

ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ONOMASTICA

BY

ALAN H. GARDINER

TEXT, VOLUME I

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press, Ely House, London W.1

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
CAPE TOWN SALISBURY IBADAN NAIROBI LUSAKA ADDIS ABABA
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI LAHORE DACCA
KUALA LUMPUR SINGAPORE HONG KONG TOKYO


TO
HERBERT WALTER FAIRMAN
AND
RAYMOND OLIVER FAULKNER
IN
FRIENDSHIP AND GRATITUDE

FIRST PUBLISHED 1947

REPRINTED LITHOGRAPHICALLY IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY
1968

CONTENTS

VOLUME I

	<i>page</i>
PREFACE, TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY	ix
SELECTED LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxii
INTRODUCTION	I
CHAPTER I. THE RAMESSEUM ONOMASTICON	6
§ 1. Introductory	6
§ 2. Contents	7
CHAPTER II. THE ONOMASTICON OF AMENOPĚ	24
§ 1. Introductory	24
§ 2. The Manuscripts	26
§ 3. The Contents	35
§ 4. EXCURSUS: Introduction to the Tables of the Towns of Upper Egypt	40
§ 5. Text, Translation and Commentary (see below)	63
CHAPTER III. THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE WRITING-BOARD	64
AUTOGRAPHED TEXT. THE ONOMASTICON OF AMENOPĚ:	
CHAPTER II, § 5. TEXT, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY	70
I. Introductory Heading	1*
II. Sky, Water, Earth	4*
III. Persons, Court, Offices, Occupations	13*
IV. Classes, Tribes and Types of Human Being	98*
EXCURSUSES: Supplementary Note on  <i>Rtnw</i> 'Retjnu'	142*
Notes on Some Campaigns of Tuthmosis III and Amenophis II	153*

CONTENTS

VOLUME II

AUTOGRAPHED TEXT (<i>continued</i>)	page
V. The Towns of Egypt	I*
EXCURSUS: Introductory Remarks on the Delta Branches of the Nile	153*
VI. Buildings, their Parts, and Types of Land	204*
VII. Agricultural Land, Cereals and their Products	219*
VIII. Beverages	233*
IX. Parts of an Ox and Kinds of Meat	237*
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	263*
INDEXES. By J. W. B. Barns	280*

FIGURES IN THE TEXT

Scene from the Coffin Berlin 20132 showing a Pterophorus	I 57*
Symbol for the Rekhēyet-people	I 101*
Entry on the Palermo Stone	I 104*
Head of the Sherden Prince	I 197*
Heads (<i>a</i>) of a Philistine, (<i>b</i>) from the Phaistos Disk	I 203*
The Stela Or. Inst. Chicago 10510	II 54*
Ostrakon Gardiner 155	II 239*
Ostrakon Gardiner 156	II 240*

MAPS

Sketch-map of Northern Syria (Upper Retjnu) and beyond	I 133*
Sketch-map of Upper Egypt from Philae to El-Gebelên	II 3*
Sketch-map of Upper Egypt from El-Gebelên to Tahta	II 23*
Sketch-map of Upper Egypt from Tahta to Es-Sirīriyah	II 51*
Sketch-map of Upper Egypt from El-Kês to Cairo	II 99*
Sketch-map of Lower Egypt	II 132*

PREFACE

TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY

THE inception of the present work dates back nearly forty years. It was in 1907 that H. Ibscher unrolled in the Edwards Library of University College, London, the Middle Kingdom papyrus henceforward to be known as the Ramesseum Onomasticon. It may have been in the next spring that M. W. Golénischeff honoured me with a visit to the Berlin flat where I was then residing. That first meeting was the beginning of a friendship with a scholar not much less than a quarter of a century my senior which, I am happy to say, still survives and flourishes. On my showing M. Golénischeff the transcription of my newly discovered text, he bestowed on me an almost unprecedented mark of confidence by entrusting me with the publication of the much longer, if also much later, papyrus of similar content in his own possession. The two documents belong to precisely the same category, and it was obviously desirable that they should be edited together; but that the famous Russian Egyptologist should surrender this attractive task to a young student at that time practically unknown was an act of generosity deserving a better return than the unconscionable delay to which I have to plead guilty. This delay has, however, had its reasons, and I make bold to think, perhaps some compensating advantages as well. To deal with the reasons first. It soon became clear to me that the Commentary on the individual words contained in these Onomastica would necessarily be a premature anticipation of the findings of the Berlin Hieroglyphic Dictionary. No one could then have foreseen the immense interval which would elapse before even a tiny fraction of the *Wörterbuch* was complete. At all events I decided to wait until the *Wörterbuch* should itself provide the envisaged commentary, or at all events until the collecting of the materials for that great work should be much farther advanced. Its compilation, however, dragged on, and it was not until 1931 that the last volume appeared—and then entirely without references! The references were to come later, and before laying down my pen I intend to give frank expression to my views in connexion with that important matter. My present business, however,

PREFACE, TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON

is to explain away, as best I can, the long delay with which I so ill requited M. Golénischeff's kindness. When it became apparent that the Berlin Dictionary would not relieve me of the obligation of a personal commentary, I began to amass materials for the latter. In some ways I was worse placed for the purpose than many another Egyptologist. Down to 1911 I had relied on the *Zettel* (slips) of the *Wörterbuch*, as was natural so long as I lived in Berlin. It was only on my return to England in that year that the necessity of making my own collections dawned upon me. From 1915 onward I received invaluable help from my friend Battiscombe Gunn, who working in my London home ransacked all the periodicals and many editions of texts for discussions of individual words. The alphabetically arranged slips recording what various scholars had said about a multitude of hieroglyphic items has formed no small part of my working capital ever since. As my Commentary on the Onomastica began to take shape—I did not embark upon this seriously until 1935—a formidable new obstacle began to loom up. This was the bulk of my work, if anything like completeness of treatment was to be aimed at. The thought of the expense of such a publication, alike to author and purchaser, has been the source of much vacillation. At different times I have expanded and contracted my Commentary concertina-wise, and critics will have no difficulty in detecting the traces of my hesitations. The collotype Plates have been ready for more than twenty years. The Plates of transcription, admirably executed for me by Mr. H. W. Fairman, were finished more than eight years ago. Remained the recalcitrant problem of the Commentary itself. The adaptation of this to its present dimensions, sometimes by increase of size, sometimes by reduction, has been one of my principal tasks during the past four years, and for the first part of this period I put out of my mind the perplexing question as to how and when the book could be printed. At length impatience gained the upper hand, and impelled by this I sought the advice of my ever helpful friend Dr. Johnson, the Printer to Oxford University. He agreed with me that autographic reproduction of the Commentary would be far the speediest, cheapest, and most satisfactory course. I then bethought me of my former assistant Mr. R. O. Faulkner, on whose diligence and accuracy I knew I could implicitly count. He willingly gave his consent, and we made some experi-

THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY

ments as to format, spacing, &c. I must confess I never expected the finished job to present so slightly an appearance as that which the reader can now admire for himself. I will only add that I have never ceased to congratulate myself on having secured the aid of so capable a coadjutor.

A large part of my task has been geographical. I had sent M. Henri Gauthier copies of both the Ramesseum and the Golénischeff lists of towns to be utilized in his *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques*, 7 vols., Cairo, 1925-31. Concerning that extremely industrious and useful work I have mixed feelings. As regards the inaccuracies and carelessnesses perhaps the less said the better. But what above all was requisite in dealing with this topic was argument; it is not sufficient to enumerate the varying guesses of previous scholars; the essential is to set forth the reasons for which such and such an Egyptian place-name should be attached to such and such a place. I cannot pretend to anything like the learning on this subject which Gauthier's work displays; I have been a comparative novice in the field. My constant aim has, however, been to unearth the grounds for localizations. I cannot claim many new discoveries, but my hope is that my Commentary will have provided a not inconsiderable underpinning of the foundations of our geographical knowledge. The construction of comparative tables of consecutively arranged lists of place-names had been in my mind for thirty years or more, and with this project in view I secured accurate copies of all the principal lists in question, my regretted friend Kurt Sethe providing me with collections of three lists of local goddesses at Karnak, and E. Ayrton checking the Abydos list of towns, to quote only two of my helpers. The actual building up of the comparative tables had, however, to await a later stage than Fairman's completion of the Plates of transcription; as a consequence Plates XXIV-XXVII display the defects of my own somewhat uncouth handwriting. The maps incorporated in the Commentary are the last of my afterthoughts, and their elegant appearance, like that of some half a dozen figures in the text, is due to the talent of Miss Broome, whose co-operation I was fortunate enough to secure.

Arrived at this point, I find I have enumerated not a few of the compensating advantages which my procrastination has undeservedly brought me. Others have been the emergence of some new parallel

PREFACE, TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON

texts to the Golénischeff Onomasticon, one unhappily pointed out (by M. Posener) too late for inclusion. Before passing on to my remarks on the ill-fated Berlin Dictionary, I must acknowledge at least some of the more important of my obligations to other scholars. These have been so many that I run a serious risk of overlooking some. I believe, however, that each service done me by a colleague, if not here given the prominence of mention in the Preface, has at least been acknowledged in the body of my Text. For this reason I will confine myself to a few more names. Dr. J. Černý collated for me an ostrakon in Cairo, M. Lacau furnished me with extremely helpful copies of the inscriptions on the reconstructed chapel of Sesostri I at Karnak, and Professor Sidney Smith, besides affording me facilities for study at the British Museum, assisted me with valuable notes on some of the foreign place-names in the Golénischeff Onomasticon. Lastly, to Dr. Nelson I owe the photograph of an important stela in the collection of the Chicago Oriental Institute, as well as a sight of the drawings for a future volume of the great publication of the temple of Medīnet Habu.

The fact that a very large part of these volumes is devoted to philological discussion, though the standpoint has been more encyclopaedic than strictly lexicographical, affords an opportunity that may never recur of expressing my views concerning what has now become the most vital problem of our Egyptian studies. My colleagues will, I feel sure, acquit me of any desire to criticize adversely an undertaking to which I devoted myself heart and soul for the first eight years of my life as an active researcher. Still, it is undeniable that even before the War there was considerable dissatisfaction everywhere, except perhaps in Germany itself, at the slow progress of the *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache* sponsored by the united German Academies; also the quality and the arrangement of that work were in many ways open to criticism. Up to the present time (Christmas, 1945) it has proved impossible to ascertain whether the million and a half *Zettel* that had been collected and pigeon-holed have escaped the destruction which the Nazis have brought upon their country. Should these valuable materials have perished, an extremely serious loss (though not an irretrievable one) will have been suffered by our science. But even if they prove happily to have survived, the difficulties of proceeding with the task for lack of workers and of funds

THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY

will inevitably be enormous, and it behoves all students of Egyptian philology to consider what steps could be taken to supply the crying need for a dictionary adequate to the present position of our knowledge. For the purposes of my argument it will be advisable to recall the origin and gradual development of the German plan, since this will best reveal the stages at which, in my opinion, wrong decisions were taken.

Let it first of all be stated, with the utmost possible emphasis, that no blame for the present position can be attached to the initiators of the scheme. Two of the four original members of the Commission, Erman and Steindorff, were scholars of the highest eminence, as well as men of common sense and much practical experience. The outcome of their grandiose plan betrays merely those defects which appear inevitable in any undertaking of like dimensions. Most persons who have built houses live to regret the mistakes that they have made; the larger the house and the less the preliminary experience, the greater chance there is of serious blunders being committed. The critic who subsequently censures the architect, builder, or client is usually guilty of a sad lack of perspective, and I wish to make it clear once and for all that my own criticisms aim merely at contributing to more successful planning *in the future*. The original announcement (*ZÄS* xxxv [1897], 111-12) envisaged a beginning of the printing eleven years from the start. Actually the first volume is dated 1926 and the last 1931; the first fascicule of the references in their final form (*die ausführlichen Belegstellen*) appeared in 1937, and the eighth fascicule (the last received) in 1940. Since the eight fascicules, together taking at least three years to complete, covered only the 506 pages of Vol. II, at the same rate of progress the end of the work, which had to deal with the 2,786 pages of the main dictionary void of references, could not have been predicted before 1954 or 1955. Thus for over fifty years students abroad who had no access to the Berlin collections would have been deprived of any dictionary more serviceable than that of Brugsch, seeing that Budge's stout volume (1920) contained very few references, and Erman and Grapow's *Ägyptisches Handwörterbuch* (1921) none at all, and it cannot be sufficiently stressed that *for every serious student of hieroglyphics references are indispensable*. We are still far from having reached the stage where the meaning of an Egyptian word can be


proclaimed *ex cathedra*, and every learner who has spent more than a couple of years over the subject ought to be put in a position to question, if he considers himself to have good cause, the inherited lexicographical beliefs of his teachers.

A primary flaw in the German scheme, as I see it, was that it modelled itself upon the *Thesaurus linguae latinae*, i.e. upon the crowning repository of a language for practically every item in which there is good traditional authority.¹ In one respect, however, that model has done us an inestimable service. Most of the scholars for whom I am writing know the fundamental method of the Berlin dictionary, but for those without such knowledge I now outline the general procedure. Every original text was to be incorporated *in extenso* in the Dictionary's raw material. Passages of about 30 words were written on each slip until the end of the text was reached. Every hand-written slip was then reproduced mechanically in some 40 examples (i.e. one for every word and ten spares) and on each separate printed slip was underlined in red a different word, this also being noted by hand in the top right-hand corner. Then the printed slips so prepared were stored away each in its own alphabetically arranged slip-box. This series of operations (wherever carried through without a hitch) secured, for the texts already *verzettelt*, that the raw materials from which the final editor must select his illustrative evidence were absolutely exhaustive. Since this method not only records every occurrence of every word in the texts, but also exhibits that occurrence in its own particular context, I believe the method ought to be employed (if monetary resources allow) in the making of all vocabularies of special texts and groups of texts. I myself have had indexed in this way the whole of my *Late-Egyptian Stories* and *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, yielding forty-three slip-boxes in all, and I hope that a complete printed vocabulary of those two books will be the ultimate outcome; such a vocabulary would be an important contribution towards an ideal Egyptian dictionary as I conceive it. But I

¹ It is difficult to say how far Erman, in 1897, conceived of the final form of the *Wörterbuch* as similar to that of the Latin *Thesaurus*. At all events he no longer thought of it in that light ten years later, see *Sitzb. Berl. Ak.*, 1907, 400. Anyone who contemplates the making of an Egyptian dictionary cannot do better than study with the most meticulous care all Erman's utterances at different stages of his enterprise. His various articles entitled *Zur ägyptischen Wortforschung* I, II, III, IV (loc. cit. 1907, '12, '28) are a mine of practical wisdom, though I can only partly agree with his final conclusions.

am anticipating, and wandering away from my present theme, namely the merits and demerits of the *Wörterbuch*.

For the next nine years the collecting of the material proceeded apace in carefree fashion. The multitude of slips soon outgrew the room in which they at first were stored, and before long were transported aloft to the top of the Neues Museum, where three spacious chambers afforded scope for almost unlimited expansion. In the early days the band of contributors was fairly international. Breasted collected inscriptions in the principal museums of Europe, and I did the like for the papyri at Leyden and Turin. Sethe took the Pyramid Texts as the principal of several provinces of his own. Junker became the recognized authority for the Graeco-Roman temples, outdoing everyone else in industry and speed of accomplishment. Many more names may be read in the *Vorwort* of 1926. Erman presided over the whole undertaking, whilst himself putting on slips those texts that specially interested him. Thus students from all over the world combined to concentrate in Berlin a vast and unwieldy mass of evidence which some day would have to be dealt with by a limited number of workers on the spot. Herein lay the germ of the chief defect of the method adopted.

In 1906 Erman deemed that the time had come to start reaping the harvest that had grown so abundantly. Four of us, Burchardt, Junker, I, and Erman himself, started upon the 'working out' (*Bearbeitung*). At my suggestion the various articles on individual words were duplicated for criticism by scholars away from Berlin, and above all by Sethe at Göttingen. Sethe's observations proved so numerous and often so subversive that they did not provide all the satisfaction hoped for, and we were not always contented to see our work cut into strips, salutary though that surgical operation on occasion certainly was. But other reasons led before long to the abandonment of these early essays in editorship: the articles thus produced rapidly showed themselves to be (1) far too lengthy and (2) far too wasteful of time. I still possess the whole series, which may prove of considerable value should it turn out that the *Zettel* themselves have suffered destruction. To give an example, perhaps rather an extreme one, Junker's treatment of  wr 'der Grosse' occupies the equivalent of 45 foolscap pages, equal say to at least 30 pages of the finished *Wörterbuch*, where the same word, it is true without the

PREFACE, TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON

references, has absorbed only 1½ pages. Common sense declared that the *Wörterbuch* could never be terminated on this scale, and that there could be but few private purchasers who would find themselves able to house such a work. These first tentatives administered a shock.

A few years later I left Berlin, lucky to get away a considerable time before the outbreak of the first world war. For that reason I am not personally conversant with the motives which led to the next modification of plan, but from what I heard later those motives do remarkable credit to the loyalty of Erman's principal assistants, but only little credit to their sense of scientific expediency. It was realized that Erman was growing old and might never live to see the end of the work. It was therefore decided to limit the *Wörterbuch* proper to an enumeration of the thousands of words, with some examples of their variant writings, and with the principal heads of meaning as demanded by the different contexts in which they were found. This work was pushed ahead with all speed, so that on 16 June 1931 there was sent me a postcard signed by the three main editors reading as follows: *Nun ist das Wörterbuch fertig* ('Now the Dictionary is finished'). A gifted scholar to whom I showed this postcard made the caustic comment that it ought to have read 'Now the Dictionary is about to begin'. That there is an element of truth in this harsh verdict is indisputable, since, as I have already observed, the references are quite indispensable in dealing with a branch of linguistics as youthful as our own. To be just, and to purge my present account of all exaggeration, it has to be admitted that I frequently consult with considerable profit those volumes of the *Wörterbuch* the references appertaining to which have not yet been published. The result of such consultation is, however, often highly tantalizing. Sometimes indeed it may point the direction in which a usage that interests me has to be sought, but more often than not it does little more than tease with the thought that there exists (or existed) at Berlin evidence which is denied me and without which I simply cannot accept the *ipse dixit* of the three German scholars, despite their undisputed acumen and eminence. One drawback to the putting of the references in volumes separate from the main text of the dictionary is that for each reference required one is compelled to consult two separate books. But to this proceeding there exists

THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY

another objection far more serious. Each meaning laid down in the *Wörterbuch* thus deemed to have been finished in 1931 has had attached to it a number pointing forward to a reference volume to follow. In other words, the main *Wörterbuch* of 1926-31 has imposed upon the future volumes of references a rigid framework from which it is extremely difficult to depart. In a rapidly moving science like ours the aspect of an entire group of words may easily, within a few years, have changed to a remarkable degree; I will only mention, as a case naturally very familiar to me, my discussion of the words šš, ššr, &c., in *Bull. inst. fr.* xxx, 161 ff. It is clear that what seemed true in 1931 will not necessarily seem true in 1951, and it may therefore be laid down as a fundamental principle that *the main text of a hieroglyphic dictionary must always be contemporaneous with the references constituting the evidence for that main text*, in other words that the divorcing of main text from references is a mistake.

This mistake could, of course, have been minimized if the volumes of references had followed the appearance of the main *Wörterbuch* at a reasonably short interval. And such, indeed, was the intention at first carried into practice. In 1935 appeared a fascicule of printed references consisting of 96 pages and covering the whole of vol. I of the main work. It was estimated at the time that by this method the entire work might have been completed within three or four years—I believe the time mentioned to me was even less. Had this course been pursued, possibly the entire work might have been published before the commencement of the second world war; at any rate the end would have been well in sight. Unhappily the plan was changed in favour of the autographed illustrative passages (*Belegstellen*), which, as already explained, covered only vol. II of the main text. Erman defended this change of plan in the fourth of his aforementioned (p. xiv, n. 1) articles entitled *Zur ägyptischen Wortforschung*. I see that this article is dated 1928, so that after all it appears likely that, had the original plan for the volumes of references been adhered to, the entire *Wörterbuch* could have been in our hands before 1939.

The reasons for the abandonment of the printed volumes of references were set forth by Erman with his usual plausibility and felicity of expression, and it has to be admitted that some of them are not without cogency. He pointed out that mere references to books involve the consultation of great, rare, and costly tomes, and that many

of the references concern texts that have not been published at all. As regards these latter Erman says that it does not help the reader to know on what wall of a great temple the passage in question occurs. I do not agree; it *does* help to know from what kind of source a particular meaning or usage could be illustrated, and it *may* help greatly in case the reader is in a position to consult the wall in question; in any case the tiny snippet of an unpublished text that is given in the *ausführlichen Belegstellen* can only be of limited utility, and the genuine remedy for unpublished texts is—to publish them! To return to the objection about the great, rare, and costly tomes. This unhappily is true, but it is an objection that must remain true until all texts have been democratized as they are in Capart's *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca*. Nothing could be more desirable in theory, but in practice a great number of inscriptions and minor texts must necessarily always remain embedded in the great, rare, and costly tomes in question. These, therefore, will remain indispensable for those whose job is actual research and a true advance in our knowledge.

When the change of plan from the printed book-references to the autographed fuller hieroglyphic references was decided upon, I was deeply dismayed, as I knew that many more years must elapse before the impatiently awaited Hieroglyphic Dictionary could become accessible outside Berlin. I had some correspondence and conversations with Sethe on the subject, and at moments at all events won him over to my way of thinking. I was less successful in my talks with Erman and Grapow. The main point to be noted, however, is that there was never in my mind nor in the minds of the others any choice between *alternative modes* of producing the volumes of references. The question was merely whether the printed book-references should be published first and the full hieroglyphic examples later, or whether the already started system of book-references should be scrapped altogether in favour of the more comprehensive and leisurely plan. The scheme which I ultimately put before Grapow, and to which, alas, he paid very little attention was (1) that the fascicules of book-references should be pressed forward with all possible speed, and (2) that the dictionary should then be started entirely anew, the volumes of this second edition to contain main text (writings, meanings, and variants) as well as the hieroglyphic evidence for the same. The second larger and more informative work could have been

pursued in a suitably deliberate fashion, taking account of the suggestions of critics and of such private communications as the editors might receive; in any case it would have been assured that the main text was always as truly up to date as the evidence adduced in support of it.

I come back to a criticism already adumbrated, and it is the most serious criticism of all. The materials for the *Wörterbuch* had been culled by a multitude of international workers, and had become enormous in bulk. The working out of these materials lay in the hands of three scholars in Berlin, of whom the one with the best judgement, if not with the greatest learning, had become—how sorrowfully I recall it!—blind as well as old, the second was engaged in many different and hardly less important tasks, while the third—let proper tribute be paid to his industry and devotion—carried on his shoulders the main burden of the enterprise. A million and a half dictionary slips to be perused, weighed, and selected from by a single scholar, that is what it amounted to! The undertaking was superhuman, and all respect is due for such measure of success as was achieved.

All the above is past history, and if what I have written above may seem to some like 'crying over spilt milk', that has been very far from my aim and intention. Suppose now that the slips prove to have survived intact, what then? In what way can the unfinished work still be turned to advantage? I would propose that the book-references should be continued as at first contemplated, only perhaps in autography rather than in print. The whole would then admittedly present an inconsistent and ragged appearance, but as we have abundantly learned during these past years, if coupons are not available for new clothes, we must be content with patchwork.

Let us imagine that the preliminary *Wörterbuch* is finished, and finished speedily; how then shall a fuller and more extensive one be initiated to supplement it? If the million and a half *Zettel* continue to be the sole source of the working material, my main objection will not be met. The bulk of the material is far too great to be dealt with by any small band of students assembled in one and the same place, unless indeed we are content to see the work progress at snail's pace. What then is the remedy? I put forward for consideration by my colleagues what to myself has always seemed the wiser plan. I have

PREFACE, TOGETHER WITH REFLEXIONS ON

a horror of large undertakings, though indeed our science can boast of a few, like Crum's *Coptic Dictionary* and Breasted's *Ancient Records*, which have been carried through to a victorious finish. Would it not be better for a number of special dictionaries or vocabularies to be started in different places, and then ultimately combined into a great general dictionary which would constantly refer back to these smaller but fuller ones? I have instanced above the vocabulary that I hope to see made of my *Late-Egyptian Stories* and *Miscellanies*. We still derive great profit, despite their imperfections, from Piehl's *Dictionnaire du papyrus Harris I*, from Stern's index to the Ebers papyrus, from Budge's vocabulary to the Book of the Dead, and from Speleers' index of the Pyramid Texts. A higher standard of scholarship is desirable than that of any of the above-named works, but all of them have earned our heartfelt gratitude. At the present time I conceive that we might ask the Oriental Institute at Chicago to consider the feasibility of a dictionary of Medînet Habu, Professor de Buck might be called upon to arrange a vocabulary of the Coffin Texts, the brilliant band of young French scholars might have requested of them a vocabulary of the Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasty inscriptions that specially interest them, Professor Blackman and Mr. Fairman might be looked to for a dictionary of the Edfu temple, and some other scholar might be entrusted with a complete index of the medical texts. All these special vocabularies would advance simultaneously in different places, and would go into greater detail as regards their own particular fields than could the comprehensive dictionary to be eventually superimposed upon them as a coping-stone. For further information that could not be obtained from the dozen or so special indexes recourse could be had to the Berlin collections, if still extant, as well as to the private notes of individual scholars.

There is much more I might wish to add on this vital issue, but I must desist lest this strange Preface should become strange to the point of absurdity. A few more details must be dealt with very briefly. (1) The Berlin *Belegstellen* suffer from the defect that they contain no references to previous discussions of words in books or special articles, except in a very few cases; as with the place-names (see above, p. xi) Egyptian philology has not yet reached the stage at which it can dispense with discussion, and discussion is barely

THE HIEROGLYPHIC DICTIONARY

possible in the body of the dictionary itself; hence the necessity of bibliographical references, though these must be very carefully selected and must rigorously eschew articles which are unprofitable. (2) Meanings like 'species of tree, animal, fish' (*Art Baum, Tier, Fisch*) so common in the *Wörterbuch* are hardly good enough; we may concede that much useless speculation has been exerted in these fields, but besides these there exist many admirable and convincing investigations which should not have been ignored. (3) No references have been given for variant writings, which, moreover, are not well enough treated; a case in point is the omission of the phonetic writing of *ikm* 'shield', which has special interest as showing the value of the sign Δ . (4) Some means ought to have been devised, perhaps an asterisk attached to the readings, of indicating words that are *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* or very rare; and in this case all the references that exist ought to be given. (5) The separation of words beginning with — (*z*) from those beginning with || (*š*) is unpractical and in part unscientific. The distinction between the two sounds became early obliterated, so that for the greater part of Egyptian history it can only be said that all such words began with *s*. Moreover, in the case of words not found before the Middle Kingdom it is impossible to tell whether their ancestors had initial *z* or initial *š*, so that the placing of them under one or other of these two rubrics is most misleading. The better course would have been to throw all these words together, though noting in the transcriptions whenever there is Old Kingdom evidence for the exact sound; thus the words for 'back' and 'protection' would both be given under *s*, but in the former case (*š*), and in the latter case (*z*), would be added in brackets.

With these few final observations I close this disquisition, which I devoutly hope will not be deemed presumptuous or out of place.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the proofs of the foregoing Preface were finally corrected, news has come to hand that the *Wörterbuch* material is safe and in the possession of the Berlin Academy. Egyptologists will be relieved at these tidings. Little progress with the publication can, however, be expected for the next few years, so that I have not thought fit to alter anything that I have written above.

May, 1947.

SELECTED LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Of the many abbreviations used in this work most will be familiar to the Egyptologists for whom it is intended. Here are given chiefly those abbreviations which (1) might be found ambiguous, (2) use merely the author's name, or (3) do not belong strictly to the literature of Egyptology.

Amélineau	E. Amélineau, <i>La géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque copte</i> . Paris, 1893.
Amélineau, <i>Nouvelles Fouilles</i>	E. Amélineau, <i>Les nouvelles fouilles d'Abydos</i> . 3 vols. Paris, 1899-1904.
Amelung, <i>Vatican</i>	W. Amelung, <i>Die Skulpturen des vatikanischen Museums</i> , Berlin, 1903-36.
Ball	J. Ball, <i>Egypt in the Classical Geographers</i> . Cairo, 1942.
Berend	W. B. Berend, <i>Principaux monuments du Musée égyptien de Florence</i> . Paris, 1882.
BGU	<i>Ägyptische Urkunden aus den . . . Museen zu Berlin : Griechische Urkunden</i> .
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i> .
CIG	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> .
CIS	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum</i> .
Crum	W. E. Crum, <i>A Coptic Dictionary</i> . Oxford, 1939.
Dittenberger	W. Dittenberger, <i>Orientis Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae</i> . 2 vols. Leipzig, 1903-5.
Engelbach, <i>Supplement</i>	R. Engelbach, <i>A Supplement to the Topographical Catalogue of the Private Tombs of Thebes</i> . Cairo, 1924.
Forrer, <i>Forschungen</i>	E. Forrer, <i>Forschungen</i> . Berlin, 1928.
Gauthier [,DG]	H. Gauthier, <i>Dictionnaire des noms géographiques</i> . 7 vols. Cairo, 1925-31.
Gelzer, <i>Geo. Cyp. descriptio</i>	H. Gelzer, <i>Georgii Cyprii descriptio Orbis Romani</i> . Leipzig (Teubner), 1890.
Hesychius, <i>Lex.</i>	M. Schmidt, <i>Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon</i> . Ed. Minor. Jena, 1867.
Hopfner, <i>Fontes</i>	Th. Hopfner, <i>Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae</i> . 5 vols. Bonn, 1922-5.
Kminek-Szedlo	G. Kminek-Szedlo, <i>Catalogo di antichità egizie</i> (Museo civico di Bologna). Turin, 1895.
Knudtzon, <i>EA</i>	J. A. Knudtzon, <i>Die El-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . 3 vols. Leipzig, 1915.
Maspero & Wiet	J. Maspero & G. Wiet, <i>Matériaux pour servir à la géographie de l'Égypte</i> . Cairo, 1919.

SELECTED LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Munier, <i>Recueil</i>	H. Munier, <i>Recueil des listes épiscopales de l'église copte</i> . Cairo, 1943.
Not. Dign.	<i>Notitia Dignitatum et Administrationum omnium tam civilium quam militarium</i> . See Ball, pp. 160 ff.
Pauly-Wissowa	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , edited by G. Wissowa. Stuttgart, 1894-1939.
Preisigke	Fr. Preisigke, <i>Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden</i> . 3 vols. Berlin, 1925-31.
Preisigke, <i>Namenbuch</i>	Fr. Preisigke, <i>Namenbuch enthaltend alle . . . Menschnennamen</i> . Heidelberg, 1922.
Ranke, <i>Keilschr. Mat.</i>	H. Ranke, <i>Keilschriftliches Material zur altägyptischen Vokalisation</i> , in <i>Abh.</i> Berlin, 1910.
Roscher, <i>Lex.</i>	W. H. Roscher, <i>Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie</i> . Leipzig, 1884-1921.
Rossi	Fr. Rossi, <i>I papiri copti del Museo egizio di Torino</i> . 2 vols. Turin, 1887-8.
SB	Fr. Preisigke, <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten</i> . 5 vols. Strassburg, 1915-38.

INTRODUCTION

THE three compositions dealt with in this volume might, on a superficial view, fitly be described as Glossaries, and such, indeed, has been the name hitherto accorded to them. That, however, this designation is incorrect is shown by the wordy and pretentious heading to the most extensive of the three, that which gives Amenopë as the name of its author. Professor Glanville¹ has rightly pointed out that Amenopë had in mind a sort of catalogue of the universe, professing to enumerate the most important things in heaven, on earth, and in the waters. Lexicography was not Amenopë's aim, at all events not his primary aim. Early thought was little interested in words. On the other hand it was intensely interested in things, and the classification and hierarchical arrangement of these may well have seemed a worthy ambition. Hence we have these three lists of entities, very crude attempts to cope with the endless variety of the world, but none the less first steps in the direction of an Encyclopaedia. No explanations are given except of the names of cattle that form a sort of Appendix to the earliest of the books here edited, and the other words in the lists were expected to tell their own tale.

What designation can be suggested to replace the incorrect term Glossary? Before answering this question let us consider that term itself, and examine whether it is really unsuitable and whether Ancient Egypt had nothing corresponding to it. According to the *New English Dictionary* (Oxford) a Glossary is 'a collection of glosses; a list with explanations of abstruse, antiquated, dialectical, or technical terms; a partial dictionary'. A Gloss is defined as 'a word inserted between the lines or in the margins as an explanatory equivalent of a foreign or otherwise difficult word in the text'. The compositions here to be studied fail to qualify as Glossaries, first because they are primarily concerned, not with words, but with things, and secondly because explanations are lacking. It must not be thought, however, that the notion of a Glossary was unknown to the Egyptians. On the contrary, we possess in the xviiith chapter of the Book of the Dead a fine example of a commentary on an ancient

¹ *JEA* xii, 171 f.

INTRODUCTION

text, even if its explanations are more theological than philological. To give an example:

'I am the great one who came into existence of himself.' [Commentary] *'He is the great god, he is Nūn'* (i.e. the god of the primeval waters).

It is impossible to deny to the last words the quality of a genuine gloss. We even catch an echo of the disputes of rival commentators, for in the New Kingdom the earlier explanation has become expanded as follows:

'Who is the great god that came into existence of himself? He is water, he is Nūn, the father of the gods. Another statement: He is Rēc.'

More practically useful were the glosses found in the Ebers medical papyrus, of which the following is a sample (102, 9-11):

'As to "his heart is benighted and he tastes his heart", this means that his heart (i.e. consciousness) is deficient, and darkness is in his body by reason of fury; and that he has occasions of "eating his heart"' (i.e. losing consciousness).¹

The glosses of the Ebers papyrus are doubtless explanations of a number of phrases collected out of other medical books now no longer extant. To that extent they better deserve the name of Glossary than the similar explanations in the Edwin Smith surgical papyrus. Two ostraca in my possession² enumerate the parts of an ox and accompany them with elucidations of an analogous kind; transcriptions will be found near the end of the autographed commentary on the afore-mentioned book having Amenopē as its author.

There is another type of Glossary, exceedingly common in the cuneiform literature, that is not exemplified in our Egyptian material, namely vocabularies of foreign words accompanied by translations. We possess, indeed, one cuneiform tablet from El-'Amārnah³ giving renderings of certain Egyptian words, and this, for all we know, may have been compiled by an Egyptian, or at least with Egyptian help; but nothing of the kind occurs in hieratic or hieroglyphic, and though

¹ *cm ib* is a familiar collocation of words, in which, as *Wb.* i, 184, 14. 15 rightly recognizes, *ib* is sometimes subject, sometimes object. Here the parallelism with 'tastes his heart' shows that *ib* is object, but the context proves that the sense *bereuen* given for the use with object in *Wb.* is impossible; *Wb.* does not quote this passage nor others rightly explained in Sethe, *Dramat. Texte*, 166 as meaning *ohnmächtig werden*.

² Since the above words were written, these ostraca, numbered G 155. 156, have passed into the possession of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

³ *JEA* xi, 230 ff.

INTRODUCTION

I would not go so far as Glanville and maintain that on account of its political and geographical situation, so different from that of Babylonia, Egypt never felt the need of such Glossaries, yet the possibility remains that the Egyptians did in fact omit to evolve that type of manual. From the Middle Ages we possess a number of *Scalae*, as they are called, wherein Coptic words are explained in Arabic, but these are too modern to concern us here. Of like nature to a Glossary, but merely classifying and explaining hieroglyphic signs, is the hieratic papyrus of Roman date the publication of which was one of the late Professor Griffith's earliest contributions to Egyptology.¹ Fragments of what appears to be a Ramesside counterpart are reproduced in Pleyte and Rossi's *Papyrus de Turin*, pl. 144.

The lists of entities with which this book is concerned are clearly not Glossaries, since, as we have seen, they lack the explanations which are an essential feature of glosses, and the same objection rules out the term Encyclopaedia. Their title to be called Vocabularies could be upheld only if the lists could be shown to refer primarily to words, rather than to things, and that was clearly against the intention of the compilers. Here, however, the case is not quite so evident, for any catalogue must *ipso facto* be comprised of words. Nor can our compositions be regarded merely as manuals for teaching spelling. It may be doubted whether the Egyptians ever conceived of spelling-books like those used by European children, and all teaching of the kind may have been left to the individual teachers. Upon ostraca and elsewhere we have isolated words doubtless written for the sake of practice, and there is a whole class of Theban ostraca, discussed some years ago by Professor Wilson,² that brought the stereotyped formulae of Middle Kingdom letters to the knowledge of youthful scribes. This is not the place to raise the question whether the Late-Egyptian Miscellanies collected in a book of my own³ were,

¹ The Sign Papyrus, in *Two Hieroglyphic Papyri from Tanis*, extra memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1889.

² *Mélanges Maspero*, i, 901. While I am convinced, with Wilson, that these are school exercises, I do not believe them to date from the Middle Kingdom, but from the Twentieth Dynasty. I myself possess a very large specimen from Thebes, and there are others elsewhere. The writing seems to copy Middle Egyptian writing, but not to be the genuine article. Perhaps by this means the pupil learnt to master the unfamiliar Middle Egyptian script, as well as the expressions of an earlier period. I believe that all these ostraca emanate from Dêr el-Medīnah.

³ *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*, in *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca*, Brussels, 1937.

INTRODUCTION



as often supposed, wholly didactic in purpose, but true it is that incorporated in them are long lists of natural products, vegetables, fishes, minerals and the like, which are too closely akin to the compositions here edited to permit us to pass them completely in silence.¹ The probable view is that these lists were compiled as much to give instruction in the nature and sources of the things brought to the king by way of tribute as to fulfil the mere function of spelling exercises. Still, the predominance in the Miscellanies of rare words makes it not unlikely that the philological purpose played, if not the primary, yet at least an important secondary part. The same may hold good to some extent of the catalogues here under consideration. But both because the heading of the book written by Amenopĕ affirms the purpose to be different, and also because quite common words are included, it seems advisable to accept Glanville's view that our compositions are lists of entities rather than lists of words.

This judgement is reinforced by general considerations. We do indeed possess from Ancient Egypt a few indications of grammatical interest—an ostrakon or two on which something like a paradigm has been scribbled;² and we find lip-service, and more than lip-service, done to the search for 'beautiful words'.³ But when all is said, it must be admitted that the philological preoccupations of the Egyptians were very rudimentary. When they spoke of 'words' they never referred to their 'meanings';⁴ their preference rather was to concentrate attention on 'things' and their 'names'.⁵ This is in harmony

¹ Good examples are Anast. IV, 13, 11-17, 9; Koller, 3, 5-4, 7; P. Chester Beatty IV, vs. 7, 4-10, 15 with the fragment of a duplicate detected in a Toronto ostrakon by M. Kuentz, see *Bull. inst. fr.* xxxvi, 180. Of similar tendency is the list of Syrian places skilfully worked into the satirical letter contained in Anast. I.

² Ostr. Petrie 28 gives in a vertical column the writings of *iw-i*, *iw-f*, *iw-k*, *iw-n*, *iw* (plur.), *iw-sn*, *iw-t*, curiously overlooking *iw-tn* and *iw-s(t)*; Cairo ostr. 25227 (Daressy) gives *iw-s(t)*, *mt(w)-k*, *iw-tw*, *mt(w)-tw*. These two are of Ramesside date. Prof. Reich (*JEA* x, 285) edits a much more perfect specimen in Demotic of the Ptolemaic period, and approximately of the same kind is the ostrakon published by Hess *ZÄS* xxxv, 147.

³ So in the Eloquent Peasant and on the writing-board Brit. Mus. 5645 published at the end of my *Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage*.

⁴ The nearest Egyptian approach to the notion of 'meaning' is doubtless to be found in the verb  *whr* 'interpret', lit. 'loose', what is 'tied'  *tsst*, see *Wb.* I, 348, 8 ff.

⁵ Examples in reference to common nouns are, however, rare; cf. 'a herb whose name (*rn-s*) is *snwt*', Ebers 51, 15-6. Usually the word signifies either a 'proper name' or an 'attribute' (of a god), nothing more general than this.

INTRODUCTION

with the attitude of classical antiquity. Among the Greeks the earliest word-lists were not Lexica, but Onomastica: catalogues of things arranged under their kinds, not alphabetically classified series of words.¹

Here at last we find the term best suited to the Middle Kingdom papyrus from the Ramesseum and to the composition contained in the manuscript discovered by M. Golénischeff. They are Onomastica in the sense understood by Julius Pollux, as well as by various English writers from the beginning of the eighteenth century. The modern tendency to confine the use of this term to vocabularies of proper names is reprehensible, and I welcome the opportunity here offered to use the word in its original sense.

That the Onomasticon of Amenopĕ was an instructional book is clear from its title, which actually contains the Egyptian word (*sbōye*) for 'instruction'. We must remember, however, that this word had a wider meaning than some might feel inclined to give it nowadays. A survey of the Egyptian books bearing that name shows that the Pharaonic writers held the laudable view that a man is never too old to learn, together with the perhaps less laudable view that one is never too old to teach. The heading of the Ramesseum Onomasticon is lost, but it evidently belongs to the same tradition as the later work. The separate headings on the writing-board at University College, London, are possibly a constant formula ('*I cause you to know . . .*') which introduced each section of a larger work of which we should here then have an excerpt. Whether the use of the pronoun of the second person singular indicates that the book was addressed to some single specific pupil is uncertain.

I have not included in this book a number of ostraca that have claims to belong to this category, partly because their nature is mostly dubious, and partly because Dr. Černý and I hope to find a niche for them elsewhere.

¹ See the interesting remarks in F. Dornseiff, *Der deutsche Wortschatz nach Sachgruppen*, pp. 9 ff.

CHAPTER I

THE RAMESSEUM ONOMASTICON (*Pap. Berlin 10495*)

§1. *Introductory*

THE papyrus reproduced below in plates I–VI, for which the abbreviation On. Ram. will henceforth be used, emanates from a great find made by Quibell some fifty years ago in a tomb of the late Middle Kingdom discovered by him under one of the storerooms at the back of the Ramesseum of Thebes.¹ The only manuscripts thus far published out of this extensive, but extremely fragile and ill-preserved, collection are that containing the early portions of the story of Sinuhe and the Eloquent Peasant and that to which Prof. Kurt Sethe, who edited it, gave the name of the Dramatic Papyrus; also an edition by the late P. C. Smither of some interesting copies of dispatches from officials stationed at Semnah and elsewhere will have appeared by the time this book goes to press. The exact date to which the tomb should be assigned—it may have been that of a doctor or magician—is not quite certain, but may be roughly described as Dyns. XIII–XIV. The individual documents found in the tomb were possibly written at considerable intervals, but it seems unlikely that they could range over a greater period than about a century. Palaeographically, Sinuhe R may be placed with Möller between the great Berlin literary texts and ‘Boulaq 18’, this latter being fixed by internal evidence to the reign of one of the kings named Sebkhotpe. The Ramesseum Onomasticon exhibits a bolder and perhaps earlier handwriting, but we possess no sufficient evidence for determining its date with precision. The signs are clear and well formed, obviously the work of an experienced scribe. For the modern scholar, however, transcription is a matter of some difficulty. It is characteristic of Middle Kingdom hieratic that many of its forms are ambiguous, simple signs like those for \Leftarrow , \Rightarrow and \Leftarrow being often indistinguishable. When a text so written contains a large percentage of unknown words, and is full of lacunae into the bargain, the editor has obviously a formidable task before him. The late Prof. G. Möller was good enough to revise my copy, and this gives me

¹ Egyptian Research Account, 1896. *The Ramesseum*, by J. E. Quibell, p. 3.

THE RAMESSEUM ONOMASTICON

hope it is fairly free from obvious errors. The Corrigenda at the end of the second Text volume must of course be consulted.

By arrangement with Sir Flinders Petrie, this papyrus was disposed of to the Berlin Museum in 1910 in order to cover the cost of unrolling and mounting, tasks which had necessitated a visit of Dr. H. Ibscher to England in 1907. So delicate was the material, and so much had it suffered from exposure to damp, that the only course possible was to fasten down upon gelatine each fragment as soon as unrolled, and the whole was mounted under glass in ten sheets. The beginning is lost and there are large gaps between the early folds. The end, on the other hand, is intact, and the *verso* of the last portion gives some cursive accounts which I have attempted to transcribe on pl. VI A. The length of the consecutive text apart from the fragments at the beginning is 178 cm., and the height 14 cm. The lengths of the separate sheets, reckoned from right to left, are as follows: 41, 45, 45 and 47 cm. The first join runs over the sheet adjoining it on the left, whereas the two remaining joins are below the neighbouring sheets. The papyrus is very fine in quality, and its colour a dark brown on which the black ink shows up only indifferently well. There are no rubrics.

§2. *Contents*

The title, if ever there was one, is lost. We may conjecture it would have conveyed much the same sense as the Introduction to the Onomasticon of Amenopĕ (see below, Chapter II), though possibly in more concise and less bombastic language. After the title the word-lists will have begun. A separate line was devoted to every word, and the determinatives are divided by an interval from the preceding phonetic spelling, so that the species of things referred to can be rapidly and easily recognized by the reader, or rather would have been so recognized had the determinatives been less ambiguous than they usually are. In two sections (before ll. 171–82 and before ll. 217 ff.) short vertical lines give the classificatory headings. A rare feature of this papyrus is that the lines are numbered,¹ every tenth line being preceded by the appropriate number, and in ll. 324–5 the scribe has added a total informing us that the book ought to have enumerated 343 items, but that it in fact contained only 323. In

¹ The vertical columns of a literary text on the *verso* of the perhaps roughly contemporary Butler papyrus (*Proc. SBA* xiv, 451 ff.) are similarly numbered.

reality the number of items was even smaller, since one item is missing between the line-numbers 230-40, and another between 250 and 260. It is worth noting that the determinatives were evidently added after the relevant column of names had been completed, since they are often out of line, and in two instances recorded in the critical notes on ll. 268, 298 there are either less or more determinatives than words corresponding to them. A last peculiarity to be mentioned is that the text, as occasionally happened at this period, was enclosed between parallel lines ruled lengthwise near top and bottom.

The lists are followed by an enumeration of twenty different types of cattle, the lines unnumbered, but a total being added at the end, and on the *verso*, as already stated, there are some very obscure accounts in a different and more cursive handwriting.

To pass from generalities to particulars, from the beginning down to No. 90 (the original line-numbering is here retained) not a single word is completely preserved or translatable. The lists will have included plant-names and liquids, to judge from the determinatives; an entry in Fragment B might easily be restored as *hnkt* 'beer'. In Nos. 91-2 we for a moment touch *terra firma* with '*šft*-oil' (or 'resin') and 'first-quality oil of the *š*-tree'. In the next two columns,

¹ These are two of the seven oils or oleo-resins enumerated frequently and in stereotyped order in tombs subsequent to Dyn. V, see Junker, *Giza II*, 75. *Šft* is Copt. *šcqe*, *šciqu* (Crum, 379), corresponding to *شقران*, explained in Hava's *Arabic Dictionary* as tar extracted from the juniper; *cqe* is used also as name of a tree, and *we ncqe* is rendered in Greek as *ξύλον κέδρινον*. In *JEA* xvii, 13 ff. Lucas deals with the 'cedar'-tree products employed in mummification, and quotes authority to show that what the ancients called *κέδρος* 'cedar' was a juniper; he also states that an oleo-resin has been found to have been much used in mummification, and that it may well have been obtained from the juniper. Evidence given in my *Admonitions*, pp. 32-3, shows that *šft* was used in mummification and, no less than *hnt nt š*, was a product of the *š*-tree; and the classical writers speak of *κεδρία* and *cedrium* as utilized in connexion with mummies. The inference thus far, accordingly, is that the *š*-tree must be a juniper. The *š*-tree, together with its product *šft*, was brought from the Lebanon (*Admonitions*, loc. cit.); and various junipers are found in the Lebanon. To this view, however, there are serious objections: Loret emphasizes the unsuitability of juniper-wood for shipbuilding, a purpose (*Ann. Serv.* xvi, 33 ff.) for which large planks of *š*-wood were constantly used; and he, therefore, holds that the *š*-tree was *Abies cilicica*, the Cilician fir, this view being favoured also by Glanville, *ZAS* lxxviii, 8 f. for the true *š*, though he takes the ordinary sort to be *Pinus Pinea*. As against these views, the report on wood used in ancient objects from Egypt which Lucas has given in his *Ancient Egyptian Materials*, 376 ff., gives but little prominence to firs and pines. Newberry (*Egypt as a Field for Anthropological Research*, 14. 16) believes that *š* was

however, we are once more adrift; here again liquids and plants alternate, with three entries (Nos. 108, 113-14) perhaps devoted to wickerwork objects and several others determined by signs that may refer to minerals, seed, or other substances manifesting themselves in fine particles. Nos. 122-33 deal with birds, beginning with two well-known kinds of goose (*r*, *trp*); among the following, *dndn*, *mnt* (probably = *mnwt* 'pigeon'),¹ *hrt* and *wš:t* will all be found in the dictionary, while *kk* (No. 132) is presumably the 'hoopoe', in Pharaonic times known from only one other instance,² but the name being apparently contained in the Coptic compound *κακογυπατ*. The birds are succeeded by fishes (Nos. 134-52), most of the names damaged, but among them being some of which the identity can be guessed (*šb[dw]*, *ims[kš]*), if not determined with certainty (*ncr*, *šdw*, *wšd* for later *wš*, see for this the Commentary on On. Am., No. 365); *tssw* (No. 139) is the oldest example of a fish-name of which Černý has discussed the many variants.³ After the fishes we return to birds (Nos. 153 ff.), which in No. 162 or No. 163 give place to a disproportionately short series of quadrupeds. Four of the bird-names are completely destroyed, but *dšt* 'crane', [*dš*]⁴ 'flamingo' and *bik* 'falcon' are certainties, while *šiw* (No. 161) may be a small bird depicted at Beni Hasan (II, 4), where, however, the hieroglyphic legend gives *š*. The animals include the 'gazelle' (*ghs*), the 'bubalis' (*ššw*), the 'North African Wild Sheep' (*ibw*)⁵ and the 'giraffe' (*mmi*); it is regrettable that a lacuna has deprived us of the full name (*bf*?) here given to the cynocephalus ape (No. 170).

Then follows the list of southern fortresses discussed by me in an article (*JEA* III, 184 ff.) which formed a sort of philological appendix

a name for coniferous trees generally. The sole point on which all authorities are agreed is that the 'cedars of Lebanon' mentioned in the Bible, the classical *cedrus* and the Egyptian *š*-tree, were none of them identical with 'cedar' in the modern botanical sense.

¹ See the notes on *mnt* in the supplement to the autographed commentary on On. Am., under C 3, 1. 3.

² N. and N. de G. Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, etc.*, p. 25, where reference is made to Keimer's article *Bull. inst. fr.* xxx, 318 ff.

³ *Bull. inst. fr.* xxxvii, 38 ff.

⁴ See, too, Leps., *Todtb.*, 31, 9.

⁵ *Wb.* I, 62, 18, depicted Steindorff, *Ti*, pl. 128; *Beni Hasan*, II, pls. 4 and 13. Newberry tells me that Hilzheimer in Borchardt, *Sahurē*, II, Text, 173 is right in describing the animal (there shown in photograph) as *Ammotragus lervia*, a designation superior to that of *Ovis tragelaphus* in *Wb.*

to the plans and descriptions of the actual monuments printed in the same volume by Somers Clarke, P. Douglas Wells, and Sir Henry Lyons. A few years later Borchardt¹ published a monograph embodying the results of a very short visit made to the Second Cataract by Schäfer and himself in 1900; it seems hardly likely that this hasty investigation can have added much of importance to the articles published in *JEA*, but there are some photographs which are not unwelcome. On the linguistic side, little additional material has come to light unless it be in the still unpublished excavations by Reisner. Also one or two of the names occur in a Ramesseum papyrus with copies of dispatches from an Egyptian official stationed in one of the southernmost of these outposts; right up to a few days before his untimely death P. C. Smither was devoting intensive study to this difficult papyrus, and his results have been prepared for publication in *JEA* by Prof. Gunn; meanwhile I shall quote one or two observations from a letter addressed by Smither to myself. The fortresses of On. Ram. number seventeen (Nos. 171–87), and extend from south of Semnah at the upper end of the Second Cataract to Gebel es-Silsilah nearly 70 km. north of Elephantine, and like the towns that follow are obviously arranged in consecutive order from south to north. Here no more shall be repeated from my former essay than the identifications there proposed; deviations therefrom and comments due to Borchardt² or Smither will be accompanied by the letters B or S respectively:

Dsr-hst (?); B, Kidinkalo?

Shm-Hckwrc-mchrw, Semnah.

Itnw-pdwt, Kummah.

Hsf-Twntyw, Uronarti.

Wcf-h:swt, Shalfak (S).³

Dr-Wtyw (?) or *Dr-mtyw* (?), see the Corrigenda, Mirgissah.

Ikñ, Dabnarti = Dabe (B, Dabe ?). S queries this.⁴

¹ *Altägyptische Festungen an der zweiten Nilschnelle*, Leipzig, 1923.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 25, n. 4.

³ Extract from letter 13, viii, 43: 'Your suggestion that this was probably Shalfak fort is now proved by the large number of sealings found on the site, Boston MFA, *Bull.* xxix, 70.'

⁴ From letter: 'In the Semneh boundary decree, Nubians are permitted to go north to trade at *Ikñ*, "but without allowing any boat belonging to Nubians to pass by *Hēh* northwards for ever". It seems rather unreasonable, therefore, to identify

Bwhn, Wādy Ḥalfah.

Ink-twy, Sarret el-gharb? B, Wādy Ḥalfah East?

Hsf-Mdw,; B, Sarret el-gharb?; S, Faras?¹

Mcm, Anibah.

Bki, Kûbân.

Snm, Biggah.

[*3*] *bw*, Elephantine.

. . . *dd*,; B, Kûbânîyah?

lost,
















Hny, Gebel es-Silsilah.

After the fortresses comes an important list of twenty-nine towns (Nos. 188–216) which will receive individual attention within the framework of the Commentary on the similar, but much longer, series in the Onomasticon of Amenopē, see below, II, pp. 1*–44*, together with pls. xxiv, xxv. The list extends from Elephantine to a little beyond Ekhnîm. Since the fortresses continue as far north as Gebel es-Silsilah, the two lists overlap, and the name of Elephantine occurs twice (Nos. 184, 188). After every town-name there is added a symbol of a peculiar and problematical type, the purpose of which it is not easy to discern. There is, however, a clear analogy between these symbols and those accompanying the enumeration of the different varieties of cattle to be discussed a few pages on, and the two sets of symbols must be considered together. Perhaps they were abbreviations used in inventories or the like. There are certain Theban ostraca which display similar cryptic symbols sometimes accompanied by numbers,² and though these are just as little intelligible, they possibly give some inkling of the use. Another suggestion of mine, namely, that these symbols were employed for branding upon the heads of slaves or cattle, a practice for which one of the best pieces of evidence is in a fragmentary papyrus belonging to the Museum of Varzy (Nièvre),³ suits the town-names well enough, but *Ikñ* with one of the islands (e.g. Dabnarti) at the mouth of Wādy Matûkah. The road from the Wādy Selîmah Oasis away to the south-west must come fairly close here on its way to Wādy Ḥalfah, and Mirgissah might make a suitable trading-post.'


¹ From letter: 'Your objection to Faras is perhaps no longer valid since Griffith's excavation of the Dyn. XII fort, *Liverpool Annals*, viii, pl. 16, pp. 80 ff.'

² Petrie, *Formation of the Alphabet*, frontispiece; Daressy, *Ostraca (CCG)*, pl. LIX, Nos. 25316, 25318; Černý, *Ostraca hiératiques (CCG)*, pl. LXVI, No. 25651, vs.

³ *ZAS* v, 76 ff.; to be republished in my *Ramesseid Administrative Documents*, pp. 59–60.





will not do for the list of cattle; in the latter case the symbols refer to the different colours and markings of the animals, and these would not, of course, be branded with signs merely indicating what any observer could see for himself. To return to the individual symbols: some of them, indeed the great majority, indicate either the initial sound of the place-name in question (e.g. Nos. 189, 197, 198), or else consist of some characteristic sign entering into its spelling, e.g.  in  No. 206,  in  No. 207,  in  No. 212. Interesting is a case where a letter of the alphabet designates a town of which the name begins with a trilateral sign (No. 190); this seems to imply a consciousness of the alphabet as such which some have recently been rather unreasonably inclined to doubt. In the isolated case of Coptus the nome-sign, consisting of two falcons, serves as the symbol (No. 205). If I am right in restoring the group accompanying No. 210 as the Horus name of Ammenemes III, this is useful in determining which Ammenemes was meant by the cartouche contained in the name. There remain some obscure cases: one does not see why This (No. 213) should be represented by a sign which bears some resemblance to , but is curtained off and stands on a pedestal or platform. A building of some sort serves as the symbol of Ekhnim (No. 215), and presumably depicts the  *hnt* which enters into the Egyptian name of that town.¹ The sign  which is the badge of *Nhb* (El-Kâb, No. 192) is particularly interesting, since late nome-lists mention as the characteristic of the place the  *bt* (old  *bd*)² or 'natron' which it produced;³ as the Textual Note on pl. II A indicates, the sign here is really  and can hardly be , and it seems accordingly likely, either that there was some mythological nexus between 'natron' and 'bone', or else that a confusion between the hieratic for  and for  had arisen as early as the Middle Kingdom.


To revert to the towns themselves, seven out of the twenty-nine are mentioned nowhere else, and this doubtless points to the early prominence of a number of places that later sank into insignificance,

¹ This interpretation seems justified by the determinative . The word cannot well be identified with the *htyw* or 'terrace' so often used in connexion with Min, see *Wb.* III, 349, 1; Gauthier in *Kémi*, II, 41 ff.





² *Wb.* I, 486, 8; also De Morgan, *Kom Ombos* (II), No. 885.




³ See the valuable article by Lucas in *JEA* XVIII, 62 ff., reprinted in his *Ancient Egyptian Materials*, pp. 221 ff.



unless indeed they changed their names. The nome-capitals of the first nine Upper Egyptian nomes all appear in the list, except that Thebes is represented, this not unexpectedly, by Hermonthis (No. 200). Stelae of Dyn. XI had acquainted us with the importance of Gebelên and its neighbourhood at that period, so that the appearance of *Hft* and *Pr-Hthr* (Nos. 197-8) does not surprise, and the same applies to This (No. 213). *Kûs* (No. 204) is a town that has held its own throughout the whole of Egyptian history. It is pure chance that has preserved for us outside references to *Iw-šnšn* (No. 203) and *Šbt* (No. 207). Not the least interesting feature of the list is the part played in it by royal names: Unis of Dyn. V is there found, and so are Sesostri I, Sesostri III, and Ammenemes III of Dyn. XII. It is amusing to note that the town of Hû, now no more than a modest monosyllable, was originally 'the Mansion of the Sistrum of Kheperkarê, deceased' (No. 209). The later tendency was to drop the king's name as the memory of his power and glory faded; at least this is exemplified in *Wḥ-swt* (No. 211), and that it is true of Memphis is a fact familiar to all Egyptologists. I conclude this characterization of the town-list of On. Ram. by stressing its arbitrary nature. For example, the famous  *Iw-m-itrw* 'Island-in-the-river' near Gebelên is omitted, though frequently mentioned in the Middle Kingdom. So, too,  *Drty*, the modern Et-Tôd, and  *Mḏw*, the modern Medâmûd, are absent, though the French excavations at both places have placed their early prosperity beyond all doubt. On the other hand,  *Nbt* 'Ombos', near Tûkh, may possibly have been passed over intentionally on account of its Typhonian associations.¹

At the close of the abruptly terminated list of towns a short vertical title (No. 216 A) ushers in a very different category of objects. The words 'Things placed upon water' would be incomprehensible but for the fact that the determinative  for loaves or cakes discloses the nature of the next thirty or more items. Even so, the meaning of the heading is far from clear; I take it to signify that the cakes and biscuits were normally dipped in water before being eaten. The category may have extended as far as No. 253, since, though the last five determinatives are lost, the word *ht(w)* in No. 252 designates

¹ For these four towns see Nos. 331, 331 A, 337, and 341 in the Commentary on On. Am.


a well-known kind of loaf (*Wb.* III, 204, 8. 9). Among the preceding items those that are unknown far outnumber those common in our texts. However, *šwt*, *prsn*, *pct*, *šrt*, *pst*, and *šryt* all present a familiar appearance; the variant  for  (No. 224) is by no means rare, but it may be doubted whether any other example could be quoted earlier than the New Kingdom; also it is strange that On. Ram. should distinguish *šwt*, *šrt*, and *šryt*, all of which *Wb.* IV, 421, 3 ff. has not unnaturally lumped together. For No. 225   *bit* should be read, see *Wb.* I, 417, 7, where it is doubtless rightly identified with the later *bit*; *bhsu* (No. 219) and *gw* (No. 234) are rarities, but will be found in *Wb.* This list of products of the baker's or confectioner's industry should be compared with that in the Onomasticon of Amenopē (Nos. 508–48); they possess in common no more than three items (*bit*, *pst*, and *šryt*).



From confectionery the scribe of On. Ram. passes to cereals (Nos. 254–65), reversing the order later to be adopted by Amenopē. There is a difficulty about the initial word (No. 254), since it appears to project beyond the line of the rest of the column; one expects , *it* 'barley', but the damaged signs or sign lend no countenance to this suggestion. For *bty* (= *bdt*), *bš*, *bn(r)it*, and *swt* the student must consult the Commentary on On. Am.; in that document as well as elsewhere *bš* and *bn(r)it* are juxtaposed, as they are here, and for that reason I was at one moment tempted to conjecture that *bn(r)it* in such contexts was a specially sweet cereal and had nothing to do with dates at all; however, the elaborate discussion by Struve in his commentary on the Moscow mathematical papyrus does not mention, much less favour, that possibility. In pl. III A the correct reading of No. 260 has not been recognized; it is clearly   *nd* 'flour', cf. On. Am. No. 506. *Wgmw* (No. 261) is a rare word derived from a stem meaning 'triturate';² it apparently means 'crushed grain' and is perhaps, not completely identical with *nd* that here precedes it.³


¹ The curious treatment of *o* in this word as a phonetic sign, which is shown by the appending of the phonetic complement *e*, would cause no surprise in the New Kingdom, where writings like  are common. At so early a date the phenomenon seems confined to On. Ram., where an example has occurred already in  No. 192.





² *Wb.* I, 377, 9; see, too, Breasted, *Edwin Smith Papyrus*, p. 497; Montet, *Scènes*, 235; *ZAS* LXI, 5.

³ *Wb.* I, 377, 10 gives only a word for 'powder' from a late text which I have been

The following word  *bi*¹ occurs in medical texts, and since it is found qualified as 'of wheat' or 'of barley' may well, as *Wb.* I, 432, 10, 11 supposes, be a kind of coarse meal or 'groats'. The three remaining words classified by their determinatives as grain are all unknown, though the strangely written No. 263 looks as though it were a variety of 'wheat' (*swt*, No. 259), and *šrt* (No. 265) might be the chief ingredient in one or other of the similarly named cakes, see above.

After the cereals the scribe has inserted five items with the determinative , this, however, being inadvertently omitted in No. 268; the last item of the five (No. 270) is completely destroyed. The first (No. 266) is the common word for 'salt', *hmst*, Copt. ^{SB} ⲉⲙⲓⲧ, which at first sight seems repeated in No. 315. No. 267 (*h*) is known from a number of sources and is thought to be a kind of bread;² this is usually determined with , as is also *šbt* (No. 268), recorded only from the medical literature (*Wb.* IV, 437, 10. 11; 438, 1). Next comes a very familiar word in *srmt* (No. 269), often named as a beverage, but from the determinative here and elsewhere also stored away in a dry state; that it was sometimes consumed in that state is proved in the Commentary on On. Am., under No. 563.

A list of no less than forty-one entries follows, all determined with , and the captions on pls. III–IV, printed many years ago, betray the regrettable fact that these entries were at that time regarded as parts of the human body. To such a view the word *hpš* (No. 275) is no real objection, since although written with the foreleg of an ox, it is commonly employed of human beings as well, though perhaps more frequently with a meaning akin to our 'strong right arm' than in a strictly physiological sense. However, *iwr* (No. 276), *swt* (No. 277) and *shn* (No. 306 = On. Am. No. 604), belong to the longer offering-list of the Old Kingdom,³ there clearly referring to

unable to verify. *Urk.* IV, 687, 14–15, describing the richness of the land of Djahy, says 'their barley was on the threshing floors  as well as *wgm*, it is more plentiful than sand of the shore'; lastly, Edgerton & Wilson, *Historical Records*, p. 33, n. 64a, have recognized the word in *Medinet Habu*, [I], 28, 64, where the enemy is said to be    'crushed like *wgm*'.

¹ The lacuna marked after *i* in the transcription should be omitted.

² *Wb.* I, 12, 10 ff.; add to the references there Sethe, *Dramat. Texte*, p. 214; *Urk.* IV, 171, 9.



³ Junker, *Giza II*, 85 ff.

the parts of an ox, and the two latter, so far as is known, only so used; this indicates that the scribe was here writing with an eye to the butcher, rather than to the surgeon or the medical practitioner. If any doubt on the point should still be felt, it must surely be dispelled by *whmt* 'hoof' (No. 281);¹ also *pdsu*, a part of the back (No. 284),² and *knkn* (No. 303, see on On. Am. No. 593) are unknown except in reference to slaughtered oxen. Thus it can barely be disputed that the lists of objects determined with *s* in both the principal Onomastica here treated are concerned solely with sacrificial joints³ and the like; for this observation I am indebted to Mr. W. R. Dawson, who has also furnished me with valuable comments on a number of the items. In On. Ram. the order of enumeration affords but little help, since though *d3d3* 'head' (No. 273) comes near the beginning, *nhbt* 'neck' (No. 283) is a long way off, and is preceded by words connected with the legs (Nos. 278–81). These, it is true, are grouped together, as also are the orthodox set of viscera (Nos. 295, 297, 298), but on the whole, disorder has prevailed over order. A number of the entries in On. Ram. are half-destroyed or subject to insurmountable difficulties of reading (Nos. 271, 272, 289, 294, 296, 305), while others provide us with unfamiliar names for the explanation of which we have no resource (Nos. 285, 287 [each of these followed by an indented word which looks like a qualification, Nos. 286, 288], 304, 307). No. 308 can at least be translated: 'bone of the back of the head, good'; but what the final epithet can mean, or which of the two elements of the compound it qualifies, is obscure, unless we accept an interesting, if daring, hypothesis that Dawson has put forward for consideration. He writes that if 'back of the head' can mean 'below the base of the skull' the main hyoid bone might here be intended; this is a thin bone shaped somewhat like the Greek letter Y, whence the name *ὀστούν ὑοειδές*, and is often carried about as a charm against rheumatism, &c.; Dawson asks whether this custom might not have originated in the Egyptians' calling it *ḫ*, i.e. 'good', 'lucky', an epithet which may have been suggested by the shape. It seems to me that Dawson's idea may be right, even if his final suggestion





¹ *Wb.* I, 340, 12. 13.


² *Wb.* I, 567, 1; for analogies to the writing here see Dévaud, *Sphinx*, XIII, 89.


³ *Phwyf*, No. 293, see below, does not appear to suit this description and is absent from other lists.




be rejected. Some of the items not specifically mentioned hitherto are common to the Ramesseum Onomasticon and to that of Amenopē, and where necessary these have been discussed in the commentary to the latter. Thus *drw* 'flank' (No. 274, cf. pl. VA, B 11) is On. Am. No. 605. *Dpt*, sometimes at least meaning 'loins' (On. Am. No. 592), here appears in three entries, each with its own epithet, and in the two first occurrences the word is dual: No. 290, 'two long *dpt*'; No. 291 'two *dpt* of *wsh* [or *sk* (?)]'; No. 292, '*dpt* of the rectum (?)', see below on No. 293. *Mhtw* 'intestines' (No. 295) is On. Am. No. 602. *Nnsm* 'spleen' (No. 297) is On. Am. No. 600. *Mist* 'liver' (No. 298) is On. Am. No. 598. *H3ty* 'heart' (No. 300) is On. Am. No. 601. *Ffy* (No. 301), which my note on pl. IVA took to be a miswriting of *wf(s)* 'lung', On. Am. No. 579—the position near *nnsm* and *mist* suits this suggestion well—is probably after all a separate word, since, as Dawson points out, Ostr. Gard. 156, an important list of parts of an ox, of which a transcription will be found in the autographed text, after naming *wf(y)* as No. 11, places a  near the end of the list of viscera (No. 17) and thus appears to regard it as a different member; he also quotes  from a potsherd naming various kinds of meat, Petrie, *Tell el Amarna*, pl. 25, No. 101. The wholly problematic *rcmw* (No. 302), if that be the true reading, is quoted under On. Am. No. 603. Common also to On. Ram. and On. Am., and not hitherto mentioned, is *kb3t* 'breast' (No. 310), see under On. Am. No. 584; it is very curious that the author of On. Ram. should have left this to so near the end of his list.



There remain a few entries not found in On. Am. and yet known from other sources; upon these I will now comment in turn.




No. 278.  *sdh*, rendered *Unterschenkel*, i.e. 'shank', *Wb.* IV, 394, 1 ff. is clearly a part of the leg, since the writing  is well known, e.g. P. Ebers, 30, 1, and the word is found with others referring to the leg, not only here, but (e.g.) P. Ch. Beatty VII, vs. 5, 3; there were two members of the name, cf.  Metternich stela 28. In these two examples it is used of man; written  it is mentioned as an edible part of an ox, *P. Boulaq* XI, 3, 14; 5, 7 = *Mélanges Maspero*, I, 190–1. As such, Dawson thinks that the word refers to what butchers call the 'shin of beef'.





No. 279.  *mnt* 'hind leg' of ox, 'leg', 'thigh' in men, fully illustrated in *Wb.* II, 68, 8 ff. The 'foreleg' is *hps*, see under On. Am. No. 595.





No. 280.  *hnd* 'leg' or 'foot' according to *Wb.* III, 313, 22–3;



as a choice piece of meat, determined with , Budge, *BD.*, 466, 14; 478, 7, but this is  of *Pyr.* 124. 133. 1547, which *Wb.* III, 314, 18 treats as a word apart, apparently considering *hnd* determined by  as etymologically connected with the verb *hnd* (not *hnd*) 'tread'. Material to judge of this problem is not available to me. The word does not occur in later secular texts like *P. Boulaq XI* and *Ostr. Gard.* 155. 156, but is found as a medicament in *P. Ebers* 63, 10; 97, 6. A picture of slaughtering in *Nav.*, *Deir el Bahari* 107 seems to connect it with the foreleg, and the joint is occasionally named in lists of offerings, e.g. *op. cit.* 143; *P. Ch. Beatty IX*, rt. 10, 14, though not found in the stereotyped early longer list. Since the *Dêr el-Bahri* pictures are traditional, perhaps the word became obsolete early. *Wb. loc. cit.* mentions *hnd* as part of the human body, but I have not found it in that sense.

No. 282.   *ist* 'back'; too common to need further comment.


No. 293.   *phwyt* 'rectum', *Wb.* I, 537, 3, a derivative of  *phwy* 'hind quarters' found elsewhere only in the medical papyri, see in particular *P. Ch. Beatty VI*. Here the word has occurred already in the compound expression of No. 292. See, too, my footnote above, p. 16, n. 3.


No. 299.   *mndr*, mentioned among viscera, both of man and of animals, *Wb.* II, 94, 1. 2. The position here immediately after 'spleen' and 'liver' and just before 'heart' is clearly not fortuitous, since in *Nav.*, *Litanie du soleil*, 14, 36 = 20, 41 = 32, 33 we find the enumeration 'liver, spleen, lung, *mndr* and intestines', and when in *P. Ch. Beatty VIII*, vs. 4, 10 'heart, lung, spleen and  were found named in that order, Faulkner was probably right in conjecturing (*Text*, p. 73, n. 6) that this is not the *mndt* familiar elsewhere as a part of the face (*Wb.* II, 93, 10), but a writing of *mndr*. *P. Ebers* 91, 11 recommends *mndr* of a goat (*wrtv*) as the ingredient of a drug, and 101, 7-8 speaks of finding something in (i.e. the core of?) a cyst 'like the *mndr* of a mouse'. *Ostr. Gard.* 156 mentions *mndr* twice in its account of the parts of an ox; in l. 16 we again find it in close association with 'lung, heart, liver, spleen and intestines' (ll. 11-15) and as a single organ; the previous reference (l. 9) is in a very obscure gloss. Dawson first conjectured that *mndr* was an alternative word for  *r-ib* 'stomach', but later hazarded the guess that it indicated rather the 'gall-bladder'; in form it appears to be a derivative of *ndr* 'to catch hold of', 'secure'.

No. 311.   *bbyt*, 'region of the throat', elsewhere known in this exact writing only from *P. Edw. Smith*, 12, 1, where it is mentioned in close conjunction with   *bbwy* named several times in the same passage; for *bbwy* Breasted elicited the meaning 'clavicles', 'collar-bones' (p. 349), and the *bbyt* is clearly a region in the neighbourhood of these. Dawson takes exception, however, to the terms in which Breasted defined this region (p. 349) and himself describes it as 'in man the region of the upper part of the thorax, on both sides of the body immediately overlying the clavicles, and in the ox (where

the flesh is much thicker) between the "neck" and the "brisket"'. *Wb.* I, 455, 5 adds a less full writing   *bbt* from Graeco-Roman texts (Chass., *Mammisi*, 89. 90 and another unpublished), which it renders 'throat'; this must surely be identical with *bbyt* in *On. Ram.* and the surgical papyrus. It is to be noted that *bbyt* here appropriately follows *kbt* 'breast', which, however, is itself glaringly out of place; perhaps both were an afterthought.

From the above survey it is clear that only a certain proportion of the parts of an ox named in *On. Ram.* are found also in *On. Am.* This latter has many parts (Nos. 582. 583. 585. 587. 588, etc.) that are absent from *On. Ram.* The two ostraca often quoted above and later to be given in transcription add new names, but themselves lack some found in the other two sources. A few of the divergences may be the result of changes of name due to the different periods to which the documents belong, but the main cause is undoubtedly the writers' caprice and indifference to completeness. Even so, it is singular that the compiler of *On. Ram.* has not thought fit to include the joints called *spht* and *mid*, mentioned in the Pyramid texts and of fairly common occurrence later.

The remainder of *On. Ram.* (Nos. 312-23) is devoted to items determined with , a form of determination which thus occurs for the fourth time. Such repetition might plausibly be explained by the wide range of significance of the determinatives in question; it might, for example, be sought to show that Nos. 266-70 were all condiments of one kind or another, and that Nos. 312-23 were all of them fruits,¹ or at least products of trees, as several of them indubitably are. But to such a view *hmst* 'salt' (No. 315) and *hsmn* 'natron' (No. 316) seem at first sight recalcitrant, and *hmst*, as we have seen, occurred already as No. 266; however, we shall discover below that there was a fruit or vegetable called *hmtyt* or *hmst*, a homonym of the word for 'salt'. Again here we find a certain grouping of the names, but it would appear that, whenever the author had an afterthought, as in the case, if not of 'salt', at least of 'natron', the fear of spoiling the consistency of his series never deterred him. To turn now to details. For the very rare *bti* (No. 312), a fruit of bitter taste, see *Wb.* I, 417, 9f. The next word, written

¹ The determinative , properly belonging only to the vine (*ivrt*), is here abnormally used with both *swtb* (No. 318) and *nbs* (No. 320), and stresses the fact that fruit is meant.

dkw (No. 313), presents some difficulty, since though the meaning 'powder', 'meal' (*Wb.* v. 494, 15 ff.) cannot be doubted,¹ yet such a word without added qualification seems too general for our Onomasticon, while, on the other hand, though merely *dk*, instead of the fuller *dkr*, occurs in the word for 'fruit' (𓄏𓄏𓄏, *Wb.* v. 495, 8 ff.), it is not quite certain that the determinative = could have been dispensed with, and the objection of excessive generality would apply here too;² in No. 314 *hft-mw* seems an unpromising compound, and *Wb.* records nothing of the kind; a natural suggestion is 𓄏𓄏𓄏 *hmt*, but here again not only is no such word known with the determinative 𓄏𓄏𓄏, but also the substitution of 𓄏 for 𓄏 does not suit the hieratic. Passing over the presumed 'salt' and 'natron' (Copt. ⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ *vítpon*), *kzw* (No. 317; *Wb.* v. 96, 14-15) has been proved by Keimer³ to be the name of the still unripe fruit of the sycomore-fig (*nht* = *Ficus sycomorus*), whereas *nkw* (No. 319; *Wb.* II, 343, 8 ff., but there fem. *nkw*) was shown by him to be the ripe fruit, which was always notched in order to destroy through an influx of air the insects that bred in it (Copt. ⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ, ⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟ, ⲉⲗⲁⲛⲟⲩ). These two are in On. Ram. somewhat perversely separated by *šwzb* (No. 318), well known⁴ to be the classical *persea*, the Arabic لبخ *lebbakh*, scientifically *Mimusops Schimperii*, in Coptic ⲉⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ, ⲉⲙⲛⲉ, with many variants (Crum, 603). In No. 320 *nbs* is the much mentioned Egyptian name of the Christ's thorn-tree,⁵ *Zizyphus spina Christi*, once in Old Coptic as ⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ (ZÄS xxxviii, 86), the Arabic سدر *sidr*, with a well-flavoured yellow or reddish berry called in Arabic نبق *nabk*; it must be this berry which is here called *pi*, but the word is unrecorded, 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏, *išdt nt nbs* being occasionally used instead. In *tpw n st* (?), which follows in No. 321, the first word is found especially as the name of a product of the *wcn*-tree (*Wb.* v. 295,

¹ The examples followed by 'alabaster' (*šs*) and 'natron' (*hsmn*), both from P. Edw. Smith, 21, 6-7 are particularly convincing.

² Mar., *Cat. d'Abydos*, No. 908 quotes 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏 for what is usually written 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏 or the like, but Lange & Schäfer gives 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏 instead (Cairo 20266); the latter reading is unconvincing, since no such expression is known.

³ *Acta Or.* vi, 288 ff.; also *Anc. Eg.* XIII, 65 f., and again in far greater detail, *Bull. inst. fr.* xxviii, 50 ff. An additional example, again fem., occurs in P. Ch. Beatty III, rt. 7, 2, in translating which I refused, as I do here, to use the accepted, but barbarous, English spelling 'sycamore'.














⁴ Detailed account, Keimer, *Gartenpflanzen*, I, 31 ff., 144 ff.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 64 ff., 160 ff.

8. 9), but there seems no means of restoring the damaged second word. *Inst* (No. 322) is found in P. Ebers mostly determined with 𓄏𓄏𓄏, and in P. Hearst only with 𓄏𓄏𓄏, but the identity of the two is proved by Ebers 79, 15 = Hearst 7, 2; this was one of the commodities brought by the Eloquent Peasant in the story from the Wâdy Naṭrûn (*R* 34), and *Wb.* (I, 100, 1) here breaks through its custom in order to propose a questioning and highly questionable identification with Greek ἀνισον 'anise'. Lastly (No. 323), we find an entry *imy n hmyt* containing a word *hmyt* which Loret has treated most interestingly in *Mél. Maspero* I, 854, n. 1; 866 ff., his point of departure being that remarkable passage in P. Edwin Smith (21, 9-22, 10) which records an elaborate process of obtaining from *hmyt* an oil that will restore youth to the aged; Loret concludes that *hmyt* is the common Egyptian green crop called حلبه *hilbah* in Arabic and fenugreek in our own language (= *Trigonella foenum graecum*, L.); apart from the almost certainly mistaken identification of the Egyptian and the Arabic words, Loret's account¹ reads convincingly to the layman, but I gather that Keimer would not agree with it, since in *Bull. inst. fr.* xxviii, 84 he expresses the opinion that fenugreek was a very late importation into Egypt; also we must take into account that the word *imy* here suggests a seed or kernel, and this hardly suits Loret's identification. Possibly the same word *hmyt*, unknown to *Wb.*, is contained in a passage of the stela of Ramesses II from Menshiyet eş-Şadr (*Ann. Serv.*, xxxviii, 223), where the king boasts of having 'brought by water Upper Egypt to Lower, and Lower Egypt to Upper, in barley, emmer, wheat, 𓄏𓄏𓄏 𓄏𓄏𓄏 *hm(?)* and beans without number'; 'salt' would be very incongruous here. It now must seem conceivable that *hmyt* in No. 315, despite its proximity to *hsmn*, is not the word for 'salt', but the name of a fruit.




The absence of figs and grapes in this last section of On. Ram. is astonishing from our Western point of view, but characteristic enough of an Egyptian author. With No. 323 the Onomasticon





















¹ *Op. cit.* 867 Loret combats Dawson's suggestion (*JEA* XII, 240 ff.) that the Egyptian name of fenugreek was *šn-t* 'earth-hair' by reference to Ebers 9, 19-20, which appears to say that *šn-t* was a name of the *prt mnwh* 'fruit' (or 'seed') of the edible papyrus (*Cyperus esculentus* L.); I am inclined to think Loret's interpretation of this passage may be correct, though the words *hr.tw r.s* 'it is called' more commonly follow, than precede, the designation in question; here to take 'fruit of *mnwh*' as the name of a Cretan bean (perhaps the only alternative) seems impossible.

proper comes to an end, there remaining only the total of the component words, discussed already pp. 7 f., and the kind of supplement formed by the list of varieties of cattle (pls. v, vA). Something has been said already about the symbols that precede each variety, and the suggestion that they served as abbreviations in inventories is confirmed in three cases by a Nineteenth Dynasty papyrus fragment from Kôm Medînet Ghurâb ('Gurob') published in my *Ramesside Administrative Documents*, p. 19, ll. 3-4. Thus  (B 3, the note of interrogation can be omitted) doubtless corresponds to    *hbyt* in the said fragment; a similarly written word is used of food, etc., used in temple festivals, and here *hbyt* presumably means a festival bull or one used for sacrifice in the temples. Similarly  in the fragment is to be interpreted as the wholly red bull designated in On. Ram. B 1 by the symbols ; the alternation of  and  is too familiar to need comment; on the other hand it is worthy of remark that the strange relationship that has been noted¹ between  *wšd* 'green', 'fresh' and *dšr* 'red' here again finds an illustration. The abbreviation  on the 'Gurob' fragment is a trifle doubtful, but if correct clearly contains the same symbol as On. Ram. B 16. Thus far we have found one of the symbols referring to the use for which the bull was destined, and two referring to its hue; to these last two must be added  *km* 'black' for the completely black bull of B 9, and were we able to read  in B 12—which a comparison with the  of No. 212 above seems to forbid—a word *šb* 'pied', cf. *šb*, might be postulated to describe the black and white bull in question. Most of the other symbols are enigmatic; only the sail-sign of B 7 is explicable, seeing that the Egyptian word for 'sail' (*ht*, see the note on the text) is a homonym of the word for 'dirty'² found in this line and the one before it, as well as in B 19; here, then, we have a play on words.

An attempt must now be made to translate the list:

¹ Sethe, *Untersuchungen*, III, 127.

² The word is rather rare: apart from the obscure *ht*  in Pyr. 321, the only certain published examples appear to be P. Ebers 87, 15-16, 'Another recipe for removing the dirt (*htw* ) of the face'; Turin ostrakon, *Rec. trav.* II, 116, 'those who were dirty (*ht* ) are now in bright attire (*wbht*)'; Pitankhy 135-6, 'my clothes are dirty until Neith is made favourable to me'. Perhaps less physically in a heading of Ch. 125 of the Book of the Dead in a Leyden papyrus, Pleyte, *Étude*, p. 31 'To flourish (*wšd*) every day, without his becoming (*ht*) squalid (?)'.

- B 1)  That is a red bull.
 That is a red bull, with white belly.
 A white and red bull.
 A red bull with white face and many spots (?).¹
 (B 5)  That is a red bull with a white face.
 A dirty red bull with white on its face.
 That is a red bull whose skin is dirty.
 That is a red and black bull.
 A completely black bull.
 (B 10)  A black bull with white on its belly.
 A bull with black patches (?),² white on its flanks.
 A black and white bull.
 A white bull, black in front and black behind.
 A bull
 (B 15)  [A] [bull] black.
 That is a completely white bull.
 That is a white bull with red ears.
 That is a white bull with black ears.
 That is a black bull with white belly and (?) dirty.
 (B 20)  That is a draught-ox (?)
 Total 20

The fragmentary accounts on the *verso*, pls. VI, VI A, with their three dates, the mention of a scribe named Iusomb, and a number of figures, possess too little interest for further consideration here.

¹ *Šrw* is an unknown word, not in *Wb*.

² *Nksw* is another unknown word, and the meaning assigned is sheer guesswork.

CHAPTER II

THE ONOMASTICON OF AMENOPĚ

§1. *Introductory*

SINCE no less than nine different manuscripts are now known to contain greater or smaller portions of the text, it is obviously desirable to give it a comprehensive name, and I trust that the name proposed above will prove acceptable. As an abbreviation On. Am. will serve, and where a particular manuscript has to be quoted we may append in brackets a letter such as G (Golénischeff) or H (Hood). The substitution of Onomasticon for Glossary has been vindicated already (pp. 1 ff.), and the attribution to AmenopĚ, son of AmenopĚ, supported by five of the nine sources, is contradicted only by one. This latter is the London leather roll, where the author's name is lost, but his father bore the name Prennūfe. It is difficult to see in this exception anything but the unblushing piracy manifested also in P. Ch. Beatty I, rt. 16, 9. The name AmenopĚ is written AmenemopĚ with the preposition *m*, but the assimilation of this *m* to the preceding *n* had long been effected, so that AmenopĚ is here adopted as the better modern rendering.¹ The date when AmenopĚ lived may be conjectured to be the very end of the Twentieth Dynasty; few examples of the name are earlier than Ramesses III. Had AmenopĚ's treatise been composed a hundred years earlier, say, in the reign of Ramesses II, it would be strange that no fragment should have been discovered in the characteristic writing of Ramesside times. All the manuscripts we possess show features associating them with the Twenty-first or Twenty-second Dynasty, and it is evident that at that period the composition enjoyed considerable vogue. Whereas the Ramesside age was still productive of literary works of merit, the like—apart from the wonderful narrative of Wenamūn—does not appear to have been true of the period immediately following; and it is a curious parallel to the Hellenistic trend that in their lack of creative ability the Egyptians of the time of the Priest-kings should have taken refuge in mere learning. Certainly there was never written a book

¹ Amanāpī would be better still, but is rejected since for other names we lack the material that would enable us to live up to so high a standard.

THE ONOMASTICON OF AMENOPĚ





more tedious and less inspired than the Onomasticon of AmenopĚ. Internal evidence confirms the date here suggested for the archetype. Among the administrative and occupational titles enumerated in an early part of the work (Nos. 72–229) many go back to very ancient times, but none seems likely to have been obsolete in the Twentieth Dynasty; a few of them became particularly prominent about that time. For example, the title 'chief taxing-master' (No. 110, *ꜥ n št*) is first met with under Akhenaten, but most of our references date from the reign of Ramesses III and later. The 'chief of department' (No. 79, *ꜥ n ꜥt*) is exclusively a Ramesside functionary. The titles connected with 'the Great-Green', i.e. the sea (Nos. 105, 113), hint at an age when the Mediterranean sea-board had acquired increased importance. The mention of the Tjekker people (No. 269), as well as of the Philistines (No. 270), can in no case antedate the reign of Ramesses III. If my theory of the successive names of the great city of Tanis is well founded,¹ the mention of Dja'ne among the towns of Lower Egypt (No. 417) would point to the Twenty-first Dynasty, i.e. to a period when the name of Ramesses was less popular than it had until recently been. Lastly, the number of words borrowed from abroad, many of them unknown, hints at a very late period. Cumulatively the evidence warrants the conjecture that AmenopĚ wrote his book no earlier than the reign of Ramesses IX. There are certain divergences between the manuscripts, it is true, and these might be thought to desiderate a certain interval of time between them and the archetype. Still the differences are small, and if, as we have good reason to suppose, the text was much copied, variants and omissions would quickly appear. Few of the divergences to be noted cannot be explained either by the carelessness of the individual scribe or by the ignorance of a decadent period.

Concerning the personality of AmenopĚ nothing is known. He was a '*scribe of sacred books*² in the House of Life',³ a title which in this

¹ *JEA* xix, 127 f. The controversy is summarized anew in my commentary on Nos. 410, 417.

² From later variants the element *mdt* in the very ancient title *ꜥꜣꜣ* appears to be really singular, but the Egyptian phraseology evidently does not mean to imply that the bearer wrote only one such book. The element *ntr* is probably meant very generally. 'Scribe of sacred books' is probably the English rendering which most nearly gives the sense of the Egyptian.

³ On the *Pr-ꜥnh* 'House of Life' see my article in *JEA* xxiv, 157 ff.

precise form seems to occur only once again.¹ In the Canopus and Rosetta decrees the 'scribes of sacred books' and the 'scribes of the House of Life' are mentioned together in the enumeration of the priests assembled to honour the king, and correspond to the *πτεροφόροι καὶ ἱερογραμματεῖς*² of the Greek text. At the end of the decrees  'writing of the House of Life' in Canopus corresponds to  'writing of divine words' in Rosettana, the Greek rendering in each case being *ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν*, i.e. hieroglyphic writing as opposed to demotic or epistolographic. Nevertheless, our sources in no way suggest that the 'House of Life' confined its activities to the compilation of hieroglyphic texts to the exclusion of hieratic. The terms  and  appear to be almost synonymous; if there is a difference it is only that the former emphasizes the strictly religious writing or composition performed in the scriptorium called the 'House of Life', whereas the latter stresses the place of performance, leaving it open whether the work was religious or secular—for the latter alternative semi-secular would be more correct.

§ 2. *The Manuscripts*

The Golénischeff papyrus alone has pretensions to a nearly complete text; the rest of the eight here used vary in bulk, down to the short extract in the Cairo papyrus containing the maxims of Ani, this extract being equivalent to only two lines of Gol. A potsherd from the Ramesseum owes its brevity to its broken condition. The enumeration here is in the approximate order of importance.

- (i) The Golénischeff Onomasticon. Abbrev. Gol. or G.
- (ii) P. Hood = Brit. Mus. 10202. Abbrev. Hood or H.
- (iii) Brit. Mus. 10379, a strip of leather. Abbrev. L.
- (iv) The Ramesseum papyrus fragments. Abbrev. R.
- (v) Cairo ostrakon J. 67100, a potsherd. Abbrev. OC.
- (vi) Brit. Mus. 21635, a wooden writing-board. Abbrev. W-b.
- (vii) *P. Boulaq IV* (Ani). Abbrev. B.
- (viii) A fragmentary potsherd from the Ramesseum. Abbrev. OR.

The manuscript of this chapter had long been complete when G. Posener sent me a quotation from Budge's introduction to the second volume of *Hieratic Papyri* which he published for the British

¹ de Morgan, *Cat. des Monuments*, 1, p. 93, no. 130.












² For the precise meaning of *πτεροφοροι* see No. 129 of the autographed Commentary.





Museum (p. 18), showing that another duplicate of importance exists in the great London collection. This is on the *verso* of the famous Teaching of Amenope, and consists of three columns with no less than 49 lines. Posener has devoted a note to his discovery in *JEA* xxxi, 112. Unhappily the papyrus itself is not accessible for study at the present moment (1945), and cannot, therefore, be used in this book. The eight manuscripts transcribed in my Plates must now be described in turn.

(i) *The Golénischeff Onomasticon* (Plates VII–XIII)



This papyrus, now preserved in the Museum of Fine Arts at Moscow, was discovered by fellâhîn at El-Hîbah opposite El-Fashn in Upper Egypt together with two other papyri, of which one is the famous story of Wenamûn and the other an extensive model letter in flowery language still unpublished. In the same autumn of 1891 the fragments into which these papyri had been torn by the finders were acquired from two Cairo dealers by M. Golénischeff, who himself put them together. This information is given in the articles in which Golénischeff published short extracts from the geographic portion of the Onomasticon (5, 5–8 and 5, 9–13) and produced the first complete transcription of Wenamûn; see *ZÄS* xl, 101 ff. and *Rec. trav.* xxi, 74, respectively. In 1905 M. Golénischeff brought these papyri temporarily to Berlin, and this afforded Professor Erman and myself the opportunity of copying them. Unhappily I made no final revision, though the papyri remained in Berlin much longer than was originally intended, consequently the present Plates of transcription have been based on (1) the excellent photographs given me by M. Golénischeff and here published, (2) Erman's slips for the Berlin Dictionary, and (3) replies to queries which I addressed to Professor Möller after Dr. Ibscher had put the papyrus in order and I myself had left Berlin.

As will be seen from the Plates, the papyrus is in good condition so far as it goes, the main lacunae occurring in pp. 4, 6. It is of rather coarse texture and light colour, and apparently measures 153 cm. in length by 23 cm. in height. The joins are at fairly uniform distances of 19.5 cm. from one another, and it is contrived that the pages should lie between the joins, and not pass over them. The space between the pages is remarkably small as a rule. Probably there

is a protecting strip at the beginning, but this point has not been verified. On the *verso*, i.e. on the vertical fibres, only a few words are written (see pl. xxi), and these, curiously enough, are a duplicate of 5, 13 of the *recto*. The writing on the *recto* starts with the title of the book, and continues, without lacunae, save in a very few places, down to the end of the seventh page, where it ends abruptly. One fancies that the writer started with a fine enthusiasm, but wearied of his task, since his hand degenerates sadly from its pristine neatness and increases in size the farther he proceeds. It seems obvious that the hand is the same as that of Wenamūn, and this would fix the date to the closing years of Ramesses XI, when Herhōr had just risen to power, but had not yet asserted his claim to the throne.¹ The forms of  in Gol. 1, 14; Wen. 1, 38 are identical, and so are those of  Gol. 2, 3; Wen. 1, 2; of  Gol. 7, 11; Wen. 2, 20; of  Gol. 2, 1; Wen. 2, 29; of  with two diagonal strokes; of the entire word  Gol. 5, 12; Wen. 1, 3; and of many other groups and signs which I have carefully compared. On the other hand, there are a few puzzling differences; the small  with a dot over it is very common in Gol., but entirely absent from Wen.;  in Gol. 2, 6 has one tick to the right, whereas Wen. 2, 69 has two. However, these divergences may be due either to the difference of subject-matter or to the lapse of a few years between the writing of the two manuscripts. In my opinion that the hand of Wen. and Gol. is that of one and the same scribe I am fortified by the concurrence of Dr. Černý, an excellent judge. At all events the two papyri, which it will be remembered were found together, are nearly contemporary. Characteristic of the period are semi-hieroglyphic forms like  and , both in 1, 5; and  in 3, 4 is a very strange hieratic sign.

A difficulty of transcription common to all manuscripts of the Onomasticon is illustrated in Gol. 1, 13. The same sign  is used for revered persons of either sex. Möller (*Hier. Pal.* III, Nos. 26, 46) rendered it by  when followed by a tall vertical stroke, but by  when the said stroke is absent. I have conventionally adopted  throughout, adding the stroke in the isolated case where it occurs (Gol. 1, 13 as det. of the fem. *hy*). I need hardly say that the stroke is

¹ See the admirable article by Kees, *Herihor und die Aufrichtung des thebanischen Gottesstaates*, in *Nachr. v. d. Ges. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, neue Folge, Bd. 11, Nr. 1, particularly p. 14.

characteristic of hieratic  and of  when this reads *špsy*; it apparently originated in the cloth hanging over the back of the chair.

Rubrics occur from time to time, and professed at least to indicate the headings to the various sections. The subdivisions into which the text falls will be discussed below under § 3 (pp. 35 ff.).



(ii) *The Hood papyrus* (Plates XIV–XV)

Under this name is generally known *P. Brit. Mus. 10202*, which was purchased in 1872 from Mrs. Hood of Nettleham Hall, Lincolnshire. She was the widow of the Rev. W. Frankland Hood, who had gone out to the Nile Valley for reasons of health, and there formed his important collection between 1851 and 1861. The bulk of the collection was sold at Sotheby's on 11 November 1924, a valuable biographical note by Prof. Newberry being prefixed to the sale-catalogue. The papyrus was first published by G. Maspero in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1888 under the title *Un manuel de hiérarchie égyptienne*, and subsequently reprinted in the same author's *Études égyptiennes*, vol. ii, pp. 1–66. The two lithographic Plates accompanying this *editio princeps* give a sufficiently accurate notion of the hieratic, so that a facsimile is unnecessary here. Maspero's Plates were made from tracings of photographs given to him by the American Egyptologist Wilbour in 1877, and the publication was deferred for ten years because H. Brugsch, to whom Wilbour had also given copies of his photographs, had likewise projected an edition.¹ Finally Brugsch himself gave in hieroglyphic type the actual word-list, *minus* the introductory heading and the sections on heaven, water, and earth, in his work *Die Aegyptologie*, 1891 (cheap reprint, 1897), pp. 211–21, accompanying the text by a translation and brief comments. The first seventeen items are enumerated in his *Dictionnaire géographique*, p. 1116, and from No. 18 to No. 51, *op. cit.* p. 1112.

The well-preserved manuscript is of light brown colour and measures 60.5 cm. in length and 23.3 cm. in height. The two pages of hieratic are written in black, without rubrics, over the horizontal fibres. A protecting strip of 13 cm., with the vertical fibres above
















¹ Maspero refers to the papyrus as *le Papyrus Hood-Wilbour*, and to other writers it has quite improperly become known as the Wilbour papyrus. That name will doubtless henceforth be reserved for the great official document which I have edited for the Trustees of the Brooklyn Museum.

the horizontal, is gummed over the sheet to the left before page 1, and after page 2 there are 7 cm. blank before the left-hand margin is reached. This margin describes a slightly undulating line, and has every appearance of having been cut off with scissors from a longer roll in modern times. Evidently the scribe had intended to copy the entire work, but for one reason or another stopped short at the end of the second page.

The hand is of the rather crabbed kind characteristic of the early Twenty-first Dynasty. Maspero considered it to be identical with the hand of the *Maximes d'Ani* (*P. Boulaq IV*), but I am unable to agree. There is a certain superficial resemblance due to the proximity in date of the two papyri, but when one examines details, hardly a sign is made alike. Also the orthographic habits of the two scribes were utterly different. In the Hood a number of the signs have several different shapes, e.g.  (two forms in 1, 3),  (2, 13 contrasted with 2, 14). As usual at this period, transcription becomes a more arbitrary proceeding than one could wish, but it is hoped that my critical notes will to some extent mitigate this defect. Noteworthy is the use of dots between the different groups serving much the same purpose as with us a comma or semi-colon.

(iii) *The London Leather Roll* (Plates XVI–XVIII)

Brit. Mus. 10379 is a long strip of crinkled leather much blackened in places, 89 cm. in length and with a greatest breadth of 21.5 cm. A clipping from the sale-catalogue pasted on the back of the frame gives the number 198, and states that the manuscript came from Memphis. Supplementary notes in ink afford the information that it fetched ten guineas at Stevens, King Street, Covent Garden, on 17 November 1837, and that it had previously been lot 284 (or 204?) at Burton's sale. The text was identified and a description given by Prof. Glanville in *JEA* XII, 171 ff. The *recto*, which was presumably the flesh side, is inscribed with thirty-five and a half lines of hieratic, covering nearly two-thirds of the length. This takes us only to Gol. 2, 9, so that the scribe tired of his task at an even earlier stage than the scribe of Hood, who struggled bravely on as far as Gol. 3, 3. Nearly the entire length of most lines is preserved, but a sign or two are occasionally missing, since the text runs right up to the present edge. In a few lines near the beginning some words have faded or

been washed out. Traces of earlier writing are visible here and there. The *verso*, consisting of 24 lines, gives an extract from the same book, repeating ll. 15–25 of the *recto*, but in short lines each containing one, two, or (in one instance only, *vs.* 23) three items. The peculiarity of using very short lines is characteristic of a very late period, cf. the *Maxims of AmenopĚ* and the writing-board Brit. Mus. 21635, published below in pl. XXII. But it cannot be denied that at first sight the hieratic hand, a sample of which is shown in pl. XVIII, looks very archaic, and on an original inspection, Černý and I were inclined to regard Glanville's attribution to the Nineteenth or Twentieth Dynasty as rather too late than too early. Nevertheless, I am now convinced that the writing is as late as, if not later than, both Gol. and Hood, though the scribe may well have been consciously adopting an archaistic style or else unconsciously employing forms from early manuscripts he had previously copied. In particular the appearance of  (see the note on *rt.* 17) might easily point to the Eighteenth Dynasty. The reasons in favour of the Twenty-first Dynasty are, however, overwhelming. The peculiar sign for revered persons (see above, p. 28) is substantially the same as in our other sources. The very upright *e w* recalls the Berlin Hymn to Amūn. The habit of allowing the tail or the whole of *e* to fall to the left of *w* in the combination  (see *rt.* 11, note^a) is another late trait. After the Ramesside period forms that are practically hieroglyphic are common in literary papyri; here we have  *rt.* 2;  *rt.* 3 and others. Still more cogent is the evidence from spellings. It is inconceivable that under the Eighteenth Dynasty, or even under the Nineteenth,  (*rt.* 18) should have been written for  or   (*rt.* 25) for  . The spelling   in *rt.* 26 is an abnormality known only from late times. Lastly,   *rt.* 23 = *vs.* 20 with  is characteristic of Wenamūn, though also occurring slightly earlier.¹ If to such testimony of detail are added the arguments above set forth (pp. 24 f.) for placing the composition of the book at the very end of the Twentieth Dynasty, the case for the late origin of L seems irresistible.

As a witness to the text L is of little value, being careless in the extreme and also eccentric. Still it occasionally renders service, see

¹ See *Turin A*, *vs.* 0, 9, on a newly discovered fragment not included in my *Late-Egyptian Miscellanies*.

Nos. 39, 83, 92. It seemed superfluous to publish a facsimile of the hieratic, and the sample line already mentioned must suffice.

(iv) *The Ramesseum Fragments* (Plates XIX-XXI)

In pls. XLIII-XLV and XLVII of his volume *Hieratic Ostraka and Papyri found in the Ramesseum, 1895-6* (Egypt Research Account, London) W. Spiegelberg published a large number of papyrus fragments belonging to a duplicate of the Golénischeff Onomasticon.¹ This latter being unpublished at that time, Spiegelberg could naturally identify only such fragments as corresponded to entries in the Hood papyrus. We ourselves are in a similar position with regard to five fragments of some size here transcribed in pl. XXI, and it is just possible that they may come from a part of the Onomasticon of AmenopĖ omitted in Gol. and H.² Professor Glanville at University College, London, and Professor Montet at Strasbourg have searched in vain for the originals from which Herr Woessner made his tracings for the above-named publication. I had hoped that careful study of the fibres might make it possible to reconstruct the manuscript. Indeed, I have spent many hours trying to do this on the basis of the tracings alone, but have found the task impossible for the following reasons.

A large number of the fragments contain only a word or two from a single line,³ and though of course the place of many of these may be determined, they are useless for establishing the length of the lines or the position within them. For that purpose only a limited quantity of the pieces are valuable, the best being XLVII, *a* (from the bottom of a page), XLV, N, XLV, P, and XLV, Q. From XLV, P + XLV, N + XLIII, B, 1 I was able to ascertain that the length of the lines at this point was practically identical with that of the corresponding lines Gol. 1, 11-13 (see here pl. XIX, top), and since from XLV, P, right, it was evident that an entire page preceded, it seems that the word *shmt*

¹ Mixed up with these fragments were others (pl. XLII, XLIII top, XLIV top, XLV, O, R) in the same or very similar writing apparently belonging to a Late-Egyptian Miscellany.

² They are not likely to come from the lost later portions of the Onomasticon, as it would be difficult to explain why not a single fragment corresponding to Gol. pp. 5-7 has been preserved.

³ The at first sight peculiar numbering adopted by Spiegelberg for the fragments in his pl. XLVII is due to his assigning to the fragments the numbers allotted to the various items of the Onomasticon in Brugsch, *Die Aegyptologie* (see above, p. 29).

on the same fragment must be the first word of the second page of this manuscript. The only first-rate evidence for following up this conclusion is provided by XLVII, *a*, the last line of which, from the bottom of a page, corresponds to Gol. 3, 5, the thirty-second line of the latter manuscript. To judge from Gol. 3, 1-3 with the three previous lines of the said fragment, R may in its third page have contained more items to the line than the second or third page of Gol. On the whole it looks likely that R had ten lines to the page, and that XLVII, 95, l. 2 + XLVII, *a*, l. 4 belong to the last line of its third page. When, however, we come to draw out the different pages of R on the basis of these clues, all kinds of difficulties arise. The word [𓂏]𓂏𓂏 in XLVII, 48, if, as seems necessary, it corresponds to *Kmt* in Gol. 2, 6—the twentieth line of Gol.—must be the concluding word of the top line of R, p. 3, since there is so much room above it and a clear space to its left. On the other hand, *hry-tp¹ n t* in XLVII, 41 = Gol. 2, 4 will, unless *hry* here is the very first word of R 2, 10, make an impossibly long line of R 3, 1, even allowing for the fact (see above) that the lines of R, p. 3 were considerably longer than the lines of Gol. Similarly XLVII, 52 (to the extreme right of Spiegelberg's plate) = Gol. 2, 7-8 would make the line in R far too short. From the tracings of XLVII, 76 = Gol. 2, 12 (?) and XLVII, 77 = Gol. 2, 13 it is difficult not to conclude that these fragments belong to the last line of a page, but this conclusion cannot be reconciled with the clear evidence (see above) available from XLVII, *a*. Lastly, we must remember that Gol. 1, 14 omits three whole lines of Hood (1, 13-16) and that in Gol. 2, 9 there is again an omission, amounting to three-quarters of a line of Hood (2, 9-10), where, as XLVII, 57 shows, R partly at least followed the latter manuscript. Similar additions or omissions, not to speak of possible inversions, may well have occurred in different parts of R.

For these reasons it seemed wise to renounce any attempt to reconstruct R, except as regards the top lines of its second page. Consequently, in my pls. XIX-XX all other identified fragments are merely arranged in their correct order. They extend as far as Gol. 4, 15.





One has the impression that R had a more correct and earlier text

¹ In my Plate 𓂏 should be added above 𓂏, cf. Spiegelberg, *op. cit.*, XLII, 2, last line for this writing.

than any other of our sources, and it is all the more to be deplored that so little of it has survived.

(v) *The Cairo ostrakon* J. 67100 (Plate xxii)

This hitherto unpublished ostrakon consists of a large potsherd with buff slip, having a greatest height of 34 cm. and a greatest breadth of 26 cm. I first became acquainted with the chief of the four fragments of which it is composed about 1910, when it was still in Weigall's storehouse at Thebes. At that time I made a careful copy and a tracing, adding to these later when the ostrakon had reached the Cairo Museum. The text here given owes much to a revision of the original made by Dr. Černý some years ago. Despite the present great size a good deal has been lost: the whole of the top line, of which only the tiniest trace subsists, and the beginnings of all the eight subsequent lines here numbered 1-8. The text, written on the convex side, corresponds to Hood 1, 1-7 (l. 1 being entirely lost), and 1, 12-14; besides minor omissions, Hood 1, 8-11 have been passed over. The last few signs are written very boldly in consonance with their meaning.

The handwriting, though not so clearly characteristic of the late Twentieth or early Twenty-first Dynasty as Gol. and Hood, is none the less probably to be assigned to that date. Hieroglyphic forms abound, e.g. , , , and the final .

OC has several readings of interest, which may indeed have been the readings of the archetype. Cf. Nos. 11, 12, 20.

(vi) *The Writing-board Brit. Mus.* 21635 (Plate xxii)

This interesting document was first brought to my notice by the late Prof. Spiegelberg. It is a wooden board with a projection pierced so as to admit of suspension by a string and measures 28.5 × 13 cm., with a thickness of 2 cm. Bold black semi-hieroglyphic characters are written directly upon the wood, the text on the *recto* corresponding to Gol. 4, 10-12, and that on the *verso* to Gol. 4, 12-13. A note on the *recto* informs us that it was completed on the last day of a month; and a similar note on the *verso* refers to 'day 2', obviously of the month next following. The name *Pi-šri-n-Bstt*, *Πενοβάστis*, may well be that of the apprentice responsible for the writing, which would then be dated to the Twenty-third Dynasty or later. There are two erased groups of no importance on the *verso*.

(vii) *Pap. Boulaq IV, verso.*

On the *verso* of the famous Maximes d'Ani (Mariette, *Papyrus de Boulaq*, 1, pl. 27) the opening words of our Onomasticon are written twice over, the longer quotation corresponding to Gol. 1, 1-2. These two texts are given as B¹ and B² in the autographed text. The manuscript is not earlier than the middle of the Twenty-first Dynasty.


(viii) *Potsherd from the Ramesseum.*

Published by W. Spiegelberg, *Hieratic Ostraca*, pl. 11, No. 8, and pointed out to me by Prof. Gunn. Contains a few words from the Introduction and the following line. Given as OR in the autographed text to follow the printed part of this volume.

§ 3. *The Contents*

Apart from the bombastic heading upon which comment has already been made, On. Am. consists simply of a series of words or short combinations of words, each describing some entity or class of entities in the physical world. Without adding to the entries in Gol. such further ones in H and the other texts as may be supposed to have stood in the archetype, I have counted 610 items, but it must be remembered that Gol., our most extensive manuscript, gives out at the bottom of the seventh page. Even if we were to accord to the entire work as many as 2,000 items—a number probably much in excess of the truth—such a figure would be fantastically small for a catalogue of the universe, the more so when it is noted that the honour of a separate mention is done to particular kinds of pastries or cakes (Nos. 508 ff.), which thus receive as much individual attention as the great city of Memphis (No. 394) or as heaven itself (No. 1). Out of such grotesque beginnings have our encyclopedias arisen! None the less, On. Am. not only adds to our store of Egyptian words, but also, as we shall see, is a first-rate authority for the topography of the Nile Valley.

That the author had in mind, not merely enumeration, but also classification, is apparent from even a superficial perusal of the items, and it is natural to assume that the rubrics which occur in Gol. from time to time were intended each to mark the beginning of a fresh category. By no means in all instances, however, is this assumption confirmed. On the first page it is true that the rubricized

word for 'dew' (No. 18) closes the series of celestial phenomena, and ushers in a number of terrestrial ones which, as their common determinative  shows, all have some connexion with water or moisture. So too in No. 48 a rubricized word *dbw* commences a series of sorts of land. After No. 62 there is an abrupt transition from physical or geographical facts to persons, and it is doubtless only due to superstitious reasons that the scribe has refrained from writing the first word, that for 'god' (No. 63), in red.¹ Among the bureaucratic titles succeeding the designations of divinity and royalty, a rubric is assigned in Nos. 92-3 to the 'overseer of cattle' and the king's own 'steward', but here there is no real transition to a new topic. Almost as purposeless seems the rubricizing of the words for 'the royal scribe and lector-priest' in No. 114, though it is true that most of the titles immediately following are priestly rather than secular. There is no heterogeneity between the 'preparer of tripe' (No. 140) and the confectioners of Nos. 141-2 sufficient to entitle the latter to the prominence accorded by red ink, nor have the next three rubrics (in Nos. 165, 185, 208) any better justification. In No. 230 the great class-distinctions of mankind both call for and receive this signal that a new topic is being introduced, and the foreign peoples that follow in Nos. 238 ff. have a more or less legitimate place in the same category, at all events more so than the three military designations uncomfortably sandwiched in as Nos. 234-7. The next two rubrics, in Nos. 274, 308, appear entirely without *raison d'être*, but the initiation of the town-list in No. 313 is appropriately marked by a rubric. In No. 408 the rubric comes just too late to separate Lower from Upper Egypt. In No. 419 the list of towns ends and the use of red ink rightly accompanies the beginning of a series of buildings and parts of buildings, but why does no rubric occur again until 'ploughland' is reached in No. 474? The truth is that the cohesion of the categories is often so questionable that the scribe may well have found a difficulty in deciding upon a suitable course of action. This is aptly illustrated at the point we have now reached, where types of agricultural land give place to cereals and these to cakes and bread made from the same. It is very odd that the last five sorts of cakes (Nos. 541-6) should be rubricized instead of the beverages (Nos. 550 ff.)

¹ Cf. *P. Ch. Beatty* VIII, vs. 10, 8, 11.

that follow them. After this fall from grace our scribe wins a good mark by inaugurating with a rubric (No. 579) the list of meat, in the midst of which he abruptly abandoned or was released from his tedious task.

For the purposes of the text and commentary that form the main object of the present volumes, it seemed preferable to divide up the composition anew, the subdivisions obtained being as follows:

- I. Introductory heading.
- II. Sky, water, earth (Nos. 1-62).
- III. Persons, court, offices, occupations (Nos. 63-229).
- IV. Classes, tribes, and types of human being (Nos. 230-312).
- V. The towns of Egypt (Nos. 313-419).
- VI. Buildings, their parts, and types of land (Nos. 420-73).
- VII. Agricultural land, cereals and their products (Nos. 474-555).
- VIII. Beverages (Nos. 556-78).
- IX. Parts of an ox and kinds of meat (Nos. 579-610).

It is not claimed that all the items fit into the above categories with perfect ease and appropriateness, nor are the classes entirely exclusive mutually. Thus *mnt* 'mud-flat' occurs both in II (No. 56) and in VII (No. 476); a word for 'hillock' (*bwt*) is repeated in VI and VII at so short an interval (Nos. 467, 475) that a mistake must be suspected. To expatiate upon the author's choice of items and upon his glaring omissions would be hardly profitable; it must suffice to point out that in II one expects some general word for 'earth' to balance 'sky' in No. 1, that among the towns of Upper Egypt some as important as Djarty (Eṭ-Tôd) and Shedet (Medînet el-Fayyûm) are missing, while the list for Lower Egypt, omitting Bubastis and Athribis, is utterly inadequate, and that the list of parts of an ox inserts some unknown to our other sources, while neglecting others conspicuous therein. From time to time the Commentary will be found to incorporate a remark of general import, where special groupings or series of allied words receive such notice as appeared necessary.

Some stress, however, must be laid upon the sequence of items in different parts of the work, since unless comment were made upon this topic valuable clues to the meaning might occasionally be missed. A cursory examination might possibly suggest the conclusion that all that can legitimately be concluded from any short sequence of

words is that each word brings a fresh differentiation of its own; even this would not be entirely true, since it may be reasonably conjectured that *ḥdt* (No. 18) and *ḥwdt* (No. 19) are mere variant writings of one and the same word, and it is absolutely certain that *Db* (No. 318) and *Bḥdt* (No. 319) refer to the same town, the modern Edfu. An obvious dittograph in Nos. 524, 525 cannot be fairly quoted in this connexion, but it is apposite to note that the vizier appears in two separate entries (Nos. 73, 86) and the 'herdsman' likewise appears twice (Nos. 152, 228). On the other hand, certain titles dealing with the king's own household (Nos. 93, 111, 124) may refer to duties that were really different. At the opposite pole to the exaggeration which finds very little arrangement in the entire book stands the verdict implied in the title given by Maspero to his edition of P. Hood; in naming this *Un manuel de hiérarchie égyptienne* he generalized the fact apparent from subdivision III, where Amenopĕ starts from the top with deities, demigods, and the king, and follows mankind through his various ranks and callings down to the humblest of free occupations, that of the herdsman (Nos. 228-9). The truth stands midway between what I may term respectively the pessimistic and the optimistic judgements upon the composition. It may be confidently stated that the author did aim at some sort of rational classification, but on the other hand it would be folly to try and deduce from the sequence of official titles a genuine order of precedence. In a general way Amenopĕ may be said to have attempted an arrangement from highest to lowest (I, III), and from general to particular (III, IV, V, IX), while, of course, it is not open to dispute that the list of Upper Egyptian towns follows an order from south to north (further details in § 4). Here, however, I am more concerned with small groups of items, and as best illustration of my thesis I will first quote the collocations 'god', 'blessed spirit', 'king' (Nos. 63, 65, 67)¹ and 'patricians', 'plebeians', 'sun-folk' (Nos. 231-3), both of which exhibit sequences of words which have more or less close analogies elsewhere. From the recently published P. Wilbour (the great official document mentioned above, p. 29, n. 1) it emerges that the three kinds of land here rendered 'fresh land',

¹ See my Frazer lecture *Attitude of the Egyptians to Death and the Dead*, p. 39, n. 11. The actual sequence here is found (e.g.) in the Turin Canon of Kings, as also in the Manethonian tradition, see *Manetho* (ed. Waddell), pp. 5, 10, &c.

'tired land', and 'agricultural land' (Nos. 53-5) reflect an administrative classification familiar in Ramesside times. Similarly Nos. 598, 599, 600, 602, though their succession is interrupted by the intrusive mention of the 'heart' (No. 601), enumerate in the traditional order the four inner organs placed under the protection of, or, perhaps more accurately, identified with, the four sons of Horus embodied in the Canopic jars. Again, the series of seven kinds of emmer or spelt (*bdt*) in Nos. 494-500 and of six kinds of wine (*irp*) in Nos. 566-71 are intimately connected groups. Found also are contrasted concepts like 'darkness' and 'light' (Nos. 13-14), 'shade' and 'sunlight' (Nos. 15-16), or persons paired in reference to sex like 'male and female musician' (Nos. 214-15), though in Nos. 295-8 'woman' has had to be separated from 'man' on account of the priority given to age-distinction in 'man', 'stripling', 'old man'. Enough has been said to show that the relations between consecutive entries are by no means always on a dead level of equality, and that consequently we must always be on the look-out for some significant nexus of thought in neighbouring items. However, as is shown by the chasm between the last member of any one of our sub-divisional categories and the first member of the next, any such nexus may be completely absent, and it must not be forgotten that rubrics that might have marked a change of topic are not found in any manuscript except Gol., the scribe of which evidently had great difficulty in selecting appropriate places for the same (see above). The state of affairs above outlined shows that no principle of contrast or kinship can be systematically employed as a means of eliciting the meanings; on the other hand, appeal to one or other of these principles may occasionally be useful as corroborative evidence of significations elicited on other grounds.

To give a coherent account of so unsystematic a composition as On. Am. is barely possible, and I shall now conclude my remarks with some allusion to further categories to be found in the fragments of R or of a papyrus very closely akin to it (pl. XXI). Here we find birds and quadrupeds and there is nothing about the handwriting to compel the conclusion that they belonged to a different manuscript and composition. It is accordingly possible¹ that had the scribe of Gol. persevered in his task, the items here recorded

¹ See, however, p. 32, n. 2 above.

would have been encountered in due course. A few of the words in question are dealt with in the Supplement to my Commentary, but many of them are too much broken to deserve any mention at all.

§ 4. *Excursus. Introduction to the Tables of the Towns of Upper Egypt*

In this book are published for the first time the two most important Pharaonic lists of Upper Egyptian towns that have survived. The list in the Golénischeff MS. of the Onomasticon of Amenopë comprises no less than 80 place-names, more than double the number found in any other document. The Ramesseum Onomasticon mentions only towns between the First Cataract and a little beyond Ekhnîm, 31 names in all; but that series possesses the inestimable advantage of being centuries earlier than any other, and it is clear that in the meantime certain towns had sunk into insignificance, or else had changed their names. The value of these two fundamental sources for Egyptian topography is enhanced by the fact that both observe strict order from south to north, or rather from up-stream to down-stream, and a survey of the material hitherto known shows this to have been no unusual practice. It is strange that no earlier attempt has been made to exhibit the principal lists of the kind in tabular form, for such a tabulation could not fail to possess considerable demonstrative value. If the order shown in the lists proved to be generally in harmony, the places therein allotted to the separate towns would mutually confirm one another, and would indicate very clearly the region in which each town had to be sought. In Plates XXIV–XXVII I have attempted a tabulation of the kind.

Great attention must be paid to the number accompanying each place-name, since this, in comparison with the neighbouring numbers, indicates whether the place is in its right position in the south-to-north series, or whether there has been some transposition. It would have been convenient if the nature of each transposition could have been made clear to the eye at a glance, but some experimenting showed that the use of special symbols for the purpose would have hindered rather than helped comprehension. Only one device has been adopted: when a higher number, i. e. one further on in the list, precedes a lower one in the table, this fact is made conspicuous by boxing it in thus: 10; if it is a short consecutive series which thus

precedes *en bloc* a lower number, then the box is divided between the first and last numbers of the series, e.g. 10 A11 A12 in the Medînet Habu list. It must be clearly understood that the table can achieve no more than provide mutual confirmation of the order given in the parallel columns; for example, it goes far towards establishing the fact that Anasha lay to the south of Hardai when we find this town preceding Hardai *both* in the Harris papyrus *and* in the recently published P. Wilbour. In certain other respects the table may be actually misleading. Thus Šbt, No. 207 in the Ramesseum Onomasticon, is seemingly to the south of Nbwt, No. 25 in the Abydos town-list; the real position may have been just the reverse, and if so, the wrong order in the table will have been due merely to the graphical necessity of showing one of the two places in front of the other. Closer inspection of the table enables us, however, to infer that both Šbt and Nbwt lay between Denderah and Hû, and since it is also indicated that the distance between Denderah and Hû was some 55 km., a rough notion may also be obtained as to the possible distance between Šbt and Nbwt. Plainly, to utilize the tables properly demands intelligence; but if intelligence be employed, it may well render good service. In certain cases (e.g. Nekhbet in the column headed KARNAK) the name of a deity has had to be substituted for the place-name, the latter not being specified; but also elsewhere, even if the town is named, the deity is also included. Several considerations have prompted this course, in the first place the intrinsic interest of the information; but also the divine name may be geographically instructive as providing the link between the Egyptian place-name and its Greek equivalent, e.g. mention of the dog-god Wepwawet of Asyût, interpreted by the Greeks as a wolf, supplies the connexion between the Pharaonic Šwt and the Greek Λύκων πόλις. Occasionally the same horizontal line may contain two different names, e.g. the line of Ekhnîm contains both Hnt-Mn and Ipw, but this procedure is adopted only when it is quite certain that the names are alternatives; it is not merely considerations of space that have prompted the devotion of two lines to Edfu, in Egyptian represented by both Db and Bhd, since On. Am. has separate entries for these two names; but here a bracket has been added in order to prevent misconception. Lastly, I have inserted in the table, confessedly in a very arbitrary fashion, modern names for which the Egyptian

equivalent, if there ever was any, is not known; these places have been admitted on account of their use in connexion with the discussions in the Commentary or for some such reason.

In the autographed portion of this work, where the details of On. Am. are treated individually, the observations upon the towns of Upper Egypt named therein have been expanded so as to form a commentary on the table above characterized. Though the Onomasticon still provides the framework, comments on the other towns appearing in the table seemed indispensable. For example, $\text{𓆎} \text{𓆏}$ *Drty* 'Djarty', i.e. Eṭ-Tôd, unaccountably omitted from On. Am., as well as from On. Ram., is found in its proper place in the Abydos list between Imiotru (El-Gebelên) and Hermonthis, i.e. between Nos. 331 and 332-3 of On. Am.; for this reason I have assigned to it the number 331 A and have treated it as though it belonged to On. Am. The topographical section of the Commentary on On. Am. thus provides a series of notes on the most important towns of Upper Egypt, though only in so far as they are named by one or other of the lists in the table. In these notes I have attempted above all to adduce the grounds on which the site has been identified, or alternatively to show reason why previously proposed localizations should be rejected. I have added a number of bibliographical references, and have here and there introduced additional testimony absent from Gauthier's very industrious and useful, though extremely uncritical and often inexact *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques*, 7 vols., Cairo, 1925-31.

I must emphatically disclaim any intention to have dealt exhaustively with all the towns of Upper Egypt¹ or indeed finally with any of the problems at issue. My notes are not the outcome of collections and preparations made over a number of years. I have merely investigated, as best I could at a difficult time and under not wholly satisfactory conditions, the facts concerning such towns as came specially before my notice, learning a great deal in the process, but without having gained that mastery over the subject which might have justified more pretentious claims.

I now proceed to give details concerning each column of the table in turn.

KM. = KILOMETRES. Under this head are given the distances not between the successive towns, but along the river to points opposite

¹ In the general characterization of the list in On. Am. (below, p. 57) there are mentioned several important Upper Egyptian towns therein omitted, for information concerning which the reader would search my Commentary in vain.

them. Probably this was the standpoint adopted by the ancient scribes in determining the order in which the towns were placed. The difference may be considerable; for example, the distance between Eṭ-Tôd and Armant along the river has had to be given as only 1.5 km., but the actual distance between these two towns is over 4 km., since the former lies well out into the cultivation, not far from the Arabian desert. I have measured the river-distances as accurately as lay in my power on the 1:50,000 maps of the Egyptian Survey Department. My results do not always tally with those given in Baedeker and in Lyons's *Physiography of the River Nile*, p. 5, but neither do these two agree completely with one another, Baedeker giving 740 km. for the river-journey between Cairo and Luxor, while Lyons allows only 726 km. I am far from asserting my own greater accuracy in this matter, but having to measure shorter stretches I have set down the results as they presented themselves to me, in the hope that I may not anywhere have erred too glaringly.¹ My approximations have had the main purpose of showing where consecutive towns clustered close together, and where they lay at some considerable distance apart.

ARABIC. In this column transliterations of the modern names are given, taken from the Survey maps or the best other available sources. In the Commentary will be found the actual Arabic writings. The disconcerting fact revealed itself that the sources often do not agree among themselves. I have tried to use special care in distinguishing feminine names from those ending in -a, writing the former with -ah. It has proved impossible to achieve any great consistency as regards the vowels, but I have sought at least to indicate the quantities. As regards final vowels some inconsistency will be noted; Hû is given thus, but it seemed pedantic to replace the usual Edfu by Edfû.

BANK. Under this heading R stands for 'right bank', L for 'left bank', islands in the river being marked as I. The river winds about a good deal more than is sometimes imagined, so that 'east bank' and 'west bank' would often have been inexact.

GREEK, &c. Only one name or name-form is given as a rule, and then preferably the oldest or that which in some way reflects the

¹ How easy it is to go astray in such matters is shown by Junker's statement (*WZKM* xxxi, 74) that Esna is only 24 km. from El-Kâb, whereas in reality it is 32 km. The 8th German edition of Baedeker (pp. 353-4) gives the figure correctly, but the corresponding English edition, besides other almost incredible mistakes (pp. 363-4), gives the same distance as only 8 miles!

Pharaonic name or cult. Where a Greek name is wanting, its place may have to be taken by a Latin one (e.g. Asfynis) or by a Coptic one (e.g. ⲡⲉⲱⲛ). I cannot pretend to have devoted serious research to the investigation of these names, most of which have been derived from Parthey's very convenient monograph *Zur Erdkunde des alten Aegyptens*, extract from *Abhandl. d. kön. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1858; I have, however, profited very greatly from notes furnished by Dr. H. I. Bell for the Greek names, and by Dr. Crum for the Coptic. The admirable book entitled *Egypt in the Classical Geographers* by the late Dr. John Ball, Cairo, 1942, reached me too late to be made the basis of my work, but in revising I have consulted it often and have rejoiced to observe so large a measure of agreement between its findings and my own.

TRANSLITERATION. Since the table can be of use only to scholars, it sufficed to give unvocalized equivalents. In the Commentary on the Onomasticon of Amenope vocalized forms are suggested for use in popular works.

THE LISTS. These are given, as far as possible, in order of antiquity, beginning with the oldest, and it is only for Pharaonic times that I claim to have achieved completeness. The Graeco-Roman temples teem with geographic material, industriously collected and studied by such scholars as Brugsch, Dümichen, and J. de Rougé. Without denying the interest and importance of the later lists of nomes, towns, and local divinities, I have felt the less compunction in omitting all but the principal—a course dictated by the fact that any such tables must have a limit—because they are in almost every case subordinated to the division of Egypt into nomes, give for each nome only one deity and one town, and consequently pass over the lesser places for which the earlier lists provide such valuable testimony. To this generalization the occasional series of Graeco-Roman 'autonomous districts', as Brugsch called them, form a partial exception; in the few places where these occur they are appended to the nome-lists as a sort of supplement, and adhere to the same habitual custom of enumerating their items from south to north. Of these lists of supplementary districts, discussed by Gauthier, *Les Nomes d'Égypte*, 56 ff., I have included in my table two, one from Edfu, and one from Kôm Ombo. On only a slightly different footing is the list of supplementary towns and local deities in Chassinat, *Edfou*, VI, 231 ff., following

upon a list of deities of the nome-capitals of Upper Egypt; for these I have unfortunately found no space in my table, where also I have had to ignore the list of crocodiles identified at once with Suchus and with the gods of many nome-centres, Newberry, *The Amherst Papyri*, pl. 15. Similarly I have had to pass over the highly important representations of local deities in the temple of Denderah published by Brugsch, *Thesaurus*, 619, 621, 623, and by Mariette, *Dendérah*, IV, 40-1 (= Düm., *Geogr. Inschr.*, I, 77-81); Lanzone, *Pap. du Lac Moeris*, pls. 4 ff. has a similar series of nome-deities, but they are not in consecutive order. By way of compensation, I have quoted these divinities in the Commentary whenever it seemed desirable. Perhaps I shall be blamed for admitting to the tables the Luxor list, the stela Leyden V 1, and the list on the naos from the Wâdy el-'Arîsh, since their adhesion to the south-north order is, to put it mildly, vacillating, and was frankly not intended in the case of the stela. My excuse is, first, that they do adhere to the said order at least in part, and second, that the places they name seemed too interesting to exclude. At first I planned to devote a column to the late Book of the Dead, P. Louvre 3079, of which the relevant portion is given by Brugsch in his *Dictionnaire géographique*, 1061 ff.; on further reflection, I decided that little was to be gained thereby, and I have accordingly omitted it. Lastly, mention must be made of the unpublished P. *Brit. Mus.* 10569, a valuable Ptolemaic enumeration of deities, incorporating among other things two topographically arranged series of cult-places (1) of Osiris, and (2) of 'all the gods and goddesses who are in—'; these series extend from Upper Egypt far down into the Delta; the papyrus is to be edited by R. O. Faulkner, who has kindly allowed me to utilize his transcript wherever needful.

I. *The Ramesseum Onomasticon*, abbreviated On. Ram. This has been sufficiently described in Chapter I above, to which the reader is referred. In the column devoted to this town-list references are given in three cases to the list of fortresses that precedes; *Hny* (Es-Silsilah) is given as fortress, but omitted from the towns.

II. *Rekhmirêc*. Taxation scenes from the Theban tomb (No. 100) of the Vizier Rekhmirêc, *temp.* Tuthmosis III, brilliantly conjured out of the much damaged wall by P. E. Newberry, *The Life of Rekhmara*, pls. 5, 6. The place-names appear to have been deciphered by Newberry with great accuracy, and the new copies which

N. de G. Davies kindly placed at my disposal, though making a few minor corrections, do not present the legends in nearly as intelligible a form, probably because the walls have suffered considerably in the interval. The chief improvement in Davies's new edition, from the inscriptional point of view, is his recovery of parts of the fifth register on both walls; the only new place-name that emerges, however, is that of Shashōtp. Sethe's convenient summary in *Urk.* IV, 1119-39 has no independent value.

The scenes record the dues paid to the Vizier at Thebes by the local officials of various towns south and north of the Southern capital. To some extent the disposition of the scenes upon the walls imitates the actual geographical conditions, the southern entrance-wall depicting the tribute-bearers from the South and the northern entrance-wall those from the North. At some distance from the main entrance, but facing it, was on each wall represented the Vizier engaged in inspecting the precious deliveries. The officials approach him in either case, but with the difference that on the south wall it is the officials from the southernmost places that are nearest to him, while on the north wall the places closest to Thebes precede those farther away. Thus the towns on the south wall succeed one another in their true topographical positions, while those on the north wall are reversed. Within each individual register the sites follow one another in, so far as can be seen, their proper sequence, but if the registers are compared with one another it will be found that an official of a given town may sometimes be out of his correct position in relation to an official in another register. For example, the 'herald' (*whmw*) of Edfu in the top register of the south wall (*a* 2) stands a little ahead of the 'herald' of Kôm Ombo in the fourth register, though Kôm Ombo is a good 60 km. to the south of Edfu. Such departures from the underlying plan are, of course, due solely to the exigences of the artist's subject-matter. Consequently, in speaking of these scenes in the tomb of Rekhmirê as observing topographical order, I refer only to the individual registers. My numbering is arranged accordingly, letters being used for the registers from the top downwards, and numbers for the places from front to back; thus *a* 2 means the second legible place-name—not necessarily the second official, since the same town may be mentioned twice over (e.g. *c* 1), or else omitted and merely implied—on the south

wall, and *d'* 1 the first town in the fourth register on the north wall. For practical reasons it seemed advisable on occasion to give a number to a lost place-name (e.g. *a* 3), or else to omit a name that appeared doubtful or was unique. All that really matters to the student who uses the table is to be able to compare the numbers belonging to the same register; on both walls the higher number means a town farther north.

An explanatory inscription describes the nature of the scene on either wall. That on the south wall reads:

Inspection of the dues payable to the bureau of the Vizier of the Southern City and payable by the mayors, headmen, district officials, heralds of the nomes, their scribes and the scribes of their estates which are in the Head of the South (𓂏𓂛𓂏𓂛) beginning from Elephantine and the fortress of Biggah, made in accordance with writings of antiquity by the Vizier [Rekhmirê].

The corresponding inscription on the north wall is practically identical except that for 'their estates . . . South' it substitutes simply 'their fields' and then continues 'front at Coptus, back at As[yût] by &c.', i.e. 'southwards from Coptus and northwards to Asyût by &c.'² It is strange that in the fourth register of the accompanying scene mention is made of Kûš, a place south of Coptus, thus contradicting the heading.

It is doubtful to what period these scenes really belong. The reference to 'writings of antiquity' warns us that Rekhmirê's wall-paintings were merely copies of much older originals. It is perhaps significant that two of the towns (Nos. 346 A, 346 B, of the Commentary) are known elsewhere only from On. Ram. and that both of them have as component elements the names of kings of the Twelfth Dynasty.

III. *Abydos*. To the reign of Ramesses II belongs a consecutive series of personified towns depicted in the northern half of the First Octostyle Hall of his temple at Abydos, the counterpart of a similar series of personified nomes in the southern half of the same room. The mention of the latter will conjure up for every Egyptologist the general appearance of both series. They occupy the base of the wall, and each town or nome presents the appearance of a kneeling Nile-


¹ So Davies; Newberry 𓂏𓂛.

² Also the north wall omits the words 'made . . . antiquity', and varies the epithets applied to the Vizier.

god or woman holding out a tray of food or drink; the name of the place in question is written upon a nome-standard attached to the head of the fictitious being who personifies it. A preceding vertical line shows, with slight variations, the identical type; it is the speech of the town itself:

Recitation. I come to the Lord of Diadems (*or* the Lord of the Two Lands), Ra^cmesse-miamūn, I bring him all the victuals (*or* these libations) (that are with me).¹



Those to whom pictures speak more eloquently than verbal descriptions may consult Miss Murray's photograph of five consecutive towns in *Ancient Egypt*, III (1916), 125 and Mrs. Davies's fine coloured facsimile of one, *Ancient Egyptian Paintings*, pl. 90. The photograph is of service as showing that some of the towns were depicted as Nile-gods and others as women; the first thirteen figures are male, the fourteenth being female; after this female and male alternate. I am at a loss to understand the basis on which the differentiation rests; it does not refer to the gender of the place-name, nor to the bank on which the town lay, nor yet to the sex of the principal deity who was there worshipped; in the hope that other scholars may be lucky enough to discover the reason, I have added M (=male) or F (=female) to every name. Perhaps there was no reason except caprice; at all events the town of Ombos near Coptus is a woman on the northern wall (No. 21) and a Nile-god in the southern series (No. 5). My table has utilized a collation made for me by Ayrton in 1908 and later revised by myself; but since already at the earlier date several of the names had suffered or perished entirely, the admirable early copies by Brugsch and Mariette retain their importance.² Full bibliography, Porter and Moss, VI, 36, after (40). The town-list, beginning on the western half-wall, originally had 38 names, but the last five names immediately following *Ipw* (Ekhmīm) seem to have been lost at the time of Mariette's excavations; the first three are not towns, but the Nubian regions of Khant-ḥen-nūfe, Cush and Ta-sti.³ I have not entered in my table


¹ Other scenes of the kind add , e.g. Capart, *Abydos. Temple de Sēti Ier*, pl. 15.

² Mariette, *Abydos*, II, pl. 12 is nearly faultless, and corrects the only serious blunder made in Brugsch's earlier editions, namely in No. 19. Caulfield's copy is useful as giving the hieroglyphs in facsimile, but transposes some names and omits others.

³ On these see Steindorff in *Griffith Studies*, 360 ff.

the three towns of Ombos (Tūkh), Kha^cyet (Manḳabād) and Khmūn (El-Ashmūnēn), curiously intercalated among the nomes of the southern half of the same hall, as though they were 'autonomous' in the sense given to that term by Brugsch; but mention is made in the Commentary in each case. On the west side of the portico of the same temple, three names survive from what was evidently a nearly identical list of towns, dating from the same reign; these have been published by Mariette, *op. cit.*, II, pl. 6, bottom; see too Porter and Moss, VI, 35 under (17) and (18). One of these names is utilized below in the Commentary (Nos. 327-9), since it shows a variant. Daressy has some comments on the Abydene list, *Rec. trav.* x, 139-41; XI, 79.

IV. *Luxor list*. Far less important is a series of town-names, likewise from the reign of Ramesses II, contained in an inscription in the temple of Luxor for which Daressy is our only authority. The text (*Rec. trav.* xxxII, 62-9) is one described as Litanies d'Amon, a description justified only if the word *litanie* be taken in its secondary French sense of 'endless rigmarole'. The Luxor inscription contains no supplications, but is an enumeration of the aspects and cult-places of Amen-Rē^c in which offerings were presented to him by Ramesses II. A number of place-names occur in the earlier parts, but in no systematic order. The consecutive series, from Elephantine to beyond Heliopolis, starts in l. 47 and is uninterrupted and indisputable only as far as Heracleopolis in l. 59. Nevertheless, I continue onwards as far as Heliopolis (l. 64), ignoring ll. 60-62. After *Nḥb* (El-Kâb) in l. 50 there is a big jump to *Iwnt* (Denderah) in l. 51, probably due to some confusion between *Iwnyt* (Esna) and the said *Iwnt*. The names are all those of nome-capitals except  in l. 54, where I suspect some corruption of , the common designation of the XIIth nome and its metropolis. Outside the consecutive series a few other towns are mentioned, which I have included in the table; the numbers attached to them will show any interest they may have for our present purpose.

V. *The Karnak goddesses' list*. Within the great complex of temples at Karnak there are three examples of an identical hymn of praise addressed to Amen-Rē^c by the personified city of  *Wst nḥtt* 'victorious Thebes'. (a) The earliest example, which is incomplete, now displays the cartouche of Sethos II, but Legrain, its sole editor

(*Ann. Serv.* xv, 273-83), stated that the inscription had been usurped from Ramesses II; for its position between the Hypostyle Hall and the Seventh Pylon see Porter and Moss, II, p. 49, after (5). (b) A duplicate from the reign of Ramesses III is found in the Sanctuary of the temple built by him and entered from the great Forecourt, see Porter and Moss, II, p. 12, under (12); first published by Dümichen, a new edition occurs in Brugsch, *Thesaurus*, 1407-9,¹ and the latest of all in the Chicago Karnak volumes, *Ramses III's Temple*, pl. 59 (see the key, pl. 56, A). (c) An example from the reign of Ramesses XI is unpublished and known to me only from a copy written out for my benefit by my friend K. Sethe, who found it in the 'Chonstempel, zweiter Raum, linke Schmalwand'; Sethe wrote out for me at the same time both the other texts, seemingly with use of collations of his own. It is from these copies that I mainly quote, choosing for my table those spellings which seemed the most accurate. The differences are unimportant, at all events for our purpose; of the three examples, that of Ramesses XI is perhaps the least correct, but shows one or two useful variants.

The introduction reads:

Recitation by victorious Thebes, the lady of the scimetar, the mistress of every nome. I have come to thee, lord of the gods, Amen-Rē, lord of the Thrones of the Two Lands. The entire Ennead propitiates thee, their arms (raised) in praise at thy appearing and they play the sistrum before thy beautiful face. Every town is come to thee, and all the lands bowing down to propitiate Thy Majesty's beauty, that thou mayst protect thy son (here royal name) with all life, duration and prosperity, and mayst give him thy victories, thy scimetar, thy strength and thy power.

Then follows a long series of couplets, of which the first two read:

Thy noble daughter propitiates thee, Mūt, the lady of Ashru,
Satis and Anukis praise thee.
Nekhet propitiates thee,
The lady of R-ōne praises thee.

With Satis and Anukis the hymn starts at Elephantine and the First Cataract, and then passes from El-Kâb and its neighbourhood to various Upper Egyptian towns in correct topographical order, naming the principal local goddess in each. So it continues as far as

¹ By Brugsch wrongly ascribed, in his heading, to Ramesses II and accordingly misplaced by Porter and Moss.

Memphis and Heliopolis, where the goddesses are more numerous and the sites less clearly consecutive. The final words are:

They speak unto thee in peace, O Amen-Rē, Ruler of the Ennead.

In conclusion it may be worth mentioning that in the Graeco-Roman temples there are likewise lists of local goddesses arranged in consecutive topographical order, but there they are strictly subordinated to the division of Egypt into nomes, one goddess being allotted to each nome. A good example is Chassinat, *Mammisi*, p. 11, though here a number of the nomes have no goddess assigned to them. So too in the concluding phrases of the nome-list Mariette, *Dendérah*, II, 28 = Porter and Moss, VI, 63, under (151)-(152) = Brugsch, *Dict. géogr.* 1391-2.

VI. *The stela Leyden V 1.* This highly interesting inscription, reproduced in a fine collotype in Boeser, *Aegyptische Sammlung*, VI, pl. 1, is ascribed to the Eighteenth Dynasty by its editor, but must, I think, belong to the early Nineteenth; at all events the name of Amen-Rē has not been erased. A complete translation of the main text is given here, the first, so far as I am aware, to appear in English.

Praise to thee, Osiris in front of the Westerners, (even)¹ to Thoth, lord of Khmūn, the great god in front of Ḥasrōet dwelling in Ḥe-yebtjet,² the divine power that came forth from³ Rē, who discriminated between (?)⁴ the two witnesses, who pacified the two lords and brothers and gave the Sound eye to its owner, possessor of prestige within the Ennead, marvellous in the secret shrine, great of stride in the Bark of the Evening, most glorious of arisings in the Bark of the Dawn, great in Djedu, following whose steps the living soul led by Rē fares northward! Hail to thee in all thy⁵ names, Thoth the substitute of Rē, by the chief chisel-wielder of the Lord of the Two Lands, Ḥatiay, justified, son of the chief chisel-wielder Ya, justified.

He said: O nobles great and small, all ye patricians, all ye plebeians, all ye sun-folk, I speak to you. It has come about⁶ that I am distinguished above all others. Relate it to generation after generation, the aged teaching the

¹ From the epithet 'great in Djedu' some lines farther on, it seems clear that Thoth was here identified with Osiris; or rather Osiris with Thoth, for Thoth seems in the centre of the picture, and the long list of deities of Hermopolis suggests that Ḥatiay belonged to that city.

² For these two localities see Comm. under No. 377.

³ Ḥ is clearly a mistaken transcription of a hieratic \mathfrak{H} ; for the epithet see Boylan, *Thoth*, 186.

⁴ I conjecture doubtfully that \mathfrak{H} in \mathfrak{H} is a faulty transcription of \mathfrak{H} *wdr*.

⁵ The original has 'his'.

⁶ Lit. 'I have become, I am'

young. For I was humble of family, one of small account in his town. The Lord of the Two Lands recognized me, and I was greatly esteemed in his heart. I beheld the king in his form as Rē in the secrecy of his Castle. He exalted me above the courtiers so that I mingled with the great ones of the Castle. My lord took pleasure in my utterances, whilst he ignored those greater than me. The hidden things of the heart were told to me when I was in the place of quiet, and men went abroad in the Two Lands saying concerning me 'How great is the favouring of him!'

He appointed me to take charge of operations when I was but a weanling, he found me estimable in his heart, and I was introduced into the House of Gold¹ in order to fashion the forms and images of all the gods, and none of them was hidden from me. I was a master of secrets seeing Rē in his changing appearance and Atum in his true shape.² Then there was Osiris, lord of Abydos, in front of the lords of the Sacred Land, and there was Thoth, lord of Khmūn in front of Kher-Tjehenu.³ I saw Shepsy⁴ in his mysterious secrecy, and Unwet in her changing appearances. There was Min cleaving to his beauty, and Horus dwelling in Ḥasrōet, Neḥem-away,⁵ the daughter of Rē, Sakhmis beloved of Ptaḥ, and the Khmūn deities who are in Khmūn in front of Ḥe-yebtjet⁶ [1].⁷ There was Khnum, lord of Ḥ-wōr, Ḥekayet and Ḥathōr [2];⁸ Amen-Rē dwelling in Unu [3]⁹; Ḥathōr in Kōs, daughter of Prē protecting the Precious one [4];¹⁰ the Ennead which is in 'Agy [5];¹¹ Haroēris in Ḥa-Snofru [6];¹² Hemen, lord of Ḥfō [7].¹³ There was Mont, dwelling in Djarty [8],¹⁴ and Anubis, lord of the Dawning Land [9].¹⁵ There was Horus in front of Ḥebnu [10];¹⁶ Pakhet, lady of Set (?) [11];¹⁷ Thoth, Bull

¹ The goldsmith's workshop, see the illuminating references in *Wb.* II, 238, 16-18.

² Is $\overline{\text{𓂏}}$ here written for $\overline{\text{𓂏}}$ *Wb.* II, 151, 10? The example differs somewhat from the others quoted there, in which 're-embodiment', 'reincarnation' seems a more likely rendering than 'Abkömmling'. As affirmed by Faulkner, *JEA* XXII, 134, the latter word may be the later writing of *mštw* in the Pyramid Texts (*ZÄS* xxxi, 81), in which case it has nothing to do with *mš* 'bear'.

³ Gauthier, VI, 46, but the entry should have been under $\overline{\text{𓂏}}$ *Hr*. From the context in or near Hermopolis, and so probably not to be equated with the otherwise unknown *Inrw-ḥnt*, No. 24 of the Wādy el-'Arish list, over-confidently identified by Gauthier, I, 85 with the *Ἀλαβάστρων* of Ptolemy.

⁴ Commentary, under Nos. 358, 377.

⁵ Δ is a misinterpretation by the sculptor of the Δ in his hieratic draft.

⁶ Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis*, § 81, in *Abh. d. k. Preuss. Ak. d. Wiss.*, 1929.

⁷ Here and henceforth the numbers in square brackets are those accorded to the gods and places in my table.

⁸ Comm. under No. 379.

⁹ Comm. under No. 377 A.

¹⁰ Comm. under No. 374. The epithet is utterly obscure.

¹¹ Comm. under No. 324. ¹² Comm. under No. 325. ¹³ Comm. under No. 326.

¹⁴ Comm. under No. 331 A.

¹⁵ Comm. under Nos. 327-9.

¹⁶ Comm. under No. 382.

¹⁷ Comm. under No. 381 A.

in R-ōne [12];¹ 'Anty in U-'Anty [13];² Amūn of 'Foreteller of Victories' [14];³ the Bull, lord of Sakō [15];⁴ Ḥekayet, lady of Gāsy [16]⁵ and the two Haroy-goddesses [17].⁶ It was I who caused them to rest in their eternal shrines, carrying them in the conduct of the king's festival with which I was charged (?).⁷ When the king sailed in his ship, I was in front of it, treading upon the throne of gold to salute the Two Lands; I ate bread from the king's breakfast, and it was washed down with his own ale. And the gold of favour was given me by the king himself.

Herein speak I no falsehood, the Two Lands are my witness. As Ptaḥ liveth, the lord of truth, the lord of the White Wall (Memphis), I have spoken this truthfully. He gave me⁸ the recompense of one who acts loyally towards him, a duration of good life, this his servant being at the feet of his lord to fulfil my duration, to seize the prow-rope⁹ of his command, and to pass into honoured veneration.

To the author of the above lively eulogy of self no very deliberate south-north ordering of localities can be imputed, but two groups of places, the one with five members (Nos. 5-9), and the other with six (Nos. 10-15), do in fact very nearly accurately exhibit such an arrangement. Where the intention is dubious, naturally the demonstrative value of the series cannot be great. On the other hand, some of the place-names are rare, and it is useful to find an opportunity of displaying them in a manner that facilitates comparison with other lists. Hence their inclusion in my table.

VII. *The Medīnet Habu list*. This name is given to a number of scenes on the inner face of the outer wall of the great temple of Ramesses III, above the rooms of the back portion, where the king was portrayed worshipping the deities of a large number of towns and localities arranged in strict sequence from south to north. Had these wall-decorations survived intact, they might well have rivalled

¹ Comm. under No. 382 B.

² Comm. under No. 384 B.

³ Comm. under No. 386 A.

⁴ Comm. under No. 386.


⁵ Comm. under No. 339.

⁶ The numeral 2 makes it nearly certain that the two *Hrt*y 'contented ones', i.e. Isis and Nephthys, were here meant; see *Wb.* II, 498, 9. 10. 13. 14, where a single rubric would have sufficed. The context suggests that these goddesses possessed a cult localized somewhere north of Cynopolis, but no such local cult seems to have been recorded as yet.

⁷ Here the translation is rather doubtful; is the reference to the *Sed*-festival?

⁸ *Sw* is presumably for *swt*.


⁹ *Ssp ḥwt(t?)* 'to grasp the prow-rope' is elsewhere used figuratively of welcoming persons, see my notes *ZÄS* XLIII, 160; Davies and Gardiner, *Tomb of Huy*, p. 26, n. 3; the present extension to the joyful acceptance of a thing is perhaps unique.


even the Onomasticon of Amenope in their usefulness for our studies, the more so since they are concerned as much with local cults as with topographical data. Unhappily the losses have been very severe, and in particular a huge gap in the western or rear wall made it necessary for Daressy, whose first comprehensive account *Rec. trav.* XVII, 118 ff. I have followed in the numbering of the scenes, to divide them into two series A and B. Series A begins midway along the South wall with four places beyond the First Cataract that do not concern us here; A5 is Elephantine, and so the places continue on to one (A15) entirely destroyed just beyond Esna, where the South wall comes to a close. About three-quarters of the West wall have perished, and when series B opens not very far from its northern end we find ourselves only a little to the south of Hû (Diospolis Parva). Daressy has not thought it worth while to mention a much damaged scene where the king was shown offering wine to  Mût and which I should label Bo. After B5 we turn the corner upstream from Abydos and there are six scenes as good as lost between here and the last preserved scene of the North wall, where B26 records the deities of H-wôr (Hûr) just below Hermopolis. After one more entry the list of lesser towns probably terminated, since the two similar scenes which occupied the adjoining portion of the East wall were devoted to the triads of Heliopolis and Thebes respectively, and the last on the North wall, completely lost, will accordingly have represented the gods of Memphis.

It is clear from the reproductions of the ram-headed Suchus of Pi-onkh in Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs*, ed. Birch, II, fig. 551, and of this and two other deities in Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, Text, III, 184, that at least some scenes of the series were available to the early Egyptologists. My statements above and the names entered in the table are derived from my own notes and copies, but I am indebted to Dr. Nelson, director of the field-expedition of the Oriental Institute of Chicago University, for having allowed me to consult the drawings made by his staff. I have naturally also used the earlier publications.

As regards the topographical value of this list, there is nothing to excite suspicion except perhaps B20, the town of 'Anty, lord of Dju-fy, the localization of which presents a very serious problem, see the Commentary under No. 368.

VIII. *The Harris Papyrus*. Next in date comes the great Harris


papyrus, recording the benefactions of Ramesses III, but actually written after the death of that king. Thebes, Heliopolis and Memphis have long sections of their own, but these are followed by a section devoted to the smaller temples whose gods were honoured by the king, and here (61, a, 1-b, 17) the temples of the Upper Egyptian towns in question are named in correct order from south to north, except that This and Abydos are placed first, perhaps on account of their superior importance. Note that in the papyrus the word  'House of' stands before each of the divine names contained in the list. The series begins with that Ombos which is near Coptus, and ends at Aphroditopolis (Atfih); after this follow a few Delta temples (62, a, 1-5). The transcription published by Erichsen in the *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* of Brussels (1933) will be found handy, though the official Brit. Mus. facsimile (1876) should be compared.

IX. *The Wilbour papyrus*. Another valuable topographically arranged series of temples is to be found in the hardly less important papyrus recently edited by me under this name for the Brooklyn Museum (Plate volume, 1941; Text, 1947). The document deals with the assessment for taxation purposes of temple and other land, and is dated in the fourth year of Ramesses V. Since the assessments are concerned only with fields between the Fayyûm and Tihna, a matter of some 130 km., it is comprehensible that ownership did not extend in any case farther south than Hermonthis. As in the Harris papyrus, the great centres of Thebes, Heliopolis and Memphis are dealt with separately, precedence being given to them over the series of smaller shrines. These latter, again following the custom of the day exemplified in P. Harris, have been conscientiously arranged in order from south to north, and as in the same papyrus  'House of' is found before each of the names of the deities contained in the headings. The manuscript divides its material into four lengthy sections, each concerned with fields in a different region or zone and assessed within a short separate span of days. Each of these sections is divided into paragraphs, the headings of which include its own particular series of greater and lesser temples as landowners, and though the localities in which the fields themselves lay¹ do not appear in more than one section, the temples exercising proprietorship over them may

¹ These localities are introduced by the words 'Measurement (made) in . . .' as headings of sub-divisions of the paragraphs.

of course do so. It is to some extent a matter of chance what temples are named as landowners in a given section: for example, Sakō (El-Ḳēs) is so found in no less than three of the four sections, but Ninsu (Ihnâsyah), doubtless at all periods a much more considerable place, occurs only in the first. Again, two towns which we have reason to believe were fairly close neighbours may appear together only in one section, one of them being missing from another section; Anasha and Men'onkh are found in contiguity in Section IV, but only the former occurs in Section III. The essential point, however, is that whatever land-owning provincial temples there may be in a section, these are arranged in south-north order. The position is thus, *mutatis mutandis*, analogous to that of the different registers in the taxation scenes of the tomb of Rekhmirē, as described above, pp. 45-7. In order to discover from the table the relative positions attributed to two towns in the papyrus, only the paragraph-numbers belonging to the same section must be compared. Those students to whom the above explanations seem insufficient are referred to my Commentary, long since ready for press, and above all to Table I therein. It remains to add that to a limited extent the localities with land-owning temples and chapels do fall into groups confined to their own section, since unimportant shrines would naturally possess fields only in their own immediate vicinity. Lastly, it must be realized that the column devoted to P. Wilbour in the table of the present book contains a number of localities of much smaller size than those of the other lists, all of which are concerned only with towns of some importance, while one or two even restrict themselves to nome-capitals.








X. *The Onomasticon of AmenopĚ*. Concerning the purpose, character and date of this document all that is necessary has been said in earlier pages of the present chapter. Since, moreover, its specifications have been made the base, in the Commentary below, of our elucidations of the topographical table, it here remains only to make some observations of a more general nature. In length the list of towns in On. Am. greatly surpasses any other list, and the items are on the whole well spaced out along the entire length of the Nile Valley. It is only when the Delta is reached that the enumeration loses all semblance of completeness, and displays an inadequacy little short of grotesque. If Gol. at this point faithfully reproduces the archetype, we can only conclude that the author lost interest when the possibility


of arranging his towns in orderly sequence was denied him. If, then, such a purpose lay at the root of his labours, all the more may a high degree of trustworthiness be expected in his arrangement. Nor, indeed, have we much tangible ground for questioning his accuracy in this respect. In naming Ombos (Ṭūkh, No. 341) after Coptus (No. 340) he has reversed the true order, but the towns lie on opposite sides of the river and the mistake is venial. The same holds good with Sakō (No. 386) and Hardai (Cynopolis, No. 385), and perhaps also with Neshyet (No. 355) and Ekhmîm (No. 354). With regard to Pi-boinu (No. 345) and Hû (No. 346) we shall find ourselves inclined to credit AmenopĚ with the truth rather than two earlier lists and a later one. Pi-^cAnty (No. 368) presents an unsolved problem. From here as far as Heliopolis there exists no tangible ground for criticism, though a doubt might suggest itself with regard to Pi-neb-ōne (No. 381). Naturally, we have no means of checking the location of towns not named elsewhere, and though our faith in AmenopĚ ought to be considerable, it should by no means be absolute. The oddest thing about his list is that he has omitted Djarty (Eṭ-Ṭôd, No. 331 A), Anasha (No. 383 A), Shedet (Crocodilopolis, No. 392 B) and He-nesu (No. 387 A), none of them insignificant; P-emdje (Oxyrhynchus),¹ which is certainly to be distinguished from Spermeru (No. 388) occurs in no list whatsoever and perhaps came into prominence only later. We should certainly have expected some reference to  Tj-w-djy 'Teudjoi' (El-Ḥibah),² though possibly under one of its other names. Yet other towns that might well have found a place in the list are Su (392 C), Mertum (Meydûm) and the comparatively little known capital of the XXIst nome (No. 392 E). It certainly looks as though AmenopĚ had found some difficulty in staying the course, and as though the incompleteness which becomes so conspicuous in the Delta series had already begun in the last sixth of the valley itself.



XI. *The Wâdy el-'Arîsh list*. The long mythological inscription first published by Griffith in Naville, *The Mound of the Jew*, pls. 24-5 from a naos which at that time lay in the Wâdy el-'Arîsh on the easternmost border of Egypt contains in its last three lines a list of 33 towns (or rather 32, since Nekhen appears in two different writings)

¹ Gauthier, II, 83, and see in my Commentary on P. Wilbour.


² Gauthier, VI, 7.

supposed to have been built by the god Shu. These evidently profess to be in order from south to north, since they begin with Elephantine and since Heracleopolis and the Fayyûm occupy positions near the end. There are, however, so many departures from the true order that the list is worthless for locating the places named. None the less, the series deserved to be included in the table partly to show how unreliable Egyptian lists of the kind could sometimes be and partly on account of some rare names and writings that it contains. According to Griffith, the inscription is of Ptolemaic date. The monument has now found a resting-place in the Ismâîliyah Museum, and a new edition of the text, with good photographs and a translation, is given by G. Goyon in *Kēmi*, VI, 1-42. For seven place-names it was impossible to find niches in the table; they are Nos. 6 , 17 , 24 , 25 , 31 , 32 , 33 . About none of these have the dictionaries of Brugsch and Gauthier anything illuminating to say, except that *Bndt* (31) is named twice elsewhere, with Suchus as its god, whence it may well have been a site in the Fayyûm, as indeed its position in the list suggests.



XII. *The great Edfu nome-list*, on the outer walls of the sanctuary, eastern half, at base, Porter and Moss, VI, 147 after (223-6). Ptolemy IV is seen advancing towards Horus of Edfu to present to him the twenty-two nomes of Upper Egypt, which, depicted in their usual guise as Nile-gods, follow the king in procession bearing trays with libation jars and lotus-blossoms; on the heads of these personifications are standards bearing the names of the nomes they represent. The accompanying legends are placed in the mouth of the king, who declares in his introductory words that he is bringing to Horus the nomes of  *Hn-nhn* 'Upper Egypt' (*Wb.* III, 372, 15) with 'all that is in them', this phrase being explained to mean their gods, relics, priests and so forth. For religion and cult this most important of all nome-lists is of inestimable value, but less so for purely topographical purposes, since only the nome-capitals are named, not the smaller towns. In the table I have prefixed the nome-sign in each case, accompanied by its number in the series of Upper Egyptian nomes. No place could be found in the column for the



¹ The , doubtless a determinative, has been cut over , which was evidently a misinterpretation of it.

names of the nome-deities, since they are given in somewhat prolix form as a rule, but in the Commentary some of the more interesting entries are noted. In the absence of photographs or good recent collations I have used the copies in Brugsch, *Dict. géogr.* 1358 ff., which on the whole inspire confidence.

XIII. *Chassinat, Edfou*, VI, 42 ff. incorporating earlier publications enumerated Porter and Moss, VI, 161, under (310)-(311);¹ XIV. *De Morgan, Kom Ombo*, Nos. 895-9 = *Catalogue des Monuments*, III, 257 ff. = Porter and Moss, VI, 196, under (190)-(193). These are two of the three lists of supplementary districts briefly characterized above, pp. 44-5, and discussed in Gauthier, *Nomes*, 56 ff. Here they are best described together; we are concerned only with their utility for geographical studies, not with their political or administrative import. The Edfu list dates from the reign of Ptolemy IX Alexander I and that at Kôm Ombo from the time of Vespasian. Both follow, and are on the same footing as, ordinary Graeco-Roman nome-lists, showing figures personifying districts and mentioning in the accompanying legends the most prominent town of the district, if indeed the latter is not itself the town. The Edfu list curiously follows a list of the nomes of Lower Egypt; that from Kôm Ombo more naturally succeeds the list of Upper Egyptian nomes. The Kôm Ombo list comes to an abrupt conclusion at as early a point as Gebelên, whereas the Edfu list continued down into the Delta. Serious losses, however, make the Edfu list almost inutilizable after Kûs, and in consequence col. XIII is not continued as a whole beyond the first plate of the table, though some extracts from the list are inserted thereafter and regions following Pi-Haṣpi are dealt with under No. 397 of the Commentary. To illustrate the nature of the legends accompanying the figured representations, I translate No. LXXII of the Edfu series. Here the personification of the district of Ombi bears on his head the signs  signifying the name of that district and town; the legend reads as follows:















The King of Upper and Lower Egypt (cartouche blank), the son of Rē Ptolemy (part of cartouche blank) living for ever, has come to thee, Horus Behdety, great god, lord of heaven, bringing to thee *Nbw* (Ombi) with what

¹ In reproducing these earlier copies of groups now destroyed Chassinat has made at least one serious slip: in No. LXXVII he has printed , where both Dümichen and de Rougé gave  doubtless rightly.

is in it, and   *Pr-Hr* 'House of Horus' with what comes forth from it. Thou art he who overthrows the enemies of the sun, and makes massacre of

It will be seen that two towns are named in this legend, but they are merely alternative designations of Ombi itself. In the table it was naturally inconvenient to give more than one of the two, and here and elsewhere I have chosen that designation which seemed more to my purpose.¹

Analogous (as already noted p. 44, bottom) to the Edfu list is another

¹ Confusion has arisen in the minds of editors and commentators over No. LXXVI of the Edfu list just described. The trouble began with Dümichen, *Geogr. Inschr.* 1, 65, 25, who perhaps through some error in his notes substituted  i.e. *Hft* two places further on in the table, for  *Hwt-sw-R* which Chassinat (p. 43, n. 3) says is perfectly well preserved on the wall. De Rougé (pl. III, No. 25) follows Dümichen, a fact that does not speak well for the independence of his copy. Curiously enough, Chassinat affirms his belief that Dümichen's emendation is 'fondée en principe', giving as his ground that  is the name of the Serapeum of the VIth nome of Lower Egypt and has been recorded already in the same Edfu text as belonging to that nome, see p. 39, No. LVII. He further says that  is the metropolis of the ancient district  'qui fut promu au rang de nome sous les Lagides'. Lastly, he says that there is no proof that there were two places called . Gauthier, *Nomes*, pp. 61-2 agrees with Chassinat that the sculptor has here blundered in substituting that name for *Hft*, but thinks the blunder was due to a confusion with  which occurs next door to it in my table. Both Chassinat and Gauthier have overlooked another Edfu passage, Chass. *Edfou*, VI, 231 ff., which is about to be described in the text. Here XXV refers to the Khnum of Esna, XXVII to Amün, lord of Hfö, and XXVIII to Amün, lord of  Hasfün. What interests us is the intermediate XXVI, where we read: 'Said by Hathör,  lady of 'Akny, prominent in Se-Rē'. Hence it is clear that *St-R* or *Hwt-sw-R* is a locality closely connected with 'Agy, here written 'Akny ('*kn*). Accordingly, the sculptor of No. LXXVI in the Edfu list that was our starting-point has made no mistake, but has substituted for 'Agy and the Hathör-region to which it belongs (see the Kôm Ombo list) a region of  Horus of the East containing a town named *Hwt-sw-R* (= *St-R*), which we must think of as near, if not identical with, 'Agy on the same eastern bank. This is confirmed by the Kôm Ombo list, which, as will be seen from the table, has separate entries for (1) the Hathör region with its town 'Agy and (2) the Horus of the East region with a town connected with Rē, but given in the somewhat different form  *Tt-n-R-Bhbh*? 'Mound-of-Rē-Bekbekh (?)'. It remains to ask, then, whether there were two distinct places of the name *Hwt-sw-R*, one in Upper Egypt and one in the VIth nome of Lower Egypt. The answer depends on whether the  of Chass., *op. cit.* VI, 39 quoted above is a legitimate variant of  *Hwt-nsyt-n-R* Chass., *Dendara*, II, 134 (similarly at Esna, but without clear indication of whereabouts, *Rec. trav.* XXVII, 190, l. 52), a name of *Hsew* Xoïs, also found in the shortened form  Düm., *Geogr. Inschr.* III, 45. See further on this point in the Commentary under No. 414 of On. Am.

dating from the reign of the same Ptolemy on the inner face of the north part of the girdle wall of the temple, Chass., *Edfou*, VI, 231 ff. = Porter and Moss, VI, 165 under (324)-(326). The supplementary districts follow upon the nomes of Upper Egypt, and after enumerating 12 districts from Ombi past Kûs to one town beyond Denderah then make a big jump to Sambeḥdet at the extreme north of the Delta (see *JEA* xxx, 44), add one more and then conclude. The districts are not quite the same as in those in the Edfu list constituting col. XIII of the table, but no space was found to include this further list as well. In one essential point the latter, together with the virtual Upper Egyptian nome-list that precedes it, differs radically from the two others above described: it displays, not personifications of nomes and districts, but the deities of those nomes and districts. The deities address Horus Beḥdety, the god of Edfu, and one of the legends, already used in a footnote, is here quoted as an example:

Said by Hathör, lady of 'Akny (i.e. 'Agy, near Esna) prominent in Se-Rē: I give life and well-being into thy noble nose! I have come to thee, Horus Beḥdety, great god, lord of heaven, bringing thee the Hathör-town with that [which is in] it, Ptaḥ and Amün rejuvenating [thy] limbs.

This list is quoted from time to time in the Commentary.

XV. *The papyrus Cairo 58018* = Golénischeff, *Papyrus hiératiques* (CCG), pl. xvii and pp. 74 ff. This is an example of the book edited by Lieblein under the title *Le livre égyptien Que mon nom fleurisse* (Leipzig, 1895). In the papyri in question, all of extremely late date, the deceased prays

Let my name flourish in Thebes and in the nomes for ever and ever even as flourishes the name of (e.g.) Khnum in Elephantine,

see Lieblein, *op. cit.*, pp. x-xi, xxx-xxxi, lxii-lxiv. Brugsch, *Dict. géogr.* 1067-9 deals with the same passage, utilizing three papyri at Turin and five in the Louvre, none of them identical with those edited by Lieblein. Golénischeff, *op. cit.*, p. 23, adds another Cairo papyrus (58007) unknown to both Brugsch and Lieblein, whereas 58018 is that of Lieblein, pp. xxx-xxxi. The earlier versions of the same text, or rather one very much like it, do not contain the list of deities and towns that interests us, see *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum: Chester Beatty Gift*, Text, p. 91; also Thebes, *Tomb 93*,

see Porter and Moss, I, 124 (7). That list is in accurate order from south to north, and the various manuscripts show but few differences.

Out of the twenty-two nomes of Upper Egypt, fourteen only are represented; to these are added Ombi immediately after Elephantine, Kûs after Thebes, Mi-wēr corresponding to the later Arsinoite nome, and Memphis, which belongs to the Ist of Lower Egypt. Osiris of Abydos (VIIIth nome) and Thoth of Hermopolis (XV) are omitted doubtless because they occurred earlier in the text of which our list is the continuation and expansion. Seth of Shashōtp (XI) and of Oxyrhynchus (XIX) were ignored on account of that god's ill-repute; the god of nomes XII and XVIII very possibly for the same reason. Why Hathōr of Aphroditopolis (Atfih, XXII) has been passed over, and the XXIst nome entirely disregarded, is not clear. At what date the list here treated originated is not known, and in such circumstances it seemed best to regard it as the latest of all included in the table.

In concluding the account of the consecutive lists of Upper Egyptian towns it seems appropriate to make some reference to a monument which, while not of quite the same character, has supplied information of real value to the Commentary and is of particular importance on account of its early date. This is the nome-list on the reconstructed temple of Sesostris I at Karnak, of which a preliminary description has been given in *Ann. Serv.* xxxviii, 567 ff. I owe a great debt of gratitude to M. Lacau, who was good enough to write out for my benefit all the inscriptions relevant to my present problem. Immediately below the row of nome-standards is a register containing the names of the principal nome-deities, sometimes coupled with the name of a town. Some of the entries are quite obscure, and I have not thought it desirable to use the list except where it is definitely illuminating; scholars must await the edition promised by M. Lacau.

It will be observed that in the tables I continue the entries as far as Heliopolis, though from the old Egyptian standpoint we are already in Lower Egypt on entering the Memphite nome. The reason for the course adopted is that On. Am. presents its towns consecutively until Heliopolis is reached, and one or two other lists do the same. It seemed a pity not to display their data comparatively.





Some observations are desirable in reference to the maps which will be found in their appropriate places amid the autographed Commentary. These maps have been devised to assist students who might not have other reference books to hand. All have been executed by Miss Broome on the basis of material supplied by myself. In the map of Northern Syria I am indebted for help to Professor G. R. Driver, who has kindly enabled me to present the modern town-names in forms more accurate than are usually found, though some inconsistencies remain as regards the vowels; and to Dr. Schaeffer I owe, besides the loan of his guide-book, answers to several questions concerning the identification of particular sites. In the maps of the Nile Valley I have made the innovation of placing in the margin, at approximately their right levels, the names of towns which are mentioned in the lists as belonging hereabouts, but the exact location of which has not been determined. Lastly, in the map of the Delta it seemed useless to include any of the modern waterways except the main two (Damietta and Rosetta branches), since it is certain that the river has changed its course very greatly from time to time; indeed these main two have been inserted more for purposes of orientation than because they correspond in any way to realities of antiquity. On the other hand, I have shown in red the Delta branches as, according to the late Dr. Ball, they presented themselves to the mind of the geographer Ptolemy in the 2nd century A.D.;¹ we need have no illusions that they corresponded at all exactly to the branches of Ramesside times, but at all events they are likely to have been nearer those branches than are the channels as they exist today.

§ 5. *Text, Translation and Commentary*

[It having proved necessary to autograph this section, no more than the heading is here given in its logical and proper place. The actual content of the section occupies the latter part of this Text volume, and practically the whole of a second one.]

¹ The omission in the map of Ptolemy's river mouths has been intentional, as two of them are peculiar to him and the others have no particular interest for Egyptologists.

CHAPTER III
THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE WRITING-BOARD
(‘Univ.’, Pl. xxiii)

THE third Onomasticon with which this work is concerned is a document of much smaller size and importance than the two to which the previous chapters have been devoted, but is too closely akin to them to be passed over in silence. It is the upper half of a writing-board (length 30 cm., height 11 cm.) covered with stucco and painted a chocolate-brown. Since the hole for suspension, which is quite close to the break, must have been at a point very near the middle, the original height was obviously about 21 cm. The facsimile by Spiegelberg, who was the first to draw attention to this document, *Rec. trav.* XIX, 92 ff., should be consulted for the hieratic, but I cannot follow him in dating it approximatively to the reign of Ramesses II; the forms of  *rt.* 1, *vs.* 1 and of  *rt.* 2. 3. 4 as well as the initial  in place of  *rt.* 1, are practically conclusive for Dyn. XXI–XXII.¹ Here it will be convenient to give a consecutive translation before discussing the individual items, and the brevity of the text makes it unnecessary to number these separately.

TRANSLATION

Recto (1). I acquaint you with the occupations that are in a temple: guardian of the Treasury, guardian of the Granary, (2) maker of *bit*-loaves, baker, maker of *kw*-cakes (?), baker of *šry*(*t*)-cakes, butcher, confectioner, (3) maker of *psn*-loaves, shaper of incense, basket-weaver (?), dyer of red cloth, (4) maker of rush mats (?), bouquet-maker, gardener, bearer of floral offerings

No doubt the scribe, or the author whose instructions he obediently followed, could have continued this enumeration much further. He preferred, however, to break off at the end of his fourth line, and at some later date added upside down a few words from a prayer to Amūn:



Come to me, Amūn, come and save [me from] from (?) their mouths (?)

¹ Even later, doubtless, is the list of furniture on an ostrakon published by Virey, *Rec. trav.* VIII, 170 ff., which I shall have occasion to quote in connexion with the *verso* of Univ.



THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE WRITING-BOARD





Verso. (1). I acquaint you with the work of a (wood-)carver (*gnwty*?) and initiate you into what he makes: chapel, (2) divine bark, carrying stands for gods, sanctuary,, doors, poles, poles (3) for uraei, statue in its chapel, beds, palanquins, footstools (4) (for the) feet, boxes,, coffers, chests, receptacles, coffins (*the rest is lost*).


COMMENTARY


Recto and *verso* are similar in form, and begin with a reference to that ‘causing to know’ (cf. Arab. تَعْرِيف) which was the customary Egyptian mode of introducing a list. The *šdm.f* form  is, however, embarrassing, being usually past in affirmative main clauses; perhaps, however, it is here Middle, not Late, Egyptian; Erman, *Neuäg. Gramm.*², § 283, quotes  Harris, 75, 2, but this is not quite similar, since it follows ‘Hearken to me’ and may, therefore, be final. There can be no question of emending to *r rdīt rh.k* (or *rh.tw*), the more usual beginning, since *wn.i tw* in *vs.* 1 shows that the 1st pers. sing. was involved.





Rt. 1. *Trwt* ‘occupations’ rather than ‘offices’. The words that follow confirm my view that the similar entries in On. Am. (they begin near No. 137) had in mind avocations pursued within the precincts of a temple, perhaps that of Amen-Rē at Karnak.





Srw pr-hd, srw šnw. For the parallelism of ‘Treasury’ and ‘Granary’, those two great repositories of Egyptian wealth, see on On. Am. No. 454. In connexion with the  ‘Estate of Amūn’ simple ‘guardians’ (*srw*) are found among the witnesses at the Tomb-robberies trials P. Brit. Mus. 10052, 4, 20 = Peet, pl. 28 (‘of the Treasury’); 10053, 7, 7. 9 = pl. 19 (‘of the Granary’), and Lefebvre, *Grands prêtres*, pp. 52 ff. quotes mentions of their ‘chiefs’ (); so too in an unpublished continuation of Pleyte and Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 33. These guardians were probably in no higher station than that of a modern *ghafir*.



Rt. 2. *Tr(w) bit*, On. Am. No. 143. *Rthty*, On. Am. No. 146.  *ir(w) išk* can hardly contain the fairly common  *išk* ‘leeks’, Copt.  *Wb.* 1, 34, 1, and the context suggests that we may here have a writing or miswriting of  *irw kw* ‘preparer of *kw*-cakes’, *Wb.* v, 8, 4, an occupation for which I can quote only the example given by Lefebvre, *Inscriptions*, p. 32 (with note *m*, p. 37), where *kw* is co-ordinated, as apparently here, with *bit* and *psn*. *Ps šry(t)*, On. Am. No. 141. *Sif*, On. Am. No. 139. *Bnrty*, On. Am. No. 150.









Rt. 3. *Tr(w) ps(n)*, On. Am. No. 144. *Sšk sntr*, On. Am. No. 147. *Nbd(y)*, On. Am. No. 175.  *ps insy* ‘dyer of red cloth’, lit. ‘boiler’, *Wb.* 1, 100, 10, to the examples there quoted add Spiegelberg, *Museum Meermannno-Westreenianum*, p. 8; that the tissue called *insy* was bright red is proved by the colours of the bands presented to the various gods in the

temple of Sethos I at Abydos and described in the texts as  *mnh* *ht* *insy* 'insy-linen', see Mar., *Abyd.* I, p. 52, footnotes; Lucas, *Anc. Eg. Materials*, 314 f. quotes Pliny xxxv, 42 to the effect that the Egyptians pressed the white material, then saturated it with mordants able to absorb colour, and finally plunged it into boiling dye.



Rt. 4. *Ir(w) wst šw*, On. Am. No. 137. *Hnd mshw*, possibly the name of the maker of those formal bouquets described by Keimer in *Am. Journ. Sem. Lang.*, xli, 145 ff. or perhaps, since the specific name of these appears to have been  *ms*, the maker of ordinary wreaths (*msh*, see *Wb.* II, 31, 1 ff.); *hnd* is given by *Wb.* III, 312, 15 as the name given to the action of 'bending' wood (see Montet, *Scènes*, 314), so that the reference may well be to 'twisting' together the stems of flowers; in Ostr. Gardiner 96, after the mention of the festival of King Amenophis there is added  'wreaths twisted, 300, real (?)'. *Ksry*, On. Am. No. 225. *Fry htp* is rightly rendered by Spiegelberg *Träger der Blumensträuße* on the basis of the title  'bearer of floral offerings of Amūn', Dümichen, *Kalender-inschriften*, 47, from the tomb of Nakht at Thebes (No. 161); the proximity of the word for 'gardener' supports this view, though the determinative of *htp* is borrowed from the word for 'basket'; *Wb.* I, 574, 6 quotes a similar title with the more general determinative .










Vs. 1. For *gnwti* (?), which from the following enumeration here must be taken in the restricted sense of 'wood-carver', see on On. Am. No. 155. That  is for  will not be doubted by those who know the habits of Late-Egyptian scribes; see the parallels in the note on the text. For the sense 'initiate' someone 'into', overlooked by *Wb.*, cf.  'I am initiated into the decrees (?) of Mont', Anast. I, 28, 2, so explained already in my edition. The form  is difficult, but the meaning clear. *Ksr(i)* 'chapel', see *Wb.* v, 107, 12 ff.

Vs. 2. *Wt*, see *Wb.* I, 271, 8 ff., used only of ceremonial ships of gods and king; for the *wt* of gods in particular towns, see especially Brit. Mus. 1332 = *ZAS* LXVIII, 39 f. with pl. 2. *Fry ntrw*, cf.  'this carrying-stand of the great goddess' Pleyte and Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 67, 9, rightly quoted by *Wb.* I, 574, 13; the reference is probably, not to the banners on which the figures of gods were borne by single priests, the special name for which was  *ist* 'standard', *Wb.* I, 26, 7, but rather to those table-like stands carried on the backs of a number of priests by means of the *nbiw* 'poles' shortly to be mentioned, e.g. *Medinet Habu* (ed. Chicago), III, pls. 223 ff. *Dbr*, doubtless as *Wb.* v, 439, 4 a borrowing from Semitic, cf. Hebr. דְּבִיר 'innermost chamber', 'sanctuary'; surviving in Copt. ^{SB}ⲧⲁⲃⲓⲣ 'sanctuary', the initial τ in Bohairic, instead of ⲑ, strongly favouring this view; the form ⲧⲁⲃⲓⲣ, quoted by Spiegelberg only to reject the comparison, appears to have

been a mistake, but his reference to  Brugsch, *Wb.* 1634, from a text in Edfu now published Chass., IV, 328, 8 probably holds good; I have found no mention of this writing in *Wb.* The next signs are confusedly written, but probably represent a word rather than a mere determinative of *dbr*; I do not hazard a conjecture. *šw*, see *Wb.* I, 164, 12 ff.; from the writing, various sets of double doors appear to have been meant. *Nbi*, old *nb*, the term for the 'poles' used in carrying sacred boats, shrines and the like, see *Wb.* II, 243, 5 ff.; the extraordinary spelling here has its parallel on the *verso* of *Pap. Boulaq IV* (see *Wb. ibid.* under 9)¹ and is a blend of the normal writing  and the fairly common  due to the consideration that the word ought to begin with *nb*. The easiest way of explaining the next entry is to regard it as repeating the word *nbi* (the corruption of hieratic  into hieratic  is very easy) and taking this, not as due to dittography, but as qualified by *n irrt*; in any case the reference is to those rows of uraei seen at the top of the royal throne and so forth; I render accordingly. *Tw(t) m hnw krr(i)f*, no comment is necessary. *Hrtiw* 'beds', *Wb.* III, 43, 15; the meaning, fairly clear from Two Brothers, 13, 3 was confirmed by Von Calice, *ZAS* LII, 130 from an ostrakon mentioning the legs; to the examples quoted by Spiegelberg, *Rec. trav.* xv, 141 add Ostr. Berlin 12343 = *Hierat. Pap.* III, pl. 34; Ostr. Gardiner 9. 33. 44. *Kniw* 'palanquin'; *Wb.* v, 51, 13 ff. gives *Tragsessel*, *Sessel* as meaning of this masculine word, known from M.K. onwards, and the determinative of the closely related feminine  *knyt*, see *Wb.* v, 52, 1 and my *Inscription of Mes*, p. 12, points to the former meaning, English 'palanquin', 'litter'; the corresponding O.K. word was  *hwdt*, *Wb.* III, 250, 3. In *Westcar* 7, 12 *kniw* clearly means a palanquin, since Djedi travelled in it, and its poles (*nbiw*) are mentioned; cf. also *Urk.* IV, 666, 16, but there the accompanying 'footstool' (*hdmw*) is mentioned, cf. the next word here, and the question arises whether the notion of portability is always present, the more so since the popularity of this mode of conveyance may have waned with the coming of the chariot; however, Klebs, *Reliefs . . . d. neuen Reiches*, 143, n. 6 quotes several N.K. examples of palanquins being used by the king. The related verb *kni* means 'embrace' and so suggests an 'arm-chair'; Ostr. Gardiner 44 mentions among objects given in barter a *kni* of wood of which it is further said .

¹ The expression *mh.f ps nbi* here declared to be incomprehensible may well be so in the place quoted (Mariette, *Pap. Boulaq*, pls. 27-8 is very inadequate as a facsimile), but the personal name *Mh.f-ps-nbi* (Ranke, 163, 21; also in a papyrus at Brooklyn) undoubtedly means 'He-fills-out-the-*nbi*-measure' and falls into line with the expression *nhn n nbi* 'a child of a *nbi*-measure' Anast. III, 5, 7 = P. Ch. Beatty IV, vs. 5, 7, again declared incomprehensible *Wb.* II, 244, 2, but brilliantly explained by Gunn in Frankfort, *Cenotaph of Seti I*, pp. 93 f.; I would only add that on the ostrakon that was Gunn's starting-point the *nbi* was clearly still a measure of length (doubtless = 2 cubits), not a cubic measure like the demotic equivalent and the Greek *vaúβιον*.

 'with its *mryt* on its *st*, and its footstool; value 15'—perhaps these words will find illumination at the hands of some archaeologist. *Knw* and *hdmw* are mentioned again together, Ostr. Colin Campbell 16; also in a list of furniture of Dyn. XXII or thereabouts, *Rec. trav.* VIII, 171. Elsewhere *knw* may possibly mean a shrine of some sort, at all events Schäfer, *Mysterien des Osiris* in Sethe, *Unters.* IV, 17, deals with an example where the word has a shrine-like determinative; in the New Kingdom mention is not seldom made of *knw* of kings which had their own priests, see *JEA* XXII, 177. Further literature: Maspero in *Rec. trav.* I, 56; Brugsch, *Wörterb. Suppl.* 1254; Bissing, *Statistische Tafel*, 43 f. *Hdmw rdwy* 'footstools (for the) feet', *Wb* II, 505, 17 ff., found first in Dyn. XVIII (*Urk.* IV, 666, 17) and probably a borrowing from Semitic, cf. Hebr. 𐤍𐤊𐤍; the addition here, though strictly superfluous as it would appear, is by no means uncommon, earliest example 𐤍𐤊𐤍  Cairo 46124 = Carter and Newberry, *Tomb of Thoutmôsis IV*, p. 40; add to the examples quoted in *Wb.*, Blinding of Truth, 6, 3-4; Ostr. Gardiner 44; Ostr. Colin Campbell 16.

Vs. 4. *Gw(wt)* 'boxes'. *Wb.* v, 160, 7 records the word as existing from M.K., doubtless alluding to  *P. Kahun* 19, 17, which, being followed by  | 'that which is in it' shows that a box of some sort was meant; payment made to a carpenter (*hmw*) for   *t; gwt* 'the box', Ostr. Berlin 10665 = *Hierat. Pap.* III, pl. 38; among other articles of wood,   Ostr. Gard. 44;   Ostr. Nash 11. The probable relationship to  *Wb.* v, 153, 9 ff. need not be here discussed; examples of this latter are Harris 13, *b*, 10; 64, *c*, 3; 71, *a*, 4; *Rec. trav.* XXII, 166. *Whm(w)* is known to *Wb.* I, 345, 3 only from the present example. '*fd(wt)* 'coffers', a common word, in O.K. *ḥfdt*, see *Wb.* I, 183, 15 ff.; examples from N.K. texts, Ostr. Gard. 8; Ostr. Colin Campbell 3; Ostr. Nash 11; *Rec. trav.* VIII, 171. *Hn(w)* 'chests', very common *Wb.* II, 491, 9 ff. *Mhn(w)* 'chests', 'coffers', see On. Am. No. 440; *Wb.* II, 115, 1-3 quotes all the instances known to me. *Wt(w)* 'coffins', common, *Wb.* I, 379, 7; good examples not there quoted, Ostr. Berlin 12343 = *Hierat. Pap.* pl. 34.

AUTOGRAPHED TEXT

representing ch. II, § 5, see above, p. 63.














THE ONOMASTICON OF AMENOPE

§ 5. *Text, Translation, and Commentary*

For the abbreviations designating the various manuscripts
see above, p. 26.

I. INTRODUCTORY HEADING.
















G ¹¹	<u>பிரபு*பாடின குஞ்சு</u>	புரிந் = டீசு
H ¹¹	பிரபு*பாடின குஞ்சு	புரிந் = டீசு
L ^{11.1}	பிரபு*பாடின குஞ்சு =	புரிந் = டீசு
B ¹	<u>பிரபு*பாடின குஞ்சு</u>	புரிந் = டீசு
B ²	பிரபு*பாடின குஞ்சு	புரிந் = டீசு ends

G			
H			
L			
B ¹			
OR			




















G			
H			
L			
B ¹			
OC ¹			
OR			

On. Am., Introductory Heading.

G	^{f3}		
H	^{f3}		
L			
OC	²		
OR	³		

G   
 H   
 L   
 O   
 OR   

TRANSLATION.

G                   





 2^*

On. Am., Notes on Introductory Heading.

NOTES



















G 1,1 Whc ib, mtr hm and rh wont nb are doubtless three co-ordinated infinitival phrases, so that whc ib should not have been rubricized. Whc ib elsewhere known only as an epithet 'loosed of heart', i.e. 'intelligent'; Wb. I, 348, 15. — Mtr 'instruct'; Wb. II, 171, 19.























G 1,2. Šhr 'bring into being' is obviously inferior to šhr 'copy' of the other texts, and may have been due to mishearing in dictation. — Š hr šrw in G is the old word šrw discussed by me Bull. inst. fr. XXX, 176 ff., a vague word for which the rendering Ausspruch in Wb. IV, 548, 8 ff. seems without justification. H and others substitute šrw apparently signifying 'constellations' or the like, but for such a word Wb. IV, 547, 1 provides but poor authority.





G1,3. For the writing , probably due to the influence of , see L-bq. Stories, 64a, note^c on 3,12. —  of H is possibly again an error due to dictation; there is a word hst or hstyw meaning 'roof'; below, No. 433, and the scribe may have imagined some such meaning as 'roofed over by the sun', but there is no authority elsewhere for such a rendering, and  hzy, later often transitive 'shine over', 'illuminate' (WB III, 15, 2.3), is clearly superior.

Gr 1, 4. M32, from old mst (Wb. II, 34, 17 ff.), rendered προνοηθέν-
tes in Canopus q, is here not improbably a consciously grandilo-
quent word, though the Coptic equivalent MEEYE is common
for 'think'. — For the title of Amenopë and the substitution
of another name in L, see the printed Introduction.

II. SKY, WATER, EARTH.

①  G, OC;  H, *pt* 'sky'. ②  G, H;  OC, *itr* 'sun'. ③  G;  H; om. OC, *ich* 'moon'. ④  G, H, OC, *sb* 'star'. ⑤  G, OC;  H, *Isk* 'Orion'. Some literature, Wainwright in *JEA* XXII, 45 f.; Boll, *Sphaera*, 164 ff.; Schott, *Die altägyptischen Dekane*, (in *Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, Heft XIX), pp. 8 ff., and particularly Pls. 1. 2. 3. 5. 11. ⑥  G;  H;  OC, *Mshtyw* 'the Foreleg'. From the earliest times *Mshtyw* was the name of the constellation known to ourselves as the Great Bear, but in *Pyr.* 458 the det.  shows it was originally conceived of as an adze, a view that left important traces in later funerary ritual. From the early M. K. onwards the constellation was depicted as the foreleg of a bull, and sometimes later even as the bull itself. For much interesting information see Wainwright in *Griffith Studies*, 373 ff.; for further pictures see the article by Schott quoted under No. 5; the Greek survivals of the Egyptian conception, Boll, *Sphaera*, 162 ff. The variant *mskn* in H occurs once also in *Dyn.* XX, Brugsch, *Thes.* 125; L adds to *Mshtyw* the name *Hprō*, which likewise means 'foreleg', and  is found as a star or constellation in Budge, *BD* 58, 10; however, the Coptic equivalent  (Crum 582) renders Ἀρκτοῦρος of LXX in Job 9, 9. ⑦  G;  H;  OC; *Jcn* 'Cynocephalus Ape', a constellation, Brugsch, *Thes.* 85. 124. 127.

⑧  G;  H;  OR, *Nht* 'the Strong one', a constellation; *Wb.* II, 318, 8 translates *Riese*, perhaps wrongly. ⑨  G;  H;  L; traces only, OR, *Rrt* 'Slow', a constellation, *Wb.* II, 438, 9; according to Brugsch, *Thes.* 128, 2 (with the pictures *ibid.* 124-7) identical with the hippopotamus goddess whose duty it was to guard the Foreleg (*Mshtyw*); for the additional scene in the tomb of Senenmut see *Bull. MMA*, 6q. Exped. 1925-7, Fig. 40. ⑩  G;  H;  L;  OC; a trace only, OR, *kri* 'storm-cloud', 'storm', *Wb.* V, 58, 6 ff.; written  *Pyr.* 261;  *Pyr.* 281; det. *Nar.*, *Jodtbl.* 16q, 18; in some passages, e.g. *Shipwrecked Sailor*, 57, 'storm' is definitely meant, but the clearly related Copt. ^s κλοολε means 'cloud'. ⑪  G;  H;  L;  OC, *h: h: (w)* 'tempest', *Wb.* III, 363, 8, 9, later reduced to  *hsty*, *Wb.* III, 364, 2. ⑫  G;  H;  L;  OC, *shd-t* (or simply *shd*?) 'dawn', *Wb.* IV, 226, 7, presumably from this passage only; OC makes it plausible that there has been contamination with  *hd-t* 'morning', *Wb.* III, 208, 7-9, and that the M. K. *shd*, *Wb.* IV, 226, 8, was intended. ⑬ G; H; L; OC, *kkwy* 'darkness'. ⑭ G; H; L; OC, *sw* 'sun', 'light'; likewise contrasted with *kkwy* e.g. Berlin 6910; Metternich, 83.

Textual Notes. 9^a Omitted for lack of space at end of a line. 10^a  wrongly borrowed from Nos. 5-9. 11^a See note 10 a. 11^b The apparent  is in origin doubtless merely a cramped ; it was this writing in H that beguiled Brugsch, *ZAS* XX, 47, into reading  as *Xr.* 12^a See note 10 a.

[15] G; H; L; OC, *h3bt* 'shade', 'shadow'; fem., cf. *Wenamun*, 2, 45. 46, Copt. ^a HBI. [16] G; H; L; OC, *kh* 'sunlight',

Wb. V, 66, 13. [17] G; H; L, *sty itn* 'rays of the sun'; to be taken together, cf. *itn* above, No. 2. [17A] OC only, *šnc* 'storm-cloud',

Wb. IV, 507, 3 ff.; an individual addition. [18] G (in red), H, L (in black); OC, *isd* 'dew', Copt. ^s EIOTE, ^b iwt.

[19] G; H; L; om. OC, *wdt*? obscure, not in *Wb.*; possibly doublet of No. 18.

[20] G; H; L; OC, possibly different words; *Wb.* IV, 26, 11 in quoting the unique writing of G mentioned *šnk* as a variant, but this was due merely to misreading of the word in H. In Graeco-Roman times a word occurs, e.g. *Rochem.*, *Edfou*, I, 332, 7, with as variant, e.g. *Mar.*, *Dend.* I, 66, 6, 19, but these appear to be only designations of special parts of the Nile, see *Wb.* IV, 204, 7-9. OC certainly intended the Semitic word *šnp* 'snow', see Burchardt, No. 801, and such may also have been the intention of On. Am.

[21] G; H, L; OC; *srmt* (GHL), see *Wb.* IV, 198, 4-5, apparently known elsewhere only from Graeco-Roman texts as designation of a particular piece of water; *snmt* of OC suggests *snm* 'rainstorm' of *Wb.* IV, 165, 11. 12, e.g. *Urk.* IV, 84, 9; 386, 16.

[22] G; H, L; OC, *nw* 'primaeval waters', 'Nile', *Wb.* II, 214, 18 ff. For the difficulties connected with the reading (*nw*, *nur*, *nwn*, etc.)

Textual Notes. 16^a borrowed from *h3* 'back of head'. 17^a For . 21^a As often, for by omission of a dot.

6*

see my note *Eq. Gramm. Suppl.* p. 20. Cf. Copt. ^a NOYN 'abyss' (Crum, 226), *gh* Noḏv; also as mythical entity, *Sethe*, *Amun und die acht Urgötter* (Abh. Berlin, 1929), §§ 127 ff.

[23] G; H; L; OC, *mtr* 'flood', i.e. Nile, *Wb.* II, 174, 8; Spiegelberg, *Demotische Chronik*, p. 59, gives demotic references and raises the question of Copt. ^s MTW, ^b EMOW (once, see Crum, 193), which may be derived rather from *mdwt* 'depth' (*Wb.* II, 184, 8 ff.); the in Bohairic, if correct, would tend to favour the etymology from *mtr*; perhaps there was contamination of the two words. The position between Nos. 22 and 24 shows that the river was meant.

[24] G; H; L, *itw*, later *iz*, 'river', 'Nile'.

[25] G, H, L, *ym* 'sea', borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. *yam*, Copt. ^s EIOM, ^b IOM, *Wb.* I, 78, 11; earliest spelling (reign of Suthmosis III), see below, p.

[26] G; H; L, *h3nw* 'wave', *Wb.* II, 481, 10; for the Copt. ^s ZOElM, ^b ZWIM, despite the difficult *n* > *m*, see *Rec. trav.* XXVIII, 213 f.; XXXI, 77 f.

[27] G, H; L, *hnw* 'swampy lake', see *JEA* XXIX, 38 f., cf. Copt. ^s ZONE (Crum, 690); not 'canal' as understood hitherto, *Wb.* III, 105, 1.

[28] G; H; L, *š* 'pond', 'lake', *Wb.* IV, 397, 1 ff.

[29] G; H; L, *hnmt* 'well' (in desert); see below, No. 36.

[30] G; H, L, *hnmt* 'basin (?)', masc., see *JEA* XXVII, 90, n. 5.

[31] G, H, L, *hnini* some sort of irrigation basin or canal?, e.g. *Lansing*, 12, 10; *Anast.* IV,

Textual Notes. 23^a Om. at end of line for lack of space, compare above, No. 9^a. 23^b See *Pl. XIV*, 1, 1, note^a. 23^c OC has here extensive omission, probably recommending with No. 63. 27^a A corruption of .

7*

- 1b, 5. [32] G; H; L, nwy(t?) 'waters', generic word, whether masc. or fem, Wb. II, 221, 3.14; L may have thought of No. 50 below, which it omits. For the possibly related word see below, No. 473. [33] G; H; L, bkt 'pool', Wb. I, 466, 11, borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. בִּקְתָּהּ, Arab. بركة. [34] G; H; L, hnty(w) 'frontier', 'front' or 'southern part', Wb. III, 306, 7, contrasted with No. 35. [35] G; H; L, phuw 'back' or 'northern part', Wb. I, 538, 5 f., here contrasted with No. 34; there are also homonyms meaning 'backwater' and with a technical geographical sense, but these are clearly not meant here. [36] G; H; L (further on as substitute for No. 46), šdt, 'well', Copt. $\omega\omega\tau\epsilon$, $\omega\omega\tau$, Wb. IV, 567, 1; as contrasted with hnmt (No. 29), apparently on the irrigated land, see ZÄS XXXV, 14; L III, 108. [37] G; H; L (in place of No. 36); L (as No. 37), sd(t?) 'cleft(?)' (for water), apparently only here, Wb. IV, 375, 9. [38] G; om. H; L, dbt, meaning unknown, probably only here, Wb. V, 568, 1. [39] G; om. H; L, chw(?), chmy(t) 'river-bank(?)' as G only here, Wb. I, 224, 14; L apparently understood chmt, ihmt 'river-bank', Wb. I, 125, 17. [40] G; om. H; L, šqr, meaning unknown, only here, Wb. IV,

Textual Notes. 32^a Traces appear to suit, but this sign is elsewhere det. only of kbt and kbt. 34^a Det. wrongly carried on from preceding Nos. 35^{a-b} Det. here again carried on from preceding entries. 36^a Det. less suitable than and probably wrongly carried on from Nos. 34-35. 39^a Omitted for lack of space at end of line. 40^{a-b} Damaged and faint.

- 550, 9. [41] G; om. H; L, ybr, ybl 'watercourse', borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. יַבְרָה (constr. plur.), only here in Egyptian, Wb. I, 63, 16. [42] G; om. H; L, mšky 'place for drawing water', borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. מִשְׁכָּה, only here in Egyptian and once only in Hebrew (Ju. 5, 11), accordingly somewhat doubtful; Wb. II, 155, 1. [43] G; om. H; L, h(3)s 'runnel', Wb. III, 332, 6, doubtfully identified with Urk IV, 919, 4 and Lebenomiide, 94-5; in Urk II, 20, 6 sh should be read, not hs, see under No. 416 below. [44] G; H; L, wdnw 'flood' (of water), Wb. I, 409, 10; ZÄS LIII, 134. [45] G; H; L, wq3(t), meaning doubtful, Wb. I, 376, 10, probably related to a word for the lower jaw-bone. [46] G; H; L substitutes šdy, see above under No. 36] st3 'current', to judge from originating verb st3 'flow' (Wb. IV, 353, 18); known to Wb. IV, 355, 9 only as a geographical name. [47] G; H; L, bsi 'water-hole', Wb. I, 418, 1. [48] G; H; L, db(w), meaning uncertain, but clearly different from No. 49; Wb. V, 434, 8 apparently knew only this example, but see L. Eg. Misc., p. 22 a, l. 8, n. a-b. [49] G; H; L, wdby(w) 'shores', 'river-banks', in G probably plural, Wb. I, 409, 2. [50] G; H; om. L, rn(w?), meaning doubtful and apparently

Textual Notes. 46^a Dyn. XX deformation of . 46^b Unaccountably omitted. 48^{a-b} Det. probably wrongly carried over from Nos. 45. 47; so too in No. 44. 49^{a-b} See last note. 50^a L has a lacuna equal to about two entries, and then some unintelligible signs.

only here; L may have thought of this word in No. 32; Wb. V, 313, 1 has read with tn- in both cases, which is possible on the principle enounced Pl. XIV, 1, 1, note ^a; see too under Nos 398-9. [51] G: G; H; om. L; R, ishm, shmt 'standing water (?)', a meaning suggested by Lansing, 12, 6. Wb. I, 133, 1 and IV, 216, 5 propose the rendering 'inundation', which is certainly too general; cf. the place-name Anast. VI, 27. [52] G: H; om. L; R, iw 'island'; Wb. I, 47, 4; probably also in wider sense of Arabic gezīrah, JEA XXII, 181; on gezīrah see Griffith, Mound of the Jew, p. 58, also my commentary on P. Wilbour. [X] The three next kinds of land appear from P. Wilbour, Text B, to have formed a recognized administrative classification and to have been assessed (for what purpose is obscure) in the proportions 10: 7½: 5 respectively. [53] G; H; om. L; R, nhb 'fresh land', see P. Wilbour, Commentary; Wb. II, 308, 8 does not attempt to define the meaning closely. [54] G; H; [L, see Pl. XVI, 14], tni 'tired land', see P. Wilbour, Commentary; in that papyrus nhb, tni, kzyt occur often in that order. Wb. V, 311, 5 does not define meaning. [55] G; H; L, kzyt '(normal) agricultural land', lit. 'high land', in Gk. γῆ ἡπειρος (σιτοφόρος), see P. Wilbour, Commentary; Wb. V, 6, 4 has not fully understood the meaning; see too on No. 54. [56] G; H; L; R, met 'mud', 'clay', 'mud-flat', Copt. ^aOME, ^aOME, ^aAME, ^bOMI, translating Gk. πηλός; repeated below as No. 476. The entries in Wb. relating to this and some cognate words need radical revision. The writings

Textual Note. 54^a & here suggests tni, see No. 244.

with met (I, 185, 14) and metmet (I, 186, 12) ought not to have been separated (a cross-reference is given), compare G and H here and see Sethe, Verbum, I, §338. In Wb. I, 78, 2 ^aOME, ^bOMI are wrongly equated with im (so too Spiegelberg, Stwb. 88, though quoting a demotic met), which leaves unexplained the occasional broken vowel of OME. The true etymology was given, following Maspero's suggestion boue, by Griffith, Kahun Papyrus, pp. 100.107, where he corrected his reading met in P. med. Kah. 1, 25 (Pl. V) into met, also rightly reading met met 'black mud' (with met instead of met) in bers 67, 17; the word met met Salbe in Wb. I, 185, 12 should accordingly be eliminated. Since the Kahun passage reads met met with the related verb met, it seems necessary to render this as 'smear' rather than as 'rub'; Wb. I, 185, 11 has reiben, frottieren for this otherwise unknown verb, for which a cross-reference is given to the likewise unique verb metmet of Westc. 4, 16 (Wb. I, 186, 5); here metmet n.f must similarly mean 'besmeared him' (with unguent), the parallel verb sin in the same passage having perhaps a comparable relationship (in spite of z in place of s) with another word for 'mud' (sin). The meaning 'mud' for the word here occupying us was recognized by Erman and Lange in editing Lansing 4, 5 (the potter's hands and feet are 'full of mud'), 6, 6 (the pair of plough-oxen are found 'in the mud', cf. also Turin A, vs. 2, 7 = L. Eg. Misc. 122, 16, translated JEA XXVII, 21). As a kind of land where agriculture was possible see, besides No. 476 below, Pleyte & Rossi, Pap. Turin, 100, 3 (translated JEA XXVII, 24);

P. Berl. 8523, 25 = ZÄS LIII, 109; Brugsch, *Thes.* 540, 1; a somewhat obscure example, ZÄS XXXVIII, 31. Thus we may distinguish for cmct, var. cmcmct, three meanings: 1, 'mud' (as substance, in medical texts); 2, 'muddy ground'; 3, 'mud-flat', as agricultural land. In Egyptian the word is feminine; in Coptic it is mostly masculine, but once at least feminine, see Crum, 254. [57]

ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L; ΔC^{cmct} R, iw-f-n(or-m)-nri 'low-lying shoal', lit. 'it-comes-in-the-return-of-the-year(?)'; Wb. II, 279, 13 has mistaken the meaning; cf. ΔC^{cmct} G, ΔC^{cmct} H, ΔC^{cmct} L, ΔC^{cmct} R, Peniufneri, P. Brit. Mus. 10412, 6 = *Late Ramesside Letters*, p. 55. [58] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H;

ΔC^{cmct} L, ht 'woodland', a rare derived sense of ht 'wood', 'tree'; Wb. III, 341, 11; an example, Kuenty, *Qadech*, p. 368. [59] ΔC^{cmct} G;

ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, scy 'sand', Copt.⁵⁸ ωω: the late writing with 44 (e.g. Piankhi, 102) was perhaps induced by the analogy of other words ending in -ō, e.g. styt = CBW. [60]

ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L; ΔC^{cmct} R, mzw(b) 'new land'; Wb. II, 27, 8; P. Wilbour distinguishes (a) ΔC^{cmct} 'island', our No. 52, (b) ΔC^{cmct} 'new island', and (c) ΔC^{cmct} 'new land'; Copt.⁵ MOYE, ^B MOYI 'island' seems an abbreviation of (b).

[61] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L; a trace R, pct, some kind of land; Wb. I, 504, 2 translates 'shore'. Here doubtless in antithesis to idb, No. 62, as also in P. Wilbour, where we find the more normal writing ΔC^{cmct}. It is just possible that the word may be identical with ΔC^{cmct} (varr. with ΔC^{cmct}, ΔC^{cmct}, ΔC^{cmct}) pct of Pyr.

Textual Notes. 57^a Due to confusion of nri and tri. 60^a Due to confusion with mzw 'new'.

1183. 1205; this can hardly be ein gewässer am himmel as Wb. I, 497, 19 says, since in the second of the above-quoted passages it is said that 'the pct is opened, the pct becomes full of water'; this suggests 'land susceptible of irrigation'. [62] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L; ΔC^{cmct} R, idb 'riparian land'; Wb. I, 153, 2, see too *Rec. trav.* XXV, 193; contrasted with pct (No. 61) also in P. Wilbour, see the Commentary thereto.

III. PERSONS, COURT, OFFICES, OCCUPATIONS.

☒ For the sequence 'god', 'spirit', 'king' see the printed Text, ch. 2, §3.




















[63] ΔC^{cmct} G, H, L, ntr 'god'. [64] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, ntrt 'goddess'. [65] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, rt; ΔC^{cmct} L vs.; ΔC^{cmct} OC, sh '(male) spirit'. A fuller translation would be 'male blessed dead'. As many have seen, sh here combines

the notions expressed in the combination νεκρὸς οἱ ἡμιθεοί, Waddell, *Manetho*, p. 26. [66] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, rt., vs.; ΔC^{cmct} R; ΔC^{cmct} OC, sh 'female spirit'.












[67] ΔC^{cmct} G, L, rt. vs., OC; ΔC^{cmct} H, nsw, earlier nbt-sw 'king'. For the most important literature on the reading and etymology see Sethe, ZÄS XLIX, 15 ff.; Blackman, *Rec. trav.* XXXVIII, 69, cf. my note *ibid.* 70; some of Sethe's views are combated by Chassinat, *Rev. ég. anc.* II, 1 ff.

[68] ΔC^{cmct} G, L, rt.; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, vs.; ΔC^{cmct} OC, noyt 'queen'; Wb. II, 332, 8, rare and elsewhere only of goddesses. [69] ΔC^{cmct} G; ΔC^{cmct} H; ΔC^{cmct} L, rt.; ΔC^{cmct} L, vs.; ΔC^{cmct} OC, hmt-nsw 'King's wife', the ordinary

Textual Notes. 63^a Not written in red for superstitious reasons. 64^a See last note. 68^a Erroneously taken as the identically written plural. 69^a The end of a cartouche, thus frequently abbreviated in hieratic.

word for the Egyptian queen. 70^a  G; ( L, rt.;  vs.;  R;  OC, mwt-nsw 'King's mother'. 71^a  G;  H;  L, rt.;  vs.;  R, msw-nsw 'King's child', elsewhere only plural, since the singular is rendered by s3-nsw, s3t-nsw 'King's son', 'King's daughter'. 72^a  G, H, L, rt.;  vs.;  OC, r-pct (iry-pct) 'Crown-prince', the only meaning still alive in Ramesside times, *Wb.* II, 415, 23; for this see my *Eg. Hier. Texts*, I, 17*, n. 7; in the relief Berlin 12412 = *ZÄS* XXXIII, Pl. 1, the Crown-prince, who is also  imy-r m3c 'general', takes precedence of the two Viziers, as here in On. Am. The reading of  as iry-pct (iri-pct) has been admirably defended by Kuentz in *Griffith Studies*, 101f., but in view of the complexity of the problem and the variety of the opinions that have been expressed, a lengthier discussion is not superfluous. The writing  is by far the commonest at all periods; the oldest examples as applied to a human being are possibly that on the statue naming Imkhötep (Dyn. III), *Ann. Serv.* XXVI, 191, and that on a vase of a high-priest of Heliopolis found by Amélineau (Dyn. III, see under No. 118). The variant  occurs already *Kyr.* 1458. 1465 and is found sporadically in M. K. and Dyn. XVIII, e. g. *Brit. Mus.* 572; Dévaud, *Max. Ptah.* 2; in Dyn. XVIII  makes its first appearance, e. g. Cairo 779 = Borchardt, *Statuen*, III, 88, and is frequent in Ramesside times, there alternating with the rarer  see the many examples in *Wb.*, *Belegstellen*, II, 415, 16 ff.







Textual Notes. 70^a See last note. 70^b Superfluous, see Pl. XIV, note 1, 12^c. 71^a An individual variant, due to the fact that the singular of msw-nsw is elsewhere unknown.




















These last variants suggest that the title is a compound containing the word  pct 'men', 'patricians' (below, No. 231), a suggestion supported by the Graeco-Roman  (*Wb.* II, 415, from an unidentified source) and still more by  (Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, III, 9) as Dyn. XIX variant of the corresponding feminine title. The etymology from pct, apparently first mooted by Fiehl in 1882 (see *ZÄS* XXXII, 119, n. 2), was adopted by Maspero, *Et. ég.* II, 15f., then by Spiegelberg (*Rec. Trav.* XVII, 96; XXIII, 200f.), Loret (*L'Égypte au temps du totémisme*, 53), Moret (*Mus. Guimet*, p. 22), and finally by Sethe (*Urgeschichte*, § 74). Renouf (*Proc. SBA* XII, 359; XV, 100) opposed the etymology on the by no means negligible grounds (1) that late variants cannot be regarded as decisive, and (2) that Maspero's interpretation as *gardien des hommes* does not agree well with the frequent epithet of the earth-god *ḥēb as*  of the gods. Rejection of Fiehl's etymology is also implied in Erman's purely philological hypothesis based on the often combined fem. titles  and  *ZÄS* XXX, 64; the latter word being at that time read *hctt*, it seemed to follow that the former should have the value *rpctt*, which could only be the feminine of a *nisbe*-form *rpcty*, and this last might well, it was thought, be the true reading of . The foundation for that hypothesis was, however, undermined by Sethe's discovery (*ZÄS* XXXIX, 135 ff.) that  has the value *hst*, so that  must be *hstt*, corresponding to a masculine *hsty-c*, a derivative of *hst-c* 'beginning', though both this and the derived title were regularly written . By analogy Sethe conjectured (loc. cit. 137, n. 1) that  was to be read *rpcty-c*, though a more rigorous logic might have counselled an equally inexplicable *sty-pe*. In my *Eg. Gramm.* Erman's *rpcty* was unfortunately retained for the masculine. Kuentz finally disposes of this by pointing out that the

well authenticated Greek equivalent $\sigma\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (Reich in *Sphinx*, XIV, 5) could not possibly be the outcome of rpcty, in which the t would necessarily have been retained. The transliterations rpct for the masculine title and rpct.t for the feminine given in *Wb.* loc. cit are very puzzling; it is not clear whether these words were there regarded as compounds or not. If not, the paradox emerges that the masculine title is represented by a feminine word, and the feminine title by the feminine of that feminine word. This paradox is so startling, that we must assume that the title was believed to be a compound containing a word pct as its second element, though the transliteration should in that case have placed a hyphen after p. Furthermore, the transliteration rpct.t would then become impossible for the feminine title, since all analogy shows that in such a title it is the first element, not the second, that must receive the feminine ending; even better evidence than that of $\overline{\text{h}}\text{t}(\text{t})$ -c (see above) is afforded by $\overline{\text{h}}\text{nt}(\text{t})$ -š (*Wb.* III, 311, 3; Berlin 15417 = *Aeg. Inscr.* I, 17), the feminine counterpart of the masculine title $\overline{\text{h}}\text{nt}(\text{y})$ -š (*Wb.* III, 311, 1), of which the structure is revealed by the plural $\overline{\text{h}}\text{ntyw}$ -š (Lepsius, *Denkm.*, *Ergänzungsbl.* Pl. 9). Thus as minimum transliteration of the feminine of $\overline{\text{p}}$, $\overline{\text{p}}$ we arrive at rt-pct, the feminine ending of the second element falling away in course of time. The writings of the feminine title $\overline{\text{p}}\text{t}$, $\overline{\text{p}}\text{t}$ are undeniably strange, but Kuentz is probably right in ascribing them to *une raison d'eugraphie*. The normal spelling $\overline{\text{p}}$, which is occasionally found even for the feminine title (Jéquier, *Pyr. Oudjebten*, p. 9; *Pyr. Neit*, pp. 11. 42), is now paralleled by the O.K. writings $\overline{\text{h}}\text{t}$ for hr(i)-hbt and $\overline{\text{h}}\text{nt}$ for hrt-nt, in both of which the

feminine ending is regularly suppressed, see *JE A XXIV*, 244 f.; cf. too Dyn. IV $\overline{\text{h}}\text{t}$ for hrt 'vizier', below, No. 73 and Dyn. V $\overline{\text{h}}\text{t}$ for hrt 'nbwt', below, No. 276; also see No. 120. Sethe's final view (*Urgeschichte*, § 74) hazarded the guess that the first element was $\overline{\text{p}}$ 'mouth', so that the entire title signified 'mouth of men', i.e. speaker on their behalf, and Junker, *Giza II*, Index, p. 204 reads $\overline{\text{p}}$ as rs-pct, thus adhering to Sethe's etymology. However, Kuentz rightly objects that no feminine of the compound could have been formed by making its component r 'mouth' a feminine. The only possibility is to regard this r as a writing of $\overline{\text{p}}$ 'appertaining to', a writing which is by no means unknown and for which see my comments *JE A XXIV*, 84, n. 3. The Greek $\sigma\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (see above) agrees well enough with the reading iry-pct or, as we should transliterate it for Middle Egyptian, iry-pct, though in view of Coptic $\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon$ for $\overline{\text{p}}$, which likewise begins with a vowel, the Greek equivalent would not of itself exclude $\overline{\text{p}}$ 'mouth' as the first element.

Returning now to Renouf's objections to $\overline{\text{p}}$ as belonging to the true etymology of the title, it must be admitted that late variants cannot always be accepted as valid evidence in such a matter. The Roman period provides also a variant $\overline{\text{p}}$ (*Rec. trav.* XV, 159), and this has as demotic equivalent $\overline{\text{p}}$, in the child-determinative of which Spiegelberg (*ZÄS* LI, 84) saw a reference to the stem rnpi 'be young'; if this view were correct, it would account for the epithet $\nu\epsilon\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ given to Κρόνος = hēb in Diod. I, 27. However this may be, these late writings point to an etymology which is not that of iry-pct 'appertaining to the pct-people' — Maspero's *gardien des hommes* hardly suits the requirements of the case — and support is thus given to

Renouf's opinion that this may have been only a late invention. His second objection, namely that such an etymology ill suits the common title of ḥēb  'iri-pct (rpt) of the gods', var.  'iri-pct of all the gods' (full references Sethe, loc. cit.) becomes less cogent when we remember (1) that ḥēb, as god of the earth, may well have been considered to have been the first to reign among men, and (2) that pct (see below, No. 231) does not mean quite simply ordinary men but, at least in one of its common acceptances, men of the original Egyptian stock, and consequently men of the ruling caste. Thus in effect the title might mean 'he who first among the gods had to do with the autochthonous Egyptians (pct)' or else 'first earthly ruler among all the gods'. In truth, our evidence does not admit of a final judgement in this matter, though some persuasive evidence will be produced in the discussion of the pct-people (below, No. 231). Apart from the consequence that would be entailed if  entered into the etymology of , there are only two clear indications that can guide us; the real etymology must be (1) such as to fit the mythical character of ḥēb, and (2) such as to suit the attribution of the title to nobles of the highest class and above all to the Crown-prince. The definition in Newberry, *Beni Hasan*, I, p. 11 'a title believed to imply a right of inheritance' is obviously not far wide of the mark; Queen Hatshepsut receives the epithet  'hereditary princess, daughter of ḥēb, heiress of Osiris' (*Urk.* IV, 224, 10), which appears to link the title with descent and inheritance from the gods; the first phrase occurs as early as Dyn. VI, see *ZÄS* XXIV, 3. A possible alternative to the etymology from  is perhaps worth

recording: little attention has been paid to the determinative  employed in this; if it represented a clod of earth, the pct belonging to iri-pct and also underlying pct 'men', 'patricians' might well be the word  (No 61 above) discussed in my Commentary on P. Wilbour and signifying some kind of land, conceivably the ordinary tilth of Egypt.  G, OC;  H; L, rt.;  L, vs.;  'vizier', curiously repeated below, No. 86. The reading  is proved by a few writings like  Cairo 20184, k;  Brit. Mus. 572; practically confined to Dyn. IV is the variant  from which a connexion with the word for 'man', 'male' has been conjectured. The accepted rendering 'vizier' is very apt, since this word (from an Arabic stem meaning 'bear a burden') designated the Chief Minister of State under Muslim rulers, and such too was the position occupied by the  under the Pharaohs. For the early history of the office see Sethe in *ZÄS* XXVIII, 43 ff.; fullest editions of the inscriptions relating to the vizier's duties and installation, see N. de G. Davies' forthcoming volume on the tomb of Rekhmirē; holders of the office, A. Weil, *Die Verziere des Pharaonenreiches*, Strassburg, 1908. Whether the official described as  and depicted preceding the king on the slate palette of Narmer was the vizier is disputed; but it is difficult to see how else the title could be read, or what other office the man could have held. From Dyn. IV onwards the judicial function is very prominent and appears to be indicated (see Brugsch, *Wörterb. Suppl.* 1306 ff.; *ZÄS* XXIV, 6 f.) by the combination       


god of law and order (see Brugsch, DG 1361, under XV) is significant of the view taken of his functions; an isolated case where a woman of exalted rank (Dyn. VI) bore the title of vizier accompanies this with 'daughter of Ithoth,' see ZÄS XXIV, 3 ff.; also later texts gave the title of vizier to Ithoth, e.g. Book of the Celestial Cow, Bull. inst. fr. XL, 97; Mar., Dend., II, 33, c; cf. Diod. I, 17. For the vizier as 'Overseer of the Residence-town' see under No. 86. [74]

Πρῶτοι φίλοι G; Πρῶτοι φίλοι H; Πρῶτοι φίλοι I;
 L, rt.; ----- I, vs; Πρῶτοι φίλοι OC, smr wety 'sole
 friend', the commonest title of courtiers. The old suggestion that
 this title was the origin of the predicate πρῶτοι φίλοι conferred
 on courtiers from the reign of Ptolemy V onwards is discussed at
 length in Bevan, Ptolemaic Egypt, 277 ff. From the Egypto-
 logical side the suggestion is very attractive; that smr really
 did mean 'friend' or the like is indicated by the frequent addi-
 tion of n mrt 'of love' with the sense 'uniquely loved friend'; cf.
 also the rôle of 'friends' in the funeral ceremonies. For the word see
Wb. IV, 138, 5 ff.; also the queen was 'Friend of the Horus', *ibid.* 139, 6.














[75] 𐎧𐏁𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 G; 𐎧𐏁𐎫𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 H; 𐎧𐏁𐎫𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 L, rt.; 𐎧𐏁𐎫𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 L, vs.; ----- 𐎧𐏁𐎫𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 R;
𐎧𐏁𐎫𐎠𐎫𐎡𐏁𐎢𐎺𐎠𐎥𐎲𐎦𐎵𐎤𐎶 OC, ss-nsw omsm (older smsw) 'eldest King's son'. How far the very ancient title 'son of the King' is to be understood_a literally is discussed_{sic} in detail Junker, Giza II, 31ff._{sic}











[76, 77] $\Xi_{\text{odd}}^{\text{odd}} = G$; $\Xi_{\text{odd}}^{\text{odd}} = H$; $\Xi_{\text{odd}}^{\text{odd}} = L$,
 $\text{rt.}; \Xi_{\text{odd}}^{\text{odd}} = L$, $\text{vs.}; \Xi_{\text{odd}}^{\text{odd}} = R$;












Textual Notes. 74^a Intrusive and meaningless. ^bBorrowed from a common Ramesseide writing of sr. ^cBorrowed from mr 'ill' under the influence of following wc (stg), from which it is wrongly omitted. 75^a Dittography. 76^a Nos. 78-86 have here been omitted by homoeoteleuton.



 OC, apparently more or less corrupt in all Mss; L and OC seem to have interpreted as a single title, but it is doubtful whether they can really have understood 'overseer of the hosts (MHHWE), (even) the great ones of the courtiers'. Another possibility (a) 'overseer of the army' and (b) as separate entry, 'the great ones of the courtiers', is improbable, since 'overseer of the army' occurs again as No. 87. The most likely view is to take as No. 76, imy-r mšc wr 'great overseer of the army', Wb. II, 155, 17, and to interpret No. 77 as imyt 'the courtiers', a comprehensive term; this renders intelligible the repetition in No. 87 of imy-r mšc 'overseer of the army', i.e. 'general', while here we have 'generalissimo'. The 'great overseer of the army' was a post often accorded to the Crown-prince himself, thus to Amenhikhopshef under Ramesses II (Gauthier, Livre des rois, III, 80), later to Merenptah under the same king (op. cit. III, 95), to Seti-merenptah under Merenptah (op. cit. III, 125) and to the future Ramesses IV under Ramesses III (op. cit. III, 175). No better illustration could be provided of the distinction here made between the generalissimo and a lower officer called simply 'overseer of the army', i.e. 'general' than the relief at Berlin showing the attendance of high dignitaries at the funeral of a high-priest of Memphis, ZÄS XXXIII, Pl. 1 opposite p. 24. The title 'great overseer of the army' occurs already in the M. K., Newberry, Beni Hasan, I, 8, 7; Cairo 20546. 78 Om. G;

in the M. K., Newberry, Beni Hasan, I, 87; Cairo 20546. [78] Om. G;
 ⲟⲩⲁⲓ ⲛⲙⲏⲧⲉⲣⲱⲡⲓⲥⲕⲁⲃⲏⲗⲓ H; ⲟⲩⲛⲭⲓⲥⲑⲛⲁⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓ
 L, rt; ⲟⲩⲛⲭⲓⲥⲑⲛⲁⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓ L, vs.; ⲟⲩⲛⲭⲓⲥⲑⲛⲁⲓⲛⲫⲓⲥⲓ OC
 (ends here), sḏ sct n hr k, nht 'despatch-writer of Horus, mighty Bull,' i.e.
 of the King; here, as below in 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 111, 124 the simple
 word nsw 'King' is replaced by a more high-sounding epithet; sḏ sct
(n) nsw or the like is fairly common, e.g. ZÄS XLIV, 59; Cairo 1221; 42225;
 Archiv. äg. Arch. I, 32.33; P. Willbour, A 42,7; 55,4; cf. the Ptolemaic ἐπιστολογράφος.







The var.  is noteworthy, since this usually reads *md.t*. [79]
 Om. G;    H;    L, rt.;    L, vs., *ct n ct n ntr nfr* 'chief of department of the good god', i.e. of the King, see on No. 78. The word *ct*, properly 'room', 'cell', then later 'house' (see below, No. 423), was often in titles qualified by an addition, see Proc. SBA XIII, 447 ff. Perhaps so here: an    *ct n ct hnt* 'chief of the department of donations(?)' is known from Ramesside times, see Louvre 3629 = Pierret, I, 66. The title with slight varr, *Uriage b* = Rev. eg., n.s.I, 164; P. jud. Jurin, 4, 2.3; with *cyt* 'departments' plur., P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 4. The High-priest of Amün Roma also had a subordinate bearing the title *ct n ct*, Lefebvre, *Inscriptions*, p. 40, No. 18. Titles beginning with *ct n*, Copt. ^sAN-, see Spiegelberg, *Rec. trav.* XXI, 21 ff.; ZÄS XLII, 56; below, Nos. 84-110. 111. They are all Ramesside or post-Ramesside. [80]










Om. G;      H;    L, rt.;   L, vs., *whm tpy (n) nsw n hm.f* 'first King's herald of His Majesty' for the tautological last words see on No. 78; exx. Wb. I, 344, 8; Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.* Nos. 84-90. 201. His functions at Court are set forth in Louvre C26 = *Urk.* IV, 966 ff. and seem to have corresponded closely to those of the Ptolemaic εἰσαγγελεὺς, see Cumont, *L'Égypte des astrologues*, 31, n. 4. Wb. rightly stresses the fact that he had not only to make reports and introduce people to the King, but also to make known the royal commands. He had also military functions, however, see below on No. 197, where the simple 'herald' is discussed. [81]







Om. G;     H;    L, rt.;   L, vs.;   R,



Textual Notes. 79^a A truncated  80^a A superfluous addition found at this period also after a few other tall thin signs, cf. after I below, Nos. 154, 165, 166, 308; the source seems to be due to the influence of , see my *L.-Ég. Stories*, p. 314a, note on 7, 3. 81^a An incorrect form, for which see below, No. 98.

tzy hr hr wnm n nsw 'fan-bearer on the right of the King', Wb. III, 246, 10. Frequent as a title from Dyn. XVIII onwards, but often doubtless only as honorific epithet of high officials like the King's son of Cuoh, the Vizier or the First herald. It occurs, however, also as sole or principal title, see Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.*, Nos. 76, 118. The Theban tombs often show two fan-bearers beside the royal throne; perhaps op. cit. No. 77, which omits *hr wnm*, gives the title of a fan-bearer who stood on the left. There seems no Greek equivalent; to be carefully distinguished from the *tzy sryt* of No. 98. [82]

Om. G;   H;   L, rt.;   L, vs.; *hst sh(t) <n> Nb-tswy* 'performing excellent works for the Lord of the Two Lands', an epithet rather than a title. [83]

Om. G;   H;   L, rt.;   L, vs., *imy-r imy(w)-hnt n nsw nht* 'superintendent of the chamberlains of the victorious King', see above on No. 78; L shows that the Mss, all corrupt, are aiming at the common  exx. Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 67; Piehl, *IH* III, 91, 92; Cairo 630. The simple  or  *imy-hnt*, lit. 'he who is in front', was active in temple and tomb, as well as at the Court; as chamberlain of the King he placed the crown on his head and decked him with jewels, see especially *Inscr. dedic.* 46; Brit. Mus. 574; Leyden V4; *Mém. Miss. arch.* fr. I, 23-32; for discussions see Gauthier, *Personnel*, 61-3; ZÄS XLVII, 113; Bissling & Kees, *Re-Heiligtum*, III, pp. 23-4, 57-8. [84]

Om. G;   H;   L, rt.;   L, vs., *ct n h n nb.f* 'chief of bureau (diwân) of his lord', very rarely mentioned and functions unknown; an ex. Stockholm 52 = Mogensen,

Textual Notes. 82^a  omitted, since next word begins with *n*; so too in No. 124. 83^{a-b} Spelling influenced by the late writing for  *Nhm*, see below, No. 320. ^c Superfluous.

Stèles ég. 57-9. [85] Om. G; H; L, rt.; L, vs.;

L, vs., *s3 nsw m hnw pr-nsw* 'royal scribe within the Palace', cf. the Ptolemaic βασιλικὸι γραμματεῖς. [86] Om. G; L, rt.; L, vs.,

tsty imy-r nwt n ts-mry 'the vizier and overseer of the cities of Egypt'. *tsty* 'vizier' occurred above in No. 73, where it was discussed. The addition

here is modelled upon the combination *imy-r nwt tsty* 'over-

seer of the Pyramid-city and vizier', which was the M. K. outcome of rather more complex combinations like this latter ap-

pearing first in Dyn. V, see Weil, *Verziere*, pp. 27. 32. 53. As the king's chief

minister the vizier of the Old Kingdom naturally dwelt at the Pharaoh's

newly built capital and became the governor thereof. At the end of the

New Kingdom the reference to the Pyramid-city, though retained as

a survival (op. cit. p. 122), had become completely meaningless, and in

Dyn. XX the title was modified into 'overseer of cities and vizier'

(op. cit. p. 161; Legrain, *Statues, Indices*, 29), naturally with the mean-

ing here found in On. Am.; in the present explicit form the two

elements were transposed, on account of the genitive expanding and explaining the plural 'cities'. ☒ At this point we pass from the

grandees in the immediate entourage of the King to his military staff, but after only three essential members of this have been named (Nos. 87-9) five high administrative officials intervene (Nos. 90-4). Then the list of army officers is continued in Nos. 95-8. Nos. 107-8 deal with scribes concerned with the organization of the army, and later on there are some references to soldiers of lower rank (Nos. 197-8. 201. 202(?). 234-5) and to

Textual Notes. 85^{a-b} Perhaps arising from a variant *imy*, or from a correction of *m hnw*. ^c Superfluous. 86^a A corruption of hieratic . ^b Meaningless.

certain types of troop (Nos. 236-7), but curiously enough there is no mention of *Soc⁴ wew*, the common 'soldier' (see Calice in *ZAS* LII, 116 ff.), a designation which *Wb.* I, 280, 3 wrongly persists in defining as *Art. niederer Offizier*. [87] G; H; L, rt.; L, vs.;

imy-r m3c 'general', lit. 'overseer of a (military) expedition', *Copt.* ⁵ ΛΕΜΗΗΩΕ, *Crum* 143, where references are given to Griffith's funda-

mental article *Proc. SBA* XXI, 270 ff. and to others as well. The entry

here is no mere repetition of No. 76, since there *imy-r m3c wr*, i. e. 'general-

issimo', is probably to be read, see my observations thereon. See further Helck, *Militärführer*, 27 f. [88] G, H; L, rt.; L, vs., *s3 mnfy(t)* 'scribe of the infantry', *Wb.* II, 80, 5,

to be distinguished from *s3 m3c*, *Wb.* II, 155, 18. For the word *mnfy* see below, No. 236, where the following 'chariotry' (No. 237) shows

that, as elsewhere, 'infantry' was meant. [89] G; H; L, rt.; L, vs., *idnw n pr m3c* 'lieutenant commander of the army', *Wb.* I,

154, 9; *idnw* means literally 'substitute', 'representative', and the nat-

ural supposition would accordingly be that this title meant 'lieu-

tenant general', i. e. the second in command under the *imy-r m3c*

'general' (above, No. 87). With this would agree the fact that the Har-

emhab Decree, 21 definitely speaks of the two *idnw*, possibly one for





each half of the country, and the same number seems implied by the naming of two alike in the Munich judicial papyrus *ZAS* LXIII, 107 and in *Anast.* V, 23, 7-8; the important tombs at Thebes of the Dyn. XVIII bearers





of this title and the scenes depicting their responsibility for the army provisions show at all events that some *idnw* of the army were very high-ranking officers;












Textual Note. 87^{a-b} See above, No. 76, after which G omits ten items.



see too Helck, *Militärführer*, 55ff. However, it appears that there were also other military *idnw*, e.g. of the chariotry, No. 95 below, see also No. 105; and it should be recollected that the King's son of Cush had two *idnw* under him, see Keimer, *JEA* VI, 84ff.; Gauthier, *Rec. trav.* XXXIX, 229ff.; note further that Lansing, 9, 5-6 mentions the *idnw* only in the fifth place of its list of officers.

☒ Next come the chiefs of some loosely interrelated public offices, with a misplaced rubric in Nos. 92-3 of G. One might have expected a reference to the granaries of the land to follow No. 90, but the office of 'overseer of granaries' is postponed until No. 121, where its introduction is irrelevant.

[90]  G, H, L, rt., vs., *imy-r pr-hd n hd nbw* 'overseer of the Treasury of silver and of gold'; the addition of the words 'of silver and of gold' is rare, if not unique, but cf. such titles as 'overseer of the two houses of silver' (written , but  is meant) and 'overseer of the two houses of gold' Cairo 20729, a, cf. Lange & Schäfer, III, pp. 45 f. For  *pr-hd* 'Treasury', lit. 'White House', see below, No. 455. The commodities with which it dealt may roughly be defined as all those which did not fall within the province of the *snwt* 'granary'; for a list dating from Ramesside times cf. P. Ch. Beatty V, rt. 8, 2 ff.; some of the things obtained from the Treasury in O. K., *Urk.* I, 146, 11ff.; 175, 11. For New Kingdom examples of 'overseer of the Treasury' see Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.* Nos. 11. 80; Legrain, *Statues, Indices*, p. 29; note that the great temples had their own official of the name no less than the Pharaoh; here in On. Am. the royal functionary is evidently meant. The sort of task he might be called on by Pharaoh to carry out was the inspection of the Treasury of some local temple, e.g. that of the temple of Khnum at Elephantine, see Pleyte & Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 59, 1.

[91]  G;  H;  L, rt., vs.,
Textual Notes: 91^a omitted. ^b Emend .

ipwty nsw r hst nb(t) 'King's envoy to every foreign land', *Wb.* I, 304, 9; further examples, *Ann. Serv.* XIV, 30; *Anc. Eg.* IV, 65; Petrie, *Koptos*, Pl. 19. [92]  G;  H;  L, rt., vs., *imy-r i(hw)* 'overseer of cattle', *Wb.* I, 119, 21; for the reading, apart from L, see Griffith, *Rylands Papyri*, III, 257, n. 2. For some of the functions of this important official see (e.g.) *Urk.* IV, 1021; Haremhat Decree, 27; *L. Eg. Misc.* 123, 1; cf. also Kees, *Kulturgeschichte*, 25. Besides the officials bearing this title belonging to the royal or central administration there were others attached to all the great temples, many of which owned their own herds, see P. Harris; P. Wilbour; also Lefebvre, *Histoire*, p. 50; Legrain, *Statues, Indices*, p. 30. [93]  G;  H;  L, rt.;  L, vs., *imy-r pr-nsw* 'overseer of the palace', lit. 'King's house'. The title as given by H. L. occurs in the O. K. (Lepo., *Denkm.* II, 112, e), but later is elsewhere unknown or very rare. For the writing of G cf. Cairo 952 = Borchardt, *Statuen*, IV, 2, where the qualification 'in the Southern city' follows, but presumably even in these two cases *pr* and *nsw* are closely bound together, and the title of 'steward' (*imy-r pr*) is not to be understood; for this latter see No. 124 below. What difference of function existed between Nos. 93 and 124 and the differently worded, but substantially similar, No. 111 is unknown. [94]  G;  H;  L, rt.;  L, vs., *imy-r ssmt* 'overseer of horses'; several examples Berlin, *Aeg. Inschr.* II, 609; others, *Ann. Serv.* XIV, 30, cf. Z. ÄS LXV, 87; Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.* No. 91; here again the title is not confined to the central administration, since Lefebvre, *Histoire*, p. 50 quotes an 'overseer of horses of Amūn'. Among the royal functionaries,

Textual Notes 93^{a-b} Not included in the rubric for superstitious reasons, see Pl. VIIA, n. 2^{a-b} on 1, 12. 94^a  and  are commonly confused in hieratic, see *L. Eg. Misc.* p. 37a, l. 13, n. 2^{a-b}. ^c erroneously borrowed from *ssmt* = *ssmw*, see No. 75 above.

however, the 'overseer of horses' was of high rank, and two sons of Ramesses III held the office, Gauthier, *Libre des rois*, III, 175 f. See further Helck, *Militärführer*, 59 ff., with a good collection of Dyn. XVIII evidence and interesting suggestions which it has been impossible to consider here.

☒ The mention of horses recalled to Amenoph's mind several other titles connected with chariots; of these all are exclusively military except No. 96, so that the way is paved for the 'standard-bearer' of No. 98. For the other military titles in On. Am. see above, the remark before No. 87.

[95] G; H; L, rt.; L, vs., *idnw n t-nt-htr* 'lieutenant commander of chariotry', a common title, e.g. Borchardt, *Statuen*, Index, p. 64; P. Wilbour, *Commentary*. For the *idnw* see above, No. 89. *I-nt-htr* occurs again below, No. 237.

[96] G, H; L, rt.; L, vs., *htrn* 'charioteer', *Wb.* V, 148, 12 ff.; examples are common, for some see Burchardt, No. 1044; Helck, *op. cit.*, 64 ff.; others, P. Wilbour, *Commentary*. The 'first charioteer of His Majesty' was an important personage, the title being borne under Ramesses III by a royal prince, Gauthier, *op. cit.* III, 176.

[97] G; H; L, rt., vs., *snry* 'chariot-warrior', *Wb.* III, 459, 17; Edgerton & Wilson, *Historical Records*, p. 24, n. 25^c; Helck, *op. cit.* 65, n. 1; the det. here is quite unusual, and if not due to the initial signs suggesting a very common corruption of due to similarity in hieratic, has the justification that this warrior, when he dropped the shield protecting the charioteer, may have shot with the bow. L's reading *styw* 'archers' is possibly the result of the same corruption, since this word has not been found used of Egyptians earlier.

Textual Notes. 95^a b mend . ^b To be transposed. ^c b mend . 97^a Perhaps substitute .

than Piankhi, 32; of Libyans, Israel Stela, 5. *Snry* may be a derivative of *snry* 'move quickly', *Copt.* CNAEIN. [98] G; H; L, rt.; L, vs., R, *tyt* *snryt* 'standard-bearer', *Wb.* IV, 192, 13; see Faulkner's article in *JEA* XXVII, 12 ff.; more examples in P. Wilbour. Such standard-bearers served both on ships and on land; for the career of one of them see Davies, *Tombs of Two Officials*, Pl. 26, with p. 35.

☒ The next two entries, which name personages concerned with executing the duties owed by the King to the gods, were possibly meant to link up with Nos. 90-4, after which the military or semi-military titles Nos. 95-8 formed a digression.

[99] G; H; L, rt.; L, vs. (endo); R, *hry sš(w) wš htr-nt* (var. *wš htr-nt*) *n ntrw nbw* 'chief (or 'chief[s]?', see below) of the scribe(s) who place offerings before all the gods', var. 'of the offering-table(s) of all the gods'. For *sš wš htr-nt* of G and R cf. No. 125 below, the same title minus the initial 'chief of'; *wš htr-nt* is a fairly common phrase, and *Wb.* I, 254, 6 quotes two *sš wš htr-nt* of late date. Here arises for the first time a problem which is of importance also in connexion with Nos. 100. 101. 106. 121. 125: does the comprehensive indication in the second half of the title refer to the functions of a single official, or is that indication a substitute for some specific limited name (here [e.g.] 'before Amün' or 'before Ptah'), so that in one and the same entry a large number of similarly employed persons is embraced? In No. 101 'the mayors of the towns and villages' the latter alternative is clearly the right one;

[100] R, *hry sš(w) wš htr-nt* (var. *wš htr-nt*) *n ntrw nbw* 'chief (or 'chief[s]?', see below) of the scribe(s) who place offerings before all the gods', var. 'of the offering-table(s) of all the gods'. For *sš wš htr-nt* of G and R cf. No. 125 below, the same title minus the initial 'chief of'; *wš htr-nt* is a fairly common phrase, and *Wb.* I, 254, 6 quotes two *sš wš htr-nt* of late date. Here arises for the first time a problem which is of importance also in connexion with Nos. 100. 101. 106. 121. 125: does the comprehensive indication in the second half of the title refer to the functions of a single official, or is that indication a substitute for some specific limited name (here [e.g.] 'before Amün' or 'before Ptah'), so that in one and the same entry a large number of similarly employed persons is embraced? In No. 101 'the mayors of the towns and villages' the latter alternative is clearly the right one;

Textual Notes. 98^a For from which differs in hieratic only by the presence of a dot. So too No. 139 below. 99^{a-b} b mend . ^c For .

'towns and villages' is a substitute for a single place-name in the case of each mayor. So too doubtless in No. 106, since no single 'intendant of foreign lands' will have served at once in Syria and in Iush. The remaining cases are much more difficult. In the present instance both possibilities are open, since beside titles like 'chief of the temple-scribes of the Estate of Amūn' (*Lefebvre, Histoire*, p. 44), there are also such titles as 'chief of the temple-scribes of the Estate of Amūn and of all the gods of Upper and Lower Egypt', op. cit. p. 282; *Legrain, Répertoire*, No. 39; graffiti copied by me near Kasr Ibrahim. The question is of vital importance in connexion with the entire organization of the Egyptian Church (*sic venia verbo*), but cannot be investigated here. The variant reading *sd wdhw* in Hand L is equally familiar, but whether it refers to the same or to a different function is unknown; for examples see (e.g.) *Wb.* I, 393, 16; Louvre A 68 = Pierret, I, 9 (□); Berlin, *Aeg. Inschr.* II, 614 (without □); also Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, Text, p. 45.

H; 𓄏𓄏𓄏𓄏 L, rt., imw-r (or imw-r?) hmw-ntr n ꜥmꜥ ꜥmhw 'overseer (or 'overseers'?) of the prophets of Upper and Lower Egypt.' Here the same problem arises as in No. 99. The interpretation as a singular and in reference to the gods of both lands yields a common title of the high-priests of Amūn of Thebes, see Lefebvre, *op. cit.*, Index, p. 248. On the other hand, in the Middle Kingdom every provincial town had an 'overseer of prophets' at the head of its priesthood, see Gauthier, Personnel, 21 ff.; Kees, Kulturgeschichte, Index, s. v. Prophetenvorsteher. I take this opportunity of recommending, contrary to my earlier practice, the translation of 𓄏𓄏 hm-ntr by 'prophet,' as authorized by the Canopus and Rosetta Decrees (ed. Spiegelberg, Index, sub No. 241); this rendering may serve as a corrective to the popular

opinion that the 'prophet' (*ἑκ. προφήτης*) was necessarily one who fore-
told the future; on the other hand, the term 'high-priest' can convenient-
ly be retained for 'first prophet,' if and when desired.

G; H;
 L, rt., n₃ h₃tjw-c n₃ dmyw whwt 'the mayors
of the towns and villages'; the general interpretation here is discussed above
under No. 99. For h₃tjw-c (reading see above under No. 72) the nearest literal
translation might be 'headman', but there is much to be said for rendering
'prince' in O.K. and M.K., when the holders of this title were more of the na-
ture of independent barons, but 'mayor' in Ramesside times, when they occu-
pied much more lowly positions under a centralized government. For the
rendering of dmyw whwt as 'towns and villages' see below under Nos. 313.

4.21. Strictly speaking the term ḥṣty-ḥ is appropriate only to the towns (dmwyw), the 'headmen' of the villages being described by another word ḥṣ ṣw, literally 'commander'; Griffith was probably right (JEA XIII, 200, n.6) in regarding ḥṣ ṣw ḥṣ ṣw ḥṣ ṣw ḥṣ ṣw in Nauri Decree, 29 as composed of two co-ordinated elements (1) ḥṣty-ḥ 'mayors' (scil. 'of towns') and (2) ṣw whyt, whereas Spiegelberg, Rechtswesen, 97, finding the same expression slightly differently written in De Rouge, Inscr. hiérog. Pl. 256: P. Leyden 348, vs. 10, 3 = L.-Ég. Misc. 136, rendered Fürsten die in Dörfern gebieten — the towns could hardly have been ignored in these contexts; on the other hand, I believe Griffith to have been mistaken in interpreting the second element as 'controllers of Bedawi camps', since the determination of whyt by ḥ in the other two passages, as well as frequently elsewhere, shows that it had ceased to possess its earlier sense of a nomad

Textual Notes. 101^a For the interesting writing with □ preserved in the l^h. TOPA115 (Sphinx, XIV, 5) see Spiegelberg, Demotica, I, 6; ZS LI, 84; JE XIX, 27; exx. as early as M. K. are claimed by Wb. III, 25, 7, but is not the □ in these merely an unusually thick !?

encampment. 102 G; H; L, rt., rw dw rw dw rw dw 'the great controllers of His Majesty'. For the various occupations covered by the term rw dw see Breasted, *Ancient Records*, Index, 57, s.v. Inspectors; also *Rec. trav.* XXIX, 12 ff.; ZÄS XXXIX, 34. In view of the corresponding verb (*Wb.* II, 413, 10) meaning to 'look after', 'manage', I now prefer the rendering 'controller' to 'agent' formerly used by me; Breasted's 'inspector' is undoubtedly too passive an equivalent. In P. Wilbour the rw dw appears to manage estates on behalf of far distant temples that owned them; and this sense of representing an absent party is present, as it would seem, both in the rw dw of the royal Harom and in the rw dw who was the 'trustee' of the estate of a deceased testator. Among the many examples of the word quoted in *Wb.* II, 413, 12 ff., perhaps it is only those of loc. cit. 26 that really illustrate the present entry; after Dyn. XX the title rw dw rw dw rw dw 'great controller keeping a town in check (?)' becomes frequent (more examples Legrain, *Statues*, *Indices*, p. 31), perhaps reflecting the unsettled conditions of the period.

103 G; H; L, rt., hry st n pr nsu 'in command of the secrets of the Palace'; less a title than an epithet applied to viziers, six examples occurring in Weil, *Veziere*, p. 124 (add 22) three of them being followed by No. 104 below. 104 G; H; L, rt.; R, hry tp n ti dr f 'at the head of the entire land', an epithet of viziers; for three examples see under No. 103, and for two more, Weil, loc. cit.; but also employed in respect of other high officials, e.g.

Textual Notes. 102^a n of G is clearly the best reading. 103^{a-b} Corruptions of , see also on No. 173. 104^a n wrongly omitted in Pl. XIX.

Cairo 579.1112. 105 G; H; L, rt.; R, idnw imy r htm n pr (read pr) Wsd wr 'deputy of the fortress-commander of the sea', lit. 'the great-green', i. e. the Mediterranean; this title with idnw is not known elsewhere, but without it see *Rec. trav.* XXII, 106 (Dyn. XVIII, n Wsd wr); Bilgai Stela, q = ZÄS L, Pl. 4 (Dyn. XIX, n pr Wsd wr); the last example justifies the interpretation of as despite the agreement of G. H. R.; but perhaps not so in No. 113, q. v. It is tempting to interpret 'fortress-commander' *Ann. serv.* XIV, 30 as an abbreviation of the full title here given, especially as it immediately precedes 'overseer of the river-mouths' (No. 109 below); however, the Stela of the Year 400 (ZÄS LXV, 87) appears to expand that title into 'fortress-commander of Sele'. 106 G; H; L, rt., imy r h swt n H rw K i s 'intendants of foreign lands of Syria and Cush', in H. L. probably 'of Syrians and Cushites', cf. especially the writing of L, which suggests Copt.⁵ edw w 'Nubian'; the holders of this title doubtless very seldom or never combined the said function in both countries. Many King's sons of Cush were 'intendants of the southern lands', see JEA VI, 78; *Rec. trav.* XXXIX, 227-8; similar titles Breasted, *Ancient Records*, Index, 56, s.v. Governor; Borchardt, *Statuen*, Index, 60; Legrain, *Statues*, *Indices*, 30. 107 G; H; L, rt., sd dn 'scribe of distribution', an army official evidently the counterpart of No. 108, together with whom he is named Gouryat & Montel, *Hammâmât*, No. 12, l. 15, where we read ; hence the apparent idnw of G is really for , sd dn

Textual Notes. 105^a A common corruption of , the best-known case being for , e.g. Ceram, *Late Ramesside Letters*, 21, 14; 64, 7; other certain cases in On. Am. are in Nos. 380. 419; possible cases in Nos. 360, 405-6; on No. 113 see in the text. ^{b-c} Not space enough for imy r htm. 104^{a-b} Bets. wrongly borrowed from mtw 'engrave'.

'share out,' Wb. V, 466, 5.

[108] G; H;

L, rt., sš shw 'scribe of assemblage', an army official the counterpart of No 107; besides the Hammâmât example there mentioned see Berlin 22.77 =Aeg. Inscr. II, 72; also a statue at Arignon, Rec. trav. XXXV, 201.

[109] G; H;

L, rt., imy-r h3w<t>y (var. rw-h3w<t>y) n phurw 'overseer of the river-mouths of the hinterland'; for 'river-mouths' see Edgerton & Wilson, Historical Records, p. 31, n. 53 a; closely similar titles are 'overseer of every river-mouth (r-h3t) of the Great-Green' (i.e. the Mediterranean), name lost, Tuthmosis III, Gardiner & Peet, Inscr. of Sinai, pl. 64, No. 196 = Urk. IV, 889; 'overseer of river-mouths', Pra^smesse, under Haremhab, Ann. Serv. XIV, 30. On these, and the related title above, No. 105, see Helck, Militärführer, 22 f.

[110] G; H;

L, rt., 3 n st n t3 dr-f 'chief taxing-master of the entire land', see for the meaning Hieratic Papyri..... (Chester Beatty gift),Text, p. 48, n. 8; also, more correctly, my P. Wilbour, Commentary.

[111] G; H;

L, rt.; R, 3 n pr n h33 n kmt 'major-domo of the Ruler of Egypt', only here with a designation of the King: references, Wb. I, 514, 7; in Brit. Mus. 138 (Decree in favour of Amenophis, son of Hefui) side by side with , otherwise one might consider 3 n pr a late-Ramesside equivalent of the latter, cf. No. 124 below.

[112] G; H;

L, rt.; R, hry s3(w) n tms n t3 knbt st 'chief of scribes of the mat(?) of the Great Court'; theTextual Note 112^a a mistake for H.reading n tms (cf. Wb. V, 307, 13), not nt h3b, as Wb. III, 167, 11 has, seems certain in spite of Urk. II, 19, 4, but requires further discussion; meanwhile see my L.-Bg. Misc., p. 17a, n. 12^b and below under Nos. 195, 196.For the Great Court see my Inscription of Mes, pp. 33-5.

[113] G; H;

L, rt., hry s3w s3w n pr W3d-wr 'chief of the record-keepers of the House of the Sea', lit. 'the Great-Green', i.e. the Mediterranean; the title (see Wb. III, 418, 11) seems to require mention of an administrative building, so that is probably correct, not a substitute for as in No. 105. Nos. 114-20


refer to priestly persons of relatively high rank, the lower ones being dealt with below in Nos. 125 ff. In Nos. 114-20 we have the designations of the high-priests of the three great cities of Thebes, Heliopolis and Memphis respectively.

[114] G; H;

L, rt.; R, s3 nsw hry-hbt m hr 'the royal scribe and lector-priest as(?) Horus'; s3 nsw is probably, though not certainly, to be taken with what follows. If m is not merely for n 'of', which would be very unusual, the reference is perhaps to the lector-priest who represented the King in temple ceremonies. For hry-hbt see below, No. 129.


























[115] G; H;



L, rt.; R, s3 fr-enh s3 m is wt-f 'scribe of the House of Life, skilled in his profession'; for the 'House of Life', omitted in L and R, see JE XXIV, 157 ff.; it designates those scriptoria in which religious and learned works were composed and copied. This entry andTextual Note 113^a The ending ty is not usual in this particular title, but see on No. 194. ^bFor , an easy corruption in hieratic. 114^a See on No. 129. ^b omitted. 115^a Clear; a corruption of .






























No. 131 in combination yield the approximate title of Amenop^{te} himself as given in the heading to this book. [116] G; H; L, rt.; R, *hry-hbt* *mnt(t)-bit* 'lector-priest of the royal couch'; for *mnt-bit* 'throne' or 'bed' of the gods and the King, otherwise known to *Wb.* II, 63, 3 only from Graeco-Roman times, compare the following words which I do not venture to translate, from a hymn addressed to Osiris under different aspects and repeating the refrain *ii-n* (*i*) *m hry n* 'I came in jubilation to.....': [117] G; H; L, rt.; R, *hm-ntr thy n* 'Imn *m Wst* 'First Prophet of Amⁿ in Thebes', see Lefebvre, *Histoire des grands prêtres d'Amon de Karnak*. [118] G; H; L, rt., *wr m₃ n Rē-Itm* 'greatest of seers of Rē-Itum', title of the high-priest of Heliopolis, but secondarily found also at Hermopolis, Thebes and El-Amarnah, *Wb.* I, 329, 7 ff. Apart from an oral suggestion that *3* in , the usual O.K. writing, means the stern of the solar bark (*Wb.* II, 6, 3.4), all scholars seem agreed that *m₃* here is the verb 'to see', as was certainly understood in late times; add to the variants collected in *ZÄS* LVII, 17 beside Cairo 589 = Borchardt, *Statuen*, II, pp. 144 ff. checked with Pl. 106, Dyn. XVIII; Legrain, *Statues*, III, Pl. XXXIV (Dyn. XXII or later) — the misquotation of Brit. Mus. 155, 8 (Dyn. XIX?) as written with Proc. SBA XI, 72 (after *Trans. SBA* VIII, 326) shows how necessary it is to quote photographs or to verify readings in some way. The absence




Textual Notes. 116^a See on No. 129. 117^a has been omitted.

of such variants in earlier times is by no means conclusive against the accepted view, since the title of queens written 'She who sees Horus and Seth' in the later Old Kingdom (*Wb.* II, 7, 13) appears in Dyn. I as Petrie, *Royal Tombs*, II, Pl. 27, 129. Nor need much weight be attached to the early inversion Amélineau, *Nouvelles Fouilles*, II, Pl. 22, 8 = Speleers, *Recueil*, p. 4, No. 31 (Dyn. III); *Ann. Serv.* XXVI, 191 (statue naming Imhotep); Palermo Stone, vs. 4, 3, which might be a variant meaning 'great seer'. Variants like are well authenticated from the beginning of Dyn. XVIII, and, together with an example with of M. K. date (*ZÄS*, loc. cit.), show that the second element in the title was a plural, a fact which surely disposes of the above-mentioned oral conjecture. On the whole, Sethe's translation 'greatest of seers' (*ZÄS* LV, 65) possesses considerable probability, and even the often expressed view that regards this high-priest as a professional astronomer — *Obersternseher*, *ibid.* — receives some support from the epithets 'over the secrets of heaven, seeing (*m₃*) the secrets of heaven' accorded to one of them in Dyn. VI, Mar., *Mast.* 149, quoted by Junker, *Giza* I, 255. Perhaps, however, since the conception of the sun as the all-seeing eye of heaven was quite Egyptian, though not particularly prominent, the title of 'greatest of seers' was a mere appellation; the special names of local high-priests often reflect the functions ascribed to the deity whom they served, cf. apart from No. 119 below, *hd h_{rw}* 'builder of flesh' as high-priest of the XXI st Upper Egyptian nome, of which Khnum was the god; also 'arbitrator between the twain' as high-priest of Thoth in the Hermopolite nome of Lower Egypt; full list of such high-priests, Brugsch, *DG* 1361. 1368; see too my conjectural explanation of *it-ntr* 'father of the god' below, No. 127. In the Old Kingdom the title is more often than












not directly followed by  'On', i.e. Heliopolis (Murray, *Index*, Pl. XIX), but this must be short for *m* 'Onw and cannot well be taken as object '... who see On', cf.      to act as 'greatest of Seers in Heliopolis', *Westc.* 9, 12. From the above-quoted mention on the Palermo Stone it would appear that in Dyn. V there were two *wr m3w* at once, as also there were two high-priests of Ptah (No. 119); a subordinate with the same title is perhaps found in Graeco-Roman times, Mar., *Dend.* IV, 32. No monograph on holders of the title has yet been published.      G;      H;      L, rt., *wr hrp(w) hmt n Roy-inb-f* 'greatest of Artificers of Him who is South of His Wall', i.e. of Ptah, title of the high-priest of Memphis, *Wb.* I, 329, 12. The name of the god Ptah is both here and in No. 120 replaced by an epithet, cf. the similar procedure with the King, above, Nos. 78, 79, 80, etc. The literal meaning of the priestly title is 'greatest of those who undertake a craft' (or 'crafts', so *Wb.*), see Sethe in *ZÄS* LV, 65; Murray, *Index*, Pl. XIX shows two examples where  or  *nbt* follows, i.e. 'all crafts'. Ptah was an artificer by trade, the Greek Ἡφαίστος, see Stolk, *Ptah*, 13 ff., and his high-priest partook of his nature, see on No. 118. With this agrees the fact that when Mycerinus had a tomb constructed for one of his foremost nobles, the architect was assisted by the two high-priests of Memphis (*Urk.* I, 18, 13; 20, 7); note that in Dyns. IV and V there were regularly two, see further *op. cit.* 38, 15; 85, 2, see too Sethe's remarks in Borchardt, *Sakurē*, II, Text, 122. Also just as Ptah (identified with   *Zkr*) was belauded as the maker of

Textual Notes. 119^a This writing might indicate an abbreviated pronunciation ending with the *h* of *hrp*. ^b Doubtless a corruption of , in hieratic very similar to a mere stroke. ^{c-d} Clearly a misinterpretation of , though this may itself have followed in the lacuna.

jewels (Davies, *Antefoker*, Pl. 10; Harris, 6, 10), so too his high-priest wore a marvellous breast-jewel, *ZÄS* XXXIII, 22 f. — however, the oldest wearer (Murray, *Saggarā Mastabas*, II, Pl. 1) does not receive the full title, but only  among many others. Two complements appended to *wr hrp(w) hmt* in O. K. are not fully explained: (1)   with var. , e.g. Mar., *Mast.* pp. 113. 123. 130. 157. 350, perhaps 'belonging to (i.e. 'functioning on') the day of festival', but rendered by Sethe (Murray, *op. cit.* II, p. 21) 'belonging to the festival of the Sun'; (2)   'in the Two Houses' (Mar., *Mast.* pp. 130. 148. 375. 390), according to Erman, *ZÄS* loc. cit. 'in Upper and Lower Egypt', cf. Jéquier, *Mon. fun. Pepi II*, II, Pl. 46, lowest row. An incomplete list of holders of the office was given by Schiaparelli, *Museo arch. di Firenze*, I, 201 ff.; many are named, often with their dates, on a late stela in Berlin recording sixty generations, Borchardt, *Die Mittel zur zeitlichen Festlegung*, 96 ff.     G;       H;       L, rt., *stm n Nfr-hr* 'Setem-priest of Kindly of face', i.e. of Ptah, a second title of the high-priest of Memphis; here, as in No. 119, the name of the god Ptah is replaced by an epithet — for the meaning of *Nfr-hr*, *lyk. Neferw̄s*, see *ZÄS* LIII, 115. In the great *bdw* nome-list the Memphite high-priest is designated    , Brugoch, *DG* 1368; in a similar list at Denderah (*op. cit.* 1377) the variant   occurs. From Dyn. XX or thereabouts this variation is frequent; ultimately, as Griffith (*Stories of the High Priests*, pp. 3 ff.) has shown, the word early almost always written  *sm* (*Wb.* IV, 119, 3 ff.) was pronounced with the consonants *stm*, *str*. Griffith supposed that the intrusive *t* was at first merely graphic, and indeed it is

common denominator for the next five entries. As already remarked, one would have expected to find the 'overseer of the granary' (No. 121) next to the 'overseer of the Treasury' (No. 90). Nos. 122-3 have to do with the King's personal life, and might perhaps more fitly have adjoined No. 79. The functions of the King's own 'steward' must have had some analogy to those of the officials named in Nos. 93-111. Lastly, the scribe of the divine offerings in No. 125 cannot be regarded as belonging to the series of priests that follows in 126 ff. [121] Om. G;  H;  L, rt., *imy-r snwt n smc Is-mhw* 'overseer of the granaries of Upper and Lower Egypt'. Here the problem mentioned under No. 99 again presents itself, but in this case reference is certainly made to a single official whose powers extended over the entire country; examples of the title as here given are found with the owners of tombs 46. 57. 87 at Thebes, all Dyn. XVIII, see Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.*; other examples Louvre A 74 = Pierret, I, 11; C 75 = *op. cit.* II, 54; so too on a stela and two cones in the Berlin Museum, *Aeg. Inschr.* II, Index, p. 609, the stela (No. 7316) having as variant  'of the Lord of the Two Lands', which apparently defines the same office in another way; this last form also in Theban tomb 79. The title 'overseer of the granary' without further addition is common, and in one case at least (*Urk.* IV, 530, 13 ff.) it seems implied that he was responsible for the deliveries of corn from a very wide area; indeed, there is no sign that in the civil administration it ever referred to a restricted provincial area. On the other hand, the temples had officials of their own so called, often of Amün, Lefebvre, *Histoire*, p. 52; P. Wilbour (Dyn. XX) names in Text A one for Karnak (§ 56) and two others for Medinet Habu (§§ 129. 229). For the word *snwt* 'granary' see below, No. 454.




Textual Note. 121^a Doubtless a mistake for *i*, which is very similar in hieratic.

[122] Om. G;  H;  L, rt.;  R, *wb3(?) nsw m ch* 'King's butler in the Palace'. The readings of both H and L are certainly corrupt and the proposal of *Wb.* I, 458, 15 to connect the former with *bnwt* 'millstone' and to render 'miller' is not happy; the emendation  *wb3* in H seems almost certain, the more so since this important title would otherwise be passed over in silence; the reading of L is perhaps corrupted from the shorter , hardly from some writing of  *wdpw*, this apparently the earlier word for much the same function, though also including the meaning 'cook', see Peas. B1, 176; *Wb.* I, 388, 3. To *wb3* (together with its feminine *wb3yt*) *Wb.* I, 292, 1 ff. assigns the meanings 'servant', 'attendant', but the determinative  combined with the frequent epithet  *web cwy* 'clean of hands' points to a close connexion with the preparation and serving of the royal meals, and perhaps especially with the wine or beer that was used in these; examples with and without the epithet Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.*, Index, s. v. Butler. In tomb 92 at Thebes the 'King's butler' is seen presiding over the preliminaries for the feast, see Wreszinski, *Atlas*, I, Pls. 295-7. In *Paheri*, Pl. 7, regs. 1 and 2 the wine is actually handed by a *wb3*; so too Davies, *Tombs of Two Officials*, Pl. 21, top. Particularly significant is the expression  *wb3 dp irp* 'butler tasting the wine', P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 5 = *L. Eg. Misc.* 137, 1. This expression might suggest that the determinative  is a vessel for wine or beer; but the common alternatives  and the like found in Dyns. XIX-XX

Textual Notes. 122^a Corrupt, see in the text; the *L* was overlooked by Maspero and Brugsch, hence their interpretation as *swtn* 'butcher', on which see my *Admonitions*, p. 64 and Sethe in *ZAS* XLIX, 32. ^{b-c} Clearly superfluous, see *L*.

(e.g. Mar., Alydos, II, Pl. 49.30; Louvre 3629 = Pierret, I, 66; Med. Habs [ed. Chicago], Pl. 109; Couryat & Montet, Hammâmât, Pl. 4, l. 13) appear to depict a ewer for water and a napkin; for the habit of pouring water on the hands before the meal, see Two Brothers, 4, 8-9 = L.-Bq. Stories, p. 13, l. 15. Towards the end of Dyn. XX the King's butlers became very numerous and important, see Breasted, Ancient Records, Index, p. 51; such close attendance on the King was calculated to breed favourites, and these butlers were often foreigners.

[123] H; L, xt; R, imy-r
chnwty n Pr-nsw 'chamberlain of the Palace'. The word chnwty,
translated Kabinett in Wb. I, 226, 16, is probably a compound consisting
of the word ṯḥ 'region', 'part' and an adjective hnwty 'inner' connec-
ted with ḥnw 'interior', cf. the O. K. ḥnw-c in the simi-
lar sense, Wb. III, 372, 10, see Urk. I, 42, 15; 43, 18; 51, 13, 16; 83, 14; 86, 6. In
my Notes on the Story of Sinuhe, p. 67, I quoted evidence for chnwty
as that part of the palace where courtiers were received, and p. 96 ren-
dered 'Privy Chamber', perhaps, as I now think, too specific and definite
a translation. All available examples of the title imy-r chnwty
have been collected by Gauthier, Bull. inst. fr. XV, 169 ff.; he shows
the title to have been unknown in O. K., extremely common in M.K.,
but relatively rare later. Bearers of the title are sometimes said to
have been attached to a high official, e.g. the seal-bearer or vizier;
provincial princes of the Middle Kingdom had their own; more
often they are spoken of as belonging to some building, department

Textual Notes. 123^a A misinterpretation of l-li found as early as Lincke, B187.
b-c A development of the det. l (itself due to misinterpretation, see note.^a) of a type not uncommon in Ramesside hieratic, cf.    for lns 'heavy', L.-bg. Misc., Index, p. 140.

or office, e.g. 'treasury' (pr-hd), 'nursery' (kp). The reference in *On. Am.* to the royal palace is apparently unique, but it cannot be doubted that it was to the palace that belonged an imy-r chnwty seen in company with the two viziers, the treasurer, etc., at the funeral of a high-priest of Memphis on a relief belonging to the Berlin Museum (ZÄS XXXIII, Pl. 1 opposite p. 24, end of Dyn. XVIII or a little later). The duties ascribed in our texts to the imy-r chnwty (Gauthier, loc. cit. 203 ff., see too 194) were certainly in part special missions; but two stelae, considered in conjunction with the meaning of the title and the references in the story of Sinuhe, appear to define his functions fairly clearly; in Brit. Mus. 572 (Sharpe, Eg. Inscr. I, 80) Antef, attached to the diwân of the vizier, is said to have 'introduced the great ones of Upper Egypt' and to have 'placed (them) on their bellies'; the owner of the stela Cairo 20571, belonging to the diwân of the seal-bearer, is said to have 'known the place of his foot in the palace, causing truth to mount up to his lord, reporting to him the state of the Two Lands, and giving instructions to his courtiers with regard to standing and sitting'. Probably no more suitable translation can be found for imy-r chnwty than 'chamberlain'; Gauthier has 'chef de bureau', which seems to imply more participation in administrative business than I believe the title to possess.

business than I believe the title to possess. [124] G;
 H; L, it. (ends here);

R, imy-r pr wr n nb tswy 'great steward of the Lord of the Two Lands', from M.K. onwards clearly one of the highest officials under the King, the administrator of his personal estates, see Vogelsang in Sethe, Unters. VI, 36f. Just as in P. Boulaq XVIII (ZÄS LVII, 15**, 55, Dyn.

Textual Note. 124^a ~~mn~~ omitted before a word beginning with n, cf. above, No. 82, n.^a.

XIII) he was the foremost official after the vizier, so too in the Dyn. XVIII-XIX funeral procession mentioned under No. 123 the *imy-r pr* 'King's scribe and steward'. Again in P. Wilbour, B1, 2 *Usimacrē-nakhte*, described exactly as in this Memphite relief, is found administering many times as many 'khato-lands of Tharakh' belonging to Ramesses V as any other official. It was the 'great steward' Yupa who decreed the ninth jubilee of Ramesses II, an act on other occasions undertaken by the vizier himself; but here (Mond & Myers, *Temples of Armant*, Pl. 93, 1) the title is qualified by the addition 'of the Mansion of Usimacrē-set-pennrē in the House of Amūn', i. e. 'of the Ramesseum'. The magnificence of the Theban tombs of personages bearing the title 'great steward' (only once with following *imy-r* 'of the King') bears testimony to their wealth and importance, Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.* Nos. 48. 71. 73. 93. 183. Slight variations of form are found, *op. cit.*, *Index*, p. 41. For other stewards (sometimes qualified as *wr* 'chief') attached to queens, see *op. cit.* p. 42; belonging to Amūn, p. 43; various further examples e. g. Engelbach, *Supplement*, p. 31; Berlin, *Aeg. Inschr.* II, *Index*, p. 608. At all periods the 'steward' was a necessary adjunct to any large estate, and at Beni Hasan in Dyn. XII the prince Amenī had three (*Beni Hasan*, I, Pl. 13) and the prince Khnem-hotpe no less than five (*op. cit.* I, Pl. 30), though we have no means of telling whether they were all engaged in managing the prince's personal possessions. The translation 'steward' renders the sense, and the Greek equivalent was perhaps the διοικητής, though οἰκονόμος is verbally the closer equivalent; *imy-r pr* is literally 'overseer of the house', where 'house' has its wide sense of 'estate'; see too *Wb.* I, 514, 10 ff. [Postscript. The personalities and functions

connected with the office of 'great steward' are elaborately and ingeniously studied, so far as Dyn. XVIII is concerned, by Selch (*Militärführer*, 41 ff.), who, however, in my opinion draws from the scenes in the tombs and the titles of their owners far more precise views with regard to the political history of the times than this evidence warrants].

[125] *imy-r pr n nb tswy* G; *imy-r pr n nb tswy* H; *imy-r pr n nb tswy* R, *ss wsh htp-ntr n ntrw nbw* 'scribe who places offerings before all the gods', the official whose chief was mentioned in No. 99, q. v. Here, it would seem, singularly out of place. ☒ Priests and temple-employments follow, starting with the general terms, in the plural, for the higher grades and thence descending to menial occupations like those of confectioners and the like (Nos. 148-51); how far Amenopē intended to extend his list of temple employees is uncertain, but the University College writing-board (Ch. III of this book, with Pl. 23, henceforth quoted as Univ.) suggests that it extended at least thus far. The remaining employments from Nos. 152-229 may also possibly have belonged to the temple service.

[126] *imy-r pr n nb tswy* G; *imy-r pr n nb tswy* H, *hmyw-ntr* 'prophets', lit. 'god's servants'; Copt. ⁵ϢONT, sing. See above on No. 100, and for some further details No. 127. [127] *imy-r pr n nb tswy* G, H, *itw-ntr* 'god's fathers', often rendered inaccurately 'divine fathers'; *Wb.* I, 142, 1 ff. translates correctly, but gives an utterly inadequate account of the different applications of the term. Here only a preliminary sorting will be attempted, but to this will be appended a provisional hypothesis; the use in reference to a class of priests is our main concern. The position intermediate between *hmyw-ntr* 'prophets' and *wrbw* 'ordinary priests',



Textual Note 125^a For *n* 'of'.











lit. 'pure(ones)', occurs elsewhere, but less frequently than was assumed in my note ZÄS XLVII, 94; examples, Berlin 8803 = Aeg. Inscr. I, 147 (M. H.); Cairo 42186 = Lefebvre, Inscriptions, p. 25 (Dyn. XIX); Bull. inst. fr. XXXIV, 136 (Dyn. XXV); Louvre A92 = Pierret, I, 27 (late); Cairo 22151 = Ahmed Kamal, Stèles, 139 (Ptolemaic?). This hierarchical order is not without justification, but the classes are far from mutually exclusive; it was shown ZÄS, loc. cit., that the First prophet of Amün was called also ḥmwr it-ntr ḥry 'First god's father', and so too the Second prophet was called 'Second god's father' (further details, Lefebvre, Histoire, pp. 19f.); a 'Fourth prophet of Amün' (Urk IV, 106) was also called ḥmwr it-ntr ḥry ḥbt 'Fourth god's father'; Vatican 127c (Marucchi, Mus. eg. Vat. p. 124) is the stela of a ḥmwr it-ntr ḥry ḥbt 'First god's father in the House of Ptah and prophet, Neferronpe', but it seems very uncertain whether he was identical with the vizier of that name who was also High-priest of Memphis (Weil, Verziere, p. 94). In the Theban tomb of Imisibe (No. 65, Ramesses IX) eight god's fathers of Amün are followed by the Fourth, Third, Second and First prophets in that order (Champ, Not. descr. I, 565.861). In an inscription of the High-priest Roy (Cairo 42185 = Lefebvre, Inscriptions, pp. 9f.) he speaks of having retained his second son at his side as Second prophet, whilst another son was Setem-priest in the Ramesseum, one grandson was Fourth prophet, and a second was a god's father and lector-priest (ḥry ḥbt). The well-known high-priest Bekenkhons relates in the biography of his Munich statue (Deréa, Oeuvres diverses, I, 285f.) how, after serving as wbt-priest for 4 years, he became a god's father for 12 years, and then passed successively through the ranks of Third (15 years) and Second (12 years) into that of First prophet (27 years). 'God's father of Amün' is also common as a title elsewhere. Thus in the temple of Karnak it seems to have been the fashion to apply the name 'prophet'

only to the four highest god's fathers and to use the latter term for the rest. On the other hand, there are many invocations naming more than one kind of priest which employ either ḥmwr ntr (Urk IV, 120, 17; 151, 12; 508, 16; 1223, 10; Louvre C50 = Pierret, I, 52) or else itw ntr (Urk IV, 100, 11; Cairo 34057 = Lacau, Stèles, p. 103; cf. also Urk IV, 349, 16), each of these two forms to the exclusion of the other. In the list of priests (late Dyn. XVIII) belonging to the small temple of Ptah and Hathor at Karnak (Ann. Serv. III, 100) they are headed by the First prophet of those deities followed by sixteen more priests, all of whom are simply wbt except Nos. 2.5.9.14, who are ḥry ḥbt 'lector-priest'; there is no mention of god's fathers at all, and since the prophet at the head of the list is styled 'First prophet', at least some of the others must have been prophets as well. On the whole we may accept the conclusion that all genuine priests were ipso facto members of the class of wbt, and that out of these the prophets (ḥmwr ntr 'god's servants') were selected; the latter could also be called itw ntr and there was a tendency for only the highest of the 'god's fathers' to be called 'prophets'. It must surely seem paradoxical that the highest priests should have stood to their god in the relation of 'servants', whilst at the same time they, and even the less prominent among them, could be described as 'fathers' of the god. In attempting to remove this difficulty attention must be paid to the use of it-ntr in connexion with the royal family. It-ntr as so employed is defined by Wb., following a suggestion that apparently originated with Brugsch (Geschichte, table opposite p. 180), as the designation of the non-royal father of a king. This definition suits admirably in the case of the two kings in connexion with whom it was first put forward, namely King Neferhotep and King Khacneferer-Sebekhotep (see Weill, La fin du moyen empire,

I, 421 ff.), but Borchardt in an article entitled Der ägypt. Titel 'Vater des Gottes' (Ber. Sächs. Ges. Wiss., 1905) brought important evidence to show that it-nt might also, on occasion, mean the father-in-law of the King. He, indeed, was inclined to generalize this modification of the previously accepted view, but with obvious lack of success in the case of the two kings named above. His formulation, however, fits several undoubted cases, e.g. that of Khui, the father-in-law of King Phioh I of Dyn. VI, see Davies, Deir el Gebrawi, I, 29 ff., and Iuya, the father-in-law of Amenophis III. Unfortunately for both these views it now appears that the stipulation 'non-royal' must be abandoned, since in Gauthier, Inscr. dedic. p. 12, l. 59 (a case quoted by Wb. itself) the courtiers, in addressing Rameses II, describe the dead Sethos I as it-nt mry ntr 'the father of the god, the beloved of the god', here adding the epithet which in another use soon to be mentioned was a constant adjunct of it-nt and ultimately (perhaps not before Dyn. XXII, e.g. Cairo 42188 = Legrain, Statues, II, p. 55) found its way, usually abbreviated as it, into the simple priestly title as applied to priests even of lower rank than the highest prophets; a second example of a royal bearer of the title it-nt is the it-nt mry ntr 'father and beloved of the god, son of Rē, Intef, may he live for ever' in the well-known rock inscription of the Shatt er-Rigāl (Proc. SBA III, Pl. opposite p. 98 = Winlock in Am. Journ. Sem. Lang. LVII, Fig. 7 opposite p. 142), where despite Winlock's view the presence of the King's mother and consequent analogy with the Neferhotp scarabs strongly suggests that he must be the father (deposed or otherwise) of the King Nebhepetrē. Menthotpe before whom he stands. To proceed, however, this title it-nt, mostly accompanied by the epithet mry (ntr), is of constant occurrence with officials of the highest


rank in whom no relationship to the living king has been or need be suspected, men, as Faulkner points out, in the position of Elder Statesmen; Wb. I, 142, 6 quotes a number of examples, including the vizier Ptahhotpe of the famous proverbs (P. Kruse), but could well have included the many examples of New Kingdom viziers (Weil, Veziere, p. 125) and High-priests of Amūn (Lefebvre, op. cit. pp. 254, 258, 262, 270); in the case of these high-priests the addition of 'beloved' or 'beloved of him' makes it impossible to separate this employment from that in regard to other high dignitaries, while at the same time it cannot be completely divorced from the title it-nt of the less important prophets of Amūn. It has thus been seen that it-nt or it-nt mry ntr or it-nt mry-f is applied to royal and non-royal persons alike; the one common factor is that the word ntr always signifies the living king, to whom the holder of the title stands in the relation of father, whether actual or by marriage (father-in-law) or by virtue of high station, advanced age, outstanding wisdom or some such attribute. Arrived at this point, we must surely find it difficult to deny that in the priestly title it-nt the word ntr likewise refers to the king, though in the Middle and early New Kingdoms only in the case of the very highest priests could the further privilege be claimed by them of enjoying the king's love. Putting my hypothesis into other words, the 'Father of the God' in the temples may have been any priest of sufficient age and standing for him to expect the Pharaoh to adopt a filial attitude towards him. If this view be correct, what we must render as 'god's father of Amūn', 'of Suchus the Sheditite', 'of Atum' and so forth (see Borchardt, op. cit. pp. 286 f.) must be construed as signifying 'a father of the King belonging to the priesthood of Amūn' and so forth, and thus would vanish the

he was also at the head of the priesthood ( imy-r hmw-ntr 'overseer of the prophets', op. cit. I, 283, see above, No. 100), he declares (op. cit. I, 288) 'I am the son of a wcb like every one of you'. The title  wcb ('great wcb') occasionally found (Wb. I, 283, 10) evidently refers to the head of the particular priesthood in question, e.g. 'of Anubis', op. cit. I, 305; 'of Horus the Behdetite' at Edfu, Bull. inst. fr. XXXVII, 108; occasionally it may have a more general or indefinite sense, as in the Ritual of Amün edited by Moret (the great priest imy hrw-f 'of the particular day', Rituel du culte, 1, 2). The two high-priests of Amün who have left us sketches of their careers (Bekenhons, see on No. 127; Amenemhet, ZÄS XLVII, 92 f.) both started as wcb-priest. Evidence from a list of priests in the temple of Ptah at Karnak, see under No. 127. The name refers to the act of purification which was the indispensable preliminary to participation in the rites of the cult. According to Anast. II, 7, 6 f. = Sall. I, 7, 6 f. the priest (wcb) performed the three daily services (the number, see too Pleyte & Rossi, Pap. Turin, 33, 12) only after having cleansed himself in the river winter and summer alike, and in all weathers. For a priest accused of neglecting this duty see JE A X, 121. A relief at Karnak depicts the prophets and certain priestesses engaged in the act of purification, Legrain & Naville, L'aile nord, Pl. 11, B. No comprehensive treatment of the Egyptian priesthood in Pharaonic times has yet appeared; from the papyrological side see W. Otto, Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten, Leipzig, 1905-8. The chief Egyptological contributions to the topic thus far are: Blackman, art. Priest, Priesthood (Egyptian) in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics; Gauthier, Personnel 9ff;




Kees, Kulturgeschichte, 242 ff.; particularly important material will be found in the articles by Borchardt, ZÄS XXXVII, 89 ff.; XL, 114 ff.; and for late times, P. Rylands IX, edited by Griffith. [29]   G;   H, hry-hbt 'lector-priest', Wb. III, 395, 4 ff. The writing without b in H has occurred already in Nos. 114 (H. R.); 116 (H. R.); and shows that in Dyn. XX this consonant had disappeared, a fact for which there is further evidence elsewhere, see ZÄS L, 80. Since Sethe's discovery (ZÄS LXX, 134) that the second word in the compound was a feminine, though the ending -t is almost always omitted, confirmation has been given to Brugsch's view (Wörterb. Suppl. 803 f.) that this word is the hieroglyphic  hbt 'ritual-book' (Wb. III, 61), so that the entire title signifies 'he who carries (lit. 'is under') the ritual-book'. In accordance with that meaning the lector-priest is constantly depicted in temple (e.g. Borchardt, Sahurêc, II, Pl. 19; Naville, Deir el Bahari, IV, Pl. 110) and in tomb (e.g. Bissing, Gem-ni-kai, II, Pls. 29-31 = JE A XXIV, Pl. 5) reading from a papyrus roll, though elsewhere (see Bissing & Kees, Re-Heiligtum, III, p. 54) he is merely prominent in the ceremonies. Knowledge of ritualistic use was his principal qualification, as is well expressed, as regards the funerary cult, by the words in an O. K. tomb 'Beloved of the King and of Anubis is the lector-priest    who shall perform for me the things beneficial to a blessed spirit according to that secret writing of the lector-priest's craft,' the reference here obviously being to the realization through magic-working incantations of the funerary banquet, see Junker, Vorläufiger Bericht..... 1914, Pl. 2 in Anz...... Akad. Wien, 1914. The lector-priest is also often depicted   šdt sšhw












'reciting incantations' with upraised arm ḥ, e.g. Griffith, Siut, Pl. 2. Though it is certain that such 'lectors' were often priests, it is by no means proved that they always were, and their magical powers were often exerted for non-religious ends, see P. Westcar, *passim*; the lector-priest as discoverer of semi-magical spells, P. med. London, 8, 12; giving medical treatment, P. med. Berlin, 8, 10. The comparison with the Hebr. הַרְטָמִּי מִצְרַיִם 'sorcerers of Egypt' (Ubb, loc. cit.), though wrong philologically, has been shown by Spiegelberg and Stricker to be right in substance, see JEA XXIV, 164 f., since the Hebrew word is derived from ḥry-tp, a comparatively late abbreviation of the common title ḥry-hbt hry-tp 'chief lector'. That title was often claimed by feudal lords, who, as noted under No. 128, frequently stood at the head of the local priesthood in M. K. as 'overseer of prophets'. At Asyût in Dyn. XII the temple-staff also possessed another 'lector-priest' (Griffith, *op. cit.*, Pl. 7); at El-Lahun at the same period the 'chief lector' was distinct from the 'overseer of prophets', but there was also a ḥry-hbt ḥs 'ordinary lector' (ZÄS XL, 114; Griffith, Kahun Papyri, p. 26). For much more, but by no means exhaustive, information on this topic see Lefebvre, Histoire, 16f.; Gauthier, Personnel, 34 ff.; Kees, Kulturgeschichte, Index s.v. Vorlesepriester; a proper treatment would distinguish the different periods. Here will be added only a note on the Greek equivalents: P. Casati gives ταριχεύτης 'embalmer', which stresses only one side of the lector's activities, and that not at all accurately, see for references Möller, Die beiden Totenpapyrius Rhind, p. 48*, No. 316; far closer would be Clement of Alexandria's ιερογραμματεὺς (Hofner, Fontes [III], 372, cf. also Diod. I, 87), whom he describes as ἔχων περὰ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς



βιβλίον τε ἐν χερσὶ καὶ κανοῦν, ἐν ᾧ τό τε γραφικὸν μέλαν καὶ σχοῖνος, ἢ γράφουσι, a description agreeing admirably, apart from the κανοῦν — by this 'palette' must somehow be meant, κανόνα 'euler' has been suggested — with the annexed vignette from a Dyn. XXII coffin Berlin 20132 (Möller, *op. cit.* p. 79; photo, Gressman, Jod u.





























Auferstehung, Fig. 3 in Der alte Orient, XXIII, pt. 3); here it is clearly a lector-priest that is depicted, and the feathers on the head cannot but recall the title πτεροφόρος (Preisigke, III, 383), a class whom Hesychius, Lex. 1301 = Hofner, *op. cit.* [IV], 652, declares to have been τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἱερέων τινές; this surely must be the best Greek equivalent of the Egyptian ḥry-hbt 'lector-priest'; note, however, that in the Decree of Canopus (Urk. II, 126, 8) and on the Rosetta Stone (*op. cit.* 172, 5) πτεροφόροι καὶ ἱερογραμματεῖς corresponds rather to ḥry-hbt ḥs mdst-nr 'scribes of the god's book'. Lastly, Wilkinson, Manners & Customs (ed. Birch), II, p. 324, fig. 436, 9 figures what is clearly a lector-priest with two feathers on his head, but this comes from the initial procession of the festival of Min as depicted at Medinet Habu (*op. cit.* III, Pl. 60), where the great majority of those present, for some unexplained reason, wear similar feathers; in other scenes of the same festival, as in that of Sokar (best seen in the key-plate, Med. Habu, ed.

Chicago, [IV], Pl. 196) no feathers are worn either by the lector-priest or by anybody else, so that the representation in Wilkinson's book cannot be used as evidence. Furtwängler, Kleine Schriften, II, 357 quotes a Roman relief (Amelung, Vatican, II, Pl. 7, No. 55) showing Egyptian priests, among whom there is a ἱερογραμματεὺς wearing a single feather on his head; Furtwängler attributes this practice to the connexion with Thoth; bronzes with Thoth as an ibis constantly show a feather in front of him (Lanzzone, Diz. Pl. 405, 3), and other pictures of the god (op. cit., Pls. 402, 3; 403; 404, 3) are quoted as displaying him with feather on head [these last examples, however, are hardly convincing]. Furtwängler returns to the subject again op. cit. 379 ff., figuring very late sculptures of Hermes wearing the feather from Syria and Ascalon.  s3 hwt-ntr 'temple scribe', Wb. III, 5, 1. The title is not uncommon from O. K. onwards; even the smallest temples must have had a scribe to keep accounts and so forth, and the office is named in Dyn. XII on the temple-staff alike at Aoyût. (Griffith, Liût, I, 284) and at El-Lahûn (ZÄS XL, 114); in the latter case he was evidently only a lay-priest, as he is spoken of as 'in his month', i.e. serving only one month in every season, cf. in very late times a 'temple scribe'  of the fourth class (φύλη); Louvre C 112 = Pierret, II, 33; the temple of Aoyût. had also a  s3 h3t 'scribe of the altar', but neither at Aoyût. nor at El-Lahûn is mention made of a 'scribe of the god's book', No. 131 below, though many must have existed to write coffin texts, etc. Great temples like that of Amûn in Ramesside times had numerous 'temple scribes', for a 'chief' (☐ hrry) of them occurs, see Lefebvre, Histoire, p. 44; whether those with specialized functions like 'counting the grain of Amûn' (op. cit. p. 53) came under the same heading is unknown. References for O. K., Murray, Index, Pl. 38; for later times,

Lange & Schäfer, Grab- u. Denksteine, III, 70; Borchardt, Statuen, V, 80;
 Legrain, Statues, Indices, 36. 137  G;  H;  I
 R, s3 md3t-ntr 'scribe of the god's book', Wb. III, 480, 8; JE XXIV, 176;
 see too under No. 130 and in the indexes of the books there quoted.
 This entry and No. 115 together yield approximately the title of
 Amenopse himself (see the printed Introduction), and it is strange
 that the two entries should be thus separated. 132 
 G;  H;  R, k3wtj 'porter', lit. 'Builder's workman',
Wb. V, 102, 4 ff. This occupational title was dealt with by Spiegelberg, ZÄS
 XXXVII, 36f; LXIII, 150, where many writings closely akin to that of R
 were cited, mostly followed by the name of a god or temple; at first
 Spiegelberg was inclined to regard the word as a derivative of  k3t
 'work', 'constructional work', but later he abandoned this view on account
 of the strangeness of the spellings. There can, however, be little doubt
 that his first view was correct, though the absence of  is noticeable.
 In the Dyn. XII list of the staff of the temple of 3l-Lahun (ZÄS XL, 114)
 the  k3wtj of the temple' occupies the last place,
 receiving even smaller rations as pay than the (day) and night door-
 keepers (iry-c3, below, No. 193) who precede. The absence of  in most
 examples may be due to a change of meaning of this word in connexion
 with temple-employ (add Nauri Decree, 98). At least one case shows
 that the original reference to building survived down to Dyn. XIX, cf.
 k3wtjw m inr 'workmen (building) with stone',
Rec. Trav XIII, Pl. 1, ll. 5-6. In the end Spiegelberg decided in favour of
 the rendering 'door-keeper', because on two late monuments he found
k3wtj as variant of iry-c3. But just because both words are used there
 must be some difference between them, though we must admit with




him that the functions may have been very closely related. Capart (*Bulletin critique des religions d'Égypte*, 1904, p. 39) quoted a Leyden coffin (M 24) depicting a *h3wtj* with a broom in his hand, and compared also the picture Petrie, *Tell el Amarna*, Pl. 5. This too may have formed a regular part of that employee's work. But to me, as to Sethe, who rendered *Träger* in *ZÄS* XLIV, 41, the relationship to the late verb  *h3wt* 'carry', 'raise', with such variants as  (Wb. V, 103, 1ff.) is obvious, and from that presumably denominative verb the meaning 'porter' must be deduced. Below in No. 223 we have *h3wtj* *hbs*, apparently 'clothes-porter', and in No. 222 there may have been some similar qualification.


                         








examples of † ⲙⲁⲛ ⲕⲓ and similar writings from N. K. and later, and the meaning is definitely established by the occurrence of the title on a pair of astronomical instruments used for observing the stars (Borchardt, ZÄS XXXVII, 10 f.; Sloley, JEA XVII, 169); Florence 1635 mentions a 'chief' () of hour-watchers of Osiris in Abydos; similarly, but attached to Amen-Rêc, Copenhagen Mus. nat. 35+7 (Nielsen, Pl. 27). For M. K. and N. K. the equivalent is ⲙⲉⲧⲱⲩⲏ * wnwtj 'hour-man'; Wb. I, 317, q, with the significant Dyn. XVIII writing ⲙⲉⲧⲱⲩⲏ ⲟⲩⲗⲓ in the tomb of Nakht at Thebes (ed. Davies); Nakht was 'hour-man of [Am-ūn]'. Florence 1776 (Schiaffarelli, Museo Arch. I, 491) is the N. K. (?) stela of a ⲡⲣⲥⲃⲭⲱⲩⲏ * ⲑⲇⲫⲱⲩⲏ * 44 ⲔⲐⲓⲅⲓⲛ scribe of the department of hour-watchers of Pharaoh, hour-watcher (wnwtj) on the roof of the Palace'. The simple writing * occurs also late, see Rec. trav. XXVI, 157. The writing here in G has an ending ⲍⲚ which looks like the plural ending (several plural words have just preceded), but since this ending is attached to the second element of the compound, not to the first (imy), the suspicion arises that † ⲙⲉⲧⲱⲩⲏ ⲕⲓ is only a late writing of wnwtj, naturally conveying a false etymology 'he who is in the hour'; for † representing initial m, see below, Nos. 140.602. Thus would be confirmed Griffith's equation of demotic † ⲙⲉⲧⲱⲩⲏ ⲕⲓ (P. Rylands IX, 2, 10; 15, 2, see Griffith's notes pp. 222, n. 4; 238, n. 2) with the Coptic MNOUT, see above; this equation was suggested by the first of the two passages, where the demotic word is used of 'the wardens who were guarding us'. It is not unlikely that the hour-watchers when off duty served as temple watchmen, warders or doorkeepers. The change ^ewnwtj > ^emntwj is by no means improbable, cf. nn wn, Copt.^s MMON, Sethe, Verbum, I,






















§ 203. [135] G; H, ms wdrn
‘bringer of offerings’, Wb. II, 135, 23; two more examples, ZÄS XLIV, 41;
L, 76; exclusively Ramesside; one man bearing the title was a priest
(wcb) of Khons; in two cases it is the ‘chief (\square) of offering-bringers’
that is named. [136] H, f3(y)
hnty ‘bearer of the wine-jar stand’, as title perhaps only here;
hnty, see Wb. III, 301, 12; also Nelson in JAOS LVI, 232 ff.
[137] G; H; R, šwt-šw
‘maker of runners(?), lit. ‘a way of rushes(?)’, meaning highly
conjectural, Wb. IV, 434, 12 without translation; other examples of
this occupational title, Univ. rt. 4; P. Brit. Mus. 10068, vs. 4, 10 = Peet,
Tomb-Robberies, Pl. 15. Wst-šw among various items of furniture,
etc., Ostr. Nash 6; Ostr. Cairo (Černý, Ostraca) 256 γγ, vs. 6. Wb. ibid.
11 quotes wst-šw as a measure for vegetables, bundle or the like; this
clearly refers to examples like Ostr. Berlin
10631 = Hierat. Pap. III, Pl. 36, among commodities given or exchanged;
 parallel to again in a list. If
the suggestion that wst-šw is a runner or long mat be correct, these
last examples could perhaps only refer to mats covered by herbs or vegeta-
ble fodder. However, the word šww, šwy supposed to enter into this com-
pound is, according to Wb. ibid. q. 10, known only as a term for a poor
kind of food [e.g. Prisse, I, 5] or as a remedy for rubbing down a sick ox,
and the conjecture ‘rushes’ thus lacks any sound foundation. It is a
remarkable fact, overlooked by Wb., that there is another compound
of very similar appearance, namely wst-šw, literally ‘sun-
path’ or ‘path of light’, for šw see above, No. 14; this compound is used

Textual Note. 135^a L is not to be read, see ZÄS XLVIII, 39; so too Nos. 162. 183.

to describe the long sloping entrance passage of royal tombs, evidently that passage which is still lighted by the sunlight from without, see Cairo 25184 (Daresy, Ostraca, Pl. 32; Id. in Rev. arch., 3rd ser. XXXII, 235 ff.), here 30 cubits long and 6 (?) wide; probably to be restored likewise in the Turin plan, JEAI V, 145; so too  Ostr. Cairo (Cerný, op. cit.) 25581, rt., length 20 cubits and 3 spans. It is tempting to connect the two compounds with one another, and anyone who favoured this view could argue that  in the first compound was not the determinative of šw, šwy alone, but of the entire expression wst-šw; however, it would be remarkable that not a single instance showed šw with the determinatives , and further, the transition of meaning from 'sunlighted passage' to something that could be fabricated and could be used as a receptacle or measure for herbs or grass would be difficult to explain. Here it must suffice to have stated the problem and to have left it unsolved.

[138] 

left it unsolved. [138]  G;  H;  R, mhr 'milker' (of cows), Wb. II, 115, 18; perhaps only here, but the cognate verbs hr, mhr are known; cf. too No. 153. [139]  G;  H, stf 'butcher', later form of sft, Wb. III, 444, 1; examples Univ. et. 2; P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 4; Mogenssen, Inscr. hier.... Copenhagen, p. 51. [140]  G;  H, pnc imy-h

p. 51.                     

1441 $\square \overset{a}{\parallel} \overset{b}{\parallel} \overset{c}{\parallel} \overset{d}{\parallel} \overset{e}{\parallel} G$; $\square \overset{a}{\parallel} \overset{b}{\parallel} \overset{c}{\parallel} \overset{d}{\parallel} \overset{e}{\parallel} H$; $\square \overset{a}{\parallel} \overset{b}{\parallel} \overset{c}{\parallel} \overset{d}{\parallel} \overset{e}{\parallel} R$, no scyt(t)
'baker of scyt(t)-cakes, Wb. I, 552, 12, not uncommon; to the examples there
quoted add Spiegelberg & Pörtner, Aeg. Grabsteine, I, No. 31; P. Leyd. 348.

Textual Notes. 139^a The common faulty substitute for ~~¶~~ as above, No. 98, n.^a.
141^a For the same writing see below, Nos. 142. 145. 609. ^b The rubric here and in No. 142 seems wholly meaningless.












vs. 10, 5 = L. - Eg. Misc. 136, 16; Spiegelberg, Literat. Ostr. Ramesseum, Pl. 13, No. 115 (of Ḫō, i.e. Medinet Habu); Berlin 4397 = Aeg. Inschr. II, 579; a 'chief' (ḫ) of the bakers of š(yt)-cakes of the House of Amūni; Legrain, Repertoire, No. 43. For various writings of š(yt) and the probability that several words are involved, see below under No. 548.


[142] G; H; R,

ps rhs 'baker of rhs-cakes,' for these see Wb. II, 442, 5; the title probably only here.

[143] G; H;

277r 14 R, irw bit 'maker of bit-loaves', so too Univ. rt. 2; Lefebvre, Inscriptions, pp. 32-3. For bit see Wb. I, 433, 1 ff. and below, No. 511, the older form being 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏 b3it, see On. Ram. No. 225 and Wb. I, 414, 7; why irw here, not pw as in Nos. 141-2? 144

  G;    H;   R, irw psn 'maker of
psn-loaves', Wb. I, 54.9, 18 ff.; see also On. Ram. 2.24.4; Lefebvre, Inscript.
tions, pp. 32-3; also below, Nos. 509.512. 145   G;   H,

c^hrw 'brewer', Wb. I, 237, 4. For the apparent misreading of H cf.
P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 4 = L. Eg. Misc. 136, 15. 146 ←  G;

𐤀 𐤁 𐤂 𐤃 H, rkhty 'baker', Wb. II, 459, 14; see Rec. trav. XXXIX, 20,
 and for proof of reading, Gardiner, Eq. Gramm., p. 504 (1131). Contempor-
 ary hieroglyphic inscriptions would probably always have written 𐤀 𐤁,
 owing to complete assimilation of hieratic 𐤀 to hieratic 𐤁, see Dévaud, Rec.
trav., loc. cit.; for the single hieroglyphic example known to him, see
 Lefebvre, op. cit. p. 32.

9785 H, s3k snt 'shaper of incense', also Univ. st. 3; on an ostrakon, Rec. trav. XIX, q3; also Urk IV, 267; s3k here probably means 'compress by means of heat' so as to mould the incense into conical or other forms.

[illegible]

frs trr 'cooker of.....'; the unknown trr again below, No. 554, there as here immediately before hr, hence probably some sort of sweetmeat or sweet cake. 149 G; H;

..... R, irw hni 'maker of sweetmeats' or the like, honey being an ingredient, Wb. II, 492, 11 ff.; the word hni itself means 'sweet', Wb. II, 492, 14. See too No. 148 above. 150 G; H; R, bruty 'confectioner', a derivative of brnt 'date-palm'; Wb. I, 463, 16 knows the derivative only from On. Am. and Univ. st. 2-3, but add P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 5 = L. Eg. Misc. p. 136, 16. 151 G; H; R, irw mcds

'maker of baskets of date-cake (?)'; reading and meaning, see JEA XXXVI, 158. 152 G; H, m(i)niw 'herdsman', Wb. II, 14, bottom; repeated below, No. 228. For the reading see ZÄS XLII, 116 ff., and for the various animals and birds tended by men with this title see the article by Černý in the Vatican centenary volume.

153 G; H, fzy mhn 'milkman', lit. 'carrier of milk-jug(s)'; mhn is a later form of mhr, Wb. II, 115, 5; the demotic P. Berlin 3119, 4 gives this title, which is translated in the Grey Antigraphon (Wilcken, UPZ II, 131) by γαλακτοφόρος.

154 G; H; R, hmw 'carpenter', so regularly in Late Egyptian when not qualified by an additional word, good examples Feet, Tomb-Robberies, Text, p. 119; the prototype of Copt. ^{5B} ραμωε (*hmw-ht) is not found in Ramesside times, see Wb. III, 82, 9-14; see too Nos. 165, 166. 155 G; H; R, gnuty (?) 'sculptor'; reading and scope of the term not

fully established, though Univ. vs. professes to enumerate his products,

Textual Notes. 149^a A corruption of ; so too No. 150. 150^a See last note. 153^{a-b} Seems demanded by the space, more than in Pl. IXA. ^c Superfluous. 154^a See No. 80, n. ^a.

which are mainly those of the cabinet-maker or wood-carver; perhaps, however, he also worked in stone; for some examples see Rec. trav. XXXVI, 165, nn. 4, 5. See Montet, *Scènes*, 291 ff. for the reading above provisionally adopted; Wb. II, 145 suggested kó-tj and refers the reader thither, only to disappoint him; Sethe (ZÄS LIV, 50 ff.) showed that the supposed reading mōnty was based upon an error and that the comparison with Copt.

⁵ BECNHT, ⁶ BACNHT 'smith', *ghk.* Χαλκεύς is impossible; the latter word is derived from a tool bnt, see Wb. I, 477, 5 ff. 156 G; H, mdhw 'carpenter', 'shipbuilder', Wb. II, 190, 8 ff.; reading, see Eg.



gramm. p. 492, under S10. 157 G; H; R, scnhy (portrait-) sculptor, Wb. IV, 47, 17 ff. The word means 'he who makes




to live' and perhaps was originally understood in that literal sense, see JEA IV, 2. It is at present impossible to distinguish between this occupation and No. 155, but perhaps the scnh always sculptured portraits and worked in the round; for the 'chief (=) of sculptors' making the wooden statuette of a child see Wreszinski, *Atlas*, I, 73, a. Some other examples of the word, Rec. trav. XXXVI, 165, n. 6; 166, n. 1; de Morgan, *Cat. Mon.* I, p. 40, 174 (another 'chief'); *Ann. Serv.* XI, 86; P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 7 = L. - Eg. Misc. 137, 4. 158 G; H; R, 'coppersmith', reading still un-



known, see Eg. gramm. p. 478, under N34, and Wb. III, 99; sufficient examples are quoted Wb. I, 438, 3 ff.; for the Coptic word having this meaning see on No. 155. Ball. II, 4, 7-8 describes the occupation: 'I have seen the coppersmith at his work beside his furnace; his fingers are like crocodile-skin and he stinks more than the roe of fish.' 159 G; H; R, nby 'goldsmith', Wb. II, 241, 1 ff. 160 G; H, nōdy 'worker in precious stones', not merely 'jeweller' as Wb. II, 324, 18,




since engaged in adorning temple Anast. IV, vs. C6; see JEA XXII, 177,



and particularly Mar., P. Boulaq XIX (delivery of *mhmmt*, a semi-precious stone); Bologna 1945 = Kmínek-Szedlo, p. 214, attached to House of Gold; Wreszinski, *Atlas*, I, 73, a, working with bow-drill.



[161]  G;  H, *hwt* 'maker of faience', doubtless properly 'fuser (of glaze)', *Wb.* I, 447, 5; elsewhere only Tablet Rogers (Bull. inst. fr. XLI, 114), of makers of shawabti-figures, with the parallel text Brit. Mus. 16672.



[162]  G;  H, *ms s3t* 'purveyor of precious stones', *Wb.* II, 135, 22; the title is suspiciously like  'quarryman', *Wb.* II, 135, 19.




[163]  G;  H, *tbw nsw* 'King's sandal-maker', *Wb.* V, 363, 15, examples Berlin 70.7295 = *Aeg. Inschr.* II, 200.198; Steindorff, *Aniba*, II, Text, p. 253, two examples, both of Dyn. XVIII. Anast. I, 264 suggests that *tbw*, like Engl. 'saddler', had wider functions than the title indicates.



[164]  G;  H (ends here);  R, *irw tryn* 'corset-maker'; *tryn*, a Semitic word, Assyr. *siriyām*, Hebr. *טריין*, *טריין* Burchardt, No. 1162, where other examples are quoted.



[165]  G;  R, *hmuw mrkbt* 'chariot-maker', *Wb.* III, 82, 10, examples Mogensen, *Inscr. hier.*.... Copenhagen, p. 38; *Mélanges Maspero*, I, 825; *mrkbt* is Semitic, Hebr. *מרכבת* (Burchardt, No. 482), Copt. ⁵ Ⲡⲣⲟⲟⲩⲧ, ⁶ Ⲡⲉⲣⲉⲟⲩⲧ; *hmuw wrryt* (Florence 2584 = Berend, 82) likewise means 'chariot-maker', but employs an Egyptian word for 'chariot'.

[166]  G;  R, *hmuw ch3w* 'arrow-maker'; *Wb.* I, 216, 15 quotes from Sall. II, 7, 4 a similar *irw ch3w*.



[167]  G;  R, *irw pdwt* 'bow-maker', *Wb.* I, 569, 17; elsewhere perhaps only



Textual Notes. 161^{a-b} Clearly to be transposed. 162^a See on No. 135. ^{b-c} Read as in H, an easy corruption in hieratic. 163^a  for  as several times already. 164^a Emend into . 165^a See No. 89, n.^a. 166^{a-b} Emend as in R; the corruption has been assisted by the preceding word.



Cairo 25760, rt. 18 = Černý, *Ostraca*, Pl. 93.* [168]  G, *str* 'marker of necklaces(?)'; the late verb  *Wb.* IV, 344, 5, examples Brugoch, *Wörterb. Suppl.* 1159.




[169]  G, *tsy b33* 'stone-worker', lit. 'wielder of the *b33*-tool', *Wb.* I, 478, 13; in opposition to the *bant* (*Wb.* I, 477, 5), which was a tool for working metal, the *b33* was used for working stone, as its deto. indicate; it was perhaps a heavier tool than the sculptor's chisel  *md3t*, for which see No. 181.


Pleyte & Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 138, 4 speaks of 'the blow of a *b33* on a man's head', which suggests that it was used more for chipping than for cutting. Ostr. Gardiner 42 speaks of twenty such stone-workers engaged on a building in one single day; an additional reference, P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 6-7 = *L.-Eq. Misc.* 137, 3.

[170]  G;  R, *irw w3bt* 'bead-maker'; *Wb.* I, 373, 8 quotes for *w3bt* only Mutter u. Kind, 1, 1.3, but these examples are fairly convincing; perhaps cf. also *šbyw*, *Wb.* IV, 438, 11.



[171]  G;  R, *ncy* 'rope-maker', *Wb.* II, 207, 2, only one more example apart from the single instance of the cognate verb. However, the word appears to have survived in demotic, see Griffith, *Dodecaschoenus*, p. 300, s.v. *hry*.




[172]  G;  R, *mh hw* (or *bht*?) 'fan-maker', lit. 'filler' (with the ostrich-feathers?); the fragment of R can hardly belong elsewhere, No. 81 being already occupied.


[173]  G;  R, Pl. XXI, position very doubtful, *s33* 'barber(?)'; no such word is known, but it is perhaps significant that, just as *s33* here precedes the common word for 'barber', so too *s33*, a miswriting of H for *s3t3* in No. 103, is there determined with the razor .


[174]  G, *hc kw* 'barber', *Wb.* III, 365, 3; the related verb, Copt. ⁵ ⲕⲱⲙⲉ, ⁶ ⲕⲱⲙ. On the Egyptian barber in general,


Textual Notes. 168^a With a note of interrogation in the Plate, but hardly doubtful. 169^a Doubtful, see the photographic Plate. 173^a Doubtful, and if correct, presumably to be emended.




see Kees, Kulturgeschichte, 90 f. Salier II, 5, 3 describes his life: 'the barber shaves late into the evening he betakes himself from street to street, to seek whom he may shave'. Other examples of the word, P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 8 = L. & G. Misc. 137, 5; P. Brit. Mus. 10053, rt. 7, 11 = Pest. Tomb. Robberies, Pl. 19; a 'chief (☐) of barbers of Amün', Cairo 34082 = Lacau, Stèles, p. 131. [175]  G,  R, nbdy 'hair-dresser (?)'; Wb. II, 246, 10 f. gives the word the two meanings Flechter and Friseur, but can quote for the former only. Univ. rt. 3 and for the latter only the present entry, where the meaning is suggested by 'barber' preceding. The corresponding verb, like its Coptic equivalent







⁸ NOYBT, is usually employed in the former sense of basket-work, the sole example quoted by Wb. II, 246, 5 for plaiting the hair being the well-known reflexive instance Two Brothers, 2, 10. Even here the sense is uncertain in view of No. 176 immediately following. [176]  G,  R, irw tkt 'maker of (?)', Wb. V, 411, 2, clearly only from here; Burchardt, No. 1046, plausibly suggests to emend the unknown tkt into  hkt, a word compared with

Hebr. כִּתְּרָה, 'covering' and found Anast. IV, 17, 1; Harris 14, 6, 4; Ram. Adm. Doc. 20, 8; 22, 6, 7; in several of these passages hkt is described as the 'covering' (hbyt) of something and everywhere it is in company with words for garments or the like. ☒ Nos. 177-87 enumerate quarry-workers, builders and the like. Nos. 177-9 occur in the same order P. Leyd. 348, vs. 10, 6 = L. & G. Misc. 137, 2-3. [177]  G, iky 'miner', as at














Hammâmât and Sinai, not rare, Wb. I, 139, 10, 11; see too my Notes on the Story of Sinuhe, p. 154. [178]  G, hrtj 'quarryman', lit 'necropolis-man', a derivative of hrt-ntr 'necropolis', JEA XXII, 174; XXIV, 244;






Textual Note. 178^a  has been omitted.


see also Wb. III, 394, 14 and here No. 177. [179]  G, hmc (?) 'demolisher'; the phrase hmc n kdy mentioned Wb. III, 282, 8 is due to the misreading of No. 180 here following; the example quoted in the remark before No. 177 is perhaps the only other known example of this occupational term, evidently the derivative of a verb for 'demolish', the reading of which as hmc or simply hm is rather uncertain - the problem is discussed below under No. 465A. [180]  G;  R, sd kdy 'draughtsman', lit. 'scribe of contours', Wb. V, 81, 2 ff.

The second element in the compound was early written  (Cairo 20243 = Lange & Schäfer, I, p. 266 (see also Index, p. 71 for further writings) with the meaning 'contours', the basic meaning of the stem kd being 'turn round', cf. Copt. ⁵ KWTE. In the Story of Sinuhe (var. to B 302-3) the sd kdw undertakes the drawings in the tomb, while the  (above, No. 155) does the carving (). In Louvre C 12 = de Horrack, Oeuvres, Pl. 5 the sd kdw adds the colours to the cleansed sculptures Davies, Tomb of Two Sculptors, Pl. 14 shows a man so described writing an inscription on a pot; so too Florence 2606 = Berend, Pl. 10. For the mutual relations of this craftsman and that next following here, the descriptions in the Turin papyrus depicting the tomb of Ramesses IV are of importance; a corridor and two chambers are said to have been  'drawn with outlines, carved with the chisel, and filled with colours', see JEA IV, 134, 138, 139. Further literature: ZÄS XIV, 146 ff.; Rec. trav. XXIV, 185 ff.; XXXVI, 165. In demotic this title occurs in P. Berlin 3119, and the Grey Antigraphon (Wilcken, UPZ II, 131) renders it by Συγλύφος, which, however, is far more suitable to the associated No. 181 below. [181]  G;  R,







Textual Note. 181^a Borrowed from the word for 'writings', emend D.







t3y md3t 'sculptor' (in relief), lit. 'wielder of the chisel'. Wb. II, 188, 6 wrongly queries the reading md3t: at Dér el-Medīnah  is a frequent variant of  (the same person, e.g. Brunyère, *Fouilles* [1924-5], p. 169, fig. 112) and  is the phonetic writing of the tool, Boeser, *Beschreibung*, IV, Pl. 14, N. K.; see too Jéquier, *Frises d'objets*, 278; Schiaparelli, *Libro del Funerale*, Pl. 70; demotic md3y, ZÄS LVI, 26; Griffiths (*Proc. SBA* XXI, 270) compared Copt. maxe (ḡk. λαξευτήριον), but Guum (p. 213) renders this 'axe', 'pick'. For the successive stages of work implied in Nos. 180-181 see on No. 180; pictures of the md3t-chisel in use, Davies, *Two Ramesside Tombs*, Pls 36-7; *Tomb of Two Sculptors*, Pl. 11; Florence 2606 = Berend, Pl. 10. [182]     G;  R, kd(y) 'gypsum-worker', Wb. V, 82, 8; cf. Cairo 25605 = Černý, *Ostraca*, Pl. 58*, where the kd(y) delivers kd 'gypsum' (ZÄS LVIII, 51), and so was perhaps the provider rather than the preparer (irt kd, see Pleyte & Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 38, 6) or the plasterer who used it. [183]     G;  R, ms in(r) 'bringer of stone', Wb. II, 135, 22, quoting Urk. IV, 1154, 10. For similar writings of inr see below under Nos. 327-9.







☒ The rubricizing of the next two entries seems pointless, and would have been better reserved for No. 197, the next place at which any sort of unity can be observed between more than five consecutive entries. [184]      G, ikd ndo(t)

'potter', lit. 'builder (in)-little'; Wb. II, 385, 16, giving the same literal rendering, suggests building with mud-bricks, but three ostraca with duplicates of Sall. II, 5, 7 (Petrie 40; Gardiner 329; Univ. College) give the expression with  as det., and the obscure passage refers

Textual Notes. 183^a See on No. 135. ^b = has been omitted in Pl. IXA by mistake.

to 'heat' (t3), to 'baking' (ps) and has a certain corruption of the word for 'pots' (krht, so actually Ostr. Gardiner 329); the most conclusive proof, however, is 'I have set many people to provision you....'    and potters using the potter's wheel and making vessels', Ann. Serv. XXXVIII, 223; other examples Berlin 12546 (Aeg. Inscr. I, p. 150); Ebers, 69, 18-9; P. med. Berlin, 8, 11. The Copt.⁵ ΕΚΩΤ means both 'builder' and 'potter'; see too below, Nos. 185, 186. [185]    G, ikd knw 'potter of knw-measures', Wb. II, 493, 5, where no

other instance is given and the meaning 'potter' is suggested. [186]    G, ikd inbw 'builder of walls', Wb. V, 74, 4; named also Sall. II, 6, 1. [187]    R, s3kw(ty) 'patcher (?)' of stonework, the stem s3k meaning 'join together', 'compress' or the like (see on No. 147); elsewhere (Harris 29, 11; P. Leyd. 370, vs. 15 = Černý, L. Ram. Letters, p. 11) with the ending -ty, whence Wb. IV, 26, 12-13. distinguishes two words.

☒ Here there is an abrupt transition to occupations of different types. [188]    G;   R, md3yw 'Medjay', earlier written md3w 'Medjau', here and in N. K. usually in the sense of 'police' or 'troops' serving mainly in the desert; the name is derived from the Nubian land of  md3 'Medja', but later the rank and file, as well as the commanders, seem to have been as a rule of Egyptian birth; the Zouaves and Suisses of France have often been compared. Wb. II, 186, 1 ff., giving many examples, deals with the words solely from a lexicographical point of view; W. Max Müller, Egyptological Researches, II, 72 ff., has a large collection of evidence, but his discussion is unsatisfying; here the aim is less completeness than a review of current opinion and an attempt to cope with the essentials of the problem.

In O. K. Medja is one of several evidently contiguous Nubian districts, of which ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲱⲩⲓⲧ 'Wawat', ⲉⲓⲙⲓ 'Iam' and ⲉⲓⲧⲓⲉⲧ 'Irtjet' are those most commonly named. The natives of all these are described as ⲛⲁⲓⲱⲩⲓⲧ 'Nehoyu', a general term for men of Nubian, but not of negro, race, see Junker in JEAVII, 121 ff.; in the campaign of Phio I against the Beduins of Sinai, the army commanded by Weni had contingents from the above-named districts or tribes (Urk. I, 101). Among the officials addressed in a decree of the same reign (Urk. I, 209, 16) is the chief interpreter of Medja, Iam and Irtjet, showing that they were at least to some extent subject to Egyptian jurisdiction. In the following reign, that of Merenrē, the chieftains of Medja, Irtjet and Wawat visited the neighbourhood of Aswān to pay homage to the King in person (Urk. I, 110-1); this event may well have coincided with their assistance to Weni (also the chieftain of Iam here played a part) in dragging down acacia wood for vessels to be used in transporting the granite for King Merenrē's pyramid (Urk. I, 109). If, as Weigall (Antiquities of Lower Nubia, pp. 5 ff.) not unreasonably assumed, this timber was felled within the provinces ruled by these chieftains, those provinces can have lain at no great distance from Egypt, and the impression obtained is that all were comprised within the 350 km. stretch of river between the First and Second Cataracts. Some details confirming this view are ascertainable. Wawat is known to have extended northward as far as the fortress of Senmet (Biggah, below, No. 314), see Shipwrecked Sailor, 8-10; a graffito at Korosko (ZÄS XX, 30) records an expedition by Ammenemes I 'to overthrow Wawat', which at that time, accordingly, may probably have reached as far southwards; in the New Kingdom

it apparently included the whole of Lower Nubia (Reisner in JEAVI, 84). A rock-inscription of Phio I (Weigall, op. cit. Pls. 56. 58 with p. 108, see also Urk. I, 208) at Tomās, some 30 km. upstream from Korosko, commemorates an official who had been sent thither to 'open up' (wb3) Irtjet, whence Tomās may be concluded to have lain within the district so named. However, the chieftain of Irtjet was also chieftain of Setju, and Setju is indicated as downstream from Irtjet (Urk. I, 125-7), so that possibly in Dyn. VI Wawat did not yet extend as far upstream as Korosko. The prince of Elephantine Harkhuf was sent in the reign of Merenrē to 'open up' the land of Iam (Urk. I, 124 ff.), which evidently lay farther away from Egypt than Setju and Irtjet also mentioned by him; as he does not speak of Medja, this presumably lay yet further afield. Evidence bearing on the exact position of Medja at this early period is wanting, but it seems unlikely that it lay S. of the Second Cataract, though Weigall (p. 9) is certainly wrong in locating it as far north as Derr, which is near Tomās and must consequently have been included in Irtjet. For the M. K. the name of the fortress Hsf-Md3w 'Repelling the Medjay' (On. Ram. No. 180) affords important testimony, since it would be meaningless had not the Medjay at that time been actual or potential aggressors; the list of fortresses places this one between Wādī Halfa and Anībah, and as its site both Sarret el-Gharb and Faras have been proposed. However, at the period to which our Md of On. Ram. belongs, namely Dyn. XIII, the Medjay-people were certainly mostly beyond the Second Cataract, since the Ramesseum papyrus which will be given the name of 'the Semnah Despatches' (edition by

embrace the whole of Nubia then accessible, but there is no reason to suppose that here Medja and Wawat did not refer to, or at least contain, the two provinces originally signified by those names.

That in the Middle Kingdom and even a little later the tribal name Md3w, Md3yw 'Medjau', 'Medjay' had come to mean 'Nubians' in a broad sense is indicated by its being singled out to designate any people from Nubia and beyond. Thus in Admonitions, 14,14 we find the sentence 'the Medjay are pleasant with Egypt', i.e. perhaps are on good terms with that land, which itself was rent by civil war; it is true that here there is also an obscure reference to Neh-syw (cf. the damaged but probable occurrence of the same word in the above-quoted He-nub graffito); the relations between the terms Nehsyu and Medjay are quite obscure. Half a millenium later King Kamose utilized a troop of Medjay in his attack upon the Hyksos (JEA III, 104), but we have no means of knowing whether these auxiliary troops were still pure Nubians racially.




If the word Medjay had thus become a term for Nubians pushed southward beyond the limits of their original home, it is not unnatural that later interpretation should have assigned a corresponding meaning to the name of the land Medja. I venture the theory that allusions to the land Medja from the Middle Kingdom onwards are either pure antiquarianism, as in the lists of Iuthmosis III, (Urk. IV, 199, 78), Sethos I and later (Gauthier, DG III, 65f) or else use the word in a vague and undefined, often perhaps merely literary, way for the Sudan in the widest sense. An aromatic herb or wood named ḥsyt of Medja' (P. Kahun, 20, 61; bbers 33, 21) seems the only serious obstacle to this theory, but


Max Müller points out that the same commodity was a product of Pwēnet (Deir el Bahari, III, 74), a land (usually called Punt) with which from Dyn. XVIII onwards we find Medja coupled. Thus Amūn is called '[lord] of Medja-land and ruler of Pwēnet' at Dēr el-Bahri (Urk. IV, 318) and also in the Cairo hymn to Amūn (Urb. II, 186, 2 for this and similar references). No geographical significance can be attached to the description of Merenptah as the 'bull victorious against Aush so as to slay ḥsyt the Medjay land' (Gauthier, Amada, p. 118). Of a less rhetorical nature is the inscription placed by the viceroy of Nubia in the reign of Iuthmosis II on a doorpost of the temple of Kummah (S. end of Second Cataract) informing us that he was permitted to commemorate himself there ḥsyt 'after he had inspected Medjau in its entirety' (Leps., Denkm. III, 58 = Urk. IV, 142).





This last inscription fits in well enough with Breasted's definition of Medja as 'in the upper half of the huge "S" formed by the course of the Nile between the junction of the two Niles and the Cataract' (History, 137); similarly Gauthier, DG III, 65). If I disagree with this opinion, which at all events is far superior to Max Müller's fantastic notion that Medja has to be sought to the east of the Blue Nile in its lower part, it is because it ignores the distinction between the district originally called Medja and the later widely dispersed and ill defined habitats of the Medjay. It would seem as though, strictly speaking, there existed no such land as Medja after the beginning of the Middle Kingdom; at all events we hear more and more about the people called Medjay and less and less about the land of Medja. Recent German opinion has been unduly influenced by


Schäfer's identification of the word with the modern racial name Beja (*Äthiopische Königsinschrift*, 136), an identification accepted by (e.g.) E. Meyer, *Geschichte*³, § 165 a; Sethe, *op. cit.* 36 f.; Kees, *Kulturgeschichte*, 237. Even those who, like Max Müller, emphatically reject the equation appear influenced by its consequences; for Müller's view see above; Von Bissing, who takes the same line (*Rec. trav.* XXXIV, 127), objected to the etymology less on philological grounds than because he holds that the Egyptian Medjay could not possibly have been identical with such miserable nomads as the Beja. In other words Von Bissing had in mind the Bisharin and 'Ababda who dwell in the desert between Upper Egypt, together with Lower Nubia, and the Red Sea. Sethe (*loc. cit.*) was evidently of the same mind when he spoke of the Medjay as ruling the Nubian desert between Nile and Red Sea 'possibly northwards as far as the region of Coptus'—here he compared *Urk.* IV, 931, taking, as we shall see, a wrong view of the Medjay in Tuthmoside and Ramesside times. The views expressed by Breasted and Gauthier are preferable to those above mentioned mainly because they regard the Medjay as southerners (Nubians) rather than as nomads of the Eastern Desert. Apart from this, Von Bissing's objection might be answered by quoting the Beja tribe of the Hadendowa now living on the borders of Britrea, who have on occasion proved themselves stalwart warriors. For an admirably written account of the Beja people and their history see the chapter by D. Newbold in A. J. de C. Hamilton, *The Anglo-Egyptian Sudan from within*, London, 1935; also

G. W. Murray, *Sons of Ishmael*, London, 1935.






Schäfer's etymology might still be true if it were supposed that descendants of the Medjay were gradually pushed back from the Batn el-Hagar southwards and eastwards towards the Red Sea. The trouble is that its truth and its falsity are equally unprovable. An earlier view was that the name Beja was a Bisharin mispronunciation of the Arabic Bedāwi, but this hardly squares with the occurrence of Bejá in an inscription from Adulis (S. of Massawa) and of the Βουχαῖται in another from Axum (Dittenberger, Nos. 199. 200), both inscriptions dating from some centuries before the Hegira. Here we are a long distance from Nubia and the Greek γ makes a connexion with Egyptian md³ very difficult, to say the least. Schäfer's hypothesis was advanced in connexion with a supposed mention of the Medjay in the inscription of the Ethiopian king Nastesen. The name is there written  Mdy and is doubtless identical with  Mdd in the earlier inscription of Harsiotef (*Urk.* III, 126-7). But it is very doubtful whether these two names of tribes or places have really anything to do with the Medjay. Sethe, who following in the footsteps of Griffith conclusively proved that Copt. ^{SB} ΜΑΤΟΙ was derived, not from Medjay as previously supposed, but from Μῆδοι 'Medes', the name given alike by Semites and by early Greeks to the Persians (*Nachr. Göttingen*, 1916, 124 ff.), conjectured that  on the stela of Nastesen likewise referred to the Persians. This possibility will have to be reconsidered when the chronology of the kings of the Napatan dynasty has become better established (provisionally see Reisner in

JE A IX, 75). Apart from these problematic examples, it is very doubtful whether there is any instance of Md3y in the true geographic sense of 'Nubians' after Dyn. XVIII. Thenceforward the term meant 'police' or the like, with the minimum of implication as an ethnic. A reference to  Md3y in the legend of Horus at Edfu certainly alludes to the Persians, see Kees in *Nachr. Göttingen*, 1930, 345 ff. I have been unable to check Max Müller's statement concerning a Masûya said to be found in Persian inscriptions (*Asien u. Europa*, 116); if the name does so occur, its connexion with the Medjay would still have to be proved.



It has been seen that both the O. K. inscriptions and the Carnarvon tablet relating to the exploits of King Kamosê testify to the use of Medjay-Nubians as auxiliaries in the Egyptian army. This employment must in the times preceding Dyn. XVIII have been much more general than our sources disclose, since before the end of that period the word Md3y had become very familiar in the occupational sense of 'policeman', 'desert-ranger'. Perhaps the first trace of this is in the reign of Sesostris III, when a  appears on the staff of the temple of El-Lâhûn, ZÄS XL, 114. The determinatives  or  are occasionally found later and bear eloquent witness to this semantic development. Another early example is on a very crude stela in the Musée Guimet (C14, see Moret, Pl. 13), where the title  is given to two men bearing the Egyptian names Res and Ptahwêr; to judge not only from the style but also from a criterion that is not quite conclusive (JE A XXV, 34 f.) this stela might belong to Dyn. XIII; one of the two men is indeed coloured, but according to Moret's text

the colour is red and he does not suggest that a Nubian was intended. Nor indeed have I found, for the times following Dyn. XVII, a particle of evidence except the name Md3y itself and the title wr n Md3y 'chief of Medjay' that the police or troops so named comprised men of Nubian stock; on the other hand, many facts can be quoted tending to suggest that individual officers or men described as Medjay were real Egyptians. At El-Amârnâh a whole regiment of Medjay are depicted in the tomb of their 'captain' () Maku, see Davies, *El Amarna*, IV, Pls 17 ff; Maku is an Egyptian name, and there is nothing in the appearance of his men to indicate foreign blood. At El-Kâb (Paheri, Pl. 7, top row) a Medjay was son of the sister of the mother of the tomb-owner's mother. There is no reason to think that the Nebamûn of Tomb 90 at Thebes, who started life as a marine, subsequently became a standard-bearer, and ended up as a 'captain of Medjay on the West of Thebes' (Davies, *Tombs of Two Officials*, Pl. 17) was other than an Egyptian; the bowmen depicted in this tomb (Pl. 27) again differ in no way from ordinary Egyptians. A Medjay on a Turin stela mentioned *Rec. trav.* IV, 141 appears among a number of Egyptian men and women and the sculptor has apparently distinguished him from them only by his military costume. The names of simple Medjay throughout the whole of the New Kingdom are as characteristically Egyptian as those of their officers, see particularly the list of Medjay with their mothers Pleyte & Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 93; other names P. Mallet, 2, 1-2; P. Brit. Mus. 10054, vs. 2, 18 (= Peet, *Tomb-Robberies*, Pl. 7); 4, 6 (= *op. cit.* Pl. 8); 10068, rt. 5, 3 (= *op. cit.* Pl. 11); vs. 2, 11-2 (= *op. cit.* Pl. 14).





Here I have referred only to simple Medjay, of whom we naturally learn less than we do of their officers.


That the latter were Egyptians is frequently certain. The Mayor of the West of Thebes Pwero who figures so prominently in the tomb-robberies of the reign of Ramesses IX is often called a  'captain of Medjay', usually with the addition  'of the Necropolis', see P. Abbott, 1, 7.9; 4, 5.9; P. Léopold II, 1, 4; Botti & Peet, *Giornale*, Pl. 14, 3; in this connexion it should be noted that Pleyte & Rossi, *op. cit.* 42, 8 speaks of 'the two captains of Medjay' as though the Necropolis possessed only that number (perhaps cf. also Daressy, *Ostraca*, 25302), but it is difficult to reconcile this with the above-mentioned list of Medjay, which once contained 24 names in all, among them those of 6 'captains' (). The title 'captain of Medjay' is common - I reserve the rendering 'chief' often employed with  for the  wr of whom more will be said presently. At Thebes the Medjay were so little nomadic in Dyn. XX that not only captains of the corps, but also some of their subordinates, possessed houses on the West bank (P. Brit. Mus. 10068, vs. 2, 11-2; 3, 20; 4, 9; 5, 2. 16; 6, 29; 7, 7. 27 = Peet, *op. cit.* Pls. 14-6; and a house at Thebes was also owned far earlier by Nebamün of Tomb 90 (see above), as probably also by one Didi whose cones (Daressy, No. 4) show him to have enjoyed a very similar career. Of the activities of the Medjay at Thebes it is clear from P. Abbott, 1, 20; 4, 5-6, etc., that they protected the Necropolis and the royal tombs; the statement Israel Stela 23 that 'the Medjay pass the night asleep' (now that the Libyans are defeated) speaks eloquently for their role as frontier guards. When one of the Medjay was sent to the Delta with a letter (Botti & Peet, *op. cit.* Pl. 53, 15. 21)



this may have been a merely exceptional commission; but as evidence how unmilitary an occupation that of a 'captain of Medjay' might occasionally be is shown by one who, under Akhenaten, served on a bench of magistrates in a case relating to the payment of a debt (ZÄS XLIII, 39, l. 18).

This legal action was heard at Kôm Medînet Ghurât near the entrance to the Fayyûm, and our texts show clearly that the Medjay were as often employed in the north of Egypt as in the south, as often to the west of the Nile as to the east. If we find a garrison of Medjay at the fortress of Biggah (Pleyte & Rossi, *op. cit.* 57, 3), so too we find others stationed in the Wâdy et-Jumîlât (Anast. V, 18, 6 ff., cf. also 25, 2 ff.); if we read of 50 Medjay headed by one  'deputy of the chief' taking part in the huge expedition of Ramesses IV to the Wâdy Hammâmât (Couryat & Montet, Pl. 4, l. 16), or of a 'captain of Medjay of Coptus' in the reign of Tuthmosis III prostrating himself before the high-priest of Amün in company with the 'overseer of the gold-countries of Coptus' and an 'overseer of hunters' (now) on an occasion when gold and other products are being brought from the Eastern desert (Davies, *Tomb of Menkheperuasont*, Pl. 9), we have to set against these the already discussed prominence of the Medjay in the Theban Necropolis; also Anast. IV, 2, 6 = Koller, 2, 4-5 compares the restless pupil with a  'hunter of the desert, a Medjay of the West.' It is evident from this testimony that the Medjay of the New Kingdom had little if any connexion any longer with Nubia, and the last quotation, speaking of the West instead of the East, could hardly






but be disconcerting to those who, like Sethe (*Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten*, pp. 36 f.), even in the New Kingdom associate the Medjay with the Beja and the Eastern desert. On the other hand, the parallelism already twice noted with the word nrw 'hunters' (so too *Urk.* IV, 994 and here in On. Am.) suggests that they were quite specially concerned with desert-life, and we shall hardly go astray in supposing that pursuit of the wild game found in the desert was a common habit among them; cf. also the Medjay in parallelism with whcw 'bird-catchers' as well as 'fishermen' (see Nos. 208-9 below) in P. Leyd. 370, rt. 12-3 = Černý, *Late Ramesseid Letters*, p. 10. In Graeco-Roman times md3(y) is applied to Min of Coptus, to Arenonuphis, and to the King as an occupational epithet 'goodly desert-ranger' or the like, always in connexion with the Eastern desert, see *Wb.* II, 186, 6-8; this use was doubtless influenced by the later coupling of the land of Medja with the name of Pwēnet (Punt), see above, p. 79*.




The title  wr n Md3y 'chief of Medjay' is of fairly frequent occurrence in the New Kingdom, and conveys an obvious reminiscence of the times when the Medjay were still a genuine Nubian tribe. The old word for 'chieftain' in this connexion was  hk3, but we found  wr substituted for hk3 in P. Boulaq XVIII. That the 'chief of Medjay' was a man of higher rank than the 'captain' ( hry) seems certain not only from the greater frequency of the latter title, but also from the fact that whereas Pwero (see above) was the most highly placed 'captain' of whom we have record, the title 'chief of Medjay' in one case at all events is accorded to a viceroy of Nubia;









 Juny, the viceroy in question, lived under Sethos I and Ramesses II and is expressly said to have been a native of Ninsu (Heracleopolis Magna), see Gauthier in *Rec. trav.* XXXIX, 205 ff. Another bearer of the title was the extremely well connected Amenemōne of the family monument at Naples (Brugsch, *Thes.* 951 ff.); he was a son of the high-priest of Amūn Wennofer and lived under Ramesses II; he is doubtless the same as is mentioned P. Leyd. 348, vs. 6, γ = L-ḫg. *Misc.* 134. A third named Penrēr was also architect at the Ramesseum (*Rec. trav.* XXII, 143; Daressy, *Cônes*, No. 228); it seems almost certain that this was the native of Coptus who caused to be erected the stela Petrie, *Koptos*, Pl. 19 and who also bore the titles 'overseer of foreign lands over the northern land' and 'first charioteer of His Majesty'. The title was borne under Tuthmosis III by Neferkhat (*Urk.* IV, 990) and later by his son Menkheperresont (op. cit. 991 ff.); Tomb 91 at Thebes belonged to another of these 'chiefs' who lived under Tuthmosis IV, but whose name is lost; others of whom monuments survive are Kuru, see Dyroff & Pörtner, *München*, Pl. 10, No. 15; Daressy, *Cônes*, No. 106; Neby, who was mayor of Selē, but had apparently been previously commandant of a fortress in Nubia (J3 n W3wst), Leyden V43 = Boeser, *Beschreibung*, VI, Pl. 13, No. 22 (probably Dyn. XIX); one Hury who was steward of the Ramesseum under Ramesses II, Lepo, *Denkm.* III, 175, b; Mahury under Ramesses V, P. Wilbour, A, 46, 40. It is not impossible that there was only one bearer of the title at any given moment; P. Brit. Mus. 10054, vs. 2, 18 (Peet, op. cit. Pl. 7) describes the Medjay Nesamūn as son of 'the chief of Medjay' without name, a usage



found only with the very highest officials. On the other hand, Anast. V, 25, 2-3 localizes a certain Anhermakhte as 'chief of Medjay of the District of Prē', a restriction of sphere of action which appears to point to there having been more than one such 'chief'; moreover, a reproof is addressed to this man by the lieutenant-commander of Ijeku, which is unlikely if Anhermakhte had been of the very highest rank; he is told roundly that he is a man of the people who has been raised to a position of control over the Medjay; this at all events confirms the fact that he was an Egyptian. At Hammāmāt under Ramesses IV we met with a 'deputy' (idnw) of the chief of Medjay. Elsewhere we find a  'deputy of Medjay' who was obviously deputy of a 'captain' () who is depicted beside him (Davies, Tombs of Two Officials, Pl. 27). In a third case (Dareddy, Cônes, No. 245) it is not clear whether the idnw n Mdꜣy was a deputy of the 'chief' or of a 'captain'.


Little is heard of the Medjay after Dyn. XX. For the possible occurrence of the title hry Mdꜣy in early demotic see Griffith, Rylands Papyri, Text, pp. 87. 233. 420, and for late hieroglyphic occurrences of a similar title see Max Müller, *op. cit.* pp. 78 f. To sum up the results of this long discussion, three periods in the history of the term mdꜣw, mdꜣy may be roughly distinguished: (1) the O. K., when it referred to a small district possibly just N. of the Second Cataract; (2) the M. K. to Dyn. XVII, when the Medjay were still Nubians, but the name had been generalized to embrace people living probably far beyond the Second Cataract; (3) Dyn. XVIII onwards, when the word is an occupational title meaning












'policemen' or 'desert-rangers', and had possibly lost all actual connexion with Nubia and Nubians. [189] 
 R, nw 'hunter'; Wb. II, 218, 19 ff. Examples quoted under No. 188 show how closely associated the Medjay were with the hunters called nw; a third title found in parallelism, but yet distinct, is the  'overseer of the deserts', presumably the ἐρημοφύλακες of Ptolemaic times, see Kees, Kulturgeschichte, 229. The meaning of the word nw is guaranteed by the determinative of a man leading a dog Urk. I, 2, 4; cf. also  Couyat & Montet, Hammāmāt, No. 126, a title that recalls the Greek ἀρχικυνηγός; cf. too the fine stela in Berlin with many dogs (Dyn. XI), ZÄS LXV, 108 ff. Such an 'overseer of hunters' is shown armed with a bow and carrying ostrich feathers; his followers bring an ostrich, desert hares, an ibex and ostrich eggs, Davies, Tomb of Menkheperasonb, Pl. 9. Since the tomb-owner here was high-priest of Amūn, the overseer here described was doubtless an 'overseer of the hunters of Amūn', a title found also Brit. Mus. 107. 142; Gardiner & Weigall, Top. Cat. No. 149; P. Léopold II, 3, 12. Atum of Heliopolis also had hunters of his own, Harris, 28, 4. The men so employed played an important economic part, and were evidently organized accordingly. Since a nomarch of Dyn. XII had his 'overseer of hunters' (Newberry, Beni Hasan, I, Pl. 30), doubtless at times the King also possessed a service of the kind; but of this we hear nothing. Further examples: Mar., Abydos, I, 49, 2; P. Ch. Beatty I, vs. G, 2, 2. [190] 
 R, hrꜣwty 'diver'; the meaning seems obvious, cf. hrꜣ in Horus &










is wrong (read wcr^{tiw}) and the second rather doubtful; P. Bologna 1086, 14 has  'captain of heralds of the army of the soldiery of Pharaoh', suggesting that each regiment had its own 'herald'; the title does not, however, appear in the list of officers Lansing 9, 5-6. In Urk. IV, 3, 14 a deed of bravery is reported to the  'King's herald'; Ahmosē Pennekheb has the strange title  'herald who makes captures' Urk. IV, 35, 13 (Breasted, however, rendered 'repeating captures'); other 'King's heralds', 'first King's heralds' or 'heralds of Pharaoh' (Breasted, Ancient Records, Index, p. 57) were not solely military officers, but some of them do speak of their prowess on the battlefield, see Helck, Militärführer, 40, n. 5. For the civil functions of the 'first King's herald' see above on No. 80.


[198]     sk(i), an officer of sorts, Wb. IV, 319, 16 (skt is read from a variant of which the source is unknown to me); references, ZÄS LXV, 94; P. Willbour, A 80, 30; 96, 17; the deto. in R suggest kinship with the verb sq (sq³) Anast. I, 23, 2, there used as in Lansing of a military action performed 'in front of the army', but the interchange of k and q is not usual so early. [199]     R, mškb 'transport officer (?)', Wb. II, 158, 7-10, but not all the evidence suits this meaning, see Edgerton & Wilson, Historical Records, p. 8, n. 16a; the form of the word strongly suggests Semitic origin, but Alt's identification with an Old Aramaic word for a particular caste or class of the population (ZÄS LXXV, 16) seems very improbable. [200]



 G,  R, scš3 'policeman', 'guard', Wb. IV, 55, 14. The word is

Textual Notes. 198^{a-b} Immediately precedes No. 200. 199^a follows a red paragraph-mark  and apparently preceded No. 198.



derived from a verb meaning 'repress'— the literal meaning 'make many' may have come to signify 'scatter', 'disperse'. Harris 28, 6 is instructive: 'I made companies of police (scš3) for thy bank(s) in order to police (scš3) the bank of the Atiy-canal in thy consecrated (dsr) place'; ibid. 8 shows that among other things they protected the crops, see below, No. 204. In the temple of Ramesses II at Abydos a man flourishing a stick is described as  scš3, Naville, Détails relevés temples égyptiens, Pl. 27; a 'captain () of scš3', P. jud. Turin, 6, 5; 'scš3 of His Majesty', Spiegelberg & Portner, Aeg. Grabsteine, I, No. 22; a simple scš3, op. cit. II, No. 26; a  'scš3 of the ergastulum' on a shawabti-figure at Uriage, Devéria, Mémoires, II, 248; on a box for such figures in the same collection (Rev. ég., new series, I, 184) is mentioned a 'scš3 of the offerings (hṯp-nṯr) of Amūn'. Thus the police called by this title seem to have exercised in the towns, temples and fields much the same functions as the Medjay (above, No. 188) did in the desert and in the necropolises. [201]    R, ḥ3w 'bearer of weapons', Wb. III, 243, 13, examples Urk. IV, 994, 15; Vienna I, 33 = Wreszinski, Aeg. Inschr. p. 130 [202]   G;  R, sw (?), meaning unknown, perhaps not in Wb.; written as in R, P. Leyd. 350, vs. 3, 34; 4, 10; Inscription of Mes N 17 = Sethe, Unters. IV, 106; a 'first mškb of His Majesty' (see No. 199 above) was also   'of the lord of the Two Lands', Thebes, Tomb 6.



[203]    G;   R, mri 'groom', Wb. II, 110, 5. [204]     G, sswry 3ḥ (t?) 'guardian of crops' (3ḥw see Wb. I, 18, 8.9), very probably the γεννηματοφύλαξ of



Textual Notes. 201^a amend . 202^{a-b} R gives the better spelling.



Ptolemaic times, see *Archiv. f. Papyrusforschung*, III, 204, though for this Nauri decree, 39 has a rival candidate in  *hw* 3 *ht* 'protectors of fields', and *sc* 3, above, No. 200, is another. For *swty* see on No. 194.  The next three entries deal with boatmen, after





which Nos. 208-9 refer to callings in which a boat would naturally be used; these two last are somewhat purposelessly rubricized.

[205]  *G*;  *R*, *nfw* 'sailor', Copt. ^sNEEQ, ^bNEQ, *Wb.* II, 251, 1 ff.; though the term may mean the captain of a small sailing-vessel, it is also the word for the ordinary sailor as in Coptic; in P. Leyd. 350, vs. 5, 14 a single boat has five of them, and 5, 18 perhaps mentions two more.


[206]  *G*;  *R*, *iry hst* 'pilot', lit. 'he who is in front', *Wb.* I, 104, 8. To this correspond Copt. ^sNEEQ NQH, *gk.* πρῶτος.




[207]  *G*, *irw hmy* 'steersman', correspond- ing to Copt. ^speqꝛꝛmme; *Wb.* III, 81, 15 mentions only *irt hmy* 'to act as steersman' and besides *hmy* contained therein there is another alternative  *iry hmyt* 'he who is at the helm', *Wb.* I, 104, 10; III, 81, 12. Examples are quoted *Vogelsang, Kommentar zu den Klagen des Bauern*, 117. 135.



[208]  *G*;  *R*, *whc 3pdw* 'bird-catcher', *Wb.* I, 350, 6.

[209]  *G*;  *R*, *whc rmw* 'fisherman', *Wb.* I, 350, 5; Late Egyptian usually contents itself with *whc* alone, so too Copt. ^sOYΩZE, ^bOYOZI. [210]  *G*;  *R*, *swty* 'trader', 'merchant', *Wb.* IV, 434, 5, Copt.




^sEΩWT, perhaps a later form modelled on EKWT; to the ex- amples quoted *Spiegelberg, Rechnungen*, 61 add (e.g.) *Lansing*, 4, 8; *JEA* XXI, Pl. 13, 4; *Nauri decree*, 40; *Wenamün*, 2, 28. This and




Textual Notes. 205^a  in Pl. XX is a mistake. 209^{a-b} In black for some unexplained reason.




the next two words are possibly plurals. [211]  *mhr* 'buyer(?)', doubtless a word borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. מְכַר 'price', Assy. *mahirānu* 'buyer'; *Wb.* II, 132, 10 knows only this example, which it takes as the complement of *swty*, No. 210; but *G* is very careless about its determinatives. [212]  *G*;  *R*, *mkri* 'seller', borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebr. מְכַר 'sell'; according to *Wb.* II, 163, 3 only here.



 Nos. 213-9 are all concerned with music and dancing. [213]  *G*, *hsy(t?)* 'female(?) singer', *Wb.*




III, 165, 13, cf. Copt. ^sΩWC 'sing'; the division of this word between two lines and comparison of Nos. 214-5 make it probable that the archetype had *hsw hsy(t)* 'male and female singer'. [214, 215]


 *G*, *smc smcy(t)* 'male and female musician', *Wb.* IV, 478, 12; 479, 8; here taken together because the det.  serves for both. For the word see especially Dévaud in *Sphinx*, X III, 103 ff., where it is held that the primary meaning was 'clap the hands' rhythmically. [216]  *G*, *wy(?)*, reading and meaning unknown, not in *Wb.*




[217]  *G*, *Imhw* 'Libyan dancers', not in *Wb.*; see Hölscher, *Libyer und Ägypter*, 30-2, where grounds are given for believing that these dancers were not real Libyans (for *Imhw* 'Libyans' see below, No. 238), but Egyptians decked out as such. [218]  *G*,  *R*, *kms*, dancers of some kind, probably only here, *Wb.* V, 131, 3.

[219]  *G*;  *R*, *dkk (or dpg)*, dancers of some sort, probably only here, *Wb.* V, 568, 11. [219A] Not in *G*;  *R*, *kksk* 'dancer(s)', from an Egyptian verb *kksk*, Copt. ^sOCOC, ^bOCXEC, *Wb.* V, 142, 4.



Textual Notes. 211^a  perhaps borrowed from *hr* 'tomb'; emend ? 217^a See below on No. 238. 218^{a-b} Perhaps wrongly borrowed from No. 203.




Examples of the verb, Anast. III, 4, 1 = V, 8, 7; P. Leyd. 350, rt. 2, 8 = ZÄS XLII, 19. As noun only a single example is known, *kskst*, fem., Louvre C 17, with the picture of a girl dancing, Bull. inst. fr. XXX, Pl. 2 to the article by Boreux. [220]  G, *šmwr* 'leader', Wb. IV, 288, 1. If the reading is correct, this entry is contrasted with the next; but since all the neighbouring words refer to persons in humble stations, I strongly suspect that  *šmsw* 'follower', 'henchman' (Wb. IV, 485, 6) was meant, the more so since at this period  is a not uncommon miswriting of *m šmsw* 'in the suite of', e.g. Harris, 28, 2; cf. 3, 4.









[221]  G, *sdmy(w)* 'servants', lit. 'hearers', Wb. IV, 389, 16, here clearly not in the common specialized sense of 'judges', Wb. IV, 388, 13.




[222]  G, *k3(w)ty*....(?) 'porter of....(?)'; unless this entry is a mere repetition of No. 132, the last signs refer to some particular class of object (e.g.  *šnr* 'stone'??) as in No. 223. [223]  G, *k3(w)ty hbs* 'clothes-porter', see on No. 132; perhaps only here in this combination.




























☒ Nos. 224-9, concluding the enumeration of human employments, deal exclusively with agricultural callings. A few more military terms occur near the beginning of the next section (Nos. 234-7) and two nautical occupations near the end of it (Nos. 308-9), the latter very much out of place.

[224]  G, *k3my* 'vineyard-keeper', Copt.^{5b} *OME* mostly with the same sense, Wb. V, 106, 10. See on No. 225; for the originating word *k3mw*, earlier *k3nw*, see on No. 458. [225]  G, *k3r(w)y* 'gardener'; despite the outlandish spelling, possibly influenced by a common writing of *k3wty* (see No. 132), there can be no

Textual Notes. 221^a Elsewhere in Late Egyptian normally written with . 222^a Certainly not ; since  would have been used.

doubt that  *k3ry* 'gardener', Wb. V, 108, 13 is meant. Nauri decree, 39 names *k3myw* and *k3ryw* side by side, showing that they were distinct. This is confirmed e.g. by the countless wine-jar inscriptions, which always show (*hry*) *k3myw*, never *k3ryw*. *K3my* is not quite exclusively a vineyard-keeper, however, since Harris 27, 10 shows that tenders of olive-trees were also so called. *K3ry* is a term common in Upper Egypt, applied to growers of vegetables (e.g. Horus & Seth, 11, 9; Pleyte & Rossi, Pap. Turin, 37, 12-8) and of flowers (Sall. II, 6, 5-7). It seems possible that *k3my* and *k3ry* are dialectical differentiations of the older word *k3ny*, likewise rendered 'gärtner' in Wb. V, 107, 8, in which case *k3my* would be the Lower Egyptian, and *k3ry* the Upper Egyptian, form. [226]  G;  R, *ihwty* (*chwty*) 'tenant farmers' and also 'agricultural labourers', Wb. I, 214, 7; JEA XXVII, 21-2. [227]  G, *w3dty* 'vegetable-dealer(?)', a derivative of *w3dt* 'vegetables', lit. 'greens', No. 482 below; only here according to Wb. I, 267, 1, which renders 'Gemüsegärtner'; for this, however, the usual word is *k3ry* (No. 225 above), so that possibly a vendor of vegetables was meant, like Copt.⁵ *CANOYOTE*. [228]  G, *m(i)nw* 'herdsman', repeated from No. 152 above, here perhaps in order to mediate No. 229; Wb. III, 270, 11 read wrongly *hps* from a transcription made before the papyrus was re-mounted and legible; a word *hpsy* does, however, exist, see P. Wilbour, Commentary. [229]  G, *iry s3* 'keeper of cattle-pens'. Wb. IV, 13, 6-7 knows the second element, written , only from Graeco-Roman sources, cf., however,  P. Brit. Mus. 10274, vs. 12 = Proc. SBA XIV, [Pl. VI] in a

Textual Note. 226^a Given as  in Pl. XX;  is a faulty transcription of  often used in hieroglyphic by the Egyptians themselves, e.g. Petrie, Tarkhan I, 80, 19 (Dyn. XVIII); Med. Habu (ed. Chicago), 140, 60.


M. K. text; also perhaps                           


IV. CLASSES, TRIBES AND TYPES OF HUMAN BEING.

This section is in the main a list of foreign peoples, but is ushered in and closed by terms of greater generality. Some specific names of military and nautical occupations at the beginning and end (Nos. 234-7, 308-9) strike a discordant note, particularly those at the end.


[230]                              


as their meanings differed in origin and as the differences continued to be remembered. The sole detailed attempt to investigate the problem appears to have been that of J. Pirenne in *Ann. inst. phil. hist. orient.* (*Mélanges Bidez*), Brussels, 1934, 689 ff.; this has rendered service in spite of faulty references, mistranslations and deductions far exceeding what is warranted by the facts.











In early times the four terms are never found in contrast with one another, and it is not until the early M.K. that pct and rhyt are so found; they are the only two to be thus contrasted, and they always occur in that order. Consequently it is necessary to discuss the four terms separately. The word  rmt, the most general of them, is the commonest word for 'man', and though in the New Kingdom it was occasionally used for 'Egyptians' as opposed to Asiatics (*ꜥmw*), Nubians (*Nḥsyw*) and Libyans (*ꜥmhw*), see *Wb.* II, 423, 4 together with the famous pictures in the tomb of Sethos I (bibliography, Porter & Moss, I, 23), this employment is secondary, and the word needs no further consideration here. Of the other three, rhyt is that concerning which we have the most information, and may, therefore, be fitly studied first.

The word  rhyt is regularly written with a sign for a crested bird which has been recognized as the lapwing (*Vanellus cristatus*, see Davies, *Ptahhetep*, I, Pl. 18, No. 410); rhyt must be presumed to be the name of the bird, whence its use as a symbol for the homonymously named people; how the latter came by their name, or what ^{are} its etymological connexions, is altogether obscure. The earliest reference to them is probably on the fragment of a slate palette in Cairo, where the picture of a lapwing, preceded by











a quadrangular sign, is seen above the deck of a ship: Cairo 14238 bis, see Quibell, *Archaic Objects*, p. 233, where the drawing differs considerably from that in Steindorff's article *Festschrift f. G. Ebers*, 124. More enlightening are the scenes on the great mace-head of the King 'Scorpion' (now in Oxford, Quibell, *Hierakonpolis*, I, Pl. 25.26c): here lap-



wings are shown suspended by the neck from a series of military ensigns (like the later nome-signs) evidently symbolizing a conquered people; as pendant to these representations there is, facing in the opposite direction, another series of similar ensigns from each of which is suspended in like fashion a bow of the shape . The latter clearly allude to the Nine Bows under which the early dynastic Egyptians symbolized all subjugated peoples, see Max Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, ch. 2; Roeder in *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, s.v. *Neunbogen-völker*; Sethe in *ZÄS* LVI, 47 ff. The same antithesis of Lapwing-people (henceforward sometimes called *Rekhēyet*) and Bow-peoples is found on the statue of Djoser (Dyn. III) described and discussed by Gunn (Ann. Serv. XXVI, 177 ff. Here, as often later, the King has his feet firmly planted on the Nine Bows, but in front of these, represented in a way suggesting that they were rendered submissive, though not conquered, are three lapwings of the appearance seen in the figure above. On this appearance Mrs. Firth (ibid.) made the interesting comment that live ducks and other birds are frequently to be seen in the modern Egyptian markets with their wings twisted round one another, so that they cannot disengage them; this prevents them not only from flying but also from walking, and they cannot stand properly and consequently lie on their legs, as the rhyt-birds do here and elsewhere. In Old Kingdom

hieroglyphs  is sometimes found in place of , and later  is of frequent occurrence. Gunn rightly recalls such New Kingdom representations as Naville, *Deir el Bahari*, (IV), Pl. 110, where six rekhyt-birds under the royal throne, in the same posture as here, but each provided with human arms and lying on a -sign, are adoring the sovereign, the signs  being written at each end of the row; the meaning of this is given in words in *op. cit.*, Pl. 85, where two symmetrical lines of text under the royal throne each run: *    "Adoration of (= by) all the rekhyt, that they may live." Another interesting example is on the Karnak wall where Iuthmosis III is shown slaying all the princes of Syria; these are brought to him by the goddess of Thebes, who holds in her hand cords attached or supposed to be attached to the 115 name-rings surmounted by the busts of the Syrian princes in question; but in the same hand she holds a short cord attached to the signs  'all the Rekhēyet' (not very correctly Mar., *Karnak*, Pl. 18; see the photograph, Capart & Werbrouck, *Thebes*, p. 46, fig. 26; here the distinction between the Rekhēyet and the Nine Bows is implicitly retained.

Gunn has drawn the sober and plausible conclusion that in view of 'the fact that in later times the rekhyt were clearly regarded as a part of the Egyptian population, we may conclude that they were a race dwelling in the Delta, or a little south of it: originally hostile to the Upper Egyptian kingdom, they later became subjects of the united monarchy'. He adds: 'Thus the upper surface of the statue-base perhaps contains a traditional symbolic representation of general triumph over enemies, the distinction

being made that while the foreign Nine Bows are trampled under the king's feet, the rekhyt, having become Egyptians, merely lie helpless before him'. Before criticizing this view, I will deal briefly with Pirenne's attempt to improve upon it, premising that the scope of the present work renders it impossible to examine all the passages he quotes. Pirenne's final formulation (p. 707) is that the Rekhēyet were 'les citoyens, habitants des villes du Delta, et depuis la V^e dynastie, tous les habitants des villes'. In support of this contention he draws (pp. 700 ff.) a contrast between the Rekhēyet and the   mrt often mentioned in Dyn. VI decrees, the latter being according to him free men employed on the agricultural domains. For this contrast he relies upon a title    ^{sic} hry wdt rhyt mrt only once found with the addition mrt (Mar. *Maxt.* 229), though twice without it in the same tomb and once in another tomb (*op. cit.* 419); and he assumes that in a third tomb (*op. cit.* 217-8)   (possible variant ) is to be read hry wdt mrt. It is just conceivable that in the first-named title there is an antithesis between rhyt and mrt, but even so and without discussing the meaning of mrt, that antithesis could provide but a slender basis for proclaiming the rhyt to have been town-dwellers, a hypothesis to which, so far as I can see, not a single one of the many existing examples of the word lends colour. In maintaining that the Rekhēyet were Delta people, Pirenne agrees with Gunn, but the testimony he quotes (pp. 691 ff.) is in two cases, as Newberry points out in a letter, incorrectly read and interpreted (the slate palette of Narmer has , not , see *Ann.* (Liverpool), I, 17 ff.; the palette published by Steindorff, *loc. cit.* gives in its first town-name, not a crested

Lapwing, but an eagle owl). No sufficient reason is given by Pirenne for the theory that the Rekhēyet were originally a people of the Delta. Such a reason, however, exists and is implied rather than stated in Gunn's account. The mace-head of the King 'Scorpion' makes it probable that the defeat of the Lapwing people and the Bow people there depicted were actual contemporary events. But the 'Scorpion' was an immediate predecessor of Menes reigning at Hieraconpolis, which was evidently the starting-point for the campaign or series of campaigns that ended in the defeat of Lower Egypt and the uniting of the entire land under the Upper Egyptian king. If then the Bow-people represent the foreign enemies of Egypt, is it not plausible to suppose that the Rekhēyet were the subjects of the conquered King of Lower Egypt who in due course submitted to the conqueror and became loyal subjects of his, though their inferior status was long remembered?






Without rejecting this theory out of hand, I feel bound to set forth the grounds for a more sceptical and inconclusive view. If the Rekhēyet were originally only the inhabitants of the Delta, would not some memory of that fact have revealed itself among the almost innumerable mentions of them that have survived? Nowhere do we find any association of the Rekhēyet with Lower Egypt, unless it be in an entry of the Palermo Stone (rt. 3,4) which Sethe has rendered 'Flooding of the western nomes of Lower Egypt, sickness of all people (ḥꜥt rhyt nbt)' *Aeg. Ausdrücke f. rechts u. links in Nachr. Göttingen*, 1922, 203.














But here it is difficult to know whether most to admire the ingenuity or the daring of the rendering; as with a large percentage of the entries of the same monument, I have no translation of my own



to offer. If the student will re-examine the two scenes quoted by Gunn from Dêr el. Bahri he will see that the Rekhēyet are represented as belonging to Upper Egypt no less than to Lower Egypt; but if the Rekhēyet were originally the people of Lower Egypt, how did this extension of their domain come about? Another difficulty in the way of Gunn's hypothesis is that the Nine Bows, as has often been pointed out (Max Müller, *op. cit.* 11f.; Roeder, *loc. cit.*; Sethe, *ZÄS* LVI, 47), contain among their number both ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt 'Upper Egypt' and ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt ḥꜥt 'Lower Egypt' (e.g. Davies, *Tomb of Ken-amun*, Pl. 11A; Id., *Tomb of Ramose*, Pl. 29), so that they would seem to have constituted together all those peoples over whom the Pharaoh could claim to hold sway. However, the general impression left by the many known references to the Nine Bows is that they were predominantly foreigners, and there is even one isolated hint (*Pap.* 511, c) that the original number may have been seven, not nine, thus excluding Upper and Lower Egypt; without regarding the Bow-people of the mace-head of the 'Scorpion' as somehow fundamentally different from the Lapwing-people, that representation would be very difficult, if not impossible, to interpret. On the other hand, both the later view of the Rekhēyet as disseminated throughout the whole of Egypt and the occasional references to their rebellion and subsequent submission lead me to think their name may originally have been that of any Egyptians whatsoever who had shown hostility towards the kingdom of Hieraconpolis. It must, however, be admitted that different solutions, e.g. that of an earlier race upon whom the dynastic Egyptians imposed their yoke, are not entirely ruled out. If anyone

should choose to maintain that the scene on the mace-head of the 'Scorpion' is traditional like that on the base of the statue of Djoser, it would be difficult to disprove his contention. In the passage following the dreams of the Dream-book (P. Ch. Beatty III, rt. 11, 3.8) there are references to the *Rekhēyet* which appear to represent them as subjects of Seth, but the context is too much damaged to warrant any far-reaching deductions. Lastly, there is a possibility that the word rhyt meant from the start simply the 'lower classes', always liable to rebellion; we shall see that this was current even as early as the Pyramid Texts.

The following examples have been chosen to illustrate various aspects and relations of the people called *Rekhēyet*. (a) Examples exhibiting them as enemies of Pharaoh or of rebellious nature: *Rēc* 'equips for him (scil. the resuscitated dead king) Upper Egypt and equips for him Lower Egypt; he destroys for him the Asiatic strongholds;  he shakes off from him all *Rekhēyet* who are rebellious under his fingers', *Pyr.* 1834, employed also later in the ritual of the dedication of statues at Medinet Habu, *ZÄS* LXX, 52 ff.; once we find the sign for rhyt traversed by a knife , Palermo Stone, rt. 2, 6;  'I restrain for thee the hearts of all *Rekhēyet*', legend accompanying a scene where the deities are predominantly Upper Egyptian, Borchardt, *Sakurēc*, II, Pl. 20 (invalidates Pirenne's argument [p. 697] based on op. cit. Pl. 19, with Text, p. 95, quoted with wrong reference);  'I give to thee all foreign lands and all *Rekhēyet*', *Urk.* IV, 223, 12 (note the coordination with foreigners);  'Horus, smiter of the *Rekhēyet*', Newberry, *Beni*




Hasan, I, Pl. 7, so too Pl. 24; II, Pls. 4.5; (b) the *Rekhēyet* are pacified and viewed as subjects of the King: '[Horus gives me this his bread]  wherewith he has pacified his *Rekhēyet*', *Pyr.* 1058, for the conjectural restoration see Sethe's Commentary, IV, 329;  'Horus over his *Rekhēyet*', *Pyr.* 644; again with personal suffix,  'Horus Powerful-of-kas (i. e. Queen Hatshepsowe) in front of her *Rekhēyet*', *Ann.* *Serv.* XXVI, Pl. 4A; see too the above-mentioned scenes with the *Rekhēyet* adoring at the foot of the royal throne, together with the sign ; (c) the *Rekhēyet* as 'common folk': the vizier Ptahhotpe petitions the King to be granted a 'staff of old age' () and continues, 'may the like be done for thee,  so that affliction among the *Rekhēyet* may be crushed, and the Two Regions may work for thee', *Prisse*, 5, 4;  'doors which keep away the *Rekhēyet*', clearly the common people, *Pyr.* 655; so too a New Kingdom stela alludes to the  'gate of the adoration of the *Rekhēyet*' in the temple of Amen-Rē, the populace being obviously kept outside, Piehl, *Inscr. hiérog.* I, 83; (d) titles containing the word:  mdw rhyt 'staff of the *Rekhēyet*', mdw probably in the sense of 'support', see above 'staff of old age', the more so since this common O. K. title (Murray, *Index*, Pl. 25) usually occurs near titles like  ('standing) near the head of the King' and  'of prominent seat', i. e. in a position where influence could be exerted on behalf of the lower orders;  'master of largess (to) the common people', see above, p. 103* and for hri wdb my article *JEA* XXIV, 86 ff.; (e) epithets contrasting pct and rhyt:  'exalting the *Pēcet* over the *Rekhēyet*', epithet of an overseer of prophets,


Brit. Mus. 159 (Dyn. XI); a vizier is one who $\overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ 'judged between Pēcet and Rekhēyet,' but it is not clear whether this means that he judged them equally or that he discriminated between them, Couyat & Montet, *Hammâmât*, 113, 3.

The word $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ pct, which the equivalent $\overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ now enables us to vocalize as Pēcet, if perhaps not quite as obscure as rhyt, likewise involves matters of great obscurity. The connexion with the word $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ iry-pct 'hereditary prince' has been discussed already under No. 12, where an etymology from pct, the designation of a particular kind of arable land (above, No. 61), was deemed to be not impossible, though in that case the Pēcet-people would have to have the same etymology. The general sense of 'nobles', 'people of the upper class', is accepted by Pirenne (p. 708), though not by Wb., where the meaning is defined as 'mankind' (*die Menschen*) in contrast to animals and gods. With some slight modification the two senses are not incompatible, on condition of viewing the Pēcet as the autochthonous inhabitants of Egypt and accordingly as having prior rights over subsequent newcomers. This is the conclusion that appears to me the most probable, though the evidence in favour of it is insufficient. Pirenne's definition as 'nobles' certainly overshoots the mark, since *Sinuhe* R 10-1 speaks of the grieving $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ 'nobles' as '(sitting) head on lap, (while) the $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ Pēcet were in mourning'. On the other hand, to regard the Pēcet as patricians, and thus as in marked opposition to the Rekhēyet as plebeians and conquered rebels, clearly meets the requirements of the case; it is remarkable that Wb. does not mention this opposition at all under pct, and under rhyt speaks only of the two words as coordinated


(in *Verbindung*), an understatement to which Brit. Mus. 159 (see pp. 107-8*) gives a decisive answer. Pirenne's denial (p. 709, n. 2) that Rekhēyet ever means 'subjects', 'subordinates' cannot be justified by a (so far as I am aware) isolated case in the Coffin Texts (*Rec. trav.* XXVII, 225) where the word has $\overline{\text{A}}$ as determinative. Wb.'s determination of the meaning of pct as 'mankind' is obviously influenced — and rightly so — by the use of $\overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ n pct to mean '(with) human face' (see above, p. 99*), a usage which goes back to the Coffin Texts (e.g. Lacau, *Sarcophages*, I, p. 185) and probably is older still. Here the contrast is with animals, but that with the gods is equally ancient. Of outstanding importance is Spell 268 of the Pyramid Texts (370-1), where the King's coronation day is described; here it is said, $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ 'This Neferkarē res-
cues the Pēcet-people as a limb of himself', he wrests the Upper Egyptian crown (wrt) from the Two bnneads; in other words the Pēcet are regarded as the very flesh and blood of Horus, in fact as the people of the dynastic race. Furthermore, Horus is here regarded as an essentially terrestrial god; at the beginning of the passage it is said 'Rēc arises, the (two) great bnneads shine forth', and the subsequent employment of the verbs nhm, hfc, both expressive of some degree of violence, stresses the fact that the Pēcet are removed


¹ That Sethe (Commentary, II, 93) has misunderstood et im f, which he interprets 'as a limb of him' (i.e. of Seth in the preceding sentence) is evident (1) from the variant $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ with fem. suffix in the version from the pyramid of Queen Neith (ed. Féquier, Pl. 7, l. 32) and (2) from the use of the phrase elsewhere; when in Couyat & Montet, *Hammâmât*, 113, 9 it is said 'His Majesty sent me out $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ as a god sends (or sent) a limb of himself' one is reminded of Rēc who despatched his eye to destroy the rebels; on a stela of Dyn. XI (ZÄS XXXIV, 27) a nobleman says of himself, 'I entered the heart of His Majesty $\overline{\text{A}} \overline{\text{B}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{D}} \overline{\text{E}} \overline{\text{F}} \overline{\text{G}} \overline{\text{H}} \overline{\text{I}} \overline{\text{J}} \overline{\text{K}} \overline{\text{L}} \overline{\text{M}} \overline{\text{N}} \overline{\text{O}} \overline{\text{P}} \overline{\text{Q}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{S}} \overline{\text{T}} \overline{\text{U}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{W}} \overline{\text{X}} \overline{\text{Y}} \overline{\text{Z}}$ his unique servant like a limb of himself'; so too, but rather less clearly, in a third instance, Chass., *Edfou*, III, 10.




earth is excluded. Among later references there is a particularly curious one on the floor of a Bershak coffin (Dyn. XI), where three men dragging a sled whereon is a boat carrying the shrine of Kēc are described as  'the Henmēmet, the crew of Kēc, whose number is unknown', Cairo 28085, 49 = Lacau, *Sarcophages*, I, p. 219. It is noticeable that the *hnmmt* are particularly associated with the rising or nascent sun or solar king; thus the dead Ammenemes I, addressing his son Sesostri I just ascended upon the throne, says 'my eyes behold [thee] born in an hour of joy in presence of the Henmēmet who give thee praise', Sallier II, 12, 4-5 = Millingen, 3, 8-9, and Sesostri I, speaking to his courtiers of his debt to Harakhti, says 'he appointed me to be lord of the Rekhēyet, being created in the sight of the Henmēmet', Berlin leather document, I, 10-1 = *Studia Aegyptiaca*, I, 49. So too a Coffin text (Lacau, op. cit. I, 142-3) puts into the mouth of the deceased the statement 'I shall be like Kēc every day  born every day before the Henmēmet'. The association of these people with the sun-god is so close that it is little wonder they are found as the inhabitants of Heliopolis, cf.  (Osiris) to whom the Henmēmet rejoice in Heliopolis', Cairo 20498 = *Rec. trav.* XXXIX, 122. The rendering 'sun-people' or 'sun-folk', first (I believe) proposed by Gunn, renders the term with sufficient accuracy, as well as with sufficient vagueness.

☒ The following references to classes of soldiers will appear the less out of place when it is recalled that foreign troops, presumably recruited from prisoners, were in regular employment in Ramesside times. 234. 235  G, *ts pḏwt* 'commander(s?)



of troops'; the two words are probably to be taken together, since they


occur thus a number of times from Dyn. XX onwards, *Wb.* I, 571, 6; in the great inscription of Meneptah, 45 = W. Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, I, Pl. 25, the title is followed by *mnfy*, *nt-htr* as here (Nos. 236. 237); at Medinet Habu (ed. Chicago, I, 29, 46-7) arms are being distributed to the *imy(w)-r mšc*, *hry(w) pḏwt*, *tsu pḏwt* 'generals, captains of troops and commanders of troops', and it is clear from this as well as from other sources (Helck, *Militärführer*, 37 ff.) that the  *hry pḏt* (*Wb.* I, 571, 1 ff.) was of higher rank than the *ts pḏt*, even if the English translation 'captain of troops' does not suggest that position.



236  G, *mnfy(t)* 'infantry', *Wb.* II, 80, 1 ff.; here and elsewhere in juxtaposition to *(t)nt-htr* 'chariotry', and hence clearly for 'infantry'; but *Wb.* is right in attributing to the word a wider meaning in other contexts. Possibly a formative in *m* from *nf* 'wrongdoing', *Wb.* II, 252, 1-2, and in that case the etymological meaning might be 'aggressors', 'attackers'. *š* *mnfy* 'scribe of infantry' see above, No. 88.



237  G,  R, *t-nt-htr* 'chariotry', lit. the (troop) concerned with horses', see *Wb.* III, 200, 6 ff. and for the word-formation, *ZÄS* XXXIV, 50; the use of the term 'cavalry' in regard to the Egyptian army (so e.g. Helck, op. cit. 59 ff.) has no justification except on etymological grounds; mounted soldiers were unknown to Ancient Egypt of the Ramesside period — isolated representations of men on horseback, e.g. Kuentz, *Qadech*, Pl. 42, top, do not contradict this statement — and the Hebr.  'horseman' of Ex. XIV, 9 is an anachronism, see Driver, ad loc.; cavalry were perhaps first used by the Assyrians in the ninth century B.C. (see *CAH* III, 10). The 'lieutenant-commander' (*idnw*) of chariotry, see above, No. 95. ☒ The list of foreign peoples that follows (Nos. 238-94), insofar as the names

are identifiable, mostly reflects the external relations of Egypt in the Ramesside period. The first five entries (Nos. 238-42) relate to Libya, to use that term (see No. 241) in its Greek sense of all Africa lying W. and NW. of the Nile valley. The two first names (Nos. 238-9) are of very ancient origin, and it is desirable here to note that the Egyptians, while frequently introducing new terms for their foreign neighbours, seldom completely discarded the old ones, though they were in that case apt, as with the two names in question, to retain them in rather a vague manner. Of such names the relatively brief list in On. Am. has no others. Two important names of countries (Khor and Amor) occur, not in the list of foreign lands and peoples, but at a later stage in On. Am. In order to keep together the discussions of all such names, it has been thought fit to intercalate the commentary on Nos. 567. 571 immediately after No. 260. Note further that my vocalized renderings of place-names, both foreign and Egyptian, are intended merely for practical convenience, and unless they have been assimilated to genuine, correct pronunciations derived from some other source, follow the purely conventional system advocated in Gardiner & Weigall, *Top. Cat.* 14f., and again in *Eg. Gramm.*, Appendix B, pp. 428 ff.







238  G;
 R, *Imkw* 'Tjemh-people', Gauthier, *DG VII*, 75f; Hölcher, *Libyer und Ägypter*, 24ff. On. Am. naturally begins its account of the westerners with the name which in Ramesside times was the most general term for the Libyans in the ethnological sense, i.e. people with fair skins, blue eyes, and red hair, as seen in the tombs of








Textual Note. 238^a In late Egyptian writing *l* appears to be sometimes, though not always, a substitute for old ; see too Nos. 217 above and 239 below, and Burchardt, § 139.


Sethos I and some later kings among the four races of mankind, Porter & Moss, I, 16, 26; 20, 7; 23, 8-9; see too the fine representation on a faience plaque from Medinet Habu, *Ann. Serv.* XI, Pl. 3, fig. 9. This racial type is represented far earlier, e.g. in the tomb of a princess discovered by Reisner at Gîzah; there the mother of the princess, queen Hetphras (II), a daughter of King Cheops, is shown with white skin and bright yellow hair; again there is depicted at Beni Hasan (ed. Newberry, I, Pls. 45. 47) a whole party of Libyan men and women with the characteristic bodily colouring, long mantles and feathers on the heads. These are, however, not specifically designated as *Tjemh*. That name itself occurs early: the army recruited by Weni for the Asiatic war (Dyn. VI) contained contingents alike from a number of Nubian peoples, described as *Nhóyw*, and, not so described, from  ^{sic} *Is-Imh* 'Tjemh-land', *Urk.* I, 101; in the same reign of King Merenrê Harkhuf, a noble of Elephantine, was sent to conciliate the prince of Yam, a district somewhere N. of the Second Cataract, and found him departed to wage war on  *Is-Imh* 'Tjemh-land', *Urk.* I, 125f. It seems utterly impossible to identify this *Tjemh-land* with the northern region of that name heard of later, and the most plausible, if the most daring, hypothesis is that the term '*Tjemh-land*' was applied to any region into which the fair-skinned Libyans had encroached. For example, the recruits of *Tjemh-land* whom Weni incorporated into his army (*Urk.* I, 101, 16) may well have come from the Oasis of Kharga, since they are mentioned, not in the earlier portion of the same passage which speaks of the Delta, but in the same breath as several Nubian tribes. Much more puzzling, however, is the reference in the biography of Harkhuf (*Urk.* I, 125, 13 ff.), where he tells how, having for


the third time been sent to Jam (somewhere N. of Wādy Halfa, pp. 74^f), he found the chief of that tribe departed to Tjemh-land 'to smite Tjemh to the western corner of heaven'. An expedition to Khargah seems an impossibly ambitious undertaking for the chieftain of a petty Nubian tribe; and also Khargah lies in the wrong direction from Harkhuf's home at Elephantine, as well as too far away from Yam. The natural supposition is that Harkhuf actually reached Yam, and on arrival there found its chief gone to fight the Libyans, whom one would accordingly expect to find still further away towards the SW. In that direction, however, there is no habitable region until Dongola is reached — the Oasis of Selimah can hardly rank as such — and Dongola is an even more improbable place for Harkhuf's Tjemh-land than the Oasis of Khargah. I must confess that the passage utterly defeats me. The Tjemh-land invaded by Sesostris I as reported in the Story of Sinuhe was clearly to the north-west of the Delta, and it is in this direction, perhaps extending as far west as Tripolitania, that we must place all later-mentioned Tjemh-people. In Dyns. XIX-XX the term seems used in a rather vague traditional sense, the more precise designations being Libu (below, No. 241) and Meshwesh (No. 240); if there is any difference between this term and the other traditional one (Tjehnu, No. 239), it is that Tjehnu-land was nearer to Egypt than Tjemh-land. For the Egyptian dances said to be performed by Tjemh dancers see above, No. 217. [239]  G, Tjny 'Tjehnu-people', Gauthier, VI, 80f.; Hölscher, 12 ff. This very ancient name occurs already on a palette ascribed to King 'Scorpion' (, ZÄS LII, 57 ff.) and on a

Textual Note. 239^a See No. 238, note ^a.

cylinder of his successor Narmer (, Quibell, Hierakonpolis, I, Pl. 15, 7); Id., Archaic Objects, Pl. 64). Throughout the Old Kingdom and down to Dyn. XVIII,  Tjnw 'Tjehnu', var.  Tjny, Pyp. § 455, is the name of a land; the inhabitants of the land were called  hrtiw - 'Hatyw - ra', a word that can hardly be other than the common Egyptian word for 'princes', Hölscher, 16 f. These people, conquered chieftains of whom, with their wives and children, are depicted in the funerary temples of several O. K. kings (Borchardt, Sahurê, II, Pl. 1; Id., Ne-user-Kêr, Pl. 10; Jéquier, Mon. fun. Pepi II, II, Pls. 9, 10) have the same dark red complexions as Egyptians, wear tails like the Pharaohs, and show above their foreheads a little tuft of hair strangely recalling the uraeus on the brow of Egyptian kings; they also have the phallus-sheath worn by prehistoric Egyptians. These traits distinguish them from the Libyan Tjemh-people (No. 238) and show them to have been closely akin to the Egyptians themselves. On the above-mentioned palette the name Tjnw stands among a number of trees believed by Newberry to have been olives; and it is significant that an early mentioned oil is called  hrtt thnw 'first-class thnw-oil' (Pyp. § 54), with thnw written in much the same way as in the name of Tjehnu-land. Newberry has shown that the cultivated olive was indigenous to north-west Africa (Proc. Linn. Soc. CL [1937], meeting of Oct. 28), and though these observations do not enable us to locate Tjehnu very precisely, Newberry's view that it lay immediately to the west of the NW. corner of the Delta accords well with the other facts at our disposal. In the campaign of Sesostris I against Tjemh-land (see under No. 238) he brought back prisoners of  hrtt thnw 'those who are in Tjehnu-land'

(Sinuhe, R 14, cf. *ibid.* 15-6), as well as cattle, which could not have found the necessary feeding-stuffs except along the Mediterranean littoral. Several cults connect Ijehnu with the western Delta; a god  Ihnyw 'he of Ijehnu' is found among other Lower Egyptian gods (Jéquier, *op. cit.* Pl. 60, with p. 51), and may be identical with  Ihnuw mentioned in a similar connexion Naville, *Festival Hall*, Pl. 7, 20; this Horus of Ijehnu Kees (*Re-Heiligtum*, III, p. 11) has plausibly equated with  Horus of Ijehnu (?), 'high of arm' named a number of times in the Old Kingdom; a  Nit Ihnuw 'Neith of Ijehnu' also occurs once (*op. cit.* p. 9). At this point we must discuss some facts that have suggested to Sethe, who is followed by Hölcher (20 f.), that Ijehnu may in early times have included the Fayyûm. The scenes in the funerary temple of Sahurêr (Borchardt, II, Pl. 1) record  Bz, better known in the writing  Bzhuw 'Bakhu'. This, though later to become the name of the mountain marking the eastern horizon of Egypt, was originally a mountain in the West (Book of the Dead, ch. 108, see ZÄS LIX, 43* f.), and the god of Bakhu was the crocodile-god Suchus (*loc. cit.*; *Pyr.* § 456). However, Suchus was by no means confined to the Fayyûm; the great Edfu nome-list describes the god of the IVth nome of Lower Egypt as a form of Suchus (Rochem., *Edfu*, I, 330; see also Roeder, *art. Sobk*, I, A in Roscher, *Lex.* IV, 1096); as son of Neith, Suchus appears also to have been worshipped in the Saitic nome (*loc. cit.*; Brugsch, *DG* 1064, 62). Thus, though various deities belonging to the Delta are shown to have had intimate associations with Ijehnu, there is no definite evidence for an extension of Ijehnu further south. In the Sahurêr reliefs the prisoners from Ijehnu are presented to the king by the goddess of the West and by  3s nb Ihnuw 'Ash,

lord of Ijehnu'; all that can be concluded from this is that Ijehnu lay to the west of Egypt. It is worthy of remark that in the same reliefs great booty of oxen, asses, goats and sheep is commemorated; so too, minus the goats, on the early palette. The inference to be drawn from all the above facts is that the Old Kingdom Ijehnu, with its various Lower Egyptian deities, the Egyptian name of its inhabitants, and the far from wholly un-Egyptian appearance and apparel of its chieftains, must either have included the western border of the Delta, or else have lain only just outside it. For the comparatively rare Middle Kingdom references see Hölcher. In the campaigns of Meneptah and Ramesses III the words Ihnuw 'people of Ijehnu' and Ij Ihnuw 'Ijehnu-land' are mostly used in a vague traditional sense; but since the great Karnak inscription of Meneptah (l. 13) states that the prince of the Libu fell upon  hst nt Ihnuw 'Ijehnu-land', we may take it that that expression still meant the region adjoining the Delta immediately to the West; by this time the inhabitants of Ijehnu were long since foreigners and presumably were always thought of as of Libyan stock, fair-skinned and speaking a Berber dialect.


[240]  G, mšwš 'Meshwesh', Gauthier, III, 19; Hölcher, 60 ff.; a Libyan people identified by Brugoch with the *Māšwes*, whom Herodotus (IV, 191) located in the neighbourhood of Tunis. Since a supposed reference among the northern peoples subjugated by Iuthmosis III (*Urk.* IV, 792, No. 282) obviously does not apply to them, and since there is no plausible ground for assigning to the reign of Haremhat the statue in front of the temple of Ramesses III at Karnak on which Müller (*Egyptological Researches*, I, Pl. 56) found


the name Meshwesh, the earliest mention is in the satirical letter (temp. Ramesses II) Anast. I, 17, 4, where, together with some Sherden (No. 268), Kehek (No. 242), and Nubians (Nhsyw), they formed a contingent of an Egyptian army; this probably presupposes a Libyan war in which Meshwesh were taken captive, in or before the reign of Ramesses II. Under Meneptah they joined in the invasion of Egypt organized by the prince of the Libu (No. 241), but there, as also in the first Libyan war of Ramesses III, played only a subordinate part. In that monarch's later, but less important war, the Meshwesh were the principal enemy, and from this time onward we hear more and more of them and less and less of the Libu. King Shoshenk I, who ascended the throne about 930 B.C., was a 'prince of the Meshwesh' (JEA XXVII, 83 ff.) and henceforward many petty princes bear this title, using for 'prince' either the Egyptian word wr or the Libyan word Mšwš ms, see ZÄS XXI, 69; JEA XIX, 23, and often writing (see *ibid.*) the name Meshwesh in the abbreviated form Mšwš Me; for enumerations of these princes or chieftains see Breasted, Ancient Records, V (Index), pp. 53. 88. In Dyn. XXII they were established in the Oases (that of Dakhlah, JEA XIX, 19 ff.) as well as in the interior of Egypt. The latest reference (apart from purely historic ones like de Morgan, Kom Ombo, No. 168, in a Graeco-Roman geographic list) is on the great stela of the Ethiopian conqueror Piankhi (end of VIIIth century B.C.), where at least six princes of the Me are named as rulers in different Delta towns, among them Busiris and Mendes, Urk III, 11. 46. That the Meshwesh were Libyans is confirmed by the general similarity of their outward appearance in the sculptures to that of the Libu, Hölscher, 42 ff.; the Egyptians mention




as the feature that struck them most the wearing of the feather on the head, see Israel stela 6; Piankhi 19; the main difference is that they wear the phallus-sheath instead of the kilt of the Libu, a fact correlated by Hölscher with the absence of circumcision among the Libu. The outlandish names and titles found in connexion with the Meshwesh and Libu suggest that they both spoke a Berber dialect, and this is at least true of the above-mentioned word for 'prince', in Berber mess. [241] 𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓



defeated them in his 5th year, see Edgerton & Wilson, *Historical Records*, pp. 4 ff. for translations of all the relevant inscriptions. In the second Libyan war the Meshwesh were the predominant partners of the coalition. Towards the end of Dyn. XX the Libu were still a constant menace, and under Ramesses IX, X work in the Theban necropolis had sometimes to be suspended owing to their presence, *JEA* XII, 257 f.; XIV, 68. After Dyn. XXI mentions of the Libu are extremely rare, in marked contrast to the Meshwesh, apparently the sole known examples being the stela of a prince of the Libu who was also prince of the Meshwesh) under Shoshenk IV, Müller, *op. cit.* I, Pl. 88, and another prince of the Libu named Ankhhor from later in the same reign, *Rec. trav.* XXXV, 136; *Ann. Serv.* IX, 277 f. Accordingly, it is not clear whence the early Greeks obtained the name and gave it so wide an extension of meaning; possibly they learned it directly from the Libyans themselves. The physical characteristics, costume and weapons of the Libu are discussed Hölscher, 32 ff. They had the fair complexions, red hair and blue eyes seen in the pictures of the Djemh-people, see above under No. 238; they wore a long ornamented cloak leaving one shoulder bare, a single lock falling to the level of the shoulders, arms and legs tattooed; however, they differed from the Meshwesh in wearing kilts instead of phallus-sheaths and in being uncircumcised; large quantities of their uncircumcised phalli (𓂏𓂐𓂑𓂒𓂓𓂔𓂕𓂖𓂗𓂘𓂙𓂚𓂛𓂜𓂝𓂞𓂟𓂠𓂡𓂢𓂣𓂤𓂥𓂦𓂧𓂨𓂩𓂪𓂫𓂬𓂭𓂮𓂯𓂰𓂱𓂲𓂳𓂴𓂵𓂶𓂷𓂸𓂹𓂺𓂻𓂼𓂽𓂾𓂿𓃀𓃁𓃂𓃃𓃄𓃅𓃆𓃇𓃈𓃉𓃊𓃋𓃌𓃍𓃎𓃏𓃐𓃑𓃒𓃓𓃔𓃕𓃖𓃗𓃘𓃙𓃚𓃛𓃜𓃝𓃞𓃟𓃠𓃡𓃢𓃣𓃤𓃥𓃦𓃧𓃨𓃩𓃪𓃫𓃬𓃭𓃮𓃯𓃰𓃱𓃲𓃳𓃴𓃵𓃶𓃷𓃸𓃹𓃺𓃻𓃼𓃽𓃾𓃿𓄀𓄁𓄂𓄃𓄄𓄅𓄆𓄇𓄈𓄉𓄊𓄋𓄌𓄍𓄎𓄏𓄐𓄑𓄒𓄓𓄔𓄕𓄖𓄗𓄘𓄙𓄚𓄛𓄜𓄝𓄞𓄟𓄠𓄡𓄢𓄣𓄤𓄥𓄦𓄧𓄨𓄩𓄪𓄫𓄬𓄭𓄮𓄯𓄰𓄱𓄲𓄳𓄴𓄵𓄶𓄷𓄸𓄹𓄺𓄻𓄼𓄽𓄾𓄿𓅀𓅁𓅂𓅃𓅄𓅅𓅆𓅇𓅈𓅉𓅊𓅋𓅌𓅍𓅎𓅏𓅐𓅑𓅒𓅓𓅔𓅕𓅖𓅗𓅘𓅙𓅚𓅛𓅜𓅝𓅞𓅟𓅠𓅡𓅢𓅣𓅤𓅥𓅦𓅧𓅨𓅩𓅪𓅫𓅬𓅭𓅮𓅯𓅰𓅱𓅲𓅳𓅴𓅵𓅶𓅷𓅸𓅹𓅺𓅻𓅼𓅽𓅾𓅿𓆀𓆁𓆂𓆃𓆄𓆅𓆆𓆇𓆈𓆉𓆊𓆋𓆌𓆍𓆎𓆏𓆐𓆑𓆒𓆓𓆔𓆕𓆖𓆗𓆘𓆙𓆚𓆛𓆜𓆝𓆞𓆟𓆠𓆡𓆢𓆣𓆤𓆥𓆦𓆧𓆨𓆩𓆪𓆫𓆬𓆭𓆮𓆯𓆰𓆱𓆲𓆳𓆴𓆵𓆶𓆷𓆸𓆹𓆺𓆻𓆼𓆽𓆾𓆿𓇀𓇁𓇂𓇃𓇄𓇅𓇆𓇇𓇈𓇉𓇊𓇋𓇌𓇍𓇎𓇏𓇐𓇑𓇒𓇓𓇔𓇕𓇖𓇗𓇘𓇙𓇚𓇛𓇜𓇝𓇞𓇟𓇠𓇡𓇢𓇣𓇤𓇥𓇦𓇧𓇨𓇩𓇪𓇫𓇬𓇭𓇮𓇯𓇰𓇱𓇲𓇳𓇴𓇵𓇶𓇷𓇸𓇹𓇺𓇻𓇼𓇽𓇾𓇿𓈀𓈁𓈂𓈃𓈄𓈅𓈆𓈇𓈈𓈉𓈊𓈋𓈌𓈍𓈎𓈏𓈐𓈑𓈒𓈓𓈔𓈕𓈖𓈗𓈘𓈙𓈚𓈛𓈜𓈝𓈞𓈟𓈠𓈡𓈢𓈣𓈤𓈥𓈦𓈧𓈨𓈩𓈪𓈫𓈬𓈭𓈮𓈯𓈰𓈱𓈲𓈳𓈴𓈵𓈶𓈷𓈸𓈹𓈺𓈻𓈼𓈽𓈾𓈿𓉀𓉁𓉂𓉃𓉄𓉅𓉆𓉇𓉈𓉉𓉊𓉋𓉌𓉍𓉎𓉏𓉐𓉑𓉒𓉓𓉔𓉕𓉖𓉗𓉘𓉙𓉚𓉛𓉜𓉝𓉞𓉟𓉠𓉡𓉢𓉣𓉤𓉥𓉦𓉧𓉨𓉩𓉪𓉫𓉬𓉭𓉮𓉯𓉰𓉱𓉲𓉳𓉴𓉵𓉶𓉷𓉸𓉹𓉺𓉻𓉼𓉽𓉾𓉿𓊀𓊁𓊂𓊃𓊄𓊅𓊆𓊇𓊈𓊉𓊊𓊋𓊌𓊍𓊎𓊏𓊐𓊑𓊒𓊓𓊔𓊕𓊖𓊗𓊘𓊙𓊚𓊛𓊜𓊝𓊞𓊟𓊠𓊡𓊢𓊣𓊤𓊥𓊦𓊧𓊨𓊩𓊪𓊫𓊬𓊭𓊮𓊯𓊰𓊱𓊲𓊳𓊴𓊵𓊶𓊷𓊸𓊹𓊺𓊻𓊼𓊽𓊾𓊿𓋀𓋁𓋂𓋃𓋄𓋅𓋆𓋇𓋈𓋉𓋊𓋋𓋌𓋍𓋎𓋏𓋐𓋑𓋒𓋓𓋔𓋕𓋖𓋗𓋘𓋙𓋚𓋛𓋜𓋝𓋞𓋟𓋠𓋡𓋢𓋣𓋤𓋥𓋦𓋧𓋨𓋩𓋪𓋫𓋬𓋭𓋮𓋯𓋰𓋱𓋲𓋳𓋴𓋵𓋶𓋷𓋸𓋹𓋺𓋻𓋼𓋽𓋾𓋿𓌀𓌁𓌂𓌃𓌄𓌅𓌆𓌇𓌈𓌉𓌊𓌋𓌌𓌍𓌎𓌏𓌐𓌑𓌒𓌓𓌔𓌕𓌖𓌗𓌘𓌙𓌚𓌛𓌜𓌝𓌞𓌟𓌠𓌡𓌢𓌣𓌤𓌥𓌦𓌧𓌨𓌩𓌪𓌫𓌬𓌭𓌮𓌯𓌰𓌱𓌲𓌳𓌴𓌵𓌶𓌷𓌸𓌹𓌺𓌻𓌼𓌽𓌾𓌿𓍀𓍁𓍂𓍃𓍄𓍅𓍆𓍇𓍈𓍉𓍊𓍋𓍌𓍍𓍎𓍏𓍐𓍑𓍒𓍓𓍔𓍕𓍖𓍗𓍘𓍙𓍚𓍛𓍜𓍝𓍞𓍟𓍠𓍡𓍢𓍣𓍤𓍥𓍦𓍧𓍨𓍩𓍪𓍫𓍬𓍭𓍮𓍯𓍰𓍱𓍲𓍳𓍴𓍵𓍶𓍷𓍸𓍹𓍺𓍻𓍼𓍽𓍾𓍿𓎀𓎁𓎂𓎃𓎄𓎅𓎆𓎇𓎈𓎉𓎊𓎋𓎌𓎍𓎎𓎏𓎐𓎑𓎒𓎓𓎔𓎕𓎖𓎗𓎘𓎙𓎚𓎛𓎜𓎝𓎞𓎟𓎠𓎡𓎢𓎣𓎤𓎥𓎦𓎧𓎨𓎩𓎪𓎫𓎬𓎭𓎮𓎯𓎰𓎱𓎲𓎳𓎴𓎵𓎶𓎷𓎸𓎹𓎺𓎻𓎼𓎽𓎾𓎿𓏀𓏁𓏂𓏃𓏄𓏅𓏆𓏇𓏈𓏉𓏊𓏋𓏌𓏍𓏎𓏏𓏐𓏑𓏒𓏓𓏔𓏕𓏖𓏗𓏘𓏙𓏚𓏛𓏜𓏝𓏞𓏟𓏠𓏡𓏢𓏣𓏤𓏥𓏦𓏧𓏨𓏩𓏪𓏫𓏬𓏭𓏮𓏯𓏰𓏱𓏲𓏳𓏴𓏵𓏶𓏷𓏸𓏹𓏺𓏻𓏼𓏽𓏾𓏿𓐀𓐁𓐂𓐃𓐄𓐅𓐆𓐇𓐈𓐉𓐊𓐋𓐌𓐍𓐎𓐏𓐐𓐑𓐒𓐓𓐔𓐕𓐖𓐗𓐘𓐙𓐚𓐛𓐜𓐝𓐞𓐟𓐠𓐡𓐢𓐣𓐤𓐥𓐦𓐧𓐨𓐩𓐪𓐫𓐬𓐭𓐮𓐯𓐰𓐱𓐲𓐳𓐴𓐵𓐶𓐷𓐸𓐹𓐺𓐻𓐼𓐽𓐾𓐿𓑀𓑁𓑂𓑃𓑄𓑅𓑆𓑇𓑈𓑉𓑊𓑋𓑌𓑍𓑎𓑏𓑐𓑑𓑒𓑓𓑔𓑕𓑖𓑗𓑘𓑙𓑚𓑛𓑜𓑝𓑞𓑟𓑠𓑡𓑢𓑣𓑤𓑥𓑦𓑧𓑨𓑩𓑪𓑫𓑬𓑭𓑮𓑯𓑰𓑱𓑲𓑳𓑴𓑵𓑶𓑷𓑸𓑹𓑺𓑻𓑼𓑽𓑾𓑿𓒀𓒁𓒂𓒃𓒄𓒅𓒆𓒇𓒈𓒉𓒊𓒋𓒌𓒍𓒎𓒏𓒐𓒑𓒒𓒓𓒔𓒕𓒖𓒗𓒘𓒙𓒚𓒛𓒜𓒝𓒞𓒟𓒠𓒡𓒢𓒣𓒤𓒥𓒦𓒧𓒨𓒩𓒪𓒫𓒬𓒭𓒮𓒯𓒰𓒱𓒲𓒳𓒴𓒵𓒶𓒷𓒸𓒹𓒺𓒻𓒼𓒽𓒾𓒿𓓀𓓁𓓂𓓃𓓄𓓅𓓆𓓇𓓈𓓉𓓊𓓋𓓌𓓍𓓎𓓏𓓐𓓑𓓒𓓓𓓔𓓕𓓖𓓗𓓘𓓙𓓚𓓛𓓜𓓝𓓞𓓟𓓠𓓡𓓢𓓣𓓤𓓥𓓦𓓧𓓨𓓩𓓪𓓫𓓬𓓭𓓮𓓯𓓰𓓱𓓲𓓳𓓴𓓵𓓶𓓷𓓸𓓹𓓺𓓻𓓼𓓽𓓾𓓿𓔀𓔁𓔂𓔃𓔄𓔅𓔆𓔇𓔈𓔉𓔊𓔋𓔌𓔍𓔎𓔏𓔐𓔑𓔒𓔓𓔔𓔕𓔖𓔗𓔘𓔙𓔚𓔛𓔜𓔝𓔞𓔟𓔠𓔡𓔢𓔣𓔤𓔥𓔦𓔧𓔨𓔩𓔪𓔫𓔬𓔭𓔮𓔯𓔰𓔱𓔲𓔳𓔴𓔵𓔶𓔷𓔸𓔹𓔺𓔻𓔼𓔽𓔾𓔿𓕀𓕁𓕂𓕃𓕄𓕅𓕆𓕇𓕈𓕉𓕊𓕋𓕌𓕍𓕎𓕏𓕐𓕑𓕒𓕓𓕔𓕕𓕖𓕗𓕘𓕙𓕚𓕛𓕜𓕝𓕞𓕟𓕠𓕡𓕢𓕣𓕤𓕥𓕦𓕧𓕨𓕩𓕪𓕫𓕬𓕭𓕮𓕯𓕰𓕱𓕲𓕳𓕴𓕵𓕶𓕷𓕸𓕹𓕺𓕻𓕼𓕽𓕾𓕿𓖀𓖁𓖂𓖃𓖄𓖅𓖆𓖇𓖈𓖉𓖊𓖋𓖌𓖍𓖎𓖏𓖐𓖑𓖒𓖓𓖔𓖕𓖖𓖗𓖘𓖙𓖚𓖛𓖜𓖝𓖞𓖟𓖠𓖡𓖢𓖣𓖤𓖥𓖦𓖧𓖨𓖩𓖪𓖫𓖬𓖭𓖮𓖯𓖰𓖱𓖲𓖳𓖴𓖵𓖶𓖷𓖸𓖹𓖺𓖻𓖼𓖽𓖾𓖿𓗀𓗁𓗂𓗃𓗄𓗅𓗆𓗇𓗈𓗉𓗊𓗋𓗌𓗍𓗎𓗏𓗐𓗑𓗒𓗓𓗔𓗕𓗖𓗗𓗘𓗙𓗚𓗛𓗜𓗝𓗞𓗟𓗠𓗡𓗢𓗣𓗤𓗥𓗦𓗧𓗨𓗩𓗪𓗫𓗬𓗭𓗮𓗯𓗰𓗱𓗲𓗳𓗴𓗵𓗶𓗷𓗸𓗹𓗺𓗻𓗼𓗽𓗾𓗿𓘀𓘁𓘂𓘃𓘄𓘅𓘆𓘇𓘈𓘉𓘊𓘋𓘌𓘍𓘎𓘏𓘐𓘑𓘒𓘓𓘔𓘕𓘖𓘗𓘘𓘙𓘚𓘛𓘜𓘝𓘞𓘟𓘠𓘡𓘢𓘣𓘤𓘥𓘦𓘧𓘨𓘩𓘪𓘫𓘬𓘭𓘮𓘯𓘰𓘱𓘲𓘳𓘴𓘵𓘶𓘷𓘸𓘹𓘺𓘻𓘼𓘽𓘾𓘿𓙀𓙁𓙂𓙃𓙄𓙅𓙆𓙇𓙈𓙉𓙊𓙋𓙌𓙍𓙎𓙏𓙐𓙑𓙒𓙓𓙔𓙕𓙖𓙗𓙘𓙙𓙚𓙛𓙜𓙝𓙞𓙟𓙠𓙡𓙢𓙣𓙤𓙥𓙦𓙧𓙨𓙩𓙪𓙫𓙬𓙭𓙮𓙯𓙰𓙱𓙲𓙳𓙴𓙵𓙶𓙷𓙸𓙹𓙺𓙻𓙼𓙽𓙾𓙿𓚀𓚁𓚂𓚃𓚄𓚅𓚆𓚇𓚈𓚉𓚊𓚋𓚌𓚍𓚎𓚏𓚐𓚑𓚒𓚓𓚔𓚕𓚖𓚗𓚘𓚙𓚚𓚛𓚜𓚝𓚞𓚟𓚠𓚡𓚢𓚣𓚤𓚥𓚦𓚧𓚨𓚩𓚪𓚫𓚬𓚭𓚮𓚯𓚰𓚱𓚲𓚳𓚴𓚵𓚶𓚷𓚸𓚹𓚺𓚻𓚼𓚽𓚾𓚿𓛀𓛁𓛂𓛃𓛄𓛅𓛆𓛇𓛈𓛉𓛊𓛋𓛌𓛍𓛎𓛏𓛐𓛑𓛒𓛓𓛔𓛕𓛖𓛗𓛘𓛙𓛚𓛛𓛜𓛝𓛞𓛟𓛠𓛡𓛢𓛣𓛤𓛥𓛦𓛧𓛨𓛩𓛪𓛫𓛬𓛭𓛮𓛯𓛰𓛱𓛲𓛳𓛴𓛵𓛶𓛷𓛸𓛹𓛺𓛻𓛼𓛽𓛾𓛿𓜀𓜁𓜂𓜃𓜄𓜅𓜆𓜇𓜈𓜉𓜊𓜋𓜌𓜍𓜎𓜏𓜐𓜑𓜒𓜓𓜔𓜕𓜖𓜗𓜘𓜙𓜚𓜛𓜜𓜝𓜞𓜟𓜠𓜡𓜢𓜣𓜤𓜥𓜦𓜧𓜨𓜩𓜪𓜫𓜬𓜭𓜮𓜯𓜰𓜱𓜲𓜳𓜴𓜵𓜶𓜷𓜸𓜹𓜺𓜻𓜼𓜽𓜾𓜿𓝀𓝁𓝂𓝃𓝄𓝅𓝆𓝇𓝈𓝉𓝊𓝋𓝌𓝍𓝎𓝏𓝐𓝑𓝒𓝓𓝔𓝕𓝖𓝗𓝘𓝙𓝚𓝛𓝜𓝝𓝞𓝟𓝠𓝡𓝢𓝣𓝤𓝥𓝦𓝧𓝨𓝩𓝪𓝫𓝬𓝭𓝮𓝯𓝰𓝱𓝲𓝳𓝴𓝵𓝶𓝷𓝸𓝹𓝺𓝻𓝼𓝽𓝾𓝿𓞀𓞁𓞂𓞃𓞄𓞅𓞆𓞇𓞈𓞉𓞊𓞋𓞌𓞍𓞎𓞏𓞐𓞑𓞒𓞓𓞔𓞕𓞖𓞗𓞘𓞙𓞚𓞛𓞜𓞝𓞞𓞟𓞠𓞡𓞢𓞣𓞤𓞥𓞦𓞧𓞨𓞩𓞪𓞫𓞬𓞭𓞮𓞯𓞰𓞱𓞲𓞳𓞴𓞵𓞶𓞷𓞸𓞹𓞺𓞻𓞼𓞽𓞾𓞿𓟀𓟁𓟂𓟃𓟄𓟅𓟆𓟇𓟈𓟉𓟊𓟋𓟌𓟍𓟎𓟏𓟐𓟑𓟒𓟓𓟔𓟕𓟖𓟗𓟘𓟙𓟚𓟛𓟜𓟝𓟞𓟟𓟠𓟡𓟢𓟣𓟤𓟥𓟦𓟧𓟨𓟩𓟪𓟫𓟬𓟭𓟮𓟯𓟰𓟱𓟲𓟳𓟴𓟵𓟶𓟷𓟸𓟹𓟺𓟻𓟼𓟽𓟾𓟿𓠀𓠁𓠂𓠃𓠄𓠅𓠆𓠇𓠈𓠉𓠊𓠋𓠌𓠍𓠎𓠏𓠐𓠑𓠒𓠓𓠔𓠕𓠖𓠗𓠘𓠙𓠚𓠛𓠜𓠝𓠞𓠟𓠠𓠡𓠢𓠣𓠤𓠥𓠦𓠧𓠨𓠩𓠪𓠫𓠬𓠭𓠮𓠯𓠰𓠱𓠲𓠳𓠴𓠵𓠶𓠷𓠸𓠹𓠺𓠻𓠼𓠽𓠾𓠿𓡀𓡁𓡂𓡃𓡄𓡅𓡆𓡇𓡈𓡉𓡊𓡋𓡌𓡍𓡎𓡏𓡐𓡑𓡒𓡓𓡔𓡕𓡖𓡗𓡘𓡙𓡚𓡛𓡜𓡝𓡞𓡟𓡠𓡡𓡢𓡣𓡤𓡥𓡦𓡧𓡨𓡩𓡪𓡫𓡬𓡭𓡮𓡯𓡰𓡱𓡲𓡳𓡴𓡵𓡶𓡷𓡸𓡹𓡺𓡻𓡼𓡽𓡾𓡿𓢀𓢁𓢂𓢃𓢄𓢅𓢆𓢇𓢈𓢉𓢊𓢋𓢌𓢍𓢎𓢏𓢐𓢑𓢒𓢓𓢔𓢕𓢖𓢗𓢘𓢙𓢚𓢛𓢜𓢝𓢞𓢟𓢠𓢡𓢢𓢣𓢤𓢥𓢦𓢧𓢨𓢩𓢪𓢫𓢬𓢭𓢮𓢯𓢰𓢱𓢲𓢳𓢴𓢵𓢶𓢷𓢸𓢹𓢺𓢻𓢼𓢽𓢾𓢿𓣀𓣁𓣂𓣃𓣄𓣅𓣆𓣇𓣈𓣉𓣊𓣋𓣌𓣍𓣎𓣏𓣐𓣑𓣒𓣓𓣔𓣕𓣖𓣗𓣘𓣙𓣚𓣛𓣜𓣝𓣞𓣟𓣠𓣡𓣢𓣣𓣤𓣥𓣦𓣧𓣨𓣩𓣪𓣫𓣬𓣭𓣮𓣯𓣰𓣱𓣲𓣳𓣴𓣵𓣶𓣷𓣸𓣹𓣺𓣻𓣼𓣽𓣾𓣿𓤀𓤁𓤂𓤃𓤄𓤅𓤆𓤇𓤈𓤉𓤊𓤋𓤌𓤍𓤎𓤏𓤐𓤑𓤒𓤓𓤔𓤕𓤖𓤗𓤘𓤙𓤚𓤛𓤜𓤝𓤞𓤟𓤠𓤡𓤢𓤣𓤤𓤥𓤦𓤧𓤨𓤩𓤪𓤫𓤬𓤭𓤮𓤯𓤰𓤱𓤲𓤳𓤴𓤵𓤶𓤷𓤸𓤹𓤺𓤻𓤼𓤽𓤾𓤿𓥀𓥁𓥂𓥃𓥄𓥅𓥆𓥇𓥈𓥉𓥊𓥋𓥌𓥍𓥎𓥏𓥐𓥑𓥒𓥓𓥔𓥕𓥖𓥗𓥘𓥙𓥚𓥛𓥜𓥝𓥞𓥟𓥠𓥡𓥢𓥣𓥤𓥥𓥦𓥧𓥨𓥩𓥪𓥫𓥬𓥭𓥮𓥯𓥰𓥱𓥲𓥳𓥴𓥵𓥶𓥷𓥸𓥹𓥺𓥻𓥼𓥽𓥾𓥿𓦀𓦁𓦂𓦃𓦄𓦅𓦆𓦇𓦈𓦉𓦊𓦋𓦌𓦍𓦎𓦏𓦐𓦑𓦒𓦓𓦔𓦕𓦖𓦗𓦘𓦙𓦚𓦛𓦜𓦝𓦞𓦟𓦠𓦡𓦢𓦣𓦤𓦥𓦦𓦧𓦨𓦩𓦪𓦫𓦬𓦭𓦮𓦯𓦰𓦱𓦲𓦳𓦴𓦵𓦶𓦷𓦸𓦹𓦺𓦻𓦼𓦽𓦾𓦿𓧀𓧁𓧂𓧃𓧄𓧅𓧆𓧇𓧈𓧉𓧊𓧋𓧌𓧍𓧎𓧏𓧐𓧑𓧒𓧓𓧔𓧕𓧖𓧗𓧘𓧙𓧚𓧛𓧜𓧝𓧞𓧟𓧠𓧡𓧢𓧣𓧤𓧥𓧦𓧧𓧨𓧩𓧪𓧫𓧬𓧭𓧮𓧯𓧰𓧱𓧲𓧳𓧴𓧵𓧶𓧷𓧸𓧹𓧺𓧻𓧼𓧽𓧾𓧿𓨀𓨁𓨂𓨃𓨄𓨅𓨆𓨇𓨈𓨉𓨊𓨋𓨌𓨍𓨎𓨏𓨐𓨑𓨒𓨓𓨔𓨕𓨖𓨗𓨘𓨙𓨚𓨛𓨜𓨝𓨞𓨟𓨠𓨡𓨢𓨣𓨤𓨥𓨦𓨧𓨨𓨩𓨪𓨫𓨬𓨭𓨮𓨯𓨰𓨱𓨲𓨳𓨴𓨵𓨶𓨷𓨸𓨹𓨺𓨻𓨼𓨽𓨾𓨿𓩀𓩁𓩂𓩃𓩄𓩅𓩆𓩇𓩈𓩉𓩊𓩋𓩌𓩍𓩎𓩏𓩐𓩑𓩒𓩓𓩔𓩕𓩖𓩗𓩘𓩙𓩚𓩛𓩜𓩝𓩞𓩟𓩠𓩡𓩢𓩣𓩤𓩥𓩦𓩧𓩨𓩩𓩪𓩫𓩬𓩭𓩮𓩯𓩰𓩱𓩲𓩳𓩴𓩵𓩶𓩷𓩸𓩹𓩺𓩻𓩼𓩽𓩾𓩿𓪀𓪁𓪂𓪃𓪄𓪅𓪆𓪇𓪈𓪉𓪊𓪋𓪌𓪍𓪎𓪏𓪐𓪑𓪒𓪓𓪔𓪕𓪖𓪗𓪘𓪙𓪚𓪛𓪜𓪝𓪞𓪟𓪠𓪡𓪢𓪣𓪤𓪥𓪦𓪧𓪨𓪩𓪪𓪫𓪬𓪭𓪮𓪯𓪰𓪱𓪲𓪳𓪴𓪵𓪶𓪷𓪸𓪹𓪺𓪻𓪼𓪽𓪾𓪿𓫀𓫁𓫂𓫃𓫄𓫅𓫆𓫇𓫈𓫉𓫊𓫋𓫌𓫍𓫎𓫏𓫐𓫑𓫒𓫓𓫔𓫕𓫖𓫗𓫘𓫙𓫚𓫛𓫜𓫝𓫞𓫟𓫠𓫡𓫢𓫣𓫤𓫥𓫦𓫧𓫨𓫩𓫪𓫫𓫬𓫭𓫮𓫯𓫰𓫱𓫲𓫳𓫴𓫵𓫶𓫷𓫸𓫹𓫺𓫻𓫼𓫽𓫾𓫿𓬀𓬁𓬂𓬃𓬄𓬅𓬆𓬇𓬈𓬉𓬊𓬋𓬌𓬍𓬎𓬏𓬐𓬑𓬒𓬓𓬔𓬕𓬖𓬗𓬘𓬙𓬚𓬛𓬜𓬝𓬞𓬟𓬠𓬡𓬢𓬣𓬤𓬥𓬦𓬧𓬨𓬩𓬪𓬫𓬬𓬭𓬮𓬯𓬰𓬱𓬲𓬳𓬴𓬵𓬶𓬷𓬸𓬹𓬺𓬻𓬼𓬽𓬾𓬿𓭀𓭁𓭂𓭃𓭄𓭅𓭆𓭇𓭈𓭉𓭊𓭋𓭌𓭍𓭎𓭏𓭐𓭑𓭒𓭓𓭔𓭕𓭖𓭗𓭘𓭙𓭚𓭛𓭜𓭝𓭞𓭟𓭠𓭡𓭢𓭣𓭤𓭥𓭦𓭧𓭨𓭩𓭪𓭫𓭬𓭭𓭮𓭯𓭰𓭱𓭲𓭳𓭴𓭵𓭶𓭷𓭸𓭹𓭺𓭻𓭼𓭽𓭾𓭿𓮀𓮁𓮂𓮃𓮄𓮅𓮆𓮇𓮈𓮉𓮊𓮋𓮌𓮍𓮎𓮏𓮐𓮑𓮒𓮓𓮔𓮕𓮖𓮗𓮘𓮙𓮚𓮛𓮜𓮝𓮞𓮟𓮠𓮡𓮢𓮣𓮤𓮥𓮦𓮧𓮨𓮩𓮪𓮫𓮬𓮭𓮮𓮯𓮰𓮱𓮲𓮳𓮴𓮵𓮶𓮷𓮸𓮹𓮺𓮻𓮼𓮽𓮾𓮿𓯀𓯁𓯂𓯃𓯄𓯅𓯆𓯇𓯈𓯉𓯊𓯋𓯌𓯍𓯎𓯏𓯐𓯑𓯒𓯓𓯔𓯕𓯖𓯗𓯘𓯙𓯚𓯛𓯜𓯝𓯞𓯟𓯠𓯡𓯢𓯣𓯤𓯥𓯦𓯧𓯨𓯩𓯪𓯫𓯬𓯭𓯮𓯯𓯰𓯱𓯲𓯳𓯴𓯵𓯶𓯷𓯸𓯹𓯺𓯻𓯼𓯽𓯾𓯿𓰀𓰁𓰂𓰃𓰄𓰅𓰆𓰇𓰈𓰉𓰊𓰋𓰌𓰍𓰎𓰏𓰐𓰑𓰒𓰓𓰔𓰕𓰖𓰗𓰘𓰙𓰚𓰛𓰜𓰝𓰞𓰟𓰠𓰡𓰢𓰣𓰤𓰥𓰦𓰧𓰨𓰩𓰪𓰫𓰬𓰭𓰮

of On. Am. I should add that Sidney Smith has not seen my later greatly expanded efforts, so that the absence of a remark of his by no means signifies assent to any contention of mine. For the places within the Hittite world he recommended the map in A. Götze, *Kizzuwatna*, 1940 (here abbreviated to *Kizz.*). As already noted, On. Am. later incidentally mentions two names of Asiatic lands neither of which occurs in the present list; they will be dealt with below under Nos. 564, 571 immediately after No. 260.

[243]  G, *Kōkō* 'Keshkesh', Kuentz, *Qadech*, pp. 241. 341. 385 (with Pl. 25); Gauthier, V, 209 quotes also Petrie, *Koptos*, Pl. 18, No. 1; Müller, op. cit. II, 110, to which add Naville, *Bubastis*, Pl. 36, B; in Egyptian only from the reign of Rameses II and solely in connexion with his Hittite campaign. Earlier explanations, see Gauthier. Götze, *Kleinasien zur Hethiterzeit* (in *Orient und Antike*, 1924), 21, rightly identifies with the Gašgaš of the Amārnah and Boghaz Keui tablets, and Sidney Smith writes: 'The Gašgaš were neighbours of the old province Hatti and of the land Hayaša. This land bordered on the Hittites and on Azzi; this latter lay north of the great bend in the Euphrates below Kharput. The location of Gašgaš north-east of Hattus and probably along the Black Sea east of Samsun seems fairly certain, as Götze argues [*Kizz.* 22 ff., 40]. Esarhaddon calls Kashtariti, the ally of Ishpaka (the Scythian "Spaka" mentioned by Herodotus), "chief of the Kashkashshi" (*CAH* III, 82), so that both Egyptians and Assyrians render with *k*'; Sidney Smith then quotes Sturtevant to the effect that the Akkadian distinction between *k*, *q* and *q* did not exist in Hittite.

[244]  G, *R*, *Dne* (?)





Textual Notes. 244^a See Pl. 10; perhaps  (in any case the correct reading) with a smudge above it; not  as in Pl. 10 A. ^b For  attached to a word meaning 'old' cf. *lsw* below, No. 297; Horus & Seth, 57; *lne*, Admonitions, 16, 1.




'Dene (?)', usually transliterated as Danuna (see the variants below) and identified with the Δαυαοί, a name properly applying only to a tribe living in the plain of Argos, but in the Iliad used of the Greeks generally, see Hall in *Recueil Champollion*, 303 ff. [tracing the identification back to de Rouge in 1861, see his *Oeuvres diverses*, IV, 145]; Meyer, *Geschichte*², II, 1, 224. 556. 586 etc. In Egyptian texts this name occurs, apart from On. Am., only in texts of the reign of Rameses III, i.e. it is not found among the allies of the Hittites against whom Rameses II fought, and consequently is here out of place, see the note before No. 243; nor does it occur among the 'Peoples of the Sea' gathered together to attack Egypt by the prince of the Libu under Meneptah. It has been supposed that this people is mentioned in the Amārnah letter 151, 52 (ed. Knudtzon, II, p. 625), where Abimilki of Tyre reports that the king of Danuna has died and has been succeeded by his brother. But there is nothing in the context to suggest that Abimilki was able to supply information from outside Palestine and Syria, and it is highly unlikely that at so early a date Danaans were anywhere in the neighbourhood of those countries (against Meyer, op. cit. 224) also, as we shall see, the pronunciation Danuna for the name as written in hieroglyphs is very uncertain, perhaps even unlikely. The mentions under Rameses III are only four in number. In the historical retrospect Harris 76, 7 Rameses is made to say, 'I slew the  (group writing *Ds-in-iw-n3*) in their islands', the next sentences referring to the *Ikr* and *Prst* and to the *šrdn* and *Wšš* of the sea. At Medinet Habu (ed. Chicago, Pl. 44 = *Lepsius Denkm.* III, 211) a row of  prisoners is depicted with exactly the same closely feathered head-gear and striped kilts as the *Prst* (Philistines) just beneath them, see the figure












below, p. 203*; in the adjoining text we read 'My scimitar laid low those who came to exalt themselves: Prst, D, [almost identically written] and Šklš'. Lastly, in the great inscription of yr. 8, ll. 17-8 (op. cit. Pl. 46 = Greene, Fouilles, Pl. 2) it is said: 'their confederation (so rightly guessed Wb I, 97, 4 and Edgerton & Wilson, p. 53) consisted of Prst, Lkr, Šklš, Denē and Wss'. In this last passage the final D present in the other three cases is omitted as in On. Am., and in view of the redundancy of late-Egyptian spelling excessive importance need not be attached to it; it might merely repeat in another form the sound intended by the previous group; on the other hand, there is the possibility that it might represent an ending. However this may be, the existence of a shorter form without repeated n is certain, and receives strong support from the determinative A in On. Am., which links the name to the stem tni (later tni) 'old', 'decayed' actually found in On. Am. No. 54 in the derivative tni 'tired land', q. v. The group-writing tni clearly derived from the interrogative in iw, Coptic ENE, is found in words of which the Hebrew and Coptic equivalents show the vocalizations -nō or else -nē (Burchardt, § 73), and although Albright, Vocalization, pp. 46 f. assumes a value -nu in all cases, all that one is entitled to deduce is that the group indicates n + a vowel, whence Denē is as good a guess as Denō. The above considerations increase the probability of the identification with Δαναοί on the purely phonetic side; historically, the equivalence is very plausible, the parallelism with the Philistines demanding a people of importance, and the legend of the Trojan war showing that an eastward movement of the Danaans from the mainland of Greece was a matter of common knowledge, though apart from the reference in P. Harris there seems no authority for their settlement
























































in any islands. [245] G, Ht 'Khatti', the land of the Hittites, Babyl. Hatti, cf. Hebr. Heth, supposed ancestor of the race, and the adj. Hittite, Gauthier, IV, 188 f. Burchardt, § 131, supposes, probably rightly, that the last element of the hieroglyphic spelling is group-writing and therefore reads Ht, not Ht3; Wb III, 349, 16 gives both alternatives. Earliest references in Egyptian under Thutmose III, where gifts (inw - 'tribute' is too highly coloured a word) from 'the prince of Great Khatti' are named, see Urk IV, 701, 11; 727, 13; the meaning of such gifts is shown by a passage of the great Memphis stela of Amenophis II (l. 33, see Ann. Serv. XLII, 23), where the princes of Nahrin (below, No. 260), of Khatti and of Sangar (below, No. 286), i.e. the three greatest northerly potentates of the time, are represented as immediately sending to establish friendly relations with Pharaoh, as soon as they have heard of his victories in Syria. Under Ramesses II we find Ht 'the land of Khatti', e.g. Kuentz, 212. For the most important allusions to Khatti under Ramesses III, see below, p. 131*. For the history of this great country, with its capital at Boghaz Keui, on the high plateau in the centre of Asia Minor, E. of the river Halys, see Meyer, Geschichte, II, 1, 24 ff. and passim; F. Bilabel, Geschichte Vorderasiens und Ägyptens, 134 ff.; also the more recent book L. Delaporte, Les Hittites Paris, 1936. [246] R, Lk 'Lukki', i.e. 'Lycians', Lk Δύκιοι, an identification first proposed by de Rouge in 1861 (Oeuvres diverses, IV, 418) and now universally accepted, Gauthier, III, 132. Under Ramesses II the name Lk appears among the confederates

Textual Note. 246° W is high up and must have had a sign below it, see Pl. 10.


of the Hittites, where it is particularly closely associated with Krkš,  hnr Lk 'the land of Krkš and Lk', Kuentz, 213, cf. 227; see too *op. cit.* 241. 262 and the prisoners 385 = Pl. 25; the fact that prisoners were taken might account for the personal name  p. jud. Turin, 4, 14, though this occurs only later under Ramesses III-IV; the name of the Lukki is probably also preserved in another personal name  In-Rkš, see below, p. 132*. Ms is another name closely associated in two passages, Kuentz, 213. 385, though not in juxtaposition elsewhere, 226-7. 240-1. 262. Under Meneptah the Lukki are among the five 'Peoples of the Sea' whom the prince of the Libu banded together against the Egyptians; in the wars of Ramesses III they do not appear, nor are there any later references to the people as such. In an Amârnah letter (38, 10 = Knudtzon, EA, I, 293) the king of Alasia (i. e. Cyprus) rebuts a suspicion that he is in league with the Lukki by stating that people from their land yearly take a small town in his own. A Hittite treaty mentions the Lugga among various small localities (Meyer, *op. cit.* II, 1, 545); Sidney Smith writes, 'The Lugga-land adjoined Millawanda (possibly Milyas), one of the Arzawa-lands [see below, No. 249] on the south coast of Asia Minor. The Lugga seem to have been independent; they may only have held the coast of Lycia, the creeks being suitable for piratical raids and subsequent seclusion'. For Hittite Lukki, Masa (= Ms above), Karkisa (= Krkš above) see the authorities quoted by Wainwright JEA XXV, 149. In Götze's map (Kizz. at end) Masa and Karkisa (thus written) are located in the later Caria, S. of the Meander, on the S.W. coast of Asia Minor; the Lycia of Greek times is not very far away to the south-east, on the S. coast.  G;






 R(M15, omitted in Pl. 20), Pds 'Pidasa', only here and in the Kadesh texts, Kuentz, 213. 227. 240. 341. 385 = Pl. 25; in the last-named place prisoners of Drdny, Pds, Krkš, Ms and Lk are shown together, and for the relative proximity of the last three see under No. 247. Sidney Smith writes, 'Pds = Hittite Pitašša, not doubted by competent scholars since the equation was proposed by Götze, *Kleinasion zur Hethiterzeit*, p. 22. Pitašša must lie S.W. of Hattuš [Boghaz Keui] and north of the Arzawa lands'. In Götze's map [Kizz. at end] Pitašša is placed roughly in the neighbourhood of the later Iconium, i. e. just beyond the NE. border of Pisidia, the name of which some have thought, in spite of the metathesis, might be derived thence; however, there is a town Πηδασις near Halicarnassus, besides other comparable place-names like Πίδασα and Πηδασον, see Bilabel, *Geschichte*, 240.  G, 'Irtw' Arzawa', Babyl. Arzawa, well-known from the Amârnah and Boghaz Keui tablets to have been, not a town, but a land or rather a number of lands. Meyer (*op. cit.* 159, n. 1) and others placed Arzawa in Cilicia, but the localization has had to be altered since Sidney Smith (JEA VIII, 45 ff.), followed by Götze (Kizz.) proved that Kizzuwatna (Ég.  Kidwdr, see Kuentz, 227. 241) occupied that position; see the sketch-map, p. 133*. Hence the same scholars now place the Arzawa lands along the Mediterranean further to the West, S.W. of Khatti and roughly in the region later occupied by Pamphylia. The language of Arzawa, first made known by the two letters in the Amârnah find, is Indo-European and related to Hittite, and now usually goes under the name of Luwian. A strong argument in favour of the position of Arzawa westward of Kizzuwatna is that none of the Hittite treaties with Arzawa


presents an Akkadian version, whereas the opposite is true of *Kizzu-watna*, which must, accordingly, have lain outside Anatolia proper and have bordered on Syria (Götze, *op. cit.* 4f). On the Egyptian side the opinion favoured by Sidney Smith and Götze receives some slight support from the fact that Arzawa is named next *Idasa* not only here in *On. Am.*, but also once among the four mentions of the name among the confederates of the Hittites in the Kadesh texts (Kuentz, 212) while once (240) the two names are separated only by the  *Ms.*, *Hitt. Masa*, a people closely connected with the Lukki (Lugga) or Lycians, see above under No. 247; the other two mentions (Kuentz, 226. 242) provide no such hint, but it is significant that all the passages except the last give Arzawa an extremely prominent position among the Hittite allies, thus distinguishing that name from those of Kadesh and Ugarit (Eg.   , i.e. *Rās esh-Shamrah*), Syrian places which come trailing at the end of the list. This is important because  or , as Arzawa is written in the Kadesh texts, was formerly identified with the Phoenician island-town of Aradus (Babyl. *Arwada*, Hebr. , *lyk. "Apaðos*, see Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 186f, and the sketch-map, p. 133*), and is still so identified by Gauthier (I, 99). Burchardt (No. 125) was apparently the first to break away from this error, though final proof is afforded only by the entry here in *On. Am.*, which, placing the name among the Hittite allies, substitutes  for  of the Kadesh texts, and marks the *w* of the final syllable by . The writing in the Kadesh texts does indeed present some difficulty, since not only is this *w* absent (the same objection would apply to the identification with *Arwād*, Aradus), but also there is ground (not very solid) for thinking that  may stand, not only for Babyl. *z* (cf.

 , Babyl. *Uzu*, Burchardt, No. 190), but also for Babyl. *d*, see *op. cit.* 5143, where     *Intw* in the Annals of Iuthmosis III (*Urkk.* IV, 689, 14, var.     *ibid.* 687, 5) is equated with Babyl. *Ardata* in the Amārnah letters (Knudtzon, *EA* 1156f.) and    var.   ,      , *Urkk.* IV, 781, 4, with Babyl. *Gudašuna* (Knudtzon, 1278); note, however, that  here, as often in the Annals, may well be only a mock archaic writing of *t* (, ). We have now seen that    of the Kadesh texts, in spite of some orthographic difficulty, undoubtedly refers to Arzawa. The same must be true of identical or similar spellings in the geographic lists (Simons, lists XI. XII. XXXVI;   XIV. XXII. XXXIII), in four cases out of the six next to *Ht* 'Khatti'; the two earliest of these lists date as far back as the reign of Haremhab. In the great list of Ramesses III at Medinet Habu (ed. Chicago, Pl. 101 - Simons, XXVII = Jirku XXII) No. 88    is, as Edgerton & Wilson, *Historical Records*, 110 point out, a mistake for      , cf. the parallel list of Ramesses II at Karnak, Simons, XXIII, No. 24. However, Arzawa is at least once mentioned in the reign of Ramesses III, namely in the inscription of year 8 (*Med. Habu*, ed. Chicago, Pl. 46, l. 16), where it is said that no land could stand before the Mediterranean aggressors, from Khatti, Kedy, Carchemish, Arzawa (   ) and Alasia (      *Isr*, Cyprus) onward. There is also a scene (*op. cit.* Pl. 87) in which Ramesses III is shown attacking two Hittite towns, of which one bears the legend      ; if Arzawa was meant, the event depicted was doubtless completely apocryphal, and as Edgerton & Wilson, *op. cit.* p. 94, n. 36, observe, the picture may have been a slavish copy of one of the reign of Ramesses II. Is there then no genuine mention of Aradus in Egyptian texts? *I. Bologna* 1086, ll. 11-2 = *ZÄS* LXV, 92 speaks of a slave of




𐎠𐎡𐎢𐎣𐎤𐎥𐎦𐎧𐎨𐎩𐎪𐎫𐎬𐎭𐎮𐎯𐎰𐎱𐎲𐎳𐎴𐎵𐎶𐎷𐎸𐎹𐎺𐎻𐎼𐎽𐎾𐎿𐏀𐏁𐏂𐏃𐏄𐏅𐏆𐏇𐏈𐏉𐏊𐏋𐏌𐏍𐏎𐏏𐏐𐏑𐏒𐏓𐏔𐏕𐏖𐏗𐏘𐏙𐏚𐏛𐏜𐏝𐏞𐏟𐏠𐏡𐏢𐏣𐏤𐏥𐏦𐏧𐏨𐏩𐏪𐏫𐏬𐏭𐏮𐏯𐏰𐏱𐏲𐏳𐏴𐏵𐏶𐏷𐏸𐏹𐏺𐏻𐏼𐏽𐏾𐏿𐐀𐐁𐐂𐐃𐐄𐐅𐐆𐐇𐐈𐐉𐐊𐐋𐐌𐐍𐐎𐐏𐐐𐐑𐐒𐐓𐐔𐐕𐐖𐐗𐐘𐐙𐐚𐐛𐐜𐐝𐐞𐐟𐐠𐐡𐐢𐐣𐐤𐐥𐐦𐐧𐐨𐐩𐐪𐐫𐐬𐐭𐐮𐐯𐐰𐐱𐐲𐐳𐐴𐐵𐐶𐐷𐐸𐐹𐐺𐐻𐐼𐐽𐐾𐐿𐑀𐑁𐑂𐑃𐑄𐑅𐑆𐑇𐑈𐑉𐑊𐑋𐑌𐑍𐑎𐑏𐑐𐑑𐑒𐑓𐑔𐑕𐑖𐑗𐑘𐑙𐑚𐑛𐑜𐑝𐑞𐑟𐑠𐑡𐑢𐑣𐑤𐑥𐑦𐑧𐑨𐑩𐑪𐑫𐑬𐑭𐑮𐑯𐑰𐑱𐑲𐑳𐑴𐑵𐑶𐑷𐑸𐑹𐑺𐑻𐑼𐑽𐑾𐑿𐒀𐒁𐒂𐒃𐒄𐒅𐒆𐒇𐒈𐒉𐒊𐒋𐒌𐒍𐒎𐒏𐒐𐒑𐒒𐒓𐒔𐒕𐒖𐒗𐒘𐒙𐒚𐒛𐒜𐒝𐒞𐒟𐒠𐒡𐒢𐒣𐒤𐒥𐒦𐒧𐒨𐒩𐒪𐒫𐒬𐒭𐒮𐒯𐒰𐒱𐒲𐒳𐒴𐒵𐒶𐒷𐒸𐒹𐒺𐒻𐒼𐒽𐒾𐒿𐓀𐓁𐓂𐓃𐓄𐓅𐓆𐓇𐓈𐓉𐓊𐓋𐓌𐓍𐓎𐓏𐓐𐓑𐓒𐓓𐓔𐓕𐓖𐓗𐓘𐓙𐓚𐓛𐓜𐓝𐓞𐓟𐓠𐓡𐓢𐓣𐓤𐓥𐓦𐓧𐓨𐓩𐓪𐓫𐓬𐓭𐓮𐓯𐓰𐓱𐓲𐓳𐓴𐓵𐓶𐓷𐓸𐓹𐓺𐓻𐓼𐓽𐓾𐓿𐔀𐔁𐔂𐔃𐔄𐔅𐔆𐔇𐔈𐔉𐔊𐔋𐔌𐔍𐔎𐔏𐔐𐔑𐔒𐔓𐔔𐔕𐔖𐔗𐔘𐔙𐔚𐔛𐔜𐔝𐔞𐔟𐔠𐔡𐔢𐔣𐔤𐔥𐔦𐔧𐔨𐔩𐔪𐔫𐔬𐔭𐔮𐔯𐔰𐔱𐔲𐔳𐔴𐔵𐔶𐔷𐔸𐔹𐔺𐔻𐔼𐔽𐔾𐔿𐕀𐕁𐕂𐕃𐕄𐕅𐕆𐕇𐕈𐕉𐕊𐕋𐕌𐕍𐕎𐕏𐕐𐕑𐕒𐕓𐕔𐕕𐕖𐕗𐕘𐕙𐕚𐕛𐕜𐕝𐕞𐕟𐕠𐕡𐕢𐕣𐕤𐕥𐕦𐕧𐕨𐕩𐕪𐕫𐕬𐕭𐕮𐕯𐕰𐕱𐕲𐕳𐕴𐕵𐕶𐕷𐕸𐕹𐕺𐕻𐕼𐕽𐕾𐕿𐖀𐖁𐖂𐖃𐖄𐖅𐖆𐖇𐖈𐖉𐖊𐖋𐖌𐖍𐖎𐖏𐖐𐖑𐖒𐖓𐖔𐖕𐖖𐖗𐖘𐖙𐖚𐖛𐖜𐖝𐖞𐖟𐖠𐖡𐖢𐖣𐖤𐖥𐖦𐖧𐖨𐖩𐖪𐖫𐖬𐖭𐖮𐖯𐖰𐖱𐖲𐖳𐖴𐖵𐖶𐖷𐖸𐖹𐖺𐖻𐖼𐖽𐖾𐖿𐗀𐗁𐗂𐗃𐗄𐗅𐗆𐗇𐗈𐗉𐗊𐗋𐗌𐗍𐗎𐗏𐗐𐗑𐗒𐗓𐗔𐗕𐗖𐗗𐗘𐗙𐗚𐗛𐗜𐗝𐗞𐗟𐗠𐗡𐗢𐗣𐗤𐗥𐗦𐗧𐗨𐗩𐗪𐗫𐗬𐗭𐗮𐗯𐗰𐗱𐗲𐗳𐗴𐗵𐗶𐗷𐗸𐗹𐗺𐗻𐗼𐗽𐗾𐗿𐘀𐘁𐘂𐘃𐘄𐘅𐘆𐘇𐘈𐘉𐘊𐘋𐘌𐘍𐘎𐘏𐘐𐘑𐘒𐘓𐘔𐘕𐘖𐘗𐘘𐘙𐘚𐘛𐘜𐘝𐘞𐘟𐘠𐘡𐘢𐘣𐘤𐘥𐘦𐘧𐘨𐘩𐘪𐘫𐘬𐘭𐘮𐘯𐘰𐘱𐘲𐘳𐘴𐘵𐘶𐘷𐘸𐘹𐘺𐘻𐘼𐘽𐘾𐘿𐙀𐙁𐙂𐙃𐙄𐙅𐙆𐙇𐙈𐙉𐙊𐙋𐙌𐙍𐙎𐙏𐙐𐙑𐙒𐙓𐙔𐙕𐙖𐙗𐙘𐙙𐙚𐙛𐙜𐙝𐙞𐙟𐙠𐙡𐙢𐙣𐙤𐙥𐙦𐙧𐙨𐙩𐙪𐙫𐙬𐙭𐙮𐙯𐙰𐙱𐙲𐙳𐙴𐙵𐙶𐙷𐙸𐙹𐙺𐙻𐙼𐙽𐙾𐙿𐚀𐚁𐚂𐚃𐚄𐚅𐚆𐚇𐚈𐚉𐚊𐚋𐚌𐚍𐚎𐚏𐚐𐚑𐚒𐚓𐚔𐚕𐚖𐚗𐚘𐚙𐚚𐚛𐚜𐚝𐚞𐚟𐚠𐚡𐚢𐚣𐚤𐚥𐚦𐚧𐚨𐚩𐚪𐚫𐚬𐚭𐚮𐚯𐚰𐚱𐚲𐚳𐚴𐚵𐚶𐚷𐚸𐚹𐚺𐚻𐚼𐚽𐚾𐚿𐛀𐛁𐛂𐛃𐛄𐛅𐛆𐛇𐛈𐛉𐛊𐛋𐛌𐛍𐛎𐛏𐛐𐛑𐛒𐛓𐛔𐛕𐛖𐛗𐛘𐛙𐛚𐛛𐛜𐛝𐛞𐛟𐛠𐛡𐛢𐛣𐛤𐛥𐛦𐛧𐛨𐛩𐛪𐛫𐛬𐛭𐛮𐛯𐛰𐛱𐛲𐛳𐛴𐛵𐛶𐛷𐛸𐛹𐛺𐛻𐛼𐛽𐛾𐛿𐜀𐜁𐜂𐜃𐜄𐜅𐜆𐜇𐜈𐜉𐜊𐜋𐜌𐜍𐜎𐜏𐜐𐜑𐜒𐜓𐜔𐜕𐜖𐜗𐜘𐜙𐜚𐜛𐜜𐜝𐜞𐜟𐜠𐜡𐜢𐜣𐜤𐜥𐜦𐜧𐜨𐜩𐜪𐜫𐜬𐜭𐜮𐜯𐜰𐜱𐜲𐜳𐜴𐜵𐜶𐜷𐜸𐜹𐜺𐜻𐜼𐜽𐜾𐜿𐝀𐝁𐝂𐝃𐝄𐝅𐝆𐝇𐝈𐝉𐝊𐝋𐝌𐝍𐝎𐝏𐝐𐝑𐝒𐝓𐝔𐝕𐝖𐝗𐝘𐝙𐝚𐝛𐝜𐝝𐝞𐝟𐝠𐝡𐝢𐝣𐝤𐝥𐝦𐝧𐝨𐝩𐝪𐝫𐝬𐝭𐝮𐝯𐝰𐝱𐝲𐝳𐝴𐝵𐝶𐝷𐝸𐝹𐝺𐝻𐝼𐝽𐝾𐝿𐞀𐞁𐞂𐞃𐞄𐞅𐞆𐞇𐞈𐞉𐞊𐞋𐞌𐞍𐞎𐞏𐞐𐞑𐞒𐞓𐞔𐞕𐞖𐞗𐞘𐞙𐞚𐞛𐞜𐞝𐞞𐞟𐞠𐞡𐞢𐞣𐞤𐞥𐞦𐞧𐞨𐞩𐞪𐞫𐞬𐞭𐞮𐞯𐞰𐞱𐞲𐞳𐞴𐞵𐞶𐞷𐞸𐞹𐞺𐞻𐞼𐞽𐞾𐞿𐟀𐟁𐟂𐟃𐟄𐟅𐟆𐟇𐟈𐟉𐟊𐟋𐟌𐟍𐟎𐟏𐟐𐟑𐟒𐟓𐟔𐟕𐟖𐟗𐟘𐟙𐟚𐟛𐟜𐟝𐟞𐟟𐟠𐟡𐟢𐟣𐟤𐟥𐟦𐟧𐟨𐟩𐟪𐟫𐟬𐟭𐟮𐟯𐟰𐟱𐟲𐟳𐟴𐟵𐟶𐟷𐟸𐟹𐟺𐟻𐟼𐟽𐟾𐟿𐠀𐠁𐠂𐠃𐠄𐠅𐠆𐠇𐠈𐠉𐠊𐠋𐠌𐠍𐠎𐠏𐠐𐠑𐠒𐠓𐠔𐠕𐠖𐠗𐠘𐠙𐠚𐠛𐠜𐠝𐠞𐠟𐠠𐠡𐠢𐠣𐠤𐠥𐠦𐠧𐠨𐠩𐠪𐠫𐠬𐠭𐠮𐠯𐠰𐠱𐠲𐠳𐠴𐠵𐠶𐠷𐠸𐠹𐠺𐠻𐠼𐠽𐠾𐠿𐡀𐡁𐡂𐡃𐡄𐡅𐡆𐡇𐡈𐡉𐡊𐡋𐡌𐡍𐡎𐡏𐡐𐡑𐡒𐡓𐡔𐡕𐡖𐡗𐡘𐡙𐡚𐡛𐡜𐡝𐡞𐡟𐡠𐡡𐡢𐡣𐡤𐡥𐡦𐡧𐡨𐡩𐡪𐡫𐡬𐡭𐡮𐡯𐡰𐡱𐡲𐡳𐡴𐡵𐡶𐡷𐡸𐡹𐡺𐡻𐡼𐡽𐡾𐡿𐢀𐢁𐢂𐢃𐢄𐢅𐢆𐢇𐢈𐢉𐢊𐢋𐢌𐢍𐢎𐢏𐢐𐢑𐢒𐢓𐢔𐢕𐢖𐢗𐢘𐢙𐢚𐢛𐢜𐢝𐢞𐢟𐢠𐢡𐢢𐢣𐢤𐢥𐢦𐢧𐢨𐢩𐢪𐢫𐢬𐢭𐢮𐢯𐢰𐢱𐢲𐢳𐢴𐢵𐢶𐢷𐢸𐢹𐢺𐢻𐢼𐢽𐢾𐢿𐣀𐣁𐣂𐣃𐣄𐣅𐣆𐣇𐣈𐣉𐣊𐣋𐣌𐣍𐣎𐣏𐣐𐣑𐣒𐣓𐣔𐣕𐣖𐣗𐣘𐣙𐣚𐣛𐣜𐣝𐣞𐣟𐣠𐣡𐣢𐣣𐣤𐣥𐣦𐣧𐣨𐣩𐣪𐣫𐣬𐣭𐣮𐣯𐣰𐣱𐣲𐣳𐣴𐣵𐣶𐣷𐣸𐣹𐣺𐣻𐣼𐣽𐣾𐣿𐤀𐤁𐤂𐤃𐤄𐤅𐤆𐤇𐤈𐤉𐤊𐤋𐤌𐤍𐤎𐤏𐤐𐤑𐤒𐤓𐤔𐤕𐤖𐤗𐤘𐤙𐤚𐤛𐤜𐤝𐤞𐤟𐤠𐤡𐤢𐤣𐤤𐤥𐤦𐤧𐤨𐤩𐤪𐤫𐤬𐤭𐤮𐤯𐤰𐤱𐤲𐤳𐤴𐤵𐤶𐤷𐤸𐤹𐤺𐤻𐤼𐤽𐤾𐤿𐥀𐥁𐥂𐥃𐥄𐥅𐥆𐥇𐥈𐥉𐥊𐥋𐥌𐥍𐥎𐥏𐥐𐥑𐥒𐥓𐥔𐥕𐥖𐥗𐥘𐥙𐥚𐥛𐥜𐥝𐥞𐥟𐥠𐥡𐥢𐥣𐥤𐥥𐥦𐥧𐥨𐥩𐥪𐥫𐥬𐥭𐥮𐥯𐥰𐥱𐥲𐥳𐥴𐥵𐥶𐥷𐥸𐥹𐥺𐥻𐥼𐥽𐥾𐥿𐦀𐦁𐦂𐦃𐦄𐦅𐦆𐦇𐦈𐦉𐦊𐦋𐦌𐦍𐦎𐦏𐦐𐦑𐦒𐦓𐦔𐦕𐦖𐦗𐦘𐦙𐦚𐦛𐦜𐦝𐦞𐦟𐦠𐦡𐦢𐦣𐦤𐦥𐦦𐦧𐦨𐦩𐦪𐦫𐦬𐦭𐦮𐦯𐦰𐦱𐦲𐦳𐦴𐦵𐦶𐦷𐦸𐦹𐦺𐦻𐦼𐦽𐦾𐦿𐧀𐧁𐧂𐧃𐧄𐧅𐧆𐧇𐧈𐧉𐧊𐧋𐧌𐧍𐧎𐧏𐧐𐧑𐧒𐧓𐧔𐧕𐧖𐧗𐧘𐧙𐧚𐧛𐧜𐧝𐧞𐧟𐧠𐧡𐧢𐧣𐧤𐧥𐧦𐧧𐧨𐧩𐧪𐧫𐧬𐧭𐧮𐧯𐧰𐧱𐧲𐧳𐧴𐧵𐧶𐧷𐧸𐧹𐧺𐧻𐧼𐧽𐧾𐧿𐨀𐨁𐨂𐨃𐨄𐨅𐨆𐨇𐨈𐨉𐨊𐨋𐨌𐨍𐨎𐨏𐨐𐨑𐨒𐨓𐨔𐨕𐨖𐨗𐨘𐨙𐨚𐨛𐨜𐨝𐨞𐨟𐨠𐨡𐨢𐨣𐨤𐨥𐨦𐨧𐨨𐨩𐨪𐨫𐨬𐨭𐨮𐨯𐨰𐨱𐨲𐨳𐨴𐨵𐨶𐨷𐨹𐨺𐨸𐨻𐨼𐨽𐨾𐨿𐩀𐩁𐩂𐩃𐩄𐩅𐩆𐩇𐩈𐩉𐩊𐩋𐩌𐩍𐩎𐩏𐩐𐩑𐩒𐩓𐩔𐩕𐩖𐩗𐩘𐩙𐩚𐩛𐩜𐩝𐩞𐩟𐩠𐩡𐩢𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿𐪀𐪁𐪂𐪃𐪄𐪅𐪆𐪇𐪈𐪉𐪊𐪋𐪌𐪍𐪎𐪏𐪐𐪑𐪒𐪓𐪔𐪕𐪖𐪗𐪘𐪙𐪚𐪛𐪜𐪝𐪞𐪟𐪠𐪡𐪢𐪣𐪤𐪥𐪦𐪧𐪨𐪩𐪪𐪫𐪬𐪭𐪮𐪯𐪰𐪱𐪲𐪳𐪴𐪵𐪶𐪷𐪸𐪹𐪺𐪻𐪼𐪽𐪾𐪿𐫀𐫁𐫂𐫃𐫄𐫅𐫆𐫇𐫈𐫉𐫊𐫋𐫌𐫍𐫎𐫏𐫐𐫑𐫒𐫓𐫔𐫕𐫖𐫗𐫘𐫙𐫚𐫛𐫜𐫝𐫞𐫟𐫠𐫡𐫢𐫣𐫤𐫦𐫥𐫧𐫨𐫩𐫪𐫫𐫬𐫭𐫮𐫯𐫰𐫱𐫲𐫳𐫴𐫵𐫶𐫷𐫸𐫹𐫺𐫻𐫼𐫽𐫾𐫿𐬀𐬁𐬂𐬃𐬄𐬅𐬆𐬇𐬈𐬉𐬊𐬋𐬌𐬍𐬎𐬏𐬐𐬑𐬒𐬓𐬔𐬕𐬖𐬗𐬘𐬙𐬚𐬛𐬜𐬝𐬞𐬟𐬠𐬡𐬢𐬣𐬤𐬥𐬦𐬧𐬨𐬩𐬪𐬫𐬬𐬭𐬮𐬯𐬰𐬱𐬲𐬳𐬴𐬵𐬶𐬷𐬸𐬹𐬺𐬻𐬼𐬽𐬾𐬿𐭀𐭁𐭂𐭃𐭄𐭅𐭆𐭇𐭈𐭉𐭊𐭋𐭌𐭍𐭎𐭏𐭐𐭑𐭒𐭓𐭔𐭕𐭖𐭗𐭘𐭙𐭚𐭛𐭜𐭝𐭞𐭟𐭠𐭡𐭢𐭣𐭤𐭥𐭦𐭧𐭨𐭩𐭪𐭫𐭬𐭭𐭮𐭯𐭰𐭱𐭲𐭳𐭴𐭵𐭶𐭷𐭸𐭹𐭺𐭻𐭼𐭽𐭾𐭿𐮀𐮁𐮂𐮃𐮄𐮅𐮆𐮇𐮈𐮉𐮊𐮋𐮌𐮍𐮎𐮏𐮐𐮑𐮒𐮓𐮔𐮕𐮖𐮗𐮘𐮙𐮚𐮛𐮜𐮝𐮞𐮟𐮠𐮡𐮢𐮣𐮤𐮥𐮦𐮧𐮨𐮩𐮪𐮫𐮬𐮭𐮮𐮯𐮰𐮱𐮲𐮳𐮴𐮵𐮶𐮷𐮸𐮹𐮺𐮻𐮼𐮽𐮾𐮿𐯀𐯁𐯂𐯃𐯄𐯅𐯆𐯇𐯈𐯉𐯊𐯋𐯌𐯍𐯎𐯏𐯐𐯑𐯒𐯓𐯔𐯕𐯖𐯗𐯘𐯙𐯚𐯛𐯜𐯝𐯞𐯟𐯠𐯡𐯢𐯣𐯤𐯥𐯦𐯧𐯨𐯩𐯪𐯫𐯬𐯭𐯮𐯯𐯰𐯱𐯲𐯳𐯴𐯵𐯶𐯷𐯸𐯹𐯺𐯻𐯼𐯽𐯾𐯿𐰀𐰁𐰂𐰃𐰄𐰅𐰆𐰇𐰈𐰉𐰊𐰋𐰌𐰍𐰎𐰏𐰐𐰑𐰒𐰓𐰔𐰕𐰖𐰗𐰘𐰙𐰚𐰛𐰜𐰝𐰞𐰟𐰠𐰡𐰢𐰣𐰤𐰥𐰦𐰧𐰨𐰩𐰪𐰫𐰬𐰭𐰮𐰯𐰰𐰱𐰲𐰳𐰴𐰵𐰶𐰷𐰸𐰹𐰺𐰻𐰼𐰽𐰾𐰿𐱀𐱁𐱂𐱃𐱄𐱅𐱆𐱇𐱈𐱉𐱊𐱋𐱌𐱍𐱎𐱏𐱐𐱑𐱒𐱓𐱔𐱕𐱖𐱗𐱘𐱙𐱚𐱛𐱜𐱝𐱞𐱟𐱠𐱡𐱢𐱣𐱤𐱥𐱦𐱧𐱨𐱩𐱪𐱫𐱬𐱭𐱮𐱯𐱰𐱱𐱲𐱳𐱴𐱵𐱶𐱷𐱸𐱹𐱺𐱻𐱼𐱽𐱾𐱿𐲀𐲁𐲂𐲃𐲄𐲅𐲆𐲇𐲈𐲉𐲊𐲋𐲌𐲍𐲎𐲏𐲐𐲑𐲒𐲓𐲔𐲕𐲖𐲗𐲘𐲙𐲚𐲛𐲜𐲝𐲞𐲟𐲠𐲡𐲢𐲣𐲤𐲥𐲦𐲧𐲨𐲩𐲪𐲫𐲬𐲭𐲮𐲯𐲰𐲱𐲲𐲳𐲴𐲵𐲶𐲷𐲸𐲹𐲺𐲻𐲼𐲽𐲾𐲿𐳀𐳁𐳂𐳃𐳄𐳅𐳆𐳇𐳈𐳉𐳊𐳋𐳌𐳍𐳎𐳏𐳐𐳑𐳒𐳓𐳔𐳕𐳖𐳗𐳘𐳙𐳚𐳛𐳜𐳝𐳞𐳟𐳠𐳡𐳢𐳣𐳤𐳥𐳦𐳧𐳨𐳩𐳪𐳫𐳬𐳭𐳮𐳯𐳰𐳱𐳲𐳳𐳴𐳵𐳶𐳷𐳸𐳹𐳺𐳻𐳼𐳽𐳾𐳿𐴀𐴁𐴂𐴃𐴄𐴅𐴆𐴇𐴈𐴉𐴊𐴋𐴌𐴍𐴎𐴏𐴐𐴑𐴒𐴓𐴔𐴕𐴖𐴗𐴘𐴙𐴚𐴛𐴜𐴝𐴞𐴟𐴠𐴡𐴢𐴣𐴤𐴥𐴦𐴧𐴨𐴩𐴪𐴫𐴬𐴭𐴮𐴯𐴰𐴱𐴲𐴳𐴴𐴵𐴶𐴷𐴸𐴹𐴺𐴻𐴼𐴽𐴾𐴿𐵀𐵁𐵂𐵃𐵄𐵅𐵆𐵇𐵈𐵉𐵊𐵋𐵌𐵍𐵎𐵏𐵐𐵑𐵒𐵓𐵔𐵕𐵖𐵗𐵘𐵙𐵚𐵛𐵜𐵝𐵞𐵟𐵠𐵡𐵢𐵣𐵤𐵥𐵦𐵧𐵨𐵩𐵪𐵫𐵬𐵭𐵮𐵯𐵰𐵱𐵲𐵳𐵴𐵵𐵶𐵷𐵸𐵹𐵺𐵻𐵼𐵽𐵾𐵿𐶀𐶁𐶂𐶃𐶄𐶅𐶆𐶇𐶈𐶉𐶊𐶋𐶌𐶍𐶎𐶏𐶐𐶑𐶒𐶓𐶔𐶕𐶖𐶗𐶘𐶙𐶚𐶛𐶜𐶝𐶞𐶟𐶠𐶡𐶢𐶣𐶤𐶥𐶦𐶧𐶨𐶩𐶪𐶫𐶬𐶭𐶮𐶯𐶰𐶱𐶲𐶳𐶴𐶵𐶶𐶷𐶸𐶹𐶺𐶻𐶼𐶽𐶾𐶿𐷀𐷁𐷂𐷃𐷄𐷅𐷆𐷇𐷈𐷉𐷊𐷋𐷌𐷍𐷎𐷏𐷐𐷑𐷒𐷓𐷔𐷕𐷖𐷗𐷘𐷙𐷚𐷛𐷜𐷝𐷞𐷟𐷠𐷡𐷢𐷣𐷤𐷥𐷦𐷧𐷨𐷩𐷪𐷫𐷬𐷭𐷮𐷯𐷰𐷱𐷲𐷳𐷴𐷵𐷶𐷷𐷸𐷹𐷺𐷻𐷼𐷽𐷾𐷿𐸀𐸁𐸂𐸃𐸄𐸅𐸆𐸇𐸈𐸉𐸊𐸋𐸌𐸍𐸎𐸏𐸐𐸑𐸒𐸓𐸔𐸕𐸖𐸗𐸘𐸙𐸚𐸛𐸜𐸝𐸞𐸟𐸠𐸡𐸢𐸣𐸤𐸥𐸦𐸧𐸨𐸩𐸪𐸫𐸬𐸭𐸮𐸯𐸰𐸱𐸲𐸳𐸴𐸵𐸶𐸷𐸸𐸹𐸺𐸻𐸼𐸽𐸾𐸿𐹀𐹁𐹂𐹃𐹄𐹅𐹆𐹇𐹈𐹉𐹊𐹋𐹌𐹍𐹎𐹏𐹐𐹑𐹒𐹓𐹔𐹕𐹖𐹗𐹘𐹙𐹚𐹛𐹜𐹝𐹞𐹟𐹠𐹡𐹢𐹣𐹤𐹥𐹦𐹧𐹨𐹩𐹪𐹫𐹬𐹭𐹮𐹯𐹰𐹱𐹲𐹳𐹴𐹵𐹶𐹷𐹸𐹹𐹺𐹻𐹼𐹽𐹾𐹿𐺀𐺁𐺂𐺃𐺄𐺅𐺆𐺇𐺈𐺉𐺊𐺋𐺌𐺍𐺎𐺏𐺐𐺑𐺒𐺓𐺔𐺕𐺖𐺗𐺘𐺙𐺚𐺛𐺜𐺝𐺞𐺟𐺠𐺡𐺢𐺣𐺤𐺥𐺦𐺧𐺨𐺩𐺪𐺫𐺬𐺭𐺮𐺯𐺰𐺱𐺲𐺳𐺴𐺵𐺶𐺷𐺸𐺹𐺺𐺻𐺼𐺽𐺾𐺿𐻀𐻁𐻂𐻃𐻄𐻅𐻆𐻇𐻈𐻉𐻊𐻋𐻌𐻍𐻎𐻏𐻐𐻑𐻒𐻓𐻔𐻕𐻖𐻗𐻘𐻙𐻚𐻛𐻜𐻝𐻞𐻟𐻠𐻡𐻢𐻣𐻤𐻥𐻦𐻧𐻨𐻩𐻪𐻫𐻬𐻭𐻮𐻯𐻰𐻱𐻲𐻳𐻴𐻵𐻶𐻷𐻸𐻹𐻺𐻻𐻼𐻽𐻾𐻿𐼀𐼁𐼂𐼃𐼄𐼅𐼆𐼇𐼈𐼉𐼊𐼋𐼌𐼍𐼎𐼏𐼐𐼑𐼒𐼓𐼔𐼕𐼖𐼗𐼘𐼙𐼚𐼛𐼜𐼝𐼞𐼟𐼠𐼡𐼢𐼣𐼤𐼥𐼦𐼧𐼨𐼩𐼪𐼫𐼬𐼭𐼮𐼯𐼰𐼱𐼲𐼳𐼴𐼵𐼶𐼷𐼸𐼹𐼺𐼻𐼼𐼽𐼾𐼿𐽀𐽁𐽂𐽃𐽄𐽅𐽆𐽇𐽋𐽍𐽎𐽏𐽐𐽈𐽉𐽊𐽌𐽑𐽒𐽓𐽔𐽕𐽖𐽗𐽘𐽙𐽚𐽛𐽜𐽝𐽞𐽟𐽠𐽡𐽢𐽣𐽤𐽥𐽦𐽧𐽨𐽩𐽪𐽫𐽬𐽭𐽮𐽯𐽰𐽱𐽲𐽳𐽴𐽵𐽶𐽷𐽸𐽹𐽺𐽻𐽼𐽽𐽾𐽿𐾀𐾁𐾃𐾅𐾂𐾄𐾆𐾇𐾈𐾉𐾊𐾋𐾌𐾍𐾎𐾏𐾐𐾑𐾒𐾓𐾔𐾕𐾖𐾗𐾘𐾙𐾚𐾛𐾜𐾝𐾞𐾟𐾠𐾡𐾢𐾣𐾤𐾥𐾦

The localization of Carchemish at Jerabis (properly Jerâbulus = Hierapolis) is discussed at length by Hogarth, *Carchemish*, Pl. I, ch. 2; in the lack of cuneiform tablets found on the site (there are many inscriptions in 'Hittite' hieroglyphs) the evidence, though very strong, is only circumstantial. 251  G, *Kd(y)* 'Kedy', a region to




the N. of Syria, probably between Carchemish and the Mediterranean, for the available evidence and discussion see Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 242 ff.; Gauthier, V, 179 f.; but from the former must be eliminated the references to the  *nbdu-kd*, e.g. *Urk.* IV, 84, 3; 613, 16, since that expression, as recognized *Urk.* II, 247, 5 and explained in detail Hölcher, *Libyen und Ägypten*, 34, n. 10, means simply 'those of bad character (*kd*)', a term of abuse applied to the foreign enemies of Egypt; Gauthier strangely includes under the place-name *Kdy* a town  *Kd* mentioned in scenes of funerary ceremonies, Davies & Gardiner, *Tomb of Amenemhet*, Pl. 12, with p. 51, n. 2; but I suspect that this otherwise unknown town is a corruption of  *Kdm* found in the Pyramid Texts and elsewhere, see Sethe's Commentary, IV, pp. 291 f. After these excisions the sole reference to the Syrian Kedy in Dyn. XVIII is in the Annals of Tuthmosis III (*Urk.* IV, 649, 10)¹, where in a damaged context the allies of the prince of Kadesh appear to be described comprehensively as  *Hrw Kdw* 'Khorians and Kedians'—one is tempted to paraphrase 'Palestinians and Syrians'. At all events this passage suggests that Kedy covered a wide area. In the Kadesh texts of Ramesses II the list of allies of Khatti once (Kuentz, 342) concludes with the words 




Textual Note. 251^a The reading  is far from certain, see the photographic facsimile.

¹ The use made by Müller of Lepo, *Denkm.* III, 32, 24 = *Urk.* IV, 663, 1 is entirely wrong.

 *Kdy* *r dr.f* 'the entire land of Kedy', which confirms this impression. Elsewhere in the same texts Kedy again occurs among the Hittite allies (Kuentz, 213.224), in most copies appearing in the commoner writing  *Kdy*. The letter which the encomium of the town of Ramesses Anast. II, 2, 1 ff. = IV, 6, 7 ff. represents as sent by the great prince of Khatti to the prince of Kedy proposing that both should go down to Egypt to do homage to Ramesses II may or may not allude to an actual historical visit; it is noticeable that the ruler of Khatti addresses the ruler of Kedy as a neighbour little less powerful than himself. As we have seen, the inscription of year 8 at Medinet Habu (ed. Chicago, 46, 16-7) gives a list of lands, doubtless all regarded as of great strength, which had proved unable to resist the onslaught of the 'Peoples of the Sea' whom Ramesses III defeated; the lands named are Khatti, Kedy, Carchemish, Arzawa and Alasia. No such name as Kedy occurs in either the Amârnah letters¹ or the Boghaz Keui tablets, and Sidney Smith is probably right in supposing (*JEA* VIII, 46 f.) that it was a purely Egyptian name not used either by its own inhabitants or by the Hittites; however, his further conjecture that the equivalent employed by them was Kizzuwatna (see above on No. 249) is open to the objection (perhaps not absolutely fatal) that in Kuentz, 227 Kizzuwatna (eg.  *Kdwdr*) is mentioned separately from Kedy in the same list. The conjecture of Hall (*JEA*, loc. cit.) and others that Kedy means the place where one 'goes round' (i.e. the Gulf of Issus) seems intrinsically improbable, though the stem *kd* in Egyptian does signify 'turn', 'go round'. Happily the remaining


¹ Meyer's tentative suggestion (*Geschichte*, II, 1, 102, n. 1) that the reference in the Amârnah letter 75, 37 to the Kutiti-lands relates to Kedy is not favoured by Knudtzon's translation nor by Weber's commentary (pp. 1071 f.).



Egyptian references are not entirely uninformative. A scene in the temple of Luxor (publications, see Porter & Moss, II, 109[117]) shows a fortress stormed by Ramesses II and manned by foreigners of Hittite appearance; the hieroglyphic legend reads  'The town named *Hn*.... taken by His Majesty in the land of Kedy and in the territory of Nahrin'. Nahrin (below, No. 260) was the name mostly used by the Egyptians for the country E. of the Euphrates near and beyond Carchemish (No. 250) and is mentioned in the Kadesh texts of Ramesses II among the allies of the Hittites; but it is quite obscure what is meant here. There are grounds for thinking that Kedy extended to the sea. The late-Egyptian Miscellanies contain numerous references to 'beer of Kedy' (Anast. III A, 2 = IV, 16, 1; III A, 5 = IV, 16, 4; IV, 12, 11 = V, 4, 1) and in one instance this is described as  'beer of Kedy of the port' (Anast. III, 3, 6). As another product are also mentioned poles of *mry*-wood (Anast. III A, 8 = IV, 16, 7; cf. also IV, 17, 2); an adjacent entry names other wooden objects from  'Imr' Amor', so that Kedy and Amor were certainly distinct. If, as we shall see below under No. 571, Amor was in Dyn. XIX the name of a state in North Syria running along the coast with Limyra (Babyl. *Šumur*, Eg. *Imr*) as one of its principal ports and extending inland at times to a very considerable distance, Kedy must have lain still further north, reaching no doubt to the Gulf of Issus, but apparently extending a good deal further to the East than Kizzuwatna as located by Sidney Smith and Götze. A few passages without demonstrative significance are here ignored; for *Kdy* as personal name, curiously overlooked by Ranke, see Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, II, 168 f.; of a woman, P. Bologna 1086, 11.

[252]  G, *Kd(yw)* 'Kadesh' on the Orontes (Eg.  *Yrnt* e.g. Kuentz, 224), definitely identified with *تل نبي مند* Tell Nebi Mend, on the left bank of that river and within the angle made by a small tributary entering from W, only a few kilometres S. of the southern end of the artificial *بحيرة حوص* 'Lake of Homs'. As Breasted has shown (*The Battle of Kadesh*, 13 ff., in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, 1903), in Abulfeda's day (14th cent. AD) this lake was still alternatively known as *بحيرة قدس* 'The Lake of Kedes', and even more recent evidence exists of the presence of the name in the neighbourhood. Successful excavations have been made on the site by M. Pézard (*Qadesh. Mission à Tell Nebi Mend*, in *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*, No. 15, Paris, 1931), though without bringing to light any inscriptional evidence confirming the identification; a much defaced stela of Sethos I was found. The Annals of Tuthmosis III write  *Kdsw*, implying a division of syllables *Kd-šw*, but here the time-honoured Biblical spelling Kadesh is retained. In the Amarna letters (Weber in Knudtzon, *EA* pp. 1118 f.) the town is referred to either as *Kinza* or as *Kiddi*, the latter with the variants *Kidda* and *Gizza*; E. Meyer is probably right (*Geschichte*, II, 1, 100) in thinking the two names really distinct, the former being the true name and the latter an appellation meaning 'the sanctuary', from the Semitic stem *kds* 'holy'; in the Old Testament *קֶדֶשׁ* Kedesch and *קַדְשָׁיִם* Kâdêsh are names of places much further south in Palestine, and it is very doubtful whether Kadesh on the Orontes is there mentioned at all, see Brown, Driver & Briggs, *Hebrew Lexicon* s. vv.; indeed, after Ramesses II, that town disappears entirely from history, apart from two very doubtful allusions under King David and Pharaoh Necho, *CAH* III, 297, n. 1; 356. Mentions in the hieroglyphic lists of Shoshenk I and Tirhaka (Simons, lists XXXIII,



XXXVI) are mere tradition. Conversely, it is extremely unlikely that any reference to Kadesh in the Egyptian texts or lists (see Gauthier, V, 182) refers to any place except the great northern stronghold, see further below. The excavations on the site point to a destruction of the town only a few decades after the famous battle between Ramesses II and the Hittites; but at several later periods the walls were to rise again, last of all under the Romans, see Mesnil du Buisson in Mélanges Maspero, I, 919 f. The town owed its great strategic and political importance to its commanding position at the northern end of the so-called إبلا bl-Bikâr 'The Valley', the classical Coele-Syria, the plain that lies between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. Through this inland plain armies pressing northward or southward had necessarily to pass, unless indeed they preferred the narrow coast road via Arwâd and Ugarit. Under Tuthmosis III the prince of Kadesh gathered together all other princes from that part of the world in the endeavour to stem the Egyptian king's advance. It is clear that the final objective of that king was the still more distant Nahrin, in order to reach which the territory of Kadesh on the Orontes would have to be overrun. It is necessary to stress this point, which nearly all historians have recognized, since even quite recently the view has been repeated that the Kadesh which headed the coalition was not that on the Orontes, but the North Palestinian place still bearing the name 7 km. NW. of the Lake of Huleh; see Simons, p. 36; so too less explicitly Jirku, p. 5, n. 2. The error arises from the mention of Kdšw as first item, immediately preceding Mktî (Megiddo), in the list of northern peoples overcome by Tuthmosis III in his first campaign and recorded in three copies on the walls of the temple of Karnak (Urk IV, 179 ff.; list I in Simons and Jirku). The name 'Palestine-list' given by Müller to this catalogue of

place-names and regrettably retained by later editors implies a misconception of its scope and is contradicted by the presence in it, not only of this Kadesh of disputed identity, but also of Damascus (No. 13), of Abku, doubtless the אבק of 2 Sam. 8, 8 and the Jubki of the 'Amârnah letters in the Anti-Lebanon (No. 6), of Shemesh-Edom (No. 51), which is mentioned just before the references to the crossing of the Orontes on the newly discovered stela of Amenophis II (Ann. Serv. XLII, 5), and possibly of other less certainly northern sites between Mount Hermon and the Hauran — the proposals in Meyer, Geschichte², II, 1, 92, n. 1 mostly differ from those of Jirku and others. Even if, as Noth maintains in his very interesting, but from the nature of the case highly speculative, discussion of the Tuthmosis lists (ZDPV LXI [1938], 44 f.; 52 f.) the headings were secondary additions and not to be accepted as trustworthy statements of the meaning of the lists, nevertheless it would be going too far to condemn them as completely at variance with the truth. The heading common to a and c reads: 'Catalogue of the countries of Upper Retjnu whom His Majesty confined in the town of Megiddo and whose children His Majesty brought as living captives to Thebes on his first campaign of victory'; we may take it as certain that the 117 names (not 119, see Noth) all belong to the first campaign and that some of them at least refer to princes who were captured in the fortress-town of Megiddo. [Note that the Gebel Barkal stela, l. 19 (ZÄS LXIX, 31) mentions 330 princes among the allies, and implies, though without stating it, that they were all shut up at Megiddo during the seven months' siege]. If it be admitted that the list includes such princes, we are at once liberated from the necessity of supposing that all the place-names fall within the limits reached by Tuthmosis III in his 23rd year; some may lie much further afield. Noth's theory, which cannot be fully set forth here, supposes that the names are arranged

in the order in which they occurred in the official records or campaigning journals used by the compiler; sometimes they give the sequence in which the places were actually reached (so, for example, with Nos. 53 onward) and sometimes not. This theory clearly explains the presence of Kadesh and Megiddo together at the head of the list, just as they occur together Urk. IV, 6149, 5-6; any account of the campaign could hardly fail to couple them in this way, and such a coupling leaves the question of the location of Kadesh entirely open. The mention of 'Upper Retjnu' in the heading may similarly apply only to some of the names in the list; as I shall point out in my Supplementary Note pp. 142* ff., 'Upper Retjnu' was the name given to Syria from the Lebanon region northwards, and we shall find evidence that Kadesh on Orontes lay within it. Müller (Egyptological Researches, II, 163) does not mention Upper Retjnu in this connexion, but asserts that in one case Kadesh is said to be in Nahrin, in a second case in Amor, and in a third in Djahy. The passages in question do not warrant any of these assertions. The damaged context Urk. IV, 730, 9 ff., after relating Tuthmosis' return to the region of Kadesh — the town itself had been sacked in the sixth campaign of year 30 (op. cit. 689, 7) — merely says that the king captured many Nahrin warriors there; for this renewed attack upon Kadesh compare also the narrative of Amenemhab (op. cit. 894, 5 ff.). Again, on the north wall of Karnak (Bibliography, Porter & Moss, II, 21 [62]) Sethos I is shown capturing 'the town of Kadesh', the defenders of which are depicted as Syrians; running down the fortress is a further explanatory legend with the words 'The ascent which Pharaoh made to destroy  the land of Kadesh and the land of Amor'; as Wreszinski (Atlas, II, 53) has seen, Müller's rendering 'of the land of Amor', which is followed by Breasted (Ancient Records, III, § 441) is quite impossible; Meyer (op. cit.

450, n. 2) admits this, but still adheres to Breasted's view (different from that of Müller and based on the fact that the town is shown standing on a wooded rock unlike the town on the Orontes) that the Galilean Kadesh is here meant; for such a view there seems but little reason, since Egyptian artists allowed themselves great license, and moreover the stela of Sethos I found by Pézard at the more northerly Kadesh proves that that Pharaoh did penetrate thus far. Thirdly, the opening words of the official account of the great battle of Kadesh under Ramesses II (Kuentz, 329), immediately after stating that His Majesty was in  Djahy 'Djahy' (a name that appears to designate parts of both Palestine and Phoenicia, see below, pp. 145* ff.), continues 'A good awakening in the tent of His Majesty on the southern hilltop of Kadesh'. The expression is a little misleading, but there is nothing to prohibit our interpreting this second localization as referring to a stage in the army's movements a good deal further on, and it is contrary to all that is known about Djahy to extend it as far north or as far inland as Kadesh. According to Götze (OLZ 1929, col. 832) the Egyptian victory at Kadesh is shown by Sittite records to have been a Pyrrhic one. After Ramesses II, as already noted, Kadesh on Orontes disappears from history, and its name is conspicuously absent from the formerly important towns and countries twice above quoted (under Nos. 249, 251) as unable to withstand the attacks of Ramesses III's Mediterranean enemies. To conclude, Meyer maintained (loc. cit.) that the goddess of the city was that  Kdš 'Kadesh' who is shown on Egyptian stelae standing upon a lion; as Cook, Religion of Ancient Palestine, p. 106 points out, there is no proof of this; to the latter scholar's excellent collection of illustrations and references add Sallier IV, vs. 1, 6, amid an enumeration of the deities worshipped at Memphis.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON RTNW 'RETJNU'


In view of the heading to Tuthmosis III's list of northern peoples, translated above, p. 139*, a fresh discussion of the geographic term Retjnu seems desirable, the more so since Müller's chapter (*Asien u. Europa*, ch. X, pp. 143 ff.) was unconvincing from the start, and much new material has come to light since it was written. The oldest known examples are still those in the story of Sinuhe, where after stating 'land gave me to land', the hero tells how he came at last to Kpny 'Byblus', whence he turned back (hsi, see below, pp. 159 ff.) to Kedmi, spent a year and a half there, and finally found a home with Amus son Nenshi, 'the prince of Upper Retjnu'. Since my notes on this text were published, various ostraca have been found, the comparison of which, as Clère has shown in *Mélanges Syriens offerts à René Dussaud*, 829 ff., completely confirms the text on which the above paraphrase is based.¹ Here we are concerned solely with the sense. With the new interpretation 'turn back' for hsi, we cannot tell how far in the homeward direction Sinuhe proceeded before the hospitality of the prince of Upper Retjnu put an end to his wanderings. At present I am inclined to attach greater importance to the geography of the tale than I did in my *Notes* (pp. 166 ff.) or than Brman did in his *Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*, trs. Blackman, 14, n. 5. The epithet  hrt attached to Rtnw here surely signifies 'upland', 'highland', cf.  'tomb in the desert', 'necropolis' and a rather mysterious use of hry in Anast. I, 22, 3. Since we cannot leave the later evidence entirely out of account, we may provisionally conjecture that Sinuhe settled down with his new protector at no very great distance from the Lebanon. The one suspicious point about the passage is that it appears to assume a single ruler for 'Upper

¹Clère also argues in favour of 'Ammonenshi, as the name of the Syrian prince, but the evidence for both alternatives is about equal, and for the moment I retain my former view.

Supplementary Note on Rtnw 'Retjnu'.

'Retjnu', as though this were an area of limited extent. The epithet hrt 'upper' is not found with other Middle Kingdom references to Retjnu. These references, which apparently are concerned with places further south, are, firstly, the stela of Sebekkhu (Garstang, *El Arabah*, Pl. 5; also an edition by Peet), where the owner, who lived on into the reign of Sesostrius III, describes his feats of arms after Skmm and vile Retjnu' had 'fallen' presumably into rebellion; Skmm has been thought to be Shechem-Nablûs in the centre of Palestine, whether rightly or wrongly it is difficult to determine; it is strange that Retjnu should be coupled with it as though itself, too, a district of limited size. Secondly, in the inscriptions of Serâbit el-Khâdem dating from the time of Ammenemes III-IV the Egyptian miners were assisted by Retjnu-people, and particularly by 'the brother of the prince of Retjnu'; it seems that the Retjnu-people here spoken of could not have lived far from the peninsula of Sinai, see Černý in *Archiv Orientalni*, VII, 384 ff., where the references are collected and studied. Since Retjnu does not occur in the imprecatory inscriptions on the bowls and figures published by Sethe and Rosener, this concludes the evidence for the Middle Kingdom. We seem to see that Retjnu was used generically, as it were, for both Palestine and Syria, or for particular districts therein; at the level of the Lebanon it was called 'Upper Retjnu'; down in the south it received no qualifying adjective.

In the New Kingdom references to Retjnu are very frequent, and there can be no question of collecting or studying them all here; for the most important see (besides Müller) *Wb.* II, 460, 10 ff.; Breasted, *Ancient Records*, V, Index, pp. 94 f., s. v. Retenu. It has become the fashion to speak of Retjnu as used at this period in a very vague and general way (*sehr vage und allgemein gebraucht*, Noth in *ZDPV* LX [1937], 201), but I find it difficult to agree with this formulation. The term was evidently a very wide one,


and the country, not being a political unity, probably had no definite boundaries. So far as can be seen, the *Retjnu* of Dyn. XVIII may be provisionally defined as (1) Palestine and Syria together, (2) a land of petty principalities, and (3) excluding the large kingdoms of Nahrin and Khatti. As regards (2) the extreme frequency of the phrase 'the princes' ('great ones') of *Retjnu* is significant, cf. Urk. IV, 668, 14; 689, 14; 691, 13; 726, 13; 773, 2, to quote the *Annals* of *Tuthmosis III* alone. It cannot be objected against (3) that *op. cit.* IV, 668 includes among the princes of *Retjnu* the prince of *Ashshur* (below, No. 265), since the restoration of l. 3 is quite uncertain, and l. 14 clearly names the princes of *Retjnu* in contrast to the foregoing prince of *Ashshur*; from the somewhat similar context 641, 6 ff. all we learn is that the gifts of the prince of *Ashshur* were transmitted through *Retjnu* country. That *Retjnu* and *Nahrin* were considered as separate is seen already in the inscription of *Ahmosē*, son of *Abana*, where we read (*op. cit.* IV, 9, 8 ff.): 'After this (His Majesty) proceeded to *Retjnu*.... and His Majesty arrived at *Nahrin*'. We shall see under No. 260 that *Nahrin* in Dyn. XVIII was synonymous with the kingdom of *Mitanni*, and that at least one inscription of *Tuthmosis III* places it wholly to the E. of the *Euphrates*; for the question whether all the places in the Syrian plain W. of *Carchemish* were accounted to *Retjnu* there is, so far as I can see, no evidence — I regard it as improbable, and at all events *Müller's* supposition (*op. cit.* 144) that 'Lower *Retjnu*' (see below) was a Middle Egyptian name later replaced by '*Nahrin*' lacks all foundation; it is, indeed, disproved by a stela of *Amenophis III*, where the two names occur within a single sentence,  'Nahrin, vile Cush, Upper *Retjnu* and Lower *Retjnu* are at the feet of this good god like *Rē* eternally', *Petrie, Six Temples*, Pl. 10.

To hark back to Noth's statement that in the New Kingdom the term Retjnu was vaguely used, this does not seem to be borne out by the historical inscriptions of Dyn. XVIII. Here it is constantly said that 'His Majesty proceeded to (or 'was at') the land of Retjnu' and in such contexts, though not in phrases like 'the princes of Retjnu', I think it can be made probable that 'Upper Retjnu', i.e. perhaps Syria N. of Lebanon was regularly intended. In the Annals of Tuthmosis III the summaries of the doings and booty of different campaigns sometimes use the phrase 'when His Majesty was in the land of Retjnu' (𓏏𓏏𓏏𓏏 Urk. IV, 689, 5; 696, 16; 721, 10), whilst sometimes we find 'when His Majesty was in Djahy' (𓏏𓏏𓏏 op. cit. IV, 685, 4; 703, 17; 709, 16). These cannot well be vague phrases, and clearly there must have been a distinction between them! The continuations in the latter case provide no definite testimony, but for the whereabouts of Djahy we now possess some admirable evidence not available to Müller (op. cit. ch. 13, pp. 176 ff.), who wrongly equated it with Phoenicia. The list of envoys whom P. Leningrad 1116A, 67 describes as 'Lords (mryn) of Djahy' includes the envoys from as far south as Ascalon, as far north as Megiddo and Taanach, and even further inland than the two latter, even to Kinnereth (the sea of Galilee); the Napata stela of Tuthmosis III (l. 30, ZÄS LXIX, 34) extends the domain of Djahy still further north, for it says 'I hewed in Djahy every year some true cedar (more correctly 'pine') of Lebanon', and this is confirmed by the Kadesh texts, where 'His Majesty was in Djahy' in the Report (Kuentz, 329) in all probability corresponds to 'His Majesty was in Ramesse, the town which is in the Valley of the Cedar' in the Poem (Kuentz, 223). Roughly, then, we may identify Djahy with Palestine as far










¹This has been rightly seen by Meyer, *Geschichte*², II, 1, 83, n.1, but he takes the less defensible view that Djahy was the coastal region, and Retjnu the interior of Palestine.

north as Lebanon, which would make it necessary to relate the Retjnu of the phrase 'when His Majesty was in Retjnu' to the country still farther north, which country could only be Syria or Rtjnw fwt 'Upper Retjnu'. In Urk IV, 689 'His Majesty was in the land of Retjnu' is immediately followed by 'arrival at the town of Hadesch', and though this is not conclusive in itself (see above my argument from the inscription of Ahmosë), there are other grounds for placing Hadesch on Orontes in the domain of Upper Retjnu. Comparing op. cit. 664, 17 ff. with 744, 3 ff., it appears that the three towns which Suthmosis III gave to Amün had previously been the property of the prince of Hadesch and they are described as being in Upper Retjnu, one of the towns, Ngs, being almost certainly the Nuhašše of the 'Amârnah letters, a town and province within no great distance of Aleppo (see below, pp. 168* ff.), fits in well with the conception we have formed of Upper Retjnw; however, the only other of these towns for whose location we have any evidence at all, namely Yncm, the Januamma of an 'Amâr-nah letter (197, 8), has been placed by Saaristo, quoted with approval by Jirku (p. 33, n. 3) and Noth (ZDPV LX[1937], 217), 5½ miles SW. of Siberias. Lastly, it is by no means improbable that the name 'Upper Retjnu' in the above-quoted heading to Suthmosis III's geographical list was due to the presence of Hadesch as its first place-name. The inscriptions of Amenophis II provide more evidence that 'Retjnu' was sometimes used in the sense of 'Upper Retjnu', which is thence seen to have extended even farther north than Ugarit (Hâsh-shamrah), see below, p. 165*. In the great stela from Memphis recently published (Ann. Serv. XLII, 1 ff.) it is said at the beginning of the narratives of both campaigns (the first, l. 3; the second, l. 17) that 'His Majesty proceeded to Retjnu', but on the



Amada stela, referring to the first campaign, it is said 'after His Majesty returned from Upper Retjnu' (l. 16). It may be noted in passing that there is not the slightest evidence that Amenophis II ever turned eastward in the direction of Nahrin; the reference to the smiting of Nahrin on the Memphis stela (l. 2) is in an epithet that is clearly mere rhetoric. The first campaign as described on the Memphis and Karnak stelae (for the latter see Ann. Serv. IV, 126 ff.) mentions Ugarit among the northernmost places that were reached.




But if, in the early New Kingdom, Palestine was apt to be called Djahy, and the name Retjnu to be employed where stricter parlance would have said 'Upper Retjnu', it cannot be doubted that Retjnu in the wider sense continued, as in the Middle Kingdom, to cover both Palestine and Syria. The second campaign of Amenophis II, as described on the Memphis stela, appears to have been confined wholly to Palestine S. of the plain of Esdraelon; yet at the head of the list of the prisoners taken (ll. 29-30) are upwards of 100, perhaps even of 200, 'great ones of Retjnu', besides 179 of their brothers. At this point we may well revert to the problem of  Rtnw hrt 'Lower Retjnu' touched on already above. Apart from a representation of 'all the chiefs of Lower Retjnu' side by side with 'all the chiefs of Upper Retjnu' in the tomb of Amenemhat (JE A XX, Pl. 25), the expression 'Lower Retjnu' is known only from such brief collocations of names as on the above-quoted stela of Amenophis III and from what Noth (ZDPV LX [1937], 198 ff.) has aptly termed the 'conventional' part of the topographical lists, where it always follows 'Upper Retjnu'; Simons (Index, p. 210) quotes examples from the reigns of Amenophis II, Sethos I and Ramesses II. There is thus no evidence to determine












































where 'Lower Retjnu' was situated; but in view of the facts above stated and of the complete absence of Djahy from the topographical lists, Müller's guess is surely much inferior to one which would regard 'Lower Retjnu' as simply an alternative name for that part of Retjnu which could not be described as 'Upper', in fact as the counterpart of what was known in the Middle Kingdom as 'Retjnu' without adjectival qualification.




It is surprising that Noth, whose admirable researches have been cited several times above, should quote with approval (op. cit. LX [1937], 201) a theory of Retjnu propounded by A. Alt, op. cit. XLVII [1934], 170ff. This theory, known to me only from the résumé given in Bilabel, *Geschichte*, 429, revives Mariette's old identification of Retjnu with the  of Tuthmosis III's northern list (*Urk.* IV, 783, No. 64), which is taken to be the town of Lydda, Hebr. לֵידָא, 18 km. SE. of Jaffa, and assumes that this once formed a kingdom of its own; like many such hypotheses built on equally tenuous grounds this one is likely to prove ill-founded; it would only have acquired some plausibility if the town of Lydda had, in Tuthmosis' list, been written  like the name of the land; we know nothing concerning the pronunciation of Rtnw, apart from the now unfashionable connexion of the word with לוֹטָן *Lôtân*, the son of שֵׁעִיר *Sêcîr* (Eg.  *Sêc*, see *Kêmi*, V, Pl. 3 and Harris 76, 9) and the father of חֹרִי *Hôri* (cf. Eg.  *Hôri*); to this equation Meyer (*Israelstämme*, 339) raised the objection that  would be required instead of , an objection that would certainly be valid if Rtnw were a Palestinian word borrowed by the Egyptians; it is true that if לוֹטָן were taken from the later Eg. form  Rtnw one would expect  rather than ,

but in spite of all phonetic difficulties the identification of *Lôtân* with Rtnw, Rtnw seems to me highly probable.

In Dyn. XIX the term 'Retjnu' was replaced by  Rtnw (see below under No. 567), but, true to Egyptian habit, continued to be employed in antiquarian fashion. In the Decree of Canopus (*Urk.* II, 131), where it is curiously accompanied by the adjective  'eastern' (i.e. perhaps E. of Egypt), it represents *Συρία* in the Greek.

[253]  G, 'Ir, unknown elsewhere in this form. Sidney Smith suggests that 'Irkh should be emended, i.e. Alalakh, cf.  in the Annals of Tuthmosis III, *Urk.* IV, 719, 17, misinterpreted by Breasted, *Ancient Records*, II, §512, but excusably, since he could not have known anything about that town and district. The localization of Alalakh first emerged from cuneiform tablets discovered by Sir Leonard Woolley in 1934-9 at Atsheneh, a short distance inland from Antioch, and just E. of the Orontes where it makes its great westward turn towards the sea; see *Antiquaries' Journal*, XIX, 38ff. and the sketch-map above, p. 133*. The population of Alalakh was largely Khurrian (see on No. 567), particularly the nobility. Sidney Smith, in *Alalakh and Chronology*, 31ff., has sketched the history of the place, which was the capital of a small state called Mukish from about 1780 to 1190 B.C. My own comment on Sidney Smith's emendation is that, although the orthography of On. Am. is often eccentric, the necessity of emending has not hitherto presented itself. Far more convincing is Grdseloff's proposal to read  'all [Al]alakh' in l. 13 of the Karnak stela of Amenophis II (*Ann. Serw.* IV, 130). This restoration seems to me almost certain (1) because the narrative

there is clearly dealing with that part of the world, and (2) because of the rarity of the combination  — the topographical lists of Tuthmosis III have not a single instance.  Lost.    G, Kḫnfy 'Byblus', the famous Phoenician coast-town at the foot of the Lebanon, some 40 km. N. of Bērit, oldest writing   Kbn, in M.K. usually   Kḫny, Babyl. and Assy. ḡubla, Hebr. גְּבִל, ḡk. Βύβλος, Arab. جبيل. Jebel; besides Gauthier, V, 197f. see the volumes on the excavations by Montet and Dunand and for classical times, art. Byblos in Pauly-Wissowa.                                  


argument on the fact that in two out of the six occurrences quoted by Simons (Index, 220) Takhoy is found next or near to Kadesh; here let it be noted that in the *Medinet Habu* list (ed. Chicago, 1912, 25) the writing  Ish shows the same inversion of consonants as in On. Am. It is uncertain in which of the Dyn. XVIII reigns the regiment  'Crushing Takhoy' mentioned on the Vienna stela of its standard-bearer (*Rec. trav.* IX, 38) obtained its name. The evidence from the *Amârnah* letters is somewhat ambiguous. In 189, 9 ff. Aitugama of Kadesh reports that Namiawaza, the governor of Ube under Amenophis III, had surrendered all towns of the Pharaoh in Takhji and Ube to the SA.GAZ, the northern kinsmen of the Habiri (the later Hebrews) but that he, Aitugama, had restored them to their allegiance; Ube (doubtless eg. , Burchardt, No. 35; Gauthier, I, 53; IV, 209) is localized slightly differently by different cuneiform scholars, Weber (in Knudtzon, *EA* 1112 f.) placing it in the neighbourhood of Damascus, while Weidner (*Politische Dokumente*, 14, 1) defined it as the entire region S. of Homs as far as Damascus — if the restoration [Takhji] in 197, 19 is correct, it is named in the same context as Damascus. One thing is clear from a survey of all the evidence: Kadesh and Takhoy are again and again associated in our texts, and the one cannot have been very far distant from the other.

NOTES ON SOME CAMPAIGNS OF TUTHMOSIS III AND AMENOPHIS II.

1. The narrative of Amenemhab. In order to provide a solid basis for the discussion of Nahrin and certain of its westerly neighbours, it seems desirable here to interpolate an excursus on some of the more important documents of Dyn. XVIII, so far as these affect our topographical problems. In the comments upon Takhoy (No. 258) it was claimed that all the military exploits narrated in the well-known 'biography' of the soldier Amenemhab (*Urk.* IV, 890 ff.) probably relate to the same campaign of Tuthmosis III, his eighth, that of the year 33. The fact is by no means self-evident, nor can it be proved with absolute certainty, and indeed other scholars (Breasted, *Ancient Records*, II, §§ 574 ff.; Meyer, *Geschichte*², II, 1, 131, n. 1; Yeivin, in *JPOS* XIV, 214, n. 103; 220) have held the opposite view, without however agreeing among themselves. Breasted thought that the old soldier recounted the adventures of his career 'as they occurred to him, without attempt at order, beyond the involuntary association of events that belong to the same campaign'. Meyer, on the contrary, believed that Amenemhab's feats of arms followed one another in exact chronological order, apart from the two colourful episodes at the end, that dealing with the elephants and that recording the breaching of the new wall at Kadesh. Lastly, Yeivin supposes that the events down to l. 11 belong to the reign of Amenophis II, and were followed by incidents in strict chronological sequence all belonging to the reign of Tuthmosis III. To criticize Yeivin's interpretation first, he defends this strange narration of occurrences in the later reign before those of the earlier by remarking that, whereas Amenemhab had previously only used

'my lord' or 'His Majesty', in l. 12 he inserts the prenomen of Tuthmosis III. Unhappily Yeivin has failed to note that after an intervening reference to 'the king' (l. 13), the scribe again (l. 16) introduces the actual name of Tuthmosis III — this time the nomen — and the prenomen occurs once more in l. 38. This evidence suffices to show that no significance whatever need be attached to the employment of the cartouche; in these passages it serves as mere synonym of 'His Majesty', etc. An even more decisive objection to Yeivin's view is that it assumes a crossing of the Euphrates on the part of Amenophis II, for which we have no other evidence at all. As pointed out on pp. 146* f., of the three stelae of this reign dealing with its wars, two speak only of the king's proceeding to Retjnu, and the third refers to Upper Retjnu. Had Amenophis really emulated the achievement of Tuthmosis I and III in reaching the heart of Nahrin, surely he would have let us know it. The sentence 'the princes of Mitanni (= Nahrin, see No. 260) come to him with tribute upon their backs' found on three columns at Karnak with identical inscriptions (Borchardt in Sethe, *Unters.* V, 43) at best refers to gifts brought by envoys, at worst is a mere idle boast like the reference to the smiting of Nahrin already (p. 147*) quoted from the Memphis stela. Finally, it has been shown (pp. 150* f.) that Minmosë's allusion to the setting up of stelae in Nahrin and in Haroy refers to the reign of Tuthmosis III, not to that of Amenophis II.

Meyer considered that the reference with which the biography opens (ll. 4-5) to a capture of prisoners in the Negel, the stony region to the S. of the mountains of Judaea, is connected with the campaign of year 39, and that all the following incidents belonged to the subsequent years. This interpretation entails a second crossing of the Euphrates (l. 10) and a second elephant hunt at Niy (l. 23), in other words a duplication of the

happenings of year 33 (*Urk.* IV, 69 b ff.). Some recent discoveries militate strongly against such a view. The great retrospective stela of year 47 discovered by Reisner at Gebel Barkal (*ZÄS* LXIX, 24 ff.) narrates as the culminating achievement of the reign — placing it even before the Megiddo victory of the first campaign — the crossing into Nahrin, the erection of the stela there, and the elephant hunt on the return journey to Egypt. Even the number of elephants against which the king had to contend is the same (120) as in the inscription of Amenemhat (l. 23) and as on another stela which is retrospective albeit curiously dated a couple of months earlier than the earliest date in the Annals of Tuthmosis III (Mond & Myers, *Temples of Armant*, pl. 103, l. 7). In neither of these important texts is there any hint of a second attack pressed home against Nahrin, and the postulate of a second crossing of the Euphrates must be abandoned. With it falls the whole of Meyer's reconstruction. Nevertheless there is a difficulty in the way of my alternative view which needs to be met before this part of my argument is concluded. According to Meyer, and indeed also according to Breasted's translation of the biography, there is an apparent mention of a capture in Nahrin immediately after the afore-mentioned capture in Southern Palestine, and this might be an obstacle to my conception of an orderly sequence of incidents, since a few lines later (l. 7) we are back to the W. of Aleppo, which, as we shall see later, could at this period hardly be described as in Nahrin. The text of the first episode in the biography reads as follows: . Here is

¹ I have collated with a facsimile made by Newberry many years ago.

most serious objection that can be made to my theory is perhaps that so many events are crowded into the framework of a single campaign. The topographical gains received from the above analysis are (a) that the text of Amenemhat tends to confirm the proximity of Takhry to Kadesh and (b) that if it should prove, on other grounds, that Niy likewise had to be sought somewhere in the N. of Syria, here too Amenemhat might be fairly safely invoked as a witness.


2. The location of Niy. Since the discussion in Müller, Asien u. Europa, 262 ff. much more information has come to light from the Egyptian side. The latest detailed treatment is by Yeivin (op. cit. 218 ff.), whose conclusion, coinciding closely with that of Müller, has recently won the approval of Sidney Smith (Alalakh and Chronology, p. 37, n. 102). To quote Yeivin's own words, 'Niya must be if not actually on the banks of the Euphrates at any rate within easy reach of the river, either on its west or east side'. With this opinion I cannot agree, nor do I think it follows from the material available to Yeivin in 1934. To take the hieroglyphic evidence first: in the inscription, probably of Iuthmosis I, published Naville, Deir el Bahari, [I], Pl. 7 and again Urk. IV, 103 ff., Yeivin is perfectly right in condemning Sethe's extraordinarily clever, but altogether over-daring, restoration of a text of which actually only twelve words are preserved. Sethe makes the sculptor say: '[His Majesty himself hunted $\underline{\text{xx}}$] elephants [in the land of Nahrin, being on his] chariot, [after His Majesty had proceeded to overthrow] Upper [Ketynu], in [his 4th campaign of victory. His Majesty came to the land] of Niy [and found these elephants there]', etc. It is at least clear that an elephant hunt at Niy, similar to that of Iuthmosis III forty years later, is here being recalled, but there is no ground for accepting




more than a small fraction of Sethe's restorations; in particular the phrase implying that Niz was in Nahrin has nothing to justify it.

The sources for Tuthmosis III's hunt are now four in number, the most picturesque, of course, being that in Amenemhat's narration, the subject of recent interesting comment by Newberry (JEA XXX, 75):

'Again [I saw] another excellent feat which the Lord of the Two Lands performed in the land of Niy, when he hunted 120 elephants for the sake of their tusks. Then began the largest elephant among them to fight opposite His Majesty, but I cut off his trunk (lit. 'his hand') whilst he was alive in front of His Majesty, I standing in the water between two stones. Then my Lord rewarded me with gold,' etc.

Apart from the mention of the water and whatever can be learnt from the place-names in the preceding and following incidents (see above, p. 157*) this passage throws no light on the geographical position. On the great Gebel Barkal stela (ll. 16 f.) the Nir episode almost immediately follows the detailed description of the Nahrin campaign (ll. 8 ff.). Three important Egyptian words must here be discussed in order to justify my rendering of the sentence intervening in ll. 14 f., namely 'I turned southward to Egypt, after I had put Nahrin to the sword'. (1) The verb hsj (hzy), 3rd ac inf., is rendered 'sieh begeben nach'; Wb. III, 159, 4. Disregarding here the transitive and reflexive uses, I wish to point out that in Dyns XVIII - XIX hsj was the technical term used for the homeward turn after the culminating point of an expedition had been reached. Thus in the Gebel Barkal passage just quoted, and again on the Karnak stela of Amenophis II, ll. 9-10 'second month of summer, day 10, turning back southwards towards Egypt'; and so too at the end of the Kadesh Poem (Kuentz, 323) 'His Majesty turned peacefully homeward'. This meaning was recognized as long ago as 1896 by Griffith, who

in ZAS XXXIV, 45 translated Millingen 2, 10 'I pushed up to Elephantine and  I turned back to Natho' (lege 'the papyrus marshes'). I regret that in my *Notes on the Story of Sinuhe*, p. 23, I did not recognize this sense (see now above, p. 142*). Here it need only be added that the intransitive and reflexive uses followed by *m* with a person (*Wb.* III, 159, 5. b. 12) must signify 'turn back to face....' in an aggressive way; cf. also *m* *hs.f* 'coming to meet him', *Urk.* IV, 1105, 17, together with *Wb.* III, 159, 15 ff.


(2) The words  *hd(i)* and  *hnt(i)* are well known to signify 'fare downstream' and 'sail upstream' respectively, and the difference of the determinatives is significant, a sail obviously being of far greater use when travelling against the stream. On the Nile these verbs may naturally be rendered alternatively 'travel northwards' and 'travel southwards'; the question now arises, what was their meaning when employed in reference to foreign travel, far from the great northward flowing river of Egypt? The question becomes vital in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, since that river flows from north to south. For example, in *Urk.* IV, 697, 6, following the narration of the crossing of the Euphrates and the erection of a stela beside it, the text continues  'after His Majesty (Tuthmosis III) had travelled ^{northwards?} _{southwards?}}', sacking the towns and razing the villages of that fallen one of vile Nahrin'. Yeivin (*JPOS* XIV, 214, n. 103) thinks that here *hd(i)* may have had its original sense 'fare downstream', i.e. since the Euphrates is in question, southwards. Breasted (*Ancient Records*, II, § 479) took the opposite view, for which he was taken to task by Meyer, *Geschichte*², II, 1, 127, n. 3. Meyer prefaces his comments with the not very pertinent remark (since Tuthmosis and his army obviously travelled by land after the river-crossing) that the Euphrates is navigable only downstream. In support of his own

opinion. Meyer quoted the well-known passage of the Tombos stela (*Urk.* IV, 85, 14), where the Euphrates is described as 'that inverted water which makes *hd(i)* in making *hnt(i)*'. To translate this description adequately into any modern European language is impossible, since if we render with Breasted 'which goes downstream in going upstream', the verbal antithesis is preserved only at the cost of a contradiction in terms, and if we render with Meyer *auf dem man beim Südwardfahren abwärts fährt*, we lose the verbal antithesis which alone gives point to the Egyptian description. However, Breasted propitiates his puzzled readers with an admirable footnote: 'For the Egyptian on the Nile north was "downstream" and south was "upstream". It seemed very curious to him that in another country as here on the Euphrates, one went south in going downstream; hence the anomaly of the text, which becomes clear if we substitute "south" for "upstream".' It will be seen that Breasted has no substantial fault to find with Meyer's rendering, but he draws exactly the opposite conclusion. It is difficult to understand why Meyer imagined that the Tombos passage confirmed his view; he appears to have overlooked that his own translation, in a passage admittedly referring to the Euphrates, renders *hnt(i)* with 'travel southwards', a rendering that implies a meaning 'travel northwards' for *hd(i)*, the opposite of *hnt(i)*. However peculiar the physical constitution of the Euphrates, obviously the Egyptians would not, when on its banks, divest themselves of their usual linguistic habits. The decisive argument is provided by other passages illustrating the way in which these two verbs were employed in reference to the Syrian and Mesopotamian areas. In the passage of the Gebel Barkal stela which was our starting-point (p. 159*) the addition of *z* *Is-mri* 'to Egypt' shows that *m* *hnt(i)* must here signify 'southwards', since even though a considerable westward journey was also involved, the predominant direction

both with the speedy destruction of Šmšw-itrn 'Shemesh-
Bdom, an unidentified town named in Tuthmosis III's Syrian list (Urk.
IV, 783, No. 51, see above, p. 139*), on a block of the reign of Amenophis II,
(Ann. Serv. XXXVII, 43, fig. 6) and on what appears to be a Stolemaic
copy of the same published by Müller, Egyptological Researches, II, p. 66.
This, if the reading of M1 is correct, was on the 25th day of the 1st month
of summer; on the very next day (K4) His Majesty crossed the ford of
the Orontes (K4 = M4 f.). At that point he found himself obliged to turn
about to look after the rear of his army, who were being attacked by some
Asiatics. After pursuing these and slaying their leader (K5 f. = M5 f.),
Amenophis returned (A4 𐎏𐎟𐎗𐎟 M6) in triumph, presumably to the ford of
the Orontes. Now since the very same word (mšdt) is used in reference to
the ford crossed by Rameses II a short distance S. of Kadesh (Kuentz, 231.
351), we might be inclined to suppose that the ford crossed by Amenophis
was that identical one. However, the place-names found in the next few
lines suggest a position much further north, though not necessarily so
far north as the mouth of the Orontes, where Badawi, the editor of M, is in-
clined to put it. What follows is of great importance for the position of
Niy. In K9 we find the notice 'second month of summer, day 10, turning
back southwards towards Egypt' quoted above, p. 159*; these important
words are omitted by M. Of course we cannot be sure what the king had
been doing since the 26th day of the 1st month, the date last mentioned;
he may possibly, after dealing with Asiatics attacking his rear, not only
have returned to the ford, but also have marched a long distance beyond
it, probably without any opposition to speak of. It is not, accordingly, quite
certain that the ford of the Orontes already mentioned was not that to the
S. of Kadesh, though if so, we must acknowledge that the annalist has

made a great leap forward at this point. Immediately after the turn southward, both texts record a visit by chariot which the king made to Niyy, where he found the chief and the men and women of the town manning the walls and supplicating him for peace (K 10 = M 7). That Niyy lay S. of the point where His Majesty made his homeward turn is explicitly stated by M ($\overline{\text{A}} \text{L}^1$ Δ III $\Delta\Delta$ $\overline{\text{B}}$ $\overline{\text{H}}$) 'His Majesty drew nigh southwards to Niyy'. The next movement in the campaign was related more fully by K than by M: K 11 reads 'Now His Majesty had heard that some Asiatics who were in the town of $\overline{\text{Q}} \text{U}^1$ $\overline{\text{S}}$ 'Ikt' were striving to find a way of ejecting the troops of His Majesty'; M 8 has simply 'His Majesty drew nigh to $\overline{\text{Q}} \text{U}^1$ $\overline{\text{S}}$ 'Ikt'. Both texts agree, however, in stating that the king surrounded all those who had defied him (Δ Δ $\overline{\text{D}}$ $\overline{\text{O}}$ bṭn sw nb) and annihilated them (K 12 = M 8). On account of the inexplicable omission of the r, I had felt sceptical about admitting the identity of $\overline{\text{Q}} \text{U}^1$ $\overline{\text{S}}$ in the Karnak text with $\overline{\text{A}} \text{N}^1$ $\overline{\text{T}}$ $\overline{\text{U}}$ $\overline{\text{M}}$ 'Ikt' named among the allies of the Hittites in the Kadesh campaign (Kuentz, 214. 227. 241. 342) and occurring also in the topographical lists (Simons, lists IX. XII), this latter being now by common consent equated with Babyl. Ugarit of the Amârnah and Boghaz Keui tablets, the site of which has been excavated by Schaeffer at Rās esh-Shamrah, near the sea 11 km. N. of Ladiķīyeh (Laodicea), see the sketch-map, p. 133*; however, the statement in the next line of M(9) that the king passed a peaceful night in his tent near $\overline{\text{Z}}$ $\overline{\text{I}}$ $\overline{\text{X}}$ $\overline{\text{M}}$ 'Irḫ' dissipated my doubts, since the Amârnah letter 126, 5, as Badawi has seen, names Talkhi and Ugarit together as sources of Urkarinu-wood, adding that the writer (Rib-addi of Byblus) cannot send any of this wood since Aziru of Amor does not allow his ships to land there. It is unnecessary to follow the details of this first

campaign much further, since most of the places named are unknown; however, it is of importance to note that immediately after its account of the chastisement of Ugarit K 13 appears to have a reference to 'all [Al]alakh', i.e. to the region a little distance inland from Antioch, see above, No. 253; there follows a date 'second month of summer, day 20+...', indicating a minimum of 10 days and a maximum of 19 for all the movements from the turn in the homeward direction to the subjection of Alalakh; M 10, on the contrary, soon brings Amenophis to Kadesh.

Before attempting to draw a conclusion from these two most interesting documents — we need not concern ourselves with the naming of Niy in two topographical lists, Simons I, 132 and VI — it will be well to review the cuneiform evidence. It is not true to say, as Ueivin does (op. cit. 221) that the two mentions of Niy in the 'Amârnah letters' do not help at all in the identification. The first is in a letter from Akizzi, king of Katna, and Katna (Eq.  Kdn, see Urk IV, 188, 15 and in the topographical lists, Simons, Index, p. 216) has been proved from tablets found on the site to be El-Mishrifah, 18 km. N. E. of Homs; Jirku, 26, n. 1 is seemingly over-cautious in not considering the references to the goddess 'Nin-egal, lady of Katna' sufficient evidence. The second letter is addressed to Pharaoh by the inhabitants of Tunip (see below under No. 260); both name Niy as a place known to and of interest to the writers: 53, 40 ff. says that just as Akizzi himself loves Pharaoh, so also do the king of Nukhashshe (below, pp. 168* ff.), the king of Niy and the king of Zinzar (above, p. 154*), these names all evoking the neighbourhood of the Orontes N. of Kadesh; 59, 24 is less informative, merely expressing the fear lest Aziru might treat Tunip as he had treated Niy. The treaty between the Hittite king Shubbiluliu and the

Mitanni king Mattiuaza (Weidner, Politische Dokumente, p. 11) mentions in the historical portion how the former, having returned from his victorious foray into Mitanni, crossed the Euphrates and made himself the lord of Halpa (Aleppo) and of Mukish; then he adds (I quote from Ueivin, 221), 'Takuwa, the king of Niy, came to meet me at the land of Mukish to sue for peace'; naturally Takuwa could have come from any point of the compass, provided the distance was not too great, but the least probable of all starting-points is that advocated by Sidney Smith (loc. cit.), who writes 'Niy lay almost due east of Aleppo, hence the king of that land followed the Hittite to Mukish'; if Niy had been where Sidney Smith states, would not Takuwa have been much more likely to stay quietly at home, rejoicing to see the back of the redoubtable Hittite conqueror?




Let us sum up: Niy lay on the homeward route from Nahrin and was not in that country; also it lay on a lake, not on the Euphrates or any other river. The stelae of Amenophis II prove, however, beyond a doubt that it was situated somewhere within range of the Orontes, the northernmost possibility being Alalakh, and the southernmost Kadesh. It speaks against the neighbourhood of Alalakh that in the Hittite treaty Takuwa had to 'come to' Mukish, consequently he was not there on the spot. The stelae of Amenophis show signs of irresolution or of conforming to the exigencies of the moment after the homeward turn; following upon the chastisement of Ugarit we do not expect to find the king again 70 km. further north at Alalakh. Lastly, we have found Niy a subject of interest to a king of Katna, over 35 km. N. of Kadesh. Winkler appears to have placed Niy at Apamea, now Kalat el-Mudik, E. of the Orontes, and on the way from Hamath to El-Bâreh, see Weber in Knudtzon, EA, 1115; here


was the ים-אֶפְרַיִם 'the sea (or 'lake') of Apamea'; and Albright (*apud* Yeivin, 222, n. 148), I know not upon what grounds, wished to associate himself with Winkler's conjecture. This would be a little south of the latitude of Kâs esh-Shamrah, and it seems to me, in view of all the data, a very good guess indeed. Nor is that guess vitiated by the fact, pointed out by both Yeivin and Sidney Smith, that Tiglathpileser I hunted elephants in the district between the Euphrates and the Khâbir; elephants may have been found in several different places.



It was said above, p. 158*, that if it should be proved, on other grounds, that Niy was situated somewhere in the N. of Syria, the biography of Amenemhat might reasonably be used as corroborative testimony. In that text, as is shown above all by the twofold reference to Kadesh, once before and once after Niy, there seems to have been the same sort of vacillation in this part of Syria alike in the campaign of Tuthmosis III and that of Amenophis II. But at least we now see that in Amenemhat Niy is not glaringly out of its true position, and thus we have discovered nothing to contradict the conjecture, frail though it may be thought by some, that the narrative of that doughty warrior relates in their true order events all belonging to the eighth campaign of Tuthmosis III in his 33rd year.



3. Eg. Ngs = Babyl. Nuhašše 'Nukhashshe'. The location of Eg. Ngs is of interest in connexion with several of the problems discussed in the above pages. We have seen (p. 146*) that Tuthmosis III mentioned this as one of three towns which had apparently been or contained property of the prince of Kadesh (Urk. IV, 664, 17 ff.) and which he subsequently presented to Amūn (744, 3 ff., cf. 185, 15 ff.). These towns were captured and made friendly in the 34th year, though four years later some

places in 'the province' (Ḫ) of Ngs had to be subdued, see 716, 15-17; 717, 5. The three towns, the names of which were Ngs, Yncm (𐎶𐎠𐎢𐎴𐎠𐎢𐎴𐎠𐎢𐎴) and Hnkr (𐎶𐎠𐎢𐎴𐎠𐎢𐎴𐎠𐎢𐎴), are said (744, 3) to have been in Upper Retjnu. The last-named town is unknown elsewhere, and some slight difficulty arises over Yncm, since there are some grounds for placing this S.W. of Tiberias (above, p. 146*) and therefore rather far S. for Upper Retjnu, if my reasoning in connexion with the latter is sound; in any case, it is surprising to find this place mentioned as in any way connected with Kadesh. These difficulties, on which see Noth in ZDPV LXI [1938], 63, n. 1, ought not perhaps to be minimized; on the other hand, I do not feel that they need impede us in identifying Ngs with Babyl. Nuhašše and Aram. 𐤍𐤒𐤔, an equivalence which will be found to harmonize well with the conception we have formed concerning Upper Retjnu. Phonetically the correspondence of Eg. ḡ with Babyl. ḫ and Aram. or Hebr. ṣ is unexceptionable, and the example of Gaza (below, No. 264) shows that the Arabic letter here would have been ḡ ghayin; other parallels are Sangar (No. 286) and the name of the Mitannian princess Lulukhepa (below, p. 174*). The complex problem was fully discussed by Noth in ZDPV LII (1929), 124 ff. The Aramaic 𐤍𐤒𐤔 'Lacash' is found in an inscription of the 8th cent. B.C. erected by Zkr, the king of Hamath, 70 km. N. of Kadesh, and of Lacash, and found at Afis, 40 km. S.W. of Aleppo, see the sketch-map, p. 133*; it is not certain, however, that Lacash was Afis, and indeed the equation of Nuhašše with Lacash might be questioned, though the position of both seems to have been very similar; the identification of Lacash with Nuhašše is at all events not indispensable to the equation of Nuhašše with Eg. Ngs. For the position of

the latter there is, on the Egyptian side, an important piece of evidence in the mention of  'the entire land of Ngs' among the allies of the Hittites in the Kadesh texts (Kuentz, 224). Among those allies Kadesh seems to have been the southernmost, and indeed it is intrinsically improbable that any other should have been further south. As pointed out elsewhere in this book, the proximity of names in topographical lists cannot be taken as evidence of proximity of position; none the less it is interesting to note that on a colossal statue from the temple of Amenophis III at Thebes, as copied by Rosellini, the name of  Ngs stands next to  Arb 'Aleppo'; see *Bull. inst. fr.* XXXV, 144. The evidence for Nukhashshe in the Amarnah letters was fully reviewed by Weber in Knudtzon, *EA*, 1103 ff. Both he and Noth seem to me to depreciate somewhat unjustly this source of evidence. For example, the juxtaposition of the kings of Nukhashše, Nii and Linzar in one letter (see above, p. 166*) suggests that they were neighbours. However, the testimony from Boghaz Keui seems more convincing; according to one document (Weidner, *Politische Dokumente*, No. 1, ll. 38 ff.) the Hittite king Shubbiluliu coming from Asia Minor passed through Nukhashshe on the way to Kadesh on Orontes. The equivalence Nukhashše = Ngs is further evidenced by the fact that both were clearly not merely a town, but a whole region; for the Egyptian expressions revealing this see above. The maps in Sidney Smith, *Early History of Assyria*; Bilabel, *Geschichte* thus appear to indicate the position of Nukhashše = Ngs quite correctly; it occupied an area of indeterminate size between Homs and Aleppo. One additional piece of information about Ngs in an Egyptian text is interesting as showing the great mixture of populations in Palestine

and Syria at the time of the Egyptian conquests there; the Memphis stela of Amenophis II mentions among the prisoners taken in that king's second campaign '15070 living  Nugassians' (*Ann. serv.* XLII, 21); this is the more curious, since the second campaign does not seem to have reached much further north than the plain of Esdraelon.




[259]  G, Ncrayn 'Ne-carin (?)'; no such people or country appears elsewhere in Egyptian texts, the only similar word being a Semitic one, Hebr. נְעָרִים 'youths', employed in the hieroglyphs to designate some sort of troop in the Egyptian army, *Wb.* II, 209, 10. However, Sidney Smith comments as follows: 'There is a possibility that this is a true geographical name. The Assyrians from the ninth century onwards continually mention the Nairi-land or -lands; these districts were situated along the Taurus, between Miliddu (= Mulatia) and Lake Wan, and were sometimes subject to Urartu but not normally. The name does not occur earlier, so we may presume that it is a political term that arose owing to the landslide of 1200 B.C. It is possible that the Egyptians would know this name, for this area produced the hard woods that were imported into Egypt, as Schäfer has shown. As to the phonetic equation, Nairi implies a Stimmablaut, Na'-iri and that ' may well be an 'ayin which would correspond to Egyptian '. Sidney Smith admits, in conclusion, that this is a mere guess, and that the difference of date is an objection.




[260]  G;  R, Nhrayn (Nhry) 'Nahrin', the country near and mainly to the E. of the Euphrates in its upper courses (closer definition below), *Babyl.* Nafrima, Narima, Hebr. נַהֲרַיִם 'Naharaim' (but the Massoretic pointing as a dual is wrong), for references see *Wb.* II, 284, 1; Gauthier, III, 96, and for an analysis of many occurrences


of the name with dates, Breasted, Anc. Rec. Index, p. 89; earliest examples in the reign of Tuthmosis I, Urk. IV, 9, 10, latest perhaps, apart from On. Am. and the topographical lists (Simons, Index, p. 208), in the Hades and other texts of Ramesses II, e.g. Kuentz, 212. 226. 341; it is particularly worthy of note that Nahrin is not mentioned in the much-quoted passage from the inscription of year 8 of Ramesses III enumerating the important countries that had been unable to withstand the onslaught of the 'Peoples of the Sea', see above, p. 135*. Müller's chapters on the subject Asien u. Europa, chs. 20. 21, pp. 249 ff.) need thorough-going revision. As regards pronunciation and etymology the following points are of importance: the occasional variant (so regularly in the story of the Doomed Prince, early Dyn. XIX; also Anast. IV, 15, 4) presumably incorporates the word rn 'name', Copt. ^{so} PAN, PIN in its status absolutus, and this indicates a pronunciation Nahr̄in or Nahrina, identical with that of the Amārnah letters except that the latter replace the Egyptian n by m; the traditional Hebrew pointing as a dual is thus ruled out, and Meyer's substitution of the interpretation Παροποταμία as given by Polybius for Μεσοποταμία as supposed by Champollion (Müller, 249) is, accordingly, very apt. At all events the word for 'river', Hebr. נָהָר Nāhār, constitutes the main portion of the name, as is attested, not only by the location on the Euphrates, but also by the determinative in the rare Dyn. XVIII hieroglyphic variant Urk. IV, 710, 15 (see also 710, 4; 711, 5 compared with the writing for the bed of the brook Kn, 655, 13). With regard to the ending -n (or possibly -na) Sidney Smith writes: 'It is connected with the adjectival -anu formation, of which a good example is ^{ad} Labnanu, Mount Lebanon [eg. Rmn̄n,

later Rbrn, Wb. II, 421, 5; 414, 5], from an old Laban which occurs in the Amarna letters in the form Lapan. This view of the termination is made certain by the form Nahr̄ima, for this -ma is also a geographical ending in Syria; Sidney Smith then quotes Skmm on the stela of Sebekkhu, Garatang, El Arabah, Pl. 5. In support of this view compare the word Nhr̄y 'noble of Nahr̄in', quoted Wb. II, 286, 11 from an unpublished Dyn. XVIII inscription; it is doubtful what importance is to be attached to forms without the final -n like Davies, Tombs of Two Officials, Pl. 28; cf. also the variant of R here in On. Am.

So far as the Amārnah letters are concerned, the Babylonian name Nahr̄ima (with variants) is found only in the mouths of Syrian and Palestinian princes. That by it, as well as by the Egyptian 'Nahr̄in', the kingdom of Mitanni was meant in Dyn. XVIII, at least from the reign of Tuthmosis III onwards, is proved by decisive evidence. From that reign, but not earlier, the name Mtn 'Mitanni', Babyl. Mitanni, occurs occasionally in hieroglyphic (Gauthier, III, 25 f.), and Yeivin (JPOS XIV, 197, n. 18) has shown that the occurrences of Mtn on the Igebel Barkal stela of Tuthmosis III fully establish the identical application of that name and of Nhr̄n; whilst the latter is the word there usually employed, l. 6 speaks of 'the vast army of Mitanni' and l. 12 commemorates the seeking of 'that vile enemy [] [throughout] the countries of Mitanni'. Even more convincing is the hieratic docket (ZÄS XXVII, 63) on the tablet from Amārnah (No. 27) containing a letter to Amenophis IV from Tushrat-ta, who there, as always, styles himself 'king of Mitanni'; the docket, which names the same messengers as the cuneiform text, refers to the

letter as  'the letter of Nahrin'. Lastly, the princess *Ḫg*,  *Ḫg*, a wife of Amenophis III, is said on that king's marriage scarab (Newberry, *Scarabs*, Pl. 32) to have been  daughter of the prince of Nahrin *Strn*, while the Amārnah letter 17 from the above mentioned Iushratta alludes to her as 'Giluḫepa, my sister', another letter (29) disclosing the fact that this sister was the daughter of Iushratta's father Shuttarna, who was likewise king of Mitanni. As regards the position and extent of Nahrin, Müller's views have vitiated the opinions and the maps of Egyptologists and Assyriologists alike; here we usually find Nahrin and Mitanni distinguished, Nahrin extending to the W. as far as the Orontes and to the E. an indefinite distance beyond the Euphrates, while Mitanni is confined to the region E. of the Euphrates. The presumed westward extension of Nahrin rests upon testimony of the reign of Ramesses II to be examined later. We may begin by asking ourselves whether Nahrin was a purely geographical or a purely political term; if the former, its boundaries are likely to have been relatively stable, though perhaps vague; if the latter, the area of the land will have expanded or contracted with the military successes or failures of its armies. Unhappily it seems impossible to make a definite choice between the alternatives above offered; the name was geographical at least to the extent that it clearly alludes to the river Euphrates, and political to the extent that in the reign of Iuthmosis III until towards the end of the dynasty Nahrin and Mitanni appear to be synonymous and convertible terms. We have no choice but to consider the problem historically. Much is now known about the history of Mitanni, see (e.g.) Sidney Smith, *Early History of Assyria*, chs. 14.15; Albright in *JEAS* XIV, 283 ff.; Weber in Knudtzon, *EAS*, 1039 ff. The earliest king who is known by name was Saushohatar, who may or may not


have ascended the throne as early as the latter portion of the reign of Iuthmosis III. It is not known whether Mitanni was already an independent kingdom when Iuthmosis I crossed the Euphrates and set up a stela on its east bank, thus claiming sovereignty over Nahrin (*Urk* IV, 694, 3 ff., cf. also 9, 10; 36, 10; 85, 13-14). The Gebel Barkal stela (*ZAS* LXIX, 24 ff.) gives the most circumstantial account (though there are others, see above, pp. 154* ff.; 162*) of the same feat as repeated by Iuthmosis III in his 33rd year¹, and here we find the important description of the way in which he crossed the Euphrates ( *Phr-wr*, Gauthier, II, 149, perhaps rather 'the Great Winder' than 'the Great Bend', as rendered by Breasted), boats being constructed near Byblus and hauled on cars to enable 'His Majesty's [army] to cross  'that great river which flows between this country and Nahrin'. The biography of Amenemhab speaks (*Urk* IV, 891, 8 ff.) of a capture made 'in the land of Carchemish' before it goes on to narrate the crossing of  'the water of Nahrin'. These two passages indicate, the first of them very explicitly, the second less so, that Nahrin lay to the E. of the Euphrates, and there seems no good reason for combating that view. Perhaps, however, it needs to be interpreted somewhat liberally, since the Armant stela, as we have seen p. 162*, refers to the crushing of the towns on both sides of the river, and those on the W. bank may have been accounted to Nahrin as well as


¹So apparently explicitly stated *Urk* IV, 694, 4, though after a serious lacuna, and the passage is obscure for other reasons. The word 'eastern' is unluckily missing on the Armant stela, see above, p. 162*. The Gebel Barkal stela says (l. 13) that the stela was erected  'on that mountain of Nahrin, being taken from a mountain on the west side of the Euphrates'; Reisner translated 'carved in the mountain on the western side of the Euphrates', surely wrongly; perhaps the stone was better on the W. bank, or perhaps the quarrying work had to be done while the transport of the troops was in progress. The erection of such stelae was the Egyptian equivalent of our hoisting of the Union Jack.

referring to Nahrin, Gebel Barkal stela, 8; the antithesis of Karoy and Nahrin has been mentioned above, cf. also the scarab of Amenophis III, Berlin 16781 = Aeg. Inschr. II, 261. It remains to add that the kingdom of Mitanni was clearly thought of as a confederation of lands; h3 swt Mtn 'countries of Mitanni' (p. 113*) occurs again JE XIV, 281, and h3 swt Mtn 'lands of Mitanni' is found in the tomb of Menkheper-rasont (Urk. IV, 931, 1) and elsewhere (op. cit. 589, 9, cf. 616, 8).





After less (perhaps much less) than two centuries of domination Mitanni disappears from the historical scene and from the Egyptian inscriptions, except as a memory in certain Ramesside topographical lists (Simons, Index, p. 204); the growing power of Assyria had put an end to her ambitions. The name of Nahrin, however, still figures largely in the texts of the time of Ramesse II, and the question is, what is meant by it? Among the allies of the Hittites in the Kadesh inscriptions Nahrin finds a prominent place (Kuentz, 212. 22b. 341), as does also at least one city-state (Carchemish) in the direction of the Euphrates. It might perhaps be thought that Nahrin was now used as a rather vague geographical term no longer confined to trans-Euphratean lands; the Kadesh poem, however, provides evidence that it still possessed some sort of political meaning. It is obviously the Ramesside testimony which hindered Müller from regarding Mitanni and Nahrin as coterminous. On p. 136* attention has been drawn to a scene in the temple of Luxor, where Ramesse II is seen storming a town evidently occupied by the Hittites and described as 'in the land of Kedy and in the territory (x S S) of Nahrin'. A similar state of affairs is found in reference to the town of Dpr 'Dapur'. In a scene at the Ramesseum referring to the



campaign of Ramesse II's eighth year (Wreszinski, Atlas, II, Pl. 90), this place is described as h3 swt Mtn 'the town which His Majesty sacked in the land of Amor'. The great men of the town are here shown as Syrians; for the land of Amor see below, No. 571. In the two parallel scenes where Ramesse II is seen attacking without his corselet (op. cit. II, Pls. 107-9, Luxor; Pls. 78-9, Ramesseum), the line of inscription on the fortress itself runs, in the one case 'Town of Khatti which His Majesty took', and in the other 'Town which His Majesty took h3 swt Mtn in the land of Khatti'; the latter formulation is valuable as showing that 'in the land of' need not be understood geographically, but only militarily; in the accompanying text describing Ramesse's valour in attacking without troubling to don his armour (ZAS XLIV, 36 ff.) Dapur is not actually named, but is described as h3 swt Mtn 'the town [of the] fallen ones of Khatti which is in the territory of the town of Junip in the land of Nahrin'; and here the defenders are depicted as Hittites. The approximative position of Junip, Babyl. Junip, (Gauthier, VI, 49; Weber in Knudtzon, EA 1125) is given by the Kadesh Report (Kuentz, 345), which speaks of the Hittite king as still far from Kadesh 'in the land of Aleppo (Hrb) N. of Junip'. Concerning Dapur nothing further is known; its mention in Anast. I, 22, 4 next Kadesh cannot form the basis of any argument, and it is useless building upon the improbable comparison with Heb. דביר Debir. Here then we have a town which is stated to be (1) in the land of the Hittites, (2) in the land of Amor, (3) in the territory of Junip, and (4) in the land of Nahrin; (1) and (2) can be understood as signifying that after

(and) the region of the (plur.) Khor's (demotic, A5) corresponds to Ἐκ τε Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης in the Greek. The story of Wenamün (2,39) likewise testifies to the inclusion of Phoenicia in the land of Khor (Dyn. XXI): the Egyptian hero of the tale, sojourning in Byblus, contrived to have a messenger sent to Egypt, who in due course returned to him in Khor (A44 ); other passages in the same text (1,8; 1,x+14) mention 'the great sea of Khor', in the former place referring to the Mediterranean coast between Egypt and Hôr just S. of Carmel. So too, as Griffith, *Rylands Papyri*, III, 318 points out, the Satrap stela (Urk. II, 15,4) speaks of the expedition 'to the land of Khor' in connexion with the Gaza campaign. It is thus clear that later conceptions placed the entire Philistine and Phoenician coast at least as far N. as Byblus within the territory of Khor; even as early as the beginning of Dyn. XIX Khor was evidently sometimes thought of as a vast country, presumably embracing the whole of Syria; this emerges from the fact that in the story of the Doomed Prince (55) the ruler of Nahrin, i.e. Mitanni, seeking suitors for his daughter's hand, 'caused to be brought all sons of all the princes of the land of Khor'.

In Dyn. XVIII¹ references to Khor as a land are very rare, the earliest known being in the Annals of Tuthmosis III, where a 'great ewer in work of Khor' is among the booty taken at Megiddo from the possessions of the prince of Kadesh (Urk. IV, 665,16), and where another passage mentions '5 bows of Khor' among plunder taken (op. cit. 712,2). Since the Annals elsewhere (op. cit. 699,8) speak of silver vessels in 'work of Djahy ()' and apparently have a preference for Djahy as the regular name of Palestine as distinct from Syria (see above, p. 1145*ff), these references to artefacts of Khor may have been specifically to the work of

¹ Breasted's restoration (*Syria*, XVI, 318 ff.) of the name Khor on the statue of the M. K. vizier Senwoaret 'ankh found at Ras esh-Shamah (see the photograph op. cit. XV, Pl. 14 with pp. 131f.) is unacceptable on many grounds: (1) it is anachronistic; (2) the determinatives are absent; (3) it does not suit the context; and (4) it would be at best a very daring conjecture.

that element of the population called Khorians (see below), though this is a mere guess. One of the only other monuments of Dyn. XVIII mentioning Khor as a land is the stela of a standard-bearer of (the regiment called)  Menkhepruwer (i.e. Tuthmosis IV) - destroys Khor, Louvre C 202 - Brugsch, *Thes.* 1461; no useful inference can be drawn from such a mention. Occasionally even in Dyn. XIX, the name Hsrw is apparently used in such a way as to envisage only a restricted area in southern Palestine; so perhaps when Sethos I is said to have 'caused the princes of Khor to have ceased from boasting', Lepsius, *Denkm.* III, 126, 1, or when it was reported to him that the enemies of the Beduin country ( Hsrw) had 'abjured sloth (?) and their heads of tribes were gathered together all in one place, standing on the hills of Khor () and had started turmoil and violence', op. cit. 128 a. 1; elsewhere in the same series of scenes (op. cit. 126, a) we are told that Sethos spoiled the Beduins (Hsrw) 'from the fortress of Selē to (the) Canaan'. So too on the Israel stela (l. 27) the dictum 'Khor is become a widow (Hsrw, paronomasia) for Egypt' follows immediately upon others concerning Isezer, Yenoam and Israel, which suggests a limited region, though it is true that the series started with Ijehnu (Libya) and Khatti. It may be noted that Khor never appears in the topographical lists edited by Simons and discussed by Jerku, but perhaps it was not to be expected there.¹ The earlier equivalent was  Ktnw 'Ketjnu', see above, pp. 1142*ff.

Rather less rare in Dyn. XVIII are references to 'the Khorians' () and varr.) as a people, and in one of the earliest examples (Urk. IV, 649,10, Annals of Tuthmosis III) these are coupled with  Kdw 'the Kedians', evidently the natives of Kedy (above, No. 251), whom we found as the Syrian neighbours of the Mitannians, somewhere between Carchemish and the Mediterranean; this alone would suggest that the term Khorians already at

¹ Breasted's restoration in the Karnak list of Amenophis II (*Ancient Records*, II, 5798 A) is a mistake, as Simons, p. 129 points out.

this time signified, if not all the Syrian peoples south of a point fairly far north, at least a very important element in the populations of Syria and Palestine. Striking fresh evidence of this is found in the recently discovered great stela of Amenophis II from Mit Rahînah (Memphis), see Ann.-Sew. XLII, Pl. I and p. 21; here the prisoners taken in the second campaign are summed up as 'princes of Retjnu, 144; brothers of princes, 179; 'Apiru' ($\overline{\text{𓂏}} \overline{\text{𓂐}} \overline{\text{𓂑}}$), 3600; living Beduins ($\overline{\text{𓁃}} \overline{\text{𓁄}} \overline{\text{𓁅}} \overline{\text{𓁆}} \overline{\text{𓁇}} \overline{\text{𓁈}} \overline{\text{𓁉}}$ Szsw (nhfsw)), 15020; Khorians ($\overline{\text{𓂀}} \overline{\text{𓂁}} \overline{\text{𓂂}}$), 36300; living Nugasians² ($\overline{\text{𓂃}} \overline{\text{𓂄}} \overline{\text{𓂅}} \overline{\text{𓂆}}$), 15070'; as the presence of 'Apiru'-people shows, not all of these names refer to either territorial or ethnic distinctions; for our purposes the main points to be noted are (1) the absence of the name of Khor as a land throughout the inscription, Retjnu appearing to take its place as a comprehensive designation of the country conquered, and (2) among the captives from this country the Khorians provide by far the largest contingent. A far smaller number of Khorian captives presented to Amūn (1588) is mentioned on a stela of Amenophis II's father Tuthmosis III (Urk. IV, 742, 8). A tablet of the reign of Tuthmosis IV (Petrie, Six Temples, Pl. 1, 7) speaks of the 'Settlement of "The Fortress of Menkheprurei" with the Khorians ($\overline{\text{𓂀}} \overline{\text{𓂁}} \overline{\text{𓂂}}$) [from] the booty of His Majesty in the town of Kd' — the town-name is doubtless to be restored, with Breasted, Ancient Records, II, § 821 and Gauthier, V, 164, as $\overline{\text{𓂃}} \overline{\text{𓂄}} \overline{\text{𓂅}} \overline{\text{𓂆}}$ Kd[?], i.e. Gezer, the Philistine town. An ostrakon of Dyn.

1 The latest and most thorough discussion of the 'Apiru is that by Speiser in the article quoted below, p. 186*, with valuable information furnished by Gunn, see pp. 33 ff. The present example is considerably the earliest of the seven now known from Egyptian texts, and is the only one, apart from that in the story of the Taking of Joppa, 15 and an obscure mention on a stela from Beisan dating from the reign of Sethos I, representing this people as dwelling on Palestinian or Syrian soil; also the very large number of prisoners named is remarkable. There can now be no doubt that the 'Apiru are identical with the Habiru of the 'Amarna tablets, and that the name corresponds to the later Hebr. word הַבְּרִי ḥebri 'Hebrew'. The etymological sense of the word is 'one who crosses' or 'passes by', and Speiser thinks that this was not yet an ethnic nor yet a topographical term, but was used to describe bodies of foreign adventurers constantly on the move.

2 For Ngo see above, p. 168* ff.

XVIII published by Steindorff ZÄS XXXVIII, 15 ff. gives a list of prisoners or slaves headed 'the new Khorians', some of the names being undoubtedly Semitic, while others are certainly not; for later discussions see Gustav, op. cit. LXIV, 54 ff. To show the wide extension of the term an example of the reign of Rameses II may be quoted; that king, reproaching his army as cowards at a critical moment of the Kadesh battle, exclaimed 'Would I were in Egypt like my fathers, who never saw Khorians and never fought with them', Kuentz, 275. Of great frequency throughout the New Kingdom (I have not been able to determine the date of the earliest examples) is the masc. personal name B-Hsrw 'Lehkōri' (Kanke, 116, 17), for which Pahura, Pihura have doubtless rightly been given as the Babyl. equivalents (Kanke in Knudtzon, EA 11 22); Hess (ZÄS XXX, 119 f.) quoted a bilingual ostrakon giving Ἰκ. ΠΧοῖρις for dem. B-Hsrw, though it is curious that the derivatives of Hsrw in Copt. Ⲡⲙⲉⲗ, ⲉⲕⲗⲟ (Spiegelberg, Mut. 230 f.) should show l in the place of r; the masc. name in Ramesside times more rarely lacks the article (Kanke, 273, 20. 24), but the fem. B-Hsrw 'Lehkōri' (op. cit. 364, 3) is common.

The problem of the land called Khor by the Egyptians has assumed an entirely new aspect since a non-Semitic people called Hurri 'the Khurrians' began to play an important part in the calculations of cuneiform scholars. The presence in Mesopotamia of a people of that name had long been known, but it was not until about twenty years ago that their great significance as a cultural influence in the second millennium B.C. began to be revealed by discoveries in the district of Kirkûk, E. of the Tigris and S.E. of Niniveh. The evidence of personal names has been the chief testimony to the wide dissemination of this people. Though opinions are still in a state of flux, scholars of high authority are now of opinion that the Khurrians contributed a large ingredient to the Hyksos invaders of Egypt, and

after the expulsion of these left behind them throughout Syria and Palestine elements of the population whom the Old Testament still knew as Ḥorites, e.g. Gen. 14, 6; Deut. 2, 12, in these passages located in Mount Seir and in Edom. Egyptologists had long been tempted to identify the Khorians of the Egyptian texts with the Biblical Horites, e.g. Haigh in ZÄS XIII, 29 f.; Stern, op. cit. XXI, 26, n. 1, though Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 155 f. felt unable to assent to that view. The present tendency is to identify the Hebrew Horites with the cuneiform Khurrians, rejecting, however, the etymology often mooted for the former from Hebr. ḥor 'cave', which would make them into Troglodytes. The connexion with the Khorians of the Egyptian texts is also mostly upheld, though it must be noted that no cuneiform equivalent is known for the land Khor as applied to Syria or Palestine. For the entire question see (e.g.) Speiser, *Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B. C.*, in *Ann. Amer. Sch. Or. Res.* 1933; Götze, *Hethiter, Churrites und Assyrer*, 1936; Alt, *Völker und Staaten Syriens* (*Der alte Orient*, XXXIV, 4), 1936, pp. 19 f.

Combining Babyl. Ḥurri, Hebr. Ḥori and Gk. Χοίρης the pronunciation Khōri seems justified for eg. Ḥrw, var. Ḥrw (Ḥrw), Ḥrw 'Khorian' (Wb. III, 232, 7 ff), especially if we transliterate Ḥr, Ḥri, regarding the spelling as group-writing; possibly, though not certainly, we may be right in vocalizing the name of the land as 'Khōr'. The conclusions suggested by the facts above rehearsed are that when the conquering Pharaohs of Dyn XVIII reached Palestine they found no inconsiderable portion of its inhabitants describing themselves as Ḥurri or Ḥori; this term the Egyptians extended to the entire population whether of non-Semitic or of Semitic stock; subsequently they formed from the eg. Khōri the name of a land Khōr, first perhaps applied only to southern Palestine, previously

called Djahy; later, however, Khōr was given a wider meaning so as to include Syria as far as the Amorite border.

571 Ḥmr irp n Ḥmr 'wine of Amor'. Babyl. Amurru occurs as name of this country often in the Amārnah letters, see the full discussion by Weber in Knudtzon, EA 1132 ff.; Hebr. has only Ḥmōri 'Amorite', a people represented in O.T. as living partly in the later Judah, and partly beyond the Jordan. We have here to deal neither with this Biblical tradition nor yet with the far earlier (3rd millennium B.C.) extension of the Amorite language and power into northern Babylonia; Sidney Smith, *Early History of Assyria*, 43 says of the word Amurru that throughout history it 'was used by the inhabitants of the river valleys to designate the northern plateau of the Syrian desert'; varying in extent, 'when it was a political entity, during the second millennium, its borders were sometimes confined to the hill country now known as the Jabal Druse, sometimes the term included lands from the Mediterranean to Hit'. Here we are concerned only with this later phase, from the Amārnah period onward; nor can the limits of the land be critically considered, the evidence for this belonging entirely to the cuneiform sources. In the Amārnah letters, Amor is definitely a state with the Phoenician port of Sumur (Zimyrā, see the sketch-map, p. 133*) as one of its principal towns¹, and possessing its own prince or ruler 'Abdi-Ashirta who, while professing allegiance to Pharaoh, was evidently far more under the influence of the aggressive Hittite power. 'Abdi-Ashirta's son Aziru, after at first leaning strongly on the side of Egypt, subsequently despaired of support from Akhenaten, who was wholly occupied with his religious

Textual Note. 571^a The det. ḥ is doubtless borrowed by attraction from irp preceding; emend ḥmr.

¹ Sumur of the Amārnah letters, the Zimyrā of Pliny, used to be placed at Tell Sumra, a short distance north of the mouth of the Eleutherus river (the Nahr el-Kelāḥ), see Weber in Knudtzon, EA 1141; now it is believed to have been situated at Tell Simiriyyān some distance further north, see *Syria*, XXI, 183. 22 ff.

On. Am. wine of Khor is contrasted with that of Amor. Such passages establish the separate identity in Ramesside times of the various countries named. To the same period belong examples of the personal name P_3 -Im(y) 'The Amorite', Pleyte & Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 37, 14; Mar., *Cat. d'Abydos*, No. 1055. There remains only to be recalled the mention in the Decree of Canopus, where, as we saw pp. 181* f., Amor as equivalent of $\Sigma\upsilon\pi\lambda\alpha$ is contrasted with 'the Khor' = $\Phi\omicron\iota\nu\iota\chi\eta$.

[261] lost. Since Nos. 262-4 are three of the five chief Philistine towns known to the Old Testament, it might seem natural to have found here one of the two others. However, neither Gath nor Ekron are known in hieroglyphic, nor yet in the Amārnah tablets, and there is no evidence that either was of importance in pre-Philistine times. Consequently, either Gezer (Gauthier, V, 164) or Lachish (op. cit. III, 129) is a likelier candidate for the vacant place. For the Philistines themselves, see No. 270 below.

[262] G , 'Iskūn 'Ascalon', Babyl. *Aškāluna*, Hebr. $\text{יִשְׁכּוֹן אֲשָׁלֹן}$, the modern عسقلان , on the coast N. of Gaza, Gauthier, I, 105 [the reference to Dümichen is wrong]; II, 166; IV, 210. Sethe suggested that G 'Iskūn on some of his magical potsherds (*Achtung feindlicher Fürsten*, pp. 52, 57) might refer to Ascalon, with z serving as z ; apart from this very doubtful Dyn. XII example and that in On. Am., only four Egyptian occurrences have been quoted. The earliest, probably dating from the second half of Dyn. XVIII, is P. Leningrad 1116 A, vs. 76 (also 186 b) where 'the envoy of Ascalon' (G Iskūn) is named in a list of envoys described in the heading as 'lords (mryn, Babyl. *maryannu*, said to mean properly 'chariot-warrior') of Djahy'. In several Amārnah letters (Nos. 320 ff.) the prince of Ascalon Widia protests his devotion to Pharaoh, but in 287, 14 Abakhiba of Jerusalem throws doubt upon the town's loyalty. It evidently had shown itself hostile in the reign of Ramesses II, since he is depicted storming it in a lively scene at Karnak, Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, 58; here its

defenders are typical Syrians. The Israel stela of Meneptah (Lacau, *Stèles*, p. 58, l. 27) uses in its much-quoted concluding boast the words G Iskūn 'Ascalon has been taken'. The town is never mentioned in the topographical lists, except in one fragment (Berlin, *Aeg. Inscr.* II, p. 597), where the name is written G Iskūn . None of our examples dates from after the conquest by the Philistines, when Ascalon became one of their chief cities.

[263] G , 'Isd 'Ash-dod', Assy. *Ašdudu*, Hebr. אֲשְׁדּוֹד , only here in Egyptian texts and not in the Amārnah letters. Another of the great Philistine cities, N. of Ascalon and not far from the sea.









[264] G , *gdt* 'Gaza', Babyl. *Gazati*, *Azzati*, Hebr. אֲזַטִי , Gk. $\Gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha$ (the equation with $\text{K}\acute{\alpha}\delta\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ Hdt. II, 159 is only an uncertain conjecture), Arab. غَزَّة the southernmost of the great Philistine towns, Gauthier, V, 164. 213. Its capture is mentioned (with the writing G Iskūn) at the beginning of Suthmosis III's first campaign, *Urk.* IV, 648, 10-1. In the Amārnah letters (Nos. 289, 296) it stands in danger of an enemy, doubtless the Habiri (see above, pp. 152*, 184*, n. 1) and has to be occupied by an Egyptian garrison. In the satirical letter Anast. I, 278 the scribe apostrophized is taunted with ignorance of the distance between Raphia

(G Rph) and Gaza, here written G Iskūn *Hdt.* In Anast. III, vs. 6, 1. 6 two men who carried post to Syria under King Meneptah are said to have been natives of Gaza, the name of the town on each occasion being faultily written. No mention of the town is found in the topographical lists.

[265] G , 'Isr 'Assyria' or, perhaps less probably, 'Asher'. The writing of G differs from that usual for 'Assyria', but also does not completely agree with that supposed to signify 'Asher'. The two alternatives must be examined. (1) G Isr 'Assyria', Babyl. *Assur*, Assy. *Aššur*, Hebr. אֲשֻׁר , Gauthier, I, 105. The meaning is assured by the earliest occurrences in the

Textual Note. 263^a < G > omitted by error.



Annals of Tuthmosis III, years 24 and 40, where gifts of the prince of Ashshur are mentioned, Urk. IV, 668, 6; 671, 8. Among those gifts is named in both cases ḥsd m3c 'true lapis lazuli', and lapis lazuli is mentioned in the 'Amārnah letters' (15, 12; 16, 11) as sent as a present from Assyria; however, the proof of the equation here in question is afforded by the inclusion among the same prince's gifts in year 40 of ḥsd nfr n Bbr 'good lapis lazuli of Babel', Urk. IV, 668, 13 (not real lapis, but a blue frit, Sidney Smith, Early History of Assyria, 232); this makes it well-nigh certain that Issr and Bbr refer to regions related in some way or not too far from one another. In view of the brilliant military success of Tuthmosis the princes of even very distant lands were only too ready to enter into friendly relations with him, so too the prince of Khatti (Urk. IV, 701, 11). It seems likely, though against usual Egyptian practice (see, however, No. 269 below) that the doubled s is indicated by the juxtaposition in ḥsd of ḥ and ḥ; such was apparently the opinion, though not explicitly stated, of Burchardt, who transliterated as ḥḥr, see his § 106 and No. 140, and for ḥḥ his § 15. Anyhow, that writing shows considerable persistency, being found in five topographical lists of different dates (Simons, Nos. 4. 12. 20. 22. 36), not counting an example with erroneously omitted ḥ, No. 15, one with omission of ḥ, No. 25, and ḥḥ B-Isr 'The Assyrian', EEF Archaeological Report 1903-4, 11, according to Spiegelberg, ZAS XLII, 59 a personal name. The importance of the doubled s to indicate Assyria, and to distinguish this name from that of Asher, was insisted on already by Müller (Asien u. Europa, 236 ff., 277 ff.). (2) ḥḥ may accordingly stand for ḥḥ Asher, the name of the Israelite tribe which later occupied the hinterland of southern Phoenicia and which has now been found in the mysterious legend of Keret edited by Virolleaud from a tablet found at Râs esh-Shamrah, see Weill in Journ. As. 1937, 16; in that legend Asher forms part of the kingdom of Tyre,




i.e. occupies the same position as in Israelite times. The writing  occurs in a list of Sethos I in the Wâdy Abbâd, Simons, No. 17; closely similar is  Anast. I, 23, 6, which recalls how a prince of that land named Kdrdy was attacked by a wild animal (htmt) in a narrow pass infested by  Shôsu, i.e. Syrian Beduins; the mention of these people, as well as the absence of the doubled s, makes it certain that Assyria was not meant. However, rigorous proof of the equation with Asher is absent, and the topographical lists contain at least two intermediate writings which it is difficult to allocate,  Rec. trav. XVI, 50;  Simons, No. 9, cf. also the personal name  P. Leyd. 350, vs. 3, 29. It is altogether too venturesome, with Müller, Egyptological Researches, II, 106; Meyer, *op. cit.* 467, n. 3, to discover Asher in the name of the town  Kutior (so too Simons, No. 23) which is depicted in a scene at Karnak as being stormed, not far from 
ḥ, Hebr. יָדַע 'Acre', by Rameses II, Wreszinski, Atlas, II, 55a.






To decide whether 'Isr' in On. Am. is to be identified with (1) or (2) is not easy, and there might even be a third alternative. The writing speaks rather in favour of (2), but it is clear that all the foreign names of On. Am. fall into groups, and if Sidney Smith's conjecture with regard to No. 266 is correct, then the preference must undoubtedly be given to the equation with (1) 'Assyria'.

[266] 𐎶𐎵𐎲𐎠𐏀𐎧𐎺 G; 𐎶𐎵𐎲𐎠𐏀𐎧𐎺 R (doubtful), Sbr̥y, perhaps 'Shubarai', name of a people often mentioned by the Assyrians; Burchardat, No. 774, offered no interpretation; Gauthier, V, 4 makes a very improbable comparison with Sbir, according to Anast. I, 24, 5 one of the stations on the military road to Palestine. Sidney Smith writes 'It is extremely tempting to see in this name an attempt to render šubarū — we do not know the lengths of the vowels.... These were a Mesopotamian people, often called "wide-flung," continually mentioned by the

Textual Note. 266^{a-b} See fragment L, 6 on Pl. 21; the more doubtful since mh in the following line does not appear in G.

Assyrians (CAH II, index; also my *Early History of Assyria*, pp. 270-271) at the end of the 13th century. The name seems to be applied to the people called by the Hittites Hurri, and seems also to be derived from the Sumerian geographical name for Mesopotamia and the middle Tigris region, SUBAR'. The question whether this interesting suggestion is to be accepted hangs closely together with the problem of No. 265. If Isr there is to be interpreted as 'Assyria', there could be but little doubt that Sidney Smith's conjecture here is right. 267 Lost. It is impossible to tell whether the missing name belonged to the same group as Nos. 265-6, or whether it designated, like Nos. 268-70, one of the Mediterranean peoples of which so much is heard in Dyns. XIX-XX. 268  Isdn 'Sherden', Babyl. Sirdanu, a Mediterranean people whose name has probably survived in the name 'Sardinia'; 𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍 in a Phoenician inscription of the 9th century B.C. (CIS 144), the 𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍 𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍 𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍, with the adjective 𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍𐤍𐤓𐤕𐤍: references, Gauthier, V, 105; history of proposed identifications, Hall in *Recueil Champollion*, 297 ff.; fullest discussion, von Bissing in *WZKM* XXXIV, 230 ff.; important archaeological evidence based on researches of the Russian A. A. Zakhárov, Hall in *Klio*, XXII, 335 ff. First mentioned in the 'Amārnah letters (122, 35; 123, 15), where Sherden are spoken of as belonging to an Egyptian garrison at Byblus; this probably presupposes a conflict with Mediterranean peoples in the reign of Amenophis III or earlier, when some of these people will have been taken prisoners. So explicitly in Anast. II, v. = *L. Eg. Misc.*, p. 20, where allusion is made to the equipping with weapons of  Isdn 'Sherden [of] the Great Green (i.e. the Mediterranean) who are captives of His Majesty'; similarly Anast. II, 5, 2; as contingent of an Egyptian army, Anast. I, 14, 4, doubtless under Ramesses II. Similarly at the beginning of Ramesses II's poetical account of his campaign against the Hittites he tells (Kuentz, 220) how 'he made ready his army, his chariotry and the Sherden whom

His Majesty had captured'; here the exclusive mention of this one foreign people shows the important part they already played in the Egyptian army. This importance they retained under Ramesses III, as is shown by various passages in the Harris papyrus: in 75, 1 the retrospect of his career put in the mouth of that king begins with an address to 'the officers and princes of the land, army, chariotry, Sherden, the multitudinous troops and all dwellers in the land of Egypt'; in 76, 5-6 they are again mentioned as belonging to the Egyptian army, coupled with the (Libyan?) Kehek, see above, No. 242; in 78, 10, the same two peoples are spoken of as dwelling quietly in their towns; from 76, 8 we learn that when first captured they were housed in fortresses  Isdn and possibly branded with the Pharaoh's name; the 'towns' mentioned in the subsequent passage doubtless refer to settlements of their own in the midst of land granted them for cultivation in peace time. They and their descendants thus became an integral part of the population of Egypt; in P. Wilbour, under Ramesses V, many of them are found holding plots of their own and all bear Egyptian names; this was in the country immediately S. of the Fayyûm, but the Amiens papyrus shows that there were similar colonies farther upstream, see my P. Wilbour, Commentary, ch. I, 59, b, for details and for later references. As enemies of Egypt the Sherden are mentioned first under Ramesses II in the badly damaged stela Petrie, *Tanis*, II, pl. 2, No. 78, where we read '..... Sherden rebellious (bit) of heart..... battle-ships in the midst of the [sea].....'; von Bissing (op. cit.) quotes as confirmation the Aswân stela of year 2, de Rouge, *Inscr. hiérog.* 253, 8, which among bombastic phrases in praise of Ramesses II says, 'he destroyed warriors of the Great Green (the Mediterranean) and Lower Egypt spends the night sleeping (peacefully)'; in de Rouge's  we must emend  and Breasted's translation *Ancient Records*, III, 5479 should be corrected accordingly. These two passages in combination show that many years before

Meneptah the Delta had been attacked from the sea, and that Sherden people had been among the attackers; but it is legitimate to doubt whether it was Ramesses II who repelled this attack, which may have taken place under one of his immediate predecessors. The records of Meneptah are much more explicit: the great Karnak inscription (Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, I, Pls 17 ff.) describes how the *Ekwesh*, *Tursha*, *Lukki* (above, No. 247), Sherden and *Sheklesh* (l. 1) had been incited against Egypt by the prince of the *Libu* (Libyans, No. 241); in l. 52 the Sherden, *Sheklesh* and *Ekwesh* are collectively described as  (var.  *Ann. Serv.* XXVII, 23, l. 13)  'the foreign lands (var. 'foreigners') of the sea', just as under Ramesses III (Harris, 76, 7) the Sherden and an otherwise only once mentioned people called *Weshesh* (, *Wes*, see *Med. Habu*, ed. Chicago, [I], 16, 18) are qualified by the same epithet 'of the sea'; a third example will be quoted below; in the same l. 52 of Meneptah's Karnak text the three peoples there named are said to have 'had no foreskins' (*krnt*, see above, p. 122*), i. e. were circumcised. Sherden warriors were engaged on both sides in the battles in which Ramesses III defeated the Philistines (below, No. 270) and the *Ijekker* (below, No. 269); it is perhaps on account of this ambiguous position that they are never mentioned in the accompanying texts. The sculptured representations at Medinet Habu are, however, unmistakable; in the land battle (ed. Chicago, Pl. 34) we see Sherden in active combat against the enemy; in the sea-fight (Pl. 39) other Sherden are allies of the sea-robbers and possess ships of their own. The identity of these foreigners rests strictly upon one single wall where a series of foreign princes is depicted with accompanying hieroglyphic legends (Medinet Habu, Pavilion, front wall, Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, 160 A, 160 B; for other publications see Porter & Moss, II, p. 143, top). The Sherden prince, described as  'Sherden of the sea', differs from all the others by wearing a helmet with horns and a projecting

spike ending in a ball or disk, see the accompanying figure; he has an aquiline nose, full beard and wears a large ear-ring. The rank and file of




the same race, both in the Egyptian army (*Med. Habu*, ed. Chicago, [I], 17, 35; [II], 62; a head in colour, 65, c) and in the battle-scenes, display the same characteristic helmet, but they are mostly beardless (an exception 34,




top right) and the ear-ring is confined to the prince; the helmet, occasionally without spike and ball, often comprises a strap passing under the chin. Breasted (*First preliminary report*, in *AJSL* XXIII, 2-3) rightly condemns the brightly coloured pictures from Abu Simbel as published by Champollion (*Mon.* 28) and Rosellini (*Mon. Stor.* 101); the originals, of which he gives a photograph, show the same round shields and great swords as at Medinet Habu (e.g. 39); elsewhere (e.g. Kuentz, Pl. 22) they have shorter swords, and their other main weapon is the lance, never the bow. This mode of armament raises the question of the original and later homes of the Sherden (see the articles by von Bissing and Hall quoted above). The earlier Egyptologists, from de Rouge onward, equated the Sherden with the Sardinians, and were confirmed in their view by the further identifications of the *Tursha* with the *Τυρσηνοί*, i. e. the Tyrrhenians or Etruscans, and of the *Sheklesh* with the *Σικελοί* or Sicilians. Accordingly, the invasions under Meneptah and Ramesses III were thought of as starting from the western Mediterranean, a view that suits their association with the Libyans; and bronze statuettes found in Sardinia, as well as a silver bowl from Chiusi, show helmets with horns undoubtedly similar to those of the Sherden; see Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 376 ff.; however, the spike with ball or disk is missing. A different view of all these peoples was taken by Maspero in 1873 (in a review reprinted in his *Études de mythologie*, III, 104 f.) and further elaborated by him in 1875 (*op. cit.* 195 f.); he recalled that the Etruscans were traditionally






stated (Hdt. I, 94) to have been immigrants from Lydia, and that the Sardinians were likewise of Asiatic origin (for this there seems no authority), and he conjectured that it was from their original homes in Asia Minor that they made their attacks on Egypt; the Sheklesh he divorced from Sicily altogether, comparing the name to that of Sagalassus in Pisidia. A later attempt to connect the Sherden with Sardes, the capital of Lydia, is open to very serious philological and archaeological objections, see Bilabel, Geschichte, 240f. Against the view taken by de Rougé and Chabas, there is general agreement that the Etruscans cannot have reached their Italian home before the 8th century B.C., and the connexion of the name Sheklesh with the Σικελοί, resting on the sound alone, is now regarded with disfavour. It would be interesting to know whether the Sardinian bronzes and the bowl from Chiunsi (both quoted as pertinent by Hall, Klio, XXII, 336) can be dated at all accurately. Provisionally it seems plausible to accept the identification of the name Sherden with that of Sardinia, and the identification of the name Turosha with that of the Τυρσηνοί, but to regard Sardinia and Etruria as much later homes of the peoples in question. Against the theory of Maspero there are serious objections. In the first place, as Wainwright has pointed out in JE XXV, 148 ff., of the three peoples, the Turosha, the Sheklesh and the Sherden, only the Turosha were known to the Hittite world, the natural inference being that the Sheklesh and the Sherden lay outside it. In the second place, it is strange that scholars have not been content to accept the direct Egyptian evidence which describes these peoples as 'of the Sea'. In the explanatory legends to two of the scenes depicting the great battles of Ramesses III (Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [I], Pls. 38. 42, see Nelson's commentary on the sea battle in Journ. Near East Studies, II, 43) the enemies are described respectively as 'the northern countries which were in their isles'¹ and 'the countries who came from their land(s) in the isles in the midst

¹ Meyer, op. cit. 585 has an unjustifiable gloss on the word 'islands': so erocheinen dem Ägypten die Küsten Europas.

of the Great Green', and though this description may perhaps not be equally true of all the peoples involved, it is the best information available. It is worth noticing that the Homeric hymn to Dionysus (Lang's translation, pp. 213 ff.) speaks of the Τυρσηνοί as sea-pirates. Thus we may take it that in the 13th and 12th centuries B.C. the confederations of northern peoples seeking new homes had temporarily settled in islands of the Mediterranean, and presumably, since the westward movement appears to have been mainly a later development, in those of the Eastern Mediterranean; thence not only did they attack Egypt by sea, but also overrun the whole of Asia Minor, sweeping aside the resistance offered by the Hittites and by the other peoples whom they met on their way; see Meyer, op. cit. 586 for this interpretation of the vague but crucial passage Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [I], 46, 16 ff. Such a view does not exclude the probability that their original homes were elsewhere than in the Mediterranean, and we may continue to believe (e.g.) that the Turosha once lived in Lydia. As regards the Sherden, Zakhárov has produced what appears to be highly important archaeological evidence from the Caucasus. Here bronze and copper statuettes have been found belonging to the Bronze Age and showing helmets closely akin to those worn by the Sherden and already known (see above) from Sardinia. Even more important in the opinion of experts like Hall and Sidney Smith are long broadswords similar to those depicted for the Sherden at Abu Simbel and at Medinet Habu (Pls. 34. 39) and for the Philistines in the latter place (ibid.); there were also shorter swords or daggers of triangular shape like those carried by both Sherden and Philistines. For further details see Hall in Klio, loc. cit.; if, as he points out, the Caucasus was the original home of the Sherden, this would agree with the statement of Herodotus (II, 104) that the inhabitants of Colchis were circumcised.


[269]  G, Jkr 'Jjekker', one of the peoples of the sea which attacked Egypt and Syria in the reign of Ramesses III, Gauthier, VI, 69f. Two examples

show a repeated k, cf.  Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [I], 43; another example, damaged, [I], 28, 51; see No. 265 for another case of such doubling, usually not shown in Egyptian writing, and so in the commonest writings here. A place-name  occurs in one of the Karnak lists of Tuthmosis III (Urk IV, 788, 136), but is undoubtedly a mere homonym, since the few identifiable names of the list all belong to Northern Syria; so Burchardt, No. 1171, and most scholars implicitly; Jerku hesitates, p. 19, n. 3. Otherwise this people is not mentioned before Rameses III, and is unknown to the Hittite texts (Wainwright, JE XXV, 151). Presumably an island-people at the time of the great invasion; for the general interpretation which I favour see on No. 268. In appearance the Tjekker seem to have been indistinguishable from the Pelesti (Philistines, No. 270), wearing the same feathered caps, cf. Med. Habu [I], 43 (Tjekker) with 44 (Pelesti): in several enumerations of the allies the two names are juxtaposed, op. cit. 28, 51; 46, 18; 107, 7; Harris 76, 7. In two representations of the princes of these respective lands the feathers in the caps are not clearly marked, see Wreszinski, Atlas, II, 160A and 160B (figure); both are bearded, while the common soldiers are always clean-shaven. In the story of Wenamün (Dyn. XXI) the Tjekker are in possession of the coast-town of Dôr, just S. of Carmel (1, 8-9); later on they are mentioned as sea-pirates (2, 63, 71). After this they disappear from history. Various attempts have been made to identify the Tjekker with some people or place mentioned by the classical authors or the Old Testament, e.g. the Teucri (Trojans), the town of Ziklag, etc.; Hall, who quotes these suggestions Recueil Champollion, 301. 306, himself thinks that the name suits Σικελοί (Sicilians) better than does that of the 'People of the Sea' called Sheklesh, and Albright also favours this identification (Vocalization, p. 65); these comparisons, resting solely upon similarity of sound, are of course highly speculative.  G, Prst 'Pelesti', 'Philistines', Assy. Palastu, Hebr. פְּלִשְׁתִּים, more rarely פְּלִשְׁתִּים Gk. Φυλιστιείμ, but more often paraphrasing as ἀλλόφυλοι, Josephus Παλαιστῖνοι, Gauthier, VI, 46; Macalister, The Philistines, 1914; Eissfeldt, art. Philister in

Pauly-Wissowa; some other literature see below. The best hieroglyphic writing  (Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [I], 44, sim. 28, 51) admirably suits the identification, suggested already by Champollion (Recueil Champollion, 297); the occasional  (Med. Habu, [I], 29, 22; 46, 18) is a mere substitute for , but  in Harris 76, 7 and here in G would, in earlier texts, have been syllable-closing. Apart from the mention on a statue usurped at an uncertain date (Steindorff conjectured Dyn. XXII, JE XXV, 30 ff.) by one Petese, a  'envoy of Canaan and of Palestine' (so Steindorff rather than 'Philistia'), the Egyptian name Prst is confined to Medinet Habu and to the reign of Rameses III, where the people bearing it belong to the 'Peoples of the Sea' who invaded Egypt and Syria from their 'islands' (see on No. 268) and were particularly closely associated with the Tjekker (see on No. 269), whom they resembled in appearance and in martial equipment, wearing the same feathered headdress and being armed with the lances, the round shields and the long broadswords and triangular daggers used by the Sherden; besides the references already given see Müller, Asien u. Europa, 387 ff. Since in Dyn. XXI the story of Wenamün finds the pirate Tjekker established in Dôr, it would not be unreasonable to guess that the Pelesti settled on the coast further south, even if there were no further evidence to support the conjecture, and the coupling of Prst and P3-Knccn on the above-mentioned statue would afford some confirmation. An attempt must now be made to summarize the complex evidence which tends in the same direction and which attempts to fix the earlier home of the Philistines; see Meyer, op. cit. 560 f. for the Old Testament evidence, more fully in the writings of Macalister and Eissfeldt. Hebrew and Greek tradition agree in regarding the Philistines as of alien race; they were uncircumcized, and in that respect differed from the Semites; the rendering of Pelishtim by LXX as ἀλλόφυλοι is explicit; even if it rests on a faulty etymology. Amos 9, 7 puts the

question 'Have not I brought up..... the Philistines from Caphthor (כַּפְתֹּר)?' and in Jer. 47, 4 the Philistines are described as 'the remnant of the יִזְרְאֵל of Caphthor'; יִזְרְאֵל often means 'island', but is also used for 'sea-coast', so that this passage is no unambiguous confirmation of the Medinet Habu indications; in Deut. 2, 23 people called Caphthorim are stated to have destroyed the Amorim 'which dwell in villages as far as Gaza', and this qualification shows that only the Philistines can have been meant. A late Assyrian inscription speaking of Kaptara as a 'land beyond the Upper Sea' (Sidney Smith, Early History of Assyria, 89, see too Sayce in Essays in Aegean Archaeology presented to Sir Arthur Evans, 107 ff.) throws but little light upon the location of Caphthor, which the Greek translators of two of the three Old Testament passages daringly equated with Cappadocia. However, a persistent tradition connects the Philistines with Crete. Not overmuch weight need be attached to the ethnic כְּרִיתִי 'Cherēthite', which various passages (e.g. Ezekiel 25, 16; Zephaniah 2, 5) associate with the Philistines and which the LXX twice renders as Κρηῖτες 'Cretans'; if we stigmatize 'Cappadocia' for Caphthor as an unwarranted guess, we are hardly entitled to do otherwise as regards 'Cretans' for Cherēthites; nevertheless, the resemblance being closer, the latter comparison is preferable to the former, which is favoured by Wainwright (PEF Quarterly Statement, 203 ff.), doubtless only, however, because it fits into his own theory, see below. I prefer, however, to ignore the possible evidence from the name of the Cherēthites, since the matter is now complicated by the discovery on tablets from Rās esh-Shamrah of the name Keret as that of a Phoenician hero, king of the Sidonians, see Dussaud, Découvertes de Ras Shamra, 58 f. A passage of Tacitus (*Hist.* V, 2) speaks of Judaeos Creta insula profugos and it is opined that he substituted 'Jews' for 'Philistines'. More important is Stephen of Byzantium, s.v. Γάλα, who identifies Marna, the god of that town, as Zeus the Crete-born; and some coins of that town name ΜΕΙΝΩ, which is supposed to be that of the famous Cretan king Minōs.

Much controversy has raged around the now widely accepted theory that 𐤊𐤍𐤕𐤍 Kfti_w, var. 𐤊𐤍𐤕𐤍 Kfti_w (Gauthier, V, 198 f.) is the hieroglyphic equivalent of Caphthor and consequently the Egyptian name of Crete. The chief opponent of that view is Wainwright, who holds, as Müller, Asien u. Europa, 337 ff. did before him, that Kfti_w corresponds to Cilicia and the south-eastern coast of Asia Minor; his latest statement is printed Journ. Hell. Stud. LI (1931), where references are given to earlier articles by himself and others. Here I shall content myself with two observations: (1) if Caphthor was an Egyptian word, the presence of the final _w need not be regarded as a serious obstacle to a derivation from 𐤊𐤍𐤕𐤍, since there are several analogies for the intrusion of this letter, see JE XXIX, 76, top; (2) the hypothesis entertained by some, that 𐤊𐤍𐤕𐤍 can have designated both Crete and the Cilician coast, appears to me absurd, and I maintain that scholars must choose between the alternatives. It is, however, unnecessary to discuss this matter at any length, since apart from the reinforcement that would be given to the Caphthor-Crete equation if the Egyptian 𐤊𐤍𐤕𐤍 proved to be Crete, the Kfti_wan and Philistine problems are completely irrelevant to one another. If the Kfti_wans were Cretans, it is certain that they must also be Minoans; it is equally certain that the Philistines, or their forebears the Pelesti, were not. The round shield and feathered head-





dress of the Pelesti were unknown to the Minoans, but the headdress in question (see the adjoining figure a) finds a remarkable analogon in the man-hieroglyph (fig. b; the original faces right) of the famous


Phaistos disk. That remarkable object of baked clay (Evans, Palace of Minos, I, 647 ff.), with its spiraliform inscription of elsewhere unparalleled hieroglyphs, was found at Phaistos on the south coast of central Crete together with













characteristic objects of the last Middle Minoan period, and consequently must date from circa 1600 B.C. Everything points to its being an import from abroad, and it is hardly too venturesome to conclude that it emanated from an early home of the ancestors of the Philistines. At a much later period the feathered headdress is reported to have been affected by the Lycians (Hdt. VII, 92 Λύκιοι εἶχον.....περὶ τῇσι κεφαλῇσι πέλους περὶσι περιστεφανωμένους) and an Assyrian relief of the time of Sennacherib (Layard, Nineveh, II, 44, reproduced also by Hall in Journ. Hell. Stud. XXXI, 123) shows it worn by some foreign soldiers, possibly mercenaries. This very late evidence can, however, throw no light on the place where the Philistines originated; nor must it be forgotten that the scanty indications that we possess point to the Selesti of the time of Rameses III, not only as having attacked Egypt from the sea, but also as having travelled overland, presumably across Asia Minor, to the north of Syria; it was on this voyage, presumably, that their women and children used the carts drawn by humped oxen shown in the reliefs of the land-battle at Medinet Habu (ed. Chicago [I], 34). To sum up, we have found nothing to contradict the statement made in the Medinet Habu texts that the Selesti, like the rest of their confederates, started upon their invasions from islands of the Mediterranean; nor have we found anything to undermine the Biblical and Greek tradition that the Philistines approached Palestine from Crete. But the differences of armament between the Minoans and the Selesti, combined with the evidence of the Phaistos disk, make it certain that Crete was not the original home of the Philistines, however long they may have sojourned there on their way to Egypt and Palestine. That home may perhaps be looked for somewhere in the northern Aegean, though possibly the occupation of islands there was again only one stage in their migratory wanderings. Recently it has again become fashionable to connect the Selesti with the Πελασγοί (see the comments









Meyer, *op. cit.* 218, n. 3); upon this hypothesis, which is shared (e.g.) by Albright (Vocalization, 42, B1), it is perhaps better to venture no opinion. 271

 G, Hm 'Khurma(?)', Hitt. Hurma. Concerning this guess of mine Sidney Smith writes: 'Gardiner's suggestion that the Hittite name Hurma is to be compared is very probable. This city lay in the Hurri-province of the Mesopotamian kingdom sometimes called Mitanni, and there is no doubt that Hur- in the name is the national name, the -ma a suffix, cf. the Khurrian forms hurrohe and hurwohe in Dushratta's letter. It may be, of course, that the place meant here is not the same as that mentioned by the Hittites, though the name is identical'. 272  G,

unrecognizable. 273 Destroyed in G.  With the rubric embracing

Nos. 274-6 we embark upon a series of names for the great majority of which no other examples can be produced. The mere presence of a rubric suggests that we are here parting company with Asia, but No. 276 certainly contains a writing of H(x)w-nbw(t) 'the Mediterranean islands', and we therefore have to look northwards for at least some of the countries named. No. 286 Ingr strongly supports this view. On the other hand, No. 288 Irwi is certainly Nubian, as may possibly also be No. 289 Krt and, if it is a compound, No. 291 Ir-g(?)as. It would be strange if a considerable number of names in On. Am. did not belong to Nubia, but the collections made by Schiaparelli, La Geographia dell' Africa Orientale, Roma, 1916 and those of Gauthier afford but little help. In these circumstances it seems hopeless to try to identify such foreign names unless their unusual appearance practically excludes the possibility of homonyms occurring in different lands, like Ingr and Irwi mentioned above, or unless the company they keep points in some definite direction. For this reason I have greatly abbreviated this portion of my Commentary. 274  G, Mki 'Meki', location unknown.

The restoration is confirmed by No. 212 above and by No. 450 below, both of these entries writing initial Mk- as though it were the particle  'behold'. Sidney Smith suggests as a possibility the Maḥāi named by Herodotus (IV, 175) as one of the aboriginal tribes of Libya. 275  G, Dui 'Dju', location unknown. The list of Nubian localities Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [II], 102 begins with the name , but there seems little likelihood that this is identical with Dui here. 276  G, H3(i)w-nbw(t) 'the Mediterranean islanders' or perhaps occasionally the islands themselves, Wb. III, 11, 2 ff.; Gauthier, IV, 12. 224 (variants, references, earlier explanations); Müller, Asien u. Europa, 24 ff., fullest discussion. As regards the writing in G, Brman read , failing to recognize , which is, however, certain;  looks plausible in the photograph, but Möller was undoubtedly right in substituting  tyw for this, see the forms of that sign 3, 14. 15; 4, 11. 12; tyw has, of course, no right to a place in this compound, but cf.  Med. Habu, ed. Chicago, [II], 111. The oldest writing is  Borchardt, Sakurē, II, Pl. 19, where the expression concludes the enumeration 'Bow-people' (Twntyw), Asiatics (Mntw), all foreign lands and Mediterranean island-dwellers'; in op. cit. Text, 96 Sethe repeats an explanation which had been given already in his Unters. III, 133, n. 7, and which, if not correct in every respect, is certainly on the right lines. He recalls the expression of the Pyramid Texts  629b (P), var. M  dbn pḥr h3 nbwt, cf. also 847; 1631; this expression, from parallelisms in the neighbouring lines, is clearly the name of a sea, the literal translation being 'the circle which turns around the islands', a sufficiently accurate description of the Aegean Sea. Out of this expression, Sethe tells us, the Egyptians later made a word for the islanders themselves (H3-nbt). In his Commentary to the Pyramid Texts (III, 168) Sethe somewhat


elaborates this explanation, rendering  literally as 'baskets' and saying that nbwt, etymologically connected with nbi 'swim', is here employed for the islands thought of as swimming; he now transliterated the word for the islanders H3ju-nb-wt. That  means 'basket' is certain, see Wb. II, 2271; the sign depicts a basket, and the value nbt is proved by Lyr. 557. I cannot help feeling that an etymology from nbi 'swim' is incompatible with the meaning 'basket' and that it should be abandoned. Why the Egyptians compared the Aegean islands to baskets is not as clear as it might be, but it seems incontestable that they did; in Urk. IV, 616, 7 certain people, here placed in parallelism to 'the lands of Mitanni' and apparently different from , , 'those who are in the islands in the midst of the great green', shortly afterwards are described as  imyw nbwt.sn 'those who are in their baskets'; it is just possible that 'basket' was thought of, not in reference to its shape, but as a receptacle isolated from others, in which case nbwt.sn in the expression imyw nbwt.sn might perhaps not refer to islands at all, but to isolated habitations, wherever they might be. However, it is by no means certain that the two expressions just mentioned were intended to be mutually exclusive; there is some degree of identity or overlapping in , , 'Nine Bows, islands in the midst of the great green, H3(i)w-nbw(t), and rebellious foreign lands', Gabel Barkal stela, l. 14 = ZASLXIX, 29. To return to the expression dbn pḥr h3 nbwt, here pḥr h3 clearly means 'turn around', pḥr not being a transitive verb until a comparatively late date, whence h3 can only be the preposition 'behind', 'around'; pḥr h3 is well authenticated for 'turn around', see Proc. SBA XXV, 334. But , H3(i)w nbwt must be rendered literally 'those who are around the islands', hardly 'those belonging to (the circle which turns) around the islands'; the transference from the encircling sea to the inhabitants, who might well be said

to be 'in' (H3(i)w-nbt), but scarcely 'around' the islands, is very strange. None the less, it seems undeniable that Sethe's hypothesis is upon the right lines. Noticeable is the variant H3(i)w-nbt. Mk. IV, 83, γ, which appears sufficient guarantee of the transliteration H3(i)w-nbt. Direct testimony for the meaning is afforded by the Ptolemaic trilingual decrees, e.g. H3(i)w-nbt Canopus, 37 (= Mk. III, 154), rendered in the Greek by γραμμα-
σιν..... Ἑλληνικοῖς and in the demotic by H3(i)w-nbt, Coptic ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ,
ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ, i.e. 'Iones 'Ionians'; cf also Mk. III, 197, 9; 213, 8; 230, 4. Müller, loc. cit., besides discussing the various strange variants, produces other evidence from Greek times, the most interesting being the gloss made by the Edfu priests on the H3(i)w-nbt, which traditionally occupied a place among the Nine Bows representing the Egyptian world (see above, p. 101*); this (Chass., Edfou, VI, 199) reads H3(i)w-nbt 'said concerning the islands of the sea and the many great northern lands'. Here, then, we have H3(i)w-nbt designating, not merely the Mediterranean peoples, but also the places where they lived; the distinction between countries and the inhabitants thereof is, in Egypt as well as elsewhere, often tenuous and hardly to be drawn. None the less, the islands themselves are generally referred to as H3(i)w-nbt 'regions of the Medi-
terranean islanders', variant H3(i)w-nbt 'lands', see Mk. III, 12, 7, 9; Gauthier, I, 127; P. Ch. Beatty IV, rt. 10, 5, misinterpreted by me Text, 33; even commoner is the phrase H3(i)w-nbt (var. H3(i)w-nbt) H3(i)w-nbt 'the middle islands (var. 'the islands in the middle) of the Great Green', of which Wainwright has collected a number of examples Annr. (Liverpool), VI, 79 ff.; see too Gauthier, I, 41. [27] H3(i)w-nbt G, 'Hd 'Hed', un-

known. 278 ~~§~~ ~~---~~ ~~///~~ G, Nh..... 'Neh.....'; the restoration to Nh(yu)
'Nulrians' suggested in Pl. 10 A is far too uncertain to detain us here.


[279] // ----- // ~~G~~, name lost.

[280] ⁶⁷⁷⁷² 1 S ~~m~~ ~~n~~ ~~p~~ " (121) G, [J] n

Sere, 'the land of Serek'; Sidney Smith writes 'may well be the city Serigga mentioned in Hittite records as one of the important cult-centres'; this suggestion, like those on Nos. 281, 282, etc. is subject to the caution that we have, in this portion of Or. Am., no definite clue to the region of the world in which the foreign place-name is to be looked for. [281] 






G, Mui 'Mui'; Sidney Smith suggests Μη'ωv of Hdt. I, 4, an early name of the Lydians. 282 $\frac{\pi}{\Sigma} = 1, 5$ $\frac{\pi}{\Sigma} = 1, 5$ G, Irmi 'Irmi'. I suggested


'Arameans', cf. Hebr. אֲרָמִי 'Aramean', but this entry could hardly less well suit the Nubian ⲁⲣⲙⲓ — concerning ⲉⲃⲏ I am much more doubtful, see Gauchier, I, q3f; Schiaparelli, op. cit. 195ff. [283] ⲁⲩⲱⲛⲟⲩ

G, Yrk 'Aruka'; here again one may question whether this is not the Nubian Yrk registered Gauthier, I, 98. 284 

G, Kur 'Kur'; the reading is guaranteed by the same word in a compound, No. 285, and a clue is offered by the phonetic determinative 𐎧.

The problem is to find a language in which kw can represent a word for 'old', 'chieftain' or 'great'; Burchardt, 539, is inclined to agree to a comparison of Hebr. כְּבִיר 'great', but Sidney Smith does not think this plausible, as indeed it is not. Consequently, one is wholly at a loss to locate this place-name.



R, Ssw-kwr 'Sesu-kur', doubtless a compound place-name containing (1) the well-known abbreviation of the name Ramesses, cf.  (II   p; Dmr(?) n Ssw 'the Djemer of Sesu', Anast. I, 18, 8, and the word kwr found in No. 284. The location is utterly obscure. 286  

G;  R, Ingr 'Sangar', a kingdom or principality of great importance that can only be Babylonia itself, Babyl. Sanhar, Hebr. שַׁנְחָר. Writings, etc., Gauthier, V, 6; discussion of the cuneiform evidence, Weber in Knudtzon,






EA 1080 ff.; the identification with Babylonia is due to Meyer, *Festschrift* f. G. Ebers, 63 f. Decisive Egyptian testimony to the importance of this country is found on the recently discovered great stela of Amenophis II from Mit Rahinoh (Memphis), where, after the long recital of that monarch's campaigns in Syria, the text concludes (*Ann. Serv.* XLII, Pl. 1, ll. 33 f.) with the words: 'Now when the prince of Nahrin, the prince of Khatti, and the prince of Sangar (𓂏𓂐𓂑) heard of the great victory which I alone had achieved, they said in their hearts..... so as to beg for peace from His Majesty', etc.; the fact that the prince of Sangar should thus be coupled with the mighty rulers of Mitanni and Khatti proves his kingdom to have been on a par with theirs. Similarly we find in an inscription at Aswān of the reign of Ramesses II, 'Sa<n>gar (𓂏𓂐𓂑) and Khatti [come] bowing down before his might', de Rouge, *Inscr. hiérog.* 253, 10 f. = Lep. *Denkm.* III, 175, 9. The occurrence in no less than thirteen Egyptian topographical lists (Simons, *Index*, 213) likewise stresses the country's importance, and though no weight at all can be attached to the position which place-names occupy in these lists, still the observation here made is confirmed by the presence of Sngr, mostly written 𓂏𓂐𓂑 or similarly, side by side with Nahrin and Khatti in some of the shorter ones, e.g. the chariot of Tuthmosis IV (Simons, VIII) and the Abydos list of Ramesses II (Simons, XXV). The same impression is obtained from the Annals of Tuthmosis III, where, as in the case of Amenophis II above quoted, it was doubtless the military success of the Pharaoh which caused the princes of distant lands to take steps to propitiate him. As a result of the brilliant campaign of year 33 substantial gifts were sent by the princes of Sangar, Khatti and probably also Ashshur — the last name is restored from Urk IV, 668 on the basis of the nature of the presents. These consisted in the main of lapis lazuli, including that of Babel (Urk IV, 668, 13; 701, 3);



but it cannot be argued from the presence of lapis of Babel under the heading of Sangar that the city of Babylon belonged to Sangar, since lapis of Babel was sent also by the prince of Ashshur (Assyria). To complete the Egyptian evidence before turning to the problem of the location, no argument that Sangar lay relatively close to Egypt can be derived from a scarab in the Petrie collection bearing the words 𓂏𓂐𓂑𓂏𓂐𓂑 'Nebmairei (Amenophis II), the capturer of Sangar', *Proc. SBAXXI*, Pl. 3 opp. p. 155; this can only be qualified as mendacious bombast. Nor can any evidence as to the location be gleaned from a papyrus (Anastasi IV) which names as products foals (17, 9) and an unguent called Nkft (15, 3). Somewhat more instructive is the reference in Ramesses II's Luxor enumeration of the sources of mineral and other imports (Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, II, 92) to 𓂏𓂐𓂑𓂏𓂐𓂑 dw n Sngr 'the mountain of Sangar', whence silver and precious stones were obtained. A negative fact supporting the equivalence of Sangar and Babylonia is the absence of the name of Babel from any of the Egyptian topographical lists edited by Simons and studied by Jerku, and indeed, apart from the two mentions under Tuthmosis III, Babel does not occur again in hieroglyphic before Persian times (Gauthier, II, 20 f.); if Sangar and Babylonia are identical, any separate mention of Babel would obviously be superfluous. The Hebrew Shinrai is indisputably Babylonia, since Gen. 10, 10 speaks of Babel, Erech (= Uruk) and Accad as 'in the land of Shinrai'. The correspondence eg. Sangar, Hebr. Shinrai. Babyl. Sanhar has a parallel as regards the third consonant in the name of Gaza (above, No. 264), showing that consonant to be the equivalent of Arab. Ḡhayin. See too on Ngr = Babyl. Nuhasše, above, p. 169*. Weber's learned discussion (see above) had as its starting-point the 'Amārnah letter 35, 49, where the king of Alasia (Cyprus) attempts to dissuade Pharaoh from alliance with the kings of Khatti and Sanhar. This is the sole instance of the name



in that collection of letters, where Babylonia is usually referred to as Karduniaš; the last-named fact is, however, no serious objection to the thesis here maintained, since it by no means follows that the same designation would be adopted by the rulers of Babylonia itself as was employed by the king of Cyprus; an instance of this has been found in Eg. 'Nahrin' as the equivalent of Babyl. Mitanni. More embarrassing are the words 'Assur, Babilu and Šanḫar' in a Hittite treaty quoted by Weber in his postscript, but it is perhaps not impossible that this treaty may date from a time when Babylonia was temporarily split into two parts. In the first shock of this new information Weber abandoned his former adherence to the equation Sangar = Babylonia. However, Meyer, *Geschichte*², II, 439, n. 3, quotes another treaty of the time of the Hittite king Muwatall, where Alaksanda of Ullusa is commanded, in case of war, to support his overlord against the kings of Egypt (Mizri), Babylonia (Šanchara), Mitanni (Chanigalbat) and Assur (Forrer, *Foroch*. I, 76); the absence here of any other name that could stand for Babylonia strongly favours Meyer's view. Nevertheless, various scholars have taken a different line, some, like Müller in *Asien u. Europa*, 269, thinking that the name of Egyptian Sangar is the Greek Σιγγάρα (Pauly-Wissowa, IIIA, 232 f.) and the modern جبل سنجار *ğebel Singâr*, W. of Mosul, and others comparing it with the name of the Sagur river which enters the Euphrates from the NW. southwards from Carchemish; both views are open to the objection that the obviously identical Babyl. Šanḫar points to the presence of the consonant ghayin. For the names of some of the supporters of these divergent opinions see Weber, loc. cit.; Jack, *Date of the Exodus*, 35, n. 1.



[287]  G, Brhs(?) 'Berhes(?)', unknown. [288]  G, Lwi 'Jerwe', a negro country of which the chief is depicted at




Textual Note. 287^a Or possibly 4.


Medinet Habu, Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, 160A.160B = Porter & Moss, II, 173, 7, here written  Jryw 'Jeryew'; so too already in two southern lists of Iuthmosis III, written  (var. ) Ur. IV, 797, 20; a variant  occurs on a rock-stela of Ramesses III behind Medinet Habu, Lepo, *Denkm.* III, 218c = Text, III, 224, where it is said 'he forced a way through the countries of Upper Egypt consisting of the Nubians, Terwans and 'I-ry-people ()', he caused to [be] destroyed]' Gauthier, VI, 43 lists the entry of On. Am. as referring to Northern Syria, doubtless on account of Sangar, No. 286, but see what was said in the note preceding No. 274.



























[289]  G, Krt 'Keret'; unknown, unless, as is not very probable, this district is identical with  Krt mentioned on the stela of Harxiof, l. 155 (Ur. III, 136) and in demotic texts copied by Brugsch (DG 399) and in which he found (op. cit. 361 f.) the Egyptian name of Κόρτι, the present-day قرتة *Kortah*, 3 km. S. of Kûbân on the W. bank. This information is taken from Gauthier, V, 191. However, there is another Korti upstream from Old Dongola (Crum in *Rec. trav.* XXI, 226) which appears to offer an alternative possibility.



[290]  G, Sh(?)r 'Sh(?)er', reading doubtful; for the phonetic determinative  see the remarks above on No. 284.



















[291]  G, Jr-g[?]s 'Jer-ge[?]ses'; it is tempting to regard this place-name as a compound and as referring to the often mentioned Nubian locality  grs 'gerses'; however, this suggestion is so speculative that I content myself with referring to Gauthier's article on grs, V, 214.





[292]  G, Ikns 'Iknes'; at Soleb under Amenophis III a Nubian locality  is mentioned (Schiaparelli, op. cit. 144), but since there is also in the same temple an  Ik 'Iken' (op. cit. 143) and also because of the lacuna, an identification is very doubtful, see Gauthier, I, 111.

[293]  G, Shb 'Shb', unknown; it is to be hoped no one will propose

an inversion of  'Ibht 'Ibhat', Gauthier, I, 64. [294]  G,  Bgrk(?) 'Begrk(?)', unknown locality.  The remaining words of this section (Nos. 295-312) refer to differences of age, sex and status among human beings, though Nos. 305.307.308.309 do not fit well into this formulation; the last three, together with No. 309 A, are all connected with boats; a sailor's life was perhaps regarded as a slavish occupation. [295]  G,  'man', here contrasted with mnh following; so (e.g.) P. Bologna 1086, 2.1.26; Anast. IV, 7, 2-3; Med. Habu (ed. Chicago), [II], 75, 20. [296]  G, mnh 'strip-ling', Wb. II, 83, 13. [297]  G,  'old man'. [298]  G;  W-b, st 'woman'. [299]  G;  W-b, nfr (t) 'young woman', lit. 'beautiful one', Wb. II, 258, 6; the lack of the woman determinative in G might tempt one to regard this as epithet of the preceding st, but wrongly; see W-b, and cf. nfrt contrasted with st in Med. Habu (ed. Chicago), [II], 75, 22. [300]  G;  W-b, th šbn 'various person(s)', Wb. IV, 441, 10; after enumeration of captured foreigners of different ranks, ages and sex see Med. Habu (ed. Chicago), [II], 75, 25, where the plural  is rightly written. [301]  G;  W-b, (ddk) 'boy', Wb. I, 242, 11 ff., purely late-Egyptian. [302]  G;  W-b, nhn 'child', from infancy upwards, Wb. II, 314, 3 ff. [303]  G;  W-b, rnn 'lad', Wb. I, 435, 17, thus of human beings only late-Egyptian and rather rare. [304]  G;  W-b, rnn 'maiden', according to Wb. II, 435, 18, only here and Canopus, 32. [305]  G;  W-b, shy 'weaver', Wb. IV, 264, 2.

Textual Notes. 294^a Certainly not R. 295^a This is the first example of a word-dividing stroke found a number of times below, e.g. Nos. 322. 388. 440. In the plates of transcription this stroke has been wrongly rendered as mn everywhere. 297^a For  as det. of words for 'old' see above, No. 244, note^a. 298^a Without dot for  as often. 300^{a-b} Influenced by the verb wb 'answer'. 305^a Made certain by the duplicate text; correct 4, 11, note^a in Pl. 10A accordingly.

[306]  G;  W-b, hyr 'subordinate', 'assistant', Wb. III, 393, 9 ff. [307]  G;  W-b, shy, meaning unknown, Wb. V, 618, 6; to judge from the context, name of a craft. [308]  G;  W-b, imy-r (hmr (var. mdh) whr 'overseer of carpenters (var. 'carpenter') of the dockyard'; for whr see Wb. I, 355, 10 f.; the title seems unknown in either form. [309]  G;  W-b, huty (var. hyt) 'sailor' or 'ship's hand'; the two obscure passages quoted by Wb. II, 485, 8 suggest a sailor rather than a shipbuilder, Amenemope 27, 1; in the Petersburg literary letter read huty n  , not ; Lange, commenting on the former passage, rightly compares Copt. ⁵ ⲉⲟⲩⲏⲧ and hytw (plur.) in the demotic story Sh. I, 3, 28; for the Coptic word Crum hesitatingly gives 'passenger on board ship' as the primary meaning, but the demotic story suggests rather 'ship's hands', i.e. those of the crew not engaged in the navigation. [309A] Not in G;  W-b, shy 'boat-builder', doubtless an otherwise unknown derivative of the verb  sh, used of binding together papyrus boats, Wb. IV, 96, 13 ff. [310]  G; not in W-b, shy, lit. 'a goer forth'; some metaphorical sense must be intended, hardly 'hero', see my Notes on the Story of Sinuhe, p. 44, or yet 'deserter', cf. Urk. IV, 665, 11. Wb. I, 526, 3 quotes only this passage, and unwarrantably renders 'carpenter's assistant'. [311]  G;  W-b, hmy (w) 'slaves' (male). [312]  G;  W-b, hmy (wt) 'female slaves'.

Textual Notes. 307^a In this late hieratic  is often written exactly like . 308^a Very uncertain. ^b See above, note ^a on No. 80. 311^a For , wrongly with a dot. 312^a For , wrongly without dot.