,  
 396d. The powers of Wenis protect him.  
 397a. Wenis is the bull of the sky, who conquers (?) according to his desire, who lives on  
     the being of every god,  
 397b. Who eats their entrails (?), who comes when their belly is filled with magic  
 397c. From the Island of Fire.  
 398a. Wenis is equipped, his spirits are united,  
 398b. Wenis appears as this Great One, Lord of (divine) helpers,  
 398c. He sits (with) his back to Geb,  
 399a. It is Wenis who judges with him whose name is hidden  
 399b. (In) this day of slaying the Oldest One.

<sup>1</sup> *Rec. de Trav.*, IV, 59-61.

<sup>2</sup> *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, 127-9.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Literatur der Aegypter*, 30-2.


<sup>4</sup> Or, of course Tety in the text of T.

- 399c. Wenis is the Lord of Food-offerings, who knots the cord,  
 399d. Who himself prepares his meal.  
 400a. It is Wenis who eats men and lives on gods,  
 400b. Lord of porters, who despatches messages.  
 401a. It is "Grasper-of-Horns" who is in *Kh̄w* who lassoes them for Wenis,  
 401b. It is the serpent "He-whose-head-is-raised" who watches them for him and who drives them to him,  
 401c. It is "He-who-is-upon-the-Willows" who binds them for him,  
 402a. It is "The-Wanderer-who-slaughters-the-Lords" who strangles them for Wenis,  
 402b. He cuts out their intestines for him,  
 402c. He is the messenger whom he sends to punish ;  
 403a. It is "He-of-the-Winepress" who cuts them up for Wenis,  
 403b. Cooking for him a portion of them in his evening cooking-pots.  
 403c. It is Wenis who eats their magic and swallows their spirits ;  
 404a. Their great ones are for his morning portion,  
 404b. Their middle-sized ones are for his evening portion,  
 404c. Their little ones are for his night portion,  
 404d. Their old men and old women are for his incense-burning.  
 405a. It is the Great Ones who are in the north of the sky who place for him the fire  
 405b. To the kettles containing them with the thighs of their oldest ones.  
 406a. Those who are in the sky serve Wenis,  
 406b. The cooking-pots are wiped out for him with the legs of their women.  
 406c. He has gone around the two complete skies, he has encircled the two regions,  
 407a. Wenis is the Great Mighty One who has power over the mighty ones,  
 407b. Wenis is the figure of a god who endows with divinity (?) the great figures of the gods.  
 407c. Him whom he finds in his way, him he devours for himself quite raw,  
 407d. The protection of Wenis is before all the noble ones who are in the horizon.  
 408a. Wenis is a god, older than the oldest,  
 408b. Thousands serve him, hundreds offer to him,  
 408c. A warrant-of-appointment as "Great Mighty One" is given to him by Orion, Father of the Gods.  
 409a. Wenis has reappeared in the sky, he is crowned as Lord of the Horizon,  
 409b. He has smashed the vertebrae and the spinal marrows,  
 409c. He has taken the hearts of the gods,  
 410a. He has eaten the Red Crown, he has swallowed the Green One,  
 410b. Wenis feeds on the lungs of the Wise Ones,  
 410c. He is satisfied by living on hearts and their magic.  
 411a. Wenis rejoices (?) that he devours the *ššw* which are in the Red Crown ;  
 411b. Wenis flourishes, their magic is in his belly,  
 411c. The dignities of Wenis are not taken from him,  
 411d. He has swallowed the intelligence of every god.  
 412a. The lifetime of Wenis is eternity, his limit is everlastingness,  
 412b. In this his dignity of  
     " If he wishes, he does,  
     If he wishes not, he does not,"

- 412c. Who is within the boundary of the horizon for ever and ever.  
 413a. Lo, their soul is in the belly of Wenis, their spirits are with Wenis,  
 413b. His surplus of food is more than (that of) the gods, being cooked for Wenis with their bones;  
 413c. Lo, their soul is with Wenis, their shadows are with their companions.  
 414a. Wenis is with this which appears, which appears, which hides, which hides;  
 414b. The doers of (evil) deeds have not power over the hacking up (of the earth (?)),  
 414c. The favourite place of Wenis is with those who live in this earth for ever and ever.

## COMMENTARY.

393a. *Gp* (W); *igp* (T). Erman, "bewölkt sich," from Coptic Ⲅⲏⲛⲉ; Breasted's "pour water" is probably the more correct, not only on account of the det. of rain, which occurs in both texts, but also on account of the connection of this word with *igb* "flood."

'*Ih*. Erman "regnen (?)," Breasted "rain down," connecting this word with  "to rain," while Maspero ("se battent") apparently connects it with *hw* "to strike." In T, however, it has the det. of night, which suggests that the real meaning is "to darken," the natural result of the sky "pouring water."

393c. *Grr-šn gnmw*. Breasted, "the porters (?) are silent," presumably from *gr* (2 lit.) "to be silent, to be still." But why then the doubled *r*? Was *gr* originally a 3ae inf.? The meaning "to be still" properly refers to absence of sound only, but it might easily be transferred to absence of motion, as seems to be the case here, since in T *gnmw* has the det. of motion. *Gnmw*. Breasted, "porters (?)," but the usual word for "porters" is *inw* (cf. § 400b). It seems rather to be connected with the Coptic Ⲅⲏⲛⲟⲩⲧ "the Pleiades," which would fit the context exactly. The change from masc. to fem. might be due to the word being later treated as a collective.

396c. *Pprt b* *ih* *nt* *bs*. Obscure. *Pprt* is apparently the *šdm*-f-form, used in place of *šdm*-f, as known from Sinuhe and elsewhere. *B*, if it refers to the soul of the king, lacks the personal suffix. *ih* is here a name for the serpent on the royal diadem. *Nt* is possibly an early writing for *nt*.

397a. *Nhd*, probably a niph'al formation of *hd* "to push, to attack."

399c. An allusion to the ceremonial lassoing of the sacrificial animal. Cf. the scene from Abydos figured in CAPART, *Le Temple de Seti Ier*, Pl. XLVIII.

400b. *Hj*. Breasted, "to despatch." The word is not otherwise known in this sense, which might however be derived quite easily from the more common meaning "to throw." Erman's "erteilen" does not take sufficient account of the fact that *hj* is a verb of motion.



401a. *Ihm* *wpwt*. Erman, "Scheitelfasser"; Breasted "Grasper of Forelocks." Sethe translates "Gehörne" (*Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 45, 48). Probably "Grasper of Horns" is the more exact translation, since it maintains the imagery of hunting the victims like cattle.


401b. For *šsr* = "to raise" see Ember in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 51, 120 and n. 4. The allusion is to the characteristic attitude of the cobra about to strike.

406b. *Šsr* is probably the same word as *šsr* by metathesis of *š* and *š*, and this itself is a variant of *šhr*, which occurs in Ebers, 97, 17 with the meaning "to sweep out, to clean out." Here it would refer to the cleaning of the cooking-pots after use.


407b. This is a jingle like 407a, where the keyword was *šhm*. The substantive *šm* (later *hm*) means "figure of a god"; thus the second *šm* here must be the participle of a

transitive verb meaning "to make into a divine figure," "to endow with divinity" or the like.

407c. *Mwmw* occurs three times in the Pyr., each time in an identical context, *i.e.* in §§ 278a, 407c, and 444e. In § 444e T has the variant  instead of the more usual . According to Ember (*Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 51, 116 and n. 3, quoting Sethe) the meaning of *mw* is "raw," the reduplicated *mwmw* meaning "entirely raw."

411c. The writing of the negative in T () shows that we have here the emphatic negative and the verb *hmi*, not the simple negative and the verb *nhm*. *Hmi* usually means "to drive away," but here the sense is certainly "to take away," being in this case synonymous with *nhm*. Possibly this last is a niph'al formation from *hmi*, with loss of the weak final radical. The form here employed is the *sdmw-f* passive, the doubled radical being perhaps due to a desire to avoid the use of the weak consonant *w*.

#### THE LITERARY ASPECT.

The poetic form employed by this hymn is the oldest of all styles of poetry, the "parallelism of members," familiar to everyone in the Hebrew Psalms. While our ignorance of the vocalisation prevents us from restoring the sound and rhythm of the original, the parallelism is clearly distinguishable, both in the grammatical construction and in the thought to which it gives expression. For example, the following lines are parallel in structure, and all begin with the verb  *iw* "to be":

" Are the 'kas' of Wenis about him,  
Are his attributes under his feet;  
Are his gods upon him,  
Are his uraei on his brow."

The passages which describe the butchering and cutting up of the victims show this parallelism in a more marked degree, being constructed on the general plan "It is X who does so-and-so for Wenis":

"It is 'Grasper-of-Horns' who is in *Kh3w* who lassoes them for Wenis;  
It is 'He-whose-head-is-raised' who watches them for him and drives them to him;  
It is 'He-who-is-upon-the-willows' who binds them for him."

In §§ 409a-410a is a series of short lines which describe the actions of the Pharaoh in the terms "he has done so-and-so":

"Wenis has reappeared in the sky, he is crowned as Lord of the Horizon,  
He has smashed the vertebrae and the spinal marrows,  
He has taken the hearts of the gods,  
He has eaten the Red Crown,  
He has swallowed the Green One."

The parallelisms of this hymn, of which the above quotations are typical examples, are however in a comparatively advanced stage of development, and are less obvious in the English translation than some of the cruder forms, which depend to a large extent upon actual repetition. It is possible from the hymns in the Pyramid Texts to trace the gradual



growth of this poetic form from the merest repetition to a developed literary style. Perhaps the most primitive of all is the following extract from Pyr. Spruch 222 :

"He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Rē<sup>c</sup>.  
 He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Ndl.  
 He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Pndn.  
 He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Dndn.  
 He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Great Bull (*smj wr*).  
 He has come to thee his father,  
 He has come to thee, O Great Embracer (*shn wr*)."

In this extract, simple in structure though it is, there is clear evidence of literary artifice. Further, there seems to be an attempt at rhyme. Of the last four couplets, the first two end on the same syllable, *d-n*, and the last two end on *w-r*, while the lines appear to scan.

The next stage in the development is the limiting of the repetition to the opening phrase of each line or stanza. This is the form of parallelism which occurs most frequently in Egyptian hymns, whether of Pyramid Age or later. A good example of this form from the Pyramid Texts is the "Hymn to the Crown" from Spruch 221 :

"Hail, Crown *Nt*! Hail, Crown *In*! Hail, Great Crown!  
 Hail, mighty of magic! Hail, Serpent!  
 Cause thou the terror of Wenis to be like thy terror;  
 Cause thou the fear of Wenis to be like the fear of thee;  
 Cause thou the cry (?) of Wenis to be like thy cry (?);  
 Cause thou the love of Wenis to be like the love of thee;  
 Cause thou that his sceptre be at the head of the living;  
 Cause thou that his staff be at the head of the spirits,  
 Cause thou that his sword prevail against his enemies."

Another poetic construction based on the same principle is the constantly recurring refrain, as in this passage from Spruch 266 :

"The reed rafts of the sky are placed for Rē<sup>c</sup>;  
 I, Rē<sup>c</sup>, cross on them to the horizon with Horus of the Horizon.  
 The reed rafts of the sky are placed for this Pepi;  
 He crosses on them to the horizon with Horus of the Horizon.  
 The reed rafts of the sky are placed for Horus of the Horizon;  
 Horus of the Horizon crosses on them to the horizon with Rē<sup>c</sup>.  
 The reed rafts of the sky are placed for this Pepi;  
 This Pepi crosses on them to the horizon with Rē<sup>c</sup>."

The third stage is best illustrated by the quotations which have been made from the Cannibal Hymn itself, where the actual repetition is confined to the initial word, the parallelism being maintained by similarity of idea and by the grammatical structure.

Finally, in Spruch 269 there is a hymn, intended for use in the ritual of burning

incense, which is more complicated in design. It consists of a series of couplets, each complete in itself. The rule of parallelism is maintained by making the two lines of each couplet begin with the same word, but a new element is introduced by making the second line reciprocate the sense of the first :

“The fire is laid, the fire shines ;  
 The incense is laid on the fire, the incense shines.  
 Thy perfume comes to Wenis, O incense ;  
 The perfume of Wenis comes to thee, O incense.  
 Your perfume comes to Wenis, O gods ;  
 The perfume of Wenis comes to you, O gods.  
 Wenis is with you, O gods ;  
 Ye are with Wenis, O gods.  
 Wenis loves you, O gods ;  
 Love him, O gods.”

This last quotation shows a great advance in poetic construction on the mechanical repetition of Spruch 222, and it probably represents the best of which the Egyptian of the Pyramid Age was capable in this department of literature.

#### THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT.

This hymn gives us a remarkable view of the life after death, utterly different from the better-known Egyptian doctrines as to the future life. Instead of the deceased living a peaceful life in the Elysian Fields, sowing and reaping his corn, or sailing through the hours of day and night on board the bark of the Sun-god, we here see him as a mighty hunter, slaying and devouring the gods as food. So great is the terror inspired in the inhabitants of the celestial regions by the advent in the sky of the deceased Pharaoh, that the rain pours down, the earth quakes, the whole universe is thrown into disorder. On his arrival in the next world, the Pharaoh takes his seat before Geb as the judge of all creation, his power and glory pervading the whole sky. When he requires food, he hunts the gods as he was wont to hunt wild cattle upon earth, bringing them down with the lasso, while attendant spirits act the part of huntsmen, butchering the game, preparing it for food, and cleaning the cooking-pots after the meal. All sizes, large, medium, and small, are cooked for the Pharaoh's meals, the old ones, men and women, who are unfit for food, being burnt for incense. The internal organs, hearts, lungs, and viscerae, all are eaten, while the legs of the victims are used for fuel or to wipe out the cooking-vessels.

The object of this cannibalism is quite unmistakable. By devouring the bodies of the gods, the Pharaoh not only obtains physical nutriment, but also becomes possessed of the powers and qualities of his victims: “He has swallowed the intelligence of every god”; “Their magic is in his belly”; “He eats their magic and swallows their spirits”; “He is satisfied by living on hearts and their magic.” By thus absorbing the power, intelligence, and magic of the gods, the Pharaoh combines in his own person all the attributes of divinity, and becomes Deity itself, the supreme Omnipotent. The text tells us so in the plainest of terms: “A warrant of appointment as ‘Great Mighty One’ is given to him by Orion, father of the gods”; “he has power over the mighty ones”; “he endows with divinity the great figures of the gods.” His life becomes everlasting, he is free to act as he desires, and when he wishes he can mingle with those who are still living on earth.

In considering the way in which such an idea arose, one is forced to the conclusion that it is a reflection of a custom of cannibalism which was either in full practice at the time

when this text was carved in the pyramids of Wenis and Tety, or had died out long before these kings reigned, but which had become enshrined in the religious literature. The first suggestion may be ruled out at once, as there is no evidence that cannibalism was practised in Egypt at the time of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, nor is it likely that such a custom would continue with a people that had attained to a high state of material and intellectual culture. There thus remains only the second alternative, that this hymn is a reflection of an ancient custom which had long since died out, but which became embalmed in the Pyramid Texts. The question then arises, at what date was cannibalism still practised? Some evidence on this point is given by the text. The lines "He has eaten the Red Crown, he has swallowed the Green One," "Wenis rejoices (?) to devour the *šbšw* who are in (or 'with'?) the Red Crown" show that the practice of eating one's opponents in war still obtained at the time of the struggle between Upper and Lower Egypt, which resulted in the wearer of the White Crown of the South overcoming the wearer of the Red Crown of the North, whose goddess was Buto, "The Green One." It might of course be objected that these lines are metaphorical in reference to the conquest of the North, and that they do not refer to actual cannibalism, but such an assumption involves giving the whole hymn a metaphorical and allegorical character, since there is no reason to suppose that the lines quoted above are metaphorical, to the exclusion of the remainder of the text. To assume, however, that this hymn is figurative throughout, is equally out of the question. The Egyptian, so far as his writings reveal him to us, was a literal person, whose attempts at metaphor were usually commonplace and often clumsy, and a piece of sustained symbolism such as this would be quite beyond his powers. We are thus forced to conclude that the lines referring to the conquest of the North are, in common with the rest of the hymn, to be taken literally, that this text does really represent the actual belief current when it was composed, and that cannibalism was still practised, at any rate during war, at the time of the struggles between the rival kingdoms. In our admiration of the civilization and achievements of the Egyptians, we are perhaps apt to forget that their remote ancestors were African savages, with customs probably similar to those of the African savage of to-day.

That this hymn actually represents the belief of the kings in whose pyramids it appears is unlikely. These Pharaohs were sun-worshippers, followers of Rē, and so would of course accept the doctrine of the solar hereafter, which consisted of eternal association with the sun-god, as either a servant or an equal, according to which variant the individual adhered. It is, however, characteristically Egyptian to include utterly inconsistent ideas of the hereafter in the same body of religious texts, perhaps on the principle that if one belief failed in its purpose, another might serve, and so this hymn, gruesome in content but sanctified by age, found its way into the Pyramid Texts. It may possibly be more than a coincidence that it is found only in the two earliest of the inscribed pyramids of Sakkārah. Perhaps the later kings of the Sixth Dynasty felt that such a primitive view of the life after death was too crude for them to inscribe in their tombs.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that further evidence of the antiquity of the hymn is afforded by the fact that the only two great gods mentioned in it are Geb and Orion, both of whom, especially the latter, fall into the background in later times. There is as yet no trace of that Solar faith which, rising into prominence in the Fourth Dynasty, became in the Fifth Dynasty the State religion, and maintained that position to the end of Egyptian history, while there is equally no indication of the cult of Osiris, which did not attain its fullest power till the close of the Old Kingdom.

## KIZZUWADNA

BY SIDNEY SMITH, M.A.

BOGHAZ KEUI has produced documents of the greatest importance for the student of the ancient East, whatever his special subject may be<sup>1</sup>; it is, therefore, not surprising that the material they offer should be the subject of study from various points of view. But the material remains useless until the approximate location of the many names, whether of physical or political features, of the geography of Asia Minor, is determined; and every writer who has dealt with the subject has perforce had to make statements or express opinions on geographical points. The most important pronouncements and discussions of recent years have been by Professor Hrožny<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Weidner<sup>3</sup>, Dr. Forrer<sup>4</sup>, Professor Garstang<sup>5</sup>, Professor Sayce<sup>6</sup>, Dr. Hall<sup>7</sup>, Dr. Hogarth<sup>8</sup> and Herr Albrecht Götze<sup>9</sup>. It is the purpose of the present article to examine some of the arguments and counter-arguments advanced by these writers.

The correct method of inquiry into a new set of geographical names is not in doubt. (1) Certain fixed points must be ascertained; (2) approximate location must be deduced from itineraries, or geographical groupings of names; (3) the approximate position being known, it is legitimate to identify a place if a later name be known which corresponds to that of the inquiry, provided that the name is not too far removed in time, and is the earliest name known for the site or natural feature; (4) under exceptional circumstances, with exceptional names, it may be possible to use modern names for identifications, provided it be shown that they are possibly old. Such identifications, when based simply on linguistic grounds, should always be accompanied by a question mark, and should not be used as a sound basis for further speculation. They are rarely worth putting forward.

The fixed points for the study of the geography as far as Syria is concerned are very numerous, since names are mentioned which can be located by contemporary Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions. The only fixed point in Asia Minor is Hattušaš, the capital of the Hittite kings, at Boghaz Keui. A certain number of approximate locations are assured from the accounts of campaigns and definitions of boundaries in the royal inscriptions and treaties, while some help is obtained from the grouping of names in other documents; a

<sup>1</sup> Forrer has pardonably exaggerated when he says, *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 175, "Die Keilinschriften aus Boghazköi haben jetzt durch ihre Fülle und Mannigfaltigkeit über das Dunkel blendendes Licht ausgegossen mit einer Plötzlichkeit, wie sie in der Geschichte der Geschichtsforschung einzig dasteht." But in truth the documents from Boghaz Keui provide nothing so startling and revolutionary as resulted from the decipherment of the hieroglyphs and cuneiform writing.

<sup>2</sup> *Boghazköi Studien* (*B.S.*), no. 2.    <sup>3</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 58; *B.S.*, nos. 6, 8, 9.    <sup>4</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, nos. 61, 63.

<sup>5</sup> *L.A.A.*, x, 21-6, 172-79, and *Index of Hittite Names* (*I.H.N.*), in collaboration with Dr. Mayer.

<sup>6</sup> "The Early Geography of South-Eastern Asia Minor" in *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 44-9 and "The Languages of Asia Minor" in *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay* (*A.S.*), 391-98.

<sup>7</sup> "The Hittites and Egypt" in *A.S.*, 165-85.

<sup>8</sup> "The Hittite Monuments of Southern Asia Minor" in *A.S.*, 225-38.

<sup>9</sup> *Kleinasion zur Hethiterzeit*, Heidelberg, 1924 (*K.Z.H.*).

good instance is Išuwa<sup>1</sup>, which is to be placed east of the bend of the Euphrates by Kharput. In a few cases some degree of certainty can be felt about identifications with names which occur in Egyptian, Assyrian and Greek, and these occasionally settle the location of a place. As instances Hūbišna<sup>2</sup> and Kutmar may be cited<sup>3</sup>.

The difficulties entailed in the use of the fourth method, more especially in the East, are too well known to require exemplification. Of all the sites that have been identified with certainty in Syria, Mesopotamia and Iraq, some few have recognisably retained their names, *e.g.*, Warka; others have been distorted almost beyond recognition, *e.g.*, Carchemish, Jerābis, Jerablus (modern natives); while a large proportion, some of which offered tempting identifications, are entirely changed, *e.g.*, Gozan, Tall Ḥalaf. In Asia Minor even greater difficulties present themselves; throughout the ages there have been given to old sites names of the most various periods, belonging to an even greater variety of languages than is to be found in Syria and Mesopotamia. The names even of mountains and rivers have been more freely changed than in Mesopotamia.

I should not have ventured to state observations commonly known, were it not for the fact that the study of Hittite geography is likely to be prejudiced by the breach of sound methods of inquiry. Two examples may be quoted, to prove the danger more especially of Professor Garstang's methods. A river Šēḫa, from which a district took its name, is approximately located somewhere along the Mediterranean sea-board west of the Gulf of Issos. It is variously located, (a) in central Pisidia (Forrer<sup>4</sup>), (b) in Cilicia Tracheia, a western tributary of the Calycadnus (Sayce<sup>5</sup>), (c) in Phrygia, the Maeander (Götze<sup>6</sup>). It will be gathered that the approximation is at present a very loose one. Professor Garstang's note reads:

ŠEḪA: A river of Arzawa giving its name to a district associated with Aḫḫiawa (Anchiale). It is readily identified with the Sarus Fl., Turk. Seiḫan.

Turning to his note on Aḫḫiawa one finds

AḪḪIAWA: A district mentioned in association with the Land of the River Šēḫa. If the latter is correctly identified with the River Seiḫan in Cilicia, there can be no doubt that this name is to be identified with Anḫiale (Gk. Ἀγχιάλη). The first element in the Hittite doubled consonant ḫḫ was probably nasal, as in Greek gg, seen also in the Assyrian spelling, Ingrira....

This argument then depends entirely on the equation Šēḫa = "Seiḫan," since there is nothing whatever in Professor Garstang's argument to locate Aḫḫiawa apart from philological speculation. Now the facts about the Sayḫān are well known; it is not a Turkish, but an Arabic name. Le Strange has stated the facts quite clearly.

The rivers Sarus and Pyramus were known to the Moslems respectively as the Nahr Sayḫān and Nahr Jayḫān. In early days they were the frontier rivers of the lands of Islam towards the Greek country. As such, on the analogy of the more famous Oxus and Jaxartes of Central Asia, which were called the Jayḫūn

<sup>1</sup> See maps in *M.D.O.G.*, nos. 58 and 61; *I.H.N.*; *K.Z.H.*; and the references in *B.S.*, no. 6, 4<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The identity of Hūbišna in the Hittite texts with the Hūbišna of Assyrian times (from the reign of Sargon II onwards), six centuries later, is not doubted, see HROŽNY, *B.S.*, no. 2, 98<sup>9</sup>. The common identification with Gk. Kybistra, maintained by SAYCE, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 45, GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 30, is doubted by GARSTANG, *I.H.N.*, 22, who suggests Gk. Kabassos.

<sup>3</sup> FORRER, *Provinzeinteilung des Assyrischen Reiches*, 20, identified this with Assyrian Kullimeri, and also, *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 229, with Armenian K'Imar, Byzantine *Χλωμάρων*. So also GARSTANG, *I.H.N.*; for the modern site, Keruman on the Sebene Su, see WEIDNER, *B.S.*, no. 6, 8<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 5.

<sup>5</sup> *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 47.

<sup>6</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 25.

and the Sayhûn by the Arab geographers...the rivers Pyramus and Sarus were named the Jayhân and Sayhân<sup>1</sup>.

The medieval Arabs knew the rivers Oxus and Jaxartes under the names, respectively, of Jayhûn and Sayhûn, which like the Tigris and Euphrates, the legend said, were the rivers of Paradise. The origin of these names is not quite clear, but apparently the Arabs took them from the Jews, Jayhûn and Sayhûn being corrupted forms of two of the rivers mentioned in Genesis ii, 11, 13, to wit the Gihon and the Pison<sup>2</sup>.

Professor Garstang uses a name first applied to the Saros in the seventh century A.D. to identify a name of the thirteenth-twelfth centuries B.C. There is no proof whatever that the name Sêha survived. The philological speculations concerning Abhiawa = Ingira = Ἰνγιάλαη are worthless. The latter is a purely Greek name. It has yet to be proved that in the twelfth century a Greek colony existed at Anchiale, and whether, if so, it would have been called by that name<sup>3</sup>.

The second instance is somewhat similar. Two districts mentioned in the documents bore the name Walmâ, one on the river Aštarpa<sup>4</sup>, one on the river Hulaiaš. The river Aštarpa has been identified (a) with the Calycadnus (Sayce<sup>5</sup>), (b) "am ehesten einer der westlichen Zuflüsse des Ak-Göl, des Sees von Ereğli" (Götze<sup>6</sup>), (c) as one of the rivers of the Saros basin (Forrer<sup>7</sup>). Professor Garstang's note reads:

WALMAA: Textually<sup>8</sup> Wa-al-ma-a. A town of Arzawa near the river Aštarpa. Identified with Strabo's Olbia near the mouth of the river Isbarta, the Kestrus Fl. in eastern Pamphylia.... The form is comparable with the Lycian Ula-ma and the Ulamoi of Steph. Byz.....

The note on the river Aštarpa is as follows:

AŠTARPA. R.: This river is mentioned twice in the accounts of the campaigns of Muršil III in Arzawa, who fought a battle near it in the neighbourhood of Walmaa (Olbia) and fixed his headquarters upon its banks. It was apparently the "Upper Boundary" of "Mira and Kawaliya" and if these principalities are identical with Milyas and Kabalia, then there can be no doubt as to the identity of the river with the modern R. Isparta. The names of three rivers of Arzawa, the Šeha, the Aštarpa and the Šiyanta thus seem to reappear more clearly in their Turkish forms of Seihan, Isparta and Eshen(ide). The name Isparta or Isbarta is derived, Professor Ramsay points out, from the town name Baris (*εις Βαρραν*): the old river name has thus been assimilated to the modern form.

It is clear from this that Professor Garstang's argument as to the Aštarpa depends on his identification of Walmâ as Olbia, rather than vice versa; whether even so his curious interpretation of the modern name, in face of Professor Ramsay's proof that it is derived from a Greek phrase, as an assimilation to an old form, is worth consideration at all, need not be discussed here. Why should Walmâ be Olbia? The latter is a purely Greek name; even if the sites could be proved identical beyond doubt, it would not be necessary to regard Olbia as a phonetic equivalent of Walmâ unless the latter name also means "the

<sup>1</sup> LE STRANGE, *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, 131.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 434.

<sup>3</sup> Forrer equates Abhiawa with Ἀχαιῶα, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 9.

<sup>4</sup> *K.A.B.*, IV, no. 10, Obv. 31, (mat ali) Walmammaš. GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 15, reduces this to Walmâ, and distinguishes the two districts; FORRER, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 4, also gives Walmâ and identifies the two districts by placing Walmâ at the junction of the rivers he identifies as the Aštarpa and Hulaiaš (see the map).

<sup>5</sup> *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 47.

<sup>6</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 24.

<sup>7</sup> So much may be deduced from the map, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63.

<sup>8</sup> Garstang's use of this word is not quite clear. Thus he says:—"KURŠAURA: This name, textually Garsaura..." where it obviously bears a different meaning from the present passage.

happy." The identification is a negation of all sound methods<sup>1</sup>. As a matter of fact, Walmâ may be an inland district, as indicated by Forrer<sup>2</sup>.

The truth is that until approximate locations are more generally agreed upon than at present, it is useless to adduce names, unless they are exceptional and the equivalence is striking. If for instance Kuršaura is to be located near Archelais, it may legitimately be identified with Gk. Γαρσαουρα; if Arzawa included Cilicia west of the Cydnus, it is just to compare the name Ἀρζυβιος<sup>3</sup>; if Kuwalia be somewhere near Korakesion, the name Κούαλις may be derived from it<sup>4</sup>. In the absence of a fairly close location however, most comparisons of the kind are highly doubtful, and lead to confusion rather than understanding. For instance Gk. Μιλύας is variously identified with Mirâ (Garstang<sup>5</sup>, Götze<sup>6</sup>) and Millawanda<sup>7</sup> (Forrer).

The chief method of study therefore should be that given above as (2); only on rare occasions, when certain points have been settled, should the method numbered as (3) be employed. Unfortunately the use of (2) in Hittite geography has led to such completely contradictory results that the ordinary student will deduce therefrom that the information available is not capable of any assured interpretation. The confusion may be most clearly seen if the maps of Forrer<sup>8</sup>, Götze, Weidner<sup>9</sup>, and Garstang and Mayer be compared. Thus Forrer places the lands of the Gašga(š) north of Ḫattušaš, south of Kizzuwadna; Garstang and Mayer locate the same districts west of the Euphrates, opposite Išuwa; while according to Götze the Gašga(š) lands correspond to eastern Cilicia<sup>10</sup>. Weidner identified Mt. Niblani with the Nemrud Dagħ, just west of the Euphrates—an identification quite contrary to the inscriptions he quoted in its support<sup>11</sup>; Garstang and Mayer are unable to mark it on their map, since they identify it with Nimrud Dagħ, east of the Euphrates, near Lake Wân—a view unsupported by any evidence; while Weidner<sup>12</sup> has subsequently adhered to the only possible view, that Mt. Niblani<sup>13</sup> is a variant of Mt. Lablani, and is the Lebanon. Forrer places Pala (Bala) in Paphlagonia; for Garstang and Mayer the same country is east of the Euphrates and Išuwa; while Götze<sup>14</sup> states "Tumana und Pala umfassen einen Länderstreifen, der sich von den Kilikischen Toren nordwestlich von Taurus und Antitaurus bis nach Kalašma hinaufzieht." Weidner<sup>15</sup> thinks that Forrer's original opinion<sup>16</sup> that Pala lay west of Sivas is "ungefähr richtig." To these instances may be added the rivers Aštarpa and Šêħa quoted above; and numerous other differences might be cited. In some cases the identity of certain names in the Hittite inscriptions them-

<sup>1</sup> The same remark applies to Albright's suggestion that the river Šianta is "to be found in the classical Xanthus," *I.H.N.*, 42.

<sup>2</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, map.

<sup>3</sup> SAYCE in *J.H.S.*, XI, 250.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, XLIII, 48.

<sup>5</sup> *L.A.A.*, x, 24.

<sup>6</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 23.

<sup>7</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 5.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, nos. 61 and 63.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, no. 58.

<sup>10</sup> Curiously enough none of these authorities refers to the decisive statement of HROŽNY, *B.S.*, no. 2, 158. If in the unpublished inscription Bo. 2002, *Rev.* I, 35 f. the people of the enemy state Kašgaš and "the people of Kummaħa" are mentioned as neighbours, then the Gašgaš can only be located somewhere on the west bank of the Euphrates north of the Taurus, as Hrožny points out.

<sup>11</sup> *B.S.*, no. 6, 77<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 8, 3<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> It seems to me possible that Mt. Niblani should be read Mt. Liblani. While recognising that an interchange of *n* and *l* takes place, I am not convinced that it does so in the initial position. Thus Nulaħhi which occurs as a variant of Lulaħhi should perhaps be read Lalaħhi; so also Nuħašši =  $\text{𐎶𐎵𐎶}$  is perhaps to be read Laħašši.

<sup>14</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 13.

<sup>15</sup> *B.S.*, no. 8, 109<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> *S.P.A.W.*, 1919, 1037.

selves is in question; thus Weidner identifies Ḥaššuwa and Aššuwa<sup>1</sup>, and Aššuwa and Išuwa<sup>2</sup>, while Hrožny<sup>3</sup> and Forrer<sup>4</sup> do not admit this. Sayce<sup>5</sup> reads a certain name Baršuḫanda, and identifies it with Buruḫanda; Forrer<sup>6</sup> and Garstang read Mašḫanda, and distinguish the two. Yet even on this doubtful reading far-reaching speculations are based.

The confusion appears hopeless for the present; it will doubtless be partially dispelled by the publication of more texts and further discussion. The immediate duty is to distinguish between locations which are certain, those which are probable and those which are possible. One location at least is regarded as certain by some authorities, whereas there is reason to believe that at the most it should not be regarded as more than possible. The case in question is that of Ḳizzuwadna.

The suggestion was made by Winckler that the state Ḳizzuwadna is to be located on the Black Sea, owing to the mention of iron in storehouses there, in a letter sent by a Hittite king to an Egyptian Pharaoh<sup>7</sup>. Hrožny at first stated that Ḳizzuwadna was perhaps Pontus<sup>8</sup>; in reference to a text which deals with the utterances of a "priestess of Ḳumani," also called "a priestess of Ḳizzuwadna," he stated that as Ḳizzuwadna lay on the Black Sea, it must be between Comana of Pontus and the sea, east of Ḥatti<sup>9</sup>. Weidner, before Hrožny's second statement, had dealt with the matter in relation to the letter mentioned, of which he gave a translation of the relevant passage, as follows<sup>10</sup>:

Was das reine Eisen betrifft, dessentwegen du mir geschrieben hast<sup>11</sup>, so ist reines Eisen in Kizwatna in meinem Siegelhause nicht vorhanden. Eisen anzufertigen war schlecht gängig. Aber ich habe geschickt<sup>12</sup> und man wird reines Eisen anfertigen. Bisher ist es nicht fertig<sup>13</sup>; ist es fertig<sup>13</sup>, so werde ich es dir schicken. Für diesmal schicke ich<sup>14</sup> dir hier eine eiserne Schwertklinge.

He then proceeded

Kizwatna...erscheint also hier als das Eisen produzierende Land. Kizwatna umfasst West-Armenien und Pontus, die im Pontus sitzenden Chalyber haben aber dem ganzen Altertum als Erfinder der Eisentechnik gegolten.

Forrer stated that Ḳizzuwadna lay "am Nordrande Kleinasien<sup>15</sup>," and pointed out that the language of the country was "das Luvische." He now refers to Ḳizzuwadna as "Kaiserreich Trapezunt<sup>16</sup>."

The arguments adduced for this location of Ḳizzuwadna were, then, (1) that iron was stored and perhaps worked in Ḳizzuwadna, (2) that a city called Ḳumani, possibly one of the two famous Comanas, was in Ḳizzuwadna. There are certain difficulties about this location, which led the present writer to attempt to show<sup>17</sup> that the main argument is not conclusive, and that certain evidence pointed rather to Ḳizzuwadna lying on the Mediterranean coast, round the Gulf of Issos, and on the Saros. Certain place names, it was suggested, might be identified with names in the Assyrian inscriptions, and a different

<sup>1</sup> *Studien zur hethitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, I.

<sup>2</sup> *B.S.*, no. 8, 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, no. 1, 200.

<sup>4</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 6.

<sup>5</sup> *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Boghazköi Texte in Umschrift*, Heft 2, 23.

<sup>7</sup> WINCKLER, *Vorderasien im zweiten Jahrtausend*, 61.

<sup>8</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 56, 43<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> *B.S.*, no. 2, 61<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 58, 77.

<sup>11</sup> The text, *K.A.B.*, I, no. 14, Obv. 19, reads *ša ašpuranni*, and WEIDNER'S collation, *K.U.B.*, IV, 50 a offers no correction; but clearly he emends to *ša tašpuranni*. The point is immaterial.

<sup>12</sup> The original uses the present.

<sup>13</sup> The translation is not intended to be literal.

<sup>14</sup> The verb is partially broken away.

<sup>15</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 61, 23.

<sup>16</sup> *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 182; *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 12.

<sup>17</sup> *Journal*, VIII, 45-7.



interpretation of the passage in the letter was pointed out as having more force. Professor Sayce<sup>1</sup>, who had come to the same conclusion independently, advanced his own reasons; Ḳumani he identified as certainly Comana Cappadociae. Professor Olmstead<sup>2</sup> identified Ḳizzuwadna with Cilicia, mainly on the ground of classical names. Dr. Hall<sup>3</sup>, reverting to the present writer's opinion, mentions that there are "reasons for thinking...that the real position of Ḳizzuwadna is to be found in East Cilicia." Finally Dr. Hogarth<sup>4</sup> has put forward some weighty arguments, present possibly in the minds of others, which led him independently to the view that Ḳizzuwadna lay round Arinna and Ḳumani in the basins of the Karmalas and the Saros.

Dr. Weidner, in his edition of the treaties from Boghaz Keui, restated the view that Ḳizzuwadna is Pontus, without adducing fresh evidence<sup>5</sup>. Götze<sup>6</sup>, who says "Darüber ist Einigkeit erzielt, dass Kizwadna an der Küste des Schwarzen Meeres zu suchen ist," identifies the Šamri as the Iris, and uses this location as a certainty to locate other districts, as does also Dr. Weidner<sup>7</sup>. Professor Garstang, whose own views of Ḳizzuwadna are ruled by a series of identifications with names of different periods<sup>8</sup>, advanced the following arguments for the location in Pontus<sup>9</sup>.

(a) It bordered on Ḳarri and Ḳatti: Urušša (Eriza) was a point on or near the junction of the common frontiers. (b) It includes Komana—at a date undetermined. The antiquity of the name of Komana Cappadociae is doubtful (*cf.* Arinna). (c) In the later empire, probably during the reign of Ḳattušil, it contained the iron-stores, hence probably the iron-fields, and the earliest known iron-fields were those of the Chalybes, which though ill-defined were somewhere in Pontus. (d) The frontier as revised by Muršil III..... (e) The general position of the central portion of the frontier, along the heights to the north of the Euphrates...indicated by the foregoing considerations, is borne out by several chance references, notably Muršil's incursion to Biggainarešša and the position of Urušša....

These arguments deserve individual consideration to test their validity.

(a) That Ḳizzuwadna bordered on Ḳarri is a fact of considerable importance. On it is based the theory that the land of Ḳarri included the kingdom subsequently known to the Assyrians as Urartu. But if Ḳizzuwadna lay on the Mediterranean, Ḳarri in the treaty is a term which included Mitanni, where the Ḳarri were always the ruling class; this interpretation accords with the supremacy of the Ḳarri during the reigns of Muršiliš, the son of Šuppiluliu<sup>10</sup>, and Arnundaš<sup>11</sup>. The Hittite king who concluded the treaty with Šuna-

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, VIII, 233-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, 230<sup>4</sup>; see also his *History of Assyria*, 45, "Kissuwadna or Cilicia." It may perhaps be pointed out that *z* in the Semitic documents from Boghaz Keui may represent *zayin*, *tsadhe*, or *samekh*. The Egyptian spelling, to my mind, points to *zayin* as the most probable, and also to the longer form Ḳizzuwadna as preferable to Kizwatna. Whether the consonant before the *n* was a *d* or hard *t* there is no proof.

<sup>3</sup> *A.S.*, 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, 232-3.

<sup>5</sup> *B.S.*, no. 8, 90<sup>4</sup>. The strangely worded remark, "S. Smith, der Kizwatna in Kilikien sucht, dürfte schwerlich auf Zustimmung rechnen dürfen" is sufficiently answered by the independent conclusions of other authorities.

<sup>6</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 4-5. Herr Götze misstates my argument when he says "Smith...Kizwadna mit ägypt. Kode identifiziert und so am mittelländischen Meere lokalisiert." My statement was, that if, on the ground of other evidence, Ḳizzuwadna lies on the Mediterranean coast of Cilicia, about where the land called Kode by the Egyptians is almost universally assumed to be (Götze assumes that "Ḳd" is Ḳalpaš, Aleppo), it is not impossible that the two terms cover the one the other.

<sup>7</sup> *B.S.*, no. 8, 109<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> *L.A.A.*, x, 172-7.

<sup>9</sup> *I.H.N.*, 28.

<sup>10</sup> Dr. Hall has discussed this name in *Journal*, VIII, 220-221; with his conclusion I can only agree, that "it seems best to transcribe it as Šuppiluliu." Note that Forrer now uses "Šoppiluljoma," *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 13, (without remark) for his previous Šubbiluliumaš, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 61, 31.

<sup>11</sup> For the historical fact see Forrer's statement, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 61, 32.

aššura of Ẁizzuwadna cannot have been Muršiliš, since the grandfather of the Hittite king in question can only be Šuppiluliu<sup>1</sup>. The treaty was certainly concluded before the battle of Kadesh, in the reign of Muwattališ, and may well have been agreed on in the opening years of that reign, the first step towards regaining a path into Syria. Thus the land of Ḫarri cannot be used as an argument; it is capable of two interpretations. As to Urušša, the identification of which with Eriza is stressed, its location depends entirely on that of Ẁizzuwadna.

(b) This argument is just, and no exception can be taken to it, unless it be that the existence of the Pontic Comana is equally doubtful. In this connection Professor Garstang's argument may even be reinforced by another consideration, namely that the ordinary view<sup>2</sup> of Tiglathpileser I's annals, Col. v, 67–Col. vi, 38, where the lands of Mušri and Ẁumani are mentioned, is open to some doubt, since Ẁumani there may be identical with the land often mentioned east of the Tigris in other Assyrian inscriptions<sup>3</sup>, and Mušri and Arini therefore be situated somewhere in Media<sup>4</sup>. Arini in that passage should not therefore have been adduced by me as an argument.

(c) This argument, a restatement of that already noted, consists of two members; the first may be classed as possible, the second irrelevant. All that the letter proves is that iron was stored and perhaps worked in Ẁizzuwadna; that the "iron-fields" actually lay in that country is a *non sequitur*, but is possible. That the vague stories of the classical authorities about the Chalybes should be adduced until the locality of Ẁizzuwadna is fixed for other reasons is not strictly logical, and confuses the question.

(d) and (e) both depend on identifications with classical and modern names. Of themselves these have no more value than those adduced by Professor Olmstead<sup>5</sup>. Curiously enough the evidence of the other Hittite documents leads Professor Garstang into some dilemmas, which must be noted. A district on the border of Ẁizzuwadna, reckoned in the territory of that state, is called Atania. In other documents<sup>6</sup> a district called Adaniaš is mentioned in connection with Arzawa. Now *d* and *t* constantly interchange in the Boghaz Keui documents, so that there is strong reason to believe that the same district may be intended<sup>7</sup>. Professor Garstang distinguishes the two. Another town mentioned in the definition of the border of Ẁizzuwadna, called Šàlia, has been identified<sup>8</sup> with a town also

<sup>1</sup> *K.A.B.* I, no. 5, I, 14. See FORRER, *S.P.A.W.*, 1919, 1036; *M.D.O.G.*, no. 61, 32. WEIDNER, *B.S.*, no. 8, 88<sup>b</sup>. In *O.L.Z.*, 1923, 160, Weidner wrongly states that I identified the Hittite king as Muršil. I have made no such statement.

<sup>2</sup> Stated by me with too much conviction, *Journal*, VIII, 46.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., KING, *Records of the reign of Tukulti-Ninib I*, 46–7, 80.

<sup>4</sup> This seems to be Professor OLMSTEAD's view, *History of Assyria*, 41, 333, since he speaks of "the first line of mountains to the north and east of the triangle, the region of Mušri," and states that the "Misuri clan of Kurds preserves the name of the ancient Mušri." Yet on p. 64 he says "he (Tiglathpileser I) must march against a new enemy on the north-west frontier, the Musri, about the east branch of the Tigris." Apparently "north-west" should read "north-east"; but the Ẁumani or UẀumani lay due east of Assyria.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal*, VIII, 230<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> FORRER, *Boghazköi Texte in Umschrift*, II, no. 23, B. II, 7–8 and duplicates.

<sup>7</sup> So, implicitly, SAYCE in *Journal*, VIII, 23; OLMSTEAD, *op. cit.*, 230<sup>a</sup>. Both authorities identify Atania-Adaniaš with Adana, as against the suggestion, *Journal*, VIII, 46, that it may be the Assyrian Atun, Gk. Tynna. How old the name Adana may be I can find nothing to prove; it is noticeable that it does not occur in connection with Shalmaneser III's or Sennacherib's campaigns to Tarsus.

<sup>8</sup> WEIDNER, *B.S.*, no. 8, 109<sup>10</sup>; GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 4.

given<sup>1</sup> as a point on the boundary between Dattašaš(?)<sup>2</sup> and Hatti, and Professor Garstang seems inclined to accept this identification. It is the more probable since the city of Erimma in the Ḳizzuwadna treaty may be identical with the city Arimmattaš in the Dattašaš(?) treaty<sup>3</sup>. But on the Dattašaš(?) boundary lay a city called Ušša. If therefore Dattašaš(?) and Ḳizzuwadna were coterminous along a portion of the boundary, Ušša must be somewhere near Ḳizzuwadna. But Ušša is identified by Professor Garstang with a city of the same name mentioned between Nenašša and Ḥubišna, and with Aleppo and Pala,—facts which led Professor Garstang to propose Issos as a probable identification<sup>4</sup>. But he can hardly believe that Dattašaš(?) stretched from the boundary of Ḳizzuwadna, as given by him, to Issos. His postulates demand either that Ušša in the Dattašaš treaty should be distinguished from the Ušša in the other documents, or else that Šālia and Erimma on the Ḳizzuwadna border be distinguished from Šāliaš and Arimmattaš on the Dattašaš(?) border. Such a position is of course logical and intelligible. But we may go further. The border of Dattašaš(?) included districts which adjoined the river Ḥulaiiaš. Now the river Ḥulaiiaš has been variously located, (a) between the Highlands and Cilicia (Forrer<sup>5</sup>), (b) in Cilicia, the Pyramus (Sayce<sup>6</sup>), (c) in the north, “am ehesten der Fluss von Angora” (Götze<sup>7</sup>). That the Ḥulaiiaš territory bordered on Arzawa is clear from the texts<sup>8</sup>; Dattašaš therefore bordered on districts which adjoined Arzawa, unquestionably on the Mediterranean. Professor Garstang’s postulates can only be maintained therefore if the identifications of Šālia and Erimma with Šāliaš and Arimmattaš be rejected<sup>9</sup>. Thus on the borders of Ḳizzuwadna we have Atania, Šālia and Erimma; in Arzawa, Adaniaš, in Dattašaš, and therefore near Arzawa, *in approximately the same relative position*, Šāliaš and Arimmattaš. The assumption is possible, hardly probable, and certainly not to be accepted as certain unless absolutely proved<sup>10</sup>.

The arguments of Professor Garstang then are all, save one, unconvincing, unless his identifications of names be in themselves arguments. The one sound ground advanced relates to the doubt about the identification of Ḳumani with Comana Cappadociae, and that is by no means decisive in favour of the Pontic Comana.

If Professor Garstang’s arguments are the best that can be alleged in favour of the location on the Black Sea—and they are the only arguments yet put forward—the statement that “it is far more probable that Ḳizzuwadna lay round and to the west of the Gulf of Issos than that it should be located on the Black Sea<sup>11</sup>” may be repeated. Until it is proved

<sup>1</sup> *K.A.B.*, IV, no. 10, Obv. 29.

<sup>2</sup> So read by GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 17<sup>3</sup>, whose interpretation of *K.A.B.*, IV, no. 10, Obv. 30, is very attractive. Forrer reads Tešub-tašša; SAYCE, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 45, Tarḥuntašša, where a translation of the passage concerning the boundary is given.

<sup>3</sup> So WEIDNER, *B.S.*, no. 8, 109<sup>11</sup>, who reduces Arimmattaš to Arimma.

<sup>4</sup> So also SAYCE, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 46.

<sup>5</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 4.

<sup>6</sup> *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 45. Sayce’s identification would be certain if *hallabuwanza* is correctly translated by him “the Aleppian territory.”

<sup>7</sup> *K.Z.H.*, 25.

<sup>8</sup> See the discussion in GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 16–18; the fact is also recognised in FORRER’s map, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63.

<sup>9</sup> How Weidner reconciles his acceptance of these identifications with his location of Ḳizzuwadna is not clear.

<sup>10</sup> FORRER’s map, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, implies that the same objection may be urged against his geographical locations. It may be remarked that Professor Garstang is inclined to assume doublets where no sufficient reason, only a theory, is given, *e.g.*, in the case of Nenašša.

<sup>11</sup> *Journal*, VIII, 47.

that Atania, Šália and Erimma cannot be Adaniaš, Šáliaš and Arimmattaš, it may be presumed, so long as the identification is not treated as absolutely certain, that they are the same places. Until some better explanation is forthcoming the fact<sup>1</sup> that at one time the border of Armatana and Ḫatti was at the city of Ḫizzuwadna<sup>2</sup> can only mean that the people of Armatana, which certainly lay on or near the western bank of the Euphrates<sup>3</sup>, were pushing westwards<sup>4</sup>, as also were the Gašga and the people of Išuwa in the same text, while the Arzawan invasion seems to show an eastward trend along, or southward to, the coast.

The evidence that Ḫizzuwadna bordered on<sup>5</sup>, or lay near to<sup>6</sup> Arzawa is so difficult to account for according to Professor Garstang's geographical system that it is not surprising that an entirely different system is advocated by Götze, who also holds that Ḫizzuwadna lay on the Black Sea. For him, Dattašaš (?) is approximately Paphlagonia; the district of Pitašša<sup>7</sup>, on the border of Dattašaš (?), lies to the south, adjoining the northern border of Mira, a district of Arzawa which lies far inland. These countries must then have been states of very considerable extent, though nothing in the texts can be taken to imply that they were of great importance. Whether Götze's reconstruction of the geography is probable or even possible must depend very largely on the unpublished texts of geographical importance concerning which Forrer has summarily given his views<sup>8</sup>; if these latter approach the truth, Götze's arguments must be dismissed. His position is really vitiated by the assumption that Ḫizzuwadna can only lie on the Black Sea, from which he argues as a fixed point. His location of the Gašga in Cilicia and the Pala northwards depends on faulty arguments. Amongst the towns on the border of Ḫizzuwadna is one of uncertain reading<sup>9</sup>; Götze, without a query, reads Zaparašša, which may be correct, and identifies it with a town known to lie in the district Kalašma. This identification is then used as the basis of further argument. Götze's location of the Gašga ignores Professor Hrožny's evidence.

The problem of the reconstruction of Hittite geography resembles in its nature that presented by a finely constructed jig-saw puzzle. Neglect any small detail in design, force any "join," and the problem will never be solved. What has been said above may serve to show one respect in which the maps hitherto produced have depended on a violent forcing of the facts to suit an unproven hypothesis, rather than a delicate adjustment of deductions to facts; hence the lamentable confusion to be found in them.

I was originally led to consider that Ḫizzuwadna was more probably on the Mediter-

<sup>1</sup> *K.A.B.*, VI, no. 28, Obv. 13; see *Journal*, VIII, 233.

<sup>2</sup> (*alu*) *Kizzuwadna*, an abbreviation for (*mat alu*) *Kizzuwadna*, as frequently.

<sup>3</sup> See *K.A.B.*, I, no. 1, Obv. 13, 16, 22.

<sup>4</sup> An advance northwards would have been, on Garstang's hypotheses, not against Ḫatti but against Ḫizzuwadna; and how could a state on the Black Sea act as a "buffer" (*I.H.N.*, 7) between Armatana to the south and the Hittite to the west?

<sup>5</sup> At Atania.

<sup>6</sup> Dattašaš (?) intervening at some point.

<sup>7</sup> BLAŠ.ŠA., read Pitašša by FORRER, *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 4 and GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 17; SAYCE, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 46, reads Biassas.

<sup>8</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63; Forrer announces a work on the geography of Arzawa and the south coast of Asia Minor.

<sup>9</sup> The copy, *K.A.B.*, I, no. 5, IV, 49, reads (*alu*) *Za-ba-ar-aš-na*. It seemed (and seems) to me possible that the *aš* was due to an accidental doubling of the horizontal wedge, and I accordingly read (*alu*) *Zabarna*. Weidner's emendation (*alu*) *Zabarašša* is more violent, but possible; he supports it by the identification adopted by Götze. LUCKENBILL'S *Zabarina*, *A.J.S.L.*, XXXVII, 187, seems to me impossible, though hailed by GARSTANG, *I.H.N.*, 28, as correct. In *L.A.A.*, x, 176, a different view is stated.

ranean than the Black Sea by certain general considerations, which led me to propose some geographical identifications. Other writers have since stated a few general considerations, and these may be enumerated here, whether previously published or not, since some authorities do not, apparently, admit their force. They fall under the headings of (1) historical probability, (2) linguistic and (3) archaeological evidence.

(1) Historical probability. The gods of Ḳizzuwadna, mentioned in the Mitanni treaty, were worshipped by the Hittites, for Šuppiluliu installed his son Telibinuš as "Priest of Ḳizzuwadna<sup>1</sup>." Now the religious text which Hrožny has translated<sup>2</sup> puts into the mouth of a priestess of Ḳizzuwadna a series of incantations and rituals which resemble very closely the texts of this type from Babylonia and Assyria. This serves to show a cultural connection with these countries. It is useless in this connection to argue that the Sumerian and an early civilisation at Astrabad<sup>3</sup> may possibly have common elements; the incantations and rituals from Babylonia in question did not originate in the early Sumerian period, and can hardly have been written much before 2000 B.C., possibly later. It is historically improbable that Babylonian influence ever reached a people whose home was Pontus.

The Hittite Code of Laws has revealed the very important fact that the *ummane Manda*<sup>4</sup> were known to the Hittites. There is no sound reason for distinguishing these Manda men from the Manda who, five centuries later, in alliance with the Chaldaeans and the Medes, burst through the defences of the Assyrian Empire. The historical probability, as has often been pointed out, is, that the Umman-Manda came from the Black Sea and the Caucasus region. If the Hittites, to whom no one attributes any considerable extension eastwards, came into contact with them, it is very probable that Pontus, at the time of the later Hittite kings, was in the hands of the Umman-Manda. Perhaps the cities mentioned in this connection in the Code are to be located on the Black Sea or thereabouts.

The historical importance of the treaty itself demands consideration. Muwatalliš and the Ḫarri were at issue over the peoples of the western bank of the upper Euphrates, who, flying from a Hittite punitive expedition, had taken refuge with their southern neighbour, as had also happened in the reign of Šuppiluliu. Muwatalliš demanded of the Ḫarri that they should be abandoned; the Ḫarri replied by sending an army and plundering Muwatalliš' lines of communication. Muwatalliš then attempted diplomacy; if the Ḫarri protected mutinous subjects of the Hittites, then the Hittites would conclude alliances with subjects of the Ḫarri. The threat having no effect on the Ḫarri, the treaty with Ḳizzuwadna was concluded, since Šuna-aššura had his own reasons for wishing to break away from his allegiance to the Ḫarri, chiefly owing to a personal insult to himself<sup>5</sup>. Ḳizzuwadna appears then as a pawn in the game between the Hittites and the Ḫarri, a *quid pro quo* for the rebellious people of the upper Euphrates. That the Ḫarri, whose land lay about the Euphrates, south of Išuwa, and reached the point where the river debouches from the

<sup>1</sup> *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 182.

<sup>2</sup> *B.S.*, no. 2, III.

<sup>3</sup> ROSTOVITZEFF, *Journal*, VI, 4-27, and *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*.

<sup>4</sup> HROŽNY, *Code Hittite*, § 54. The present argument holds whatever the exact sense of the passage may be. Note that Sayce has introduced an unnecessary confusion, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 48, "the land of Tabal-ki." The text reads, "the city of Tamalki." There is no proof that the name Tabal was known to the Hittites; it appears in Assyrian inscriptions of the ninth century, a minor indication of the landslide which took place in Cilicia after the fall of the Hittites. Tamalki appears in the Cappadocian tablets in the form Timelkia, see CONTENAU, *Tablettes cappadociennes*, no. 76, 7.

<sup>5</sup> *K.A.B.*, I, no. 5, Obv. I, 38.

Anti-Taurus<sup>1</sup>, were ever in a position to claim the overlordship over a king of Pontus, seems very improbable, for their wars were mainly conducted in the richer lands of Mesopotamia. That a king of Pontus was only able to exchange one suzerainty for another, and could make no effort at independence, is inexplicable. Grant that Šuna-aššura was a king of a small land, whose importance for the two great powers consisted in the fact that it was the key to northern Syria, and the position is clear.

One of the terms of the treaty is, that if the king of the Hittites makes war on "another land, whether against the Ḫarri or against Arzawa," Šuna-aššura agrees to send a contingent of 100 span of horses and 1000 infantry. The special mention of these two particular powers has most point if Ḫizzuwadna lay between the two<sup>2</sup>. If this be accepted, and it seems historically the most probable, Ḫizzuwadna can only lie in eastern Cilicia, unless Götze's peculiar geographical scheme be possible. The geographical arrangements of Forrer, Weidner, and Garstang are incompatible with this simple explanation.

In the lists of the vassal states which fought at Kadesh given by the Egyptian scribes, Ḫizzuwadna is named between Lk and Krkmš (Luxor), before Krkmš (Karnak), between Lk and Ḫdš, immediately after Krkmš (Papyrus Raifet). The Egyptians must have had fairly accurate knowledge of the geography of the northern Mediterranean sea-board at this time, owing to the close connections established; if Lk are the Lugga of the Hittite texts<sup>3</sup>, the mention of Ḫizzuwadna between the Lugga and Carchemish or Kadesh is not accidental, but roughly geographical. Götze's explanation, "Kizwadna, der wichtigste Vasall in Ost-Kleinasien ist den syrischen Vasallen vorausgestellt," seems a desperate device to avoid the implication.

(2) The linguistic evidence. Forrer has repeatedly stated that "das Luvische," the language of Luia, was spoken in Ḫizzuwadna, in Cappadocia and in Cilicia<sup>4</sup>. Luia certainly lay immediately west of the lands of Arzawa. If Ḫizzuwadna immediately adjoined Arzawa on the east, there was originally a solid phalanx of people speaking the same language<sup>5</sup>; the probability of this is confirmed by the fact that the people of Arzawa were invaders<sup>6</sup>, who presumably were of "Hittite" race. Luia and Ḫizzuwadna once formed a geographical unit from a linguistic point of view. "Luvish" appears to be a purely Asianic language of the northern Mediterranean littoral<sup>7</sup>. That a language native to that coast was also spoken in Pontus seems improbable, and the far-reaching speculations based on the assumption that Ḫizzuwadna is on the Black Sea need only be considered when it is conclusively proved that Ḫizzuwadna is so to be located.

<sup>1</sup> This is the geographical position of (*matu*) Ḫaria defined in Tiglathpileser P's annals, Col. III, 36-65. SAYCE has pointed out, implicitly, *Journal*, VIII, 234, that Tiglathpileser found the lands along the east bank of the upper Euphrates in exactly the positions indicated for them in the Boghaz Keui texts; the fall of the Hittites did not affect this area. The assumption that the Ḫarri ruled as far east as Lake Wān, and northward to the boundary of Pontus, depends entirely on the location of Ḫizzuwadna. Since the Ḫarri provided the ruling class in Mitanni and Syria, an enormous extent of country, unequalled by any other ancient power save Assyria, is assigned to them.

<sup>2</sup> This was first pointed out, to my knowledge, by HOGARTH, *A.S.*, 232; it seems implicit in the geographical identifications of Sayce and Olmstead. Note that it strongly reinforces the assumption that Šālia, Erimma and Atania are to be identified with Šāliaš, Arimmattaš and Adaniaš.

<sup>3</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 4.

<sup>4</sup> *M.D.O.G.*, no. 61, 23; *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 216. For Forrer, Cilicia is Arzawa.

<sup>5</sup> The argument was first adduced by SAYCE, *Journal*, VIII, 233. <sup>6</sup> *K.A.B.*, VI, no. 28, Obv. 8.

<sup>7</sup> A point raised by Dr. HALL, *A.S.*, 174. Professor UNGNAD thinks that "das Luvische" may be Lycian, *Z. Ass.*, (N.F.) I, 1.

In the incantation text dealt with by Forrer<sup>1</sup> a priest of Ḳizzuwadna, in "Luvish," invokes Šantaš, obviously the chief god of his country since it is translated by the ideogram for Marduk. All the available evidence points to Sandon being endemic in Cilicia.

Of the twelve names of cities<sup>2</sup> on the border, four certainly end in *-na*, one probably does so. This *-na* termination is common in the names of both cities and districts in North Syria and the Anti-Taurus, and seems to point to that area.

The name of King Šuna-aššura recalls that of U-aššur-me, king of Tabal in the reign of Tiglathpileser III<sup>3</sup>. To the best of my knowledge it does not resemble any demonstrably Hittite or Luvian name. It is not clear to me that these names are not theophorous<sup>4</sup>; in other words it is possible that we ought to read Šuna-Aššura. The god Ashur was worshipped in the neighbourhood of Caesarea (Mazaca) at the end of the second millennium, and not impossibly his worship remained in the country throughout the Hittite period until the eighth century.

The river Šamri which marked the boundary of Ḳizzuwadna for a certain distance bore a Semitic name. It might possibly be supposed that this is merely a Semitic translation of a native name<sup>5</sup> were this not contrary to the habits of antiquity. The names of cities were not infrequently changed, but I know of no case in which natural features, more especially mountains and rivers, were rechristened. Very occasionally a descriptive term is used; thus Demavend, whose native name probably remained unknown to the Assyrians, was called "Lapis Lazuli Mountain." Similarly the Halys in the Hittite texts is designated "the Red River"; but this implies I think that the native name actually meant "red" and that the ideogram was read in native wise. There is no sound ground for supposing that Šamri is anything but the name in common use for the river. Does anyone believe that a river flowing into the Black Sea had a Semitic name? On the other hand, a Semitic name for the Saros is quite intelligible.

(3) The archaeological evidence. This has been frequently adduced by Professor Sayce<sup>6</sup> and fully stated by Dr. Hogarth. For those accustomed to lay emphasis on such evidence, it is clear and convincing<sup>7</sup>.

The conclusion of the matter seems to be that those who believe that Ḳizzuwadna lay on the Mediterranean have put forward arguments that deserve careful consideration, not mere negation. To my mind they have made such a location probable; I do not think we are justified yet in assuming that it is certain to the extent of building further hypotheses upon it. On the other hand those who consider that Ḳizzuwadna certainly lay on the Black Sea should put forward some more logical arguments than have yet appeared. In the meantime more caution should be shown in the acceptance of such equations as Ḳizzuwadna = Katpatuka = Κατπαδοκία<sup>8</sup> by scholars. The name might equally be found in Cataonia<sup>9</sup>, or something quite different.

<sup>1</sup> *Z.D.M.G.*, (N.F.) I, 216-17.

<sup>2</sup> Note that owing to a careless error on my part Anumushsha in *Journal*, VIII, 45 should read Anamušta. On the other hand Eḫbina is correct (so also Weidner), and is the only possible reading, against Luckenbill's Durbina, accepted by Garstang. <sup>3</sup> *K.B.*, II, 20, ll. 59, 64.

<sup>4</sup> The *-me* is clearly the emphatic particle constantly appended to names. U may be an ideogram.

<sup>5</sup> This seems to be GARSTANG's view, *L.A.A.*, x, 176. He identifies it with the Gk. Boas, alleging an analogy of meaning which is not convincing. Šamri means "violent," and is as applicable to the Saros or half a dozen other rivers as to the Boas. <sup>6</sup> See his latest remarks in *A.S.*, 395. <sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, 229-233.

<sup>8</sup> Proposed by Zimmerer, accepted by Hommel; independently proposed by Herzfeld, accepted by Meyer. For references see GÖTZE, *K.Z.H.*, 5. Also accepted by SAYCE, *J.H.S.*, XLIII, 46.

<sup>9</sup> HALL, *Ancient History of the Near East*, 359.

## A HISTORICAL DOCUMENT OF RAMESSIDE AGE

By T. ERIC PEET

It is a singular and distressing fact that a very considerable proportion of the original written sources for Egyptian history and archaeology still remain unpublished. This is due firstly to the fewness of those capable of translating them, and secondly to a very natural scruple on the part of those who are. Egyptian texts are never easy, and many of the renderings are so uncertain that the scholarly translator hesitates to give them unless accompanied by the evidence necessary either to support them or to enable others to improve upon them. This means that every translation ought to be accompanied by a copy of the original, or if the document be in hieratic by a transcription into hieroglyphs—an expensive matter in these days—and by a mass of critical notes which are not only very costly to print but which repel the average reader, and thus actually detract from the historical value of the publication. Such scruples as these, though honourable, are probably exaggerated, for their consequence is that masses of material of priceless value for Egyptian history lie locked up in philologists' notebooks instead of being available for general use.

It is with this consideration in mind that I venture to publish the translation contained in this article. The papyrus in question is both incomplete and difficult. A hieroglyphic transcription of so long a document is out of the question in this *Journal*, though I hope eventually to publish one elsewhere. Rossi's facsimile (see later) aided by the short critical notes here added will enable scholars to control some of my readings, and the non-philologist may rest assured that every translation about which there is the least doubt has been marked with a query.

It is customary for historians of Egypt to dismiss the Twentieth Dynasty in a few pages as a period of decline ending in complete disaster. The evidence generally produced for this view is, rightly enough, the tomb-robbery papyri of about the reign of Ramesses X, the apparent cessation of the exploitation of the turquoise mines of Sinai after Ramesses VI, and the melancholy story of Wenamūn dating from the reign of Ramesses XII. There are, however, other documents which tell the tale less dramatically perhaps but no less unmistakably. Many of these are to be found among the papyri of the Reale Museo di Antichità in Turin. The particular papyrus to which I wish to call attention is not unknown to scholars. It was published in bad facsimile by Pleyte and Rossi in their *Papyrus de Turin*, Pls. LI to LX, and a partial translation and commentary was published by Spiegelberg<sup>1</sup> in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 29, 73 ff. In the summer of 1923, while working on the papyri in Turin, I made a complete collation of this document<sup>2</sup>. It con-

<sup>1</sup> The more one works among the business and legal papyri of the New Empire the more one realizes how much this branch of our subject, like many other branches, owes to the industry and scholarship of Spiegelberg.

<sup>2</sup> I owe some readings, probably more than I realize, to a collation previously lent to me by Gardiner.



stitutes such a striking picture of the times during which it was compiled that it seems worth while to publish here a translation in full.

The papyrus, which as at present mounted measures 133 cm. by 41, is written on both sides in a large slanting script. The true verso, *i.e.* that side on which the main fibres of the papyrus run vertically and which was almost always filled last by an Egyptian scribe, but which is here to be read first, and treated as recto, contains two complete pages of writing<sup>1</sup>. It is clear, however, that there is at least one page lost in front of these for on the right-hand edge near the top are the ends of two lines of such a page. The first is illegible and the second gives "He said, It is true." There are three pages of writing on the true recto and as the third of these is a short page ending with a blank of at least 7 cm. below its last line it is probable that the papyrus ended here<sup>2</sup>, and that this side must be regarded as the verso.

It is not easy to say what is the precise nature of our document. It has its closest parallel in Papyrus Salt 124 of the British Museum<sup>3</sup>. This last contains a series of charges against a single individual, and, as is clear from its concluding lines, it either constitutes or is a digest of the indictment actually laid before the Vizier. Our papyrus is a little different from this. Even in its damaged state it contains charges against at least three separate individuals. Moreover Section A is headed "The records<sup>4</sup> which are in the hands of the *wcb*-priest Penanket." The papyrus would therefore seem to have been a list of documents embodying charges against various persons. Each document, however, is described in some detail and this fact distinguishes the papyrus from Papyrus Ambras<sup>5</sup> at Vienna, which gives the barest description of a series of documents dealing with the famous tomb-robberies<sup>6</sup>. Presumably the documents described here formed part of the temple archives of Khnum, since they were in the hands of a priest, though this is not definitely stated. Whether the papyrus is a mere catalogue of these for record purposes, or whether, like Papyrus Salt, it was to be part of an actual indictment before the Vizier or other official we have no means of knowing.

As it now stands the papyrus consists of three distinct sections and the lost pages undoubtedly contained at least one other separate section, for recto page 1 begins a new section. This section (A), recto 1, 1 to recto 2, 17, is a list of records (*shw*) stated in 1, 1 to

<sup>1</sup> This recto is covered with *papier végétal* and heavily varnished, so that it is at times intensely difficult to read.

<sup>2</sup> Pleyte-Rossi's plates should be read in the following order: 57-8 (recto 1), 59-60 (recto 2), 51-2 (verso 1), 53-4 (verso 2), 55-6 (verso 3). The fragment of the lost page at the beginning of the recto is given on Pl. 57, left.

In Pl. 60 the narrow vertical fragment near the left edge of the right-hand page must be transferred to the left edge of the left-hand page, where it fits on. The wide gaps marked by Rossi both before and after this fragment are to be closed. On the left-hand page the large fragment shown really consists of two fragments meeting on a vertical line continuing the left edge of the narrow vertical gap shown by Rossi in the three bottom lines. These two fragments should be separated by about a centimetre.

In Pl. 52, which gives the back of Pl. 60, corresponding modifications must of course be made. The vertical fragment under the number I fits on to the right-hand edge of the papyrus, the great gap in the centre is to be closed, and the large fragment on the right is to be divided into two separate pieces with about a centimetre between them as before.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. too page 4 of the verso of Pap. Harris A (B.M. 10053). <sup>4</sup> *nt shw*. Cf. Abbott Pap., 6, 23.

<sup>5</sup> VON BERGMANN, *Hieratische Texte*, 6; *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1876, 1 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also the Paris leather roll published by Virey and referred to in SPIEGELBERG, *Studien und Materialien*, 53.

be in the charge of the *wcb*-priest of Khnum, Penanḳet. Seventeen charges of the most varied type have survived, and if they were all well founded the accused man must have been a surprising specimen of the ancient Egyptian "crook." His name is unfortunately lost to criminology, for he is referred to throughout as "this *wcb*-priest" or more fully "this *wcb*-priest of Khnum." His name must thus have occurred in the lost page which precedes recto 1.

The second section (B) begins with verso 1, 1 and ends at 1, 6, where it is separated from what follows by a blank space. The section is clearly incomplete at the beginning and something is therefore lost between recto 2 and verso 1, or in other words our papyrus is incomplete at both ends. The criminals, for they are plural, do not in what is left to us display that versatility in wickedness which distinguishes the priest of Khnum, for all the charges are those of theft.

The third section (C), verso 1, 7 to the end, began with a date which is unfortunately lost but which cannot have been earlier than Year 4 of Ramesses V. The first charge is one of enormous peculations extending over a period of 10 years against a boat's-captain, whose name would seem from verso 1, 9 and verso 2, 7-8 to have been Khnumnakht<sup>1</sup>. It was this man's duty to carry in his boat certain taxes payable in barley to Khnum at Elephantine. He conspired "with the scribes, the inspectors and the farmers" to convert to his own use almost the whole of the grain. From verso 2, 12 to the end we are dealing with a series of miscellaneous charges. On verso 3 these become so fragmentary that we cannot ascertain what part Khnumnakht himself played in some of them, but, as there is no gap between verso pages 2 and 3, the 3rd Person Singular of 3, 1 can refer to no one else. Here then is another master spirit of the Egyptian criminal world.

The theatre of the misdeeds of these various persons is clearly Elephantine, and more particularly the temple of Khnum there. The records in the first section are said to be in the charge of Penanḳet, an *wcb*-priest of the temple.

It is greatly to be regretted that not enough of the document remains to show us before what court these numerous offences were tried, for tried they must have been. There appears to be no evidence to indicate whether all offences both religious and lay were dealt with by the same courts in Egypt or whether there existed anything of the nature of an ecclesiastical court. In Pap. Mayer A various priests, guilty of participation in the tomb-robberies, are tried by the same court as their lay fellows<sup>2</sup>, and there seems no reason for supposing that a priest who broke the law in Egypt was treated differently from other men, despite the various exceptions which later history affords. At the same time it might not unreasonably have been imagined that offences of a strictly religious nature by priests would be tried by a special court. Such a court would of course have consisted wholly or mainly of priests, probably those of the temple where the offence was committed. Yet there is no example of any such court, and the one court known to us consisting entirely of priests tried a civil action concerning rights in property<sup>3</sup> leased to the temple.

On the other hand priests were certainly eligible for service in criminal and civil courts (*ḳnbt*)<sup>4</sup>. In the Abbott Papyrus the thieves are tried for tomb-robbery by a court (*ḳnbt Ḳt nt Nwt*) of 8 members including a high-priest and prophet of Amūn<sup>5</sup>. In the inscription of

<sup>1</sup> This is not quite certain owing to the lacunae.

<sup>2</sup> Pap. Mayer A, 11, 5 and 13; also 12, 15 and 16.

<sup>3</sup> Pap. Berlin 3047; *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 17 (1879), 71 ff.

<sup>4</sup> SPIEGELBERG, *Stud. u. Mat.*, 61-2.

<sup>5</sup> Pap. Abbott, 8, 3.

Mes<sup>1</sup> a priest of the litter (or whatever *w<sup>c</sup>b n knbt* may mean) is sent out to investigate a division of lands, for he is a member (*sr*) of the court (*knbt*) which dealt with the case. Dr. Blackman points out to me the interesting but damaged passage in the great decree of Horemhab<sup>2</sup> where the priesthood appears to take a very large part in the newly reconstituted courts (*knbt*) of the country.

The fact is that our knowledge of Egyptian legal procedure is extremely scanty. Not more than a dozen cases are known to us in all, and those incompletely. The documents at our command date from various periods, and deal with cases of the most varied nature, and many more papyri will have to come to light if we are ever to succeed in reconstructing the judicial system in anything like its entirety<sup>3</sup>.

M. Moret has tried to make out a case for the existence of *tribunaux ecclésiastiques* in the Ramesside era, enjoying not only considerable power and popularity but capable of being appealed to against the decisions of the ordinary courts<sup>4</sup>. This case is based purely on the identity of the Mes or Mesmen of the famous oracle stele from Abydos<sup>5</sup> with the defendant in the inscription of Mes, an identity which must be regarded as quite hypothetical. If we do not feel able to accept this equation the ecclesiastical courts resolve themselves at once into mere judgements by oracle such as that contained in the stele mentioned above, in the British Museum ostrakon published along with a Berlin papyrus by Erman and in the papyrus under discussion<sup>6</sup>. Such judgements undoubtedly enjoyed considerable popularity, especially in small disputes concerning property and theft, and particularly in the Theban necropolis, but we shall need much more evidence before we can presume to elevate them into the dignity of ecclesiastical courts<sup>7</sup>.

The papyrus, or at least that portion of it which remains, is not actually dated, but it is clear from verso 2, 12-14 that it was written not earlier than the fourth year (probably after the end of that year) of the king there entitled Pharaoh, who, as is clear from lines 5-6 of the same page, is the successor of Ramesses IV Ḥḫma<sup>c</sup>rē<sup>c</sup> Setepenamūn, or in other words Ramesses V Userma<sup>c</sup>rē<sup>c</sup> Sekheperenrē<sup>c</sup>. Maspero has rightly pointed out that these same lines show that Ramesses IV ruled six years, for to Year 6 of this king (line 5) succeeds in the yearly series Year 1 of Pharaoh, *i.e.* of the reigning king Ramesses V. Spiegelberg has removed the possible objection that a year might have been skipped in this list by noting that in lines 12-14 below a yearly peculation of 100 *khar* (50 plus 50) is stated to amount to 1000 *khar* from Year 1 of Ramesses IV to Year 4 of Pharaoh, from which it is clear that the whole period covered is ten years, giving six years for the reign of Ramesses IV.

A further question is raised by these dates. Gardiner<sup>8</sup> and Sethe<sup>9</sup> have lately shown that in the New Empire, contrary to the custom both of earlier and of Ptolemaic times

<sup>1</sup> GARDINER, *Inscription of Mes*, pp. 12-13, nn. 8-9.

<sup>2</sup> BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, III, §§ 64-5.

<sup>3</sup> Spiegelberg long ago emphasized this (*Stud. u. Mat.*, 63) and pointed out the danger of assuming that the *knbt* were standing courts of law, and that their duties were solely legal and not administrative.

<sup>4</sup> *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres*, 1917, 157 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Annales du Service*, XVI, 161-73.

<sup>6</sup> Further to this subject see ERMAN, *Zwei Aktenstücke aus der thebanischen Gräberstadt*, in *Sitzungsber. der K. P. Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Classe*, 1910 (XIX), 330 ff.

<sup>7</sup> At the same time they must have put great power in the hands of the priests, who either caused the god's image to nod its head by some mechanical device or, what is perhaps more likely, reported that the image, invisible to the suppliant, had or had not done so.

<sup>8</sup> *Journal*, v, 190.

<sup>9</sup> *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 58, 39-42.

the regnal years of a king were reckoned from the date of his accession and not from the calendrical New Year's Day. Now in the list which runs from verso 1, line 13 (in this line restore Year 1 of Ramesses IV) to line 9 of verso 2 it is clear that the amount of grain annually due to the temple of Khnum was 700 *kar*. Thus a full amount was exacted in the last year, Year 6, of Ramesses IV, and yet unless this king died on the date of his accession this year must have been an incomplete year. Similarly this year is reckoned as a full year in the arithmetic of lines 13-14. Put briefly the difficulty is as follows. The papyrus seems to show that certain taxes or offerings made to the temple of Khnum were calculated yearly on the basis of the regnal years of the kings. When a change of reign took place the last year of the first king must in the nature of things have been incomplete, sometimes less sometimes more. And yet in the case before us the full amount of the dues is reckoned for this defective year. Unless it be that in the case before us the Year 6 of Ramesses IV was so nearly complete that it might without injustice be counted as complete the Egyptian taxpayer would seem to have had a cause of complaint which would have more than satisfied the grumbling propensities of his modern fellow-sufferer. Did Khnum then exact his full year's dues when the regnal year was only a month or six weeks in length? Surely not. Common sense forces us to suppose that a tax in kind, such as grain, would only be exacted once on each harvest. And does it not follow as a corollary that a very short last regnal year, more particularly one containing no harvest, may quite conceivably be omitted in a list such as that before us? In other words, though the last year of Ramesses IV *for taxation purposes* was Year 6, is it not possible that he actually began a Year 7 which, as it contained no harvest, was for these same purposes omitted? If this idea is correct such lists are to be used with caution for purposes of dating.

## TRANSLATION.

*Section A.*

Recto, page 1.

(1) The documents which are in charge of<sup>1</sup> the priest Penanquet called Sed of the temple of Khnum. (2) Charge concerning the black cow which is in his possession: it gave birth to five calves<sup>2</sup> of Mnevis, and he carried them off and appropriated them in the field. He parted with<sup>3</sup> them and he took them away to the south and he sold<sup>4</sup> them to the priests.

(3) Charge concerning the great calf of Mnevis which he had. He parted with it and he sold it to certain Nubians of the fortress of Bigah and received its price from them.



(4) Charge concerning his going to Thebes and receiving certain documents.....<sup>5</sup>, though Re<sup>c</sup> did not suffer him to flourish for ever. He brought them to the south in order to lay them before Khnum, but he (the god?) refused to acknowledge them.



(5) Charge concerning his debauching the citizeness Metnemeh, daughter of Pasekhety: she was wife to the fisherman Dhoutemhab son of Pentaure.

<sup>1</sup> *r iw*d, "in charge of." Cf. Pap. Bol. 1094, 6, 7; Pap. Bibl. Nat. 197, III, ro. 4 and vs. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *km* Spiegelberg refers to Pap. Harris I, 30, 3.

<sup>3</sup> *sc*d dt m. Cf. *sc*d dt n, Pap. Salt 124, ro., 1, 7, in a similar but damaged context.

<sup>4</sup> Read *wf dit w m*  ; Coptic *uyshe*.

<sup>5</sup> *nhw n mdwt n*  . Reading very uncertain.

(6) Charge concerning his debauching Tebes the daughter of Shuiu : she was the wife of Ahauty.

(7) Charge concerning the theft by Yem (?) of a sacred-eye amulet in the temple of Khnum. He (the priest) appropriated it together with the man who stole it.

(8) Charge concerning the handing over to the temple (?) by the priest Bekenkhons of a chest<sup>1</sup> in which were two..... : he opened it and he took a.....from it. He laid them before Khnum and he (the god) acknowledged<sup>2</sup> them.

(9) Charge concerning his coming into the inside of the fortress when he had only done 7 (??) days of drinking natron<sup>3</sup>. Now the scribe of the treasury, Menthuherkhepesh (*sic*) made

(10) this prophet of Khnum take an oath by the Ruler saying, I<sup>4</sup> will not let him enter with the god until he accomplish (?) his days of drinking natron<sup>5</sup>. But he disobeyed and entered (11) with the god when he had three days of drinking natron (still to do ?).

(12) Charge concerning the election by the vizier Neferronpe of the priest Bekenkhons to be prophet of Khnum, whereupon this priest said to the priest Nebun, We will introduce (?) another.....priests<sup>6</sup> and (13) we will cause the god to cast out<sup>7</sup> the son of Pashuty. He was examined and it was found that he had actually said it. He was made to take an oath by the Ruler not to enter the temple. But he gave (14) a bribe<sup>8</sup> to this prophet, saying, Let me enter with the god, and this prophet took his bribe and let him enter with the god.


Recto, page 2.




(1) Charge concerning Pharaoh's sending the overseer of the treasury Menemtir to examine the treasury of the temple of Khnum, and this priest had stolen 60 *dšw*-garments from the treasury of the temple of Khnum. And they made a search<sup>9</sup> for them (2) and found 24 of them in his possession, he having disposed of the rest.

(3) Charge concerning the cutting off by this priest of the ear of Wenemtuemnefer, son of Beksetyt, without the knowledge of Pharaoh.

(4) Charge concerning the sending by the vizier Neferronpe of the servant Pekhal the younger and the servant Panefunezemenkhons (?), saying, Bring (?) to me the divine father




<sup>1</sup> Very uncertain ; *w<sup>c</sup> fdt r hst-ntr(?) iw ...wt 2 imš.*

<sup>2</sup>  (*sic*). Read *hnn(?)* "to nod."


<sup>3</sup> Read  (*sic*) . The *ns* is most uncertain.  is possible, but it is tempting to read an abnormal N.K. form of the numeral 7. If *wn* is read we might supply *m nsin* after it, "while we were in our days of drinking natron," but this leaves *ns(?) iir-f* unexplained.

<sup>4</sup> *I.e.* the prophet, whom the scribe of the treasury makes responsible.

<sup>5</sup> Read *iir-f mh(?) nsif hrw.*

<sup>6</sup> The text reads  (three unintelligible vertical signs between  and ). *bs* "to introduce" here seems to be III Inf. despite GARDINER, *Sinuhe*, 71. *Cf.* perhaps also SETHE, *Urk.*, IV, 82, 11.

<sup>7</sup> *hst r bl.* *Cf.* Pap. Bol. 1094, 9, 9-10.

<sup>8</sup> *iwf ddt*  *cf. Rec. de Trav.*, 16, 60, but whether in the same sense I cannot determine.

<sup>9</sup> *hr ir iw-tw [hr] whš-w.*

Ḳakhepesh. (5) Now the servants found me serving a monthly turn of the first *phyle*<sup>1</sup>. And so the servants left me alone, for they said, We (?)<sup>2</sup> will not take you during your month of service. So said they. But this priest gave them a *dšw*-garment of Upper Egyptian cloth and a chair and two spears (?) of copper, a tusk (?) of ivory of two cubits and a bundle of *t;w*-vegetables<sup>3</sup> .....1000.....fish, .....light beer, saying to them, Do not release him. [He spent ?] 15 days without having.....the great.....s and the chief..... (8) The ..... (9) in the land of Egypt, for it is I who.....the god (?)..... he caused them (?) to let [me ?] go.....

(10) Charge concerning the leaving by Prome.....of the house of Bek.....the mother...the (?).....saying to him.....(11) he blinded<sup>4</sup> Beksetyt her daughter likewise, and they remain blind today.

(12) Charge concerning the quarrel which this priest had with the herdsman Pakamen of the temple (of Khnum ?) when he answered and said to him..... (And when) (13) three months had passed Zaza died (?)<sup>5</sup>.....he having said it<sup>6</sup>.....

(14) Charge concerning their handing over 20 oxen to this priest in Year 1 of King Ḥekma<sup>c</sup>rē<sup>c</sup> Setepenamūn the great [god]. They seized (?) the oxen in his possession..... (15) he brought them from above (?)...he gave the oxen.....he having given [them to ?] the chief.....also.....<sup>7</sup>.

(16) Charge concerning the giving by the priest Penanket of 20 *deben* of copper and three *dšw*-garments of Upper Egyptian cloth to this priest [in order that he might deny ?] every charge<sup>8</sup> which was made.....

(17) Charge concerning this priest's standing up in front of this god [and saying] if he would make a good man.....to thee<sup>9</sup>. So said he to him as he stood.....

### Section B.

Verso, page 1.

(1) Charge concerning their stealing the large.....(copper) belonging to the boat of Khnum and making away with it.

(2) [Charge concerning] their stealing 10 *rd*-garments of coloured cloth, total 15, from the temple of Anket Mistress of Ašwān. The scribe of the treasury Mentuherkhepeshef who was acting as mayor of Elephantine examined them and found these in their possession, (3) they having given them to Amentekh, a workman of the Place of Truth, and having received their price. And this prince took a bribe from them and let them go.


(4) [Charge concerning] their opening a storehouse of the temple of Khnum which was under the seal of the inspectors of the granary who inspect for the temple of Khnum (?) and stealing 180 (?) *khar* of barley from it.

<sup>1</sup> *iw* *ḥ*<sup>c</sup> *kw* *ibd* *n*  (so Gardiner).

<sup>2</sup> *iw* in error for *iw*-*n*. <sup>3</sup> *t;w*. Cf. Pap. Harris I, 65 a, 7-8 and 74, 5-6.

<sup>4</sup> *kṯmn* transitively. Cf. Pap. Tur. Judic. 5, 5. <sup>5</sup> *ph pt* (possibly *ph r pt*).

<sup>6</sup> Rossi's facsimile (Pl. 60) is fairly accurate. *iw bn wšbt tš dš dš st pt...iw i-ir-f dš-w*. But what is the grammar of this?

<sup>7</sup> See Rossi's facsimile Pl. 60. The line runs: *iw f int-w m ḥrw wnn i-ir-f dš nš iḥw m mšbw iw i-ir-f dš...pt* 

<sup>8</sup> *wšbt* (? for *wšbt*) *nb nš iw-tw dš-w*. For *wšbt*, a charge, cf. Pap. Abbott 6, 11.

<sup>9</sup> *ir iw f irt w<sup>c</sup> nfr n rmt...iri-w* (or *iri-f!*) *nk*.

(5) [Charge concerning] the opening.....Khnum (?).....stealing *rd*-garments of Upper Egyptian cloth. And the prophet found them in their possession and took them but did nothing to them.

(6) [Charge concerning].....a.....full of the garments of the divine fathers and the priests in which they [carry] the god. They [were] found in their possession.

*Section C.*

(7) [Year].....[under the majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt].....life, health and prosperity, the Great God. (The) farmers.....the grain in order to give their 700 *khar* of barley to Khnum, Lord of Elephantine, here in the southern district. They brought them by boat (8).....Elephantine. They were carried by boat, and they [brought?] them, and unloaded into the granary of the god and they were received for him every year. Now in Year 28 of (9) [King].....this boat's-captain, he died. Now....., who was prophet of the temple of Khnum, brought the merchant .....Khnumnakht: he made him (10).....barley here in the northern district and he began to transport it by boat. Now in Year 1 of the King of Upper Egypt Ḥekma<sup>c</sup>rē<sup>c</sup> Setepenamūn, life, health and prosperity, the Great God, he made away with much of the barley. Now this boat's-captain (11).....nakht(?) 140 deben belonging to the treasury (?) of Khnum, .....making 7 deben of gold. The gold was not in the treasury of the temple of Khnum, and what he had appropriated of the barley was not in the granary<sup>1</sup> of Khnum, he having stolen (12).....Khnum. (a blank here) The six (?) rowers (?) of the crew of the boat of Khnum: they were with him in his.....

(13) [Year 1 of King Ḥekma<sup>c</sup>rē<sup>c</sup> Setepenamūn] received (?) at Elephantine by the hand of the boat's-captain.....100 *khar*; remainder 600.

Verso, page 2.

(1) Year 2 of King Ḥ., life, prosperity and health, the Great God, 130 *khar*; remainder 570 *khar*.

(2) Year 3 of King Ḥ., life, prosperity and health, the Great God, 700 *khar*; he brought none of them into the granary.

(3) Year 4 of King Ḥ. etc. 700 *khar*: arrived in the boat of (?) the Staff, by the hand of the sailor Panekhtta 20 *khar*; remainder 680 *khar*.

(4) Year 5 of King Ḥ. etc. Received for the divine offerings of the Staff (?) of Khnum 20 *khar*; remainder 680 *khar*.

(5) Year 6 of King Ḥ. etc. 700 *khar*: he did not deliver them.

(6) Year 1 of Pharaoh, life, health and prosperity, 700 *khar*; he did not deliver them.

(7) Year 2 of Pharaoh, life, prosperity and health, arrived by the hand of the boat's-captain Khnumnakht 186 *khar*; remainder 514 *khar*.

(8) Year 3 of Pharaoh, life, prosperity and health, 700 *khar*. Arrived by the hand of this boat's-captain 120 *khar*; remainder 580.

(9) Total: barley of the temple of Khnum, Lord of Elephantine, which this boat's-captain had conspired with the scribes, the inspectors and the land-workers (11) of the temple of Khnum to purloin and appropriate to their own use, 5004 (*sic*) *khar*.

(10) (A note crowded in between ll. 9 and 11.) Now Khnumnakht (?)..... take his barley: he lives on the top of the hill: received (?) from him barley (??).

<sup>1</sup> ḥr p<sup>i</sup>:f wg m n<sup>i</sup> it bn st m t<sup>i</sup> knwt.

(12) Charge concerning the exaction by this boat's-captain of the temple of Khnum of taxes<sup>1</sup>; an assessment(?) of 50 *khar* from (??) Rome, son of Penanḳet, and an assessment(?) of 50 *khar* from (??) Paukhed, son of Pathewemabu, total 2, making 100 *khar* from Year 1 of King Ḥeḳmaḳrēḳ Setepenamūn, life, prosperity and health, the Great God, up to Year 4 of Pharaoh, making 1000 *khar*: he appropriated them to his own use and brought none of them into the temple of Khnum.

(15) Charge concerning the burning by this boat's-captain of the temple of Khnum of a boat belonging to the temple of Khnum together with its spars and its rigging. (16) But he gave a bribe to the inspectors of the temple of Khnum and they made no report about it. He has not (*sic*)<sup>2</sup> up to this day.

Verso, page 3.

(1) Charge concerning his procuring abortion for the citizeness Tarep[yt].....

(2) Charge concerning the giving by Panekhtta, a sailor of the Staffs of Khnum,.....  
.....: he gave a bribe to the inspectors (3) and they never reported it.....

(4) Charge concerning the debauching by this sailor Panekhtta.....[of X], a land-worker of the temple of Khnum, Lord of Elephantine who is in the city of Pa.....

(6) Charge concerning the opening by the *w<sup>c</sup>b*-priest Payiri(?) of this.....(7) and he did it in great haste.....

(8) Charge concerning the sending by the divine father Dhouthotpe of the temple of Month,.....<sup>3</sup> (9) who was doing the duties of the post of divine father of the temple of Khnum, of a (?).....(10) letter by their hand for the scribe of the temple Dhoutemhab. And they caused to send.....(11) caused their hides to come forth on.....






#### COMMENTARY.

##### Section A.

##### Charges against "this *w<sup>c</sup>b*-priest."

The first two charges, recto 1, 1-3, deal with certain Mnevis-calves. The crime consists in his selling these, and the simple explanation may be that they were not his to sell. But there is another possible explanation. The Mnevis-bull, the sacred bull of Heliopolis, in which Rēḳ was incarnate, would seem, like the Apis, to have possessed a *ḥarīm* of cows; and that not only in his Heliopolite home but also, to judge by our papyrus, at Elephantine, and doubtless elsewhere (see BLACKMAN, *Rock Tombs of Meir*, II, 25-7). From the male offspring of the Mnevis and these sacred cows the new Mnevis would eventually be chosen, and for this reason they were not to be sold or parted with.

The charge of l. 4 is obscure owing to the difficulty of the reading. Spiegelberg has however pointed out the parallel with Pap. Rollin, ll. 2-3, and it is tempting to suppose that the documents in question were, like those of Pap. Lee and Rollin, to be used for

<sup>1</sup> Rossi is accurate. Spiegelberg's  @ @ @  is tempting after *šdī* (to levy a tax) and perhaps right, though the form of  would be most abnormal. The obvious reading would be  @ @  <sup>*sic*</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> *bn šw šīḳ pš hrw*. Omit *bn šw* or suppose a verb lost after it.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps nothing lost.



magical purposes. Or were they perhaps forged documents such as those referred to in the inscription of Mes, giving him rights which he really did not possess? In any case he laid these documents before Khnum with the evident intention of getting the god to approve either his ownership of them or his action in getting them<sup>1</sup>. The approval of the god was to be shown in the usual way by nodding the head (*hnn*).

Line 7 contains a charge of theft and 8 is very similar, though the exact wording is uncertain. On this occasion the god seems to have given a favourable response.

The lines that follow, 9-14, contain one of the most interesting points in the papyrus. The general sense is certain, and the priest's crime consisted in taking part in divine service and carrying the image before he had properly purified himself by washing the mouth with natron for the prescribed number of days<sup>2</sup>. Dr. Blackman tells me that he is aware of no evidence for fixing the number of days required for purification either by natron or by any other means<sup>3</sup>. If our reading of the passage is correct the period was an Egyptian "week" of ten days.

The fortress is doubtless that of Elephantine, within which the temple of Khnum lay. The interference of the scribe of the treasury Mentuherkhepeshef is explained by verso 1, 2 where we learn that this man was acting as mayor of Elephantine. It must have been in virtue of his holding this office that a purely religious question was referred to him, a layman.

Lines 12-14 are difficult owing to obscurities of reading. The vizier Neferronpe had appointed a certain Bekenkhons as a prophet, and the criminal priest in some way takes advantage of this to get rid of another *w<sup>c</sup>b*-priest called merely the child of Pashuty, whom presumably he dislikes. The wording seems to show that this was to be done by means of an oracle. The plot is exposed and the ringleader excommunicated, but he manages to re-enter the temple service by bribing the newly appointed Bekenkhons.

The vizier Neferronpe was already known from ostraca<sup>4</sup> dating from the reign of Ramesses IV. For the election of *w<sup>c</sup>b*-priests by the Vizier compare Pap. Bologna 1094, 5, 2-3<sup>5</sup>.

The next charge, recto 2, 1, contains one point of interest, the sending of an overseer of the treasury to examine the treasury of the temple of Khnum. It is clear from this that the Pharaoh still had control of the temples in the reign to which this refers. Compare, for an earlier example, the famous Coptos decree of Nubkheperurē Antef where a scribe of the divine treasure of Amūn is sent to enquire into an offence, probably treason, in the temple of Min<sup>6</sup>.

From the next charge, 2, 3, it would seem a legitimate deduction that the Pharaoh alone might order the cutting off of nose and ears.

Lines 4-9 contain an interesting charge. The vizier Neferronpe sends two messengers to summon to his presence a certain divine father *Kakhepesh*, who, judging by the use of

<sup>1</sup> To the documents quoted by ERMAN, *op. cit.*, for these oracular responses concerning the ownership of property add an important unpublished papyrus in the British Museum dealing with an oracle of Amūn.

<sup>2</sup> BLACKMAN, article *Purification (Egyptian)*, in *Hastings' Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*, § v, 7.

<sup>3</sup> He quotes, however, the difficult passage MARIETTE, *Dendera*, IV, Pl. 44c, where the mourners personifying Isis and Nephthys in the annual re-enactment of the embalment of Osiris are purified "four times, seven days by seven days." Does this mean 28 days in all?

<sup>4</sup> DARESSY, *Ostraca*, 25033 etc.; WEIL, *Die Veziere des Pharaonenreiches*, § 40.

<sup>5</sup> For the election of priests in general see BLACKMAN, article *Priest, Priesthood (Egyptian)*, in *op. cit.*, § XII.

<sup>6</sup> PETRIE, *Koptos*, Pl. VIII.

the first person singular in what follows, must be the writer of this papyrus, unless the scribe has inadvertently quoted from his evidence without turning it into *Oratio Obliqua*. Now the priesthood of every temple was divided into four watches (*šw*), each of which served a month in turn<sup>1</sup>, and the messengers, finding that *Ḳakhepesh's* watch was then in service, decided to wait until this service should be completed. The criminal, however, who for some reason unexplained was anxious to get rid of *Ḳakhepesh*, attempted to bribe the messengers, but the result is obscured by the fragmentary state of the text at this point. We do not know the reason of the Vizier's summons, but since the messengers of this great official were content to wait for at least 15 days before carrying out his command we may safely infer that a very considerable sanctity surrounded a priest during his month of service.

The charge of ll. 10-11 is partly obscured by lacunae, and from there the difficulties become more and more severe until we reach the end of the page.

### *Section B.*

#### Charges against certain unknown persons.

This section, verso 1, 1-6, is the least interesting of the three. It deals with cases of vulgar theft, and the only matter of importance is the corruptibility of *Mentuherkhepesh*, a scribe of the treasury, who was acting as prince of Elephantine.

### *Section C.*

This section began with a year-date in the reign of a deceased Pharaoh, of which only the words "the Great God" remain<sup>2</sup>. The section describes the conditions under which the thefts which follow were committed. If I understand the passage rightly, despite the lacunae, the situation is as follows. The temple of *Khnum* at Elephantine owned some corn-land in the "northern district," and the farmers of this land, referred to in verso 2 line 9 as "farmers of the temple of *Khnum*," held their land in consideration of an annual tax to the temple, amounting in all to 700 *khar* of barley. This barley was collected and carried by river to Elephantine by a certain boat's-captain who died in Year 28 of *Rameses III*. Thereupon a prophet of the temple, whose name is lost, replaced him by a certain *Khnumakht*<sup>3</sup>. Presumably this man remained honest for the few remaining years of *Rameses III*, but in Year 1 of his successor *Rameses IV* he began to purloin large quantities of the barley with the connivance, as we see from verso 2, 9, of the "scribes, inspectors and farmers of the temple of *Khnum*." If my transcription of l. 12 is correct, other members of the boat of *Khnum* were also involved. Owing to the lacunae in l. 11 it is impossible to seize the bearing of the reference to 140 *deben* of gold.

There follows a list of the defalcations in each year up to Year 3 of Pharaoh, *i.e.* *Rameses V*. The total, 5004 *khar*, is incorrect; it should be 5724. The common error of taking a 60-sign in hieratic for an 80 may account for the 20, and the 700 is perhaps to be explained by the fact, obvious on the original, that the scribe first missed out Year 1 of *Rameses IV* and crowded it in afterwards. As, however, totals in Egyptian account papyri are frequently wrong, it is doubtful whether this attempt at justification is worth making.

<sup>1</sup> BLACKMAN, article *Priest, Priesthood (Egyptian)*, in *op. cit.*, § VIII, 3a.

<sup>2</sup> At this period the dead Pharaoh is "the Great God" and the reigning Pharaoh "the Good God."

<sup>3</sup> See, however, p. 118, n. 1.

The only other point of interest in this part of the papyrus is the reference to the Staff of Khnum. In verso 2, 3 we have "the boat of the Staff," in l. 4 is a reference to the "divine offerings of the Staff of Khnum," and in verso 3, 2 there is a "sailor of the Staffs of Khnum." The question of the staff of the deity has been discussed by Spiegelberg<sup>1</sup>, who points out that we hear of the Staff of the following gods, Thoth, Hathor, Horus and Khons<sup>2</sup>, and is inclined to think, judging from representations of such staffs on the walls of the Denderah temple, that they are to be regarded as fetishes of the deity. Each deity, he adds, could manifest himself in a staff, and thus the god became identified with the staff. The references to the Staff of Khnum in this papyrus tell us nothing more as to the nature of the conception, except that it was sometimes regarded as plural (unless this be a mere scribe's error), that it possessed its own boat on the Nile and that divine offerings were made to it.

The exact nature of the further charge in ll. 12-14 is difficult to perceive. All that is clear is that the boat's-captain diverted to his own use 100 *khar* per annum of some commodity presumably barley<sup>3</sup> which formed the contribution to the temple of two persons, Rome and Paukhed.

The charge of ll. 15-16 explains itself. Here the inspectors of the temple are definitely accused of venality.

The charges of verso 3 are of a varied nature and are obscured by lacunae. In l. 1 we have a charge against the boat's-captain, but the two charges which follow concern the sailor Panekhtta, unless the lacunae mislead us. Of the rest not enough remains to enable an opinion to be formed. The fact revealed in ll. 8-9 that a divine father of the temple of Month could do the duties of divine father in the temple of Khnum is not without interest.

The whole papyrus forms a vivid picture of the venality of the state officials and of the power and the corruption of the priesthood. Small wonder that when at last the priests overthrew the monarchy they proved incapable of governing the country in its place.

<sup>1</sup> *Rec. de Trav.*, 25, 184 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Add Amūn (Pap. Turin P. R. xxxii, 8).

<sup>3</sup> See, however, p. 124, n. 1.

## MISTAKES IN CHEMICAL MATTERS FREQUENTLY MADE IN ARCHAEOLOGY

BY A. LUCAS, O.B.E., F.I.C.

*Formerly Director, Chemical Department, Egypt.*

AS various inaccuracies in chemical matters frequently occur in archaeological reports, the writer has ventured in the following note to draw attention to some of the more serious of them, in the hope that in time they may be rectified. As the question is not one of who is right, but of what is right, it has been thought better to avoid giving references. The matter will be made as little technical as possible.

### **Ancient Egyptian Plaster.**

As the terms limestone, lime, whiting, carbonate of lime and gypsum will frequently be employed these will be defined and described at the outset.

#### *Limestone.*

This is the natural rock which forms the hills bordering the Nile valley from Cairo to Esnah, where the Nubian sandstone begins. Chemically it is carbonate of lime and, being a natural product, it is rarely pure, but contains varying proportions of sand, clay and small amounts of other ingredients. It is amorphous and not crystalline.

#### *Lime.*

This is produced by heating limestone, or other forms of carbonate of lime, to a temperature of about 900° C. (1652° F.). When freshly burned it is "quick" lime, which chemically is calcium oxide and which on the addition or absorption of water becomes "slaked" lime, which is calcium hydrate. When exposed to the air, slaked lime gradually absorbs carbon dioxide and becomes converted on the surface into carbonate of lime, that is, it reverts to its original condition.

Lime is used for many purposes, especially for building, ordinary mortar for example, as distinguished from cement mortar, being a mixture of lime and sand. A similar mixture is also employed as a plaster for walls.

After careful and prolonged search, the writer has been unable to find any evidence of the use of lime in Egypt before the time of the Roman occupation. The reason for this doubtless arose from the scarcity of fuel and from the fact that a material (gypsum) which answered all the purposes of lime occurred plentifully in the country and could be burned at a much lower temperature. The Romans, however, who knew lime in Europe, where gypsum would be useless for outdoor work on account of the wet climate, appear to have introduced lime-burning into Egypt, a country where the raw material is very abundant and where the only drawback is the scarcity of fuel.

#### *Whiting.*

This is a soft, friable, amorphous form of carbonate of lime, identical in nature and properties with chalk.

*Carbonate of Lime.*

This occurs in many forms, but only those of interest in the present connection need be mentioned: these are limestone, including powder or dust derived from limestone, whiting, and as an impurity in sand, clay, soil and many minerals. It can also be produced by exposing lime to the air.

*Gypsum.*

This is sulphate of lime, containing water in intimate chemical combination. On being heated to a temperature of about 100° C. (212° F.) gypsum loses about three-fourths of its water and forms a substance which has the property of recombining with water, producing a hard mass. The temperature usually employed for burning gypsum varies from 100° C. (212° F.) to about 204° C. (400° F.). The calcined material in the pure form as made in Europe is known as "plaster of Paris."

Gypsum is slightly soluble in, and easily disintegrated by, water and hence is not suitable for outdoor use in a wet climate. It occurs plentifully in Egypt and is worked on a considerable scale at the present time; as well as being found in fairly pure rock-like formation, which has to be quarried, it also occurs extensively in the desert, just below the surface of the ground, in loosely aggregated masses, which are easily dug up. As thus found, gypsum is never pure, but contains varying proportions of carbonate of lime and sand, together with small amounts of other ingredients. The presence of carbonate of lime, which is readily disclosed by chemical analysis, has led those who were not familiar with Egyptian gypsum and who only know the purer European article, to imagine that it is due to an intentional admixture with lime, which in course of time has become converted into carbonate by natural processes, as happens in the case of lime mortar. In the same way the presence of the sand, to those who only know of sand in this connection as a deliberate addition to mortar or plaster, is equally confusing and conveys a wrong impression. Ancient Egyptian plaster however is simply crude gypsum burned and powdered, and the carbonate of lime and sand which it contains are not artificial additions but impurities derived from the raw material, in which they occur naturally. Occasionally, however, carbonate of lime, beyond that naturally present, may have been added in the form of powdered limestone in order to give a lighter colour to the plaster.

Three specimens of present day crude gypsum from Helwân, near Cairo, gave the following results on analysis:

	%	%	%
Sand	7·6	3·7	2·1
Gypsum	75·4	85·2	89·9
Carbonate of lime, etc.	17·0	11·1	8·0
	<u>100·0</u>	<u>100·0</u>	<u>100·0</u>

The plasters used by the ancient Egyptians may now be described. They are as follows:

*Mud Plaster.*

This consists of clay of varying, and generally poor, quality. Mud plaster as found in Upper Egypt contains, as a rule, a considerable proportion of carbonate of lime as a natural impurity in the clay. For use the mud was usually mixed with chopped straw.

*Gypsum Plaster.*

This varies considerably in colour and may be white or practically white, different shades of grey, or very light brown. Occasionally gypsum plaster is pink on the surface, but this colour is adventitious and is due to chemical changes that have taken place in the iron compounds by exposure. Twenty different specimens of gypsum plaster from tombs at Thebes have recently been analysed with the following results:

	Min. %.	Max. %.
Sand	9.0	30.0
Gypsum	9.6	85.5
Carbonate of lime, etc.	trace	73.0

In thirteen out of these twenty specimens the minimum percentage of gypsum was 66.3 and the maximum of carbonate of lime, etc. was 21.9. This plaster often contains a large number of small black particles, which are the remains of partially burned fuel. The identity of this material with crude gypsum is evident and therefore to call ancient Egyptian plaster a lime plaster is wrong.

A similar material was used as mortar and the results of the analysis of fifteen different specimens, taken respectively from the Sphinx, Temple of the Sphinx, Gîzah Pyramids and Karnak, were as follows:

	Min. %.	Max. %.
Sand	2.0	25.5
Gypsum	23.4	89.2
Carbonate of lime, etc.	0.7	71.8

Sometimes on the surface of one plaster there is a thin coating of another plaster, of a white or practically white colour, which consists essentially of carbonate of lime and contains only a trace of gypsum. It seems probable that in such cases the binding material is not the small amount of gypsum present, which may be regarded as an impurity, but is glue (size), and generally this coating is so thin that it may have been put on like a modern distemper. The presence of size as an adhesive however is very difficult to prove, since the plaster may have been sized to make it suitable for painting.

*Miscellaneous materials used for or in plaster.*

In addition to the mistakes made owing to a misapprehension of the origin of the carbonate of lime in gypsum plaster, other mistakes often due to a confusion between lime and carbonate of lime, are not uncommon. Thus one writer in describing certain Theban tombs states that lime was mixed with gypsum, mud, limestone-gravel, *hîb*, and chopped straw respectively, to form the various kinds of plaster used. This however is a mistake, for what the plasters in question do contain is not lime, but carbonate of lime.

The same writer refers to *hîb* (a local material which, in the neighbourhood of Thebes, is still used as a plaster) as "a kind of decayed limestone," and another writer calls it a "soft lime plaster." It is however merely a natural mixture of clay and limestone, both in a very finely divided condition, which is washed out of the hills and plateaux and deposited in hollows and pockets at a lower level. Another writer states that certain walls were prepared for decoration by being covered with "a layer of coarsely ground limestone" on which was laid a thin layer of "very fine limestone plaster." Limestone however, whether coarsely ground or very fine, would neither cohere nor adhere and could not be used as plaster. It is suggested that these plasters contain carbonate of lime and not limestone,

and that gypsum is also present, the carbonate of lime occurring simply as an impurity. In the case of the thin surface layer of finer plaster the binding material may be glue (size).

The very thin white coating on certain ancient walls is often erroneously called "lime-wash." This, which means washed with lime, is a misnomer, due to the fact that in Europe the material used for such a purpose is lime. In Egypt however, as already stated, there is no evidence that lime was known, the material employed being probably a wash of whiting, mixed with size to make it adhere. The only names that can be suggested are "whitewash" or "distemper," which although ambiguous are not incorrect.

#### Various kinds of stone.

Mistakes in nomenclature are also very common in connection with various stones used by the ancient Egyptians. A few of the more frequent will be mentioned,

##### *Alabaster.*

In connection with alabaster there are two problems, firstly whether the name rightly belongs to the sulphate of lime or to the carbonate of lime, both of which are of similar appearance, and secondly whether the carbonate is calcite or aragonite. Although the ancient Egyptians occasionally used sulphate of lime for making small objects, and the present writer has chemically tested certain articles and found them to consist of sulphate, by far the greater part of the material called alabaster employed for sarcophagi, statues, vases and other objects and also for inlay is carbonate of lime and not sulphate, and there is no doubt that in Egyptology alabaster means carbonate of lime. Whether or not the carbonate has the prior claim to the name need not be discussed, but it is so well established that it should be allowed to stand.

Calcite and aragonite are of similar composition, both being carbonate of lime, and also of very similar appearance, and the differences between them, though substantial, cannot always be seen by simple inspection. These differences are in crystalline form and in specific gravity. Much of the material employed by the ancient Egyptians is of a well marked banded character and this is all certainly calcite. Of the non-banded variety a considerable proportion is also calcite, as may be proved by the determination of its specific gravity. It is not denied however that aragonite may occasionally have been used, but the greater part of Egyptian alabaster is calcite.

##### *Sandstone.*

Sandstone, chiefly from the quarries at Silsilah and *Ḳirtâs*, was largely employed in ancient Egypt for building purposes and the greater number of the temples in Upper Egypt are of sandstone. A harder and more compact variety of sandstone from *Gebel Aḥmar*, near Cairo, was however sometimes used for making sarcophagi and statues. This latter is termed "quartzite" by the geologist, but frequently "crystalline sandstone" by the archaeologist. As all sandstone is crystalline, the special use of this adjective to describe one variety is unnecessary and it is better to call it by its correct name of quartzite.

##### *Bitumen and Pitch.*

As a rule every material found in connection with burials in Egypt that looks at all like bitumen or pitch is called one or the other. Thus the black material on mummies is almost invariably termed bitumen or pitch, or occasionally tar, as is also the black coating on various funerary objects.

The writer has shown<sup>1</sup> that the black preservative material on mummies is generally resin, though occasionally gum-resin or gum, which has blackened in the manner so characteristic of organic bodies by the chemical changes brought about by age. It is true that many Greek, Roman and Arab writers make the statement that bitumen or pitch from Judaea was used in mummification, and this may possibly have been the case during the later periods, though it has not yet been proved, but the use of these materials earlier than Ptolemaic times is most improbable. The writer, who has made special search and has examined a very large number of specimens of these black pitch-like materials from Egyptian mummies of all periods, has failed to find a single example of bitumen or mineral pitch. He has however identified a few specimens of wood pitch.

The black coating, often lustrous, on various wooden funerary objects such as coffins, boxes, and figures of gods, animals, birds, etc., which, despite its close resemblance in appearance to varnish or paint, is almost always called bitumen or tar, has been found to be resin in every case in which it has been examined.

As the funerary objects in question were intentionally and originally black, the resin cannot have blackened from age like that on mummies and therefore a naturally black resin must be postulated. Such a resin however, although not unknown, is most unusual, the colour of most resins being various shades of brown or red. A few black resins however do occur; thus there is a black dammar; the resin from *Canarium strictum*, which grows in western and southern India and which would be a suitable material for making varnish. Natural varnishes, too, are known, such as the resin from *Rhus vernicifera* (Japan and China), the resin from a species of *Melanorrhoea* (China), the resin from *Melanorrhoea lacicifera* (Indo-China), and the resin from *Melanorrhoea usitata* (Cochin-China and Cambodia). These resins when fresh are greyish white, viscous fluids which, on exposure in thin films, dry to hard, black, lustrous surfaces and are used as lacquers. It is probable that something of this nature may have been employed by the ancient Egyptians. It is suggested that "black varnish" would be the best name for this material.

<sup>1</sup> *Preservative Materials used by the Ancient Egyptians in Embalming*, Cairo, 1911. *Journal*, 1914, 1, 241-5.



## NOTE ON SOME OSTRACA FROM EL-'AMARNAH

By WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S.

SOME time ago I acquired a series of 70 wine- and meat-jar inscriptions which were formerly in the Amherst collection. These were found by Petrie's expedition of 1891-2 and include a few purchased from the natives by Mr. Howard Carter. Most of my series is unpublished excepting those numbered 91 to 101 by Griffith in PETRIE, *Tell el-Amarna*, Pl. XXV.

There is one (No. 6) which is of special interest because it is one of the few in which the vineyard-master's name is undamaged; but the name itself is more remarkable still since it contains the hated word Amūn. The text reads as follows:



[Year ...] Wine of the House of Aten which is in the.....

[The master of] the vine-dressers Amenemhēt of the mansion.....

The occurrence on a single fragment of the names Aten and Amūn is so unusual that it appeared to me to be worth putting on record. There cannot be the slightest doubt as to the reading Amūn.

To the list of sources published by Gunn<sup>1</sup> I can add two more types from my collection.

No. 53 has "wine from the House of the King's-mother..." and

No. 61 . From this writing it appears that *Itn* is not necessarily written first, and therefore by analogy with this instance of the princess M'aketaten, Meritaten is probably the correct restoration in No. 10 of Gunn's list (*op. cit.*, 166) in spite of his footnote to the contrary.

<sup>1</sup> *City of Akhenaten*, I, 166.

## THE CASTANET DANCERS OF ARSINOE

BY W. L. WESTERMANN

THE following document is one of those allotted to Cornell University out of the general purchases of papyri of the season of 1922. The Cornell allotment reached the University in February 1923. The document is in itself neither highly significant nor entirely new in content, but the results of the task of interpreting it for publication seem to have enough social and economic interest to warrant separate treatment before the more formal appearance of the papyrus in a projected volume of the Cornell lot. These results are to be regarded as an indication of an open field for a longer and more complete study of the theatre and all forms of musical and other entertainments in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt as they appear in the papyri, in the archaeological, and in the literary sources<sup>1</sup>.

This Cornell contract had been folded twice, lengthwise, causing the loss of from one to three letters in the right hand crease.

Contract with Castanet Dancers  
for a Festival.

Philadelphia

206 A.D.

Cornell Papyrus Inv. No. 26, Second Series.  
8 inches × 3¼ inches.

Ἴσιδώρα κροταλι[στ]ρία  
παρὰ Ἄρτ[ε]μι[σί]ης ἀπὸ κώ-  
μης Φιλαδελφείας. βούλομαι  
παρ[α]λαβεῖν σε σὺν ἑτέραι κρο-  
5 ταλ[ισ]τρίαί, (γίνονται) (δύο), λειτουργήσασαι  
παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπὶ ἡμ[έρ]ας ἕξ ἀπὸ  
τῆς κδ̄ τοῦ Παῦ[ν]ι μηνὸς κατ' ἄρ-  
χα[ί]ους, λαμβανόντων ὑμῶν  
ὑπὲρ μισθοῦ καθ' [ἡμ]έραν ἑκάσ-  
10 τῆν (δραχμᾶς) λς καὶ π[ροσ]παρε[χόν]των  
ἡμῶν κριθῆς [(ἀρτάβας)] δ καὶ ἄρ-  
των ζεύγη (εἴκοσι τέσσαρα) ἕ[φ' ᾗ] δέ, ἐὰν κα-  
τενέγκηται ἰμ[άτ]ια ἢ χρυσᾶ  
κόσμια, ταῦτα σ[ῶ]α παραφυ-  
15 λάξομεν, παρ[εξ]όμεθα δὲ  
ὑμῖν κατερχομέ[νο]ις ὄνους  
δύο καὶ ἀνερχο[μ]ένοις  
τοὺς ἴσους.  
ἔτους ιδ' Λουκίου Σεπτι[μ]ίου Σεουήρου  
20 Εὐσεβοῦς Περτίνακος [καὶ] Μάρκου  
Αὔρηλίου Ἄντωνε[ίνο]υ Παρθικοῦ  
Σεβαστῶν καὶ Πουβλίου Σεπτιμίου  
Γέτα Καίσαρος Σεβ[αστο]ῦ. Παῦ[ν]ι ις̄.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. WILHELM SCHUBART, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde*, 401.

“To Isidora, castanet dancer, from Artemisia of the village of Philadelphia. I request that you, assisted by another castanet dancer—total two—undertake to perform at the festival at my house for six days beginning with the 24th of the month Payni according to the old calendar, you (two) to receive as pay 36 drachmas for each day, and we to furnish in addition 4 artabas of barley and 24 pairs of bread loaves, and on condition further that, if garments or gold ornaments are brought down, we will guard these safely, and that we will furnish you with two donkeys when you come down to us and a like number when you go back to the city.

Year 14 of Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Parthicus, Augusti, and Publius Septimius Geta Caesar Augustus, Payni 16.”

## NOTES.

1. Κρόταλα (*κρότοι*, Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, II, 4, 192) are “clappers” of some kind, which Clement distinguished from “cymbals.” Cf. P. Hib. 54 of 245 B.C., where the musical instruments required for a festival are a drum, cymbals and castanets (*τύμπανον καὶ κύμβαλα καὶ κρόταλα*). WILCKEN, *Chrestomathie*, 494, n. 17, is justified in his remark, “κρόταλα sind nicht Kastagnetten,” in the sense that the clappers were not chestnuts. In the general use of the word “castanet,” as a clapper-like instrument, this translation is the best that I can find. See DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, *Dictionnaire*, s.v., which requires, rather than discredits, the translation “castanets.”

This is the first appearance of the form *κροταλιστρία*. P. Oxy., III, 475, 18 of 182 A.D., has the third declension form *κροταλιστρίς*. But compare the form *ὄρχηστρία* for “dancer” in P. Grenf., II, 67.

2. The name of the first party of the contract, Artemisia, has become dim. The form ending in *-ιη* has appeared before. See PREISIGKE, *Namenbuch*, s.v. (1922).

7. Comparison with the similar contract P. Grenf., II, 67, ἀ]πὸ τῆς υγ Φαῶφι μηνὸς [κατ]ὰ ἀρχαίους makes the reading certain, though I was long in doubt about it. Mr. H. Idris Bell, of the British Museum, has kindly checked the reading of Grenfell, just quoted, and fully confirms it.

Κατ' ἀρχαίους. Another example of the late use of the old Egyptian year, *annus vagus*, as opposed to the fixed year introduced into Egypt by Augustus, with its intercalated day in each fourth year. Cf. P. Grenf., II, 67, n. 10.

8. Λαμβανόντων ὑμῶν. The masculine form of the participle is also used in P. Grenf., II, 67, although there, too, the parties of the second part, the two dancers, are women. The use of the masculine must, I believe, have some technical legal explanation and is not to be regarded as a mistake for *λαμβανούσων*, as the editors of P. Grenf., II, 67 assumed.

11. WILCKEN in reprinting P. Grenf., II, 67 (*Chrestomathie*, 497), found the reading *πυρο]ὑ ἀρτάβας* of line 14 uncertain. H. I. Bell later re-read it as *πυροῦ* (see F. PREISIGKE, *Berichtigungsliste*, I, 190). The payment of barley in our contract follows the money payment (also 36 drachmas per day in P. Grenf., II, 67), just as the wheat payment does in the Grenfell contract. There is no reason to doubt the reading *πυροῦ* of Grenfell-Hunt and Bell.

12. For ἀρτων ζεύγη as “pairs of bread loaves” see WILCKEN, *Griechische Ostraka*, 755-57. The Twins of the Serapeum (P. Lond., XIV, 22f.) were to receive eight loaves per day, *i.e.* four pairs. That is exactly the amount which the two dancers receive in our document, 24 pairs of bread loaves for 6 days, or 4 pairs of loaves per day. Evidently this

payment and the barley (also the wheat and ψωμία in P. Grenf., II, 67) are in lieu of "keep," or food, for the six days. Ψωμία developed the meaning of ἄρτος in late Roman and Byzantine times, TH. REIL, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Gewerbes im hellenistischen Aegypten*, 157, Leipzig, 1913.

16-17. Κατερχομένοις—ἀνερχομένοις. Compare the regular use of καταβαίνειν, "to go down" to a village from a city, and of ἀναβαίνειν, "to go up" into the city from a village. WILCKEN, *Chrestomathie*, No. 495.

#### DISCUSSION.

The closest extant parallel to the Cornell contract printed above is P. Grenf., II, 67 of 237 A.D. Its provenance and general content are the same—engagement of two dancers (ὄρχηστρίαι) from the city of Arsinoe in the Fayyûm for the celebration of a ten day (?) festival in the village of Bacchias. The difference in time between the two contracts is 31 years; but the money payment per day for the artists is the same, 36 drachmas. The general form is the same, both being χειρόγραφα of the letter-contract type. The technical phraseology and the sequence of the provisions of the contract are similar. There are, however, two outstanding differences in the two contracts. The first party in P. Grenf., II, 67, is a guild, or corporation, of Bacchias (συνόδου κόμης Βακχιάδος), its president (Ἀύρηλιου Ἀσκληᾶ ἡγουμένου) acting officially for the guild in the making of the contract. And the dancers in P. Grenf., II, 67 received an advance payment as earnest money, ὑπὲρ ἀραβῶνος .....(δραχμὰς) [.] β<sup>1</sup>.

The contract form for the hiring of dancers, and other minor artists remained constant for at least three decades at the beginning of the third century in the north-eastern corner of the Fayyûm about Philadelphia, as these two contracts show. This was to be expected. Legal phraseology in itself tends toward the stereotyped; and the habits of Egypt, particularly, were old habits. They had been tested pragmatically and their value approved by long experience. Why, then, change an adequate form?

This particular legal form had the following elements:

1. Address to the artist in charge of the group or company whose services were desired.
2. Request for services, the type of services being implied in the professional name of the artist, κροταλιστρίς, ὄρχηστρία. The verb λειτουργεῖν is colourless.
3. Number of days' services to be contracted for, with exact fixation of the date of beginning and closing of the festival concerned.
4. Payment for services.
5. Special conditions. In the Cornell document, obligation of the hiring party to insure the artists against loss of their professional wardrobe. In P. Grenf., II, 67, an advance on account to the artists.
6. Arrangements for transportation of the artists, from and back to their place of business.

The woman Isidora, party of the second part in our contract, was a dancer, known as a specialist in dancing with the castanets (κροταλιστρία). Living at the metropolis, Arsinoe, her services were contracted for by the woman Artemisia of the village of Philadelphia for

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the irrevocable earnest payment in a Rainer Papyrus mentioned by WESSELY, *Karanis und Soknopaei Nesus*, p. 26, paid to a flageolet player, an ἀραβῶν ἀναπόρριπος of 4 drachmas ἐπὶ τῷ ἀλλῆσαι τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ὄρον ἐφ' ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ.

a festival at her home, which was a private celebration only in the sense that it was paid for by Artemisia herself. Oxyrhynchus Papyri, III, 475 of 182 A.D. offers a clear picture of the semi-public character of these privately organized celebrations. It is a request for official inspection and report on the accidental death of a slave boy in the village of Seneptha near Oxyrhynchus. "Late yesterday afternoon, the sixth, while the festival was going on and the castanet dancers were giving their customary performance at the house of my son-in-law Ploution—Epaphroditus, his slave, aged eight, desiring to peep over from the roof of the same house and see the castanet dancers<sup>1</sup>, fell and was killed." The performances would necessarily, in view of village housing conditions in Egypt, be held in the open, either in the court yard or in the street, and be enjoyed by the people of the village.

This is a vivid glimpse into the intimate village life of Egypt in the second century of our era, as clean cut as that passage in Acts xx, 9 which tells of the young man who fell out of the window of a loft hall at Troas when Paul was preaching and so met his death. Of greater value is the information which can be gleaned, from the Cornell Papyrus published above and a group of related documents, upon the economic organization of professional entertainers in Roman Egypt and the character of the contracts which they made. Two of these, a contract for instruction in flageolet-playing, and a mutilated contract for an artist's services, are from the period of Augustus<sup>2</sup>. The remaining documents, ten in number if we include Cornell Inv., 26, fall within the second, third and early fourth centuries.

The professional entertainers lived, in all the cases in which their actual homes can be determined, in the cities, such as Arsinoe, Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis. This is most natural in view of the greater opportunities for employment in their professions which urban life offered<sup>3</sup>. In engaging the services of the entertainers it was customary for the person hiring them to make his contract with one or two professionals who, either singly or together, were in the business of hiring artists and grouping together temporary companies of them for the fulfilment of single contracts, or had their own organized companies whose services they completely controlled. To the first type of organization, in which the contracting artists would be in a rather difficult position regarding their help, we may assign P. London, II, 331 (pp. 154–5): "To Cosmas, Chief of the flageolet players<sup>4</sup>, from Satyrus, son of Satyrus, from the Island. I wish you to undertake, with three skilled gymnasts (?) and four maidens, to celebrate a festival in the above-mentioned village for six days<sup>5</sup>." It is thus that I should interpret the contract (P. Corn. Inv., 26) with Isidora the castanet dancer, who probably worked the small town festivals with some temporary companion. An organized company (*συμφωνία*) of artists appears in the contract P. Flor., 74, of 181 A.D.

<sup>1</sup> Θεάσασθαι τὰς κροταλιστρίδας. The verb and the whole setting of this document, and the garments and gold ornaments of the artists in the Cornell papyrus, show that these were dancers, not "castanet-players," as translated by the editors of the Oxyrhynchus document.

<sup>2</sup> B.G.U., IV, 1125 of 13 B.C. and P. Oxy., IV, 731 of 8–9 A.D.

<sup>3</sup> At Arsinoe: the castanet-dancers of P. Corn. Inv. 26; the flageolet-players of P. Grenf., II, 67; the flageolet-player, gymnasts and four little girls of P. Lond., II, pp. 154–5. At Hermopolis: the pantomimists and musicians of P. Flor., 74; the flageolet-player of *Stud. Pal.*, xx, 78. At Oxyrhynchus, the flageolet-player and other musicians of P. Oxy., x, 1275.

<sup>4</sup> I accept Wilcken's resolutions *πρω(νοη)τ(ῆ) ἀλλη(τριδων)* in *Chrestomathie*, 495, and his other suggestions for ll. 4–5.

<sup>5</sup> Probably the woman Pamounis of P. Geneva, 73, was not the head of a regular company. She makes the contract for herself "with three other dancers" (*παισταίς*, see WILCKEN in *Archiv*, III, 402).

with Sarapion and Phoibammon, pantomimists of Hermopolis, which reads, after the customary address: "I agree that you (two) have undertaken, with the entire company which you have of musicians and others, to render service for five days from Tybi 26th to the 30th .....in the before-mentioned village of Ibion." In P. Oxy., XII, 1275, of the third century, one Copreus is addressed in the contract as "head of a company of flageolet players and musicians" (*προεστῶς συμφωνίας ἀλλητῶν*), and the contract is for the services of Copreus himself and his company<sup>1</sup>. Our contracts are with people living in the villages. They deal, one may surmise, with the second-raters of the profession. In the cities greater artists were hired as individuals. Such, at least, is the impression given by two accounts which we have from Oxyrhynchus, P. Oxy., III, 519 and VII, 1050. They are both public accounts. In the one case a mime, a Homerist, and a dancer are listed as being paid individually, but the musicians are grouped. In the other, a flageolet player, a mime and a Homerist appear separately in the payment list.

On the understanding developed above, that there were companies of professional entertainers in Egypt which were fairly permanent in their organization, I offer a new interpretation of P. Oxy., IV, 731, of 8 A.D. It was regarded by the editors as a contract for the professional services of some kind of an artist<sup>2</sup> for a year's term. So far as it goes this is correct. The artist contracted that his services were to be available upon the ninth and tenth of every month, and for two additional days at the Isis festival and three days at the time of "the Stars of Hera," a total of 29 days during the year. The large number of days of service to be rendered and the fact that he is to receive a fixed salary of 40 silver drachmas for the year leads to the conclusion that the artist was contracting his services for a year's time to the business managers<sup>3</sup> of an entertainment company (*συμφωνία*). But the document itself gives the information that it is an antichretistic pledge of these services<sup>4</sup> in lieu of interest upon a money loan made to the artist the nature of which was recorded in the missing first part of the contract. It is for this reason that the professional entertainer says, "in consideration of which I shall give you my services monthly on the 9th and 10th<sup>5</sup>." Because of the complicating character of the antichresis in this agreement and the fact that the amount of the loan is lost, it is difficult to use the document for the purpose of determining the relative rate of pay of artists. It is useful as being the only example as yet extant to show that the antichretistic contract was employed in hiring artists as well as apprentices to weavers and nailmakers<sup>6</sup>.

Acknowledging the peculiar character of the contract P. Oxy., IV, 731, it still has points of interest which may be safely deduced and applied to the study of the entertainer class. The contract of services was to run for a year, for three fixed periods, the ninth and tenth of each month, the Isis festival (2 days), and the festival of the Stars of Hera (3 days). The

<sup>1</sup> In P. Grenf., II, 67, the contract is also made with a person who furnishes two dancers, but does not himself go to the village.

<sup>2</sup> As proven by the mention of the two festivals and the verb *λειτουργήσω*, l. 4, as in P. Corn. Inv., 26, l. 5.

<sup>3</sup> More persons than one were mentioned as parties of the second part in this contract as shown by *ἐμῖν*, l. 4, and *ἔχετε* and *δώσετε* later in the contract.

<sup>4</sup> P. Oxy., VII, 731, 13-14, *ἡ ὁμολογία τῆς <(α)>παραμονῆς*. For the *παραμοναί* agreements see WILCKEN, *Papyruskunde*, I, 1, 261; MITTEIS, *Papyruskunde*, II, 1, 67, n. 6; H. LEWALD, *Zur Personalexekution*, 13 ff.

<sup>5</sup> P. Oxy., IV, 731, 5-7.

<sup>6</sup> P. Teb., I, 384 and *B.G.U.*, 1124. Cf. WESTERMANN, *Apprentice Contracts in Class. Phil.*, IX, 296, 300.

ninth and tenth were busy days in the profession, presumably because they were feast days of some kind. For these 29 days' service<sup>1</sup> the artist was to receive a fixed sum of 40 silver drachmas, and 13 silver drachmas 2 obols as *ὀψώνιον*, which must be understood in its original meaning of "allowance for food." If the artist is needed by the company beyond the stipulated number of 29 days, he is to be hired by the day at the same rate, 1 drachma 2 obols. This provision is evidently put in so that the company head may be in a position to meet unexpected calls. For the opportunities offered to the artists of meagre attainments were not confined to the public and private festivals. Wessely has published a contract (*Stud. Pal.*, XIII, 6, xx, 78) between a flageolet player and a wine-growing farmer in which the musician agrees to work with the wine-treaders, playing to them throughout the period of the vintage. Obviously, as Wessely suggested, he supplied the rhythm for the movements of the vintagers in their work. This is to be regarded as an "efficiency" or "speeding up" process, as it is called in American industry, rather than as a mere means of entertainment for the vintagers. The relation between rhythm and labour movements among primitive peoples, lasting well down toward the period of modern machine industry, has long since received comprehensive treatment by Karl Bücher<sup>2</sup>. The ancient Greeks were accustomed to use the flageolet to give the rhythm for the movements of the vintagers in treading grapes and grain, for which there was an especial musical composition customarily used<sup>4</sup>. One is not warranted, however, in drawing the conclusion that the use of the flageolet as an aid in industrial processes, as it thus appeared in Ptolemaic-Roman Egypt, was specifically an innovation in Egypt brought in by the Greek conquerors. Rhythmical labour was equally well-known in Pharaonic Egypt.

The contract just discussed (P. Oxy., iv, 731) for the hire of an artist's services for a year by entrepreneurs differs only slightly from one modern type of contract which actors make with booking agents. Often the modern agents guarantee to hire an actor for a specified number of weeks at a stated sum per week. This amount the booking agents are required to pay, whether they are able to book the contracting actor or not. As I understand the Greek contract<sup>3</sup> the artist has a guarantee of 29 days of work and his pay of 40 drachmas per year. He does, however, forfeit 1 drachma 2 obols per day for each day of the specified 29 days on which he does not work. This seems to be nothing more than a measure to avoid loss on the part of the entrepreneurs in case of sickness of the artist or other unavoidable cause of failure to meet the terms of the contract. The guarantee by the heads of the company is not, apparently, affected thereby. The company head is not relieved from the contractual obligation of paying for the 29 days' work, except in the case when the artist fails to meet his obligation of doing the required work.

Some idea of the rate of pay of these artists may be obtained by analysis of the documents concerned. The artists furnished their equipment, such as instruments, costumes and gold

<sup>1</sup> Really counted as thirty days in making up the total payment for the year. See the editors' note to ll. 8-9.

<sup>2</sup> P. Oxy., iv, 731, 10-11, ἐφ' ᾧ [δ]ώσετέ μοι κατ' ὀψώνιον ἀργυ(ρίου) δραχμ[ᾶς δεκ]ατρῖς δύο ὀβόλους. The restoration of δεκ]ατρῖς is no doubt correct. It is to be observed that the food allowance is thus fixed at just  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the total money payment (40 drachmas) for the 29 days of the contract.

<sup>3</sup> In his *Arbeit und Rhythmus*, Teubner, Leipzig, 1909.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 39 f., where the references are cited. Cf. the terra-cotta group of four women kneading bread, with a flageolet player giving the rhythm (original in the Louvre), reproduced by Bücher as Pl. II.

<sup>5</sup> My interpretation differs slightly from that of the editors.

ornaments (as in P. Corn. Inv., 26, 14–15)<sup>1</sup>. P. Hibeh, 54<sup>2</sup>, of 245 B.C., despite its early date, may be taken as typical of the customary instruments and costumes furnished. A well-to-do Greek writes to a friend asking him to send a flageolet player, and requests that the artist bring flageolets of a particular type, the Phrygian<sup>3</sup>, along with the others. If it is necessary the friend is to advance the money to the player for the purchase of the Phrygian flageolets. The giver of the festival wishes also the presence of a particular artist, an effeminate<sup>4</sup> named Zenobius, who is to bring a drum, cymbals and castanets; and his costume was to be “as elegant as possible.”

The artists customarily required in the contracts that transportation to and fro, in case they went out into neighbouring villages, be furnished them. In P. Corn. Inv., 26, one donkey was supplied for each of the two artists; in P. Grenf., II, 67, three donkeys for two dancers, the third animal evidently carrying the instruments and properties. The presidents of the village of Souis in P. Oxy., x, 1275, in arranging for a public festival in the village, agreed to furnish ten donkeys for a flageolet player and his company of flageolet players and other musicians. Only four donkeys were furnished for eight persons in P. Lond., II, 331 (pp. 154–55), the eight including a flageolet player, three gymnasts and four girls.

The question of the amount of pay received by the artists is difficult to determine. The absolute amount is retained in six different documents. The pay is, in most cases, contracted for both in money and in kind. The “double loaves of bread” which appear in a number of the contracts were no doubt used immediately by the artists as food during the period of the festivities. This is made clear in P. Gen., 73 (WILCKEN, *Chrest.*, 496). The contracting agent of four dancers, who signed them up for seven days for the festival of a guild in the village of Philadelphia in the Fayyûm, makes the following arrangements for the services of his group: “I am to receive from you (the head of the guild) on account of money payment<sup>5</sup> 28 drachmas daily, you feeding us and furnishing suitable entertainment<sup>6</sup>, and as honorarium<sup>7</sup> three artabas of dates from the guild.” The requirement of food stands here in the place commonly taken in the contracts by the arrangement for double bread loaves. The wheat, barley, dates, raphanous oil and vinegar which appear in various contracts must be figured as an element of the earnings of the artists rather than as a part of the food supplied. Herein lies the difficulty of determining the relative wage-earning power of these entertainers.

The following table is arranged so as to supply a survey of the material which may be useful in giving a solution to the problem:

<sup>1</sup> Costly dress and ornaments of the mimes, HERMANN REICH, *Der Mimus*, 158–9, Berlin, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> WILCKEN, *Chrestomathie*, 477.

<sup>3</sup> *Tibia Phrygia*, DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, s.v. *tibia*, v, 312 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Μαλακός* seems to refer to a definite type of professional dancer. The editors of P. Hibeh, 54, call attention to the *cinaedus malacus* of PLAUTUS, *Miles Glor.*, 668. Possibly the *μαλακός* was a male dancer who dressed as a woman and executed feminine dances.

<sup>5</sup> Ἴς μισθοῦ λόγον.

<sup>6</sup> *Ξενίαν ἐπιτήδειον*, which must refer to lodging, as the context shows. This is the only case where lodging is expressly mentioned in the contract. Unfortunately the papyrus is incomplete, so that it is impossible to say whether the artists may have furnished their own transportation, by jackass, as an offset to the lodging furnished to them.

<sup>7</sup> *Τιμή*. See WILCKEN, *Chrest.*, 496, “Ehrensold.” There is a clear distinction made here between *μισθός*, the money payment, and *τιμή*, the honorary present, as also in P. Oxy., VII, 1025, 19–20. Although the *τιμή* had probably been regarded, originally, as a gift to the artists, in these contracts it has become an essential part of the contractual arrangement. Economically and legally it is a payment in kind. Realistically translated it would be a “commodity payment,” as opposed to *μισθός*, the money payment.



Document	Date	No. of Artists	Length of contract	Total Payment	Average money payment if equally distributed	Ordinary wage of a labourer for com- parison <sup>1</sup>
P. Lond., II, 331 pp. 154-55 WILCKEN, <i>Chrest.</i> , 495	165 A.D.	1 flageolet player 3 gymnasts 4 dancing girls	7 days	40 drachmas per day	5 drachmas per day each	143 A.D.-162 A.D.; 1 drachma 2 obols
P. Flor., 74	181 A.D.	2 pantomimists with musicians and others	5 days	36 drachmas per day 30 double loaves bread and 4 small loaves <sup>2</sup>	18 drachmas per day each	178/9 A.D., labourer, 1 drachma 2 obols
P. Oxy., III, 519 WILCKEN, <i>Chrest.</i> , 492	second century	1 mime 1 Homerist musicians 1 dancer	not given	- 497 drachmas (total) - 448 drachmas (total) - amount lost - 1(?) <sup>4</sup> drachmas (total)	cannot be deter- mined	
P. Gen., 73 WILCKEN, <i>Chrest.</i> , 496	second-third century	4 dancers	7 days	28 drachmas per day 3 artabas of dates	7 drachmas per day each	second century, donkey driver, 1 drachma 4 obols
P. Corn. Inv., 26	206 A.D.	2 castanet dancers	6 days	36 drachmas per day 24 double loaves bread 4 artabas of barley	18 drachmas per day each	215 A.D., brick- layer, $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachmas
P. Grenf., II, 67 WILCKEN, <i>Chrest.</i> , 497	237 A.D.	2 flageolet players	10 (?) days	36 drachmas per day 15 double loaves bread 3 artabas of wheat	18 drachmas per day each	
P. Oxy., X, 1275	third century	1 flageolet player and company of flageolet players and musicians	5 days	140 drachmas per day 40 double loaves bread 8 kotylai of raphanous oil 1 jar of wine 1 jar of vinegar	cannot be deter- mined	
P. Oxy., VII, 1025 WILCKEN, <i>Chrest.</i> , 493	end of third century	1 mime <sup>3</sup> 1 Homerist	customary number of days	customary money payment and payments in kind		

<sup>1</sup> For the examples cited in this column see table II of Louis Wessr, *The Cost of Living in Roman Egypt* in *Classical Philology*, xi, 1916, 304.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ ἐν βουκέλλαις τέτραπας, cf. the Latin *buccellae*.

<sup>3</sup> Βουκόλιος. SCHUBART, *Einführung*, p. 400, describes this person as a "character actor."

As a comparison of a different nature there may be placed against the flageolet players' pay of P. Grenf., II, 67, the daily wage of a skilled labourer, namely a shipwright, in P. Flor., I, 69, amounting to 7 drachmas. This document is dated as of the third century<sup>1</sup>.

In drawing inferences from the comparisons made above, several disturbing factors must be considered :

1. In determining the daily rate for entertainers the sum must be distributed over two additional days, namely the time lost in travelling to and fro between villages and metropolis.

2. With this the fact must be considered that a portion of the expense for food for the entertainers was supplied.

3. The payment in kind must be added to their money wage.

4. The higher rate taken by the head of the company of artists requires a deduction from the daily wage of the employed artist. This is a factor impossible to estimate.

The rough impression which one gains of the great difference in pay of artists as against day-labourers is probably more apparent than real. Perhaps the best point of departure is, after all, the antichretistic contract of 8/9 A.D. discussed above (P. Oxy., IV, 731) with the artist who obtained a guarantee of 29 days' work during the year. This performer received pay at the rate of 1 drachma 2 obols per day with a food allowance of 13 drachmas 2 obols for the entire year. This allowance distributed over 30 days (which is the actual basis of calculation for the year's pay) brings the pay of the artist up to 1 drachma  $4\frac{2}{3}$  obols. To this there must still be added the indeterminable amount of the interest of the loan which is now lost in the earlier part of this antichretistic contract<sup>2</sup>. Hazarding a rough guess, the addition for interest would bring the performer's pay to about two drachmas a day. With this pay the best comparison is the wage of weavers,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  asses per day, and of a master weaver, 6 asses per day, in a Latin papyrus of 1 A.D.<sup>3</sup> The equivalents in the Graeco-Egyptian coinage are  $5\frac{1}{4}$  obols and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  drachmas<sup>4</sup>. On this calculation the ordinary entertainer, under contract with the manager of a company, received about twice the pay of a common weaver and about 25 per cent. more than a master weaver. Obviously the bulk of the earnings of the organized entertaining companies went to the entrepreneurs.

From the available sources it is possible to obtain only a vague idea of the relative economic standing of different types of artists within the profession. From Oxyrhynchus of the second century, Christian era (P. Oxy., III, 519), we have a fragmentary list of payments made by the city officials for festival entertainment. Assuming that they were all hired for the same period, the mime received 496 drachmas and a Homerist 448 drachmas. In the list there follows a payment "on account of music" (amount lost) and that for a dancer. The reading of this last item is not certain; but it seems to lie between one hundred and two hundred drachmas. P. Oxy., VII, 1025, of the late third century, is a contract for the hire of a mime, here called a *βιολόγος*, and a Homeric reciter. These two performers had been hired frequently for the same festival by the same city<sup>5</sup>. In consequence the terms of the contract were that they were to serve for the usual number of days and for the usual money payment and emoluments in kind. Significant here is only the fact that the order of the two is the same as in P. Oxy., III, 519, the Homerist following the mime. This order

<sup>1</sup> A. SEGRÉ, *Circolazione Monetaria*, Rome, 1922, 116-17.

<sup>2</sup> This point was missed by LOUIS WEST in *Classical Philology*, XI, 304, table II.

<sup>3</sup> P. Oxy., IV, 737.

<sup>4</sup> LOUIS WEST, *l.c.*, 295.

<sup>5</sup> P. Oxy., VII, 1025, 10-12, ἐξ αὐτῆς ἤκετε καθὼ[ς] ἔθος ὑμῖν ἐστιν συναγγυριδεῖν.

is also followed in P. Oxy., VII, 1050, col. II. In this document the payment to a flageolet player appears listed with those made to a boxer, a theatre guard, a sprinkler, and the temple slaves.

The popularity of the mimic artists and the high financial rewards which they received are well known<sup>1</sup>. Counting six days for the festival at Oxyrhynchus recorded in P. Oxy., III, 519, the mime would be receiving pay at the rate of 82½ drachmas per day, the Homerist at the rate of 74½ drachmas. Counting ten days for the festival which by Wilcken's reading of P. Grenf., II, 67<sup>2</sup> is the longest recorded festival noted in artists' contracts, they would be paid at the following rate per day: mime 49½ drachmas, Homerist 44½ drachmas. Obviously these artists were, as a group, much more highly paid than dancers and musicians, probably also more highly regarded in the public esteem<sup>3</sup>.

Hermann Reich has expressed the belief that the mimists did not presume to demand a place in the guilds of Dionysiac artists<sup>4</sup>. Among the members of the Dionysiac guild of Ptolemais, however, we find listed a cithara player, a singer to cithara accompaniment, a dancer, a flageolet player for tragic performances, and a trumpeter<sup>5</sup>. If the lower classes of artists, including even the castanet dancers, gymnasts, flageoletists and other musicians who appear in our village and small city contracts, did not have access to the more respectable Dionysiac associations, they must surely have had their own social-industrial groups. The number and character of these associations already known in Egypt<sup>6</sup> is sufficient warrant for this supposition.

Training for the musical profession was obtained by apprenticeship of a boy, either slave or free, to a trained performer. The only apprentice contract in the musical *techné* which we have<sup>7</sup> is unfortunately mutilated. Nevertheless, it gives an astonishing impression of the degree of specialization which existed in the musical profession. Just as Isidora, the dancer of the Cornell contract, was a specialist in castanet dancing, so the slave boy Narcissus is to be instructed in certain musical specialties which are clearly defined in the apprentice contract. He is to know four tunes (?)<sup>8</sup> on the double Lydian flageolets, two of these to be arranged as accompaniments to other instruments. He is to have also at his disposal five tunes<sup>9</sup> on the syrinx and on another Egyptian instrument of the flageolet type

<sup>1</sup> REICH, *Der Mimus*, 159-62. The noted Dionysia of whom Cicero spoke in his defence of Quintus Roscius the comic actor, *pro Roscio comoedo*, 8, was a dancer, not a mimist as Reich says. GELLIUS, I, 5, 3, calls her a *saltatrix*.

<sup>2</sup> In *Chrestomathie*, 497.

<sup>3</sup> WILCKEN, *Grundzüge*, 421, has made the interesting observation that there was a marked difference between the village festivals and those of the cities, the latter being more distinctively Greek (Homerists, mimists, etc.), the former retaining in much higher degree old-Pharaonic characteristics (dancers, flageolet players, etc.). He feels that the difference noted arises from the stronger Greek element in the cities. The fact, so far as our present materials go, is only that Homerists and mimic actors do not appear in the villages. This can be fully explained on the simple ground of the high payments demanded by the Homerists and mimes and the lower cultured niveau of the villagers. It is to be noted that the dancers and musicians lived in the cities and presumably found much work to do there, as I suggested earlier in the paper.

<sup>4</sup> REICH, *Der Mimus*, 27.

<sup>5</sup> DITT., *Or. Gr. Ins.*, I, 51, 30 ff., cf. SAN NICOLÒ, *Aegyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, I, 46.

<sup>6</sup> See San Nicolò's study, quoted above.

<sup>7</sup> *B.G.U.*, IV, 1125 of 13 B.C. Cf. WESTERMANN, *Apprentice Contracts in Class. Phil.*, IX, 295 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Μαγὰδ(ο) . . . ἀπ(ι)α*, *B.G.U.*, IV, 1125, 21.

<sup>9</sup> *Λειτουργί(α)ς*, "accomplishments" actually, 23.

which is unknown to me<sup>1</sup>. Two of these are to be adapted as accompaniments. Further he is to be taught two accompaniments to go with cithara performances for the Serapis festivals (?); four more accompaniments and six more musical numbers which appear to be for solo rendition. Two of these are for the Phrygian flageolets which have already been mentioned as special instruments (P. Hibeh, 54).

This teaching contract for flageolet playing is filled with technical expressions. It clearly needs a complete interpretation, on the basis of Schubart's readings, by a musically trained scholar. If I am not greatly mistaken two of the compositions are to be arias (*κρούματα*) played on the longer, or left hand, reed of the double tibia, which usually carried the *κρούσις* or accompaniment<sup>2</sup>. The period of training in this contract seems to cover not more than six months<sup>3</sup> which would imply that the slave had already some mastery of the rudiments of the instrument before entering upon his technical training<sup>4</sup>. The contract calls for a testing of the musical candidate by three persons of technical proficiency who are to be selected by agreement between the two parties to the contract. Economically considered the contract shows that teaching the *μουσικὴ τέχνη* was another source of revenue for accomplished performers. The remuneration received by the master flageoletist in this instance amounts to 100 drachmas<sup>5</sup>. In view of this contract and the numerous apprentice contracts in the banausic crafts<sup>6</sup> it is scarcely doubtful that the dancing profession was recruited by similar business-like methods.

No more contracts with professional entertainers appear among the published papyri after the end of the third century. Even the words *αὐλητής*, *ὄρχηστρία*, *κροταλιστρίς* and the like, cease to appear in the later documents. These facts do not prove by any means that dancing and musical entertainments ceased in Egypt with the development of an anti-hedonistic attitude fostered by Christian ascetism. The fact of the non-appearance of entertainer contracts may be due entirely to the Tyche which rules papyri finds, just as, for that matter, no contract with an artist has so far appeared from the three centuries of the Ptolemaic rule in Egypt. Reich has shown how the stage-production of the mime continued in the fourth century, even in Jerusalem itself, despite the thunderings of the Church Fathers against the mime and its actors<sup>7</sup>. The same thing must have held true of the performances of the lesser artists such as Isidora and her companion of the city of Arsinoe whose vocation it was to bring pleasure into the toilsome lives of the Egyptian villagers.

<sup>1</sup> *Τερεῖτη*, 23, *Αἰγυπτίους τερεῖταις*, 4.

<sup>2</sup> L. 31, *ἐναριστεροῖς κρούματα β*. See DAREMBERG-SAGLIO, s.v. *tibia*, v, 318, and cf. *tibia dextra* and *tibia sinistra* in Varro, *de re rust.*, I, 2, 15-16.

<sup>3</sup> L. 6, 33.

<sup>4</sup> Horace in the *Ars Poetica*, 414, says: qui Pythia cantat tibicen, didicit prius extimuitque magistrum.

<sup>5</sup> L. 5, 32.

<sup>6</sup> Article on *Apprentice Contracts* in *Class. Phil.*, IX.

<sup>7</sup> *Der Mimus*, 747 ff., 787 ff.

## A MUSICIAN'S CONTRACT

(An Appendix to the above)

BY H. I. BELL

As an appendix to Prof. Westermann's valuable article it seems well to publish the text of a contract in the British Museum which belongs to the same class as P. Corn. Inv. 26. I should indeed have preferred to delay publication till I could clear up one or two doubtful points of reading, but the desirability of making Prof. Westermann's material complete outweighs the objection to publishing the text in its present condition.

The papyrus, which was acquired in 1911, was apparently undated (see ll. 22-3, n.), but it formed part of a group of documents from the muniments of a family (citizens of Antinoopolis, though resident in the Fayyûm) whose genealogy can be traced, and the Philosarapis here concerned was the son of a Lysimachus who in 133 was 7 years old and brother of a Heraclides *ὁ καὶ* Valerius who in 151 was 20 days old. He himself was active in the reigns of Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta. We may therefore date this contract about the end of the second century, and it cannot be far removed in time from the Cornell papyrus. Probably the third year referred to is that of Severus.

Contract with Flageolet Players.

Tebtunis

A.D. 194 (?).

P. Lond. Inv. No. 1917.

7 inches × 4 inches.

Αὐρηλίῳ [Ὁ]νωφρι [αὐ]λητῆ τὴν ἐργασίαν

παρὰ [Α]ὐρηλίου Φιλοσα[ρά]πιδος Λυσιμά-  
 χου Ἀντινο[έως]. ἐορτ[ῆς] οὔσης ἐν κώ-  
 5 μη Τεπτού[ν]ι [καὶ] εὐ[ωχ]ομένων ἡ-  
 μῶν ἀπὸ τῆ[ς] κῆ [τ]ῆ [δ]ντος μηνὸς  
 Φαῶφι τοῦ[τ] ἐρεστῶ[το]ς γ (ἔτους) ἔτι τε καὶ  
 κλι. . . ξο[ν]τός μου [ἄμ]α ἐτέροις βού-  
 λομαί σαι [π]αραλαβ[εῖν] σὺν ἐτέροις  
 10 τρισὶ τελε[ί]οις λιτο[υ]ργήσαντας ἐπὶ  
 ἡμέρας ἕξ λαμβαν[όν]των ἡμῶν  
 παρ' ἐμοῦ ὑπὲρ μι[σ]θ[ο]ῦ ἐκάστης ἡ-  
 μέρας δρα[χ]μᾶς δ[έ]κα ὀκτὼ λιτουρ-  
 γούντων ἡμῶ[ν] ἄν[ευ] μισθοῦ  
 15 ἄλλην ἡμέραν μ[όνη]ν ἀλλὰ καὶ δώ-  
 σω ὑμῖν ὑπὲρ θαλ[ί]ων δραχμᾶς ἕξ  
 καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν ὑπ[ὲρ] ἀν[α]βάσεως  
 καὶ καταβάσ[εως] δραχμᾶς δύο ὅσα  
 δὲ [ἐ]ὰν κατέ[ρ]χ[ε]σθε] ἔχοντε(ς) ἀργα-  
 20 λε[ῖ]α τῆς αὐτ[ῆς] τέχνης ταῦτα σῶα  
 ὑ[μ]ῖν ἄπ[αντα] ἀποδώσομεν.

Αὐρή[λιος . . .]. ρ . σω . αβ

υ[ ]

9. l. σε. 11. υ of υμων corr. from η. 12. ε of εμου corr. from α. 13. δραχμας perhaps corr. from δραχημν.

"To Aurelius Onnophris, flageolet player by trade, from Aurelius Philosarapis son of Lysimachus, citizen of Antinoopolis. Since there is a festival in the village of Tebtunis and we are feasting from the 28th of the present month of Phaophi in the present 3rd year, and moreover I am giving a banquet (?) along with others, I wish to engage you with three other fully trained performers, to perform for six days; you to receive from me for wages eighteen drachmas per day and to perform without wages one other day only. Moreover I will pay you as a gratuity six drachmas, and I will pay you for your journey up and down two drachmas; and whatsoever implements of your said craft you bring with you we will return to you in safety."

## NOTES.

8. The word at the beginning is difficult. *κλιν* is certain and *ο[ν]τος* is unavoidable. After *ν* (which is confused by the down-stroke of the *φ* of *Φαῶφι*) is a straight up-stroke like *ι* followed by what may be *ε* or *α*. The next letter is either *ζ* altered to *ξ* or *ξ* altered to *ζ*, preferably the former. *κλιναρχούντος* cannot be read. On the whole the least unsatisfactory solution is to regard the stroke after *ν* (which is in a fold of the papyrus) as a set-off from the down-stroke of *φ* or an error and to take the letter following as *α*, thus reading *κλινάζοντος* (or *κλινάξοντος* as a future) in the sense "holding (or presiding over) a banquet"; but it cannot be said that this is a very probable conclusion.

16. *θαλλίων*: cf. P. Oxy., XII, 1481, 7, n.

19. Not wholly satisfactory. P. Corn. Inv. 26 suggests that *κατενέγκητε* or some part of the verb should be read, but the space seems clearly too large for it. Even to read *κατε[ν]ε[ν]γ[χ]ουτε* (*sic*) = *κατενέγγωνται* as a barbarous passive<sup>1</sup> hardly fills the lacunae.

22-3. I can at present make nothing of this. It should be the subscription of one of the parties (though apparently in the same hand as the rest) or the date. The last seems quite impossible, and I cannot read either *Φιλοσάραπης* or *Ὀννώφρις*. In l. 23 *ὑ[μᾶς]* or *ὑ[μῶν]* is suggested, but then what precedes? There is a blank space below l. 23 and no trace of a dating clause.

<sup>1</sup> In P. Corn. Inv. 26, 12 f. I would correct to *κατενέγκητε* and render "(if) you bring down."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT

## A. POPYRI (1922-1923)

By H. IDRIS BELL

[I HAVE again to thank Mr. TOD and Mr. NORMAN H. BAYNES for references; and I should like to add a word of gratitude to the many scholars whose kindness in sending me copies of their works has so materially lightened the labour of preparing this bibliography. As before, I have not referred to articles in such works as PAULY-WISSOWA-KROLL or, as a rule, to brief reviews and notices which add nothing to the subject dealt with.]

## 1. LITERARY TEXTS.

[Omitting religious and magical works, for which see § 2.]

*General.* There is this year no volume of literary texts from Oxyrhynchus to record. *P. Oxy.* xv, noticed by me last year, has been reviewed by M. CROISSET (*Journ. des Savants*, N.S., xx, 1922, 261-6), C. O. ZURETTI (*Riv. di Fil.*, N.S., I, 1923, 101-6), U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF (*D. Lit.-Z.*, XLIII, 1922, 313-7), W. N. STEARNS (*Class. Journ.*, xvii, 1922, 477-8), and A. KOLAR (*Listy Filol.*, XLIX, 1922, 297-9; not accessible to me; see *Aegyptus*, iv, 93, no. 2865).

Two small collections of literary texts have, however, been published. The first, by W. CRÖNERT, consists mainly of unpublished papyri but includes one text already published. They are:—i. Euripides, *Alexander* (P. Strassb. 2342, 2343, 2344). Three fragments, 1st cent. B.C. Attempted reconstruction of portions and discussion of plot. ii. Papyrus containing a collection of lyrics from dramas, viz. (i) *Phoenissae*, (ii) *Medea*, (iii) unknown. Strassb. WG. 304-307 (four pieces). Cartonnage. There may be other "ungelöste Mumienreste." Only partially copied. Late Ptolemaic. iii. Passage from the *Orestes* quoted by Demetrius Laco. P. Hercul. 1012. iv. Unidentified tragic fragments. Strassb. 1917 (2nd or 3rd cent.), 1313 (beginning of Roman period). v. Fragments of a comedy, a dialogue between an Athenian and a Spartan, apparently containing a criticism of Spartan policy, probably between 404 and 395 B.C. Interesting. Strassb. 2345. Early 3rd cent. B.C. vi. (On the verso of ii.) An anthology. Quotes some lines in praise of a royal officer. CRÖNERT thinks they are from a Comedy. vii. Republishes the Freiburg "Macedonian Dialogue" (P. Freib. 2). CRÖNERT explains the curious format on the theory that the work was written not by professional literary scribes but by "Kanzlisten" for their employer, who gave them odd bits of papyrus; no doubt the leaves should have been stuck together later. Gives new text and notes. As to the text itself, CRÖNERT determines the two sides, viz. Antipater and Cassander with Menaechnus and Sterope against Olympias with Mnesippus and Callistratus. The dialogue takes place soon after Alexander's death. The intention was probably to exalt the Alexander ideal (which was specially prominent under Trajan). The writer had good sources. (For REITZENSTEIN's article on this see below, under *Drama*, p. 150.) viii. Fragment of Lycurgus, *Katà Μεγεσαίχμου εισαγγελία*. P. Berol. 11748. 2nd-3rd cent. A facsimile of i is given. *Griechische literarische Papyri aus Strassburg, Freiburg und Berlin*, in *Nachr. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1922, 1-46.

The second is a selection of literary papyri from the already splendid papyrus collection of the University of Michigan, edited by J. G. WINTER. The texts are:—(i) Homer, *Iliad*, xviii, 439-617. Collation only. A good typical text. The papyrus is written in a good calligraphic hand of the 2nd-3rd cent. P. Mich. 2. (ii) An epic fragment, perhaps Hesiod, *Eoëae*. Facsimile. A good hand, which WINTER dates "2nd or 3rd century A.D."; I should myself be inclined to place it not very late in the 2nd. Text and translation, with notes. P. Mich. 11. (iii) An anonymous treatise on the use of myth, called on the verso *Περὶ μύθων*. The format is curious, the text being written on both sides of the papyrus, in each case in one broad and one narrow column. (Qu. a codex?) WINTER thinks the text is a student's or professor's notes, or an epitome of some sort, which seems likely. The date is probably the 3rd cent. Text, translation, and notes. P. Mich. 6. *Some Literary Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection*, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LIII (1922), 128-41.

POWELL and BARBER's *New Chapters (Journal, VIII, 1922, 83)* has been reviewed by É. CAHEN (*Rev. ét. gr.*, XXXV, 1922, 463-5; laudatory), A. TACCONI (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXIX, 1922-3, 129-31; favourable; regrets tendency to ignore Italian work), and by A. K[OLAR] in a periodical not accessible to me (*Listy Filol.*, XLIX, 1922, 249-50; see *Aegyptus*, III, 372, no. 2589).

F. G. KENYON has published a very interesting and instructive article on the literary texts found at Oxyrhynchus, using them to illustrate the state of culture and literary resources of a typical (if somewhat superior) Egyptian metropolis. *The Library of a Greek of Oxyrhynchus*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 129-38.

A. KÖRTE has issued another of his valuable reviews of recently published literary papyri. Only the first part of this, ending with the orators, has yet appeared. *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen*, in *Archiv für Pap.*, VII, 114-60.

PR[Æ]SIGKE (?) reviews DEUBNER's *Bem. zu ein. lit. Pap.* (*Journal*, VII, 1921, 89) in *Lit. Zentralbl.*, LXXIII (1922), 851, and WILCKEN, in a review of M. NORSI's *Elenco di opere letterarie (Journal, VIII, 1922, 83 f.)*, takes the view that the papyrus is a catalogue of a library, with a list of *desiderata*. *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 112.

*Epic poetry and mythological literature*. In no. CLXXIV of his *Lesefrüchte (Hermes, LVIII, 1923, 73)* WILAMOWITZ publishes some textual notes on P. Amh. II, 16 (Apollonius, *Argonautica*, I, 776-94). In *B.G.U.* VI (see below, § 3, p. 158) is published an ostrakon (no. 1470) of the 3rd/2nd cent. B.C. containing Homer, *Od.*, I, 1-7.

H. J. M. MILNE has edited in full, with brief notes, the fragmentary but (from the point of view of literary history) very interesting P. Lond. 273, containing an epic on the Indian adventures of Dionysus, one fragment of which, with a description and discussion of the whole, had previously been published by KENYON. *Dionysiaca*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 3-10. MILNE's text is followed by an article by WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, discussing the epic. *Zu den Dionysiaca*, pp. 11-16.

R. GANSZYNIEC recognizes in P. Oxy. 670 a hymn on the freeing of Hera from the magic chair into which she had been entrapped by Hephaestus. ΗΡΑΣ ΛΥΣΙΣ, in *Arch. f. Religionsw.*, XXI (1922), 498-9.

In the article *Papyruskunde* mentioned below (§ 7, p. 168) W. SCHUBART publishes, to illustrate the methods employed by editors of literary papyri, an unpublished fragment (P. Berol. 13426 verso) containing a narrative of the Orpheus legend. It contains 21 lines and dates from the first half of the 2nd cent. (p. 42 of the article).

*Lyric poetry*. EDMONDS's *Lyra Graeca*, I (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 97) has been reviewed by A. C[ALDERINI] (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 221-2), P. SHOREY (*Class. Phil.*, XVIII, 1923, 188-9), and E. BETHE (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 55-8). All three reviewers, while recognizing the merits of EDMONDS's volume, deplore the extensive "restorations" which he permits himself. I noticed last year (*Journal*, IX, 97) EDMONDS's reply to LOBEL's unfavourable criticism of the volume. He has now published in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* (CXXI-CXXIII, 1922, publ. 1923, 11-14) a fuller account of those parts of his paper (dealing with metre and the Aeolic dialect) which were curtailed in the *Classical Review*.

EDMONDS has also communicated some replacings of fragments of the great Bacchylides papyrus, giving new restorations and new readings of certain passages. *Some Notes on the Great Bacchylides Papyrus*, in *Class. Rev.*, XXXVII (1923), 148-9. E. ORTH proposes to read in Bacchylides, XVIII (XVII), 16 (the "Theseus") δόμ]ον for the νέ]ον of PALMER. *Bacchylideum*, in *Hermes*, LVIII (1923), 459-60.

G. COPPOLA has published an article on the fragments of Alcaeus, in which, after general remarks on the poet's genius, he comments in detail on a number of poems, of which he gives texts. *Su Alceo di Mitilene*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 283-95. An article by C. THEANDER is inaccessible to me. *Zu den Στρασιωρικά des Alkaios*. *Strena Philologica Upsaliensis, Festschrift Persson*, 1922 (see *Sokrates*, XLVIII, 1922, 184). E. L[OBEL] has fitted together nine fragments of the Alcaeus papyrus P. Oxy. 1233, now in the Bodleian, thus producing one column complete in height though not in breadth and part of another. With the help of a scholiast on Theocritus he gets three complete lines towards the bottom of col. 2. He gives a new reading in fragment 4 of the papyrus. *Nine Fragments of Alcaeus (P. Oxy. 1233)*, in *Boll. Quart. Record*, IV, 20-1.

A volume devoted to Alcaeus and Sappho by P. PASELLA (*I frammenti di Alceo e di Saffo*, Roma, n.d. 8°. Pp. 30) I know only from a review by A. TACCONI (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXIX, 1922-3, 20; "un lavoretto... assai tenue e di nessuna pretesa" but "non va privo di pregi"). Equally inaccessible is a translation of the fragments of Sappho by G. LANGE. *Die Fragmente der Sappho*, München, Musarion-Verlag, 1922. Pp. 73 (see *Aegyptus*, III, 375, no. 2643). E. BIGNONE discusses P. Oxy. xv, 1787, fr. 1+2, ll. 24, 25, proposing in the first line παιδοθε for Hunt's ζήσοχα or δη μάλα or άδύ γε. *Sopra un frammento di Saffo di recentissima scoperta*, in *Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXX (1923), 66-7.



*Elegiacs, Epigrams, Satire, Panegyric.* An article by V. DE FALCO, in which he collects the references to Archilochus in the Herculaneum papyri, may be briefly referred to here. *Archiloco nei papiri ercolanesi*, in *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 287-90.

I noticed last year two new editions of Callimachus. I have this year to record a further one. This is a volume of the Loeb Library, in which A. W. MAIR edits Callimachus and Lycophron, while G. R. MAIR adds an edition of Aratus. Many of the papyrus fragments of Callimachus are included. Pp. viii+644. 2 star-maps. This volume is reviewed by J. SITZLER (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 265-8) and (along with PFEIFFER's *Call. Fragmenta* and *Kallimachosstudien*; see *Journal*, IX, 1923, 98) by E. A. BARBER (*Class. Rev.*, XXXVII, 1923, 2-5) and (along with CAHEN's edition; *ibid.*) by A. ROSTAGNI (*Riv. di Fil.*, N.S., I, 237-41). CAHEN's edition is also reviewed by A. DELATTE (*Bull. Bibl. et Péd. du Musée Belge*, XXVII, 1923, 17-18) and PFEIFFER's edition by the same (*ibid.*, 19) and his *Kallimachosstudien* by J. SITZLER (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 145-8). A. D. KNOX, in the volume mentioned below, includes a chapter on the papyrus of Callimachus's *Iambi* (P. Oxy. 1011), in which he rejects many former readings and suggests new ones.

In the *Class. Rev.* (XXXVII, 1923, 91-2) has been published a report of a paper read by A. D. KNOX to the Oxford Philological Society on Feb. 9, 1923, on P. Bodl. f. 1 (p), P. Lond. 155 verso, P. Heid. 310, in which he developed his view of the relation of these papyri and the nature of the work they contain. He has since published, under the title *The First Greek Anthologist: With notes on some Choliambic Fragments* (Cambridge University Press, 1923. Pp. xiv+37. 3s. 6d. net), a longer and more detailed work on the same subject, in which, after a short introduction, he gives a revised text of the fragments with new readings by himself and H. J. M. MILNE and a textual commentary, and follows this by a discussion of the work. He here develops more fully his view that it is an anthology, compiled by Cercidas, of passages from the dramatists (both tragic and comic) "and at least the more sententious choliambic writers." He recognizes portions of the work in other papyri, e.g. *Berl. Klass. Texte*, v, 2. It was, in his opinion, the first anthology, and, being widely circulated and very popular as a quarry for quotations, thus displacing the works from which it was compiled, it helped in the decay of Greek letters. He gives a verse translation<sup>1</sup>.

J. G. MILNE has published an ostrakon containing twelve iambic lines, written in uncials of the 2nd century. They consist of detached gnōmai, forming an alphabetic acrostic, A to M. MILNE suggests that they were perhaps a literary exercise. *A Gnomi Ostrakon*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 156-7.

F. SCHEMMEL, in an article on the great legal school of Berytus, refers to the panegyric poem in the *Berliner Klassikertexte* (v, 1). *Die Schule von Berytus*, in *Phil. Woch.*, XLIII (1923), 236-40.

*Drama.* In the *Ichneutae* of Sophocles, ll. 280-282, R. RAU proposes to read ἐξ ὑπρίας κλιθεῖς ἐμχανή-σατο | τοῖονδε θηρὸς ἐκ θανάτου ἡδονῆς | ἔμμεστον ἀνατίθηλε καὶ κατώδυνον. *Sophokles Ichneutai 281 f.*, in *Phil. Woch.*, XLIII (1923), 989-91. In l. 125 of the same play L. RADERMACHER proposes, in place of τ[ι τοῦτ' ἰύζεις;], the reading τ[ι τοῦθ' ἰύζεις;], pointing out that ὦ ὦ is to be distinguished from ἰύ. *Sophokles Ichneutai 125*, in *Wiener Studien*, XLII (1920/21), 81-2.

N. WECKLEIN, using the Petrie papyrus fragments as well as the others, makes an attempt to reconstruct the plot of the *Antiope* of Euripides. *Die Antiope des Euripides*, in *Philologus*, LXXIX (1923), 51-69. I know only from an entry in the *Class. Rev.* and reviews by N. WECKLEIN (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 993-5; laudatory) and E. LOBEL (*Class. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 1924, 43; important; communicates some new combinations of fragments and consequent readings) an annotated edition of the *Hypsipyle* by G. ITALIE. *Euripidis Hypsipyla cum notis criticis et exegeticis*. Inaug. Diss., Leiden. Berlin, E. Ebering, 1923. Pp. xii+80. Inaccessible to me is also an article by A. KOLAR on the Firmin Didot fragment attributed to Euripides, which, as recorded by me last year (p. 98), has recently been claimed as a fragment of Menander's *Epitrepontes*. *Nový zlomek Menandrových Epitrepontu*, in *Listy Filol.*, I (1923), 18-24, 94-8; see *Aegyptus*, IV, 104, no. 3062; 236, no. 3443.

This brings me to Menander, who, as usual, claims a good deal of attention. ALLINSON's edition (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 86) is reviewed by A. KÖRTE (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 73-5; rather unfavourable; "einen wesentlichen Fortschritt bedeutet sie nicht"). In an interesting article (which however does not seem to add very much to what was generally agreed before) M. ANDREWES draws a detailed parallel between Menander and Euripides, showing the former's debt to the latter alike in his general attitude to life, in his plots and construction, and in single scenes and lines. *Euripides and Menander*, in *Class. Quart.*, XVIII (1924), 1-10. In a detailed article on the *Samia* E. WÜST agrees with WILAMOWITZ that the two fragments

<sup>1</sup> A propos of KNOX's remark (p. 1) about the title of P. Lond. 155 verso I would ask: need there have been a title here at all? The regular place for the title was at the end of a roll; it might be given at the beginning also, but this was not obligatory.

belong to the latter part of the play. His view of the disputed part of the plot is as follows: Chrysis had a child, which she is ordered to expose. Finding out Moschion's love for Plangon, she determines to tell Demeas of this and persuade him to agree to their marriage by saying that Plangon has had a child by Moschion. Moschion is then to bring the exposed child (Chrysis's) into the house as his own. He shows how this hypothesis helps towards the understanding of what follows. *Die Samia des Menandros*, in *Philologus*, LXXVIII (1923), 189-202. G. COPPOLA has published an article on Menander in which he deals with the *Colax*. After discussing P. Oxy. 409, of which he gives a revised text and a translation, with notes and a general commentary, he passes on to the materials elsewhere which furnish evidence for a reconstruction of the drama. On p. 153, in a foot-note, he gives a revised text of ll. 585-95 of the *Ἐπιτρέποντες*. *Studi Menandrei*. I. *Intorno al ΚΟΛΑΞ di Menandro*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 137-55. In a previous article he had discussed the fragment P.S.I. 99, trying to prove that it comes from the *Ναύκληρος*. He gives a reconstruction of it, which however is very hazardous, as the lines are so imperfect, and his theory that Straton was the *ναύκληρος* involves an alteration in l. 3 of Fr. 348 which seems unnecessary. *Ἡ ΝΑΥΚΛΗΡΟΣ di Menandro e il pap. Soc. It. 99*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 49-56. F. G. ALLINSON explains that in his Loeb edition of Menander he abstained from including the fragment P.S.I. II, 126 because he did not feel sufficiently certain that it belongs to the poet. He discusses the question of authorship and while not unfavourable to the Menandrian attribution prefers to leave it open. He gives a translation and the text of ll. 60-87 with notes. *On a fragment of Greek Comedy attributed to Menander*, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LII (1921), 69-81.

There are again several Herodas items. The great HEADLAM-KNOX edition (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 98 f.) has been reviewed by W. D. WOODWARD (*Class. Phil.*, XVIII, 1923, 77-9; "a singularly thorough and exhaustive piece of work"; various suggestions and corrections), A. TACCONE (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXIX, 1922-3, 149; favourable), and (along with GROENEBOOM's edition) G. MURRAY (*Class. Rev.*, XXXVII, 1923, 38-40). GROENEBOOM's edition has also been reviewed by G. ITALIE (*Museum*, Leiden, XXX, 1922-3, 257-60). W. R. HALLIDAY corrects a slip of KNOX and HEADLAM on p. 161 of their edition, showing that according to Porphyry, *de antro nympharum*, "the tongue as well as the hands was purified with honey" in the Mithraic mysteries. *Herodas, Mimes III 93*, in *Class. Rev.*, XXXVII (1923), 115. In chapter III of his *First Greek Anthologist* referred to above KNOX corrects various errors in HEADLAM's edition, the result of further reflection or re-examination of the papyrus. E. KALINKA discusses the identification of the temple visited in Mime IV and the division of the parts, and offers some suggestions for reading or interpretation. *Herodas, in Aus der Werkstatt des Hörsaals (Stzgsber. Wien. Ak., 197. Bd., 6. Abh., Wien, 1922, A. Hölder)*, 3-10. G. LUMBROSO, in one of his delightful letters, shows, from many parallels, that *ἐὺδῖν* in Mime I, 28 is to be taken literally, of the climate, not metaphorically, as HEADLAM takes it. *Lettere al Signor Prof. Breccia*, XLI, in *Bull. de la Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, 19, N.S., v, 103-13. In a letter to WILCKEN (*Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 60, letter LXIX) he calls attention to the occurrence (in varying order) of the phrase *δόξα καὶ πλοῦτος καὶ δύνανται*, in both the Pseudo-Aristeas and Herodas I, 26. It is "un frammento del gergo ellenistico." A verse translation of the Mimes by Q. FANUCCI (*I mimiambi di Eronda, scene della vita greca*. Firenze, La Nave, 1923. Pp. 70) is not accessible to me (see *Aegyptus*, IV, 104, no. 3054).

The bibliography in *Aegyptus* (IV, 236, no. 3446) refers to an article on the Oxyrhynchus mimes by K. FÜRST. *Zlomky reckych mimu novejsi dobou objevené*, in *Listy Filol.*, I (1923), 84-94.

I have referred above (under the heading *General*) to the re-publication by CRÖNERT of the "Macedonian Dialogue." R. REITZENSTEIN appends to CRÖNERT's edition of this and other literary papyri a note on the dialogue, in which he develops his view that it is a late tragedy set to two pupils to paraphrase in prose. They chose (or were set) different portions. Olympias was the heroine. At the end of this note CRÖNERT expresses his objections to REITZENSTEIN's theory, with arguments which have force indeed but do not seem conclusive. *Zu dem Freiburger Alexander-Papyrus*, in *Nachr. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, 1922, 189-96.

*Music*. The Christian hymn with musical notation published as P. Oxy. xv, 1786 has, naturally, attracted instant attention. R. WAGNER discusses it from the musical standpoint, speaking well of it ("überall verrät sich eine kunstverständige Hand...Keines der früher bekannten Denkmäler zeigt solchen melodischen Reichtum"), and also deals with the text. *Der Oxyrhynchos-Notenpapyrus*, in *Philologus*, LXXIX (1923), 201-21. A note by H. L[IEZMANN] on the papyrus, giving words and music in ancient and modern notation, appears in *Z. neut. Wiss.*, XXI (1922), 236-8, where is also a reference to an article on the subject by H. ALBERT in the (then) latest number of the *Zeitschr. f. Musikwiss.* On the subject of this papyrus see also below, § 2, under the heading *Christianity*.

An article by A. K[OLAR?] on the Berlin musical papyri is inaccessible to me. *Nový nález recké hudby na berlinském papyru*, in *Listy Filol.*, XLIX (1922), 250-1 (see *Aegyptus*, III, 376, no. 2669).

A popular article on the surviving specimens of ancient Greek music has been contributed by H. I. BELL to a Welsh musical magazine. *Specimens of Ancient Greek Music*, in *Y Cerddor Newydd*, III (1924), no. 25, 3-5.

*Historical writers.* A recent addition to the useful series of *Kleine Texte* (and by no means the least useful of the series) is a collection of the smaller historical fragments on papyrus, edited with commentary by FR. BILABEL. The plan of the work excludes, on the one side, such larger and separately published works as the *Athenaion Politeia*, the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, and the like, and, on the other, quotations in the Didymus commentary and such bits of historical information as may be found in biographies, school texts, etc. Fourteen texts are given, including two unpublished ones, no. 11, a fragment of a Manetho epitome, found by BILABEL at Qarâra, and a fragment from the Berlin collection (P. Berol. 13361), of rather uncertain character. There are indexes of geographical and personal names. The little volume will be very useful to historical students. *Die kleineren Historikerfragmente auf Papyrus*. Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1922. (*Kleine Texte*, Nr. 149.) Pp. 64.

KENYON's new edition of the *Athenaion Politeia* (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 86) is reviewed by G. COLIN (*Rev. ét. gr.*, XXXV, 1922, 107-8).

E. L[OBEL] has recognized that P. Oxy. IV, 680 refers to Solon's travels. He thinks the work too concise to be a life of Solon. The fragment is interesting because it shows that one version of the story made Solon go to Soli in Cilicia not Cyprus. (The papyrus is at Manchester, not in the British Museum, as LOBEL, by a slip of the pen, states.) *An Historical Fragment in the British Museum*, in *Bodl. Quart. Record*, IV, 96.

U. WILCKEN points out (*Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 66) that in P. Oxy. XV, 1798, the anonymous Alexander history, the episode of the hungry king and the bread must refer to Darius, not (as the editors took it) to Alexander. He further quotes authorities for the hostility between Parmenio and the physician Philip. Elsewhere he has edited a Berlin papyrus (P. Berol. 13044) containing an account of the well-known interview between Alexander and the gymnosophists. In this article he first discusses various recently discovered MS. authorities on the history of Alexander, and then gives the text of the new papyrus, with a full commentary. He thinks that the legend originated with the Cynics. If his theory is right the papyrus (the date of which is about 100 B.C.) is important as throwing light on the development of the Alexander romance. *Alexander der Grosse und die indischen Gymnosophisten*, in *Stzgsber. Pr. Ak. Wiss.*, 1923, XXIII, 150-83. *À propos* of this article, G. VITELLI publishes an advance *erratum* to the as yet unpublished P.S.I. VII. After reading WILCKEN he has recognized in P.S.I. 743 (a papyrus containing a Greek text in Latin script) a fragment of a similar narrative of the interview with the gymnosophists. He publishes a revised text of the fragment. *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 314-5.

A. CALDERINI, in an article on the biographical papyrus P. Oxy. XV, 1800, discusses the principle of the collection, showing that there is a similar scheme of arrangement in each life. He suggests that the work was "uno scritto di uso scolastico, appartenente forse ad un maestro di scuola," and discusses in special detail the lives of Sappho and Aesop. *Di un nuovo testo biografico nei papiri di Ossirinco (P. Oxy. XV, 1800)*, in *Rend. R. Ist. Lomb.*, LV (1922), 1-6 of off-print.

*Orators.* The most important item under this head is the latest volume of the *Berliner Klassikertexte* (Heft VII, *Rhetorische Papyri*, ed. by K. KUNST. Berlin, Weidmann, 1923. Pp. 38, 3 plates), which consists entirely of rhetorical texts. This part is issued in a new format, uniform with the new form of the *B.G.U.*, which, though perhaps due to motives of economy, is handier to use than the old. It includes three papyri only, of somewhat unusual length, none of them by any identifiable author. The first, a papyrus of the 3rd cent. B.C., is a rhetorical exercise in the form of a speech by Leptines in his own defence. The second, of the 1st cent. B.C., contains two works, the first, of which only the conclusion remains, ending in the eulogy of a Hellenistic king, perhaps a Ptolemy; the second is both longer and more interesting, being a dialogue, similar to the "Macedonian dialogue." The scene is laid at Pella, and the subject is the arrest of the Athenian Demades and his son Demeas in consequence of the discovery of compromising documents in the papers of Perdiccas. He is accused by the Corinthian Dinarchus. The third papyrus, which is dated 3rd/4th cent., contains a declamation on the subject of foreign relations. It is of little interest, and is of less extent than the other two. A facsimile of one column of each papyrus is given.

E. LOBEL, in mounting the new Lysias papyrus P. Oxy. XIII, 1606, which was assigned to the Bodleian, has succeeded in combining some more of the fragments, and communicates the results in the *Bodl. Quart. Record*, IV, 47-8.

A re-edition of G. SETTI's edition of the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, which I know only from a brief review by A. C[ALDERINI] (*Aegyptus*, III, 1922, 361), makes use of the papyrus evidence for the text, particularly that of P. Oxy. v, 844. *Isocrate, Il Panegirico, comm. da G. SETTI, 2<sup>a</sup> ed. con modificazioni ed aggiunte di D. Bassi*. Torino, Chiantore, 1922. Pp. liv+115. L. 11.

A. KÖRTE, by the help of P. Oxy. XIII, 1607 (the Hyperidean authorship of which he rejects), establishes the date of Hyperides, *pro Lycophrone*, as B.C. 333. *Die Zeitbestimmung von Hypereides' Rede für Lykophron*, in *Hermes*, LVIII (1923), 230-7. WILAMOWITZ devotes no. CLXXII of his *Lesefrüchte* (*Hermes*, LVIII, 1923, 61-9) to this orator. The article is mainly a literary appreciation.

*Philosophy*. H. J. M. MILNE has identified P. Lond. 184, acquired in 1891 and published in *Archiv f. Pap.*, II, 368, no. 125, as part of the *Symposium* of Xenophon and as belonging to the same roll as P. Giss. I, 1. He republishes the text, which, as in Giss. I, is a good one. *A fragment of Xenophon's Symposium VIII, 6-9*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 41-2.

E. BIGNONE, in an article on P. Oxy. xv, 1797, accepts the editors' identification of it as part of the Περὶ Ἀληθείας of Antiphon. He gives a translation, with some textual notes, and discusses both this and the previous Antiphon MS., P. Oxy. 1364. *Sopra un nuovo papiro della verità di Antifonte Sofista*, in *Riv. di Fil.*, N.S., I (1923), 145-66, 309-32. The earlier papyrus, Oxy. 1364, is the subject of a note by H. SCHÖNE in *Rhein. Museum*, LXXIII, 2 (reference in *Class. Quart.*, 1923, 111).

CHR. JENSEN has published, with elaborate excursus, the fifth book of Philodemus, Περὶ Πουμάρων. He gives the text, a translation, an index of words, and then a commentary in three chapters, viz.: "Neoptolemos und Horaz"; "Zur Poetik des Stoikers Ariston von Chios"; "Zur Poetik des Krates von Pergamon." Indexes follow. *Philodemos über die Gedichte, fünftes Buch*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1923. Pp. xi+178. The volume has been twice reviewed by D. BASSI (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 223, and *Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXX, 1923, 76-7) and (along with a work which I take this opportunity of referring to: H. M. HUBBELL, *The Rhetorica of Philodemus: Translation and Commentary*, in *Trans. of the Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, XXIII, 243-382. New Haven, 1920. \$1.20; rather severely criticized) by J. L. STOCKS (*Class. Rev.*, XXXVIII, 1924, 32-3; laudatory).

*Science, Medicine, and Mathematics*. A noteworthy publication under this head is an edition by O. O. KRÜGER and G. F. TSERETELI of a medical papyrus at Moscow (P. Med. I, Alexander III Museum). It originally belonged to V. S. GOLENISHCHEV, and was first published in 1903 by A. G. BEKSHTEM. There are two fragments, now for the first time combined, thereby enabling fresh readings and supplements to be made. The date is the 2nd cent. The papyrus contains a pharmacopoeia and medical recipes alphabetically arranged. The editors give parallel passages from Dioscorides and Pliny. They decide against the hypothesis, suggested by the first editor, that it is the original work of Sextius Niger. *Meditsinski Papirus*, in *Bull. de l'Acad. des Sc. de Russie*, 1918 (Petrograd, 1918), 1261-78. (For a synopsis of the Russian commentary I am indebted to Mr. H. J. M. MILNE.)

C. BONNER has published an article on a very important Dioscorides papyrus at the University of Michigan (P. Mich. 3). It is the more important, because it has on the verso a date corresponding to the year A.D. 191, which takes it back near to the time of Dioscorides himself. (Incidentally the papyrus has palaeographical importance, for it is written in a hand of the sloping angular type which one would naturally attribute to the 3rd century.) The textual importance of the MS. proceeds from the fact that it agrees remarkably with E, and hence modifies WELLMANN's conclusions. As usually in the case of papyrus texts, the new evidence shows the necessity of an eclectic text, and the danger of following one authority or group of authorities exclusively. *A Papyrus of Dioscorides in the University of Michigan Collection*, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, LIII (1922), 142-68. 1 plate.

FR. BILABEL publishes some interesting fragments of a cookery book (P. Heid. Inv. Nr. 1701 a, b, c). There are recipes on both sides of the papyrus, those on the recto being of the 3rd, those on the verso of the 4th/5th cent. (an unusually long interval of time between recto and verso if these datings are correct). The author is unknown. BILABEL, in his introduction, discusses ancient cookery books in general. Texts, translation, and commentaries follow. At the end P. Heid. Inv. Nr. 1001 a, b, containing Latin recipes, is published. It is doubtful whether this is a cookery book or something in the nature of a *De re rustica*, particularly perhaps a treatise on viticulture. The second supposition is perhaps the likelier. Facsimiles of both papyri are given. ΟΥΡΑΥΤΥΤΙΚΑ und Verwandtes (*Mitteil. a. d. Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, 1). *Stzgsber. Heid. Akad.*, 1919, 23. Abh. Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1920. Pp. 33. 3 plates.

F. E. ROBBINS has published a Michigan papyrus (P. Mich. 621) containing tables of fractions similar to those in the well-known Akhmim mathematical papyrus or those published in CRUM and BELL's *Wadi*

*Sarga*. He refers to a brief description of the papyrus by L. C. KARPINSKI in *Isis*, v (Oct., 1922), 20-5. *A Greco-Egyptian Mathematical Papyrus*, in *Class. Phil.*, xviii (1923), 328-33.

*Romances*. LAVAGNINI'S *Origini del romanzo greco* (*Journal*, viii, 1922, 88) has been reviewed by P. DONNINI (*Athenaeum*, Pavia, N.S., I, 1923, 146-52), G. A. PIOVANO (*Riv. di Fil.*, N.S., I, 1923, 248-50), G. MUNNO (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, xxix, 1922-3, 53-6), B. E. PERRY (*Am. Journ. of Phil.*, xlv, 1923, 371-3; "thoroughly convincing and scholarly"; "his main conclusions are likely to stand the test of time and criticism"), and J. C. (*Listy Filol.*, 1923, 61, not accessible to me; see *Aegyptus*, iv, 104, no. 3051, where other reviews are also cited).

I know only from a review by B. LAVAGNINI (*Aegyptus*, iv, 1923, 224-5) a work by F. ZIMMERMANN on the *Chariton* MS. first published by WILCKEN. *De Charitonis Codice Thebano*. Diss. Inaug., in *Philologus*, lxxviii (1922), 330-81, separately published, Tübingen, 1922, pp. 57. ("Esso è la base per quella nuova edizione del romanziere la cui necessità è oggi vivamente sentita fra quanti si occupano di questo campo di studi.")

For a possible romance fragment edited by BONNER see below, § 2, under the heading *Magic*.

*Literary criticism, grammar, etc.* E. L[OBEL], having in the course of mounting P. Oxy. xiii, 1611, the work on literary criticism, now in the Bodleian, made some combinations of fragments, communicates the result and prints a part of the text in its new form, with notes. He also gives a new reading of a scholion in the Alcaeus papyrus P. Oxy. xi (misprinted as x), 1360, fragm. 3. *Bodl. Quart. Record*, iv, 47-8.

F. JACOBY, in view of a Phylarchus quotation in Athen. viii, 333 A proposes  $\beta\epsilon\rho\chi\upsilon\iota\varsigma$  in P. Oxy. xv, 1801, 43 (the glossary). After  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\delta\alpha\varsigma$  he wonders whether  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \beta\lrcorner\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  can be read. *P. Ox. 1801 und Phylarchos*, in *Hermes*, lviii (1923), 239-40.

## 2. RELIGION, MAGIC, ALCHEMY, ASTROLOGY.

(Including Texts.)

*Pagan cults*. TH. HOPFNER has now published the second part of his valuable *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae* (*Fontes Historiae Religionum*, Fasc. II, Pars II, Bonnae, Marcus et Weber, 1923. Pp. 147-271), the first part of which I noticed last year. The new part covers the authors from Horace to Plutarch. Part III will continue the collection to Porphyry. Part I has been reviewed by A. WIEDEMANN (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 265-6), F. W. v. BISSING (*Phil. Woch.*, xliii, 1923, 615), G. RADET (*Rev. ét. anc.*, xxv, 1923, 72), Part II by G. RADET (*Rev. ét. anc.*, xxv, 285; the reviewer's name is misprinted "Trade"), and the two parts together by T. E. PEET (*Class. Rev.*, xxxvii, 1923, 188).

HOPFNER has also published a useful general article (originally a lecture in the "Urania" at Prague, 3 Feb., 1922) on Greek mysticism. *Griechische Mystik*, reprinted from *Theosophie*, xi (1922), 3/12. Leipzig. Pp. 34.

A collection of Orphic fragments by O. KERN, which contains the papyrus fragments, among others the interesting ritual published by SMYLY as P. Gurob I, is at present inaccessible to me. *Orphicorum fragmenta*. Berolini, Weidmann, 1922. See *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 236, no. 3447. I may, in this connexion, add a passing reference to KERN'S previous volume *Orpheus* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1920. Pp. 69. 2 plates). In his *Papyrus magiques grecs de Paris* referred to below under the heading *Magic* S. EITREM refers (p. 11<sup>1</sup>) to the appearance of a third edition of O. WEINREICH'S well-known work *Eine Mithras-liturgie*, with readings by K. PREISENDANZ.

A long and very important review of HOPFNER'S *Geheimlehren von Iamblichus* (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 101) by W. SCOTT appears in *Journal*, ix, 243-51.

PREISIGKE'S *Vom göttlichen Fluidum* (*Journal*, vii, 1921, 96-7) has been reviewed by G. ROEDER (*Lit. Zentralbl.*, lxxiv, 1923, 614) and M. PIEFER (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 264; cannot accept PREISIGKE'S views; thinks he has taken a path which "notwendig in die Irre führt"); his *Gotteskraft* (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 100) by H. LEISEGANG (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 378-9; favourable); and both works together by A. JACOBY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, iii, 1922, 415-21; on the whole laudatory; welcomes PREISIGKE'S treatment but thinks he exaggerates his theory, and points out difficulties, etc.).

TH. REINACH has published an article, the value of which need not be emphasized for those who know the author's work, on some of the articles in the *Gnomon* papyrus which concern the Egyptian religion. *De quelques articles du "Gnomon de l'Idiologie" relatifs au culte égyptien*, in *Rev. Hist. Rel.*, lxxxv (1922), 16-25. He there refers to an important article on the same subject by P. ROUSSEL in *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel.*, vi (1920), 326 ff., which I am unable to see.

A very important work by FR. v. WOESS on the institution of asylum in Graeco-Roman Egypt was projected from the juristic point of view and therefore strictly belongs to § 6 below; but since v. WOESS has advanced a new theory of the much-disputed *κατοχή* in the Serapeum papyri something must be said of the book here. The author, on this matter, takes up a middle position between SETHE and WILCKEN. With the latter he emphasizes the *religious* factor as against SETHE's view that the *κατοχή* was a kind of arrest for debt, but he agrees with SETHE in regarding the *κατοχή* as an undesirable position. He reconciles the two points of view by his ingenious and extremely well argued theory that it was another name for asylum; the *κάροχοι*, including Ptolemy, were refugees, whether from justice or from the vengeance of private enemies, who found a refuge within the sanctuary of the temple precincts. His argument is a very strong one, but it has weak places, and though it is at present hazardous to dogmatize, I confess myself, on the whole, unconvinced<sup>1</sup>. *Das Asylwesen Ägyptens in der Ptolemäerzeit und die spätere Entwicklung. Mit einem Beitrag von...E. Schwartz.* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung, 5. Heft.) München, O. Beck, 1923. Pp. xii + 282. K. SETHE, in a review of WILCKEN's *U.P.Z.*, I, i, devotes a good deal of space to an examination of WILCKEN's view, in the main upholding his own theory, though in a note (p. 113<sup>2</sup>) he accepts v. WOESS's view. His argument, the tone of which is commendably free from dogmatism or asperity, is extremely important, and the strength of some parts of it must be admitted; but again I am not entirely convinced, particularly after reading the appendix to *U.P.Z.*, I, ii (see below, § 3), in which WILCKEN replies to both v. WOESS and (more briefly) SETHE. SETHE's review in *G.G.A.*, 1923, 106-23.

VON GRONINGEN's monograph on P. Oxy. 1380 (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 89) has been reviewed by P. ROUSSEL (*Rev. ét. anc.*, xxv, 1923, 71) and G. LAFAYE (*Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxv, 1922, 100-1); praises execution, but does not accept the author's thesis). C. C. EDGAR calls attention to a marble relief found at Cairo, which gives a representation of a temple, no doubt that of Astarte mentioned in P.S.I. v, 531. He also publishes a Greek inscription of the Early Ptolemaic period illustrating the worship of Hathor as Aphrodite at Kom Abou Billou. *Miscellanea*, I and II, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, xix (1923), 114 ff.

An important publication is one by R. REITZENSTEIN on the Greek text of the Tefnut legend. This text is contained in the fragmentary papyrus P. Lond. 274, described but not published by KENYON, and was copied by CRÖNERT. REITZENSTEIN, who acknowledges the help of CRÖNERT and of SPIEGELBERG, who translated the Demotic version, gives the text in a diplomatic transcription and in modern form, with a translation of the corresponding portions of the Demotic. He appends an interesting discussion of the story itself and of the *genre*, the importance of which he emphasizes. *Die griechische Tefnutlegende.* (Stzgsber. Heid. Akad., 1923, 2. Abh.) Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1923. Pp. 31.

W. SPIEGELBERG explains that the Egyptian *Klnd-pt-hrd* = "*Klnd*, das Kind" is Greek Κο(λ)λάνθης, the personal name. *Der Gott-Kolanthes (Klnd)*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LVIII, 1923, 155-6.

In the course of some *Note epigrafiche* (*Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 129-31), E. BRECCIA discusses the cult of Apollo at Alexandria, the religious connexions of the word ζωθήκη, and the priest of Alexander; also (p. 127) the cult of Dionysus.

For a papyrus which throws light on the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus see below, § 3 (notice of my *Notes on Early Ptolemaic Papyri*).

In a note on the narrative of the burial of the Patriarch Jacob in *Gen.*, I, 2 ff., W. SPIEGELBERG shows that the Jahvist narrator of the Joseph story had good knowledge (at second hand) of Egyptian customs. In particular he illustrates from Egyptian and papyrological sources the custom by which the physician was also an embalmer. *Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen., 50, 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägyptischen Quellen*, in *Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi (1923), 421-4.

*Christianity. Biblical and theological texts.* A publication (if it is a publication) of some Septuagint fragments by G. RUDBERG is at present inaccessible to me. *Septuaginta-fragmente unter den Papyri Osloenses*, in *Videnskapselsk. Forhandl.*, Kristiania, 1923, -no. 2. Pp. 8, 1 plate. (See *Aegyptus*, iv, 345, no. 3607.)

I have referred above to SPIEGELBERG's note on the *Genesis* narrative of Jacob's burial.

S. G. MERCATI compares with 2 *Petr.* 2, 22, Ostr. Berol. 12319 and a saying of Heraclitus. *Note papirologiche*, in *Biblica*, III (1922), 451-4 (note 7). For the New Testament see also below, § 8.

<sup>1</sup> For example, on p. 149 the explanation given of the phrase ἐν κατοχῇ in the case of persons not in permanent κατοχή seems to me weak. I cannot feel that the honour accorded to κάροχοι as such is satisfactorily reconciled with the sanctuary theory (pp. 149-51). The argument on p. 153 does not convince me. The facts mentioned on p. 160<sup>1</sup> are against v. WOESS's theory except on his supposition that Ptolemy had fled for fear of "Blutrache"; and for that supposition there is no evidence whatever.

EVELYN WHITE's edition of the Sayings of Jesus is reviewed by J. G. MACHEN (*Princeton Theol. Rev.*, xx, 1922, 334-6).

H. LIETZMANN has published a fragment of an apocryphal Gospel. It consists of two leaves of a codex (P. Berol. 11710), written in a hand of the 6th century or (probably) later. The passage is a conversation between Jesus and Nathanael. The most noteworthy point in the text is perhaps the occurrence of the curious form  $\delta \rho\alpha\upsilon\beta\acute{\iota}\varsigma = \text{Rabbi}$ . *Ein apokryphes Evangelienfragment*, in *Z. f. d. neut. Wiss.*, xxii (1923), 153-4.

A reference may be made in passing to the discovery by PETRIE at Kau in Upper Egypt of an early (4th cent.) codex of St. John's Gospel in Coptic. Specimen leaves were shown in the exhibition at University College last summer, and a note on the MS. appears in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 45.

A. NEPPI MODONA has published an article on recent Christian texts from Oxyrhynchus. These are:— (i) *L'“Apologia” di Aristide e il nuovo frammento d'Ossirinco*. On P. Oxy. xv, 1778. He gives an account of the history of the work of modern scholarship on the *Apology*, with the text of the new fragment, the *Barlaam and Josaphat* and Syriac texts in the same passage, and textual notes. (ii) *L'innologia cristiana primitiva*. On P. Oxy. xv, 1786. He gives a brief sketch of the history of Christian hymnology, mentioning other early hymns in papyri, adds an account of early music and of other musical papyri, and reproduces the text, with the music in modern notation. (iii) *Un frammento della “Didache” in un nuovo papiro di Ossirinco*. On P. Oxy. xv, 1782. He sketches the history of the work and the problems which centre round it, and reproduces the papyrus text. (iv) *Il “Pastore d'Erma” in un recente papiro d'Ossirinco*. On P. Oxy. xv, 1783. Account of the work and the problems concerning it, with text of the papyrus, etc. The article makes no additions to knowledge, but furnishes a useful conspectus of the material. *Documenti della primitiva letteratura cristiana in recenti papiri d'Ossirinco*. (*Estratti Rivista “Bilychnis,”* II S., 1923.)

The fragment of the *Apology* of Aristides dealt with by MODONA in the above article has quickly been followed by another and much larger and more important fragment. This is a papyrus acquired by the British Museum in 1922 (P. Lond. Inv. No. 2486). It consists of two leaves from a papyrus codex of the early 4th cent. Though forming a single sheet of papyrus, the leaves are not continuous, but formed the outside leaves of a large quire. The first contains part of the *Song of Songs*, the second part of the *Apology*, thus showing that the volume included both works—a curious combination. The Aristides portion has been edited by H. J. M. MILNE. It bears out in the main the conclusions formed by GRENFELL and HUNT on the basis of the Oxyrhynchus fragment, showing that the *Barlaam and Josaphat* text is considerably abbreviated and therefore an inadequate guide to the original form, but that it is faithful so far as it goes, while on the other hand the Syriac version, though reproducing the original much more adequately, is verbose and not always accurate. *A new Fragment of the Apology of Aristides*, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxv (1923), 73-7.

The *Didache* fragment referred to in MODONA's article is the subject of short notes by B. H. STREETER (*Didache*, I, 3-II, 1, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxv, 1923, 78; calls attention to the fragment as illustrating the diffusion of the work in Egypt) and by H. LIETZMANN (*Z. f. d. neut. Wiss.*, xxi, 1922, 238). I may mention in this connexion that the British Museum last year acquired a much larger fragment (3 columns) of a Coptic version of the *Didache* (late 4th or early 5th cent.), which seems of considerable importance for the text and of which Mr. HORNER is preparing an edition.

The hymn with music to which MODONA devotes one section of his article has already been dealt with in § 1 above, under the heading *Music*. A hymn of the Virgin Mary and a liturgical (?) fragment are published (nos. 809, 810) among the Strassburg ostraca edited by VIERECK (see below, § 3).

*Documents and history*. MACKEAN's *Christian Monasticism* is reviewed by H. G. EVELYN WHITE (*Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxv, 1923, 93-4; “a sound and well-documented outline of the early history of monasticism”; some criticisms of detail).

G. GHEDINI has published a very useful volume, in which he collects, with a general introduction and bibliography, full special introductions, translations and commentaries, a grammatical appendix, and elaborate indexes, the Greek Christian letters of the 3rd and 4th cents. found on papyrus. The convenience of having these scattered letters combined into a single volume, where formulae and phraseology can be readily compared, will be enormous to editors of similar texts; and the student of Christian Egypt and indeed of early Christianity generally will find this a volume of very exceptional interest. *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del iii e iv secolo*. (*Suppl. ad “Aegyptus,” S. divulg., Sez. greco-romana*, n. 3.) Milano, 1923. Pp. xxviii+376. The volume is reviewed by D. BASSI (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, xxx, 1923, 61-2; high praise; “come lavoro di divulgazione...omne tulit punctum”), W. M. CALDER (*Class. Rev.*, xxxviii, 1924, 30-1), and A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, iv, 1923, 90). An article by CALDERINI on this volume (*Echi del*

*Cristianesimo primitivo*, in *Vita e pensiero*, Milano, 1923, fasc. 7; see *Aegyptus*, IV, 239, no. 3505) is not accessible to me.

J. R. KNIPPING, in a paper read at a joint session on papyri of the American Historical Association and the Classical Association at New Haven, Dec. 29, 1922, deals at length with the *libelli* of the Decian persecution. In an interesting introduction he discusses the various problems which the discovery of the *libelli* has raised, taking the view that such declarations were not required merely from Christians or suspected Christians. He endeavours to use the evidence of these documents to elucidate the problem of the *dediticii*, but the effort seems to me ineffective; it is very unsafe at this period to use names as evidence of either race or creed. They can in certain cases be so used, but only to a limited extent and with very great caution. After this KNIPPING reproduces the texts (with translations) of all the known *libelli*, including seven unpublished ones, of which two are at the University of Michigan, one at that of Wisconsin, two at Hamburg, and two in the Rylands Library. The article, with its full collection of texts, will be a great convenience to students of the subject. *The Libelli of the Decian Persecution*, in *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XVI (1923), 345-90.

A. DEISSMANN points out the significance of the remarkable Zoilus letter from the Zeno archive (P.S.I. 435) for the history of religion, calling attention to parallels and contrasts between it and the letters of St. Paul. He gives the text and a translation. *The Letter of Zoilos*, in *Expositor*, 8 S., XXIV (1922), 420-9. He also discusses this letter, giving a translation, in his Selly Oak Lectures, 1923. *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*. Transl. by W. E. WILSON. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1923. Pp. 287 (Zoilus letter on pp. 258-68).

*Magie*. S. EITREM, who in recent years has been one of the most productive workers in the field of the magical papyri, continues to publish valuable articles on the subject. The magical papyri of Leyden are, in whole or in part, the subject of three articles. In a collection of notes on various subjects he publishes new readings for and annotations on P. Leid. V (note 36) and W (37), the great Paris magical papyrus (38), and WESSELY, *Studien*, xv, 250. *Varia*, in *Nord. Tidskr. f. Fil.*, x (1922), 102-16. A further article, which forms a supplement both to the above and to readings by PREISENDANZ in *Rhein. Mus.*, LXVIII (1913), 312 ff., contains additional notes on Leid. V; in this EITREM criticizes various readings of PREISENDANZ. *Notes on the magical papyrus, pap. Leid. V (J. 384)*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 59-60. This was followed by *Additional remarks on the magical papyrus, Pap. Leid. V (ibid., 183-5)*. In another article EITREM communicates revised readings of two Berlin papyri originally published by PARTHEY in 1867. *Zu den Berliner Zauberpapyri*, in *Videnskapsselsk. Forhandl.*, 1923, No. 1. Pp. 15. 1 Plate. Another he devotes to P.S.I. 1, 28 and 29, publishing new readings of and notes on these papyri. *Notes on Pap. Soc. It. 1, 28 and 29*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 61-3. In another he publishes the results of a recent visit to the British Museum, where he did very valuable work on the magical papyri contained in Vol. I of Kenyon's Catalogue. The time at his disposal was limited, and no doubt had his stay been longer the results would have been even greater; but even as it is, this article, with its new readings and commentary, marks a notable advance. *The Greek Magical Papyri in the British Museum*, in *Videnskapsselsk. Forhandl.*, 1923, 3. Pp. 27. Finally, he has devoted a lengthy and important article to the Paris magical papyri. In Part I of this he deals with the "great" papyrus, giving a revised reading of the opening passage, with a commentary, and notes on many later passages. Part II is concerned with the fragments of the Mimaut papyri at the Louvre, of which EITREM gives a complete revised text. An index of selected words and three good plates conclude this valuable monograph. *Les papyrus magiques grecs de Paris*, in *Videnskapsselsk. Skrifter*, Kristiania, II, 1923, No. 1. Pp. 49.

R. GANSZYNIÉC has published an emended text of the magical hymns in P.S.I. 1, 28. *Zwei magische Hymnen aus Florentiner Papyri*, in *Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, III (1922), 120. E. KURTZ, however, in a supplementary note, thinks the process of emendation should be considerably more drastic; he gives a specimen, for I, ll. 1-5. *Zu den magischen Hymnen aus Florentiner Papyri (ibid., 340)*.

C. BONNER has published an interesting fragment, which contains a claim for magical powers. Hence I notice it in this section; but it seems likely, as BONNER points out, that it is not strictly a magical papyrus, but (*e.g.*) a romance. That it is a romance is supported by the fact that the magician confesses his powers to be limited as regards love. The papyrus is of the 2nd or 3rd cent. according to HUNT; BONNER prefers the earlier date<sup>1</sup>. *A papyrus describing Magical Powers*, in *Proc. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LII (1921), 111-8.

<sup>1</sup> In l. 3 κελεύσαι seems an unlikely correction. Qu. κηλώσαι (κηλώω=κηλέω)? In l. 18 f. "I wish to appear to thy daughter" seems likelier than BONNER's "I wish that it appear to thy daughter."



A. KAPPELMACHER adduces fresh arguments (especially the fact that in school exercises the base of arrangement is the consonants, here the vowels) for supposing that the combinations of letters in P. Leid. II, 260 ff., have a magical significance. *Zur Deutung der ABC-Denkmaeler*, in *Wiener Studien*, XLII (1920-21), 85-7.

A. DELATTE compares the headless demon not infrequently found in magical and kindred texts with the headless first "decanus" of Capricornus in astrology; he thinks they are of identical origin. *Études sur la magie grecque*. 2. ΑΚΕΦΑΛΟΣ ΔΑΙΜΩΝ, in *Musée Belge*, xxvi (1922), 255-9.

K. PREISENDANZ edits a rather interesting love-charm from a Berlin papyrus (P. Berol. 9909), acquired at Ashmunên in 1903. Its interest lies not so much in the formulae, which, with one exception, are of a common type, as in the fact that the papyrus, which was folded several times, so as to be inserted in the mouth of the mummy (whose νεκυδαίμων was invoked to aid the lover), had attached to it the so-called οὐσία, i.e. (on the homoeopathic principle) some of the hair of the beloved. This is apparently referred to in the one unusual formula of the text, κείραι παρὰ σοὶ τὸ θεῖον μυστήριον. The papyrus is of the 4th-5th cent. *Papyrus magica inedita*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 305-8.

PREISENDANZ has also continued his miscellaneous notes on the magical papyri (*Miszellen zu den Zauberpapyri*, v, in *Wiener Studien*, XLII, 1920-1, 24-33; vi, *ibid.*, 125-33). The subjects of these notes are as follows (I quote headings only): v, 7, ἐνίστασθαι; 8, μακρὸν εἰς ἀπόθεσιν; 9, P. IV, 851-897; 10, παραγελασῶ (thinks this is παράγγελμά πω); 11, Θεολογία; 12, Ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ; 13, IV, 1766; 14, IV, 1227-1264; 15, ΟΚΕΩΣ; 16, Σαρραπ...; 17, ΟΝΕΙΡΟΘΑΥΠΤΑΝΗ; 18, IV, 2768 ff. (ἀκρουροβόρος); vi, 19, (κατ)άρα?; 20, ΑΓΩΝΙΣΩ; 21, ΒΡΑΚΙΩΝ?; 22, ΕΙΣΚΡΙΝΕΙΝ; 23, ΜΥΛΑΡΙΟΝ, ΔΟΓΟΣ 'ΒΑΥΚΥΩΝ' u. a.; 24, Ἐνοχος; 25, Ἐπίθυμα σεληνιακόν. Apis; 26, Προάγω; 27, Κωμαστήριον.

G. LUMBROSO, à propos of a passage in C. LIVI'S *Opuscoli di storia naturale*, illustrates the use of χαρακτήρ to denote magical signs for forcing the δαίμονες. *Lettere al Prof. Calderini*, xvii, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 57-8.

PERDRIZET'S *Negotium Perambulans in Tenebris* (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 102) is reviewed by A. M[ORIN? ] (*Journ. d. Sav.*, N.S., XXI, 1923, 134-5; "à lire cette élégante plaquette, on trouve plaisir et, mieux encore, profit").

HOPFNER'S *Offenbarungszauber* (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 90) has been reviewed by K. PREISENDANZ (*Lit. Zentrabl.*, LXXIV, 1923, 100-1; very laudatory) and M. P. NILSSON (*D. Lit.-Z.*, XLIII, 1922, 930-1).

EITREM'S *Christliches Amulett* (*Journal*, IX, 102) has been reviewed by WILCKEN (*Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 113), E. PETERSON (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, IV, 135), L. A. CONSTANS (*Journ. d. Sav.*, 1922, 181-2; merely reproduces text), and CH. GUIGNEBERT (*Rev. Hist. Rel.*, LXXXVII, 1923, 128-9).

An article by I. HAMMER JENSEN on ancient alchemy is inaccessible to me. *Die älteste Alchymie*, in *Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab*, Hist.-phil. Medd., IV, 2, 1921. See *Aegyptus*, IV, 234, no. 3406.

Two astrological texts are published (nos. 811, 812) among the Strassburg ostraca edited by VIERECK (see below, § 3).

### 3. PUBLICATIONS OF NON-LITERARY TEXTS.

(*N.B. Miscellaneous notes on and corrections of documents previously published are placed in § 9 below.*)

There have during the year been some important publications of non-literary texts, both in volume form and as isolated texts in periodicals. The second Heft of WILCKEN'S monumental *U.P.Z.* has appeared. It continues but does not conclude the Serapeum papyri, and contains many more texts than Heft 1, which was largely taken up by the introductory matter. The introductions and commentaries to the single texts are of the same elaboration and display the same amazing erudition and mastery of the subject as before. I have referred above (§ 2) to the appendix, in which WILCKEN replies to v. WOESS and SETHÉ respecting the κατοχή. *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)*. I. Band: *Papyri aus Unterägypten*. 2. Lieferung. Berlin und Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter, 1923. Pp. 147-296. WILCKEN has separately published a note giving further information concerning a Vatican papyrus included in Heft 1, with new readings. This information he owes to a Dutch scholar, Dr. JAN KAMPSTRA. *Zu P. Vat. B=Par. 36=U.P.Z. I, 7*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 64-5. I have previously referred (§ 2, p. 154) to SETHÉ'S important review of Heft 1.

Another major publication is Vol. VI of the Berlin papyri (*B.G.U.*), edited by W. SCHUBART and E. KÜHN. With the exception of the special volume (v) devoted to the *Gnomon* papyrus, this is the first to appear in the new format, in which the body of the work as well as the indexes is printed in the ordinary way and a fuller commentary than of old is given. It is true that even this commentary, owing to the serious financial position, has had to be cut down to a minimum. Further to save expense the

texts are printed continuously, divisions of lines being indicated by the insertion of numbers, as in WILCKEN and MITTEIS, *Chrestomathie*. Long use creates a prejudice in favour of the older usage in this last point, but the form here adopted is quite convenient to use and cannot be objected to in the circumstances.

It is a proof of the richness of the Berlin collection that after the appearance of five previous volumes it should be possible to publish one of this size (it contains 93 papyrus texts) made up exclusively of Ptolemaic texts, and that even yet there remain a considerable number of Ptolemaic papyri unpublished. The volume falls into two parts, the first, edited by SCHUBART, containing only papyri, the second, by ΚÜHN, only ostraca. Of these last, which are numbered continuously with the papyri (a great convenience), there are 196. Ostraca, for all their value, are not thrilling reading, and most students will find the first part the most interesting portion of the volume. This is quite miscellaneous in character, beginning with official documents of various classes, passing through such semi-official documents as petitions and returns to legal contracts of several kinds, and concluding with private accounts and private letters. The following items may be singled out for special mention: 1211 is the well-known Dionysus decree, previously published by SCHUBART separately; 1212 is a collection of royal edicts, of which C relates to asylum; 1214 is a decree concerning Egyptian notaries, also published previously by SCHUBART; 1215 is an interesting official letter concerning a revolt or mutiny (in the third cent. B.C. !); 1216, a land survey, has some very important evidence for religious cults; 1217 contains conversions of the value of various kinds of corn to wheat (others are found in two large accounts of the Zeno archive recently acquired by the British Museum); 1218-1222 a collection of documents (all much mutilated) concerning state auctions; 1231 is an order for a delivery of corn to a force of 2000 men sent to the (Small ?) Oasis; 1242 concerns ἀσημωνία, an interesting new word, the significance of which SCHUBART briefly discusses; 1245 has reference to a noteworthy case of ἀναχώρησις on the part of cleruchs to asylum in the Serapeum at Oxyrhynchus; 1249 contains the puzzling new words ἀφωνρεύς and ἀφώντισσα, the former apparently possessing some military significance; 1250, if SCHUBART'S view is right, shows that the penalty for the unauthorized renaming of a man or his patria by an official was (for the official) death; 1252, an interesting petition about a concession of hunting rights; 1256 shows that even a Macedonian might be compelled to undertake the lampadarchia; 1259 and 1260 are Gebelên papyri; in 1289, 11 a shepherdess is apparently mentioned; 1290, a valuable (for wages) builder's account; 1297 is from the Zeno archive; 1303 mentions the taking of an oath in the (sacred) crocodile cemetery.

The ostraca are grouped (so far as they are tax-receipts) by taxes, those which are not by classes. 1305 is very interesting if KÜHN'S reading of the name as Ἀντώνιος is correct, as it reveals the presence of a Roman in Egypt in the third cent. B.C. (cf. my article *Notes on Early Ptolemaic Papyri* referred to below); 1319-1335 with the introduction to them are of importance for the salt-tax; 1420 is a document very interesting for its anomalous form, previously published by P. M. MEYER in his *Jurist. Papyri. Ägyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin: Griechische Urkunden*, vi. Band. *Papyri und Ostraka der Ptolemäerzeit*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1922. Pp. 192; 4 pages of hand-copies of Demotic script.

The third fasciculus of Vol. I of the Lille Papyri has at last appeared and includes much important material. The editor-in-chief is, as before, JOUQUET, but much of the work of this part was done by LESQUIER and COLLART, and it is with an emotion of keen regret that one reads the masterly commentary and reflects that we shall have no more work from LESQUIER'S pen. As before, all the papyri are Ptolemaic, and belong to the third cent. B.C., being of the reigns of Philadelphus and Euergetes I. Nos. 30-38 are interesting and valuable accounts of cleruchic holdings, all of the reign of Euergetes I, and their value is much increased by the full and able commentary. The same may be said of 39-51, a series of documents concerned with loans to cultivators, all of the 35th year of Philadelphus. The introduction to this noteworthy series is particularly valuable; reference may be made to the important evidence on the vexed subject of the Epigone, pp. 195-6. 59 is of value for the beer-tax. For the indexes to Vol. I we have still to wait till the fourth fasciculus appears. *Institut papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus grecs*. Tome I, fasc. III, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1923. Pp. 135-261. This part has been reviewed by A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, iv, 1923, 339-40). A review by H. I. BELL appears below.

A new undertaking which deserves a hearty welcome is a publication of the papyrus collections of Baden (Freiburg and Heidelberg). Two parts have at present appeared, in the format familiar as that of the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Heidelberg Academy. Heft 1 contains Demotic papyri, edited by W. SPIEGELBERG. In this volume are published three Heidelberg papyri which contain contracts of divorce and two (found at Ḳarâra near Hibeh) which together make up a συγγραφὴ τροφίτου. These documents, edited by such a master as SPIEGELBERG, would in any case be valuable, but the importance of the volume is much increased

by the apparatus with which the editor has furnished the texts. In connexion with A, the contracts of divorce, he gives a list, with partial texts and translations, of the other known specimens of this class of document, and to B, the *συγγραφή τροφίτου*, he appends a table (with commentary) of the parallel documents and follows this by excursus on a Paris and on a Turin papyrus of the same class. *Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen*, Heft 1. *Demotische Papyri*. Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1923. Pp. 47. 2 plates; 2 facsimiles in the text. Heft 2, edited by FR. BILABEL, contains 43 Greek papyri with two mummy labels. At the beginning BILABEL gives an account of the collection and a general introduction to the series. The papyri are miscellaneous in character, and range in date from B.C. 225/4 to A.D. 577 (?); but most of the documents which are not Ptolemaic belong to the Roman period. In general they are useful but not exciting, but there are exceptions. Special mention may be made of 2, which has real historical value, since it throws some light on the civil war between Euergetes II and his sister; 3, a juristically puzzling text; 14, which is perhaps of interest for the Ptolemaic army; 16, which concerns the revolt in the Thebaid about B.C. 88; and 36-40, an interesting collection of papers from a family archive of the early second century, single pieces from which were already known in other collections. In 36, 10-11 is a reference to the Jewish revolt. Heft 2. *Griechische Papyri (Urkunden, Briefe, Mumienetiketten)*. Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1923. Pp. xii + 80. Both parts are reviewed by A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 340-1).

Another important publication is that of the Strassburg ostraca by P. VIERECK. Vol. I, which alone has appeared, contains only the texts, with purely critical annotations; the commentary on the subject-matter is reserved for Vol. II, which, it is to be feared, will not see the light for some time. Ostraca are never very appetizing reading, since they are always extremely brief and most often contain tax-receipts; but for a study of the taxation system and often incidentally for such matters as chronology, nomenclature, etc., they are of great value. The value of the Strassburg ostraca will of course be greatly enhanced, at least for most students, by the commentary when it appears; but in the meantime the materials are all here and to be had for the search, which is facilitated by the excellent indexes. VIERECK has arranged the tax-receipts, not, like KÜHN, with the Berlin ostraca in *B.G.U.* VI, by taxes but by formulae. As he remarks, there are arguments for and against either plan. That which he adopts has obvious advantages, and its inconveniences are largely removed by the use of the index of taxes. Tax-receipts, which cover a wide range of imposts, occupy a large part of the volume (507 ostraca if we include three certificates of work). In the other sections special reference may be made to an interesting series of farm accounts and records of work. In 805-808 are alphabets. Reference has already been made to the theological and astrological texts. The Demotic ostraca and Demotic portions of bilingual ostraca are edited by W. SPIEGELBERG. *Griechische und Griechisch-Demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elsass*. I. Band: *Texte*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1923. Pp. xv + 356. The volume has been reviewed by C. O. ZURETTI (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXX, 1923-4, 77-8).

A brief reference may here be made to a publication which, though not concerned with Egypt, will interest many papyrologists because of the parallels which exist between the legal and notarial practice of Egypt and Mesopotamia. This is Vol. VI of the series *Hammurabi's Gesetz (Übersetzte Urkunden mit Rechts-erläuterungen)*; Leipzig, E. Pfeiffer, 1923. Pp. xii + 220, edited by P. KOSCHAKER and A. UNGNAD. As the title indicates, this consists of miscellaneous legal documents, given in translation only, with brief commentary. The volume is a Corpus of the early texts published since 1911, but it is not complete, and the texts here omitted will, it is hoped, make up a further volume. The texts are arranged by classes. There is a table of contents at the beginning of the volume and a concordance of numbers at the end, but no index.

Only one instalment of C. C. EDGAR's publications of the Zeno papyri has appeared during the year, but the texts included in it do not fall in interest behind the earlier ones; indeed, since they all belong to what we may call Zeno's pre-Philadelphian period, they are of rather unusual interest. They are as follows:—67, Apollodotus to Charmides, B.C. 257. Letter with enclosures on naval finance. Interesting for the fleet, taxation, and the position of the Greek cities (Halicarnassus). 68, — to Zeno (?). Year 28 (?). About some affair concerning the payment of 20 talents. Reveals intrigues against Apollonius. 69, List of articles left at Hermopolis [Parva], 257 B.C. 70, — to Zeno on the curing of dice made of gazelles' bones; *n.d.* 71, Account of flour during a journey in Palestine. Probably year 27. (See below, § 4, under *Topography*.) 72, Archelaus to Crito, about the supply of spars and a three-sculled boat; *n.d.* A facsimile of 71 recto is given. *Selected Papyri from the Archives of Zenon (Nos. 67-72)*, in *Ann. du Service*, XXII, 209-31.

W. L. WESTERMANN and A. G. LAIRD, having discovered a Zeno papyrus in the collection of the

University of Wisconsin (P. Wis. Inv. No. 1), have published it, with a translation and a valuable and interesting commentary. It is an account of farm work. *A New Zenon Papyrus at the University of Wisconsin*, in *Journal*, ix (1923), 81-90.

Another American Zenon papyrus (P. Mich. 45) has been published by A. E. R. BOAK. It is an interesting and well-preserved letter, the subject of which is the sale of corn, useful for the study of prices. A crux as to the rate, which seemed extravagantly high, has since been cleared up by C. C. EDGAR (*Aegyptus*, iv, 1923, 79). *A Zenon Letter of 256 B.C.: Papyrus Michigan 45*, in *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 284-6.

H. I. BELL has published an Early Ptolemaic contract of loan (P. Lond. Inv. No. 2243), perhaps from the Zenon archive, which possesses several points of interest. It throws light on the cult of Arsinoe Philadelphus, various cult-titles of whom it reveals; it contains useful data relating to the army; and it numbers among its witnesses a Roman mercenary soldier. The date is the 34th year of Philadelphus; there are grounds for believing that the provenance is Alexandria, on the topography of which, if that be the case, it throws new light. *Notes on Early Ptolemaic Papyri: 1, An Early Ptolemaic Contract of Loan*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 17-27.

J. PARTSCH has published an *ἀνῆ ἐν πίστει* which possesses some juristic importance. PARTSCH's article is not accessible to me, but the text is reproduced, with a brief discussion, by V. A[RANGIO]-R[UIZ], who gives the date as B.C. 179-78, on what grounds I do not see, as no date occurs in the text. Original publication in *Festschrift für Otto Lenel*, 155; ARANGIO-RUIZ in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 309-11.

J. KAMPSTRA publishes, from the Berlin collection, a petition, probably to the Archidicastes, which, according to KAMPSTRA, introduced that part of the process for the recovery of debts which followed the *ἀντίρρησις* of the debtors. The 25th year [of Augustus] is mentioned. *Papyrus 11886 der Berliner Sammlung*, in *Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII (1922), 556-9.

In SCHUBART's article *Papyruskunde* (see below, § 7) are published, as specimens of editorial methods, the already known Dionysus decree of Philopator and an unpublished letter (P. Berol. 11662) dated in the reign of Claudius. It concerns the decoration of a house and is distinctly interesting. Pp. 54-6 of the article.

The Hebrew papyri found by PETRIE at Oxyrhynchus in 1922 (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 105) have attracted much attention. H. LOEWE, in an interesting article, reproduces the texts, with a translation, and discusses them at considerable length. He dates them early, naming the years A.D. 11 and 211 as, roughly, the extreme limits of time. He regards them as Pentecostal Pizzut. *The Petrie-Hirschfeld Papyri*, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxiv (1922-3), 126-41. H. ST. J. THACKERAY calls the attention of Jewish readers to this article and accepts LOEWE's theory as to the Pentecostal reference. *New Light on the Petrie-Hirschfeld Papyri*, in *Jewish Guardian*, iv (1923), 182, p. 6. J. LEVEEN, publishing photographs of A and C and giving a revised text of the former (Dr. BARNETT having correctly placed a misplaced fragment), dissents from the early date assigned by LOEWE. *The Petrie-Hirschfeld Papyri* (*ibid.*, 185, p. 9). In an article on *Pentecost and Eschatology* (*ibid.*, 190, p. 7) J. H. ARBUTHNOT takes up a middle position on this point. I am of course quite unqualified to decide on the Hebrew script, but the Greek writing on one of the fragments makes the early date very difficult to accept. A. NEPPI MODONA also calls attention to these papyri, giving facsimiles of A and an attempt at a translation of this and of C. *Antichissimi papiri ebraici rinvenuti recentemente a Ossirinco*, in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 31-7. He returns to the subject in a later article, adding new readings, partly due to the changed position of the fragment in A. He takes a cautious view on the question of the date, but seems to incline to the view of LEVEEN. *Ancora sui papiri ebraici di Ossirinco Petrie-Hirschfeld* (*ibid.*, pp. 125-31).

K. WESSELY publishes a census return of the year A.D. 187-8 from Socnopaei Nesus. This papyrus, which, as he expresses it, "indicavi vel potius abscondidi in libro Wiener Urania, Vol. I, 41, pp. 425-27, 26 Decemb. 1908" with a photographic facsimile, is in his own collection. *Instrumentum census anni p. Chr. n. 187-8*, in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 123-4.

A noteworthy text has been published by H. B. DEWING from the Princeton collection (P. Princeton 55). This is a *dialysis* between Cyrus, Bishop of Lycopolis, and two brothers. It contains a very interesting list of garments. The date is A.D. 481. The upper part is mutilated, but most of the roll is well preserved. DEWING, who gives a brief account of the Princeton collection as a whole, appends to the text a translation and brief commentary. His transcription contains some obvious errors of reading or restoration, and he has been kind enough to give me his opinion of various corrections I proposed, several of which he accepts; but as he is at present unable to refer to the original I prefer not to note them here. *A Dialysis of the Fifth Century A.D. in the Princeton Collection of Papyri*, in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, LIII (1922), 113-27.

M. HOMBERT has published a very interesting document from the Ghent collection. It comes from Aphrodito, and doubtless belonged to the archive of Dioscorus. It is an agreement between a guild of *ἀγρεῖραι* and *ὁ ἔνδοξος οἶκος*, possibly that of the *comes* Ammonius. Its special interest proceeds from the fact that in the latter part there are laid down regulations for the *ἀγρεῖραι*; unfortunately this is the most imperfect part of the document. The date is A.D. 536. HOMBERT, who adds a translation and brief commentary, gives some account of the Ghent collection. I may here mention that this promising young scholar is at present studying under JOUGUET at Paris, with a view to eventually editing the Ghent papyri. *Un document nouveau d'Aphrodito*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 43-8.

W. E. CRUM has edited the Coptic ostraca in the Museo Archeologico at Milan, with some from his own collection. The latter (especially no. IX, a mortgage of a house) are more interesting than the Milan ones, which are mostly imperfect. *Coptic Ostraca in the Museo Archeologico at Milan and some others*, in *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 275-83.

A. E. R. BOAK has published the text of the Coptic syllabary (P. Mich. 765) of which he previously gave a description in his *Greek and Coptic School Tablets* (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 92). *A Coptic Syllabary at the University of Michigan*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 296-7.

I may here briefly refer to the discovery of some parchment Greek documents by the French at Salsilyeh in Mesopotamia. A description of these, with the text of one containing a law on inheritance, is given by B. HAUSSOULLIER. *Une loi grecque inédite sur les successions "ab intestat,"* in *Rev. hist. de droit fr. et étr.*, 1923, 515-53.

Vol. VII 1/2 of the *Archiv f. Pap.* contains WILCKEN's usual masterly notices of papyrus publications. The following works are reviewed (the numbers refer to the pages of the *Archiv*):—P. Gurob, 69-72; P. Frankf., 72-4; LEWALD's supplementary publication of Frankfurt papyri (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 92), 74; P. Edgar, 74-80; P.S.I. VI, 80-6; P. dem. Lille, 87; P. Strassb. II, 87-93; P. Oxy. XIV, 93-8; *Stud. Pal.* XX, 98-106 (also reviewed by E. KÜHN, *Or. Lit.-Z.*, XXVI, 1923, 114-15); *Stud. Pal.* XXII, 106-8; MEYER's *Pachtangebot* (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 92), 109; BILABEL's *El-Hibe* (*ibid.*, 95), 109; JOUGUET's *Édit d'Hadrien* (*ibid.*, 92 f.), 109-10; BELL's *Thyestes of Sophocles* (*ibid.*, 85), 110-11; BELL's *Some Private Letters* (*op. cit.*, VII, 1921, 94), 111-12.

VIERECK's edition of the Brussels and Berlin ostraca (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 104) has been reviewed by C. WESSELY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, IV, 1923, 135), and FR. BILABEL (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 320-1); P. Mon. I (very belatedly) by A. BERGER (*Z. vergl. Rechtsw.*, I, 1922-3, 387-8; high praise); MEYER's *Jurist. Papyri* by F. PRINGSHEIM (*Vierteljahrsschr. f. Soz.- u. Wirtschaftsg.*, XVII, 1923, 109-11; favourable) and L. WENGER (*D. Lit.-Z.*, XLIII, 1922, 673-5, 701-4); P. Lond. V, anonymously (*Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XLII, 1922, 289-90); CRUM and BELL's *Wadi Sarga* by C[ALDERINI] (*Aegyptus*, III, 1922, 362) and C. WESSELY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, IV, 1923, 134); and PREISIGKE's *Sammelbuch* by E. KIESSLING (*Phil. Woch.*, XLIII, 1923, 733-5).

#### 4. POLITICAL AND MILITARY HISTORY, ADMINISTRATION, CHRONOLOGY, TOPOGRAPHY.

*General.* A reference may be made here to two useful historical bibliographies in *Bursians Jahresbericht*, CLXXXIX (1921), 3. Abt. These are:—M. FLUSS, *Bericht über die Literatur zur Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit von Tiberius bis auf Diocletian (14-284 n. Chr.) aus den Jahren 1894-1913*, pp. 53-117; A. NAGL, *Bericht über die Literatur zur Geschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts aus den Jahren 1894-1914*, pp. 119-80. Papyrological literature is included in these surveys.

A. CALDERINI reviews SCHUBART's *Ägypten* (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 105) with F. SCHUBART's *Von Wüste Nil und Sonne in Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 218-20. The former book is also reviewed, along with WENGER's *Volk und Staat* (*Journal*, IX, 107), by G. ROEDER (*Lit. Zentrabl.*, LXXIV, 1923, 341-2) and WENGER's work by SCHUBART (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, XXVI, 1923, 62-3).

SCHUBART in his *Papyruskunde* (see below, § 7, p. 168) refers (p. 53) to a work by C. CICHORIUS, *Römische Studien* (Leipzig, 1922), which I have been unable to see.

*Political history and position of nationalities.* Though in strictness it falls outside our subject, I may here refer to an elaborate work by D. MALLETT on the relations between Greece and Egypt before the Macedonian conquest. *Les Rapports des Grecs avec l'Égypte (de la conquête de Cambyse, 525, à celle d'Alexandre, 331)*. *Mém. de l'Inst. fr. d'Arch. Or. du Caire*, XLVIII, 1922. Pp. xv + 209.

H. WILLRICH, in an article on the Tobiad family, with which some of the Zeno papyri bring us into touch, differs on various points from GRESSMANN's views. He uses the evidence of Josephus and the *Maccabees*. *Zur Geschichte der Tobiaden*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 61-4.

C. C. EDGAR suggests that "Theogos" who murdered Magas, Philopator's brother, was Theogenes, the *dioecetes* under that king. *Miscellanea* (in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, xix, 1923, 114-18), iv.

E. W. WEBSTER holds, with great probability, that the hostage Alexander of P. Lond. Inv. No. 2087 was not, as ROSTOVITZEFF took him in his *Large Estate*, the son of Lysimachus but the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Deidamia, sister of Pyrrhus, *ὁς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κατεβίωσε* (Plut., *Dem.*, 53). *Alexander, the Son of Demetrius Poliorcetes*, in *Class. Phil.*, xvii (1922), 357-8.

*À propos* of the action of the Roman ambassadors to Ptolemy Philadelphus in handing over to the aerarium the gifts received from the king, G. LUMBROSO, in his 44th letter to Breccia (*Bull. de la Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 19, N.S., v, 107-8), quotes similar rules for the Venetian ambassadors. In his following letter (*ibid.*, p. 109) he discusses the ephemerides and similar records of the Ptolemies, etc., quoting various authorities.

W. D. GRAY, using the Heptakomia papyri, the anti-Semitic literature, etc., discusses the policy and administration of Hadrian in his early years. *New Light from Egypt on the Early Reign of Hadrian*, in *Am. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, xl (1923), 14-29.

H. HENNE, in his article on the Graux papyri (see below, § 9, p. 170), apparently brings forward some new and important evidence on the depopulation of Egypt in the second century.

G. SEGRÈ has published a noteworthy article on the *Constitutio Antonina* (P. Giss. 40, col. 1). After a detailed discussion of alternatives he accepts indeed MEYER's restorations of the crucial passage as the most probable, but attaches *χωρίς τῶν δεδευτικίων* to the immediately preceding phrase: "alle città di soggetti o 'stipendiariae' in senso più stretto ('res publicae' o 'civitates dediticiae' o 'dediticiorum') non si estendesse l'impegno di lasciare immutata la loro costituzione, come per le altre 'civitates' o 'res publicae' romane, latine, o peregrine autonome." He justifies his view (a) by the position of the phrase, (b) by the evidence of the literary authorities, who mention no exceptions to Caracalla's grant of the citizenship. He proposes to develop these views in two further chapters. His further treatment will be eagerly awaited; in the meantime I can only say for myself that his thesis is at first sight very attractive. The text, as previously interpreted, was never very satisfactory, for the position of the phrase *χωρίς τῶν δεδευτικίων* is, on that interpretation, clumsy and more awkward than would be expected in a presumably official translation. *Di nuovo sull' editto di Caracalla relativo alla concessione della cittadinanza romana e sul papiro di Giessen 40, col. 1*, in *Bull. Ist. di Dir. Rom.*, xxxii (1922-3), 191-211.

G. LUMBROSO suggests that in Ammianus, 22, 11, 4 *oraculorum* may mean, not *oracula deorum*, but *oracula principum*. *Lettere al Signor Prof. Breccia*, xlii, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, no. 19, N.S., v, 104-5.

The edition of the letters and laws of Julian by BIDEZ and CUMONT (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 107) has been reviewed with high praise by P. MAAS (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, iv, 1923, 136-7), D. BASSI (*Riv. di Fil.*, N.S., i, 1923, 252-3), A. PUECH (*Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxv, 1922, 465-6), and É. CAHEN (*Rev. ét. anc.*, xxv, 1923, 198-201; "celui-ci est un instrument de travail de premier ordre; on ne pourra plus, sans lui, rien tenter sur Julien et son temps").

CASANOVA collects various forms of the legend, as to the burning of the great Alexandrian library by the Arabs from various periods, and discusses their origin. The legend goes back to the time of Šalāh ad Dīn (12th cent.), but rests on older traditions; Umar I and 'Amr really were opposed to religious books other than the Koran. *L'incendie de la bibliothèque d'Alexandrie par les Arabes*, in *C.-R. Ac. d. Inscr. et B.-L.*, 1923, 163-71. (See also below, § 5, p. 165.)

P. JOUGUET, in an interesting paper read to the ninth section of the Congress of Historical Sciences at Brussels, traces the policy of the Lagids towards the native Egyptians. He thinks Euergetes II in the main followed Epiphanes in his amnesty and does not deserve the honours of a rehabilitation. At the end he briefly sketches the story of the disappearance of Hellenic culture in Byzantine times. (See also below, § 5.) *Les Lagides et les Indigènes égyptiens*, in *Rev. belge*, 1923, 419-45.

E. BRECCIA publishes an inscription which establishes the existence of a new *πολίτευμα* in Egypt, that of the Boeotians. He appends some remarks on the *πολιτεύματα* generally. *Un nuovo πολιτεύμα pseudo-etnico*, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 119-22.

A. VON PREMERSTEIN has produced an important work on the anti-Semitic literature of Alexandria, the so-called *Heidnische Märtyrerakten*. The "Paulus and Antoninus *Acta*" (recension a) stand, he holds, on a different footing from the rest; the remainder formed parts of a single work written in the Septimian age, very likely after Caracalla's massacre at Alexandria. The protocol form was only a literary convention; hence it must not deceive us into attaching to the work an historical value which it possesses only to a limited extent. Incidentally he dates the events of the "Isidorus *Acta*" 30 Apr. and 1 May, A.D. 53

He gives new texts (in part) of them and of Oxy. 1089 and the "Appianus Acta." *Zu den sogenannten alexandrinischen Märtyrerakten. Philologus*, Supplementband xvi, Heft 2, 1923. Pp. 76. The work is reviewed by A. JÜLICHER (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, XLVIII, 1923, 373-4).

G. LUMBROSO aptly quotes a passage from ELIA BENAMOSEGH, *Storie degli Esseni*, on the Jews at Alexandria. *Lettere al Signor Prof. Breccia*, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 110, letter XLVI.

*Administration.* L. WENGER has reviewed OERTEL'S *Liturgie* (*D. Lit.-Z.*, XLIII, 1922, 471-7).

A. CALDERINI, whose energy seems inexhaustible, has lately been paying special attention to the important subject of the census in Roman Egypt. One elaborate monograph seems more properly to belong to § 5 below and is there noticed (p. 165), but two articles on the subject must be mentioned here. In one he calls attention to the fact that the two classes of census returns, (a) addressed to several officials and (b) addressed to one only, show also, at least in the Arsinoite nome between A.D. 130 and 215, and probably elsewhere, but very likely not at other periods, different formulae; and he therefore concludes that one return was sent to each of the officials concerned, to be kept by him, while one (collective) was sent to all, signed by each, and either placed in the βιβλιοθήκη δημοσίων λόγων or returned to the person making the return. *Di due specie di schede del censimento individuale romano d'Egitto*, in *Rend. R. Ist. Lomb.*, LV (1922), 1-11 of the off-print. In the other he discusses the various copies of a single return found in *B.G.U.* 90, 224, 225, 410, 537, Grenf. II, 55, noting the differences between the texts and seeking to determine the relations (in the matter of mutual dependence) between them. *Sei esemplari di un'unica scheda di censimento romano*, in *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 341-5.

In a very interesting and (to my mind) cogent article J. G. TAIT raises the question whether in the Roman period the strategi and royal scribes were forbidden to hold their offices in the nomes of which they were natives. He adduces some very strong arguments, though he does not claim that they are conclusive. Certainly the matter deserves serious consideration. *The Strategi and Royal Scribes in the Roman Period*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 166-73.

In a series of epigraphic notes E. BRECCIA discusses, among other points, expressions like γυμνασιάρχουντα τὸ λ' ἔτος (p. 123 f.); and also the titles θεσμοφόριος and εἰσαγωγεὺς (p. 126). *Note epigrafiche*, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 123-41.

In an article divided into four "observations" B. A. VAN GRONINGEN discusses various problems affecting or raised by P. Rylands 77, the document concerning the election of a cosmetes, his particular object being to interpret the evidence which the papyrus affords as to the methods of election of municipal magistrates generally. His conclusion is, briefly, that after the co-optation of a suitable person by the κοινόν of magistrates the subsequent proceedings took place before the tribunal of the strategus; but that whether the person nominated refused or accepted the office, the final decision, whether confirmation of an election or decision of a disputed nomination, was reserved for the prefect or his delegate, the epistrategus. *Observationes quattuor in Papyrum "Rylands" LXXVII*, in *Mnemosyne*, N.S., LI (1923), 421-34.

The University of Michigan in 1921 and 1922 acquired a fine collection of papyri from the archive of the grapheion of Tebtunis. The gem of the collection was a long roll, containing a register of the grapheion, now P. Mich. 622. A. E. R. BOAK, in a short note included in the *Proceedings of the American Philological Association* (LIII, 1922, No. 4; *The Grapheum of Tebtunis and Ceresouchon Oros*), gives some account of this; and he has since published a longer article on it, in which, besides describing the papyrus and discussing the problems it raises, he publishes ll. 1-19 of col. i of the verso. The papyrus is one of exceptional interest for the light it throws on the practice of the village grapheia, and it is to be hoped that a complete publication of it will not be too long delayed. *The Anagraphai of the Grapheion of Tebtunis and Kerkesouchon Oros: Pap. Michigan 622*, in *Journal*, IX (1923), 164-7.

REINACH'S *Code fiscal* (on the Gnomon papyrus; *Journal*, VIII, 1922, 94 f.) has been reviewed, in the form of an article, by G. GLOTZ, who makes some valuable suggestions of his own. In particular he gives a new explanation of τῶν δύο τέρατρον in Art. 44: it "s'agit manifestement d'un quart à confisquer sur chacun des deux responsables." τῶν δύο = ἀμφοτέρων, "une locution de la langue courante qui annonce le grec moderne." *Un code fiscal de l'Égypte romaine*, in *Journ. des Sav.*, xx (1922), 215-24. Another review by M. BESNIER appears in *Rev. crit.*, LVI (1922), no. 1 (not accessible to me; see *Aegyptus*, IV, 94, no. 2870). TH. LENSCHAU reviews STUART JONES'S *Fresh Light* (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 94) in *Phil. Week.*, XLIII, 1923, 1006-7 (some queer inexactnesses; even the title is misprinted as *Irish Light*!).

A very important work on the civil administration of Byzantine Egypt has been published by G. ROUILLARD. It does not perhaps add a great deal of new knowledge to what was already known, though Mlle. ROUILLARD'S discussions of single points are always instructive; but it is an invaluable collection

and statement of the available evidence, the more so since it deals mainly with the later period (from Justinian), on which GELZER's well-known book dwelt more lightly than on the earlier Byzantine age, and goes into all the detail of the machinery, whereas GELZER concentrated more on the main outlines. In some interesting and illuminating chapters Mlle. ROUILLARD paints a general picture of the shortcomings of the system and the economic misery of the country. *L'administration civile de l'Égypte byzantine*. Paris, Presses Universitaires [1923]. Pp. xi+243. Reviewed by P. COLLART (*Rev. de Phil.*, XLVII, 1923, 171-5; laudatory; a good sketch of the development).

I owe to Mr. BAYNES a reference to a Russian article by USPENSKY on the papyri as materials for knowledge of the Byzantine administration. *Novaya strua vnosya shchaya ozhivlenie v istoriyu Vizanti*, in *Viz. Vrem.*, XXII, 1-12.

*Military history*. H. I. BELL, quoting from P. Lond. Inv. No. 2358 (an account from the Zeno archive), where *οι πρεσβύτεροι στρατιῶται* are twice mentioned, proposes the reading *τοῖς πρεσβυ[τέροις στρατιώταις]* in P.S.I. VI, 627, 1. Who these "elder soldiers" were is not clear. "The Elder Soldiers," in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 29.

M. HOLLEAUX collects instances of the title *ἡγεμὼν τῶν ἕξω τάξεων* and, discussing it, states the objections to the ruling view that the last three words are the genitive of *αι ἕξω τάξεις*. Then, from Diod., XIX, c. XXII, 1-3, he shows the correctness of LESQUIER's theory that they are the genitive of *οι ἕξω τάξεων*, officers "à la disposition," not on active service. *ΗΓΕΜΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΞΩ ΤΑΞΕΩΝ*, in *Rev. ét. gr.*, XXXV (1922), 198-210.

C. C. EDGAR, quoting the Hadra vase 26234 in the Cairo collection, which mentions a man who was *τῶν σ(ωματο)φυ(λάκων)*, remarks that the abbreviation proves the title to have been a common one. The date is probably early in the reign of Philopator; hence the use of such titles goes back further than has often been supposed. *Miscellanea*, IV, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, XIX (1923), 114-8.

*Topography*. In an interesting article on P. Edgar 71 F. M. ABEL identifies various places mentioned in that document and gives a sketch map of the itinerary. *La liste géographique du papyrus 71 de Zénon*, in *Rev. biblique*, XXXII (1923), 409-15.

A. ALT identifies the *Πηγαί* of P.S.I. 406 with a place mentioned by Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII, 9, 2 (=260 ff., Niese). It was a predecessor of Herod's foundation Antipatris. *Pegai*, in *Z. d. Deutschen Pal.-Vereins*, XLV (1922), 220-3.

A. CALDERINI devotes an article to Lycopolis as illustrated by the papyri and by other sources. An onomasticon of the city is given. *Nella patria di Plotino, Licopoli*, in *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 255-74.

A reference may here be given to a work which does not indeed concern our period but which may, retrospectively, be useful to students of Graeco-Roman Egypt. This is an elaborate monograph by Prince OMAR TOUSSOÛN on the branches of the Nile, as illustrated by Arab authors. *Mémoire sur les anciennes branches du Nil, époque arabe*. (*Mém. prés. à la Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, I, 2, pp. 65-213. 6 maps.) Reviewed by S. GRANDE (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, XXIX, 1922-3, 201-2) and A. CALDERINI (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 85-6).

*Chronology*. I have been unable to see a work by F. W. READ on this subject. I reproduce the rather curiously worded entry in *Aegyptus*, IV, 350, No. 3692:—"READ F. W., *Regnal Years and calendar Years in Egypt 1923 pagine 111-15*" (qu. iii + 15 ?).

H. I. BELL challenges GRENFELL's revised reading of the dating clause in P. Hib. 84 (a). It appears that the year really is the 5th, not the 40th; and since this is an impossible date if Soter consistently reckoned his regnal years continuously with those of his satrapy, the number ε must refer to the tenure by Meneleas of the priesthood of Alexander. Ptolemy's regnal year is therefore not mentioned. *The Date of P. Hibeh 84 (a) = Mitteis, Chrest. 131*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 27-9.

In the possibly Alexandrian contract of loan published by H. I. BELL (above, § 3, p. 160) the month date is expressed by the *φθινόπωτος* method, which BELL regards as one argument for its Alexandrian provenance. WILCKEN in this connexion calls attention to the occurrence of the same method in an inscription edited by PLAUMANN, which PLAUMANN on other grounds regarded as probably from Alexandria. In *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 66.

L. HOLZAPFEL continues his series of articles on Imperial datings. The titles of this last instalment are:—8. *Didius Julianus und Septimius Severus*. Anhang. *Die Kaiserlisten bei Theophilus von Antiochia und Clemens Alexandrinus*, in *Klio*, XVIII (1923), 253-8.

In a very important article on the puzzling chronology of the third-century emperors A. STEIN deals first with the reigns Gallienus to Aurelian. He discusses the data, showing their inconsistency and the impossibility of fitting the regnal years as given by datings into the actual period covered. He conjectures



that there were two and perhaps three systems: (1) official, giving 15 years to Gallienus, 3 to Claudius, 7 to Aurelian, (2) unofficial: (a) 16 to G., 3 to C., 6 to A., (b) 16 to G., 2 to C., 7 to A. But (a) and (b) are only certainly necessary in one case each. His theory seems very plausible, but it is hardly proved and his arguments are not always beyond cavil. He then deals with the other reigns, from Decius to Diocletian. At the end he gives a very useful table of regnal years. *Zur Chronologie der römischen Kaiser von Decius bis Diocletian*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 30-51.

A. STEINWENTER proposes for the dating clause in CRUM and STEINDORFF's *Kopt. Rechtsurk.*, no. 77, practically (except, correctly, *ἐκρου* for my *πέμπρου*) the same reading and restoration as mine in the Addenda to PREISIGKE's *Sammelbuch*, I, 668, of which he did not know. *Zu den Kaiserdatierungen unter Herakleios*, in *Byz. Z.*, XXIV, 81-3.

##### 5. SOCIAL LIFE, EDUCATION, ECONOMIC HISTORY, NUMISMATICS.

*Social life.* H. I. BELL, in a popular article, originally a lecture, traces the history of Hellenism in Egypt—its permeation of the country under the early Ptolemies, its dilution by non-Hellenic influences, its apparent revival under the Romans, and its decline and eventual disappearance—from the beginning of the Macedonian period to the Arab conquest. *Hellenic Culture in Egypt*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 139-55. JOUGUET's remarks on this subject in his article on the policy of the Lagids towards the natives have already been referred to above (§ 4, heading *Political and Military History*, p. 162). KENYON's article *The Library of a Greek of Oxyrhynchus* (§ 1, p. 148 above) is also very instructive in this connexion.

An article in Finnish by L. O. TUDEER on the intellectual life of Roman Egypt as revealed by the Oxyrhynchus papyri is inaccessible to me even did the language not constitute an impassable barrier. *Oxyrhynchos Eräitä pärtteitä Egyptin henkisestä elämästä roomalaisajalla*, in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, Helsingfors, 1923, 1-14 of the off-print (see *Aegyptus*, IV, 233, no. 3402).

G. LUMBROSO, à propos of an inscription (epitaph on Machon), comments in a letter to Breccia on the rivalry which it reveals between Alexandria and Athens. In a letter preceding this he writes on the excesses (destruction of books and temples, etc.) of the triumphant Christians at Alexandria. (On the Alexandrian library see also § 4 above, p. 162.) In *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., V, 166-8, letters XLIX and L.

WILCKEN in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 104, mentions a Bonn dissertation by H. SCHMITZ on *Die hellenistisch-römischen Stadtanlagen* ("Teildruck 1921") which should be very interesting but which I have been unable to see.

E. BRECCIA has published, with photographic views and plans, an article on some recently discovered baths near Alexandria. *Di alcuni bagni nei dintorni d'Alessandria*, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., V, 142-51.

A. CALDERINI attempts to use the census returns and census lists preserved on papyrus as a means of throwing light on the composition of the family and family life generally. After giving a list of the extant documents he discusses such questions as the occupations, status, age of marriage of the persons concerned, age of paternity and maternity, relative ages of husband and wife, number of children, marriage of brother and sister, etc. The discussion is very interesting, but evidence so fortuitous, incomplete and of such unequal geographical and chronological distribution is a very uncertain guide, so that the results founded upon it are of limited application. *La composizione della famiglia secondo le schede di censimento dell'Egitto romano*. *Pubbl. d. Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore*, s. III, Vol. I, fasc. 1. Vita e Pensiero, Milano, [1923]. Pp. 61. Reviewed by W. SCHUBART (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, XXVI, 1923, 444; "die Grundlage bleibt zu schmal; wertvolles findet man nur, wenn man alle Zeugnisse heranzieht"); two Italian reviews not accessible to me are referred to in *Aegyptus*, IV, 356, no. 3815.

G. LUMBROSO in letter XV to CALDERINI cites some curious parallels for the belief in the creation of life out of the earth (mud), and in letter XVI discusses an epigram (*Anth. Pal.*, XI, 363) which proves the celebration at Alexandria of the *lampadodromia*. *Aegyptus*, III (1922), 292-4.

The lamented G. MÖLLER notes the existence and discovery in Egypt of miniature pyramids, such as P. Lips. 30 mentions. *Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 66.

*Education.* J. G. MILNE edits a further ostrakon from a lot originally published by him in *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XXVIII. It shows that XV and VIII of that series fit together; it contains the same text as they. MILNE accepts the suggestion of C. COOKSON that the text is an exercise in scansion. *More Relics of Graeco-Egyptian schools*, in *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XLII (1923), 40-3.

I have referred above (§ 3, p. 161) to BOAK's publication of a Coptic syllabary.

*A propos* of a passage quoted from K. PRAECHTER, G. LUMBROSO discusses the διαρριβαὶ σοφιστῶν at Alexandria. *Lettere al Signor Prof. Breccia*, XLIII, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 105-7.

*Economic history.* CICCOTTI's *Lineamenti* (*Journal*, ix, 1922, 108) has been reviewed by A. PIGANJOL (*Journ. des Sav.*, N.S., XXI, 1923, 84; "cette compilation, qui ne trahit aucun effort personnel de recherche ni de méthode, est cependant un manuel qui sera utile pour orienter les travailleurs") and A. ANDRÉADÈS (*Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxv, 1922, 454-6; laudatory).

SEGRÈ's *Circolazione monetaria* (*Journal*, ix, 1922, 108) is reviewed by C. WESSELY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, III, 1922, 427-8; laudatory; "jedenfalls eine wichtige Etappe auf dem schwierigen Wege, die antike Volkswirtschaft kennenzulernen").

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE has published an article on the rise of prices in Roman Egypt, basing it on the materials collected by SEGRÈ. His article, though interesting, seems to me to contain both dubious history and dubious economics; he attributes to the "trades unions" more power than they possessed, and he appears to forget that wages are not the only factor in the determination of prices. *The Rise of Prices in Roman Egypt*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1922, 103-7.

ROSTOVITZEFF's masterly work *A Large Estate* has been everywhere received with praise. Reviews by the following have come to my notice: C. C. EDGAR (*Journ. Hell. Stud.*, XLII, 1922, 292-4; important; laudatory on the whole but points out various oversights or misconceptions); W. L. WESTERMANN (*Class. Weekly*, xvi, 1923, 110-12; do.); H. I. BELL (*Class. Rev.*, XXXVII, 1923, 32-4); J. G. M[ILNE] (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 129); F. ZUCKER (*Hist. Zeitschr.*, CXXIX, 69-78); J. PARTSCH (*Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII, 1922, 564-7; mentions some fine Philadelphia rolls of B.C. 179-173 at Freiburg, to be published in the third Series of *Mitt. aus d. Freib. Papyri*); W. SCHUBART (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 266-8; the book, despite various shortcomings, belongs "zum besten, was über den Staat der Ptolemäer geschrieben worden ist"); M. A. LEVI (*Boll. di Fil. Class.*, xxx, 1923-4, 83); L. C. WEST (*Class. Phil.*, xviii, 1923, 95-6); N. HOHLWEIN (*Musée Belge*, xxvi, 1922, 315-19); P. COLLART (*Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxv, 1922, 467-72); a short notice by WILCKEN in *Archiv f. Pap.*, vii, 74-5.

In an interesting article on Philadelphus's agricultural policy R. JOHANNESSEN calls attention to the double sowing (δισσορεῖν) and three-months wheat in P. Edgar 27, which he illustrates from Theophrastus, *Hist. Plantarum*. *Inter alia* Theophrastus refers to double crops at Chalcia, an island belonging to the Rhodians, etc. JOHANNESSEN thinks the King's order in Edgar 27 may have been suggested by a scientist of the type of Theophrastus and have been intended as an experiment. *Ptolemy Philadelphus and Scientific Agriculture*, in *Class. Phil.*, xviii (1923), 156-61.

C. C. EDGAR, *à propos* of some remarks of WILCKEN on the importation of Milesian sheep, quotes a passage from one of Zeno's accounts proving the importation of Sicilian pigs; also a letter of Apollonius on the planting of pines, for use *and beauty*. *Miscellanea*, v, in *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, xix (1923), 114-18.

In this connexion I may mention that the first volume of SCHNEBEL's work on Egyptian agriculture is now ready for press, and efforts are being made to raise a fund for its publication. It is greatly to be hoped that they will be successful. The subject is one of primary importance and exceptional interest, and the material bearing on it in papyri is unusually rich; but no big systematic attempt had previously been made to deal with it.

M. ROSTOVITZEFF has published a paper (originally read at the Historical Congress at Brussels last year) on the crisis of the Roman Empire in the 3rd cent. It seems likely to be of considerable importance, but I have unfortunately been unable, up to the present, to see it. *La crise sociale et politique de l'Empire romain au III siècle après J.-C.*, in *Musée Belge*, xxvii (1923), 233-42 (see *Aegyptus*, iv, 348, no. 3665).

G. MÖLLER calls attention to evidence, in a Hieratic letter of the Nineteenth Dynasty at Cairo, for the existence at that period of a tax on donkeys, such as we know existed in the Graeco-Roman period. *Ägyptologische Randbemerkungen*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, vii, 65.

F. LOT in a paper read at the Brussels Historical Congress dealt with the difficult question of the *caput* as a fiscal unit in the Byzantine taxation system. So far as I am aware this paper has not been published, and I am dependent for a knowledge of its contents on the summary issued in advance. From this it appears that LOT sought to establish that the *caput* "représente une propriété foncière 'moyenne' et que sa base est assez large pour qu'elle puisse servir d'assiette à une contribution foncière élevée." It is to be hoped that the paper, whose title is *Le "caput" fiscal du Bas-Empire, son étendue et sa valeur imposable*, will be published.

*Numismatics.* G. F. HILL publishes a fine well-preserved bronze coin of Domitia, wife of Domitian, from Alexandria, which the British Museum has recently acquired. On the obverse is the head of Domitia,

on the reverse *Ειρήνη Σεβαστή*. The year is the 11th, when there was a sudden change in style, with a great improvement in art and fabric. *An Alexandrian Coin of Domitia*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 164-5.

J. G. MILNE analyses (except in section 1, by reigns) the coins found at Oxyrhynchus: (1) Ptolemaic; (2) Augustus-Diocletian; (3) Diocletian (post-reform)-Honorius (these also by mints); (4) Justinian-Heraclius. He mentions also those of the 5th cent. and the Arab ones. He points out the curious fact that under Constantine Egypt became a coin-importing country. One of the coins is from the London mint. In the 5th cent. the evidence reveals a complete economic collapse. *The Coins from Oxyrhynchus*, in *Journal*, VIII (1922), 158-63.

In the *Mitt. d. numism. Ges. in Wien*, xv (1922), 164, appears, under the title *Trichryson*, a note of a lecture by W. KUBITSCHKE on P. Edgar 5 and SCHUBART's article on it.

## 6. LAW.

I may refer here to an article by S. PIVANO referred to more fully below, § 9.

The year under review has witnessed the appearance of an important work. This is the 17th edition of R. SOHM's classical *Institutionen, Geschichte und System des römischen Privatrechtes*, revised by L. MITTEIS and edited by L. WENGER (München u. Leipzig, Duncker u. Humblot, 1923. Pp. x+756).

L. ADAM reviews (*Z. f. vergl. Rechtsw.*, I, 1922-3, 377-81) KOHLER and WENGER, *Allgemeine Rechtsgeschichte*, I Hälfte: *Orient. Recht u. Recht der Griechen und Römer*.

P. KRÜGER calls attention to and reprints P. Oxy. xv, 1813 and 1814. *Neue juristische Funde aus Ägypten*, in *Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII (1922), 560-3. P. B. does the same for the latter papyrus (*Bull. Ist. Dir. Rom.*, XXXII, 1922-3, 277-82).

At the Brussels Historical Congress P. DE FRANCISCI read a paper entitled *Quelques observations sur l'histoire du testament conjonctif réciproque*, which, from the summary, apparently touched on the papyrus evidence. While on the subject of inheritance I may refer to the Salsilyeh parchment dealt with above (§ 3, p. 161).

I know only from a review by P. DE FRANCISCI (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 337-8) an apparently very important article by J. PARTSCH on the publicity of sales of real property in Ptolemaic Egypt ("un primo tentativo di sistemazione dei principi regolanti la pubblicità dei contratti immobiliari sotto i Tolemei"). PARTSCH thinks that the Ptolemies imitated "sistemi in vigore nelle città greche dell' Asia Minore." DE FRANCISCI gives the article high praise. *Die griechische Publizität der Grundstücksverträge im Ptolemäerrecht*, in *Festschrift für Otto Lenel*, Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1921.

I have already dealt from the religious point of view with VON WOESS's very important work *Das Asylwesen* (see above, § 2, p. 154); but it was specially from the juristic side that the author approached the subject, and something must be said of it here. He inclines to think that the institution of asylum originated in dynastic times, though it perhaps fell into disuse under the Persians; hence its appearance under the Ptolemies was at most a revival only. He traces the institution downwards, through the Roman period (when it diminished in importance but did not wholly disappear) to its revival in the Christian age. It was a symptom, on the one hand, of governmental tyranny, on the other, of the economic misery of the subject classes. As to details, he thinks state debtors and the Persians of the Epigone were excluded from the benefits of asylum. In § 7 he develops the theory that the ἀγώγιμος clause means, "can be arrested even in asylum." In an appendix E. SCHWARTZ publishes the βασιλικὸς νόμος περὶ τῶν προσφευγόντων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. In Appendix I VON WOESS collects the inscriptions concerning asylum. Reviewed by V. ARANGIO-RUIZ (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 332-6).

The same author has also published an interesting article on personal execution and the *cessio bonorum*. He holds that personal execution continued to the latest period, and indeed was probably at all times the normal method, for the reason that the conditions of the *cessio bonorum* were such that for many persons they were inapplicable. "Die cessio bonorum war von Haus aus nur bei nachgewiesenem Unglücksfall... zugelassen" (p. 509 f.). People who could find no sureties ("die Masse der kleinen Leute also") were arrested on the institution of the process (p. 513 f.). But, further, *bona* must be present in sufficient quantity. He uses throughout the evidence of papyri. *Personalexekution und cessio bonorum im römischen Reichsrecht*, in *Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII (1922), 485-529.

A work by A. J. BOYÉ entitled *La denuntiatio* is cited in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 204, for a correction in P. Iand. II, 9; but I am unable to see it.

WŁASSAK's *Judikationsbefehl* (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 109) is reviewed by O. LENEL (*Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII, 1922, 567-74) and his *Anklage und Streibefestigung im Kriminalrecht der Römer* (*Stzgsber. Wien. Ak.*, CLXXXIV, 1 Abh., Wien, 1917, 8°. Pp. 252. 8 Kr.) by A. STEINWENTER (*Münch. Krit. Vierteljahrsschr.*, 3 F., XX, 346-85; a few papyrus references).

A. STEINWENTER, à propos of P. Cairo Masp. III, 67295, I, 1-31, II, 1-25, discusses the question whether the *libellus contradictorius* was obligatory. He decides that "eine ausdrückliche Erklärung des Beklagten bei der Ladung, den geltend gemachten Anspruch bestreiten zu wollen" was legally necessary (this was probably the ἀντιβιβλίον of Nov. 53, 3), but *libelli contradictorii* were optional. He also holds that the first was derived from classical-Greek and Hellenistic law, the second developed from it, so that it was only mediately connected with Greek law. *Libelli contradictorii*, in *Archiv f. Pap.*, VII, 52-9.

A work by S. CUGIA entitled *Profili del tirocinio industriale (diritto romano: papiri greco-egizi)* (Napoli, Alvano, 1922. Pp. 113) is not accessible to me. See *Aegyptus*, IV, 107, no. 3114.

SAN NICOLÒ's *Schlussklauseln* (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 110) has been reviewed by G. LAUTNER (*Z. vergl. Rechtsw.*, XL, 1922-3, 462-7; laudatory) and H. I. BELL (*Journal*, IX, 1923, 120-1; do.).

#### 7. PALAEOGRAPHY AND DIPLOMATIC.

W. SCHUBART contributes to the third edition of GERCKE and NORDEN's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* a chapter entitled *Papyruskunde* (I, 9, pp. 27-68). In this very interesting and instructive sketch of our subject he draws on the more strictly diplomatic and bibliographical part of his *Einführung*, but incorporates later material and modifies his treatment in various ways. As specimens of editorial procedure he republishes one and edits for the first time two other papyri from the Berlin collection, to which I have already referred at the proper place above. In this article SCHUBART refers (p. 65) to an article of his own entitled *Fragen und Aufgaben der Papyruskunde* (*Z. d. Deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum*, I, no. 5/6, 1918) which is inaccessible to me.

In his bibliography in *Sokrates* (see below, § 9, p. 170) SCHUBART refers (p. 186) to an article by H. IBSCHER entitled *Von der Papyrusrolle zum Kodex* (*Arch. f. Buchbinderei*, XX, Heft 3/4, 1920), which I am also unable to see.

A. MENTZ has published a summary sketch of Greek and Latin palaeography, making use of the papyri and particularly emphasizing the mutual relation and inter-action of Greek and Latin script. The text is given in continuous form, uninterrupted by notes and references, which are collected at the end of each chapter. There are no facsimiles, but many reproductions of single letters in their varying forms. *Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Schrift bis zur Erfindung des Buchdruckes mit beweglichen Lettern*. Leipzig, 1920. Pp. 155. Reviewed by F. RÖRIG (*Hist. Vierteljahrsschrift*, XXI, 1922-3, 194-6; favourable).

As part of a series entitled *Auxilia ad res italicas mediæ aevi exquirendas in usum scholarum instructa et collecta* (Ostinelli, Como), L. SCHIAPARELLI has published two very useful volumes. The first is a study of the Latin script in the Roman period, in which large use is made of the papyri and other documents from Egypt. Tables of letter-forms are given, and there is a good bibliography (in which however there is the usual ample allowance of misprints in the English references). *La scrittura latina nell'età romana*. 1921. Pp. xi + 208. 32 illustrations.

The other is a handy and well printed collection of documents, including papyri and wax and bronze tablets from Egypt, inscriptions, tablets from Pompeii and Verespatak, etc. *Documenti romani*. 1923. Pp. xv + 160.

These two volumes seem admirably adapted to their purpose, and their usefulness will by no means be confined to the classes for whom the series of which they form part is more particularly intended. Both are reviewed by A. C[ALDERINI] (*Aegyptus*, IV, 1923, 86-9) and the second by O. MARTIN (*Rev. Hist. de Droit*, 4 Sér., II, 1923, 308-10; favourable).

A very useful and handy little booklet, with excellent plates, has been published by E. KÜHN on the subject of ancient writing-materials. *Antikes Schreibgerät. (Meisterwerke in Berlin.)* Berlin, Julius Bard [1923]. Pp. 12. 12 plates.

D. BASSI gives an account of the activities of his Department during the period 1913-1923. *L'Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi dal 1913 al 1923*, in *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 117-22.

A careful study of the form of the ancient Greek letter has been published by FR. X. J. EXLER. This work, which is a doctoral dissertation for the Catholic University of America, covers only the period from the 3rd cent. B.C. to the 3rd of our era. It is classified under the following heads: Opening Formulas; Closing Formulas; Date Formulas; Conventional Phrases. There is a general introduction on epistolo-

graphy. The various formulae are arranged in groups, the similar ones being placed together in chronological order. *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography*. Washington, D.C., Catholic University of America, 1923. Pp. 141. Reviewed by W. M. CALDER (*Class. Rev.*, xxxviii, 1924, 31).

HASEBROEK's *Signalement* has been reviewed by O. LEUZE (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 443-4) and M. ENGERS (*Museum*, Leiden, xxx, 1922-3, 78-9); and PREISIGKE's *Skaptoparene* by A. STEINWENTER (*D. Lit.-Z.*, xliii, 1922, 260-2).

WILCKEN points out that two hands alternate in the Elephantine scolia, *Berl. Kl.-Texte*, v, 2, 56 ff. In *Archiv f. Pap.*, vii, 66.

The last part of the New Palaeographical Society's Series II contains two good facsimiles of papyri. One is P. Edgar 48, the epitaphs on Zeno's hound (Pl. 116), the other P. Fay. 87 = P. Lond. 825 (Pl. 117).

#### 8. LEXICOGRAPHY AND GRAMMAR.

H. LIETZMANN reviews MOULTON and MILLIGAN's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, xxii, 1923, 155-6).

PREISIGKE's *Fachwörter* has been reviewed by H. WILLRICH (*Theol. Lit.-Z.*, xlviii, 1923, 248).

G. LUMBROSO, in his 48th letter to BRECCIA, quotes some passages from KOHEN's translation of Polybius on Egyptian names. *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, N.S., v, 112-3. W. SPIEGELBERG identifies the name Κομοᾶνις with Gm = w-H'pj. Κομοᾶνις, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, lviii (1923), 155. PREISIGKE's *Namenbuch* has been reviewed by A. S. HUNT (*Class. Rev.*, xxxvii, 1923, 138-9), K. SETHE (*G.G.A.*, clxxxv, 1923, 227-30; some valuable remarks on accentuation; thinks it better to abstain from the accentuation of Egyptian names in Greek form, or at least to be very sparing in the use of accents), C. WESSELY (*Byz.-Neugr. Jahrb.*, iv, 1923, 136), W. SCHUBART (*Or. Lit.-Z.*, xxvi, 1923, 206-9; some criticisms of plan but very appreciative), and E. KIESSLING (*Phil. Woch.*, xliii, 1923, 133-4; some corrections).

G. LUMBROSO, in his 14th letter to CALDERINI, points out that the occurrence of the word σμαρία in an inscription from Achoris published by LEFEBVRE illustrates its use on Alexandrian coins. *Aegyptus*, iii (1922), 291.

N. D. COLEMAN in a note on *Mark*, ix, 49, 50, tries to prove, using papyrus evidence, that ἄλας = salted food, especially fish. His argument is not altogether convincing, but there may be something in his idea. *Note on Mark ix 49, 50: A new meaning for ἄλας*, in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, xxiv, 1922-3, 387-96.

On the analogy of ἀνδρισμός in P. Lond. iv, 1338 as "Mannschaft" S. G. MERCATI suggests that ἀνδραποδιμός in S. EFHRAEM SYRI *In Abraham et Isaac*, v, 437-40 bis = "i servi." *Note papirologiche*, in *Biblica*, iii (1922), 451-4 (note 6).

An interesting but not specially original volume has been published by H. G. MEECHAM, the object of which is to illustrate from the Oxyrhynchus papyri the language and thought, particularly the former, of the New Testament writers. *Light from Ancient Letters*. London, George Allen and Unwin, 1923. Pp. 189. A short notice in *Times Lit. Suppl.*, July 12, 1923, p. 475. A review below.

J. R. MANTEY, using papyrus evidence, collects instances of uncommon uses of prepositions in the New Testament. *Unusual Meanings for Prepositions in the Greek New Testament*, in *Expositor*, xlix (1923), 453-60.

#### 9. GENERAL WORKS, BIBLIOGRAPHY, MISCELLANEOUS NOTES ON PAPYRUS TEXTS.

In a review of SCHUBART's *Einführung V*. ARANGIO-RUIZ praises the work, but deprecates the large amount of space devoted to literary papyri. *Un nuovo manuale di Papirologia*, in *Atene e Roma*, N.S., iii (1922), 283-6. The work is also reviewed by L. WENGER (*D. Lit.-Z.*, xliii, 1922, 289-97).

A hearty welcome must be given to a second edition, revised and incorporating recently published material, of SCHUBART's excellent work *Ein Jahrtausend am Nil*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1923. Pp. lxxx + 144, 4 plates, 35 illustrations in the text. This well-produced and in every way attractive book should have a wide sale, and it is to be regretted that it has not been translated into English.

A new edition (the fourth) has also appeared of A. DEISSMANN's great classic *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1923. Pp. xvii + 447, 83 illustrations in the text). It is unnecessary to enlarge on the merits of a work so well known and in such constant use. It is sufficient to say that the whole volume has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date, and that much material published since the appearance of the last edition has been incorporated into it. An English translation is, I believe, being prepared. Reviewed

by H. A. A. KENNEDY (*Expos. Times*, xxxiv, 1922-3, 415-16), W. M. CALDER (*Class. Rev.*, xxxviii, 1924, 29-30), and H. LIETZMANN (*Z. neut. Wiss.*, xxii, 1923, 155).

A. S. HUNT, in an interesting article, sketches the history of the Graeco-Roman branch of the Egypt Exploration Society and its services to papyrology. *Twenty-Five Years of Papyrology*, in *Journal*, viii (1922), 121-8.

PREISIGKE's *Antikes Leben* is reviewed, with high praise, by A. BERGER (*Z. vergl. Rechtsw.*, I, 1922-3, 399-400). A. C[ALDERINI] reviews MILLIGAN's *Here and There among the Papyri* (*Journal*, ix, 1923, 112), in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 220-1.

H. B[OLKESTEIN] reviews two lectures which are inaccessible to me. One is by M. ENGERS on *Papyrologie en Oude Geschiedenis* (a lecture at the University of Amsterdam); the other one by D. COHEN on *De Grieksche papyrologie en hare beteekenis voor de kennis der antieke beschavingsgeschiedenis* (a lecture at Leyden). Reviews in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, xxxviii (1923), 128-31.

R. C. HORN publishes a popular article entitled *Life and Letters in the Papyri* (*Class. Journ.*, xvii, 1922, 487-502).

A work of a general character on the papyri was published in 1919 by J. HÜTTLOVA (*Poklady egyptských hrobu. Z dejin papyru a papyrovych nálezu*. Praha [Prague], 1919. Pp. 64), and was reviewed by F. HOFFMEISTR (*Listy Filol.*, xlvi, 1919, 358-9), but book and review are alike beyond my reach. See *Aegyptus*, iv, 347, no. 3633.

A. CALDERINI has published a paper read at the Brussels Historical Congress, in which he makes proposals for an institution to centralize papyrological studies. He refers to the example set by *Aegyptus*. *Comment procéder à une organisation pratique pour l'étude des matériaux papyrologiques*, in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 190-6.

A. E. R. BOAK gives a brief account of the papyrus collection of the University of Michigan, mentioning specially the more important literary and theological papyri and the two chief collections. *The University of Michigan Collection of Papyri*, in *Aegyptus*, iv, 38-40.

CALDERINI calls attention (*Aegyptus*, iv, 217-18) to an article by H. HENNE which seems to be of considerable importance but is inaccessible to me. In it he gives an account of the Graux papyri, so called because they were bought out of funds left for the purchase of papyri by the late Charles Graux to the Bibliothèque Nationale. The two which HENNE deals with provide new evidence for the depopulation of Egypt (the Fayyûm) in the first century of our era. *Papyrus Graux*, in *Bull. Inst. fr. Arch. Orient.*, xxii (1923), 189-214, 2 plates.

G. ROUILLARD has done a great service in compiling and publishing a classified list of the published papyri of the Vienna collections. She gives first a bibliography of publications, then a list of the single papyri arranged in classes, finally a table of contents. *Les papyrus grecs de Vienne: Inventaire des documents publiés*, in *Rev. d. Bibliothèques*, jan.—mars, 1923. Pp. 92. Reviewed by D. BASSI (*Aegyptus*, iv, 338-9).

S. DE RICCI has published another instalment of his admirable *Bulletin Papyrologique* (v, 1913-1922; in *Rev. ét. gr.*, xxxvi, 1923, 66-114), which may, without exaggeration, be described as a model of what a bibliography should be.

SCHUBART continues his bibliography (*Papyrusforschung*) in *Sokrates: Jahresb. d. Phil. Vereins*, XLVIII (1922), 181-94.

D. BASSI has published a bibliography of the papyrological articles in the *Riv. Fil. Class.* during the 50 years 1872-1922. *Papirologia greca e latina*, in *Riv. Fil. Class.*, I (1922), 133-5.

Reference should also be made to the very complete and well-arranged bibliography in the *Byz. Zeitschr.*, which will frequently be found of service to papyrologists. *B.Z.*, xxiv (1922-3), 133-295.

S. PIVANO has published a lecture given by him in the University of Turin, in which he reviews the services of Italian scholarship to papyrology, particularly on its juristic side. *Gli studi di papirologia giuridica e la scienza italiana*, in *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 245-82.

E. KALINKA publishes suggestions and notes on various papyri, viz.: WILCKEN, *Chrest.* 497=Grenf. II, 67; MITTEIS, *Chrest.* 29=Taur. 13; 79=Oxy. 37; 80=Flor. 61; 106=B.G.U. 1146; 311=Eleph. 2. *Aus der Werkstatt des Hörsaals (Stzgsber. Wien. Ak., cxcvii, 6. Abh., Wien, 1922), 27-36*. A. G. ROOS publishes suggestions and notes on P. Giss. 22, 76, 47 and MEYER, *Jur. Pap.* 14 (=Oxy. 1467). *Animadversiones in Papyros nonnullas Graecas*, in *Mnemosyne*, N.S., LI (1923), 415-20. A. WILHELM, in the course of some notes *Zu griechischen Inschriften und Papyri (Anz. Ak. d. Wiss. Wien, Ph.-hist. Kl., 1922, xv-xviii, 12 July, pp. 42)* deals (pp. 40-2) with the well-known Germanicus edict in the Berlin collection, in which the

mysterious combination *εὐνοπαρεία* has hitherto defied all attempts at elucidation. He explains it convincingly as *ἐν ὑποπαραΐα*: "meine Wirksamkeit ist an allen Segnungen der Herrschaft ihrer Göttlichkeit nur *in untergeordnetem Masse* beteiligt." S. G. MERCATI in C.P.R. 30 proposes *θεολόγος* in place of *εὐλόγος* as the epithet of St. John the Evangelist. *Note papyrologique*, in *Biblica*, III (1922), 451-4, note 5.

#### 10. MISCELLANEOUS AND PERSONAL.

It is welcome news that the third Heft of Vol. I of the Hamburg Papyri is in the press and indeed is, I understand, nearly ready. WESSELY is autographing the second volume of HOPFNER's *Offenbarungszauber*. I learn from Dr. E. DIEHL of Riga that O. KRUEGER, an assistant at the Hermitage, is preparing an edition of all the papyri in various collections in Russia.

STEINWENTER and OERTEL have started an "Arbeitsstätte für Papyrologie" at Graz; and WESTERMANN, who is now at the Columbia University of New York, is training a papyrologist there and hopes to organize a group of workers in the field. He is himself working at the Cornell papyri.

Papyrology has sustained an irreparable loss in the death from pneumonia, on 8 February of this year, of FR. PREISIGKE. Coming to the study comparatively late in life, he threw himself into it with marvellous energy and endurance. His excellent edition of the Strassburg papyri shows his skill as an editor of unpublished material, while his monographs on the municipal magistracies, on banking, on the inscription of Scaptopara, on the divine "fluid," etc., reveal a wide range of knowledge and interest and the capacity for working out a long argument and presenting a thesis with plausibility. His own administrative experience gave his researches on ancient administration a special authority, though no doubt it sometimes led him to attribute to ancient practice a consistency and degree of system which it lacked. But it is as the compiler of such invaluable works of reference as his *Berichtigungslisten*, *Sammelbuch*, *Fachwörter*, and *Namenbuch* that he established his strongest claim on the gratitude of papyrologists. His eagerly-awaited index of words is already in the press, and it is greatly to be hoped that it will be possible to publish this work. That would indeed be the best tribute which his colleagues could pay to his memory. (See below.)

A memorial volume in honour of JEAN LESQUIER has been published. It includes a biography by P. JOUGUET, an account of the funeral obsequies from the *Lexovien*, notices by various friends, and a bibliography. *Jean Lesquier (1879-1921): Hommages à sa Mémoire recueillées par ses amis*. Lisieux, E. Morière, 1923. Pp. 68.

L. WENGER has published a lengthy and important memoir of MITTEIS. *Ludwig Mitteis und sein Werk*. Wien, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freytag. Pp. 82. Photograph. Other obituaries of him have been published by P. KOSCHAKER (*Ber. üb. Verh. d. Sächs. Ak. d. Wiss.*, Ph.-hist. Kl., LXXIV, 1922, 21-9), P. VINOGRADOFF (*Journal*, VIII, 1922, 258-9), and J. PARTSCH (*Z. Sav.-St.*, XLIII, 1922, v-xxxi).

WILCKEN publishes obituary notices of DIELS, ROBERT, MITTEIS, NICOLE, LESQUIER, TH. REIL, and MÖLLER. It appears that the second part of REIL's *Gewerbe* was almost complete when he died.

B. SCHWARZ published a short article on WILCKEN's career and work in honour of his sixtieth birthday (*Leipziger Tageblatt*, Wed., 20 Dec., 1922).

*Finished March 1924.*

## FRIEDRICH PREISIGKE

By the death, on 8 February last, of FRIEDRICH PREISIGKE, honorary professor at Heidelberg, papyrology, which in recent years has had to deplore the deaths of such scholars as Jean Maspero, Plaumann, and Lesquier, has suffered another irreparable loss. Preisigke belonged to a class of scholar little represented in papyrological studies and rarer in Germany than in this country—the unacademic, non-professional researcher, who studies his subject only in the leisure left from professional duties. Born at Dessau in 1856, he entered the postal service, to which his father also had belonged, and after serving at Magdeburg, Berlin, and Hamburg, he returned in 1893 to Berlin, where he took up the study of papyri and eventually gained his doctorate with an acute and important work entitled *Städtisches Beamtenwesen im römischen Ägypten* (Halle, 1903). In details the conclusions there stated have been corrected by subsequent research, but the little treatise still retains an acknowledged place in the literature of the subject, and at the time of publication it marked a very noteworthy advance in knowledge.

Preisigke was later removed to Strassburg as *Kaiserlicher Telegraphendirektor*, and there he remained till the end of the war and the consequent loss of Strassburg. His residence there afforded him the opportunity of studying the till then mainly unpublished Strassburg collection of papyri, of which he edited the non-literary documents (*Griechische Papyrus...zu Strassburg*, Band I, Leipzig, 1912; Band II, Leipzig, 1920). The second volume, owing to the loss of the province, had to remain incomplete, containing only such documents as had been finally edited before the French occupation. His edition of these papyri is described by no less an authority than Wilcken as “one of the soundest and most sterling achievements in this field”; and it is indeed astounding that a busy official should have been able, in his spare time, to undertake the severe and exacting work involved in editing so successfully documents of this kind. Another work of the same class was his *Griechische Urkunden des Ägyptischen Museums zu Kairo* (*Schr. d. Wiss. Ges. in Strassburg*, 8. Heft, Strassburg, 1911), an edition, on a less elaborate scale, of a number of papyri at Cairo. A further work, undertaken in collaboration with W. Spiegelberg, who edited the Demotic texts, is *Die Prinz-Joachim-Ostraka: Griechische und demotische Beisetzungsurkunden für Ibis- und Falkenmumien aus Ombos* (*Schr. d. Wiss. Ges. in Strassburg*, 19. Heft, 1914). The commentary on these texts, in which Preisigke deals at length with administrative and other questions, is particularly valuable.

To most men situated as Preisigke was these volumes would have been labour enough, but they formed only a part of his amazing output. He devoted himself specially, on the one hand, to the study of ancient administration and economics, a subject which his own experience made very attractive to him and enabled him to treat with peculiar authority, and, on the other, to the production of works of reference, very necessary now that papyrological materials are so numerous and widespread. To the former class belong his bulky volume *Girwesen im griechischen Ägypten* (Strassburg, 1910), an exhaustive study of Graeco-Egyptian banking still valuable as the most comprehensive work on the subject but vitiated in many respects by a misunderstanding of certain documents used in evidence, and his monograph on the Scaptopara inscription, *Die Inschrift von Skaptoparene in ihrer Beziehung zur kaiserlichen Kanzlei in Rom* (*Schr. d. Wiss. Ges. in Strassburg*, 30. Heft, 1917), as well as some elaborate articles in periodicals, like his study of P. Teb. 5 (*Die Friedenskundgebung des Königs Euergetes II*, in *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung*, v, 301–16) and his very important discussion of the Graeco-Roman record office for landed property (*Das Wesen der βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων*, in *Klio*, XII, 402–60). In dealing with matters of this kind he had no doubt the defects of his qualities, for that acquaintance with modern practice which made him so valuable an interpreter of ancient analogies sometimes led him to attribute to the Graeco-Roman administration a degree of method and consistency which is doubtless attained in the German bureaucracy but which seems improbable in ancient times; but his treatment was always suggestive and not infrequently illuminating.

He cast his net more widely in a slim volume contributed to the series *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, of which it formed No. 565. In this volume (*Antikes Leben nach den ägyptischen Papyri*, 1916) he surveyed, in a brief but interesting sketch, the daily life of Graeco-Roman Egypt.

To the second class of work belongs a whole series of undertakings, in which perhaps Preisigke rendered to papyrology services of more permanent value than in any other sphere. These are: *Fachwörter des*



*öffentlichen Verwaltungsdienstes Ägyptens* (Göttingen, 1915), a handy and useful, though not exhaustive, list of technical terms in Greek papyri, with explanations and references; *Berichtigungsliste der Griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten* (Strassburg, 1913–22), a collection of the published, with many unpublished, corrections to papyrus texts: *Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, a collection of Greek texts of all kinds (papyri, inscriptions, ostraca, etc.) published in periodicals and other places unprovided with an exhaustive index (of this series two volumes had appeared before Preisigke's death, the first consisting entirely of texts, the second of indexes to them); and *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922), an index of personal names in the Greek papyri, ostraca, inscriptions, etc., from Egypt. A word-index to published papyri was already in the press at the time of the author's death, and it is much to be hoped that it will be possible to complete the printing of this invaluable work.

After the loss of Strassburg Preisigke removed to Heidelberg, where he was appointed honorary professor and where he organized a Papyrus Institute. To the series of monographs published by this he himself contributed two volumes, the first entitled *Vom göttlichen Fluidum nach ägyptischer Anschauung*, the second, continuing the thesis of the first, *Die Gotteskraft der frühchristlichen Zeit*. In these he ventured outside the sphere most familiar to him, and despite the learning and ingenuity displayed I cannot think the results wholly successful.

Even the list of works specified above is by no means exhaustive. Preisigke's energy was indeed amazing, and had he been spared he would doubtless have enriched the science of papyrology with yet further valuable publications. He had not the philological equipment nor even, perhaps, the critical instinct which would entitle him to be called a great scholar, but he was certainly a scholar of immense industry and enthusiasm and of considerable acumen, and his services to papyrology can hardly be over-estimated.

H. I. BELL.

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Society's excavations at El-'Amarnah closed down on February 26th, not 6th as stated in our last number. An exhibition of the antiquities found will take place in London, probably early in July, in rooms at Burlington House kindly placed at our disposal by the Society of Antiquaries.

Preliminary reports of the excavations at El-'Amarnah will appear in the combined Parts III and IV which will be issued in the autumn of this year. Those who feel inclined to lament the lack of plates in the present number will then find themselves amply compensated, for both these reports and Mr. Winlock's important article on the Seventeenth Dynasty royal cemetery at Thebes will be profusely illustrated with collotypes.

M. Henri Munier asks us to announce that he is preparing for next year a catalogue, by authors' names, of all the works in the Bibliothèque du Musée égyptien in Cairo, of which he is librarian. He adds, "Pour répondre au désir et au plan de M. Jean Capart, il serait à souhaiter vivement que toutes les bibliothèques égyptologiques suivissent cet exemple: de la sorte l'Institut de Bibliographie établi par le savant belge à Bruxelles pourrait, par le dépouillement de tous les catalogues, éditer, d'une façon plus rapide et plus complète, le Manuel de Bibliographie qui rendrait tant de services à tous les égyptologues."

At the fifth Congrès des sciences historiques, held at Brussels in 1923, a provisional committee was appointed to deal with the establishment of a new periodical for Byzantine studies. We are now asked by this committee to announce that the first number of this periodical, which will be called *Byzantion*, will appear in October of this year. The journal will hereafter be issued twice yearly, and will contain original articles, reviews, and bibliographies of Byzantine publications. Manuscripts, which may be submitted in almost every European language—though some of these will eventually appear in French translation—should be sent to the editor, 12, rue Royale, Brussels.


Professor Sethe will, we hope, forgive us for announcing, without asking his permission, that he is about to issue an entirely new edition of Erman's useful *Aegyptische Chrestomathie*. It will contain, we understand, a complete text of Sinuhe and of the Westcar Papyrus, together with considerable portions of the Eloquent Peasant and a number of unpublished hieroglyphic and hieratic inscriptions. Printing is to start at once, and those who wish for copies of this book, which should be invaluable for class work, should write to Professor Sethe, Ägyptische Abteilung des Staatsmuseum, am Lustgarten, Berlin C 2. The price will be about 5 gold Marks (roughly 5/-).

Professor Olmstead sends the following note on a point in his article *Near-East Problems*, in *Journal*, VIII, 223 ff.—

Since writing the above, I have examined the Khian cylinder seal mentioned on p. 225,

in company with Professor T. George Allen of the University of Chicago, and he has sent me the following note :

“The cylinder seal of Khian preserved at the Art Institute, Chicago, has the permanent registration number 94.1280. Its lower end, of uncertain length, is lost. The part preserved reads, according to my collation: ‘King of Lower Egypt, lord of the Two Lands, lord...life of the people (of Egypt) [or ‘that the people (of Egypt) might live,’ or perhaps, as suggested in my *Handbook*, ‘life in the presence of Khian’]...King of Upper Egypt, who increased...in [his] body...*S-wsr-(n)-r*<sup>c</sup>, son of Re<sup>c</sup>, of [his] body...’

“The writing <sup>1</sup> (*sic*) is probably intended for *t'wy*, ‘the Two Lands.’ If read instead as *mr-t* without determinative, it might do for ‘vassals’ or even for ‘love,’ but it would be highly abnormal for *mry-t*, ‘embankment, shore, dyke.’ This last word, in a more natural writing, is actually used of the Syro-Palestinian coast in the annals of Tuthmosis III (*Urk.* IV, 729). It would be attractive to read it here; but both the writing and the second *nb*, not shown in Pier’s copy, which might then be either ‘lord’ again or the modifier ‘all,’ are against it.”

As supplement to p. 232, we may add a reference to the newly published inscription of Tukulti Ninib, or as probably we should now say, Tukulti Urta I, *cf.* LUCKENBILL, *A.J.S.L.*, XXXIX, 61 ff. In the beginning of his reign, he tells us, he was forced to meet an attack of the Hittites from the Euphrates crossing (SCHROEDER, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*, II, no. 61, 23). With this is in some way to be connected the letter fragment (*K.Bo.* III, 74) from Dudhalia to Tukulti Urta, *cf.* LUCKENBILL, *loc. cit.*

In an earlier number of this *Journal*, VIII, 45 ff., Sidney Smith has anticipated my location of Kissuwadna with Cilicia and of the Shamri river with the Sarus. He is wrong in identifying Atania with the Atun of Sargon and Aruna with the Arinna of Tiglath Pileser I. The latter is in Musri, only a few miles from Nineveh (OLMSTEAD, *J.A.O.S.*, XXXVII, 179, n. 29, where the reference to the Hittite treaty should be deleted). The current identification of the former with Tyana (OLMSTEAD, *Sargon*, 83) is not proved by the finding of the Midas inscription at Tyana (MYRES, *Liverpool Annals*, I, Pl. XIII), for Atun’s king Matti allied himself to Mita-Midas.

<sup>1</sup> The two lower signs are very roughly made.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*Les figurines funéraires égyptiennes.* By LOUIS SPELEERS. Pp. 188, 46 plates and 5 sketches. Brussels: Sand (for the Fondation Universitaire de Belgique). 1923.

Monsieur Louis Speleers has the pen of a ready writer, and has now added another to the several works on the archaeology of Egypt and Western Asia that he has lately produced. M. Speleers has always been specially interested in *šauabti*-figures, and has studied them in many museums besides his own at Brussels, where his chief, M. Capart, has in the last few years created a national collection of Egyptian antiquities worthy of Belgium. His book is therefore valuable as the result of special study. It is not a detailed catalogue, naturally, of all the funerary figures in half-a-dozen of our chief museums, nor does M. Speleers, as he says, overload his work with all the inscriptions that belong to the *šauabtis* that he does describe. He wishes his book to be readable, and not unwieldy. As it is not an official catalogue of all the objects of the kind in the museums concerned, this is no doubt the best course to pursue. Otherwise one would not be able to see the wood for the trees. An official catalogue, which must at times be unreadable by any but scientific researchers, is in quite a different case.

The present reviewer is himself specially interested in *šauabti*-figures as he is engaged on an official catalogue of those in the British Museum. Since the publication of Sir Ernest Budge's *Mummy*, thirty years ago, Mr. Towry Whyte's article of 1896 in the *P.S.B.A.*, and Prof. Newberry's chapter in the report on Lord Northampton's excavations in the Theban Necropolis, little that is very new has been written specially on *šauabtis*, though of course there is much information to be gleaned from the publications of archaeological excavations, such as our own of the Egypt Exploration Society, and those of Professors Petrie, Garstang, and Reisner, and their colleagues. M. Speleers sketches the history of the *šauabti* from the Middle Kingdom, when it first appeared, to the Thirtieth Dynasty, when to all intents and purposes it disappeared. He explains its confused origin in both the mummiform statuettes of the deceased and the wooden model figures of servants that were placed in the tomb. He treats of the text of the sixth Chapter of the *Book of the Dead* and its variants. He describes the chief types of the different periods and goes into the necessary detail with regard to the objects represented as carried by the *šauabti*, such as the hoes, the basket, and so forth. He illustrates his book with nearly fifty photographs of *šauabtis* from the collections at Brussels, Berlin, the Louvre, Leyden, Hildesheim, Gower Street, and Oxford. And in several summary sketches he indicates graphically the main differences in the detailed appurtenances of the *šauabti* at different periods.

As to the history of funerary figures, there is no doubt that they were still used in early Ptolemaic times, and even in Roman days we have the strange blue, green, and yellow glaze figure of "Söter, a sailor" (CΩTHPNΔVTHC), which is probably a *šauabti* and certainly Roman, in the British Museum (No. 30769). Speleers does not mention this interesting object, the latest of its kind known. He does mention the mould for a *šauabti*-figure, B. M., No. 50667 (p. 18), but does not note that it is probably of Ptolemaic date. He mentions the extremely interesting faience figure with the head of a Greek found at Sakḳārah, and published by Maspero in *Annales*, 1902, which is certainly pre-Ptolemaic but after the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. The Apis-headed figure at Brussels which he publishes (Pl. 40) is of about the same date—about fifth century B.C.—unless indeed it is early Ptolemaic. There is no doubt that Dr. Birch was wrong in saying (*Alnwick Catalogue*, p. 246) that "after the 26th dynasty they [the *šauabtis*] appear to have been discontinued, as none of a later age have been discovered," though in his note on p. 3 M. Speleers says "nos constatations confirment aussi l'opinion de ceux qui prétendirent qu'après la XXVIe dynastie il n'y a plus de figurines (Comme S. Birch, *Catalogue*, etc., p. 246)," while on p. 63 he admits them until the Thirtieth; "après cette période, elles tombent en désuétude."

The Middle Kingdom figures in our museums are of great interest. There is little doubt that most of them date towards the end of the period, and with some it is, as usual, hard to decide whether they should be classed as late Middle Kingdom or early Eighteenth Dynasty. Such an one is the *šauabti* of Rensenb, found by Peet at Abydos, of which there is an example in the British Museum (No. 49349), and another at Brussels, illustrated by Speleers on Pl. 8. As I have said in my *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 24,

n. 1, this *šauabti*, which is of Thirteenth Dynasty date, might but for the Middle Kingdom conceit of cutting off the legs of the animal-hieroglyphs in the inscription, to prevent them running away, be regarded as of the early Eighteenth Dynasty. Such objects are a valuable weapon in the hand of those who, like myself, do not believe in Prof. Petrie's long chronology, but prefer that which is generally accepted. "One cannot suppose that Rensenb's *ushabti* is five or six hundred years older than the Eighteenth Dynasty." An interesting figure in the Ashmolean (Speleers, Pl. 9) is possibly of the Twelfth Dynasty. The British Museum possesses, besides No. 49349, at least five other Middle Kingdom stone *šauabtis*, Nos. 8862, 30037, 32556, 36435, and 49418, all exhibited in the Fifth Egyptian Room, case 138. Of these, two or three are probably of the Twelfth Dynasty, others Thirteenth-Seventeenth. Of early Eighteenth date we have those of Ipušere (No. 32557), the priest Euwi (24390), Nos. 51818-19, and the magnificent statuette of king Amosis I (32191), besides others. It is impossible to believe that more than two or three centuries separate them from the Twelfth Dynasty. M. Speleers' Pl. 21 is of this type. Of wooden figures there are several, notably that with the *imš*-inscription of Senbi, presented by Dr. Gardiner.

M. Speleers gives a satisfactory series of pictures of typical *šauabtis* of the fully developed Eighteenth-Nineteenth Dynasty style, including Puyemrē's (Pl. 14), but then his interest seems to tail off somewhat. We can find no mention, and no picture either, of the remarkable and curious alabaster *šauabtis* of the Twentieth Dynasty, with their rude pebble shapes and their crude decoration in green wax-paint. M. Speleers has apparently forgotten all about them. Then the types of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty can hardly be said to be described at adequate length. Possibly they bored M. Speleers with their monotony. But they are often very fine things.



To my mind the author has not devoted anything like enough space to types and makes. The fine wooden *šauabtis* of the Eighteenth Dynasty hardly appear. He mentions the bronze *šauabti* (of the same date) as a great rarity, and instances the British Museum and other collections as possessing specimens, but does not mention the finest of all, probably the rarest and finest *šauabti* known, the great bronze figure exhibited by Lord Carmichael at the Burlington Club's show, in 1921, and described by Prof. Newberry and myself in the catalogue.



M. Speleers is most interested in the tools and other appurtenances of the *šauabti*-figure. In his analysis of these he has done most useful work, and has pointed out new facts, such as the representation of the brick-mould in addition to the baskets, vases, etc. (p. 49, Pls. 23, 24). The dead man might therefore be expected to make bricks in the next world: a very menial occupation; but no doubt it was wisest to be prepared for unpleasant contingencies! The author's sketches 4 and 5 are valuable as collecting the various types of the sacks, bags, pots, yokes, etc. of the *šauabtis*, and sketch 3 emphasizes the differences between "la houé et le hoyau"; but we cannot admire sketches 1 and 2, which had better have been re-drawn by a more practised hand. In the "get up" of the figures he does not seem to notice, judging by his description ("leur barbe (de dieu ou de momie) est indiquée par quelques traits obliques et parallèles," which are not accounted for), that the beard was plaited. The god's beard, turned up at the end, does not appear on the *šauabtis* till the Saïte period. M. Speleers speaks always of the "fouet," whereas it seems very probable that the object so called is when in the hands of an Osirian in reality the *ladanisterium*, as Prof. Newberry maintains. But in later times it was undoubtedly confused with the task-master's whip as a sign of authority.

That brings us to the matter of the "surveillants." Mr. Quibell showed in 1896 at the Ramesseum, as M. Speleers states, that one in ten of an average box full of *šauabtis* is a reis, wears the apron of the living, and carries a whip. A woman's *šauabti* had of course female reises! (Pl. 26). At the same time it is not to be supposed that every *šauabti* in the costume of the living is to be regarded as a reis. It became the fashion after the middle of the Eighteenth Dynasty to represent men and women of place and worth in their gala costume worn in life, a fashion that persisted till the Twenty-Second Dynasty, and occurs, but very rarely, under the Twenty-Fifth and early Twenty-Sixth (Brit. Mus. 32932). Then it disappears, as M. Speleers says; but it is not correct to say that it was absolutely unknown under the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty.

M. Speleers mentions Reisner's remarkable royal *šauabti* from the Sudan, and so is commendably up-to-date.

The word *šauabti* M. Speleers thinks meant originally "corvéable," or practically "labourer," rather than "answerer" or any other of the equivalents proposed for it, and connects it with a word in the Dahshûr decree of the Sixth Dynasty, published by Bonhardt, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, XLII, 5, which he reads

 , and translates "corvéable," though it is highly unlikely that at that time  would appear

without  would be *de rigueur*, and the word must be . His view therefore can hardly be maintained. Certainly it looks as if it were in later days, when the word became *šauabti*, generally regarded as connected with *uōšb*, and as meaning "answerer" or "representative." Speleers gives analyses of the various versions of the sixth Chapter of the *Book of the Dead*, from the earliest to the latest forms. The list of variants on p. 105 is useful.

The author is not always quite careful enough in his citations. On p. 7, n. 2, I cannot identify the reference to *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, vol. VII, p. 54: there is nothing on that page about *šauabti*. On p. 10, n. 1, the first volume of the Egypt Exploration Fund's publication, *The Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari* is referred to as "NAVILLE, *Deir el-Bahari*, t. I, pl. 9, 11; E. E. F. 1907." The date identifies the book, otherwise NAVILLE, *Deir el-Bahari*, I, would refer to the first volume of the great book on Hatshepsut's temple and the excavations of 1893-8. The later book should have been quoted as NAVILLE, HALL, and AYRTON, *Deir el-Bahari, XIth Dyn.*, I. That is the usual and proper way of referring to it, as the title-page shows, and the mention of the subordinate authors would have been gracious, since it was they who wrote the chapter describing the find that M. Speleers is referring to, and one of them (Ayrton), who was in charge of the excavation of the tombs, was the actual finder. Then Professor Newberry's book on Rekhmiré is called (p. 37, n. 1) "NEWBERRY, *Life of Rekhmaré*." Prof. Newberry wrote and printed "Rekhmara," and M. Speleers has imported his own spelling into Newberry's title, which is unusual procedure. The reference on p. 62, n. 2, to the *Annales*, t. III, 1902, p. 190, should be p. 186. Possibly there are other instances of wrong references that I have not noted. What is the meaning of the strange reference (p. 74, n. 1) "Brit. Mus. No. 6692 (Set B, pl. 16)," and "Brit. Mus. Set 35, pl. 2"? What is "Set"? On the same page Prof. Elliot Smith's name is spelt wrongly; and on p. 14, n. 3, a dukedom is posthumously conferred on the late Lord Carvarvon. We are certain that Professor Garstang never used the faddy American form *Catalog* (Pl. 7).

There are a few misprints such as "Dješerwi" (š for s) on Pl. 4; "Hycksos" (p. 28); "Sinubhe" (p. 89, n.); "*Nahrungsmännchen*" (sic! p. 153), and a queer mix-up on p. 15, n. 2, "D'après LORET, *Rec. tr.* t. v, p. 72, les fellahs se servent encore des mêmes outils appelés *en arabe* 'couffe' et 'hoyau.'" The italics are mine.

We wish too that writers in French would abandon the use of that strange invention, the word "klast" (p. 33), and with this final *vœu* our criticisms of detail end. M. Speleers has written a book that contains matter of great value: I can only wish that he had told us more, and had given us more such interesting variations of the usual themes as that delightful little "scribe accroupi" at Brussels, who is so busy writing down the number, 403, of his fellow-*šauabti* (Pl. 1). M. Speleers shows reason to suppose that the number in the average *šauabti*-box was (in later times, at any rate) 365, one for each day of the year (*cf.* ERMAN, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, XLIV, p. 131), often *plus* 36 reises, the scribe, and the head-reis (?). The two last seem to have been something of a luxury, and it was not everybody who had even 401 *šauabti*, or even the more modest 365, at any rate until Saïte times, when, as is indicated by the enormous numbers of *šauabti*s of individual persons that have been found, the proper number was relentlessly provided by the undertaker.

They are quaint little people, the *šauabti*-folk, and a lover of Egyptian things could do worse than confine himself to collecting them. But if he does, he must look out for good and interesting specimens, and eschew the cheap and common Saïte multitude.

H. R. HALL.

*Assyrian Medical Texts (Cuneiform)*. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. Oxford University Press. 1923. Pp. vii + 107.

*Assyrian Medical Texts (Translations)*. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. Reprinted from the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*. London; John Bale, Sons and Danielsson Ltd. 1924. Pp. 34.

A large proportion of the cuneiform texts extant are concerned with the treatment of the sick; and these texts provide a store of information about the religious beliefs, superstitions and scientific knowledge of the Babylonians and Assyrians similar to that contained in works dealing with funerary ritual in the case of Egypt. Mr. Campbell Thompson, who has already published almost all the plant and drug lists, and the incantations for sick men, in the British Museum, has now published 660 tablets (exclusive

of those adequately published by Küchler) which for the most part contain prescriptions for various specific diseases. This exhausts the material in the British Museum for all practical purposes. His translations of these texts have already begun to appear, and are of such importance for the study of ancient civilisation that the attention of Egyptologists should be immediately drawn to material which must, in many respects, resemble the medical papyri. Mr. Thompson's pioneer work on these texts will remain our principal authority on the cuneiform side for many years.

The Babylonians themselves claimed, as Mr. Thompson points out, that the practice of medicine as found in these tablets was known before the Flood, and this claim is borne out by the evidence of conservative practice which van Oefele long ago pointed out as the characteristic of medicine in all ages. Doctors still used bronze knives in the seventh century B.C.; useless elements were still included in prescriptions with useful drugs, abracadabra figured as largely in the treatment of skin troubles as poulticing and purging. Furthermore, several priests had to be consulted in the treatment of any case. The incantation priest on his way to the sick man's house had to note any natural omens, and consult the "seer" as to their nature; his observation of the sick man's symptoms was prefaced by omens drawn from the accident of his position. In this way the great work "When an incantation priest goes to a sick man's house" began. Then came the observation of the sick man's symptoms which commenced with the head, and proceeded carefully through every member of the body down to the feet, even including the veins of the eyelid. From these observations the nature of the disease was diagnosed. In many cases the disease is named; quite as often, the conclusion is that it is "the hand" of some god, or even of the king. The distinctions drawn in this matter between the gods are not at present quite clear, but from the texts already published, by Boissier, Thompson, Holma and in *C.T.*, xxxvii, it is certain that a very careful terminology for various illnesses was in use, more especially in the case of fevers and skin complaints. The nature of the sickness having been decided, the incantation priest busied himself with reciting the formulae, and performing the rituals prescribed, some of which are known to us in THOMPSON, *Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*. Meanwhile presumably the doctor pounded up the concoctions which have remained a *crux interpretum* for many years. These potions are arranged under various heads: some are prescribed when a certain member of the body is sick; others are for a whole class of diseases, such as skin diseases: others are for sickness of a more general description, such as that arising "if a man is bewitched."

The texts have been copied by an expert hand, and the copies have been reproduced most successfully. The book is a pleasure to handle and read; and if a few errors have crept in among so much material they are so trivial as to be easily corrected. Thus in K 3687, Obv. 12, read *qaqqadsu imqut* (RU. RU-ut); Obv. 23, the sign for "blood" is omitted before "in his mouth"; Obv. 26-7 are a duplication of the same line. K 2723, Obv. 11, the last sign is certainly "hand(s)"; Obv. 40-1 the last sign is "eyes (2)," not AR; Obv. 67 the second sign is surely SA, cf. line 65.

The translations of these texts given by Thompson in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* are intelligible and readable, a pleasant change from the ungrammatical nonsense which sometimes masquerades as translation of cuneiform texts. The chief feature is the scientific method adopted by the translator of naming those plants which he has identified exactly or approximately, so that even before his "Assyrian Herbal" is published some conception of his method and results may be formed. The plant-lists have obviously been used to assign various plants to their "family"; the use of the drug obtained from the plant has then helped to identify the plant, more especially where parallels could be found in other medical literature, such as BUDGE, *Syriac Book of Medicine*. These identifications will enrich lexicography, not only in the Semitic languages. The connection of mandrake with the plant *namtarru*, and the derivations of *σανδαράκη* and *σάνδυξ* from Assyrian terms will raise in an acute form a discussion from which much of interest will result, namely the problem of how far Greek medicine was immediately derived from, and how far it was independent of, the older practice of the East.

A few suggestions may be offered as a tribute of interest in the work. The word generally translated "temples," but once "forehead," cannot have this meaning since the temples cannot "go together" (107, 3, 65), and is probably not to be read *putu* (see 107, 3, 51), but *nakkaptu* (*Z. Ass.*, xxxiv, 92<sup>4</sup>) "eyebrow," including the upper eyelid, to judge from 20, 2, 5. There is good evidence that (*abnu*) *šu-u* = (*abnu*) *ušu*, diorite, see WEISSBACH, *Babylonische Miscellen*, 7, and GRANT, *Business Documents*, no. 52, 3. For the phrase translated "spread on a skin" perhaps "wrap in a skin" would be preferable, from *ederu* "to enclose." The forms II. 2 and III. 2 of *abalu* are translated variously by Thompson, but both seem to mean "add." The word *gulgullu* cannot mean "excrement" in view of K 2852, II, 10; Thompson's

previous rendering "skull" is actually favoured by K 2532, 7, where a stork is boiled, and its *gulgul* mixed in a potion. The boiling is obviously to remove superfluous flesh from the skull. *bararu* and *palamu* said of the eyes are synonyms of *nakaru*, *A.J.S.L.*, xxxviii, 194; cf. *C.T.*, xvi, 34, 217, the devils "spy about like a hunting dog." The explanation of No. 14 is that sick men in certain cases had to repair to the "place" (oracle rather than "temple") of Shamash to complete their cure, cf. *M.V.A.G.*, 1918, I, 25 ff.: "seeing fair things" refers to the inspection of the liver for omens. The explanation of LIŠ as "needles" in so far as it depends on *itguruti* is unconvincing: this word seems to mean "bent, complicated," cf. *Z. Ass.*, xxxi, 41, and JENSEN, *Kultische Texte*, 9\*–10\*. Should not No. 19, 11 be read *išid urkarini maši*, "crushed root of box"? In No. 26, the root *katamu* whether used as noun or verb surely means "shut," in reference to the eyes. Thus col. I. 6, "If a man's eyes are sick and are shut" corresponding to line 8, "If a man's eyes are sick and for many days will not open." See also col. II. 37, "[if] shutting hurts his eyes." In the same text, col. I. 22, read "sheep's milk" for "cow's milk." In col. II. 31 *ultatani*<sup>c</sup> may be from *ni<sup>c</sup>u*, in which case the text describes the suffusion of the eye with blood owing to an abrasion of the lid to which unguent has been applied. Col. III. 2 *harištu* must, with its variants *erīšti* and *urrišti*, mean a "woman in labour." For *harašu* = *erešu* cf. *R.A.*, xix, 97<sup>1</sup>; and for meaning cf. Creation I. 84. In the ritual with the cord, III. 7, perhaps it would be better to translate "thou shalt touch" rather than "thou shalt bind" (*lapatu* not *rakasu*, cf. col. IV. 29). In IV. 31 read "the wind which hath blown on the eye of a man," see KÜCHLER, *Medizin*, 90, 119. The passage col. IV. 52 I would render "thou makest to spring up the standing crop...reaping, binding, binding, ear, ear...[Shamash reaped] Sin garnered, Shamash when he reaped, Sin when he garnered...." For *habburu* as "crop" ("seed-corn" is impossible) see THUREAU-DANGIN, 8<sup>me</sup> *Campagne*, 229. For *šašu* III. 1 of *ašu*, used as an independent form, said of removing kernels from husks, compare *šušu* said of a stoned date, *M.V.A.G.*, 1913, 2, 40. In No. 27, line 6, read "a raven's egg."

It only remains to express the hope that these translations may finally embrace all the material included in the volume of texts, and that Mr. Thompson's labours may shortly lead to a similar treatment of the Egyptian material.

SIDNEY SMITH.

*Hammurabi's Gesetz*, Band VI. By P. KOSCHAKER and A. UNGNAD. Pfeiffer; Leipzig, 1923.

The new volume of this great work consists of translations with legal explanations of most of the Babylonian legal documents of the period 2200–1800 B.C. which have been published since 1914. Dr. Ungnad has now published translations of nearly 2000 texts in this work. The painstaking labour of many years has been fully justified, for students of comparative law on the Continent, with Ungnad's work at their disposal, are devoting themselves to a minute study of the old Babylonian legal system in increasing numbers. Dr. Koschaker, who may be considered the head of this school in Germany since Kohler's decease, has now undertaken the explanation of points of legal procedure in these texts, and his task has been ably executed. Abandoning the method of summing up important deductions in a general manner, he has preferred to add notes to Ungnad's translations, and the change in method is clearly an improvement. It is much to be hoped that the intensive study of old Babylonian laws and legal procedure will arouse interest in the subject in England. The material remains of Babylonian civilisation are so very scanty that the subject seems to lack interest; the present volume should show how much remains to be investigated, especially in regard to the similarities of ancient law to, and dissimilarities from, the practice of Roman juriconsults. It is also to be hoped that attention will soon be paid to the very large amount of material of the Neobabylonian period, which has of late been much neglected.

SIDNEY SMITH.

*Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae*. By C. CLEMEN. Bonn, 1920. 116 pp.

*Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*. By TH. HOFFNER. Parts I–II, 1922–3. 271 pp.

This well-planned series aims at presenting in a cheap and serviceable form the Greek and Latin literary sources for the history of various religions, and is under the editorship of C. Clemen, who himself leads off with the Persian religion in the first fasciculus. The authors included, conveniently arranged in chronological sequence, are amply representative, the best editions are utilized, and a brief, but for the purpose sufficient, critical apparatus is appended. For students of the religion of ancient Egypt, in



particular, Dr. Hopfner's careful compilation should, when completed, prove very useful. The two parts so far issued bring him down to Plutarch only, and he would perhaps have been better advised in the case of works so extensive and so easy of access as Herodotus, Book II, Diodorus, Book I, and Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.*, to limit the citations to references instead of printing them at length, by which means the two parts might have been reduced to one. Part III is to reach Porphyry, and at least one further part will be required. A comprehensive index (absent in Fasc. I) will, it is satisfactory to learn, conclude the work.

A. S. HUNT.

*Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie.* Von FRANZ DORNSEIFF, Privatdozent an der Universität Basel. (Στοιχεία, *Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes und der Griechischen Wissenschaft* herausgegeben von FRANZ BOLL. Heft VII.) Teubner: Leipzig, 1922. Pp. 177.

Man and woman are prone to speculate with numbers whether at Monte Carlo or the Great Pyramid, and whether with the chronology of Bishop Ussher or the lists of the Stock Exchange; and superstition in some form or other generally creeps into the speculation. When, as in the case of Greek writing, numbers are expressed by letters of the alphabet, divine names and epithets are brought into the game and developments are fast and furious. Moreover in an age when the knowledge of reading and writing was confined to a few, the magic power of letters was felt more strongly by the unlettered multitude and was exploited and probably believed in by the lettered class. Did not the number of the Greek vowels agree with that of the planets and of the days of the week? and did not the number of the letters of the alphabet allow exactly two for each month? These and a thousand other facts were no mere coincidences; they had a mystic meaning and belonged to the constitution of the universe; consequently the supreme gift of power was obviously the reward of the wizard who really understood them.

In the cold-blooded manner of the unbelieving yet enthusiastic student, Dornseiff pursues the intricate divagations of mysticism and magic in the employment of the alphabet and has produced a valuable monograph. Palaeographers and epigraphists meet with these things almost everywhere from the Roman period onward. A well-known puzzle is XMI in Christian inscriptions from Syria, Egypt and Nubia: it can be interpreted in many ways—on the one hand as representing the initials of Χριστός Μιχαήλ Γαβριήλ and other expressions, on the other as a numerical substitute 643 for words or phrases of which the letters added together produce the same numeral (e.g. ἄγιος ὁ Θεός). Dornseiff has overlooked a parallel group XIII 689 which is not uncommonly found in Nubia (GRIFFITH, *Nubian Texts of the Christian Period*, p. 42; *Rec. de Trav.*, xxxvii, 52) and still awaits interpretation.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

*Harvard African Studies*, Volume IV. *An English-Nubian Comparative Dictionary*, by G. W. MURRAY. Oxford University Press, 1923. xlv and 196 pp.

Amongst the Berberines of Lower Nubia there are three well-marked dialects, all of which are pretty well known, thanks especially to the labours of Lepsius, Reinisch, Almkvist and Zettersteen. They form by far the greater bulk of this Dictionary. There are also fragments of Christian Nubian from a thousand to seven hundred years old at least, little if at all contaminated with Arabic which at the present day provides 30 per cent. of the Berberine vocabulary. Mr. Murray has at various times lived and worked for the Egyptian Survey Department among these people in Lower Nubia, has gleaned through all printed materials (including obscure vocabularies of earlier travellers which had very little authority), and has tested the correctness of the results as well as added to them upon the spot. This procedure gives to his combined vocabulary a special authenticity.

Outside the Nile Valley, in the hills of Darfūr and Kordofān there are village-groups each speaking a different language, and some of these languages are essentially Nubian; serious investigation of them has lately begun, and Mr. Murray has included the known words in his alphabetical arrangement. A discussion of Nubian phonology and a slight sketch of the grammar precede the vocabulary.

Further his desert wanderings have brought the author into contact, not only with Arabs but also with Bisharīn and Hadendoa peoples speaking Hamitic tongues: this may explain why he is so much interested in the kin of certain Nubian words, perhaps borrowed or lent, in other scarcely-related groups of languages in north-east Africa. One column in his dictionary is devoted to comparisons with words in such languages, many of them new and convincing. Mr. Murray moreover has his own views on the

history and classification of the Sudan and Nilotic languages, subjects on which no two people acquainted with the available evidence as yet think alike. Considering our position in the Sudan and the importance of the Nubian tribes, this English work should have a welcome in the British Empire, and we are grateful to the American institution which undertook the risk of its publication, utilising for it the special founts and printing skill of the Oxford University Press.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

*Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes, avec un portrait de Champollion*, by H. SOTTAS, directeur d'études à l'école pratique des Hautes Études, et E. Drioton, professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. 3 planches et 5 figures. Paris: Geuthner, 1922.

This is really a manual of ancient Egyptian writing, comprising an elaborate discussion of its nature and varieties, a survey of the evidence of classical authors in regard to it, and of the early attempts at decipherment from that of the learned Jesuit Kircher in the seventeenth century onwards, and a narrative of Champollion's final solution of the problem. Forty-two pages are occupied by a very full list of hieroglyphic signs with their phonetic, word-sign and determinative values (retaining however the customary printed forms which are often very unintelligible and debased). Finally there are illustrative extracts from texts in hieroglyphic, hieratic and demotic. Bibliographies accompany each section.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

*Light from Ancient Letters: Private Correspondence in the Non-Literary Papyri of Oxyrhynchus of the first four Centuries, and its Bearing on New Testament Language and Thought.* By HENRY G. MEECHAM. George Allen and Unwin, London, 1923. Pp. 189. Price 7/6 net.

The most obvious criticism of this volume is that the author has unduly narrowed the field of research. He limits his survey to the private letters of the first four centuries from Oxyrhynchus—or rather to those published in the series of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, which are by no means all the papyri found at Behneseh. The temporal limitation is, for the author's purpose, justifiable enough, and the restriction to private letters is at least intelligible; but the virtual exclusion of documents from other sites than Oxyrhynchus is quite arbitrary and can hardly be defended. Are we to suppose that the people of Oxyrhynchus were nearer in spirit to the New Testament writers than the inhabitants of other places in Egypt? Doubtless the reason for this restriction is convenience, for Grenfell and Hunt's editions, with their unusually accurate texts, their admirable translations, and commentary at once adequate and compact, are models of everything a papyrus publication should be; but in serious research mere convenience must not be allowed to rule.

I have dwelt on this point, because the restriction of the ground is symptomatic of the book as a whole, which, despite its undeniable merits, has a somewhat amateurish air; the knowledge it reveals seems to be *ad hoc* knowledge, and one feels an absence of background. Symptomatic of this is the timidity with which the author cites authorities even for statements which are the merest commonplaces of the subject, as when he tells us (p. 26) that "Moulton dates the papyri from 311 B.C. to the seventh century A.D.," or invokes Naville *viâ* Cobern as witness for the Thmuis papyri (why refer to these carbonized and often illegible papyri at all rather than, for example, to the rich finds at Socnopæi Nesus, Tebtunis, or other Fayum sites?). The absence of background is felt, for instance, in his rather naive remarks about family affection on p. 130 or in his statement (p. 154) that the numerous allusions to seals and sealing in the papyri "apparently refer to a very common practice in the ancient East."

Yet it must not be supposed that the book is without merit. On the contrary, granted the limitations I have indicated, the author has done his work well, and his volume, conveniently arranged, interestingly written, and displaying a critical spirit and common sense, will be very useful to those who, without the leisure or the inclination to carry their researches very far, desire to have in a handy form an introduction to the subject of the relations between the New Testament and the Hellenistic world revealed in the Greek papyri. Should a second edition be called for, it is to be hoped that the author will enlarge his "terms of reference" and make the work more completely representative of the papyrus material as a whole. As a contribution to such a revision a few remarks on points of detail may be offered here.

The author discusses on pp. 40-5 the classification of letters. He rejects Witkowski's classification by the standard of the writer's education as too subjective, and a chronological arrangement on the ground of

the frequent uncertainty of dating, in favour of one by contents or substance. Each method has its advantages and defects, and there is no strong objection to the author's; but it must be pointed out that it is no less uncertain than the others, since letters often embrace more than one subject, and from the purely linguistic point of view either Witkowski's or the chronological classification seems preferable.

On p. 48 the author's discussion of *λοιπόν* should be enlarged by including the meaning "therefore" not infrequently found in later texts. P. 58: *παρουσία*, "the visit of a royal personage": "or of his deputy" (e.g. the Roman prefect) should be added. P. 81: "A -ν could be added apparently without any difference to pronunciation." This is a very dubious assertion, especially where the ν is followed, as in this case, by a vowel. Surely the explanation is merely that ἦν was confused with ῆ. Uncertainty in the use of moods, and irregularities in the conjugation of εἶμι are characteristic of late Greek. P. 104: *ιδιόρος* is a curious form for *ειδόρος*; is it a misprint? P. 133: ὥρας ἄ is apparently taken as "about 3 p.m."; but immediately afterwards ἀπὸ ὥρας ἦ appears as "8 p.m." Of course the two phrases are on a par, and there is no warrant for such renderings as 9 o'clock, 8 o'clock, or 7 o'clock. P. 135 f.: Reference might here be made to PREISIGKE'S *Die Gotteskraft der frühchristlichen Zeit*. I cannot accept the main thesis of that work, but there is probably an element of truth in it, and Preisigke's evidence should at least be considered. P. 140: "The practice of women picking up foundlings...and earning money by nursing them." There was no such practice. P. Oxy. 37 refers to a man picking up a foundling and paying a woman to nurse it. P. 142: The author has confused census returns (WILCKEN'S *Steuersubjekts-Deklarationen*) with property returns (*Mobilien-Deklarationen*). P. 148: Rather misleadingly worded. Σωτήρ was of course the established cult-title of Ptolemy I; it was not necessary to cite Deissmann's authority for this, and it must not be inferred, as the author's words may suggest, that it was a regular title for all the Ptolemies. P. 156: It is surely superfluous to refer to this shipwreck as an illustration of the Hellenistic background of the New Testament. St. Paul was shipwrecked, it is true, but what of that? Are we to infer that shipwreck was an established social custom, which no self-respecting ancient would neglect?

Two larger points to conclude. On p. 144 the author is hardly justified in passing over so cavalierly the very real belief in immortality among the pagans. A belief in a resurrection was the central point of the Osiris (Sarapis) cult, the most popular of the Egyptian cults in later times. And the phrase "may Osiris give thee the cold water" so frequent in epitaphs, even the word εὐψύχει, should serve to indicate that a belief in survival beyond the tomb was far commoner than Christians of to-day are apt to suppose.

Again, on p. 153 the author certainly misrepresents the mystery-cults when he implies that they did not proclaim "redemption from sin." Their purification was often ceremonial purification only, but it is impossible to study the evidence fairly without seeing that to some at least of their votaries there was a good deal more in them than that<sup>1</sup>. Christianity is not served by ignoring the merits of the pagan cults. Only prejudice will deny that its victory was a case of the "survival of the fittest"; but at least we may say of some of those cults that in their later forms they were not unworthy rivals to it.

Most of the author's conclusions are however sensible and well-considered, as, for example, his remarks on Hebrew influence (p. 85), his estimate of the nature of St. Paul's letters (pp. 97-102), and his final chapter. Altogether the book, though by no means above criticism, may be commended as a useful and competent summary of the subject.

H. I. BELL.

*Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus Grecs.* Publiés sous la direction de PIERRE JOUGUET avec la collaboration de PAUL COLLART [et] JEAN LESQUIER. Tome premier, fasc. III. Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1923. Pp. 135-261.

No less than fifteen years have elapsed since the second fascicule of this work appeared, years some of them of such agony and unrest as the world has but seldom experienced. The present fascicule was already at press when the war broke out in 1914, and that calamity, with its aftermath of economic unsettlement, was responsible for the long delay. In the interval one of the editors, to whom we owe a large portion of this part, has alas! been taken from us.

This fascicule contains no text quite so noteworthy as the estimate of work with a plan contained in Part I nor anything of such general interest as the fragment of a code in Part II, but the average of value is at least as high as in either of the previous parts. It begins with a valuable series of accounts (Euergetes I) relating to cleruchic tenures, forming fragments of a single roll. These texts are difficult and

<sup>1</sup> Cf., e.g., the evidence noted by A. D. NOEK, *Class. Rev.*, xxxviii, 58-9.

imperfect but of real importance for the study of the cleruchies, and they are furnished with a most interesting commentary. They contain several conversions of various crops into the equivalent value of wheat. (I may mention that these are supplemented by many similar conversions in two lengthy unpublished accounts from the Zeno archive now in the British Museum.) To the note on 37, 13 (p. 177; on χέρσος) should now be added a reference to WESTERMANN'S *The "Dry Land" in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*, in *Class. Phil.*, xvii (1922), 21-36. In 38 f we have an interesting example of that mixture of crops apparently common at the period, flax and barley (λινοκριθή)—an instructive illustration of the value which even a small scrap of papyrus may have.

This series is followed by an equally valuable one consisting of orders for loans in kind to cleruchic holders. These raise many interesting and some perplexing questions, and the commentary of the editors makes very important contributions to the subjects discussed. On p. 218 their note on ἐμπυρισμός should be modified in view of Westermann's almost certainly correct explanation of the word in *Journal*, ix (1923), 89 f.

The remaining texts are of less note, but include several by no means without interest, for example a valuable account (59) of payments for the beer-tax and an interesting letter (53) concerning a reversal of an administrative decision.


It goes without saying that the editorial work is of high quality. The length of the "additions et corrections" at the end is chiefly due to the time which has elapsed since the early part of the fascicule was printed.



H. I. BELL.

*The Tomb of Puyemrē at Thebes.* By NORMAN DE GARIS DAVIES. New York, 1923.

The Metropolitan Museum of New York has produced another fine work, a pair of magnificent volumes of the Tytus foundation, in memory of the late Robb de Peyster Tytus. Those of us who remember the late Mr Tytus, and saw him at work on, for instance, the Theban palace of Amenophis III at El-Malkatah, will be very content indeed that the memory of so enthusiastic and generous a patron of Egyptian archaeology should be commemorated in so entirely worthy a manner, owing to the pious care of his mother. Nothing would please Tytus more than to see the work of others, his successors in the Theban field, published in this splendid style. But the volumes of course are almost too magnificent in their get-up. They are show books, and frankly it would seem more appropriate to publish in this princely manner books of greater importance than *The Tomb of Puyemrē*, which is simply an interesting account of a single Theban tomb, illustrated by facsimiles absolutely accurate in line and colour of its wall-paintings, which might just as well have appeared in the modest format of the publications of the Egypt Exploration Society. It has however seemed good to those in charge of the foundation to produce its books in this gorgeous manner, and there need no more be said except to express appreciation. The paper is real paper, that will last for ever, so that this record of an Egyptian tomb will survive most others; the collotypes are of the finest, the colour printing of the best. The type is very fine; it bears traces of French influence on its design, which impart to the fount a not unpleasing note of difference from the usual Anglo-American founts, while avoiding the extremes of lankiness and over-serifedness which make French types so often ugly yet always so characteristic, and therefore inappropriate to the English language and always strange and unfamiliar in it. This great fount just stops short of this in time.

Of a luxury-work like this, by so well-known an author, there is of course no need to say much more than that the description of the tomb is entirely adequate. Mr. Davies tells us things old and new, is most careful in his telling, and, as we might have been sure beforehand, satisfies all scientific needs while at the same time interesting the amateur. We jib rather at some of his chapter-headings, such as "Personalalia" (!), "Pleasant Hours at Home and Abroad," and "Burial Assurance." The Egyptologist will know what is meant, and no doubt Puyemrē hoped that he would spend many pleasant hours

 ("dulce est desipere in loco—aeternitatis!"), and that his proper burial would assure him of some sort of triumph over death; but the titles we have quoted savour too much of the newspaper. "Personalalia" indeed is deplorable; we deprecate so modern and ugly an atmosphere being introduced into ancient Egypt. One notes a tendency in American books to imitate the newspaper "scare-head": notably in Olmstead's recently published *History of Assyria*. Perhaps Mr. Davies, who is not an American, has in this case felt obliged to sacrifice just a very little to the newspaper spirit.

The name Puyemrê is that which we usually spell Puámrâ, Puimrêç, or Puyemrêç. Mr. Davies transliterates unusually at times; notably he uses *j* for . I have myself used *tj* for this  $\mathfrak{Z}$ , which is usually represented by *z*. Of course *z* is a very poor representative of the Egyptian sound, which was presumably rather  $\mathfrak{Z}$ . If we do not use *d* in popular transcription, we should use  $\mathfrak{Z}$  rather than *z*. The French *j*= $\mathfrak{Z}$ ; but in English one cannot use the French *j*, while the English *j* is almost as inefficient a representation of the sound as plain *z*. And in any case *j* has the fatal defect of being at once mispronounced not only by every German, Dutchman, and Scandinavian, but by all Slavs as well, and in their own way by the Spaniards. *Tj* I have thought got over the difficulty, as it cannot be mispronounced by the Teutons, whose *tj*- (= *tj*- with *y*-consonantal) sounds very like our *tch*-, the transcription favoured by Sir Ernest Budge, which however has the defect of representing one sign by as many as three. We cannot admit Mr. Davies's plain *j* any more than the French *dj*, if we are to try at all to obtain a transliteration that is generally intelligible by and conveys roughly the same sounds to the minds of all. One does not want *dzh*, which is as cumbersome as *tch*; *z* is usual: why not use the Slav  $\mathfrak{Z}$ ? But the Germans, the Slavs (and the Esperantists) must themselves abandon their equally aggressive *j* for , and be content to adopt the *y* which is understood by all the rest of the world as well as by themselves. They can rest assured that *j* in the sense of *y* will never be adopted here in transliteration, popular or scientific. And as *y* means just the same to them as it does to us, they might just as well adopt it and have done with it in Esperanto as well as in Egyptian transliteration.

Mr. Davies will pardon this digression, which he has brought on himself by his writing the ancient name of Deir el-bahri in a way which a German would pronounce "Yeeser-yoeru," whereas "Tyeeser-tyoeru" would not have been so far from the truth.

I note that Mr. Davies, *à propos* of Puyemrêç's representations of foreigners, accepts Mr. Wainwright's shifting of Keftiu from Crete to Cilicia, which I cannot wholly do, in view of the Minoan evidence. As I have often said, it seems to me that Mr. Wainwright was possibly justified in extending Keftiu to Cilicia, though we have as yet absolutely no archaeological proof that he was; but that he was totally unjustified in shifting it away from Crete altogether. We have no right to suppose that the Men of the Isles were not Keftians, and the tomb of Rekhmirêç shows us that both were Cretans as the foreigners of Sennemut's and Menkheperrêçsenb's tombs were too, and as Puyemrêç's foreigner with the characteristic Minoan long hair (Frontispiece) was too. The fact that another Minoan-seeming man on Plate XXXI carries a North-Syrian vase is to my mind merely a proof of how the Egyptians confusedly assigned to some of these northern peoples the products of others, not of the presence of Minoans in North Syria. We must always remember that the Danuna, the Zakkarai, the Shardina, and the other seafaring tribes that frequented the coasts of Asia Minor and Phoenicia were neither Keftians nor Minoans, possibly not any of them Cretans. But whence did Sennemut's "Keftians" and their vases come from but Crete? or Rekhmirêç's Keftians and Chiefs of the Isles?



Mr. Davies has some interesting appendices: notably one on the Temples of Thebes, a comparison of contemporary lists of temples with that given by Puyemrêç. Those who are interested in religious ceremonies will no doubt meet in his pages much that will arrest their attention. The proof-reading of the book would seem to be above reproach. It is a worthy fellow to *The Tomb of Nakht*.





H. R. HALL.






*De Egyptische Voorstellingen betreffende den Oerheuvel*, by ADRIAAN DE BUCK. Proefschrift ter verkrijging van den graad van Doctor in de Godgeleerdheid aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. 1922.

One of the most interesting creation-myths of the world, one that exists in the mythologies of many nations, is that which explains the first emergence of dry land from the primeval waste of waters, in the form of a hill. This "Oerheuvel," as Mr. de Buck calls it in Dutch (in German "Urhügel"; we, having lost the convenient prefix "ur" if we ever had it, can only translate the term clumsily by some such phrase as "primeval hill" or "mount," if it is translatable at all), is often regarded as the centre of the universe, the "navel of the world," *ὀμφαλὸς γῆς*, and conventionally as its highest point, though it is obviously often nothing of the kind. The world-navel however ought to be its summit, and is so "officially." As a matter of fact it may be a low island, like Delos, a rock as at Delphi, or a citadel like that of Jerusalem. In all cases it is a specially holy place, an abode of divinity from most ancient times. Delos, surrounded by the Cyclades, was the holy isle that had arisen from the waves, Delphi the centre of

Greece, Jerusalem the citadel that seemed to be the crown and summit of the Judæan hills. And all were early cult-centres. The idea of the *ὀμφαλὸς γῆς* as at Delphi has been specially studied by ROSCHER in the *Abhandlungen* of the philosophical class of the Saxon Academy, 1913 and 1915, and at Jerusalem and elsewhere in the Semitic world by WENSINCK, *The Ideas of the Western Semites concerning the Navel of the Earth*, in the *Verhandlungen* of the Dutch Academy at Amsterdam, 1916. The ideas of the Jains, Brahmans, and Buddhists with regard to the central mountain of the earth (Mount Meru) have been treated in connection with the Greek conceptions of the *ὀμφαλὸς* by Roscher. Other writers have also dealt with the subject.

Mr. de Buck has taken as the subject of his doctorate-thesis the search for a similar idea in Ancient Egypt. He has not been unsuccessful, although the available data are scanty and by no means so clear as among the Greeks and Semites. The profane might say that one can find anything one likes in Egyptian religious texts if one looks long enough, or at least that one can make anything one likes of anything in them. This would be an exaggerated view. The interminable cosmogonical and theological texts contain of course any number of confused and contradictory statements, but hard sifting (if it is considered worth the trouble) will usually result in the critic being able (or believing himself able) to put forward a theory of what the normal Egyptian view was on this or that point of belief. Mr. de Buck considers that he has been able to winnow out certain beliefs of the Egyptian concerning the *ὀμφαλὸς*, and his view has much probability in its favour. He finds an "oerheutel" in the myths of both Heliopolis and Hermopolis, as well as at Thebes. The yearly recurrence of the inundation and its subsidence naturally gave rise to the conception of the first creation of land as a mound rising from the waters of Nun. The mound on which each great holy place was built was naturally regarded by its priests and inhabitants as the real original "oerheutel," the *ḫꜣy* or "high place," the *ḫꜣy* or "riser," whereon the gods first appeared after the end of the reign of "Chaos and Old Night." The sign  does not represent the rising sun, but, as is clear from the way in which it is printed in coloured texts and from its oldest forms, is a round hill from behind which the sun's rays stream upwards: it represents the first stream of sunlight rising at dawn beyond the mountain of the horizon, the hill of the earth, , "the mound...that raises its

head from out the water of Rē<sup>c</sup>." The word  meaning "mound" derives its meaning from the verb "to appear," and the ideograph of "appearing" and so of the king "appearing on the throne" (eventually coming to mean "crown" or "diadem") was originally the picture of the "oerheutel," the *ḫꜣy* of earth on which Rē<sup>c</sup> originally appeared:  , "I purify myself on that 'Riser' of land on which Rē<sup>c</sup> purified himself" (*Pyr. Texts*, 542). And Pepy is himself as god the isle that rises in the midst of the sea, *νήσω ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὄθι τ' ὀμφαλὸς ἐστὶ θαλάσσης* (*Od.*, I, 50), : he is the centre of the world.

At Heliopolis we find the word *ḫꜣy* strongly localised as the name of the holy navel-hill. In *Pyr. Texts* 1652 we find Atum Kheperer invoked as , "thou hast raised thyself like the Height," and in the Book of the Dead he is , "lord of the High Place." This high place to which one ascended by steps Mr. de Buck identifies as the place known as "The High Sand" , to which king Pi<sup>c</sup>ankhi repaired to make his offerings when he entered Heliopolis to see his father Rē<sup>c</sup> in the sacred *Benben*-chamber and thus legitimize himself in the North as rightful pharaoh. It is significant that he went to "the High Sand" after he had bathed in the Nile, representing the Stream of Nun from which the "oerheutel" had risen . Mr. de Buck considers that this high-place was the original , the mound with its obelisk on it, from which the Fifth Dynasty sun-shrines at Abusir were copied. After he had made the offering on the hill Pi<sup>c</sup>ankhi ascended the great stairway and entered the *Benben*-chamber.

The importance of the High Place at Heliopolis is obvious, but it is not so easy to identify it as an *ὀμφαλὸς γῆς* or even as a simple "oerheugel" with no suggestion of a central navel unless, with Mr. de Buck, we assume that almost every holy place was in general belief an "oerheugel," that the holy place was also a high place upon which Rē first appeared, and where the king took his seat upon his throne, as at Heliopolis. In Babylonia the *zikkurra*, which was designedly an imitation of a mountain, is considered by Dombart to have been also the seat of the sun-god. On the cylinder seals we often see the god climbing the steps of his *zikkurra*.

At Hermopolis we find more definite idea of an "oerheugel"; Rē when he began to appear as king was upon the *h3* of Hermopolis, . This mound is also described as the "Isle of Flame," in the Pyramid Texts which reminds us of the -island behind which rose the flame of the sun-god's rising. The 17th chapter of the Book of the Dead refers to the Hermopolitan belief: see GRAPOW, in *Urkunden*, v.

At Thebes we find Karnak described on one of Hatshepsut's obelisks as "the noble Mound of the First Time," or as we should say, "of the earliest ages," "of the beginning of things": "de eerwaarde heugel van het oerbegin." Karnak was then distinctly an "oerheugel." Other texts convey the same idea: Thebes is "the Mound (*h3y*) placed in Nun at the beginning," and this mound was the central point where creation began ; see SETHE, *Thebanische Tempelinschriften*, *passim*.

Following Lefébure, Mr. de Buck points out the oft ignored importance of the god Tanen or Tatenen (*T3tnn*) as an earth-god and so the colleague of Qeb, with whom he is sometimes implicitly identified, as he is constantly and openly with Ptah as Ptah-Tanen. With the Nubian Dedun, the original of the Tithōnos of the Greeks, he had nothing to do. The spelling of the name of the god with the symbol was no doubt a comparatively ancient hieroglyphic pun, so to speak, in view of his function as the god of the earth (*t3*): it could also be spelt or . Sethe supposes that the syllabic spelling as points to a foreign origin, and that he was the god of Sinai (where he often occurs in inscriptions: GARDINER-PEET, *Inscr. of Sinai*, I, No. 53) and presided over metal working: hence his identification with Ptah-Hephaistos the smith. This may well be, but Ptah himself, "the Opener," is probably of Semitic origin, and like him, Tanen may have been introduced into the Egyptian pantheon in very early days. He is often referred to as the most ancient of gods. Ptah-Tanen is the god who formed the "oerheugel" into dry land after it emerged from the waters: "thou hast formed the land.....when thou wast in thy activity as Tatenen, in thy manifestation as the uniter of both lands.....thou hast drawn it (the land) from out the waters of Nun."

Mr. de Buck concludes his study with a section on the "oerheugel" in connection with the royal ascension of the throne and the *Sed* festival, which is interesting.

I have endeavoured above to give the outline of Mr. de Buck's thesis in my own words and with a few added remarks. The general comment that I should be inclined to make is that while he has conclusively shown the existence of the "oerheugel" idea in Egypt, this does not altogether correspond to what the Greeks meant by the *ὀμφαλὸς γῆς*. There is no strictly analogous idea of a world "navel," no *umbilicus*, properly speaking, with its connection with the underworld and its life-giving properties connected with the function of the navel-cord, in Egypt: no "navel" word is used. The nearest approach is when Pepy as a god is invoked as himself the central island of the earth, rising from the sea. The idea of the sacred first land is there, certainly.

Mr. de Buck's work is interesting, and he has well utilized his various authorities, both ancient and modern.

*Amenofis IV*: by HENRI ASSELBERG. (Overdruk van den schrijver: three articles from *De Katholiek*; Utrecht, 1922.)

Mr. Henri Asselberg kindly sends us copies of three popular articles written by him for the Dutch religious paper *De Katholiek* on the subject of Amenophis IV, Akhenaten. We wish that Dutch writers would not use the unscholarly method of writing the Greek  $\phi$  as  $f$ : after all,  $\phi$  was not originally  $f$ , but  $ph$ , as is shown by the fact that the Romans wrote Philippus and not Filippus, and it is not clever to try to abolish history, whether the offender is Lord Grimthorpe, or Sir Izaak Pitman, or Mr. Asselberg. After this initial grumble on a point of detail, which is really of little importance (although protest is called for), we can say that Mr. Asselberg has written a very acceptable popular account of Akhenaten which should interest Dutch readers. The author makes no pretence to first-hand research on the subject, and he naturally follows popularly accepted views of the more sensational kind with regard to that weird "individual" (which he certainly was!) Akhenaten. He is occasionally somewhat old-fashioned as to his authorities, quoting Lieblein, for instance, as of equal authority with modern writers. But in other cases he is quite up to date, and we notice with pleasure that he refers with interest and goodwill to our excavations at El-'Amarnah and their publication in this *Journal* although he considers that the work of the Germans was "jammerlijk onderbroken" there by the world-war. We may take exception to "jammerlijk": our excavators can do the work quite as well as the Germans, although we may regret that the Germans were unable to go on with it. By the way, when Mr. Asselberg says, referring to the fate of the El-'Amarnah tablets: "het meerendeel dezer tafeltjes bevindt zich thans in Berlijn terwijl de overige hoofdzakelijk terecht kwamen in de musea van Cairo en Londen," he really exalts the horn of Berlin to a greater height than it deserves. Berlin has it is true the majority of the tablets, but to say that "most of the rest found their way to Cairo and London" gives an erroneous impression, as if the Cairo collection were more important than that in London, and both were very far inferior to that of Berlin. That of Cairo is, as it is also inferior to that in London. The facts are that Berlin possesses 194 tablets, the British Museum 86, and Cairo 50.

So much for the "Spijkerschrift." We note one or two debateable statements, such as that "Egypte is 't onbetwist oudste cultuurland," which would please our "diffusionists"; but in view of Sumerian and even pre-Sumerian possibilities from Babylonia this should not be said without a query and preferably without the "onbetwist." And it is strange to see the late Mr. Theodore Davis described as an "Engelschman"! The energetic explorer of the Tombs of the Kings would hardly have tolerated being connected with Newport, Mon., rather than with Newport, R.I.! However, this is not the sort of blemish that will mean anything to Mr. Asselberg's Dutch audience, whom we take to be chiefly Roman priests and ecclesiastically-minded laymen. The religious side of Akhenaten naturally interests Mr. Asselberg and them most, and he has written for them an informing though of course not original series of articles, in which he has used his authorities for Akhenaten's religion as well as can be expected. We are glad to add these articles to the collection of 'Amarnah-literature in the library of the Egypt Exploration Society.

H. R. HALL.

BOTTI, GIUSEPPE. *Frammenti di un testo storico in onore di Tutmosi III.* (*Rendiconti R. Accad. Naz. dei Lincei*, Classe sci. morali ecc., xxxi, 348 ff.) Rome, 1923.

" " *Frammenti di registri di stato civile della XXa Dinastia.* *Ibid.*, 391 ff.

" " *Il culto divino dei Faraoni.* (*Mem. R. Acc. Linc.*, Cl. sc. mor. ecc., xvii, 141 ff.) Rome, 1923.

Dr. Botti has for some time past been working on the famous papyri of the Turin Museum. He has continued Schiaparelli's work of reassembling the numberless fragments to which fate and the ignorance of past decades have allowed some of these papyri to be reduced, and he has already reconstituted some interesting and important documents. Thus some fragments written during the Nineteenth Dynasty contain a copy of a description of a military exploit of Tuthmosis III, carrying back by more than a hundred years the literary form hitherto known to us only from the so-called Poem of Pentawer. Another group of fragments gives a list of householders and their families. As the verso of these fragments contains accounts of provisions distributed to workmen of the necropolis at Thebes Botti very reasonably concludes that the households enumerated on the recto are those of the cemetery workers. The document would thus be a further proof of the high organization of the Theban necropolis in the Twentieth Dynasty.

A third papyrus, in 35 small pieces, contains an account of certain religious ceremonies in which the



names of various dead kings figure largely. Botti interprets the document as describing the carrying in procession of royal images in their boat-shrines, either on the temple lake or on the Nile, and ceremonies attendant on this. The papyrus dates either from the late Nineteenth or the Twentieth Dynasty, the latest royal name in it being that of Ramesses II. Botti brings this papyrus into connection with a somewhat similar and more complete document found by the Italian expedition at Dêr el-Medînah in 1908, which describes ceremonies instituted by Ramesses II in honour of King Amenophis I. He comes to the conclusion that the reign of Ramesses II marks a very important stage in the history of the cult of the dead Pharaohs. The article is of primary importance for the student of Egyptian religion and ritual.

T. ERIC PEET.

W. J. PERRY. *The Growth of Civilization*. Methuen, London, 1924.

This book is a popular exposition of the author's views on the origin of early civilization as given in his earlier works *The Children of the Sun* and *The Origin of Magic and Religion*, both of which have been reviewed in this *Journal* (x, 63, ff., and below). There is some new material in the last two chapters where Mr. Perry attempts to show that warfare is not natural to mankind but developed mainly out of the class system, and the book ends with a rather obscurely worded suggestion that this hypothesis should be applied to the reform of our modern social institutions.

T. ERIC PEET.

*The Children of the Sun* by W. J. PERRY, M.A. Methuen and Co., Ltd., 36, Essex Street, London, W.C.

Mr. Peet in his criticism of Mr. Perry's *The Origin of Magic and Religion* in the last number of this *Journal* says: "My examination of the Egyptian evidence, which is a vital part of his argument, makes it quite impossible for me to accept Mr. Perry's results even if I could believe in his general method of reasoning. Mr. Perry will hardly deny me the right to wonder whether his Indian and American evidence would stand specialist criticism any better than his Egyptian." As the Egyptian evidence in the *Children of the Sun* is much the same as in *The Origin of Magic and Religion* it is unnecessary to go into that side of the question again after Mr. Peet's review.

As in *The Origin of Religion and Magic* Mr. Perry has produced this book to further certain theories with which he and a few other anthropologists are associated. It is unfortunate that he has started with a theory and has tried to adjust facts to that preconceived idea. *The Children of the Sun* is a laborious volume in which the author has utilised to the full his almost encyclopaedic knowledge of authorities: but his discrimination does not always equal his industry.

According to his theme, there once existed a world-wide "archaic" civilization, of which the *fons et origo* was Egypt. It is difficult to understand how this culture spread, since it reached, says Mr. Perry, Central America during the last centuries B.C., and inspired the Maya culture, and also reached Cambodia and gave rise to the Khmer civilization. Since, however, the latter culture as exemplified by the ruins at Angkor dates from the seventh or eighth centuries A.D., Mr. Perry's chronology is paradoxical and unconvincing.

The elements of the "archaic" civilization are set forth as follows:

1. Agriculture by means of irrigation.
2. The use of stone, typically for pyramids, dolmens, stone circles, and rock-cut tombs.
3. The carving of stone images.
4. Pottery-making.
5. Metal-working and pearl-fishing.
6. The use of polished stone implements.
7. A ruling class in two divisions:
  - (a) The Children of the Sun, connected with the sky-world, born of theogamies, who practise incestuous unions.
  - (b) A class associated with the underworld, who survive as war-chiefs.
8. The sun-cult.
9. The practice of mummification.
10. The great mother goddess.
11. Human sacrifice, connected with agriculture and the cult of the mother goddess.
12. Mother-right.

13. Totemic clans.
14. The dual organization.
15. Exogamy.

This list presents a culture complex of so wide a range that it would be difficult to mention a people in the whole world whose culture did not include several of its component elements. However, according to Mr. Perry, it is not necessary for the entire complex to be found in one place; even the appearance anywhere of one element (*e.g.* agriculture by means of irrigation, or dual organization) is taken as satisfactory proof of the existence of the "archaic" civilization.

It is impossible to deal, in a brief review of so diffuse a volume, with the details of the author's argument; but I propose to consider as far as possible the continent of America. It is somewhat surprising to find that practically no allusion is made to the southern regions: for one might have expected that Peru, with its worship of the sun at Cuzco, would have assisted Mr. Perry's theories. However, he would have found that his statement on page 2 that "the essential fact is that irrigation tends to disappear in the later stage of culture" is quite untrue as regards that country; it is doubtful if any early people ever attained to such perfection in irrigation as that of Peru prior to the arrival of Pizarro.

When Mr. Perry does use Peru to give weight to his theories he is singularly unfortunate in quoting a writer in the *Transactions of the New Zealand Institute* who stated that two kinds of bananas were cultivated in Peru before the arrival of the Spaniards. This writer states that "to transplant the banana from Polynesia to the shores of America, across more than 2,000 miles of ocean would tax the skill and knowledge of any ordinary European gardener; but for a people who have dispersed this species and the bread-fruit through the countless islands that form their home it would be a simple undertaking." Everyone who has studied the subject knows that the preponderating weight of evidence indicates the banana was first brought to the Americans from Africa after the discovery, and it is remarkable that though the Peruvians represented their foods again and again in pottery there is no example known of a pot in the form of a banana.

The chief part of America used by Mr. Perry is the Pueblo area, the culture of which he derives from Mexico. There is in Mexico a ruined *pueblo*, Casas Grandes in the Province of Chihua-hua. If the culture of the Pueblo arose in Mexico it would naturally follow that the earliest Pueblo culture would be in the South. This is by no means the case. The earliest pottery is the black on white, followed by black on red, although black on white continued during the period. It is a remarkable thing that the earliest form of this pottery appears in some dry caves in Utah associated with the basket-makers' culture, and at Casas Grandes the earliest pottery found near by at the ancient Pueblo is black on red. The ruins themselves provide a polychrome pottery with vases modelled sometimes realistically from human and animal forms. These do not appear in early Pueblo sites in the United States, and later are of extraordinary rarity, having only been found in two isolated cases—a perfect pot at Hawikuh, and part of a pot excavated by the reviewer at Kechipaun near by, last year.

Mr. Perry attempts to show by the use of a small map representing a large territory that the ruins of Pueblo follow rivers and railways, and he says: "What cause can have led men, all over the wide area, practically universally, to settle in close proximity to water? I suggest that the cause was the search for pearls and pearl-shell." It is almost incredible that a man holding Mr. Perry's position should have overlooked the fact that even before America had prohibition the natives drank water. Has Mr. Perry any idea of the country? It is practically a desert. Did the Saxons when they worked up the rivers of Britain search for pearls? Most of the rivers, such as the Zuni River, even in the rainy season are little more than brooks. The ruins in New Mexico and West Arizona are so extraordinarily numerous that it would be impossible for the trains passing near water not to be close to ruins. Yet the well-known Seven Cities of Cibola are about 40 miles from the railway. Mr. Perry seems certain that the Pueblo Indians worked mines which were near them. Then it is a very strange thing that no metal tool has ever been found in any ruin dating to Pre-Columbian days and no gold found either. That they worked the turquoise mines is indisputable, but that the use of that stone shows an influence from Mexico is not necessarily the case, but rather the contrary, as unless the Mexicans had seen turquoises they could not have known of their existence in North New Mexico. Turquoise was possibly introduced into Mexico by the Aztecs or earlier Toltecs who came from the north. The elaborate turquoise inlaid mosaics were essentially an Aztec or Toltec introduction and turquoise mosaics are still made by Zuni. The Pueblos like other Indians in North America probably sank mines to obtain haematite for paint, but not to obtain the metal for other uses.

When Mr. Perry starts dealing with the Maya civilization which for the purposes of his argument is vital since it is, with that of Peru (which he neglects), the earliest and highest civilization in America, he shows no intimate knowledge of the subject or of the material available for students. It would be possible for any one who has studied the subject to quarrel with 90 per cent. of the categorical statements he makes concerning it; even his geography is at times at fault, and indeed upholders of the theory that Maya civilization was imported from the west have little appreciation of the physical geography of the country; they have yet to explain how it was carried across the complicated mountain chain of the Andes through hundreds of miles of tropical jungle to a point far down the Atlantic slope, where it took root and flourished, without leaving a trace of its passage.

The Children of the Sun could if they wished have settled further west in Guatemala, as ruins of a definitely later period have been found at El Baul and Pantaleon and Quen Santo. On page 420 Mr. Perry tells us that the Maya civilization "seems to spring full-blown from the ground, to use the candid words of Mr. Joyce." It is only a few years ago that we used to be taught that Egyptian civilization sprang up thus, but the use of the spade at length revealed the pre-dynastic graves, with the earlier history of what eventually became the Egyptian civilization.

Scientific excavation of Central America is still in its infancy; it was only started in the eighties by Dr. Alfred Maudslay, and explorers for the most part have confined their attention to the more obvious ruins above ground. In time, when the use of the spade is resorted to, we shall doubtless learn something sure of the development of this civilization, and it is better and more scientific to wait till that day than to spin webs which spread from Egypt to Guatemala. An excellent warning is furnished by the fate of those cognate theories of the unfortunate le Plongeon. Even the string of pearls which Mr. Perry makes one of his chief bonds across the Pacific breaks, as it is highly remarkable that these Children of the Sun, absorbed in the quest of pearls when they reached the Pacific (the richest pearl field in the world), should have forgotten what they came for and used only the shell (except in the doubtful instance of Tahiti). Apparently when they reached the gulf of Panama they remembered the object of their quest, but on attaining the Maya area made no use of this whatever, for in spite of what Mr. Perry says there is no real evidence of the use of pearls by the Mayas.

Mr. Perry is doubtless quite correct in believing that the ancient civilizations of America were not absolutely isolated from each other. The dredging of the Cenote at Chichen Itza has produced gold ornaments; while some were of Aztec design, others were of the type found in large numbers in Costa Rica and Columbia and doubtless were traded north. It is of interest, too, that north of Manta, Ecuador, there were legends of invaders who arrived in *balsas* and at La Tola near Manta were found a number of pottery fragments, some showing a strong resemblance to late Maya Art.

However, the book is of value in that it leads to reconsideration of current opinions, although it is scarcely likely to lead to their considerable modification.

LOUIS C. G. CLARKE.

*The Oxford Excavations in Nubia.* By F. Ll. GRIFFITH, M.A. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, VIII-X. Liverpool: 1921-3.

The last two decades have witnessed great activity in exploration in Nubia, a region in which, up to that time, very little archaeological work had been done since the time of Lepsius. The decision of the Government to raise the Aswân dam, a step finally decided upon in 1907, immediately brought into prominence the question of safeguarding and recording the archaeological sites which the alteration in water-level would affect. The Survey Department immediately took steps to establish the Archaeological Survey of Nubia, which, first in charge of Dr. Reisner, and later of Mr. C. M. Firth, systematically worked over a great area and published its results in the voluminous *Bulletins* and *Reports*, which contain a vast amount of archaeological and anthropological data. Meanwhile the Service des Antiquités set about the consolidation and publication of the temples, and the results of this undertaking are contained in an elaborate series of memoirs. At the same time an expedition sent out by Chicago University under Professor Breasted explored and photographed the pre-Ptolemaic temples and Weigall, then Inspector for the Service, was active in the district and published a report on the antiquities of Lower Nubia with which he was concerned. During the same period expeditions organised by the Universities of California (Eckley B. Cox, Jun. Expedition), Liverpool (under Garstang), Berlin (under Schaefer and Junker), and Leipzig (Seiglin Expedition), worked actively in Nubia. In 1909-10 Mr. Griffith worked upon the meroitic inscriptions (for

this Society) and in the three succeeding years he took charge of the Oxford excavations in Nubia. From 1913 onwards the concession was handed over to Dr. Reisner who has for ten years carried out extensive explorations in Napata and its district and on other sites for the Harvard-Boston Expedition.

The results of most of these active field-parties have been published—some as special memoirs, others as preliminary reports in various journals, but others are still unpublished. In the journal of the Liverpool University Institute of Archaeology, *The Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, Mr. Griffith has during the last three years published a systematic account of the work of the Oxford Expedition. This account, as might confidently be expected, is in all respects what such a report should be. It contains a complete catalogue of all the antiquities, admirably and abundantly illustrated, with all their archaeological data, their present whereabouts, and their mutual relationships. In addition to this there is just as much, and no more, introductory matter as is necessary to grasp the significance of the whole of the work undertaken, and an admirably clear and brief historical account of Nubia and its relations to Egypt.

Before passing on to examine this report individually, it may be observed that in this, and the reports of the other Nubian expeditions, we have a vast amount of material, collected and published in recent years and upon modern methods. That is to say, in surveying the whole material, we may, for practical purposes, compare all these publications as equal with equal; we are not confronted with the problem which is almost always present in dealing with Egyptian sites, of having part of the published material in copies nearly a century old when the standard of epigraphic accuracy was not, and could not be, comparable with that of modern work. The vast and complex Nubian materials now at the disposal of scholars must not be allowed to get out of hand. There is at the present time a great need for a clear and succinct account of Nubia from prehistoric to Christian times, based upon the results of the last twenty years' field work; it is only by such a general conspectus that the missing links in the chain will make their absence apparent and scholars thus be directed especially to seek them out, find them if possible, and weld them into their places. As all archaeological work is necessarily confined to more or less limited areas, exploration reports or memoirs must deal with all material, irrespective of age or nature, that is to be found in that area, and must be, in fact, a detailed history and description of the microcosm enclosed within the boundaries of the concession. It is a truism to say that each of these microcosmic histories is but a small fragment of a consistent whole, and that a co-ordination of all units is necessary to make it possible to reconstruct the history and archaeology of a district or of a country. In spite of this, the fact remains that excavation records, each complete in itself, are liable to be docketed and filed after the manner of documents in a Government office, as it is no man's "job" to bring them all into focus. Let us hope that in the case of Nubia, where all the circumstances are favourable, an attempt will be made to crystallize in a short but authoritative form the results of the labours which so many scholars have ungrudgingly bestowed upon Nubian research in the last twenty years.

The Oxford expedition worked in two different areas. The first two seasons (1910-11, 1911-12), were devoted to Faras on the border between Egypt and the Sudan, about 25 miles above the second cataract. In this interesting region, the earliest remains—with the exception of a single palaeolith—which were found consisted of a proto-dynastic cemetery and settlements. The graves were shallow oval pits, containing contracted burials, and pottery both of Egyptian and native wares. Some of the latter, treated with haematite applied in streaks or patterns, is of special interest. Stone vessels were rare, only a few specimens being found, but many good specimens of bronze implements of various kinds came to light, and a quantity of amulets, etc., of ivory, shell and other materials. A complete catalogue of all the graves and their contents is given, with accurate notes of the positions of all the objects<sup>1</sup>.

The second article<sup>2</sup> opens with an interesting and valuable summary of the history of Nubia from the Old to the New Kingdom, in order to show the significance of the finds made by the Oxford expedition in their proper chronological sequence. A cemetery of the type called by Dr. Reisner "C-group" was found and some 244 graves excavated. This cemetery dates from the intermediate period between the Old and Middle Kingdoms. A fort of Middle Kingdom date was also discovered and planned, but very few objects, other than broken pottery, were recovered from the site. Of the New Kingdom far more remains were found. These included a temple of Hathor, which yielded a fine series of scarabs, amulets and other small objects, and a quantity of inscribed architectural fragments, while near by was a small speos or grotto dating from the reign of Ramesses II, whose cartouches appear amongst the inscriptions. Remains were also found of a temple of Tuthmosis III. An Eighteenth Dynasty temple, built by Tutankhamūn, containing

<sup>1</sup> *Annals*, VIII, 1-18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 65-104.

fragments of some interesting ceremonial scenes was cleared and planned. It was of considerable size (56 x 25 m.) and consisted of a colonnaded forecourt, hypostyle hall and sanctuary. Of special interest is the prominence given to the viceroy Huy on the temple walls. It may be noted that the temple was called *Sehtep-entêr* ("Pacification of the gods") and was dedicated after the overthrow of the Aten cult when Tutankhamun had returned to orthodox Thebes: the deities worshipped in this temple were Amun, Isis, Hathor and the King himself. The inscriptions from these temples are all published in full in the plates together with some others from East Serra, which is situated further south.

The work of the third season was carried out at Napata, after which Dr. Reisner took over the concession and has worked it every winter since with brilliant results, which have been recorded in this *Journal* and elsewhere. The site worked by the Oxford expedition was Sanam, and it produced a rich crop of material belonging to the age which followed the New Kingdom—the Ethiopian period. The third article<sup>1</sup> deals with the great temple of Tirhakah and the royal treasury. The walls of the temple were adorned with a remarkable series of processional and ceremonial scenes. Of special interest are the pictures of carts or wagons on four wheels, and of men riding horseback seated on decorative saddles. Amongst the antiquities discovered special mention must be made of a fine head of a statue of Amun with disk and plumes sculptured in yellow serpentine, the foundation deposits, an ostrakon depicting two rows of men taking part in some ceremony, moulds for making ushabtis, fragments of colossal vultures and uraei, lions' and rams' heads, etc. In the ruins of the treasury some remarkable objects in iron, bronze, silver, glass and other materials were found.

The cemetery of Sanam is the only one yet explored in the neighbourhood of Napata containing other than royal burials<sup>2</sup>. Although the graves had no superstructure, or at least, if they ever had, none has survived, they corresponded in date with the prosperous period represented by the temples, and were rich in antiquities of high artistic merit and workmanship. The graves were of several types, some containing contracted, and others extended burials, and it seems that in some cases at least mummification had been attempted. The antiquities discovered were of a particularly varied and interesting kind, great numbers of amulets, scarabs, pottery, etc. being found.

We may, perhaps, express a word of regret that no anatomist was attached to the expedition. The very important anthropological and ethnographical results of the Archaeological Survey of Nubia, based upon the systematic examination of skeletons and mummies, show how much is to be gained in this direction. The generally ill-preserved condition of the bones discovered in the course of the Oxford excavations emphasises more than ever the need for specialist treatment: Nubia has many anthropological problems to solve, and a critical use should be made of the material from all sites.

W. R. DAWSON.

*Die Literatur der Aegypter. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3 and 2 Jahrtausend v. Chr.*

By ADOLF ERMAN. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1923.

In the preface of this truly delightful book Professor Erman rightly says that "no one who is unacquainted with this (the ancient Egyptian) literature ought to pass judgement on the Egyptians and on the epoch in human history to which they belong." Thanks to Professor Erman any one who can read German will now be able to estimate fairly whether or no Egyptologists are justified in claiming that the ancient inhabitants of the Nile Valley produced didactic and imaginative literature of a high order, as well as great architecture, sculpture, and painting.

It is much to be hoped that this book will be translated into English by a scholar who is equipped with literary taste as well as with philological and archaeological knowledge, so that the contents of so rich a treasure-house may be as satisfactorily displayed to British and American readers as to Professor Erman's fellow-countrymen.

The introduction comprises an outline of Egyptian history, the dating of the earlier period being that of Eduard Meyer and not, be it observed, that recently proposed by Dr. Borchardt. Professor Erman, it will be noted, suggests that the Fifth Dynasty was possibly a great age for literature as well as for art (p. xiv), and he is likewise inclined to accept a suggestion put forward by the reviewer in *Discovery*, III, 36, that the Herakleopolitan Period was marked by a great outburst of literary activity (p. 3).

The introduction has also a good deal to tell us about the different forms of Egyptian literature, about

<sup>1</sup> *Annals*, ix, 67-124, and Pls. IV-LXII.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, x, 73-171, and Pls. XI-LXVI.


the scribe, the script, and the writing-materials employed, and also about the difficulties confronting the translator owing to textual corruptions,—for many of the examples of Egyptian literature that we possess are, unfortunately for us, only preserved in the form of the carelessly executed writing-exercises of school-boys.

A *propos* of schoolboys, the reviewer would like to draw the attention of readers to the entertaining account of Egyptian education during the New Kingdom on pp. 238–41.

For scholars the most valuable part of the book is undoubtedly that containing the altogether admirable translations of New Egyptian literary texts and the accompanying introductory and explanatory notes, the rich harvest of a life-long study. These translations and notes (pp. 197–384) will be of the greatest assistance to students when beginning to study the language of the later period.

In the translation of Akhenaten's *Hymn to the Sun* (pp. 358–62), which is far the best that has yet appeared, there are just one or two points which the reviewer would like to call in question.

P. 358. Erman renders *iš-tw išt-šn nb iw-w hr tpu-šn n ʿm-sn* (line 3, bottom) “Würden alle ihre Sachen genommen, die unter ihrem Kopfe liegen, sie merken es nicht.” Would not the following rendering be more correct? “All their things are stolen, even when they are under their heads<sup>1</sup>, and they know it not.”

P. 359.  (line 6) surely means “Samen” rather than “Knaben.” If *mšy* is not to be regarded as the female counterpart of the male ejaculate, then *šhpr* perhaps means “developing”; cf. *šhpr* “educate,” “bring up,” and *hprw* “upbringing.”

Breasted's translation of *wp-k rš-f hr mdw* (line 7) “thou openest his mouth in speech,” is on the whole preferable to Erman's “so öffnest du seinen Mund, wenn es reden will(?)”

As Erman translates *dmšy-f* (line 7) as “seine Kraft” in the passage “Du machst ihm im Ei seine Kraft (?), um es zu zerbrechen,” there is no reason why he should leave *r dmšy-f* untranslated in the succeeding passage. The combination is probably rightly rendered by Breasted “with all his might.”

Professor Erman's translation of the *Gedichte auf Theben und seinen Gott* (pp. 363–73) is in some respects an improvement on that of Gardiner in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 42. For example:

P. 372. The rendering of the passage *ʿk-f krty—ibty-fy* (Section 600) “Als er die Grotte unter seinen Füßen eintrat, da kam der Nil unter seinen Sohlen hervor,” is preferable to “When he enters, the two caverns are under his feet. Nile goes forth from the grotto beneath his sandals.”

There are also instances of changes having been made for the worse.

P. 365. Erman translates *iy-n šcy r hnb išt* (Section 10) “der Sand kam zu dem Ackerboden(?)”; but, as Gardiner points out in a footnote, *hnb išt* probably means something like “the delimitation of fields,” and renders the words probably more correctly: “Sand came to circumscribe(?) the fields.”

P. 366. Why leave untranslated the perfectly intelligible words *nn wšt šw-ty im-f* (Section 20), “There is no path empty of him,” and the also translatable passage *iw nfr—šnfr ib-f* (Section 40), “A fair colour becoming a goodly shape. Forming his images, creating himself. A goodly divine force (*šm*) enlivening his heart”?


P. 370. Surely *bw rš-tw iw n-f* (Section 200) does not mean “sein Wesen kennt man nicht,” but rather “his colour (or ‘complexion’) is not known.”



In *Der grosse Amonshymnus*, zweites Lied, p. 353, the words *nb mkš* (GRÉBAUT, *Hymne à Ammon-Ra*, § VIII, 5), and viertes Lied, p. 357, the words *twi irw* (GRÉBAUT, *op. cit.*, § XXIV, 2), are left untranslated. Erman has evidently overlooked Spiegelberg's interesting discussion of the word *mkš* in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 53, 101–4, in which it is shown that the object in question is the case containing the documents which assigned to the Pharaoh all his rights and privileges as the successor and embodiment on earth of the god Horus. *Twī irw* probably means “pleasant, agreeable, of forms” (see GARDINER, *P.S.B.A.*, XXXVI, 1914, 23)

With regard to the translations of selections from the *Pyramid Texts*, pp. 25–35, may the reviewer venture upon some minor criticisms?

P. 29. Surely *phr n-f psdt ntrw tmt* (*Pyr.*, 304e) means not “die Neunheit des Atum bedient ihn,” but “the whole Ennead serves him.”

Again *hmš rf m ist nb tm* (*Pyr.*, 305a) means not “er sitzt auf irgendeinem Throne des Atum” but “he sits on the throne of the Lord of All” (see SETHE, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 54, 44).

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  “Rescuing whom he will even when he is in the Tēi,” *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 42, 28.

P. 31. It might perhaps be pointed out that EMBER in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 51, 114 [37], compares the verb   *dšd* (*Pyr.* 402 a) with the Arabic ذرر and accordingly suggests that the meaning is not "abstechen" (so Erman) but "to strangle."

Do not the words *iw phr n-f hšw iw wdn n-f ššwt* (?) (*Pyr.*, 408 b) mean "Thousands serve him, hundreds make oblation to him," rather than "Tausende werden ihm zuteil (?) und Hunderte werden ihm geopfert" ?

P. 32. According to Ember in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 51, 111 (8), the verb *nšb* (*Pyr.*, 411 a) means "to bite" not "to gulp down" (verschlingen).

*Hštt* (*Pyr.*, 816 c) probably means "forehead-unguent" rather than "feines Öl"; see the reviewer's art. "On the Name of an Unguent used for Ceremonial Purposes," in *Journal*, vi, 58-60.




P. 33. Breasted (*Development*, 22) is possibly right in translating *mšt-f ʿndt ʿnhšt tšwy im* (*Pyr.*, 1194 a, b) "his unblemished birth whereby the Two Lands live."

*Škr* in *škr-n n-f N. išk-w-k pw* (*Pyr.*, 1108) seems to mean "to hammer" rather than "to stamp."


The reviewer has made a fairly careful study of certain of the translations in Section II *Aus der älteren Zeit*, reading them side by side with the Egyptian texts and also comparing them with previous translations. May he be allowed to set down the results of his study in some detail, first pointing out, in the case of each particular translation, where he thinks Professor Erman has improved upon the work of his predecessors, and then offering certain criticisms, some of which at any rate both Professor Erman and, with his permission, the scholar whom he makes responsible for the almost inevitable English edition of this book, may regard as worthy of consideration ?

Of the translations in question one of the best is that of the very difficult "Mahnworte eines Propheten," pp. 130-148. How excellent Erman's new renderings are of certain hitherto obscure passages will appear in the following paragraphs.

P. 133. "Der Fluss ist Blut; trinkt man von ihm, so weist man es als Mensch zurück, (denn) man dürstet nach Wasser" is a more satisfactory rendering of *İtrw m snf šwr-tw im-f ny-tw m rmtt ib-tw maw* (2, 10) than Gardiner's "The river is blood, and (yet) men drink of it. Men shrink from (?) (tasting) human beings, and thirst after water."

P. 134. Erman rightly gives "leere" as the meaning of   (2, 11) instead of "dry" as Gardiner translates the word, *šw* "dry" according to ERMAN-GRAPOW, *Glossar*, 179, being written with determ. ☉ or .

P. 135. *Hd nwb* (3, 8) "Das Gold wird vermindert"; so Erman rightly as against Gardiner's "Gold is lacking."

P. 138. Erman gives a brilliant rendering of the difficult passage *nhm ... m rš n ššy—hr hkr* (6, 2-3): "Man raubt die Abfälle (?) aus dem Maule des Schweines, ohne (so wie früher) zu sagen (): 'das ist besser für dich als für mich,' weil man so hungrig ist."

P. 141. Equally clever is the translation of *Dbh n-f tšht-f m nb šhrw* (7, 11), "Wer ihm sonst um seine Neigen bat, der besitzt jetzt starkes Bier" (lit. beer that bowls one over!). Gardiner's translation is much less satisfactory "He who begged for himself his dregs is (now) the possessor of bowls full to overflowing(?)."

P. 143. "Kisse" as the meaning of *šdw* (9, 1) gives better sense than "waterskin."

"Stopfen" seems a more likely meaning of *šdt* (9, 1 and 4, 2) than "prepare," "make ready."

P. 147. "Mit Amuletten geschützt," Erman's rendering of *tšr m wdšw* (14, 2), is decidedly preferable to Gardiner's "stored in safety."

Now for one or two criticisms :

P. 132. The perfectly translatable sentence *n dd rhty fšt štpw-f* (1, 3), "The washerman refuses to carry his load," is omitted, evidently by an oversight.

P. 133. It might be noted that Erman renders *wšr* (2, 4) as "barren," against the view of Sethe and Gardiner, who take the verb to mean "be wanting," a view which finds support in the passage quoted by GARDINER in his *Admonitions*, p. 2 (PIEHL, *Inscr.*, I, 38, 9-39, 1).

P. 134. The words *mš-k šy šnw* (2, 13), left untranslated by Erman and Gardiner, must mean "behold it is a net," i.e. a trap. For *šnw* "net" see *Urk.*, iv, 2 = *Journal*, v, 49; *Urk.*, iv, 659.

P. 144. Erman gives "Weizen" as the meaning of *bdt* (10, 4), but it surely means "spelt."





*Der Kampf des Königs Kamose*, pp. 83-5.

P. 83. The meaning of *in R<sup>c</sup> rdī šw m nšwt dšf* (*Carn. Tabl.*, I, 2) is rather "Re<sup>c</sup> has installed him as a veritable king" than "Re selbst hat ihn zum König gemacht."

P. 84. "Der die rechten Gedanken hat" for *nty šhrw* (*Carnarvon Tablet*, I, 10) is distinctly preferable to Gardiner-Gunn's "just of counsel."

Erman has evidently not read Battiscombe Gunn and Gardiner's joint translation of this text (in *Journal*, v, 45, 46), which is in certain points a distinct improvement on that which Gardiner printed in *Journal*, III, 95-110. Thus the later translation of *šš·i šw r ih-nšsy* (*Carn. Tabl.*, I, 3), "To what purpose am I cognisant of it, this power of mine, when one chieftain is in Avaris, another in Kush, and (so) I sit in company with an Asiatic and a Negro" is far preferable, from the point of view of syntax, to "Ich mochte wissen, wozu meine Stärke dient. Ein Fürst sitzt in Auaris und ein anderer in Nubien und ich sitze da, zusammen mit einem Asiaten und einem Neger."

*Bdt* (*Carn. Tabl.*, I, 6) surely means "spelt," not "Weizen."

Erman leaves *hpr wd* (*Carn. Tabl.*, I, 8) untranslated, though "success will come," the rendering of both the above-mentioned English translations is a highly likely one. *Rwd* occurs with a similar meaning both in *Kubbân Stela*, 20, and in *Tut<sup>c</sup>ankhamûn Stela*, 8.

*Die Lehre für König Meri-ka-re*, pp. 109-19.

P. 112. "Seine Taten werden haufenweise neben ihm gelegt" (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 55) seems a more satisfactory translation of *rdi-w spw·f r gš·f m ḥ<sup>c</sup>w* than Gardiner's "his deeds are laid beside him for (all) treasure."

P. 117. "Gott greift den an, der gegen den Tempel feind ist" seems to be a possible translation of *tkk ntr šbi-hr r pr* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 110). Gardiner renders the words "God thwarts (?) the rebel...home."

"Das Königtum ist ein schönes Amt. Auch wenn es keinen Sohn und keinen Bruder hat, der die Erinnerung daran fort dauern liesse, so stellt doch einer (das Denkmal) des andern wieder her" is on the whole a better rendering of *šwt pw nfrt—in w<sup>c</sup> šmnh ky* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 116-17) than Gardiner's "A goodly office is that of King; it has no son nor has it a brother who is made to endure upon its monuments. One brings honour to another."

P. 110. "They who know (the extent of) his knowledge do not thwart him" seems a more natural and satisfactory translation of *n tkk-n šw rhw rh·f* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 33-4), than "den greifen die Gelehrten nicht an, wenn er gelehrt ist."

P. 111. The quite legible words *šrud tšw·k* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 38) "make strong thy frontiers" have been left untranslated.

Why are the words *špsš pw hwd m šrw* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 45) not translated? They clearly mean "August is he who is rich in magistrates."


*Mty n nb ḥš-ib* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 46) means "Uprightness of heart befits the sovereign" rather than "Einem Herrn mit rectem Sinne geht es gut."

Translate *ir mš<sup>c</sup> wšh·k tp tš* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 46-7) "Do right that thou mayest live long upon earth" and not "Tue das Rechte solange du auf Erden weilst."

P. 112. Erman's translation of *ššn pw šrh·y m šš* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 54) "Übel ergeht es, wo der Ankläger der Weise ist," in which he takes *šš* "der Weise" to mean Thōth, seems too far-fetched. It is better to take *šrh·y* as perf. pass. participle="he who has been cited," "the accused," and translate "Woful is the accused when in the capacity of (m) one who knows," i.e. an instructed person who therefore should know better, or perhaps rather, as Gardiner suggests, one who knows he is guilty.

P. 113. Gardiner's interpretation of the passage *rnpt 20—n hrđw* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 58-9) is more satisfactory than Erman's. The latter scholar takes *rnpt 20* as a genitive defining *rwd mš*, and refrains from translating the rest of the passage, evidently overlooking Gardiner's clever suggestion that the word *šky* means "father of a family,"=lit. "one who causes to enter," i.e. begets children.

P. 115. Gardiner's rendering of *mš·k nšwt nb šwt-ib—m-ḥšb tšš·k* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 79-81), "Behold the king is a lord of joy. Thou art indolent and sleepest through my strength; thou followest thy desire through what I have done. There is no enemy within thy border," is better than "Siehe, du König, du Herr der Freude,...du schläfst in deiner Stärke. Folge deinem Herzen in dem, was ich tat, so

pointed out that one of the priests attached to the temple of Ḥarshef at Herakleopolis Magna was entitled  *nšwt* (BRUGSCH, *Dict. géogr.*, 1377).

hast du keinen Feind innerhalb deiner Grenzen." Erman, it will be observed, does not accept Gardiner's emendation *m ḥpš-i* for the *m ḥpš-k* of the MS.

P. 116. "Mit schlechtem Wasser" is surely an impossible translation of *šhw mw* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 A recto, 91-2). The substantive *šhw* means "pain," "trouble." Here, where the word is used as an adjective, the meaning must be "painful," "troubled." Insert with Gardiner the preposition *m* before *mw*, which begins with the same letter, and translate "troubled (with) water."

*Die Weissagung des Nefer-rehu*, pp. 151-57.

P. 154. "Was gemacht ist, ist als wäre es nie gemacht und Re möge (wieder) zu gründen anfangen" is a much more satisfactory translation of *iryt m tmt ir šš' R' m grg* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 B recto, 22) than Gardiner's "Things made are as though they had never been. Day begins in falsehood (?)."

"Es ist kein Rest geblieben und nicht das Schwarze vom Nagel bleibt von dem, was da sein sollte" is a brilliant rendering of the apparently hopeless passage *n ḥpr dšt n sp km n 'nt m šš-t-f* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 B recto, 23).

The passage *iw R' iw-d-f šw rmtt—šwyt* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 B recto, 51-2) is rendered by Erman "Die Sonne trennt sich von den Menschen; sie geht auf, wenn es die Stunde ist (?). Man weiss nicht mehr, dass es Mittag wird und man unterscheidet den Schatten nicht mehr." This is a distinct improvement on the rendering adopted by Gardiner who did not recognise the reference to the sun-dial.

It has occurred to the reviewer that the following translation is possible and also preferable to that of Erman:—"Rē' separates himself from man. He rises (*wbn-f*), and the hour passes (*wn<sup>1</sup> unwt*), (but) one knows not that it is noon, (for) one discerns not his (the sun's) shadow (i.e. the shadow that should be cast by the sun, were it not overclouded, on the dial)."

Two passages in this text are left untranslated, though they are not so hopeless as we are thus led to suppose. They are:—*Gr m iwḥ—m t' šš'-n-k im* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 B recto, 20-1), and *mī-k wn wrw m šhrw nw t'* (*Pap. Petersburg*, 1116 B recto, 22). The first is very difficult, but there is much to be said for Gardiner's rendering:—"He who is silent is a transgressor. Behold, that exists whereof men spoke as a thing to be dreaded. Behold, the great one is fallen in the land whence thou art sprung." There is less excuse for leaving the second passage untranslated, for it must mean, as is also the view of Gardiner, "Behold, princes (i.e. a number of petty rulers) are in control of this land," where the Pharaoh, of course, should be the sole ruler. For *m šhrw nw* "in control of," cf. *dī-tw-i š hr šhr-f* "I am placed under his control" (*Sinuhe*, B 217; see also *Bersheh* II, 13, 12; 21, 10; *Siut*, v, 23; *Urk.*, IV, 96).

*Die Geschichte des Sinuhe* (pp. 39-56).

P. 42. *Bty* "zwei Büsche" (B 5); so Erman rightly. Gardiner strangely translates "two brambles."

P. 43. Despite Gardiner's remarks on p. 21 of his *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, Erman's rendering of *fh-n-i r Kpny* (B 29) "ich zog von Byblos fort" seems more satisfactory than "I set forth to Byblos."

P. 48. The translation of *dī n-i ntr ḥtp* (B 160-61) "möchte der Gott mir Gnade geben," where *n-i* is taken as dative and *ḥtp* as a substantive, seems preferable to Gardiner's "I have caused God to be gracious," where *dī-n-i* is in the form *sdm-n-f* and *ḥtp* pseudopartic.




P. 51. "Der grosse Gott der dem Re gleicht, macht selbst den, der ihm dient, verständig," Erman's rendering of *Ntr 'š mītw R' hr ššš' bšk n-f dš-f* (B 216-17), is perhaps an improvement on Gardiner's "Great god, like unto Rē' in making wise one who was labouring for himself."

P. 52. *Nn šhš Rtnw n-k-im šy mitt tsmw-k* (B 222) "ohne dass ich Retenu's gedenke: das ist dein, so wie es deine Hunde sind" is preferable to the rendering adopted by Gardiner who tacks *nn šhš* on to *ḥprw m nrwt-k* and translates "who have grown up in love of thee, albeit unremembered," and then begins a new sentence with *Rtnw n-k-im šy*.

P. 41. Surely *sn 'wy-i* (B 3) means "my arms opened" or "were spread open," not "meine Arme sanken."

P. 42. "Da ereilte es mich, dass ich vor Durst niederfiel" is impossible grammatically. As Gardiner has pointed out, the passage, according to the text of R, line 47 (*hr-n ibt šš-n-s wi*), can only mean "thirst fell and overtook me" or according to that of B, lines 21-2 (*hr n ibt šš-n-f wi*) "the fall of thirst overtook me."

P. 44. *Šmy-f šš-t-n-f ḥpr* (B 51) "(Er war es, der die Fremdländer bezwang, während sein Vater innen im Palaste sass) damit er ihm melden könnte, das ihm Aufgetragene sei geschehen (?)" is hardly in

<sup>1</sup> Reading . The  may easily have dropped out between the two groups .

accordance with the rules of grammar, for in that case *hpr* would be pseudopartic. and should be in the fem. not masc. form. Gardiner's view seems the only tenable one, namely that *hpr* is the pass. infin. of *irt* = "feri," and that *št-t-n-f hpr* means "what had been commanded him to be done." The version of R, *šmy-f n-f št-t-(n)-f hpr*, which Erman adopts and, in the reviewer's opinion, mistranslates, is to be rendered "he (Sesöstris) reported to him (Amenemes) what he (A.) commanded to be done."

P. 45. Erman has overlooked Gardiner's point that *iw-f m nšwt* cannot be taken as a principal clause, but qualifies the preceding sentence,—“Men and women go by, rejoicing over him, now that he is king.”

P. 47. Erman only gives what he considers to be the general meaning of the very difficult passage, B 114–26, instead of—and that seems a great pity—reproducing Gardiner's clever rendering of it, a rendering essentially sound both from the point of view of sense and grammar.

Erman translates *hmwt tšyw hr ʿi* (B 132) “die Frauen der Männer redeten aufgeregt,” but Gardiner's “women and men jabbered” is much better. Erman has evidently not read Gardiner's art. in *P.S.B.A.*, 37, 123, nor seen the note on p. 158 of his *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*.

P. 48. Erman's rendering of the passage *hr irt ntr r htp n ts-n-f im-f th-n-f r kt hššt* (B 147–9) “Und (dies) hat der Gott getan um einem gnädig zu sein, der sich an ihm vergangen (?) hatte, der zu einem andern Lande entronnen war.” is in certain respects grammatically impossible. Gardiner supplies plenty of evidence to show that *ts m* means “be vexed with” or sim. Accordingly *r htp n ts-n-f im-f* is to be rendered “in order to be gracious to him with whom he was vexed,” a rendering that complies with the demands of grammar and sense. It is curious that Erman should take the meaning of *th-n-f r kt hššt* to be “who ran away to another land” instead of “whom he (God) had led astray into another land,” for on p. 51 he translates *bšk th-n ib-f r hššwt drdryt* (B 203) by “Diener, den sein Herz nach feindlichen Ländern hin verleitet hat.”

*Pw hpr sp nfr* (B 160) can hardly mean “möge das Gute geschehen,” but rather, as Gardiner has pointed out, “that which has happened (*i.e.* Sinuhe's victory and additional acquisition of wealth) is a happy event.”


Why are the words *irr-f my iht r šmnh phwy n šfn-n-f* (B 161) left untranslated? Gardiner's rendering “May he do the like so as to make good the end of him whom he hath afflicted” is perfectly satisfactory.

The difficult passage *wdb-f ʿ-šw im* (B 165) is also left untranslated. May it not mean: “May he turn<sup>1</sup> towards him whom he hath oppressed unto (or “at<sup>2</sup>”) the place whither he hath brought him”?

*Nd-i hrt hnwt tš* (B 166) does not mean “möchte ich die Landesherrscherin...nach ihre Wünschen fragen” so much as “May I greet (*lit.* enquire after the state of) the Lady of the Land”; cf. *iw nd-tw hrt-i m šnb ʿnh* “I was greeted (or “enquired after”) with (the words) ‘Health, life!’” (*Urk.*, iv, 59).

P. 49. “Übel” is a poor rendering of *wgš* (B 168), which surely means “feebleness.” Again *irty dnš* (B 169) does not mean “Meine Augen sind schwach” but “my eyes are heavy.”

P. 50. Why are the words *n ntf m ib-i r-k* (B 185) left untranslated? The whole passage should be rendered “This thought, it seized on thy heart, (but) it was not in my heart against thee.”

Gardiner has produced sufficient evidence to show that  (B 194–5) is the correct reading here. It is therefore over-cautious to print “die Tänze der....”

“An deinen Opfersteinen” does not fully give the meaning of *r rš ʿbšw-k* (B 195–6), which should be rendered “at the door of thy façade-stela<sup>3</sup>.” The stela here referred to represents the façade of a house, the door occupying the centre of the lower portion. Such a stela is to be seen in the tomb-chapel of Pepiʿonkh the Middle at Meir with the tethering-stone to which the victims were fastened directly opposite it<sup>4</sup>.

P. 51. After his admirable rendering of the difficult preceding passage, why does Erman leave *iw bšk im-hr šhr-f* (B 217) untranslated? Gardiner has quite convincingly shown that the words mean: “The servant there is in the hand of him who takes counsel on his behalf. Yea, I am set under his (the king's) guidance.”

P. 52. In view of the parallel expression in the Brit. Mus. stela quoted by Gardiner on p. 85 of his *Notes*, *hššw pw mtrw rrw* (B 221) should probably be rendered “they are chieftains whose names are renowned.”

<sup>1</sup> Or should we render “turn the arm towards,” or, as we should say, “give a helping hand to”?



<sup>2</sup> For *r* = “at,” see *Urk.*, iv, 768, *pš twt...šmš r ht-ntr tn*, “this statue...which serves at this temple.”

<sup>3</sup> *ʿbšw* (plur.) should probably be emended to *ʿbš* (sing.).

<sup>4</sup> BLACKMAN, *The Rock Tombs of Meir*, iv, Pls. I, xxv, 1, xxvi, 1.

<sup>5</sup> MS. *nft*.

P. 54. *Īr-n-k w'rt* (B 257), left untranslated, probably means "Thou hast traversed the waste."

P. 55. "Löse dein Horn und zieh deine Pfeile heraus" is not a satisfactory translation of *nif<sup>6</sup> 'b-k šfḥ šsr-k* (B 274). According to Erman the king is here thought of as a bull and is asked to set free him whom he has transfixated with his horn. Presumably Erman also supposes that the king is requested to pull his arrows out of the persons he has shot? But in view of the parallel passage in the *Piankhi Stela*, the variant reading of the *Berlin Ostrakon No. 2*, and the use of   in *Koller*, I, 8, with the meaning "bow," Gardiner is probably right in rendering "Slacken (*i.e.* unstring) thy bow, loosen the arrow (*i.e.* remove it from the string)."

It is somewhat surprising, after Gardiner's remarks in his *Notes*, pp. 109-110, and the reviewer's art. "The House of the Morning" in *Journal*, v, 148-65, that "Kabinett der Verehrung" should still be given as the meaning of *pr-dwst* (B 282).

Judging from the footnote Erman seems to agree with Gardiner's interpretation of *r irt ḥ'w-f* (B 283) "in order to wait upon him" (*ḥ'w*, according to G., being an abstract word for "service," "attendance"). It seems unnecessary caution, therefore, to represent these words by "um seine...zu machen" in the actual translation.

P. 56. Why leave *ḥmw nw šḥt* (B 287) untranslated? *ḥm* is a not uncommon word for "figure" of a divinity. Gardiner's "painted devices of the horizon" is quite a reasonable rendering.

It has long been the opinion of the reviewer that the words *tj-kwy 'cb šnw-i* (B 291) are intentionally jocose and should be translated "I was plucked (*i.e.* underwent depilation<sup>1</sup>) and my hair was raked together"; the idea being that so much hair was removed from Sinuhe's body that it had to be raked together like the straw on the threshing-floor, which was raked together with a wooden fork under the feet of the oxen treading out the corn! This interpretation is hinted at by Gardiner in his *Notes* (pp. 111-12) but not followed out in his translation.

Erman still retains his old translation of the last words of the story, "So lebe ich belohnt von Könige, bis dass der Tag meines Hinscheidens kommt," overlooking what Gardiner has pointed out, namely that "a clause beginning with *iw-i* must be the continuation of the descriptive passage that precedes," for "otherwise we should have *hr wn-n-i* or *hr m-k-wi* or the like," and ignoring the fact that the tale is written in the form of a funerary biography. The story should therefore end thus: "There is no humble person for whom the like has been done; and so I enjoyed the favours of the king's bounty until the day of death came."

*Die Klagen des Bauern*, pp. 151-75.

This is the most unsatisfactory of all the translations appearing in this book. Dr. Erman had not access, of course, to Gardiner's brilliant rendering which has recently been published in *Journal*, IX, 5-25, and which has made back numbers of all previous attempts at translation; but on the other hand the same scholar's admirable "Notes on the Story of the Eloquent Peasant" in *P.S.B.A.*, xxxv, xxxvi, should not, as apparently is the case, have been entirely disregarded. The following are some of the consequent deficiencies:

P. 159. We still read of "Redemet-" instead of "Reremetpflanzen" (R 9).

The combination *šmš-tj n rš-wst* (R 44), which Gardiner has shown to mean "a river-side path," is rendered ".....eines weges."

P. 160. "Da die eine Seite versperrt war, habe ich meinen Esel auf die andere geführt und nun nimmst du ihn fort, weil er sich ein Maul voll Gerstenhalme genommen hat" appears as the translation of the passage *w'ct ḥd-tw-š-bst nt šm'c* (B 1, 13), instead of the much more satisfactory rendering proposed by Gardiner "One (bunch of corn) only has been spoilt. I brought my ass on account of .....<sup>2</sup>, but thou takest it away on account of its filling its mouth with a bunch of corn."

P. 163. Instead of "In order that he may continue to speak, keep thou silence," Gardiner's clever and undoubtedly correct translation of *in-mrwut wn-f hr dd gr* (B 1, 79-80), we have a rendering based upon the improbable theory of Vogelsang that the last word is the particle *gr* "also," here having the meaning of "further," for which use there is no evidence whatever.

<sup>1</sup> For this practice see the reviewer's art. "Purification (Egyptian)" in HASTINGS, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, x, pp. 477, 481.

<sup>2</sup> In his latest translation Gardiner suggests that *šn'c*, *šn'cty* means "endurance," "power of withstanding long travel."

P. 164. As long as Gardiner's remarks on the meaning of the interrogative *in iw* are disregarded, the passage *in mwt—s n nhh* (B 1, 92-5) is unintelligible. Accordingly we find not only the question deprived of its right sense, but also the words *in mwt mwt hn' hryw-f* left untranslated. But, as Gardiner points out, the passage should be rendered: "A mortal man dies even as (lit. along with) his underlings, and shalt thou be a man of eternity (*i.e.* live for ever)!"

It is unnecessary, however, to go on multiplying examples of the ill results of Gardiner's *Notes* being overlooked. All that need be said is that if and when this in most respects truly admirable book is translated into English, it is most desirable that permission should be obtained from Professor Erman to substitute Dr. Gardiner's latest translation of the *Peasant* for his own, which is based in the main upon that put forth by Dr. Vogelsang in his not always felicitous *Kommentar zu den Klagen des Bauern*.

Similarly it is to be hoped that in an English edition much more use will be made of Gardiner's *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*; in fact the best thing would be in this case also to substitute Dr. Gardiner's translation for that given here, incorporating, of course, Professor Erman's improvements, to which attention has been drawn above.

Just one more criticism. The book would be much more useful to scholars if the columns and lines of the original documents were indicated, for that would save so much time when one wanted to look up particular passages. The reviewer would suggest that in the English edition the same method of indicating columns and lines should be employed as that adopted by Dr. Gardiner in his translations of *The Story of Sinuhe* and *The Eloquent Peasant*, where such indications are placed in the margin. This presents a better appearance than when the text is broken up by numerals in brackets, as is the case in the same scholar's "New Literary Works from Ancient Egypt" in *Journal*, I, 23-35, 101-5.

AYLWARD M. BLACKMAN.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
A HEAD OF KING RAMESSES I FROM HIS TEMPLE AT ABYDOS	79
AEMILIANUS THE "TYRANT" ... ..	J. Grafton Milne ... 80
THE MOUSE IN EGYPTIAN AND LATER MEDICINE ... ..	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 83
THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS: AN ANSWER TO PROFESSOR NAVILLE AND OTHERS ... ..	Alan H. Gardiner ... 87
THE "CANNIBAL HYMN" FROM THE PYRAMID TEXTS ... ..	R. O. Faulkner ... 97
ÛIZZUWADNA ... ..	Sidney Smith ... 104
A HISTORICAL DOCUMENT OF RAMESSIDE AGE ... ..	T. Eric Peet ... 116
MISTAKES IN CHEMICAL MATTERS FREQUENTLY MADE IN ARCHAEOLOGY ... ..	A. Lucas, O.B.E., F.I.C. ... 128
NOTE ON SOME OSTRACA FROM EL-'AMARNAH ... ..	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 133
THE CASTANET DANCERS OF ARSINOE ... ..	W. L. Westermann ... 134
A MUSICIAN'S CONTRACT ... ..	H. I. Bell ... 145
BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT. A. POPYRI (1922- 1923) ... ..	H. I. Bell ... 147
FRIEDRICH PREISIGKE ... ..	H. I. Bell ... 172
NOTES AND NEWS ... ..	174
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS:	
LOUIS SPELEERS, <i>Les figurines funéraires égyptiennes</i> ...	Reviewed by H. R. Hall ... 176
R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, <i>Assyrian Medical Texts (Cunei- form), Assyrian Medical Texts (Translations)</i> ... ..	,, ,, Sidney Smith 178
P. KOSCHAKER and A. UNGNAD, <i>Hammurabi's Gesetz</i> ... ..	,, ,, Sidney Smith 180
C. CLEMEN, <i>Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae</i> ; TH. HOPFNER, <i>Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae</i> ..	,, ,, A. S. Hunt ... 180
FRANZ DORNSEIFF, <i>Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie</i> ... ..	,, ,, F. Ll. Griffith... 181
G. W. MURRAY, <i>Harvard African Studies</i> ... ..	,, ,, F. Ll. Griffith... 181
H. SOTTAS, <i>Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes</i> ... ..	,, ,, F. Ll. Griffith... 182
HENRY G. MEECHAM, <i>Light from Ancient Letters...</i> ... ..	,, ,, H. I. Bell ... 182
PIERRE JOUGUET, <i>Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus Grecs</i> ... ..	,, ,, H. I. Bell ... 183
NORMAN DE GARIS DAVIES, <i>The Tomb of Puyemré at Thebes</i>	,, ,, H. R. Hall ... 184
ADRIAAN DE BUCK, <i>De Egyptische Voorstellingen betreffende den Oerhevel</i> ... ..	,, ,, H. R. Hall ... 185
HENRI ASSELBERG, <i>Amenofis IV</i> ... ..	,, ,, H. R. Hall ... 188
BOTTI, GIUSEPPE, <i>Frammenti di un testo storico in onore di Tutmosi III; Frammenti di registri di stato civile della XXa Dinastia; Il culto divino dei Faraoni</i> ... ..	,, ,, T. Eric Peet ... 188
W. J. PERRY, <i>The Growth of Civilization</i> ... ..	,, ,, T. Eric Peet ... 189
W. J. PERRY, <i>The Children of the Sun</i> ... ..	,, ,, Louis C. G. Clarke 189
F. LL. GRIFFITH, <i>The Oxford Excavations in Nubia</i> ... ..	,, ,, W. R. Dawson... 191
ADOLF ERMAN, <i>Die Literatur der Aegypter. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3 und 2 Jahr- tausend v. Chr.</i> ... ..	,, ,, A. M. Blackman 193

Volume X. Parts III—IV.

1924

**THE JOURNAL**  
OF  
**EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY**

LONDON:  
PUBLISHED BY  
**THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY**  
REPRINTED PHOTOGRAPHICALLY AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, 1972

**THE JOURNAL**  
**OF**  
**EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY**



**ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

**THE JOURNAL**  
**OF**  
**EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY**

**VOLUME X**

**PUBLISHED BY**  
**THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY**  
**13 TAVISTOCK SQUARE, W.C. 1**

**LONDON**

**1924**

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
A STATUE OF HOREMHAB BEFORE HIS ACCESSION H. E. Winlock ... ..	1
THE TOWN OF SELLE (ZARU) IN THE 'AMARNAH TABLETS ... ..	Professor W. F. Albright ... 6
A PECULIAR FORM OF NEW KINGDOM LAMP ...	N. de Garis Davies ... .. 9
A NEW VIZIER OF THE ELEVENTH DYNASTY ...	Ludlow S. Bull, Ph.D. ... .. 15
UNPUBLISHED HEBREW, ARAMAIC AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM EGYPT, JERUSALEM AND CARCHEMISH ... ..	Rev. Professor A. H. Sayce ... 16
THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS ... ..	Edouard Naville ... .. 18
A RARE VIGNETTE FROM THE BOOK OF THE DEAD	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 40
THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAWLS WITH A RIPPLED STRIPE IN THE THEBAN TOMBS ... ..	Ernest Mackay ... .. 41
THE STORY OF THE ELOQUENT PEASANT—A SUGGESTION ... ..	G. D. Hornblower, B.A. ... 44
NOTE ON THE EGYPTIAN PAPYRUS BOAT ...	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 46
THE RITE OF OPENING THE MOUTH IN ANCIENT EGYPT AND BABYLONIA ... ..	Aylward M. Blackman, D.Litt. ... 47
A HEAD OF KING RAMESSES I FROM HIS TEMPLE AT ABYDOS ... ..	... .. 79
AEMILIANUS THE "TYRANT" ... ..	J. Grafton Milne ... .. 80
THE MOUSE IN EGYPTIAN AND LATER MEDICINE	Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ... 83
THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE EXODUS: AN ANSWER TO PROFESSOR NAVILLE AND OTHERS ...	Alan H. Gardiner ... .. 87
THE "CANNIBAL HYMN" FROM THE PYRAMID TEXTS ... ..	R. O. Faulkner ... .. 97
ḲIZZUWADNA ... ..	Sidney Smith ... .. 104
A HISTORICAL DOCUMENT OF RAMESSIDE AGE	T. Eric Peet ... .. 116
MISTAKES IN CHEMICAL MATTERS FREQUENTLY MADE IN ARCHAEOLOGY ... ..	A. Lucas, O.B.E., F.I.C. ... 128


	PAGE
NOTE ON SOME OSTRACA FROM EL-'AMARNAH ... Warren R. Dawson, F.Z.S. ...	133
THE CASTANET DANCERS OF ARSINOE ... .. W. L. Westermann ... ..	134
A MUSICIAN'S CONTRACT... .. H. Idris Bell ... ..	145
BIBLIOGRAPHY (1922-23): GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT.	
A. PAPYRI ... .. H. Idris Bell ... ..	147
FRIEDRICH PREISIGKE ... .. H. Idris Bell ... ..	172
A LOST STATUE OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY ... ..	203
THE EGYPTIAN NAME OF JOSEPH ... .. R. Engelbach ... ..	204
THE DECAY OF A CIVILIZATION ... .. H. Idris Bell ... ..	207
THE TOMBS OF THE KINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY AT THEBES ... .. H. E. Winlock ... ..	217
EARLY PSALMS AND LECTIONS FOR LENT ... .. H. J. M. Milne ... ..	278
AN EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY MEASURE OF CAPACITY G. P. G. Sobhy ... ..	283
A GRAMMATICAL EXERCISE OF AN EGYPTIAN SCHOOLBOY ... .. Dr. Nathaniel Reich ... ..	285
EXCAVATIONS AT EL-'AMARNAH, 1923-24 ... .. F. G. Newton ... ..	289
EXCAVATIONS AT EL-'AMARNAH, 1923-24 ... .. Professor F. Ll. Griffith, F.B.A.	299
BIBLIOGRAPHY (1923-24): ANCIENT EGYPT ... .. Professor F. Ll. Griffith, F.B.A.	306
BIBLIOGRAPHY (1923-24): CHRISTIAN EGYPT ... .. De Lacy O'Leary, D.D. ... ..	324
HUGH EVELYN-WHITE ... ..	331
NOTES AND NEWS ... ..	60, 174, 333
THE SPELLING OF PROPER NAMES IN THIS JOURNAL ... ..	336
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS ... ..	63, 176, 338
LIST OF PLATES ... ..	351
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT ... ..	353
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, DETAILED LIST ... ..	354
INDEX ... ..	356

## A LOST STATUE OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY

### Plate XII

OUR frontispiece, Plate XII, shows the upper part of a statue of Prince Ahmose, eldest son of King Seḫenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta'ō II of the Seventeenth Dynasty. For the photograph we have to thank Mr. H. E. Winlock, and the plate is indeed one of the illustrations to his article which follows, and is dealt with on pp. 255-6. The statue itself was in 1899 in the possession of Daninos Pasha, but its present whereabouts is unknown. Mr. Winlock succeeded in unearthing four photographs of it, Plates XII, XVIII-XX, and in view of the disappearance of the statue itself it seemed wise to reproduce them all, especially as they are rapidly deteriorating<sup>1</sup>. That shown in the frontispiece has a particular interest as a full-face view of a statue of the Intermediate Period between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties, a period from which singularly few works of art have survived. As might be expected from its date on the verge of the Eighteenth Dynasty the statue shows much more affinity with the works of that dynasty than with the sterner mood of the Middle Kingdom.

<sup>1</sup> Berlin also possesses a set. See SETHE, *Urk.*, IV, 12.




Ahmose, son of Sekenenrē' Ta'o II.

*From an old photograph.*

## THE EGYPTIAN NAME OF JOSEPH

BY R. ENGELBACH

THOUGH there have been numerous suggestions for the hieroglyphic form of the name given by Pharaoh to Joseph  $\text{זָפְנַת פַּעֲנָח}$  Zaphnath-paaneah, none of them can be said to be completely satisfactory.

M. Alexis MALLON<sup>1</sup> remarks, however, in a recent work on the Hebrews in Egypt "Le nom égyptien de Joseph,  $\text{זָפְנַת פַּעֲנָח}$  (Gen. 41, 45) *Şafnat Paʿaneh*, est assurément la transcription littérale du composé  *de(d) pmet(er) efʿonh* 'Dieu dit: il est vivant.' On dirait en Copte  $\text{Ⲭⲉ ⲡⲓⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉϥⲟⲛⲉ}$ , ce qui explique la chute des lettres mises entre parenthèses. L'équivalence philologique est incontestable et, de fait, incontestée."

To me it seems slightly premature to put *Q.E.D.* to a problem of such general interest until the proof is entirely convincing, or until it is certain that there is no other equivalent which, philologically or otherwise, has a better, or even an equal claim to consideration.

The accepted equivalent was, I believe, first suggested by Prof. Steindorff<sup>2</sup>, and I do not dispute its possibility. The omission of the final *d* in *dd*, the disappearance of the *r* in *ntr* in the singular and the equivalence of  $\text{𓆎}$  and  $\text{𓆏}$  are all well vouched for, but I submit that it need not be the correct equivalent.


M. Mallon points out that objection has been taken to the equivalent *dd pʿ ntr iwʿ ʿnh*, since, in the very many known examples of this form of name, the actual name of the god is always inserted<sup>3</sup>, and his suggested explanation is that Pharaoh, out of delicacy for Joseph's monotheistic sensibilities, refrained from introducing into his name a word which might be offensive. Pharaoh, however, could easily have given Joseph an honorific title not involving a god's name at all.

My objections to the accepted equivalent, though none of them can be said to be conclusive, are as follows:

Names such as "—— spake: he lives" and "The gift of ——" seem to me to be intimately connected with some incident at or previous to the birth of the child. But Joseph's birth was an event of which the Egyptians knew nothing, since it took place outside of Egypt. Secondly, the vocalisation of the accepted equivalent differs entirely from that of both the Massoretic version and the sources of the Septuagint. It further takes no account of the division of the name into two parts, which is even indicated in the Greek of the Codex Bodleianus. Owing to the long period between the writing down of Genesis and the pointing of the Hebrew, many words are, no doubt, erroneously vocalised, but in the case of a national hero like Joseph, whose story was known throughout the ages by young and old, a certain amount of consideration should be given to the traditional pronunciation,



<sup>1</sup> MALLON, *Orientalia, Les Hébreux en Égypte*, No. 3, 1921, 75.





<sup>2</sup> *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, xxvii, 1889, 42.


<sup>3</sup> In other forms of personal names, "the god," unprecised, is known.  "The God is mighty" (MAR., *Mast.*, 168) is an example.



particularly since the pointing of many of the Egyptian names, such as Pithom, Raamses, Pharaoh and others, is tolerably correct. In the equivalent  $\alpha\epsilon\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\omicron\sigma\eta$  not a single vowel, even the accented one of the last syllable, agrees with the Massoretic pointing. In the versions from the sources of the Septuagint  $\Psi\omicron\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\prime\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\chi$ ,  $\Psi\omicron\upsilon\theta\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\chi$ ,  $\Psi\omicron\mu\theta\omicron\mu\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\chi$ , etc.<sup>1</sup>, though the first half has obviously been subject to doubt, the final half agrees with the Massoretic version closely ( $\phi\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\chi$  or  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\chi$  and  $\rho\alpha\acute{\nu}\epsilon\alpha\eta$ ). Another objection, which I bring forward with some diffidence, is that if the name was written originally in two halves and was intended to represent  $\alpha\epsilon\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\omicron\sigma\eta$  it would have been written **צפנת אפענה**.

Amenhotpe in his tomb at El-Kâb is described as  *ʾImn-htp dd-tw nf H3pw*, Amenhotpe called Hapu<sup>2</sup>, and I suggest that the word **צפנת** *Safnat* is a metathesis for **צתנף** *Šatnaf*<sup>3</sup>, and that the form in which the writer of Genesis received the name of Joseph was *Yūsif šatnaf Paʿnēʾh* "Joseph called Paʿnēʾh," and so wrote it down under the impression that all the unfamiliar syllables represented the name! Such inclusions of extraneous words into a name are not unknown; one can cite the well-known Istamboul = *εἰς τὴν Πόλιν*, "Into the Town," as an example. The equivalent , as regards the consonants, is quite as possible as *dd pʾ ntr*, and the vocalisation appears to be much closer to the traditional pronunciation.

If this be true, we have to search for the name Pharaoh gave to Joseph in **פִּעְנֵה** *Paʿnēʾh* or *פֶּאנֶה*. There seems to be no doubt that the root  *ʿnh* is contained in this word, and we know a name of the Twenty-first Dynasty,  having exactly the same consonants. It is likely, however, that there is a small error in the pointing of the Hebrew and that the name was pronounced in the Egyptian with the *a* after the *ʿ*, giving *Paʿanēʾh* rather than *Paʿnēʾh*. This modification is also required in Steindorff's equivalent. Names of the form **אסנת פרע** and **פֶּרְעִי פֶּרְעִי**<sup>4</sup>, which are presumably the equivalents of  and , abound at this time.


As to the vocalisation of , the form  $\pi\omega\eta$  "The life" does not seem satisfactory. It is probable that the true form is a participial form in *a* representing the agent, as  $\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}$  (- $\rho\eta\tau$ ) "one who is contented," from  $\mu\tau\omicron\sigma$  "to rest," or  $\eta\alpha\delta\eta\tau$  (- $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ )<sup>5</sup> "that which is hard to know," and that the name means "One who lives." All Coptic forms of this class,

<sup>1</sup> REDPATH, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, III.

<sup>2</sup> LEPSIUS, *Denkmäler*, III, 43 b.

<sup>3</sup> Note that in the accepted version there is also a metathesis in the sounds of *p* and *f*, which are written alike in the unpointed Hebrew as in the Aramaic.

<sup>4</sup> The division into two words of the name of the High-priest of Heliopolis **פֶּרְעִי פֶּרְעִי**, when that of the first employer of Joseph, who appears to have had the same name, is written **פֶּרְעִי פֶּרְעִי**, seems to be an error, as here tradition is in favour of the name in one word. There seems to be an error in both names of the Massoretic text, as an *ayin* in the Egyptian text is almost invariably reproduced in the Hebrew.


<sup>5</sup> I believe the form  is known, but I have not been able to find a reference to it up to the present.

<sup>6</sup> SETHE, *Verbum*, II, 408.



however, which have come down to us are directly connected with a complementary word, whether the verb is transitive or intransitive, so we are unable to say with any certainty what form they would take if they stood alone. At any rate *P<sup>c</sup>anē<sup>a</sup>ḥ* is a possibility<sup>1</sup>.

The finding of a nickname for Joseph expressing his character or fame is, to my mind, labour lost, since it is the exception rather than the rule for Egyptian nicknames to be of a descriptive nature<sup>2</sup>. They are either incomprehensible or else derived from the actual name by forming a shorter word from its characteristic consonants<sup>3</sup>.

It will be seen that the suggested equivalent does not in any way put back the possible date for the name of Joseph. The reconciliation of the names Pa<sup>c</sup>aneah, Puṭiphrē<sup>c</sup>, and Aseneith with Joseph's probable date must therefore still be left to those who specialise on this subject.

<sup>1</sup> The form  (e.g. LEPSIUS, *Todtenbuch*), Greek *Απαγγελος*, is also a possibility, if the Massoretic division of the name is to be ignored.

<sup>2</sup> SETHE, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, XLIV, 88.

<sup>3</sup> NAVILLE, in his *Archaeology of the Old Testament*, 80, suggests that Zaphnath-paaneah represents the Egyptian *tst nt pr ḥnḥ* or "Officer of the House of Life" (College). Apart from the fact that Joseph's appointment was in the Department of Agriculture and not in the Public Instruction, the now accepted equivalent - (in  = *sh pr ḥnḥ*) for *pr ḥnḥ* rules out this possibility.

## THE DECAY OF A CIVILIZATION

By H. IDRIS BELL

*Volk und Staat in Ägypten am Ausgang der Römerherrschaft: Festrede...am 22. Juni 1921.* Von L. WENGER. München: Verlag der Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1922.

*Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'Empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites (518-616).* Par JEAN MASPERO. Ouvrage revu et publié après la mort de l'auteur par A. FORTESCUE et G. WIET. Paris: Librairie ancienne Édouard Champion, 1923. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, 237<sup>e</sup> fascicule.)

*L'Administration Civile de l'Égypte Byzantine.* By G. ROUILLARD. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France [1923].

*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XVI. Edited with translations and notes by B. P. GRENFELL, A. S. HUNT, and H. I. BELL. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1924.

It is possible by the very title of a book to prejudge the subject with which it deals, and probably Gibbon's great classic has done even more by its title than by its contents to disseminate the idea that the Byzantine Empire was a mere degenerate survival, a bloodless simulacrum, of Roman greatness. Only in comparatively recent years have scholars begun to insist that East Rome was something more than that; was a distinct and imposing Empire, which for centuries kept at bay the floods of barbarian or oriental invaders, and behind whose bulwarks the renascent culture of the West found freedom to develop. Even yet the old idea, suggested by Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, still persists in the general public; and it must be confessed that there is, *prima facie*, a good deal of excuse for it. Comparison between the history of East Rome and that greater, undivided Empire from which it sprang is inevitable and cannot but be to the disadvantage of the later power. Especially must this be true if we approach its history, as the papyrologist naturally does, from the standpoint of Egypt. For whatever may have been the case elsewhere, the history of Egypt during the Byzantine period was one of indubitable decay; and in Egypt, torn finally from the Empire by the arms of 'Amr, there was no revival of the Byzantine power after the storms of the seventh century.

It is hardly to be wondered at then that the earlier generation of papyrologists looked upon the Byzantine age with a rather stepmotherly eye, devoting their attention mainly to the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. It is only in the last decade and a half that the great importance and, in its own way, real interest of the Byzantine age has been generally recognized. A glance at the titles of the books named above will show how much attention is now being devoted to this once neglected field of study; and the books themselves illustrate, each in its own sphere, that decay of which I have spoken as typical of the epoch, though they do not perhaps explain it. Whether indeed it will ever be fully explained is a little doubtful. It extended to every sphere of life; in economic well-being, in administrative efficiency, in culture and intellectual grasp alike we are conscious of a decline. What strange microbe was it whose devastating effects could thus blight a whole civilization?

Without accepting the materialistic theory of history, one may perhaps hazard the assertion that the ultimate cause was largely, if not mainly, economic. Egypt, like the

Empire in general, never recovered from the agony of the third century. Like some business firm which has, by choice or necessity, undertaken commitments to which its capital is inadequate, Rome thenceforth carried upon her back the burden of liabilities which she could never redeem. But indeed the origin of the trouble lay further back than the third century. Whatever was the case elsewhere, in Egypt Rome started with a false theory of government. Egypt was to her, as in the well-known epigram of Tiberius, a sheep to be sheared; a source of revenue to be exploited, not a trust to be administered for the good of the inhabitants. Practically, with an intelligent administration, such as for the most part that of the early Empire was, it might be thought there would be little difference, since it is the object of the shepherd, as Tiberius pointed out, to shear indeed but not to flay his sheep; but in fact it matters enormously from what standpoint a government regards its task. Pre-occupied far too exclusively with the fiscal interest (in which, one must admit, it was but the heir of the Ptolemies), the Roman government of Egypt could never afford to be generous; it exacted always the utmost possible in taxes and services, and so, living as it were up to the limit of its income, had no reserves with which to meet an emergency. The inevitable consequence was a growing economic difficulty, which was already serious in the second century; and the troubles of the third century did not create the problem, they merely made it insoluble.

Cruelly over-burdened with taxes and liturgies, the old families of the nome-capitals, from whom the municipal magistrates were recruited, and with them the urban middle classes generally and the better-to-do landowners of the villages, were involved in economic embarrassments which led in many cases to ruin; and it was precisely these classes in whom Hellenic culture had found its securest support. They had now neither the leisure nor the material resources to maintain their old interests, and it was while this economic crisis was at its height that Christianity swept like a flood over the country, diverting to theological controversies the energies which had hitherto found an outlet in the gymnasias and the world of culture centred there. At the same time appeared a new factor. The impoverishment of the Hellenized middle class tended to obliterate the distinction, at first so jealously observed by the Romans, between it and the native Egyptian population, while simultaneously the spread of Christianity among the latter gave them a confidence and a national self-consciousness which they had hitherto lacked. From henceforth they tended to become more and more the determining factor in the life of Egypt as a whole. The result was a narrowing of interest and an immense impoverishment of the intellectual life of the country.

This impoverishment told upon Alexandria hardly less than on the provincial capitals. The subtle Greek intellect still continued its speculations there; but its interests were narrowed to the one subject of theology, and its vigour exhausted itself in the splitting of unimportant hairs. Schism followed schism to the minutest subdivisions, each maintained with an obstinacy in inverse ratio to the religious importance of the issues involved; till at length, religious strife added to the economic collapse which had divided the population into a semi-servile proletariat and a landed aristocracy powerful enough to set the Imperial authority at defiance, Egypt fell like a rotten pear into the hands of 'Amr and his Arabs.

In his *Volk und Staat*, which was originally a *Festrede* delivered at a meeting of the Bavarian Academy and is here republished with a commentary and useful references to the literature of the subject, Wenger has of course no opportunity for a detailed history

The work is a brilliant and readable sketch of the condition of Egypt under the Byzantine Emperors; and in this limited space Wenger contrives to glance briefly at the chief factors which were operative, so that the essay may be cordially recommended as an introduction to the subject as a whole. He emphasizes the spiritual as opposed to the economic factors—the reviving nationalism, which led the native Egyptian populace to look upon Rome as their natural enemy, or at least to withhold that good-will and ready co-operation without which the strongest government is of necessity ineffective, and the pre-occupation with religious motives which gave to theological and ecclesiastical differences a decisive political importance; but at the same time he draws a vivid sketch of the economic decay and its effects. The two sets of factors, in truth, constantly interacted; the government was thwarted in its efforts by the passive resistance or unfriendly indifference of the populace, but that resistance or indifference was itself in large measure due to the failure of the government to secure the economic welfare of the governed. “The state was for ever demanding and demanding. But what did it offer to people who pay and ought to pay willingly? The answer is short and hard: practically nothing.” So Wenger puts it, and he is certainly right. He admits that the intentions of the Emperors were usually excellent. They continued to issue edicts exhaling good-will and a desire for justice, but their intentions were rarely translated into acts. For between them and the subject peoples stood the bureaucracy and the feudal nobility. The former was largely recruited from the latter; and when it was not, its members either aspired to become themselves part of the landed class or at least found it prudent to conciliate its favour. The Emperor was far away, the great nobles close at hand; and if a choice had to be made it was better to earn the very present gratitude of Flavius Apion round the corner than the hypothetical commendation of the eternal Augustus at Constantinople.

Thus the common man saw on the whole but little of the Imperial justice and benevolence. What he did see was a state punctual to demand the uttermost farthing of its dues but impotent to protect him from the aggressions of powerful neighbours and the tyranny of corrupt officials. What wonder if his attitude towards Byzantium and towards government in general was one of hatred tempered by contempt? And since the Imperial authority could not help him, he must find a protector nearer at hand. Thus the administration was involved in a vicious circle: its weakness in face of the feudal nobility only strengthened the latter by driving more and more of the smaller landowners to become the clients of the nobles.

This would not have mattered so much had the feudal nobility used its power well, but there is no indication that it did so. So far as our evidence goes, it was extraordinarily unproductive of men pre-eminent for either character or capacity. The classes who governed Egypt could neither guarantee order and justice at home nor protect the province from the raids of the desert nomads; and when a serious military enemy appeared, like Persia or the Arabs, the whole structure collapsed.

When the war broke out the late Jean Maspero was engaged on a history of the Egyptian Church from the death of the Emperor Anastasius in A.D. 518 to the Arab conquest; but his death in the attack on Vauquois left the work unfinished. His father took in hand the task of preparing the MS. for publication, but himself died not long afterwards, and eventually, through the medium of Mr. W. E. Crum, the representatives of the deceased found in the late Father Fortescue an editor admirably adapted to the very

exacting task of arranging and putting into shape the materials left by Jean Maspero. These materials were of various character. Certain parts of the work were practically ready for the press; other portions were unrevised, with lacunae in places, and full of references not only unverified but often in a form which, though doubtless clear to the author, were by no means so to the reviser; and finally others had hardly advanced beyond the stage of rough drafts or schemes of work. The original plan had been to extend the history to the Arab conquest; but the materials for the period between the reconciliation of the Monophysite churches in 616 and that date were in such a condition that they could not be utilized, and it was decided to end the narrative with the year 616. All the rest was taken in hand by Father Fortescue, who, with the most laudable industry and enthusiasm, verified references, normalized spellings, linked up unconnected passages, and reduced the whole to a definite shape, adding notes where necessary and supplying some appendices. The fate which had attended the work continued however to operate; Father Fortescue himself died before his work was wholly completed, and the final preparation of the volume for press and the supervision of the printing fell to the lot of MM. G. Wiet (who has supplied valuable material from Arabic sources) and B. Haussoullier.

The work is now before us, and will certainly take its place among the standard authorities for the history of Byzantine Egypt. Friends of Jean Maspero and students of Coptic Christianity will read it with mingled feelings: on the one hand with renewed admiration for the range of knowledge, perspicacity and gift of attractive exposition which characterized the author, but on the other with a sense of keen regret that a scholar of such brilliance should have been cut off so early. Above all, one must express one's gratitude to those, including Mme Maspero, who have made possible the appearance of the volume.

It will be seen that the work is only a fragment; but within the limits finally set the labour of the editors has done a great deal to remove the sense of mutilation. There are no doubt ragged edges, incompletenesses (chapter VIII for example is unfinished), and occasional blemishes which the author would very likely have removed on revision, but we have nevertheless a continuous and readable narrative, and one of very great interest; of interest not merely on the principle of *homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto* but because, though the ecclesiastical squabbles recorded may often seem to turn on nothing more vital than the difference " 'twixt Tweedledum and Tweedledee," they were in fact of far greater historical importance than the theological points at issue, since they were at once the cause and the symptom of the break-up of the Empire. Alike in his first chapter, where he gives an excellent account of the Monophysite position, and in numerous other passages Maspero emphasizes the triviality of the points on which the Monophysites joined issue with the Chalcedonians. Doubtless the more extreme among them developed heresies quite incompatible with the Catholic position; but then these extremists were utterly repudiated by the main body, who linked them in a common damnation with the Chalcedonians themselves. The whole of the orthodox (if we may use the word) Monophysite position was illogical and self-contradictory; the slightest good-will or spirit of give-and-take would have bridged the very narrow gap between it and the Catholics. Good-will was by no means wanting on the Imperial side; more than one of the Emperors made strenuous efforts to conciliate the schismatics, even to the extent of watering down the Catholic dogmas with heretical elements, but all to no purpose. For, as Maspero brings out, it was at bottom not a theological quarrel at all. Jealousy of Constantinople, nationalistic tendencies, the self-conceit of Copts and the intransigence of Syrians were, rather than

strictly religious motives, the effective causes. It was the schism which made the heresy rather than the heresy which made the schism. "In the main monophysitism is not a heresy, it is merely a schismatic intention," says Maspero. In truth it is impossible to feel much sympathy with the Monophysites. It must be admitted that the Imperial policy was vacillating and inconsistent, particularly in the reign of Justinian, when the Monophysite Empress had a habit of cancelling at the back-door of the Palace the measures taken by her Catholic husband at the front, and undoubtedly persecutions (though neither so frequent nor so savage as Monophysite writers allege) were undertaken from time to time; but the Monophysites never showed the least reluctance to persecute on their side, and their obstinate refusal to concede even the most trivial points in response to repeated overtures by the government, their savage internal feuds and mutual jealousies, and the equivocal character of several among their leaders combine to make up a picture of singular unloveliness.

Incidentally the fortunes of the Egyptian Church are an excellent illustration of the drawbacks of a schismatic movement. In the history of a Church schisms are sometimes necessary, or at least inevitable; but they are never anything better than a *pis aller*. The schismatic body, cut off from any effective participation in the life of the universal Church and driven by its position to emphasize negative points of difference rather than great constructive principles, tends always to a certain provinciality of outlook, a certain crudeness of thought. So it certainly was with the Egyptian Church, which after the Monophysite schism steadily deteriorated in importance and intellectual weight. Some decline from the great days of its early history may be detected even in the fourth century, and E. Schwartz seems inclined to attribute the decay largely to the aggressions of the Patriarchs of Alexandria on the Alexandrian presbyters, and particularly to St. Athanasius; but there is probably a good deal of prejudice and exaggeration in this view. Intellectually Athanasius and Cyril were of course not of the calibre of Origen or even Clement, and Cyril at least had as unattractive a personality as a "saint" can well possess, but both were men of powerful minds and commanding personalities, who spoke with authority, and whose utterances reverberated through the Christian world. After the fatal Council of Chalcedon the change is palpable; and in the end Alexandria, once the great nursery of Christian philosophy, became in the world of thought an entirely negligible quantity.

A few notes and criticisms on matters of detail may be added.

On p. 24 (*cf.* pp. 34-5) Maspero probably exaggerates the force of *παρῖς*. The national conceit of the Copts is obvious enough, but in the *libellus contradictorius* of Horapollon to which he refers it seems doubtful whether *παρῖς* really means Egypt, as Maspero understands it. In P. Lond. 1915, 18 (see my *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, 73) the phrase *ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρῖδι* clearly refers to the man's native city, and I would suggest that in P. Cairo Masp. 67295 *παρῖς* refers not to Egypt but to Panopolis; the erring wife eloped on a Nile boat with her lover, *en route* perhaps for Alexandria. She thus became *ὑπερόπιος*, *i.e.* left the *ἐνοπία* of Panopolis.

Maspero disputes (pp. 31 ff.) the general view that Egypt after Diocletian was mainly a Christian country, and that Christianity became in a sort the national religion of the Copts. That there has been exaggeration is not improbable, but Maspero on his side seems to me to exaggerate the force of the arguments to the contrary. We cannot safely argue from Alexandria, which was a largely Greek and indeed cosmopolitan city, to Egypt proper. Evidences of paganism in the *χώρα* are extraordinarily scanty if paganism did survive to any great extent. The worship of Isis at Philae, which was maintained chiefly for the benefit of the tribes beyond the frontier, is no real exception.

In note 3 of p. 37 Fortescue appears to imply some doubt as to the right of the Patriarchs to the

title "Pope" and as to the early date alleged for the title by Eutychius. But in P. Amh. i, 3, which was written at Rome between A.D. 264 and 282, Bishop Maximus is referred to as *Μάξιμον τὸν πάπα*[ν].

The practice of selling "monasteries" referred to in note 4, p. 56, may be illustrated by a reference to P. Oxy. xvi 1890 and the documents cited in the note on ll. 7-8. But as there pointed out, *μοναστήριον* in these cases probably meant "something on a much more modest scale than is generally understood by the modern equivalent."

In note 2 on p. 62 the word "paysans" may puzzle some readers. It is obviously a misprint for "papyrus."

To Maspero's remarks on the civil power of the Bishops under Justinian (pp. 138 f., 267) may be added a reference to the details mentioned by Mlle Rouillard on p. 64 of her book reviewed below.

On p. 145 Maspero seems to speak with some reserve of the sense "messenger" for *σύμμαχος* ("des courriers à pied qu'on appelait, *paraît-il*, *σύμμαχοι*"; cf. the equally hesitating footnote); but the usage is perfectly well known in the papyri. Many instances will be found, e.g., in the indexes to P. Oxy. xvi and P. Lond. iv.

On p. 176 and elsewhere the timidity of the Copts is perhaps exaggerated. Military courage was never a characteristic of the Egyptians, who have probably at no time made very good soldiers; but military courage is not the only kind, and courage of a sort cannot be denied to a race so tenacious of its nationality and so stubborn in its adherence to its own ways. The many Egyptian martyrdoms in the Great Persecution of Diocletian should be sufficient proof. Here again Maspero has probably been misled by extending to the *χώρα* impressions derived from Alexandrine evidence only. Later on (p. 233) he emphasizes the difference between Alexandria and the *χώρα*: here a medley of contending schisms, there "le monophysisme pur, la doctrine des grands patriarches...régnait incontestée." The fierce but fickle and at bottom cowardly city mob of Alexandria was worlds away from the peasant of Upper Egypt or the monk of the desert monasteries.

It is a mistake to say (p. 291) that the Meletians are not heard of after Damian. I have shown in my *Jews and Christians* (p. 42 f.) that the sect continued to exist at least till the eighth century.

On p. 330, note 3, Maspero makes the brilliant suggestion that the "strategus Patricius" of M. Chabot's translation of Michael the Syrian should really be "Strategius the Patrician." This is probably confirmed by the evidence of P. Oxy. xvi, which shows that Flavius Strategius, the last representative known to us of the great Apion family, was living and bore the title Patrician in A.D. 615, 616 (see p. 6).

In the discussion on p. 337 f. of the date of Anastasius's *Hodegos* I confess I find the arguments against the "Arabs" there mentioned being Muslims unconvincing. But this is doubtless matter of opinion.

Finally I would refer to the very important note by G. Wiet on p. 353, which brings further confirmation of Butler's theory (accepted by Maspero) that the famous Mukaukis was the Patriarch Cyrus.

Mlle Rouillard's subject is the civil administration of the country, not the religious quarrels which distracted it, though she has at times to allude to these. It can be said without hesitation that she has produced an excellent and most valuable piece of work. It is not indeed pioneer work, like Gelzer's brilliant *Studien zur byzantinischen Verwaltung Ägyptens*. It shows careful research and a capacity for the lucid and judicious statement of conclusions derived from the evidence thus amassed rather than marked originality, the pregnant hint which reveals unsuspected vistas, or large imaginative reconstructions. These however were hardly called for; Gelzer marked out the main lines of development, leaving to later scholars the task of detailed exploration and the intensive study of single problems. In this sphere much remained to be done. Gelzer's work was published in 1909, when as yet only a few of the Cairo Aphrodito papyri had appeared; and though he supplemented it later by a valuable article in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* that article also is now somewhat out of date, since it preceded the publication of volumes II and III of Maspero's Cairo catalogue, of the Munich papyri, and of volume V of the London papyri, to say nothing of Parts XX and XXII of Wessely's *Studien*, which contain many Byzantine texts. Moreover the plan of Gelzer's volume differs entirely from that of Mlle Rouillard's. It



numbers but 107 pages, hers 243, and of his no less than 63 pages are devoted to the Early Byzantine period, particularly to the difficult question of the history and areas of the provinces, whereas Mlle Rouillard deals in the main with the period from Justinian onwards and with the details of the administrative machine, collecting with exemplary industry the evidence concerning many officials who in Gelzer's work are but briefly referred to or wholly omitted. The result is precisely the volume which students of Byzantine Egypt have long desired, an indispensable work of reference in which they can find with ease such materials as are available for the settlement of any administrative problem which may confront them.

It is hardly necessary to say that there remain even yet many unsolved questions, many gaps in our knowledge. Our material is still fragmentary and haphazard, confined to a few localities and often tantalizingly ambiguous. We get hints which it is impossible to follow out; we hear of officials whose titles suggest functions known to have been exercised by others but of whom we know nothing further, while the fact that the feudal estates were organized on lines parallel with the Imperial administration often makes it difficult to decide whether a given official was in private or public service. Nevertheless we do get, not obscurely, a general picture of a vast bureaucratic hierarchy, wheels within wheels, a great host of professional civil servants in the higher posts and at the administrative centres, supplemented locally and in the subordinate posts by the liturgical system: here the better-to-do peasant or middle bourgeoisie forced, *multa reluctantes*, into posts often ruinous to their economic position, there the salaried servants of the state, efficient or inefficient, well or ill-paid, but all ready to augment their official salary by the recognized system of *sportula*, if not by the illicit methods of speculation from state funds or extortion from the tax-payer.

Diocletian had hoped, by simplifying the financial system, to lessen the chances of maladministration, but the simplification entirely failed to prevent corruption, and successive attempts to remedy this merely multiplied the number of officials, inspectors and inspected, check upon check, thus burdening the finances of the state and increasing the difficulties of the oppressed by the addition of yet more hands open for the reception of bribes and baksheesh.

The fact is that even a perfect system of administration (and the most zealous admirers of Byzantium will hardly allege that its system was perfect) can be worked successfully only if there exists in the community a real public spirit, a tradition of social obligation. In Byzantine Egypt there was no such spirit; only on the one side a stiff-necked refusal to render services due except under direct compulsion, on the other the desire to make an official career the road to personal aggrandisement. The vicious circle was complete; and the shortcomings of one class merely accentuated those of another.

After sketching briefly the system in force before the reforms of Justinian, and then discussing in detail the administrative structure, the financial organization, the *annona civica*, and the administration of justice as Justinian established them, Mlle Rouillard, in the second and shorter part of her work, proceeds, with admirable success, to trace the actual working of the system and its practical results for state and individual. She reveals impartially the faults of every party to the life of the community, tax-payers, officials, and central government. For there were faults everywhere, even in the Emperors, who, despite undeniably good intentions, were constantly forced by the exigencies of circumstance to transgress their own principles, and whose policy was often vacillating and ill-judged. It

was no miraculous visitation of God but the inevitable working out of cause and effect which transferred a province already spiritually lost to the Empire from Byzantium to the Caliphate.

The most serious criticism of detail to be passed on the volume is that it contains too many misprints, revealing considerable carelessness in the reading of the proofs. The following are among the more serious misprints not corrected in the *Errata*:—P. 31, l. 8, 463 must be a mistake for 563. P. 42, note 1, read *P. Cairo* 67, 287, iv, 1. (For the ἀπλικιτάριος see now my note, *Jews and Christians*, 68.) P. 46, l. 2, read *palatii* (the reference to Cairo Masp. 67321 in the note appears to be an error). P. 53, note 5, read *P. Lond.* iv, 1461, 14. P. 83, note 2, l. 10, read ἐποψίας. P. 96, note 5, l. 5, read χρυσῶναι (several of the references should be deleted, as the papyri referred to do not actually mention the χρυσῶνης). It was probably a slip of the pen that on p. 80, l. 2, produced “les συντέλεια ἀστικά,” as if συντέλεια were the plural of συντέλειον; but Mlle Rouillard seems rather shaky in her Greek forms (e.g. on p. 66, ἀναγνώστεις as plural of ἀναγνώστης, *ibid.*, note 3, πραγματεῦς for πραγματευτής).

On p. 2 (*cf.* p. 30) it is inexact to identify Arcadia with “l’ancien Fayoum.” Arcadia was the old Heptanomia and certainly included Oxyrhynchus.

On p. 11, where the patronage of the great landowners and magistrates is treated, the Church should be mentioned, for it too possessed large estates and numbered many *coloni* among its clients.

On p. 49, to the officials of the prefectal *officium* must now be added the *princeps officii*, for whom see *P. Oxy.* xvi, 1880, 3, n. He appears from that passage to have had an *officium* of his own.

On pp. 49–60 is a valuable discussion of the pagarch, an official whose origin and functions are surrounded by a good deal of uncertainty. Mlle Rouillard’s treatment of it is very thorough and judicious, and her conclusion, though, as she points out, no more than hypothetical, seems to me very likely. The account of the *defensor* (pp. 62–3) may now be supplemented by the new evidence of *P. Oxy.* xvi (pp. 86–7). On p. 66 it is an error to class the ἀναγνώστης with the members of the communal *officium* or to connect the word with γνωστήρ; these ἀναγνώσται were ecclesiastical.

It seems highly probable that Justinian’s air-tax (ἀερικόν) referred to on p. 70 was levied on the so-called ἀήρ, *i.e.* the space on the (flat) roofs of houses (see Preisigke, *Hermes*, LIV, 431); it was in that case a sort of additional house-tax.

Mlle Rouillard several times (p. 79, etc.) speaks of κομητικά and ἀστικά as communal taxes for village and municipal purposes; but Grenfell and Hunt have made it very probable (*P. Oxy.* xii, pp. 69–71) that they were simply the ordinary state-taxes, collected in villages and towns respectively.

*A propos* of the discussion on p. 120 *f.* of the question whether the amount stated as the quota of the corn-tax refers to *modii* or artabas it may be pointed out that in the requisition of the praeses in *P. Lond.* v, 1663 the amount of wheat is stated in *modii*. This is an argument in favour of *modii*, but on the other hand the artaba is used in other documents of the kind, e.g. in *P. Cairo Masp.* 67030, and as Mlle Rouillard remarks, the amount suits artabas better than *modii*.

In note 3 of p. 158 Mlle Rouillard suggests doubtfully “garde-frontière” as the sense of *ripariius*. The fact that the *riparii* were officials of the police may seem to support this, but in a fourth century document (*P. Lond.* v, 1648) we find them associated with officials responsible for the upkeep of the embankments, and it may be therefore that the *ripa* is to be taken in the obvious sense; that the *ripariius* was originally a conservator of the dykes and only later developed into a general police official. The account of the functions of the *riparii* should be supplemented by a reference to *P. Lond.* v, 1650, to which may now be added *Oxy.* xvi, 1877, 15, n.

On p. 169 the phrase *ruinés par les liturgies* with the following instance rests on a mistranslation by Wilcken of the word ἀπολειτουργέω; see *P. Lond.* v, 1708, 29, n.

The papyri referred to in note 3 of p. 180 relate, not, as Mlle Rouillard, following the original view of the editors, takes them, to a racing-stable, but to the private posting service of a feudal noble.

Maspero’s *History of the Patriarchs* depends in the main on literary authorities and might, with few exceptions, have been written much as it stands had the soil of Egypt never yielded a single Greek papyrus; but the importance of papyrology may be estimated when it is mentioned that Wenger and Mlle Rouillard are indebted for much more than half their material to the evidence of papyri. The new part of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*,

which contains exclusively texts of the Byzantine age but appeared too recently to be used by either Wenger or Mlle Rouillard, makes a valuable addition to the literature of the period. It is obviously impossible for the present writer to review it in the proper sense, but since the object of this article is to call the attention of historical students who are not papyrologists to recent publications, and to sketch in outline for the general reader the main conclusions suggested by them, it is perhaps excusable to indicate briefly in what directions the volume is likely to be useful.

The papyrological specialist, at least if he approach the subject from the juristic side, will probably find the legal texts the most appetizing, but to the general historian they are only incidentally of value, in so far as they illustrate social conditions and administrative practice. For him the most interesting parts of the volume are likely to be the long series of letters with which it opens (to these must be added nos. 1929–1941 among the “Minor Documents”) and the various texts which concern the administration of the great feudal estates. Letters are always of special value to the social historian; and jejune as they often are, limited in their interests and often obscure in detail, the papyrus letters illustrate very clearly the ways of thought, the standpoint, the mental life of Egypt. Those in the present volume, though they mostly belong to the category of business correspondence, are no exception. The historian of culture will note their turgid style and long-winded formulae of politeness, which reveal the mental disintegration of the age; an age which, because language had lost all its finer shades, strove vainly by piling words on words to recover their old significance, which mistook bombastic verbiage for thought and was fain to substitute high-sounding titles for solid achievement. Every grade of society had its appropriate epithet; and as always happens in a hierarchic system each class was continually striving to arrogate to itself the prerogatives of the class above it, so that titles continually dwindled in their importance.

Among the purely private letters two stand out individually. One is the extraordinary rignarole in which a writer whose head had perhaps been turned by a course of romances rather obscures than describes a riot at Lycopolis. In a wild jumble of words, some of them strange to the Greek language, he aims at dramatic vividness and merely succeeds in revealing his own mental nullity. The other is the remarkable letter of condolence published as no. 1874. The stark actuality of death could shake even a Byzantine into some measure of sobriety, and this letter, illiterate though the Greek may be, is much superior to that just mentioned; but if we contrast it with the well-known letter of Irene (P. Oxy. 115) we shall perceive at once the decadence which had taken place since the second century. The simple and austere dignity of the pagan is infinitely more moving than the gush and slobber of the Christian, with his babble of Abraham's bosom and the singing in Paradise. It would be unfair to impute the decline to Christianity. The whole generation was in fact suffering from a sort of fatty degeneration of the intellect, and there is no reason to suppose that things would have been different had Constantine never forsaken the Unconquered Sun for the Galilaeen.

To the student of social and economic history the texts which concern the feudal estates are probably of most value. There is a most important collection of accounts which illustrate the administration and economic resources of these; and many of the letters also relate to the same subject. A whole series, which centre round a certain Victor, probably belonged to the archive of the Apion family, that great house which, Apion succeeding Strategius and Strategius Apion, dominated the life of Oxyrhynchus for a century and a

half. Its possessions were immense, its state princely. One member of the family was *consul ordinarius*, several bore the consular dignity and the title of Patrician; at least one was Duke of the Thebaid, one perhaps *comes largitionum*, and the family held many pagarchies. Sprung from Oxyrhynchus, it later held possessions in other nomes also, including the Fayyûm and the Cynopolite nome. Its estates were organized on similar lines to those of the Imperial service, with a veritable hierarchy of officials; and to the ordinary inhabitant of Oxyrhynchus Apion or Strategius must have seemed far more potent for good or ill than the half-legendary Augustus at Constantinople. No wonder the "miserable slave Anoup" (P. Oxy. 130) cringed before the "most magnificent Patrician" as his brothers of Aphrodito "grovelled in the track of the immaculate footsteps" of the Duke Athanasius (P. Cairo Masp. 67002).

But human glory is a flower that quickly fades, and Fortune was ever of a feminine fickleness. In less than thirty years from the date of the latest of the Apion papyri the Arab army of 'Amr had wrested Egypt from the nerveless hands of Byzantium, and great and humble alike, the most magnificent Flavius Apion and his miserable slave, had become the subjects of an alien power, infidels to a strange religion, compelled alike to pay that mark of their servitude, the *jizyah* ordered by the Commander of the Faithful at Mecca.

## THE TOMBS OF THE KINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY AT THEBES

By H. E. WINLOCK

With Plates XII—XXI

THE following paper is a fragment of a more ambitious project. In 1914 I made an attempt to identify the tombs of the kings of the Eleventh Dynasty in Thebes and to sketch briefly the work which had been done upon them<sup>1</sup>. This led on to the larger scheme of collecting the material for a general history of the Theban Necropolis and its excavations, but the war and work in the field far from a library since the war, have both effectually prevented finishing any part of it except that which deals with the Seventeenth Dynasty.

The plan followed has been a sort of archaeological "stock-taking" at the conclusion of the century of explorations which Athanasi began on behalf of Salt. To assemble in one place the really surprising amount of work which has been done since those days has seemed an ample justification for such an undertaking, but the reader should be warned that the material has been so scattered in unexpected places, and so uncoördinated and even contradictory, that any review of it degenerates into seemingly purposeless meanderings and browsings in the older literature. There are no new facts to present—in truth some of the facts which follow are so old that they have been forgotten these many years. There are, perhaps, a few new theories, but many of them may go the way of some of the older ones here demolished. However, it is to be hoped that some may stand and that a clearer conception of the Theban Necropolis may serve as a point of departure for a much-needed history of the Seventeenth Dynasty.

It has long been recognized that in Thebes the principal source of antiquities dating from the Intermediate Period between the Twelfth and Eighteenth Dynasties has been the hill called the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ and the plain in front of it<sup>2</sup>. There was, to be sure, a scattered and attenuated cemetery in the hills behind the Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah, and a few graves in the region of the Ramesseum, but they have yielded little of importance in comparison with the larger cemetery<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> WINLOCK in *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, 1915, 1 ff.


<sup>2</sup> Mariette—as will be noted frequently below—recognized this fact clearly except in so far as he confused this period with the Eleventh Dynasty. Thus he wrote to Chabas on Feb. 1, 1860 (MASPERO, *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, 18, cxiii): "I am following the study of the Eleventh and Seventeenth Dynasties at Ḳurnah. In this there is something singularly confusing and the Intefs are so curiously mixed with the Neferhotps and Sekenenre's that they seem to be of the same time.....What I am sure of is that the location of the royal tombs is in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ." Maspero (who was influenced by Mariette even to maintaining always, as the latter did to Chabas, "furthermore nothing whatever of the Twelfth Dynasty") gives a map in *Struggles of the Nations*, 506, which errs only in that the cemetery of the period is not extended sufficiently to the north.

<sup>3</sup> At Dêr el-Bahrî a Twelfth to Thirteenth Dynasty cemetery has been excavated by the Metropolitan Museum (WINLOCK in *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1922, Dec., II, 30) and graves of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Dynasties have been found in the valley of the royal cache and on the site of the S'ankherê' temple (*ibid.*, 1921, Nov., II, 34; MOND in *Annales*, 1905, 80). Lord Carnarvon told me of finding a *rishi* coffin not far from

The northern<sup>1</sup> limit of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ Intermediate Cemetery lies on either side of the mouth of the Valley of the Kings, where the dry torrent crosses the plain to the cultivated fields. In the winter of 1908-9 Petrie found a grave of the period in the north bank of the wady where it breaks out of the hills, and traces of others along the same side of the wady mouth, in the plain near the Eleventh Dynasty tombs<sup>2</sup>. Other graves existed in the plain across the wady, south of the Seti Temple<sup>3</sup>, and a decorated tomb of the period was discovered near the mouth of the little watercourse which descends from the northern end of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ<sup>4</sup>. The southern limit appears to have been the high-walled causeway leading to the Mentuhotp Temple at Dêr el-Bahrî. Beside its lower end in the Birâbî, there was a small brick pyramid of the late Seventeenth or early Eighteenth Dynasty, and a cluster of tombs from which came cones dated in the reigns of Ahmose I and Amenophis I<sup>5</sup>. Close by, on the site of the propylaea to Hatshepsut's causeway, the already plundered Middle Kingdom tombs<sup>6</sup> became the nucleus for a cemetery which was at least as early as the Intermediate Period King Ma'ibrê<sup>7</sup> and which continued to be used through




the site of the old German House; Petrie discovered a typical M.K. tomb re-used in the early Eighteenth Dynasty under the Tuthmosis IV Temple (*Six Temples*, 7, Pl. XXIV): and Quibell found several tombs of the Twelfth to Eighteenth Dynasties under the Ramesseum (*Ramesseum*, 3, Pls. III, VI-IX, XVIII;



GARDINER in *Journal*, III, 184). The cartouche  restored by Quibell  would appear

more probably to have been , Ahmose I (see my remarks on page 264). Other tombs of the same period were found behind the Ramesseum, by Mond in 1924.

<sup>1</sup> "North" and "south" will be used in the Egyptian sense—both ancient and modern—of "down" and "up" the Nile. In the Theban Necropolis this is about N.E. and S.W. but it has the advantage of being the natural orientation of the locality.

<sup>2</sup> The unplundered grave of a woman in a *rishi* coffin (one of the best preserved and recorded up to the present) is described by PETRIE, *Qurneh*, 6 ff. and Pls. A stela with the characteristic names


 and  is on 17, Pl. X, and a statue base with the typical name  on Pl. XXX, 6, from the outskirts of the Eleventh Dynasty cemetery north of the wady.


<sup>3</sup> PETRIE, *op. cit.*, 12, describes among other remains, a fragment of a limestone statuette of  of  "Prince Intefmose called the Red Child" (Pl. XXX, 3), and a fragment of a stela which showed a King Sekhemrê..... adoring Amûn (Pl. XXX, 4).


<sup>4</sup> Near A in the map, Pl. XIII. Found by Gauthier in 1906 (*Bull. Institut français*, 1908, 162-3, Pls. VII-X) and copied by Petrie in 1908 (*Qurneh*, 10, frontispiece).

<sup>5</sup> Near B in the map, Pl. XIII. Found by Winlock in 1912-13 (*Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1914, 16, Fig. 10). See also under Kamose below, page 262.

<sup>6</sup> MEYER, *Geschichte*, § 298, note, quoting CARNARVON and CARTER, *Five Years*, 64 ff., is mistaken in supposing that these tombs were in continuous use from Amenemmes IV to Tuthmosis III. The latter authors make it perfectly clear that the secondary *rishi* burials were made only after a lapse of time during which the original M.K. burials lay undisturbed.

<sup>7</sup> A scarab on a *rishi* burial inscribed  was found by Lansing in 1916-17. PETRIE, *History*, I, 257, suggests that Ma'ibrê was the prenomen of the Hyksos Sheshi. In view of the rarity of Hyksos scarabs in Thebes, it is worth noting that I found one of Sheshi at Dêr el-Bahrî in 1923.





of the Intefs of the Louvre, Kamose and Ahhotep  
 and possibly of Kamose or of Ahmose Sapaïr

rary of the inspectors in the Abbott Papyrus.

Drawn by L. F. Hall




the reign of Kamose down to the construction of the Dêr el-Baḥrî avenue<sup>1</sup>. Back on the hillside, behind this cemetery, was the tomb of Tetiky, son of Raḥotp, who died in the reign of Ahmose I<sup>2</sup>, and above it another plundered Middle Kingdom tomb which was used like those below, as a community burying-place<sup>3</sup>. The area thus defined—roughly between A on the north and B on the south on the map, Plate XIII—is the cemetery to be studied in this paper.




The kings who were buried in this cemetery were a far remove from the mighty and extravagantly wealthy Pharaohs of the great periods. They left no gigantic mortuary temples with endowments rich enough to support whole colleges of priests, and for the most part those who tended their tombs have passed into limbo without leaving a trace. We shall only meet with a doubtful mortuary priest of a King Intef, a chief prophet of Kamose and a priest of Tuthmosis I, who was ka-servant of Ta'o II and Kamose at the same time. No others are known even approaching the period of the kings whom they served.

However it is reasonable to suppose that the kings of the Empire endowed the cults of their immediate ancestors, the last kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty. We have no reason to suppose that these last kings of the line were either more powerful or more wealthy than their own forbears. The greater popularity of their cults must have been due to funds with which they were endowed, and hence they were held in a pious veneration among the priests of the Necropolis under the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties. By this period, Amenophis I and his mother Nefretiri had become the deified patrons of the cemeteries, and all their line buried in the sacred mountain of Thebes and ruling over it in death, became the "Lords of the West<sup>4</sup>."

Several monuments show them seated in rows or represented by lists of their cartouches, adored like a pantheon of gods. In a Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah tomb these deities are headed by Mentuḥotp III and the two divine queens Aḥḥotp and Nefretiri, after whom follow

<sup>1</sup> Discovered by CARNARVON and CARTER, *Five Years Explorations*, 34, 51 ff. The excavation of the area was continued by LANSING (*Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1917, May, II). The conclusion of Lord Carnarvon's work, and the excavations of the Metropolitan Museum by me in 1912-13, and by Lansing in 1916-17 are to be incorporated into one publication by the latter. Under Kamose, below, mention will be made of the tablet found by Carnarvon and Carter and of a "Superintendent of the Prophets of Kamose, Mes."

Lansing also found the coffin of a  here. Intermediate shawabtis found in this locality are in CARNARVON and CARTER, *op. cit.*, 50 and NORTHAMPTON etc., *Theban Necropolis*, 26 ff.











<sup>2</sup>  son of  and ; CARNARVON and CARTER, *op. cit.*, 2, 14 ff.; WEIGALL in *Annales*, XI, 170; GARDINER and WEIGALL, *Topographical Catalogue*, Tomb 15.

<sup>3</sup> Found by PASSALACQUA, *Catalogue raisonné*, 199 ff. and the material throughout the book *passim*. An abstract is given in *Ausführ. Verzeichnis, Berlin*, 190, with cross references to the material, which is shown in *Ägypt. und Vorderasiat. Alterthümer, Berlin*, Pls. 30, 33, 35, 37 and the jewelry in SCHÄFER, *Goldschmiedearbeiten*, 25 ff. The tomb was one of the Eleventh Dynasty corridor tombs on the southern spur of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ (see p. 272, n. 2) which was so high up on the hillside that it escaped being buried by the Hatshepsut causeway (like Carnarvon's and Carter's tombs below), and therefore continued in use until the time of Ramesses II. The earliest burials, at the back of the tomb, had perished before Passalacqua's day but Seventeenth-Eighteenth Dynasty shawabtis buried for them in front of the doorway, as in the tomb of Tetiky, were found.


<sup>4</sup> So in the tomb of Khabekhet.

Ahmoṣe and all the legitimate and orthodox kings down to Seti I, the sovereign of the worshipper<sup>1</sup>. There was a similar scene on the offering table of the scribe Ḳen<sup>2</sup>, which gives the same orthodox list of kings down to Ramesses II, but starts with Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup>, Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> and Wazkheperre<sup>c</sup> as predecessors of Ahmoṣe I. Still more elaborate lists are those in the Dêr el-Medînah tombs of two Twentieth Dynasty priests, Inhurkhou<sup>3</sup> and Khabekhet<sup>4</sup>. Here it is not so much the great kings of the Empire who are venerated, as those lesser personages who were closely related to its founders. Mentuḥotp III, as the inaugurator of the prosperity of Thebes, takes a prominent place, and after him follow Ahmoṣe I and Amenophis I with their respective mothers Aḥhotep and Nefretiri and numbers of their offspring. In addition they both include King Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta<sup>c</sup>o-Ḳen and the fuller list of Khabekhet adds Kings Sekhtenrē<sup>c</sup> and Wazkheperre<sup>c</sup> Kamose and two kings' sons, Ahmoṣe and Binpu, among others.

From these lists of the "Lords of the West" buried in the Theban Necropolis we can collect the following names of royalties antedating Ahmoṣe I:



King  in the list of Ḳen.  
<sup>5</sup> in the list of Khabekhet.  
 <sup>6</sup>   in the lists of Ḳen, Inhurkhou and Khabekhet.  
 Queen  in all lists.  
   in the list of Khabekhet.


<sup>1</sup> ROSELLINI, *Mon.*, I, xlv; CHAMPOLLION, *Mon.*, II, clxxxiv. Hatshepsut and the Aten worshippers from Akhenaten to Ay are omitted from these lists.


<sup>2</sup> From Dêr el-Medînah; formerly in the Clot Bey Collection and now in Marseilles. Bibliography in GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 162. Ḳen was . The Great Place was the region in which were located the tombs of Amenophis I and Queen Inhapi. See MASPERO, *Momies royales, Mém. miss. fran.*, I, 551, 3, 7; BREASTED, *Ancient Records*, IV, pars. 665-7, and DARESSY, *Cercueils des cachettes royales*, 61018-20.


<sup>3</sup> Seen by Wilkinson, but its discovery attributed by Prisse to his own travelling companion Lloyd de Brynestyn; afterwards removed to Berlin by Lepsius. A fragment of the stela is in the Louvre, No. 338. Bibliography in MASPERO, *op. cit.*, 617 and *Rec. Trav.* II, 170, with some improvements on the Prisse and Lepsius copies.

<sup>4</sup> Tomb No. 2 in GARDINER and WEIGALL, *Catalogue*. According to a MS. notebook of Gliddon's, it was opened by Wilkinson and copied by Hay. MASPERO, *loc. cit.*, 618, gives the bibliography of the copies by Wilkinson, Burton, Champollion, Prisse and Lepsius. See further SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 68. A fragment from near the end of the top row—or from a similar list—is in the Petrie Collection.

<sup>5</sup> LEPSIUS, MASPERO and WIEDEMANN (*Geschichte*, 303) read the last sign in the cartouche . Champollion and Prisse copied it , in which they have been followed by SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 4, and BURCHARDT and PIEPER, *Königsnamen*, 53, No. 273. There can be no question that the name should be formed Se-X-en-rē<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> In Ḳen .

 in the list of Khabekhet.

 in the lists of Ken and Khabekhet.

The only comment necessary here is upon the first two names. Accuracy does not seem to have been insisted upon in drawing up these lists and in that of Khabekhet there is an idea of precedence not wholly chronological. And yet, taking the lower and upper rows of this last list alternately, it can be read with a certain orderliness: Mentuhotp III, and Amenophis I, leading; Ahmose I and his wife Nefretiri next; Sekhentenrē<sup>c</sup>; Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta'o-Ken and Queen Ahhotp<sup>1</sup>; Wazkheperre<sup>c</sup> Kamose and the lesser royalties following. Similarly the list on the offering table of Ken starts out Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup>, Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup>, Wazkheperre<sup>c2</sup> and Ahmose I. Finally in the Karnak list of ancestors of Tuthmosis III, Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup> appears next to Sekenenrē<sup>c3</sup>. In short there seems to have been a tradition of a Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup>—or Sekhentenrē<sup>c</sup>—preceding Sekenenrē<sup>c4</sup>, with Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup> vouched for by two fairly good documents and Sekhentenrē<sup>c</sup> by only one, and that one not quite so trustworthy. The similarity of the two names will be noticed, and it will be seen how easily the consonants *n-h-t* in the one might become *h-n-t* in the other by metathesis<sup>5</sup>, or by a misreading of hieratic. Hence it seems safe to accept Daressy's proposal that but one king existed—Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup>, who became Sekhentenrē<sup>c</sup> by a scribal error<sup>6</sup>.

Some forty years later than the last of these lists of the Lords of the West—in the 16th year of Ramesses IX, 1126 B.C.—the tombs of some of these Seventeenth Dynasty royalties figured largely in the affairs of the Necropolis. From the contemporary files of the inspectorate of the cemeteries, located in Medinet Habu probably, come a number of papyri discovered in the fifties of the last century<sup>7</sup>. These are surveys of tombs, inventories of

<sup>1</sup> By an error of the scribe, Ahhotp is a king and, to keep the order as read above, should change places in the list with Kamose.


<sup>2</sup> The list here turns a corner on the offering table and by a confusion on the scribe's part Mentuhotp III is introduced between Kamose and Ahmose.

<sup>3</sup> SETHE, *Urkunden des 18ten Dyn.*, 609.

<sup>4</sup> A close connection between Senakhtenrē<sup>c</sup> and Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup> and Kamose was early recognized by MASPERO, *Mummies royales*, 639 and *Struggles of the Nations*, 76, n. 4. So also WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 302; SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 4; MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 309, note; WEILL, *Fin du Moyen Empire*, 158, 550; BURCHARDT and PIEPER, *Königsnamen*, 53, no. 274.

<sup>5</sup> Suggested to me by Lansing.

<sup>6</sup> *Rec. Trav.*, 1892, 146; followed by PETRIE, *History*, II, 9, 16, and in a curious way by BUDGE, *Book of Kings*, I, 104 and *History*, III, 180, who says Daressy has proved the identity of the two, and who therefore

composes a titulary .

<sup>7</sup> PEET, *Mayer Papyrus*, 1, gives a list and bibliography to which should be added the fact that the Amherst Papyrus is now in the collection of J. P. Morgan in New York. There is little information on the finding of the papyri. Pap. Ambras and Pap. Amherst would seem to have been discovered in the early fifties and Pap. Abbott was purchased by the B. M. in 1856. Pap. Mayer A and B were in England in 1863 and probably were found no later than Pap. Harris A which turned up in 1860 in Medinet Habu. Now Ambras contains a catalogue of documents relating to the Ramesses III Temple of Medinet Habu, as well as a catalogue of tomb robber documents which surely includes Amherst, and perhaps Abbott. Thus all the documents (except Mayer A and B which are intimately related to Abbott, however) can be connected with Medinet Habu, and there I should place the headquarters of the Necropolis Administration in the Twentieth Dynasty.



goods stolen from the tombs, lists of persons accused of theft and even the minutes of their trials. All are business-like, straightforward documents, clearly the verbatim reports of legal investigations and therefore thoroughly trustworthy historical evidence, if some slight allowance be made for an occasional, natural error in drafting.




The most impressive and most interesting of these is the Abbott Papyrus. The situation which it details has been excellently summarized by Breasted<sup>1</sup>. The Mayor of Thebes had laid certain information against the Mayor of the Necropolis, under whom the tombs were being pillaged. The Vizier appointed a commission of ten officials—chiefs of police, necropolis inspectors and two confidential scribes from the Vizier's and the Treasurer's *diwāns*—who were to investigate the charges in company with the accused Mayor, and report back to the Vizier and the King's Butlers. Followed by a party of police this committee crossed the river to the cemeteries and inspected ten royal tombs and a number of private ones. They then drafted a report dealing with these private tombs in a very summary manner, as being of small importance, but giving a list of the ten kings' tombs examined, followed by clear and concise statements of their condition, which have all the earmarks of having been recorded by the scribes on the spot. These tombs, in the order in which they were reported upon, were the






- (1) Tomb of King Amenophis I.
- (2) Pyramid of King Intef I.
- (3) Pyramid of King Nubkheperre Intef.
- (4) Pyramid of King Sekhemre-Wapma Intef.
- (5) Pyramid of King Sekhemre-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf.
- (6) Pyramid of King Sekenenre Ta'o.
- (7) Pyramid of King Sekenenre Ta'o-o.
- (8) Pyramid of King Wazkheperre Kamose.
- (9) Pyramid of King Ahmose-Sapaïr.
- (10) Pyramid of King Mentuhotp III.

Three of these tombs definitely lie outside the scope of the present paper. No. 2 and No. 10 date from the Eleventh Dynasty, and No. 1 from the Eighteenth. Furthermore, No. 9 of "King" Ahmose-Sapaïr has long been recognized as involving a scribe's error<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Ancient Records*, iv, §§ 500 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Many of the names of this period which contain the element *Sekhem* have been read *Seshesh*. The two signs  *sh̄m* and  *ss̄-t* both determined the names of sistra or similar instruments and were frequently confused by the ancient scribes (ERMAN, *Grammatik*, 315; GARDINER in *Rec. Trav.*, 1912, 75). WEILL in an interesting excursus (*op. cit.*, 277, continued on 286) proves that in these royal names the correct form is *Sekhem* and assembles the arguments in favour of transliterating the names in the order *Sekhemre-X* as done by STEINDORFF (*Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 94) rather than the order *Sekhem-X-re* frequently followed.

<sup>3</sup> WIEDEMANN in *P.S.B.A.*, 1886, 220, and MASPERO (*Enquête judiciaire*, 80), believed that an actual king, preceding Ahmose, is named in the Abbott Papyrus; BRUGSCH (*Gesch. Aeg.*, 256) supposed that a viceroy under Ahmose is here named. Maspero changed to the conclusion that the "King" of the Papyrus and the "Prince" of other monuments were the same person in *Momies royales*, 638, in which he followed BRUGSCH and BIRCH in *Rev. Arch.*, 1859, 272 and SCHIAPARELLI, *Il libro dei funerali*, 17. SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 71, expressed very trenchantly the impossibility that two separate Sapaïrs were involved and PETRIE, *History*, II, 44, made the perfectly plausible suggestion that in transcribing the title   the element  had been dropped in the Papyrus.

There was no "king" of this name, but there was a well-known "King's-son Ahmose called Sapaïr," the heir of Amenophis I<sup>1</sup>, who died young and was venerated among the Lords of the West on innumerable monuments. That it was his tomb which was investigated is beyond doubt—the question is, how did the scribes make their mistake? Possibly the original complaint listed a tomb of "King Ahmose-Sapaïr" and the committee's scribes transcribed this error into their notes; or possibly a scribe carelessly wrote  for . Again there is a third possible explanation. Mariette found two seals in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, identical in workmanship and therefore probably contemporary in date, bearing the names  and <sup>2</sup>. If the seals date from the generations immediately succeeding Seḳenenrêc, this "Son of Rêc Siamûn" is an enigma<sup>3</sup>. However there was a son of Ahmose I named Siamûn buried in the necropolis and honoured among the Lords of the West, and it may be argued that this seal had belonged to a caretaker of his tomb. It would then become probable that in the tomb also Prince Siamûn was called  and the same may have been true of Ahmose-Sapaïr in his tomb, to the confusion of the scribes of the Abbott Papyrus<sup>4</sup>.

The positions of certain of the tombs in this list show that all of them were put down in the order in which they were inspected<sup>5</sup>. No. 1 is described as being "the High Ascent, north of the Temple of Amenhotp of the Garden" and Carter has found it on the top of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ Hill, north of the mortuary temple of Amenophis I<sup>6</sup>. No. 2 is specified as being "north of the Temple of Amenophis of the Forecourt," and it was discovered by Mariette in the plain beyond the Seti Temple<sup>7</sup>. No. 3, we shall find, was situated at the foot of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ near its northern end. Then follow Nos. 4 to 9, after which there is an evident break as No. 10 is said to have been in Zeseret—Dêr el-Bahri,—where it is to-day one of the prominent landmarks<sup>8</sup>. This break, and the fact that no qualifying phrases locating Tombs 3 to 9 are given, make it evident that Nos. 3 to 9 were all in the same district, and so I have placed them, strung out along the foot of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ in a purely diagrammatic manner, in the accompanying map, Plate XIII<sup>9</sup>.

The itinerary marked on this map is not as unreasonable as might be supposed at first. Unquestionably ten tombs were specified in the charges to be investigated<sup>10</sup>. The tomb of Amenophis I was that of the most prominent king and was also the most inaccessible.

<sup>1</sup> The involved argument proving this relationship must be deferred to another occasion.

<sup>2</sup> Bibliography under King Seḳenenrêc, page 248, below.

<sup>3</sup> According to Gauthier, Legrain published the seal of Siamûn and that of Seḳenenrêc under one number. This led LIEBLEIN, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de l'ancienne Égypte*, 1910, 125 and 132, to create a King Seḳenenrêc IV-Amensi to whom he attributed a dozen or fifteen years of reign!

<sup>4</sup> Son of Rêc, like the cartouche, may have been used by an heir to the throne. Hallowed tradition may well have received some strange accretions in this formative period. PETRIE, *History*, II, 44.

<sup>5</sup> As I have already suggested in *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, 1915, 37.

<sup>6</sup> B. A. R., IV, par. 513 and CARTER in *Journal*, 1916, 147.

<sup>7</sup> B. A. R., IV, par. 514 and WINLOCK, *op. cit.*, 20.

<sup>8</sup> B. A. R., IV, 520, and NAVILLE, *Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Deir el Bahari*.

<sup>9</sup> It should be emphasized that the tombs 4 to 9 are placed on the map only in the most general way. It is quite possible that Nos. 8 and 9 should be near point A.

<sup>10</sup> See below, page 265.

The inspection was made in September, and we may quite safely assume that the eleven officials, many of whom may well have been old and corpulent, would prefer to puff their way up the desolate little valley to the High Ascent before the sun shone down upon it in the fierceness of full mid-day heat. The first tomb examined and the findings dictated to the scribes, the commissioners and their accompanying police scrambled down the hill to the second tomb, nearly a mile away. With these two outlying tombs disposed of, Nos. 3 to 9 lay on their direct path to Dêr el-Baḥrî, fully two miles distant. Therefore the party crossed its own tracks and followed along the foot of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, visiting the little pyramids in their list until they reached the great avenues leading to the temples of Zeseret, where lay the last remaining tomb which they had to examine.

While this list is strictly speaking an itinerary, nevertheless so far as Nos. 3 to 8 are concerned it has an unexpected chronological value. Assume for the moment that these six tombs are of one period—the thesis of this paper—their order from north to south is equally their order from earlier to later.

Returning to the map it will be noticed that the early Eleventh Dynasty kings and their courtiers were buried on the plain opposite Karnak and just north of the Valley of the Kings. Mentuhotp III was buried in Dêr el-Baḥrî with the nobles of his reign grouped around the 'Asâsîf, and S'ankhkerē' and his followers in the cliffs to the south<sup>1</sup>. The cemetery of the dynasty thus grew from local north to local south. Of the Eighteenth Dynasty, the founder's temple and tomb are unknown, but the chapel of Amenophis I is on the plain in front of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ and the tombs of the nobles of the first generations of the dynasty are clustered behind it on the hillside. The entrance to the mortuary monument of Tuthmosis I and Hatshepsut is a couple of hundred yards beyond, with the temples of Tuthmosis III, Amenophis II, Tuthmosis IV and Amenophis III following one after another to the south, and the tombs of their contemporaries honeycombing Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah behind them<sup>2</sup>. Again, Seti I built the temple for his father and himself up by the mouth of the Valley of the Kings. Ramesses II placed his between existing monuments to the south, and Merenptah beyond him again. Already the front of the Necropolis was becoming so crowded that Siptah and Tausret were content with small vacant sites between the existing temples for their unimposing little chapels, but Ramesses III with a more ambitious project, went as far south as Medînet Habu. The old lake of the palace of Amenophis III blocked further development in that direction and such of the Twentieth Dynasty temples as have been found are sandwiched-in, in any sort of order, among those of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth.

This trend of the Theban Necropolis from the plain near the mouth of the Valley of the Kings southward had a perfectly natural cause. The plain is the nearest bit of desert, and hence the best place for a cemetery, in the neighbourhood of the heart of Thebes around the temples of Karnak. At Karnak, from time immemorial, there must have been a ferry to the Necropolis. Boats put across from the wharves near the Amûn Temple to the landing-stage directly across the river, which went by the name of "Opposite-her-Lord"—





<sup>1</sup> WINLOCK, *op. cit.*, 13 ff., and *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1921, Nov., II, 29; 1922, Dec., II, 19.

<sup>2</sup> In GARDINER and WEIGALL, *Topographical Catalogue*, there are 98 decorated, Eighteenth Dynasty tombs in the Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah neighbourhood, all but two of them later than Hatshepsut. In the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ there are 23, of which 16 are not later than Tuthmosis III. When it is considered that the most important courtiers of this last king were buried in Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah, the general trend from north to south following the kings' temples is evident for the courtiers' tombs as well.


*Kheftet-hir-nebes*. The old quays there were relined with fine stone in the days of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III to meet the growing traffic<sup>1</sup>, and so usual was it to take the *Kheftet-hir-nebes* ferry that the name came to signify the whole of Western Thebes<sup>2</sup>, and in true Egyptian style was even personified as a goddess who was the counterpart of Thebes itself<sup>3</sup>. It was near the road leading from this busy ferry that each king would have his monument, and those who could not find place there turned south into the hills already hallowed by the rulers of the Eleventh Dynasty.

It is thus a fact that so long as a free choice was open, the founder of each dynasty built his monument as near as possible to this ferry road, and his descendants built theirs in a row to the south. Before the Eighteenth Dynasty there was no difficulty in the way of this choice and we may assume, therefore, that the tombs Nos. 3 to 8 in the Abbott Papyrus followed this controlling tendency. And that this assumption is at least partially correct is evident immediately, because Sekenenrē and Kamose, who are last on the list, are admittedly the last of the Seventeenth Dynasty and the immediate predecessors of the Eighteenth. We thus have the foundation of a chronicle for the Seventeenth Dynasty in the Abbott Papyrus. That it is only a foundation is evident of course, first, because all the tombs of the kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty were not inspected; and secondly, because, while the general north to south tendency may be true, it may not hold strictly between two adjoining tombs in so rugged and restricted an area as the Dirā' Abu'l-Nagā.


It now remains only to study the general designation of the royal tombs of the period before taking them up individually.







Ever since Birch, Chabas and Maspero first translated and commented on the Abbott Papyrus it has invariably been noticed that the royal tombs—except that of Amenophis I—were called  and that the rest of the tombs inspected were differentiated under other names—;  or . *Mer* means, essentially, a "pyramid," but Mariette's discovery of the tomb of Nubkheperre Intef and his description of it as a chamber cut in the rock, and not a pyramid, has resulted in the word *mer* being taken in this papyrus in a merely figurative sense for "king's tomb," an idea which has

<sup>1</sup> SETHE, *Urkunden des 18ten Dyn.*, 312 (earlier in *B. A.R.*, II, par. 339): "Ihre Ufer (*ḥmt*) waren gedämmt (*dnī*) aus Stein; schöner war sie als ihr früherer Zustand." The ideogram for the structure is a "fortress" but the same sign is used by Hatshepsut for her temple at Dêr el-Bahrî (*B.M. Hieroglyphic Texts*, v, 26). Another reference to the same restoration, here credited to Tuthmosis III, is in *B. A.R.*, II, par. 606—LACAU, *Stèles*, 34010. The Hatshepsut quays were doubtless on the prolongation of the Dêr el-Bahrî causeway.

<sup>2</sup> SETHE, *op. cit.*, 64 and 83 (*B. A.R.*, II, par. 70), where it is the pendant of Thebes, and like Thebes a town , in the days of Tuthmosis I. See next note.

<sup>3</sup> Accompanying Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III on the two stelae in note 1 above and Tuthmosis III in *B. A.R.*, II, par. 655. SETHE, *op. cit.*, translations, 34 and 43, considers that *Kheftet-hir-nebes* was merely a name of Thebes. However, the expression "the district of the Mayor of the West Side in *Kheftet-hir-nebes*" (*B. A.R.*, II, par. 927) inclines me to stick to a modification of the older view which originated with BRUGSCH in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1863, 38, and was followed by MASPERO, *Struggles of the Nations*, 506 and map. They applied the name to the hills opposite Karnak on the analogy of "the Brow of Thebes" for the western hills noted by MASPERO, *op. cit.*, 310, *Rec. Trav.*, II, 112. The recent discovery that *ḥmt* is to be translated "bank" or "quay" shows that the western wharves, rather than hills, is the place. All hope of ever finding the quays of *Kheftet-hir-nebes* is doomed when one considers that the Napoleonic, Wilkinson and modern maps show the river shifting in only one century enough to obliterate all trace of them. (On the shift between 1797 and 1830 see NEWBERRY in *Annales*, 1906, 79.)

gained force from the appearance of the determinative  after other words for tomb, in various places.

However, too much confidence is not to be placed in the thoroughness of Mariette's study of the Intef tomb which he found. On the contrary there is excellent ground for taking the word literally as meaning "pyramid." A consistent terminology is evident in the whole body of tomb robbery documents. Thus  is used to describe primarily the royal tombs of the Valleys of the Kings and of the Queens, which were purely subterranean passages<sup>1</sup>;  is some definite type of private tomb which makes the name peculiarly applicable to those cenotaphs which were erected in Abydos<sup>2</sup>; and even the word , the ancient generic word for tombs in general<sup>3</sup>, has a specialized meaning of "burial chamber" in the Amherst Papyrus. This consistency of usage is observable in the fact that the entirely subterranean tomb of Amenophis I is not described as a *mer*—except by inference in one general total—but *mer* is applied to the two tombs of Wahankh Intef and of Mentuhotp III which appear from their existing remains to have been actual pyramids. The same I judge to have been the case of the early Eighteenth Dynasty *mer* of Tetisheri at Abydos<sup>4</sup>. But more convincing, two of the remaining tombs in the Abbott Papyrus, which are  themselves, have particular features called the  (without ) which can only be translated "pyramid." Mention is made of "the stela of the pyramid" of Sekhemrê-Wapma<sup>t</sup>, and "the lower chamber of the pyramid" of Sekhemrê-Shedtawi<sup>5</sup>. In the face of this, we can only conclude that Mariette missed the pyramidal feature above the tomb of Nubkheperrê, and translate the word *mer* literally as "pyramid."


The pyramids of the period listed in the Abbott Papyrus begin with:

#### THE TOMB OF KING NUBKHEPERRÊ INTef



<sup>1</sup> Tombs in the Valley of the Queens: Pap. Abbott, iv, 16; v, 3-4, 7-8; in the Valley of the Kings: PEET, *Mayer Papyri*, B, 8-10; DARESSY, *Cercueils des cachettes royales*, 61019. In the Ambras Papyrus the tomb of the Great Captain of the Army is *hr* in contrast with the *mr* of King Sebekemsaf.

<sup>2</sup> Abydos cenotaphs are so called on the Tetisheri stela (see below) and the Kares stela (SETHE, *Urkunden des 18ten Dyn.*, 45, translations, 24). Cf. SCHÄFER, *Mysterien des Osiris*, 7.

<sup>3</sup> The commonest word for "tomb" in Egyptian. Even in the O.K. it is applied to mastabas or rock-cut tombs indifferently (MARIETTE, *Mastabas*, 201, 204; DE MORGAN, *Catalogue*, I, 172, 173, etc.). Since Papyrus Abbott, I, 4, apparently applies *isi* to the tomb of Amenophis I, MASPERO (*Enquête judiciaire*, 12-13) recalls the Greek *σίπυξ*, "reed or flute," applied to the Tombs of the Kings by classical authors, and derives *isi* likewise from , a "plant" (BRUGSCH, *Dict.*; LORET in *Rec. Trav.*, 1894, 11; KAMAL in *Annales*, IX, 27). However, it is too old a word for this derivation. There is nothing in O.K. tombs to give rise to the simile with a reed, and it is more likely to have a relation with the word "office" or "chamber."


<sup>4</sup> References to the tomb of Wahankh Intef in WINLOCK in *Amer. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, 1915, 20 ff. Naville's reconstruction in the *Eleventh Dynasty Temple at Deir el Bahari* of a pyramid in the Mentuhotp temple has not been bettered. CURRELLY (*Abydos*, III, 35) describes the Tetisheri monument as a square "mastaba" with slightly sloping sides (cf. PEET, *Cemeteries of Abydos*, II, 35-6). The ruins, although only 2 metres high, suggest to me, however, the pyramids described by MARIETTE, *Abydos*, II, 42-44, Pls. 66-7.

<sup>5</sup> See below, pages 234 and 237.










Coffin of Sekhemrē'-Wapma't Intef.  
*In the Louvre.*





Coffin of Nubkheperre' Intef.  
*In the British Museum.*

Mariette either did not recognize it or it had completely disappeared<sup>1</sup>. In front, broken into several pieces, lay two small obelisks, 3·50 m. and 3·70 m. high respectively, which had ornamented the façade. Very well preserved inscriptions were arranged in vertical columns down the four sides giving the names of the Horus Neferkheperu, Lord of the Two Diadems Heruhirnestf, Beautiful God, Lord of the Two Lands, Lord of Offerings, Nubkheperrê<sup>c</sup>, Bodily Son of Rê<sup>c</sup>, Intef who is beloved of the gods Osiris, Sôpd Lord of the (Eastern) Mountains and Anubis Lord of the land of Zeseret.



Mariette's discovery of 1860 would appear to have been anticipated by the Arabs of Ḳurnah in 1827<sup>2</sup>, when they seem to have found the tomb intact as it was left by the inspectors in the reign of Ramesses IX. Their plundering on the slopes of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ led them to a little tomb which they said had but one chamber (a contradiction of the Mariette description which, perhaps, should be taken more seriously than I have done). In the centre of this chamber, the living rock had been left to form a sarcophagus free-standing from the walls but not detached from the floor, within which lay the wooden coffin. This Athanasi bought for Salt, from whose collection it passed into the British Museum<sup>4</sup>. It is a gilded coffin with *rîshi* (feather) decoration whose inscriptions name




the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Intef   (Pl. XIV).

<sup>1</sup> PASSALACQUA (*Cat. raisonné*, 191) destroyed a number of small brick pyramids in 1822-3.


<sup>2</sup> Obelisks of modest size and rather stumpy form in front of tomb doors go back to the earliest times. See VON BISSING in *Rec. Trav.*, 1912, 21, with numerous examples from the First to the Seventeenth Dynasties. Additional O.K. examples are, at Sakḳârah: MARIETTE, *Mastabas*, 434; MASPERO, *Art in Egypt*, fig. 65; LYTHGÖE, *Tomb of Perneb*, 21; at Gîzah: REISNER in *Boston Mus. Fine Arts Bull.*, 1913, 56; M.K., BIRCH, *Cat. Alnwick Castle*, 324, Pl. VI. An obelisk-like stela from a private grave in the Theban Necropolis will be noticed under Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf. The presence of a pair of obelisks in front of the tomb of Nubkheperrê<sup>c</sup> was the arrangement in the Fifth Dynasty tomb of Perneb and recalls the statement of Strabo that originally there were obelisks in front of all the royal tombs at Thebes—a statement which, as Passalacqua saw, could not at any rate have been true of the royal tombs in the Valley of the Kings.

<sup>3</sup> The original description of the Arabs' excavation was published by Yanni Athanasi, Salt's agent in Ḳurnah, in *Researches and Discoveries in Upper Egypt*, x, quoted by Dr. G. TOMLINSON (Bishop of Gibraltar) in *Trans. Roy. Soc. of Literature*, 1839, 238. Tomlinson and Leemans had been in correspondence before this, and Leemans covered the same ground in his *Lettre à M. François Salvolini*, 1838, 28, and subsequently in *Mon. égypt. du Musée à Leide*, II, 18. The most frequently quoted authority, however, is PRISSE (*Rev. Arch.*, 1847, 710), who claimed that his information had been furnished him at Thebes by an associate of Yanni who had tried to find the site for him, but without success. In spite of the fact that Prisse may have made enquiries in Ḳurnah, nevertheless his published account is nothing more nor less than a complete plagiarization of Leemans and of a letter from the latter published by TOMLINSON, *ibid.* The story has been quoted from one or another of these sources by all those who have described the articles found.


<sup>4</sup> B.M. 6652. The coffin was No. 986 (ATHANASI, *ibid.*) in Salt's last collection which he mentions in a letter of Oct. 7, 1827, as that day shipped to Europe (HALLS, *Life and Correspondence of Henry Salt, Esq.*). He died three weeks later near Alexandria and the collection was sold in the summer of 1835, in



That this was the coffin of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef there is no direct and incontrovertible evidence since the prenomen is lacking, as is the case with nearly every object from the burial-chambers of the kings of this period. We shall find that three Kings Intef are known, buried in the cemetery of the Seventeenth Dynasty, and of their three coffins only one bears a prenomen. Omitting this last and disregarding the ever-present possibility that there may have been still other Intefs, we reduce the question to two kings (known from the Abbott Papyrus) and two coffins (in the British Museum and the Louvre). Now the coffin in the British Museum spells the name  with the  and so do all of the contemporary monuments definitely known to be of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup><sup>1</sup>. The other coffin and the scant remains of the other kings omit the <sup>2</sup>. On this ground alone the British Museum coffin may be assigned to Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> and this assignment gains force from two other circumstances. First, there is a good case for assigning the Louvre's doubtful coffin to Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> Intef the Elder. Secondly, if this British Museum coffin is assigned to Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup><sup>3</sup> it is difficult to explain how it could have been found in 1827 in a tomb evidently intact and yet the canopic box of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> only made its appearance twenty years later.

The Arabs who opened the coffin claimed to have found the mummy of the king resting within, wearing a diadem upon his head outside the bandages; beside him lay two bows and six flint-tipped arrows, and among his wrappings they found a heart scarab mounted in gold, "and also many other objects of interest," according to Athanasi.

When the coffin came to be cleaned in London some eight bits of bandages were found sticking in the bitumen with which the inside was lined. They were covered with texts in a strong hand similar to that of the Berlin Sinuhe and Eloquent Peasant manuscripts, and one ends with the name of the King . The mummy itself having been

London where the coffin went for a song, as it was only after the tarnished gold was cleaned in the British Museum that the cartouche was discovered. An excellent description and plate are given by TOMLINSON, *op. cit.* The best description of later date is that of STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 84 ff., with illustration. Other illustrations are in PETRIE, *History*, I, fig. 165 and BUDGE, *Guide to the First and Second Egypt. Rooms*, 1904, 68, Pl. X. Mentions of varying value are made by Leemans; PRISSE, *loc. cit.* and in *Rev. Arch.*, 1845, 6; BIRCH in *Rev. Arch.*, 1859, 269 and *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1869, 53; WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 223; BUDGE, *History*, II, 184 and *Book of Kings*, I, 84 (where by some confusion he says it bears the cartouche of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup>); GAUTHIER, *Rois*, I, 221. Finally the literature is reviewed by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 361, and many valuable suggestions made.


<sup>1</sup> The archaic spelling  analyzed by ERMAN in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, XXXIX, 147.

<sup>2</sup> This line of argument is, so far as I am aware, entirely due to the ingenuity of WEILL, *op. cit.*, 357, cf. 372, n. 2. His rule for the spelling of the name of this king has been confirmed by the recent publication of the armlets of Queen Sebekemsaf (see below, page 233). Its one possible exception is that the name of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Heruhirma<sup>t</sup> Intef was first spelled  on his coffin in the Louvre, but it was immediately corrected to . On less definite grounds the British Museum coffin has been assigned to Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> by STEINDORFF, *op. cit.*, and MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 309, n. It has been left unassigned to any known king by WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 223; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, I, 221, and DARESSY in *Annales*, 1911, 65.

<sup>3</sup> BUDGE, *ibid.*, and PETRIE, *op. cit.*, 268.

<sup>4</sup> STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 86; BUDGE, *Guide to First and Second Egyptian Rooms*, 68, where bits of papyrus are also mentioned which everyone else has missed.

destroyed, or probably having been so badly prepared that it fell to pieces as all mummies of this date do, a later one was substituted by the Arabs who sold it. The bow and arrows, unless they too went to the British Museum, are lost. No mention is to be found of them except in Yanni's oft-times copied story.

The diadem eventually found its way into the collection of the Chevalier d'Anastasy<sup>1</sup> and thence to Leyden. It is of a form which had long been popular with the Egyptians—a "boatman's cirlet" —a ribbon tied around the brow and knotted with a pair of blossoms at the back of the head in a bow knot, the ends of which hang down behind<sup>2</sup>. On the forehead is the royal uraeus in gold; the ribbon is of silver decorated at intervals with stripes of three or four lines incised; the two flowers at the back were inlaid with plaques of dark blue and light green-blue glass. Boeser has shown that it had been added to in modern times, doubtless by those through whose hands it passed before d'Anastasy bought it. Along the edges there had been fixed rows of little faïence beads of different colours attached with thread to holes punched here and there in the original silver band. At irregular intervals between the rows of beads were thirty-one silver pendants with rings at top and bottom, inlaid with light blue, dark blue, and green glass. Boeser's idea was that the pendants were from a "broad" collar of the Middle Kingdom and the beads were of later date. Silver and glass, however, are two rare materials in Egypt before the Empire, and I should not hesitate to say that in this case the similarity of colours, material and workmanship between the pendants and the cirlet itself, are sufficient grounds for assigning the pendants, at least, to a "broad" collar which the mummy of the king would undoubtedly have worn. The threads having rotted and the whole thing having fallen to pieces, the Arabs simply embellished the cirlet with them.


The heart scarab<sup>4</sup> is of green jasper set on a plinth covered with gold. The beetle itself


<sup>1</sup> Athanasi knew nothing of its fate, but had heard it described. Leemans, on the strength of this description, and possibly on hearsay which he does not recount, recognized this diadem as one in the collection sold by d'Anastasy in 1828 to the Dutch Government. He so informed Tomlinson in a letter, which the latter published, and in his own writings invariably accepted this identity. It has always been adopted by subsequent students, and has every appearance of being correct. While d'Anastasy's agent Piccinini does not appear to have been living in Kurnah before Passalacqua's departure early in 1825, he certainly was in residence north of the "Mandara" on the Dirá' Abu'l-Nagá before March 1829 (CHAMPOLLION, *Lettres*, 1833, 178; NEWBERRY in *Annales*, 1906, 83). He may well have been purchasing at the time of the find of the Intef coffin and thus both the coffin and the diadem would have arrived in Leghorn in 1827—the first in Salt's collection, the second in d'Anastasy's. The point has considerable bearing on the story of the heart scarab.

<sup>2</sup> A similar cirlet is so labelled in the coffin of Hapi Ankhtifi in the Metropolitan Museum (12. 183. 11) and in two other instances quoted by MACE and WINLOCK, *Senebtisi*, 58. While I have translated *šsd hny* as "boatman's cirlet," I take this for a very archaic name, for all classes of men and women wear it from the O.K. and later. I should seek its origin in the white tapes sometimes worn about their hair by sailors (*Deir el Gebrawi*, I, Pl. IV; REISNER, *Boats*, 61, 99). Gentlemen fishing or hunting in the marsh frequently are shown with a ribbon or an actual cirlet about their hair (*Deir el Gebrawi*, I, Pls. III, V, VI; *Musée égypt.*, III, Pl. XXXVI).

<sup>3</sup> Descriptions are given by LEEMANS, *op. cit.*, and *Description raisonnée*, 66 (illustrated in *Mon. égypt. du Musée à Leide*, II, Pl. XXXIV) and Prisse copying him in *Rev. Arch.*, 1847, 710; but far better in BOESER in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1908, 30, and *Egypt. Versammlung te Leiden*, III, 8, Pls. XVIII and XXII. Mentioned by WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 224; STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 86; MEYER, *Geschichte*, § 309 n.; WEILL, *op. cit.*, 363; JEQUIER, *Mem. Inst. Français*, 1921, 45.

<sup>4</sup> The best description (with illustration) of the heart scarab is by HALL, *Cat. of Scarabs in B.M.*, No. 211, where he makes the extremely good point that the evidence of the scarabs appears to be in favour of placing

has a human face. The gold covering of the base has a beaded line around the edge of the beetle and into it on bottom and sides are impressed sentences from the Book of the Dead, to be recited for the Osiris King Sebekemsaf, Triumphant, 

. The bird signs are legless. The scarab was sold with the coffin, and with it passed into the Salt and British Museum collections, but all the information which Yanni Athanasi could obtain was that it "was placed on the breast of the mummy without having, as is usual, any ornament attached to it."

Naturally one hesitates to accept the story of a scarab of a dead King Sebekemsaf on the mummy of a King Intef, or the historical conclusions which might be drawn from it<sup>1</sup>. In fact the point involved makes another excursion into the Kurnah of a hundred years ago worth while, to see what we can make out of the probabilities of the case.

Yanni Athanasi, long established in Kurnah as Salt's agent, bought the coffin found by the natives early in 1827, its faked-up mummy and the heart scarab; Piccinini, lately arrived as d'Anastasy's agent, seems to have bought the faked-up diadem, and both purchases arrived in Leghorn in the latter part of the same year. The Salt collection was largely of Theban origin, but d'Anastasy's had been formed for the most part in Saqqarah, and it is probable that what little he had from Thebes was brought together by Piccinini in the short interval between his arrival in Kurnah, about 1826, and the shipment which was made in 1827. Now among this Theban material there was, in addition to the diadem of Intef, the canopic box of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf<sup>2</sup> and the *rishi* coffin of a certain Menthunakht<sup>3</sup>. This last was fixed up for sale exactly as the Intef coffin had been. As a substitute for the badly preserved mummy of Menthunakht, there was provided a later and more durable one with wreaths and a wooden panel, and beside it were placed an incongruous terra-cotta figure and a hawk. The shawabti figure of a woman named Kamose, put into the coffin, and a remarkably well-preserved wooden lyre<sup>4</sup>, may, of course, be from Menthunakht's tomb. Arguing from Piccinini's short residence in Thebes, the tombs of King Sebekemsaf and of Menthunakht must have been found just about the time of the discovery of the Intef tomb. Judging from the mummy-substituting it would almost seem that the same gang must have made all three finds which they purposely divided between Piccinini and Athanasi. "The custom which prevails among the Arabs of their selling separately, and to different persons, objects of antiquity found together," complains Yanni, "is really to be lamented. It arises from their wish to conceal from the chief of their village the riches they possess."

the Sebekemsafs and Intefs in the Seventeenth Dynasty rather than in the Thirteenth Dynasty before the Sebekhotps. The scarab has received mention by all those who have touched on the find of 1827—Athanasi, Tomlinson, Leemans, Prisse, Birch, and Steindorff in the articles already quoted. See also RHIND, *Thebes*, 105; WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 276; BUDGE, *History*, III, 125; *3rd and 4th Egypt. Rooms*, 217; NEWBERRY in *P.S.B.A.*, 1902, 289; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 75, n. 1; and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 363, 383. See also below, page 268, under Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf. A scarab of the period of Kamose, or a little later, was found in the Birabi by LANSING (*Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, Suppl., May, 1917, fig. 21), similar to the scarab proper here, but lacking the plinth.


<sup>1</sup> See Weill, among others.


<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 268.

<sup>3</sup> BOESER, *Egypt. Verzameling te Leiden*, III, 3, Pl. VIII. BORCHARDT in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1894, 115, n. 1, is undoubtedly right in his description of the faking done by the Arabs in this case.

<sup>4</sup> BOESER, *op. cit.*, 7, Pl. XXII, believes that the lyre has been restored with pieces from a number of different sources. Lansing's contemporary lyre (*Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, Suppl., May 1917, 22) shows, however, that the Leiden lyre is absolutely authentic.

The probabilities therefore are obvious. The British Museum would seem to have received the coffin of Intef and the heart scarab of Sebekemsaf, and Leyden the diadem of the former<sup>1</sup> and the canopic box of the latter. However, the probabilities are equally strong that the tombs of Nubkheperrē Intef and Sekhemrē-Wazkhou Sebekemsaf were found by these Arabs near each other, from which it would follow that the kings themselves should stand close together in the chronicle.

Mariette discovered the tomb of a  in January 1860—practically simultaneously with the tomb of Nubkheperrē and therefore probably near it and possibly of the same date. From it he got the form for a mirror handle, two toilet vases and a magic wand<sup>2</sup>. No other antiquities from the graves of the courtiers who might have been buried around the King's tomb have been recognized so far as I am aware, unless we accept as such a soft, blue paste pendant in the form of a lion's head with the king's name

between uraei , procured by Drovetti in Thebes in the days of Athanasi and Piccinini<sup>3</sup>. Scarabs with a similar design are not uncommon and some of them may well have come from this cemetery, but so far as I know there is no information concerning them<sup>4</sup>.



Nubkheperrē Intef's queen—"The Great Royal Wife who has assumed the Beautiful White Crown, Sebekemsaf"—came from an Edfu family of royal descent and was buried there among her own ancestors, doubtless with her own immediate retainers beside her. Her tomb was repaired in the days of Queen Ahhotp and was found again and plundered by the natives of Edfu about twenty-five years ago. It naturally lies outside the scope of this paper<sup>5</sup>.





<sup>1</sup> Newberry suggests to me that Yanni's statements about the diadem should not be taken too confidently, and that the diadem as well as the scarab may have come from the tomb of Sebekemsaf. This is quite possible, but as no historical conclusions are affected by adhering to the old view that the diadem was Intef's, it seems preferable to let it stand.

<sup>2</sup> All in Cairo. See BÉNÉDITE, *Miroirs*, 44102; BISSING, *Steingefässe*, 18079, 18154; DARESSY, *Textes magiques*, 9437.

<sup>3</sup> In the B.M. (Slade Collection); figured in NESBITT, *Glass—South Kensington Art Handbooks*, 1888, 10; mentioned by BIRCH, *Egypt. Antiquities, Alnwick Castle*, 179; WILKINSON, *Egyptians*, II, 142; PETRIE, *History*, I, 273.


<sup>4</sup> Listed and one figured in PETRIE, *op. cit.*, 270, fig. 166.

<sup>5</sup> ENGELBACH, *Annales*, 1922, 116, publishes a fragment of a stela from Edfu made for an unknown man and his wife the  among whose children were two daughters 

 and . The well-known stela from Edfu recounting the restoration of the tomb of Queen Sebekemsaf is best in LACAU, *Stèles du Nouvel Empire*, 34009, and SETHE, *Urk. des 18. Dyn.*, 29, translations 16. NEWBERRY in *P.S.B.A.*, 1902, 285, published a pendant from Edfu of workmanship similar to the heart scarab above, bearing the names of King Intef and Queen Sebekemsaf, the King being recognized as Nubkheperrē from the spelling of the name  by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 372, n. 2. Also there have recently been published—but doubtless from the same source—a ring of  and spacers from an armlet bearing the full names of King Nubkheperrē Intef and Queen Sebekemsaf, exhibited by Perrins in the Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Ancient Egyptian Art*, 1922, 18, Pl. L. There is little doubt but that all these monuments refer to the same queen. Not so certain is the head-rest of the Chief Accountant of a Queen Sebekemsaf, Reri by name (NEWBERRY, *op. cit.*, 289; BUDGE, *3rd and 4th Egypt. Rooms*, 1904, 70), which may have come either from Edfu or Thebes.









Canopic Box of Sekhemrē'-Wapma't Intef.

*In the Louvre.*




Canopic Box of Sekhemrē'-Wazkhau  
Sebekemsaf.

*In Leyden.*




Canopic Box of Sekhemrē'-Smentawi  
Dhout.

*In Berlin.*

(Pl. XV). It is one of those rare and refreshing objects that need give us no worries for its invocations of the gods are in favour of King Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> Intef-<sup>c</sup>o, both names written within one cartouche and the epithet "The Elder" usually given: 

It will have been noticed that in the clerk's transcription of the king's name from the stela or some other inscription at the tomb, into the Abbott Papyrus; in the cartouche on the pyramid apex; and again on the canopic box, this sovereign is always known as Intef-<sup>c</sup>o—"the Elder." This is an epithet totally lacking from all the monuments which can be definitely assigned to the other known Intefs of this period. However, it does appear

twice—, on a coffin in the Louvre which is closely similar to the one in the British Museum assigned above to Nubkheperrē<sup>c</sup>, and which, like this latter, nowhere gives a premen. This Louvre coffin, therefore, unless we are to accept the existence of a king named Intef "the Elder," who is otherwise unknown, may be logically assigned to Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup><sup>1</sup>.

This coffin may have been discovered with the canopic box between 1845 and 1849. In any case it is known to have come with the coffin of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Heruḥirma<sup>t</sup> Intef from a cache in the plain near the northern end of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ before 1854<sup>2</sup>. In that

in that collection, although he was very much interested in all royal names compounded with Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>. M. Bénédite, who most obligingly made long researches for me in the archives of the Louvre in 1916, found no mention of the box in the *livre d'entrée*, which contains the acquisitions since 1849, and in the *inventaire Napoléon III* of 1857 found it bearing the No. 491. Hence it seems certain that it was acquired by the Louvre before 1849, and by Clot Bey after 1846. It has received passing notice from PIERRET, *Cat. de la Salle historique*, 152, No. 614; PETRIE, *History*, I, 268; MASPERO, *Histoire*, I, 461, n. 2; STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 84, 86, 94; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, I, 220; MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 309 n., and most important: WEILL, *op. cit.*, 352, with copies of the inscriptions. The photograph on Plate XV is the first to be published. M. Bénédite is to be thanked for having had it taken for me.


<sup>1</sup> This attribution is that of STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 86; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, I, 220 (who by an error in his notes likewise assigns the other coffin in the Louvre to this King, quoting Pierret and Piehl); MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 309 n., and of WEILL, *op. cit.*, 357.

<sup>2</sup> That it came from Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ is stated by CHABAS, *Rev. arch.*, 1859, 269, who probably had Mariette's information. Hood, who excavated in Ḳurnah in 1857, labelled a necklace in his collection as found in that year in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ near the tombs of the Intef Kings. (The original label is still in Nettleham Hall, near Lincoln, England.) Since it was only on Feb. 1, 1860 that Mariette first wrote to Chabas of his projected excavations which eventually yielded the Eleventh Dynasty Intef I, and the obelisks of Nubkheperrē<sup>c</sup> Intef, there is little doubt that Chabas' and Hood's information was on the Louvre coffins—less likely that they were referring to the dig of 1827. BRUGSCH, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, 1879, I, 111, writes, evidently from memory: "At the foot of the western mountain...more than twenty years ago (writing in 1876), Arabs seeking for treasure brought to light two very simple coffins of these (Intef) pharaohs...lightly hidden under loose heaps of stones and sand. The cover was richly gilt and the band of hieroglyphics which occupied the middle of it, contained the name of Anentef. During my stay in Egypt in 1854...I had the good luck to discover, in the lumber-room of the residence of the Greek consul, the coffin of a second Anentef, which was distinguished by the surname of 'the Great' (Elder). This last coffin is now in the collection of the Louvre." Since the gilded coffin in the Louvre is that which bears the name Intef-<sup>c</sup>o, Brugsch's memory is clearly hazy in his description and, in view of the Chabas and Hood statements, I do not doubt that it was equally so when he named the finding-place as the 'Asâsif. For his 2nd English edition (1881, I, 131), Brugsch taxed his memory once more and mixed the Leyden circlet into the story. However, in view of the close association of Brugsch with Mariette and his chances to procure first hand information in 1854 and 1857 it seems safe to accept the essential point that the Louvre coffins were found buried in a *cache* in the rubbish. In the same *cache* were found Kamose in 1857 (see below, page 259) and Ahḥotp in 1859 (page 252).





each other is, I think, probable if it be admitted that the kings were brothers. That the first tomb appears to be south of the second in the Abbott Papyrus may have been due to the lie of the land, which made the inspectors take them out of order, or which upset the general north and south tendency of the necropolis. The case is repeated with the tombs of the Tacos below.



THE TOMB OF KING SEKHEMRÉ-SHEDTAWI SEBEKEMSAF.




The next tomb listed in the Abbott Papyrus<sup>2</sup> was :

The pyramid of King Sekhemrē-Shedtawi, L.P.H., Son of Rē, Sebekemsaf, L.P.H. It was found that the thieves had broken into it by mining into the lower chamber of its

pyramid,  from the outer hall of the tomb  of Nebamūn, The Overseer of the Granary of King Menkheperre (Tuthmosis III), L.P.H. The burial-place


 of the King was found void of its lord, as well as the burial-place of the Great Royal Wife, Nubkhas, L.P.H., his royal wife 



; the thieves having laid their hands upon them. The Vizier,

the nobles and the inspectors made an examination of it, and the manner in which the thieves had laid their hands upon the king and his royal wife was ascertained.

The news of the robbery was that night the common talk of Thebes<sup>3</sup>, but already the eight thieves had been taken into custody and examined "with a double rod," and the day after they were taken to the tomb to be re-examined on the scene of their crime<sup>4</sup>. The confession wrung from them at this last inquisition was taken down and recorded under the



was cut in the flank of the hill. As his Intef IV was Wahankh Intef I of the Eleventh Dynasty, buried in the plain north of the Seti Temple, his Intefs II and III were doubtless the Eleventh Dynasty Intef II and Mentuhotp I buried near by. It is essential to remember that Mariette and Brugsch both seem to have known that the Louvre Intef coffins were not found in tombs, but simply buried in the rubbish.

<sup>1</sup>  is invariably used to designate this tomb in the Abbott, Ambras and Amherst Papyri.









<sup>2</sup> Pap. Abbott, B. A.R., iv, par. 517, followed here except for rendering of *nfrw*.   
 was the "lowest" or "innermost" chamber of the tomb of Ramesses IV (GARDINER in *Journal*, 1917, 140, 143). Hence my translation rather than Breasted's "base," the less specialized meaning of *nfrw*.




<sup>3</sup> Pap. Abbott, B. A.R., iv, par. 528.





<sup>4</sup> Pap. Abbott, B. A.R., iv, par. 540.


title of "The examination of the pyramid of King Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi"  <sup>1</sup>, which was filed in the archives of the Necropolis together with "The inspection of the pyramids" (possibly the Abbott Papyrus), among "The writings with regard to the thieves, which were in the other jar." The catalogue of this particular jarful of documents exists to-day in the Ambras Collection<sup>2</sup>, and part of the document in which the thieves' confession was recorded is preserved in the Amherst Papyrus<sup>3</sup>.

An indefinite amount of this document is lost. Of the first surviving page, some four lines of the beginning are gone, and with them the thieves' description of their work of breaking into the king's burial-place where they found him resting. The existing part recounts how they broke into the chamber:

Of the Royal Wife Nubkhas, L.P.H. in the place of its outer wall  . It was roofed over and surrounded by.....ed with mortar, and covered with blocks<sup>4</sup> ..... ..... ..... . We penetrated them all, and found her resting likewise. We opened their sarcophagi  and the coffins  in which they were.


<sup>1</sup> Dr. Alan Gardiner puts everyone under a great debt by supplying the correct form of the name in Pap. Ambras which has long been misread. The trouble has been with the sign . Gardiner writes me that the form here used is familiar to him from late Ramesside papyri, though Möller has no corresponding type. At this period it tends to become triangular and when the loop is very small, as here, the shape may become like that of . He holds the reading of  here to be absolutely certain. It is perhaps worth while to list the previous readings in order to eliminate the entirely fictitious names which have crept into



our histories from them. Brugsch (see next note) read  "Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Aptawi," in which he was followed by NAVILLE in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1876, 112; by WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 277; by PETRIE, *History*, I, 233; and by GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 16. Erman read the name  "Merytawi." MEYER, *Geschichte*, pars. 300-1, read it  "Khutawi." PIEPER, *Könige*, 20 and 30, at first hesitated between "Khutawi" and "Aptawi" and then, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1913, 95, decided upon  "Hutawi."


Weill finally suggested  "Geregtawi." Brugsch, Naville, Meyer, Pieper, Weill, Erman and Ranke (*Aegypten*, 128), have all identified this king with No. 17 on fragments 76-78 of the Turin Papyrus, Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>.....tawi Sebekhotp. Wiedemann, Petrie, and Gauthier are, so far as I know, the only ones who have definitely refused to accept this identity. The elimination of this Sebekhotp from the Theban Necropolis is important historically.

<sup>2</sup> Gardiner most generously supplied me with a translation of the Ambras Papyrus which he had collated very carefully with the original in Vienna on two separate visits, finding a number of new readings. It was first published by BRUGSCH in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1876, 1 ff.; and later by VON BERGMANN, *Hieratische und Hieratisch-Demotische Texte*, viii-x, Pl. VI, and translated by ERMAN, *Aegypten*, 167 (English ed., 114). Its similarity to the other tomb-robbery documents was recognized by Brugsch, Erman, Breasted (*B. A.R.*, IV, par. 499 a), Weill (*op. cit.*, 306), and Peet (*Journal*, 1915, 174), where the perfectly plausible ground is taken that the unnamed king in whose sixth year it was dated was Ramesses X.

<sup>3</sup> NEWBERRY, *Amherst Papyri*, 25, Pl. V; *B. A.R.*, IV, par. 538.





<sup>4</sup> For  meaning gypsum for plaster or cement, see SPIEGELBERG in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1923, 51.

We found the august mummy of the king. He was equipped with a sword (?)  and there was a numerous set of amulets and ornaments of gold at his throat; his crown (?) and diadems of gold were on his head  and the entire august mummy of the king was overlaid with gold throughout. His coffins were wrought with gold and silver within and without and inlaid with every splendid costly stone. We stripped off the gold which we found on the august mummy of this god, and his amulets and ornaments which were at his throat, and the coffins wherein he rested. We found the Royal Wife likewise, and we stripped off all that we found on her also. We set fire to their coffins. We stole the furniture which we found with them, consisting of vases of gold, silver and bronze. We divided into eight parts the gold which we found on these two gods, on their mummies, their amulets, their ornaments, and their coffins.

From these accounts it is possible to get some idea of the tomb and its furnishings. The thieves were taken to identify "the pyramid of this god in which they located the burial-chambers"  and the burial-chamber is elsewhere called the "lower chamber of the pyramid," into which the thieves tunneled from a nearby tomb. In the confession there seem to have been two separate burial-chambers, one for the king and one for the queen, and this latter was broken into at the "outer wall," known already in the case of the pyramid of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>, through what would appear to have been a masonry lining. Evidently these burial-chambers were not in the superstructures of the tombs but were below them in the rock.

The king and the queen were each found resting in an outer sarcophagus and an inner anthropoid coffin<sup>2</sup>, the former probably something like that described in the case of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>; the latter of wood—for the thieves burnt them—covered with gold leaf like so many of the royal coffins of the period, and described as inlaid with semi-precious stones. So far as this last statement is concerned it is true that in the Twelfth Dynasty and again at the outset of the Eighteenth Dynasty gilded coffins were inlaid<sup>3</sup>, but no coffins of the period between the Middle Kingdom and the Empire so wrought, have survived. Is it possible, therefore, that those of Sebekemsaf and Nubkhas were more gorgeous than any others of their time, or are we not justified in a suspicion that the clerk who transcribed the

<sup>1</sup> *Amherst Papyri*, Pl. VI, line 8.

<sup>2</sup> This distinction between  and  appears in Papyrus Abbott, Pl. IV, 3. The determinative  is applied to a sarcophagus described as of alabaster (see below, page 266) and may therefore be merely a survival from the writing of an archaic word. In , literally "covering" but here meaning "coffin," we have another archaic word which must go back with this meaning to the early Middle Kingdom. I have already shown (MACE and WINLOCK, *Senebtisi*, 54) that when the anthropoid coffin was first developed it was looked upon simply as an "envelope" or "covering" and its decoration designed with this in view. Here in the Twentieth Dynasty we find the old word "covering" still used to describe what was now a highly developed "coffin," unquestionably anthropoid in shape.

<sup>3</sup> In the Twelfth Dynasty, MACE and WINLOCK, *op. cit.*, 41 and 46 and frontispiece; in the Eighteenth Dynasty the coffins of Ahmose I and most of his successors, DARESSY, *Cercueils des cachettes royales*, passim.

confession of the thieves was none too interested in rendering it verbatim, and threw in here and there a stock literary phrase to be in keeping with his ideas of what a Pharaoh should have had ?

The mummies themselves were bedecked with gold amulets and collars. On the king's head there were diadems, such as the Arabs found on the head of King Intef. In his coffin beside him lay his sword, and we remember the bows and arrows of Intef, and shall meet daggers on 'Akhor, Kamose and Ahhotp, and swords found by Lansing<sup>1</sup>. Finally there were vases of gold and silver and bronze. The confession of the thieves and the findings of the committee both declare that all this furniture was completely destroyed or was divided up among the robbers, and it can hardly be expected, therefore, that any of the objects buried with either the king or the queen could have survived to find their way into any modern collections<sup>2</sup>.

For the location of the tomb we have a suggestion in the Abbott Papyrus. The inspectors coming south along the plain visited it after Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> and Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> Intef and before the Sekenenre<sup>c</sup> and Kamose tombs. This would put it about the middle of the east face of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ.

There is a very tantalising statement of Mariette's that he had found the tombs of the Kings Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef and Sebekemsaf cut in the flanks of a hillock, to the west of the plain<sup>3</sup>. He never amplified this statement, and we are left in a complete quandary when we try to fathom exactly what was in his mind. Hence Weill believes that Mariette's Sebekemsaf tomb was purely imaginary<sup>4</sup>. Very ingeniously he reconstructs the story. In 1860 Mariette discovers the tomb from which the Arabs had extracted the Intef coffin in 1827; he recalls that in it were found objects bearing both the names of Intef and Sebekemsaf; in his notes he records a tomb of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef and Sebekemsaf, and later by mistake transcribes the entry as the two tombs of Intef and of Sebekemsaf and announces his discovery of such. But while Mariette was perfectly well aware that the Intef coffins all came from the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, and from Prisse's article of 1847 may have been familiar with the find of 1827, he could scarcely have identified the 1827 tomb as that of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef, for it will be recalled that no object then discovered bore that prenom. On the contrary he was thinking of the Abbott Papyrus which had recently been translated by Birch and given to the French public by Chabas. He believed that it contained information which would lead him to the discovery of the royal tombs, and with this idea in view he put his men to work<sup>5</sup>. He had noted the mention in the papyrus of the tomb of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> and had himself actually found it. If he mentions a Sebekemsaf tomb, it must have been because he thought he had found the Sebekemsaf tomb of the papyrus, which was, of course, the tomb of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi. I think the context of his letter to the Vicomte de Rougé makes this evident, and yet we are no better off. Granted that Mariette found a tomb somewhere near that of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef which he took for that of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf, we are still in the dark as to whether he actually

<sup>1</sup> *Bull. Met. Mus. Art.*, 1917, Suppl., May. For 'Akhor, Kamose and Ahhotp see below.

<sup>2</sup> This would not apply to a stela of course, and it has frequently been supposed that the stela of a Queen Nubkhas in the Louvre (C 13) belonged to this queen, but it is practically certain from the invocations and the nature of the monument that it came from Abydos.


<sup>3</sup> MARIETTE in *Lettre à M. de Rougé, Rev. arch.*, 1860, II, 28; DESJARDINS in *Rev. gén. de l'architecture*, 1860, col. 121.

<sup>4</sup> WEILL, *op. cit.*, 363.



<sup>5</sup> MARIETTE, *ibid.*, 26 and 27; VASSALLI, *Monumenti istorici*, 132-3.




had sufficient evidence, other than its position, to assign it to a Sebekemsaf, and if so, to this one<sup>1</sup> rather than to Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhou Sebekemsaf, who was probably buried near Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>.

The possible rediscovery of the tomb in 1898-9 is better documented<sup>2</sup>. On this occasion the Northampton Expedition, working on the lower slopes of the eastern spurs of the Dirā' Abu'l-Nagā, found an early Eighteenth Dynasty tomb (No. 146 in the present numbering) in which there were cones, a slab with ushabtis and a fragment of a stela of a certain  Nebamūn and his wife Suitnub. Also cones were found of a Nebamūn, Scribe of the Corn Accounts and Overseer of the Granary of Amūn. From one corner of the rear chamber of the tomb a plunderer's tunnel led under the ruins of a small brick pyramid on the hill above. So many of the circumstances agree with the Abbott Papyrus that Newberry and Spiegelberg did not hesitate to announce the discovery of the Pyramid of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf<sup>3</sup>.

The coincidences here are certainly striking, but there is a hesitation in my mind in accepting this theory, plausible as it seems at first. While agreeing that the location is very much what would be expected, I should like to see a stronger chain of evidence for the identification of this particular pyramid. The links, which are more or less weak, are: (1) Even if the scattered antiquities found around the tomb were sufficient to identify it absolutely as that of a Nebamūn and his wife Suitnub, the cones bearing the title

 have nothing definite to link their Nebamūn with the former, who was a . On the contrary these cones were quite possibly strays from Tomb 231,

less than 100 yards away, which bears the name of Nebamūn the .


(2) Even if the Northampton tomb be that of a Nebamūn, Scribe of the Corn Accounts and Overseer of the Granary of Amūn, still the name and title are so common<sup>4</sup> that the discrepancy in the latter (Overseer of the Granary of Amūn instead of the Granary of Tuthmosis III) weakens the case that this is the Nebamūn of the Papyrus. (3) The authors miss the point that the papyrus describes the tunnel as going from the outer chamber, and not "from the innermost chamber of the tomb," as they translate and as they found to be


<sup>1</sup> DARESSY in *Annales*, 1912, 65, believes Mariette actually found the Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi tomb and that from it had come the Leiden canopic-box. See further below under Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhou Sebekemsaf.


<sup>2</sup> NORTHAMPTON, etc., *Theban Necropolis*, 4 and 13.


<sup>3</sup> MASPERO in *Revue critique*, 1908, 101-3, accepts without question the authors' statement that this Nebamūn lived under Tuthmosis III; he notices no discrepancy in his titles, and agrees that the pyramid above was the tomb of Sebekemsaf. WEILL, *op. cit.*, 391, concurs. DARESSY, *ibid.*, does not agree, as he believes the tomb had already been found by Mariette and seems to take it for granted that it was a hemispeos and not a pyramid.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the Northampton cone and Tomb 231, a very little research supplied me with four other Nebamūns who were accountants of corn and were buried in Thebes. The original occupant of




Tomb 65 was Nebamūn  and the occupant of Tomb 179 was Nebamūn




 (GARDINER and WEIGALL, *Catalogue of Tombs*). DARESSY, *Mém. Miss. fran.*, VIII, gives a

cone of a Nebamūn  (No. 47) and N. de G. Davies has another in his collection


(No. 329) of a Nebamūn .



the case in the tunnel from their tomb to their pyramid. It is a pity that no attempt could have been made to excavate the pyramid and so to verify the hypothesis, for it must be admitted that even if this was not the tomb of Sebekemsaf, that tomb must have been somewhere in the general vicinity<sup>1</sup>.

Of the cemetery of the contemporary nobles, which was presumably in the vicinity of the royal tomb, some traces were found in the last years of the nineteenth century. At that time the Arabs of Kurnah brought to light a small limestone "obelisk"<sup>2</sup> or stela which probably had stood in front of the door of the tomb of a certain Sebekhotp to whom it was presented by the King . Sebekhotp was a scribe in the temples of Sebek, Anubis and Khonsu; he was the son of the Temple-Scribe Sebeknekht and the  Sebekhotp; his wife was the  Iuhetib, and his son the Temple-Scribe Anpunakht.

A stela<sup>3</sup> of this reign—or of the succeeding reign—bears the very garbled inscriptions of a chancellor  Mentuhotp. His father would seem to have been manager of the estates of a Queen Nubkhas who may well be the wife of Sekhemrê-Shedtauw Sebekemsaf, when the titles, the names, and the provenance of this stela are considered. Mentuhotp's father was the "Royal Son," Chancellor, Steward of the Royal Possessions of Nubkhas, Khenems called Nebui  and his mother the Princess  Sebekemsaf.








In recent years the natives have found a number of crude monuments said to come from the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, probably from tombs of this reign. N. de Garis Davies has presented to the Metropolitan Museum a piece of a private grave stela dating from the reign of




 and the fragment of a small limestone pedestal or shrine on which

<sup>1</sup> This is the heart of the cemetery of the Twelfth to Eighteenth Dynasties and every excavation here has yielded antiquities earlier than Tuthmosis III; *viz.* Bouriant in 1886 (*Rev. Trav.*, 1888, 93 ff.); NEWBERRY and SPIEGELBERG in 1898-9 (*Theban Necropolis*, 13 ff., 30 ff.); and CARNARVON and CARTER in 1912-13 (*Journal*, III, Pl. XIX). The Northampton Expedition found such characteristic Seventeenth Dynasty names as: Teti, Teti-Intef, Teti-an, Tetinefer, Tetiseneb, Neferhotp, Renseneb, Iafib, Tehuti, and most frequently Ahmose, with individuals of this last name bearing the titles  and . Brick pyramids in the neighbourhood seen by Bonomi in 1830 are listed by NEWBERRY in *Annales*, 1906, 83-4; a number appear on Carter's map in *Journal*, III, Pl. XIX. PASSALACQUA describes others in *Cat. raisonné*, 191. The reader must be warned, however, that at least those on the "Bowaba" are of Empire date.

<sup>2</sup> A small wedge-shaped object with reliefs on all four sides, like the stumpy little "obelisks" from the forecourts of Memphite mastabas. See the note on the obelisks of Nubkheperre. The present "obelisk" is now in the British Museum, No. 1163, for which it was acquired shortly before 1896. See CRUM in *P.S.B.A.*, 1896, 272; BUDGE, *History*, III, 127 and figure; *Guide*, 1909, 223, Pl. XXIX; *Guide Sculpture*, 81, no. 280; *Hieroglyphic Texts in B.M.*, IV, 8 and Pls. 18-21; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 74 and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 402.

<sup>3</sup> Purchased in Luxor, March 1882, for the collection of the Baron Weisz in Kalacz, Hungary. Published by WIEDEMANN in *P.S.B.A.*, 1887, 191; quoted by GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 77 and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 373, and 405. Another stela in the same collection, approximately of the same date and possibly of the same provenance, is published by WIEDEMANN, *ibid.*, and mentioned by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 394.

there is shown the  |  |  making offerings to Amenrē<sup>c</sup> and probably to Ptah and Horus. Of similar workmanship and doubtless from the same region is another fragment—in this case half of a stela<sup>1</sup>—found in Thebes and now in Graz—showing a King Sebekemsaf  |  |  offering to Ptah-Sokaris, and it will be recalled that Petrie found a small scrap of a similar stela under the Nebunenef Chapel on which there had been represented a King Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>.....  adoring Amenrē<sup>c</sup><sup>2</sup>.




Among the objects, doubtless from Thebes, which may have come from the tomb of a courtier of the period, is a very fine, dark green basalt scarab, with a gold plaque beneath on which is inscribed  |  |  surrounded by a linear ornament, interesting from its suggestion of the heart scarab described above under the tomb of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef<sup>3</sup>. That it came from the tombs of either of the two Kings Sebekemsaf seems improbable. It could hardly have survived the ancient plundering of the tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi in the Twentieth Dynasty, and it is inconceivable that it could have remained unknown for seventy years or more, if it had come from the tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau, found by the Arabs in 1827.

THE TOMB OF KING SE[NAKHT]ENRĒ<sup>c</sup> TA'Ō I—THE ELDER.



Picking up again the thread of the Abbott Papyrus inspection, we find the committee passing from the tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf southwards to :

The pyramid of King Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup>, L.P.H., Son of Rē<sup>c</sup> Ta'Ō, L.P.H. Examined on this day by the inspectors, it was found to be uninjured.

The pyramid of King Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup>, L.P.H., Son of Rē<sup>c</sup>, Ta'Ō-Ō, L.P.H., making in all two Kings Ta'Ō, L.P.H.,  |  | . II. Examined on this day by the inspectors, it was found uninjured<sup>4</sup>.

Probably no point in the Tomb Robbery documents has led to such a diversity of interpretations as these two entries recounting the inspection of the tombs of two Kings "Sekenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta'Ō." The papyrus is explicit. Two pyramids were examined, both of kings


<sup>1</sup> VON BISSING, *Ancient Egypt*, 1914, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Already mentioned on page 218, n. 3 as evidence of the extent of the Necropolis. See PETRIE, *Qurneh*, 12, Pl. XXX.


<sup>3</sup> NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. X, 24. Now in the Carnarvon Collection from the Hilton Price Collection (*Catalogue*, 27, no. 187; SOTHEBY, *Sales Catalogue*, Pl. XXII, no. 960). It has been described as from the tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau by PETRIE (*History*, I, 235) and BUDGE (*History*, III, 126, n. 1). WELL, *op. cit.*, 385, classes it as indeterminate; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 75, as Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi.

<sup>4</sup> Abbott Pap., Pl. III, 8-11, B. A.R., IV, pars. 518-19.

whose prenomens were "Seḳenenrē," the first bearing the personal name





Taḳo, and the second



Taḳo-ḳo: "Taḳo the Elder." Even the scribe

himself emphasized the strangeness of the circumstance by recording after the second: "making in all two Kings Taḳo." To suppose that the committee did not visit two tombs would entail an alteration of the total of the tombs examined<sup>1</sup>. Pesiur in his original information probably designated ten tombs<sup>2</sup>; ten, the inspectors reported upon, and we have no justification for supposing that they falsified the list. In short, the examination included two tombs of Kings Taḳo, both said to bear the prenomen "Seḳenenrē."

But this does not finish the complication. While one of these names is Taḳo and the other Taḳo-ḳo, monuments are known with a third variant, Taḳo-ḳen borne by a King Seḳenenrē, and hence most historians have either admitted the possibility, or insisted on the fact, of the existence of three kings, all bearing the prenomen Seḳenenrē, with the personal names Taḳo, Taḳo-ḳo and Taḳo-ḳen. For the student struggling through the mazes of the literature the irreconcilable disagreement among the historians so far as concerns the division of the existing antiquities among these kings, causes the conviction that where so little is clear something is wrong<sup>3</sup>.

In the first place the epithets  "the Elder" and  "the Brave" in two of the variant forms of Taḳo are not integral parts of the name<sup>4</sup>. The scribe leaves us no doubt of that when he writes "which makes two kings Taḳo" although he has just called one Taḳo-ḳo. Furthermore we are familiar with Intef-ḳo, and Amenhotp "Prince of Thebes" and a host of other cases of such epithets which can be picked out at will from any Book of Kings.

In the second place while many kings in a single dynasty may bear the same personal name, of which every period of Egyptian history popularized but a limited number, the epithets of the Sun-god were even more numerous than the ninety-nine names of Allâh, and there was no difficulty in finding a new one for each succeeding king. This was all the more necessary because the kings were not identified by ordinals as we identify Tuthmosis I, II, III and IV, but by these distinctive prenomens. In consequence, it may be said that no dynasty presents within itself a single case of duplication of prenomens, although many, if not most, do assuredly present a series of solar names obviously imitative<sup>5</sup>—for example those formed on a Se-X-enrē model.

The case for two or more kings Seḳenenrē succeeding one another in the Seventeenth Dynasty is thus untenable<sup>6</sup>, and yet the Abbott Papyrus calls for two tombs. Burchardt admits this fact and offers in explanation of the evident error involved in the names, the very clever suggestion that the scribe, carelessly glancing over an inscription, finds the name of Seḳenenrē Taḳo and records it as that of the occupant of one of the tombs, while as a

<sup>1</sup> As suggested by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 165.

<sup>2</sup> See below, page 265.

<sup>3</sup> WEILL, *op. cit.*, 160 ff., should be consulted for the intricacies of this question.

<sup>4</sup> Recognized by MASPERO, *Struggle of the Nations*, II, 76, n. 2, 78, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> So also BURCHARDT in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1912, 21, quoting Pieper.

<sup>6</sup> This difficulty was seen by BIRCH in *Rev. arch.*, 1859, 271 who begged the question. WEILL, *op. cit.*, 164, 233, and BURCHARDT in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1912, 120 (and BURCHARDT and PIEPER, *Königsnamen*, 53, no. 275) came to the conclusion independently that there was but one Seḳenenrē, but they do not suggest there were two kings Taḳo.

matter of fact it was not that of the occupant, but merely a name mentioned for some reason in the texts. In spite of the plausibility of this idea and the force of the similar case cited by Burchardt, I feel that it fails to take into consideration the formal nature of the inspection. The tombs for examination were not selected at random. A certain tomb was called for at this point and the inspectors would have searched it out *by name* and not have taken any chance tomb to which they might give any name that cropped up.

To return to the scribe's statement: "which makes two kings Ta<sup>co</sup>." Notice this is not two Kings Se<sup>kenenre</sup>. The accusation of Pesiur may well have included the tombs of two Kings Ta<sup>co</sup> and two tombs built by two kings of the same personal name would not be at all unusual of course. The evident error in the records would thus be limited to one of the prenomens, and that could easily be made if we suppose both of these prenomens were of the Se-X-enr<sup>e</sup> type.

An error was certainly made over Ahmose-Sapair and probably another at the tomb of Shuroi. A third slip, involving only a couple of hieratic characters here, need not be surprising. The inspectors are guided to the little tombs of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ listed in Pesiur's accusation. As many of the party as possible poke around looking for thieves' holes in the narrow chambers, while one of them checks the names and titles from the obelisks, the stela, the door-jambs or any other inscription he can find, and another writes them down from dictation. Finally the result of the inspection is announced by one of the responsible officials and recorded. The field-notes with all the details are taken back to the city and eventually transcribed into the formal document we possess in the Abbott Papyrus. In the dictation, in the recording, and in the copying there are three chances for the slip which has caused all the confusion. The scribe himself seems to have noticed it and to have felt a little dubious of his record when he recorded the fact that there were two Ta<sup>co</sup>'s, for he made no such entry of the fact that there were three Intefs inspected.

Since so far as the personal name Ta<sup>co</sup> goes there can be no valid question, and since historically it would be impossible to put the Se-X-enr<sup>e</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup> "the Elder" after Se<sup>kenenre</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup>, who is but narrowly separated from Ahmose I, we arrive at a King Se-X-enr<sup>e</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup> I, "the Elder," followed by Se<sup>kenenre</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup> II. This order, it is true, is reversed in the itinerary of the inspectors, but we may explain the fact exactly as the same reversal was explained in the case of Intef the Elder and his brother Intef, above. The two tombs were probably so close together and the lie of the land was such, that either the inspectors or the original builders disregarded the trend of the Necropolis from north to south—a trend which after all was only a general one. If this were true—that Ta<sup>co</sup> I and Ta<sup>co</sup> II were buried side by side—then we may reasonably carry the assumption a step further and consider that the one succeeded immediately after the other.


These assumptions lay the foundation for correcting the scribal error in the Abbott Papyrus. The name of Senakhtenr<sup>e</sup> is excellently authenticated as that of a king buried in the Necropolis and venerated long afterwards as one of the immediate ancestors of the Eighteenth Dynasty<sup>1</sup>, and I would suggest that this Senakhtenr<sup>e</sup> was Ta<sup>co</sup> I, "the Elder," the father of Se<sup>kenenre</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup> II and grandfather of Ahmose I. The emendation in the Abbott Papyrus is thus merely the substitution of the syllable *nakht*, "strong," for *ken*, "brave."

If this chain of assumptions, which has made of Senakhtenr<sup>e</sup> Ta<sup>co</sup> I the grandfather of


<sup>1</sup> Above, p. 221, and especially DARESSY in *Rec. Trav.*, 1892, 146.

Ahmose I, be found acceptable, its corollary follows automatically. He was the husband of that Queen Tetisheri who was Ahmose's grandmother.

A Queen Tetisheri is named in five early Eighteenth Dynasty documents: a stela showing her officiating at the dedication of a temple with Ahmose I; a list of farms including one which was given her in Lower Egypt after the Hyksos wars; the bandages from her mummy; two statues from her tomb, and the memorial stela set up in her honour in Abydos. That these objects all name the same Tetisheri we need not doubt. Teti names were remarkably popular at this time, but "Little Teti" is a homely enough name to have an uncommon ring for a queen, and we are probably right in supposing that there was but one who bore it<sup>1</sup>.

Tetisheri was the first of that redoubtable line of heiresses and dowagers who dominated the Eighteenth Dynasty down to its end. She was by origin a commoner—"the Royal Mother Tetisheri born of the Mistress of the House and conceived by the Honourable Thenna,"<sup>2</sup> and perhaps it is for this reason that her name does not appear in the lists of the Lords of the West who were worshipped generations later as the ancestors of the imperial line. However, she was a reigning queen in her day. Since she was called simply "royal mother" on three of her monuments—the temple dedication stela, her tomb statues and her grave-clothes—Weill<sup>3</sup> has insisted that she was not married to a king, arguing that she only bears the title "Great Royal Wife"  on the Abydos stela, which was a posthumous monument erected by grandchildren, whose self-interest would have dictated an unjustified attribution of rank to her. But the reasoning, I feel, is without merit. Weill was not aware that Tetisheri survived into the reign of Ahmose<sup>4</sup>, and that there is thus little to choose among her monuments so far as priority of date goes. Furthermore he forgets that Ahhotp, the mother of Ahmose I, was a king's daughter<sup>5</sup> and that Tetisheri, Ahmose's grandmother, must therefore have been a king's wife. If her grandchildren called her simply King's Mother, it was probably because throughout the later years of her lifetime she was regarded as the Queen Mother *par excellence*, with little thought for her shadowy husband, dead three reigns back.

An abbreviated genealogical table will give at a glance the hypotheses advanced thus far :



Tetisheri survived to be buried by her grandson Ahmose, perhaps near his own tomb, and to that extent may be said to be inappropriate to this study of the Seventeenth

<sup>1</sup> The statue of a *man*, Tetisheri son of Neferhotp, was found in the Dirâ' Abu'l Nagâ by Bouriant in 1885. See BORCHARDT, *Statuen und Statuetten*, No. 256, where it is dated M.K. It is, more probably, Eighteenth Dynasty.

<sup>2</sup> From the bandages, DARESSY in *Annales*, 1908, 137.

<sup>3</sup> WEILL, *op. cit.*, 148, 166, 540, 804. On "Royal Mother" as the title of a commoner, but a king's second wife, see SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 1 and 65.


<sup>4</sup> Shown by the temple dedication stela in the Petrie Collection, and the farm list in Cairo; WINLOCK, *Ancient Egypt*, 1921, 14.

<sup>5</sup> On the Karnak stela, see below, page 250, note 4.












Coffin of Sekenenrē Ta'o II.  
*In Cairo.*



Coffin of Queen Ahhotp I.  
*In Cairo.*

much as covered the uraeus, the hawk heads on the necklace, the vulture on the chest, and the name of the god Ptah Sokaris—emblems of divinity which superstition imbued with the power to strike dead the sacrilegious. Since the professional thieves do not seem to have been deterred by any such scruples in the tomb of Sebekemsaf, we cannot be far wrong in laying so discriminating a bit of thievery to the priests themselves. Whatever qualms they may have had were set at rest and their guilt atoned by painting yellow the face and headdress they had despoiled of gold, by rewriting in red ink the inscriptions, and by daubing a necklace on the breast and streaks of blue about the eyes from which they had wrenched the metal frames. The rest of the lid was left covered with the white *gesso* from which they had scraped the gold leaf. Traces of the original incised inscription remain, however, and in them may be read the name of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt,





Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup>, Son of Rē<sup>c</sup>, Ta<sup>c</sup>o, the Brave  [o] <sup>1</sup>,  
the name given him in the Khabekhet list of Lords of the West.

It is conceivable, of course, that the king was buried absolutely without the equipment of the dead; but as he had been completely unwrapped and then hastily bundled up again, it may be that not only the gold from his coffin but his jewels and arms as well passed into the hands of the priests. It is interesting to note, in passing, that not a single object of intrinsic value was left upon any of the royal mummies by the time that they were put in the hiding-place in Dêr el-Baḥrî.

The mummy<sup>2</sup> of King Ta<sup>c</sup>o II shows him to have been fairly tall for an Egyptian (1.702 m.), with a large, typically Egyptian head, and the massive, muscular frame of a well-built, active man. He had thick, black, curly hair and was clean shaven. At death he was very little more than thirty years old. The theory that he was a Berber rests solely on the unsupported guess of Maspero<sup>3</sup>, inspired by the emaciated features of the mummy, a horrible caricature of a Berberine *bawwâb*.

The manner of his death has made Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> one of the romantic figures of Egyptian history. As Elliot Smith reconstructs the story from the wounds on the king's head, he was the victim of a surprise attack by two or more enemies who came upon him unaware as he lay asleep, or who sneaked up behind him and felled him with a thrust beneath his left ear by a dagger<sup>4</sup> which sank deep into his neck. So sudden was the attack that he never raised his hands to ward off their blows, which with axes, swords and clubs, they rained upon his face, crushing it in while he lay prostrate.

The preparation of the corpse for burial was hasty, the process of embalming most summary, and no attempt was made to lay the body out in orthodox position. It was left contorted as it lay in its death agony, with the head thrown back and bent to the left, with

<sup>1</sup> The premenen once has  for ; in the second cartouche  for  is written. Wiedemann's (*Geschichte*, 301) reading of the latter, long ago corrected by Maspero (*Momies royales*, 527), gave him his King Taaten. The *shawabti*-figures mentioned by Wiedemann (*ibid.*) I cannot trace.

<sup>2</sup> The original *procès verbal* drawn up at the unwrapping was published in the *Am. Jour. Arch.*, II, 331-2 and *Rec. Trav.*, 1886, pp. 179-80, and expanded in MASPERO, *Momies royales*, 526 ff., 770-2, with notes by Dr. Fouquet, 776. The most authoritative description is by ELLIOT SMITH, *Royal Mummies*, 61051, which will be followed wherever it contradicts Maspero and Fouquet.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 772. It figures largely in PETRIE, *History*, II, 4 and 9.




<sup>4</sup> Wound No. 5 which Elliot Smith calls a spear-thrust. It is more in keeping with the arms of the period to suppose that it was a dagger. A knife can be driven with terrific force—so as to transfix a man's vertebral column in fact—making a wound not to be distinguished from a spear stab.

the tongue clenched between the teeth, with the exuded brain not even wiped away from the wounds on the head, the legs partly drawn up, and the arms and hands contracted in their last convulsion. The viscera were removed through an incision in the abdomen, but the preservation of the body was left to aromatic sawdust only. In fact the body is to-day much in the condition of a dessicated Coptic mummy, fallen apart and riddled by worms.

Maspero, followed by Elliot Smith, surmised that the king was killed far from Thebes, presumably on the field of battle, and that the embalming on the spot was but a rudimentary process with no facilities at hand. Fouquet, followed by Petrie, supposed that the body putrified on the journey to Thebes, having received but little attention in the field, and that a further attempt at embalming was made on arrival home. This theory of death in battle, whether consciously or not, is inspired by the Sallier Papyrus tale which makes Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> an opponent of Apophis, the Hyksos king. There is no reason why it should not be true, but we should not neglect an alternative possibility.

First, the wounds make it quite possible that the king was set upon by assassins, rather than that he died in combat. Surely he was not facing the foe at any rate, and the circumstances would fit perfectly a palace murder. Secondly, the embalming is really no less efficacious than that of any other mummy of the period<sup>1</sup>. Of the hundreds discovered, scarcely any have been more than a heap of bones and dust. Mariette<sup>2</sup>, Carter and Lansing found none of private persons well-preserved, and of royal mummies we need only recall the Intef found by the Arabs in 1827, and Kamose found by Mariette, both of which fell to pieces immediately. Finally, the position of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup>'s body is a further argument against the theory that he was prepared for burial, either in the field or at home, by anyone who desired to do all the usual honours. Of course it is possible to draw a picture of a defeated Egyptian army, fleeing without the time even to compose the limbs of their slain chieftain, but equally well we can imagine a more sinister drama, and see here a body hastily bundled up while still in *rigor mortis*, preserving the attitude of the death agony, and with every look of the victim of an assassination, hurriedly got out of the way. Either story is possible, but in a court, I am sure, no jury would dare go beyond a verdict of "death at the hands of persons unknown."

The wife of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta<sup>c</sup>o II has been assumed to have been Aḥḥotp<sup>3</sup>. No existing monument states it unequivocally but there is excellent circumstantial evidence of the fact.

Aḥḥotp was the mother of Ahmose I ; the principal consort of a king , and the daughter of a king . On the


<sup>1</sup> ELLIOT SMITH, *op. cit.*, 2, points out that the process employed for Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> is identical with that used on the immediately succeeding royal mummies, except that it is more hasty.

<sup>2</sup> VASSALLI, *Mon. istorici*, 136, expressly says, "The embalming was very imperfect...In most cases we found only the skeleton wrapped in linen bandages."

<sup>3</sup> First suggested (on other grounds) by MASPERO, *Momies royales*, 625 ff.; *Histoire*, II, 78, and concurred in by practically all subsequent writers. Mariette, Wiedemann, and Maspero himself (*Enquête judiciaire*, 81), had previously suggested that Aḥḥotp was the wife of Kamose.


<sup>4</sup> The Mother of Ahmose: on the stela of Iuf from Edfu (bibliography in GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 164); and Royal Mother with Ahmose, on the stela from Karnak (GAUTHIER, *op. cit.*, 163) and the Temple of Buhen (MACIVER and WOOLLEY, *Buhen*, 87, Pl. 35). She is Great Wife of a King on the same monuments and on her coffin; and a daughter of a king on the Karnak Stela. I omit scarabs because of probable confusions with Aḥḥotp II, wife of Amenophis I.

statue of a Prince Ahmose, what are undoubtedly the names of his parents are



—“The Good God, Lord of the Two Lands Ta'co” and “the Great Royal Daughter who has assumed the Beautiful White Crown, Ahhotp.” Unless we are to make a third Ahhotp in addition to the two already known, this Ahhotp must have been the mother of Ahmose I, and this King Ta'co her husband, the Se'kenenrē' Ta'co II, who was of the generation immediately preceding Ahmose I<sup>2</sup>.

Ahhotp survived her husband—it has been suggested that she lived into the reign of Amenophis I or even into that of Tuthmosis I<sup>3</sup>. That she lived into the reign of Ahmose I is unquestionable. While Tetisheri appeared as the power behind the king on the Petrie Stela at the outset of the reign, Ahhotp filled that place, after Tetisheri's death presumably, on the Karnak Stela and at Buhen. But by the twenty-second year it was occupied by Nefretiri at Turah, and this third queen took precedence over all others until the coronation of Tuthmosis I. Without doubt the rise of Nefretiri at the end of the reign of Ahmose, followed only on the death of Ahhotp. This seems evident enough from the fact that Ahhotp was buried in the regalia given her by Kamose and Ahmose, and that no later king had any part in her funeral. There is I believe, however, a trace of her husband's provision for her funeral. The coffin of Queen Ahhotp<sup>4</sup> (Pl. XVI) is so similar to that of Se'kenenrē' Ta'co II—and so unlike those of Ahmose and his family—that we may safely conclude that the coffins of both husband and wife were made together<sup>5</sup>. Se'kenenrē'c's was soon used as

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 256. The unusual title “Great Daughter of a King” appears again on this statue, and the curious orthography of  on the contemporary statuette in the Louvre, *Salle historique*, No. 8.

<sup>2</sup> B. A.R., II, par. 7.

<sup>3</sup> According to the stela of Kares, a cenotaph was built for him in Year X, Amenophis I, by the Royal Mother Ahhotp. Since Ahhotp II, wife of Amenophis I, was not the mother of Tuthmosis I, it has been presumed that this “Royal Mother” must have been the still living Ahhotp I, by MASPERO, *Momies royales*, 627; PETRIE, *History*, II, 10; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 164; BREASTED, *History*, 252; B. A.R., II, par. 49, etc. But Ahhotp II was a “Royal Mother” (see her coffin, DARESSY, *Cercueils royales*, No. 61006) having earned the title in her husband's lifetime by bearing him an heir, exactly as Nefretiri earned it in the lifetime of Ahmose I (see the Tetisheri Stela from Abydos, above, and the Turah Inscription in SETHE, *Urk. der 18ten Dyn.*, 25). With this difficulty removed there remains no valid reason for doubting that Ahhotp I was buried by Ahmose, whose jewelry was the last she had received. Petrie, MASPERO, BUTTLES, *Queens of Egypt*, 47 and Gauthier, suppose that Ahhotp survived down to the reign of Tuthmosis I because Iuf of Edfu mentions her and Ahmose wife of Tuthmosis I only, from which they infer that he passed from service under the one to service under the other, immediately, without any intervening interval.

<sup>4</sup> The coffin is described and figured by BISSING, *Thebanischer Grabfund*, Pls. XI–XII. The head is shown in profile in MASPERO, *Struggles of the Nations*, 3, and a note given in reference to the headdress in MACE and WINLOCK, *Senebtisi*, 45. The photograph on Pl. XVI was taken for this article by Mr. Burton. The body of the coffin is now missing.

<sup>5</sup> The photographs on Pl. XVI cannot show how closely similar these two coffins must have been originally. The stripping of the gold from that of Ta'co II has changed its entire surface aspect, but an examination of the originals shows that both were covered with the same thin, greenish-yellow, gold leaf, and where they can be traced, the incised *rishi* designs and the necklaces are identical on both. The wood—some imported, coniferous species—and the carpentry of both are the same. Their forms differ only in that the man wears the *nemes* headdress of a king and the woman has feminine curls. Finally, the eyes of Ahhotp's coffin are set in frames of massive gold—a most unusual feature—and since the thieves found it worth while to steal those from the coffin of Ta'co II we may conclude that his were made in the same fashion.

a result of his sudden and violent death. That of the widow Ahhotp was saved and she was laid away in it only some score of years later in the reign of Ahmose.

As in the case of Tetisheri, the burial of Ahhotp does not belong to the Seventeenth Dynasty, strictly speaking, but there is ample reason for touching on it, nevertheless.

Mariette, as the direct result of his excavations for the Prince Napoléon, was made *ma'mûr* of Antiquities on July 4, 1858. The Khedive Said Pâshâ was delighted to be liberal and enlightened—so long as it cost him nothing out of pocket. While he gave Mariette full authority to draft the *fellahîn* without pay, he refused to supply the ready money for adequate supervision of the work and Mariette's assistant of the Serapeum days, Bonnefoi, was expected to direct, single-handed, all the widely scattered excavations in Upper Egypt. Mariette's one idea was to impress his patron with a comprehensive programme of work, and when Bonnefoi died almost immediately upon his arrival in his inspectorate, the impression on Said was still the great thing and the digs were pushed along without any supervision whatever<sup>1</sup>. In December 1858 a *convée* of 102 men was raised in Thebes, and Mariette set a gang of 20 working in the plain below the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ beside the mouth of the Valley of the Kings, close to the spot where he had found Kamose the year before, but a little nearer the hill<sup>2</sup>. It was an area that had escaped previous excavations, littered with broken pottery and stone which Mariette associated from past experience with *rîshi* coffins. There he left his work entirely undirected, turning up just such burials as he had expected, from the start<sup>3</sup>. On February 5, 1859, at a depth of some five or six metres in the surface-rubbish and sand, this gang found the coffin containing the mummy and jewelry of Ahhotp.

Théodule Déveria, on leave of absence from the Louvre, was with Mariette in Bûlâk at the time and a private letter of his, written on March 22, 1859, remains by so much the fullest account of the discovery that I can do no better than translate it<sup>4</sup>:

"M. Maunier, the French consular agent, notified of this discovery, sent to Mariette a copy of the inscription from the coffin, sufficiently legible for me to realize that this was the mummy of a Queen Ahhotp<sup>5</sup>. Mariette wrote to send it immediately to Bûlâk by special steamer, but unfortunately before the letter arrived the governor of the province had the

<sup>1</sup> MARIETTE in *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1859, 161; MASPERO, *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, 18, lxxxvii-xcvi, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> The site is located by MARIETTE, *ibid.*; DESJARDINS in *Rev. gén. de l'architecture*, 1860, col. 78; VASSALLI, *Monumenti istorici*, 127-8, 131. Carter has heard a tradition in Kurnah that the site was near Tomb 155.

<sup>3</sup> Mentioned in the early accounts above. Objects from this season's dig in Cairo are BÉNÉDITE, *Miroirs*, 44018, 55, 57; BISSING, *Steingefässe*, Index, p. xl, under "Drah Abul Negga" and "Kurna."

<sup>4</sup> Later accounts, such as MASPERO, *Guide*, xiv, are derived from it. The letter itself is published by MASPERO, *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, 18, cii ff. In the other contemporary accounts, the fact that Mariette was not present, is not dwelt upon. Mariette read a report on his first season's work for the Egyptian Government before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres on August 19 and 26. An analysis appeared in the *Comptes rendus*, 1859, 153 ff., apparently drawn up by his friend and admirer Ernest Desjardins who was often his go-between with his other friends, his printers and the French Government. Under Mariette's direction and with the help of letters and notes elsewhere unpublished, Desjardins compiled an excellent account of Mariette's excavations from the discovery of the Serapeum in 1850 down to the finding of Ahhotp in 1859, which was published in the *Révue général de l'Architecture*, 1860, cols. 9 ff., with coloured plates of the jewelry. It was expected to be merely a temporary description of Mariette's work but it remains the only comprehensive account. Other references are in WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 302.

<sup>5</sup> Maunier's letter was published by MASPERO in *Rec. de Trav.*, 1892, 214.

coffin opened—whether from curiosity or animosity, no one knows. Whatever it was, I should not like to find myself in that functionary's shoes the first time Mariette sees him. As usual they threw away the bandages and the bones, saving only the objects buried with the mummy. Mariette got an inventory of them from one of his Arab employees. The governor, on his side, sent a list to the Viceroy, notifying him that he was sending the objects direct to the Khedival Court. To let them arrive at such a destination was to risk their partial or complete loss. The two lists were in good enough agreement, but they seemed to us remarkably exaggerated both in the number of things described and in their weights of gold. Supplied with a ministerial order giving the right to stop all boats loaded with curiosities, and to tranship them on board our own boat, we set sail yesterday morning, March 21st, to cruise on the Nile as far up as low water would let us. We had just about gone as far as the *Samannoud* would make it, when we saw the boat carrying the treasure taken from the pharaonic mummy coming toward us. At the end of half an hour the two boats were alongside each other. After some stormy words, accompanied by rather lively gestures, Mariette promised to one to toss him overboard, to another to roast his brains, to a third to send him to the galleys, and to a fourth to have him hanged. At last they decided to place the box containing the antiquities on board our boat, against a receipt. To our great surprise we found in it a quantity of jewels and royal insignia, almost all bearing the name of Ahmose, a king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, while the Queen Ahhotp was not mentioned once. Their fineness of execution is more remarkable than that of the little so far known, and if I am not mistaken, there are nearly two kilogrammes weight of gold, marvellously fashioned, with incrustations of hard stone and coloured enamel."

Mariette hastened with the treasure to the Khedive at Alexandria the next day, and so well did he tell his story that the Pâshâ overlooked his use of an order that was never intended to stop government steamers, burst out laughing and took him into high favour. Said did borrow a gold chain with a pendant scarab for his favourite wife, but he kept it only a short time and then returned it to the Museum<sup>1</sup>. It is somewhat surprising to read that Mariette was allowed to take the jewels to Paris to be exhibited in the Académie des Inscriptions in August 1859 when he read his report; to London for the International Exhibition of 1862<sup>2</sup>, and again to Paris for the Exhibition of 1867, where it was only through his own firm resistance to bribery that Eugénie did not wheedle them away from Ismail for her own adornment<sup>3</sup>.

It will have been noticed that in Dévéria's letter—and equally in the Mariette-Desjardins accounts of the following summer—there is no suggestion that any of the jewelry was lost, or that any of it was introduced from other sources. Indeed Dévéria calls attention to the fact that the two independent inventories agreed, and on such an occasion, at least, the governor would have been especially circumspect when he was trying to curry favour with the Khedive at Mariette's expense. Otherwise it would have been a wonder if any of the jewels had escaped.

<sup>1</sup> MASPERO, *op. cit.*, ciii.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Caroline R. Williams has called my attention to this point and given me a reference to the *Fac-Similes of the Egyptian Relics, Discovered at Thebes in the Tomb of Queen Aah-hotep; from Drawings by E. Kiddle, with Descriptive Letter Press by S. Birch*, London, W. Dufour, 1863. They were exhibited in the Egyptian Court of the International Exhibition at South Kensington by the liberality of H. H. Said Pâshâ, M. Mariette, their discoverer, being in England a portion of the time.

<sup>3</sup> The story, greatly to Mariette's credit, is told by MASPERO, *op. cit.*, clxii.

It was only in later years that Dévéria cast doubts on the find, when he wanted to deny to Kamose a place between Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> and Ahmose I. Only then was it that he dwelt on the fact that the mummy was opened in a Turkish *harīm* in the absence of any European and suggested that part of the find had disappeared, including, perhaps, pieces bearing the name of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup>. It was characteristic of Maspero that he should jump at such an idea, and von Bissing carried it to its logical conclusion by searching the European collections for lost pieces to such good effect that he included pieces of Kamose's which were actually in Paris before Aḥḥotp was found<sup>2</sup>. Daressy discredited the find from the opposite direction. Not knowing the circumstances of the finding of Kamose, he concluded that the Kamose jewels with Aḥḥotp were not found with her at all, but with Kamose himself—which is manifestly impossible when the true stories of the two finds are unravelled<sup>3</sup>. Petrie sets up a third theory. While accepting the possibility of a dispersal of objects at the time that Aḥḥotp was found, he believed that all the Kamose objects had been put into Aḥḥotp's coffin in ancient times when it was moved to the place where it was eventually found<sup>4</sup>. In support of this idea he states without any question that the Kamose objects were found outside the bandages<sup>5</sup>, but even if this were the case, it is not unreasonable considering their size and nature—boats on wheels, a large fan and a parade axe. In the Desjardins account of the finding it is simply said that after raising the bandages the jewelry was found merely laid upon the mummy with no piece actually on the body except the "diadem" and possibly the pectoral.

Personally, I prefer to go back to the original view of Mariette, Dévéria, Desjardins and Vassalli. Admitting that a few beads may have been lost carelessly, the find as we know it is practically intact. No object has ever turned up which can be traced to it indisputably—least of all those from the Kamose coffin attributed to it by von Bissing—and there is no chance whatever of the pieces bearing Kamose's name having been mixed in from the Kamose find. As for Petrie's idea that they were introduced anciently it would manifestly be unprofitable to attempt to answer it. To me there is nothing inherently impossible in believing that Aḥḥotp was buried fairly early in the reign of Ahmose, bedecked with jewels presented by him and a few objects given her by the predecessor of Ahmose, King Kamose.

The jewelry of Queen Aḥḥotp is too well known to require a description, and therefore it may be passed over here with mention of two details only. First, by far the greater number of pieces, and those the finest, bear the name of Ahmose, and we may take them as a striking index of the natural advance in wealth and skill which followed the expulsion of the Hyksos. The crude, early jewel of Ahmose found on the body of Kamose, confirms this excellently. The second detail is in regard to the nature of the "diadem" (Pl. XVII).

Mariette in his original report to the Académie des Inscriptions, described how it was found on the top of the queen's head with a thick lock of hair passed through it and imagined that the tongue must have served to divide the tresses behind. Doubts evidently arose while the jewelry was in Paris, for Desjardins, in the description which he wrote that same summer, admits that it has "more the aspect of a bracelet than a diadem," and


<sup>1</sup> DÉVÉRIA, *Bibliothèque égypt.*, 5, 321 in a footnote. MASPERO, *Guide*, 416.

<sup>2</sup> VON BISSING, *Thebanischer Grabfund*, 24, which, except for the false attributions of the Kamose objects below, remains the best description of the jewelry.

<sup>3</sup> DARESSY in *Annales*, 1908, 61 ff. In 1912 he had seen the impossibility of this view in *Annales*, 68.

<sup>4</sup> PETRIE, *History*, II, 13.

<sup>5</sup> An assumption probably derived from MARIETTE, *Notice des Monuments à Boulaq* (3rd. ed.), 257.




Armlet of Kamose.

*In the Louvre.*



Armlet of Ahhotp.

*In Cairo.*



Armlet of Ahhotp.

*In Cairo.*



Mariette himself wrote subsequently, that "if this jewel had not been found on top of the head of the queen, partly engaged in her hair, I would rather take it for one of the most magnificent specimens of a bracelet for the upper arm that one could imagine<sup>1</sup>." The same doubts have persisted in the minds of Daressy and von Bissing, but always the story of the finding has been taken as evidence that the object was a "diadem."

To me there is no question at all but that it is an armband to be worn above the elbow. It is much smaller than any known type of Egyptian diadem, but is exactly the right size for an arm, and the long tongue has the very practical purpose of lying along the inner side of the arm to prevent the heavy sphinxes from turning it over. Again the motive of couchant sphinxes is wholly unknown to Egyptian head-dresses, but does immediately recall the couchant lions of the El-Lâhûn armlets<sup>2</sup> and the couchant cats of the armlets of Queen Sebekemsaf<sup>3</sup>. Furthermore, these two sphinxes flanking a cartouche and seemingly bound to the arm by a rope of gold, give the clue to the reconstruction of the lions and cartouche of Kamose which there is no reason whatever for supposing were part of a crown.

As for the story of the finding, those who would hold that the mummy was robbed by the governor of Kēnah may take it that a real diadem was stolen by him and this one of the many bracelets was put forward to make the inventories check. But I do not think we need attack the story at all. Some queer things were done by ancient embalmers, and one only has to recall the case of the vulture pectoral bent about the skull of the so-called Akhenaten to simulate a diadem for a parallel to the armband in the hair of Queen Ahhotp<sup>4</sup>.

At the time of the discovery Maunier wrote to Mariette from Luxor: "I have the pleasure of notifying you that your *reis* in Kurnah has found at Dirâ Abu'l-Nagâ a magnificent mummy case and a chest containing four alabaster vases of various forms, without covers or inscriptions, found at the side of the mummy case." The chest seems to have disappeared. The jars were entered in the *Livre d'Entrée* in Cairo as "trouvés dans un même coffre avec la momie de la reine Aahhotep; ils contenaient des matières animales embaumées et faisaient office de canopes." Hence we find Petrie mentioning the canopic jars of Ahhotp from her coffin, and Bissing—while doubting that they were actually canopic jars—describing them as having been found within the coffin. As a matter of fact the jars are, as Bissing saw, actually reused early dynastic or Old Kingdom oil jars, and it is only their number which suggests that they were canopics<sup>5</sup>.

The statue which was mentioned above as relating Ahhotp to Sekenenrê<sup>c</sup> was in private hands in France over thirty years ago<sup>6</sup> (Pls. XII, XVIII–XX). It evidently came from the tomb of a son of Ta'o II who died in his youth, the Eldest Royal Son Ahmose, triumphant,

<sup>1</sup> MARIETTE, *loc. cit.*, 259, no. 814.


<sup>2</sup> BRUNTON, *Treasure of Lahun*, Pls. II–III.




<sup>3</sup> Burlington F. A. Club, *Ancient Egyptian Art*, 1922, Pl. L.


<sup>4</sup> Mrs. Caroline R. Williams has also noticed this parallel of the vulture pectoral in DAVIS, *Tomb of Tiyi*, 20, Pl. XX.

<sup>5</sup> MAUNIER in *Rec. Trav.*, 1892, 214; PETRIE, *History*, II, 12; BISSING, *Grabfund*, 24, and *Steingefässe*, 18478–80. Lythgoe has pointed out to me the striking parallel of a prehistoric stone vase reused in a tomb contemporary with Ahhotp, described by LANSING in *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, Suppl. May, 1917, 23, Fig. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Squeezes of the inscriptions were communicated by Daninos Pasha to Bouriant in *Rec. Trav.*, 1889, p. 159. The inscriptions were collated and completed from photographs by SETHE, *Urk. der 18. Dyn.*, 12, translations, 6. See also SETHE, *Untersuchungen*, I, 4; PETRIE, *History*, II, 6; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 159; WEILL, *op. cit.*, 149, 161. The photographs on Pls. XII, XVIII–XX, probably taken about 1890, were unearthed in New York by Mrs. Williams about ten years ago. The publication of the entire set seems worth while in view of the statue's disappearance.

for among the usual invocations for offerings to Ptah Sokaris, there are recorded the names of members of the Prince's family, who "cause his name to live in order that he may do every good for them in the Underworld." These relatives are his father, Ta'co II, and his mother Ahhotp<sup>1</sup>, as we have seen; his sister, the Great Royal Daughter Ahmose, and his sister, the Royal Daughter Ahmose the Little—she lives<sup>2</sup>. Since Ahhotp "the Great Royal Daughter" was married to her brother Ta'co II, this "Great Royal Daughter" Ahmose, the elder of the two sisters, was doubtless the Ahmose-Nefertiri whom we know as the sister-wife of Ahmose I, and who, we may suppose, had first been married to Kamose. Another early mention of her may be in a  on a stela from the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ<sup>3</sup>.

From the tomb of the Eldest Son Ahmose, in addition to his statue, may have come two shawabtis found in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, which name a , and also a scarab of unknown provenance of . He was doubtless that one of the Lords of the West who was venerated by later generations as  in the tomb of Khabekhet<sup>6</sup>.

On a statuette of Harpocrates the name of a royal personage Ahmose is associated with another, Binpu, both within cartouches<sup>7</sup>. The historical questions raised are the most difficult in the whole period and they must be begged here. However, this association of an Ahmose and a Binpu reminds us of another name in the Khabekhet list of Lords of the West<sup>8</sup>, the Royal Son Binpu . The name, although uncommon, is one of the period, a Priest of Amûn, Ahmose son of Binpi having been buried in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ<sup>9</sup> and a later Eighteenth Dynasty personage Binpu having been connected with the chapel of Rê' in the Temple of Amûn<sup>10</sup>. We can do no better, in the

<sup>1</sup> Gauthier supposes Ahhotp was the daughter of the King Ta'co of this statue, thus disregarding the force of the title "Joined to the Beauty of the White Crown" and putting two Great (*i.e.* Eldest) Royal Daughters—Ahmose and Ahhotp—in the same family. The balancing of Ta'co and Ahhotp on either side of the back of the statue (see Pl. XX) can only mean that they were the two parents of Ahmose in the centre.

<sup>2</sup> Both Petrie and Gauthier make but one daughter Ahmose of these two, in spite of the explicit differentiation of the two in the inscription:

<sup>3</sup> NORTHAMPTON, etc., *Theban Necropolis*, Pl. XVI, 3.

<sup>4</sup> NORTHAMPTON, etc., *op. cit.*, 31, nos. 11 and 16, Pls. XVIII and XIX. The latter, Newberry tells me, did not come from the Northampton excavations, but from the Salt Collection.


<sup>5</sup> Formerly in the Cairo Museum, NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. XXVI, no. 6.

<sup>6</sup> GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 160.

<sup>7</sup> The statue, now in Cairo, was given to Mariette by M. Maunier, the French Consul, in 1858. It is figured in MARIETTE, *Mon. divers*, Pl. 48, and DARESSY, *Statues de divinités*, 55.


<sup>8</sup> So MASPERO, *Mon. divers*, 14; DARESSY in *Rec. Trav.*, 1892, 145; WEILL, *op. cit.*, 157; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 169 and 180, and PETRIE, *History*, II, 13, who however goes very much too far in taking the whole lower row of names in the Khabekhet list for children of Sekenenrê' and Ahhotp, for SETHE,

*Untersuchungen*, I, 68, shows that  and  were sons of Ramesses II and

 is certainly the Eighteenth Dynasty prince whose chapel lies south of the Ramesseum.

<sup>9</sup> Funerary cone in CLÉDAT in *Bull. Inst. Fran.*, 1910, 156.

<sup>10</sup> DARESSY in *Rec. Trav.*, 1892, 145.




Ahmose, son of Sekenenrē Ta'o II.

*From an old photograph.*



Ahmose, son of Sekenenrē Ta'o II.

*From an old photograph.*



Ahmose, son of Sekenenrē' Ta'o II.

*From an old photograph.*

present state of our knowledge, than to class Binpu of the Khabekhet list under King Taʿo II and take him provisionally for one of his sons, reserving all decision as to the identity of the Ahmose and Binpu of the Harpocrates statuette.

Still another enigma—but of a different sort—is supplied by the mummy of a woman in the Turin Museum, apparently from the excavations in the Valley of the Queens in 1903-4. The label announces that this is the Princess “Aahmesit,” daughter of “Queen Thutisat” and “King Raskenen I, who started the war against the Hyksos.” So far as I am aware Sig. Schiaparelli has never given out any information either about this Ahmose or her mother Sitdhout, and until he sees fit to do so, both must remain ladies of doubtful antecedents.



For the sake of clarity it will be as well to restate the children of Taʿo II and Aḥḥotp as given above :

- (1) Prince Ahmose the Elder—died young during the reign of his father.
- (2) Princess Ahmose-Nefertiri—married the two following in succession.
- (3) King Kamose—succeeded his father and died shortly afterwards.
- (4) King Ahmose—succeeded his brother and founded the Eighteenth Dynasty.
- (5) Princess Ahmose the Little.
- (6) Prince Binpu ?—died young, possibly at the same time as Ahmose the Elder ?

Traces of at least three tombs have been found which date from the reigns of the two Kings Taʿo.

Certainly from a tomb of the reign of Taʿo II comes a scribe’s palette<sup>1</sup>, found in Thebes, bearing the inscription: “The Good God, Lord of the Two Lands, Lord of Offerings, Seḳenenrēʿ, Son of Rēʿ, Taʿo, given life ; beloved for ever and ever by Amenrēʿ, Lord of Karnak and by Sefkhet.”

A tomb which may be of either reign is that of ʿAḳḥor, in the Dirâʿ Abu’l-Nagâ, which Vassalli discovered in 1863 while excavating for Mariette, right at the bottom of the hill, not far distant from the places where the mummies of Kamose and Aḥḥotp had been found<sup>2</sup>. The date is given by a wooden throw-stick bearing the name of a King Taʿo, whose pre-nomen is unfortunately illegible.

The mummy of the “royal acquaintance” ʿAḳḥor  (sic) lay in a fine *rishi* coffin, now lost, which had the feathers on the head and the inscriptions in “relief” gilded<sup>3</sup>. The body was surrounded by a collection of personal ornaments whose intrinsic interest was largely enhanced by the fact that several of them were gifts of his friends or relatives, of whom all were not Thebans. Of most importance was the above-mentioned throw-stick lying at his side and bearing in addition to the King’s name, that of the “Royal Son, Thuyu  who accompanies his lord on his expeditions<sup>4</sup>.” A large alabaster



<sup>1</sup> In the Louvre since the early nineteenth century. Published by CHAMPOLLION, *Mons.*, Pl. CXCI ; PIERRET, *Rec. d'insc.*, I, 88 and *Cat. de la Salle historique*, 153, no. 614 bis ; PETRIE, *History*, II, 6, Fig. 1 ; MASPERO, *Enquête judiciaire*, 78 and *Histoire*, II, 75, n. 2 ; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 157 and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 161.


<sup>2</sup> VASSALLI, *Mon. istorici*, 131 ; MARIETTE-MASPERO, *Mon. divers*, 16, Pl. 51, where the objects found are figured unless otherwise stated. The date of the discovery, 1863, is correctly given by GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 157 on the authority of the *livre d'entrée*.

<sup>3</sup> VASSALLI, *op. cit.*, 137 ; DARESSY in *Annales*, 1909, 63 ; STEINDORFF in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 93.


<sup>4</sup> Best illustrations in *Mon. divers*, Pl. 51 and *Album photographique du Musée de Boulaq*, Pl. 37. Complete bibliographies in WEILL, *op. cit.*, 161, 232, and GAUTHIER, *ibid.* The old idea, most recently



Son of Rē<sup>c</sup> Ta<sup>c</sup>o  and the Horus name  and there is in the Petrie Collection a very fine gold shell pendant inscribed



THE TOMB OF KING WAZKHEPERRĒ<sup>c</sup> KAMOSE.



The inspectors passed from the tombs of the two Kings Ta<sup>c</sup>o to:

The pyramid of King Wazkheperrē<sup>c</sup>, L.P.H., Son of Rē<sup>c</sup> Kamose, L.P.H. Inspected on this day; it was uninjured<sup>2</sup>.

Uninjured it may have been in the reign of Ramesses IX, but at some subsequent date in ancient times fear of the thieves caused the guardians of the tomb to carry off "its lord" bodily, coffin and all. This they hastily buried, still unopened, in a hole in the rubbish on the plain below the Dirā<sup>c</sup> Abu'l-Nagâ near where Aḥḥotp and two of the Intefs were similarly hidden, and there Kamose lay until December 1857.

The story is sufficiently curious. In the spring of 1857 the Prince Napoléon, cousin of the Emperor Napoléon III, had recently returned from a voyage in the Arctic. Restless and discontented, he was always an embarrassment to his imperial cousin, and when he expressed a desire to travel in the Orient, everything was done to speed him on his way. The Archduke Maximilian's trip to the Nile was still being talked of, and the Prince "Plonplon" decided not only to emulate but to surpass him in the acquisition of collections. When word of the intended visit came to the Khedive Said he resolved to show his imperial visitor every possible honour, and on De Lesseps' advice, sent posthaste to France for Mariette to return to Egypt in October 1857 on an eight months' mission. Said Pâshâ wanted every step of the visiting prince to sprout antiquities, and to assure a fertile crop and save "Plonplon's" time, Mariette was to proceed up river, dig for antiquities and then bury them again all along the proposed itinerary. Funds were supplied both by the Prince Napoléon and Said Pâshâ, and the latter gave Mariette, in addition, his viceregal steamer and orders to the *mûdîrs* to draft workmen. To make all things perfect, Heinrich Brugsch arrived in Cairo in the nick of time, was seized by Mariette in the railway station, and told to prepare for an immediate start<sup>3</sup>.

Work was organized at Gîzah, Saḳḳârah, Abydos, Thebes and Elephantine, and a considerable collection was amassed in a short season. All went excellently well except that the Prince, for whom all this effort was being made, dallied in Paris. Delay followed delay until at last Mariette was informed that "important considerations" had made the projected

<sup>1</sup> PETRIE, *Scarabs and Cylinders*, xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Abbott Pap., Pl. III, 12; B. *A.R.*, iv, par. 519.

<sup>3</sup> MASPERO, *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, 18, lxxviii ff., tells the story with his usual charm. It is mentioned by DESJARDINS in *Rev. gén. de l'architecture*, 1860, col. 50 (who says that the Prince Napoléon shared in the expenses) and by DE ROUGÉ in *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscript.*, 1858, 115 ff. (a résumé of letters from Mariette). BRUGSCH, *Mein Leben and Wandern*, 205, tells of the start in racy style. Maspero states that a journal of this trip was kept in French by Mariette and Brugsch and that it was still in the latter's possession when he died in 1894.



trip impossible, and finally on February 8, 1858, came his recall to resume his duties in the Louvre. But Mariette by now had definitely decided to carve out a future for himself in Egypt, and very skilfully did he go about his first steps. Knowing Prince "Plonplon's" appetite for collections to fill his neo-classic house in Paris, Mariette discreetly suggested that if he were given the word—and permission to delay his departure for Paris—he could procure from Saïd Pâshâ for the Prince some souvenir of the trip which had never been taken. The Prince's secretary, Ferri-Pisani, replied that his master would be very happy to have, not a scientific collection, "but a few jewels, some statuettes, specimens of Egyptian art bearing on your mission of 1857-8, with some indication of how they were come by." The Khedive fell equally well into the scheme, and begged him to pick out whatever would please the Prince and to place them at his disposition, without any question of reimbursement. It only remained for Mariette to arrange that a government vessel should deliver the gift free of all charges to the economical prince, and in return for this collection which cost absolutely nothing, the grateful prince's influence was exerted to create Mariette *ma'mûr* of Antiquities a few months later. Thus the Service des Antiquités came into being.


The excavations which Mariette and Brugsch started in Qurnah had almost immediate results. They had some sort of information on the finding-place of the two Intef coffins which Mariette had purchased for the Louvre three years before<sup>1</sup>, and following up this clue they put their men to work on the flat plain below the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, just south of the mouth of the Valley of the Kings. Desjardins and Vassalli both quote Mariette as saying that the exact spot was near where Ahhotp was found during the following season, but a little further from the hill. Here was found in December 1857, the coffin of King Kamose, hidden in a mass of rubbish into which it had been dumped, carelessly, upon its right side, but absolutely uninjured and unrobbed<sup>2</sup>.

Mariette evidently judged that the coffin of Kamose was not such a "specimen of Egyptian art" as Prince Napoléon and his secretary Ferri-Pisani would appreciate and it therefore remained in Egypt. It is not of the royal gilded type, nor does it bear upon its forehead the kingly uraeus<sup>3</sup>. It is in fact a *rîshi* coffin (Pl. XXI) such as a private individual

<sup>1</sup> Explicitly stated by Desjardins; see next note.


<sup>2</sup> It is too bad that this find of Mariette's, frequently enough mentioned at the time, was totally forgotten for nearly half a century. A letter of December 31, 1857, to Humboldt from Brugsch in *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1858, 69, gave the first announcement of the discovery. Mariette in those days was so convinced, by the London and Paris Intef coffins, that all *rîshi* coffins were Eleventh Dynasty, that he and Brugsch believed this one must be of the same date. Not recognizing the King's name "Kamose" on the coffin and having on the jewelry "Ahmose" (admittedly Eighteenth Dynasty) they were completely puzzled and called this an unknown king. Later Mariette called him "Sara Ahmes," fourth King of the Eleventh Dynasty (quoted by PISANI, *vide infra*), and then returned to uncertainty in his *Lettre à M. de Rougé, Rev. arch.*, 1860, II, 29 and called him an "Ahmes qui n'est ni l'Amosis de Manéthon ni l'Ahmes Si-pe-ar du papyrus" Abbott. In this ambiguous way Kamose and his discovery is described by DESJARDINS in *Rev. gén. de l'architecture*, 1860, col. 54; by VASSALLI, *Mon. istorici*, (1867), 128 (on hearsay), and by A. MATTHEY, *Explorations modernes in Égypte*, 162 (who copies part of Desjardins' original report verbatim). And then Kamose passed out of archaeological literature (Von Bissing in 1902 assigning his jewels to Ahhotp), until finally, in one of the neatest bits of research work I know of, Daressy brought to light the coffin in Cairo, and the references in the *Lettre à M. de Rougé*, Vassalli and Matthey and reconstructed the broad details of the find in *Annales*, 1908, 61 and 1912, 64 (*cf.* WEILL, *op. cit.*, 150, 231). The date and circumstances of the connection of Prince Napoléon and Kamose, and the definite identification of the dagger, I am adding to a story for which all credit is due to Daressy.

<sup>3</sup> DARESSY, *ibid.* The coffin found its way eventually into the Cairo collection where Daressy rediscovered it in 1907. The photograph on Plate XXI was taken for this article by Mr. Burton. Brugsch distinctly says the mummy fell to dust.





Coffin of Sekhemrē'-Heruḥirma't Intef.

*In the Louvre.*




Coffin of Wazkheperre' Kamose.

*In Cairo.*

might have had. In the usual vertical inscription down the lid and in the protective recitation of the two goddesses under the feet he is named the King, Son of Rē<sup>c</sup> Kamose  

 and  without prenomen, as were the Intefs to our unending confusion.

The mummy, ill-prepared as so many of the period were, fell to dust when Mariette opened the coffin. He found, tied on the king's left arm, a few inches below his shoulder, a cord of finely plaited papyrus that held a poignard, Nubian fashion, and rummaging in the debris of the body, after he had removed the last bandages, he brought up a scarab and some amulets, and from the breast a cartouche flanked on either side by golden lions, and a bronze mirror. The dagger, the cartouche and the lions were in Said Pâshâ's gift to Prince Napoléon, the first finally passing to Brussels and the cartouche and lions to the Louvre; the mirror went direct to the Louvre; the scarab and amulets have disappeared.

The dagger is a magnificent weapon<sup>1</sup>, 31 centimetres long. In model it is identical with one of those found on the mummy of Aḥḥotp, differing only in being a little larger and in reversing the arrangement of gold and silver on the pommel and grip. The Kamose dagger-grip is of silver, and the lenticular pommel for the palm of the hand is made of hard wood covered with a single thick sheet of gold. Gold nails attach it to the grip. It is unlikely that the naked blade would have been strapped on the arm unsheathed. No sheath is mentioned, but in view of the absolute decay of the body and even the wooden mirror handle in this coffin, a leather sheath would have had little chance of surviving.

The cartouche and lions<sup>2</sup> (Pl. XVII) evidently belong together as parts of a jewel similar to Aḥḥotp's armlet where sphinxes flank the cartouche. If Mariette said he found it upon the breast of the mummy, we must remember that it was found in rummaging among the collapsed debris of a corpse which lay on its side for one thing, and for another, that it may have been laid on the king's chest anyway, just as Aḥḥotp's was apparently fastened in her hair. The cartouche of the Kamose jewel is a little box-like object of gold, 48 mm. long and 15 mm. high. On the upper face it bears  cut out of gold and soldered on, surrounded by a plaited wire border like that of the two Sebekemsaf scarabs. The sunken background was once inlaid with semi-precious stones. The lions which flanked it are of rather rough, barbaric repoussé work, each one made up of two sheets of gold pressed into moulds, one for each side, with tails of wound gold wire soldered on. On the under sides of each lion

<sup>1</sup> BRUGSCH, *ibid.*, describes it as having a pommel of gold; DESJARDINS, *op. cit.*, col. 54, says the blade is of bronze and the handle covered with gold and silver, and that it is similar to one of the Aḥḥotp daggers. In col. 107 he goes further and says that the Kamose dagger is of the same model as that of Aḥḥotp except that the disk is covered with gold and the grip with silver, while the opposite is true of the Aḥḥotp poignard. PISANI in *Gaz. des Beaux Arts*, 1859, I, 279, describes the dagger as having a lenticular disk covered with gold and a bronze blade. Brugsch saw the dagger when it was found, Desjardins and Pisani saw it in the Prince Napoléon Collection, and there is no doubt of its identity to this point. At the break-up of the collection it is lost sight of. Then there appears in the collection of the Baron Lucien de Hirsch an identical dagger, exhibited in London in 1895 by the Baroness Hirsch (Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Art of Ancient Egypt*, Pl. XIV). Finally it was published by VON BISSING, *Thebanischer Grabfund*, 24, Pl. VIII, No. 20, as a stray from the Aḥḥotp find. The Brussels dagger so exactly fits Desjardins' description that I have no hesitation in proposing it as that of Kamose.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned in all the accounts of the finding; described, and the cartouche figured, by Pisani while in the Prince Napoléon Collection. At the sale of the latter they passed into the Louvre; *Livre d'entrée*, 7167, *Salle historique*, No. 690. They have been published as part of the Aḥḥotp jewelry by VON BISSING, *Thebanischer Grabfund*, 24, Pl. VIII.

and of the cartouche there are two rings, amply large to take a stout cord such as held the dagger on the king's left upper arm. The Aḥḥotp jewel has the same cord represented in gold. As worn in life, I should regard it as an armlet for the right upper arm, worn at about the height at which the dagger was strapped on the left arm.

The mirror<sup>1</sup> is of golden coloured bronze, of the same size and shape as that of Aḥḥotp, and unquestionably it had, in its day, a similar handle. On the back there still adhere fragments of the king's bandages.

By inference we can establish from Mariette's find some interesting facts regarding the date of the burial of Kamose. Kamose died at the end of a very short reign, before he had prepared for himself the gilded coffin proper for a king's burial, and his successor interred him with little delay in a cheap coffin such as would have been procurable in any undertaker's shop. His successor was Ahmose, whose bracelet was found upon the mummy. The commonly accepted idea to-day is that Ahmose was the younger brother of Kamose<sup>2</sup>, and all the evidence from the Necropolis bears this out excellently. Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> and Aḥḥotp were the parents of Ahmose I, and there is thus no other likely explanation which can explain Kamose as the immediate predecessor of Ahmose except that Kamose was the older brother of Ahmose and thus an older son of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup>.

Two of the priests who tended the tomb of Kamose in the early Eighteenth Dynasty are known. There was that Mes, who, together with his priestly offices in the mortuary chapels of Ta'ō and Tuthmosis I, was ka-servant of Kamose, and there was another Mes of whom Lansing found traces in the Birâbî, who was chief of the prophets of Kamose<sup>3</sup>. The cult of Kamose as one of the Lords of the West in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties has already been noticed.

Even if we are able to locate the finding-place of the mummy of King Kamose, we are no nearer establishing the site of his tomb, for it is impossible to say how far the mummy was carried before being consigned to its hiding-place. The position of the tomb in the itinerary makes it one of the last before the inspectors started for the Mentuḥotp temple at Dêr el-Baḥrî, and therefore we should not be far wrong in locating it at the southern end of the eastern face of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ. Here we are in the area excavated in recent years by Lord Carnarvon and by the Metropolitan Museum—the Birâbî—and it was exactly here, near the Mentuḥotp causeway which in the Intermediate Period was the natural boundary of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ district, that I found a small Seventeenth or Eighteenth Dynasty brick pyramid in 1913, during the Metropolitan Museum's excavations. Perhaps it would be too bold to call this the tomb of Kamose, but its position, the tombs of the Kamose and Ahmose period clustering about it, and the fact that it was restored and walled in from trespass in the congested Ptolemaic necropolis, argues for its having been a royal tomb—either of Kamose or of Prince Ahmose Sapaïr.


The tomb in which Lord Carnarvon found the Kamose tablet lies within less than 150 metres from the pyramid, nearer to the foot of the hill<sup>4</sup>. It appears to have been of


<sup>1</sup> Mariette in 1859 gave the mirror to Dévéria for the Louvre, telling him that it came from the mummy of "King Ahmes" on which were also found the objects of gold then belonging to Prince Napoléon. Louvre *livre d'entrée*, 3458, VON BISSING, *op. cit.*, 24, Pl. VIII as from the mummy of Aḥḥotp.

<sup>2</sup> WEILL, *op. cit.*, 950.

<sup>3</sup> Mes priest of Ta'ō is mentioned above under Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup>; a piece of an ivory box of the second Mes is to be published by Lansing.

<sup>4</sup> CARNARVON and CARTER, *Five Years' Explorations*, 34.

the type of which Mariette found a number<sup>1</sup>; an exterior court from which a passage led into a rectangular chapel, cut in the floor of which was a shaft giving access to the burial-chambers. The tomb had been completely plundered and the contents of the burial-chambers tossed out into the court or into the chapel. The writing-tablets<sup>2</sup> were in the rubbish outside the tomb and in the chamber were found parts of the canopic box of one Katinakht  and excellent examples of contemporary pottery in profusion<sup>4</sup>.

From Thebes, and therefore possibly from a tomb of this reign, comes a scarab set in a gold funda and bearing the king's name .

Although a definite Theban provenance is nowhere stated there are three weapons in English collections which probably came from the grave of one of the courtiers of King Kamose<sup>6</sup>. The finest, by far, is the magnificent bronze sword in the Evans Collection which has received frequent mention<sup>7</sup>. Originally it must have been nearly 80 centimetres in length. The blade is cast and welded to a long socket, rolled from stout sheet metal on a mandril, at the end of which there is rivetted, with a pin which originally held the wooden handle, a bronze ring. This latter is delicately inlaid in gold with a running flower-pattern and the name of "Wazkheperrēc beloved of Iah," and down the flat rib of the blade, just as on one of the Ahhotp daggers, there is an incised inscription "The Hieracosphinx<sup>8</sup>, the Good God, Lord of Offerings, Wazkheperrēc, I am a brave ruler, beloved of Rēc, Son of Iah, Born of Thoth, the Son of Rēc Kamose, victorious in eternity."



<sup>1</sup> MARIETTE in *Letter to Birch, Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.*, 1875, 194, describes identical tombs as typical of this part of the Necropolis. The upper chamber he shows to have been the chapel open to the public. In un plundered tombs all the small finds were made in the lower chambers.

<sup>2</sup> GRIFFITH in CARNARVON and CARTER, *op. cit.*, 36, Pls. XXVII-XXVIII; GARDINER in *Journal*, 1916, 95; 1918, 45. The tablets are now in Cairo.

<sup>3</sup> CARNARVON and CARTER, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXV; three canopic jars now in the M.M.A., 12. 181. 253, were found near by, but having animal heads it may be questioned whether they belonged to the box.







<sup>4</sup> CARNARVON and CARTER, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXVI; practically all in Fig. 2 now in M.M.A.















<sup>5</sup> In the Petrie Collection, University College, NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. XXVI, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Budge, Petrie, Gauthier and Von Bissing (*vide infra*) have supposed them to have been strays from the Ahhotp find.

<sup>7</sup> Always as a spear-head, a perfectly justifiable error when its form is considered. Lansing's "two-handed sword" in the *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, Suppl. May 1917, Fig. 26 shows that, instead of a spear-shaft, the missing part was a wooden sword-grip, probably covered with gold. The Evans sword is identical with the corresponding part of the sword which Lansing found. This note had been written for a couple of years when I saw the Evans sword at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1922 and called Newberry's attention to its true nature. He published it in the Club's *Ancient Egyptian Art*, Pl. XXIII as a sword for the first time. It came from the Sturrock Collection in Edinburgh and appears to have been first described and figured by BUDGE in *Archaeologia*, 1892, 83; *History*, III, 178; then by PETRIE, *History*, II, 14; VON BISSING, *Thebanischer Grabfund*, 24, Pl. XII, 10; the inscriptions in SETHE, *Urk. der 18. Dyn.*, 13 (= translation, 8); GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 165; WEILL, *op. cit.*, 152, 229 (who is not at all clear on the existence of three inscribed antiquities, the Evans sword, Evans axe, and B.M. axe).

<sup>8</sup> Omitted here, as in all copies, because of the lack of proper type. Budge describes the sign as a hawk-headed lion crowned with the *atef*-crown. Compare the lions as titles before the cartouche of Kamose on the Ahhotp boat, and the winged hieracosphinx as a decoration on the Ahmose axe found with the same queen, and on a contemporary scarab found by Lansing in 1915-16.

The other weapons are two axe-heads of the same shape as the magnificent one buried with Ahhotp. One is in the Evans Collection, the other, the better preserved, in the British Museum<sup>1</sup>. The former bears on both sides the badly corroded inscription    
 and the latter   
 on the one side and   on the other<sup>2</sup>.

Another curious form of the names of Kamose appears on a foundation deposit plaque in University College where he is called  and <sup>3</sup>. This serves to place the name   added as the date on a stela which probably comes from a Theban tomb of Kamose's reign<sup>4</sup>. It was erected in honour of a lady , with whom are associated two other women  and , and two men  and . The dedicator Bak , the son of Tawau, "who perpetuates her name," is an armed warrior with axe on shoulder and dagger in belt, followed by his wife ; his two sons of whom one was named ; his brother  and two other men, who are called .

On these monuments we have Kamose appearing under the throne-names of Wazkhepperrê, "The-Brave-Prince," "The-Prince-of-the-South," and "The-Great-Prince." In other words, not only is he adopting an official solar name, but substituting a "princely" name for his personal name. It is going a step further than merely attaching the epithet to the personal name as Ta'o "The Brave" did, and constitutes an innovation in the composition of Egyptian royal protocols which is worth noticing. Ahmose appears to have made rather serious attempts to continue the experiment. One of his courtiers, the Chief Prophet of Amûn, and Chief Treasurer, Tehuti, who was buried near the small brick pyramid mentioned above as possibly the tomb of Kamose or Ahmose Sapaïr, has left us innumerable funerary cones.





There are three variants dated  and 

<sup>1</sup> British Museum 5421 a, presented by Simpson in 1875. Both axes in BUDGE in *Archaeologia*, 1892, 86 quoting SIMPSON and BIRCH in *Jour. Arch. Ass.*, xxiii, 293 (which I have not found); BUDGE, *Third and Fourth Egypt. Rooms*, 6 (including cast of Evans axe); *Book of Kings*, I, 104; Evans axe figured in VON BISSING, *ibid.*; cf. WEILL, *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> BUDGE in *Archaeologia* describes, but does not give the copy, of this interesting reverse side in full, only noting its differences from the obverse. Thus it has escaped the notice of those who have quoted him heretofore.

<sup>3</sup> NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. XXVI, 2; PETRIE, *Scarabs and Cylinders*, xxiii. WEILL, *op. cit.*, 230, hesitates to accept as Kamose's the name on the axe and plaque—but then he does not seem aware of two variants of the name on the same axe and the Ahmose examples to be quoted.

<sup>4</sup> Stela in the Louvre C 201 acquired about 1860; provenance unknown. DE ROUGÉ, *Notice des Mons.*, 8<sup>e</sup> éd., 151; PIERRET, *Rec. des inscript. du Louvre*, I, 59-62; DÉVÉRIA, *Bib. égypt.*, v, 315 ff.

or  <sup>1</sup>. A scarab in the Grenfell Collection bearing  and another in Turin with  give the same "princely" name in substitution for the personal name, and establish the new throne-name combination of "Nebpehtiré Prince-of-the-Two-Lands" for Ahmose I. Even as late as Tuthmosis I the tradition seems to be preserved on a rare scarab in the Carnarvon Collection inscribed , but after that it apparently disappears entirely.

The Abbott Papyrus, as has been suggested above, is clearly the investigation of definite charges involving ten specified tombs of various dates and in various localities. The Mayor Pesiur, who had laid the information, was not the man to leave any vagueness in his accusations. When the enquiry went against him and he renewed his charges, he announced that "the Scribe of the Necropolis Horishere, son of Amennakht, came to the chief side of the city, to my place of abode, and told me three very serious accusations. My scribe and the scribe of the Two Districts of the city put them in writing. Moreover the scribe of the Necropolis, Pebes, told me of two other matters—in all five. They were put in writing likewise.....and now I shall write concerning them to Pharaoh<sup>5</sup>." Unquestionably his original complaint was also put into writing and was equally specific. While it was not transcribed verbatim into the Abbott Papyrus, the note is entered in the minutes of the inspection of the first tomb, "concerning which the Mayor of the City, Pesiur, had reported ..... 'The thieves have broken into it<sup>6</sup>,'" and that this was omitted from the others is merely a matter of brevity.

Hence we are safe in stating that the six kings' tombs in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ given in the Abbott Papyrus are merely those specified by Pesiur and do not by any means exhaust the list of those which existed there. In fact there are four more tombs for which there is evidence, either that they have been found on the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ or, that being in the Theban Necropolis and of the period of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ cemetery, they probably were in it.

THE TOMB OF KING [SEKHEMRÉ'-WAḤKHA]' RA'ḤOTP.




There was a romance current in Thebes during the Twentieth Dynasty which told of the supernatural adventures of the High Priest of Amûn Khonsemḥab during his search for a tomb site<sup>8</sup>. Khonsemḥab is otherwise unknown to us and his tomb has never been

<sup>1</sup> One variant was known by both WIEDEMANN (*Grabkegel*, I, 21) and DARESSY (*Cones funéraires*, No. 233). Newberry found two variants in the Birâbî (NORTHAMPTON, etc., *Theban Necropolis*, Pl. XXIV, Nos. 11-12) and Carter one in the same neighbourhood. Finally I found quantities of all three in 1912-13 (*Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1914, 16).

<sup>2</sup> PETRIE in *Ancient Egypt*, 1916, 27, No. 16.

<sup>3</sup> PETRIE, *Historical Scarabs*, No. 779; NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. XXVI, No. 11; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 179.

<sup>4</sup> From the Timmins Collection; *Catalogue*, 28, Pl. IX. <sup>5</sup> B. A. R. IV, par. 529.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, 513. <sup>7</sup> Prenomen  from *B.M. Hieroglyphic Texts*, IV, 9, Pl. XXIV.

<sup>8</sup> On four ostraca in the Louvre, Vienna and Florence of which a translation, bibliography and commentary are given by MASPERO, *Popular Stories of Ancient Egypt*, 1915, 275.


discovered, but his office precludes the possibility of his having been buried elsewhere than in Thebes, and if he lived under the Nineteenth or Twentieth Dynasties it is quite to be expected that he would have been interred in the neighbourhood of the burial-places of his predecessors Bekenkhons and Nebunenef of the former Dynasty, who built their tombs opposite Karnak on the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ hillside<sup>1</sup>. This supposition, indeed, fits in very well with the fragments of the story which have come down to us.

Khonsemḥab is sending agents to examine a spot which has been suggested to him in the already crowded Necropolis :

He sent one of his subordinates, and with him three of the men under the orders of the High Priest of Amenrē<sup>c</sup>, to the place of the tomb of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Raḥotp, L.P.H. He embarked with them ; he steered ; he led them to the place indicated, near the tomb of the King Raḥotp, L.P.H.....Then they returned to the river-bank and they sailed to Khonsemḥab, the High Priest of Amenrē<sup>c</sup>, King of the gods, and they found him who sang the praises of the god in the temple of the City of Amūn. He said to them : " Let us rejoice, for I have come and I have found the place favourable for establishing my dwelling in perpetuity." Whereupon the three men replied to him with one voice : " It is found, the place favourable for establishing thy dwelling in perpetuity...".....Then he said to them : " Be ready tomorrow morning when the sun issues from the two horizons," and he commanded the Lieutenant of the Temple of Amūn to find lodgment for these people.


The searchers thus set out from Karnak, examined the site of the Tomb of Raḥotp, and then re-crossed the river to the Amūn Temple where they are given lodging for the night against their return in the morning. Everything points to the Theban Necropolis. Later Khonsemḥab himself is caught underground in a tomb near which he intends to build his own, and there lost in the darkness, he meets the ghost of the inmate and listens to his story.

The spirit said to him : " As for me, when I was still living on the earth, I was the treasurer of King Raḥotp, L.P.H., and also his infantry lieutenant. Then I passed before men and behind gods, and I died in the year XIV, during the months of Shomu, in the reign of King Menḥotpurē<sup>c</sup>. He gave me my four canopic jars and my sarcophagus of alabaster

 He had done for me all that is done for a man of quality ; he gave me offerings.....<sup>2</sup>.

The story is purest romance—and yet a semblance of reality is sought by making the scene and the characters actual ones. The Thebans of the Twentieth Dynasty must have known the tomb of King Raḥotp, and though it has up to the present defied discovery<sup>3</sup>, this story is sufficient evidence that it existed in the Necropolis<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 35 and 157 of GARDINER and WEIGALL, *Topographical Catalogue*.

<sup>2</sup> GOLENISCHEFF and MASPERO in *Rec. Trav.*, 1882, 4, 7. The reading , "four jars of embalment," "canopic-jars," was communicated to me by Alan Gardiner.

<sup>3</sup> PIEPER in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1913, 103, lists "Rahotep, Grab bekannt." This is, I believe, a simple misprint, the words, "Grab bekannt" having slipped down from Sebekemsaf immediately above.

<sup>4</sup> MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 301 adopts the Twelfth—Eighteenth Dynasties as the date for the Raḥotp of the Ghost Story. MASPERO, *Stories*, 276 n., goes farther and states that his tomb was probably towards Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, because of the date.





The stela of a certain Ani who was priest in the temple of a deceased King Intef exists in Reval<sup>1</sup>. This Ani may have been a mortuary priest of one of the three Kings Intef of this period—for the stela is surely contemporary with them—but unfortunately there is no definite proof that his stela came from Thebes.

THE TOMB OF KING [SEKHEMRĒ<sup>c</sup>-WAZKHAU] SEBEKEMSAF.



In discussing the tomb of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef, two objects from the tomb of a King Sebekemsaf were mentioned, a heart-scarab and a canopic box<sup>2</sup> (Pl. XV), discovered by the Arabs in Thebes in 1827, the first passing through the hands of Yanni Athanasi and Salt to the British Museum, and the second from Piccinini and J. d'Anastasy to Leiden. It is characteristic of the objects from the burial-chambers of the kings of this period that neither bears a premen. The heart-scarab is inscribed simply and the canopic box with variants for and written cursively for .

The tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf was completely stripped of its contents by the ancient thieves, who by their own confession left nothing either for their Arab descendants or for their archaeological successors. Therefore we are justified in assuming that any tomb-furniture of a King Sebekemsaf which exists to-day must have come from some other tomb, and as but one other King Sebekemsaf—Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau—is known from the monuments<sup>3</sup> probably any other such tomb was his. Of course the possibility

<sup>1</sup> WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 225. The king's name is written with within the cartouche like the Sebekemsaf graffito in PETRIE, *Season*, Pl. XIV.


<sup>2</sup> BORCHARDT in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1894, 23-6, correctly dates the box, states that it came from the d'Anastasy Collection, and gives the evidence that it came from Thebes. It has been described by LEEMANS, *Description raisonnée*, 222, and much better by BORCHARDT, *op. cit.*, and BOESER, *Sammlung in Leiden*, III, 2, Pls. VII and XXI, both with illustrations and inscriptions. It has received mention by LEEMANS, *Lettre à Mr. Salvolini*, 1838, 121 and Pl. XXIII; by WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 276; by PETRIE, *History*, I, 234; by GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 75; by MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 299 note; by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 341, 383; and by MACE and WINLOCK, *Senebtisi*, 52, n. 5. Petrie, Gauthier, and Weill (the last using the arguments given above) assign it to Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau. Wiedemann confused both Sebekemsafs in one king to whom he assigned all existing monuments, including this "ushabti box." Meyer hesitates to assign it to any known Sebekemsaf. Petrie (quoting LEEMANS, *Monuments*) mentions a coffin of Sebekemsaf in Leiden, and Gauthier has taken one line of inscription from the box and described it as from "le sarcophage en bois peint du tombeau du roi à Thebes, au Musée de Leyde, Q. 4." It does not exist. Borchardt and Weill both call attention to the similarity of the canopic boxes of Tehuti and of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>c</sup>t Intef to this one of Sebekemsaf. The illustration on Plate XV is from BOESER, *Sammlung in Leiden*.

<sup>3</sup> GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 80 and PETRIE, *History*, I, 233, make a third Sebekemsaf distinct from Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi and Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau, on the basis of the graffito in the Wâdi Hammâmât, L. D., II, 151 K, which is admittedly very badly written but which may reasonably be read

. The cartouche is repeated twice, quite clearly as and . Petrie's objection that joint names in one cartouche are not

always exists that there were still other Sebekemsafs, but it would hardly be profitable to enter their purely imaginary names in any lists we draw up. We are amply justified, therefore, in assigning the heart-scarab<sup>1</sup> and the canopic box to this Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf.

The circumstances of the discovery of 1827 pointed to the tombs of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef and this tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf having been found by the same gang, at about the same time, and presumably in the same vicinity<sup>2</sup>. Again, if it be allowed that Mariette rediscovered the tomb of this Sebekemsaf in 1860<sup>3</sup>, we should have to place it equally close to the tomb of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef, and there it undoubtedly will be found some day.

From this reign no courtier's tomb has been identified, and of the royal family we know nothing except that the king had a son named Sebekemsaf  (sic)<sup>4</sup>. If he died young, as the epithet "triumphant" might be supposed to imply, his grave should have been near that of his father in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ. If, on the other hand, the epithet is not to be taken literally as meaning "deceased" and he survived his father, he might quite well have become King Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf.

#### THE TOMB OF KING [SEKHEMRĒ<sup>c</sup>-SMENTAWI] DHOUT.




In a Theban tomb, beside a mummy in a coffin, Passalacqua found what he took for a medicine chest, but what might more correctly be called a toilet set<sup>5</sup> (Pl. XV). The outside

found after the middle of the Twelfth Dynasty is untenable. See WEILL, *op. cit.*, 828-9, 839, 843, 847. Other clear graffiti of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf in the neighbourhood are given in L. D., VI, 23, 9 and II, 151, 1 (this last being PRISSE, *Mon.*, Pl. VI, 7 and *Rev. Arch.*, 1845, 10; WILKINSON, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, II, 388; GOLENISCHEFF, *Hammamat*, Pl. XVIII, 6; COUYAT and MONTET in *Mem. Inst. fran.*, 1912, 78, No. 111). See also WEILL, *op. cit.*, 382. MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 299-300 might be read as making more than two Sebekemsafs but does not definitely say so. Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau is known from Abydos, Hammâmât, Thebes, Karnak, Medamût and Silsilah; Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi from Abydos and Thebes.



<sup>1</sup> That the scarab was from the tomb of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau is the view of PETRIE, *History*, I, 235; and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 383. The latter develops the arguments substantially as above, but goes too far in supposing that there is internal evidence in the spelling of the name to support them. GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 75, classes it under Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi.


<sup>2</sup> See above under Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef.

<sup>3</sup> See above under Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf.


<sup>4</sup> Shown on a statue of the king found by Mariette in Abydos; bibliography and discussion in WEILL, *op. cit.*, 380, 410. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, has recently (1923) acquired a statue of the General Horemhab , intended to be set up in a temple years before his eventual death as king. The expression "triumphant" is thus anticipatory in its nature and is not always to be taken as meaning "deceased."

<sup>5</sup> Berlin 1175-1182. Discovery described by PASSALACQUA, *Catalogue raisonné*, 25 and 154. First published with drawing by ERMAN in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1892, 46-7 where it is supposed to be of the Eleventh Dynasty. Definitely called a canopic box, related to that of Sebekemsaf in Leiden and dated to the Thirteenth Dynasty by BORCHARDT in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1894, 26. Photograph and description in *Aegypt. u. Vorderasiat. Altertümer aus d. König. Mus. Berlin*, 1895, Pl. 13; description in *Ausführliches Verzeichnis*, 1899, 108-9; inscriptions in *Aegypt. Inschriften, Berlin*, I, 1913, 253-5. See also MEYER, *Geschichte*, 1st ed., 149; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 123-4, where he gives references to GROTE, *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*, II, 54

chest was none other than a canopic box made for King Dhout , but a line of writing added in a blank space on the lid in another hand and with a different ink from that in which the other inscriptions are drawn, informs us that it "was presented as a gift by the King to the Great Royal Wife who has assumed the Beautiful White Crown, Mentuhotp, triumphant" 

 sic, doubtless on her predeceasing him. Nested within this chest there was a red and white papyrus wickerwork cover on four legs, which fitted over a woven palm leaf hamper, which in turn sat upon a stand made of reed. The curved lid of the hamper was fastened with two knobs of ebony inlaid with ivory, and seems to have been sealed with mud seals. Within the hamper there were six compartments, each containing a toilet vase of alabaster or serpentine, filled with salves and stoppered with papyrus, two wooden spoons, a little bowl of green faïence, and twenty-five odorous tubers.

It has long been supposed that this tomb was refound by Wilkinson. About 1832 the latter copied the religious texts on a coffin in Thebes. The coffin itself has disappeared, but since 1834 his copy has remained in the British Museum. It was made known by Goodwin in 1866 as having been inscribed for a Queen Mentuhotp, and Lepsius immediately identified this queen with that of the canopic box in Berlin. Since that day Wilkinson's coffin and Passalacqua's box have been accepted as having been found together in the same tomb, without a dissenting note so far as I am aware<sup>1</sup>. On the coffin the Queen Mentuhotp appears,


in a most interesting light, as  and as




"The Great Royal Wife, who has assumed the Beautiful White Crown, Mentuhotp; begotten by the Mayor, Vizier and Superintendent of the Six Great Houses, Senebhenaf, and born of the Princess Sebekhotp."

Now Passalacqua in writing of the finding of the canopic box, says: "elle était placée par terre dans un tombeau de Thebes, près d'une momie, dont aucun caractère ne la distinguait de celles qu'on découvre le plus souvent, tel que le 1538, quoique ayant été déposée dans un cercueil moins riche en peinture que le 1537." According to his catalogue the

and SCHORER, *Familienblatt*, vi, 784, and expresses the opinion that the relation of Queen Mentuhotp to King Tehuti is somewhat dubious. Finally WEILL, *op. cit.*, 341, 407, reviews most of the bibliography. Photograph on Plate XV is from *Aegypt. u. Vorderasiat. Altertümer*.

<sup>1</sup> GOODWIN in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1866, 53, gave a transcript of the name and titles of this Queen Mentuhotp and a list of chapters of the Book of the Dead in its inscriptions. A footnote identifying this queen with that of the canopic box is signed R. L. (Richard Lepsius). EISENLOHR in *P.S.B.A.*, 1881, 99 and WIEDEMANN, *Geschichte*, 229-30, both mention it, accept its identification with the canopic box, and are misled, by supposing that the title  is an integral part of the name, into false identifications with other monuments where the title remains but the name itself is lost. GRIFFITH in *P.S.B.A.*, 1892, 40, gives the name with genealogy as above, in which he is quoted by GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 1912, 124; MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 301 and WEILL, *op. cit.*, 407. Finally in 1910 Wilkinson's copies were published in BUDGE, *Facsimiles of Hieratic Papyri in the B.M.*, Pls. XXXIX-XLVIII.



coffin 1537 was richly decorated with paintings representing a great number of divinities and texts. Now since the rectangular sarcophagi of the Middle Kingdom were not decorated with representations of divinities, and since the only coffins known by Passalacqua which lacked such representations were his set of Middle Kingdom rectangular coffins now in Berlin<sup>1</sup>, he evidently intends to say that the coffin of Queen Mentuhotp was anthropoid in type. But the sketch by Wilkinson on his last plate shows that what he copied was a rectangular Middle Kingdom sarcophagus, and moreover one identical in type with that in Berlin, which Passalacqua found and which was his especial pride. It has the same panelled exterior, cavetto cornice and shrine roof which would have attracted Passalacqua's attention instantly, and which undoubtedly would have received mention in his catalogue, and probably have been added to his collection with the canopic box. Evidently, therefore, the Queen Mentuhotp of Passalacqua's canopic box was not the Queen Mentuhotp of Wilkinson's sarcophagus, and the latter with its interesting genealogy has no place in the study of King Dhout<sup>2</sup>.


That Passalacqua's Queen Mentuhotp was the wife of the King Dhout who presented the box to her, has been generally admitted. Had she been his mother she would have undoubtedly been called the  on the canopic box. At this period, the case of Queen Sebekemsaf must have been the exception and that of Queen Nubkhas the rule, and we can reasonably expect that Queen Mentuhotp was buried near her husband King Dhout. Therefore if we can locate, even in the most general way, the tomb of the queen, we should know in what vicinity to look for the king.

Giuseppe Passalacqua dug in Thebes between 1822 and 1825. He has left us an extremely good account of his life in Kurnah, where he procured for himself a native house on the southern end of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ<sup>3</sup>, and practically all his activities seem to have

<sup>1</sup> PASSALACQUA, *op. cit.*, 184.

<sup>2</sup> Queen Mentuhotp, daughter of the Vizier Senebhenaf and Princess Sebekhotp, must remain somewhat uncertain in date. Budge published the Wilkinson coffin as Eleventh Dynasty, and Birch (footnote to Eisenlohr's article above) and Griffith relate it to a fragment in the B.M. from the sarcophagus of Herunefer, son of an Eleventh Dynasty King Mentuhotp. I prefer a later date, however. The names of the queen's parents are typical of the Twelfth-Thirteenth Dynasties. A vizier's son Senebhenaf of the end of the Twelfth Dynasty is known from a cemetery near Dêr el-Bahrî which was characterized by coffins with texts such as Wilkinson's (WINLOCK in *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1922, Part II, Fig. 23). A Queen Senebhenas

 is well-known from scarabs of the same period or a little later (NEWBERRY, *Scarabs*, Pl. XIII, 30, and *P.S.B.A.*, 1902, 252; *Ausführ. Verzeichnis Berlin*, 416; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 124; HALL, *Cat. of Scarabs in B.M.*, I, 21; WEILL, *op. cit.*, 407). The name Mentuhotp itself goes down later still, and was borne by at least two persons contemporary with the Seventeenth Dynasty in addition to the wife of King Dhout.  owned a magic wand found in the

Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ (SPIEGELBERG in *P.S.B.A.*, 1906, 160); and a  Mentuhotp appears on bandages from the royal *cache* at Dêr el-Bahrî (MASPERO, *Momies royales*, 539, 544; DARESSY in *Annales*, 1908, 137).

<sup>3</sup> PASSALACQUA, *op. cit.*, 199-200, 203, n. 1, says that his house was in Kurnah which was, down to 1860 at least, that part of the Necropolis north of the Ramesseum, centering around the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ and the Seti Temple (CHAMPOLLION, *Lettres*, ed. 1833, 101, 457; MARIETTE in *Comptes rendus Acad. des Inscip.*, 1859, 161; VASSALLI, *Mon. istorici*, 126). In 1830 Bonomi (NEWBERRY in *Annales*, 1906, 83-4) saw the house of "Abu Saccara" (which is no more far-fetched for a *fellâh's* rendering of "Passalacqua" than "Deir Sikaïo" for the "Dêr es-Sieur Caillaud," *op. cit.*, 80) on the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, below the Bowaba which is at the southern end of the hill.

been near by. His fine Eleventh Dynasty tomb was a couple of hundred yards west<sup>1</sup>; on the southern spur of the hill he made his most important find, the community burial-place in one of the Eleventh Dynasty corridor tombs<sup>2</sup>; and in the flat, not far away, was one of his biggest digs, in which four of his men were buried by a cave-in. In his spirited description of the accident, he tells how he rushed to the rescue from his house, which was evidently near by, but since his efforts to save the men had come to nothing by nightfall, he took the discreet course and disappeared in the darkness. Across the rugged pitfalls of the 'Asâsîf he fled to the house of his friend Yanni Athanasi, and from the windows of an upper room, watched the torches flickering around the site of the accident<sup>3</sup>. Now Yanni's house still stands on Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah, and from its upper windows I have verified the fact that one can just see the southern end of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ and the adjoining flat where Carnarvon and Carter and Lansing have dug recently. In fact, except for once when he was looking for an underground passage from Dêr el-Baḥrî to the Valley of the Kings, all Passalacqua's digs were right in this neighbourhood<sup>4</sup>, and I think we are justified in assuming that his tomb of Queen Mentuḥotp was found there. This would make the southern, or at most the central, part of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ just north of the Ta'ô tombs, the logical place to look for the burial-place of King Dhout.

A new list of the kings buried in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ may now be drawn up, combining in one roster the names derived from the Abbott Papyrus and those derived from the other sources discussed :

King	Tomb Position	King's Relationships
(1) Sekhemrê'-Wahkha Ra'ḥotp	.....unknown	.....unknown.
(2) Sekhemrê'-Heruhirma't Intef	.....unknown	.....unknown.
(3) Sekhemrê'-Wapma't Intef-ô	.....near next	.....brother and predecessor of next.
(4) Nubkheperre' Intef	.....near Tomb 13	.....brother and successor of last.
(5) Sekhemrê'-Wazkhou Sebekemsaf	.....near last	.....father of next ?
(6) Sekhemrê'-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf	.....near Tomb 146 ?	.....son of last ?
(7) Sekhemrê'-Smentawi Dhout	.....lower end of line ?	.....unknown.
(8) Senakhtenrê' Ta'ô-ô I	.....near next	.....father of next.
(9) Seḳenenrê' Ta'ô-ḳen II	.....near last	.....son of last, father of next.
(10) Wazkheperre' Kamose	.....end of line	.....son of last, brother of Ahmose I.

This article has already become too extended to permit of a discussion of the purely historical bearings of such a list. The reader may consider, for example, that there are other kings whose tombs are unknown in the Theban Necropolis but who should be classed with

<sup>1</sup> Located by a sketch of Passalacqua's in STEINDORFF, *Grabfunde*, I, 1. The cave-in, below, was 200 paces east.

<sup>2</sup> In one of the most easterly of the row of Eleventh Dynasty tombs, which starts at Dêr el-Baḥrî and ends on the southern spur of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ among the native houses, into one of which this tomb broke (PASSALACQUA, *op. cit.*, 199). SCHÄFER, *Goldschmiedarbeiten*, 25, supposes that the tomb was on Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah, but there are no corridor tombs on that hill 9 ft. wide, 9 ft. high going straight into the hill for 100 ft. as this one did.

<sup>3</sup> PASSALACQUA, *op. cit.*, 213 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Brick pyramids, among which he dug (*op. cit.*, 191), are well known along this part of the hill but are not common elsewhere in the Necropolis.

those above<sup>1</sup>, and he will scent something unorthodox in the positions of the two Sebekem-safs. Nevertheless the development of such questions must be begged except in so far as the evidence of the Necropolis itself is involved. This, however, is overwhelmingly in favour of considering the above kings' tombs as one homogeneous archaeological group—not only in their location in the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ but in their form and contents as well, so far as we know them.

The tombs themselves appear to have been crude brick pyramids, necessarily of small dimensions to judge from their practically complete disappearance. The contemporary pyramid in the Birâbî, which might be the tomb of Kamose, was only eight metres square in plan, but it was disproportionately high, with sides sloping up at 66° from the horizontal. In the pyramid of Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> we find nearly the same slope (60°) and gain the additional fact that the apex was a capstone bearing the titles and names of the king. These were repeated at the pyramid of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> on two small obelisks which stood in front. The pyramid itself was massive, and we read of the thieves tunneling 2½ cubits into that of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> without getting anywhere. In fact this pyramid was solid, evidently, with the chapel (the chamber found by Mariette) cut in the face of the rock below in the fashion of a Seventeenth or Eighteenth Dynasty miniature pyramid found by Lansing in the Birâbî, which was of the type shown in the vignettes to the Book of the Dead<sup>2</sup>. Elsewhere the chapel was built against the east face (Kamose? pyramid), or was a long narrow chamber on the ground-level in the mass of the pyramid itself (Tetisheri pyramid at Abydos). At the back of this chapel was "the place where the stela of the pyramid was set up" (Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup> and Tetisheri), and from there (Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>t</sup>), or from an adjoining underground tomb (Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> and Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi), the thieves could tunnel into the lower chambers of the pyramid, which were cut in the rock below (Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> and Kamose?), and lined with masonry (Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi). This, the actual burial-place, was reached by a pit (Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>), or a stairway (Kamose?), below the chapel floor. In it stood the sarcophagus (Sekhemrê<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi), or a substitute for a sarcophagus, cut in the living rock (Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>).

Mariette, in the articles written or inspired by him, dwelt upon a custom which he had observed of burying *rîshi* coffins directly in the earth, and we have confirmation of the existence of such burials for private persons in the Seventeenth Dynasty from the excavations of Passalacqua<sup>3</sup> and of Petrie<sup>4</sup>. However it is clearly only a misleading coincidence that

<sup>1</sup> On this point I have had an extremely interesting suggestion from Newberry. According to Diodorus (Book I, xlvi) "The priests affirm, from their annals, that there were (at Thebes) 47 royal tombs, but in the reign of Ptolemy I, son of Lagus (before 300 B.C.), there were only 17, of which many had been destroyed when I visited those countries during the CLXXX Olympiad (57 B.C.). Not only the Egyptian priests who draw their information from their annals, but also many of the Greeks who visited Thebes in the time of Ptolemy, son of Lagus, and have written on the history of Egypt—among others Hecataeus—agree with what I have said." If we tried to reconstruct this priestly inventory of 47 tombs to-day, we should attribute to the Eleventh Dynasty 5 known tombs, to the Eighteenth to Twentieth Dynasties 25 known tombs, plus an additional tomb for Ahmose I and possibly one each for Smenkhkêrê<sup>c</sup>, Ramesses VIII and Ramesses IX (Petrie's numbering), and to the Twenty-first Dynasty at least 3 tombs for the three kings' mummies existing. The total would thus be 37 tombs, leaving 10 for the Seventeenth Dynasty as in my list above. Naturally we must not take too seriously a calculation which contains so many evident uncertainties, but at least it suggests that there were not many more than 10 kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty buried in their capital, Thebes.

<sup>2</sup> LANSING, in *Bull. Met. Mus. Art*, 1917, Suppl. May, Fig. 7.

<sup>3</sup> PASSALACQUA, *Cat. raisonné*, 155; SCHÄFER, *Goldschmiedearbeiten*, 19, Pl. IV, where a date which appears to me too late, is given.

<sup>4</sup> PETRIE, *Qurneh*, 6 and Plates.

four royalties were found so buried—Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Heruḥirma<sup>c</sup>t, Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>c</sup>t, Kamose and Aḥhotp—because at least two of them had originally rested in tombs whose inspection is recounted in the Abbott Papyrus. Furthermore it is to be noted that all four were found in a restricted area near the foot of the Dirā' Abu'l-Nagā between 1846 and 1859, although their original tombs had probably been fairly widely separated. All things considered, the only reasonable explanation of this circumstance is that their finding-place was a *cache* where they were hidden from the thieves at some period subsequent to the inspection in the reign of Ramesses IX<sup>1</sup>. While the guardians of the Valley of the Kings were moving the royal mummies under their care to the tombs of Seti I and Amenophis II, and thence to those of Inhapi and Amenophis I, the guardians of the Dirā' Abu'l-Nagā were removing their charges, one by one, to holes in the plain in their own district. Kamose and Aḥhotp, at least, were hidden away unrobbed. Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf and his wife Nubkhas had already been robbed, and so had Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> Ta<sup>c</sup>o II and Tetisheri by the time of the great move to the Dêr el-Baḥrî *cache*, when they were gathered up with their more famous descendants. Nubkheperrē<sup>c</sup> Intef, and probably Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf, were overlooked by both thieves and priests and seem to have rested undisturbed in their own tombs until 1827.

The existing coffins from the tombs described above all belong to the class termed *rîshi*, or "feathered," by their earliest discoverers<sup>2</sup>. Mariette, who knew the Intef coffins first and was committed to the idea that all Intefs were of the Eleventh Dynasty, fell into natural confusion over the dates of Kamose and Aḥhotp, found by him subsequently. Steindorff<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, resting on the assured positions of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> and Aḥhotp, thirty years ago pointed out the natural conclusion that the Intefs whose coffins exist were related to the last kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty, and gradually—but with curious slowness—his able demonstration has prevailed. To-day, after the excavations of Lord Carnarvon and of the Metropolitan Museum, there can be no question about the date of the general class of *rîshi* coffins. The earliest definitely belong to the period after the Twelfth Dynasty; for private persons they disappear in the first generations of the Eighteenth Dynasty, but the kings retained them at least as late as Tut<sup>c</sup>ankhamūn.

Royal coffins were naturally of gold, and we must therefore exclude from consideration those of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Heruḥirma<sup>c</sup>t Intef and Kamose, which were evidently intended for private persons and were only procured from the stocks of local undertakers to fill the emergencies which arose on the early and unexpected deaths of those kings. The remaining four known royal coffins—those of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Wapma<sup>c</sup>t and his brother Nubkheperrē<sup>c</sup>, and of Seḳenenrē<sup>c</sup> and his wife Aḥhotp—were gilded coffins made expressly for royal graves. With them we may class those of Sekhemrē<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf and his wife Nubkhas, which were described by their destroyers as "coverings"—anthropoid coffins—gilded and perhaps inlaid.


The four existing coffins are identical in style. They are of a comparatively massive construction. Inside they are painted with bitumen. The gilding actually is applied to



<sup>1</sup> PETRIE, *History*, II, 10, states this to have been the case with Aḥhotp and infers that it was probably done with other royalties. He discards the frequently stated idea that thieves carried off her coffin intact, and the heretofore unnoticed fact that at least three other similar cases existed, demonstrates that his explanation must be right.

<sup>2</sup> See especially VASSALLI, *Mon. istorici*, 137.

<sup>3</sup> *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1895, 91 ff.



the lids only and the bodies are painted a greenish-blue<sup>1</sup>. The kings are represented as wearing the royal *nemes* head-dress with the uraeus pegged on the brow, and this was added even to the stock coffin procured for Sekhemrē-Heruhirmaḥt. Aḥhotp has feminine curls. The eyes are of hard stone in metal frames; the ears are pegged on and the kings all originally had beards. Arms and hands are invisible, after the Middle Kingdom fashion. The bodies are comparatively broad; the knees are rather strongly indicated, and from them descend two sharp ridges, representing the shin bones, which merge into widely flaring feet of a peculiar, high, semicircular aspect when viewed from the front. On the chest is the broad collar with hawk-headed shoulder-pieces engraved in the gesso before the gilding, and below it a vulture, or vulture and uraeus, with outspread wings. A gigantic pair of wings envelops the rest of the body down to the feet, except for a single vertical column of inscription which goes down the front and is continued under the feet in a short invocation to Isis and Nephthys who kneel on  at either side.

The slight differences which exist between these four coffins are only such as might be explained by a short period of development. Thus, that of Nubkheperre retains the Middle Kingdom orthography of  without the legs<sup>2</sup>, and the other coffins represent the birds entire. Sekenenrē's coffin has the uraeus body wriggling back over the head-dress, and the goddesses under the feet are kneeling upon . The head-dresses of the two Intefs, which were possibly the products of the same hands, are more angular than those of Ta'o II and Aḥhotp. In fact a tendency toward gracefulness and elegance can be detected in the private coffin of Kamose. The knees are there obliterated, and while the feet remain blunted and the hands still invisible in the days of Ahmose<sup>3</sup>, in the following reign the feet become thinner and the arms and hands are freed from their bandages<sup>4</sup>. With Ahmose, imported cedar wood began to improve the carpenter's work and greater wealth tempted the inlayers of costly stones to more elaboration.

Three of the kings' canopic boxes exist—those of Sekhemrē-Wapmaḥ Intef, Sekhemrē-Wazkhou Sebekemsaf, and the one originally made for King Dhout. All three are small and follow the shape and construction of the Middle Kingdom coffins and canopic boxes with rounded lids and square gable-ends. Their decorations—blue, outlined in black, with red guide-lines on a white ground—show the usual inscriptions with an additional characteristic of the period—the jackal of Anubis painted within the square panels on each side. The Sebekemsaf box has an inner lid with the four canopic heads upon it, and there is reason to believe that in all three cases the packets of viscera were placed directly in the compartments of the box without being put in jars.

The embalming of all the mummies was uniformly poor. The body of Ta'o II, and

<sup>1</sup> This coat of greenish-blue paint was not applied to the body of Sekenenrē's coffin, possibly because it was not finished.

<sup>2</sup> This orthography survived, as a matter of fact, down to the private coffin used for Kamose.

<sup>3</sup> DARESSY, *Cercueils des cachettes royales*, 61002 and 61008, figures the coffins of Ahmose I and his son Siamūn. He hesitates to admit that these were their original coffins on page 242, but to me there appears to be no doubt that they were. The absence of hands on M.K. anthropoid coffins, I have noted in *Senebtisi*, 54.

<sup>4</sup> Three royal coffins made in the reign of Amenophis I are DARESSY, *op. cit.*, 61003 (Ahmose-Nefertiri); 61006 (Aḥhotp II); 61012 (Ahmose-Henttamihu). The development of the *rishi* coffin goes on in 61025 (Tuthmosis I); 61014 (Tuthmosis III) and in the coffins of Akhenaten and Tut'ankhamūn.

possibly Tetisheri, alone exist to-day<sup>1</sup>. Five other kings have probably been found during the last century and all their mummies seem to have perished on discovery. Bandages with religious texts have been found in three cases at least—Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>, and Tetisheri, and a Prince Mentuhotp from the Dêr el-Bahrî *cache*.

Of the objects placed with the bodies not enough are known to justify an extended comparison being made. Arms are characteristic of the period. Ahhotp's magnificent equipment, the various axes and swords from the reign of Kamose, those from the excavations of Carter and Lansing, and the daggers found by Vassalli with ÇAkhor and by Passalacqua with an unknown man, attest the warlike character of the age. It is not surprising, therefore, to find among the kings that Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef had his bows and arrows, Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf his sword, and Kamose his dagger. This last and that of ÇAkhor, both worn on the left arms in Nubian fashion, are extremely interesting. Of jewels we find that Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup> Intef and Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf both wore diadems, and that Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf had a heart-scarab similar to one of the Kamose period, or slightly later, found by Lansing. Finally the gold work on these heart-scarabs, on the Sebekemsaf scarab now in the Carnarvon Collection, and on the jewels of Queen Sebekemsaf, wife of Nubkheperre<sup>c</sup>, has the same soldered wire ornamentation as appears on the armlet placed on the mummy of Kamose and on a dagger-sheath placed on the mummy of Ahhotp by Ahmose I.

Notwithstanding its necessary incompleteness the above summary of the characteristics of the pyramids and their contents is ample to establish conclusively the fact that these Theban tombs form one homogeneous archaeological group. Hence the kings buried in them must be considered one group of Theban rulers, and since the last three are admittedly of the Seventeenth Dynasty, it follows that the remaining kings are likewise.

The inclusion of the Sebekemsafs in this dynastic group will possibly come as a surprise to the students of our current histories of ancient Egypt. Some twenty years ago Pieper very ingeniously reconstructed the family tree of Rensenb of El-Kâb, and by so doing demonstrated that one of his wives was the great-grand-daughter of a Queen Nubkhas, and another wife the daughter of a Princess Neferhotp who was a contemporary, or possibly a daughter, of a Queen Sensenb<sup>2</sup>. The Queen Nubkhas of this genealogy was thus one, or possibly two, generations before the Queen Sensenb. Since Pieper identified the first of these queens with the wife of Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf and the second with the wife of Khasekhemre<sup>c</sup> Neferhotp, it would follow that Sebekemsaf preceded Neferhotp by one or two generations. Weill went a step further<sup>3</sup>. He assumed—and it was purest assumption—that the uncle of Rensenb's first wife was the Nomarch Sebeknakht of El-Kâb. This Sebeknakht is known to have held lands willed by Sekhemre<sup>c</sup>-Swaztawi Sebekhotp, the predecessor of Khasekhemre<sup>c</sup> Neferhotp in the Turin Papyrus. Weill thus arrives at a series of kings: (1) Sebekemsaf, (2) Sebekhotp, (3) Neferhotp.

Pieper's placing of Sebekemsaf before Neferhotp has received universal acceptance. Based upon it, Meyer has placed one or both of the Sebekemsafs in a lacuna in the Turin Papyrus, among the early kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty<sup>4</sup>. Breasted also takes them for

<sup>1</sup> Since the mummy of Ta'ô II was removed to the Dêr el-Bahrî *cache* 3000 years ago, the damp level along the foot of the Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ has risen some 3 metres. This may explain how this mummy, alone of all its contemporaries, has survived.

<sup>2</sup> PIEPER, *Die Könige Aegyptens zwischen dem Mittleren und Neuen Reich* (Doctor's Dissertation, Berlin, 1904), 2-5. The genealogy has since been given by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 342, and PETRIE, *History*, I, 228.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 344.

<sup>4</sup> MEYER, *Geschichte*, par. 299.

obscure kings of the Thirteenth Dynasty ruling from Thebes<sup>1</sup>, and Weill—who is followed more or less closely by Petrie—has constructed largely from this one sequence a complicated and confusing alternation of periods of union and disruption, by intercalating the Sebekemsafs and their related kings among the Neferhotps and Sebekhotps. Pieper<sup>2</sup> and Burchardt<sup>3</sup> have steadfastly held to Steindorff's demonstration that the kings buried in Thebes form one group and have called this group the Seventeenth Dynasty, but they have held to the position of Sebekemsaf before Neferhotp, and hence for them the Seventeenth Dynasty has been contemporary with, and vassal to, the Thirteenth.

And all these complexities rest, in the last analysis, on the purest assumption. There is nothing whatever to identify the Nubkhas and Sensenb of El-Kâb with the wives of Sebekemsaf and Neferhotp, and therefore, if in all the period between the Twelfth and the Eighteenth Dynasties, there existed another Queen Nubkhas or another Queen Sensenb, the whole house of cards comes tumbling down. By a similar line of reasoning some future historian could have Archbishop Cranmer burned at the stake on the instigation of Queen Mary in the reign of William of Orange or even of George V. For in the Intermediate Period the name Sensenb, while possibly not quite as common as Mary is to-day, had a popularity which lasted at least until Queen Sensenb, mother of Tuthmosis I. The name Nubkhas has perhaps survived less often, but names compounded with *Nub* were frequently used<sup>4</sup>. Nor can this hypothesis be bolstered up with the stela of Queen Nubkhas in the Louvre<sup>5</sup>, which probably comes from Abydos and not from the tomb in Thebes. While it may belong to the Nubkhas of El-Kâb there is no authority for attaching it to the wife of Sebekemsaf.

Pieper's structure was ingenious but it rests on dangerous assumptions—how dangerous we have already seen in the discovery of the two queens called Mentuhotp. Often such an assumption is justifiable—always, in fact, until it leads to difficulties as it has here, where it makes more confused an already obscure period. For me personally, the only course is to abandon entirely the whole El-Kâb connection, divorce the Sebekemsafs and their group from the Thirteenth Dynasty and keep them with the Ta'os and Kamose in the Seventeenth Dynasty of Thebes.

<sup>1</sup> BREASTED, *History*, 211.

<sup>2</sup> Most recently in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 1913, 103-5.

<sup>3</sup> BURCHARDT and PIEPER, *Königsnamen*, Seventeenth Dynasty.

<sup>4</sup> The monuments mentioning Queens Nubkhas are the Abbott and Amherst Papyri; the Louvre stela (WEILL, *op. cit.*, 392; PETRIE, *op. cit.*, 237; GAUTHIER, *Rois*, II, 76); and the stela mentioning the steward of the Queen Nubkhas listed above under Sekhemrê-Shedtawi. It is purely an assumption on my part that this last mentions the wife of Sebekemsaf. A private name Nubkhas is mentioned by WEILL, *op. cit.*, 402, together with a name Nubhetepti. On the Louvre stela the sisters of Queen Nubkhas bear such names as Nubemhab, Nubemkhuit and Nibitemnub, and a contemporary was called Nubemhêt. From Edfû Engelbach in *Annales*, 1922, 130, has collected ten contemporary names compounded with Nub.

<sup>5</sup> See Weill, Petrie and Gauthier, above.

## EARLY PSALMS AND LECTIONS FOR LENT

BY H. J. M. MILNE

THE document which we print below, although little inferior in date to the well-known Church Calendar from Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. xi, 1357), can scarcely claim to equal that unique record either in interest or instruction. The particular choice of lections, after all, is relatively unimportant and must have been left in early days largely to local discretion. It was the more solemn part of the liturgy that tended first to grow rigid, and except in one particular case our table differs entirely from those in use at the present day.

The Epistle and Gospel, which the English Communion Service inherits from the Western Church, are the relics of a much larger body of lections, drawn both from the Old and the New Testament, which it was customary in the early Church to recite at that introductory stage of the Eucharist known as the Mass of the Catechumens. Also between each lection a psalm with response was sung, and this usage has left its mark in the Roman gradual psalm and in the so-called *προκείμενα* and *ἀλληλούια* chanted before the epistle and gospel respectively in the Byzantine rite. By the sixth century, the date more or less of our document, the Old Testament lections had been abandoned in the Greek Church, leaving only the epistle and gospel. The exact status of the psalm verses in our list is rather puzzling. They can hardly be lections in the ordinary sense, for there is no evidence that the psalms were used for that purpose. Dr. Brightman, to whom I am deeply indebted for many suggestions, is also puzzled. If they are the Byzantine *προκείμενα*, he writes, one would expect two verses (versicle and response) and also another verse or verses before the gospel.

The fragmentary character of the papyrus leaf raises several questions which a kinder fate might have left clear. Our list begins with the eve of Quinquagesima, but the top of the leaf is missing, and also all the other leaves if there were any. We cannot therefore tell whether our leaf was issued as a pamphlet for Lent alone or belongs to a larger directory which would have given a complete list of *συνάξεις* for all seasons. The fact that only Saturday and Sunday lections appear in the part preserved is explained by the ordinance of the Council of Laodicea (about 365 A.D.) restricting the celebration of the Eucharist proper during Lent to those two days. Another problem is raised by another critical gap. What figure are we to supply at the beginning of line 13? Is that Sunday, as one would naturally suppose, called the first Sunday of Lent or does the numeration start from Sexagesima? This affects the number of lines missing from the top of the page. If Quadragesima Sunday is numbered 3, then only two or at most three lines are missing, because the fifth Sunday begins at the fourth preserved line on the verso. In the other case five or six lines might have to be added, and certainly this would give a leaf of a more natural shape. Again, if we could only be sure of the end of line 28. It reads like *τὴν τῶν λιμβ[ειῶν]*, a late form of *λιχνειῶν*. Perhaps *ἀρχὴν* is to be supplied or *ἐβδομάδα*, meaning the week of delicacies, a sort of *semaine grasse*? Alternate fast weeks in Lent were a recognized institution in some of the early churches. Obviously, too, line 33 might enlighten

the decipherer. That Saturday is distinguished by alternatives in epistle and gospel as well as in the psalm. A very special day, evidently. Here we may note the curious fact that no Sunday is provided with alternatives.

A few technical details remain to be added. The papyrus, numbered 455 + 1849 in the British Museum inventory, has been pieced together from four fragments and now measures 26 × 24.4 cm. Only a few lines on each side are complete. The hand is the large rounded sloping uncial of ecclesiastical type. The letters *α* and *μ* are of the form familiar in (*e.g.*) the Codex Marchalianus, though of much less calligraphic appearance; the *ν* shows Coptic influence. The ink has the light tint common at the period, and the papyrus itself is of a bleached appearance. Contractions, which abound of course in a document of this nature, are marked by a wavy line. The customary confusion of vowels, *ε* for *αι*, *ο* for *ω*, was to be expected. Note that the chapter-numbers refer to the old *τίτλοι*. Our modern chapters derive from a 13th century renumeration of the Vulgate, and our verse-division we owe to the Greek New Testament (4th ed. 1551) of the printer Stephanus. The Psalms of course have the Septuagint numbering.

*Recto.*

- + τῷ σαβ[βάτω] οἷσα[  
 ἡ ψ(αλμὸς) λ̄ ἀνδρίζ[εσθε καὶ] κρατεούσθω ἡ κ[αρδία] ὑμῶν  
 τοῦ ἀποστόλου πρ[ὸς Φιλιππη]σ(ίους) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἕως [  
 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Μ(αθθαίου) μὴ θησαυρίζεται ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
- 5 τῇ β̄ κυρι(ακῆ) ὅτε μέλλ(ουσι) παραλαμβάνειν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Μ̄  
 ψ(αλμὸς) ριξ̄ ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας δικαιοσύνης εἰσελθῶ(ν) ἐν αὐταῖς  
 τοῦ ἀποστ(όλου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) ζ̄ κ(εφαλαίου) τῆς πρ[ὸς Κορι(νθίους)] ἐπιστ(ολῆς) συνεργ-  
 γούντε(ς δὲ καὶ) παρακαλοῦμεν  
 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) γ̄ κ(εφαλαίου) τότε ὁ Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 πν(εύματος) εἰς τὴν ἔρη(μον)
- τῷ σαββάτῳ τῆς ᾱ ὑπε(ρ)θέσεως ψ(αλμὸς) μ̄ ἐγὼ εἶπα κ(ύρι)ε ἐλέησόν μ(ε)  
 10 ἴ[α]σαι τῇ(ν) ψυχῇ(ν) μ(ου) ὅτι ἤμαρτ(όν σοι) ἡ ψ(αλμὸς) ρκθ̄ ἐκ βαθέων ἐκέκραξ(α)  
 τοῦ ἀποστ(όλου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) ξ̄ κ(εφαλαίου) τῆς πρὸς Γαλάτ(ας) ἐπ[ιστ(ολῆς)] ὁ δὲ  
 κᾶ[ρπὸς τοῦ πν(εύματος)] ἐστὶν ἀγάπη.  
 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ ε̄ κ(εφαλαίου) αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν
- τῇ ᾱ κυρι(ακῆ) τῶν νηστ(ειῶν) ψ(αλμὸς) π̄γ μακάριος ἀνή[ρ  
 τοῦ ἀποστ]τ(όλου) [ἐκ τοῦ ς̄] κ(εφαλαίου) τῆς πρ(ὸς) Ῥωμ(αίους) ἀρ[  
 15 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Μαθθαίου] ἐκ τ(οῦ) κ̄γ κ(εφαλαίου) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκε[ίνῃ  
 τῷ σαββάτῳ τῆς β̄] ὑπερθέσεως ψ(αλμὸς) ζ̄ [  
 ] ἡ ψ(αλμὸς) κθ̄ ἐν [τῷ θελήματί σου  
 τοῦ ἀποστ]τ(όλου) [ἐκ τοῦ γ̄ κ(εφαλαίου)] τῆς πρὸς [[E]] Φι[λιππησίου]ς  
 ἀδελφ[οῖ] ἐγὼ, ἐμαυτὸν [[οπ]] οὐ λ[ογίζομαι  
 20 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) λ̄η κ(εφαλαίου) ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν  
 τῇ β̄ κυρι(ακῆ) τῶν νηστ(ειῶν) ψ(αλμὸς) οβ̄ ἐμοὶ δὲ, τὸ πρ[ὸς]σ[κ(ολλᾶσθαι)  
 τοῦ ἀποστ]τ(όλου) ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Θεσσαλονικ[εῖς]  
 ἐκ τ(οῦ) κ(ατὰ) τ(ὸν) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) νζ̄ κ(εφαλαίου) καθημέ[ρου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ  
 ὅρου τῶν Ἑλεῶν {ἕως} (καὶ) τ(ὰ) ἐξῆ[ς]

*Verso (poor surface).*

- 25 τοῦ ἀποστ[τ(όλου) ἐκ [του̇ δ̇ κεφαλαίου τῆς πρὸς Τι]μόθεον ἐπιστ(ολῆς)  
 πιστὸς] ὁ λόγος εἰ γὰρ συ[ναπεθά]νομεν καὶ συνζήσομ(εν)  
 ἐκ τ(οῦ) κ(ατὰ) τ(όν) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) μῆ κεφαλαίου) τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς  
 δοῦλος)
- τῆ̇ ε̇ κυριακ(ῆ) ὅτε μέλ[λ(ουσι) παρα]λαμβάνειν τῆ(ν) τῶ(ν) λιμβ[ειῶν]  
 ψ(αλμὸς) μᾶ ὃν τρόπον ἐπιποθεῖ ἢ ἔλαφος ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς.
- 30 τοῦ ἀποστ(όλου) ἐκ [τ(οῦ) β̇] κ(εφαλαίου) τῆς πρὸς Κορι(νθίους) ἐπιστολ(ῆς)  
 καὶ π[ρ]ὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανὸς (καὶ) τ(ὰ) ἐ[ξ]ῆς  
 τ(οῦ) κ(ατὰ) Μ(αθθαίου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) κ̇ κ(εφαλαίου) . . . . . Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς ἐξομολογοῦμ(αί  
 σοι) π[άτερ . . .
- τῶ̇ [σαββάτω ] . . . . . γῆρ . . . . .
- ψ(αλμὸς) λα̇ μακάριοι ὃν ἀφέθησαν αἱ [ἀνομίαι  
 35 ἢ ψ(αλμὸς) πδ̇ ἀ]φήκας τὰς ἀν[ομίας τῶ λαῶ σου,  
 ἐκάλυψα]ς πάσας τὰς ἀμ[αρτίας αὐτῶν  
 τοῦ ἀποστ[τ(όλου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) ιδ̇ κ(εφαλαίου) ῥῶ[  
 καθὼς καὶ ὁ] νόμος λέγει εἰ [δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν  
 ἢ τοῦ ἀποστ(όλου)] πρὸς Γαλάτ(ας) ἐ[κ τ(οῦ) κ̇ κ(εφαλαίου)] δ[  
 40 τοῦ κ(ατὰ) Ἰωάννην ἐ]κ τ(οῦ) γ̇ κ(εφαλαίου) περὶ Νικηδ[ήμου  
 ἢ ἐκ τ(οῦ)] ξ̇ κ(εφαλαίου) ὁ πιστεύων ἔχε[ι ζωὴν αἰώνιον  
 τῆ̇ ε̇ κυριακ(ῆ)] τῶ(ν) νηστ(ειῶν) ψ(αλμὸς) ρ̇μξ̇ μέγα[ς ὁ Κύριος  
 τοῦ ἀποστόλου] πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἀπ' ἀρ[χῆς  
 τ(οῦ) κ(ατὰ) τ(όν)] Ἰω(άννην) ἐκ τ(οῦ) [ε̇] κ(εφαλαίου) μετὰ ταῦ[τα  
 45 ἦν ἢ ἑορτῆ] τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

*Recto.*

- + The Sab[bath ] . . . [
- Or Psalm xxx: Be of good courage and he shall strengthen your heart.  
 The Apostle to the [Philipp]ians from the beginning as far as [
- St Matthew: Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth.
- 5 The second Sunday when about to begin Lent.  
 Psalm cxvii: Open to me the gates of righteousness: I will go into them.  
 The Apostle from the 7th chapter of the Letter to the Corinthians: We then as  
 workers together beseech you.  
 St Matthew from the 3rd chapter: Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the  
 wilderness.
- The Sabbath of the first Fast-week. Ps. xl: I said, Lord, be merciful unto me,  
 10 Heal my soul for I have sinned against thee. Or Ps. cxxix: Out of the depths have  
 I cried.  
 The Apostle from the 6th chapter of the Letter to the Galatians: But the fruit of  
 the Spirit is love.  
 St Matthew from the 5th chapter: Ask and it shall be given you.  
 The [first] Sunday of Lent. Ps. lxxxiii: Blessed is the man [whose strength is in thee.  
 The Apostle from the —th chapter of the Letter to the Romans [

- 15 S. Mt. from the 23rd chapter: The same day [went Jesus out of the house.  
The Sabbath of the second] Fast-week. Ps. vii [  
] or Ps. xxix. 8 [Lord, by thy favour.  
The Apostle from the third chapter of the Letter to the Philippians:  
Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended.
- 20 S. Mt. from the 38th chapter: Verily I say unto you.  
The [second] Sunday of Lent. Ps. lxxii: But it is good for me to draw near to God.  
The Apostle from the Letter to the Thessalonians [  
From S. Mt. chap. 57: And as he sat upon the  
mount of Olives et cetera.

*Verso.*

- 25 The Apostle from [the 4th chapter] of the Letter to Timothy:  
It is a faithful saying, for if we be dead with him we shall also live with him.  
From S. Mt. chapter 48: Who then is a faithful and wise servant?  
The fifth Sunday when about to begin . . . . (?)  
Ps. xli: As the hart panteth after the water brooks.
- 30 The Apostle from the 2nd chapter of the Letter to the Corinthians:  
And who is sufficient for these things? et cetera.  
S. Mt. from the 20th chapter: At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee,  
O Father.  
The Sabbath . . . . .  
Ps. xxxi]: Blessed are they whose transgressions are forgiven.
- 35 Or Ps. lxxxiv]: Thou hast forgiven the iniquity [of thy people,  
thou hast covered] all their sins.  
The Apostle] from the 14th chapter to the Corinthians (?)  
] the law saith. And if they will learn any thing (?)  
Or the Apostle] to the Galatians from [chapter  
40 S. John] from the 3rd chapter concerning Nicodemus  
Or from the 6th] chapter: He that believeth hath [everlasting life.  
The [sixth] Sunday of Lent. Ps. cxlvi: Great [is the Lord  
The Apostle to the Ephesians from the beginning [  
S. John from the 5th chapter: After this there was  
45 a feast of the Jews.
- Line 1. The cross is apparently used here instead of the usual indentation with paragraphus.  
2. Ps. xxx, 27: 1. *κραταιούσθω*.  
4. S. Mt. vi, 19: 1. *θησαυρίζετε*.  
5. *τῆς Μ=τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς (ἡμέρας)*. The other name for Lent, *αἱ Νηστεῖαι*, is used lower down.  
6. Ps. cxvii, 19.  
7. 2 Cor. vi, 1.  
8. S. Mt. iv, 1. It is interesting to note that this Ep. and Gosp. are the same as the Roman (and therefore the English) for the 1st Sunday in Lent. (Note by Dr. Brightman.)  
9. Dr. Brightman writes: I do not remember to have seen *ὑπέρθεσις*—the carrying over or continuation of the fast of one day on to the next (superpositio, continuare ieiunium)—used in this very concrete sense of a group of fast days, but it is natural enough. Ps. xl, 5.  
10. Ps. cxxix, 1.  
11. Gal. v, 22.  
12. S. Mt. vii, 7.

13. Whether  $\bar{a}$  or  $\bar{\gamma}$  should be restored here is discussed in the introduction. Ps. lxxxiii, 5.
14. Nine passages in Romans begin with  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ .
15. S. Mt. xiii, 1.
17.  $\bar{\kappa}\epsilon$  is a possible reading = Ps. xxv, or  $\kappa(\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota)\epsilon$ , the opening of xxix, 8. But nothing in Ps. xxv suits  $\epsilon\nu$ ]
18. The writer began  $\text{Ἐφεσίους}$  but cancelled the E.
19. Phil. iii, 13. There is a comma between  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  as between  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$  δὲ and  $\tau\acute{\omicron}$  προσκολλᾶσθαι in l. 21.  $\omicron\pi$  is cancelled by dots above each letter.  $\omicron\upsilon\pi\omega$  is omitted as in some MSS.
20. S. Mt. xviii, 18.
21. Ps. lxxii, 28.
23. S. Mt. xxiv, 3. In the next line Dr. Brightman proposed  $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$  καὶ τότε ἤξει [τὸ τέλος] = xxiv, 14, but in view of line 31 the simplest solution is to omit  $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ . l. Ἐλαιῶν.
26. 2 Tim. ii, 11.
27. S. Mt. xxiv, 45.
28.  $\lambda\iota\mu\theta$ [εἶται is discussed in the introduction. The reading is not certain.
29. Ps. xli, 1.
31. 2 Cor. ii, 16 : καὶ τ(ᾶ) ἐ[ξ]ῆς suggested by H. I. Bell.
32. S. Mt. xi, 25 : MSS. : ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν. There is hardly room for all this and the order seems different.
34. Ps. xxx, 1 : l. ὄν.
35. Ps. lxxxiv, 2.
36. Some MSS. omit  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ .
37.  $\rho\omega$  is strange. In l. 38 νόμος λέγει seems fairly certain, and if  $\iota\delta$  is correctly read (the  $\iota$  may be imaginary), 1 Cor. xiv, 34 seems suitable and corresponds to the traces after λέγει. Otherwise Rom. iii, 19 might do, and would explain  $\rho\omega$ ]. Neither is quite satisfactory and the corruption seems incurable.
40. S. John iii. The old title of this chapter is  $\text{περὶ Νικοδήμου}$ .  $\text{Νικοδήμου}$  read by Dr. Brightman.
41. S. John vi, 47.
42. Ps. cxlvi, 5.
44. S. John v, 1.




## AN EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY MEASURE OF CAPACITY

By G. P. G. SOBHY

With Plate XXII

THE alabaster measure shown in the picture was bought from a well-known dealer in antiquities at Luxor in the winter of 1922. It is interesting for two reasons: first because measures of capacity inscribed with their values are not very common; second because, like all other known inscribed measures of capacity except one, it bears the cartouches of Tuthmosis III.

The inscription, as may be seen from the photograph (Plate XXII), consists of two vertical bands of hieroglyphs enclosed in squares which give the titles of Tuthmosis III:—The Good God *Mn-hpr-r<sup>c</sup>* the beloved of Amūn, the Son of the Sun *Dḥwti-mś Nfr-hpr* given life for ever—and a horizontal band giving the value of the vessel   $3\frac{1}{2}$  *hnw*. It must be remarked that the three vertical strokes representing the number 3 are neither equal nor parallel, and the first two taken from right to left could be easily mistaken for the sign  $\cap$  or ten, and the three together might read  $\cap |$  or eleven; but the use of a lens and the measured capacity of the vase show beyond doubt that the two strokes are not attached above to form the loop of the sign  $\cap$  and the reading as  $3\frac{1}{2}$  is quite sure.

The vase contained a certain amount of dried resinous material the nature of which unfortunately could not be detected by chemical analysis.

It was Chabas who, in a small pamphlet entitled *Détermination métrique de deux mesures égyptiennes de capacité*, first tried to determine the capacity of the *hin* in terms of the metric system<sup>1</sup>. On pages 11–18 of his article Chabas mentions the existence of three alabaster vases in the Museum of Leyden inscribed relatively 25, 12 and  $7\frac{1}{4}$  *hin*. The second bears, above the inscription recording its capacity, the cartouches of Tuthmosis III. When Chabas measured those vases he found that their capacities were 11·500, 5·520 and 3·335 litres respectively, showing that a *hin* was equal to 0·46 litre.


In another article, in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1876, 212–17, Chabas mentioned the existence of another alabaster vase inscribed with the cartouches of Ramesses II and marked 40 *hin*, which when measured gave a capacity of 18·400 litres, or, once again, 0·46 litre per *hin*.

In the *Bulletin de l'Institut Égyptien*, May 1897, under the title *Deux vases gradués du Musée de Gizeh*, Daressy mentions:—

(1) An alabaster vase in the Cairo Museum with cartouches of Tuthmosis III, marked 21 *hin*. Capacity 8·920 litres, or 1 *hin* = 0·425 litre.

(2) An alabaster vase at Turin with the cartouches of the same king and marked 9 *hin*. Capacity 3·72 litres, or 1 *hin* = 0·412 litre.

<sup>1</sup> I owe these references to the kindness of M. H. Munier, the Librarian of the Cairo Museum. See also *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, xiv, 424, where a *hin* equals 29·2 cubic inches; NISSAU in Iwan Müller, *Hdbuch. Klass. Altertums*, Bd. I, 684; BRUGSCH, *Ägyptologie*, 375.



Alabaster vase of Tuthmosis III.

(3) An alabaster vase in the British Museum, with no cartouches, marked  $8\frac{1}{2}$  *hin*. Capacity 4·365 litres, or 1 *hin* = 0·534 litre.

Thus the capacity of a *hin* has been very variously given, for whereas Chabas fixed it at 0·460 litre, Daressy on the other hand gave three different values, *viz.* 0·425 litre, 0·412 and 0·534. Whether these differences were due to lack of exactitude in the ancient Egyptian measures or to the way these vases were measured by the modern Egyptologists we cannot tell. All these jars have necks which received in all probability the plug with which the vase was covered and did not count as a part of the measure. This very fact however may not have been taken into consideration by the ancients themselves.

In another article by Daressy entitled *Une mesure égyptienne de 20 hin*<sup>1</sup>, in the *Ann. Serv.*, XVIII, 191-2, the author remarks:—

“Il n’y a aucune rigueur dans les mesures égyptiennes et l’on trouve des variations assez fortes entre les cubes théoriques tels qu’on peut les déduire de certains textes et les chiffres obtenus en calculant directement sur les vases conservés dans les collections. On peut donc hésiter à fixer la valeur que les anciens avaient attribuée [au *hin*]. Dans cette hypothèse le *hin* aurait eu une valeur de 0·504 l. qui reste dans la moyenne de celles qu’on peut déduire de jaugeage des vases à capacité indiquée connus jusqu’à présent. On a trouvé en effet pour le *hin* des valeurs de 0 l. ·412 (vase de 9 *hin* du Musée de Turin de Thotmes III), de 0 l. ·459 (vase de 21 *hin* du Musée de Caire, de Thotmes III, plein), de 0 l. ·482 (vase de 25 *hin* du Musée de Leide), 0 l. ·528 (vase de 12 *hin* du Musée de Leide), de 0 l. ·544 (vase de 8 *hin*  $\frac{1}{8}$  du British Museum) etc. Ce qui démontre à quelles variations sont soumises des mesures que, en raison de la matière dont sont faits les récipients, on pouvait croire avoir été vérifiées pour ainsi dire officiellement, quand elles portent les noms de pharaons.”

From the above quotation one is not astonished to find yet another variation in the capacity of the *hin*. The vase under consideration has a capacity of 1500 c.c. when filled up to the root of the neck and 1600 c.c. when filled up to the brim, which when divided by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *hin* would give 0·4028 litre for a *hin* in the first case, and 0·456 litre for a *hin* in the second case.




The *hin* persisted all through Egyptian history down to the Coptic Period. The word was written in Coptic Ⲅⲏⲛ and must be distinguished from Ⲅⲏⲁⲁⲛ, Ⲅⲏⲟ which meant an ordinary vase and had no value of capacity. The latter word was in all probability derived from *hnw* (see *sub voc.* in SPIEGELBERG, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch*). In demotic documents it appears always as a measure of honey or wine. I have a large collection of demotic ostraka recording the amount of wine distributed to men on feast days always reckoned in *hin*.

Chabas long since recognized the difference between the Egyptian *hin* and the Hebrew  $\text{הין}$ , the capacity of which latter was a little more than three litres, and the fractions and multiples of the *hin* were already known to Brugsch.

<sup>1</sup> This also bears the cartouches of Tuthmosis III and belongs to the Cairo Museum.

## A GRAMMATICAL EXERCISE OF AN EGYPTIAN SCHOOLBOY




BY DR. NATHANIEL REICH

SOME years ago Professor F. Ll. Griffith had the goodness to offer me some of his excellent collection of ostraca for publication. He presented the whole collection to the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford. I want to thank Professor Griffith for his kindness in giving me the opportunity to publish the following piece of the collection. It is Ptolemaic in date and is a grammatical exercise of an ancient Egyptian schoolboy and therefore of particular interest. The ostracon is 14 cm. long and 10 cm. broad, and the writing consists of two columns. The column A on the right side conjugates the verb *p-e-z-f* which is preserved in the Coptic so-called "nominal verb"  $\pi\epsilon\chi\alpha\sigma\iota$  "quoth he," "says" in regard to an action *perfectum* like "inquit" (cf. STERN, *Kopt. Gramm.*, § 311). It goes back to the Late Egypt.   $p^3 i\text{-}dd\text{-}f$  or, as more usually written,   $p^3 dd\text{-}f$  = "(that is) what he said," which is the younger equivalent of the old   $dd\text{-}tr$  (SETHE, *Nominalsatz im Aeg. und Kopt.*, § 40).




The column B on the left side conjugates the same verb in the form *p-e-z-w n-f*  $\pi\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\iota$  "they said to him," "one said to him" or also "they called him (by the name of)."

The order of the conjugation in the singular is that to which we are used: 1st person, 2nd person, 3rd person (masc. and fem.), but the plural has in both columns the order 3rd, 1st and 2nd person. I believe that this order is due merely to the accident that the boy made the mistake in the column A and was, therefore, forced to keep the same order in the column B for the corresponding forms.

By the same accident the pupil omitted, probably, in the singular the 2nd person of the feminine in the column A and omitted it for the reason given above in the column B too. The forms for these omitted lines would be something like this in Demotic writing:

 Hierogl. transcription:  or   
Phonetic transcription: *p-e-z-t*, Copt.:  $\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon$  = "thou (woman) saidst."

Column A.

 Hierogl. transcr.:  or   
Phonetic transcription: *p-e-z-w n-t*, Copt.:  $\pi\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\eta$   $\pi\epsilon$  = "they said to thee (woman)," "one said to thee (woman)" or "they called thee (woman, by the name of...)"


Column B.

Such paradigms are already known to us. One has been published by Brugsch (*Demotische Paradigmata*, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 16/1 ff.), the other by Hess (*Zum demotischen Lexicon*, *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, 28/1).

The following facsimile is my own, made by tracing from the original some years ago.

Column B.

Column A.



The text reads as follows :

COLUMN A:

Hieroglyphic transcription.

Singular.

1st person	
2nd person, masc.	
3rd person, masc.	
3rd person, fem.	

Plural.

3rd person	
1st person	
2nd person	

Phonetic transcription.

Singular.

1st person	<i>p-e-z-y</i>
2nd person, masc.	<i>p-e-z-k</i>
3rd person, masc.	<i>p-e-z-f</i>
3rd person, fem.	<i>p-e-z-s</i>

Plural.

3rd person	<i>p-e-z-w</i>
1st person	<i>p-e-z-n</i>
2nd person	<i>[p]-e-z-tn</i>

Coptic.

Singular.

1st person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲓ
2nd person, masc.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲕ
3rd person, masc.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲑ
3rd person, fem.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲥ

Plural.

3rd person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ
1st person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲛ
2nd person	[ⲛ]ⲉⲗⲁⲛⲓⲛ

Translation.

Singular.

1st person	<b>I said</b>
2nd person, masc.	<b>thou (man) saidst</b>
3rd person, masc.	<b>he said</b>
3rd person, fem.	<b>she said</b>






Plural.

3rd person	<b>they said</b>
1st person	<b>we said</b>
2nd person	<b>you said</b>







COLUMN B.

Hieroglyphic transcription.

Singular.

1st person		
2nd person, masc.		
3rd person, masc.		
3rd person, fem.		

Plural.

3rd person		
1st person		
2nd person		

Phonetic transcription.

Singular.	
1st person	<i>p-e-z-w n-y</i>
2nd person, masc.	<i>p-e-z-w n-k</i>
3rd person, masc.	<i>p-e-z-w n-f</i>
3rd person, fem.	<i>p-e-z-w n-s</i>
Plural.	
3rd person	<i>p-e-z-w n-w</i>
1st person	<i>p-e-z-w n-n</i>
2nd person	<i>p-e-z-w n-tn</i>

Coptic.

Singular.	
1st person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲓ
2nd person, masc.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲕ
3rd person, masc.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲑ
3rd person, fem.	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲥ
Plural.	
3rd person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲧ
1st person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲁⲛ
2nd person	ⲛⲉⲗⲁⲧ ⲛⲏⲧⲛ

Translation.

Singular.

1st person	<b>they said to me (or: one said to me)</b>
2nd person, masc.	<b>they said to thee (man)</b>
3rd person, masc.	<b>they said to him</b>
3rd person, fem.	<b>they said to her</b>

Plural.

3rd person	<b>they said to them</b>
1st person	<b>they said to us</b>
2nd person	<b>they said to you</b>

## EXCAVATIONS AT EL-'AMARNAH, 1923-24

By F. G. NEWTON

With Plates XXIII—XXXII

AFTER an interval of a year the excavations at El-'Amarnah were resumed in the autumn of 1923 under the direction of Mr. F. G. Newton during the months of October and November and afterwards under Professor F. Ll. Griffith during January and February. The general results of the expedition were the uncovering of a considerable part of the town site in the centre of the city, which included a large number of small houses and several mansions with their gardens. Besides this about half of a palace was excavated at the north end of the site and it is hoped to complete this next season. The other members of the expedition were Professor Thomas Whittemore, Mr. S. R. K. Glanville, Mr. W. B. Emery and, later, Mrs. Griffith and Miss Moss.

### The Main Town Site.

Work commenced on October 29th to the north of the 1921 excavation and joining on to the German work to the east in Square P 46. A group of nine small houses was uncovered all adjoining one another. These were entered from courtyards, and although the houses were dovetailed in so as to form one mass, the entrances were so arranged as to avoid passing through one house to get into another. Most of the walls are only one brick thick and architecturally these houses differed in no respect from the other small houses in the Main Town Site, plans of which have been published in *City of Akhenaten*, I.

Continuing further north in Square Q 45 more groups of houses were excavated, most of them rather larger than those just mentioned. In Q 45. 1 a variation from the usual type of plan was noticed, the loggia leading into the central room being on the east side. The loggias are almost invariably on the north or west, or both, in the larger houses. This house also had an excellent example of a bathroom in a well preserved condition.


A large number of interesting objects was found in these houses. In house Q 46. 33 in the corner of a small room, south of the Central Hall, four bronze knives were found varying from 33 to 40 cm. long, all in excellent condition (Pl. XXIII, Fig. 2). They were lying on the floor as though left there by mistake. Three of them had grooves down the centre and one a carving of a lotus and bird at the end of the groove. Though many other bronze knives were found these were the largest. A chisel and a pair of tongs with the ends shaped like hands were among the other bronze objects found, also a small weight in the shape of a cow's head.

In house Q 44. 4 was a coloured limestone figure of the king wearing the blue crown of the Nile with a uraeus and necklace and skirt of gold leaf (Pl. XXIV). The figure was 19 cm. high and the colour was well preserved and bright. The head was separate from the body and it was also broken above the ankles and unfortunately the feet and stand could not be found. The whole of the dump from the room and rooms adjoining was sifted but without success. The figure represented is that of a boy and the face appears to the writer to resemble that of Akhenaten but it may be Tut'ankhamūn.






I



2



3

1. Sculptor's trial-piece. North Palace. *Scale about  $\frac{1}{4}$*   
2. Bronze knives from House Q.46.33. *Scale about  $\frac{1}{4}$*   
3. Doorpost from North Palace, bearing name of Merytaten.

To the north of these groups of houses was a prominent mound, somewhat isolated, which indicated one of the larger type of houses with a garden round it. As the walls began to appear it soon became evident that this was a house of considerable importance. The walls were preserved in some places over 6 ft. high from the floor, and we had hopes of finding some plaster decorations and inscriptions to give us the owner's name but were disappointed. Most of the traces of plaster on the walls were white, and only a few pieces of yellow and decoration from the door architraves were found. The niches had the usual colouring of red with a yellow vertical band down the middle, and although in one case the niche was preserved to a height of 150 cm., no trace of inscription was visible. The larger houses at El-'Amarnah do not usually produce many finds and this proved no exception, the whole place having the appearance of being swept clean when the owner left. We had the whole of the grounds cleared, and as a specimen of the plan and arrangements of a rich man's house it proved to be perhaps the most complete so far excavated. It may be compared with the "Weihnachtshaus" excavated by the Germans in 1913 (see *M.D.O.G.* no. 52, p. 11), with the difference that the garden is on the south side instead of the north. The house is known as Q 44. 1 and an illustration of the plan is given (Pl. XXV).

The enclosing wall formed a rectangle of about 78 m.  $\times$  74 m. and the main entrance was between two enormous pylons which led into the garden on the west side. One of these was entirely washed away by the water from the *wâdî* formed after the city was deserted. The whole of the site of El-'Amarnah is intersected by watercourses formed by water coming from the hills, about two miles to the east, after heavy storms. Though these may only occur perhaps once in fifteen years the amount of damage done is considerable and in many places houses have been completely washed away. The water from this *wâdî* also spread into the pond, which must have overflowed and washed away part of the kiosk and the terrace walls of the garden. Besides the main pylon entrance there is another small entrance to the garden to the north of it from which a flight of five steps leads down. This entrance was blocked up by a wall, probably built when the owner left. In the garden there were doubtless trees and shrubs, but the ground has been so washed away by the water that we did not discover any stumps or roots, such as have been found in many other parts of the site. In the south-east corner were three furnaces built of mud bricks. It is possible that these were for burning rubbish and they are screened by a wall forming part of a circle.

The kiosk is much destroyed as indeed is the case with every kiosk so far excavated at El-'Amarnah. Every large house had in its garden one of these buildings, which have hitherto been called kiosks, as their shape and position suggest a sort of summer-house, but it would seem more probable that they were covered shrines for the adoration of the Aten, and the fact that they have all been so completely destroyed and nothing found in them strengthens this idea.


The thin wall running along the north of the garden is only preserved just above the ground and may have been for enclosing a raised flower-bed.

From the garden the house is approached by ascending a few steps, passing through a gate, and continuing between two walls up a ramp with a single step at intervals. On the right-hand side of this ramp is a long trough; at the end we pass through another gate into a large courtyard with a well in the middle, and a little further on we have the main entrance to the house on the right. There was another entrance to the house on the east side where the wall has disappeared entirely for about 14 m. Here may also have been



Painted limestone figure of Akhenaten.

*Scale †*



**HOUSE Q.44.I.**

- WALLS ORIGINALLY SUPPORTING ROOFS
- ▨ WALLS NOT SUPPORTING ROOFS
- RESTORATIONS

SCALE 1 0 5 10 15 METRES

Plan of House Q.44.I.

pylons but no traces are visible. This entrance opened on to a courtyard, from which two doors gave access to the house, the northern one possibly for visitors, as it apparently has a porter's lodge, and the other for attendants.

Before describing the interior of the house itself, it is necessary to give some explanation of the offices and outbuildings surrounding it. It will be seen from the plan that all walls shown black are assumed to have been roofed over and the walls shown hatched are considered as low walls surrounding courts and enclosures open to the sky.

Against the north wall of the court containing the well is a manger screened by a short wall. Here a visitor's animal may have been tied while he remained with his host inside the house. On the west side are various rooms where the grooms and cattle-attendants may have resided.

An entrance on the south side of the court leads into a most interesting and clearly defined part of the establishment (Pl. XXVI, Fig. 1). This is obviously the cattle house. It is 16 m. long by 3 m. 10 cm. wide, with a range of eight mangers behind a low parapet wall. They are not all the same size, the four at the south end being slightly larger than the four at the north, and there was apparently an extra manger on the inside of the parapet wall. The floor is paved with rough stones to prevent the animals kicking up the ground. The paving seems to have been laid with larger stones and more strongly made in front of the stalls, no doubt because this part received more wear. The paving ceases about a metre from the west wall, thus leaving a passage for attendants to pass behind the animals. A door from this passage leads into a long gallery that may have been used as a store for tools, etc. The food for the animals was put into the mangers from a narrow passage running along behind them. Access to this passage was obtained from an open square court to the east, which was also connected with the well courtyard by a central opening on the north side.

On the east side of the above-mentioned square court was an enclosure probably open to the sky, as the amount of earth excavated was not sufficient to allow for the walls having been of any great height. This enclosure may have been for sheep.

On the south side the court leads into another open yard with a semi-circular wall on one side, forming an enclosure which may have been for isolating some special animal. There is also a circular trough or manger standing free from the wall.

Outside the south wall of the house five circles are shown on the plan, each about 4 m. in diameter (Pl. XXVII, Fig. 2). These were granaries and are found in most of the larger houses. Their walls were not preserved for more than three bricks high though originally they probably stood a considerable height. In the house of Ra'nūfer (see *City of Akhenaten*, 1) Professor Peet found several of these granaries preserved to a height of about 1 m., but their diameter was not so great, being only 2 m. 50 cm. In this case the walls inclined inwards giving the impression that they were domed. This can hardly have been so in the present case as the span is too great for walls only one brick thick. It is more likely that they were roofed over with palm branches. The entrance to the area containing the granaries is by a gate from the garden, which leads up past some low walls which may have enclosed flower-beds, to another gate on the right leading into the courtyard. There was also another private entrance from the house which led out of the porter's lodge, Room No. 1 on the plan, and down a few steps. On the right of these steps is a square cist sunk about 1 m. deep into the ground. It is difficult to say what this was for.

The group of buildings and courts on the east side of the house is quite cut off from

that part of the grounds given up to agricultural needs and would appear to be for the attendants and servants employed in the house during the daytime. The three small circles shown on the plan in one of the rooms are ovens, and the room next to them has cooking arrangements, so it is probable that the cooking for the house was done here. In the smaller houses the cooking arrangements and oven are usually found in the house itself, but in none of the larger houses is this the case, so that one must assume that in the larger houses the kitchen was generally a separate building outside. The other rooms adjoining were probably offices and bedrooms for the attendants.

The small building to the north of the pond is placed in such a position that one may easily imagine it to be the overseer's or head-gardener's cottage. There is a niche in the main room and a staircase leading up to the roof; outside is a manger and some paving-stones where his beast would have stood. The unroofed enclosure to the east of this may have been for garden tools and stores.

The house itself is similar in general arrangement to many of the other larger houses at El-'Amarnah. The entrance is in the well courtyard and it is approached by a flight of seven low steps which raise the ground-floor level well above the garden and other buildings around. This is almost invariably the case with the larger houses. Room 1 is the porter's lodge and this had a brazier in it. Room 2 is a vestibule leading into the West Loggia the ceiling of which was supported by four columns. The bases of three of these were in position. Rooms 3 and 5 may have been for guests. From the West Loggia a large double doorway led into the Central Hall which must have been lighted by clerestory windows from above. Opposite the entrance was a mastaba or divan on which the master of the house may have sat to receive his guests. This mastaba, visible in Pl. XXVI, Fig. 2, varied from the usual type from the fact that it had a raised block of brickwork on each side which suggested the pedestals for statues, possibly of the king and queen. This is the only case so far where these raised blocks have been found. On the floor of the room were the marks showing the position of two column bases. This is unusual as the central room in most cases has either one or four columns, but it is explained by the fact that the room is not square, as is usual in the larger houses, but oblong. The remainder of the house seems to be divided into separate suites of rooms, access to which is obtained in each case from the Central Hall. Room 9 is the North Loggia with two small rooms, perhaps bedrooms, 10 and 11 leading off it. Room 12 appears to be a private sitting-room with three doors leading respectively into 13 the bathroom and wardrobe, 14 a small bedroom and 15 what has usually been called the master's bedroom. This room is always distinguished by the thickening of the walls at one end and by a slight raising of the floor at this end to form a divan. 16 is a passage which gives access to four rooms, 17, 18, 19, 20, which may have been bedrooms or storerooms. At the end of the passage, 16, one would expect to find a door for convenient access to the kitchen outside, but the wall was preserved up to about a metre in height. There may, however, have been a window here to hand food in so as to save walking all round the house. Room 7 must have been dark and would appear to be a storeroom connected with the Central Hall. Room 8 is a cupboard under the stairs and is only connected with Room 7 by a square opening 37 cm. wide, 40 cm. high and 40 cm. from the ground. Probably there was an opening in the exterior wall to enable grain or food to be poured in from outside, and then it was scooped out through the small hole between Rooms 7 and 8 and brought into the house. It will be noticed on the plan that Rooms 6, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20 all have walls built up inside them which do not belong to the



1



2

1. Mangers in House Q.44.1.
2. House Q.44.1 from the west.



I



2

1. Large house north of Et-Til, now rebuilt to form quarters for the Expedition.

2. Granaries in House Q.44.I.



original building, also that Rooms 5, 18 and 20 have their doors blocked. The walls are roughly built and this may have been done when the owner left the house, and he may have walled up certain stores with the intention of fetching them later. On the other hand it may be the work of squatters who occupied the house after the city was deserted for the purpose of taking away the stone or any valuables that remained. The braziers in Rooms 1 and 3 and a square hearth with ashes in it at the top of the steps of the small garden entrance on the west may also be part of this occupation, but there was no evidence anywhere to show that this could have been of long duration. A house of this size in all probability had an upper storey and the staircase up to it led out of the Central Hall. Several small column bases were found in the debris of the rooms which had evidently fallen from above. Similar bases were also found in the house of Nekht (see *City of Akhenaten*, I, 8-9). With regard to objects in this house we found very little as the whole place had the appearance of being swept bare when the owner left. It is seldom that much is found in the large houses and the smaller houses are much more productive in finds. This may be because the owners had large numbers of servants and cleared their houses out systematically when they left the town; also they were more accessible and tempting for looters when the town was deserted. The smaller houses on the other hand formed a regular maze of buildings and the walls were thin and must have fallen down soon after they were left and covered up anything that remained behind. The poorer people too not having servants would be unable to carry all their things away with them or to return to the city when once they had left.

Outside the southern wall of the garden of house Q 44. 1 were the remains of a small house Q 44. 13, the greater part of which had been washed away by the water from the *wādī*. In the yard of this house an interesting discovery was made. This was the top half of a large pot of the type used to contain preserved meat. The lower edge of this was broken and there were no traces of any fragments of the bottom half lying about, so it can hardly have been in its original position when in use (unless this broken half had been placed in the yard as a receptacle of some sort). On this sherd were three cartouches and an inscription in hieratic. The cartouches were those of Seti I, Horemhab and the third was entirely washed out, with exception of the letter *~* at the bottom, which might indicate that it was that of Akhenaten. This points to a continuous occupation at any rate of part of the city down to the time of Seti I. So far excavation has shown no signs of a definite habitation of any of the houses later than Tutankhamūn, but there have been traces in some of the houses of temporary squatters and, as will be shown later, this was clearly the case in the North Palace. It is quite possible that during the reigns of Horemhab and Seti I there was a colony of quarrymen occupying a part of the town. The most likely place for them to choose would be the centre of the town near the great palace and on the bank of the river. As all the land between the great palace and the river is now under cultivation we cannot excavate there, and this would explain why up to now so few traces of any later occupation have been observed. The systematic way in which almost every stone in the town has been broken up or taken away would require a considerable amount of time, perhaps many years. The Aegæan pottery found by Professor Petrie all came from the palace rubbish heaps, and the isolated fragments found by Professor Peet and Mr. Woolley increased in number in proportion as this central part of the town was approached. None were found in Maru Aten. So far no fragments have been found definitely on the original floor-level of a room and never enough pieces to put together

a whole pot. Sir Arthur Evans and Dr. Duncan Mackenzie say that these fragments are only those of such pots as would be brought over by the ordinary Syrian or Cretan workman coming to Egypt, as part of his household goods, and they are not precious or rare pots such as would have been sent as presents to the king for use in his palace.


Further excavation will we hope throw more light on this matter, but at present it seems feasible to suppose that this Aegaeon pottery was not in use at the time of Akhenaten, but was introduced later by foreign quarrymen, perhaps during the reign of Seti I.

#### The North Palace.

At the north end of the site of El-'Amarnah, beyond the modern village of Et-Til and where the cliffs converge to the Nile, there are a large number of mounds and ruined brick walls. These are separated from the main town site by the distance of about a mile and give the impression of forming a sort of suburb of the city. Owing to protection from the north wind by the cliffs many of these walls stand high above the ground.

While the excavation of the houses in the main town was going on a trial trench was dug in one of the largest and most promising of the mounds in this part of the site. The mound was in the form of a rectangle, inside which the lie of the ground showed signs of a considerable number of chambers and a hollow in the middle which indicated a small lake or a well. A general examination of it gave the impression it might be a palace, which afterwards proved to be correct. A trench was started at the north-east corner and walls of chambers with traces of coloured plaster soon began to appear. A little farther down a large piece of decoration was exposed, showing water-lilies and papyrus and birds. Another trench produced a quantity of broken stone fragments of carving and inscriptions and architectural mouldings. Sufficient evidence having been found to show that the site was of considerable importance, these trenches were temporarily filled in to prevent the plaster becoming damaged before the excavation of the building could be undertaken on a proper scale. As the excavators' house was a good hour away from this new site the time lost in getting the workmen there and back each day would have been considerable and there was also risk of damage to the finds in carrying them back so far every evening. It was therefore decided to build a new house on one of the ancient ones in the neighbourhood. That chosen was a large one, which had the greater part of its walls still standing about 2 metres above the ground (Pl. XXVII, Fig. 1). It was therefore only necessary to add another metre and put a roof on. There were also some chambers near evidently forming part of the out-buildings in the garden, which were easily adaptable as huts for the workmen. In fifteen days the rooms had been cleared of debris, the walls built up and a roof of palm branches put on and it was possible to start the excavation of the palace. The *Ḳuftīs* moved down to their new quarters and basket carriers and local workmen were engaged from Et-Til, instead of El-Ḥāg *Ḳandīl*, this village being so much nearer. The enclosing wall of the palace which is 1 m. 8 cm. thick forms nearly a square, the actual dimensions being 144 m. × 115 m. The plan published (Pl. XXVIII) shows rather more than half of this, which is all that was excavated last season.

The main entrance was from the river side on the west. This led into a large court about 48 m. square. To the right and left of this are pylon entrances leading into open




SCALE 1 5 10 15 20 25 30 METRES

Plan of North Palace.



I



2

1. Concrete foundations in north section of outer court. North Palace.
2. Remains of trees. North Palace.

courts. The one on the right has not yet been excavated, but the one on the left has a series of nine chambers on the east and west sides, with a staircase leading up to the roof in either case. A very few traces of coloured plaster were enough to show that these rooms were all painted, but the face of the walls was in such bad condition that it was impossible to make out any definite scheme of decoration. All the doors originally had stone doorposts with inscriptions on them, but only part of one was left (Pl. XXIII, Fig. 3), in the second chamber from the north, on the west side. It was inscribed with the name of the king's daughter Merytaten. A path with a low wall ran round in front of these rooms and in the middle of the court were the concrete foundations of three curious little buildings (Pl. XXIX, Fig. 1), which were evidently built of stone as the marks of the stone are still left on the concrete. Every vestige of these buildings has now gone and nothing was found in the sand covering them to give any indication as to what they were, but their shape which is imprinted on the concrete suggests a small temple or kiosk in the centre, with an altar on either side, each of them having a flight of steps leading up to a raised floor. It is possible that this was the private chapel of the palace for the worship of the Aten. In between the central and the two small side buildings were four raised blocks of stone on each side; it is difficult to say what these were for unless they were the foundation blocks of small altars for placing offerings on.

Just outside the pylon entrance to this court was found a small ostrakon or sculptor's trial piece 23 cm. square, in limestone (Pl. XXIII, Fig. 1). On it was drawn in black a picture of a princess seated in front of a table of food, eating a duck. The drawing was exceedingly fine and evidently from the hand of a skilled artist. The figure was intended to be carved in flat relief, but this had only been commenced, the line of the back and the foot being the only parts chiselled.

On the east side of the large square court mentioned above were three imposing entrances leading into the inner grounds of the palace. These were all of stone, built on concrete foundations, which are all that remain *in situ* though a few carved fragments were found on the ground, left by accident by the destroyers. The central entrance, to judge by the width of the concrete foundations, must have been very imposing.

Beyond these entrances is a large rectangular space which contained a pond with a path running all round it, with trees or shrubs planted at intervals. The pond would appear to have been of considerable depth, as the present level of the ground in the centre of the hollow formed by it was about 2 m. below the ordinary ground level, and on digging down another 2 m. water was reached. It was therefore impossible to excavate this pond to the bottom in the hope of finding things that may have fallen into it, or have been thrown in at the time of the destruction of the palace. All the edges were worn away, and though a careful search all round was made for signs no traces were found.


The trees or shrubs on the left-hand side all have a course of mud bricks built round them, roughly in the form of a circle (Pl. XXIX, Fig. 2), and this system is employed in Egypt at the present day. In several were found traces of roots and in one a broken pot with traces of powdered wood inside.

To the left (north) of the pond there are three areas separated from each other with a central door leading into each. These were no doubt for the various kinds of cattle which the king was accustomed to keep. The first portion to be entered was obviously covered, the four piers, 1 m. square, down the centre supporting the roof. Some parts of the walls showed traces of coloured plaster decoration, and it would appear that these were probably


the attendants' quarters. Beyond was an open courtyard in three sections, the easternmost of the three being partially covered. In the centre court a long trough is preserved against the east wall. It is possible that these courts were for the use of the animals during the daytime. They lead on their north side into another covered portion with eight piers supporting the roof; here the animals went for the night. The western and central of these areas may have been for sheep and goats, though nothing was found to indicate this for certain; the eastern area on the other hand had a range of stone mangers all round the walls with the figures of oxen, ibex and antelopes carved on them. Most of these had been removed and only the marks on the wall and ground were left showing where they had been. There were however 14 left, most of them damaged or broken, only one being complete. Between each was a stone ring to which the animals were tied (Pl. XXX, Fig. 1). Fragments of these mangers were also found in other parts of the site where they had been dropped when they were being carried away, and it is possible that next year more may be found. Eight of the mangers had the lower half of an ox carved on them (Pl. XXX, Fig. 1), and in no case was the upper part found. Two of these showed signs of red colour on them and it is probable that they were all originally covered. The complete manger had two ibex carved on it (Pl. XXX, Fig. 2). In one case an attendant is shown behind an ibex. Perhaps the most beautiful is that which represents two antelopes feeding (Pl. XXX, Fig. 3). The carving in all cases shows a free and spirited handling of the subject, and they are the only mangers of the kind so far found in Egypt.

The residential part of the palace occupies the whole of the eastern end contained by the outside enclosing wall, and the main entrance is central with the pond, on an axial line with the two outer entrances running right through the centre of the building. In front of the entrance there was evidently an elaborate stone portico of which only the concrete foundation remains. The width of the opening implies a double doorway and inside is a large hypostyle hall with 26 columns. Of these only two of the original bases remain, but the positions of the others are easily discernible by the imprints left by the stone on the mud-brick floor. The two side rows have five columns and the others four, which is an unusual arrangement. The most probable explanation is that the side rows had smaller columns and that they supported a clerestory wall with windows, which lighted the hall on the same principle as in the great hall of the temple at Karnak. The walls of this hall were not well preserved, but all round the bottom was a painted skirting about 18 ins. high, divided into squares with papyrus and lotus plants painted in them. Above this dado were the bare feet of men and women and sometimes the commencement of a skirt indicating processional scenes, but this was all that was left so that it was impossible to say what these pictures represented.


In this hypostyle hall were six doors arranged symmetrically, one opposite the main entrance and two on each of the side walls facing each other. The door in the centre and the two on the right lead into rooms, not yet excavated, but from which much may be expected next season. The west door in the left wall leads into a corridor which connects with a suite of four rooms, one of which had the remains of a bath in it. All these were decorated with a bright blue dado about 1 m. high and above that a black and white band. Above this nothing was preserved. To whom these rooms were assigned it is difficult to venture a guess until the rest of the palace has been excavated. The east door on the left-hand wall led into a kind of vestibule with a row of five columns. In this vestibule



I



2



3

Carved stone mangers in the North Palace.



I



2

Arcaded court with cubicles. North Palace.



extending over the width of three of the columns was a rectangular basin paved with concrete and surrounded by a curbstone. This was apparently an ablution basin and would correspond to those found in the central rooms of the large houses. A door at the north end of this vestibule leads into a beautiful little court with an arcade of columns round three sides and a series of cubicles behind it (Pl. XXXI, Figs. 1 and 2). In the centre was a sunk garden with a low parapet wall round it and steps leading down to the beds which are divided up into squares. This garden was watered by a channel which connected it with the central pond of the palace and is brought along under the floor of one of the rooms. The course of it is shown on the plan. The channel runs all round the edge of the flower-beds.

It would seem most probable that this part of the palace was the women's quarter as, except for one central doorway, it is separated from the rest of the residential part of the palace buildings. In the great palace in the centre of the town Sir Flinders Petrie discovered a court somewhat similar, which he assigned to the harem, and in building No. IV of Maru Aten there is a similar court on a much smaller scale which Mr. C. L. Woolley also considered to be the *harâm* (see PETRIE, *Tell el-Amarna*, and *City of Akhenaten*, 1).

Every doorway originally had stone doorposts, but all of these have been removed, which is unfortunate as they may have been inscribed with the owner's names. The rooms at the north end seem to have been more important than the others as in three cases they are double and have one room leading into a second. All the rooms on the east side had windows in them (Pl. XXXI, Fig. 2), whereas those on the west had not. This may have been so that they should get the benefit of the western sun in the afternoon during the winter.

The walls of many of these rooms were preserved to a height of 2 m.; traces of plaster were found in all of them, and it will be possible to make a restoration of the complete scheme of decoration. Masses of fallen plaster were found in the debris of the rooms and on the ground. Special workmen were chosen for collecting these fragments which require very careful handling and they were then all taken into the house on boards to be sorted out.

The general scheme of decoration for most of these rooms was the same. It consisted of a black dado 70 cm. high, then five bands of alternate blue and red, each divided by a thin band of white, and above these a band of check pattern. These bands covered a width of about 40 cm. making a total height from the ground of 110 cm. or 3 ft. 6 in. Above these bands came pictures of birds, fishes, geese, storks and men, all on a yellow background, but naturally only preserved in fragments (Pl. XXXII, Fig. 2). The red and blue bands returned at the corners and ran vertically up the walls and then returned again along the top, thus making each side of the wall into a framed panel with a picture in it. Above this was a broad band of black and then the ceiling, which was entirely decorated with bunches of grapes and vine leaves (Pl. XXXII, Fig. 1) as though to imitate an arbour out of doors. Quantities of this grape-vine pattern were found on the floors, and one piece was found large enough to give the arrangement of the whole pattern including the border.

The outside walls under the colonnade were decorated similarly to the inside of the rooms and the ceiling also had a grape-vine pattern.

Unfortunately none of this plaster can be brought home as it breaks and crumbles at the slightest touch. The whole of the surface is covered with small holes. This is owing to the fact that the mud plaster was made with straw and the white ant has penetrated through the paint to get at the straw behind.

All the colouring is very brilliant and the drawing of the birds and figures is vigorous and realistic, though the execution is rough and has the appearance of being hurriedly done. The picture of a goose (see Pl. XXXII, Fig. 2) is a most life-like representation.


The colonnade consisted of 27 columns, of which only the bases of 11 remain, though the imprints of the others are traceable. There are also the bases of two pilasters at the north end of the two side rows of columns. Any number of fragments of the columns and capitals and cornice were found broken up in the centre of the court and from these it was possible to make a complete restoration, including some of the inscription along the cornice.

At the south end of the court there is a balcony, which is reached by a flight of seven steps from a corridor in the king's apartments. This would appear to have been for the private use of the king when he wanted to watch the women in the garden, and the view must have been extremely charming with the flowers in the centre and the painted columns with their papyrus capitals throwing deep shadows on the ground and the coloured walls behind.


An interesting point in the construction of the walls of the palace was the finding of a bonding course of wood running right through the wall at a height of about 1 m. from the ground. No doubt there was another course about a metre higher up and this is what has caused the downfall of the walls. These courses of woodwork were of the same thickness as a brick and were put in to strengthen the wall and bring it to an exact level at a certain point before continuing to build higher. The same method is employed in good work in Egypt at the present day. Unfortunately the white ant has eaten through the woodwork and made it rotten, and the weight of the brickwork has pressed down and brought the walls down from above, and thus instead of strengthening the walls it has been the cause of their destruction.

Another point to be mentioned is the later occupation of the palace. In all the rooms of the women's quarter we found potsherds on a level of about 10 cm. above the original floor. We also found ashes showing that fires had been lit in these rooms, and these were above the original floor. Nothing of any value was discovered on this level or any datable object, nor did the pottery vary from the usual types, and the probability is that there was a temporary occupation by the people engaged in quarrying the palace for stone shortly after the city was deserted. The systematic way in which nearly all the stone has been taken away from Tell el-'Amarnah shows that there must have been some occupation by quarrymen which would have lasted for several years. We hope that the excavations of the coming season will throw more light on this matter.

The palace appears to have been built during the latter part of Akhenaten's reign as the cartouches of the Aten which were found are of the later form which came into use about nine years after his accession to the throne. It is not so large as the palace in the centre of the town, remains of which were discovered by Sir Flinders Petrie in 1891-2, and it may have been built for winter resort as it is in the warmest part of the site and sheltered from the north wind by the cliffs.



I



2

Frescoes from cubicles. North Palace.

## EXCAVATIONS AT EL-'AMARNAH, 1923-24

BY PROFESSOR F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A., F.B.A.

With Plates XXXIII—XXXVII

IN this third season of the Society's Exploration of Tell el-'Amarnah it had been intended that Mr. Newton and I should carry on the excavations jointly until the work of the British Museum at Ur called Mr. Newton away, after which I was to continue in sole charge. But fate ruled otherwise: seven weeks illness in Cairo prevented me from reaching Tell el-'Amarnah till December 21st. I had then to acquaint myself with the huge site and its present condition, my only previous visit having been a day spent there with Sir Flinders Petrie in 1887 when we occupied ourselves chiefly with the tombs and stelae. On December 27th Mr. Newton divided his spoils with the Museum authorities and the next day I began my work. The excavation of the northern palace discovered by Mr. Newton was reserved to be completed in the following season, and our workmen came southward to sites in the main city nearer our dwelling. Mrs. Griffith was with me, and Mr. Newton, having finished his packing with Professor Whittimore, started for Mesopotamia on January 2nd, leaving his assistants Mr. Glanville and Mr. Emery with us; Miss Moss arrived on January 8th and our party was complete. We lived in a very comfortable house at the south end of the ancient town, built by our German predecessors in 1908 and taken over by the Government in 1914. The floors and portions of the outer and inner walls date from the time of Akhenaten. In January and February, when the winds blew cold from the desert, we warmed again the ancient reception room for our meals and work with charcoal and resin from the ruins, and on occasion crouched round the pottery firepan of three thousand years ago sitting on low stone stools of the "period." On the west side was an open verandah corresponding to the ancient loggia-balcony: to it came our workmen daily with their finds to be rewarded with *bakhshîsh* (on account), even as of old faithful servants of Pharaoh came to the balcony of his palace to be decorated with heavy gold about their necks; and once a fortnight all the diggers assembled there to receive payment in solid cash. Each morning and evening too Mrs. Griffith and Miss Moss looked apprehensively to the verandah to see what accidents, frightful diseases, or trifling ills had sent victims to be treated gratis by European wizards. Unfortunately these wizards were sceptical of their own healing powers and not a few of the would-be patients had to be sent away as fit subjects only for the professional physician; but boracic ointment and castor oil with good advice worked wonders, not less by their moral than by their physical effects. Our relations with the natives were, as usual, of the best, though we could not altogether forget that at the railway station of Dêr Mawâs, just across the river, had been the culmination of a dastardly outrage on unarmed British officers only five years before.

The people in the villages of El-'Amarnah have always had a bad reputation since the district was first explored by Europeans. Jomard, the geographer attached to Napoleon's expedition, found them singularly unfriendly and could get no answers to the questions he

put to them. It may be no more than an independence of spirit and certain uncouthness due to Arab—as it were Ishmaelite—origin. Their inter-village feuds also are perhaps a trifle more violent than elsewhere; it was the appointment of a guard from Et-Til that caused the lamentable destruction of the magnificent palace pavements in 1912. A party from the rival village of El-Ḥâg Ḳandîl, after breaking through the substantial shelter built over them by their discoverer Flinders Petrie in 1891 out of money provided by an English society, hacked these pavements to pieces in a single night in order to spite the guard! Since then there has been little to attract sightseers to the place. Cook's steamers no longer stop and, one blessing! the burning question of *visitors* did not arise with us. None the less three dahabiyahs halted there and the travellers, Europeans and intelligent natives, were very welcome. Two relatives stayed with us a week and helped to string beads, and we also had the pleasure of entertaining two members of Sir Flinders Petrie's expedition from Ḳau, Mr. Greenlees and Mr. Starkey, for a single night.

Before entering upon the antiquities I may mention a subject that interested us considerably, namely the position taken by women in this region, which seemed to us to be exceptional. In Upper Egypt, and especially about Ḳuft, whence our skilled workmen were brought, woman is closely veiled and kept strictly at home. In the Delta, in the 'eighties we were accustomed to employ women and children amongst the workmen. But women there did not sell in the markets; the nearest approach to that was the selling of bread as a last resort for divorced wives. Bread was to be given, not sold; and though buying and selling of bread was to some extent necessary in well organized communities, a certain disgrace was attached to that occupation. With the progress of the country this view of bread-selling now seems to be changed. At the market at Dêr Mawâs however the men selling were very frequently accompanied by their wives, who took at least an equal share in the business with them. This and the part which highly respectable women took in marriage-festivities had been a great shock to our well-brought-up men from Ḳuft, but the experience of several seasons had accustomed them to the phenomena. On the occasion of a wedding at El-Ḥâg Ḳandîl we were all bidden to one of the many evening performances. It took place in a small open space in front of the bridegroom's house, shut in by other houses. It consisted chiefly of one man singing phrases, to which a choir of men, standing ranged along a wall, chanted responses, the while clapping their right hands on the left to mark the time in the most violent manner, necessitating a downward contortion of the body to the left after raising the right hand to its full extent<sup>1</sup>. The women were in the background and hardly seen, but occasionally made their presence known by a combined *zaghârit* cry. The most surprising thing however was when the aunt of the bridegroom carrying a sword and the bridegroom's sister carrying a staff appeared between the onlookers and the choir and went through an elaborate and slow step-dance to the music, passing and re-passing each other up and down the line with regulated wavings of the sword and staff. These were held horizontally in the right hand above the head, generally pointing forward. Such things may be done elsewhere by professional '*almahs* and *ghawâzis* but hardly by the people of the house.

This freedom of the women may again be due to their Arab extraction, or on the other hand to the strong Coptic element in the locality. Whether it should be regarded as a higher station accorded to them by the men or one lower than that of the typical Moham-

<sup>1</sup> The beginning of this action is perhaps shown by the crowned figures of fragment 5 on Pl. XXIX in Liverpool *Annals*, ix, from the Sanam Temple of Tirhaqah at Napata.

medan woman is a nice question, depending for its answer a good deal on the standpoint of the witness. According to Herodotus the men of his day in Egypt used to sit at home and weave while the women bought and sold in the markets, and one is tempted to ask whether the women of the El-'Amarnah region may not really have preserved a little more than elsewhere the independence of the Ancient Egyptian woman. It is to be hoped that Miss Blackman by her enquiries will be able to throw light on this and many other questions regarding local manners and customs throughout Egypt.

One of the greatest difficulties that an excavator meets with is the question where to dispose of his rubbish without interfering with future work. The ruined city of Akhetaten lies in a level plain of desert sand and small stones, and after their scattered experimental digs in January 1907 the German expedition solved the above difficulty by confining their work to the extreme eastern edge of the city, and the broad almost bare watercourse from the great desert *wādī* which cuts it at right angles. They began where a wide road running north and south between houses ended southward in the desert, clearing the narrow belt of houses eastward of it and those which fronted upon it on the west, and dumping their rubbish on the desert and the road. This road they named High Priest Street after the High Priest Wah whose important dwelling was found at an early stage in the excavation. The house which the Germans built for the expedition lies a little to the west of their excavation at the south end of the road. A plan of the ancient house which they thus restored is to be found in their preliminary report of 1907, p. 26.

The Germans in four seasons, from 1910 to 1914, followed the High Priest Street to the above-mentioned watercourse, turning down the watercourse and clearing both sides of it to the edge of the cultivation, and then commenced to dig again along the High Priest Street on the other side of the *wādī*. In all they uncovered about 1½ kilometres of the road together with the few buildings outlying on the desert to the east. Mr. Peet's and Mr. Woolley's expeditions widened parts of this clearing westward and excavated isolated houses elsewhere. We have carried the clearing onward for about two hundred metres and again have widened the belt in some places. Until the clearing has been largely extended the street system of Akhetaten cannot be defined.

It must at first sight strike any visitor as curious that the smooth mounds which mark the sites of unexcavated houses in the city of King Akhenaten are covered, not with blown sand, but with small stones and grit which could not have been carried by the wind. The explanation is seen on examining the ancient bricks, which of course are unburnt. At El-'Amarnah they are seldom composed of Nile mud as commonly elsewhere. The limestone pebbles and limy sand of which the desert is here composed bind together strongly with water. These are the materials which are used in brick-making for the cemeteries on the desert at the present day; it was the same in ancient times for the town on the desert, and consequently the house-mounds are covered with pebbles simply from the decomposition of the bricks. Wherever the explorer turns in and around the city he finds large pits of various shapes; generally a pit has a house-mound close by and often a second heap of spare material thrown out from the pit. The reason is this:—When a house or an enclosure wall had to be built, the first operation was to obtain material for brick-making: a pit was sunk and this might be carried down far enough to produce a supply of the necessary water with the help of a *shadūf* and steps. If more material were dug out than was needed for the bricks, it was left in a heap at the side; or if the owner were ambitious he made a raised platform of this rubble for his house to stand on, introducing a gentle slope or easy

stairway up to the front door. In some cases the house originally stood on the general level, and only after some years of occupation the floors were raised on rubble to increase its dignity and command more view. The pit might remain as a permanent well and sunk garden after the house was finished.


For convenience of dumping then, our first attack was on two contiguous mounds out-lying on the eastern edge considerably beyond the end of the German work. They proved to be two houses in large enclosures with remains of gardens, etc. The easternmost belonged to a "Steward of Akhetaten" whose title was preserved in colour on the sides of a red niche, though his name unfortunately had disappeared entirely. It was a stately mansion raised on a platform; considerable portions of decorated plaster were obtained from one of the rooms and a bronze weight in the shape of a goat from a rubbish pit in the enclosure.

The other house was on a still larger scale, Pl. XXXIII, equal in dimensions to any private house yet found at Akhetaten. A scrap of the door-jamb gave us the name of the owner Pnehesi, and its position suggested that he was "Pnehesi, Chief Servant of the Aten in the Horizon of Aten," the owner of the fine tomb in the northern group which opens directly towards the house; unfortunately we could find no positive evidence for the identification. In his grounds stood a shrine of considerable dimensions approached by a separate entrance with a pylon, and in its ruins were found a battered head of Akhenaten, Pl. XXXIV, Fig. 1, and fragmentary arms and legs and feet of at least three statues, all in limestone. In the house itself were the remains of a delicately sculptured and painted stela showing Amenophis III and Taia receiving offerings under the protection of the Aten; outside against a wall lay a small painted stela wrapped in cloth.

After this we doubled the numbers of our workmen for an "intensive" dig, and proceeded to join up this last excavation with the German work along the eastern side of the High Priest Street. Here we were chiefly among small houses crowded together but interrupted by large enclosures. Against the walls here as well as in the Pnehesi houses we found several burials of children and adults, sometimes at the side of the enclosure walls, at others partly under them. They were poor burials, the bodies wrapped in mats or placed in wooden coffins, now all decayed, and sometimes with a plain pot or two; but on the mummy of an aged man we were fortunate in finding a bronze finger ring (wrapped in cloth and tied to the right humerus), engraved with the prenomens of Tutankhamun, proving that he was buried at or after the end of the flourishing period of the city. We concluded that some of these burials were of survivors of the inhabitants who lingered on when the place had been partly deserted.

After this we crossed over to the other side of the High Priest Street and excavated the houses for some distance westward. Here, in the thick of the town, we found no burials.

Next we removed our workmen to the north side of our own house, investigating the large enclosure behind it and pushing northward to a very exceptional building which had been explored by Petrie and Carter many years ago; their plan and description of it still hold good except in one important particular, that they failed to recognize the entrance. The building was circular and the entrance was on the west side. The latter was marked outside by a large water-pot sunk at the right side of the doorway, and within by a small chamber at each side. The floor was roughly level, and there was an inner concentric wall surrounding a space in which two brick-lined chambers were sunk on the east, perhaps after the first construction. The floor of the outer and inner circle were at about the same height and very roughly levelled, having perhaps been irregularly cut away. This building



I




2

1. House of Pnehesi from the south-east.
2. House of Pnehesi from the south-west.





I



2

1. Head of Akhenaten from the house of Pnhesi.

*Scale about  $\frac{1}{4}$*

2. The great garden, showing the beds.



Statue of Akhenaten from the shrine in the great garden.

*Scale 3*

was completely explored: the outer wall had evidently suffered much from exposure since Mr. Howard Carter dug it out. Another circular building of the same dimensions was found by us close to the last on the south side. It was at a considerably lower level, the entrance with stairway right and left leading down to the interior floor. We cut three trenches, roughly diametrical, across it, but did not clear it, finding the gebel floor irregular, deepening to the centre, but no concentric wall. The only scrap of internal building beside the stairways was a wall one brick high north of the stairways.

We were now in a position to determine the southern course of Street A, which turned gradually westwards past the oblique end of the enclosure by our house and then between house-mounds to the Mohammedan cemetery.

The south end of the same enclosure is carried along the top of a bank; just west of our house we cleared down the bank and found house-remains and between them and our house, under the protection of the bank, a remarkably well preserved garden (Pl. XXXIV, Fig. 2) divided into tiny plots with irrigation channels and holes for trees watered by a separate channel. Both channels had to be filled from a *shadûf* well in the enclosure. Behind the row of trees was a raised platform on which a shrine appears to have stood, and lying in rubbish in a small chamber at the nearest point of the houses to the shrine were two sandstone statues in fragments. Unfortunately both were headless (Pl. XXXV), but they were of good workmanship and preserved much of their colouring; the inscriptions show that they represented respectively Akhenaten and Nefertëit, and it is practically certain that this pair of statues belonged to the shrine and were carried away from it and cast into the chamber in a counter-revolution. They belong to the later period of the reign, as is shown by the form of the Aten names upon them, and before the final catastrophe they had already suffered mutilation. The queen's statue has a new head inserted in a separate piece of stone, and this head has been broken off at the neck at some time and very roughly mended with a great patch of overlapping plaster in order to join on the same or another head. In another house near by we had an interesting find: I removed, with my own hands, a bronze axehead from the floor to find beneath it two solid masses of iron rust which might perhaps have been similar axeheads of iron. This at any rate adds to the rare evidences of the use of iron in Egypt of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

Finally we endeavoured to carry the excavation from the circular structure northward on the east side of Street A to the cross street C, but time failed to complete this task. In all we excavated nearly a hundred and fifty buildings. Wherever we dug the enthusiasm of Akhenaten's people for the beautiful glass and fayence produced at this time was obvious, and their manufacture was done on the spot. In almost every house throughout the work we found moulds for glazed ornaments, and fragments of glass rods for the manufacture of variegated vessels.

A will-of-the-wisp, the dream of a rich unplundered cemetery of the middle classes at El-'Amarnah, full of choice vases and amulets, beckons to each successive explorer. Our excellent head-rêyis Sulmân, who had so successfully tracked the Sanam cemetery at Napata, was allowed a fling at it for two days at the beginning of the year with a chosen band of assistants, but nothing came of the attempt except finding a few bones in holes in the high desert and scoring the sand stretches east of the town by many new trenches. There are square miles of sand wastes levelled by wind and rain where a cemetery might lie without indications on the surface; on the other hand it is quite possible that no such cemetery ever existed. The less important people of Akhenaten may have been buried with


earlier and later generations in the enormous cemetery of Tûnah on the edge of the western desert. We must remember too that probabilities, almost certainties, are (1) that the city was not even planned till the fourth year of Akhenaten's reign, (2) that Akhenaten died in the seventeenth year, (3) that Smenkhkerê, his son-in-law, had but a year or two of reign, (4) that Tutankhamûn reigned only six years, most of which were spent at Thebes. Even if the court and its following of priests, soldiers and workmen, lived in tents or otherwise in the "Horizon of Aten" and sought burial there from the very start, the city can have flourished only about fifteen years. Supposing that there was an average of 30,000 inhabitants, the number of those who died during that time, great and small, might have been 6000. These might have filled a very large cemetery, but to judge by other cases in Egypt only a very small proportion were buried at all in such a way as to leave bones or other deposits to bear witness to their existence. What happened to the rest can only be conjectured; but until a second-class cemetery of the "Horizon of Aten" can be found I would suggest that only one in a hundred bodies need be accounted for, so that the finding of sixty plundered or un plundered graves or skeletons might represent the above 6000. If this is correct, we need look no further than the rock tombs and the bones scattered in and about them for the cemetery of the "Horizon of Aten." Not that explorers must relax their watchfulness for burials.

The amount of excavation that remains to be done at El-'Amarnah is enormous, and there seems no reason why it should not be carried through in course of time. The interest of the work is very great and the antiquities found, in spite of the pitiless iconoclasm of the Restoration, which spared nothing great or small, seem to justify the expenditure. The Cairo Museum has treated us generously in the division of the finds, so that various museums will profit by this season's work.

It is by no means easy to obtain from the publications an idea of how far the exploration of the main site has proceeded; the plan of the German excavations in No. 55 of the *Mittheilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (reproduced in the *Smithsonian Report* for 1915), and the plans in the *City of Akhenaten*, Part I, are too scrappy to be readily placed in their right relation to other things, and the general survey of Timme is on too small a scale for the progress of the excavation to be followed upon it. The very rough plan, Pl. XXXVI, made up from various sources will serve to make the position clearer, until an accurate piecing of the materials is accomplished by an expert.

The town, about three kilometres long by three quarters of a kilometre broad (2 miles by half a mile) terminated northward with the Palace and Great Temple Enclosure excavated by Petrie and Carter in 1891. Beyond them northward there appears to be little more ancient than Coptic burials until the North Palace of Mr. Newton is reached. Just south of the Great Temple and opposite the Palace are several important buildings, including another temple and the Record House (marked Archives) in which was made the famous find of cuneiform tablets in 1887. This northern end is practically untouched by the German expedition and entirely so by the Society.

The principal roads through the city ran north and south, parallel with the river, and were very spacious. Of these three have been recognized. The Main Road near the border of the cultivation is an immemorial highway, in use long before Akhenaten built his city, and at the present day followed by travellers who go north and south along the desert edge. Along its west side towards the river lay the palace, and on its east side the Great Temple, and the massive brickwork towers of a pylon gateway which once spanned it at



General plan of Akhetaten.

*The hatched portions are those which have been excavated.*



1



2



3




4

Ptolemaic and Coptic fragments from El-'Amarnah.

the Palace are still traceable. Next to the Main Road eastward is Street A which starts from the south wall of the Great Temple enclosure and runs southward with a bend following the eastward bow of the town. Lastly the High Priest Street cuts off the eastern segment, extending only from near the Expedition house northward to the house of Pnehesi. Of cross streets east to west, several are clearly visible between the great parallel enclosures at the north end; but for the rest of the city few have as yet been detected, and probably they were very seldom more than narrow and irregular footways. Street C, partly excavated in 1921-2, is the best example yet found. When a greater breadth of the town has been thoroughly investigated it will be possible to say more about these cross streets.

The excavated portion of the city lies along the eastern edge, where there had been little disturbance in recent times, and down the *wādî* or torrent-bed. Much of the remainder, nearer the river, has been more or less destroyed of late by *sebâkh*-digging and native plundering; but everywhere there remains much to be learnt from proper excavation. Apart from Sir Flinders Petrie's long season of prodigious activity at Tell el-'Amarnah, the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft has spent four seasons there and our Society three seasons. Ten more annual expeditions may be necessary before the whole area of the Horizon of Aten with its suburbs is exhausted.

While we were at El-'Amarnah, a native dealer from Rôdah brought some antiquities for sale and I secured from him the four slabs here illustrated, Pl. XXXVII. They were said to have been found on the other side of the river. The slab of Ptolemy Soter (B.C. 310-283), Fig. 3, is remarkable for the Hathor heads on the sign of gold  alternating with the royal cartouches. "Hathor of Gold" was mistress of Cusae, twenty-five miles south of El-'Amarnah, whose great men of the Old and Middle Kingdoms were buried in the tombs of Mêr, surveyed for the Society by Dr. Blackman. It must be from Cusae that the slab came. It measures about 95 x 28 cm.

The other three are Coptic. Fig. 4 must have formed part of a frieze in a church. The design of flowers and masks (of a satyr on the left) in garlands is to a certain extent paralleled in the sculptured decoration of a church at Bâwît, a few miles south of us on the west side<sup>1</sup>. The sculpture is deep but obscured by thick whitewash. The height of the slab is about 13 inches. Fig. 2 is of the same height as the last and shows a variation of the design with a medallion of a human mask in a flower which is probably unique. Fig. 1, the tympanum of some rounded niche, measures 62 x 37 cm.; it represents two peacocks with a vase between them<sup>2</sup> and above them Christian symbols, an eagle wearing a jewel on its neck<sup>3</sup>, two crosses in the field, and on the left side a fish of wondrous execution. These slabs will find a resting-place alongside Sir Charles Nicholson's collection of Egyptian Antiquities in the University Museum at Sydney, N.S.W.

<sup>1</sup> CHASSINAT, *Fouilles à Baouît*, Pls. XXIII, XXXIII.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. CLÉDAT, *Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouît*, I, Pl. CVIII.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, Pl. IX.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY (1923—1924): ANCIENT EGYPT

BY PROFESSOR F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A., F.B.A.

THE excavation of the tomb of Tutankhamūn which in 1923 sent morning "thrills" throughout the world this year has appeared to be on the verge of a tragic ending, like the promise of a mighty harvest ruined by a cataclysmic thunderstorm. Let us hope that before this report is printed, the clouds which have gathered will disperse and the whole of the rich crop will be saved intact by the skill of the harvesters.

In other directions there have been great if less spectacular achievements. Who could have hoped that in a short twelve months the archaeology of Egypt and Syria would be broadly and precisely linked by a series of royal tombs at Byblos, and that the history of Phoenician writing would by the same means be carried back four centuries, past the point where the Greek branch parted from the main stem? Who would have predicted thirty years ago that one source of the Biblical Proverbs would be definitely traced to an Egyptian sage, or have dreamed that in a world history produced by the University of Cambridge, for one volume which represents the period 1500—1000 B.C., the Hittites would share the title-rôle with Egypt?

In the *Cairo Scientific Journal*, 1924, there are two interesting articles concerning the practice of archaeology according to modern standards, showing its aims and its difficulties; one is by ENGELBACH, *Stray Notes on Egyptian Archaeology in the Field*, XII, 134—40, the other by LUCAS, *The Use of Chemistry in Archaeology*, XII, 144—5.

Out of much practical knowledge Mrs. QUIBELL has written an excellent and well-illustrated book on *Egyptian History and Art, with reference to Museum collections*, that may be strongly recommended to travellers and other amateurs. DR. BLACKMAN'S *Luxor and its Temples*, illustrated by Major FLETCHER, is reviewed by PEET in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 1924, 327—8. Visitors to Thebes can obtain two admirable maps on a scale of about six inches to a mile (1—10,000), linen-backed, issued by the Survey Department of the Egyptian Government, entitled respectively *Luxor and Karnak*, and *El Qurna*.

*Notes on the law of antiquities* are printed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 15.

In the second half of HAMMERTON'S *Wonders of the Past* the Egyptological articles are *The Story of Agriculture* by MACKENZIE (781—9); *The Great Pyramid* by Miss MURRAY (933—6); *The Tomb of Osiris at Abydos* by GAUDET (987—91); *Tell el-Amarna* by HAYTER (1145—61); *The Rosetta Stone* by HALL (1227—8). The illustrations throughout are very noteworthy and the text is written with expert knowledge.

FALLS, *Im Zauber der Wüste*, describing the travels and excavations of Kaufmann's expedition to the Monastery of St. Menas, etc., is reviewed by PIEPER in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 454—5.

Miss BLACKMAN writes on *Mostim Saints in Modern Egypt* in *Discovery*, IV, 283—7, and *Some Modern Egyptian Saints—II, Coptic Saints* finding modern parallels to the ancient *ka*-servant, etc., *op. cit.*, V, 67—71. KAHLE gives an interesting account of Egyptian mourning for the dead at the present day with Arabic text of the songs *Die Totenklage im heutigen Ägypten*, from H. GUNKEL'S *Festschrift*.

The usual reviews of Egyptological books and periodicals continue in *Ancient Egypt* (for which an Index to the four volumes 1920—1923 is provided), by MERCER in the *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, and by DAWSON in the *Asiatic Review* under the heading *Tutankhamen: Egypt and Asia*. GEUTHNER of Paris has issued a very elaborate classified sale-catalogue of books on Egypt in two parts *Ägyptos, la Terre du Faucon*.

The study of a MS. of Horapollo in the fifteenth century A.D. led to a large literature of fanciful interpretation and invention of hieroglyphs which continued down to the days of Young and Champollion. A work on this subject, VOLKMANN, *Bilderschriften der Renaissance. Hieroglyphik und Emblematik in ihren Beziehungen und Fortwirkungen*, is reviewed by WIEDEMANN at considerable length in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 67—71.



For those who like the mysteries of "Pyramid Theory," DAVIDSON and ALDERSMITH, *The Great Pyramid, its divine Message*, vol. I *Pyramid Records* should be a great treat. Although the end of the world is not a factor in it the work promises to be the largest and handsomest product of this game with figures that has yet seen the light. In Germany some varieties of the game are played; such are represented by OPITZ, *Das Geheimniss der Cheopspyramide und die königliche Kunst* and POLISCA, *Die Sprache der Cheopspyramide*; but some German Egyptologists and other writers disapprove, as is shown by LANDT's counterblast, *Ein neuer Kampf um die Cheopspyramide*, by PIEPER's reviews in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 454, and by BORCHARDT's pamphlet noticed last year.

The new gallery in the Berlin Museum devoted to its marvellous collection of the art of El-'Amarnah is described by SCHÄFER, *Die Neuauftellung der Funde aus el-Amarna*, in *Berliner Museen, Berichte aus den Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, XLV, 1-11, and in *M.D.O.G.*, no. 63, 27-37, with plan and some photographs.

A bilingual inscription in demotic and Greek, very illegible, was seen by the savants of Napoleon's expedition at Menûf, but only the first three words of the Greek were copied; part of it was seen again by Cailliaud in 1820, but it has now completely disappeared. From the initial words it is evident that it recorded a decree different from any known. DARESSY, *La pierre bilingue de Menouf*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXIII, 49-52.

G. W. MURRAY has written a paper on *The Ababda* in *Journal R. Anthr. Inst.*, LIII, 417-23. These people form the population of the eastern desert from the frontier of the Sudan to a line north of the Koşêr road. Owing camels and cultivating land they are in continual enmity with the Arabs and have increased their territory in the last century. Mr. Murray does not say whether any traces are to be found among them of the Hamitic language which they must have spoken formerly.

#### EXCAVATIONS AND EXPLORATIONS.

MEROË. In *Journal*, IX, 157-60, *The Meroitic Kingdom of Ethiopia, Additional Note*, REISNER supplies some additions and corrections to his previous article in the same volume. The complete excavation of the Western Cemetery in 1921-1923 shows that it was used for the royal relatives in both the Ethiopian and the Meroitic period.

NAPATA. Memoir on the Ethiopian cemetery of Sanam, publishing pottery, scarabs and other small objects, GRIFFITH, *Oxford Excavations in Nubia*, in *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, x, 73-171. This and the previous instalments are reviewed by DAWSON in *Journal*, x, 191-3.

KERMA. Memoir by REISNER on his excavations: the Old Kingdom Settlement, the Twelfth Dynasty fortress of the "Lower Deffûfa," the great cemetery with *sati* burials of the Middle Kingdom including the tomb of Hepzefa, and the "Upper Deffûfa," a funerary chapel. Also a small Meroitic cemetery. *Excavations at Kerma (Harvard African Studies, v, vi)*.

SECOND CATARACT. BORCHARDT's memoir *Altägyptische Festungen an der zweiten Nilschnelle* is reviewed by ANDRÆ in *O.L.Z.*, XXVI, 608-10.

KUBANIYAH. The three volumes of JUNKER's *Bericht über die Grabungen d. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Wien auf den Friedhöfen von El-Kubaniyeh* are reviewed by PIEPER in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 191-4.

EDFÛ. The Institut Français has excavated under the direction of HENNE; the further publication of the temple is confided to Lecomte de NOUY. FOUART in *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 414.

BERENICE. Plan of the temple and notes made by Col. PURDY in 1873; also fragments of Ptolemaic Greek inscriptions from an old fort el-Abrak, 85 kilometres S.W. from Berenice, discovered by PURDY and COLSTON. Edited by DARESSY from the archives of the Institut d'Égypte, *Bérénice et El Abraq* in *Ann. Serv.*, XXII, 169-84.

THEBES, *West Bank*. The first of a series of memoirs on the extensive excavations of the Italian archaeological mission to Egypt is devoted to discoveries made in 1903-1905 in the "Valley of the Tombs of the Queens." They comprise the tombs of (1) a princess Ahmosi, daughter of Sekenenrê Ta-ô and Queen Sit-Dhout, (2) (in a lateral valley), a "king's son" Ahmosi, son of two private people, (3) Imhotp, vizier of Tuthmosis I, (4) Neberi, chief of the royal stable, (5) the splendid tomb of Nefertere-Maienmut, queen of Ramesses II; the tombs of (6) Sit-rêç, queen of Sethos I, (7), (8) two queens whose cartouches are not filled, (9)-(11) of Sethikhopshef, Kha'emwesi and Amenkhopshef, sons of Ramesses III. Unfortunately all the tombs had been utterly plundered. The finds included ostraca of Dyn. XX and palaeolithic imple-

ments from the neighbourhood. The memoir written by SCHIAPARELLI is illustrated by very fine photographs. *Relazione sui lavori della Missione Archeologica Italiana in Egitto (Anni 1903-1920)*, I, *Esplorazione della "Valle delle Regine" nella Necropoli di Tebe*.

The full story of the discovery of the tomb of King Tut'ankhamūn and of the work of conservation of the antiquities down to the end of the season 1922-1923 is told by CARTER and MACE in *The Tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amen*, I, with many illustrations of the tomb and its principal contents, reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 29; a German edition with preface by Steindorff has been issued. A communication on *Les fouilles récentes dans la vallée des rois et la sépulture de Toutankhamon* by MORET is printed in *L'Anthropologie*, xxxiii, 185-7.

LYTHGØE's report of *The Egyptian Expedition 1922-1923* (*Bull. Metr. Mus.*, Dec. 1923, Part II) contains: MACE, *Work at the Tomb of Tutankhamon* (5-11); WINLOCK, *The Museum's Excavations at Thebes* (11-39), on tombs of Dyn. XI on the north side of Dêr el-Bahrî, in the court of the temple of Menthotp where Dyn. XI mummies of tattooed dancing girls were found, a rubbish dump of the time of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III with granite figures of the queen from her temple. Amongst the tombs were the decorated sarcophagus-chamber of a high official Khety and the tomb of Nesisepek (Espeqeshut) of Dyn. XXVI imitating those of Dyn. XI and yielding some fine drawings on ostraca; DAVIES, *The Graphic Work of the Expedition* (40-53), a review of the new tendencies of Theban art during the century before Tut'ankhamūn developing fully into the style of Akhenaten.

An illustrated account of tombs cleared in Dirâ' abu'l-Nagâ by the Philadelphia expedition is given by FISHER, *A group of Theban Tombs*, in *The Museum Journal* (Philadelphia), 1924, 28-49.

A brief note of the work of the Institut Français at Dêr el-Medīnah under BRUYÈRE, discovering pyramidal tomb-chapels of Dyn. XIX, is given by FOUCART, *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 415.

*East Bank*. At Luxor a partial clearance of the outer face of the wall behind the mosque of Abu'l Haggâg showing remnants of scenes of Ramesses II besieging Syrian cities, afterwards covered up again, KUENTZ, *Rapport sur une tranchée faite par M. Baraize au temple de Louxor*, in *Ann. Ser.*, xxii, 232-4.

At Karnak M. PILLET has been very active. In 1921-1922, in the temple of Amūn the restoration of the temple of Ramesses III was begun. The ruined pylon III (Amenophis III) was taken in hand; from the foundations at the N.E. corner, 22 alabaster blocks of fine work belonging to a shrine of Amenophis I have been extracted one by one showing the main doorway to have been  $2\frac{3}{4}$  metres wide. Between pylons VII and VIII the whole court was cleared, revealing fragments of the obelisks of pylon VII and a monolithic shrine of Sesostris I in black granite (cf. *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 438). At pylon IX the only clearance necessary was on the south side of the west tower. From this pylon thousands of blocks of Amenophis IV's buildings, some of them sculptured, were recovered. A fayence cartouche of Seti II must have been one of a series which filled prepared sockets in the passage-way of the pylon, and probably a similar series had been in pylon VIII. The temple of Ramesses III in the enclosure of Mut was cleared and planned but yielded little of importance. Various repairs and work at the temple of Khons, at pylon X, etc., were done. PILLET, *Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1921-1922)*, in *Ann. Ser.*, xxii, 235-60. DARESSY publishes the statues of an official of the divine wives Amyrtaeus and Shapeniope (between pylons VII and VIII), of Senmut with princess Nefru-rê' (in front of pylon IX), of a priest Es-Min of Dyn. XXVI-XXVII (between pylons IX and X), and a stele of Horus on crocodiles (from Mut-temple of Ramesses III), *Description des monuments épigraphiques trouvés à Karnak en 1921-1922*, *ibid.*, 261-8.

In 1922-1923 PILLET continued to give much attention to the dangers of the annual infiltration of irrigation water. Observation seemed to show that the supply can be regulated so as to diminish this danger by earlier and gradual withdrawal of the water and at the same time to increase the benefit to the farmer. A very large amount of conservation and clearance has been accomplished without in most cases new discoveries being made. He notes that the recutting of old sandstone blocks by Ramesses III for his buildings has taken away their power of resistance to saltpetre. The pylon of Amenophis III continued to yield blocks of the alabaster shrine, about two-thirds of which are now recovered, showing that it was a resting-place for the sacred bark: evidently it was removed to make way for the granite shrine of Tuthmosis III; from the south tower of the pylon come nine blocks, to be added to eleven found by LEGRAIN, of a funerary chapel for Hatshepsut built by Senmut at the command of Tuthmosis III, *Rapport sur les travaux de Karnak (1922-1923)*, *ibid.*, xxiii, 99-138.

ABYDOS. Cemetery F, excavated in 1908-1909, described from notes taken by the late E. H. AYRTON, LOAT, *A Sixth Dynasty Cemetery at Abydos*, in *Journal*, ix, 161-3.

KAU to BADÂRI. At KAU the remains of the scenes in the great tomb of Uahka have been cleaned and copied and the tombs have been planned. PETRIE, *The British School in Egypt, excavations at Qau*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 16-17. A "Badarian" civilisation, a variety of the early prehistoric, is marked by peculiar slate palettes, and very thin shiny black rippled pottery. Royal names begin with Dyn. II and the finds are continuous to Dyn. XVIII. Fossilized hippopotamus bones were placed in each of the great tombs. PETRIE, *The British School in Egypt*, *ibid.*, 33-8.

MÊR. Full publication of the finest of the tombs of Dyn. VI with remarkable inscriptions, some of them in an early form of hieratic, BLACKMAN, *The Rock Tombs of Meir*, IV, *The Tomb-Chapel of Pepi-onkh the Middle*, in the series of the Society's *Archaeological Survey*.

EL-'AMARNAH. The work of the Society in 1923-1924 including the discovery of a palace at the north end beyond Et-Til with unusual features, *Journal*, x, 60-1.

DERWAH-TÛNAH. Two volumes of a very fine and scholarly publication by LEFEBVRE of the magnificent tomb of Petosiris, high priest of Thoth at the end of the Persian period, one containing all the texts printed with textual notes, the other indexes of divine personal and geographical names and of all words, together with plans, sections and views, and photographs and drawings of scenes and details. LEFEBVRE, *Le Tombeau de Petosiris: deuxième partie, Les textes, troisième partie, Vocabulaire et planches*. The first volume is to follow.

Some results of an excavation in 1912 of a cemetery of the New Kingdom. Fayence ushabtis found with a sarcophagus of the age of Ramesses II, several of them made with different coloured clays; other ushabtis of wood and shapeless ones of alabaster like the well-known figures of Ramesses VI. WEILL, *Quelques Types de Figurines funéraires des XIX<sup>e</sup> et XX<sup>e</sup> Dynasties*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 419-38.

SEDMENT. Memoir on the fruitful excavation of the cemeteries of Heracleopolis in the desert extending from Sedment to Mayanana; the finds include wonderful statues of a notable of Dyn. VI, an interesting game-board, inscribed coffins and scarabs of the Heracleopolite period and many inscriptions of Dyns. XVIII, XIX as well as large series of pottery, alabasters etc. PETRIE and BRUNTON, *Sedment* I, II (two volumes with continuous numbering of pages and plates).

EL-LÂHÛN. Memoir on work at and survey of the pyramid of Sesostris II and its surroundings in 1914, 1920 and 1921, including further discoveries at the tomb of the princess whose wonderful treasure was described in *Lahun I*. PETRIE, BRUNTON and MURRAY, *Lahun II*.

ABU RAWÂSH. CHASSINAT describes his work at the temple of the pyramid, and publishes the throne of a statue of Dedfrêç, a head of the king and the torso of a princess. In agreement with the monumental lists of the New Kingdom he places Dedfrêç between Khufu and Khafrêç, *À propos d'une tête en grès rouge du Roi Didoufrî*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 53-75. The French Institut is again working on the cemeteries, FOUCARD, in *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 414.

BENÊÂ. Publication of the find in 1921 of a limestone sarcophagus enclosed in a mass of masonry, belonging to an official of the Saite period, containing 277 ushabtis; a papyrus colonnette and a table of offerings probably belonged to the same tomb. GAUTHIER, *Sur une tombe récemment découverte à Athribis du Delta*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 171-88. Roman mosaic pavement, PILLET, *Note sur une mosaïque trouvée à Athribis*, in *Ann. Serv.*, xxiii, 59-64.

KÔM EL-KANÂTIR. The reported site of the finding of very early flint tools and pottery has been visited by PETRIE who however found no trace. *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 56.

ALEXANDRIA. The Service du Musée shows a much diminished grant and consequently there are no excavations to record. A fine mosaic recently found with hunting scene and animals is figured. BRECCIA, *Rapport sur la marche du Service du Musée pendant l'exercice 1921-1922*. A new section of the results of the Sieglin expedition has been published in a luxurious volume by PAGENSTECHEER, *Sieglin Ausgrabungen in Alexandrien*, I, *Malerei und Plastik*, A, reviewed by WEBER, *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 327-32.

#### PUBLICATION OF TEXTS.

##### (a) *From sites in Egypt, etc.*

PHILAE. Gift of vineyards at 'Agen (north of Esnah) by Marcus Aurelius to Isis of Philae, in addition to a similar gift by Ptolemy X, from Hadrian's gate. JUNKER, *Schenkung von Weingärten an die Isis von Philae unter Marc Aurel*, in *Wiener Zeitsch. f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes*, xxxi, 53-81.

AŞWÂN. Granite obelisk inscribed on one face only, ENGELBACH, *Small obelisk of Amenophis II from Aswan*, in *Ann. Serv.*, xxiii, 163-4.

EDFŪ. Id., *Two steles of the late Middle Kingdom from Tell Edfū*, *ibid.*, 183-6.

HERMONTIIS. Base of black granite group with Hathor, id., *A monument of Senusret I<sup>st</sup> from Armant*, *ibid.*, 161-162.

THEBES. Complete publication of the tombs of Amenhotpe-si-se second priest of Amūn (no. 75) and of Nebamūn, captain of police (no. 90)—particularly interesting tombs portions of which were copied by Wilkinson, Hay and other early explorers, the scenes of artificers, land-measuring, soldiering, and entertainment being specially notable. DAVIES, *The Tombs of two Officials of Tuthmosis the Fourth* (third memoir of DAVIES and GARDINER's *Theban Tomb Series*). DAVIES, *The Tomb of Puyemrē at Thebes*, in the Tytus series is reviewed by HALL in *Journal*, x, 184-5.

Revision of the texts of the tomb of Zeserkerē<sup>c</sup>-senb (previously published by SCHEIL), KUENTZ, *Les Textes du Tombeau no. 38 à Thèbes*, in *Bull. Inst. Franç.*, XXI, 119-30.

ASYŪṬ. Inscriptions of as many as can be traced of the coffins found by Ahmed Bey KAMAL, now in the museums at Miniah, Ṭanṭah and Port Said, GAUTHIER and LEFEBVRE, *Sarcophages du Moyen Empire provenant de la nécropole d'Assiout*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXIII, 1-33.

EL-'AMARNAH. Three examples from the Amherst series of inscriptions from wine and meat jars, collected by PETRIE and CARTER for Lord Amherst and now in the writer's possession, DAWSON, *Note on some ostraca from El-'Amarnah*, in *Journal*, x, 133.

ṬŪNAH. Limestone sarcophagus of a daughter of a high priest of Thoth with interesting names and titles, LEFEBVRE, *Un couvercle de sarcophage de Tounah*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXIII, 229-45.

EL-LĀHŪN. Fifty-five letters in the Berlin Museum (apparently belonging to the reigns of Sesostriis III and Amenemmes III), seven in complete transcription, the rest analysed with extracts. They concern temple affairs. SCHARFF, *Briefe aus Ullahun*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 20-51.

MEMPHIS: SAḶḶĀRAH. From a hieratic papyrus of very late date, DARESSY, *Fragments d'un Livre de l'Ouverture de la Bouche*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXII, 193-8. Block of king Amenemopi from the site of the temple of Ptah, GAUTHIER, *À travers la Basse Égypte*, *op. cit.*, XXII, 204. Fragment of stela recording a dangerous flood, from Mīt Raḥīnah, DARESSY, *La crue du Nil de l'an XXIX d'Amasis*, *op. cit.*, XXIII, 47-8. Ushabti of King Achoris from ?. GAUTHIER, *op. cit.*, XXII, 208.

GĪZAH. Granite block of prince Mery-Khufu and tomb of prince Dedfkhnum east of the Great Pyramid, GAUTHIER, *ibid.*, 205-7.

DELTA, etc. Three small Hathor columns from a temple of Apries, and sarcophagus of a high priest Harkhebi, at SAIS, GAUTHIER, *ibid.*, 199-204. Block from BEḤBĒṬ in Ṭanṭah Museum; blocks of Amasis II at and near ṬANṬAH, *ibid.*, XXIII, 68-72. Two statues of Mineptah at KAḶR MATBŪL (near Kafr esh-Shēkh); door jamba of Bai in time of Ramesses III at TELL BASTAH; shrine for Atum of Psammetichus I at NŪB TAHA (near Shībin el-Ḷanātir); block of Nekhtnebf at USĪM; fragment of statue mentioning accession of Nekhtnebf and Diospolis Inferior from ?; stela with sun-god from TELL MUḶDĀM; obeliscoid base (?) of Ramesses II from Ḷantarāh, the two chief fragments now reunited at Ismā'īliyah, GAUTHIER, *op. cit.*, XXIII, 165-82.

(b) *From museums, etc.*

TURIN. Transcripts from fragments of two papyri of Ramesses II, the one dealing with offerings to the deified kings, the other a ritual instituted by the king for offerings to Amenophis I and his queen, to partake of which were also invited other royal ancestors who had built at Karnak, BOTTI, *Il Culto Divino dei faraoni*, in *R. Accad. Naz. dei Lincei, Memorie*, 1923, 142-68. This and his previous publications from the Turin papyri are briefly reviewed by PEET in *Journal*, x, 188-9.

BRUSSELS. Elaborate publication of a rare chapter of the Book of the Dead, SPELEERS, *Le chapitre CLXXXII du Livre des Morts*, in *Rec. Trav.*, XL, 86-104. SPELEERS, *Recueil des inscriptions égyptiennes des Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire*, is reviewed by FARINA in *Aegyptus*, v, 90.

LONDON. *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae, etc. in the British Museum*, Part VI, reviewed by BLACKMAN, *Journal R. As. Soc.*, 1924, 313-15; by WRESZINSKI, *O.L.Z.*, XXVI, 557-8.

(c) *Miscellaneous.*

SETHE continues his elaborate edition of funerary spells concerning the knowledge of the "souls" of certain sacred localities. The seventh, caps. 109 and 107 (*cf.* 149 b) of the Book of the Dead, concerns the East side of Heaven, the door through which the rising Sun passes in his bark, the two sycamores between which he rises, and the Field of Rushes with its giant corn. *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 1 ff.

*(d) Hieratic and Demotic.*

BUDGE, *Facsimiles of Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Second Series*, is reviewed by DAWSON (who criticises the dates attributed to them) in *Journal*, IX, 260-2; and by SPIEGELBERG (with many interesting readings) in *O.L.Z.*, 1924, 182-91.

SPIEGELBERG has contributed four pages of facsimiles of demotic notes from ostraca to SCHUBART and KUHN's Greek *Papyri und Ostraka der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin, *Griechische Urkunden*, Bd. VI); and facsimiles and translations to VIERECK, *Griechische und Griechisch-demotische Ostraka der Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elsass*, 1<sup>er</sup> Band, *Texte*. The latter is reviewed by SCHUBART in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 20-1 and SPIEGELBERG, *Demotische Papyri* (Baden) by WIEDEMANN, *ibid.*, 20.

## HISTORY.

In a remarkably suggestive presidential address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association at Liverpool entitled *Egypt as a Field for Anthropological Research*, Professor NEWBERRY pointed out the vast changes wrought in the country by civilisation generally and by the taming of a wild riverside land to agriculture. Ancient Egypt possessed a large fauna, now driven south eastward to the Taka country between Nubia and the Red Sea, and Prehistoric Egypt a fauna which has retreated as far as Abyssinia and Central Africa. Lower Egypt must have been the early centre of civilisation on the Nile; it influenced Crete, and the conspicuous features of its royalty and of its religion came partly from Libya (the Sed-festival) partly from Asia (Osiris worship, the god 'Anzeti, the *dad*-column, etc.); the use of timber in building houses and sea-going craft must also have come from the north-east. In modern Egypt the popular superstitions, often reminiscent of Ancient Egypt, are worthy of careful study.

J. de MORGAN argues, particularly against MORET's *Des clans aux empires*, for the Asiatic origin of Ancient Egyptian culture, basing his argument largely on the extreme poverty of the Sinaitic copper deposits, the only ones immediately available for Egypt. *L'Égypte et l'Asie aux temps antéhistoriques*, in *Journal Asiatique*, CCIII, 117-59; *De l'importance supposée des mines du Sinai dans l'évolution de la culture égyptienne*, in *L'Anthropologie*, XXXIII, 283-6. Again he sketches the physical conditions in prehistoric periods and the end of the palaeolithic age caused by the bursting of the lakes which swept away all terrestrial creatures. The land was re-peopled from Libya and perhaps from other quarters, but civilisation came from Asia. *Le Monde Oriental avant l'histoire, L'Asie Antérieure et l'Égypte*, in *L'Anthropologie*, XXXIV, 17-56, 229-53; *Les premiers temps de l'Égypte*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 299-332. He also protests against the short chronology, *Observations sur la chronologie égyptienne dite réduite*, in *Revue Archéologique*, XVII, 243-54.

PETRIE replies to Peet's article on *The Antiquity of Egyptian Civilisation* and upholds the longer chronology, in *Journal*, IX, 153-6, and demolishes or tilts against various theories and axioms including some regarding the spread of culture generally and the derivation of civilisation from Egypt. *Current Fallacies about History*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 78-84.

WHEELER holds as against Ed. MEYER that the Sothic date in Censorinus need not conflict with that of the decree of Canopus, and that certain dates in a Kahun papyrus (the Lâhûn calendar), presumably of new moons, give 1909 B.C. and are to be referred to the 30th and 31st years of Amenemmes II. *The Chronology of the Twelfth Dynasty*, in *Journal*, IX, 196-200. BORCHARDT is preparing to publish further chronological researches in which the coincidence of moon-dates, dates in the movable year, and Sothic dates are utilised to give absolutely fixed results for the Old and Middle Kingdoms while such material is wanting for the New Kingdom, see *Zeits. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Ges.*, N.F. 2, iv-v. According to READ there is no certainty that regnal years were assimilated to the calendar year (year 2 commencing on the New Year's Day following the accession), but it is *probable* that Psammetichus I did so assimilate them, *Regnal Years and Calendar Years in Egypt*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 111-15.

RANKE's edition of ERMAN's *Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum* is reviewed in detail by BLACKMAN in *Journal*, IX, 263-6, by PIEPER lengthily in *O.L.Z.*, XXVI, 433-42, and by ALLEN in *Amer. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, XL, 142-4.

Professor STEINDORFF, on his installation as Rector of the University of Leipzig, chose as the subject of his discourse the physical and spiritual character of the Egyptian people; the latter was practical but modified by exceptional artistic and conservative tendencies. *Das Wesen des ägyptischen Volkes*, in *Rektorwechsel an der Universität Leipzig am 31 Okt. 1923*, 19-32.

A modest and to a great extent reliable account of Ancient Egypt is to be found in *Ancient Egypt from the Records*, by M. E. MONCKTON JONES.

PETRIE, *A History of Egypt, I, from the earliest kings to the XVIth Dynasty*, is reviewed by WIEDEMANN in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 486-7. His list of kings is commented on in detail by GAUTHIER, who also supplements his own great work with a number of new princes and princesses. *Quelques additions au "Livre des Rois d'Égypte"* (*Ancien et Moyen Empire*), in *Rec. Trav.*, xl, 177-204.

A new instance of the replacement of Har-nefer-sa by the later name Mery-rē<sup>c</sup>, SETHE, *Zum Namenswechsel des Königs Phios (Pjppj I)*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, lix, 71.

From the remnants of inscription on a sarcophagus at Dêr el-Bahrî BULL has recovered the name of a vizier Ipy, presumably of Menthotp III, *A new Vizier of the Eleventh Dynasty*, in *Journal*, x, 15.

PETRIE suggests that the Uaḥka family at Ḳau were invaders akin to the modern Gallas, and ancestors of Amenemmes I, *The Origin of the XIIth Dynasty*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 38-42.

SCHARFF writes on the ancient name of El-Lâhûn. The four names of royal pyramids and residences in the "Kahun" and Lâhûn papyri now appear all to belong to Sesostri II and Amenemmes III. *Ullahun und die mit Königsnamen des Mittleren Reiches gebildeten Ortsnamen*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, lix, 51-5.

Note on a cylinder of Khian in Chicago by OLMSTEAD, in *Journal*, x, 174-5.

*The Cambridge Ancient History, II, The Egyptian and Hitite Empires to c. 1000 B.C.* contains an account of the Egyptian New Empire by BREASTED, and chapters on its literature and art by PEET and HALL. The first volume was reviewed by MÜNZER in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 446-8, and the Egyptological portions in detail by BLACKMAN in *Journal R. As. Soc.*, 1924, 315-25.

DAVIES discusses a graffito in a Theban tomb of the third year of an unidentified ruler of the heretical period, and describes fully with plates two tombs of the beginning of Akhenaten's reign; these show the rapidity of change and invention in the first three or four years of the reign and establish the fact that the distinctive art of Tell el-'Amarnâ began at Thebes. He would see in the Aten a globe rather than a disk. *Akhenaten at Thebes*, in *Journal*, ix, 132-52.

Dr. Elliot SMITH in *Tutankhamen and the Discovery of his Tomb*, a reprint of articles contributed to the *Daily Telegraph* on funerary practices etc., is inclined to attribute Akhenaten's juvenile skeleton to the rare disease *Dystocia adiposo-genitalis* which would allow of an age up to 30 or even 36, reviewed by HALL in *Journal*, ix, 257-60. *The Tomb of Tutankhamen*, by CAPART, translated by DAWSON, is reviewed by PEET, *op. cit.*, x, 76-7. MERCER, *Tutankhamen and Egyptology*, is reviewed by BONNET, in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 401.

WINLOCK publishes a statue of Horemheb, now in the Metropolitan Museum, apparently from Memphis, and proves with the help of the fragment of another statue in Cairo from Karnak that Horemheb was general under Tutankhamûn and that his position made him king-maker. *A statue of Horemheb before his Accession*, in *Journal*, x, 1-5. See also *id.*, *Harmhab, Commander-in-chief of the Armies of Tutenkhamon*, in *Bulletin Metr. Mus.*, xviii, October, Part II, 3-16.

From a study of the original PEET translates (without text) a papyrus of Dyn. XX at Turin, of which a partial translation from an insufficient facsimile was published long ago by SPIEGELBERG. It contains a prodigious series of charges of theft, sacrilege, etc., in connection with the temple of Khnum at Elephantine in the reigns of Ramesses IV and V. "The whole papyrus gives a vivid picture of the venality of the state officials and of the power and the corruption of the priesthood." *A Historical Document of Ramesside Age*, in *Journal*, x, 116-27.

SETHE interprets the passages in which SPIEGELBERG detected a revolt of the High priest Amenhotp as a movement *against* the powerful priest. *Die Angebliche Rebellion des Hohenpriesters Amenhotp unter Ramses IX.*

SOTTAS gives a preliminary account of an interesting find of demotic papyri, accounts, and contracts of the time of Amasis II and Cambyses, from WAINWRIGHT's clearance of the great "Tomb of the Jackals" at Asyût. The principal dates are year 28 of Amasis II and years 2, 6, and 8 of Cambyses, the first known of Cambyses in contemporary demotic: the documents preserve interesting titles, place-names and personal names. *Sur quelques papyrus démotiques provenant d'Assiout*, in *Ann. Serv.*, xxiii, 34-46.

GAUTHIER gives a brief account of a trilingual stele found at Tell el-Maskhûṭah (Pithom?), a duplicate of a fragment already in the Cairo Museum, inscribed with an important decree promulgated in year 6 of Ptolemy Philopator after the great victory at Raphia. It confirms the account of the battle in Polybius, but adds little to it. It was on this occasion that divine honours were first decreed for Ptolemy Soter and Berenice. *Un nouveau décret trilingue ptolémaïque*, in *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 376-83.

In Prince Omar TOUSSOUN'S *Mémoire sur les finances de l'Égypte depuis les Pharaons jusqu'à nos jours* (*Mémoires de la Soc. Arch. d'Alexandrie*, II), the evidence for the Pharaonic period is of course almost negligible and few pages are devoted to it: on the other hand the sources for the mediaeval and modern periods are abundant.

## GEOGRAPHY.

It is welcome news that GAUTHIER is preparing a dictionary of Ancient Egyptian geographical names; the first part is to be ready for the Geographical Congress to be held in Cairo in 1925. *Aegyptus*, v, 86.

Prince Omar TOUSSOUN has supplemented his memoir on the branches of the Nile in ancient times by a still larger memoir carrying down their history to the Turkish conquest. It is illustrated by six maps, and special sections are devoted to the canal of Alexandria and the canal from Cairo through the Wâdî Tûmilât, *Mémoire sur les anciennes branches du Nil, époque arabe*. The two together compose the fourth volume of the *Mémoires* of the *Institut d'Égypte*, and also the first volume of the *Société archéologique d'Alexandrie*.

Taoua of the Antonine Itinerary is apparently the modern Ṭanṭah, DARESSY, *Les Emplacements de la Ville de Taoua*, in *Ann. Serv.*, XXII, 185-92.


NAVILLE argues, against GARDINER and PEET, for retaining his former identifications of Goshen, Succoth, Pithom, Raamses, and the ancient extension of the Red Sea, and for considering the Biblical narrative of the Exodus as more than legendary, *The Geography of the Exodus*, in *Journal*, x, 18-39. WIENER, *Pithom and Raamses*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 75-7 criticises some points in GARDINER'S article, *The Delta Residence of the Ramessides*. GARDINER replies to these and other criticisms: that Avaris was actually on the Pelusiac branch is confirmed by a Ramesside ostrakon, which makes it clear that there were three main branches of the Nile in the Delta, one of which is called "The Waters of Avaris." *The Geography of the Exodus: an Answer to Professor Naville and others*, in *Journal*, x, 87-96. In the last *Journal, Bibliography*, 206, the reference for Clédat, *Notes sur l'Isthme de Suez*, XVIII, should be completed, *Bulletin Inst. Fr.*, XXI, 145-87.

ALBRIGHT would identify Zilû in an Amarna letter with Selle or Sile, *i.e.*, Zaru, the entrance to Egypt on the north-east, and considers that the name is probably Semitic, dating from the Hyksos occupation. *The Town of Selle (Zaru) in the 'Amarnah Tablets*, in *Journal*, x, 6-8.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS.

(For foreign relations of Egypt in prehistoric times see also "HISTORY," above p. 311.)

PERRY, *The Children of the Sun*, finds no more favour with the Americanist CLARKE, reviewing it in *Journal*, x, 189-91, than his *Origin of Magic and Religion* does with PEET, *ibid.*, 63-9; HALLIDAY, in *Liverpool Annals*, XI, 51-3. PERRY'S *Growth of Civilisation* is briefly noticed by PEET, *Journal*, x, 189.

HORNELL describes a peculiar form of oculi painted on boats on the east coast of India, probably derived from the Egyptian  on funereal boats, and traces the spread of the latter decoration throughout the Mediterranean. *Survivals of the Use of Oculi in Modern Boats*, in *Journ. R. Anthropol. Inst.*, LIII, 289-321.

EUROPE. In *Mémoires Piot*, XXV, 390-400, POTTIER, *Note sur l'Égypte et la plastique grecque*, publishing a large glazed statuette from Melos (?) and others smaller from Rhodes, argues that the diffusion of small Egyptian figures by commerce stimulated Greek art to new life after the dull and inartistic Geometric period.

ASIA. In a memoir entitled *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East*, I, *Mesopotamia Syria and Egypt and their Earliest Interrelations* (Roy. Anthropol. Inst. *Occasional Papers*, no. 6), FRANKFORT holds that Egyptian pottery shows no connection with other countries before the First Dynasty, when types occur that point to north Syria, although the ivory knife-handle from Gebel el-'Arak proves connection with the art of Sumeria in the prehistoric age.

HUNT, in describing *Hyderabad Cairn Burials and their Significance*, in *Journ. R. Anthropol. Inst.*, LIV, 140-56, draws attention to the polished black-topped ware in these as in Egyptian prehistoric graves; but all weapons and tools are made of iron, iron ore being very abundant on the surface; copper is found rarely for bells and ornaments, but not bronze.

VINCENT, *La peinture céramique palestinienne*, in *Syria*, v, 81-107, holds that the heraldic grouping of two goats and tree came originally from Chaldaean-Elamite sources and not from Egypt.

BLACKMAN publishes a quantity of Babylonian ritual material furnished by Prof. LANGDON, and compares the usages indicated with those of Egyptian ritual; remarkable analogies are seen, but as yet not indications of borrowing. *The Rite of Opening the Mouth in Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, in *Journal*, x, 47-59.

A German translation of Dr. GARDINER's important paper on *The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet*, in *Journal*, III (1916), has been printed in the *Zeits. d. Deutschen Morgenl. Ges.*, N.F., II, 92-120; *Der ägyptische Ursprung des semitischen Alphabets*. EISLER has an article in Hebrew on writing in the age of Moses in the Hebrew journal *Debir*, I, 14-21; II, 46-60. Professor GRIMME of Münster has made a brave attempt to read the scanty Sinai inscriptions, *Althebräische Inschriften vom Sinai*. The Meroitic altar at Toronto, which he figures as a supplement, cannot be from the Hathor-temple at Serâbit el-Khâdim. The material, clearly seen in the photograph, shows it to be from Meroe, and presumably it came from Prof. GARSTANG's excavations.

BABYLONIA. In *Journal*, IX, 190, HALL has an interesting note on early vases from Ur and elsewhere, apparently of Egyptian alabaster (aragonite).

SYRIA, etc. Report on the archaeological work of the Syrian Service des Antiquités and the French School of Archaeology at Jerusalem during 1921-1922, including the Egyptian finds at Byblos and Tell Nebî Mend. POTTIER, *Rapport sur les travaux archéologiques en Syrie et à l'École Française de Jérusalem*, in *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 255-62, reprinted in *Syria*, IV, 316-23, cf. THOMSEN, in *O.L.Z.*, 1924, 278-80.

ARADUS (Ruad, Arvad). Obelisk of Thutmose III (only 12 cm. high) in the Bêrût Museum. *Syria*, v, 118-19 (in VIROLLEAUD's report for 1922-1923).

HOMS. Upper part of black granite stela found at Tell Nebî Mend (Kadesh on the Orontes) in 1921 showing Setî I before Ammon, the Syrian Seth, Mont and Khons. PÉZARD, *Une nouvelle stèle de Setî I*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 387-389. Copy of the name of Seth upon it by MONTET, in *Syria*, IV, 179.

In *Digue du lac de Homs et "Mur Égyptien" de Strabon* (*Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 133-41) DUSSAUD proposes to identify Tunip Qatna and Tunanat with sites round Lake Homs, and the dyke across the Orontes which formed the Lake with the "Egyptian wall" of Strabo, xvi, 2, 19, and suggests that this dates from Dyn. XVIII; BROSSÉ gives a description, photographs, and sections of the dyke, which has been frequently restored, and DUSSAUD in an introductory note suggests that Setî I was the builder of it. *La Digue du Lac de Homs*, in *Syria*, IV, 234-40.

BYBLOS (Jebeil, Gebal). MONTET describes and publishes the finds of 1921 of Egyptian objects in pits beneath the floor of the "Egyptian" temple: they range from prehistoric times to the Middle Kingdom and include an inscribed cylinder of very early date, the names of kings of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Dynasties. *Les Égyptiens à Byblos*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 237-72. The continuance of the work here in 1922 was reported by MONTET, *Les fouilles de Byblos en 1922*, in *Comptes Rendus*, 1923, 84-96, cf. *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 115.

The accidental discovery of a royal tomb (no. I, with name of Amenemmes III), cf. *Journal*, IX, 212, was promptly followed up. The discovery of four more tombs is recorded in successive reports from MONTET to the Secretary of the Paris Academy, which are printed in full in *Les fouilles de Byblos en 1923* (*Syria*, IV, 334-44); these include a sketch-map of the ground south of the Crusaders' city and a plan of the area occupied by the five royal tombs hitherto explored.

No. II was reached by a long subterranean passage from no. I. It was intact and contained fine jewellery dated by a box of obsidian inlaid with gold, bearing the name of Amenemmes IV.

No. III from its position and antiquities was earlier than I and II. It contained objects of Egyptian workmanship, unfortunately without inscription.

No. IV belongs to the same series, but had been robbed long ago; inside the sarcophagus lay some paper with writing in English and the date 1851 (?).

In these tombs the "princes of Kepni" bore purely Egyptian titles, inscribed on scimitars, etc.

At a distance of about twelve metres from IV was another pit and large burial-chamber containing three sarcophagi, two of them quite plain, the third decorated with scenes and inscriptions in Phoenician. On the side of the pit was also a Phoenician inscription. The date was given by an alabaster vase with cartouches of Ramesses II.

In *Comptes Rendus* only the briefest notes of these reports are given: 1923, 388, 409-10, 427, 435, 441, 447; 1924, 5, 7. In 1924, 99-101, DUSSAUD gives a transcription of the Phoenician inscription on the sarcophagus into Hebrew characters and translates it. But the full publication was again reserved for the



journal *Syria*. Here DUSSAUD gives proof of the Ramesside age of the sarcophagus, and publishes facsimiles of the Phoenician texts. The tomb was made for "Ahiram king of Gebal, by his son [Ipphe ?]s-baal." Moreover the throne of a statuette of Sheshonk I, found thirty years ago at Byblos, has a (contemporary) inscription of "Abibaal king of Gebal." Both of these inscriptions of c. 1250 and c. 950 B.C. show earlier forms of the signs than the stela of Mesa (Moabite stone), 842 B.C. Greek writing branched off later, in the ninth century. DUSSAUD considers that these early forms exclude derivation both from Egyptian hieratic and from the Sinai writing first deciphered by GARDINER and considered by him to be proto-Semitic and thinks the Phoenician alphabet formed of purely conventional (artificial) signs. *Les inscriptions phéniciennes du tombeau d'Ahiram, Roi de Byblos*, in *Syria*, v, 135-57.

In *Le pays de Nagaou, près de Byblos, et son dieu* (*Syria*, iv, 181-92), MONTET quotes several instances of Nega or Ga in Egyptian texts as the name of a country where the coniferous *Cash* grew. Its god in the pyramid texts is *Khet-tau*, and his name occurs along with Hathor of Kepni on the very early cylinder from Byblos. Nega is probably the densely wooded valley of the Adonis, and MONTET traces indubitable though still obscure connections with it in the Osiris myth.

In *Byblos et la mention des Giblytes dans l'Ancien Testament* (*Syria*, iv, 300-15) DUSSAUD reviews the antiquity of Byblos in the light of recent discovery and shows the genuineness of the references in the Bible to Gebal and the Giblyte wood-cutters and carpenters, especially in I Kings v.

NAHR EL-KELB. In 1922, in a special memoir, WEISSBACH published interesting photographs with bibliography and other particulars of the stelae on the rocks, including three of Ramesses II, and the cuneiform inscription recording Esarhaddon's capture of Memphis. *Die Denkmäler und Inschriften an der Mündung des Nahr el-Kelb*.

SIDON. In CONTENAU, *Deuxième Mission Archéologique à Sidon, 1920* (*Syria*, v, 9-22, 123-34), are figured an Egyptian dwarf figure from the temple of Eshmûn, north of Sidon (p. 21), three more scarabs from Kafr Djarra (Pl. XXXIV), and another from Ayaa (p. 134 and Pl. XXXVIII).

DOR (Tanturah). An historical account of the town (well known to Egyptology through the story of Unamûn) and sections cut in the mound. *Excavations at Tanturah*, in *Bulletin of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem*, no. 4, 35-44.

BEISÂN (Bethshan). An Egyptian fortress has been laid bare, with two stelae of Seti I, one of Ramesses II, and a statue of Ramesses III, all in the local basalt. One stela of Seti records the relief of "Bit-shal," when attacked by the king of Hamath, by the divisions of Rê<sup>c</sup>, Amûn, and Seth, in year 1, and names the cities of Pella Rehob and Yenoam. The stela of year 24 (?) of Ramesses II refers to the building of the city Ramesses by Semites, amongst much poetical description of the king's might. FISHER, *Bethshean, Excavations of the University Museum Expedition 1921-1923*, in *Philadelphia Museum Journal*, xiv, 227-48; cf. *Journal*, ix, 241; OVENDEN, *Notes on the University Museum of Philadelphia excavations at Beisan*, in P.E.F. *Quarterly Statement*, 1923, 158-9.

HALL reviews PATON's *Early Egyptian Records of Travel*, iv, *Tuthmosis III*, in *Journal*, ix, 252.

Kizzuwadna must be on the Levant coast of Asia Minor rather than the Black Sea, SMITH, *Kizzuwadna*, in *Journal*, x, 104-15, cf. OLMSTEAD, *ibid.*, x, 174-5. MAYER and GARSTANG have made an *Index of Hittite Names, section A, Geographical*. (*Supplementary Papers*, i, of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.) ALBRIGT holds that Eg. *Sngr* Shinar was the name of an Assyrian province in central Mesopotamia identical with the old state of Khana. *Shinar-Šangar and its monarch Amraphel*, in *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang.*, xl, 125-33.

SAYCE translates several Hittite historical texts, *Early Hittite Records*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 98-104; ZIMMERN and FRIEDRICH translate with philological notes the Hittite correspondence of the Egyptian widowed queen with Subbiluliuma; III, 7, Bibkhururiya may represent the name either of Akhenaten or of Tutankhamûn; III, 8, *dakhamun* is probably an appellation of the widowed queen and not her name; III, 49, the present translation has no trace of the sentence "my son to the kingship the general of the army has not promoted" which was in Prof. SAYCE's translation, and there is no note or comment on the passage. *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Subbiluliumaš und der Witwe des Bibkhururiaš*, in *Zeits. f. Assyriologie*, xxxv, 37-42. See also MERCER, *The Hittites, Mitanni and Babylonia in the Tell el-Amarna letters*, with many references to the Egyptian kings, in *Jour. Soc. Or. Research*, viii, 13-28.

PEET, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, is reviewed by HALL, in *Journal*, ix, 253-4; lengthily by WRZESINSKI, in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 14-20; also in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 85-7.

GRIFFITHS' *The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology* is reviewed by PEET in *Journal*, ix, 256-7, by S. A. C[OOK] in P.E.F. *Quarterly Statement*, 1923, 195, and by SPIEGELBERG in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 338.

The forty days of mourning for Jacob is perhaps a Hebrew idea ; physicians as embalmers are found in demotic texts, SPIEGELBERG, *Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen. 50. 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägyptischen Quellen*, in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 421-4. KITTEL suggests a connection between the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, the Syrian new-year feast of Adonis and the Egyptian rites of Osiris, *Osirismysterien und Laubhüttenfest*, op. cit., xxvii, 385-91. SPIEGELBERG thinks that in Deut. xi, 4 the annihilation of the Egyptians cannot be earlier than the Persian invasion of 525 B.C., and that the "nation from afar" in xxviii, 49 would best apply to the Scythians about 625, who must have devastated Palestine to the Egyptian border, *Zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums*, op. cit., xxvi, 481-2, but CASPARI points out that the report of Nebuchadnezzar's successes would account for the former even if the passage is to be interpreted literally. *Weltreichbegebenheiten bei den Deuteronomisten?* op. cit., xxvii, 8-10.

GADD, *The Fall of Nineveh*, is reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 58, and by HALL in *Journal*, ix, 254-256.

COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* is reviewed by STUMMER in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 272-4, and lengthily by FURLANI in *Aegyptus*, v, 90-4.

Phoenician graffito from the quay at Karnak, copied in 1896 ; one Aramaic and two demotic from Ma'sarah copied in 1886, all now destroyed. SAYCE, *Unpublished Hebrew, Aramaic and Babylonian inscriptions from Egypt, Jerusalem and Carchemish*, in *Journal*, x, 16-17.

WRZESINSKI has contributed an interesting article, *Die Kinder Israel in Ägypten*, to the *Deutsche Rundschau*, 1924, 251-68, giving his views on the whole subject of Israel in Egypt and the Exodus. He considers that two quite separate series of historical events are here mingled in tradition. (1) The tribes of Jacob, Joseph, and Levi entered Egypt with the Hyksos and were expelled with them under the leadership of Moses, settling in the region round their sacred place of Kadesh barnea. These events would have happened about 1780-1580 B.C. The names Moses, Hur, and Phinehas show the influence of Egypt on the tribe of Levi. (2) Eastern tribes, Hebrews, Israelites, and Ephraemites, from east of the Jordan, seized lands on the west side about 1400 B.C. (*cf.* Tell el-'Amarnah letters). The leader of these was Joshua.

#### PHILOLOGY.

CHASSINAT has published numerous and important annotations which Sir Gaston MASPERO had written in a copy of the third edition of ERMAN's *Aegyptische Grammatik, Notes sur la Grammaire Égyptienne de M. A. Erman*, in *Rec. Trav.*, xl, 1-63. SOTTAS criticises ERMAN's *Grammatik* in regard to geminated verbs, the term Pseudo-participle (which however he accepts in the absence of a better name) and the forms of the word *šrf*, *Notes de grammaire égyptienne*, in *Rec. Trav.*, xl, 73-8. SETHE proposes to publish a new edition of ERMAN's *Aegyptische Chrestomathie*, see *Journal*, x, 174.

SPIEGELBERG is impressed by the need at the present time of a palaeography, dictionary and grammar of demotic, and is himself preparing a grammar which he hopes to publish shortly. *Zeits. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, N.F., ii, iv.

SETHE has published an elaborate study of Egyptian vocalisation treating of such subjects as the absence of vowels in the writing ; the evidence of Coptic for vocalisation and the variations in the quality of the vowels (ā for ū and ō), etc. disclosed by cuneiform and Greek transcriptions of words ; the loss of accent in complexes ; accentuation of the posterior part of a complex in the New Kingdom and later, and the evidence for accentuation of the prior part in earlier times ; reconstruction of the ancient vocalisation. He now represents — by z in transcribing. *Die Vokalisation des Ägyptischen* in *Zeits. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, N.F., ii, 145-207.

ALBRIGHT claims that Egyptian is wholly a Semitic language though separated from the main group perhaps three thousand years before the Pyramid Texts were written and in consequence greatly modified ; with EMBER he has worked out a system of consonantal and vowel changes of which he gives examples and a table. *The Principles of Egyptian Phonological Development* in *Rec. Trav.*, xl, 64-70. In a separate article *The Etymology of Egyptian ḤMT "woman"* he explains its connection with a Semitic root, *ibid.*, 71-2.

GUNN in his long-promised volume of *Studies in Egyptian Syntax* claims to have discovered in particular a series of verbal forms intended to express the future : these he calls Prospective Forms at GARDINER's suggestion. The first part of the book is devoted to them, the second part to various remarks on the uses of verbs, and the third to the syntactic employment of the negatives *n*, *nn*. It is full of admirable translations of difficult passages and shows profound acquaintance with the texts.



BUCK differs from SETHE and GARDINER as to the origin and construction of the relative form of the verb, *Zum Ursprung der Relativformen im Ägyptischen* in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 65-9.


Two instances of a strong vetitive particle *w* in Old and Middle Kingdom, SETHE, *Eine bisher unbekannte enklitische Negation im Altägyptischen*, *ibid.*, 63-4. The "good" name is the short "favourite" familiar or popular name of a person, *id.*, *Noch einmal zu den Kurznamen auf j*, *ibid.*, 71. GARDINER, *A hitherto unnoticed negative in Middle Egyptian*, in *Rec. Trav.*, XL, 79-82, explains the puzzling *nfr pw* satisfactorily.

The provisional MS. of the Berlin *Wörterbuch* has progressed as far as *šps* and the material has all been worked through to the end of *š*; ERMAN is making excerpts from the difficult inscriptions of the first three Dynasties. ERMAN, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, in *Sitzb. of Berlin Academy*, 1924, LX. SPIEGELBERG's *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* is reviewed by GRAPOW on the etymological side in *O.L.Z.*, XXVI, 558-61.

SPELEERS energetically fills a gap by producing in autograph a complete index of words and names occurring in the Pyramid Texts; this cannot fail to be of great use to students, *Les textes des pyramides égyptiennes*, II, *Vocabulaires*. BLOK well points out verbal errors of the scribes occurring in the Pyramid Texts, *Bemerkungen zu einigen Pyramidentexten*, in *Acta Orientalia*, II, 213-17.


LALLEMAND studies the word *mnḥ* bringing out especially the sense of "mortising." *Les assemblages dans la technique égyptienne et le sens original du mot mnḥ*, in *Bull. Inst. Fran.*, XXII, 77-98. GAUTHIER and

LEFEBVRE, *Note sur le mot*  (regarding their publication of the Asyut coffins), in *Ann. Serv.*, XXIII, 159-60. GARDINER, *The term*  *pr-n-št* in *Pap. Mayer A*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 72, confirms

the meaning "receptacle which can be dragged." Miss MURRAY, *The Origin of* , "rub the face," in the sense of "salute," in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 55; *id.*, *The Derivation of the Name Thebes*, reading *dšm* instead of *w's-t* [not possible], *ibid.* CALICE, *Noch einmal hunima*, in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 317-18, suggests *hnm-t* "jug" as against SPIEGELBERG. ERMAN has found the name of Osiris spelt out *Wštr* on a stela at Leyden of the Middle Kingdom, so fixing the reading, see *Zeits. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, N.F., II, iv.

#### PALÆOGRAPHY.

SOTTAS and DRITON, *Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes*, is reviewed by GRIFFITH, in *Journal*, x, 182, by Miss MURRAY, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 56, by PEET, in *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology*, x, 183, and by EDGERTON, in *Amer. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, XL, 219-20.

SETHE,  *m-hn-w* "in Innern" eine Rebusspielerei, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 61-3, gives an ingenious explanation of this group as an M.K. rebus from which incorrect forms were evolved later. GUNN, *The writings of the word for "grapes,"* in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 71-2, proposes an explanation of the difficulty found by SETHE.

#### RELIGION.

HOPFNER has issued the third part of his *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae*, extending from Clement of Rome to Porphyry.

PETRIE's *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt* is a companion volume to his *Social Life* issued last year, and treats the subject with the same brevity of expression.

SPELEERS has courageously published a complete translation of the Pyramid Texts in autograph without commentary. It is of course founded on SETHE's carefully phrased edition of the texts and until an authoritative translation appears will be a help to students like his *Vocabulaires*, which form a second volume, *Les textes des pyramides égyptiennes*, I, Traduction, II, *Vocabulaires*. The translation is reviewed by FARINA in *Aegyptus*, v, 89-90.

FAULKNER, *The "Cannibal Hymn" from the Pyramid Texts*, in *Journal*, x, 97-103, translates and comments on it. Being found only in Unis and Teti and naming only Geb and Orion as deities, he looks upon it as a relic of early savagery. MORET, *Le jugement du roi mort dans les textes des pyramides de Saqqarah*, in *Annuaire*, 1922-1923, 3-32, of the *École pratique des hautes études*, interprets the passage in Unis, § 308, ll. 447-60, in which the king is represented as judged triumphant. FARINA, *Il mito di Osiri nei testi delle piramidi*, in *Bilychnis*, 1923, 5-15, discusses the myth with full references to the texts, and argues that Abydos was an original seat of the god.

ERMAN, *Der Leidener Amonshymnus*, in *Sitzb. of the Berlin Academy*, 1923, 62–81, prints a new translation of the hymn edited eighteen years ago by GARDINER and discusses its age and theology. The plays on words show late pronunciation and the text must date from the time after Akhenaten down to Ramesses II. The ideas run on the lines of Akhenaten's hymn; Amenrē is the supreme deity, the other deities exist by his will. It is a literary production, not for use in the ritual. Thebes, Heliopolis and Memphis are the great religious centres in this hymn as they were in the endowments of Ramesses III: the local gods of other centres formed the "plebs of the gods."

LEFEBVRE, *L'œuf divin d'Hermopolis*, in *Ann. Serv.*, xxiii, 65–7. The "half egg" mentioned in the Tomb of Petosiris was a relic of the legendary birth of Rē and the gods from an egg, alluded to in the Book of the Dead and elsewhere.

LEWIS writes on *The Mother worship in Egypt* in *Journal of Manchester Egypt. and Oriental Soc.*, xi, 47–58.

DAWSON, *A rare Vignette from the Book of the Dead*, in *Journal*, x, 40, publishes a vignette in a Louvre papyrus of Dyn. XVIII showing the soul hovering above the unbandaged emaciated mummy.

DARESSY, *Une représentation égyptienne du pèsement des actions sur un papyrus du Musée du Caire*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 93–104, a fine example of the later style.

GUNN, *Notes on the Aten and his names*, in *Journal*, ix, 168–76. The Aten was represented as a king, his reign commencing on the same day as Akhenaten's; Aten and the king equally celebrated Jubilees. He thinks that the two "proclamations" were made on the same day in year 6 although the stelae of the so-called "later" proclamation were inscribed long after those of the "earlier"; etc.—an important article.

HALL reviews BUDGE, *Tutankhamen Amenism Atenism and Egyptian Monotheism*, in *Journal*, ix, 257–9, and three articles on *Amenofis IV* by ASSELBERG from *De Katholiek*, 1922, *op. cit.*, x, 188.

KEES, *Nbd als Dämon der Finsterniss*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, lix, 69–70, shows that Nebez, son of Nut, was a demon of darkness. KEES, *Horus und Seth als Götterpaar*, is reviewed by ELLIS in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 30–1.

HALL reviews lengthily DE BUCK, *De Egyptische Voorstellingen betreffende den Oerhevel*, in *Journal*, x, 185–7.

HORNBLOWER, *Traces of a ka belief in modern Egypt and Old Arabia*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 67–70—the *ukht* or *karīnah*, "sister" or "double."

LACAU, *Les statues "guérisseuses" dans l'ancienne Égypte*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 189–209, publishes photographs of the remarkable statue of Zeho "the Saviour" from Athribis. It is covered with magical texts and a stele of Horus on the Crocodiles is against the knees in front: the base is also covered with magical texts and, in front of the stele, has an oval basin. With it M. LACAU publishes a stela of Horus on the Crocodiles dedicated to Astarte by a Phoenician, with a water basin on the plinth, and several statues covered with magical formulae of which the bases are lost, pointing out that all such statues and stelae were intended to have water poured over them which would thereby be charged with the virtues of the formulae. An illuminating article.

Among the MSS. left by the late Sir Gaston MASPERO was an unfinished article *Sur un rituel égyptien de magie opératoire remontant à l'époque romaine*, which is printed in *Rec. Trav.*, xl, 105–30, a very interesting reconstruction of the magical processes in the Leiden demotic papyrus, unfortunately incomplete.

CUMONT, *Le culte égyptien et le mysticisme de Plotin*, in *Mémoires Piot*, xxv, 77–92, holds that the ecstatic contemplation of the deity and the revelation of him to the individual in solitude, cultivated in Egypt at least in later times, is the source of the Neo-Platonist mysticism in Plotinus.

It may here be noted that WOESS in his *Das Asylwesen Ägyptens in der Ptolemäer Zeit und die spätere Entwicklung* considers that the temple-asylum, for which there is a good Egyptian word in demotic, was an institution in Egypt before the Macedonian conquest, and that the much-discussed *κάρουχοι* of the Serapeum were persons who had taken asylum there. But WILCKEN in Lief. 2 of his *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I, 295–6, argues against this view.

The following articles and reviews are to be found in *O.L.Z.*: xxvi, 556–7, KEES, *Horus und Seth als Götterpaar*, reviewed by WIEDEMANN; xxvi, 610, WEINREICH, *Neue Urkunden zur Sarapis-Religion*, reviewed by WIEDEMANN; xxvii, 134–6, FAURE, *L'Égypte et les Présocratiques*, reviewed by PIEPER; xxvii, 194, WILCKEN, *Urkunden*, I, 1, 2, reviewed by SCHUBART, who is undecided about the *κάρουχοι*; xxvii, 196, WOESS, *Asylwesen*, reviewed by KOSCHAKER; xxvii, 257–60, PFISTER, article, *Kultus*, in *Pauly-*

*Wissowa*, Egyptological review by PIEPER; xxvii, 320, reprint of ROEDER, *Urkunden zur Religion des alten Ägypten* (from 1915), reviewed by GRAPOW; xxvii, 321-6, GRESSMANN, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris nach Festbräuchen und Umzügen*, long review by PIEPER; xxvii, 398-9, BISSING, *Das Re-Heiligtum des Königs Ne-woser-re (Rathures)*, Band II, *Die kleine Festdarstellung*, and BISSING und KEES, *Untersuchungen zu den Reliefs aus dem Re-Heiligtum des Rathures*, I. Teil, reviewed by ANTHES; xxvii, 399-401, SCHARFF, *Götter Ägyptens*, reviewed by WIEDEMANN.

## SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, ETC.

EBBELL points to parallels in Egyptian and Greek medicine and gives the Egyptian names of three diseases of which the treatment is similar to the Greek, viz. *nššk* "baldness" or "mange" (the same word in *Leviticus*), *štrw* "night-blindness," *thn* "eye pierced or struck." *Die ägyptischen Krankheitsnamen*, in *Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.*, LIX, 55-9.

DAWSON gives examples of internal and external application of mice especially for children's diseases, later from the predynastic period in Egypt down to the present day in England. *The Mouse in Egyptian and later medicine* in *Journal*, x, 83-6.

SEBELIEN, *Early Copper and its Alloys*, in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 6-15: Analysis of slag from Sinai gave copper without tin or other important metal. Bronze appears to have been produced first naturally from ores in which tin was associated with copper. Syrian axes of bronze occur in Dyn. XII and from the New Kingdom onward bronze is plentiful.

LUCAS supplies valuable guidance as to nature and nomenclature of materials: for plasters, true lime (never used in Ancient Egypt), mud-plaster, gypsum-plaster: for stones, alabaster, calcite, aragonite, sandstone, quartzite: pitch (scarcely found) resin, black varnish. *Mistakes in Chemical Matters frequently made in Archaeology*, in *Journal*, x, 128-32.

Mdlle. HARTMANN'S *L'Agriculture dans l'ancienne Égypte*, reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 31-2, by VERNEAU, in *L'Anthropologie*, xxxiii, 248-51, and by WRZSZINSKI in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 607.

LUTZ, *Viticulture and Brewing in the Ancient Orient*, is reviewed critically by SCHARFF, in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 552-5.

L. S. B[URTON] having photographed the whole of the tomb of Sety I reproduces the astronomical ceiling in the Sepulchral Hall on which the Great Bear and other constellations are represented. *An Ancient Egyptian Astronomical Ceiling-Decoration*, in *Bulletin Metr. Mus.*, xviii, 283-6.

SLOLEY describes Egyptian outflow and inflow water clocks and PETRIE adds a note giving an explanation of the Edfu cylinder as an outflow clock (which was not contemplated by BORCHARDT in his memoir *Altägyptische Nilmessung*); *Ancient Clepsydrae* in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 43-50.

PEET has produced a complete edition of *The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus*, transcript translation and commentary, with facsimile of some additional fragments found at New York, all carefully worked out: there is an elaborate introduction on Egyptian mathematics and allied subjects. Reviewed by SPIEGELBERG in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 319-20; GRIFFITH, in *Liverpool Annals*, xi, 103-4. An excellent account of it by DAWSON is printed in *Science Progress*, July, 1924, 50-9.

## LITERATURE.

ERMAN, *Die Literatur der Aegypter, Gedichte Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3 und 2 Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, is reviewed by BLACKMAN in detail in *Journal*, x, 193-201, and by GUNKEL in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 488-90.

HORNBLOWER, *The Story of the Eloquent Peasant, a suggestion*, basing his argument on the modern practices of the 'ardahālgī or petition writers in Egypt, considers that the petitions of the Peasant were models for petition writers and that the story is merely a framework to display their excellence, *Journal*, x, 44-5.

BUDGE has published *The Teaching of Amenemāpt son of Ka-nekht, the Egyptian hieroglyphic text and an English translation, with translations of the moral and religious teachings of Egyptian kings and officials illustrating the development of religious philosophy in Egypt during a period of about two thousand years*. This long title explains the book. From the published facsimile and Sir Ernest BUDGE'S transcript LANGE produced a new version *En ny Vidomsbog fra det gamle Aegypten* in *Nordisk tidsskrift udgivet af Letterstedtska Föreningen*, 1924, 94-107. He here pointed out the late date of the composition, not earlier than 1000 B.C., and utilised a parallel text of a portion on an ostrakon in the Turin Museum copied by

GARDINER. ERMAN printed a revision of LANGE's translation in German in *Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenem-ope* in *O.L.Z.*, xxvii, 241-52, and at the same time laid before the Berlin Academy his great discovery that not only were there resemblances in wording and ideas to the Biblical Proverbs, but that the compiler of the latter had actually incorporated words and sentences from Amenemapt, apparently through the medium of a Hebrew or Aramaic version. The most striking proof is the word *sheloshim* "thirty," occurring unintelligibly in Prov. xxii, 20 (where it is translated at random "excellent things" by R.V. and A.V.) until it is seen that the reference is to the "thirty" sections of Amenemapt. *Eine ägyptische Quelle der "Sprüche Salomos,"* in *Sitzungsberichte*, 1924, 86-94. (See the *Literary Supplement of the Times*, Sept. 4, 1924, p. 539.)

PIEPER reviews JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, i. Teil, from the Egyptological standpoint, touching especially Hecataeus and Herodotus, in *O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 483-6.

BÉNÉDITE divides Book II of Herodotus into three parts, (1) general considerations, (2) ancient history, (3) modern history; the first might have been compiled at home, while the other two are the work of a traveller, arranged to a great extent in the topographical order of the voyage. *Comptes Rendus*, 1924, 154-5. SPIEGELBERG suggests that the story how Sesostrius on his wife's advice escaped from the surrounding fire by bridging the flames with their children originated in a dragoman's explanation of one of the many representations of the king trampling on prostrate enemies. *Der Ursprung einer herodoteischen Novelle* in *Klio*, xix, 101-2.

Students of Diodorus may welcome the reports of enormous pythons (*cf.* Diod., iii, 36) existing in the Nile swamps which are given by JACKSON, *The Nuer of the Upper Nile Province*, Appendix A, in *Sudan Notes and Records*, vi, 187-9.

Miss M. A. MURRAY recognizes the Manethonian lists of Saite kings in the lists of Egyptian kings of Maqrizi, *Maqrizi's Names of the Pharaohs* in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 51-5. [The standard edition of the *Khitat* by WIET, who worked out the correspondence of the lists, following on KAMAL and GALTIER, should be referred to.]

#### LAW.

SPIEGELBERG gives new translations of four papyri in the form of sales, showing that the vendor thereby handed over himself and all that he possessed to a female relative in order to secure attention and support during his life and suitable burial after death. The dates range from Alexander the Great to Euergetes. *Ägyptische Verpfändungsverträge mit Vermögensabtretungen* (*Sitzungsb. Heidelberger Akad.*, 1923, 6 Abh.).

REICH translates two marriage documents and one divorce from the find of Ptolemaic demotic papyri at Thebes in 1922, *Marriage and Divorce in Ancient Egypt* in *Museum Journal* (Philadelphia), 1924, 50-7.

#### ARCHAEOLOGY.

In *L'Anthropologie*, xxxiii, 229-30, BOULE reviews SELIGMAN, *The Older Palaeolithic Age in Egypt*; 275-9, VIGNARD replies to J. DE MORGAN's criticisms on his recent articles. In *Bull. Inst. Fr.*, xxii, 1-76, VIGNARD describes his researches at Sebil near Kom Ombo where he has found three distinct levels of microlithic industries with fossilised bones of hippopotamus, etc., but no trace of pottery. They end with the disappearance of the tributaries of the Nile and the beginning of the present climate of Egypt. The second level appears to bridge the gap between the Mousterian and Aurignacian in Europe. Finally he suggests that Sebil was the original hive of this industry which from time to time sent out swarms in all directions, at least in Africa and Europe. *Une nouvelle Industrie lithique "Le Sebilien."*

BÉNÉDITE has written a brief but attractive sketch of Egyptian art with illustrations, *L'art égyptien dans ses lignes générales*.

In *The Problem of the Obelisks, from study of the unfinished obelisk at Aswan* ENGELBACH shows (from examination and experiment) how the granite was selected, the obelisk quarried, detached and conveyed, and by what contrivances it must have been set up. This is a most illuminating work, leaving only the problem of the sculpturing untouched. He had previously published his main results in a report for the Service des Antiquités, *The Aswan Obelisk with some Remarks on the Ancient Engineering* (1922), reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1923, 88-9.

NAVILLE reviews JÉQUIER, *L'architecture égyptienne*, under the title *Les temples ramessides et saïtes*, in *Revue Archéol.*, xvii, 339-41.

KÖSTER has written an illustrated work on ancient ships and navigation in which Egypt takes an important place, *Das antike Seewesen*, reviewed by ALLEN in *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.*, XL, 219.

In the series *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, a volume *Danemark, Copenhagen, Musée Nationale*, by BLINKENBERG and JOHANSEN, contains 16 plates of Egyptian pottery, and specimens of Cypriote and other wares from Egypt are figured.

SPELEERS has written an instructive monograph on the types of ushabti-figures discussing the objects which they hold and the variations of the formulae inscribed upon them. *Les figurines funéraires égyptiennes*; important review by HALL in *Journal*, x, 176-8, also reviewed in *Ancient Egypt*, 1924, 32, by BONNET in *O.L.Z.*, XXVII, 401, and by PEET in *Liverpool Annals*, XI, 53-4.

BORCHARDT publishes from Tell el-'Amarnah a fine coloured stela (an altar-piece with folding doors) showing the royal family under the Aten, and the magnificent coloured bust in limestone of the queen, with many illustrative pieces, *Porträts der Königin Nofret-ete aus den Grabungen 1912/13 in Tell el-Amarna*.

SCHÄFER has published three wonderful little volumes in a series entitled *Meisterwerke in Berlin*, dealing with the collections from Tell el-'Amarnah: *Die Religion und Kunst von el-Amarna* gives the latest information regarding the heresy and its art, and two volumes of *Kunstwerke aus El-Amarna* contain photographic illustrations of the principal treasures in sculpture, plaster masks, etc., Band I of those derived directly from the excavations, Band II of those obtained from other sources. Reviewed by WIEDEMANN in *O.L.Z.*, XXVI, 555-6, XXVII, 326-7.

A photograph of an unpublished granite statue of Tutankhamūn in Cairo is published in *Aegyptus*, v, 20.

An atlas of fifty-one fine photographic plates of the treasures of sculpture in the Egyptian collection at LEYDEN with a brief introduction, BREMMER, *Egyptische Kunst uit het Museum te Leiden*.

The Art Institute of Chicago has issued a *Handbook of the Egyptian Collection* by ALLEN, well illustrated, with many fine scarabs and small objects bearing historical names.

Dr. OSBORNE has published an illustrated catalogue of his collection of Greek and Roman terracotta lamps, found in Egypt and chiefly at Alexandria and ranging from the Ptolemaic period to the Christian. *Lychnos et Lucerna* (issued by the Soc. archéologique d'Alexandrie).

In various journals the following articles on archaeological subjects occur:—

*Journal*. IX, 131, GREENLEES, *An unusual tomb scene from Dirā' abu'l-Negā*, preparation of bed-chamber for the night, Dyn. XVIII. IX, 263, SCHAEFER, *Von Aegyptischer Kunst, besonders die Zeichenkunst*, second ed. in one volume, briefly noticed by DAVIES. x, 9-14, DAVIES, *A peculiar form of New Kingdom Lamp*, publishes an interesting series of figures of candles and cones for illumination and fumigation, as shown in the private tombs of Dyn. XVIII and more developed in Dyn. XIX, with translation of an unpublished inscription regarding a funerary candle. x, 41-3, MACKAY, *The representation of shawls with a rippled stripe in the Theban Tombs*, dating from Tuthmosis I to Amenophis II: probably imported from Syria, which country had learned the method of weaving them from Babylonia. x, 46, DAWSON, *Note on the Egyptian Papyrus Boat*, admirably illustrated by a model of a reed canoe from Lake Tsana obtained by Colonel LYONS. x, 75, short review by PEET of WRESZINSKI, *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*. x, 77, of DAWSON's translation of CAPART, *Egyptian Art, Introductory Studies*. x, 79, *A Head of King Rameses I from his temple at Abydos*, a drawing by Major FLETCHER made in 1912 before the destruction of the chapel.

*Ancient Egypt*. 1923, 65-6, PETRIE, *Types of Early Scarabs*, before Dyn. XII. 1923, 71-4, ENGELBACH, *Supports of Pylon Flagstaves*, illustrated from paintings and sculptures: probably a wooden cantilever fixed in the pylon, with a wooden block pinned on either side to hold the staff in front: and the flag not permanently attached to the staff. 1923, 97, THOMAS, *The branch on prehistoric ships*, quotes Sir Harry JOHNSON's statement that in the Cameroons a huge palm-frond in the bows of a boat acts as mast and sail in one.

*Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*. XI, 48, WRESZINSKI, *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, reviewed by PEET. XI, 54, LUTZ, *Textiles and Costumes among the Peoples of the Ancient Near East*, criticised by PEET.

*Man*, 1923, no. 123 (cf. 1924, no. 25), SETON-KARR, *Prehistoric Man in the Sinai Peninsula*, flint implements (illustrated) from South of El-'Arish similar to types from Siwah. 1924, no. 28 (cf. nos. 61, 96), BURCHELL, *A note on two objects found among tombs of the Old Kingdom at El Kab*, two vessels of Dyn. IV found by QUIBELL are candlesticks similar to ancient forms found in Eastern Bulgaria. 1924,

no. 90, THOMAS, *Description of and remarks upon the technique of a leather pillow bag of the Baqqara, in the museum of the Royal Geographical Society of Egypt, Cairo*, describes the braiding on the surface as "slit looping," also known as a binding in Ancient Egyptian basketry.

Metropolitan Museum (New York) *Bulletin*. xviii, 272-3, LYTHGOE, *Lord Carnarvon's Bequest to the Museum*, lotiform vase of opaque blue glass of Tuthmosis III, aragonite vase of Minephtah from the Valley of the Kings' Tombs. xviii, 289, LYTHGOE, *Gift of an Egyptian Statue*, squatting, of Hor, a Theban official Dyns. XXII-XXV, the body covered with prayers to deities.

*Fondation Eugène Piot, Monuments et Mémoires*. xxiv, 1-24, BÉNÉDITE, *Amon et Toutankhamon (au sujet d'un groupe acquis par le Musée égyptien du Louvre)*, black granite group of Amūn seated with small figure of Tutankhamūn, whose principal cartouches are mutilated. The king by exception wears a panther skin, probably a sign of heirship to the throne here assumed to assert his legitimate title. xxv, 1-28, BÉNÉDITE, *La cueillette du lis et le "lirion"*, two fine Saïte bas-reliefs in the Louvre of the making of attar of lilies. xxv, 29-51, BOREUX, *La stèle-table d'offrandes de Senpou, et les fausses portes et stèles votives à représentations en relief*, stela of the Middle Kingdom with five figures in high relief standing before a table of offerings; discusses the use of high relief on *ka*-doors and stela. xxv, 113-32, DRIOTON, *Un second prophète d'Onouris*, inscribed torso of a statuette in the Louvre with panther skin worn in a special way apparently marking a "second" priest. xxv, 143-69, FOUCAUT, *Un temple flottant, le vaisseau d'or d'Amon-Ré*, finds fifteen representations in Theban temples and tombs of the Golden Barque named *Userhat*, and publishes several of them. xxv, 211-27, LEFEBVRE, *Un bas-relief grec dans un tombeau égyptien*, publishes from the tomb of Petosiris a scene of sacrifice at the tomb in the Greek fashion though with some Egyptian features: suggests that this, an extraordinary subject for an Egyptian priest of about 300 B.C., was flattery of the new Greek rulers by the diplomatic Petosiris. xxv, 229-36, MICHON, *Isis Horus et Sérapis accompagnés de Dionysos*, Greek relief in the Louvre said to have come from Alexandria. xxv, 273-98, MORET, *Fragments du mastaba de Shery prêtre des rois Peribsen et Send*, brings together for the first time the scattered sculptures (including two slabs from Aix-en-Provence which probably belonged to the mastaba), ascribing them to the reign of Khephren. xxv, 333-48, NAVILLE, *La reine Achmès*, publishes a drawing of the queen's head at Dér el-Bahrī by CARTER: the conservatism of Egyptian art is due to lack of idealism. xxv, 349-85, PERDRIZET, *Antiquités de Léontopolis*. Many objects, chiefly in bronze, connected with the cult of the lion god Mihos: a large find was made in 1885, most of which came into the possession of Dr. FOUQUET. The empty thrones supported by lions probably contained figures of deities: the date of most is second century B.C. xxv, 401-17, SOTTAS, *Statuettes funéraires de la XVIII<sup>e</sup> Dynastie*, fine glazed ushabti of Kēn-Amūn a high official under Amenophis II together with model coffin and mummy and wooden ushabtis of the same. These were the gift of the king of whom he seems to have been foster-brother.

*Rec. Trav.* xl, 83-5, JÉQUIER, *La maison primitive des Égyptiens*, the type preserved in funerary monuments. xl, 131-57, CHASSINAT, *Les trouvailles de monnaies égyptiennes à légendes hiéroglyphiques*. Nearly thirty years ago a gold coin with hieroglyphic legend "good gold" on one face and the figure of a horse on the other, said to have been found at Damanhūr, was published by CHASSINAT, though generally condemned as a forgery. He now publishes a series of them from Memphis and discusses the question of their authenticity and the history of Egyptian money. Following MASPERO he believes that these coins were issued in the Persian wars between 404 and 342 B.C. for the payment of mercenary troops. xl, 158-76, SPELEERS, *Les scènes de chasse assyriennes et égyptiennes*, compares the hunting scenes in detail and concludes that the Assyrian are entirely independent. xl, 205-10, JÉQUIER, *À propos des grands lits de Toutankhamon*, on the designs of the beds and their magic virtue; similar beds are figured in other Egyptian tombs.

*O.L.Z.*, xxvi, 557-8, *British Museum: A Guide to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Egyptian Rooms and the Coptic Room*, reviewed by WRESZINSKI. xxvii, 76-81, WRESZINSKI, *Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, Lief. 11-17, lengthy review by PIEPER. xxvii, 118-19, BISSING *Ägyptische Löwenriegel*, on a scholion to Aratus concerning lion-headed bolts for temples. xxvii, 137, PETRIE, reprint of *Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt*, reviewed by SCHARFF. xxvii, 137-8, SPELEERS, *Syllabus du cours sur les origines de l'art et l'histoire de l'art oriental antique, III partie: L'Égypte*, reviewed by WRESZINSKI. xxvii, 200-2, BUBERL, *Die griechisch-ägyptischen Mumienbildnisse der Sammlung Th. Graf* reviewed by PIEPER.

*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, neue Folge, II, iv, a treatise on Egyptian metal work by the late G. MÖLLER is to be expected soon. II, vi, ROEDER reports a find of stelae dedicated to



statues of the living Ramesses II and to various gods, stated to be from Horbêt: STEINDORFF suggests that they must have come from the Residence-city Ramesses itself.

Sales of Egyptian antiquities were held by Messrs. Sotheby and Wilkinson on 31 July 1923 (Mrs. Berens), 19-20 May 1924 (Philpott, Berens and others), 30 June-1 July 1924 (Colonel John Evans), 7-8 July 1924 (various sources).

## PERSONAL.

DUSSAUD describes the work of the great Orientalist Charles CLERMONT-GANNEAU, who died on Feb. 15, 1923, in the archaeology of the Near East. For Egyptologists his discovery in 1880 of the true age of certain fragments of Aramaic papyri from Egypt is very noteworthy: his interest in the later finds of Aramaic led to excavations at Elephantine in 1906-1908 resulting in important discoveries of Egyptian antiquities. *Les travaux et les découvertes archéologiques de Charles Clermont-Ganneau in Syria*, IV, 140-73.

Ahmed Bey KAMAL, one of the few Egyptians who took an interest in the archaeological history of their country, is the subject of an obituary notice in *Journal*, IX, 241-2. He died in August 1923 at the age of 74.

POTTER writes an obituary notice of Maurice PÉZARD, an orientalist of the Louvre, who excavated at Tell Nebi Mend (Kadesh) and found there a stele of Seti I. He died in Syria on Oct. 7, 1923. *Syria*, IV, 344-5.

MICHON prints a long footnote on the successive conservators in charge of the Egyptian collections of the Louvre, from Champollion onwards, in *Mémoires Piot*, XXV, 229-30.

Two notebooks of Sir William Gell, containing matter of interest for the early history of Egyptology, have been given to Professor PEET. *Journal*, IX, 240.

A reprint of CHAMPOLLION'S *Lettre à M. Dacier relative à l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes phonétiques employés par les Égyptiens* forms the introduction to *Mémoires Piot*, XXV; the entire volume is devoted to Egyptology in honour of the Centenary. MARRO writes on the fruitful labours of CHAMPOLLION in the great collection at Turin and the important opportunity it provided for extending his knowledge and discoveries, *Il R. Museo di Antichità di Torino e Champollion "le Jeune," in Bollettino della Soc. Piemontese di Archeologia e Belle Arti*, 1923, 1-21. LAGIER relates how the duc de BLACAS and eventually Rome and the Pope protected CHAMPOLLION in his early work against the attacks of his enemies, which were largely based on Biblical chronology; his later discoveries were of a nature to raise alarm on this ground, but Champollion was cautious in publishing them, and the Catholic Church soon lost interest in the chronological controversy, though the Protestant church was inclined to revive it. *L'Égyptologie et la chronologie biblique in Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, Oct. 1923.

FARINA quotes from various publications to show the esteem in which ROSELLINI was held by contemporary scholars, *Per Ippolito Rosellini in Aegyptus*, v, 65-9; it is announced that Professor G. GABRIELI is preparing to edit the journal of ROSELLINI'S expedition to Egypt, *ibid.* 85.

GAUTHIER gives an interesting account of Baron V. DENON. This amateur artist was taken by BONAPARTE to Egypt, and as the result of three journeys in Upper Egypt, sight-seeing and sketching with the utmost enthusiasm, brought to Cairo hundreds of views and drawings of antiquities. His report determined BONAPARTE to send a commission to investigate the archaeology of Upper Egypt, but DENON himself was required to return home with the General. DENON'S publication in 1802 first revealed Egypt to the world and edition after edition was printed. *Vivant Denon en Égypte (juillet 1798—août 1799) in Bull. Inst. d'Égypte*, v, 163-93.

A much earlier explorer is discovered by MUNIER, who mentions an unpublished account of travels by Vitaliano DONATI, a professor at Turin who was sent by the king on a mission to Egypt and the East in 1759, and by his collections laid the foundation of the famous Egyptian Museum. *Un graffite copte d'Esneh in Aegyptus*, IV, 132.

Professor SAYCE in his *Reminiscences* has produced a book of singular fascination; his long connection with Egypt and Egyptology commends it to the attention of our readers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY (1923—1924) : CHRISTIAN EGYPT

BY DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D.

## GENERAL.

The most important event bearing upon Coptic studies has been the publication of photographic reproductions of the codices in the Pierpoint Morgan collection. Most of the manuscripts found in the monastery of St. Michael in the Fayyûm in 1910 passed into Mr. Pierpoint Morgan's hands in 1916, though a few found their way to the Cairo Museum. The whole collection has now been reproduced in photographic facsimile in a series of 56 volumes and copies of the series have been presented to certain of the leading libraries of the world, though it is understood that none are to be sent to German libraries<sup>1</sup>. The manuscripts thus reproduced are of exceptional interest as being complete, dated, and of known provenance.

H. HYVERNAT's supplementary article on *Coptic Literature*<sup>2</sup> gives a summary description of the material in the Pierpoint Morgan collection and also of recent additions to the Coptic literary manuscripts in the British Museum.

Mgr. HEBBELYNCK's catalogue of the Coptic manuscripts in the Vatican Library<sup>3</sup>, which will form part of the forthcoming volume of essays in honour of H. E. Cardinal Ehrle, will be found of great service to all students of Coptic. Not only are the manuscripts described fully on the lines now usual in catalogues but in several cases material is specified of which there was no previous indication, e.g. no previous catalogue revealed that there were copies of the *Difnar* for Baounah, Abib, Mesori, and the supplementary days<sup>4</sup>.

## I. BIBLICAL.

The most important material appears in the photographic reproductions of the Pierpoint Morgan collection (see above), where the Biblical material fills twelve volumes, viz.: Leviticus, Numbers (1), I, II Kings (2), Isaiah (3), the four Gospels (4), St. John (5), SS. Matthew, Mark (6), SS. Luke, John (7), the Pauline Epistles (8, 9), the Catholic Epistles (10), a Greek Sa'ïdic Evangelium (11), and a Sa'ïdic lectionary (12). Of these no. 7 is Bohairic, the others Sa'ïdic.

W. H. WORRELL: *The Coptic Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*<sup>5</sup> contains (Part I) a Sa'ïdic Psalter (imperfect), portions of the book of Job, and the verse St. Matth. i. 22. The whole work has been reviewed very fully by W. E. CRUM<sup>6</sup> and more briefly by S. A. B. MERCER<sup>7</sup>, by F. M. ABEL<sup>8</sup>, by DOBSCHÜTZ<sup>9</sup> and by D. O'LEARY<sup>10</sup>.

L. SAINT-PAUL GIRARD: *Un fragment inédit du livre de Tobie*<sup>11</sup> gives a Coptic fragment (I, 7<sup>b</sup>-20<sup>a</sup>) of the book of Tobit belonging to the same codex as the portions already published by MASPERO<sup>12</sup>, by CIASCA<sup>13</sup> and by W. E. CRUM<sup>14</sup>. The Akhmimic text of St. John discovered by Sir FLINDERS PETRIE<sup>15</sup> has been the subject of a popular description by G. C.<sup>16</sup>, by R. KILGOUR<sup>17</sup>, and by a writer in the *Times*<sup>18</sup>. It is the subject of a note in *Ancient Egypt* (1923), 45. The text is now being edited by Sir HERBERT THOMPSON.

H. DÉVAUD is proceeding with his edition of the Bohairic Pentateuch from the Vatican codex and is working in collaboration with O. BURMESTER.

<sup>1</sup> *Codices Coptici Photographice expressi Bibliothecae Pierpoint Morgan*, 1-56, Rome, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> In *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, xvi, 27-30, New York, N.D.

<sup>3</sup> AD. HEBBELYNCK: *Inventaire Sommaire des manuscrits coptes de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, pp. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Codd. 101, 102, 104.

<sup>5</sup> New York (1923), xxvi + 396, 12 plates.

<sup>6</sup> In *J.T.S.*, xxv (1924), 199-201.

<sup>7</sup> In *J. Amer. Soc. Or. Res.*, viii (1923), 88.

<sup>8</sup> In *J. Palest. Or. Soc.*, iii (1923), 203-4.

<sup>9</sup> In *Lit. Zent. Blatt.*, x (1924), 863-4.

<sup>10</sup> In *J. R. Asiat. Soc.*, xxv (1924), 199-201.

<sup>11</sup> In *Bull. de l'Inst.*, xxii (1923), 115-18.

<sup>12</sup> In *Mém. de la Mission...au Caire*, vi, 284-5.

<sup>13</sup> In *Sast. Bibl. Frag.*, i, 219.

<sup>14</sup> In *J.T.S.*, xi (1910), 253.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Journal*, ix (1923), 266.

<sup>16</sup> In *Bilychnis*, xii (1923), 74.

<sup>17</sup> In *Bible Lands*, vi (1924), 459.

<sup>18</sup> For 21/12/23.

Vol. v of HORNER's *Coptic (Sa'idic) New Testament* (1920) has been reviewed by C. SCHMIDT<sup>1</sup> and by S. A. B. MERCER<sup>2</sup>.

### II. APOCRYPHAL, GNOSTIC, ETC.

LEETZMANN: *Ein apokryphes Evangelienfragment*<sup>3</sup> gives two leaves from Pap. Berol. 11710 containing a portion of a conversation between Jesus and Nathanael presumably from an apocryphal gospel.

E. BESSON: *Les Logia Agrapha; Paroles du Christ qui ne se trouvent pas dans les évangiles canoniques, rec. et trad. par E. Besson*<sup>4</sup>, presents the Logia in popular form.

C. SCHMIDT: *Gespräche Jesu*<sup>5</sup> has been reviewed by F. HAASE<sup>6</sup>.

H. G. EVELYN WHITE: *Sayings of Jesus* (1920) has been reviewed by J. G. MACHEN<sup>7</sup>.

The new Vol. VI of CABROL-LECLERCQ: *Dictionnaire d'arch. chrét.* (fasc. lx-lxi (1924)) contains an article on Gnosticism<sup>8</sup> which makes passing reference<sup>9</sup> to Coptic Gnostic material.

L. FENDT: *Gnostische Mysterien*, München (1923), is reported, but I have not been able to see a copy.

F. BILABEL: *Ein koptisches Fragment über die Begründer des Manichäismus*, Heidelberg (1924), pp. 16, reproduces a Coptic text of Manichaean character now in the University Library at Heidelberg with a commentary. Prof. C. Schmidt refers the fragment to the seventh century.

### III. LITURGICAL.

One of the most valuable contributions to liturgical study during the past year is VILLECOURT: *Les observances liturgiques et la discipline du jeûne dans l'église copte*<sup>10</sup> which gives a detailed analysis of chapters xvi-xix of Abu'l-Barakat "Lamp of darkness" from the Paris Arabe 203 and Upsala Or. 486 drawing thence a very considerable fund of information about the liturgical books, musical tones, and the ordo of the Morning Prayer and Office of Incense in the Coptic Church.

VILLECOURT: *La lettre de Macaire évêque de Memphis sur la liturgie antique du Chrême et du Baptême à Alexandrie*<sup>11</sup> gives an account of the Alexandrian ritual of baptism and the consecration of the chrism.

A. BAUMSTARK: *Die Liturgie des sog. Eusebius von Alexandr.*<sup>12</sup> deals with the liturgy ascribed to Eusebius, and the same writer's *Die syrische Anaphora des Severus von Antiocheia*<sup>13</sup> treats of a Syriac anaphora which has a close relation to the Coptic liturgy and especially to the Sa'idic Euchologion of Vatican Cod. Copt. cix.

Two new volumes have now completed R. BASSET: *Synaxaire Jacobite*<sup>14</sup>. With the completion of this valuable work comes the most regrettable news of the editor's death. Prof. Basset has long held a place of primary importance in the world of Arabic scholarship, though perhaps his essay on the comparative grammar of the Berber languages represents his most original work. Vol. xvi of the *P.O.* which contains the former of these two portions of the Synaxarium has been reviewed by I. GUIDI<sup>15</sup>. Copies of the Latin translation of the first part of FORGET's edition of the Synaxarium<sup>16</sup> are now available<sup>17</sup>.

DELEHAYE: *Le Calendrier d'Oxyrhynque pour l'année 535-6*<sup>18</sup> deals with the contents of no. 1357 in *Oxyr. Pap.*, xi (1915): the article is chiefly of value for its notes on local churches and their saints.

D. O'LEARY: *Fragmentary Coptic Hymns*<sup>19</sup> contains hymn fragments from the Dêr Abu Makâr in the Wâdi Natrûn.

D. O'LEARY: *Theotokia* (1923) has been reviewed by LEIPOLDT<sup>20</sup>, by GASELEE<sup>21</sup>, by S. A. B. MERCER<sup>22</sup>, and by W. E. CRUM<sup>23</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, xxvi (1923), 614-15.

<sup>2</sup> In *J. Amer. Soc. Or. Res.*, ix (1924), 45.

<sup>3</sup> Paris (1923), xiii + 181.

<sup>4</sup> In *Oriens Chr.* (1923), 170-3.

<sup>5</sup> Col. 1327 sqq.

<sup>6</sup> In *Muséon*, xxxvi (1923), 249-92.

<sup>7</sup> In *Jahrb. f. Liturg. Wissen.*, II (1923), 91-2.

<sup>8</sup> In *Patr. Or.*, xvi, 2 (1922), 187-424 (Barmahat, Barmoudah, Pachons): and *P.O.*, xvii, 3 (1923), 527-782 (Baounah, Abib, Mesre, and supplementary days).

<sup>9</sup> In *Riv. degli Stud. Orient.*, x (1923), 163-8.

<sup>10</sup> ForGET: *Synax. Alexand.*, I, C.S.C.O., Rome (1923), iv, 526.

<sup>11</sup> Lond. (1924), iv + 60.

<sup>12</sup> In *Bull. School Or. Stud.*, III (1923), 178-9.

<sup>13</sup> In *J. R. As. Soc.* (1924), 307-9.

<sup>3</sup> In *Z. f. d. Neut. Wissen.*, xxii (1923), 153-4.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1922), 175.

<sup>7</sup> In *Princeton Theol. Rev.*, xx (1922), 334-6.

<sup>9</sup> Col. 1332.

<sup>11</sup> In *Muséon*, xxxvi (1923), 33-46.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, II (1923), 92-8.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1923), 227.

<sup>17</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, xlii (1924), 83-99.

<sup>20</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, xxvi (1923), 615-16.

<sup>22</sup> In *J. Amer. S. Or. Res.* (1923), 89.

M. JUGIE: *Homélies Mariales Byzantines*<sup>1</sup> contains material illustrative of the Theotokia. It has been reviewed in *Anal. Boll.*, xli (1923), 440-2.

D. O'LEARY is preparing an edition of the Coptic Difnar (Antiphonarium) from the text in the John Rylands Library (first four months only).

S. EURINGER: *Anmerkungen zu "Studien zur äthiopischen Kirchenmusik" von Dr. E. Wellesz*<sup>2</sup> as well as the essay by Dr. WELLESZ<sup>3</sup>, though dealing with the music of the Ethiopic Church, contain the fullest and most accurate observations as yet available on the kindred Coptic Church music, a subject on which no direct study at present exists.

The hymn fragment with musical notation in P. Oxy. 1786 described by NEPPI MODONA<sup>4</sup> has been the subject of an article by R. WAGNER<sup>5</sup> and has been examined also by H. L(IETZMANN)<sup>6</sup>.

#### IV. CHURCH LITERATURE.

The Didaché fragment (i, 3-ii, 1) in *Oxy. Pap.*, xv (1922), no. 1782 has been the subject of articles by B. H. STREETER<sup>7</sup>, by C. SCHMIDT<sup>8</sup>, and by Dom CONNOLLY<sup>9</sup>. A Coptic fragment of the Didaché (x-xii, 2) in the Akhmimic dialect probably of the fifth century from Brit. Mus. Or. 9271 has been edited by HORNER<sup>10</sup>.

Dom CONNOLLY: *On the text of the Baptismal Creed of Hippolytus*<sup>11</sup> discusses a formulary which has direct bearing on the Coptic "Church Order."

The discovery of a fragment of Aristides in P. Oxy. xv, 1778<sup>12</sup> has been followed by that of a larger fragment amongst the papyri acquired by the British Museum in 1922 (P. Lond. Inv. No. 2486). This is the subject of an article by H. J. M. MILNE<sup>13</sup>. The former fragment is examined by H. STREETER<sup>14</sup> and by H. L(IETZMANN)<sup>15</sup>.

A. NEPPI MODONA: *Documenti della primitiva letteratura cristiana*<sup>16</sup> is a brief article of popular character.

L. Th. LEFORT: *La règle de S. Pachôme (en grec)*<sup>17</sup> is the second part of prolegomena to the study of the Pakhomian rule<sup>18</sup>. He considers that the Latin version of St. Jerome still awaits an editor in touch with modern critical methods, a requirement not fulfilled by Albers' edition of 1923. ALBERS' edition<sup>19</sup> has been reviewed by H. D(ELEHAYE)<sup>20</sup>, by LEFORT<sup>21</sup>, and by KLOTZ<sup>22</sup>.

† W. BOUSSER: *Apophthegmata*<sup>23</sup> is, for the time at least, the leading authority on the "Sayings of the Fathers," but it is not easy reading. It contains three parts, (i) studies in the text of the Apophthegmata, the versions, subject-matter, etc., (ii) on the life of St. Pakhom, and (iii) on Evagrius, with detailed analyses of the texts utilised. Dom VILLECOURT: *Une même parabole commune aux Apoph. des Pères et à Calila et Dimna*<sup>24</sup> deals with the fable which figures as chap. vi in De Sacy's edition of the Arabic text and which is generally regarded as an interpolation due to Ibn al-Muqaffa'. If this view is correct there will be some hesitation in accepting Dom Villecourt's conclusions.

Homiletic literature is greatly enriched by the reproductions in the Pierpoint Morgan collection where no fewer than 44 volumes contain matter of this description. These are (13-14) metrical hymns in Sa'idic, (15-16) homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem and Theophilus of Alexandria, (17) life and transitus of St. John the Evangelist, (18-19) homilies of Dioscorus and Cyprian, (20) of St. John Chrysostom, (21) passion of St. Mena, homily of John of Alexandria on St. Mena, (22) St. John Chrysostom on St. Michael, (23) Sa'idic "liber institutionis" of SS. Michael and Gabriel, (24) *id.* in Akhmimic, (25) homilies of Peter of Alexandria on St. Michael, (26) Severus on St. Michael, (27) Timothy of Alexandria on St. Michael, (28) passions of

<sup>1</sup> In *Patr. Or.*, xvi, 3 (1923), 165 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1922), 177.

<sup>6</sup> *Der Oxyrhynchos-Noten Papyrus in Philologus*, lxxix (1923), 201-21.

<sup>8</sup> In *Z. f. d. Neut. Wissen.*, xxi (1922), 236-8.

<sup>9</sup> *Ein Neuer Didaché-Fund in Deut. Lit. Zeit.* (1924), 95.

<sup>11</sup> *New Fragments of the Didaché in J.T.S.*, xxv (1924), 151-3.

<sup>12</sup> In *J.T.S.*, xxv (1924), 131-9.

<sup>13</sup> *A new fragment of the Apology of Aristides in J.T.S.*, xxiv (1923), 73-7.

<sup>15</sup> In *Z. f. d. Neut. Wissen.*, xxi (1922), 238.

<sup>17</sup> In *Muséon*, xxxvii (1924), 1-28, and sep. Louvain (1924), pp. 28.

<sup>18</sup> For previous part cf. *Muséon*, xxxiv, 16 sqq.

<sup>20</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, xli (1923), 426-7.

<sup>21</sup> In *Phil. Woch.*, xliii (1923), 774.

<sup>22</sup> In *Muséon*, xxxvi (1923), 243-8.

<sup>2</sup> In *Or. Chr.* (1923), 151-4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1923), 227.

<sup>7</sup> In *J.T.S.*, xxiv (1923), 78.

<sup>10</sup> In *J.T.S.*, xxv (1924), 225-31.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1923), 228.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>16</sup> In *Bilychnis* (1923), 55.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1923), 231.

<sup>21</sup> In *Muséon*, xxxvi (1923), 128-9.

<sup>23</sup> Tübingen (1923), viii + 341.

St. Paesius, St. Thecla, etc., (29-30) passions of St. Mercurius, etc., (31) lives of St. Samuel of Kalamon, Ephraem, etc., (32) passion of St. Ptolemaeus, (33) homilies of Demetrius of Antioch, (34-35) of Cyril of Jerusalem and Evodius of Rome, (36) of Peter of Alexandria, (37) lives of St. Archellides, etc. and various homilies, (38) passion of St. Leontius, miracles "per S. Menam," (39) passions of Theodore the Anatolian, Leontius the Arab, etc., (40) of St. Theodore the Anatolian, etc., (41) of St. Psote, Philotheus, etc., (42) homilies of St. Cyril of Jerusalem on the crucifixion and resurrection, (43) ten homilies "pro tempore," (44) of St. Cyril of Jerusalem for Wednesday in Holy Week, (45) passions of St. Isidore and his companions, Apa Helias, etc., (46) passion and miracles of St. Phoebammon, (47) passion of St. Claudius Rhetor and three homilies on his life, (48) life of St. Onuphrius, passion of St. Epima Pankoleita, (49) passion of Apa Nabraha, this is not in the Pierpoint Morgan collection but in Cairo, (50) homily of Theodosius of Antioch on St. Theodore Stratelates, (51) passions of St. Theodore Stratelates, SS. Cosmas and Damian, etc., (52) homily of Severianus on SS. Peter and Paul, (53) St. Stephen, etc., (54) homilies of Sinuthius, (55) John of Alexandria, 23 solutions of biblical problems, (56) passion of the seven youths of Ephesus, life of St. Apa Phif.

Besides the volumes which are professedly homiletical the lives and passions seem to be mainly of a homiletical character.

DE VIS: *Homélies Coptes* (1922) has been reviewed by P. PEETERS<sup>1</sup>.

WORRELL: *Coptic Manuscripts of the Freer Collection*<sup>2</sup> contains (Part II) two homilies, one on St. Gabriel ascribed to Celestinus of Rome, the other on the B.V.M. ascribed to Theophilus of Alexandria. This second part is carefully examined by F. M. ABEL<sup>3</sup> who considers these homilies as illustrative of the evolution of the *genre homilétique*.

W. E. CRUM: *Der Papyruscodex saec. vi-vii der Phillips-Biblioth.* (1915) is reviewed by W. HENGSTENBERG<sup>4</sup>.

#### V. HISTORY.

G. MÉAYTIS: *L'introduction du christ. en Égypte* (1921) has been reviewed by THOMSEN<sup>5</sup>.

H. I. BELL: *New Lights on Saint Athanasius*<sup>6</sup> gives an account of certain letters dealing with the Meletian schism contained in papyri recently acquired by the British Museum. This material appears more fully in H. I. BELL: *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, with three Coptic texts edited by W. E. CRUM<sup>7</sup>. "The importance of the small groups of documents published in this volume made it advisable to edit and issue them more speedily than would have been possible if they took their turn among the general series of papyrus documents acquired by the Museum." The documents, 18 in number, are edited with very full introductions, translations, and notes. Of these one (Pap. 1912), a Greek letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians (109 lines), deals with the Jewish troubles at Alexandria, ten (Gk. Pap. 1913-1919, Coptic 1920-1921) relate to the Meletian controversy, and seven (Greek) letters belong to the correspondence of Paphnutius, one of these "1919 may actually be from the pen of St. Athanasius himself" (= Pl. V—arguments in support of this on pp. 115-17).

J. R. KNIPFING: *The Libelli of the Decian Persecution*<sup>8</sup> contains material bearing upon the history of Christianity in Egypt<sup>9</sup>.

W. A. WIGRAM: *The Separation of the Monophysites*<sup>10</sup> is a popular account of the origin of the Jacobite churches.

† J. MASPERO: *Histoire des patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'Empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites* (518-616), ed. † A. FORTESCUE et GASTON WIET, pref. B. HAUSSOULLIER<sup>11</sup>, is the long-expected posthumous work on the history of the Egyptian Church in the period shortly before the Muslim conquest. It is understood that another volume is to follow.

W. E. CRUM: *Sévère d'Antioche en Égypte*<sup>12</sup> gathers together the fragmentary details which throw light on the period (518-536) of Severus' sojourn in Egypt.

W. SCHUBART: *Ägypten von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf Mohammed* (1922) is reviewed by W. WEBER<sup>13</sup> and by F. Z.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, XLII (1924), 156-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above.

<sup>3</sup> In *J. Palest. Or. Soc.*, III (1923), 203-4.

<sup>4</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXIV (1924), 409-13.

<sup>5</sup> In *Phil. Woch.*, XLIII (1923), 14.

<sup>6</sup> In *Adelphi*, I (1924), 1006-9.

<sup>7</sup> London (1924), xii + 140, 4 plates.

<sup>8</sup> In *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XVI (1923), 345-90.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1924), 156.

<sup>10</sup> London (1923), 210.

<sup>11</sup> *Bibl. de l'éc. des Hautes Études*, fasc. 235 (1923), xvi + 429.

<sup>12</sup> In *R.O.C.*, III (1922/1923), 92-104.

<sup>13</sup> In *O.L.Z.* (1924), 1-7.

<sup>14</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXIV (1924), 429.

L. BRÉHIER: *Normal relations between Rome and the Churches of the East before the schism of the XIth century*<sup>1</sup> has been reviewed by A. MICHEL<sup>2</sup>.

TISSERAND-VILLECOURT-WIET: *Recherches sur la personnalité et la vie d'Abu'l-Barakat*<sup>3</sup> is a republication of the article in *R. O. C.* already noted<sup>4</sup>. *La doctrine chrétienne d'après l'église jacobite par Rabban Daniel b. el-Hattab*<sup>5</sup> describes a manuscript in the library of R. P. Sbath containing material illustrating the theology of the Monophysites in the fourteenth century.

TISSERAND-WIET: *La liste des patriarches d'Alexandrie dans Qalqachandi*<sup>6</sup> gives a list of the patriarchs of Alexandria from Vol. v (308 sqq.) of the edition of Qalqachandi recently published in 14 vols. from the codex in the Sultanieh (Royal) Library in Cairo. This list, drawn up at the beginning of the fifteenth century, gives no fresh information but has some points of interest.

G. GRAF: *Ein Reformversuch innerhalb der koptischen Kirche im Zwölften Jahrhundert*.<sup>7</sup> is a history of the work of the reformer Markus Ibn al-Qanbar (d. 1208) and his controversies with the bishop Michael of Dimjat dealing especially with the sacramental teaching of the Coptic Church. It has been reviewed by C. SCHMIDT<sup>8</sup>.

T. D. MOSCONA: *Coptic Churchmen*<sup>9</sup> is the report of a lecture dealing with some leading characters in the Coptic Church of the present day.

W. W. CASH: *Religious life in Egypt*<sup>10</sup> is simply a missionary's personal views about recent political events in Egypt; it gives no information about the Coptic Church.

W. S. BLACKMAN: *Some Modern Egyptian Saints* (II)<sup>11</sup> deals with the sanctuaries and sacred rites connected with St. Mittias (Matthias) and St. Egladius (Claudius) and connects those rites with the religion of ancient Egypt.

L. GUIDI: *La Chiesa Abissina* (1922) has been reviewed by S. GRÉBAUT<sup>12</sup>.

R. JANIN: *Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux*<sup>13</sup> is a manual of information about the eastern churches generally. It has been reviewed by SALAVILLE<sup>14</sup>.

Attention has already been drawn to the passions contained in the Pierpoint Morgan collections (IV above). Of kindred character is L. SAINT-PAUL GIRARD: *Un fragment fayoumique du martyre de saint-Philothée*<sup>15</sup> which gives a Fayyûmic fragment from the MS. no. 47559 in the Cairo Museum. Of this martyrdom a Sa'ïdic fragment has already been published by Balestri, and other fragments are enumerated by W. E. CRUM<sup>16</sup>, but the whole martyrdom now appears in Vol. xli of the Pierpoint Morgan collection.

DELEHAYE: *Martyr et confesseur* (1921) and PEETERS: *Les trad. orient. du mot martyr* (1921) are briefly noted by A. E.<sup>17</sup>

DELEHAYE: *Les passions des mart.* (1921) and the same writer's *Cat. Cod. Hag.* (1921)<sup>18</sup> have been reviewed by K. HOLL<sup>19</sup>.

F. FAWTIER: *Les reliques rouennais de sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie*<sup>20</sup> has a bearing on the traditional history of Sinai but not on that of Alexandria.

Some hagiographical material of Egyptian interest occurs in CABROL-LECLERCQ: *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, VI (1924). Such is the article *Georges (Saint)*<sup>21</sup>. A figure described there shows a popular representation of St. George and the dragon developed from a figure of Horus fighting with Seth, "ces analogies entre le combat d'Horus et le combat de saint-Georges ne sont pas fortuites." The article *Gallicane (Église)* in Vol. VI of the same work incidentally refers (col. 423) to the influence of Egypt on the monastic life.

W. H. MACKEAN: *Christian Monasticism in Egypt* (1920) has been reviewed by H. G. EVELYN WHITE<sup>22</sup>.

U. MONNERET DE VILLARD: *La fondazione del Deyr el-Abiad*<sup>23</sup> relates the foundation of the White Monastery.

<sup>1</sup> In *Constructive Quarterly*, N.Y. (1916), 645-72.

<sup>2</sup> In *Byz. Neugr. Jahrb.*, III (1922), 406.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal* (1923), 229.

<sup>6</sup> In *R.O.C.*, III (1923), 123-43.

<sup>8</sup> In *Z. f. Kirchengesch.* (1923), 440-1.

<sup>10</sup> In *East and West*, XXI (1923), 319-24.

<sup>12</sup> In *Aethiops*, I (1922), 61-2.

<sup>14</sup> In *Échos d'Or.*, XXVI (1923), 382-3.

<sup>16</sup> In *Theol. Texts* (1913), no. 16.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1922), 182, n. 12.

<sup>20</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, XLI (1923), 357-68.

<sup>22</sup> In *J.T.S.*, XXV (1923), 93-4.

<sup>3</sup> Paris (1923), pp. 22.

<sup>5</sup> In *Échos d'Or.*, XXVI (1923), 306-8.

<sup>7</sup> In *Collect. Hierosolym.*, II, Paderborn (1923), xv + 208.

<sup>9</sup> In *J. Manchester Egypt. and Or. Soc.*, x (1923), 8.

<sup>11</sup> In *Discovery*, v (1924), 67-71.

<sup>13</sup> Paris (1922), viii + 720, 48 illust., 9 maps.

<sup>15</sup> In *Bull. de l'Inst.*, Cairo, XXII (1923), 105-13.

<sup>17</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXIV (1924), 192-3.

<sup>19</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, XXVII (1924), 34-5.

<sup>21</sup> Cols. 1026-8 and fig. in col. 1025.

<sup>23</sup> In *Aegyptus*, IV (1923), 156-62.

## VI. NON-LITERARY TEXTS.

A. E. R. BOAK: *A Coptic syllabary at the University of Michigan*<sup>1</sup> gives a Coptic syllabary in the Fayyûmic dialect which had been previously described but not reproduced in *Greek and Coptic School Tablets at the University of Michigan*<sup>2</sup>.

R. ENGELBACH: *Ostraka in the Sahidic Dialect of Coptic*<sup>3</sup> gives a series of new ostraca texts.

H. MUNIER: *Stèles coptes du Fayoum*<sup>4</sup> gives some new inscriptions in Middle Egyptian.

H. MUNIER: *Un graffiti copte d'Esneh*<sup>5</sup> gives a Coptic *graffito* which was copied by Donati in 1759 and belongs to the series copied by De Brock: it gives the name of the monk who painted the figure of St. Theodore Stratelates in A.D. 962. A note is added (p. 136) by V. MONNERET DE VILLARD.

G. GHEDINI: *Lettere cristiane dai papiri greci del III e IV secolo*<sup>6</sup> gives a selection of 44 Greek letters (not new) with translations and notes which have some Christian bearing. It has been reviewed by W. SCHUBART<sup>7</sup>, by D. BASSI<sup>8</sup>, by H. DELEHAYE<sup>9</sup>, by A. C(ALDERINI)<sup>10</sup> in *Rass. Colt.* of Milan<sup>11</sup>, in *Rev. Biblique*<sup>12</sup>, by W. M. CALDER<sup>13</sup>, and in *Theol. u. Glaube* of Paderborn<sup>14</sup>.

GRENFELL-HUNT-BELL: *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xvi<sup>15</sup> contains 257 texts of the later Byzantine period and so of a time when Christianity prevailed in Egypt. It is a volume of non-literary texts, letters, contracts, receipts, etc. and so does not contain much with any direct bearing on Christian subjects; there are such references however in nos. 1868, 1879, 1881, etc.; a monastery is mentioned in 1890. No. 1927 is a liturgical fragment based on the Psalms; no. 1928 is Ps. xc in the form of an amulet. Three Gnostic charms against scorpions are described (p. 274) but the text is not given.

CRUM-BELL: *Wadi Sarga Coptic and Greek Texts* (1922) has been reviewed by C. WESSELY<sup>16</sup>, by H. G. EVELYN WHITE<sup>17</sup>, by P. PEETERS<sup>18</sup>, and by C. SCHMIDT<sup>19</sup>.

CRUM: *Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca* (1921) has been reviewed by I. GUIDI<sup>20</sup>.

GRENFELL-HUNT-BELL: *Oxy. Pap.*, xv (1922) has been reviewed by F. Z.<sup>21</sup>

F. BILABEL: *Griechische Papyri* (1923)<sup>22</sup> has been reviewed by W. SCHUBART<sup>23</sup>.

An article by G. WIET in the *Journal Asiatique* (1923), 338 mentions incidentally that C. KUENTZ is engaged on the Coptic papyri from Edfû, found there two years ago.

C. PREISENDANZ: *Papyrus Magica Inedita*<sup>24</sup> gives a Greek magical papyrus from the Egyptological Museum in Berlin. Part II of WORRELL: *Coptic Manuscripts of the Freer Collection* (cf. I above) contains a magical text, perhaps Gnostic, partly an amulet against perils of the sea, and partly one against sickness: this text "peut servir à démontrer la dépendance des amulettes abyssines qui foisonnent vis à vis d'une tradition copto-arabe aujourd'hui disparue"<sup>25</sup>.

W. R. DAWSON: *Egyptian Medicine under the Copts*<sup>26</sup> deals with the medical papyrus discovered in 1892 at Meshêkh, now in the French Archaeological Institute at Cairo, and has an appendix describing an instrument case in the Cairo Museum.

## VII. PHILOLOGY.

I. GUIDI: *Elementa linguae copticae*<sup>27</sup> is a grammar dealing with Sa'idic and Bohairic, the forms peculiar to the latter being distinguished by the use of red letters. The grammar is followed by a chrestomathy (pp. 31-48) and vocabulary (pp. 49-59). It has been reviewed in the *Rev. Biblique*<sup>28</sup>.

E. DÉVAUD: *Notes de lexicologie copte*<sup>29</sup> discusses several etymologies. The same writer's *Études d'etymol. copte* (1922) has been reviewed by SPIEGELBERG<sup>30</sup> and by BISSING<sup>31</sup>, other notes on etymology and

<sup>1</sup> In *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 296-7.

<sup>2</sup> In *Classical Philology*, xvi (1922), 189-94.

<sup>3</sup> In *Ann. du Serv.*, xxiii (1922), 53-8.

<sup>6</sup> *Milano* (1923), xxviii + 376.

<sup>8</sup> In *Boll. di Filol. Class.*, xxx (1923), 61-2.

<sup>10</sup> In *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 90.

<sup>12</sup> xxxiii (1924), 301-2.

<sup>14</sup> (1924), no. 1.

<sup>16</sup> In *Byz. Neugr. Jahrb.*, iv (1923), 107.

<sup>18</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, xlii (1924), 158-60.

<sup>20</sup> In *Riv. degli Stud. Or.*, ix (1921-3), 413-14.

<sup>22</sup> Heidelberg (1923), xii + 80.

<sup>24</sup> In *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 305-8.

<sup>26</sup> In *Proc. R. Soc. Medicine*, xvii (1924), 51-7, 2 figs.

<sup>28</sup> xxxiii (1924), 314.

<sup>30</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, xxvi (1923), 268-9.

<sup>3</sup> In *Ann. du Serv.*, xxii (1922), 269-74.

<sup>5</sup> In *Aegyptus*, iv (1923), 132-6.

<sup>7</sup> In *O.L.Z.* (1923), 561.

<sup>9</sup> In *Anal. Boll.*, xlii (1924), 173-4.

<sup>11</sup> i (1923), 29.

<sup>13</sup> In *Classical Review*, xxxviii (1924), 30-1.

<sup>15</sup> London (1924), xvi + 343, 3 plates.

<sup>17</sup> In *Journal*, x (1924), 75.

<sup>19</sup> In *O.L.Z.* (1924), 199-200.

<sup>21</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.* xxiv (1924), 427-8.

<sup>23</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, xxvii (1924), 21-2.

<sup>25</sup> ABEL in *J. Pal. Or. Soc.* (1923), 204.

<sup>27</sup> Naples (1924), x + 59.

<sup>29</sup> In *Muséon* xxxvi (1923), 83-99.

<sup>31</sup> In *Phil. Woch.*, xlii (1924), 270-1.

grammar appear in K. SETHE: *μενϣακ* "vielleicht" und die zugehörigen Formen<sup>1</sup> and the same writer's *Die äg. Berechnung der Schwangerschaftsdauer*<sup>2</sup> in SPIEGELBERG: *Die Etymologie von ρορϵ* "Fehlgeburt"<sup>3</sup>, in the same writer's *Der Stat. Cons. Ⲅⲛ-* vor folgend Fragesatz<sup>4</sup> and in his *Der Ausdruck εϣοτ ηροοοτ*<sup>5</sup>.

SPIEGELBERG: *Kopt. Handwörterb.* (1921) has been reviewed by C. SCHMIDT<sup>6</sup> and by GRAPOW<sup>7</sup>.

STEINDORFF: *Kurz. Abr. d. kopt. Gram.* (1921) has been reviewed by ROEDER<sup>8</sup>.

#### VIII. ARCHAEOLOGY, ETC.

C. M. KAUFMANN: *Altägyptische Bildwirkereien in Purpur und verwandte Funde aus den Nekropolen bei Schékh 'Abâde in Ober-Aegypten*<sup>9</sup> unfortunately escaped notice last year. It is briefly reviewed by C. W.<sup>10</sup>

A. F. KENDRICK: *Stuffs from Egypt with Christian Symbols* appears in a volume of essays in honour of Prof. Strzygowski<sup>11</sup>.

A fourth volume of KENDRICK: *Catalogue of Textiles from Burying Grounds in Egypt* is understood to be in preparation but is not yet published. The second volume has been reviewed by H. ABEL<sup>12</sup>.

A. F. KENDRICK: *Catalogue of Muhammadan Textiles of the Mediaeval Period*<sup>13</sup> does not contain anything definitely Christian but much of the material indirectly illustrates mediaeval Coptic art.

CABROL-LECLERCQ: *Dict. d'arch. chrét.*, VI (1924) contains several references to Coptic antiquities, notably in the article on *Gabriel* which refers to representations of that saint on fabrics from Egyptian tombs and now in the South Kensington Museum (cols. 26-7), and the article *Girgeh* which describes the remains of the monastery 35 kilo. south-west of Alexandria (cols. 1246-58, 8 figs.). One painting (fig. 5292) representing St. Menas is no doubt the figure referred to by al-Bakri in his description of this sanctuary.

M. S. D.: *A new Coptic vase*<sup>14</sup> describes a vase recently added to the 3rd Egyptian room in the New York Metropolitan Museum. It is referred to the 8/9 century A.D. and shows Persian influences.

H. MUNIER: *La Sibylle Alexandrine chez les Coptes*<sup>15</sup> discusses the Coptic "Ammia Sibylla" honoured at least locally in Egypt and identifies her with the sibyl of pagan antiquity.

STRZYGOWSKI: *Ursprung der chr. Kirchenkunst* (1920) has been reviewed by E. W.<sup>16</sup> The English translation has appeared as STRZYGOWSKI: *Origins of Christian Church Art*, translated by DALTON and BRAUNHOLTZ<sup>17</sup>, and has an additional chapter (pp. 230-52) on "Hiberno-Saxon Art in the time of Bede." It is an excellent translation but still, like the original, rather difficult reading.

C. M. KAUFMANN: *Handbuch der chr. Archäologie* (1922) has been reviewed by W. SCHNYDER<sup>18</sup>, by E. BECKER<sup>19</sup>, and by G. STUHLFAUTH<sup>20</sup>.

S. GASELEE: *Lettered Egyptian Textiles in the Victoria and Albert Museum*<sup>21</sup> describes twenty Coptic textiles most of which show definitely Christian symbols.

The British Museum *Guide to the 4th, 5th, 6th Egyptian Rooms and the Coptic Room* (1922) has been reviewed by WRZSZINSKI<sup>22</sup>.

PERDRIZET: *Negot. perambulans in teneb.* (1922) is reviewed by A. M.<sup>23</sup>

H. GLÜCK: *Die christliche Kunst des Ostens*<sup>24</sup> incidentally deals with Coptic material (cf. Pl. 27). It has been reviewed by E. WEIGAND<sup>25</sup>.

JUNKER: *Das Kloster am Isisberg* (1922) has been reviewed by D. O'LEARY<sup>26</sup>.

F. EITREM: *Ein christliches Amulett*<sup>27</sup> has been reviewed by E. PETERSON<sup>28</sup> and by M. FRENZ<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In *Z. f. äg. Spr.*, LVIII (1923), 54-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Z. äg. Spr.*, LVIII (1923), 56.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 158.

<sup>6</sup> In *Deut. Lit. Zeit.*, XLIII (1922), 23.

<sup>7</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, XXVI (1923), 558-61.

<sup>8</sup> In *Lit. Zent. Blatt.*, LXXIV (1923), 21/22.

<sup>9</sup> In *Festschr. Sebastien Merkle*, Düsseldorf (1922), 152-69.

<sup>10</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXIV (1924), 480.

<sup>11</sup> 100-3, Pl. XIII, figs. 1-4 in *Studien zur Kunst des Ostens. J. Strzygowski zum Sechzigsten Geburtstage von seinen Freunden u. Schülern*, Wien (1923), 260 pp. 126 illust.

<sup>12</sup> In *O.L.Z.* (1923), 616.

<sup>13</sup> Lond. (1924), viii + 74. 25 plates.

<sup>14</sup> In *Bull. Metrop. Mus. of Art*, N.Y., XIX (1924), 123-4. 2 figs.

<sup>15</sup> In *Bull. Soc. Arch. d'Alex.*, XX (1924), 196-201.

<sup>16</sup> In *Byz. Zeitsch.*, XXIV (1924), 474-5.

<sup>17</sup> Oxford (1923), xvii + 267.

<sup>18</sup> In *Theol. Rev.*, XXII (1923), 86.

<sup>19</sup> In *Byz. Neugr. Jahrb.*, III (1922), 408-11.

<sup>20</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, XXVII (1924), 90-2.

<sup>21</sup> *Archaeologia*, XXIII, 73-84.

<sup>22</sup> In *O.L.Z.*, XXVI (1923), 557-8.

<sup>23</sup> In *Jour. des Savants*, XXI (1923), 134-5.

<sup>24</sup> Berlin (1923), xii + 67, 132 plates and 13 illust. in text.

<sup>25</sup> In *Byz. Zeit.*, XXIV (1924), 388-90.

<sup>26</sup> In *J.R.A.S.* (1924), 309-10.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Journal* (1922), 185, and (1923), 233.

<sup>28</sup> In *Byz. Neugr. Jahrb.*, IV (1923), 135.

<sup>29</sup> In *Theol. Rev.* (1923), 303.



## HUGH EVELYN-WHITE

THE death, at the age of forty, of Hugh Gerard Evelyn-White cuts short a career in which much had already been accomplished and which promised much more. His varied classical work the present writer need do no more than record; indeed confining ourselves to what he did and was doing for Egyptian studies, there remains enough to speak of. From the King's School at Ely Evelyn-White went up to Wadham College with an open scholarship; and after making a speciality of classical archaeology, under Professor Percy Gardner, who thought highly of his capacities, he took a good degree in 1907 and, two years later, became assistant to Sir Aurel Stein, in dealing with the Central Asian antiquities then deposited at the British Museum. In that same year however (1909) he was offered work as classical specialist to the annual expedition of the New York Metropolitan Museum to Egypt. This he accepted and in this employment he continued, except during the War, until 1921. In 1914 he enlisted in the Public Schools Battalion, but his health, never robust, failed him and he was soon invalided out. Nevertheless he subsequently succeeded in obtaining a commission and was sent to Egypt, where he served with the force which advanced across the Isthmus into Palestine. But again his health gave way and he was obliged to return home. After the War he rejoined the New York expedition and of it he remained a member until 1921, when he was invited to the University of Leeds, as lecturer in classical archaeology and (incidentally) literature—a post which he admirably filled and was holding at the time of his death. In the intervals of work in Egypt and at Leeds he undertook excavations in this country: in 1909 at Carleon, in 1913 at Castell Collen in Wales, and in the present year at Cawthorn Cropton in Yorkshire.

Evelyn-White's first season in Egypt had been employed at El-Bagawât, in the Oasis of Khargah, where H. E. Winlock was then conducting an excavation. Those following, up to 1914, were spent at Western Thebes, where he worked with Winlock, N. de G. Davies and others of the expedition's staff, and whither he returned after war was over. His occupations at Thebes had not been wholly with dynastic Egypt; he took part, in the seasons of 1911–1914, in the exploration of the Coptic site at 'Abd el-Kurnah known as The Monastery of Epiphanius, and in the year following the peace he definitely turned his attention to the Christian antiquities of a far-distant site: the Oasis of the Wadi Natrûn, where the Metropolitan Museum had already carried out a preliminary architectural survey. To him was entrusted the task—no light one—of preparing both a description of the Nitrian monasteries from the archaeological and architectural standpoints and also a history of that famous monastic colony. With this object he determined to make use of the original documents, extant in at least four languages, to an extent which had not even been attempted by any of the previous historians of Nitria and which involved patient research in many divergent directions. His results are embodied in the manuscript of two large, independent works which, at the time of his death, were happily left in a state of practical completeness. How far beyond earlier writers the thoroughness of his investigations had carried him is evident in the summaries of his results published in the Museum's *Bulletin*, July 1920, Part II, and Nov. 1921, Part II. Those who have had the opportunity of reading the complete MS.

express the highest opinion of its historical value and of the qualities and aptitude for such work which he there displays. All who are interested in the history of early monasticism and of Christian archaeology must earnestly desire the speedy publication of these two volumes.

But besides these, Evelyn-White's visits to Nitria had provided materials for a third book which was to draw him into hitherto unfamiliar studies. By patience and diplomacy and with the support of influential Copts in Cairo, he had succeeded in retrieving a very considerable supplement (between 40 and 50 pieces) to the hitherto known remnants of the ancient monastic libraries. These MSS., almost all in Coptic, involved the study of that language, and in an amazingly short time he had acquired so good a working knowledge of it, as well as of the surrounding literature—though he characteristically denied that he was ever a Coptic “scholar”—that he could set about the edition and translation of these unidentified, fragmentary and often scarcely legible texts. The book which resulted, the last of the trilogy to be undertaken, will yet be the first published: the printing, at the Cambridge Press, should be terminated this autumn. He had no small share in yet another publication resulting from the New York excavations: to him is due the editing of such Greek texts as were recovered from the Monastery of Epiphanius, alluded to above. This book, it is hoped, will be issued next year.

Evelyn-White's work, hitherto published, shows throughout the same characteristics of thoroughness, mastery of his materials, familiarity with the work of predecessors, besides an uncommon felicity in translation; and in the two historical books yet to come we may expect to find high qualities of critical acumen and narrative power.

His published work, other than that connected with Egypt, comprises a long series of contributions to the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* from the year 1908 onwards, both articles and reviews. Of these the former were mainly the outcome of studies which the editing successively of Hesiod (1914), Ausonius (1919, 1921) and Statius (left unfinished) for the *Loeb Library* had necessitated. He was further to have undertaken Pliny's *Natural History* and the *Letters* of Sidonius Apollinaris for the same series, while he looked forward to preparing some day (“if I have time”) a critical text of Hesiod. His interest in early Christianity led him to study anew the Oxyrhynchus *Logia*; these he re-edited, with a critical commentary, in 1920. This, admittedly his best piece of work, was extremely well received by scholars—notably by Professor Harnack (*Theol. Lit. Z.*, 1921, p. 4), who held that it not only superseded all renderings hitherto proposed, but advanced the discussion as far as, without fresh material, it seems possible to bring it. Another reviewer (*J. H. St.*, 1921, p. 163) speaks of it as “not infrequently brilliant,” while displaying both common sense and sound judgement. One of his earliest appearances in print was as collaborator with his father, the Rev. C. H. Evelyn-White, in an edition of the Cambridgeshire *Doomsday* (1910). The same collaboration had also produced a translation of Regnault's *Horae Beatae Mariae Virginis* of 1525.

His death is a loss indeed to the world of scholarship, but to many of us it means the loss of a friend who will be greatly missed. That he was a man of high character and fine nature was clear to those who did but slightly know him; to those who had penetrated a shy and very diffident exterior he showed a capacity for warm attachment, loyalty and quixotic chivalry which, added to an invincible and almost absurd modesty, made of Hugh Evelyn-White a very lovable character.

## NOTES AND NEWS

The Society's fourth campaign at Tell el-'Amarnah will probably have begun before this number appears. Mr. Newton, who is in charge of the expedition, will leave England in the middle of October. He will once more be assisted by the American representative on our staff, Professor Thomas Whittemore, and also by Messrs. T. R. Duncan Greenlees and H. B. Clark.

The annual exhibition of the antiquities found in the Society's excavations was held in the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, from July 1st to July 12th. The objects shown came mainly from the excavations of Tell el-'Amarnah, partly from the work of Mr. Newton and partly from that of Professor Griffith. Taken in their entirety they presented a remarkably vivid picture of the life of all strata of society in the town of Akhetaten. Two lectures bearing on the excavations were given during the course of the exhibition, one by Mr. F. G. Newton, Joint Director of the expedition, and the other by Mr. S. R. K. Glanville, a member of his staff.

The Society's programme of winter lectures consists of a series of six in illustration of the Art and Science of Ancient Egypt. The lectures will be given, as in former years, in the rooms in Burlington House, once again placed at our disposal by the generosity of the Royal Society. In order to prevent overcrowding it has been decided to send one ticket only to each member of the Society, but to allow extra tickets (not more than two each) to those members who apply for them to the Secretary. A few additional tickets will be available for non-members. The following is the full list of lectures :

October 7th, 1924. "Architecture." F. G. Newton, Esq.

November 11th, 1924. "Temple Ceremonial." A. M. Blackman, Esq., D.Litt.

January 20th, 1925. "Sculpture." H. R. Hall, Esq., D.Litt.

February 17th, 1925. "Biological and Medical Science." Professor G. Elliot Smith, F.R.S.

March 17th, 1925. "Physical Science." Colonel H. G. Lyons, F.R.S.

May 12th, 1925. "Draughtsmanship." N. de Garis Davies, Esq.

Mr. F. Ll. Griffith has since our last number appeared received two honours. In the first place the title of Professor of Egyptology has been conferred upon him by the University of Oxford, in addition to that of Reader which he already held ; in the second he has been elected a Fellow of the British Academy. Professor Griffith's friends will rejoice that recognition has come in so pleasant a form to one who has done so much for Egyptology, and especially for its philological side.

Dr. Alan H. Gardiner has been elected a member of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, a well merited tribute to his contribution to the study of Egyptology. He has further been made Research Professor of Egyptology in the University of Chicago. This appointment, fortunately for us, does not involve residence in Chicago. In special connection with this appointment Dr. Gardiner has again been engaged during the past winter in Egypt on the copying and study of the Middle Kingdom Coffin Texts. We may add that his long awaited Egyptian Grammar is now in the press. Some account of this will be

given in the *Journal* when the book appears. In the meantime we only say two things, firstly that it will undoubtedly mark an epoch in the history of Egyptian philology, and secondly that it is written in such a way as to be usable not only by the advanced scholar but also by the veriest beginner.

We congratulate Dr. H. R. Hall on his elevation to the important post of Keeper of the Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, in succession to Sir Wallis Budge, who has retired after a period of service extending over many years.

Egyptologists are agreed in admitting that one of the most valuable features of this *Journal* is constituted by the Bibliographies of Ancient Egypt, Graeco-Roman Egypt and Christian Egypt which appear year after year. All three are worked out in the greatest detail, and together they form a complete account of the work which has been done and the books and articles which have been published in any one year over the whole field of Egyptology. The work of preparing these bibliographies is one which calls for immense industry and considerable expenditure of time on the part of their authors, and which brings to them singularly little intellectual profit. The Editor feels that he will be expressing the feelings of all Egyptologists in here thanking for their devotion to the *Journal* and to their science in general Professor F. Ll. Griffith, Dr. de Lacy O'Leary, Mr. H. I. Bell and Mr. M. N. Tod.

Fate, in the shape of appointments, has broken up the pleasant party which accompanied Mr. Newton to Tell el-'Amarna last season. Mr. S. R. K. Glanville has passed on to the staff of the Egyptian and Assyrian Department of the British Museum, and Mr. W. B. Emery has been selected by Mr. Robert Mond to carry on for him at Luxor that excavation and preservation work among the private tombs which is one of Mr. Mond's most valuable contributions to Egyptology.

During the past winter Mr. Mond continued his work in the neighbourhood of the private tombs at Shêkh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah in association with the Liverpool University Institute of Archaeology. Mr. Mond has very generously presented most of his finds to the Institute, and it was found possible, with his permission, to display some of them at the Society's Summer Exhibition. One of the objects of last season's excavation was to clear a space to form a dumping-ground for the rubbish from the very important tomb of Ramose which Mr. Mond next proposes to clear. Reports of these, and, we hope, subsequent excavations will be found in the forthcoming numbers of the *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*.

Mr. G. D. Hornblower writes to us as follows:

In connection with Mr. Dawson's paper (*Journal*, x, 83-86) on the Mouse in Medicine, it may be noted that the old belief in the generative powers of Nile-mud reached farther than to mice only. Pomponius Mela, in the first century of our era, has the following:—  
 "In the summer season the Nile, overflowing, irrigates Egypt, with waters so effective for engendering and nourishing that, besides abounding in fishes and producing crocodiles and hippopotami, huge beasts, it even infuses souls into its clods and out of its very loam fashions things of life. The proof is that when the flood abates, we may see on the moist fields animals not yet completed, but in the act of receiving breath, partly formed, partly still of earth<sup>1</sup>."









<sup>1</sup> TH. HOPFNER, *Fontes historicae religionis Aegyptiacae*, II, 172.

Traces of this more general belief survived a long time (see, for example, Shakspeare *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 7), and if the medicinal value of the mouse was derived from its supposed generation from Nile-mud, other creatures would be held equally efficacious. One may perhaps hazard the suggestion that the mouse shared something of the reputation of the snake as a nocturnal, secret thing of the earth, and thus, in the remoter times, may have even been connected with the spirits of the dead, as the snake so commonly is.

In modern Egyptian folklore I have not yet come across the mouse as medicine, but further research would probably reveal cases.

The following note has reached us from Professor V. Struve of Petrograd :

Professor Gardiner's ingenious identification of one of the groups of Sinai signs with the Semitic Ba'alat<sup>1</sup> must always serve as the basis of further decipherment, though he himself completes his interpretation by the words : "Unfortunately, however, I have no suggestions for the reading of any other word, so that the decipherment of the name Ba'alat must remain so far as I am concerned an unverifiable hypothesis<sup>2</sup>."

I think, however, that this "unverifiable hypothesis" can be fortified by the reading of another word. In fact, among the Sinai inscriptions there is a bilingual, though very short, but with a proper name. On the sphinx, *Journal* III, Pl. III, no. 345, are four inscriptions ; two in Egyptian and two in Sinitic. One Egyptian inscription is between the paws, another on the shoulder. One of the Sinitic inscriptions is on the right side, another on the left side of the base. The Egyptian inscription upon the shoulder can be translated thus : "beloved of Hathor, [Lady of] the Turquoise." The Sinitic inscription upon the left side of the base contains the group of signs which Gardiner read Ba'alat. This inscription thus corresponds to the Egyptian one on the shoulder. In this case the Sinitic inscription on the right side of the base should be the equivalent of the Egyptian inscription between the paws. This latter is composed simply of a Horus-name represented by one hieroglyph which, according to the copy of Professor Petrie, reads  mʒ. We ought therefore to find the same two consonants in the Sinitic inscription on the right side of the base. And in effect we do, if we use Gardiner's identification of the signs of the Sinitic script. The first of the two, the zigzag , can be equated with  mēm, "water." The second—the ox's head  = , aleph. We thus find in the Sinitic inscription the same group of consonants as in the hieroglyphic. I do not think this is a simple chance, and I surmise that the beginning of the Sinitic inscription on the right side of the base contained the name of the king who caused the sphinx to be made. This name is followed by a sign like the Egyptian hieroglyph  which Cowley takes for a determinative<sup>3</sup>, and Sethe<sup>4</sup> identifies with . The last three signs correspond to the first signs of the group read by Gardiner as . I therefore propose to transcribe the Sinitic inscription on the right side of the base either mʒ + determinative + bʿl, or mʒ h bʿl, that is either "Mʒ Lord," or "Mʒ the Lord."

In conclusion I hope my little note will fortify in some way Gardiner's ingenious identification.

<sup>1</sup> *The Egyptian Origin of the Semitic Alphabet* (*Journal*, III, 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 20.

<sup>4</sup> *G. G. N. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1917, 447-75.

## THE SPELLING OF PROPER NAMES IN THIS JOURNAL

### ALSO SOME OTHER POINTS OF STYLE

In order to secure intelligibility, and so far as possible, consistency, a definite system has been adopted in the *Journal* for the spelling of ancient Egyptian and modern Arabic names of persons and places. This system, which has been evolved gradually by the thought and labour of several of those who have done most for our *Journal*, makes no claim to be perfect. In the case of ancient Egyptian names whose vocalization is unknown to us perfection is impossible, and a reasonable compromise must be adopted. Even in the case of modern Arabic place-names certainty cannot always be attained: many of them are unmarked or wrongly spelt on our maps, and even educated Egyptians can often give no assurance as to the correct writing. For example, it is often impossible to discover whether a place-name ends in *l* or in *h*, and many places are admittedly pronounced and written in two separate ways, as for instance *اصوان* and *اسوان*. The surest guide of all, namely the local pronunciation as recorded by a properly trained ear, is often denied to us. Concessions to established tradition have also to be made. Thus it would be pedantic to write El-Uḡsur for Luxor or In-Nīl for the Nile, though on the other hand to an English reader Mawās is a far better spelling than the railway company's Moes.

Contributors to the *Journal* will save the Society much expense, the Editor much time and the average reader much mystification if they will adopt the spellings here proposed even when they are not themselves wholly in agreement with them. Needless to say the Editor will gladly hear of any suggestions for improving the system.

The system employed in the *Journal* is as follows:—

#### I. ANCIENT EGYPTIAN PROPER NAMES.

In ancient Egyptian names, unless given in their graecized forms, write *h*, *ḳ*, *ʿ* but omit *ʃ*<sup>1</sup>. *Ḥ* and *ḥ* are to be rendered by *kh*, *š* by *sh*, *ṯ* by *th*, and *ḏ* by *z*. Long vowels to be marked with *ˉ*, not *ˆ*, e.g. Amūn.

Some Egyptian kings' names:—

Amenemmes *not* Amenemhat.

Sesostris *not* Senusert.

Ramesses *not* Rameses.

Tuthmosis *not* Thutmose or Thothmes.

Amenophis *not* Amenhetep, Amenhotep, or Amenothos.

Gods' names:—

Amūn *not* Amon or Amen.

Rē<sup>ʿ</sup> *not* Ra or Rē.

#### II. ARABIC PROPER NAMES.

In Arabic names long vowels are marked *ˆ* not *ˉ*, e.g. Saḳḳārah *not* Saḳḳārah.

El- (or assimilated en-, er-, etc.) always with hyphen.

Ṭ, ḏ, ṣ, z, ḥ and ḳ to have the dot.

ع to be *ʿ* (not *ʿ* as in ancient Egyptian names), and غ *gh*.

Aleph, medial or final, to be *ʿ*. Initial aleph is to be omitted.

The feminine termination *ه* is to be written -ah, not -eh or -a.

Final *l* to be written *ā*.

<sup>1</sup> Though not, of course, to be omitted in an unvocalized transliteration, e.g. *Pḏ-šr* (Pesiūr).

## SOME OTHER POINTS OF STYLE.

In quoting a work omit the words volume and page entirely, e.g. NEWBERRY, *Beni Hasan*, II, 12 (*i.e.* volume II, page 12). Note the commas.

The name of a work quoted should be in italics (indicated in copy by a single underline). The name of an author used in a reference and *immediately* followed by the name of his work or article should be in small capitals (indicated in copy by a double underline). In no other cases are personal names to be written in small capitals except, for special and obvious reasons, in the bibliographies, where they are always so written.

Latin words and contractions of such are printed in italics. Thus:—*i.e.*, *e.g.*, *viz.*, *v.* (= *vide*), *loc. cit.*, *ap.* (= *apud*), *temp.* (= *tempore*), *cf.*, *c.* (= *circa*), *saec.* (= *century*). These words should, however, not be italicized when preceded or followed by italics. Thus we write, for the sake of clearness, e.g. *Journal*, II, 27.

The abbreviation etc. is always written in roman.

In German words write Ä, Ö, Ü, not Æ, Æ, UE. This rule cannot always be carried out in quoting from German books, or in giving the titles of German books or periodicals. In these cases the exact spelling of the original is used.

É in French capitals should be accented where the letter bears an accent.

All contractions and abbreviations must be followed by a full-stop; e.g. Mr., Dr. and St. In no case must a journal be quoted in capitals without stops; e.g. *O.L.Z.* not *OLZ*, *J.H.S.* not *JHS*.

Write always Tenth Dynasty, not Xth Dynasty or Dyn. X. The only exception is in the bibliographies, where, for the sake of space, Dyn. X should be used.

As to *op. cit.* the usage is to employ *op. cit.* for any *different* place in the *same* work, and *ibid.* only for the *same* place in the *same* work; in other words, *op. cit.* is employed when followed by a page or plate number, *ibid.* when not so followed.

In periodicals, when a different volume is quoted from that last referred to, use *op. cit.*; when the reference is to the same volume and same article, even if followed by the page, use *ibid.* Thus *ibid.* means same volume same page when referring to a book, but only same volume when referring to a periodical. *loc. cit.* is never used.

The following abbreviations of much quoted works are used:—

*Journal* (this *Journal*).

*Zeitschr. f. äg. Spr.* for *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*.

*Rec. de Trav.*, for *Recueil de Travaux*.

*Ann. Serv.* for *Annales du Service des Antiquités*.

*Proc.* (or *Trans.*) *Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, for *Proceedings or Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*.

*O.L.Z.*, for *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*.

*M.D.O.G.*, for *Mittheilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*.

*J.H.S.*, for *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

*Archiv*, for *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*.

*Z. Sav.-St.*, for *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*.

*G.G.A.*, for *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*.

*G.G.N.*, for *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*.

*Stud. Pal.*, for WESSELY, *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*.

*C.I.G.*, for *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*.

*C.I.L.*, for *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.

*I.G.Rom.*, for *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes*.

Papyrus collections to be cited according to the system used in the Oxyrhynchus volumes, except: *P. Lond.* for *P. Brit. Mus.*

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*[The number of books which now reach us for review is so large that the strain placed on those who so kindly undertake this work is rapidly becoming unbearable. What is equally serious is that the space at our disposal for reviews is already being considerably exceeded. We are therefore reluctantly compelled to reduce some of our reviews to mere notices, more especially those of publications which, though archaeological, deal indirectly or not at all with Egypt. The alternative to this, namely to restrict reviews to a certain length, would in our opinion result in lowering the standard of reviewing in the Journal. Authors and publishers may rest assured, however, that any book sent for review will at least receive a mention in this section.]*

*Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East. I. Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and their Earliest Interrelations*, by H. FRANKFORT, M.A., being No. 6 of *Occasional Papers of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. London, 1924.

The history of excavation opens with a period in which it was customary to throw all pottery on to the rubbish heap, at best reserving a few of the finer unbroken painted vases. It has now reached a stage where every fragment must be carefully sifted out and preserved together with a detailed record of its finding. This is obviously right, and the importance of pottery as a record of prehistoric and even historic events can hardly be over-estimated. With this increased respect for pottery has however come in some quarters a tendency to exaggerate its value, and to force from it conclusions which are totally unjustified. No sooner does a new ware come to light than a series of comparisons is instituted between it and various other kinds of pottery with a view to establishing "connections." The results of such comparisons, when not controlled by sound common sense, are apt to be ridiculous.

To such a school of thought Mr. Frankfort's study is a welcome antidote, for it is marked by deep and careful reflexion and by reasonable restraint throughout. Thus the author, when he finds two types of "geometric" pottery in two separate regions, does not rush to the conclusion that there is "connection" between the two places. He points out that in itself this similarity may amount to absolutely nothing, for after all clay is clay, geometrical designs are geometrical designs and cannot fail to present some resemblances, while even the shapes of useful vases must move within certain well-defined limits. He therefore goes much deeper into the problem and asks himself when and under what conditions the resemblances which so delight the heart of some prehistoric archaeologists can be considered to constitute evidence for connection, and, what is more, he is not satisfied with the vague term connection—the delight of the slipshod—but asks exactly what we mean when we say that two places or peoples were connected.

The introductory chapter in which Mr. Frankfort exposes his attitude to these and similar matters is characterized by extreme sanity of outlook and depth of thought. In the technical sections of this chapter, which have obviously been heavily compressed, room might be found to note that decoration by incision may be carried out either on the still damp or drying clay or on the fired vase. This distinction, always perceptible, sometimes forms a fundamental criterion. The change in colour (usually a darkening, not unmarked by the author) due to burnishing was also worth mention here, since by means of partial burnishing it is possible to produce a design in two colours, or more exactly in two shades of the same colour. This device has been used by potters in many parts of the world.

The next three chapters deal with the pottery of Susa, Musyan and other Mesopotamian sites, and the conclusions to be drawn from it. Here Mr. Frankfort becomes involved in all the difficulties of the Sumerian problem, which he handles courageously and yet respectfully. Above all we may be thankful to him for the boldness with which he rejects any connection between these Mesopotamian finds and those from Anau. The attempt which has been made during the past twenty years to force on us a belief in this connection is typical of all that is most dangerous in the handling of ceramic evidence. We hope that Mr. Frankfort has dealt it a blow from which it will not recover, for which we shall all think the more clearly without it.



In Chapter V, which deals with Egypt and her relations with Nearer Asia, the author at once wins our confidence in his attitude, for he tells us at the outset that whatever evidence there may be for connection it is not to be based on similarities between Asiatic painted ware and the predynastic pottery decorated either in white on polished red or in matt red on buff. From what has been said above as to Mr. Frankfort's mental attitude it will be readily guessed that he is not swept away by the resemblance between this white decorated ware and modern Kabyle pottery into supposing a foreign origin for the former in Egypt or even into calling the early predynastic civilization "Algerian." He does, however, find a strong contrast in style between this white painted ware and the other decorated Egyptian pottery with red designs on buff, so much so that he is inclined to attribute the latter and the various changes which he finds to accompany its introduction to the slow infiltration of a new people from the country, less desert then than now, between the Nile and the Red Sea. On the subject of "invaders" in general he speaks some words of wisdom which might with profit be pondered by many an older and younger archaeologist (pp. 98-9).

Coming to direct relations between Egypt and Syria Mr. Frankfort is inclined to see the first sign of them in the wavy-handled vases of the predynastic period. These he tells us differ in Egypt "from all other classes of pottery in their ware, which, on the other hand is very similar to that of identical vases from the earliest strata known in Southern Palestine." His conclusion from these facts is that the wavy-handled vases, or at least the earliest of them, were actual products of South Syria, used for the transportation of some kind of precious fat. This conclusion may be correct, but I am not convinced about the facts on which it is based. Thus Professor Droop and myself, in a series of most minute examinations of predynastic pottery in Abydos in 1911-12, came to the conclusion that the material of the wavy-handled vases was precisely the same as that of many of the decorated vases with red designs (*Cemeteries of Abydos*, II, 12), and I note that Petrie himself made a similar observation at Ballâş. Furthermore, my experience may be at fault here, but I have yet to see these "identical vases" from the earliest strata known in Southern Palestine. If they are those illustrated by Macalister in his *Gezer* and elsewhere or by Petrie in his *Tell el Hesi* then the epithet identical is ill bestowed on them, and if Mr. Frankfort would prove his case up to the hilt he must show that the fabric of some of the Egyptian vases is not merely "very similar" to that of the Palestinian but identical with it.

Mr. Frankfort next earns our gratitude by giving us the first detailed and accurate description of the foreign wares found in the early royal tombs of Abydos. They fall into four classes. The Aegaeon origin of all these types is rightly rejected and their origin is tentatively assigned to North Syria.

From this point on the work becomes more hypothetical, though never less careful and reasonable. The author supposes a high late predynastic civilization in the Western Delta, in commercial touch with Syria and Crete, and the similarities between Egyptian and Mesopotamian material of the protodynastic period, to which he makes some interesting additions, are tentatively explained by contact between Egyptians and Mesopotamians in the Wâdî Ḥammâmât, where early copper mines, as well as gold, are now known to have existed. In this connection Mr. Frankfort should beware of assuming that Semerkhet or any other Egyptian king went to Sinai for copper. Of the hundreds of inscriptions in the Wâdî Maghârah and at Serâbîṭ el-Khâdim only one mentions copper along with turquoise as the object of the expedition: the rest, where they mention anything, only speak of *mfkkt*, the translation of which as turquoise seems to me certain. Modern geological researches on these two sites show that what actually came out of the galleries worked by the Egyptians was in effect turquoise, and that they never contained any ore of copper on a workable scale. That Egypt obtained any considerable proportion of her copper supply from the peninsula is on present evidence more than doubtful. Yet Egyptologists frequently state that she did, and will no doubt continue to do so despite the protests of those who have studied the question.



Mr. Frankfort has given us an admirable study, scholarly, acute, cautious and yet not lacking in imagination, and we shall look forward eagerly to his publication of more of his work on early pottery.

T. ERIC PEET.

*Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. XI, 1924. (The University Press, Manchester.)

The Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society continues with commendable courage to issue its *Journal*, in the face of disheartening financial difficulties. In the current number there is one article dealing with Egypt. It is called *The Mother Worship in Egypt*.

An error which is not self-evident as such to the man in the street is often by dint of sufficient repetition accepted by him as a truth, and we fear that this may apply to the belief in a Great Mother

Goddess in Egypt. A certain school of anthropology is at present very anxious, for purposes of its own, to encourage this belief. The type of argument by which it attempts this has already been examined in this *Journal*. Of the reasoning used by the author of this article we can only say that it is not much worse than that of his fellows. For instance, wishing to prove that Min was once a female deity he states that a certain "predynastic archaic statue of the god Min" found by Mr. Green at Hieraconpolis and now in the Ashmolean Museum "is evidently intended to represent a female divinity." Even if we admit that this statue is that of a female, which is doubtful, what is the evidence for calling it a statue of Min? It was found not at Koptos but at Hieraconpolis, and it would never have occurred even to Mr. Lewis to call it Min but for the fact that the only other statues of such primitive type as yet known to us from Egypt happen to be those of Min found at Koptos. Mr. Lewis further tells us that the name Min goes back to the verb *men* "to stand." Unfortunately the verb *men* means "to be firm" or "fixed," never "to stand" in the sense in which Mr. Lewis requires. We are further told that on a sealing of the First Dynasty (PÉTRIE, *Royal Tombs*, II, Pl. XVII, 135) Min is called "The Lord of the pteroceras shells." On referring to the plate we find a group of four signs, the Min sign on top, beneath it a sign which we will grant to be the *Pteroceras* shell, though it is much more probably the early form of , and below this again two  signs side by side. We freely admit that we cannot translate this group of signs, but we would assure Mr. Lewis that by no "infernal juggle" can it be made to mean what he makes it mean.

We have gone so far into detail only to show the sincerity of our criticism and shall go no further. The article is typical of the "arguments" used to foist a Great Mother Goddess upon a reluctant Egypt. Everyone who gives his life to the study of Egyptology knows perfectly well that neither in the Egyptian texts nor in the other remains of the Egyptian civilization is there any clear evidence for the existence in early Egypt of the belief in a Great Mother Goddess in the sense usually attributed to these words, namely a goddess who is the mother of mankind and who stands for the creative or reproductive principle. Egyptologists are naturally a little tired of these continual attempts from outside to teach them their business, and equally naturally they protest from time to time, but with very little effect. The serious matter is that this theory, resting on arguments seldom better and often worse than those which we have quoted above, is being used as a basis for far reaching speculations concerning the origin of civilization in general. Mr. Lewis himself announces in his article a forthcoming work on *The Origin and History of the Great Mother*. We should welcome such a work, but we would implore Mr. Lewis at the outset to set resolutely aside his belief that the worship of a Great Mother Goddess can be proved for Egypt. His book will be the better for it.

T. ERIC PEET.

*Harvard African Studies*, volumes V, VI: *Excavations at Kerma*. By GEORGE A. REISNER, Ph.D. Peabody Museum of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., 1923. Vol. V, parts I-III, pp. xvi and 528; vol. VI, parts IV-V, pp. xxiv and 559; 78 plates, 26 plans and 345 figures in the text.

Kerma lies on the east bank of the Nile, just above the Third Cataract and near the island of Argo. Here the remains of two solid buildings of crude brick drew the attention of early travellers; they stood on low ground strewn with pottery and other indications of extensive habitation. In 1912 a scheme for irrigating and cultivating a large part of the site had been carried through, and the Sudan government was anxious that an archaeologist should explore the place before the water was let in. Happily Dr. Reisner appeared in the nick of time and his boldness in facing the material difficulties was seconded by the aid of the government officials, and rewarded by the most splendid results. In commencing he found that one of the "Dufôfa" buildings (the name is so spelt by Murray in his English-Nubian dictionary and connected with the Nubian *difî* "village," "city") was a fort or fortified Residence of the Middle Kingdom and the other turned out to be a great tomb-chapel for the Egyptian governor under Sesostri I on the edge of a vast necropolis. Beside these remains Reisner found only a small but by no means uninteresting Meroitic cemetery which is duly described in his first volume.

But the great necropolis was a discovery of the first rank, revealing an unexpected civilisation and linking up with certain hitherto unexplained finds in Lower Nubia and Egypt. The record and discussion of this occupies practically the whole of the two thick volumes. Reisner explains it as the product of an Egyptian trading and military colony under the charge of Hepzefa, the nomarch of Asyût in the reign of Sesostri I, settled in a country of rude arts and adapting the available materials and to a certain extent the native crafts and customs to the standards of Egyptian skill and luxury. Its most flourishing time was

at the beginning, immediately after the conquest by Sesostri I, and though revived from time to time by fresh arrivals of craftsmen and others from Egypt, on the whole there was steady deterioration. Burial of living slaves, etc., in the grave, a variety of *sati*-burial, was the rule here in all classes, and strange to say this revolting custom was observed on a great scale at the tomb of Hepzefa himself. His enormous circular barrow, elaborately chambered, was most fortunately identifiable in the general wreckage by the base of his own statue and the well-preserved statue of his wife found in it. The manufacture of glazed ware was greatly developed in the colony, as well as of fine black-topped pottery of a well-marked type, and inlays in ivory and cap-decorations in mica in the form of birds, animals and plants. The colony continued to exist down to the end of the Hyksos period when it was overwhelmed by fire and sword. Its destruction was soon afterwards avenged by the subjugation of Upper Nubia under the Pharaohs of the New Kingdom. The Middle Kingdom colony seems to have originated some new impulses in Egypt, but its effects in Nubia were utterly wiped out.

Now that the full evidence from Kerma is available it is readily seen that there is no support for Prof. Junker's bold theory of a Nubian origin for the "Tell el-Yahûdiyah" ware. Amongst the many thousands of vases here catalogued there are only seven examples of that widely distributed ware, a great contrast to its abundance at Tell el-Yahûdiyah; as Dr. Reisner concludes, its place of manufacture must be sought in Lower Egypt.

One word of warning. It is impossible for an Egyptologist actively engaged in the field to retain a mastery of the whole of his subject. While Dr. Reisner has been presenting us at intervals with new chapters of history of extraordinary importance and richness taken straight from his excavations, he has perforce left inscriptions and language mostly to the care of others. Many of the second-hand quotations in his last chapter are out of date and must not be looked upon as authoritative. Thus on p. 536 of vol. II, "Cush occurs once at Assuan" (in the Old Kingdom); it was long since pointed out that the true reading in the passage referred to is Kebni = Syrian Byblos, and the name Cush first appears in the Middle Kingdom; p. 546, the name of Nubia is now known to be read Ta-sti not Ta-khenty; p. 550, Uronarti means "King's island"; p. 551, note 1, by a curious confusion the abbreviation A Z must have been misinterpreted as *Archaeologische Zeitung* instead of *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*. One would be grateful for an explanation of the Arabic (?) or Nubian (?) term *keriak*, I, 39, 45; II, 290, 293: from internal evidence it appears to designate a white substance used by modern potters in polishing and finishing, but whether it is a natural mineral product or not I cannot discover. The whole work is somewhat technical but is wonderfully clear in its arrangement.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

*Muhammadan Architecture in Egypt and Palestine.* By MARTIN S. BRIGGS, F.R.I.B.A., Clarendon Press. vi + 255. 252 illustrations.

To the lay reader this comely volume will recall much of the glamour with which the medieval architecture of the Near East has clad her ancient streets, especially those of Cairo. The illustrations are numerous, mostly from excellent photographs excellently reproduced; author and publisher alike are to be congratulated on the real beauty here displayed. For those who have not had the good fortune to see the actual buildings the plates as a whole convey as good an impression of them as can be looked for in a volume of these dimensions. Some of them are under-scaled, for example fig. 42—the Citadel of Aleppo—with the minute human figures in the foreground, almost too small to be recognized, renders but inadequately the impression of magnificent immensity with which most visitors are seized. Again, the illustrations of Sultan Hasan's College-mosque, held by many to be the greatest manifestation of the art here discussed, scarcely show its real majesty; on the other hand the pictures of the more ornate of the latest Mameluke buildings do indeed express their great charm, more jewel-like and perhaps more easily expressible. We must be grateful to the author for adding some typical street scenes, hackneyed though they may be, because they make us realize the setting which, seemingly so casual, yet signally enhances the beauty of the jewel.

The text is full and thorough; it contains not only all the data of first importance but most of the details which, smaller in themselves, yield us nevertheless valuable indications necessary for the complete understanding of the architectural development. But the student will have to dig out these data for himself and may perhaps find in that exercise some of the zest of adventure, for the text, though easy,

does not sufficiently convey an orderly sense of development such as we should like in histories. The facts of religious uses and of political and religious influences are duly stated, but some of them almost casually; a preliminary outline of them and of the various technical innovations and their sources, in their chronological order, would have added much to the book's usefulness.

The origins of most features of Muslim architecture are generally treated of with thoroughness, with some exceptions, such as the pre-Muslim use of the pointed arch and the cusped window, which is not made clear enough: again, no mention is made of the origin of the open-work windows in stucco or stone, first mentioned in connection with the mosque of Ibn ʿUlfân, which surely are derived from the pierced marble slabs filling windows in Byzantine churches.

The author, like Saladin, takes a wide view of the origins of Muslim architecture, compounded as it is of many elements from the countries conquered by the Arabs, but the great debt in special to the Byzantines hardly receives its due meed of recognition. It may be noted here that the paintings in the palace of ʿAmmâr 'Amra, noticed on p. 168, belong to true Byzantine art, as heir to the Hellenistic, and not to Persian or Sassanian; the building itself seems to show Mesopotamian origins. The palace of Mshatta, of which the most important remaining parts have been transferred to Berlin, is not described nor its relations with Muslim art discussed, presumably because its date has been disputed and some consider it later than the Arabic conquest. But the weight of probability is on the other side and, in any case, the interesting mingling of pure Byzantine and late Sassanian ornament was well worth describing and its probable effects on Muslim art. Another omission concerns the College-mosque and mausoleum of Šâlih Negm-ud-din Eyûb, mentioned on pp. 85-6 and probably not described because they have been illustrated in Mrs. R. L. Devonshire's last book<sup>1</sup>. But the Eyubid period is important, showing a rapid transition in both architecture and craftsmanship from the coarser Fatimid to the later glories of the Mameluke period; Šâlih's buildings, it is true, are much dilapidated but, according to Herz Pasha, bear marks of European influence, which he thought was then coming in. The author illustrates this transitional period rather insufficiently. Nor does he bring into sufficient account all the influences from Muslim countries outside those under review; for example the Seljuicide, of which Herz Pasha found several traces in the Mosque of Sultan Ḥaṣan. Again features new in Syria and Egypt are often found in Persia a century or more earlier, a circumstance of great import. Lastly, we should like to have had a fuller account—it needs not much space—of the lovely Saracenic domes; they have been passed over by the author as outside the scope of the book, although they form an outstanding feature of the buildings, causing Lane Poole felicitously to dub the Mamelukes "the Dome-builders." In a second edition space could be found for them without enlarging the book, for, in view of the good manuals of Saracenic history that are available (notably Lane Poole's), a considerable proportion of the historical notes might be eliminated, leaving only what is essential for the understanding of chronology and the influence of political events on the current of art. Another branch of architecture, similarly excluded, that of public baths, is certainly worthy of description. Justice is done, p. 108, to the great porch of Sultan Ḥaṣan, but some account of porches in general and their development would have been welcome, for they constitute a feature of great importance in Saracenic architecture in which the treatment of them is highly characteristic. Nothing has been said of the rooms and offices pertaining to College-mosques; in most cases they are in such a ruined state that description is well nigh impossible, but some account is desirable for without it the reader's view of such colleges must be incomplete. As students in thousands still live in the Azhar mosque and receive food rations, the teaching and living arrangements for them and their officers might have been described in relation to the congeries of buildings composing El-Azhar, whereas the quarters devoted to each nationality of students are not even mentioned. The great mosque of Said Aḥmed el-Bedawî at Tanṭah receives large numbers of students and could have been used as a subsidiary illustration, though not of course as a guide, for it is completely modernized.

The author, p. 199, notices the ignorant, clumsy way in which the Saracens treated the pillars and capitals which they tore out of Christian buildings throughout the Near East; it may be added that capitals are sometimes inverted and often used as bases for pillars; it is a strange freak that artists so keenly alive to beauty should have spoiled their work by this persistent error, which might have been easily corrected; we are justified in deducing that Coptic artisans had no voice in the matter.

With regard to joggle-stones (pp. 188-9), it appears impossible that the extreme examples of seeming stereotomy, with their re-entering curves, can be indeed what they seem, and close examination would most

<sup>1</sup> *Some Cairo mosques and their Founders*; London, Constable, 1921.

likely show that they are mere veneers. The author recognizes this for the prayer-niche shown in fig. 96, and Gayet (*L'art arabe*, p. 151) points to veneering on monolith lintels and shows that the cut-out sides of excessively joggled voussiors break up in spite of the fact that they are often protected from superincumbent weight by hidden arches built above them. These complicated patterns in variously coloured stones were doubtless meant to strike the eye as one enters and to give, as it were, the keynote of the sumptuous decoration to be found within and so they find a true place in the general plan, but they inevitably suggest structural weakness and the amateur of good architecture may be excused if he takes austerer views and prefers more sober work, finding in this too much display, too jewel-like a scheme.

It is pleasant to find place given to domestic architecture, of which Chap. IX provides a good account, sufficient to explain its main features and their meanings. The houses of Damascus, however, receive too succinct a treatment (pp. 161-2); there are many fine ones, spacious and comely, as a visit to the gallery of the 'Issa minaret will show, and some of them are splendid indeed (v. figs. 168-70.) May we hope for a fuller account in the next edition?

With regard to Egyptian houses the following notes may perhaps be useful. The brick ornamentation mentioned on pp. 160-1 and 185-6 is not uncommon in towns of Upper Egypt; its extreme manifestation is perhaps found in some small tombs on the eastern Nile-bank a little south of Fûa, in the Delta, which are worthy of illustration. (It may be noted that the mud from the Nile-banks near its mouth is renowned for brick-making qualities, and the best brickwork is found in towns of these districts.) The origin of this decoration is given by Professor Lethaby as Persian.

The remains of domestic buildings found, up to 1920, at Fostâṭ (p. 154) show much use of arched windows and vaulted roofs, quite un-Egyptian in style and pointing, it seems, to Mesopotamian origin—of course other styles may be discovered. In Upper Egypt may still be seen traces of the Ancient Egyptian style; in many places the outer walls of the higher houses, built of sun-dried bricks, take the slope, natural for mud, that is noticeable in the monuments of Ancient Egypt, and the conspicuous tower-like dove-cotes show the same lines, but with greater slope. The Khan Khalîfî (p. 162) was built in 1400 A.D. by Gerkas el-Khalîfî and not by Sultan Ghûri, who rebuilt it, and so his name is still held in honour by the older merchants of the Bazaar who call him affectionately "Baba (=papa) Ghûri" and believe that he treated their predecessors with special consideration<sup>1</sup>.

The chapter on Saracenic ornament (X) is of great interest but would be improved by omitting descriptions of objects outside the scope of architecture<sup>2</sup>; the treatment of them is necessarily brief, and, in view of the many difficult points impossible to discuss in a book like this, inconclusive. With it may be grouped the chapters on crafts; were they confined to the application of crafts to architectural objects, more room could be advantageously made for the discussion of notable buildings not now described, as well as for more detail in some that have been.

It may be noted that carved wood panels of the kind mentioned at the head of p. 215 have been found in "Old Cairo" and several are exhibited in the interesting Coptic Museum, attached to the Church of the V. Mary, for which we are much indebted to the enlightened energy of Morcos Pasha Simaika. Some of them display human figures drinking, playing musical instruments, etc., similar to that on the ivory plaque in the Bargello, Florence, shown in Migeon's *Art Musulman*, II, fig. 132, and to many figures in Mōsul brass-work, Rhages polychrome pottery and Persian lusted tiles and vessels, dating from the end of the 12th to the beginning of the 14th century.

<sup>1</sup> It may be of interest to record that the bazaar name for celadon porcelain is *ghûri*, this sultan, it is said, having shown great predilection for it; it is held by the merchants that he caused the Cairo potters to make the earthenware imitations of it still to be found. The tradition may perhaps be incorrect; it is recorded by Ibn Eyās that at the time of the Turkish conquest, a few years after Sultan Ghûri, blue-and-white Chinese porcelain was in great fashion with the rich; from other Arabic sources we learn that "green porcelain," which must be celadon, was most esteemed, and, later, brilliant white porcelain. Certain magical operations, described in chap-books of today, can only be carried out in a green vessel—a relic of the medieval notions about the magical virtues of celadon.

<sup>2</sup> One of these objects is the famous brass griffin of Pisa, of which the author (p. 169), following Gayet, conjectures that it was an idol for Sultan Hâkim's new religion (the local guide-book used to call it a "Mahometan idol"!); but if we may judge from the practice of the Druses who follow, as they believe, his teachings, he was a true mystic, probably of atheistic tendencies.

The author also attributes mythical beasts in Saracenic art to China, but they are really the offspring of Mesopotamia, always prolific of such creatures.

Much mention is made of bronze on doors, etc., but a close examination of the objects themselves will show in most, if not all, cases that they are really of brass. This is clearly stated by Herz Pasha in the *Catalogue of the National Museum of Arabic Art, Cairo*, and the author himself, p. 222, first describes the door-plates of the mosque of Ṭalāʾī us-Ṣāliḥ as of bronze but a few lines further, following the *Catalogue*, says they are of sheet brass. Similarly, in the translation of Nāṣir-i-Khosran's description of the plated doors of the great Jerusalem mosque (p. 220) "copper" should be "brass" (there is confusion between the two in French as in Arabic, and doubtless Schefer's French version has been used).

With regard to the manufacture of glass (p. 225), its history in Egypt begins very early and is continuous to the Coptic period; it cannot have stopped at the Muslim conquest, for many fragments have been dug out from the ruins of Foṣṭāṭ, and the remains of a kiln have been discovered there by an amateur and specimens from it given to the British Museum.

Glazed earthenware, like glass, has a very long and continuous history in Egypt and the question of first origin in medieval times (p. 230) does not in fact arise. This is not so, however, with the much disputed lustred ware (pp. 229-30); it seems now that priority must be yielded to Mesopotamia, since the discoveries of Dr. Sarre at Samārrā; typical examples found by him and dated to the 9th century A.D. are now in the British Museum. The remarkable bowl found in Upper Egypt and now in M. Kelekian's loan exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum, with its Christian subject and the cross looped at the head in the ancient Egyptian style (*ʿonkh*), shows that the art soon came to Egypt.

The mosaics of the great mosque of Damascus are discussed by the author, but the panel discovered over the prayer-niche in the Cult-mosque of Ḳalāʾīn during the restoration mentioned on p. 101 has apparently not been seen by him. It is of Byzantine glass mosaic, rich in gold and floral scrolls; a second edition will doubtless give some account of it.

The treatment of Saracenic influences on European art (p. 239) is in some particulars not full enough; the value, for example, of Kufic lettering for decorative purposes was widely known by medieval European artists—many examples have been published by Mr. A. H. Christie in recent numbers of the *Burlington Magazine*. We may also refer to the remarkable examples of early faience found in the last few years at Orvieto and the earlier kinds of Florentine faience, full of Saracenic reminiscences.

An interesting detail omitted is the carving on the porch of Sultan Ḥasan's mosque, where, on the right hand side, are low-reliefs remarkably like those of Europe at the end of the 13th century. They represent churches, and as one of them has a dome like that on the great mosque of Jerusalem, the work has been attributed to a Syrian; Herz Pasha considered these panels as a kind of sign-manual of the chief artist, but Captain K. A. C. Creswell has shown that they were pieces looted from Palestine when taken from the Crusaders, as were the little Gothic columns flanking the main prayer-niche; he has also found fragments of the same origin in other buildings<sup>1</sup>.

Some notes on architects and craftsmen may be of interest in connection with the author's remarks on pp. 92-3. We must be careful not to take too seriously the words of the later chroniclers such as Maḳrīzī, for, unlike the earlier ones, notably the admirable Ibn Gobayir, they delight in all things marvellous and excessive and are ready to perpetuate almost any floating story if only it bears those qualities. Maḳrīzī's report of the lash, etc., under which the common labourer doubtless suffered, shows what struck him as an outstanding circumstance of the building, and he takes no account of the artistic craftsman. We have, however, good evidence that the Mamelukes in their artistic zeal not only encouraged native experts but attracted foreign ones from abroad. The contemporary chronicler Ibn Eyās, describing the dire deeds of the conquering Turks, relates<sup>2</sup> that the Sultan Selīm, greatly struck by the magnificence of the recently built College-mosque of El-Ghūrī, sent away many hundreds of workmen, of many crafts, to Constantinople to build him a similar monument, but they never arrived. It is specially noteworthy that they included Persians, Syrians, Moors, Copts and Jews, and even Arabs of the Hejāz—Cairo must indeed have been a hive of artistic activity. Even straw-mat makers came there from Abadan in Persia, a town famous for that

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, xxi (1922), 51-4.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. III, pp. 116-18, 122, 126 of the Būlāḳ edition, 1311, A.H. (1893-4, A.D.), the only one, now out of print, but the part containing the Turkish conquest has recently been translated. A serviceable digest of these passages may be found in vol. IV, pp. 1-32, of *L'Égypte Contemporaine* (Cairo; Impr. de l'Institut Français de l'Archéologie Orientale, 1913), written by Aḥmed Pasha Zeki, an ardent amateur. It is interesting to note that, according to Diodorus Siculus (bk I, ch. 46), Cambyses deported artisans from Egypt to Persia for a similar purpose. The story at least points to the early existence of this practice in the East.

industry (the popular Egyptian name for fine straw-mats is still *abadani*). Aḥmed Pasha Zeki's library in Cairo, which was, and still probably is, open to students, contains a petition dug up from the ruins of Fostât a few years ago, asking that two Persians from Abadan should be exempted from poll-tax, for they had come to Cairo to establish their craft.

The methods of architects and craftsmen are discussed by the author (pp. 92-3 and 177-8; cp. Gayet, pp. 147-8 and Saladin, pp. 13-14): a comparison with modern practice in Egypt will perhaps throw some useful light on the subject.

In Egypt today the commemorative mosque is entrusted to a master-builder with a knowledge of old traditions and reputed for active intelligence; he dresses as a superior workman and carries in his pocket a large and well-worn note-book filled with designs of architectural details, floral scrolls, geometrical patterns, etc.; he has come under the influence of Herz Pasha<sup>1</sup> and knows where the best work, especially the decorative, is to be found in the old mosques of Cairo. For the ground lay-out he goes to a European versed in the mysteries of modern sanitation and the requirements of the Public Health Department, which are beyond his ken. The stones to be used are brought to the site rough-hewn, there to be dressed by the masons with that universal tool of Ancient Egypt, the adze, under the direct supervision of the master. The decorations are laid out by him as the building proceeds, he marks out in charcoal lines the designs of the sculptured work, to be executed by his carvers in stone; the finer work he may perhaps do himself. He does not prepare in advance a complete finished drawing of his design, but keeps it in a somewhat fluid state in his head, with frequent recourse to his note-book. Thus the art of building is here indeed a "mystery," as in older times all such processes were termed, and its products are very personal; should a master die, not leaving his knowledge and note-books to a successor, the loss to his art might be great.

These methods, which still produce some really pleasant results, were doubtless those of the medieval masters, for they fit in wholly with the few records on the subject left by the chroniclers, with the exception, of course, of the part played by the Public Health Department. Further, the bag of plaster derided by Gayet becomes not only intelligible but natural, when one considers how the modern Egyptian acts when having a house built for him. He sits on a chair before the growing building, an umbrella over his head, and gives directions for changes or additions as they come to his fancy, of course consulting the master-builder. In towns this way is now mostly impossible, owing to the exigencies of the Street Service (*tanzim*), but not in open country. Very commonly a part only of the house is finished and then inhabited; the rest may, or may not, be finished—thus 'Abdul-Latîf's account is well vindicated (p. 93). Again, the traditional story of the architect whose hand the jealous tyrant cuts off, though probably a mere folk-tale applied to various splendid buildings as it has been to Sultan Ḥasan's mosque<sup>2</sup>, gains point, for our master-builder, if thus mutilated, would be struck helpless, while today European training and office methods might conceivably allow a handless architect, though handicapped, still to engender meritorious works.

As for the patron Mamelukes, they were the Renaissance princes of their times, turbulent, vicious, careless, but eager lovers of the arts they had. Certainly, if Arabic chronicles be true, the Mamelukes in their excesses outdid the Italians, but the reason may well be that while the former ruled a people alien to them and abundantly submissive before cruelty, Italian princes had to deal with the hardiness and subtlety of their own race. In both cases the eminently vicious might still be great promoters of the arts and it seems unnecessary to give the credit of Sultan Ḥasan's mosque to his ministers, as the author (p. 107) and others have done.

Of the minor crafts some have been revived and good workmen trained in the shops by European cabinet-makers, notably in brass-work, fine turned lattice-work (*mashrabîyah*), and the making of the fine polygonal panel-work found in old pulpits. The last good example of a pulpit in the old tradition is that of the great mosque of Ṭanṭah; it was finished about fifty years ago and was the work of an old man who took several years over it; the joiners of today, who honour it much, ignoring the work due to Europeans, say that it is the last specimen of the old type. Pierced plaster windows (*kamarîyah*) are still made, but not in the old way (pp. 227-8), for stencil-like patterns are cut out of thick wood and the liquid plaster is poured into them, giving straight walls to the plaster when set; chamfering may be done afterwards but the effect, like the work, must of course be mechanical and in beauty far inferior to the originals.

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Director of the Service of Preservation of Monuments of Arab Art, whose services, backed by the responsible Committee, have been of the greatest value; it is pleasant to find that they are recognized by the author, as by most other lovers of this art.

<sup>2</sup> Some chroniclers relate that the Sultan treated his architect with proper generosity.

However, Cairo possesses a vigorous School of Arts and Crafts, some of whose professors are fully alive to the old craftsmanship; Egyptian hands and brains for such work are still very keen, as a turn round the bazaars will show—nor must we forget the forged antiquities of Upper Egypt—and so, if the more wealthy public will give practical support, Egypt may again produce even monumental things of beauty. We may perhaps hope that a national government will give its aid in a matter of such really national interest.

Considering the highly technical character of much of the book and the many words in Arabic, so uncouth, the freedom from misprints is remarkable; we may note, p. 48, 1884 for 884, and p. 67 (end of the Fatimids) 1711 for 1171. On p. 45, while *muëzzin* is spelt, after the system of the British Academy, *mu'adhhdhin*, the call to prayer is termed *adân*, though by the same system it should be *adhân*. The pulpit is spelt throughout *mimbar*, but should be *minbar*, the former representing colloquial pronunciation.

The Arabic words used are nearly all correct, but it should be noted in the glossary that the proper term for minaret is *midhanah* (colloquially *madnah*; = the "place for calling to prayer"), *manâreh* meaning "the place for lights" and indicating a secondary purpose of the minaret. On p. 8 the usual translation of *Fostât* as "tent" is given, but it has long been shown that this word is derived from the Latin *fossatum* and originally meant a "military camp" and derivatively a "multitude of persons," "tent" being a still later derived meaning (cp. *širât*, "a street," from *stratum*). On p. 124, l. 11, the loggia-like *kuttâb* of Kâit-Bay's mosque is called a *sebil*. *Zayyât* (p. 226) is the "oil-man," not "cleaner." The word *mashrabîah* (pp. 147-9), commonly used by Europeans and bazaar men to denote window-screens of turned lattice-work, never means that in good Arabic but, as the author says, the little niche in the screen in which porous earthenware jars (*kullah*) are placed to cool the water they contain; it is derived from *mashrab*, = "a drink," and not, as has been suggested, from *mashrabah*, "an upper chamber" (as being that in which people drink), nor *ishrâb*, "to stretch the neck to look," as one does to drink.

As to history, Shagar-ud-durr (p. 93) reigned alone only three months, when she married her second husband, the mameluke Eybek; she was a figure of romance and her name has eclipsed his, but he was not a mere *fainéant*. On p. 70 the restoration of Hâkim's mosque after an earthquake is first given as in 1303 A.D., and a few lines later in 1309; according to Lane Poole the earthquake took place in 1303 and the restoration in the next year.

Finally, as this book should certainly find its way into the hands of many students and amateurs unacquainted with Arabic, it would be an improvement in later editions to make as little use as possible of the terminology of that language, nor is it necessary; why should we call a pulpit a *minbar* or a prayer-niche a *mihrâb*; cannot a *şahn* be rightly termed a central court, a *liwan* (strictly *iwân*) an arched recess, *makşrah* a sanctuary, and so on? Even the common *mashrabîah*, being incorrect, might be dropped for "turned lattice-work." And in English, why write "lintol" for "lintel," a spelling used by some architects, but with no authority (*v.* the *New English Dictionary*), and "style" for "stile" (an upright in carpentry), a very modern corruption?

A last improvement would be to delete the allusions to our troops and their operations scattered throughout the book, for, where they occur, they produce an almost journalistic air derogatory to the dignity of the subject and of the work itself.

But this is a small blemish, easily effaced; let us conclude with real thanks to the author for his painstaking presentment of a fascinating theme.

G. D. HORNBLOWER.

*Champollion*. By Professor E. NAVILLE. Genève: Soc. Anonyme des éditions "Sonor," 1922.

Professor Naville sends us a short pamphlet published by him in Switzerland on the occasion of the Champollion Festival at Paris in 1922. In this brochure, which is excellently printed, M. Naville describes for Swiss readers the work of the French pioneer Egyptologist, and does so in an interesting and suggestive manner, noting the influences which combined to make the young Champollion the first decipherer of ancient Egyptian, and tracing in detail his short though brilliant career. Full justice is done to Young, "qui s'était occupé du déchiffrement des hiéroglyphes, et qui, il faut bien lui rendre cette justice, avait réussi à déterminer quatre lettres qu'il avait tirées des Ptolémée et Bérénice. Il en resta là...." It is therefore (apart from its injustice) quite useless to try to ignore Young, who was on the right track and anticipated Champollion. But—*il en resta là*, and so lost his opportunity of developing his knowledge, which would have made him the Adams of Egyptology, with Champollion as its Le Verrier.

H. R. HALL.



*Excavations at Ur of the Chaldees*, by C. LEONARD WOOLLEY. From the *Antiquaries' Journal*, Oct. 1923 (Vol. III, No. 4). Sold at the British Museum.

Mr. C. L. Woolley's first preliminary report on the renewed work at Ur of the Chaldees is of the highest interest. It may be a theme of good-humoured dispute whether the excavations of the Weld-Blundell and Chicago expedition at Kish or those of the British Museum and Philadelphia expedition at Ur are the more fruitful and important. Those of us who have worked at Ur may be excused if we regard our work as carrying off the palm in respect of the interest and importance of the buildings and objects discovered.

The work at Ur, which is now being carried out by a joint expedition financed by the British Museum and the University Museum, Philadelphia, is of British inception so long ago as the days of the Crimean War, when Mr. G. E. Taylor, British Vice-Consul at Basrah, was commissioned by the Trustees of the British Museum to excavate at Tell el-Muqayyar, which R. K. Loftus and other previous travellers had indicated as a promising place for excavation. Taylor dug there and at Shahrein (Eridu) as well as at Tell el-Lahm, not far off, and the results of his work were published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1855. His antiquities are in the British Museum, where they have only recently come to be appreciated in their correct *mise-en-scène* now that the renewed excavations have told us so much that is new.

After Taylor's time the work dropped and was not resumed till the Director decided to take advantage of our military occupation of Babylonia by resuming the Museum's long interrupted work at Tell el-Muqayyar, which was now known to be the Biblical Ur of the Chaldees. Accordingly Captain R. Campbell Thompson, formerly an assistant in the Egyptian and Assyrian Department, and a well-known archaeologist and cuneiform scholar, who happened to be serving in Mesopotamia on the Intelligence staff, was commissioned by the Museum to inaugurate the resumed work, and he did so at Ur in the early part of 1918. After turning the first sod, so to speak, at Ur, Captain Thompson however preferred to work at Shahrein. His work there was taken up by myself in the next season, but has since not been resumed by Mr. Woolley, but is reserved for future operations. I succeeded Captain Thompson in charge of the Museum's diggings in February 1919, owing to his inability to return from Europe to Mesopotamia then; and although I did some work at Shahrein in order to carry on that of Thompson, the major portion of my work was done at Ur and at the small site of Tell el-'Obeid, four miles away: this work, which had to be broken off at the end of May, 1919, owing to the heat, has been completed in the present year by Mr. Woolley. At Ur part of one face of the ziggurat was cleared by me to the foundation, laying bare the lowest steps of the great stairway which in 1924 was shown to lead up on this face from each corner to a landing where it was met by a third stair rising directly against the centre of the face. I also found the temenos-wall of the temple and excavated a short portion of its length on the east side, besides uncovering an interesting building of the time of the Third Dynasty of Ur, with additions of a much later period, which Mr. Newton thinks is part of the temple of the moon-god Nannar, the tutelary deity of Ur. Several tombs were also excavated, and the description of the whole work will be found in my article in the *Journal*, ix (1923), p. 177 ff. (Ur and Eridu; the British Museum Excavations of 1919).

So much work had been done before Mr. Woolley came upon the scene. Owing to political and other difficulties the Museum was not able to resume operations after my visit until 1922, when I was unable to go out again, so that my place was taken by Mr. Woolley, who had already excavated for the Museum at Carchemish. With the British Museum was now associated the University Museum, Philadelphia, in the prosecution of the work. With Mr. Woolley went my junior colleague Mr. Sidney Smith as Assyriologist, and Mr. F. G. Newton as architect; they were later joined by Mr. A. W. Lawrence. Mr. Woolley's article in the *Antiquaries' Journal*, now before us, which is sold at the British Museum in a separate form, gives an excellent idea of what was accomplished in the season of 1922-3, and should be read in conjunction with and as a continuation of my article on Ur in this *Journal*. This will enable the development of the work to be traced uninterruptedly; and the reader will see from comparison of the plans in the two articles how the temenos-wall grew under Mr. Woolley's hands from the short stretch on one side which I found to the complete tracing of its whole length, surrounding the ziggurat (though of course not always perfect and sometimes only to be discovered with the eye of faith), and how the entirely new discovery was made of the temple Ê-nun-mah, with its extremely interesting stratification, where in my plan there is a blank whereas in Mr. Woolley's later plan appears a large building, bigger than what remains of my building "B," the shrine of Nannar(?). Then also one reads of Mr. Woolley's special finds, the headless diorite statue of Entemena, patesi of Lagash, which has now gone back to Baghdad, the queer little black steatite vase in the form of a bull with the moon and stars carved upon it, and the

other vase with a relief of a two-headed horned devil with lions careering about him, which are in the British Museum, and the remarkable jewels of the Persian period which are divided between the British Museum and Philadelphia. An oddly disappointing find was made: a foundation-deposit of building "B" was discovered, with a copper or bronze figure of the dedicating king as a basket-bearer, and his dedicatory tablet, which should have been inscribed with his names and titles, but, to the disgust of all of us, is blank, without a sign upon it. So that we do not know who built building "B," but he must have been a king of the Third Dynasty and was most probably Ur-Nammu. By the way, we hope that Mr. Woolley will not continue to call Ur-Nammu "Ur-Engur" and Shulgi "Dungi," as he does in this paper: the new readings of these names are fairly certain, and at any rate if a new reading is accepted by a majority of Assyriologists, as in this case, it should be adopted, and the old reading either abandoned or preserved in the honourable retirement of square brackets.

The foundation-deposit has gone back with the statue to Baghdad, where the Iraq Government is beginning to form a local museum, for which half the jewellery and many of the other objects found were retained. The objects from the excavations have thus now to be divided between three institutions, but enough was found in the first season since the resumption of work to satisfy all three, and the further results of the season of 1923-4 at El-'Obeid have been so successful that, with the results of my work there in 1919, the British Museum will now be equipped with collections of Sumerian art and antiquities in no way second to those of the Louvre (which came chiefly from the excavations of de Sarzec at Telloh), while the two others will possess collections only second to those of Paris and London. Mr. Woolley will probably have published his account of this work in the *Antiquaries' Journal* for October, 1924, before these lines of appreciation of his earlier article appear. And those who have not seen it will be well advised to read it in continuation of my former article in our *Journal*, 1922, p. 241 ff. (The Discoveries at Tell el-'Obeid in Southern Babylonia and some Egyptian comparisons), in which I described my unfinished excavations of 1919 at El-'Obeid, which Mr. Woolley has now completed with such success.

H. R. HALL.

*Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek.* Band I, Heft 3 (*Urkunden No. 57-117 und Indices*). Von PAUL M. MEYER. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner; Hamburg: C. Boysen, 1924. Pp. 211-269.

The Hamburg collection of papyri, though not large as compared with those of institutions like the Berlin Museum, the British Museum, etc., is a valuable one and contains not a few texts of outstanding interest, and Prof. Meyer's editions, owing not merely to the knowledge and acumen which have placed their author in the front rank of papyrologists but also to the detailed commentaries with which he furnishes them, are always specially valuable. The first part of this catalogue was published in 1911 and the second in 1913. The present instalment, completing the volume, was delayed by the war, and as compared with the other two shows clearly the effects of post-bellum conditions. The type throughout is smaller, the texts are printed continuously, not in the line-divisions of the originals, as in the previous parts, the translations have been omitted and the indexes reduced in plan, and the commentaries are briefer than before, though still showing the wealth of bibliographical reference which gives Meyer's editions so special a value. The editorial work is however of the same high quality as of old.

Some of the most noteworthy texts had previously been published by Meyer separately, but there are several new ones which make a valuable addition to our material. There are some Ptolemaic papyri and one of the Byzantine period. Of the former the interesting no. 57 had already been published; thirteen, all more or less fragmentary, come from the Zeno archive. The one Byzantine text (68) evidently comes from another well-known archive, that of Dioscorus of Aphrodito. It is an interesting lease of land. Meyer thinks there is a plurality of lessors and queries "Erbengemeinschaft?" but the plural *ὑμεῖς* would be equally appropriate to the *δημόσιος λόγος* or a monastery; and that the lease was actually from a monastery is made extremely probable by ll. 42-44, where the lessee undertakes to deliver the rent and landlord's share of the produce *εἰς τὸ ὄρος*. Almost certainly *ὄρος* is here used in the common sense of *μοναστήριον*; in l. 25 Meyer reads *ἐπ' ἀναβάσει βονῆ*, which he takes as "im Falle guter Nilschwelle," thus apparently identifying *βονῆ* with the Latin *bonus*. No doubt the true reading is *μόνη*; only if the inundation reaches the hill will this clause operate.

The majority of the texts are however of the Roman period. Several also of these (*e.g.* the interesting Latin will-formulary, no. 72, and the translation of a Latin protocol concerning the opening of a will no. 73) had been published previously, but it is useful to have them collected here, in an accessible place and indexed. There are two new fragments of *libelli libellaticorum* (61), and a good *παραχώρησις* of catocic land (62), a document relating to the transport of a mummy (74), and some interesting letters. In 69, 3, *ἐγλήμορες ...ρος* is puzzling: *ρ* is not marked as doubtful, or one might perhaps conjecture *κίκιος*. In 81, 11 f., it is surely unnecessary to correct *κατὰ τὰ κελυσθέντα* to *κ. τὰς κελυσθείσας*, as Meyer does. The meaning is "according to the instructions of the prefect." In 86, 24, Meyer corrects *πρόβασι* to *πρόβατα*, so that the meaning is "three arourae were bought for you by Vetranus for grass at 130 drachmae, and sheep have been sold by him for 68 drachmae." This does not strike me as very probable. May not *πρόβασι* be right, the meaning being "three arourae were bought for you by Vetranus for grass at 130 drachmae and have been sold by him (*i.e.* the grazing was sold) for sheep at 68 drachmae"? This is supported by ll. 11–13, where *τὸ ἀπὸ νότου περιχώμα τῶν δεκαεπτὰ ταῖς βουσί ἐπράθη* seems to refer to the sale of grazing. In 105, 14, is *σπαράσσοντα* possible? In 111, 8, *]σαν τόφθαλλον* is curious; should it not be *]σαντ' ὀφθαλμόν*?

H. I. BELL.

*Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten.* Von FRIEDRICH PREISIGKE. 1. Lieferung (a—δικη). Heidelberg: Selbstverlag des Herausgebers, 1924. (To be obtained from the author's daughter, Grete Preisigke, Gröbzig, Anhalt.)

It is not without a certain keen emotion that one takes up this volume, designed, as Prof. Gradenwitz tells us on the cover, by the author himself "as the completion of his activity" and now published, as Fate has willed, after his death. The work of which this is the first instalment is a worthy termination to a career extraordinarily fruitful of good and valuable work for papyrological studies—work undertaken not as part of a scholar's professional career but in the leisure left over from the duties of a civil servant occupying important and responsible posts. It is designed as a complete word-index to published papyri; and only those who have hunted for some word through a score or so of indexes and in unindexed texts can appreciate, on the one hand the laboriousness, on the other the utility of the undertaking. This first instalment enables a judgement to be formed on the work as a whole; and it can be said at once that it is planned on the right lines and executed with complete success. A full statement of the principles followed will be given in the introduction, to be included in the last part; in the meantime short explanations are printed inside the front cover and on a leaflet enclosed with this instalment.

The work is not a glossary or lexicon but a true index, which aims at citing every occurrence of a word, but meanings are added. In the case of words which have many shades of meaning these are distinguished, often with illustrative quotations; and there are also references to recent literature in the case of many technical terms. The general word-index, in which all words are included, will be followed by special indexes for technical words of various classes.

The arrangement is admirable, both clear and compressed; dates are indicated for all the principal references, and in the case of words like *ἀγαθός* the uses are excellently classified, phrases such as *ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ* being separately entered.

It may be taken for granted in any work of this kind that it will contain errors, omissions, whether of words or meanings, and faulty classifications, and I have noticed one or two such in this instalment (*e.g.* *δεσποινικός* means not so much "im kaiserlichen Hausdienste stehend" as specifically "pertaining to the Empress" [*δέσποινα*]; *γλυκέλαιον* should probably be *γλυκελαία* [see my *Jews and Christians*, 87 f.]; *ἀδελφή* is not merely "leibliche Schwester" but also an honorific title for a wife, like *ἀδελφός* for husband [so, correctly, Preisigke, *s.v.*]; though in individual cases this is usually uncertain, there are some clear instances, *e.g.* P. Oxy. 1070); but they do not seem to be at all numerous. The work appears indeed to have been performed with the most exemplary care and judgement, and Preisigke has once more laid all papyrologists under heavy obligations to him. He is beyond the reach of thanks; but our gratitude must be expressed to the scholars, in particular Prof. Kiessling and the Juristische Fakultät at Heidelberg, who have made possible the appearance of the work.

H. I. BELL.

*The Problem of the Obelisks.* By R. ENGELBACH, Assoc. C. and G. Inst., etc. London: T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd., 1923.

Mr. Engelbach has chosen an appropriate title for his book, for the manner in which these huge monoliths were handled, transported and erected has throughout the ages been a problem which seemed well-nigh insoluble. No one can ever behold even our modest "Cleopatra's Needle" at close quarters without being impressed by its vast mass. This monument, however, is a mere baby compared with the great obelisk lying unfinished in the quarry at Aṣwân. The latter has been exhaustively studied by the author in a special monograph published by the Service des Antiquités in 1922. He now gives us the substance of this technical work in a popular form, bereft of abstruse calculations and details, but lacking nothing of interest or of value. Mr. Engelbach has provided a solution which is almost certainly correct. He has the advantage of being not only an architect, but also an engineer and a mathematician, and by means of observation and deduction, by means of models and experiments, he has worked out with great clearness and acumen a difficult problem, and has produced a book which should appeal not only to archaeologists, but to architects and engineers as well. The illustrations, which are admirably produced, add great value to the work.

WARREN R. DAWSON.

Among other books received for review we note the following:

*Mémoires sur les anciennes branches du Nil. Époque arabe.* Tome I, Part II. (*Mémoires présentés à la Société Archéologique d'Alexandrie.*) By Prince OMAR TOUSSOUN. Cairo, 1923.

*Social Life in Ancient Egypt.* By Sir FLINDERS PETRIE. London, 1923.

*Éléments de bibliographie hittite.* By G. CONTENAU. Geuthner, Paris, 1922.

*La glyptique syro-hittite.* (*Haut-Commissariat de la République Française en Syrie et au Liban. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, II.*) By G. CONTENAU. Geuthner, Paris, 1922.

*Code hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure (vers 1350 av. J.-C.) (Hethitica, Tome I).* By F. HROZNY. Geuthner, Paris, 1922.

Dr. Hall asks us to print the following letter:

BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON, W.C. 1.  
August 25, 1924.

DEAR SIR,

I wish to correct an error into which I have fallen in my review of M. Speleers' "Figurines funéraires égyptiennes" (*Journal*, 1924, p. 176), which makes the author say directly the opposite of what he intended to say and actually does say. Owing, I suppose, to the small print of M. Speleers' note and presumably a growing need of spectacles on my part, I unluckily read the word "infirmant" in his footnote (5) on p. 3 as "confirmant," with the result of making him believe that there were no ushabti-figures made after the XXVIth Dynasty, whereas in reality he says just the opposite: "nos constatations infirment aussi l'opinion de ceux qui prétendirent qu' 'après la XXVI<sup>e</sup> dynastie il n'y a plus de figurines' (Comme S. BIRCH, etc.)."

I can only express my great regret that I should have misread M. Speleers' note and so given a wrong impression of his views on this point.

He explains to me the mysterious reference to "Set so-and-so" in a description of illustrations of certain objects in the British Museum as meaning a "set" of the picture-postcards published by the Museum. I confess this had escaped me, as he did not mention picture-postcards at all.

Yours, etc.,

H. R. HALL.

The Editor of the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

## LIST OF PLATES

	PAGE
A STATUE OF HOREMHAB BEFORE HIS ACCESSION.	
Plate I. Statue of Horemhab . . . . .	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Plate II. Statue of Horemhab . . . . .	<i>between 2-3</i>
Plate III. Statue of Horemhab . . . . .	<i>between 2-3</i>
Plate IV. Inscriptions from the statue of Horemhab . . . . .	<i>between 2-3</i>
A PECULIAR FORM OF NEW KINGDOM LAMP.	
Plate V. Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers . . . . .	9
Plate VI. Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers . . . . .	11
Plate VII. Egyptian lamps, candles and tapers . . . . .	13
A RARE VIGNETTE FROM THE BOOK OF THE DEAD.	
Plate VIII. Vignette from a funerary papyrus (Louvre 3074) . . . . .	40
THE REPRESENTATION OF SHAWLS WITH A RIPPLED STRIPE IN THE THEBAN TOMBS.	
Plate IX. 1-3. Representations of shawls of rippled material from Theban tombs.	
4. Similar material from Modern Greece . . . . .	41
NOTE ON THE EGYPTIAN PAPYRUS BOAT.	
Plate X. 1. Representation of papyrus canoe from Beni Hasan.	
2. Model in palm-fibre of reed canoe from Abyssinia . . . . .	46
A HEAD OF KING RAMESSES I FROM HIS TEMPLE AT ABYDOS.	
Plate XI. Ramesses I, from his temple at Abydos . . . . .	79
A LOST STATUE OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY.	
Plate XII. Ahmose, son of Seḳenenrē Ta'o II (from an old photograph) . . . . .	203
THE TOMBS OF THE KINGS OF THE SEVENTEENTH DYNASTY AT THEBES.	
Plate XIII. The itinerary of the inspectors in the Abbott Papyrus . . . . .	219
Plate XIV. Coffin of Sekhemrē-Wapma't Intef (in the Louvre)	
Coffin of Nubkheperrē Intef (in the British Museum) . . . . .	229
Plate XV. Canopic Box of Sekhemrē-Wapma't Intef (in the Louvre).	
Canopic Box of Sekhemrē-Wazkhau Sebekemsaf (in Leyden).	
Canopic Box of Sekhemrē-Smentawi Dhout (in Berlin) . . . . .	235
Plate XVI. Coffin of Seḳenenrē Ta'o II (in Cairo).	
Coffin of Queen Aḥhotp I (in Cairo) . . . . .	248
Plate XVII. Armlet of Kamose (in the Louvre).	
Armlet of Aḥhotp (in Cairo).	
Armlet of Aḥhotp (in Cairo) . . . . .	254
Plate XVIII. Ahmose, son of Seḳenenrē Ta'o II (from an old photograph) . . . . .	<i>between 256-7</i>
Plate XIX. Ahmose, son of Seḳenenrē Ta'o II (from an old photograph) . . . . .	<i>between 256-7</i>
Plate XX. Ahmose, son of Seḳenenrē Ta'o II (from an old photograph) . . . . .	<i>between 256-7</i>
Plate XXI. Coffin of Sekhemrē-Heruhirma't Intef (in the Louvre).	
Coffin of Wazkheperrē Kamose (in Cairo) . . . . .	260
AN EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY MEASURE OF CAPACITY.	
Plate XXII. Alabaster vase of Tuthmosis III . . . . .	283

	PAGE
EXCAVATIONS AT EL-'AMARNAH, 1923-24.	
Plate XXIII. 1. Sculptor's trial-piece. North Palace.	
2. Bronze knives from House Q. 46. 33.	
3. Doorpost from North Palace, bearing name of Merytaten . . . . .	289
Plate XXIV. Painted limestone figure of Akhenaten . . . . .	<i>between</i> 290-1
Plate XXV. Plan of House Q. 44. 1 . . . . .	<i>between</i> 290-1
Plate XXVI. 1. Mangers in House Q. 44. 1.	
2. House Q. 44. 1 from the west . . . . .	<i>between</i> 292-3
Plate XXVII. 1. Large house north of Et-Til, now rebuilt to form quarters for the Expe- dition.	
2. Granaries in House Q. 44. 1 . . . . .	<i>between</i> 292-3
Plate XXVIII. Plan of North Palace . . . . .	294
Plate XXIX. 1. Concrete foundations in north section of outer court. North Palace.	
2. Remains of trees. North Palace . . . . .	295
Plate XXX. Carved stone mangers in the North Palace . . . . .	296
Plate XXXI. Arcaded court with cubicles. North Palace . . . . .	297
Plate XXXII. Frescoes from cubicles. North Palace . . . . .	298
Plate XXXIII. 1. House of Pnehesi from the south-east.	
2. House of Pnehesi from the south-west . . . . .	<i>between</i> 302-3
Plate XXXIV. 1. Head of Akhenaten from the house of Pnehesi.	
2. The great garden, showing the beds . . . . .	<i>between</i> 302-3
Plate XXXV. Statue of Akhenaten from the shrine in the great garden . . . . .	303
Plate XXXVI. General plan of Akhetaten . . . . .	304
Plate XXXVII. Ptolemaic and Coptic fragments from EL-'Amarnah . . . . .	305

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT

	PAGE
UNPUBLISHED HEBREW, ARAMAIC AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS FROM EGYPT, JERUSALEM AND CARCHEMISH.	
Fig. 1 . . . . .	16
THE RITE OF OPENING THE MOUTH IN ANCIENT EGYPT AND BABYLONIA.	
Fig. 1. The statue standing upon a heap of sand with its face to the south . . . . .	53
Fig. 2. The statue being sprinkled with water from one of the four <i>nmst</i> -vessels . . . . .	53
Fig. 3. The statue being presented with a foreleg of beef . . . . .	54
Fig. 4. The mouth and eyes of the statue being opened with the adze called <i>dwt-wr</i> . . . . .	54
Fig. 5. The mouth of the statue being opened with a chisel . . . . .	55
A GRAMMATICAL EXERCISE OF AN EGYPTIAN SCHOOLBOY . . . . .	285, 286

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

	Reviewed by	PAGE
The Origin of Magic and Religion. W. J. Perry . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	63-69
History of Assyria. A. T. Olmstead . . . . .	Sidney Smith	70-74
Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte. Walter Wreszinski . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	75
Wadi Sarga: Coptic and Greek Texts from the Excavations undertaken by the Byzantine Research Account. Edited by W. E. Crum and H. I. Bell	H. G. Evelyn White	75-76
The Tomb of Tutankhamen. Jean Capart. Translated by Warren R. Dawson . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	76-77
Egyptian Art. Introductory Studies. Jean Capart. Translated by Warren R. Dawson . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	77
Les figurines funéraires égyptiennes. Louis Speleers . . . . .	H. R. Hall	176-178
Assyrian Medical Texts (Cuneiform). R. Campbell Thompson.		
Assyrian Medical Texts (Translations). R. Campbell Thompson . . . . .	Sidney Smith	178-180
Hammurabi's Gesetz. P. Koschaker and A. Ungnad . . . . .	Sidney Smith	180
Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae. C. Clemen.		
Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae. Th. Hopfner . . . . .	A. S. Hunt	180-181
Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie. Franz Dornseiff . . . . .	F. Ll. Griffith	181
Harvard African Studies, Volume iv. An English-Nubian Comparative Dictionary. G. W. Murray . . . . .	F. Ll. Griffith	181-182
Introduction à l'étude des hiéroglyphes. H. Sottas et E. Drioton . . . . .	F. Ll. Griffith	182
Light from Ancient Letters: Private Correspondence in the Non-Literary Papyri of Oxyrhynchus of the first four Centuries, and its Bearing on New Testament Language and Thought. Henry G. Meecham . . . . .	H. I. Bell	182-183
Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus Grecs. Publiés sous la direction de Pierre Jouguet avec la collaboration de Paul Collart et Jean Lesquier . . . . .	H. I. Bell	183-184
The Tomb of Puyemré at Thebes. Norman de Garis Davies . . . . .	H. R. Hall	184-185
De Egyptische Voorstellingen betreffende den Oerhevel. Adriaan de Buck	H. R. Hall	185-187
Amenofis IV. Henri Asselberg . . . . .	H. R. Hall	188
Frammenti di un testo storico in onore di Tutmosi III. Giuseppe Botti.		
Frammenti di registri di stato civile della XXa Dinastia. Giuseppe Botti.		
Il culto divino dei Faraoni. Giuseppe Botti . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	188-189
The Growth of Civilization. W. J. Perry . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	189
The Children of the Sun. W. J. Perry . . . . .	Louis C. G. Clarke	189-191
The Oxford Excavations in Nubia. F. Ll. Griffith . . . . .	W. R. Dawson	191-193
Die Literatur der Aegypter. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3 und 2 Jahrtausend v. Chr. Adolf Erman . . . . .	Aylward M. Blackman	193-201
Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East. I. Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and their Earliest Interrelations. H. Frankfort . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	338-339
Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society . . . . .	T. Eric Peet	339-340
Harvard African Studies, Volumes v, vi. Excavations at Kerma. George A. Reisner . . . . .	F. Ll. Griffith	340-341



NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

355

	Reviewed by	PAGE
Muhammadan Architecture in Egypt and Palestine. Martin S. Briggs . . . . .	G. D. Hornblower	341-346
Champollion. E. Naville . . . . .	H. R. Hall	346
Excavations at Ur of the Chaldees. C. Leonard Woolley . . . . .	H. R. Hall	347-348
Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek. Paul M. Meyer . . . . .	H. I. Bell	348-349
Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder usw. aus Ägypten. Friedrich Preisigke . . . . .	H. I. Bell	349
The Problem of the Obelisks. R. Engelbach . . . . .	Warren R. Dawson	350

## INDEX

- A**
- Aahmesit, 257.  
Aak, 34 ff.  
    statue of, 96.  
Abbott papyrus, 118, 222, 225, 265.  
‘Abd er-Razzak, 84.  
Abu Ḥammād, 28.  
Abydos, crude stele from, 119.  
    excavations at, 259.  
    Osiris of, 14.  
    temple of Ramesses I at, 79.  
Abyssinia, boats in, 46.  
Adaniaš, 110.  
Adet bark, 13.  
Aegean pottery at El-‘Amarnah, 293 ff.  
Aemilianus, Lucius Mussius, 80 ff.  
Aemilianus the “Tyrant”; J. GRAFTON MILNE, 80–82.  
    Summary of account of Aemilianus, 80.  
    Literary and numismatic evidence, 80–81.  
    Deductions from evidence, 81–82.  
Aetheria (Silvia Aquitana), 27.  
African population of Sinaitic peninsula, 34.  
Agathemerus, 38.  
Ahauty, 121.  
Aḥḥiawa, 105.  
Aḥḥotp, 219.  
Aḥmose, 24, 220.  
Aḥmose I, 218.  
Aḥmose of El-Kâb, 91.  
Aḥmose, statue of, 203.  
Aḥmose-Nefertiri, 256.  
Aḥmose-Sapair, 222 ff.  
Akhenaten, 4, 5, 289, 293.  
    head of, 302.  
    statue of, 303.  
Akhenaten period, Egyptian control in Palestine  
    after, 88.  
Akhetaten, 301.  
‘Akhor, 257, 258.  
Akkad, king of, 42.  
ALBRIGHT, W. F., 93.  
    The Town of Selle (Zaru) in the ‘Amarnah  
    Tablets, 6–8.  
Aleppo, 111.  
Alexandria, 208.  
    riot at, 80.  
    under Roman rule, 81.  
Alexandrian mint, 81.  
Algeria, ‘Abd er-Razzak of, 84.  
Amasis, king of Egypt, 17.  
Ambras papyrus, 117.  
Amen-em-Apt, 62.  
Amenit, 4.  
Amennakht, 265.  
Amenophis, statue of, 1, 4.  
    title of, 205.  
    tombs near temple of, 223.  
Amenophis I, 218.  
Amenophis II, 41, 43.  
    temple of, 224.  
Amenophis III, 43.  
    candles in reign of, 10.  
    palace of, 224.  
    stele with, 302.  
    temple of, 224.  
Amenrê, 4.  
Amentekh, 122.  
Amherst collection, inscriptions from, 133.  
Amorite names, 17.  
Amorites, 17.  
‘Amr, 207 ff.  
Amün, 4.  
    figure of, carved on forearm of statue, 1.  
    high priest of, 118.  
    house of, in Delta, 92.  
    laws of temple of, 5.  
    occurrence of, with Aten, 133.  
    treasure of, 125.  
Anastasi papyrus, 20, 22, 34, 88.  
Anastasius, Egyptian Church after, 209.  
Anḥiale, 105.  
Ani, 268.  
Anket, temple of, 122.  
‘Ankshernüfer, 34, 96.  
Antinoopolis, documents from, 145.  
Antonine Itinerary, 95.  
Anu of Nubia, 21.  
Arab conquest of Byzantine Egypt, 209.  
Arabia, 26.  
    nome of, 27.  
Arabian Gulf, 38.  
Arabic names, spelling of, 336.  
Archelais, 107.  
Arimmattaš, 111.  
Arinna, 109, 175.  
Armatana, 112.  
Arnuandaš, 109.  
Arsinoë, 39, 134 ff.  
    foundation of, 35.  
Artemidorus, 39.  
Artemisia, 135.  
Aruna, 175.  
Arzawa, 105.  
‘Asásif, 224.  
Ashdod, 24.  
Asia, military road to, 89.  
Asia Minor, 104 ff.  
    centre of culture in, 47.  
ASSELBERG, HENRI, *Amenofis IV* (reviewed), 188.  
Assyria, expedition of George Smith to, 17.  
Assyrian Empire, 113.  
Assyrian inscriptions, use of, in Syrian topography,  
    104.  
Aštarpa river, 106.  
Astrabad, origin of early civilisation of, 113.

- Aswan, Anket, mistress of, 122.  
 Atania, 110, 175.  
 Aten, horizon of, 304 ff.  
   occurrence of, with Amūn, 133.  
 Athanasius, St, 211.  
 Athribis, 31.  
 Ati canal of Heliopolis, 31.  
 Aton, liturgy in temple of, at El-'Amarnah, 62.  
 Atum, *see* Tum.  
 Atun of Sargon, 175.  
 Avaris, 21, 90 ff.  
   city of Hyksos, 24.  
   siege of, 91.  
   waters of, 92.  
 Augusta Historia, 80.  
 Augustus, 30.  
 Auhau, Auhauunti, 35.  
 Axamites of Abyssinia, 80.  
 Ay, 5.
- B**
- Ba'alat, 335.  
 Baali-amar, 16.  
 Baal-yomar, *see* Baali-amar.  
 Babylon, Egyptian, 17.  
   Marduk, god of, 48.  
   Nabuapaliddin of, 52 ff.  
 Babylonia, rippled fabric in, 42.  
 Babylonian civilisation, elements in common with Egyptian, 47.  
 Babylonian occupation of Palestine, 17.  
 Babylonian rite of washing and opening mouth, 47 ff.  
 Babylonian seal-cylinders, 17.  
 Bacchias, village of, 136.  
 Bailos, 31.  
 Bak, 264.  
 Balah Lake, 93.  
 Basil's Homilies, 83.  
 Bedâwîn, 34.  
   land of the, 20.  
   tribes and Egypt, 88.  
 Beersheba, 26, 39.  
 Beisân, excavations of Dr. Fisher at, 88.  
 Bekenkhons, 121.  
 Beksetyt, 121.  
 Belbeis, 31, 95.  
 BELL, H. IDRIS, 334  
   Bibliography (1922-1923): Graeco-Roman Egypt, 147-71.  
   The Decay of a Civilisation, 207-16.  
   A Musician's Contract, 145-6.  
   Obituary, Friedrich Preisigke, 172-3.  
   Reviews by, 182-3, 183-4, 348, 349.  
   with B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVI*, 214-16.  
 Benha, *see* Athribis.  
 Beni Hasan, 30.  
   tomb of Khnumhotp, 46.  
 Berlin magical papyrus, 84.  
 Bethshean, *see* Beisân  
 Bib-khuru-riyas, 5.  
 Bibliography (1923-1924): Ancient Egypt, F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A., F.B.A., 306-23.  
   1. General, 306-7.  
   2. Excavations and Explorations, 307-9.  
   3. Publication of Texts, 309-11.  
   4. History, 311-13.  
   5. Geography, 313.  
   6. Foreign Relations, 313-16.  
   7. Philology, 316-17.  
   8. Palaeography, 317.  
   9. Religion, 317-19.  
   10. Science, Mathematics, etc., 319.  
   11. Literature, 319-20.  
   12. Law, 320.  
   13. Archaeology, 320-3.  
   14. Personal, 323.  
 Bibliography (1923-1924): Christian Egypt, DE LACY O'LEARY, D.D., 324-30.  
   General, 324.  
   1. Biblical, 324.  
   2. Apocryphal, Gnostic, etc., 325.  
   3. Liturgical, 325-6.  
   4. Church Literature, 326-7.  
   5. History, 327-9.  
   6. Non-Literary Texts, 329.  
   7. Philology, 329-30.  
   8. Archaeology, etc., 330.  
 Bibliography (1922-1923): Graeco-Roman Egypt, A. Papyri, H. IDRIS BELL, 147-71.  
   1. Literary Texts, 147-53.  
   2. Religion, Magic, Alchemy, Astronomy, 153-7.  
   3. Publications of Non-Literary Texts, 157-61.  
   4. Political and Military History, Administration, Chronology, Topography, 161-5.  
   5. Social Life, Education, Economic History, Numismatics, 165-7.  
   6. Law, 167-8.  
   7. Palaeography and Diplomatic, 168-9.  
   8. Lexicography and Grammar, 169.  
   9. General works, Bibliography, Miscellaneous notes on Papyrus Texts, 169-70.  
   10. Miscellaneous and Personal, 171.  
 Bibliothèque du Musée Egyptien in Cairo, Catalogue of, 174.  
 Bigah, 120.  
 Biggainarešša, 109.  
 Bin-Ami, 17.  
 Binpu, 220, 256.  
 Birâbî, 262.  
 Bitter Lakes, 37.  
 BLACKMAN, AYLWARD M., D.Litt. The Rite of Opening the Mouth in Ancient Egypt and Babylonia, 47-59.  
   Review by, 193-201.  
 Boghaz Keui, 104.  
 Boghaz Keui Tablet, 5.  
 Book of the Dead, 40.  
 Boreux, Charles, 40.  
 BOTTI, GIUSEPPE, *Frammenti di un testo storico in onore di Tutmosi III* (reviewed); *Frammenti di registri di stato civile della XXa Dinastia* (reviewed); *Il culto divino dei Faraoni* (reviewed), 188-9.  
 Breasted, Professor J. H., 1, 46, 61, 97 ff.  
 BRIGGS, MARTIN S., F.R.I.B.A., *Muhammadan Architecture in Egypt and Palestine* (reviewed), 341-6.  
 Brugsch, H., 18, 22; at Denderah, 29.  
 Bubastis, 19, 21, 25, 26.  
   branch of Nile, 24.  
 Budge, Sir Ernest, 20, 62, 85.  
 BULL, LUDLOW S., Ph.D., A New Vizier of the Eleventh Dynasty, 15.

Byzantine Empire, 207 ff.  
 Byzantine Studies, establishment of periodical for,  
 174.

## C

- Caesarea, 115.  
 Cairo, statue of Amenophis in, 1.  
 Calycadnus, 105.  
 Canaan, 24.  
 Canaanite seal, 17.  
 "Cannibal Hymn" from The Pyramid Texts, The,  
 R. O. FAULKNER, 97-103.  
 Translation, 97-9.  
 Commentary on text, 99-100.  
 Literary Aspect, 100-2.  
 Religious Aspect, 102-3.  
 Canopus, 95.  
 CAPART, JEAN, 61.  
*Egyptian Art. Introductory Studies.* Translated  
 by WARREN R. DAWSON (reviewed), 77.  
*The Tomb of Tutankhamen.* Translated by  
 WARREN R. DAWSON (reviewed), 76-7.  
 Carchemish, 105.  
 identified with Jerablús, 17  
 Carian mercenaries, 21.  
 Carnarvon, Lord, excavations of, 262.  
 Castanet Dancers of Arsinoë, The; W. L. WESTER-  
 MANN, 134-44.  
 Text of contract, 134-5.  
 Notes on text, 135-6.  
 Discussion, 136-44.  
 Chaeremon, 87.  
 Chalcedon, Council of, 211.  
 Chaldaeans, 113.  
 Chalybes, 109.  
 Champollion Centenary, 9, 61.  
 Christian saints, cult of, in modern Egypt, 57.  
 Cilicia, 27.  
 Tracheia, 105.  
 CLARKE, LOUIS C. G., review by, 189-91.  
 CLEMEN, C., *Fontes Historiae Religionis Persicae*  
 (reviewed), 180-1.  
 Clusma, 36.  
 COLLART, PAUL, et PIERRE JOUGUET, *Institut Papy-  
 rologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus  
 Grecs*, Tome premier, fasc. III (reviewed),  
 183-4.  
 Comana, see Kumani.  
 Conder, 7.  
 CONTENAU, G., *Éléments de bibliographie hittite*  
 (received for review); *La glyptique Syro-  
 hittite* (received for review), 350.  
 Coptic Christianity, 209 ff.  
 Coptic element in population of El-'Amarnah, 300.  
 Coptic medical papyrus, 85.  
 Coptic signs corresponding to Egyptian, 22.  
 CRUM, W. E., and BELL, H. I., *Wadi Sarga: Coptic  
 and Greek Texts from the Excavations under-  
 taken by the Byzantine Research Account*;  
 Introduction by R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON  
 (reviewed), 75-6.  
 Cusae, 305.  
 Cydnus, 107.

## D

Daphnae, 27, 96.  
 Daressy, M., 32.

- Dattari, 82.  
 Dattaśaś, 111.  
 DAVIES, N. DE G., 61.  
 A Peculiar form of New Kingdom Lamp,  
 9-12.  
*The Tomb of Puyemrê at Thebes* (reviewed),  
 184-5.  
 DAWSON, WARREN R., F.Z.S., Note on the Egyptian  
 Papyrus Boat, 46.  
 The Mouse in Egyptian and Later Medicine,  
 83-6.  
 Note on Some Ostraka from El-'Amarnah,  
 133.  
 A Rare Vignette from the Book of the  
 Dead, 40.  
 Reviews by, 191-3, 350.  
 de Bellefonds, Linant, 26, 37.  
 de Blacas, L., 61.  
 DE BUCK, ADRIAAN, *De Egyptische Voorstellingen  
 betreffende den Oerhevel* (reviewed), 185-7.  
 Decay of a Civilisation, The, H. IDRIS BELL,  
 207 16  
 Introduction; decline of Byzantine power in  
 Egypt, 207-8.  
 L. Wenger; Volk und Staat, 208-9.  
 Jean Maspero; Histoire des Patriarches d'Alex-  
 andrie, 209-11.  
 G. Rouillard; L'Administration Civile de l'Égypte  
 Byzantine, 211-14.  
 B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, H. I. Bell, The Oxy-  
 rynchus Papyri, 214-16.  
 Delta, 21.  
 property of Amūn in, 92.  
 Demavend, 115.  
 Denderah, 29.  
 inscriptions at, 32, 94 ff.  
 temple at, 58.  
 Dêr el Bahrî, 15, 19, 21, 218 ff.  
 Dêr el-Medīnah, 10, 220 ff.  
 de Ricci, S., 61.  
 Dêr Mawās, 299.  
 Deveria, 40.  
 Dhout, 270.  
 Dhoutemhab, 120, 124.  
 Dhouthotpe, 124.  
 Diocletian, 213.  
 Diokles, 95.  
 Dionysiac Guild, 143.  
 Dioscorides, 84.  
 Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ, 217.  
 DORNSEIFF, FRANZ, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und  
 Magie* (reviewed), 181.  
 DRIOTON, E. et H. SOTTAS, *Introduction à l'étude  
 des hiéroglyphes* (reviewed), 182

## E

- Ebers papyrus, 84.  
 Edfu, temple at, 33.  
 Edom, Selah in, 7.  
 Egypt in Byzantine Age, 207 ff.  
 Egypt, lime not used in Pre-Roman, 128.  
 Middle, Roman rule in, 80.  
 professional entertainers in Roman, 137.  
 Selle frontier post of, 6.  
 Upper, 21-7.  
 Egyptian civilisation, elements in common with  
 Babylonian and South Russian, 47.

- Egyptian inscriptions at Tell el-Maskhûtah, 32.  
 Egyptian inscriptions, use of, in Syrian topography, 104.  
 Egyptian language classed among Semitic, 23 ff.  
 Egyptian name of Joseph, The; R. ENGELBACH, 204-6.  
   Objects to previous renderings of name, 204-5.  
   New rendering and explanation, 205-6.  
 Egyptian names, spelling of, 336 ff.  
 Eighteenth Dynasty Measure of Capacity, An, G. P. G. SOBHY, 283-4.  
   Description of measure, 283.  
   Other examples, 283-4.  
   Capacity of the *hin*, 284.  
 El-'Amarnah, 11, 29.  
   excavations at, 60, 133, 174, 289, 333.  
   liturgy in temple of Aton at, 62.  
   tablets, 6.  
 El-Bagawât, 331.  
 Elephantine, 118.  
   excavations at, 259.  
 El-Ĥâg Kandîl, excavations near, 60.  
 Elimelech, son of, 17.  
 El-Kâb, 276.  
   Ahmose of, 91.  
 Eloquent Peasant, The Story of The—A Suggestion, G. D. HORNBLOWER, B.A., 44-5.  
   Introduction; difference in style between narrative and petitions, 44.  
   Modern petition-writers, 44.  
   Explanation of story as collection of model speeches, 45.  
 Elysian Fields, 102.  
 Emery, W. B., 61, 289.  
 'En esh-Shems, 31.  
 ENGELBACH, R., The Egyptian name of Joseph, 204-6.  
   *The Problem of the Obelisks* (reviewed), 350.  
 Eridu, 58.  
 Erimma, 111.  
 Eriza, *see* Urušša.  
 ERMAN, ADOLF, 97 ff.  
   *Die Literatur des Aegypten. Gedichte, Erzählungen und Lehrbücher aus dem 3 und 2 Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (reviewed), 193-201.  
 Es-Sebû, temple of Tum Harmachis, 33.  
 Etham, 39.  
   Beduin tribes of, 34.  
 Ethiopia, 27.  
 Et-Tîl, 294.  
   excavations near, 60.  
 Euphrates, 52, 105.  
 Evelyn-White, Hugh, Obituary, 331-2.  
 Excavations at El-'Amarnah, 1923-4, F. G. NEWTON, 289-98.  
   The Main Town Site, 289-94.  
   The North Palace, 294-8.  
 Exodus, The Geography of the; an answer to Professor Naville and others, ALAN H. GARDINER, 87-96.
- F**
- Fakkûs, *see* Phakusa.  
 Faras, 61.  
 FAULKNER, R. O., The "Cannibal Hymn" from the Pyramid Texts, 97-103.  
 Fisher, Dr., excavations of, at Beisân, 88.  
 Flavius Apion, 209.  
 Fletcher, Major Benton, 79.  
 Florence, 24.  
 Florentine papyri, 95.  
 Forrer, 104.  
 FRANKFORD, H., M.A., *Studies in Early Pottery of the Near East. I. Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and their Earliest Interrelations* (reviewed), 338-9.  
 Freshwater Canal, 33.
- G**
- Galen, 85.  
 Gallienus, 80 ff.  
 Gamurrini, 27.  
 GARDINER, DR. ALAN H., 18, 57, 333.  
   on "Eloquent Peasant," 44.  
   The Geography of the Exodus; an answer to Professor Naville and others, 87-96.  
 Garstang, Professor J., 104.  
 Gašgaš, 107.  
 Gath-Carmel, 7.  
 Gaza, 24.  
 Gebel Attaka, 39.  
 Gebel el-Ahmar, 4.  
 Genesis, 26, 87 ff.  
 Geography of the Exodus, The, EDOUARD NAVILLE, 18-39.  
   Introduction; rival schools of criticism of texts, 18-19.  
   Wrong identification of Avaris with Pelusium, 19-22.  
   Avaris identified with Zoar, 22-26.  
   Goshen, 26-32.  
   Pithom and Sukkoth; Summary of evidence from Excavations, 32-36.  
   Extent of Red Sea, 36-39.  
 Geography of the Exodus, The; an answer to Professor Naville and others, ALAN H. GARDINER, 87-96.  
   Introduction; justification of original views, 87-8.  
   City of Ramesses, 88-94.  
   Goshen, 94-5.  
   Pithom, 95-6.  
   Conclusion, 96.  
 Gesem, *see* Goshen.  
 Ginti-kirmil, *see* Gath-Carmel.  
 Gizah, excavations at, 259.  
   necropolis, 4.  
 Glanville, S. R. K., 61, 289, 334.  
 Golénischeff glossary, 94.  
 Goshen, 18 ff., 94 ff.  
 Götze, Albrecht, 104.  
 Gozan, 105.  
 Grammatical exercise of an Egyptian Schoolboy, A; DR. NATHANIEL REICH, 285-8.  
   Introduction, 285.  
   Facsimile, transcriptions, translations and notes, 285-8.  
 Greece, Pîso in, 82.  
   rippled fabric in, 42.  
 Greek mercenaries under Psammetichus I, 21.  
   name of Tell el-Maskhûtah, 36.  
   pronunciation of Egyptian words, 22.  
   transcriptions of Egyptian names, 30.

- Greeks, command of sea, 25.  
 GRENFELL, B. P. with A. S. HUNT and H. I. BELL,  
*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVI* (reviewed),  
 214-16.  
 GRIFFITH, F. LL., M.A., F.B.A., 60, 333.  
 Bibliography (1923-1924): Ancient Egypt, 306-  
 23.  
 collection of ostraca, 285 ff.  
 excavations at El-'Amarnah (1923-4), 299-305.  
*The Oxford Excavations in Nubia* (reviewed),  
 191-3.  
 Reviews by, 181-2, 340.
- H**
- Hadad, 17.  
 HALL, Dr. H. R., 88, 104.  
 lecture by, 61.  
 letter from, 350.  
 Reviews by, 176-8, 184-8, 346, 347.  
 Halys, 115.  
 Hamites, 20.  
 Hapi, 1, 4, 13.  
 Harakhti, 3.  
 Harmachis conquered by Horus, 23 ff.  
 Harpokrates, 256.  
 Harris, Dr. Rendel, 85.  
 Harris papyrus, 26, 92.  
 Hathor sanctuary at Denderah, 29.  
 sistrum and *mnit*-collar, symbols of, 57.  
 Hatshepsut, 41.  
 mortuary monument of, 224.  
 Hatti, 108.  
 Hattušaš, 104.  
 Hattušil, reign of, 109.  
 Head of King Ramesses I from the Temple at Abydos,  
 A, 79.  
 Hearst medical papyrus, 84.  
 Hebrew graffito inscriptions at Karnak, 16.  
 names, Egyptian rendering of, 22, 204 ff.  
 Hebrews seize Egyptian towns, 6.  
 Hekma'rē Setepenamūn, 122 ff.  
 Heliopolis, 25, 31, 90.  
 lustrator-gods of, 54.  
 sacred bull of, 124.  
 temple of Tum Harmachis, 33.  
 Hellenic culture in Egypt, 208.  
 Herakleopolis, 95.  
 Hermopolis, 80 ff.  
 Thoth lord of, 2, 3.  
 Herodotus, 92.  
 on canal to Red Sea, 31 ff.  
 Heroonpolis, *see* Heroopolis.  
 Heroopolis, 26, 95.  
 nome of, 35.  
 Heroopolitan gulf, 22.  
 Hesat, 13.  
 Hesret, 3.  
 Historical Document of Ramesside Age, T. ERIC  
 PEET, 116-27.  
 Introduction; description and date of papyrus,  
 116-20.  
 Translation, 120-4.  
 Commentary, 124-7.  
 Hittite kings, 104.  
 Hittite prince and widow of Tut'ankhamūn, 5.  
 Hittite texts, 17.  
 Hogarth, Dr., 104.  
 Hogarth, Dr., D. G., C.M.G., lecture by, 61.  
 HOPFNER, TH., *Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae* (reviewed), 180-1.  
 Horemhab, decree of, 119.  
 El-'Amarnah in time of, 293.  
 statue of, 1 ff.  
 Hori, 92.  
 Horishere, 265.  
 HORNBLOWER, G. D., B.A., 334.  
 The Story of the Eloquent Peasant—A Suggestion,  
 44-5.  
 Reviews by, 341.  
 Horus conquest of Harmachis, 24 ff.  
 emblem of, at Edfu, 33.  
 eye of, 10, 13.  
 purification of, 54.  
 spell of, 57.  
 waters of, 93.  
 HROŽNY, F., 104.  
*Code hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure (vers. 1350 av. J.-C.)*, received for review, 350.  
 translation of inscription, 5.  
 Hubišna, 105, 111.  
 Hulaiāš, 106, 111.  
 HUNT, A. S., with B. P. GRENFELL and H. I. BELL,  
*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVI* (reviewed),  
 214-16.  
 Reviews by, 180-1.  
 Hyksos, 21.  
 Avaris city of, 24.  
 invasion and expulsion of, 87.  
 Semitic influence in names of period, 8.
- I**
- Iah, 263.  
 Ialu, 13.  
 Ibil-rabi, 17.  
 Ibn el-Bêtar, 85.  
 Indians, 80.  
 Inhurkahu, 220.  
 Intef, 219 ff.  
 Intefmose, 267.  
 Ionian mercenaries, 21.  
 Iouiya, funeral papyrus of, 40.  
 Iraq, 105.  
 Irene, letter of, 215.  
 Isarlim, 17.  
 Isbarta river, 106.  
 Isidora, 135.  
 Isieion, 95.  
 Isma'īlyah, 27.  
 sphinx from Tell el-Maskhūṭah at, 33.  
 Israelites, 24, 27, 39.  
 in Egypt, 87 ff.  
 Issos, Gulf of, 105.  
 Išuwa, 105.  
 Italy, 24.
- J**
- Jacob, 39.  
 Jaxartes river, 105.  
 Jerâbis, 105.  
 Jerablus, 17, 105.  
 Jeremiah, 27.  
 Jerusalem, Babylonian seal-cylinders at, 17.  
 Jews at Daphnae, 27.  
 Jezreel, 88.  
 Jordan, 88.

- Joseph, 26, 36, 87 ff.  
 hieroglyphic form of name of, 204 ff.  
 meets Jacob at Hieropolis, 28.
- Josephus, 87 ff.
- Joshua, 24.
- JOUGUET, PIERRE avec PAUL COLLART [et] JEAN LESQUIER, *Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus Grecs*. Tome premier, fasc. III (reviewed), 183-4.
- Journal of The Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. XI, 1924 (reviewed), 339-40.
- Judah, 26, 36
- Judith, 27.
- Junker, Dr., 20.
- Justinian, policy in Egypt, 211.
- K**
- Kabalia, 106.
- Kadesh, 25.  
 battle of, 109, 114.
- Ḳakhepesb, 122.
- Kalašma, 112.
- Kamose, 219.  
 coffin of King, 260.  
 tablet, 262.
- Kanâna, 21
- Ḳanṯarah, 6, 26, 89.
- Kapasi, 6.
- Karmalas, 109.
- Karnak, 114, 224.  
 graffito inscription in Phoenician letters at, 16.  
 list of kings, 221.  
 statues found at, 1, 4.  
 temple of Ptaḥ at, 56.
- Kasa, tomb of, 12.
- Kassite period, seal-cylinders of, 17.
- Katinakht, canopic box of, 262.
- Kawaliya, 106.
- Kelekian, M., 79.
- Kemuer, lake of, 39.
- Ken, 220.
- Kenkeme, 26.
- Kestrus river, 106.
- Khabekhet, 220.
- Khamu-Marduk, 17.
- Khana, 17.
- Khargah, Oasis of, 331.
- Kharput, 105.
- Khenems, 242.
- Kheta, 25.
- Khian cylinder seal, note on, 174-5.
- Khnum, temple archives of, 117.
- Khnumhotp, tomb of, 46.
- Khnumnakht, 118.
- Khonsemḥab, 265.
- Kingdom, New, Rite of opening the mouth in, 53.
- Ḳirtas, sandstone quarries at, 131.
- Ḳizzuwadna, 175.
- Ḳizzuwadna, SIDNEY SMITH, M.A., 104-15.  
 Canons of topographical research, 104-8.  
 Proposed locations of Ḳizzuwadna, 108-9.  
 Criticism of arguments, 109-12.  
 Arguments in support of site on Mediterranean, 112-15.
- Koptos, 29.  
 inscription of Quietus at, 81.
- Korakesion, 107.
- Korein, 30.
- Kos, *see* Kous
- KOSCHAKER, P. and A. UNGNAD, *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, Band VI. (reviewed), 180.
- Kous, 29 ff.
- Kuft, 300.
- Ḳumani, 108 ff.
- Ḳursaura, 107.
- Kushites, 20.
- Küthmann, Dr., 6, 33, 36.
- Kutmar, 105.
- Kuwalia, 107.
- L**
- Lablani mount, 107.
- Lachish, 6.
- Langdon, Professor, 47.
- Lansing, Ambrose, 1.
- Laodicea, Council of, 278.
- Lapis Lazuli Mountain, 115.
- Lebanon, 107.
- Legrain, excavations at Karnak, 16.  
 statues found by, at Karnak, 1, 4.
- LESQUIER, JEAN, et PIERRE JOUGUET, *Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille: Papyrus Grecs*. Tome premier, fasc. III (reviewed), 183-4.
- Lost Statue of the Seventeenth Dynasty, A, 203.
- LUCAS, A., O.B.E., F.I.C., Mistakes in chemical matters frequently made in Archaeology, 128-32.
- Lugga, 114.
- Luia, language of, 114.
- Luxor, 114.
- Lycopolis, riot at, 215.
- Lyons, Colonel H. G., F.R.S., 46.
- M**
- Macander River, 105.
- MACKAY, ERNEST, The Representation of Shawls with a Rippled Stripe in the Theban Tombs, 41-3.
- Macrianus, 80.
- Mahsamah, lake of, 28.
- Ma'ibré', 218.
- Ma'aketaten, 133.
- Mallon, Alexis, 204.
- Manda, 113.
- Manetho, 24, 87.
- Marcellus, *De Medicamentis*, 85.
- Mariette at Denderah, 29.
- Maru-Aten, 294 ff.
- Ma'sarah, 16.
- MASPERO, JEAN, 22, 40, 97 ff., 209.  
*Histoire des Patriarches d'Alexandrie depuis la mort de l'Empereur Anastase jusqu'à la réconciliation des églises jacobites (518-616)*, 209-11.
- Matti, 175.
- Mazaca, 115.
- Medes, 113.
- Media, 110.
- Medicine, The Mouse in Egyptian and Later, WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S., 83-6.
- Medinet Habu, 221.
- MEECHAM, HENRY G., *Light from Ancient Letters: Private Correspondence in the Non-literary*

- Papyri of Oxyrhynchus of the first four centuries, and its Bearing on New Testament Language and Thought* (reviewed), 182-3.
- Mela, Pauparius, 334.
- Meletians, 212.
- Memphis, 25, 27, 90.  
Horemhab at, 3.
- Menemtir, 121.
- Menepthah, triumphal inscription of, 31.
- Menes, cantons in Egypt before, 24.
- Menhotpurē, 266.
- Menthuherkhepes, 121 ff.
- Menthunakht, 232.
- Mentuhotp III, 219 ff.
- Mér, tomb of, 305.
- Merenptah, temple of, 224.
- Meritamūn, mummy of, 247.
- Meritaten, 133.
- Merodach, *see* Marduk.
- Mes, inscription of, 119.  
priest of Theban necropolis, 248.
- Mesopotamia, 105.  
expedition of Tuthmosis I to Upper, 42.
- Metnemeh, 120.
- Meyer, Eduard, 5.
- MEYER, PAUL M., *Griechische Papyrusurkunden der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*.  
Band I, Heft 3 (*Urkunden No. 57-117 und Indices*) (reviewed), 348-9.
- MILNE, H. J. M., Psalms and Lectons for Lent, 278-82.
- MILNE, J. GRAFTON, Aemilianus the "Tyrant," 80-2.
- Milyas, 106.
- Mimmuria, 29.
- Min, temple of, 125.
- Minemhēt, 258.
- Mira, 106.
- Mistakes in Chemical Matters frequently made in Archaeology, A. LUCAS, O.B.E., F.I.C., 128-31.  
Ancient Egyptian plaster, 128-30.  
Stone, 130.  
Bitumen and pitch, 130-1.
- Mita-Mudas, 175.
- Mitanni treaty, 113.
- Mitrahnah, statue from, 3.
- Mnevis-calves, 120 ff.
- MOND, ROBERT, 334.  
excavations at Shêkh 'Abd el-Kurnah, 61.
- Montet on German classification of Egyptian among Semitic languages, 23.
- Moret, A., 62.
- Moses, 89 ff.  
books of, 19.
- Moslem saints, cult of, in modern Egypt, 57.
- Mother Worship in Egypt, The* (reviewed), 339-40.
- Mouse in Egyptian and Later Medicine, The, WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S., 83-6.  
Explanation of, and evidence for, medicinal use in Egypt, 83.  
References to mouse in texts, 84-5.  
Modern instances, 86.
- Mouse in Medicine, The, note, 334.
- Mukaukis, 212.
- Munich papyri, 212.
- Munier, Henri, 174.
- MURRAY, G. W., *The English-Nubian Comparative Dictionary. Harvard African Studies, Volume IV* (reviewed), 181.
- Mursil III, campaigns of, 106.
- Musician's Contract, A, H. IDRIS BELL, 145-6.  
Introduction, 145.  
Text, 145.  
Translation and Notes, 146.
- Musri, 175.
- Muwattališ, 110 ff.
- N**
- Nabuapaliddin, 52 ff.
- Naharaim, *see* Naḥrima.
- Naḥrim, 6.
- Naḥrima, 29.
- Nakht, tomb of, 46.
- Naram-Sin, 42.
- Natural History of Pliny, 83 ff.
- Naukratis, 96.
- NAVILLE, EDOUARD, 40, 61.  
*Champollion* (reviewed), 346.  
The Geography of The Exodus, 18-39.
- Nebamūn, tomb of, 237.  
wife of, 42.
- Nebpehtirē, 265.
- Nebuchadrezzar, 17, 27.
- Nebui, 242.
- Nebun, 121.
- Nebunenef, 266.
- Nectanebo, 30.
- Neferronpe, 121.
- Nefertēit, statue of, 303.
- Nefretiri, 219.
- Nekht, house of, 291.
- Nenašša, 111.
- Nepera, 13.
- Netolitzky, 83 ff.
- NEWTON, F. G., 333.  
excavations at El-'Amarnah (1923-4), 60, 289-98.
- New Vizier of the Eleventh Dynasty, A, LUDLOW S. BULL, Ph.D., 15.  
1. Finding of Sarcophagus.  
2. Interpretation of Inscription.
- Niblani Mount, 107.
- Nile mud, generation of mouse from, 83.  
note, 334.
- Nimmuria, *see* Mimmuria.
- Nimrud Dagh, 107.
- Nisaba, 47.
- Nitria, 331.
- Note on some Ostraca from El-'Amarnah, WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S., 133.
- Notes and News, 60-2, 174-5, 333-5.
- Notices of Recent Publications, 63-77, 338-50.
- Nubia, 24.  
Oxford expedition in, 61.
- Nubians, 21.
- Nubkhas, 237 ff.
- Nubkheperrē Intef, 222 ff.
- Nubkheperurē Antef, Coptos decree of, 125.
- Nusku, crescent the symbol of, 52.
- O**
- Obituary, Friedrich Preisigke, 172-3.  
Hugh Evelyn-White, 331-2.
- Odenathus of Palmyra, 82.



- Olbia, 106.  
 O'LEARY, DE LACY, D.D., 334.  
 Bibliography (1923-4): Christian Egypt, 324-30.  
 OLMSTEAD, A. T., *History of Assyria* (reviewed), 70-74.  
 On, 13.  
 Orion, 18.  
 Osiris, cult of, 103.  
 Osiris To, 13.  
 Ostraca from El-'Amarnah, Note on some, WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S., 133.  
 Oxford expedition in Nubia, 61.  
 Oxus river, 105.  
 Oxyrhynchus, 80 ff.  
 Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 137.
- P**
- Pakamen, 122.  
 Pala, 107, 111.  
 Palestine, 27.  
 annexation of towns in, 20.  
 Egyptian control in, 88.  
 invasion of Egypt from, 25.  
 rebellion in Southern, 7.  
 Palmyra, Odenathus of, 82.  
 Pamphylia, 106.  
 Panefunzemenkhons, 121.  
 Panekhtta, 124.  
 Paponot, M., excavations at Tell el-Maskhûtah, 33.  
 Papyrus Boat, Note on the Egyptian, WARREN R. DAWSON, F.Z.S., 46.  
 Paramessu, statue of, 1, 4.  
 Pasekhety, 120.  
 Pashuty, 121.  
 Passalacqua, Giuseppe, 270 ff.  
 Pathewemabu, 124.  
 Patumos, *see* Pithom.  
 Paukhed, 124.  
 Payire(?), 124.  
 Pebes, 265.  
 Peculiar Form of New Kingdom Lamp, A. N. DE GARIS DAVIES, 9-14.  
 Pyramidal candles, 9.  
 Use of ritual tapers, 10.  
 Development of pyramidal lamp from candle, 10-11.  
 Evidence of use for fumigation as well as illumination, 12-13.  
 Candles in cult of dead, 14.  
 PEET, T. ERIC, 18.  
 A Historical Document of Ramesside Age, 116-27.  
 Reviews by, 63-9, 75, 76-7, 77, 188-9, 338, 340.  
 Peker, 2.  
 Pekhat, 121.  
 Pelusium, 19 ff., 81, 88 ff.  
 position of, 91.  
 Penanket, 117, 124.  
 Penby, tomb of, 12.  
 Pentaure, 120.  
 PERRY, W. J., M.A., *The Growth of Civilisation* (reviewed), 189-191.  
*The Origin of Magic and Religion* (reviewed), 63-9.  
 Persia, 27.  
 Journ. of Egypt. Arch. x.  
 Persia, journey of Ptolemy Philadelphus to, 35.  
 Persians, command of sea, 25.  
 Pertinax, 81.  
 Pescennius Niger, 81.  
 Pesiur, 244.  
 PETRIE, SIR FLINDERS, 18.  
 on Phakusa, 30.  
*Social Life in Ancient Egypt* (received for review), 350.  
 Phakusa, 18, 26 ff., 95.  
 Pharaoh, purification of, 58.  
 Philadelphia, village of, 135.  
 Philip, tooled coin of, 82.  
 Philistines, 24.  
 Phoenician graffito inscription at Karnak in Phoenician letters, 16.  
 Phrygia, 105.  
 Phrygian flageolets, 140.  
 Phuti, 17.  
 Pinehas, 92.  
 Pi-Ramesse, 87 ff.  
 Pisidia, 105.  
 Piso in Greece, 82.  
 Pitašša, 112.  
 Pithom, 18, 20, 30, 32, 39, 95 ff.  
 inscriptions referring to, 33.  
 Pliny, 83.  
 Plutarch, 83.  
 Pnehesi, 302.  
 house of, 60.  
 Pontus, 108.  
 Prefects of Egypt, 80.  
 PREISIGKE, FRIEDRICH, Obituary, 172-3.  
*Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten* (reviewed), 349-50.  
 Proper Names in This Journal, The Spelling of, 336.  
 Psalms and Lectons for Lent, H. J. MILNE, 278-82.  
 Introduction, 278-9.  
 Text, 279-80.  
 Translation, 280-1.  
 Notes, 281-2.  
 Psammetichus I, 21.  
 Ptah, temple, 4, 5.  
 temple of, at Karnak, 56.  
 Ptolemaic Egypt, theatre in, 134 ff.  
 ostrakon, 285.  
 Ptolemais, 143.  
 Ptolemais Theron, 35, 39.  
 Ptolemy, 30.  
 on canal to Red Sea, 38.  
 Ptolemy Philadelphus, stele of time of, 35.  
 Ptolemy Soter, slab of, 305.  
 Pusu-mari, 17.  
 Putu-Yâvan (Phut of the Ionians), 17.  
 Pyramid, Seventeenth Dynasty, 218.  
 of Tety, 97.  
 of Wenis, 97.  
 Pyramid Texts, The "Cannibal Hymn" from The, R. O. FAULKNER, 97-103.  
 Pyramids of Saqqârah, 103.  
 Pyramus river, 105.
- Q**
- Quietus, 80.

- R**
- Raamses, *see* Ramesses.  
 Raḥotp, 219, 266.  
 Raifet Papyrus, 114.  
 Ramesses I, head of, 79.  
 Ramesses II, campaign against Hittites, 93.  
   cartouche of, on vase, 283.  
   city of, 26.  
   epithets of, 93.  
   list of kings down to, 220.  
   stele of, 88, 93.  
   stele of time of, 23.  
   temple of, 20, 224.  
   tombs of period of, 12.  
 Ramesses III, city of, 26.  
   statue of, 88.  
   temple of, 224.  
 Ramesses IV, 119.  
   ostraca from reign of, 125.  
 Ramesses V, 118 ff.  
 Ramesses VI, 116.  
 Ramesses IX, 221 ff.  
 Ramesses X, 116.  
 Ramesses XII, 116.  
 Ramesses, city of, 19, 39.  
 Ramesseum at Thebes, tombs near, 217.  
 Ramesside Age, A Historical Document of, T. ERIC PEET, 116-27.  
 Ramesside times, rippled fabric in, 41.  
 Ramesside tombs, lamps in, 9.  
 Ramose, tomb of, 334.  
 Raḥnūfer, house of, 291.  
 Râs el-Wâdî, 28.  
 Raskenen I, 257.  
 Red Sea, canal from hill to, 30 ff.  
 REICH, DR. NATHANIEL, A Grammatical Exercise of an Egyptian Schoolboy, 285-8.  
 REISNER, GEORGE A., Ph.D., excavations at Nag' ed-Dêr, 83.  
   *Harvard African Studies, volumes V, VI; Excavations at Kerma* (reviewed), 340-1.  
 Renouf, M., on German classification of Egyptian among Semitic languages, 23.  
 Rensenb, 276.  
 Retenu, 21.  
 Rhind Papyrus, 53.  
 Rite of Opening the Mouth in Ancient Egypt and Babylonia, The, AYLWARD M. BLACKMAN, D.Litt., 47-59.  
   Introduction; Evidences of common origin of, or early contract between Egyptian, South Russian and Babylonian civilisations, 47.  
   Babylonian Ceremony; texts and interpretation, 48-53.  
   Comparison of Egyptian Ceremony with Babylonian, 53-7.  
   Use of ritual, 57-8.  
   Common origin, or Babylonian ritual derived from Egyptian, 58-9.  
 Rome, 124.  
 Roman Egypt, Theatre in, 134 ff.  
 Roman introduction of use of lime in Egypt, 128.  
 Romans in Egypt, 208.  
 Rostau, 2.  
 Rostovtzeff, Professor, 47.  
 Rougé, M., on German classification of Egyptian among Semitic languages, 23.
- ROUILLARD, G., *L'Administration civile de l'Égypte Byzantine*, 212-14.  
 Rowe, 93.  
 Russian, common elements of Egyptian civilisation and South, 47.
- S**
- Sabinus, L. Mantennius, 81.  
 Saft el-Hennah, 28 ff., 94.  
 Šakḫārah, 103.  
   excavations at, 259.  
 Salatîs, 25.  
   Avaris rebuilt by, 24.  
 Šalernitana Collectio, 85.  
 Šâlia, 110.  
 Salonina, coins of, 81.  
 Salt collection, 229 ff.  
 Šalt Papyrus, 116.  
 Šamri, 115.  
 Sanam (Napata), 61.  
 Š'ankhkere', 224 ff.  
 Šantaš, 115.  
 Sarus river, 105, 175.  
 SAYCE, REV. PROFESSOR A. H., 104.  
   Unpublished Hebrew, Aramaic and Babylonian Inscriptions from Egypt, Jerusalem and Carchemish, 16-17.  
   translation of inscription, 5.  
 Sayhân, *see* Seihan.  
 Schaefer, 5.  
 Scorpion, Lake of the, 39.  
 Sebekemsaf, 232 ff., 255.  
 Sebekḥotp, 242 ff.  
 Sebeknekht, 242 ff.  
 Sebekur, prince of Hierakonpolis, 258  
 Sebennutos, 22.  
 Šed, 120.  
 Še-e-ri, *see* Seir.  
 Seihan river, 105.  
 Seir, 7.  
 Sejti, 10.  
 Sekenenrē', 220 ff.  
 Sekenenrē' Ta'o II, son of, 203.  
 Sekenenrē' Ta'o-ḥo, 222 ff.  
 Sekhemrē'-Heruhirma't Intef, 235 ff.  
 Sekhemrē'-Shedtawi Sebekemsaf, 222 ff.  
 Sekhemrē'-Wahkha Raḥotp, 265.  
 Sekhemrē'-Wapmā't Intef, 222 ff.  
 Sekhemrē'-Wapmā't Intef-ḥo, 234.  
 Sekhmet, 2.  
 Sektet bark, 13.  
 Selah in Edom, 7.  
 Selle, 6 ff., 23 ff.  
 Semitic influence in names of Hyksos period, 8.  
   inscription of Nabuapaliddin, 52 ff.  
   names, 17.  
   signs corresponding to Egyptian, 22.  
 Senakhtanrē', *see* Sekenenrē'.  
 Senepa, village of, 137.  
 Senseneb, 247.  
 Sepa, purification of, 54.  
 Šeptakhem, Soptakhem, *see* Šaft el-Hennah.  
 Šesemt, 30.  
 Set, conquest of Egypt over, 23.  
   worship of, at Bubastis, 26.  
 Šetekh, principal duty of Avaris, 91.  
 Seth, purification of, 54.

- Sethos I, stele of, 88.  
 Seti, Paramessu, son of, 1, 4.  
   temple at Abydos, 79.  
 Seti I, 25, 29, 220.  
   Egypt threatened by Asiatics in reign of, 21.  
   El-'Amarnah in time of, 293.  
   first campaign of, against Shōsu, 24, 25.  
   list of nomes of, 31.  
   temple of, 224.  
 Sety, vizier, 91.  
 Sety-Meneptah, 89.  
 Sétza river, 105.  
 Severus, 81 ff.  
 Shaman, 17.  
 Shamri river, 175.  
 Shāsu, 20 ff., 89.  
 Shawls with a Rippled Stripe in the Theban Tombs,  
   The Representation of, ERNEST MACKAY,  
   41-3.  
   Instances of use of shawl, and method of weaving,  
   41.  
   Parallels in ancient and modern Greece, 42.  
   Syrian origin of fabric, 42.  
 Shékh 'Abd el-Ḳurnah, 217.  
   excavations at, 334.  
 Shethit, 2.  
 Shihōr, 93.  
 Shiloh, 7.  
 Shōsu, *see* Shāsu.  
 Shu, 13.  
 Shuiu, 121.  
 Shuroi, tomb of, 227.  
 Siamūn, 223.  
 Sidon, transcription of name into Egyptian,  
   23 ff.  
 Sile, *see* Selle.  
 Sillā, 8.  
 Silsilah, sandstone quarries at, 131.  
 Silvia Aquitana, pilgrimage to Egypt, 26, 27.  
 Sinai, invasion of Egypt from, 25.  
   Israelites in, 88.  
   turquoise mines of, 116.  
 Sinaitic inscriptions, 335.  
   peninsula, 20.  
   peninsula, African population of, 34.  
 Sinuhe, 39, 174.  
 Siptah, chapel of, 224.  
 Sivas, 107.  
 Smenkhkerē, 304.  
 Smith, Edwin, medical papyrus, 61.  
 Smith, Professor Elliot, F.R.S., 83.  
   lecture by, 61.  
 Smith, George, 17.  
 SMITH, SIDNEY, M.A., Kizzuwadna, 104-15.  
   Reviews by, 70-4, 178-80.  
 SOBHY, G. P. G., An Eighteenth Dynasty Measure  
   of Capacity, 283-4.  
 Sopd, 95.  
 Sopt, 30.  
 Soptakhem, *see* Sopt.  
 SOTTAS, H. et E. DRIOTON, *Introduction à l'étude*  
*des hiéroglyphes* (reviewed), 182.  
 SPELEERS, LOUIS, *Les figurines funéraires égyptiennes*  
*(reviewed)*, 176-8.  
 Spelling of Proper Names in This Journal, The,  
   336.  
 Spiegelberg, Professor, 92.  
 Statue of Horemhab before his accession, A,  
   H. E. WINLOCK, 1-5.  
   Description of statue, 1.  
   Inscriptions on Base and Scroll, 2-3.  
   Provenance, 3.  
   Date, 4-5.  
 Strabo, 30, 32, 106.  
   on canal to Red Sea, 38.  
 Strasburg Papyrus, 80.  
 Strategius, Flavius, 212 ff.  
 Struve, Professor V., 335.  
 Suez Canal, region of, 24 ff.  
   Gulf of, 36 ff.  
 Suitnub, 241.  
 Sukkoth, 18, 27, 34, 39.  
 Sumerian civilisation, origin of, 113.  
 Šuna-aššura, 109, 113.  
 Suppiluliu, 113, 119.  
 Syria, 104 ff.  
   caravan road to, 6.  
   centre of culture in Northern, 47.  
   expedition of Tuthmosis I to, 42.  
   Roman emperors of, 80.  
 Syriac Book of Medicines, 85.
- T**
- Tabal, King of, 115.  
 Tahpanes, 27.  
 Taia, stele with Queen, 302.  
 Tall Ḥalaf, 105.  
 Tanis, 24 ff.  
 Ta'ō II, 219 ff.  
 Tarepyt, 124.  
 Tarku, 17.  
 Tausret, chapel of, 224.  
 Tawau, 264.  
 Tebes, 121.  
 Tebtunis, village of, 146.  
 Tefnut, 13.  
 Tehuti, 264.  
 Tēi, 3.  
 Telibinus, 113.  
 Tell Abu Sēfah, 6.  
 Tell Battik, 95.  
 Tell Belīm, 95.  
 Tell Defennah, 27.  
 Tell el-Ḥēr, 89.  
 Tell el-Kebīr, 28.  
 Tell el-Maskhūṭah, 18, 89 ff.  
   excavations of Naville at, 32 ff.  
 Tell esh-Sherig, 95.  
 Tell 'Ishāra, 17.  
 Tell Retābah, 18, 20, 32, 88.  
 Tell Rotab, *see* Tell Retābah.  
 Tell Tennis, 95.  
 Tetiky, 219.  
 Tetisheri, tomb of, 226 ff.  
 Tety, 97 ff.  
 Thebaid under Aemilianus, 80.  
 Theban necropolis, 41, 119, 217.  
 Thebes, excavations at, 259.  
   ostrakon at, 80.  
   under Tut'ankhamūn, 5.  
 Theku, *see also* Tell el-Maskhūṭah, 18, 32, 89.  
 Thel, 22, 23; fortress of, 91.  
 Theodorus, Aurelius, 80.  
 Thenna, 246.

- Thirty Tyrants, 80.  
**THOMPSON, R. CAMPBELL, M.A., F.S.A.,** *Assyrian Medical texts (Cuneiform)* (reviewed); *Assyrian Medical texts (Translations)* (reviewed), 178-80.  
 Thoht, hymn to, 2, 3.  
   purification of, 54.  
 Thutisat, Aahmesit, daughter of, 257.  
 Thuyu, 257.  
 Ti, tomb of, 46.  
 Tiberius, 208.  
 Tiglathpileser I, 175.  
   annals of, 110.  
 Tigris, holy water from, 48.  
   valley, connection of Egypt with people of, 47.  
 Timsáh, Lake, 18, 39.  
   Red Sea extends as far as Lake, 33.  
**TOD, MARCUS N.,** 334.  
 Tombs of the Kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes, The, H. E. **WINLOCK,** 217-77.  
   Introduction: Dirâ' Abu'l-Nagâ cemetery, 217-20.  
   List of tombs and reports of inspections, 220-4.  
   Chronology and forms of tombs, 224-6.  
   Abbott Papyrus lists, 226-65.  
   Four tombs added to list, 265-72.  
   New list of tombs from papyrus and other sources, 272-7.  
**TOUSSOUN, PRINCE OMAR,** *Mémoires sur les anciennes branches du Nil. Époque arabe.* Tome I, Part 2 (received for review), 350.  
 Town of Selle (Zaru) in the 'Amarnah Tablets, The, W. F. **ALBRIGHT,** 6-8.  
   Reference to Town in History, 6-7.  
   Origin of Name, 8.  
 Troglodytes, land of the, 39.  
 Tsana, Lake, 46.  
 Tukulti Ninib, *see* Tukulti Urta.  
 Tukulti Urta I, 175.  
 Tum, 13.  
   god of Theku, 96.  
   temple of, 33 ff.  
 Tum Harmachis, sphinx a form of, 33.  
   temple of, 33.  
 Tûnah, cemetery of, 304.  
 Turbazu, 6, 7.  
 Turin Papyrus, 116.  
 Tut'ankhamûn, 4, 5, 289, 304.  
   candlestick from tomb of, 10.  
 Tuthmosis I, 41.  
   expedition to Syria and Upper Mesopotamia, 42.  
   mortuary monument of, 224.  
   priest of, 219.  
 Tuthmosis III, 25.  
   cartouche of, on measure, 283.  
   lists of, 29.  
   ordinance of, 56.  
   temple of, 224.  
 Tuthmosis IV, temple of, 224.  
 Tyana, 175.  
 Tyre, transcription of name into Egyptian, 22 ff.
- U**
- U-aššur-me, 115.  
 Ubarrum, 17.  
 Umman-Manda, 113.  
**UNGNAD, A.,** with P. **KOSCHAKER,** *Hammurabi's Gesetz,* Band VI (reviewed), 180.  
 Unpublished Hebrew, Aramaic, and Babylonian Inscriptions from Egypt, Jerusalem and Carchemish, Rev. **PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE,** 16-17.  
 Urartu, 109.  
 Urušša (Eriza), 109.  
 User, 42.  
 Ušša, 111.
- V**
- Valerian, 80 ff.  
 Venus (Nin-si-anna), 48.
- W**
- Wâdi Tûmilât, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 88.  
 Wah, 301.  
 Walmâ, 106.  
 Wân Lake, 107.  
 Warka, 105.  
 Wazkheperreċ, 220 ff.  
   Kamose, 259 ff.  
 Weidner, Ernst F., 104.  
 Wenamûn, 116.  
 Wenemtuemnefer, 121.  
**WENGER, L.,** *Volk und Staat in Ägypten am Ausgang der Römerherrschaft,* 208-9.  
 Wenis, 97 ff.  
 Westcar Papyrus, 174.  
**WESTERMANN, W. L.,** *The Castanet Dancers of Arsinoë,* 134-44.  
 Whittemore, Professor Thomas, 61, 289, 333.  
 Wiener, Harold M., 89, 96.  
**WINLOCK, H. E.,** A statue of Horemhab before his accession, 1.  
   excavations of, 331.  
   The Tombs of the Kings of the Seventeenth Dynasty at Thebes, 217-77.  
**WOOLLEY, C. LEONARD,** *Excavations at Ur of the Chaldees* (reviewed), 347-8.  
**WRZESINSKI, WALTER,** *Atlas zur altaegyptischen Kulturgeschichte* (reviewed), 75.
- Y**
- Yaptih-Hadad, 6, 7.  
 Yasummuk-Hadad, daughter of, 17.  
 Yem, 121.  
 Yuroi, 227 ff.
- Z**
- Zakâzîk, 28.  
 Zar, *see* Zoar.  
 Zaru, 6 ff.  
 Zaya, 122.  
 Zelah, 7.  
 Zeseret, 223.  
 Zilû, 6.  
 Zimmern, 47.  
 Zoar, 7, 21.  
 Zoparašša, 112.  
 Zuhru, *see* Zoar.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD  
BY VIVIAN RIDLER  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY