

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

ACCESSION NO. 40602

CALL No. 913.3205/J.E.A

D.G.A. 79.

860.2

THE JOURNAL OF Egyptian Archaeology

VOLUME 47
DECEMBER 1961

PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
2 HINDE STREET, MANCHESTER SQUARE, LONDON, W. 1

Price to non-members 70s. or \$10.00

913.3205

J.E.A.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

CENTRAL
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

ACCESSION NO. 40602

CALL No. 913.3205/J.E.A

D.G.A. 79.

Exploration Society

1882, and incorporated in 1888 as the 'Egypt

made surveys and conducted explorations and for the purpose of obtaining information about culture, and ethnology of those countries.

Objects of the Society's objects are eligible for subscription is £3. 3s. (\$10.00). If desired, the subscription may be compounded at any time by a single payment or be paid by covenants for a minimum term of

seven years. Payment of subscriptions is, however, subject to the terms of the special resolution passed on September 21, 1949, which is contained in the Society's Articles of Association.

Members have the right of attendance and voting at all meetings, and may introduce friends to the Lectures and Exhibitions of the Society. They have access to the Library at the Society's Rooms in London, and may borrow books.

Subject to certain conditions, of which details may be had on application, all students between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five are eligible for election as Associate Members. Associate Members enjoy most of the privileges of membership, and the annual subscription is £1. 11s. 6d. (\$5.00).

Persons may also join the Society as Associates at an annual subscription of 11s. 6d. Associates are entitled to receive the Annual Report and tickets for lectures and exhibitions, and to use the Library in London, but not to take out books.

Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary, 2 Hinde Street, Manchester Square, London, W. 1.

All communications to the JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY should be sent to T. G. H. JAMES, Esq., DEPARTMENT OF EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES, BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON, W.C. 1. All books for review should be sent to the SECRETARY OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY, 2 Hinde Street, Manchester Square, London, W. 1.

All subscriptions for the JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY should be sent to the HONORARY TREASURER OF THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY, 2 Hinde Street, Manchester Square, London, W. 1.

THE JOURNAL OF Egyptian Archaeology

VOLUME 47

40602



913.3205
J.E.A.

PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
2 HINDE STREET, MANCHESTER SQUARE, LONDON, W.1

1961

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CENTRAL ARCHIVES
LIBRARY, NEW YORK
Acc. No. 40602
Date 9/4/64
Call No. 913.3205 / J.E.A.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITORIAL FOREWORD	I
THE STELA OF MERER IN CRACOW Jaroslav Černý	5
AN UNUSUAL STELA FROM ABYDOS K. A. Kitchen	10
A FRAGMENT OF A PUNT SCENE Nina M. Davies	19
THE PLAN OF TOMB 55 IN THE VALLEY OF THE KINGS Elizabeth Thomas	24
ONCE AGAIN THE SO-CALLED COFFIN OF AKHENATEN H. W. Fairman	25
THE TOMB OF AKHENATEN AT THEBES Cyril Aldred	41
APPENDIX A. T. Sandison	60
FINDS FROM 'THE TOMB OF QUEEN TIYE' IN THE SWANSEA MUSEUM Kate Bosse-Griffiths	66
SOME SEA-PEOPLES G. A. Wainwright	71
THE EGYPTIAN MEMNON Sir Alan Gardiner	91
THE ALLEGED SEMITIC ORIGINAL OF THE <i>Wisdom of Amenemope</i> Ronald J. Williams	100
NOTES ON PTOLEMAIC CHRONOLOGY. II T. C. Skeat	107
THE DEATH OF CLEOPATRA VII J. Gwyn Griffiths	113
'O "ΚΑΡΑΚΑΛΛΟΣ" ΚΟΣΜΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ Abd el-Mohsen el-Khachab	119
THE ΔΙΟΛΚΟΣ OF ALEXANDRIA P. M. Fraser	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT: GREEK INSCRIPTIONS (1960) P. M. Fraser	139
BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS: Note on the supposed beginning of a Sothic period under Sethos I, by Jaroslav Černý, p. 150; A supplement to Janssen's list of dogs' names, by Henry G. Fischer, p. 152; <i>Hry-r</i> a word for infant, by Hans Goedicke, p. 154; Seth as a fool, by Hans Goedicke, p. 154; A sportive writing of the interrogative <i>in + m</i> , by Hans Goedicke, p. 155.	
REVIEWS	
SIEGFRIED MORENZ, <i>Ägyptische Religion</i>	Reviewed by J. G. Griffiths 156
R. T. RUNDLE CLARK, <i>Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt</i>	C. H. S. Spaul 157
J. VERGOTE, <i>Joseph en Égypte</i>	K. A. Kitchen 158
P. LACAU AND J.-PH. LAUER, <i>La Pyramide à Degrés. Tome IV</i>	R. O. Faulkner 164
RICARDO A. CAMINOS, <i>The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon</i>	C. H. S. Spaul 164
BORIS DE RACHEWILTZ, <i>The Rock Tomb of Irw-k3-Pth</i>	T. G. H. James 165
HANS GOEDICKE, <i>Die Stellung des Königs im Alten Reich</i>	T. G. H. James 166
CONSTANT DE WIT, <i>Les Inscriptions du Temple d'Opet</i>	J. G. Griffiths 168
FRANÇOIS DAUMAS, <i>Les Mammisis des temples égyptiens</i>	J. G. Griffiths 169
W. PEREMANS AND E. VAN'T DACK, <i>Prosopographia Ptolemaica. IV</i>	E. G. Turner 170

	PAGE
ARTHUR E. R. BOAK (AND) H. C. YOUTIE, <i>The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus</i>	171
WALTER C. TILL, <i>Die Koptischen Ostraka der Papyrus-sammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek</i>	173

LIST OF PLATES

Plate I.	The stela of Merer in Cracow	<i>facing p. 5</i>
Plates II-III.	Stela from Abydos at Liverpool	<i>between pp. 12 and 13</i>
Plate IV.	Tomb of Hepusonb. Felling trees in the Land of Punt.	<i>facing p. 20</i>
Plate V.	Tomb of Hepusonb. Chariot-makers	<i>facing p. 21</i>
Plate VI.	1. Calcite pot of Kia. 2. Magical bricks from Royal Tomb 55	<i>facing p. 37</i>
Plate VII.	Objects from 'the Tomb of Queen Tiye'	<i>facing p. 66</i>
Plate VIII.	The Sea-peoples' homelands	<i>facing p. 71</i>
Plate IX.	Two royal ladies	<i>facing p. 118</i>
Plate X.	Alexandrian coins of Caracalla	<i>facing p. 132</i>

EDITORIAL FOREWORD

IN the Editorial Foreword to Volume 46 of the *Journal*, details were given of the proposed programme of work to be carried out by the Society in the season 1960-1 as its part in the archaeological salvage operations connected with the High Dam scheme in Egyptian and Sudanese Nubia. A combination of adverse factors, however, prevented any work being done at Qaşr Ibrîm, and the full season was spent by Professor Emery's party and Professor R. A. Caminos at Buhen. The staff at Buhen consisted of Professor and Mrs. Emery, Mr. A. Mills of University College, London, and Mr. R. Deane of the University of Sydney. For the early part of the season the staff of the sondage survey (mentioned below) were also employed at Buhen. A full preliminary report of the season's work will ultimately appear in *Kush*. For readers of the *Journal* Professor Emery has supplied the following note:

With the exception of the area underneath the temple of Hatshepsut, the fortress of Buhen has been completely explored and excavated.

The excavations were reopened on November 6, in the south-east corner of the fortifications, with the object of ascertaining the extent of the spur-wall which projects from the main rectangle of the fortress along the river-bank from north to south. This wall, of which little remains but the foundations, extends for a distance of 21 metres where it ends with a large square tower.

On the completion of our work on the spur-wall we turned our attention, once more, to the interior of the fortress, and from November 15 to December 11 we cleared the remaining area of the town in squares H8, I8, and J8. Although the area was much denuded the general plan of the streets of the Middle Kingdom houses was ascertainable, and the fact was established that the town had been built on a series of lateral terraces to overcome the natural uneven slope of the ground towards the river. Most of the buildings were houses of some size and importance during the Middle Kingdom, but when rebuilt and reoccupied in the New Kingdom they had been divided up into smaller dwellings, and at an even later date some of them had been used as workshops and foundries. Small slag-heaps were a common feature in this vicinity.

As the work progressed towards the south-east part of the town it became increasingly evident that we were moving into a more or less barren area, which had been denuded by wind-erosion. Test trenches soon showed that the whole of this part of the area had been completely obliterated and that the present ground-surface was almost certainly below the original foundation-level. However, sufficient evidence remained for us to ascertain the general street-system. Over the whole town-area excavated this season we found numerous pieces of inscribed masonry mostly of New Kingdom date, but there was no trace of any building to which they may have belonged.

On December 12 we commenced the excavation of the southern defences, which included the main wall, lower ramparts, and ditch. Outside the main wall at the south-west corner we found a large building of late New Kingdom date which had been built over the Middle Kingdom ditch, and over the early New Kingdom roadway which was constructed over the lower defences when the fortress was rebuilt after its re-occupation. The removal of this late New Kingdom structure and the foundations of the roadway, considerably delayed the progress of the work, but we were greatly compensated by the stratified deposits which lay below it. In no other part of the excavations was Buhen's history of nearly 1,000 years so plainly recorded.

The southern fortifications, although not so well preserved as those on the western side of the town, were intact, as far as the foundations were concerned, and full details of their design were

ascertainable. Here again, we have the main wall with projecting rectangular towers, a lower rampart with fire-step, loopholes, and round bastions which project at intervals into the ditch. The ditch, at the river-end, turns a short distance to the south, flanking what appears to have been a spur-wall of similar design and dimensions to that discovered at the north-east corner of the fortress last year. Unfortunately, the area was much denuded by wind-erosion, and only the stone foundations of the spur-wall had survived. No gate of any sort existed in the southern defences.

The excavation of this area continued until January 21, and on February 5 we turned our attention to the corresponding defences on the north side of the fortress. Work was started at the north-east corner which had been partly excavated last year. The length of the spur-wall, running from north to south, was confirmed, and then all available labour was concentrated on the clearance of the ditch, main wall, and lower ramparts, as far down as the New Kingdom level. As with the west and south defences, after the reoccupation in the early Eighteenth Dynasty, the main wall with its projecting towers had been strengthened by the construction of an outer skin-wall, about one metre thick. The loopholed parapet had also been removed and replaced by a rather ragged retaining wall to hold back the deposit of sand and rubble which had accumulated over the lower ramparts during the late Second Intermediate Period, when Buhen was apparently an unoccupied ruin.

The New Kingdom restoration of the ruined Middle Kingdom walls was more extensive than in other parts of the fortifications. It would appear that only four of the projecting towers of the Middle Kingdom walls were still standing when Buhen was reoccupied, and these towers were rebuilt by the restorers in their first effort to strengthen the walls. But in most cases they had not built them firmly on the stumps of the original structures, but had rested their foundations on the rubble and sand deposit above them. In consequence of this the restored towers were found to be insecure and they were therefore encased in the skin-walls which were the main feature of the New Kingdom restoration.

After measurement and photography the New Kingdom restorations were removed, and the original Middle Kingdom structure was revealed, including the usual round bastions which projected from the lower ramparts into the ditch.

The remaining period of our season, from March 16 to March 27, was devoted to a general examination of the New Kingdom walls and ditch which form an irregular perimeter round the enlarged town for a distance of more than 1,300 metres. Although the massive walls of the later fortress had in most cases been reduced by wind-erosion to only the barest traces, often less than one brick thick, sufficient remained to show the full details of the original plan, and the location of the towers and gateways. Further excavation around the big gatehouse, discovered last year in the great salient on the west side of the perimeter, have revealed many new features of architectural importance.

Professor Caminos, who joined Professor Emery's camp on November 16, 1960, devoted the whole season until March 23, 1961, to the recording of the scenes and inscriptions in the two temples at Buhen. Very little remains of the Temple of Isis, but the work at the Temple of Horus was very rewarding. This latter temple, built originally by Hatshepsut and added to and modified by later rulers, is noteworthy for the wealth of colour preserved on the scenes and also for the important series of inscriptions set up by the Viceroys of Cush. One important discovery made during the season was the identification of a new Viceroy, named *Hr-m-ttri* who served in the reign of Menepthah *Hetep-himaet*; the name is confirmed by texts found within the fort. Professor Caminos also discovered evidence that a pair of columns was erected in the Temple of Horus by Taharqa who, furthermore, dedicated an altar there. It has elsewhere been claimed that the temple contained nothing later than the Twentieth Dynasty (so MacIver-Woolley, *Buhen*, Text vol., p. 17). The Temple of Horus stands within the walls of the fortress and

it is thought to have been built on the site of a Middle Kingdom temple. As Professor Emery points out, the temple-area is the only part of the fortress precinct that has not been examined by excavation. According to the recommendation of the UNESCO Consultative Committee, the temple is to be moved to ground above the level of the High Dam lake, and when this move is accomplished it will be possible to excavate the area and to establish whether there was a Middle Kingdom temple on the site.

A third enterprise was started during the early months of 1961, under the leadership of Mr. H. S. Smith of Christ's College, Cambridge. He reports:

The Sondage Survey of Egyptian Nubia undertaken by the Society on behalf of the Egyptian Antiquities Service was commenced on January 14, 1961, at Adendan on the Sudanese frontier; the season's work was closed on March 26 at Korosko, approximately 100 miles to the north. The party consisted of Mr. H. S. Smith, Mr. D. O'Connor, of Sydney University and University College, London, and Mr. M. A. P. Minns of Pembroke College, Cambridge. A houseboat and tug with crew were kindly lent by the Egyptian Service of Antiquities, who sent Ali Hassan, Inspector of Antiquities at Mallawi, to accompany the expedition. Maps and air photographs were provided by the Documentation Centre for the Monuments of Nubia at Cairo. The party, accompanied by fifteen workmen, walked the whole of the unexplored area of both banks of the Nile from Adendan to Korosko, with the exception of those areas conceded to other institutions, and parts shown by air photographs to be completely barren. Over seventy cemeteries and over twenty settlements of the Dynastic, Roman, and Christian periods were discovered, for the most part in a heavily plundered condition. As a result of trial excavations four of these sites were recommended to the Director-General of Antiquities as being worthy of investigation on a larger scale. Other sites were examined by the sondage method and the results carefully recorded for eventual publication by the Society. The party also noted such prehistoric and epigraphic sites as they encountered, though these were not within the Survey's terms of reference. A preliminary report of the Society's work will appear in due course in *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*. It is hoped that the survey of the remaining area of Egyptian Nubia northward to Shellal can be completed in the coming season, 1961-2.

The Society has good reason to be proud of the work it has already done and which it plans in the future to do on sites threatened by flooding in Egyptian and Sudanese Nubia. The publicity lavished on the archaeological problems created by the High Dam scheme in Nubia has, however, tended to obscure the probable effects of the planned perennial irrigation of Egypt on sites north of the dam which now are only partially affected by water. The raising of the general level of the water-table which will be one of the ultimate effects of the new irrigation scheme, will render many sites, marginal on the present cultivated area, or only slightly raised above the present level of the water-table, continuously waterlogged and therefore inaccessible to excavation. Some experts believe that most of the Delta will eventually be lost to archaeology. It may be necessary, therefore, for the Society to switch part of its effort in the near future to places in Egypt proper that are threatened in this way. Possibly the greatest archaeological problems created by the building of the High Dam are yet to be faced.

Among those whose deaths during the past year we must unhappily recall here, British Egyptologists will especially mourn Canon Drioton who, as Director-General of the Egyptian Antiquities Service during a particularly difficult period, always showed himself a true friend of the Society and a sure adviser of its representatives

working in Egypt. Professor Černý has contributed the following short appreciation:

The death of Chanoine Étienne Drioton, though not totally unexpected owing to his long and grave ill health, has been a sad shock to his many friends and fellow Egyptologists. These will be gratefully remembering the encouragement and generous help he was always ready to give during his long career, especially while Director-General of the Department of Antiquities of Egypt. The range of Drioton's Egyptological interests was wide, and his ready and brilliant pen has left hardly any aspect of Ancient Egypt untouched, though religion, archaeology, and Coptic art were his favourites. The study of the inscriptions at Madâmûd led him to the inscriptions of the Graeco-Roman Period and to cryptography, a field which had been lying fallow since the pioneering work of Déveria and Sethe. With Egyptian cryptography Drioton's name will be permanently connected.

We also record the sad losses of Professor Maurice Alliot, the French Egyptologist, best known for his work on the texts in the Temple of Edfu, and of Dr. Douglas E. Derry, the anatomist, who contributed accounts of mummies and other human remains to many excavation-reports and who wrote many articles in this *Journal* and elsewhere.

An event in which Egyptologists everywhere have rejoiced, in particular members of the Society, was the granting on June 16, 1961, of the degree of Doctor of Letters *honoris causa* to Miss Rosalind Moss by the University of Oxford. No tool of Egyptological scholarship is so widely used or so highly esteemed as *Topographical Bibliography*, of which Miss Moss has been the guiding genius for many years. It is particularly fitting that she should thus be honoured by her own university to which, by way of the Griffith Institute, she has added so much lustre. The Public Orator of the University, Mr. A. N. Bryan-Brown, in presenting Miss Moss for the degree, very appropriately associated with her name that of Mrs. Burney, her assistant and intrepid companion for the last thirty years:

Multi, credo, Aegyptum petierunt cognoscendae antiquitatis; nemo uberiores doctrinae messem quam haec hospita atque amica nostra percepit. Societati olim Mulierum Oxoniae privatim Studentium ascripta, cum persciter scrutata esset quid de immortalitate apud insulas Oceani Pacifici crederetur, Baccalaurei in Scientia gradum est assecuta. tum auctoritate viri strenui Francisci Griffiths ad res Aegyptias allecta maximum munus aggressa est. iam coeperat femina doctissima Bertha Porter amplam scientiae molem congerere ex qua conficerentur indices ectyporum Aegypti antiquae, picturarum, inscriptionum signis sacerdotalibus sculptarum, adiecta locorum expositione. illa rude iam donata huic rem peragendam reliquit. intra quinque et viginti exinde annos apparuerunt septem illa volumina, honorifica Prelo nostro, huic vero vel honorificentissima; iamque emendatrix indefessa editionem alteram incipit emitte. nec modo australem Consociatae Arabum Reipublicae partem visitat, sed ubicumque museum aliquod publicum vel thesaurus privatus exempla servat, haec omnia nulla haesitatione odoratur. Neoptolemis scilicet saepius fit via vi; huic propter doctrinam reverendae, propter comitatem acceptissimae non Oceanus non vellum illud ferreum ullo modo obsistit. suarum virium opumque prodiga, nulla ostentatione maxime efficax, adeuntibus praesens auxilium largitur, ubivis legentibus instrumentum ad scientiam comparandam unicum praebuit. qua denique est modestia, nec praetermitti velit hoc loco fidam adiutricem Ethel Burney, nec diutius suas laudes perpeti.

Readers of Volume 46 of the *Journal* may have noticed that on page 87 the same word is twice spelt 'barque', and twice 'bark', an unfortunate confusion for which the author of the article should carry no blame. In future the spelling 'bark' will be accepted as standard for the *Journal*, and so too, 'kiosk' and 'disk'. We offer our apologies to Mr. H. M. Stewart.



THE STELA OF MERER IN CRACOW

THE STELA OF MERER IN CRACOW

By JAROSLAV ČERNÝ

STELAE of the First Intermediate Period with biographical inscriptions of some length are not too numerous and any addition to our stock should be welcome. The limestone stela MNK-XI-999 of the Czartoryski Collection of the National Museum (Muzeum Narodowe) at Cracow has so far passed unnoticed. My attention to it was kindly drawn by Miss Moss and Magistra Julia Lisowska, the Keeper of the Collection, has most obligingly provided the excellent photograph here reproduced on pl. I as well as permission from the Director of the National Museum to publish it in the *Journal*.

The stela measures 87 cm. in length and 52.5 cm. in height, the thickness of the stone being 6 cm. Its condition is perfect and numerous traces of colour are extant in the inscriptions and in the representation. It was acquired outside Poland by Prince Władysław Czartoryski and sent to Cracow towards the end of 1890 or at the beginning of 1891.

The inscription is arranged in an initial horizontal line along the upper edge of the stela, followed by ten further vertical lines in its right half; it ends in two vertical lines between the figures of the owner and his wife, and a last line almost at the extreme left of the stela. A horizontal line above the representation gives the name and titles of the deceased's wife.

The scene represents the owner and his wife standing turned towards the right, and being offered a cup and the hind leg of an ox by two servants. No description of the details is necessary since they can be clearly seen on the photograph.


The forms of the signs of the inscription point clearly to the First Intermediate Period as its date. The text contains a number of new expressions and phrases as can be found easily enough by even a perfunctory search in Father Janssen's repertory of Old and Middle Kingdom biographical expressions.¹ It is therefore understandable that in the notes to the translation I am unable to adduce much illustrative material except for references to the *Wörterbuch*. The translation is not always easy and the following attempt at one is intended more as a challenge to others.² For the reader's convenience the inscription is also given in a drawing (kindly made by the Editor with line numbering; the forms of the signs have been reproduced as carefully as possible because of their great palaeographic interest.

Translation

(1) A boon which the king (and) Anubis, he who is upon his mountain, he in Ut, the lord of the Sacred Land in all his beautiful and pure places, give. Invocation-offerings for the revered one, the sole friend, butler and overseer of

¹ J. Janssen, *De traditioneele Egyptische autobiografie vóór het Nieuwe Rijk*, 2 vols., Leiden, 1946.

² I am much indebted to Gardiner and to the Editor for helpful suggestions and criticism, though they must not be held responsible for any of my renderings.



(f) *Iw hnn* is for *iw hnn-n-i n. Hnn n*, 'to lean on, against', 'rely on', 'approve', *Wb.* II, 495, 1.

(g) *Shm-ir(y)f* is a substantive of the now well-known formation (see Erman, *Äg. Gr.*, 3rd ed., § 186, 3; 4th ed., § 186); examples in *Wb.* IV, 250, 1 ff.

(h) I cannot see any other way of understanding $\overline{\text{𓆎}}\overline{\text{𓆏}}$, than taking *kt* as the feminine of *ky*, 'another', and $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ for a writing of *swt* (old *zwt*), 'wheat'. Is *kt swt*, lit. 'another wheat', an expression for 'cockle', an undesired weed found especially among wheat? But this is probably a far-fetched and fantastic idea.

(i) *Wb.* I, 90, 2 ff. does not give the meaning 'acquire' for *iny*, but see *Ann. Serv.* 15, 207, 5; Clère-Vandier, 5, no. 7, 3; *ÄZ* 43, 47.

(j) The sign is the copper-sign (o) coalesced with the determinative o.

(k) For *ts(w)* see Vandier, *La famine dans l'Égypte ancienne*, 74 ff., and *Mo'alla*, 220 (IV, 10) with note 2 on p. 224.

(l) *M ir nds* ($\overline{\text{𓆎}}\overline{\text{𓆏}}\overline{\text{𓆐}}$) *ikr*, lit. (this being) 'as (= what) an excellent commoner does'. For *m* of predication in this use, see Gardiner, *Gr.*, § 162, 11 (d); for the perfective *sdm-f*-form with present meaning after *m*, *ibid.*, § 454, 4.

(m) That is, have enough water by shutting water off so that it should not inundate for strangers (*ky*). The word for 'family' is *mhwt* (*Wb.* II, 114, 7) the prefix *m-* being omitted, see Grapow, *Über die Wortbildungen mit einem Präfix m-*, 26 and 10-13.

(n) *It-šm* is masculine, so that the feminine pronoun $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ must refer to *nwt*; understand therefore *iw dš<n-i> n-s*.

(o) *čš* evidently is not the adjective which would have to stand after *spw*, but the substantive *čš*, 'multitude', *Wb.* I, 229, 1 f. ('multitude of times').

(p) $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ is *čhr*, *Wb.* I, 220, 10. —The 'white' variety of *it-šm* has not been so far attested, but is not surprising since there was *it dšr*, 'red barley', *Wb.* I, 142, 15, and also *bdt hdt*, 'white spelt', *Wb.* I, 487, 3. 4. —I am unable to quote another instance for the cereal *hmi*.

(q) *čbt*, *Wb.* I, 177, 2.

(r) The reading *hnmwt* seems certain, the sign $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ being an adaptation of a hieratic form like $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ of $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$, for which see Möller, *Hierat. Pal.* I, no. 585. An essentially identical form $\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ is found in *hnms* in the MK stela no. 14450 of the University College, London. *Hnmwt* is perhaps plural of *hnmt* recorded by *Wb.* III, 294, 10.

(s) Note *m mrt nbt* here as against *m mrrt nb(t)* just before, which is probably more accurate and was intended also here.

(t) Restore $\overline{\text{𓆏}}\overline{\text{𓆏}}\overline{\text{𓆏}}$ and see *Wb.* IV, 152, 2 f.

(u) Not in Ranke, *Personennamen*. Evidently to be read *dmi-s-n<i>*, (= 'she has joined me').

There can be little doubt that the stela belongs to the First Intermediate Period. In its disposition it resembles considerably other stelae of that time especially that of Heḳayeb (Brit. Mus. [167]) published by Polotsky in this *Journal* 16, pl. XXIX. On the other hand, it has so little in common with their phraseology, that it may have come from some so far unexploited locality in Upper Egypt. There seems to be no clue as to its provenance in the inscriptions, except for the 'House of Khuu' which the owner of

the stela served. Khuu evidently was one of those nomarchs among whom Upper Egypt was at that time divided. Only two persons of some importance bearing that name are known. One is the father of Dhutinakht,¹ an early nomarch of Beni Hasan (Hare nome). Merer served thirteen rulers, which in one lifetime means a swift succession. This would be consistent with the general character of the time, but does not at all suit the Hare nome where the number of nomarchs is known² and where thirteen rulers would lead deep into the Twelfth Dynasty. To date our stela so late is quite impossible.

A second Khuu was a nomarch of Edfu.³ Nothing in our stela seems to contradict identifying him with the founder of the 'House of Khuu', but it must be admitted that neither is there anything in it to support such an identification.

Magistra Lisowska has also kindly supplied some details about the numerous traces of colour that remain on the stela, both on the figures and on the inscription. At her request Prof. Rudolf Kozłowski, Keeper General of the State Collections in the Castle of Wawel, made a chemical analysis of the pigments, for which I should here like to express my warm thanks.

The principal colour is a red, traces of which are visible on the bodies of the men, on the objects they hold in their hands, and on many of the hieroglyphs. The red pigment consists of iron oxide, with the addition of a colourless substance which is characteristic of natural earthy pigments. There are also numerous traces of a yellow colour, which has faded in the course of time and now appears dirty. In this instance the yellow pigment consists of powdered calcium carbonate coloured yellow with an organic substance.⁴ The yellow colour covers many hieroglyphs, as well as all the vertical dividing lines of the inscription and the line bordering three sides of the stela. There are few traces of white, namely, the eye of the large figure and the folds of his kilt. This white pigment consists of pure calcium carbonate, identical with the material of the yellow colour.

¹ Anthes, *Die Felseninschriften von Hatnub*, pl. 6, a.

² See, for example, the table in Stock, *Die erste Zwischenzeit Ägyptens*, 67.

³ Alliot, *Tell Edfou (Fouilles de l'IFAO, 1932)*, 2.

⁴ On this point Dr. J. R. Harris has kindly supplied the following information: 'No yellow pigment of precisely this nature is known to me, though vegetal yellows were identified by John (Minutoli, *Reise*, pp. 335-6), and an intense yellow of late date examined by Wagenaar (*Pharm. Weekblad* 70 [1933], pp. 894-902) was found to be ochre with traces of some organic material. A green pigment examined by John (Minutoli, *Reise*, p. 332) was a mixture of blue frit and a vegetable yellow, and a green plaster on a stick from the tomb of Tutankhamun owed its colour to a blue frit and a yellow that was unidentified, but was probably organic (Lucas, *Materials*³, pp. 175, 396). A pink pigment from a tomb painting of the Graeco-Roman period was identified by Russell (Petrie, *Medum*, p. 47) as madder on a base of gypsum'.

AN UNUSUAL STELA FROM ABYDOS

By K. A. KITCHEN

THE object of this paper is briefly to make known an interesting little stela which belongs to the Egyptian collection of the School of Archaeology and Oriental Studies in the University of Liverpool. I am indebted to Professor Fairman for permission to publish it, for the photographs taken specially, and for helpful comments.

This stela comes from Garstang's excavations at Abydos in 1907. Unfortunately, no record of its precise archaeological context seems to have survived, but docketts on Garstang's photographs¹ suggest that it came from either Tomb 303 or Tomb 305. It now bears the registration-number E.30 in the School's collection.

General description

The stela is carved from a creamy limestone, the surface of which is now dulled and grey, with a dark, yellowish discoloration on the reverse, upper right-hand part. It was found broken in two and has lost the top right and bottom left corners. The obverse of the stela is 51.0 cm. high and 35.0 cm. wide, but the reverse is only 50.5 cm. high and 34.5 cm. wide because the edges of the stone do not make right angles with its faces. The thickness is generally 5.0 cm., increasing to 5.5 cm. at the top left corner. Traces of colour show that the hieroglyphs were once filled with green paint, and that at any rate the men's bodies were painted red-brown while the collars of both men and women were painted with the same deep green as the hieroglyphs. No other colouring has survived.

Obverse (pl. II and fig. 1)

The front of the stela is dominated by a large *ankh*-sign of which the loop has been cut right through the thickness. Above the *ankh* were two symmetrical scenes showing the owner kneeling and making offering to Wepwawet. The right-hand scene is wholly lost except for the end of a text which must have read: [*Making offering to Wepwawet of Lower Egypt,*] by the regulator of a phylē, Ameny. Doubtless, too, the missing jackal-figure was labelled *Wepwawet of Lower Egypt*. The basis of these restorations is the well-preserved, corresponding left-hand scene where the god's figure is called *Wepwawet of Upper Egypt*. Over and behind his kneeling worshipper, we read: *Making offering to Wepwawet of Upper Egypt* (in retrograde hieroglyphs), by the regulator of a phylē, Ameny (vertical columns). The representation of Wepwawet in the form of twin jackals for North and South is quite well known on Middle Kingdom stelae.²

On either side of the *ankh* stands the owner of the stela, hands uplifted in worship. His head and the exposed parts of the body retain their red-brown paint and his collar

¹ Kept in the School of Archaeology at Liverpool. The photos are negatives A.117-120, 644, 797, 798. The photographs reproduced on pls. II and III of this article are from negatives A.797, 798.

² Typical are Cairo 20101, 20143, 20399, 20557, and 20761 in Lange-Schäfer, *Grab- u. Denksteine*.




FIG. 1

is still a faded dark green. Over a short kilt he wears a long, transparent tunic extending from the waist to half-way down the calf of the leg, with a point in front. Above and in front of the well-preserved left-hand figure there is inscribed: *Fourfold adoration of Wepwawet by the regulator of a phylē of Abydos, Amenysonb, begotten of Wæemsha*. Amenysonb and its abbreviation Ameny are Middle Kingdom names so common as to require no comment.¹ However, the name of his father, *Wꜣ-m-šꜣ*, seems to be new. It would appear to mean 'the Sole (or, Unique) One is my fate', *šꜣ(-i)*, a suggestion which

¹ Ranke, *Personennamen*, 1, 31, 13 and 32, 2.

I owe to Professor Fairman. Perhaps the Thirteenth Dynasty name Wa'emkau¹ would afford a parallel, if it may be taken to mean 'the Sole One is (my) sustenance', but this cannot be pressed. Names compounded with *šr(y)*, 'fate', seem to be very rare.²

Near Amenysonb's feet and seated before offerings is *his mother, the lady of the house Nebt-iōt, justified*, bearing a name very common in the Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period.³ In the damaged register below her, and likewise facing left, there squat *her son, the priest Si-Anḥur*⁴ and *her daughter, Nebt-ro(?) - neḥeh*, her figure being incised in the base of the *rankh*. Ranke records⁵ two examples of a Middle Kingdom name *Nbt-nḥh* to which the name of Amenysonb's sister almost corresponds. The — read here between *t* of *Nbt* and *n* of *nḥh* is certainly badly formed, but it hardly seems possible to dismiss it as merely an accidental gash and scratch. There may have been another squatting figure (facing right) at the extreme left end of this register, now wholly lost, traces of whose uplifted hand and lotus-bloom can just be discerned at the left of the offerings and below *sr.s*. Below the figures of Amenysonb's brother and sister sits another brother; of his inscription, only the head of a *sr*-bird survives. In front of this head there are traces which may just possibly be the end of a —. If so, then the lost epigraph would be just like that for Si-Anḥur: [*her son, the pries*]⁶ *Si*-. . .], possibly the other Si-Anḥur shown on the reverse, if the latter is not merely the first Si-Anḥur depicted twice. If the *n* be rejected, then read: *s[.s . . .]*, i.e., simply *h[er son, . . .]*. The rest of this sub-register is lost at the left, and also the whole left half of the bottom register; of this, there is only a sign *nb* and an unidentifiable trace.

At the right side, everything is lost above Amenysonb's waist. Below the arm of the *rankh*, two squatting women face one another. Looking right is *his sister, the lady of the house Rensonb*;⁷ facing left, there sits *his sister Khu-nūb-si*.⁸ In the register below, also facing left, there sits *the lady of the house, Nenni*. Rensonb and Nenni are both more likely to have been married sisters than wives of Amenysonb. For another possible hint that Amenysonb was unmarried, see below (reverse), on Senb-Ameny-Nebiōt. It is also noticeable that no children of Amenysonb are recorded, only brothers and sisters, which would further suggest that Amenysonb was perhaps single. Facing the older Nenni squats *her daughter Nenn(i)*.⁹ Finally, in the bottom register another couple face one another over a low, footed platter of offerings: *the doorkeeper of the temple, Serankhenptah*,¹⁰ and *his wife Titiu*.¹¹ Their relationship to Amenysonb is unknown. All the seated figures on this side of the stela smell lotus-blooms.

¹ Ranke, op. cit. 1, 76, 16, from Louvre C.12 (Sethe, *Lesestücke*, 76) of another 'regulator of a phylē of Abydos, Amenysonb', of the reign of the Thirteenth Dynasty king Nekha'nema'etrē Khendjer.

² The only two known to me are *Ti-šrit-(nt)-pt-šry*, 'the daughter of Fate' (Greek period, Ranke, op. cit. 1, 368, 19) and *Šry-nn*, 'this is fate(?)' (Late Period, Ranke, op. cit. 11, 318, 5).

³ Ranke, op. cit. 1, 188, 7 for references.

⁴ Ibid. 1, 280, 26, a common M.K. name.

⁵ Ibid. 1, 188, 24, cf. Clère, *Revue d'Égyptologie*, 3 (1938), 106 ad loc.

⁶ The — would be the uppermost of the three —'s that serve as determinative to *wrḥ*.

⁷ Common M.K. name, cf. Ranke, op. cit. 1, 222, 26.


⁸ *Hw-nbw-si*, 'the Golden One protects her', ibid. 1, 267, 8, also M.K.

⁹ Again M.K.; ibid. 1, 205, 9 (*Nni*) and 204, 17 (*Nn*).

¹⁰ An O.K. and M.K. name, ibid. 1, 301, 2.

¹¹ Compare *Ttw* or *Titw* (ibid. 1, 386, 1, M.K.), *Titi* (ibid. 378, 25, M.K.), *Tt* and *Th* (ibid. 383, 21, M.K.), *T(w)tw* (ibid. 383, 23, M.K.-N.K.), and *Tity* (ibid. 11, 330, 20, N.K.).

STELA FROM ABYDOS AT LIVERPOOL (*obverse*)



STELA FROM ABYDOS AT LIVERPOOL (*reverse*)

The one remarkable feature of the obverse is the pierced *ankh*. Although several stelae with rectangular openings are known,¹ I have so far found only two other stelae that have an aperture formed with an *ankh*: the fine stela Vienna no. 32/I 9² and a poor stela from Tomb 78 at Abydos.³ Cairo 20353 has an *ankh* hollowed out but not pierced through,⁴ which may have a quite different significance.⁵ Badawy has already suggested that the openings in such stelae were virtually false doors which provided the *ba* or soul of the deceased with a magical means of leaving and entering the burial-chamber at will; the *ba* of the deceased was the particular spirit-form of a person that enjoyed freedom of movement.⁶ However, the use of the *ankh* form of aperture remains unexplained. Could it conceivably be connected with the epithet *br-i-nh*, 'living soul', and the facility of movement (egress and ingress) be the mark of having 'life'? Moreover, since the stela published here is inscribed on both faces, it cannot have acted as a normal serdab-squint. It may be noted that Garstang's excavations at Abydos revealed other stelae pierced with holes. In Tomb 6 two small holes were cut in a stela placed in a niche,⁷ and in Tomb 1043 an uninscribed stela, found *in situ* in a niche with no statue behind it, had a single hole centrally near the top.⁸

Reverse (pl. III and fig. 2)

This side is wholly given over to agricultural and domestic scenes. As ploughing precedes harvest, and baking and brewing depend on the latter, these scenes are here taken in a general sequence from the bottom upwards.

In the bottom register, *the priest of Onuris, S[i-Anhur?]*⁹ is ploughing, but both his oxen and his plough are lost. *The Asiatic*¹⁰ *Sobkiry*¹¹ follows him, sowing seed from a bag.¹²

In the register above, *his brother, the priest Amenhotep*¹³ drives a yoke of oxen that pull a sledge on rollers.¹⁴ This sledge appears to be carrying a chest having six compartments

¹ Examples are: Cairo 20153, 20177, 20188, 20397, 20686, 20731, and 20748 in Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. IV, pls. 14-16, 28, 52, 57.

² Wreszinski, *Aeg. Inschriften aus dem K.K. Hofmuseum in Wien*, 1906, pl. i.

³ MacIver and Mace, *El Amrah and Abydos*, 87 and pl. 43.

⁴ Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. I, 363, 4; IV, pl. 26.

⁵ It could have served as a receptacle for small libations, rather than represent an exit from, and entry to, the tomb.

⁶ A. Badawy, 'La Stèle funéraire égyptienne à ouverture axiale', in *Bull. Inst. Ég.* 35, 117-39, especially 129 ff., 137-9.

⁷ Liverpool negatives A.7, A.10.

⁸ Liverpool negative A.524.

⁹ After *wcb n In* there is a small trace of *hr(t)* below *in*, and a tiny trace of the beak of a *si*-bird to the right of the *n* above *in*. See hand-copy, fig. 2.

¹⁰ Not a winnower, *kmrtw*, as this is a ploughing scene; compare Louvre C.18 and Ermitage 1064 (references in n. 2, p. 17, below) where an *sm* similarly participates in harvesting, cited by Posener, *Syria*, 34 (1957), 153.

¹¹ Well-known M.K. name, Ranke, op. cit. I, 303, 22.

¹² Cairo 20725 (Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. IV, pl. 54) shows oxen being used for ploughing, threshing, or the like.

¹³ Amenhotep is already a well-attested name in the M.K., refs. Ranke, op. cit. I, 30, 12. There was perhaps a figure at the far right of this register, now lost, to whom Amenhotep was 'brother'. The slight traces of carving to the right of Amenhotep's epigraph are obscure.

¹⁴ Hardly wheels, though this possibility cannot be ruled out. Compare the wheeled funerary car of the Thirteenth Dynasty in Tylor, *Tomb of Sebeknekt*, 1896, pl. 2, and accepted as such by Davies, *JEA* 12 (1926), 110-12, esp. 112.

labelled with the names of six rural food products that they contain. Some of the spellings are unusual, and there are no determinatives. The first item is pretty certainly *nd*, 'flour, meal', elsewhere associated with grain in texts.¹ The first sign is very badly formed, and the lower cross-stroke could perhaps be accidental; the *w*-chick is misshapen. The second item is evidently intended to be *bdt* or *bty*, 'emmer, spelt'. The peculiar spelling *bdt* probably shows the change in pronunciation from *d* to *t* (*bdt* > *btt*), the 'historical' *d* still being written together with the *t* that indicates the contemporary pronunciation;² the second *t* is, of course, the feminine ending, written even if not pronounced (*btt* > *bty*). Next comes *swt*, written with the reed-sign *sw*. Normally, this spelling is reserved for *swt*, 'meat'; but as all the other identifiable products here are vegetable ones, it may be possible that this *swt* is another erratic spelling, this time for *swt*, 'wheat'.³ I know of no other example where *swt* for wheat is written with the sign 𓂏 .⁴ The fourth item is *bnr*, 'dates', which are commonly associated with *bšr* which is our fifth item in a new spelling *bšr*, another cereal of uncertain nature. Dates and *bšr* were regularly used together for beer-making.⁵ The sixth and last substance I am totally at a loss to explain; it may be read *ihry* or possibly *ity*, neither making much sense.⁶

This scene is difficult to explain, has few parallels anywhere, and is apparently unique for a stela. The products are doubtless those regularly grown by Amenysnb and his family on their land, but where are they being taken? Are they simply being transported from the fields and threshing-floors to a place of storage? Or does this load represent a definite proportion set aside as taxes payable to the local nome-administration, or for temple dues, or for use as funerary offerings? The only remotely similar scene of which I know is that preserved in the Old Kingdom chapel of Mereruka,⁷ where two groups of three men each pull a sledge bearing three tall containers of unspecified produce. These are part of a large scene of the presentation of offerings to Mereruka.

In the next register above is a conventional scene of harvesting, transport, and treading out of the grain. The priest of Abydos, *Si-Anḥur*, justified, does the reaping, the priest *Si-Anḥur* and the priest *Wenemu*⁸ carry off the ears in a large basket, while *Renef-resu*⁹ drives the oxen and a calf over the grain on the threshing-floor.

¹ For *nd*, see *Wb.* II, 370, and Gardiner, *Onomastica*, II, 227*-8*. For *nd* in lists of grain, compare *On. Ram.*, nos. 255-62 (*bty*, emmer; *bšr*, a cereal; *bnr*, dates; *swt*, wheat; *nd*, flour; *wgmw* and *bi*, cereals), see Gardiner, op. cit. I, 14-15 and III, pl. 6; and in *On. Am.* seven kinds of *bty*, two obscure entries, then the series *swt n šht*, *bšr*, *bnr*, *nd*, *mcr*, ibid. II, 222* ff. and III, pl. 12.

² Examples of this duplication are legion: *r* and *i* in '*sturi*' (*stwr* > *stwi*), or *f* and *p* in '*pfsi*' (*fsi* > *psi*), etc.

³ *Sw* here occurs with *nd*, *bdt*, *bšr*, and *bnr* just as in the *onomastica* cited above, n. 1; other examples could readily be adduced.

⁴ Surely the word *swt*, 'reeds' (*Wb.* IV, 58) cannot be intended here, among foodstuffs?

⁵ For *bšr* see Gardiner, op. cit. II, no. 504, pp. 223*-5*. On use of *bnr* and *bšr* together for beer see ibid., no. 505, pp. 225*-7*. Nims, *JEA* 44, 63 suggests that *bšr* is malt.

⁶ The form of the second sign would suit 𓂏 slightly better than 𓂏 , unless the latter has been carelessly chipped in cutting, but *ihry* is wholly unknown. If *ity* were to be read, one hardly dare suggest that we have here a wild spelling of *it*, barley.

⁷ Duell et al., *Mastaba of Mereruka*, II, pl. 115, bottom, to be followed by pl. 113 on the right.

⁸ *Wnmw* in Ranke, op. cit. I, 79, 14. 16. 17 (all M.K.); more likely than *Kḫw* (ibid. I, 336, 27, of Late Period).

⁹ A common M.K. name, ibid. I, 223, 16.

The upper three registers are devoted to scenes of the preparation of food. In the lowest of these three, at the extreme left, there stands a tall, cylindrical mortar with pestle for crushing grain, unattended.¹ Above can be seen the sandalled feet of the




FIG. 2

official (no doubt Amenysonb himself) who superintends these activities. The tip of his staff of office is also visible. In front of the mortar is the female Asiatic, *Senb-Ameny-Nebtiôt*. This name was so long that from *Ameny* onwards it had to be squeezed in horizontally. It means: *Ameny* (and his mother) *Nebtiôt* are well. In P. Brooklyn

¹ For such mortars in use, see Davies, *Five Theban Tombs*, pl. 38, centre, and Davies-Gardiner, *Antefoker*, pl. 11, top right, and 11A, bottom.

35.1446 there occur similarly constructed names given to Asiatic servants.¹ As the name is compounded with those of Ameny(sonb) and his mother—not of a wife—it is possible, as already suggested above, that Amenysonb was unmarried or a widower and that his mother was thus head of the household. This servant grinds grain, perhaps that which has first been crushed in the mortar behind her.² The woman facing her whose name is half destroyed (. . . sonb) may perhaps be mixing or kneading dough, ready for both baking and brewing.³ Then come very abbreviated scenes of the baking and brewing. The baker *Wepwawet-n(i?)*⁴ puts dough into moulds to make tall, conical loaves, the filled moulds being stacked for baking.⁵ Behind him the brewer, the Asiatic *Iri*⁶ strains the fermenting mash of liquid and dough (whose prior mixing is not shown)⁷ into a large jar ready for decanting into other vessels.⁸ Above him the Asiatic *Sobkiry* reappears, pouring the beer into jars,⁹ several of which are shown as already stoppered.

In what remains of the second register, another servant cuts up a slaughtered ox; various joints and ribs of meat are hung up behind him. The legend reads: *cutting off*¹⁰ a haunch for (?) the regulator of a phylē, Ameny. In the top register more food is being prepared. Beyond various items of food, an unnamed figure prepares meat on a slab,¹¹ while in front of him his brother, the priest of Onuris, Wenemu boils a piece of meat on a skewer in a two-handled cauldron.¹² In front of him, again, Wenemu's 'brother' squats while roasting a duck that is now lost along with the top left corner and any other scenes upon it.

Apart from the customary scenes of cutting up slaughtered oxen, roasting fowl, and milking cows (not shown here) to provide the meat and drink offerings so often shown being presented to the deceased, scenes of agriculture and domestic activity are not

¹ See particularly Hayes, *Papyrus of Late Middle Kingdom*, 101: *Snb-hwt-s*, 'her mistress is well' and *Snb-nb-f*, 'his master is well', and similar expressions.

² For this sequence of crushing, sieving (not shown here), and grinding grain see *Antefoker*, 15, pl. 11, upper register.

³ Compare *ibid.* pl. 11, bottom right (a man).

⁴ *Wpwtwt-n* is obscure in form and apparently unknown elsewhere.

⁵ Cf. *Antefoker*, 14–15, pls. 12, 12A, 11, 11B; *Five Theban Tombs*, pl. 38, bottom.

⁶ This spelling seems unusual; for *iri*, perhaps cf. Ranke, *op. cit.* 1, 41, 23.

⁷ For this intermediate stage in brewing, mixing in water, and leaving to stand and ferment see Winlock, *Models from the Tomb of Meketre*, 28–29 (6), pls. 22–23, 64 (6) and cf. Montet, *Scènes de la vie privée*, 253–4 (Zosimus and modern Nubia). Lightly baked loaves were often crumbled into the mash, cf. Montet, *loc. cit.*; Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries* (1948), 17.

⁸ Cf. *Five Theban Tombs*, pl. 39, middle; *Antefoker*, pl. 11, bottom.

⁹ Decanting, *Antefoker*, 15, pl. 11, bottom, left half. For Asiatic servants engaged in reaping and brewing cf. Louvre C.18 and Ermitage 1064 (refs., p. 17, n. 2, below) in Posener, *Syria*, 34, 153, who also notes this employment for Asiatics in P. Brooklyn, cf. Hayes, *op. cit.* 104, 108, pl. 8, line 9: 'Apra-Reshpu . . . brewer'. For the 'Apiru as vintagers, see *Orientalia Suecana*, 1 (1952), 5 ff.

¹⁰ Reading *sh-t(w) hpš in* (for *n*) *mty-n-s* Imny, cf. Bouriant, *Tombe de Neferhotpou (Mém. Miss. fr. v, 3)*, pl. 3, second register from top, 5th line from left (= *Wb.* III, 467, 5), that a haunch will be brought (cut off) for the man's *ka*; also Vandier, *Mo'alla*, 212, 257. For *in* written for *n*, cf. *hpt di nsw (n) Wsir . . . in Wsir sš nsw . . . Iwrh(?)y* 'A boon . . . to the Osiris NN', *Rec. de Trav.* 34 (1912), 188, top B; *ibid.* 35 (1913), pl. vi, 4—a poor photograph.

¹¹ Cf. *Antefoker*, pl. 8.

¹² Cf. *ibid.*, pls. 8, 11A; also Newberry, *Beni Hasan*, II, pl. 36, top right, and Cairo 20725, second register from the top.

usually found on stelae. This stela is at once remarkable for including these scenes, especially that of the sledge, and yet for having no scene of the presentation of offerings to the deceased, the end to which one imagines all the rest to be subservient. For the inclusion of scenes like these on stelae, the few parallels include Cairo 20725,¹ Louvre C.18, and Ermitage 1064,² and Copenhagen 964;³ I have so far found no others. It would seem that such stelae probably act as substitutes for the scenes of similar activities normally found on the walls of tomb-chapels. As far as one can judge from Garstang's photographs (cf. p. 13, nn. 7, 8 above) our stela was probably found in a brick mastaba apparently devoid of any other decoration.⁴

Date

This stela is of a Middle Kingdom style, typical especially of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties; it is scarcely possible to date it any more closely. The transparent tunic with pendent points worn by Amenysnb on the obverse finds a close parallel on the stela Cairo 20498,⁵ unfortunately not photographically reproduced by Lange-Schäfer. Less close parallels are afforded by the non-transparent tunics of this type shown on Cairo 20086 (no photograph)⁶ and especially 20180 (typically Middle Kingdom), of one Wah-ka.⁷

Amenysnb, his brothers, female relations, and three Asiatic servants were attached to the worship of Osiris and Onuris in the Abydos district. Amenysnb himself is chief of a phylē in Abydos, a brother Si-Anhur is a *wrb*-priest of Abydos, while another brother, Wenemu, is a *wrb*-priest of Onuris, god of This, and Setankhenptah is a doorkeeper of one of the temples of these gods. The scenes on the reverse of the stela present a pleasant picture of an undistinguished family whose priestly members spent their time cultivating their⁸ land when not doing their month's duty in the temples.

¹ Besides the ubiquitous offering-scene in the top register, this stela shows: slaughtering of an ox, cooking meat, roasting and preparing ducks, grinding of grain, putting dough in moulds, brewing, cattle (ploughing or threshing?—the scene is damaged), transport of grain, and baking (Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. II, 356-7; IV, pl. 54).

² For Louvre C.18, Boreux, *BIFAO* 30 (1930), 45-48 and pl. 3 of the article; for Ermitage 1064, Lourie, *Mél. Maspero*, 1, 907-8 and plate. Both of these appear to be parts of miniature chapels rather than true stelae. They therefore form the connecting link between the decorated tomb-chapel proper and a stela such as that published here and Cairo 20725 which bear scenes appropriate to, and as substitute for, a tomb-chapel. Louvre C.18 and Ermitage 1064 both have very similar scenes of harvesting and brewing (with two granaries in the Louvre example).

³ Koefoed-Petersen, *Les Stèles égyptiennes*, Copenhagen, pl. 16 *a* and *b*. Besides offering-scenes with musical accompaniment, this stela has scenes of brewing and of ships on a river well stocked with fish.

⁴ M.K. tombs of this kind, consisting of a shaft and small brick mastaba with a stela set in one wall, have also been excavated at el-Iḥaraga (Engelbach, *Harageh*, 3). It could be argued that Amenysnb's stela, decorated on both sides, must have been free-standing, but in Egyptian eyes the scenes on the reverse would lose none of their efficaciousness even if they were turned inwards against a brick wall.

⁵ Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. IV, pl. 71, no. 225; cf. also Bonnet, *Die ägyptische Tracht bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches* (Unt. VII, 1917), 24 with pl. 3, 13.

⁶ Lange-Schäfer, op. cit. IV, pl. 75, no. 275.

⁷ Ibid. IV, pls. 15 and 75, no. 274. Bonnet, loc. cit., cites no other examples, and simply includes these in his M.K. section.

⁸ Unless, of course, they are actually working on the temple estates or as tenants of the local nomarch.


It should come as no surprise to find this family of modest station employing three Asiatic servants, two men and a woman, in the light of the revelations provided by P.Brooklyn 35.1446 and of Posener's subsequent study.¹ To this aspect of Egyptian life, also, this stela adds its mite of information.

¹ See especially Hayes, *op. cit.* 99, 148-9; and Posener, *Syria* 34, 151-6: 'these Asiatics could be reckoned by the dozen . . . (in the possession of) private people living in Upper Egypt' (p. 156).

A FRAGMENT OF A PUNT SCENE

By NINA M. DAVIES

THE Tomb of Hēpuseṇb (no. 67), First Prophet of Amūn in the reign of Ḥatshepsut, contains an interesting fragment which is all that remains of a scene of felling incense trees in Punt.¹



The tomb is a fairly large one with engaged pillars to right and left of the entrance; a passage leads to another chamber containing the bases of four round columns. The painting, on fine white plaster, is characteristic of the good execution of the period. With the exception of the two fragments here illustrated the scenes on the walls have been smashed into such small pieces and the queen's cartouche and figure so entirely erased, that it is difficult to suppose that it was not intentional. The thousands of small fragments unearthed in the debris are brightly coloured, and it seems likely they were buried not long after the succeeding reign of Tuthmosis III had begun.

It is fortunate that the Punt fragment (at 1 on plan) was spared, for it is of much interest since it shows the incense-trees being cut down in the country of their origin, the first of the sequence of events during the expedition (pl. IV). The background is pink desert dotted with red, blue, and white pebbles—the Egyptian's conventional way

¹ For the plan reproduced here I am indebted to Porter-Moss, *Top. Bib.* 1 (2nd ed.), part I, p. 124. See *op. cit.*, p. 133, for the tomb, and for its location see Gardiner-Weigall, *Top. Cat.*, pl. vi. For Hēpuseṇb's cone see N. de G. Davies and Macadam, *Corpus of Eg. Funerary Cones*, no. 21.

of colouring the 'Red land', i.e. the desert. All scenes of Punt showing a landscape above the ships appear to have had similar backgrounds which correspond to the pebbly sand along the sea-shore. Whether it is Hēpuseb himself who is supervising the felling of the trees or his deputy we cannot tell, but this dignitary leans on a long staff similar to that customarily carried by Egyptian officials when in contact with Puntites. The two wood-cutters as well as the official are definitely Egyptians. Hēpuseb, in his capacity of First Prophet of Amūn, would no doubt have been responsible for the adequate supply of the incense which was used in the temple-service of Amūn, and this responsibility seems implied in the scenes on the walls of his tomb.

The trees have yellow trunks and branches and green leaves. Below is shown a fragment of an Egyptian ship with a red mast and rigging. Since the sail is down we may deduce that it is anchored close to the shore and the trees are destined to be the cargo.

The rest of the proceedings can be followed on the walls of the Punt colonnade at Deir el-Bahri.¹ There the incense-trees, similar to those in our fragment, are shown growing together with palms round the houses of the Puntites along the sea-shore. One tree has been uprooted and its roots encased in a basket of earth, perhaps to be planted out later in the temple-gardens of Deir el-Bahri.² It is slung by a rope on to a long pole carried by six men who look like Egyptians although they may belong to one of the negroid tribes who are in the company of the Puntites. Another picture in the temple shows Egyptian ships which have rigging similar to the one in Tomb 67, with the trees loaded on the decks and proceeding to Thebes with sails spread and oarsmen pulling. On arrival they are greeted by a figure resembling the man superintending the tree-felling in the Tomb of Hēpuseb. He receives the precious cargo as an acceptable gift for Hātšepsut's 'father', Amūn.

A little side-light on Hēpuseb is provided by the text on a small limestone ostrakon found by H. E. Winlock when clearing the forecourt of Hātšepsut's temple.³ It is a list of offerings 'brought by Amenhotpe, wife of the High Priest of Amūn Hēpuseb, which is destined for the temple of Amūn in Deir el-Bahri [Zeseru]'. Various items follow including 'incense for fumigation, five pots'. This seems a personal contribution from Hēpuseb's family apart from the large amount which, in his official position of High Priest of Amūn, he offered daily for the gratification of the god.


The other fragment of any size in the tomb (at 3 on plan) is a scene of craftsmen, evidently chariot-makers (pl. V).⁴ In the upper register they are cutting and bending wood or leather. A man stands on the right and is, perhaps, an overseer. Below, a part of a chariot can be seen and another man engaged on similar work. These makers of chariots in the royal workshops may also be connected with the supply of incense. A chariot is used by the Egyptian official who descends from it to meet the Puntites at

¹ Porter-Moss, *Top. Bib.* II, 115-17.


² See Winlock, *Bull. MMA*, part ii (1923-4), 5-6, and figs. 1 and 17. The garden at the foot of the ramp of Hātšepsut's temple, however, has only evidence of palm-stumps and papyrus plants, while Mentuhotpe's garden has tamarisks and sycamore-fig trees.

³ Winlock, *Bull. MMA*, part ii (Dec. 1923-4), 20.

⁴ For text of chariot-makers, see Sethe, *Urk.* IV, 488 (156) D. For the stela and other fragments of text in the tomb, op. cit. 487-8 (156) A.



TOMB OF HEPUSONB. FELLING INCENSE-TREES IN THE LAND OF PUNT



Scale 1:4

TOMB OF HEPUSOB. CHARIOT-MAKERS

the port of arrival (el-Quṣeir?), and also by the official who leads the convoy of asses bearing their products to Thebes (see Tombs 143 and 89).

In the lowest register, a boy is shown facing a small standing monkey of the 'green' species which comes from Punt.

On the north wall (at 2 on plan), is the remains of a stela.¹ On the NW. wall the top of a kiosk is visible. Three hawk's heads crowned with disks, an uraeus at the end, and a bull's head below, are all that remain.

In the passage (at 4 on plan), Hepusonb kneels before a stand of food-offerings with uplifted hands. On the lintel inside the entrance to the inner room is part of a kiosk, with two crowned hawks at either end of a sun-disk flanked by an uraeus on each side, surmounted by the 'heaven' sign. All the rest, probably including Hatshepsut's figure and cartouche, has been destroyed. There are attractive and well-preserved ceiling-patterns in the tomb.²

Two other scenes in Theban tombs throw some additional light on the journey from Punt by its inhabitants and their arrival in Egypt and may be linked with the scenes in the Tomb of Hepusonb. The first is in Tomb no. 143.³ Neither the name of the owner of the tomb nor that of a king has survived, and the scenes on the walls are badly destroyed with the exception of that of the boats; but sufficient is left to make a restoration possible.⁴ The Puntites are shown arriving in their own craft which look like rafts.⁵ A triangular black sail is carrying them towards the shore while a man in the stern guides each raft with a large steering-oar. Bales of cow-hide are piled on deck and, in addition to the six men who man the boats, there are two women; one, in the upper boat, holds on to the mast and the other below is suckling a child. The pink desert, similar to that in the Tomb of Hepusonb, forms the background but the boats are set on blue water. Two chiefs have landed and are greeting the Egyptians who have come to meet them. In the upper register, the products of Punt are piled, including a tree like that in Tomb 67, while an official stands with a long staff surveying the goods to be bartered. In the register below, another official is shown holding out his hand towards a typically Egyptian collection of objects which are perhaps to be exchanged for those above. As in Tomb 89, the officer has his chariot and escort of soldiers. Loaded asses carry away the cargo from Punt including an incense-tree slung on a pole between the shoulders of two men.

The second scene is that in the Tomb of Amenmosi (no. 89).⁶ Here no ships are in evidence and the action takes place after the goods to be bartered have been landed by the Puntites. They bring panther-skins, two live panthers, bales of skins, and receptacles

¹ These fragmentary indications are supplied from notes by Norman de G. Davies.

² Jéquier, *Décoration égyptienne*, pls. v [9], x [18]. Passage, pl. xxviii [43].

³ For location of the tomb see Gardiner-Weigall, *Top. Cat.*, pl. x.

⁴ Partly published by N. de G. Davies in *Bull. MMA*, part ii (Nov. 1935), 46-49. See also Porter-Moss, *Top. Bib.* 1 (2nd ed.), part i, p. 255; plan on p. 256; boats at 6 on plan.

⁵ My painting of these Puntite rafts is in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

⁶ For location of tomb see Gardiner-Weigall, *Top. Cat.*, pl. iii, A-B. For a description of the scene and a drawing see Davies, *JEA* 26, 136, and pl. xxv. See also Porter-Moss, *Top. Bib.* 1 (2nd ed.), part I, p. 181; plan, p. 176; scene at 14.

full of aromatic gum(?). Below, large heaps of the same substance, piled up on the ground, are shown being measured before the Egyptian scribes. In the two registers below the goods have been loaded on donkeys for the journey between el-Quṣeir(?) and Thebes. They are driven along by Egyptians through this waterless region accompanied by their officer in a two-horsed chariot. The Puntites have now presumably returned home.

In the Punt scenes at Deir el-Baḥri we see two Puntites who have arrived bearing sacks on their shoulders and part of another man who holds an ebony log. He is followed by an ass which suggests that, as in Tombs 89 and 143, these cargoes were also loaded on asses for the journey to Thebes. The barter of goods, however, instead of taking place at a sea-port, is here shown being conducted in Thebes where the 'Great Ones of Punt' are presenting in person the products of their land to Ḥatshepsut, and the Egyptians have their goods laid out for exchange. The manner in which the products of Punt were transported to Thebes is fraught with problems. If Egyptian ships based on el-Quṣeir brought the goods from Punt to that port, a long journey was then required through the desert to the Nile Valley as far as Koptos. The Egyptians were familiar with the route owing to their quarrying expeditions through the Wadi Ḥammâmât, but a giraffe and a rhinoceros, as well as apes and panthers, shown at Deir el-Baḥri, could scarcely have survived the journey, the first two at least needing green foliage for food. It is also unlikely that there would have been accommodation for such large beasts on the vessels during the sea voyage. If, however, the ships sailed along the coast up the Gulf of Suez to the latitude of Memphis, the Nile is then only a relatively short distance away. The cargoes could be carried overland to Memphis and then transferred to other boats for the journey up the river to Thebes. Even so animals of the size of giraffes and rhinoceroses must have been a problem.

Another question worth consideration is how the pictures of the land of Punt with houses surrounded by trees and complete with ladders, house-dogs, and cattle, represented in great detail, could be shown on the walls of the temple. At Deir el-Baḥri one scene shows with meticulous care how two Egyptian ships are being loaded in Punt. The men carrying the different products from the shore up the gang-planks into the ships, the apes on board, all the details of the ships with their rigging and the sea-creatures in the water are all depicted in such a way that we may surmise that drawings were made on the spot. This supposition is especially probable since this was not one of the stereotyped scenes with which we are familiar. Did Ḥatshepsut therefore anticipate Tuthmosis III who took a draftsman with him to record the birds and plants in Syria? Those records were subsequently sculptured on the walls of his Festival Hall in Karnak. It seems possible then that the expedition to Punt was also accompanied by one or more draftsmen who made careful studies of what they saw there and that these studies were afterwards translated into stone by Theban sculptors.

The following tombs at Qurneh definitely picture processions of Puntites with other foreigners, carrying their characteristic products.

(a) Tomb 100 (Rekhmirê).¹ Two Puntites carry a tree in a basket slung on a pole.

¹ Davies, *Paintings from the Tomb of Rekh-mi-rê*, pl. i.

They were shown with small black beards and hair in long curls, but the black pigment on the beards has now faded to a mere stain against the carrying-pole and the curls on the right-hand man have completely disappeared.

(b) Tomb 39 (Puyemrē).¹ Egyptian scribes registering the products of Punt which comprise many trees, incense in heaps as in tomb 89, gold, ostrich-eggs, and feathers. In the lowest register there is a line of Puntites shown advancing towards an Egyptian scribe while another Egyptian brings up the rear.



Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Sāḥu-rē* (II, figs. 2, 5, 6, and pl. ii), shows bound Puntites taken captive in that king's reign (Fifth Dynasty). In the tombs listed here, however, there seems no definite evidence that Puntites were other than traders with Egypt in the Eighteenth Dynasty.

¹ N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemrē at Thebes*, I, pl. xxxii.

THE PLAN OF TOMB 55 IN THE VALLEY OF THE KINGS

By ELIZABETH THOMAS

[**Editor's note.** In view of the fact that there is no easily accessible plan of the tomb ascribed to Tiye in the Valley of the Kings, it has seemed appropriate to publish here, as a prelude to the three subsequent articles, the plan of the tomb prepared during the season 1959/1960 by Miss Elizabeth Thomas. This plan was very generously offered to the *Journal* by Miss Thomas who is in the process of preparing a general survey of the royal tombs at Thebes.]



ONCE AGAIN THE SO-CALLED COFFIN OF AKHENATEN

By H. W. FAIRMAN

EVER since its discovery by Theodore M. Davis in 1907, the so-called Tomb of Queen Tiye, and more particularly the coffin and the identity of the skeleton found within it, have deservedly occupied a prominent position in discussions of the special problems of the 'Amarna Period'. To the original publication of Davis,¹ have been added Elliot Smith's report on the skeleton,² studies by Daressy,³ Engelbach,⁴ with an article by Derry on the skeleton,⁵ and recently an article by Gardiner.⁶ References to the other works which deal with the tomb, but which have little direct bearing on the main object of the present paper, are given by Gardiner and are not repeated here.⁷

It may seem superfluous to contemplate adding yet another to these studies, but my justification is in the first place that I have a small new document to add to the evidence; secondly, that through the courtesy of Dr. Victor Girgis Antun, Chief Keeper of the Cairo Museum, and Dr. Abdel Kader Selim of the Cairo Museum I have recently been enabled to study closely both the coffin and the magical bricks from the Tomb of Tiye; and thirdly, that the previous studies have produced such contradictory views.

Davis and his collaborators at first thought that both tomb and mummy belonged to Queen Tiye, but abandoned this view when Elliot Smith showed that the skeleton was that of a man,⁸ a fact which led Davis, Elliot Smith, and Weigall⁹ to the assumption that this man must therefore have been Akhenaten. Daressy for his part felt there was little certainty about the identity of the body, but at the end of his article expressed the view that the coffin had been made for Tiye, modified for Akhenaten but never used by him, and eventually occupied by Tut'ankhamūn.¹⁰ Derry, in response to an invitation from Quibell,¹¹ undertook a re-examination of the skeleton from the tomb of

¹ Theodore M. Davis, *The Tomb of Queen Tiye*, London, 1910 (abbreviated below as Dav.).

² G. Elliot Smith, *The Royal Mummies* (CCG, Cairo, 1912), 51-56.

³ G. Daressy, 'Le Cercueil de Khu-en-aten', in *BIFAO* 12 (1916), 145-6 (abbreviated Dar.).

⁴ R. Engelbach, 'The So-called Coffin of Akhenaten', in *Ann. Serv.* 31 (1931), 98-114 (abbreviated Eng.).

⁵ D. E. Derry, 'Note on the Skeleton hitherto believed to be that of King Akhenaten', in *Ann. Serv.* 31 (1931), 115-19 (abbreviated Derry).

⁶ A. H. Gardiner, 'The So-called Tomb of Queen Tiye', in *JEA* 43 (1957), 10-25 (abbreviated Gard.).

⁷ I shall, however, employ the following abbreviations: *Amarna* for N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna*, 6 vols., London, 1903-8; *Sandman* for M. Sandman, *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten* (*Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca*, VIII, Brussels, 1938).

⁸ Dav., pp. xxiii-xxiv; subsequently repeated and amplified in G. Elliot Smith, *The Royal Mummies*, 51-56.

⁹ A. E. P. Weigall, *Life and Times of Akhenaten*, revised edition, 1922; 'The Mummy of Akhenaten', in *JEA* 8 (1922), 193-9.

¹⁰ Dar. 156-9, and especially 159.

¹¹ Derry, 116. Derry says that Quibell was Keeper in the Cairo Museum when he made the invitation. Since Quibell ceased to be Keeper in 1923, it is evident that Derry's examination and reconstruction are to be placed in 1923 at the latest, and may have been earlier. At least, his work was completed before the mummy of

Tiye, was able to make a better restoration of the broken skull than Elliot Smith had succeeded in doing, and was thus led to contradict some of the latter's principal conclusions. Subsequently Engelbach was invited by Derry to re-examine the coffin¹ and reached the conclusion that the coffin had been used for the burial of Smenkhkarē to whom, in his opinion, the skeleton belonged; the latter conclusion was then accepted by Derry. Gardiner, on studying the question, concluded that coffin and mummy were of Akhenaten. Almost immediately, however, Gardiner retracted or modified some of his principal conclusions but reiterated that he believed (a) that the coffin had been originally intended for one of the 'Amarna princesses but had been subsequently adapted for Akhenaten; (b) that 'the inscription on the foot end was largely prompted by the example of those earlier and later coffins which placed a speech of Isis in that position'; (c) that 'great weight' was to be attached to the pronoun of the second person singular masculine in the inscriptions on the foot-end; and (d) that when the body was placed in the coffin it was believed that it was of Akhenaten himself, the evidence of the magical bricks being, in his opinion, 'incontrovertible'.²

It is because of these conflicting and confusing opinions that I venture to return to this much-disputed problem. My principal concern, it should be noted, is to study again the inscriptions on the coffin. Many of the facts are elementary and well known and the general analysis and inferences have figured regularly in my lectures during the past twelve years; some of them are implicit in Gardiner's most recent statement outlined above, but it seems essential to present once more the facts, to submit them to a critical examination, and to draw from the results of this inquiry what seem to be the logical inferences and deductions. It is inevitable that such an inquiry should lead to an attempt to reconstruct the history of the coffin and to try and identify the skeleton that was found in it, but this is a secondary objective, for I am profoundly convinced that there is an urgent need for the body to be submitted to a new and objective study employing all the techniques of modern medical science, and that until this is done it is impossible to hope even to attempt to say the last word about its identity.

My collation of the coffin in Cairo was confined to the exterior of the lid and to the foot-end. Owing to the very fragile condition of the lid it was considered unwise to lift it in order to examine the under side. Thus, of the five strips of inscription I have only examined that marked A by Daressy and Engelbach, the vertical column down the middle of the lid (for its position see Eng., pl. 1). Of the other four strips, Engelbach failed to trace B, C, and unspecified parts of E; my failure to collate D and the remainder of E does not necessarily imply that they also have been lost, for lack of time prevented me from asking for search to be made for them. My collation of A and the foot-end






Tutankhamūn was examined (in 1926), for he records that during the unwrapping of the mummy of Tutankhamūn he noticed that the head resembled that of the skeleton from the tomb of Tiye (Derry, 118). It is necessary to emphasize these facts, for they demonstrate that Derry's contradiction of Elliot Smith's views was based on a more accurate reconstruction of the skull, and that his opinion was formed before Tutankhamūn's mummy was known to him or before Engelbach's study had been undertaken: it was, in fact, a genuinely independent opinion, uninfluenced by the views of others or by the body of Tutankhamūn.

¹ Eng. 98.

² *JEA* 45 (1959), 107-8 (in a review of J. Lindon Smith, *Tombs, Temples and Ancient Art*).

completely confirms the accuracy of Engelbach's copies and his indications of altered or added portions, which are perfectly clear and definite. This fact entitles one to regard his copies of D and part of E with some degree of confidence, apart from one reservation.

Daressy recalls that when the coffin was discovered the four strips in the interior had become detached and had fallen on the mummy, giving at first the impression that it had, according to Maspero, been 'roulée ensuite dans une dizaine de lames d'or flexible qui lui formaient une gaine lâche'.¹ It is evident therefore that the four strips B, C, D, and E were not found each in a continuous strip but were broken into a varying number of pieces. Daressy in fact recalls 'lorsque je dressai la catalogue de la trouvaille il pouvait y avoir hésitation sur la place à assigner à quelques-uns des débris'.² Though he states that the inserted pieces were of thinner gold and the hieroglyphs incised with less care,³ there is no indication anywhere of what criteria were employed to determine the precise strip to which each fragment belonged.

A study of the copies of Daressy⁴ and Engelbach⁵ suggests that B was in at least three pieces, D in not less than two, and E in two or three pieces.⁶ The end of column D well illustrates the difficulty in which the scholar is now placed. Daressy indicates no lacuna between , which he marks as being an insertion, and , which he considered was part of the original text. Engelbach, on the other hand, records a lacuna of unknown dimensions between these two groups, and, contrary to Daressy, marks  as an insertion, and  as original. Furthermore, Engelbach goes on to say (Eng., p. 101) that , which in his opinion is 'certainly' part of the original inscription, is on a piece of gold that differs from the rest of D but that may resemble E, so that it might possibly have belonged to column E. Engelbach gives no reason for his being certain that the epithet, though on a detached piece of gold, was part of the original text, and it may be suspected that this certainty is merely due to his mistaken idea that the coffin was that of Smenkhkarē and hence the deduction that the words *mr(y) wr n Rr* must have been original: it is quite evident that neither the assumption nor the inference drawn from it is proven. It is unfortunate that apparently no one, when it was possible to do so, ever checked the internal dimensions of the coffin to determine the probable original length of the various columns, and that no measurements are given of the lengths of the surviving strips, for these details would have made it relatively easy to establish the approximate extent of the lacunae. It seems *a priori* probable that B and C were longer than they appear to be from the published copies and that E may have been approximately the same length or slightly shorter, whereas D should probably be shorter than B, C, and E, but appreciably longer than A.

It may be concluded from this preliminary survey of the columns B, C, D, and E, and particularly of the concluding parts of each column, that there is good reason to


¹ G. Maspero, 'Le Tombeau de la reine Tiye', in *Causeries d'Égypte*, 343 (not accessible to me), quoted by Dar. 146, n. 1.


² Dar. 146.

³ Dar. 152.

⁴ Dar. 149-50.












⁵ Eng. 100.


⁶ Engelbach marks  in E as a restoration, so that presumably at that time E was in at least three pieces; Daressy, on the other hand, does not indicate that the word was missing.

⁷ Daressy gives the sign in the opposite and normal direction .

accept the accuracy of Engelbach's copies of those texts that were still accessible to him. On the other hand, it is impossible to place complete reliance on the placing by Daressy and Engelbach of the inserted fragments in the lower sections of these columns. It is quite uncertain what the original length of these columns was, and it is highly probable that a substantial proportion of the inserted texts in all four strips is missing. This fact makes nonsense of Engelbach's attempted reconstruction of the original and altered versions, and goes some way to explain why the extant portions do not make sense and cannot be arranged in connected series.¹ Hence it is clear that the incomplete material that has survived prevents any accurate reconstructions of the probable content of the later restorations, and that, similarly, lack of precise information about the original length of each strip and of the surviving portions precludes any precise reconstruction of some of them, although a guess may be made as to their approximate original nature.

It is therefore less of a misfortune that I was only able to collate strip A. This strip is complete, hence it is easier to suggest a reconstruction of the original text. At the same time it is clear that the general plan of all five strips is the same, although there must have been differences in wording after *nḥḥ dt*. If it be possible to reconstruct the original composition and wording of A, there is a high degree of probability that the remaining four strips were originally constructed on the same general lines. We therefore commence our study of the inscribed portions of the coffin with column A.

Text A is on the front of the lid of the coffin in a vertical column from just below the crossed arms to the feet² and, underlining with dots the inserted words of the later version, reads:    (erased)       . The central portion marked (a)-(b) is identical in the other four strips except for a few variants which, apart from the insertion of  in strips D and E after *nty iw-f*, are merely graphic. These variants, together with the differing beginnings and endings of the strips, may most conveniently be studied and compared in Eng. 100 and Gard. 21. In all five columns the name in the cartouche has been erased: a meticulous examination with a lens of the cartouche in strip A failed to reveal any traces of cutting—the wood is very dry, and is broken up by numerous cracks of varying width and depth.

There can be no doubt that the name in the cartouche was originally the prenomen of Akhenaten , for Gardiner has convincingly demonstrated, contrary to the declarations of Daressy and Engelbach, that *pꜣ šꜣꜣ nfr n pꜣ ꜥꜣꜣ ꜥꜣꜣ* and its variants refer to Akhenaten.³ The eighteen instances of this expression or its abbreviated variants which I have found in the 'Amarna inscriptions refer exclusively to Akhenaten.

Since, however, it was deemed essential to change the words that in all five strips originally preceded the name and titulary of Akhenaten into epithets that beyond all doubt refer to a king, it is certain that the original text must have referred to a person

¹ Cf. Gard. 20-21 where the difficulties in interpreting the surviving fragments are well brought out.

² Eng., pl. 1 facing p. 98.

³ Gard. 16.

who was not a king, for otherwise there would have been no obvious need to change the wording. But the evidence of the suffix pronouns on the foot-end of the coffin demonstrates that the coffin was first inscribed for a woman. Each column must therefore have commenced with epithets or titles of a woman who was connected with Akhenaten as wife, concubine, or daughter, and to these titles the titulary and name of Akhenaten must have stood as genitives. This being so, there can be no doubt that the name and titles of the woman in question must have been recorded in the space below *r nhh dt*, though obviously the titles must have varied from strip to strip according to the space available.




FIG. 1

By a fortunate chance it is possible to test the plausibility of this theoretical reconstruction of the original text of the strips. Dr. W. C. Hayes of the Metropolitan Museum of Art recently published a translation of a text concerning a hitherto unknown wife of Akhenaten.¹ The inscription is found on a small calcite pot; through the courtesy of Dr. Hayes I am able to reproduce a photograph of the complete pot (pl. VI, 1) together with Dr. Hayes's hand-copy of the text (fig. 1). The pot bears MMA Accession No. 20.2.11 and was bought in 1920 from Howard Carter; its provenance is unknown. The pot measures 10.7 cm. in height, 8.8 cm. in maximum breadth; it has been mended and restored in the Museum, but no part of the inscription has been restored.

There seems to be no limit to the long arm of coincidence. In December 1959 the British Museum acquired a piece of a calcite vase, originally in the collection of the late Rev. G. D. Nash, bearing a duplicate of the same text (B.M. 65901). I am grateful

¹ W. C. Hayes, *The Scepter of Egypt*, II, 294 (New York, 1959).

to the Trustees of the Museum and to Mr. I. E. S. Edwards for permission to publish this fragment, and to Mr. T. G. H. James for the facsimile of the text (fig. 2).




FIG. 2

Except for a few relatively unimportant details, the two texts are identical. On the left are the cartouches of the Aten in the early form of the name, and the nomen and prenomen of Akhenaten. The main text in three vertical columns reads: *The great, beloved wife of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, who lives on Truth, Lord of the Two Lands*¹ (*Neferkheprurê-wa'enrê*), *the goodly child of the living Aten, who shall be living for ever and ever, Kia*. Here we have an exact duplicate of the text of the five strips from the coffin, and at the same time we learn of a hitherto unknown wife of Akhenaten, though there seem no sufficient grounds for accepting Hayes's suggestion that Kia was a foreigner. The build-up of the text, it will be noted, is precisely the same as that which I suggest formed the original version of the strips. The name Kia deserves a brief passing mention. Readers of the *Journal* will recall that Aldred recently published a stela of the early 'Amarna Period on which is mentioned a man whose name he suggested should be read Kia.² This, of course, would not be the first Egyptian name that could be possessed by either men or women, but, as Aldred has pointed out, the true reading of the name on the stela is highly problematical: the decisive portion of the first sign is destroyed and there is no proof that it was ∇ ; it might have been ∇ or ∇ , and either *Nbi* or *Hbi* seems to be a possible alternative.³











¹ MMA omits *nb troy*.


² C. Aldred, 'The Beginning of the El-'Amarna Period: 1. The Stela of Kia', in *JEA* 45 (1959), 19-22, with pl. iii and fig. 1.

³ For confusion between ∇ and ∇ in personal names cf. W. Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches* (Leiden, 1958), 302.

We must now consider whether it is possible to suggest a reasonably assured restoration of the wording of strip A, and to suggest the name of the woman for whom the coffin was originally made. It is obvious from the nature of the text on the British Museum and Metropolitan Museum vases that Kia must be included in the list of candidates. I presume that no one can seriously believe that either Queen Tiye or Nefertiti should be suggested. Of the 'Amarna princesses, Meketaten seems to be excluded, because of her relatively early death and burial at el-'Amarna; 'Ankhesnamūn though we do not possess her mummy or funerary equipment, cannot be envisaged as a candidate; and the three youngest daughters of Akhenaten and Nefertiti are such shadowy personages that it would be ridiculous to put forward the name of any one of them. We are thus left with Kia and Meritaten as the two most likely candidates.

Although Kia must obviously have very strong claims for selection since she is the only person at present known who is associated with precisely the same texts as are found on the coffin, I confess myself doubtful and sceptical of her claims. In all five strips there is a maximum of three groups available before *nsw-bit*, and in A there is not room at the end for more than another three groups. The known titulary of Kia is too large for the available space at the beginning of the five strips, and it is impossible to suggest any convincing combination of title plus her name at the bottom of strip A. There are insuperable difficulties to suggesting any wording for the even longer spaces at the end of strips B, C, D, and E. Moreover, if Kia be the person, there will be considerable complications and difficulties in restoring the inscriptions on the foot-end of the coffin. For these reasons serious consideration must be given to the claims of Meritaten.

It so happens that Meritaten is the only 'Amarna princess of whom there have survived inscriptions that would fit without any great difficulty into the theoretical framework which I have suggested for the original texts on the five strips. It is well known that the excavation of Maruaten at el-'Amarna produced a number of blocks on which the name and titles of Meritaten had been surcharged over those of Nefertiti. All the texts were studied and presented with great care and detail by Gunn.¹ The original text, in vertical columns, and after the erasures had been made seems in general to have been: A —²    C D At C,  formed part of the original text but was erased and replaced by *dī cnh, dī cnh dt* or *dī cnh dt (n)hh*: in the light of our present discussion one is tempted to imagine that originally *pī šri n pī Itn* or *pī šri nfr n pī Itn* may have stood here, but if Gunn's spacing is correct, the space seems too small for even the former. Among the surcharges noted by Gunn at A are: , , . At D the surcharges include ,  and .

If these basic facts are applied to the problem of the reconstruction of the original inscriptions of the five strips from the coffin, it is evident that  would fit the space at the beginning of all five strips. At the end of strip A it is evident that room

¹ COA 1, 152-3. Drawings or facsimiles of the principal fragments are reproduced on pls. lvi; lvii, nos. 55, 59, 60, 85; lix, nos. 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47; lx, nos. 79, 104, 120, 124, 126; lxi, no. 44*.

² — is sometimes original, sometimes a surcharge.

³ This group is sometimes omitted.

must be found for Meritaten and that since it is a coffin we are discussing it is probable, but not absolutely certain, that room should be found for $\overline{\text{𓆎}}$. Hence the restoration that would fill the space would be in all probability * $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆎}}$, with or without the addition of $\overline{\text{𓆎}}$.¹ In strips B, C, D, and E restoration is not so easy since, as we have already seen, the exact extent of the space to be restored is uncertain. There is no reason whatever to suspect, however, that at the end of each strip there ever stood anything more than the name and epithets of the princess, and one can suggest that in each column there once stood the appropriate spellings and variants that best filled the available space.

I suggest, therefore, as a possible restoration of strip A: [*The beloved King's Daughter of] the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, who lives on Truth, Lord of the Two Lands, [(Neferkheprurē-warenrē)], the goodly child of the living Aten who shall be living for ever and ever: [The King's Daughter, Meritaten (justified?)]. The remaining four strips could be restored on parallel and roughly similar lines, with such variants as would be dictated by the length of each strip.*

We must now turn to the inscriptions on the foot. For the sake of convenience I reproduce here as fig. 3 Engelbach's facsimile of the texts.² My collation of these texts confirmed Engelbach's copy in all details. The inserted passages are clear and are as indicated by him. In line 7 my notes support Engelbach's reading of the suffix after *rn* as $\overline{\text{𓆎}}$, and I did not detect the beard which Daressy claimed had been added to the figure of the seated woman.³ I cannot, however, understand the reasons that prompted Engelbach to place fragment Y in line 12 and not, as Daressy did, at Z in line 9. The gap in both lines is almost exactly the same, and Y is equally out of place in either line. I assume that the fragment must have stood in one of these lines, but a quick test showed that it was not a good fit in either, and there is no evidence to indicate in which it was placed. The ruling lines at the bottom of Y are nothing like as clear and definite as Engelbach indicated, and I have considerable doubts whether they exist.

The inscriptions on the foot of the coffin fall into two parts of unequal length: line 1 to the middle of line 9, and the remainder of line 9 to line 12. The latter is clearly a duplicate of the text on the strips which we have just been discussing, and therefore my interpretation and restoration of the text is identical with that given above: the exact form of the restorations at Z and Y had better wait, however, until the discussion of all the inscriptions has been completed.

At the outset it will perhaps be better briefly to discuss the nature of this text and thus slightly anticipate some of the conclusions of the more detailed study. Gardiner's interpretation of the text rests on the assumption that because 'at the foot-end of the sarcophagi of the Eighteenth Dynasty Pharaohs it is regularly Isis who speaks', it therefore follows that the speaker in line 1 of our text must have been Nefertiti, who impersonated Isis and was addressing Akhenaten as Osiris.⁴ It is also evident that this

¹ There is not space for the inclusion of both $\overline{\text{𓆎}} \overline{\text{𓆎}}$ and $\overline{\text{𓆎}}$, and one of these must be omitted. In suggesting the inclusion of *sst-nsw* I have been influenced by the invariable use and repetition of the title at Maruaten, but on the coffin it is obvious that $\overline{\text{𓆎}}$ is a possibility.

² Eng., pl. 2 facing p. 100.

³ Dar. 151.

⁴ Gard. 18-20.




FIG. 3. FOOT-END OF THE SO-CALLED COFFIN OF AKHENATEN.

From *Ann. Serv.* 31, pl. 2, facing p. 100.*Later inserted signs or groups are indicated by dotted lines.*

same idea is still basic to Gardiner's latest, modified approach to the interpretation of the coffin and its texts (see above, p. 26 and n. 2).

A moment's reflection will demonstrate that this is pure assumption for which no adequate proof has been adduced. It is no proof to argue that because the foot-end of Tutankhamun's gold coffin shows that he followed the old beliefs and practices it automatically follows that Akhenaten, or for that matter any other Aten-worshipper in the high Aten Period, still adhered to the old funerary ways. It must first be proved that for Akhenaten and his followers the old attitude to death, to funerary practices, and to the after-life was substantially unaltered. There is in fact no evidence that this was so. During the 'Amarna Period, Osiris and Isis and their cycle share the same fate as all the other gods of Egypt, and their names, and any references to the beliefs associated with them, either disappear or are simply not mentioned. It seems extraordinary in the actual circumstances that either Akhenaten or Nefertiti should ever either overtly or implicitly impersonate Osiris, Isis, or any of the old gods. It is now clear that already at the beginning of the 'Amarna Period, before ever Akhenaten moved to el-'Amarna, Osiris was on the way out by the simple expedient of assimilating him to the sun-god. This is made abundantly clear in the lintel of Hatiay in the Louvre published some years ago by Drioton.¹ On this monument, in the course of a hymn to Osiris, we read: *Thou hast appeared like Rē on the horizon: his disk (itn) is thy disk, his image (tit) is thy image, his dignity (šfyt) is thy dignity.*² It is not merely that Osiris was absorbed into the Aten, but all the old beliefs disappear. It is true that mummification was practised, that ushabtis were employed, but the decoration of the tombs was changed, the only recorded funerary scenes being those of Meketaten³ and Huy.⁴ There is no mention of the Osirian judgement, or of any after-life, Osirian or other, in the traditional pattern. There is possibly even a hint that in the later stages at el-'Amarna perhaps the *hṯp dl nsw* was eliminated and replaced by identical formulae but couched in the form of prayers to, and adoration of, the Aten or the King.⁵ The mortuary beliefs at el-'Amarna, as Drioton has well demonstrated,⁶ were that dead and living slept when Aten went to rest and were all aroused by his rays each morning. The dead then left their tombs, accompanied the Aten to his temple and by his grace were permitted to share in the service and in the food offered thereat; thereafter they are to be imagined as continuing near their former homes and their tombs until sunset. Life after death for the worshipper of the Aten was to live near his god and his king in the temple on earth, and near his former home and tomb. The prayers for long life and for benefits after death are addressed by the dead man primarily to the Aten, often to the king himself, and occasionally to the queen. Nothing in all this suggests that the beliefs and practices postulated by Gardiner were in fact maintained. Our interpretation of the coffin inscriptions must therefore be based on the fact that the dead man in person addressed either Aten or the king.

¹ *Ann. Serv.* 43 (1944), 35-43.



² *Ann. Serv.* 43, 37; cf. 42-43.





³ U. Bouriant, *Monuments pour servir à l'étude du culte d'Atonou* (Cairo, 1903), pls. 6, 7, and 10.



⁴ *Amarna*, III, pl. 22.

⁵ Cf. *Amarna*, I, pl. 34 and p. 15.

⁶ See in particular *Ann. Serv.* 43, 21 ff.

for whom the coffin was probably made, the most probable restoration would seem to be * or *; of these alternatives, I prefer the former.

Another little crux is provided by the correction *mi Rr* at the end of line 8. Gardiner's suggestion that the original read * is improbable, partly because the space is scarcely adequate and it would have been painfully congested. A further objection is that the dead man did not pray that his god or his king might be with him but that he might be with the god or king: though the net result might, we hope, be the same, the underlying ideas of the two phrases are fundamentally and vastly different. There is space only for a very small phrase, either an Old Perfective or a very brief adverbial expression.  would fit the space admirably, but is scarcely probable in view of  in line 9. I am inclined to suggest that the original read * because *iw-k di r nhh dt* is applied to Akhenaten himself.¹ Lastly, I would draw attention to the fact that it was apparently considered necessary to alter either *di* or some equally innocuous expression, a very strange action unless it was considered that this innocent little expression was in some way inappropriate to the final occupant of the coffin, whereas *mi Rr* was apparently appropriate. We will return to this problem shortly.

The last points for consideration are the precise form of the words that once stood at Z and Y, for I hope that the preceding discussion has already established what was probably the general tenor of both passages. It would appear reasonable to expect that the first text on the foot-end should end with *mi Ytn*. The lacuna at Z might well be filled with *, and at Y we might read *.


And so at last the moment is come to give my restored translation of the original text on the foot-end of the coffin:

'For recitation by [the King's daughter Meritaten, justified]: May I breathe the sweet breath that comes forth from thy mouth. That [I] may behold thy beauty daily is [my] prayer. May [I] hear thy sweet voices of the north wind; may [my] flesh grow young with life through thy love. Mayest thou give [me] thy hands bearing thy food² and may [I] receive it that [I] may live by it. Mayest thou ever call upon my name and it shall not fail from thy mouth. [O my father, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, (Neferkheprurē-wa'enrē)], thou shalt be [here] for ever and ever, living like Aten.

'[The bodily and beloved king's daughter of] the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, who lives on Truth, Lord of the Two Lands [(Neferkheprurē-wa'enrē)], the goodly child of the living Aten who shall be here living for ever and ever: [the king's daughter Meritaten, justified].'

It is now necessary to discuss as briefly as possible the identity of the person who was finally buried in the coffin. It will be realized that the trend of the preceding argu-

¹ *Amarna*, I, pl. 38 = Sandman, 17, 1; cf. *Amarna*, I, pl. 41.

² So, rather than 'spirit' which is preferred by Gardiner. In addition to the more usual spellings, at el-'Amarna  is a common writing of 'food': cf. *Amarna* I, pl. 35 = Sandman, 5, 4-5; pl. 38 = Sandman, 16, 8-10; II, pl. 7 = Sandman, 24, 1-2. 5-6; III, pl. 16 = Sandman, 37, 9; pl. 19 = Sandman, 39, 16; 40, 3; IV, pl. 39 = Sandman, 58, 15-16; V, pl. 2 = Sandman, 60, 8-9; VI, pl. 15 = Sandman, 76, 6. 10-11; pl. 24 = Sandman, 88, 3; COA II, pl. 23, 4 = Sandman, 160, 2.






1. CALCITE POT OF KIA (M.M.A. 20.2.11)



2. MAGICAL BRICKS FROM ROYAL TOMB 55


ment is to demonstrate that the internal philological evidence of the inscriptions on the coffin, combined with our present knowledge of 'Amarna beliefs and practices, proves that at no stage in its history could the coffin have been used or inscribed for Akhenaten. This conclusion is, of course, directly contradictory to the latest opinion of Gardiner, who, as we have seen above (p. 26), maintains that when the final interment was made it was believed that the body was that of Akhenaten and that the presence of the magical bricks bearing his name is 'incontrovertible' proof of this: he also states that Aldred supports this view. For the testimony of the magical bricks to be incontrovertible two things are necessary: it must first be proved that the use of such magical bricks was still retained in the funerary practices of the end of the 'Amarna Period; and it must also be proved that the texts themselves are such as could reasonably be expected to have been employed when the Aten cult was fully developed. No attempt has ever been made to establish these points.



During my recent visit I was fortunate enough to be able to examine the bricks in the Cairo Museum, and thanks to the courtesy of the Museum authorities I am able to print a very recent photograph of the bricks (pl. VI, 2). The published copies¹ can be corrected at several points, but this must be deferred to another occasion, for our concern here is with the cartouches. On the northern brick (pl. VI, 2, right) there is not the slightest doubt that the cartouche reads . Unfortunately, it is not possible to be so certain about the southern brick (pl. VI, 2, left). The actual traces of signs are far less clear than the photograph would lead one to suppose. At the beginning one must read *o*, but the sign is reduced to a mere rubbed-down smudge. The following sign was clearly a narrow, vertical sign but is indecipherable, for no recognizable traces have survived. The next group is a very great puzzle: the traces do not suit  and there are hints of two horizontal signs one above the other, of which the upper one may perhaps slant downwards from right to left. The final group might from the photograph be read with considerable optimism as , but in front of the original I could not in all honesty authenticate a single one of the signs. It should be noted that the cartouche is distinctly smaller than that on the northern brick, and if *Nfr-hprw-Rc wr n Rc* were there, it would be somewhat cramped. In short, though I expected to find the name Neferkheprurē-wa'enrē in the cartouche, I am quite unable to suggest with any confidence any sign but *o*, and I am reasonably convinced that if the name of Akhenaten were there, it was probably in a form not paralleled in other spellings of the 'Amarna Period. I am regretfully unable to assert that the bricks were in fact of the same king.

In the circumstances, it would be unwise to press the evidence of the bricks too far: it is certain that one bore the name Neferkheprurē-wa'enrē, and one would naturally have expected the other also to have had the same name, but one cannot now be positive. Nevertheless, there are two points that require further consideration. The first is: what evidence is there that such practices as the use of magical bricks were maintained at the end of the 'Amarna Period? The answer, of course, is that there is at present no evidence either way. When, however, the evidence produced above of considerable

¹ Dav. 26-27.

changes in funerary beliefs and practices is borne in mind, when it is recalled that the same period saw a radical change in the design of royal tombs, and that Akhenaten apparently did not use the canopic vessels¹ that had been prepared for him, it is quite patent that there is no proof that the use of the magical bricks persisted at the end of the 'Amarna Period, and it is quite impossible to claim that the finding of such bricks in the Tomb of Tiye is incontrovertible proof that they had been used in the burial of Akhenaten at el-'Amarna. The second point is that each brick immediately before the name of the king bears the word Osiris, the spelling of the name on each brick being different. In the light of all that we know about the religion of el-'Amarna it is unthinkable that Akhenaten, at least at the end of his life, would have called himself 'the Osiris'.² The conclusion is inescapable that the bricks cannot have been part of the actual burial equipment of Akhenaten. I suggest that they formed part of the equipment being prepared at Thebes at the beginning of the reign, and left behind and discarded when Akhenaten moved to el-'Amarna because they were no longer in accord with the new ideas. At least, one cannot accept the bricks as incontrovertible testimony.

If Akhenaten can no longer be considered as the last occupant of the coffin, who can be suggested? There is only one king of the late Eighteenth Dynasty who can be considered, and that is Smenkhkarē. Let us admit that at present there can be no absolutely concrete proof of this assertion, at the best it is only an inference, a legitimate one perhaps, but still an inference. The evidence of the  on strip D should not be pressed too hard; for since it is now clear that not all of the original or corrected inscriptions have survived, it is impossible to tell how the expression entered into them. Nevertheless, in view of the development of our inquiry, the words may well be of significance: it should be noted, however, that they do not form part of a cartouche.

Here I must once again draw attention to the curious correction  at the end of line 8 on the foot-end of the coffin. Why was it necessary to make such a correction? If we assume that the coffin was re-worked so that Smenkhkarē could be buried in it, perhaps it was felt that *iw-k [di] r nhḥ dt*, which was so clearly associated with Akhenaten, was no longer appropriate to Smenkhkarē and was therefore replaced by a more suitable expression. Smenkhkarē may, in fact, have had a special attachment to Rē. He is, for instance, the only king of the Eighteenth Dynasty whose nomen and prenomen include the name of Rē. It is curious that I have failed to find an instance of *iw-k mi Rē r nhḥ dt* in any of the 'Amarna inscriptions, though one would have expected it to be quite common. On the other hand, when studying the inscriptions on the inside of the only one of Tutankhamūn's canopic coffinettes accessible to me³ I was surprised to discover to the right of the face the words: . It is now well known that these coffinettes, whose texts reveal a mixture of traditional and Atenist

¹ M. Hamza, 'The Alabaster Canopic Box of Akhenaton and the Royal Alabaster Canopic Boxes of the XVIIIth Dynasty', in *Ann. Serv.* 40 (1940), 537-43; it will be noted that the box is a product of the early part of the reign of Akhenaten, before the change in the name of the Aten.

² The word 'Osiris' is omitted, for instance, in all the ushabtis of Akhenaten known to me: cf. Newberry, *Funerary Statuettes and Model Sarcophagi (CCG)*, 397-403, nos. 48548-68; cf. Petrie, *A History of Egypt*, II (London, 1904), fig. 137 on p. 222.

³ *Ann. Serv.* 40 (1940), pl. xxiii.

elements, were originally made for Smenkhkarē whose name has been replaced by that of Tutankhamūn.¹ It is a curious coincidence that it is only under Smenkhkarē that I can at present produce a parallel for this phrase. Once again, I am reluctant to press this too far, but in the context of this discussion it may be significant.

To sum up: the coffin, I suggest, was originally made for Meritaten. Subsequently her body was presumably removed and the mummy of Smenkhkarē reinterred in it, the appropriate textual modification to the inscriptions being made at the same time, in places rather clumsily and maladroitly. The reason for this, I would suggest, is perhaps to be found in the fact that a substantial proportion of Smenkhkarē's funerary equipment had been taken over for the burial of Tutankhamūn.

Just how much of Tutankhamūn's burial equipment was taken from Smenkhkarē is unknown. It might conceivably be greater than is generally imagined, even though Engelbach's contention² that the second gold shrine was taken from Smenkhkarē appears to be without foundation.³ It may be presumed that at the early death of Tutankhamūn a substantial proportion of his burial equipment had not yet been made and that Ay made up the deficiency by 'borrowing' from the tomb of Smenkhkarē, which must presumably have been at Thebes. As a consequence it was necessary to make a semblance of a decent burial for Smenkhkarē who, it may be suggested, was removed to a convenient but small tomb, put into a coffin made for Meritaten his wife after the necessary inscriptional changes had been made, in parts hastily, clumsily, and without much care or attention to logic, and equipped with a small and makeshift collection of miscellaneous objects of various royal persons that happened to lie more or less conveniently to hand. Indirect support for this suggestion may perhaps be found in Mrs. Kate Bosse-Griffiths's paper published in this *Journal* (pp. 66 ff.) in which she publishes a fragment of a coloured glass vessel of Amenophis II which was found in the Tomb of Tiye but which apparently fits a glass vessel found some ten years previously in the Tomb of Amenophis II.

In this paper I have studiously avoided referring to the anatomical aspect of the problems discussed. In view of the amount of prejudice and contradictory statements provoked by the skeleton found in the coffin it would be the height of folly for one like myself, who has no medical competence, to argue on anatomical matters. It is useless even for a medical man, in the present circumstances, to argue on the sole evidence of the published descriptions, measurements, and photographs of the body, and there is a most pressing need for a new and exhaustive anatomical and pathological examination of the body, using anthropometric and radiographic techniques. But even a non-specialist is struck by some definite facts: Derry quite obviously was able to make a more accurate reconstruction of the skull than Elliot Smith, and his more recent testimony cannot be merely cast aside; both Elliot Smith and Derry, the only competent anatomists to have examined the skeleton, are unanimous that it is of a male apparently

¹ *Ann. Serv.* 40, 137: I have confirmed the accuracy of this statement by personal examination of the coffinettes in their exhibition case in Cairo.

² *Ann. Serv.* 40, 138 with pl. 24.

³ Piankoff-Rambova, *The Shrines of Tut-ankh-Amon* (Bollingen Series, XL, 2; New York, 1955), p. 51, n. 2, and cf. pl. 44.

aged between 23 and 26; and lastly, although the skull is broken and therefore capable of being examined internally as well as externally, neither Elliot Smith nor Derry has ever reported having observed a single one of the peculiarities that would undoubtedly be present if the remains were those of Akhenaten and if he had really suffered from one or other of the endocrine, pituitary, or other disorders which modern speculation has inflicted on him. After fifty-four years of speculation and worse can we not for the time being be prepared to accept the simple facts? Philological evidence, the evidence of age, and the absence of any reported strange disorder, suggest that, as far as our present knowledge goes, the body cannot be that of Akhenaten.

POSTSCRIPT: The statement at the bottom of the previous page is not quite accurate. Mr. C. Aldred informs me that, according to Mr. W. R. Dawson, the skeleton was also examined by Sir Arthur Keith and Dr. F. Wood Jones who, together with the pathologist Professor Ferguson, supported the conclusions reached by Elliot Smith.

THE TOMB OF AKHENATEN AT THEBES

By CYRIL ALDRED

IN a recent article¹ Sir Alan Gardiner has once more put us in his debt, this time by re-drawing our attention to certain neglected aspects of the deposit found in Tomb no. 55 in the Bibān el-Molūk by Theodore M. Davis and his collaborators during their season of 1906-7. Few students of the period, however, will exercise the same restraint as Sir Alan has shown in criticizing the professional standards of the archaeologists concerned in this discovery.

But it is futile to bewail the mistakes and omissions of our predecessors, and we shall have to see whether a more intensive study of the scanty and conflicting records that they have vouchsafed us may not glean a few grains of information from a well-trampled field of stubble. In the case of 'Amarna studies this may not be too arrogant a hope, since the vision of investigators has so often been blurred by a refusal to accept the logic of any deduction that conflicts with certain *a priori* assumptions about the period and its chief characters. We may therefore begin with an examination of the anthropoid coffin, which, with its human remains, was the kernel of the whole deposit, and which has attracted most of the attention of those who have had to do with the excavation or its official account. With it we may also consider the associated canopic equipment in the form of four calcite jars each with a human-headed stopper.

I

Daressy² was the first to subject this coffin to a detailed study, and among his many conjectures were the conclusions that it had originally been made for a woman, whom he identified as Queen Tiye, and that it had subsequently been usurped by Akhenaten, whose names had later been excised by desecrators. Nearly a quarter of a century after its discovery Engelbach had the coffin cleaned and repaired in the Cairo Museum, during which process he too studied the inscriptions and formed the opinion that it had first been made for Smenkhkarē³ as a private person, and then adapted for his burial as a king.³

In a later article,⁴ however, he permitted himself for a moment to speculate upon whether it had not originally been made for Queen Nefertiti, but he never followed up this afterthought. Gardiner's reconsideration of all the published evidence led him to the conclusion that there was no reason to believe that the coffin had ever belonged, or was ever intended to belong, to anyone other than Akhenaten.⁵ He has, however, recently modified⁶ his opinion as a result of some of the arguments that will now be adduced.

¹ *JEA* 43, 10 ff. I shall assume that my readers will already have digested this article.

² Daressy, *BIFAO* 12, 145-54.

³ Engelbach, *Ann. Serv.* 31, 98-144.

⁴ *Op. cit.* 40, 152.

⁵ *JEA* 43, 22.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 45, 107.

A few years ago the present writer advanced a different view from the foregoing as to the original owner of this coffin, but he had not the space in that particular context¹ to state his reasons in full. He has lately returned to the vicinity of the problem, but again without being able to give his opinion at length.² He still finds no reason for changing his standpoint, though as a result of Gardiner's arguments he has come to see that the theories of Engelbach and Derry, on which he relied for his identification of the occupant of the coffin, have no validity.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to produce as complete a typology of the royal coffins of the Eighteenth Dynasty as Hayes has been able to do for the contemporary royal sarcophagi.³ Nevertheless, for the start of the series we have virtually intact examples existing from the later reigns of the Seventeenth Dynasty,⁴ while at the end there are the three coffins of Tut'ankhamūn.⁵ The anthropoid stone coffin of Sethos I⁶ also exists to act as a control in respect of the style existing in the earlier years of the Nineteenth Dynasty. From a comparison of these various specimens we can see that the *rishi* form of decoration which was *de rigueur* at the beginning of the Eighteenth Dynasty still persisted, or had been revived, in the case of royal coffins by the time of Smenkhkarē⁷ and Tut'ankhamūn, although other fashions had long been in force for private persons. There is strong prima-facie evidence, therefore, for considering that the *rishi* coffin found in Tomb no. 55 was designed for royalty.

But while its feathered decoration is prominent, it differs from the above-mentioned congeners in having the design of a kind of imbricated shawl swathing the upper part of the body over which is placed the elaborate 'Amarna type of collar. This shawl-motive distinguishes quite sharply the coffins of royal women from those of the kings of the Dynasty; if a comparison is made with coffins of queens 'Ahmose-Nefertari,⁸ 'Ahhotpe,⁹ and Merytamūn¹⁰ of the earlier years of the Eighteenth Dynasty, all of them showing the same kind of close-feathered investment of the arms and upper body, the line of descent of our coffin will be obvious. We can readily see that the conservative tastes of the funerary furnishers in the royal workshops favoured not only the *rishi* decoration for all coffins, but also the imbricated shawl for the coffins of royal women.

There is, too, a deficiency that makes it certain that our coffin was designed for a woman. All the male royal coffins in this series display a vulture prominently as a pectoral below the collar, instead of the imbricated shawl. In the second and third coffins of Tut'ankhamūn these vultures have become very elaborate indeed, and enfold with their wings almost the entire upper half of the coffin. In the women's coffins, on the other hand, there is a conspicuous absence of the vulture pectoral, and that this is no accidental omission is seen quite clearly on the coffins of Tuyu,¹¹ which are identical with those of her husband Yuya in portraiture, style, and quality, having been made in the royal workshops doubtless by the same craftsmen at the same time, and yet are carefully

¹ Aldred, *N.K. Art*, pp. 83-84.

³ Hayes, *Royal Sarcophagi*.

⁵ Carter, *Tutankhamen*, II, pls. XXIII, XXIV, LXVI-LXX.

⁶ Bonomi and Sharpe, *Oimeneptah*, pl. 19, Q.

⁸ Daressy, *Cercueils*, no. 61003.

¹⁰ Winlock, *Meryet-Amun*, pls. XXII, XXIII.

² *Bull. M.M.A.*, Feb. 1957, 141 ff.

⁴ *JEA* 10, pls. XIV, XVI.

⁷ Engelbach, *Ann. Serv.* 40, pl. 23.

⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 61006.

¹¹ Quibell, *Yuaa and Thuiu*, pls. IV, X.

distinguished by the lack of the vulture pectoral. So indispensable was this vulture regarded in the case of a male burial that, when the undertakers came to put the body of a man into our coffin, almost the only amulet that they supplied for the barely furnished mummy was the essential vulture in sheet-gold.¹ Of course, it may be argued that as the vulture-image was particularly odious to Akhenaten, even where as here it symbolizes Nekhebet rather than Mut, he would have taken care to have it excluded from a royal coffin: but even supposing that the image of the *mwt*-bird was proscribed at the time this coffin must have been made, it is going farther than the facts warrant to insist that he would have dispensed with the essential pectoral entirely. It is almost certain, in fact, that had the coffin originally been destined for a male occupant, it would have been furnished with the similar falcon-figure of Rē-Ḥarakhti which forms the *leit-motiv* in the design of Akhenaten's canopic chest.²

Another feature tending to reinforce the view that this coffin was made for a woman is the entire absence of a kingly head-dress, either *khat* or *nemes*, and the substitution for it of a secular style of hair-dressing, the 'short Nubian cut', which, as the writer has tried to show elsewhere,³ is associated particularly with the queens and adult princesses during the reign of Akhenaten. It is, however, possible during this period of experiment and unorthodoxy that one at least of the coffins of the Pharaoh could have shown him wearing a similar kind of wig in place of a royal wig-cover,⁴ but it would almost certainly have been encircled by the diadem with its essential uraei. As it is, the uraeus on the coffin found in Tomb no. 55 gives a distinct impression of having been added as an afterthought like the uraei on the canopic jar-stoppers.

It will, in fact, be convenient at this point to refer in greater detail to the canopic jars from this deposit. Engelbach and Brunton⁵ have claimed that the uraeus coils on the stoppers of the three jars in Cairo have been cut later into the striations of the wigs. The writer, who was privileged to examine the fourth jar in New York, reached the same conclusion. He would suggest, moreover, that the hood and head of each uraeus were made of polychrome glass cemented into a shallow hole drilled in the brow of the human-headed lid. What seems to be a stump of lilac-coloured glass left when the uraeus was snapped off may still be seen in the brow-cavity of the New York stopper. The incised texts on the body of the jars have also been ground away, though the upper framing of a \equiv -sign may still be traced. It is clear, therefore, that these jars were never originally designed for a member of the royal family entitled to wear the uraeus, and

¹ Davis, *Queen Tiye*, pl. XX.

² *Ann. Serv.* 40, pls. 53-54. For traditional funerary forms during the reign of Akhenaten cf. Gardiner, *JEA*, 43, 19.

³ Aldred, *Bull. M.M.A.*, Feb. 1957, 145.

⁴ It should be noted that the broken stoppers from Akhenaten's canopic chest must have been surmounted by the bearded head of the king wearing a head-dress that exposed the nape of the neck. Since such head-gear as the Red, White, and Blue Crowns were invariably worn with streamers at this period, and as such appendages are absent from the stoppers, we must infer that they were carved in the form of the king wearing a short wig. While it is rare to find the Nubian coiffure worn with a beard, a unique contemporary example does exist in a broken shawabti of Amenophis III (Vandier, *Statuaire*, pl. CVII, 6). If the stoppers were made *en suite* with one of the coffins, then it too must have had a secular 'Nubian' wig.

⁵ *Ann. Serv.* 31, 102.

since they lack beards, unlike the shattered lids of Akhenaten's canopic chest, the supposition is strong that they represent a woman. Moreover, the pattern of wig, while exceptional for funerary use, is very similar to that appearing on the coffin from the same deposit. The resemblance between the jar-stoppers and the head of the coffin-lid is actually rather closer than might be expected, since there are grounds for believing that the complete beard found near the coffin had been added later and readily parted from the coffin-mask during the rough handling it received from the despoilers. In short, there seem compelling reasons for believing the coffin and canopic jars to have been made *en suite* for the same person, and since the jars have so patently been modified for someone else, there is warrant for believing that the coffin has also been adapted. It is perhaps not wholly irrelevant to point out here that, whereas these canopic jars could not originally have been made for Akhenaten, since he provided himself with an elaborate canopic chest left in position in the royal tomb at el-'Amarna, neither could they have housed the gold canopic coffins of Smenkhkarē' subsequently usurped by Tutankhamūn, since these are 39 cm. in height and the depth of the cavity in the jars is but 34 cm.

The eminent scholars who have studied the coffin from Tomb no. 55 have devoted most of their attention to its inscriptions, though only Daressy and Engelbach have been in a position to give the actual glyphs, whether inlaid or incised, a detailed scrutiny. We shall accept that Daressy, who carefully examined the coffin soon after its discovery, correctly reproduced what was visible. Engelbach and Brunton nearly fifteen years later substantially confirmed his observations though not all his deductions, and we have also taken their opinions into consideration. These inscriptions resolve themselves into two basic texts, a prayer on the upper part of the footboard, and a short wish coupled to a titulary on the lower half. This titulary with minor variants is repeated in the five bands (A to E of Daressy).¹ We shall confine our attention to the lid inscription A, since it is shorter than the others and must therefore have contained the essential text of which the others are mere elaborations. The range of the texts, however, can most conveniently be studied in the careful drawing of the footboard, made for Engelbach's publication,² with its clearly marked excisions and revisions, and it is to that diagram that we shall chiefly refer.

It was Daressy who first pointed out that the suffix-pronouns of the first person singular in the footboard inscription had been changed from the original figure of a squatting woman into that of a bearded god in two distinct instances, but that in one place the ancient redactor had omitted to make the essential transposition. He surmised, quite properly in our view, that the coffin had therefore first been made for a woman but he erred in thinking that this woman was Queen Tiye. For one thing, it lacked a uraeus when it first left the makers' hands as we have already postulated and as we hope to show later. For Queen Tiye, too, her usual double uraeus would most probably have been supplied. Secondly, if such a coffin had been made for Queen Tiye without any mention of her husband's name upon it, we can only conjecture that it

¹ *BIFAO* 12, 149-50.

² *Ann. Serv.* 31, pl. II; *JEA* 43, 17 [reproduced again in fig. 3, p. 33 above.].

would have been commissioned by Akhenaten in the later years of his reign, presumably at the same time as the shrine found with it in this deposit. Yet it has a feature which suggests that it was made in the earlier years of his reign. For in the unaltered portions of bands A, B, and C the word *mr̥t* is spelt with a $\overline{\text{m}}$, a practice which ceases in the later part of the reign when only $\overline{\text{m}}$ (var. $\overline{\text{m}}$) is permitted.¹ Thirdly, if this coffin had ever belonged to Queen Tiye her titles and name in its essential cartouche would have appeared on both lid and shell, in the prayer and the titularies. Yet there is no space for her name and even a minimum title to be restored to either of the two groups at the beginning and end of band A where revisions have been made. The obliterated cartouche in this same inscription, too, clearly contained the name of a king. Lastly, it seems to the writer highly probable that, if these texts had ever referred to Queen Tiye, the glyph used as the suffix in question would have been $\overline{\text{m}}$ instead of $\overline{\text{m}}$. A salient characteristic of the 'Amarna age which has often been remarked is the arrogation by the queens of the trappings and styles of their husbands.² Their names are often associated with those of the kings, so that triple cartouches have to do duty for the more usual double cartouches in certain inscriptions. Their figures even appear in representations of the Sed-Festival from which they had previously been excluded.³ Early in the reign of Amenophis III the determinative $\overline{\text{m}}$ creeps into the cartouche of Queen Tiye to establish a new tradition. Since formal texts at 'Amarna in which the king speaks invariably employ $\overline{\text{m}}$ as the first person singular masculine suffix-pronoun, it may be confidently postulated that in so solemn a text as the prayer on the footboard $\overline{\text{m}}$ would have been used, though as no hieroglyphic text exists in which any of the 'Amarna queens is made to speak in the first person, the writer can quote no parallel. Most of the foregoing objections, if not all of them, would apply with equal force to any proposal to make Nefertiti the original owner of this coffin.



To sum up the argument so far: the coffin is undoubtedly in design a woman's coffin, originally made for a member of the royal house who, however, was not a queen. Its owner, therefore, can only have been a princess, whose identity we shall attempt to establish later. For the moment we may refer to her as 'the King's Daughter, X'.

With these considerations firmly in mind we can now turn our attention to the inscriptions, and deal firstly with the prayer on the footboard. Gardiner has already subjected this text to a close study, and we shall find no necessity for departing from the main sense of his translation, except to put the entire speech into the mouth of the owner of the coffin, the princess, instead of Nefertiti. Thus in the lacuna in line 1, we shall restore $\overline{\text{m}}$ and put back the $\overline{\text{m}}$ -suffix in the appropriate places in lines 3 to 7. Line 8, however, requires more drastic restoration. It is clear from what follows in line 9 that the sense and available space require $\overline{\text{m}}$ (hardly perhaps $\overline{\text{m}}$) after $\overline{\text{m}}$, Gardiner's suggestion of $\overline{\text{m}}$ being a little too long to fit so meagre a gap. Several alternatives could be suggested to take the place of the interpolation between *py* and

¹ It is difficult to find exactly when the earlier spelling was interdicted, as both spellings are often employed together (e.g. tombs of May, Apy, ḥmose at el-'Amarna), and there may still be anachronistic uses. As the prenomen of Amenophis III bears witness, it was out of use before his death.

² *Bull. M.M.A.*, Feb. 1957, 147.

³ Aldred, *JEA* 45, 25, n. 2.




the excised cartouche. The one that appeals to the writer is  or . We shall finish the prayer at *r nhh dt* at the beginning of line 9 and translate:

Recitation by the King's Daughter X: I shall breathe the sweet air that issues from thy mouth, and shall behold thy beauty daily; my prayer (is) that I may hear thy sweet voice of the North Wind, that my body may be revived through thy love, that thou mayst give me thy two hands bearing thy *ka* and I may receive it and live by it, and thou mayst call me by my name and it shall not falter on thy lips, my god (or father) (Y) who livest for ever and ever.

The prayer thus devolves into a petition on behalf of the deceased for benefits which can only be bestowed by the king, or through his agency. This is fully in line with the thought of the time and there is hardly a sentiment in this footboard inscription which cannot be paralleled from other prayers and burial petitions in the 'Amarna tombs.¹ It will not escape the reader's attention that even in the case of a princess an appeal cannot be made directly to the Aten but only through his son and co-regent. In this connexion, the words of Davies penned over half a century ago still have an urgent relevance:

This prominence of the king is not undue arrogation, but is the outcome of the changed condition of the pantheon. The gods of burial to whom prayer was formerly addressed, were supposed to be no more, and their priesthood had no place in Akhetaten. . . . The prayers for burial favours, therefore, which would have been addressed to other powers, are naturally directed to the King, as the patron of the dead, in whose control all privileges and means of happiness for both worlds lay.²

The king so addressed in the 'Amarna petitions is always Akhenaten, and his is therefore the name that should be restored in the effaced cartouches in lines 8 and 11 of the footboard inscription. There is no other possibility. The spelling of *mst* in bands A to C show the coffin to have been made in the early part of the reign of Akhenaten, before the advent of his co-regent Smenkhkarē, the only other king admissible to consideration.

The restoration of the cartouche in line 11 gives us the means of completing the rest of the footboard inscription, and the writer would fill the lacunae Z and Y with  and  X respectively, and translate the whole passage from line 9 to the end as an elaboration of the wish :³

May she live, like the living Aten, the greatly beloved of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Living in Truth, the Lord of the Two Lands (Neferkheperurē-Wa'enrē), the beautiful child of the Aten who shall be here living to all Eternity—the King's Daughter X!

The restoration of this inscription incidentally renders the gist of the other titularies A to E.

If the preceding arguments are sound, it is evident that this coffin was made and inscribed in the earlier part of the reign of Akhenaten for one of the daughters of Nefertiti and we may now attempt to identify the princess in question.

¹ E.g. Davies, *Amarna*, I, pl. XXXIV left; II, pl. VII w.; III, pls. II, XX E.; IV, pl. XXXIX; v, pl. IV left; VI, pl. XXV, lines 14, 18.

² Ibid. I, 46.

³ Cf. *Ann. Serv.* 43, 15; Davis, *op. cit.*, pl. XXXI. The valediction *nh't* seems to take the place of *mst-hrw* in the later texts of the Aten cult.

Two candidates immediately offer themselves. One of them, Meketaten, has already been suggested by Seele in a footnote to his article on King Ay.¹ Meketaten, however, must have died late in the reign of Akhenaten, since she appears in the two representations of the tribute-scene dated to year 12 in the tomb of Ḥuya and Meryrē II,² and as these are the earliest and, indeed, the only examples of the subject, we must conclude that the artists composed a contemporary rendering of the scene and did not merely copy an earlier and anachronistic version. But if Meketaten died after year 12, and her coffin was then made or inscribed for her, we should not expect the word *mr̥t* to be written with *ḥ* on bands A to C. Moreover, the presence of her coffin in Tomb no. 55 would mean that Meketaten had not been buried in her full equipment or had been turned out of part of it in order to supply a coffin for someone else. Both these hypotheses seem to the writer highly improbable.

The other candidate is the Princess Meritaten, who on the boundary stelae K and X is promised burial with Akhenaten and Nefertiti in the Eastern Mountain. Akhenaten must therefore have prepared for her a full set of funerary furniture, probably made to match his own and that of the queen. In the prayers inscribed in the private tombs at el-'Amarna, the avowal is sometimes made that Akhenaten will be resting in the vicinity with the deceased;³ but on this particular coffin, the phrase, *nty iw-f ʿ3 ʿnhw r nhh dt* 'who will be here living for all eternity', may have a special significance emphasizing physical proximity.

In passing, it is perhaps worth while drawing attention to this extraordinary provision which Akhenaten made for Meritaten. As the eldest daughter of Nefertiti, Meritaten was the heiress and could have expected to be the wife of the next king, whose responsibility it would be to make the arrangements for her proper burial. Could some oracle or horoscope have forecast an untimely death for Meritaten, or had Akhenaten the intention of making her another chief wife as soon as she was of marriageable age according to the precedent set by his father Amenophis III and Sitamūn? The unusual family-tomb in the royal wady at el-'Amarna may have copied the pattern of that of Amenophis III in the Bibān el-Molūk, where Hayes⁴ sees warrant for believing that two subsidiary chambers had been provided for the burials of Tiye and Sitamūn. Whatever may have been the intention, events turned out different, and Meketaten it was who died young, while Meritaten became the consort of Smenkhkarē. As such, she would doubtless have been endowed with new full-sized funerary equipment, particularly as that of her husband appears to have been entirely orthodox, and her old furniture would have remained in store. It was, in the writer's view, one of these surplus coffins of Meritaten which was adapted for the person who was actually buried in it, and no one had to forfeit any part of her funerary equipment for his improvised burial.

All the evidence is that, as soon as a Pharaoh or co-regent came to the throne, he lost no time in preparing his funerary furniture, and the presumption is therefore that most of Akhenaten's burial equipment was prepared from his very first years. That this was the case seems to be borne out by the design of his canopic chest with the protecting

¹ *JNES* 14, p. 173, n. 40.

² *Ibid.* 1, pl. XXXV left; XXXVIII w.

³ Davies, *op. cit.* II, pl. XXXVIII; III, pl. XIII.

⁴ *Royal Sarcophagi*, 29.

falcon of Rē^c-Ḥarakhti at each corner in place of the sun-disk symbol which was introduced about the second year of his reign.¹ The coffins of Nefertiti and Meritaten must also have been made during the same period or a little later, certainly before his regnal year 9.

Lest any doubts should linger whether this coffin was originally made for Akhenaten or Smenkhkarē^c, let us draw attention to other objections not so far admitted to consideration. The most salient of these is that, despite the superficial opulence of the coffin with its gold-leaf and coloured-glass inlays, it is, as Engelbach has not failed to notice, really rather a modest casket for acting as the sole container of the remains of the son of the Aten, or his co-regent. Tut^cankhamūn's third coffin was of solid gold, and it is unthinkable that Akhenaten would have been satisfied with something which, while it may compare very favourably with the battered wrecks and substitutes now serving as the royal coffins, falls below a full Pharaonic standard. Even the ephemeral Smenkhkarē^c, who is unlikely to have enjoyed more than three years of co-regency,² was able to acquire magnificent inlaid gold coffinettes for his canopic equipment besides opulent mummy trappings. It is almost certain that his other burial furniture was of the same standard. It is at least clear, even from the fragments of sarcophagi and the canopic chest found in the royal tomb at el-'Amarna, that Akhenaten did not stint himself in providing the traditional burial equipment of a Pharaoh, even though its decoration may have been novel. It is extremely unlikely, therefore, that for his innermost coffin he would have been content with gilded wood.

That the coffin in question served the purpose of the innermost container is clear enough, for while the mummy was found enveloped in thick sheets of gold-foil, these were no more than an inner lining that had parted company with the damp and rotting wood of the coffin. It is also too small to hold yet another coffin enclosing an adult. It is smaller than Tut^cankhamūn's gold coffin, smaller even than the innermost coffin of Tuyu, who was a short woman scarcely 5 feet high. The inner length of this coffin was less than 1,750 mm.,³ and as its occupant must have been about 1,606 mm. high,⁴ his fully bandaged mummy must only just have fitted it, leaving little or no room for a metal or stucco mask.

Above all, the lid inscription, band A, which is almost in its pristine state, carries the royal styles in too meagre a form to have served for the coffin of a king. As it is, the nomen is entirely missing and the titulary is incomplete. It is difficult to believe that such scamped provision could ever have been made for himself by a Pharaoh at the height of Egypt's expansion during the New Kingdom.

Before Meritaten's coffin could be employed for the burial of a king, certain alterations had to be made, mostly to its exterior. The style of its decoration and its peculiar size suggest that it was the second coffin of the princess as an infant, and, from a comparison with the funerary equipment of Queen Merytamūn⁵ and Tuyu,⁶ we may

¹ Aldred, *JEA* 45, 32.

² Fairman, *City of Akhenaten*, III, 159.

³ Davis, *op. cit.* 16. Slightly different measurements are given by Daressy in *BIFAO* 12, 146.

⁴ Elliot Smith, *Royal Mummies*, 55.

⁵ Winlock, *op. cit.* 16-24.

⁶ Quibell, *op. cit.*, nos. 51005-7.

surmise that it was designed to contain an innermost coffin, probably of gold or silver, and to be contained within a larger, gilded, shrine-shaped sarcophagus on a sled. These last two containers were dispensed with entirely, if they were not utilized for other burials. A gilded bronze uraeus engraved with the late form of the name of the Aten was fixed to the brow curls of the wig. It is tempting to believe that, in the probable absence of a mask over the mummy-wrappings, the coffin-mask representing Meritaten was stripped off below the eyebrows and replaced by a portrait mask of the intended occupant, though it was not possible to make so drastic a change in the accompanying canopic jar-lids. A beard must also have been added at this stage. The hands, which presumably held amulets, perhaps *ankhs*, were probably moved nearer to the centre-line of the coffin and the amulets replaced by the kingly sceptres. Lastly, with a minimum of effort and some haste and carelessness, the styles of Princess Meritaten were expunged from the inlaid inscriptions A to C on the exterior and the incised inscriptions D and E on the gold lining of the interior, and replaced by conventional formulae so as to refer to the king who was to be buried in it. During its chequered career from the time of its manufacture, probably at Thebes during the early years of Akhenaten's reign, until its final removal from store this coffin doubtless suffered a certain amount of dilapidation. Even the careless replacement of the lid would have been sufficient to crack off a piece of the gilded gesso coating, especially at the vulnerable corners at the foot end of the shell. In the writer's opinion, it was just such a lacuna at the end of line 8 of the footboard inscription that was restored with the expression 𓂏 when the inscriptions were altered. The question remains whether the cartouches were left intact bearing the prenomen of Akhenaten, or whether they too were cleared out and refilled with the name of Smenkhkarē, the other candidate whose claims have been promoted as the new owner of the altered coffin. In attempting to answer this question, we shall now shift our investigation from the coffin to its contents.

II

The strange vicissitudes which have attended the uncovering and clearing of the deposit in Tomb no. 55 are well illustrated by the recent history of the human bones contained within the coffin. Even today, over half a century after their discovery, they have not been subjected to the close examination by the expert in morbid anatomy that their peculiarities so insistently demand. Instead, we have to make shift with the conflicting and incomplete reports of the anatomists Elliot Smith and Derry. The remains were first examined in position in the tomb by Dr. Pollock of Luxor and 'a prominent American obstetrician' on the invitation of Theodore M. Davis.¹ Both surgeons were emphatic in pronouncing the 'roomy' pelvis to be that of a woman. But when the bones were sent to Elliot Smith in Cairo in July 1907 he found to his intense surprise that they were those of a young man. In a long letter to *The Times*, dated October 15, 1907, he gave some of the reasons that led him to differ from 'Mr. Davis's two experts in regard to the sex', and reported that all the indications were that the skeleton belonged to a man

¹ Information supplied by a letter dated 5/8/07 from T. M. Davis to G. Elliot Smith, now in the possession of Warren R. Dawson and quoted with his permission. See note 5 on p. 57.

who was not more than twenty-five years of age at death. He also drew attention to signs of hydrocephalus which he claimed to have detected in the skull.

In his full report published five years later¹ he set forth the anatomical evidence in greater detail, particularly as it concerned the state of ossification in various bones and the lack of fusion in certain epiphyses. He also stated that the cranium showed a slight degree of hydrocephalus, a diagnosis that was confirmed by his colleague the pathologist Professor A. R. Ferguson. His considered findings were that the skeleton was that of a man about 25 or 26 years of age, but he added that no anatomist would be justified in refusing to admit that this individual may have been several years younger or older.

In 1926 he commented further² on the difficulty which some historians had found in reconciling the anatomical evidence that the bones must be those of Akhenaten with a demand for a life-span of at least thirty years in which to crowd the momentous events of his reign:

In considering this difficult problem I naturally turned to consider those pathological conditions which might cause delay in the union of the epiphyses. Of these, the most likely seemed to be the syndrome described by Froelich in 1900, now known as dystrophia adiposogenitalis. In patients presenting this condition cases have been recorded in which the bones at 36 years of age revealed the condition which in the normal individual they show at 22 or 23, so this suggested the possibility of bringing the anatomical evidence into harmony with the historical data. In support of this solution there are the very peculiar anatomical features of Akhenaten when alive, which have been made familiar to us by a large series of contemporary portraits. Forty years ago archaeologists were puzzled by the pictures of this Pharaoh, and it was suggested that he was a woman masquerading as a man. In the light of our present knowledge, however, they seem to be quite distinctive of Froelich's syndrome and afford valuable support to the suggestion that this was the real cause for the delay in the fusion of the epiphyses. In addition to this, the skull—both the brain-case and the face—reveals certain important peculiarities. There is a slight degree of hydrocephalus such as is often associated with Froelich's syndrome and also an over-growth of the mandible, such as may result from interference with the pituitary.

In 1931 the late Professor D. E. Derry published³ his re-examination of the skeletal remains, which from the moment of Elliot Smith's report had been generally accepted as those of Akhenaten. He denied that the skull showed signs of hydrocephalus, and claimed that, while undoubtedly of unusual shape, it was not uncommon and resembled closely the platycephalic skull of Tutankhamūn. Its shape in fact was the reverse of that produced by hydrocephalus, which, according to Derry, is due to an excess of fluid in the brain, causing a globular distention of the cranial box. He therefore dismissed the theory of hydrocephalus with the implication derived from it that this disease may have affected the normal ossification of the bones. His study of epiphyseal closure in modern Egyptians convinced him that the bones were those of a young man of not more than twenty-three years of age at death. Finally, he accepted that the skull was that of Smenkhkarē, from what he regarded as Engelbach's demonstration that the coffin was almost certainly his,⁴ and compared it with the mummy-head of Tutankhamūn, concluding that in all probability these two kings were brothers.

¹ Elliot Smith, *op. cit.*, no. 61075.

² *Cambridge Univ. Med. Soc. Mag.* IV (1926), pp. 34-39.

³ *Ann. Serv.* 31, 115-19.

⁴ *Ibid.* 31, 98, 118-19.

We may here limit comment upon Derry's report to two observations. Firstly, his definition of hydrocephalus as causing only a ballooning of the skull requires some qualification. Secondly, it is not wholly unexpected that two contemporary male members of the royal house such as Tutankhamūn and the occupant of the coffin, who would almost certainly have had several progenitors in common, could have had similar skull measurements. But if the profiles of the two heads are superimposed upon each other and orientated in the same plane, it will be seen how sharply they also differ. The skull is a distortion of the mummy-head with its prognathous profile, overgrown mandible, and prominent supra-orbital ridges.

Let us, however, approach the problem from another direction. In the early years of his reign, probably in year 2, Amenophis IV built the Aten temple at Karnak from which have come the remarkable colossal figures now in the Cairo Museum, J.E. nos. 49528-9 and 55938. The last, which has been aptly described by John Pendlebury¹ as 'a wonderful pathological study', shows the young king apparently entirely naked without any signs of genitalia. The feminine nature of Akhenaten's physique is well attested by the torsos from the broken statues found by Carter at el-'Amarna and formerly in the Amherst Collection. It is quite impossible to decide on physiological grounds alone whether these fragments represent the king or Nefertiti.² The up-slanting eyes, the long lean jaw, prominent breasts and collar-bones, heavy hips and thighs, and the spindle shanks seen in the contemporary sculptures of the king add impressive weight to Pendlebury's remark.

The writer has therefore referred the whole question of the pathology of Akhenaten as represented in these and other sculptures to Dr. A. T. Sandison, Senior Lecturer in Pathology in the University of Glasgow and Honorary Consultant Pathologist to the Western Infirmary, Glasgow, and is greatly indebted to him for his expert comments. Dr. Sandison was asked (a) if the monuments, especially the Karnak Colossi, show that Akhenaten was abnormal, and if so, what was the probable nature of his disease; (b) if the skeletal remains, as examined and described by Elliot Smith and Derry, show that the subject was likely to be abnormal, and if so, what was the probable nature of the disease; and (c) if the answers to questions (a) and (b) could be reconciled. Dr. Sandison's cautious report and his important recommendations, in which all Egyptologists will concur, are presented as an appendix to this article. Here it must suffice to state in brief his conclusions that, judging from the evidence of the monuments, Akhenaten suffered from an endocrine abnormality;³ and, pending fuller publication, the evidence of the skeletal remains found in Tomb no. 55 tends to be compatible with this diagnosis.

In the past, one of the difficulties in the way of a more precise identification of Akhenaten's pathology both from the bones believed to be his and from the extravagant representations at Karnak and el-'Amarna has been the impossibility of his being an endocrinopath and also the father of at least six daughters. This is, however, a contradiction that will have to be faced unflinchingly, and if it should ever be proved conclusively that he suffered from a chronic endocrine disorder, some other candidate will

¹ Pendlebury, *Tell el-Amarna*, pl. VI, 3.

³ Cf. P. Ghalioungui, *Ann. Serv.* 47, 29 ff.

² Hayes, *Scepter*, II, 285-6.

have to be sought as the father of Nefertiti's children. The full significance of Akhenaten's ostentatious parade of his domestic life will also have to be properly assessed. All such speculation, however, had better be left until a more thorough examination of the bones has been fully reported.

While, therefore, the representations of Akhenaten give grounds for believing that he suffered from a disease which would have rendered him incapable of procreation, it is difficult in the face of the conflict of opinion between Elliot Smith and Derry, and the incomplete nature of their data, to be insistent that the skeletal remains in the tomb also show the same pathological features, and that the bones are therefore undoubtedly those of Akhenaten. There is, however, one aspect of the burial that has not received the attention it deserves. Both Ayrton and Lindon Smith¹ are definite in describing the pose of the body with its left arm bent, the hand on the breast, and the right arm laid straight by the side, the hand resting on the thigh. This is not a posture adopted for the burial of the corpses of Pharaohs, which since the reign of Tuthmosis I onwards had had the arms flexed as though holding sceptres, a pose, moreover, which Akhenaten did not prohibit for representations of himself in relief and statuary. It is, however, a posture which is used in the burials of some of the royal women.² Are we to assume that when the embalmers came to lay out the corpse of their king they were in the same doubt about his sex as we are when confronted by the monstrosity from the Aten temple at Karnak, and was the choice of a woman's coffin for half-hearted adaptation less fortuitous than it would seem in this distinctly epicene burial?

In seeking further to identify the skeletal remains, we are thrust back upon the archaeological evidence, the most tangible part of which is the testimony of the four amuletic bricks to which Gardiner has re-drawn our attention. That these objects were not entirely destroyed or removed by the desecrators is a great puzzle; and if we could explain why they were left in the tomb we should be able to understand the workings of the ancient mind much more completely than we do. It is incredible that they could have been overlooked, despite the fact that they were not in their proper places sealed in the walls. One was found in the small niche or recess in the west wall³ with the canopic jars and it would be natural for such an object to be placed there. It must have been clearly visible to anyone tampering with the jar-lids. If the desecrators had found but one brick they would surely have sought out the other three. In fact, the absence of the accompanying amulets is inexplicable unless they were removed by the desecrators. If we are to judge from the specimens found *in situ* in the tomb of Tutankhamūn,⁴ such amulets, with the possible exception of the *Djed*, were of no intrinsic value and would not have tempted the itching fingers of any petty thief among the burial party. On the other hand, it seems nonsensical to suggest that the officials in charge of the burial arrangements would have gone to the trouble of installing all four incomplete, and therefore ineffectual, amuletic bricks for the purpose of guarding the deceased, when





¹ J. Lindon Smith, *Tombs, Temples and Ancient Art*, 66.


² Elliot Smith, *op. cit.*, nos. 61070, 61072. See also certain coffins of women, e.g. Hayes, *op. cit.* 415, and an unpublished specimen in the Royal Scottish Museum, no. 1887.597.

³ My orientations are deduced from Ayrton's report.

⁴ *ILN* 23. 5. 1931, 856, 858.



it required only some mud, a piece of stick, and a scrap of crystal or faience to render them fully effective. The conclusion is inescapable that it was the desecrators who removed the amulets, breaking the two flimsier bricks and removing part of them in the process. Why they did not also scratch out the name of the deceased on two of the bricks is inexplicable according to our modes of thought, but perhaps perfectly logical according to theirs. It is not improbable that they first sought out the amuletic bricks and neutralized them before they felt safe to proceed with the spoliation of the burial.

The fact that the bricks were discovered lying loose, however, '*in situ* or as nearly so as matters',¹ brings them into a particular intimate relationship with the coffin and its contents. Had they been found properly sealed in the walls, they might have told us only to whom the tomb had belonged originally, not who its actual occupant was. They were of two different sizes and qualities, the two larger and complete specimens being incised with glyphs and the two smaller being inscribed in hieratic. All were made of sun-dried gritty mud and have suffered from the effects of the damp which pervaded the tomb and from rough handling, so it is not surprising that only the two larger bricks have survived in a more or less legible condition. The prenomen of Akhenaten is reasonably clear despite the cursive and crumbling nature of the glyphs, and in the writer's opinion shows no signs of deliberate obliteration or alteration. It is unthinkable that anyone should have gone to the trouble of scratching out glyphs when a stamp of the foot would have demolished the entire brick. The -sign is clear on an illustration of one of the specimens at least² and cannot readily be made an . Moreover, the last group in the cartouche shows no possibility of being either  or . There seems no reason to doubt, therefore, the readings of Ayrton, Daressy, and Maspero, who all read the name as the prenomen of Akhenaten. Despite the two different sizes and qualities of the bricks, and their lack of amulets, they do form a complete set, each one having a different orientation. This and the way they had been distributed around the chamber show that when first installed they had been regarded as fully effective for their function of protecting the deceased from intruders. In view of their cheap nature and ready manufacture it is exceedingly improbable that one king's bricks would have been utilized for the burial of another, or would have been regarded as effective for that purpose without a change of name. We have no option, therefore, but to conclude that this tomb served as the burial chamber of Akhenaten, and his was the body within the coffin.

The name of Smenkhkarē may now perhaps be dropped in connexion with this deposit. The sole argument that supported his claim, apart from the disputed age of the bones, was the unique appearance of  beloved of Wārenrē, at the very end of band D. But it should be noted that this phrase does not appear in any cartouche, and could therefore apply to any member of the royal family, not least to Meritaten.³ Engelbach's argument was that it referred to Smenkhkarē before he became co-regent;

¹ Gardiner, *op. cit.* 23.

² Davis, *op. cit.*, pl. XXII right; [see also pl. VI, 2 above].

³ The closely related phrase  occurs occasionally in the 'Amarna titularies, once combined with  (Davies, *op. cit.* III, pl. XX E).

but in that case, as it occurs in the unaltered part of the inscriptions,¹ it would mean that the coffin was originally made for a man, a possibility which we have attempted to show above cannot be entertained.

The writer has little hesitation, therefore, in postulating that, when Meritaten's coffin was adapted to hold the body of Akhenaten, it was not found necessary to alter his pre-nomen already appearing on it. Indeed, this may have been an important contributory factor in deciding the choice of this particular coffin.

III

In addition to the coffin with its contents resting upon a collapsed lion-headed bier, and its accompanying canopic jars, there were a number of small objects, mostly toilet articles and the like, some inscribed with the name of Amenophis III and Queen Tiye, strewn among the debris of the tomb. More prominent than these, however, were the dismembered portions of a large wooden shrine, decorated with reliefs in gilded gesso, dumped in the approach-corridor and burial chamber, where the 'sides and cornice' had been stacked more methodically against the south wall. This piece of equipment has been described in the various reports as a 'sepulchral canopy', 'sarcophagus', 'hearse', 'catafalque', 'casket-shaped box', and 'coffin', but the presence of doors moving on copper pivots leaves little doubt that the object was a shrine, similar to those surrounding the sarcophagus of Tutankhamūn, as Engelbach has suggested, and not a sarcophagus-shaped outer coffin like that which Amenophis III provided for Tuyu.² The 'sled' referred to by Ayrton is elsewhere described by him as a 'lid'.³ Unfortunately, since the excavators give no indication of the size of this object, it is impossible to decide whether it was intended as a unit in a nest of shrines or as the outermost coffin in a set of three wooden coffins. The presumption is that even Queen Tiye would not have been entitled to the full burial trappings of a king, and probably she had to be content with a single shrine around her three coffins. That this shrine was made for her is happily not in dispute since the engraved copper tangs give her name and titles, and the inscription states that it was made for her by Akhenaten, whose cartouche and figure have, however, been erased.

In deciding what this piece of furniture was doing in the tomb, we shall have to take into account a number of circumstances which, though vaguely described by the excavators, have nevertheless been recorded, and the most important of these are, firstly, that the tomb had been opened and resealed after its original closing; and, secondly, that the coffin on its bier had been placed close to the west wall of the burial chamber.

It is, of course, clear that the tomb was not found as the burial party had left it. The blocking of limestone chips in the corridor had been re-distributed so that once a narrow orifice had been negotiated at the entrance, variously given as 3 feet and 4 feet, the intruder could walk down a continuous slope of chippings to the very heart of the burial chamber, which lay 6 feet⁴ below the level of the corridor. This ramp had evidently

¹ Daressy, *BIFAO* 12, 150; Engelbach, *Ann. Serv.* 31, 100-1.

² Quibell, *op. cit.*, no. 51005.

³ *PSBA* 29, 278.

⁴ So Davis, *op. cit.*, 2. Miss E. Thomas gives the drop as 3 feet.

been formed to facilitate the transport of heavy objects into the tomb, or out of it, after its original sealing had been broken by workmen who regarded it as unnecessary for their purpose to clear the entire corridor and its approaches down to the rock floor. Even so, the re-opening of the tomb must have been a full-scale operation conducted by the necropolis officials and not, for instance, a clandestine intrusion by furtive tomb-robbers who, as Dawson points out,¹ would have left no gold-work behind them. It must have been at this stage that the shrine was disturbed, since parts of it were found on the slope of chippings; and we shall firstly have to consider whether it was associated with the rest of the burial or was intrusive to it.

It is exceedingly improbable that there was any intention of enclosing the coffin, which had been adapted at some trouble for a king, within the unaltered shrine of a queen, and we need not waste too much space in elaborating this argument. Suffice it to add that the position of the coffin does not encourage the view that the shrine was in process of being erected around it. It is also equally improbable that a tomb would have been used as a store for costly surplus funerary equipment, especially when it could be adapted for another's burial. The only conclusions, therefore, are either that the shrine was being moved in to accommodate the burial of Queen Tiye, or it was in process of being transferred elsewhere. In either case, for some unknown reason the move was not completed. The position of the coffin, pushed up against the west wall, so leaving an empty space in the centre of the chamber, supports the view that the shrine was either destined to be installed in that area, or had been occupying it before it was dismantled. If the shrine was about to be erected, however, one would expect its various members to have been disposed in a more orderly fashion around the walls so that they could come together with the minimum of trouble and handling in a somewhat restricted area. The orientation of the various shrines in the tomb of Tutankhamūn, with their registration marks,² shows that a prescribed drill must have been observed for erecting such shrines, especially in confined spaces, though doubtless the procedure was relaxed on those very rare, if not unique, occasions when such shrines had to be taken out of a tomb for some reason or other.

The evidence, therefore, is all in favour of considering that the shrine was in process of being removed from the tomb when the operation was suspended. But this also postulates that the burial of Queen Tiye had once been housed in this same tomb, as Weigall maintained from the start,³ and there is other evidence to support this view. A number of small objects inscribed with her name were found among the debris, evidently overlooked during the removal of her goods and chattels, an operation that would perhaps have been conducted in an uncertain light since the doorway was largely blocked. It is inconceivable that such minor articles of equipment should have been moved in first to clutter up valuable space required for the assembly of large coffins and the shrine. Again, the finding of the lid of a large alabaster vase and an alabaster vase-stand in the rubbish suggests that the tomb had once housed the full complement of oils considered necessary for a royal burial.⁴ But perhaps more conclusive was the

¹ *JEA* 43, 25.

³ J. Lindon Smith, *op. cit.* 61 ff.

² Carter, *op. cit.* II, 47-48.

⁴ Carter, *op. cit.* III, 103-5.

presence of two large gilded copper marguerites of a kind which have been found in other royal tombs,¹ and which in the tomb of Tutankhamūn were sewn on a linen pall covering the second shrine. In Tomb no. 55 these stray marguerites must have been torn from a similar pall during the dismantling operations. Such a pall can only have been used in the burial of a very important member of the royal family, who in this case can hardly be any other than Queen Tiye, in view of the very meagre provision made for the burial of Akhenaten.

If Queen Tiye had been buried in this tomb, four possibilities are open: she could have been entombed first and Akhenaten's burial intruded afterwards; or Akhenaten could have been buried first and Tiye later; or Akhenaten could have been put into the tomb at the same time as Tiye was taken out; or they could have been interred together. Against the first alternative is the position of Akhenaten's coffin placed in the furthest corner of the tomb, a site that would have been most awkward for the burial party to reach if the chamber had already been occupied by Tiye's large funerary furniture. On the other hand, if Akhenaten had been buried first, his funeral arrangements would have been the responsibility of his immediate successor, Tutankhamūn, who, we may suppose, if a choice were open to him, would hardly have buried Tiye later in the tomb of her son in preference to that of her husband. If, however, the burial party moved Tiye out in order to install her son in the tomb, one wonders why they did not lighten their task by first clearing the shrine completely out of the way with the rest of her equipment: as it was, they began to move it out only after Akhenaten's coffin had been installed. On the whole, the most likely event is that Akhenaten and Tiye were laid to rest in the tomb side by side and the queen was later transferred elsewhere.

IV

After the foregoing lengthy discussion we may now be in a position to piece together the history of this deposit. Our reconstruction would be far less conjectural, however, if the excavators had been more precise in their descriptions of the tomb-sealings and the mutilations to the shrine. Nevertheless, from the little that has been recorded, we shall postulate that the tomb was re-entered once only after its original sealing.

1. Queen Tiye must have died some time between Akhenaten's twelfth regnal year and his seventeenth, probably nearer the latter. It is certain that Amenophis III would have provided his chief wife with a full suite of burial equipment in the orthodox fashion of the earliest years of his reign, and if he intended that she should eventually lie in a chamber of his own tomb, presumably the bulk of it was already in position there.² Akhenaten, or perhaps even Queen Tiye herself, may have had other ideas. The provision of the golden shrine by Akhenaten suggests that either he supplied her with a full set of funerary furniture in conformity with his heretical doctrines, or he added the golden shrine of Pharaonic burial to his mother's equipment in order to do her special honour. As a further mark of this esteem, he apparently intended that she should be buried in the royal tomb at el-'Amarna, for, according to Engelbach,³ one set

¹ Davis, *Harmhabi*, pl. LXXXIX. The smaller roundels may have come from chariot harness.

² See note 4, p. 47.

³ Engelbach, *op. cit.* 102, n. 2.

of sarcophagus fragments have been recovered from there, bearing the cartouches of Akhenaten and Tiye. Before his plans could mature, however, it would seem that Akhenaten died too in the seventeenth year of his reign and the burial arrangements for both mother and son became the responsibility of the new Pharaoh.

2. As the new Pharaoh, Tutankhamūn,¹ was a mere boy of little more than nine years, we may conclude that many of the suggestions if not the decisions in the matter emanated from his advisers, chiefly his vizier, Ay. It is clear that from the start there was never any intention of burying Akhenaten in the tomb he had made in the Eastern Mountain in Akhetaten, and the heavy burial equipment he had installed there, particularly the canopic chest, bears no traces of having been used.² In the writer's view this was not because the equipment had been smashed, as Gardiner suggests, but because the decision had already been taken to abandon el-'Amarna as an ill-omened residence in favour of Memphis, and also because opinion was uncertain whether Akhenaten by his abnormalities and his actions or inactions had really ruled 'with Rē', and whether the traditional interment of a Pharaoh was therefore appropriate in his case. The writer can see little evidence for a vicious persecution of the memory of Akhenaten until the Ramessides were firmly in the saddle and with the characteristic hostility of new dynasts *vis-à-vis* their immediate predecessors anathematized all the successors of Amenophis III up to Haremhab. Certainly the name of Akhenaten was not erased under Tutankhamūn and Ay,³ and this will have to be taken into account when we weigh the evidence of the obliterated cartouches on the coffin. While, therefore, Akhenaten's funerary equipment was doubtless impounded and he was buried quietly as though to hush up a family scandal, it is clear that he completed his seventy days of embalmment⁴ and his mummy was decently wrapped, though the funerary amulets were reduced to a gold-and-cloisonné broad collar of 'Amarna type, three broad bracelets of thin gold foil on each arm, and the vulture pectoral on the outer wrappings. The mummy was evidently furnished with longitudinal and lateral gold mummy-bands inscribed with his names and titles, for these were sent with the bones to Elliot Smith and subsequently stolen.⁵ As there was probably no room over the wrappings for a helmet type of mask in gold or cartonnage, the writer is tempted to think that in default of it the head was encircled with a diadem after the manner of the mummy of

¹ Fairman, loc. cit.

² *Ann. Serv.* 31, 124.

³ A box containing the intact names of Smenkhkarē and Akhenaten, and a state-flabellum inscribed with the untouched names of Akhenaten were found in the tomb of Tutankhamūn (*JEA* 14, 5; Carter, op. cit. III, 133).

⁴ Elliot Smith told Warren R. Dawson that with the bones sent by Weigall to him in Cairo was a mass of mummy-cloth, most of it in a perished and friable condition and yet including some fairly large pads consisting of many layers of linen still adhering. See also Lucas, *Ann. Serv.* 31, 120 ff.

⁵ There has been a good deal of confusion about these bands, Lindon Smith and Weigall insisting that they were sent with the bones, Daressy denying their existence, and Maspero merely expressing 'perturbation' when they were mentioned. Some years ago, Elliot Smith told Dawson that when the box containing the bones reached him in Cairo, he found among the contents three or four gold bands engraved with hieroglyphs. He put these into a drawer intending to take them next day to Maspero in the Museum, but before he could do so they were stolen by one of the laboratory attendants. I am deeply grateful to Dawson, not only for much information on the deposit, but also for many discussions which have helped to marshal my thoughts and to bring a little clarity into an otherwise confused subject.

Nubkheperre^c of the previous dynasty,¹ and the vulture amulet was correctly positioned on the breast.

During the period of embalmment, a coffin-case had been improvised for the mummy by adapting a specimen in store which Akhenaten had had made for Meritaten and already had his prenomen prominently inlaid in it. Similarly, the canopic jars made *en suite* with this coffin were requisitioned by grinding away their inscriptions and fitting glass uraei to the lids. Whether the gilded wooden chest that must once have housed them was also used is more doubtful.

3. The decision of Tutankhamūn to abandon the necropolis of el-'Amarna for that of his dynasty at Thebes must have imposed on his officials the burden of having to find at short notice a number of tombs to house the royal burials, including those of Meketaten, Tiye, and Akhenaten. It was at this moment that Tomb no. 55 must have been hastily prepared for the burial of Tiye and her son before the hewing of a second chamber had proceeded beyond the stage of forming a mere niche in the west wall. Despite the improvised nature of this burial, it was, in the writer's opinion, a proper interment and not a makeshift arrangement until more adequate provision could be made. If the modest, half-finished tomb has to be regarded as a sort of mortuary like the tomb of Sethos I in the reign of Siamūn,² it is extremely doubtful whether it would have been so completely filled in and sealed up while better accommodation was being prepared; or, when the final move to a veritable 'great place' was made, whether the corridor would not have been cleared completely down to the rock-floor. The disorderly strewing of the shrine of Tiye over the slope of rubble from the tomb-mouth gives no impression that it was a calm and leisurely operation that was so suddenly brought to a halt.

Queen Tiye's burial was doubtless the more elaborate, judging from the evidence of her opulent shrine and the modest coffin of her son, and since it was going to occupy the major part of the funerary chamber, the officials in charge of the entombment moved Akhenaten's equipment in first, placing his coffin on a lion-headed bier³ in the south-west corner. It was probably at this stage that it was discovered that through a miscalculation the bandaged mummy was too large for the coffin and the lid would not quite close down. Otherwise, if the tenons had gone right home and been secured by the usual pegs, the lid would later have suffered considerable damage from the desecrators intent on obliterating all cartouches both inside and outside the coffin. The lid must have been replaced as a loose-fitting cover which was jerked clear when the rotting bier ultimately collapsed. It is perhaps more conjectural that it was also now that the officials realized that there would not be enough room for Akhenaten's adapted canopic chest, which was dispensed with, the jars being taken out and stored in the recess.

The queen's furniture was then put in position, the nest of coffins occupying the centre of the burial chamber, the pall on its supports being erected around it, and the shrine enclosing all. Between the back of the shrine and the south wall were stored boxes bearing mud-sealings of Tutankhamūn. Tiye's canopic equipment was probably placed between the shrine and the east wall. Among the rest of the equipment must have been stone vessels containing sacramental oils and probably one or more chariots,

¹ Winlock, *JEA* 10, 250-1.

² Černý, *JEA* 32, 29.

³ Cf. Carter, *op. cit.* II, 89.

perhaps for serving the needs of both occupants.¹ It is probable that two sets of amuletic bricks were provided for protecting both Tiye and Akhenaten. In the case of the latter, however, only two bricks seem to have survived from his original equipment, perhaps prepared from the very first years of his reign, for the full complement had to be made up by hastily moulding thinner east and west bricks out of a different mud and inscribing them with a hieratic text in ink. The entrance corridor was finally blocked at its distal end with a dry-stone wall² and the passage filled in with limestone chips, the proximal end being closed by a wall cemented on its outer face and stamped with the necropolis seal.

4. Some years later, probably in early Ramesside times, the final act in this drama must have been played. Someone, who can only have been a Pharaoh,³ evidently decided that Tiye's burial ought to be transferred from the polluting presence of 'that rebel of Akhetaten', perhaps to the tomb of her husband,⁴ and Akhenaten's burial obliterated from all record. The officials charged with these duties were no desperate tomb-robbers with nothing to lose. We may not unreasonably suggest that they were devout, or superstitious men, with some respect for the malefic powers they believed they would provoke by this outrage. Only some such explanation will accord with the evidence that they carried out their orders in a hurried and slipshod manner. Their first task was to break down the tomb-sealing, but only for 3 or 4 feet, and to remove the filling so as to form a slope down the corridor until the dry-stone blocking at the farther end could be reached and mostly removed. The lighter articles, stone-vessels, shawabtis, chests, and the like, could then be easily manhandled from the burial chamber to the higher level of the corridor, but as soon as a space around the ingress had been cleared, more filling had to be thrown into the burial chamber to form a second ramp up which the heavier equipment could be carried. Before the coffins could be removed, the shrine had to be dismantled and stacked out of the way against the south wall, hiding some of the seals that had fallen from the boxes previously stored there. The pall was then removed, losing some of its marguerites in the process. Before the deposit of Akhenaten was touched, however, it is probable that the officials sought out his amuletic bricks and rendered them ineffectual by wrenching off their amulets, where they lay, without however doing them any more damage or moving them very far.

¹ The fragment illustrated in Davis, *Queen Tiye*, pl. VI, may be part of a blinker from a chariot-harness. See also note 1 on p. 56 above.

² Some form of blocking must have been built to prevent the corridor-filling from falling into the tomb-chamber, though the excavators do not mention any traces. Davis, *op. cit.*, pl. XXV, seems to show part of the blocking still *in situ*.

³ Both Davis (*op. cit.*, p. 4) and Weigall (*Akhenaton*, 1910, p. 272) speak of 'priests' or 'the priests of Amon-Ra' as responsible for the desecration. But no priesthood on its own initiative would have dared to take so serious a step. The royal necropolis at Thebes was not in any case under the patronage of Amūn. The commission set up in the reign of Ramesses IX to investigate the tomb robberies is predominantly secular and reported ultimately to the Pharaoh.

⁴ Carter (*op. cit.* 1, 79) claims to have discovered evidence that Tiye had been buried in the tomb of Amenophis III. He may here be referring to his unpublished notes in the Griffith Institute where he mentions the finding of fragmentary objects bearing her name in the tomb itself and an alabaster shawabti inscribed with her cartouche below the tomb entrance. Carter also recovered a faience ring-bezel of Ramesses II and other fragments which led him to suggest that the tomb had been opened in Ramesside times.

Before tackling the last big operation, the removal of the shrine, the officials turned their attention to the desecration of the burial of Akhenaten. His prenomen was expunged from the cartouches on the exterior of the coffin, care being taken to collect and remove all the chippings of wood, gilt, and inlay. The lid, which was already lying loose, was lifted off and the inscription on its underside partly excised. The mummy was next hauled up, and the cartouches cut out of the gold bands that encircled it: before it was thrust back, the name in the inscription on the gold lining of the shell was also excised. The writer is disposed to think that it was now that any mask or royal diadem was removed from the head of the mummy and replaced by the pectoral twisted into the figure of a battening vulture, perhaps as a crowning insult to one who had in his lifetime proscribed the *mw*-bird. It is difficult to see otherwise how it got bent into such a small arc embracing the head so closely,¹ and what it was doing in so unsuitable a location. The coffin lid was then replaced but not before its mask had been torn away and confiscated, the beard falling off in the process. It was not possible to do the same to the canopic jar-lids, but the uraei were snapped off instead. Why the massive bronze uraeus on the coffin was not removed is as great a mystery as the failure to eradicate the prenomen of Akhenaten from the bricks and his nomen from a side of the sepulchral shrine.² Doubtless the operations were carried out in the rays of feeble lamps or an uncertain light from the largely blocked doorway, and this may explain why a number of trinkets were overlooked and left behind, but it cannot account for all the oversights. In the writer's view it was more likely that the whole proceedings were characterized by feverish haste and apprehension. Falls of rock which often occur when sealed rock-tombs are re-opened may not have encouraged the officials to linger over their tasks. Their last move in fact was never completed. The roof and a door of the shrine had probably been coaxed out of the narrow entrance, when, for some reason, a decision was rescinded, and the word was passed down that the shrine was to be left in the tomb. The workmen, nothing loth, dropped the heavy sides where they had been waiting with them and adzed out the figure and names of Akhenaten instead, before scrambling up the slope and out into the daylight. The lid and a door were heaved back on top of the filling just inside the entrance, and the party stayed only long enough to build a new wall to seal out the accursed spot, being careful to leave no stamp or other mark upon it which would indicate that a royal tomb lay behind.

APPENDIX

By DR. A. T. SANDISON

I. Akhenaten from the Monuments

IN my opinion the monuments strongly suggest that Akhenaten was the subject of endocrine disease. The relevant abnormalities may be divided into two groups—(a) facial changes, and (b) alterations in the trunk and limbs.

(a) *Facial changes.* The monuments, especially the Karnak Colossi, show an elongated face with a prominent prognathous jaw (progeniac), large full lips, a coarse nose, large ears, and rather oblique eyes.

¹ Davis, *op. cit.* 2, pl. XXX.

² Davis, *op. cit.*, 15.

(b) *Changes in the trunk and limbs.* The most striking feature is the width of the pelvis and prominence of buttocks and thighs. The abdomen is somewhat protuberant with a transverse umbilicus. The breast regions are full, although the clavicles are well defined. On the undraped Karnak Colossus no external genitalia are visible and the whole configuration of the body is distinctly feminine. Although the thighs are large and rounded, the lower legs and arms are slim and the hands are not remarkable.

The changes in the trunk and limbs must be regarded as *feminization* and might result from a feminizing adrenal tumour or some form of hypogonadal eunuchoidism. Eunuchoid males are, however, usually tall (e.g. 72 inches), although occasional cases are of normal height (68 inches). The upper limbs are long so that span exceeds height; fingers are often long and thin. Many eunuchoids are not grossly fat but some have symmetrical adiposity of the breast, buttock, and abdominal regions.

In true eunuchoidism the fault is in the testis itself and not in the pituitary gland (primary hypogonadism). Rarely, cases have been described with acromegaloid features (pituitary hyperfunction) superimposed in the third decade of life.¹ Probably these are really cases of dyspituitarism with secondary hypogonadism. Causes of primary eunuchoidism include bilateral mumps-orchitis or tuberculosis, but many are probably of genetic origin and some cases of Klinefelter's syndrome fall into this group.²

In eunuchoidism the pelvis is gynaeceoid, i.e. approximates to the female form and is broader than the shoulders; in some eunuchoids the approximation to the female appearance is close but others show an intermediate pelvic type. Delayed union of the epiphyses is invariable; open epiphyses have been noted in an 80-year-old eunuch.³ As stated above, there may be some skeletal overgrowth not amounting to gigantism. In the skull there is often obliteration of sutures.⁴ Eunuchoids are often of above normal intelligence, tend to be passive and accommodating with an inherent inertia, but are capable of contrariness. Libido is often absent and sterility is invariable.

In the case of Akhenaten the facial changes implicate the pituitary gland and the hypogonadal phenomena manifested in trunk and limbs must be the result of secondary hypogonadism. The pituitary gland controls the testis as well as many other endocrine structures. It seems likely that here we have an instance of early pituitary hyperfunction going on to later hypofunction. In the stage of hyperfunction acromegaloid changes were manifested in the skull (pituitary cranial dysplasia) and soft tissues of the face. Such fugitive acromegaly-like changes are recognized in cases which later present with striking pituitary underactivity and secondary changes in the pituitary-controlled structures.⁵ It is not implied that Akhenaten was a true acromegalic; there is no evidence of enlargement of the extremities (nor of gigantism).

There is a syndrome characterized by failure of normal maturation of the gonads and by adiposity; this is due to a primary hypothalamic, hypothalamic-pituitary, or pituitary lesion. Probably where marked adiposity is evident the hypothalamus is involved. The hypothalamus lies above the pituitary in close relation to the gland; lesions in this region may well involve both structures. The syndrome is variously named the Fröhlich syndrome,⁶ the Babinski-Fröhlich syndrome,⁷ or the adiposo-genital dystrophy of Bartels.⁸ The changes in trunk and limbs noted in the Akhenaten monuments fit well with those occurring in this syndrome.

¹ S. L. Simpson, *Major Endocrine Disorders*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1948).

² B. Lennox in C. V. Harrison (ed.), *Recent Advances in Pathology*, 7th ed. (London, 1960).

³ S. Smith, *Forensic Medicine*, 8th ed. (London, 1945).

⁴ T. Fairbanks, *Atlas of General Affections of the Skeleton* (Edinburgh, 1951).

⁵ H. Cushing, *The Pituitary Body and its Disorders* (Philadelphia, 1912); B. S. Ray and G. J. Heuer in R. L. Cecil (ed.), *Textbook of Medicine* (Philadelphia, 1943).

⁶ A. Fröhlich, *Wien. klin. Rundsch.* 15 (1901), 883, 906.

⁷ M. J. Babinski, *Rev. neurol.* 8 (1900), 531.

⁸ M. Bartels, *Zeitschr. f. Augenh.* 16 (1906), 407.

In Fröhlich's syndrome the diagnosis only becomes obvious after the time of normal puberty, i.e. in adolescence, when genital maturation occurs and secondary sexual characteristics appear in the normal individual. In this syndrome the penis and testes remain of childish size and secondary characters fail to develop, e.g. pubic, axillary, and facial hair fail to develop in the male. The penis may be embedded in accumulations of fat of such an extent that the genital appearance approximates to that of the female (cf. the undraped Karnak Colossus). The testes are palpable in the fat but are infantile.¹ Sterility is inevitable. In the breast region there is considerable accumulation of fat but true gynaecomastia does not occur. Adiposity may not be gross but shows a typical female distribution in the breast region, abdomen, pubis (mons formation), thighs, and buttocks, which tend to sway like a woman's when the patient walks. The face and neck are sometimes affected, but the limbs distally are often slender. The combination of fat thighs and slim calves has been likened to 'plus-fours'. The abdomen may show striae. The pelvis is gynaecoid and, in general, male patients tend to be like women. As in hypogonadal eunuchoidism the epiphyses remain un-united, but increased stature is not a feature of Fröhlich's syndrome. Nevertheless, 'when a eunuchoid is fat the differential diagnosis from Fröhlich's syndrome may be difficult'.² In the syndrome patients have periods of introspection and depression alternating with euphoria and good spirits; patients are popular, companionable, may be musical and imaginative, while intellectual ability may often be above average.

It will be apparent that here, as in other aspects of endocrine disease, clinical syndromes tend to form a spectrum of changes rather than distinct and clear-cut textbook entities. This is inevitable since the endocrine organs are closely interlinked by 'feed-back' mechanisms to the controlling pituitary gland ('the leader of the endocrine orchestra'). The problem is further complicated by the close proximity of the pituitary gland to the hypothalamus, so that pathological processes may affect both structures. As mentioned above, the adiposity of Fröhlich's syndrome is almost certainly of hypothalamic origin.

Among the listed causes of Fröhlich's syndrome are craniopharyngioma (intrasellar or suprasellar—the sella turcica being the cavity in the base of the skull which accommodates the pituitary gland), chromophobe adenoma of the pituitary gland, tumours of the third ventricle of the brain (region of the hypothalamus), chronic hydrocephalus, chronic tuberculous or syphilitic meningo-encephalitis, epidemic encephalitis, and meningo-encephalitis.³ Of these, the first two are probably most frequent and likely to produce fairly easily recognized changes in the sella turcica or associated structures. The occurrence of early hyperfunction followed by hypofunction of the pituitary is much more likely to result from chromophobe adenoma of the pituitary than craniopharyngioma. It has for some time been well recognized that many adenomata of so-called 'chromophobe' type show some degree of eosinophilia of the cells and variations in staining by special methods. In the early stages these tumours may produce cranial dysplasia as a stigma which may be still recognizable radiologically after the tumour has become quite inactive. With regard to hydrocephalus it is interesting to note that this may in itself lead to the development of the Fröhlich syndrome, presumably through change in the hypothalamus, but may also be the result of other lesions causal in the production of the syndrome, e.g. craniopharyngioma.⁴ Craniopharyngioma usually manifests itself before the age of fifteen, while chromophobe adenoma is very rare before puberty.

II. Skeletal remains found in Valley Tomb no. 55

Unfortunately, the information published by Elliot Smith concerning these remains in *The Royal Mummies* (Cairo, 1912) is, although quite voluminous, strangely selective and incomplete. Further-

¹ A. Fröhlich, op. cit.

³ J. E. Kraus, *Arch. Path.* 40 (1945), 191.

² S. L. Simpson, op. cit.

⁴ B. S. Ray and G. J. Heuer, op. cit.

more, only two photographs are provided—both show the skull—one in lateral and one in oblique-frontal view; there are no illustrations of the pelvis. Much detailed information is given on epiphyseal union in various sites, but there is no mention of the general morphology of the pelvis, which was of such a type as to lead to the remains being originally thought to be those of a woman, when seen by two medical practitioners (one of them an obstetrician and therefore likely to be well aware of the importance of pelvic form and capacity) shortly after their discovery. Nor is any information given about the bones of hands or feet. Some skull measurements are provided, but the description of the cranium, facial structure, and mandible is very sketchy. A little more information is given in a letter to *The Times* (October 15, 1907) and in *Camb. Univ. Med. Soc. Mag.* (1926, 1, 34); here Elliot Smith confirms that the pelvis was 'roomy', that the jaws were prominent, and the chin large and pendent.

From this scrappy information and by study of the skull photographs the following may be inferred:

- (a) The pelvis was large, roomy, and apparently gynaecoid. Gynaecoid is here taken to imply approximation to the female form and not to mean a morphological variant in the obstetrical sense.
- (b) The bones of the general skeleton were rather slender.
- (c) The skeleton was not that of a tall man. The height is not expressly stated but is said to have been between 1.561 and 1.651 metres.
- (d) The cranium was broad and flat with considerable variation in bone thickness. The cranium is said to be large but its volume is not stated. The forehead is sloping and the superciliary (supra-orbital) ridge is very pronounced. The mandible is large with a rather vertical ramus and prominent mental tubercle. The maxilla also appears to be large with projecting upper incisors. Teeth are well-preserved. The orbits appear normal, the zygomatic bones rather heavy, and the temporal muscle attachments appear conspicuous.

From these somewhat inadequate data the following tentative conclusions may be drawn:

- (1) There is no evidence of unusual stature or span and the pelvis is of apparently gynaecoid type. These findings are consistent with secondary hypogonadism.
- (2) The skull is broad and relatively flat with some variation in calvarial thickness. Elliot Smith and Ferguson do not seem justified in diagnosing hydrocephalus on these grounds alone. However, hydrocephalus cannot be excluded; in the adult little or no enlargement of the cranial cavity results.
- (3) Unfortunately, the facial skeleton is damaged and incomplete. However, the mandible is large and prominent; so also is the maxilla. There is some apparent prognathism and the supra-orbital ridges, temporal muscle attachment, and zygomatic bones are large. These, coupled with the variation in calvarial thickness, go some way to sustain a diagnosis of pituitary cranial dysplasia.¹

It is unfortunate that we have no information about the sella turcica and its environs. Radiography of the skull might reveal some abnormality of the sella suggestive of pituitary enlargement and might also reveal pneumatization of the facial bones which is a feature of pituitary cranial dysplasia.²

Evidence might also be provided of excavation and convolutional depression of the inner table of the skull, depression of the cribriform plates, or erosion of the clinoid processes; this would support the diagnosis of hydrocephalus.³

¹ T. Fairbanks, *op. cit.*; H. Cushing, *op. cit.*; H. Mortimer, G. Levene, and A. W. Rowe, *Radiology*, 29 (1937), 135-279.

² H. Mortimer and others, *op. cit.*

³ Dorothy S. Russell, *Observations on the Pathology of Hydrocephalus* (M.R.C. Spec. Rep. Series 265), (London, 1949).

- (4) The evidence of epiphyseal union led Elliot Smith to place the age of the individual at about 25–26 years, possibly with some little variation in either direction. It seems unlikely that this will be significantly revised using the criteria given in recent texts.¹

If, however, the individual suffered from hypogonadism secondary to dyspituitarism, the age so derived would be quite fallacious; the remains might well be those of a man in the fourth decade of life. Such an individual would necessarily be sterile.

Comments made by D. E. Derry

The skull of the individual thought to be Akhenaten was later restored by Derry, who claimed that the skull type—platycephalic—was not uncommon in Old Kingdom remains. He drew attention to considerable similarity between this skull and that of Tutankhamūn. Derry denied that the skull under consideration was hydrocephalic and stated that if this were so the cranium would be of globular configuration. He is certainly wrong in making this statement; adult hydrocephalus does not lead to a globular deformity of the cranium. He is, however, probably correct in regarding the question of hydrocephalus as unproven.

Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the presence or absence of hydrocephalus does not materially influence the argument. It is true that hydrocephalus may produce the Fröhlich syndrome and even that it may accompany certain pathological lesions producing the Fröhlich syndrome, but this is by no means invariable. Derry's dismissal of the hypothesis that ossification of the bones may have been delayed on the basis of absence of evidence of hydrocephalus is invalid and on such ground he is in error in stating that the individual concerned may *not* have been more than 23 years old. The close correlation of skull sizes between the individual in question and Tutankhamūn, while interesting, is inconclusive.

III. Conclusions

The evidence of the monuments strongly suggests that Akhenaten suffered from an endocrine abnormality presenting with hypogonadism and adiposity and with residual evidence of an earlier phase of hyperpituitarism manifested by cranial and facial changes.

The skeletal remains found in Valley Tomb no. 55 have not been described or illustrated as fully as is desirable. Nevertheless, the pelvic abnormality and facial and cranial structure support a diagnosis of hypogonadism and pituitary cranial dysplasia. Pending fuller publication, the two groups of phenomena—those derived from study of the monuments and those derived from study of the remains—seem to be reconcilable. This gives considerable support to the view, long held, that the alleged remains of Akhenaten from Valley Tomb no. 55 are indeed those of that Pharaoh. One consequence which must receive consideration, however, is the virtual certainty that Akhenaten was incapable of procreation at the time of death and for many years previously. It is, however, not inconceivable that during an earlier period of hyperpituitarism, e.g. shortly after puberty, his potency and fertility might not have been grossly impaired.

It would seem important that these skeletal remains should be re-examined using modern methods of investigation, e.g. by radiological examination, preparation of casts, etc. Publication of high-quality photographs of the pelvis and of the skull in *norma facialis*, *lateralis*, *occipitalis*, and

¹ S. Smith, *op. cit.*; H. Mortimer and others, *op. cit.*; T. B. Johnston and J. Whillis, *Gray's Anatomy*, 27th ed. (London, 1938); J. Glaister, *Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology* (Edinburgh, 1945); A. B. Appleton, W. J. Hamilton, and I. C. C. Tchaperoff, *Surface and Radiological Anatomy* (Cambridge, 1938); F. E. Camps, *Medical and Scientific Investigations in the Christie Case* (London, 1953); S. Smith, *Taylor's Principle and Practice of Medical Jurisprudence*, 10th ed. (London, 1948); W. M. Krogman, *Proc. Inst. Med.* 16 (Chicago, 1946), 154; H. Flecker, *J. Anat.* 67 (1932), 118; J. D. Boyd and J. C. Trevor, *Modern Trends in Forensic Medicine*, ed. K. Simpson (London, 1953).

basalis positions is imperative. Stereophotography might also be valuable. Such evidence should be made freely available to authorities the world over. While it is appreciated that these remains are documents of incalculable value which must be jealously preserved, full information should be made available so that their significance can be reassessed. It might further be of value to determine the blood groups of the mummies of known members of this dynastic family. These might throw some light on relationships; technical difficulties would, it is appreciated, be considerable, but the results would be of enormous interest.

FINDS FROM 'THE TOMB OF QUEEN TIYE' IN THE SWANSEA MUSEUM

By KATE BOSSE-GRIFFITHS

IN 1957 Sir Alan Gardiner drew attention to the uncertain ownership of the so-called 'Tomb of Queen Tiye'.¹ Shortly afterwards a number of Egyptian objects was offered to the Swansea Museum (of the Royal Institution of South Wales) by Miss Annie Sprake Jones of Bryn Myrddin, Abergwili (Carmarthenshire). Among her gifts was a cardboard box with 'gold dust from the tomb of Queen Tiye', as she described it, which aroused my curiosity. In this box, mixed up with fine gold leaf and sand I found:²

- (a) a clay seal with a royal cartouche;
- (b) a fragment of white glass with a royal name in coloured glass;
- (c) some bright blue pieces of glazed ware;
- (d) two half cowrie-shells of gold.

The objects had been left to Miss Sprake Jones by her brother, Harold Jones, after his death in 1911. In 1907, at the time when the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye' was discovered,³ Harold Jones was employed by Theodore M. Davis as artist for his excavations in the Valley of the Kings.

When I visited Miss Sprake Jones in December 1960, she told me how her brother had obtained the objects. After the discovery of the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye' many of the American visitors to the tomb took 'souvenirs'. It was then that her brother asked Theodore M. Davis for permission to take a handful from the floor himself, and he received the reply: 'Certainly, take two!'

She also told me that the gold leaf had originally been taken in the form of a sheet, but had crumbled later on. These remarks sound genuine, especially if one compares them with the note written by Mrs. Emma B. Andrews who saw the tomb when it was newly opened:⁴

All the woodwork of the shrine, doors, etc. is heavily overlaid with gold foil and I seemed to be walking on gold, and even the Arab working inside had some of it sticking in his woolly hair.

Two of the objects in the Swansea Museum are inscribed with royal cartouches:

(a) Part of a clay seal, about 42 mm. in diameter, shaped like the capital of a papyrus column with some zigzag-design at the neck and an inscription pressed into the top (pl. VII, 1). It may have been used as the stopper of a vessel. Of the inscription is preserved *nṯr nṯr*, 'Good God', and the upper part of a cartouche with the sun-disk and the left claw of the scarabaeus-beetle. These traces can be interpreted to produce

¹ Sir Alan Gardiner, 'The So-called Tomb of Queen Tiye', in *JEA* 43 (1957), 10-25.

² Pl. VII, 1-4. 6; in the inventory of the Swansea Museum these objects are now registered under 959.3 (1-9).

³ Theodore M. Davis, *The Tomb of Queen Tiye*, London, 1910.


⁴ Sir Alan Gardiner, *op. cit.* 25.



1. Clay seal with the name of Tut'ankhamūn



4. Djed-pillar pendant,
blue glazed ware



2. Glass fragment with the name of
Amenophis II



5. Upper part of Cairo 24804



3. Ibis pendant, blue glazed ware



6. Gold cowrie-shell bead

OBJECTS FROM 'THE TOMB OF QUEEN TIYE'

only one royal name of Eighteenth Dynasty date: *Nb-hprw-Rc*, the prenomen of Tutankhamūn. Similar seals are stated to have been found in the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye', as is recounted in the excavation report:¹

In the rubbish under the funeral couch and behind the boards against the South wall we found numerous fragments of small clay seals some of which bore, besides the device, the cartouche of Nb-khepru-ra (Tutankhamen).

This clay seal therefore confirms the account of the provenance of the Swansea objects. The relevance of the name of Tutankhamūn in deciding the possible ownership of this tomb has been dealt with by Gardiner.²

(b) A fragment of white glass, roughly triangular in shape and slightly curved (pl. VII, 2). On the concave inside are the traces of a sand-core, as is to be expected in ancient Egyptian glass-ware. The measurements of the sides are 43 mm., 37 mm., and 35 mm. respectively. Its thickness is about 8 mm. A brown, semi-transparent, quite irregular and deep, wavy line runs through the white glass. On the left side, it is covered by a dark blue panel, 28 mm. wide, with two yellow cartouches crowned by yellow feathers with red sun-disks. About half of the name is broken away, but there remains part of *Imn* (left) in light blue and *hpr-Rc* (right) in red and yellow. Because of the *Imn* in the first cartouche this name can only be amended to *Imn-htp hprw-Rc*, the name of Amenophis II.

Glass vessels were not uncommon in the Eighteenth Dynasty. When Percy E. Newberry published a blue chalice from Munich with the name of Thutmose III,³ he mentioned that he knew about fifty nearly perfect glass vases of the New Kingdom, some of which were dated by the names of kings. Blue is the most common colour of the glass vases, while white glass vases are rather unusual. Davis,⁴ however, accounts for three small vases, or parts of them, of white glass which had been found in 'The Tomb of Queen Tiye', one of which could be almost completely reconstructed. But those small white vases are not decorated.

I then tried to see whether I could derive any relevant information from other vases of different material which had been found in the same tomb. Here again, the excavation report was helpful:⁵

In the south-west corner were the remains of a large oblong wooden box which had collapsed under the weight of stucco fallen from the wall above. The wood was, however, in good condition, and we were able to remove it. Between this and the west wall were the remains of another box of small size which may have originally fitted into the larger . . . so affected by the moisture that it crumbled to the touch. It has been full of small vases, wands and figures of blue glaze.

It was among these objects that a small toilet-jar in black haematite was found on which the names of Amenophis III and Queen Tiye were engraved,⁶ and a small vase of green amazonite with the cartouches of Amenophis III very lightly engraved.⁷ The

² Gardiner, *op. cit.* 11.

¹ Davis, *op. cit.* 10.

³ Percy E. Newberry, 'A Glass Chalice of Thutmose III', in *JEA* 6 (1920), 155.

⁵ *Ibid.* 10.

⁴ Davis, *op. cit.* 36, no. 43 and pl. iii, fig. 2.

⁷ *Ibid.* 35, no. 42 and pl. iv, fig. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.* 35, no. 41 and pl. iv, fig. 3.

'magical bricks', which were also found at different places, bore the name of Akhenaten. But no object bearing the name of Amenophis II was mentioned.

However, less than ten years before the discovery of 'the Tomb of Queen Tiye', the tomb of Amenophis II had been opened by Loret in 1898. In it was found a *cache* with over thirty royal burials—what Baikie calls 'a royal concentration camp'.¹

Here my inquiries were more successful. In the volume of the *Catalogue général* of the Cairo Museum which deals with the excavations at the Valley of the Kings I found a white glass vessel² which not only has a decoration almost identical with that of the Swansea fragment, but also carries on its shoulder the remains of two cartouches crowned with feathers (pl. VII, 5).

The height of this vase is about 40 cm. (16 inches); it has an almost egg-shaped body which is supported on a small stand, and a long neck. The cartouches are only partly preserved with *n htp* in the left cartouche and *n* in the right cartouche; also the tops of the feathers above the cartouches remain: in short, here are exactly the parts of the inscribed panel which are missing on the Swansea fragment. Judging from the drawing in Daressy's publication, the missing piece is roughly triangular in shape, the width of the blue panel being 28 mm., the same as on the Swansea fragment. There can be no doubt that the Swansea fragment is part of the vase in the Cairo Museum which is an outstanding example of the luxurious glass-manufacture of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

(c) Several pieces of blue glazed ware:

1. The finest is a pendant shaped in the round in the form of a squatting ibis (pl. VII, 3). The suspension hole is at the back. The piece can also stand freely on its own base. Length 25 mm.; height 17 mm.
2. A pendant in the form of the hieroglyph *dd* (pl. VII, 4). The tubular suspension hole is at the top of the pillar. The back is flat. There are traces of linen on the front and on the back, as if the pendant had been wrapped in bandages. Height 32 mm.
3. An irregularly shaped, longish bead. Length 29 mm.
4. A ring. Diameter 17 mm.; thickness 4 mm.

(d) Two identical half cowrie shells, 14 mm. long and 10 mm. high, mixed up with sand and gold leaf. In each a narrow slit-opening runs from end to end, while the lips of the slit are bluntly toothed and turned inward (pl. VII, 6). On closer examination, I discovered that the two halves fitted perfectly together and formed one single bead. By cementing them together two threading holes became evident on the left side and there must have been two others on the right side; so that one thread passed through the upper half of the 'cowrie' and another through the lower half. This gold cowrie differs from the real cowrie shell in that it is not univalve, but bivalve with the slit going right through the body. That cowrie-shell ornaments are not mentioned in the excavation report does not in itself mean that none were found in the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye'; for, according to Gardiner, 'the publication is incomplete and inaccurate'.³

¹ James Baikie, *Egyptian Antiquities in the Nile Valley* (1932), 68.

² Daressy, *Fouilles de la Vallée des Rois*, no. 24804, p. 202 and pl. xlv: 'verre opaque blanc . . . Sur le rebord est tracée une bande brune . . . Vers le haut de la panse, un rectangle bleu foncé de 0 m. 028 mill. de largeur, contient les deux cartouches d'Aménophis II, surmontés des plumes, tracés en hiéroglyphes multicolores'.

³ Gardiner, *op. cit.* 10.

Gold cowrie shells as ornaments are rare in Egypt but do occur during the Twelfth Dynasty. At el-Lâhûn¹ in 1914 Flinders Petrie found an ornament of gold cowrie shells in the burial of princess Sit-Hathor-Yunet near the tomb of Queen Weret who died during the reign of Sesostri II. Restored as a girdle, this ornament is now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

At Dahshûr ten gold cowries were found during the excavations of de Morgan.² They belong to the period of Ammenemes III. Vernier noted that these gold cowries, like the Swansea cowrie, have no back.³ The el-Lâhûn gold cowrie shells are about three times as long as that in Swansea. Mme P. Krieger-Posener (Paris), who saw the Swansea cowrie during the International Congress of Orientalists at Moscow (1960), was of the opinion that the light colour of the gold indicated a Middle Kingdom rather than a New Kingdom origin.

Natural cowrie shells have been popular as adornment from palaeolithic times onward.⁴ At Kafr 'Ammâr knotted cords with natural cowrie shells and several other amulets were found on the neck or chest of the deceased. These are dated to the period of the Twenty-third to Twenty-fifth Dynasties.⁵ The following reason for the use of cowries has been suggested:⁶

Certain shells, such as the cowrie, shaped in the form of the portal through which a child enters the world, seem to have been connected with the female principle and to have been widely employed as fertility charms.

The same reason would serve to explain their use on a knotted cord, for, according to Pliny,⁷ the wearing of a knotted cord was considered helpful to conception. However, it does not quite account for the existence of one single gold cowrie in the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye'. The Swansea finds, in fact, far from helping towards a solution, only seem to complicate the difficult problem of the ownership of the so-called 'Tomb of Queen Tiye'.

Not much more helpful is the knowledge I could gather from the Harold Jones documents which are now in the National Library of Wales at Aberystwyth. I am obliged to Miss Megan Ellis, Keeper of Prints and Maps, for letting me see the documents, which had been given to her department and to the Department of Manuscripts (in several donations in 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952) by Miss A. Sprake Jones on the request of Sir W. Davies, the Librarian.

There were no new maps or plans of the tomb; but among the great number of letters which Harold Jones wrote from Egypt to his family, there are a few which have some interest in connexion with the tomb in question. The first was written on December 1,

¹ Guy Brunton, *Lahun I, The Treasure*, 30 and pl. iii; H. E. Winlock, *The Treasure of el Lahun*, New York, 1934.

² De Morgan, *Fouilles à Dahchour I*, 65, no. 7; 68, no. 29; pls. xx, xxiii.

³ Émile Vernier, *Bijoux et orfèvreries*, 53,074, pl. lxxviii: 'Trouvé à Dahchour fouilles de Morgan dix coquillages (cyprées); au point de vue imitatif ces coquillages offrent cette étrangeté de n'avoir pas d'envers. Tous ces coquillages ont été faits en emboutissant des plaques de métal dans des creux et en les soudant ensuite deux à deux . . .'

⁴ J. W. Jackson, *Shells as evidence of the Migrations of Early Culture*, Manchester, 1917.

⁵ Petrie, *Amulets*, 131 b-g; pls. xvii-xviii.

⁶ E. O. James, *Prehistoric Religion*, 28.

⁷ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxviii, 27 and xxx, 49.

1906, shortly before the discovery of the tomb, when Harold Jones was still digging with Garstang:

... George is with me and comes across to the tombs of the Kings to camp tomorrow. I am going to use one of the tombs as a dining room.

... Theodore Davis came ... with Mrs. Andrews and his niece Miss Hardy a few days before I left Cairo. ...

More letters were written after the discovery of the tomb:

Luxor Hotel, Feb. 3rd 1907. ... Once again I am here, this time to do the drawing for Davis of the large piece of a shrine which was found covered with gilt stucco. I expect I shall be here for a week living at the tombs of the Kings.


... Having met Howard Carter ... Mr Maspero, Naville, Prof. Wiedeman, Theo. M. Davis ... Weigall, The Inspector General of Antiquities of this district. ... I stayed till 10 o'clock having a fine time looking over the things he had found—gold diadem, canopic jars with beautiful portraits of Queen Thiy etc. etc.

Feb. 5th. ... Today I have been interrupted by tourists and friends calling on me while at work and I lunched with Weigall.

... I am working way down underground in a tomb at a side of a shrine 8 feet by 6 feet and it is covered with fine modelling in stucco overlaid with thick gold leaf almost as thick as this paper and highly varnished. As naturally it is dark underground I have electric light fitted on for me and I am doing a drawing quarter size on an imperial sheet of paper. Davis has heaps of small beautiful objects which *I hope* he will want me to copy for him but of which he has said nothing as yet. ...'

Feb. 16th. ... Still at Luxor on Mr. Davis' Dahabya and still painting the head of Queen Thiy of which Mr. Davis found 4 in Alabaster. ... Mr. Davis has very kindly offered me a present of £160 for next year towards my expenses for me to give up Garstang and his excavating. ...'

From these letters it is evident that Harold Jones was employed by Theodore M. Davis very shortly after the 'Tomb of Queen Tiye' had been discovered, and mainly because of the discovery of the tomb.



THE SEA-PEOPLES' HOMELANDS

SOME SEA-PEOPLES

By G. A. WAINWRIGHT

THE peoples here discussed are some of those who attacked Menephtah in his fifth year, 1219 B.C., and Ramesses III in his eighth year, 1162 B.C.¹ They are primarily the Peleset-Philistines, Tjekker-Tjekkel, Denyen-Dainiuna, and the Teresh and Shekelesh. There were also the Meshwesh who attacked Menephtah in 1219 B.C. and then Ramesses III in his Libyan Wars of his fifth and eleventh years, 1165 and 1159 B.C.,² but not in his Northern War of his eighth year, 1162 B.C. They stand apart from the others, are a great problem, and need a separate study by themselves.³ The same applies to the Sherden with their horned helmets and, except in the Sea-Battle, with a knob on top, who make a very definite group by themselves. But unfortunately there is little positive that can be said as to whence they came or whither they went. I have so far been unable to trace them archaeologically in Sardinia.⁴

Besides these there were the Luka who did not attack Ramesses III but only Menephtah. They must have been the Lukki who were raiding in the Levant as early as el-'Amarna times, c. 1375 B.C.,⁵ and the Luka who joined Muwattallis, the Hittite king, against Ramesses II at Kadesh in 1285 B.C.⁶ Unfortunately, Egypt provides no further information about them except that Ramesses II speaks of *Krkš hnc Lkʾ* 'Kerekesh together

¹ The various tribes of raiding northerners have been listed and grouped under their respective Pharaohs in *JEA* 25 (1939), 149.

² All these dates are those provided by Rowton in *JEA* 34 (1948), 61 ff., based on that of the accession of Ramesses II. There are only two dates possible for this, 1290 B.C. and 1304 B.C. and Rowton decided for the lower. However, he now finds evidence for the earlier one, 1304 B.C. (*JNES* 19 (1960), 15-22). This would put the dates back by 14 years, to 1233, 1179, 1176, and 1173 B.C.

³ There were also the Weshesh who only attacked Ramesses III, but of them we have no pictures and only the merest mention of their name on two occasions (Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* IV, §§ 64. 403). The name has been compared to the Oassassios which appears in an inscription from Halicarnassus in Caria (Weill, in *Rev. arch.* 3 (1904), 63) or to the name of a city, Oaxos in Crete (Hall, *The Oldest Civilization of Greece*, 177), but objections have been raised to this latter identification (Id., in *BSA* 8 (1901-2), 184). The difficulty about the Carian one is that no single town in Caria can be shown to have been founded before the Middle Iron Age, beginning c. 850 B.C. and many later still; see Mellaart, in *AJA* 62 (1958), 22. But it must be remarked that Miletus was in existence in Mycenaean days as will be seen later on. The Weshesh were evidently coast-dwellers somewhere, for they are said to be 'of the sea'.

⁴ The oft-quoted horned helmets seem to be all that there is apart from the plumes on the head of Sardus Pater which, if accepted, would ally him to the Philistines, not the Sherden. There is, of course, always the name *Σαρδω*-Sardinia and that of one of the tribes, the Sardones.

⁵ Knudtzon, *Die el Amarna Tafeln*, Letter 38. The Lukki may perhaps have been about the Levant very much earlier than this, for rather before 2000 B.C. a man is mentioned in a hieroglyphic inscription at Byblos who is called Rwkq (*Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos*, II (1933-8), pl. xxxii, 2, and pp. 646. 878). This name Albright takes to be Ruku-Luku, 'The Lycian'. This belief is substantiated by the name of the man's son Kwkw, a name which reappears in the Hittite records as Kukunnis, a king of Wiluša (*BASOR*, no. 155 (1959), 33 ff.).

⁶ Apart from the Luka and the Sherden, the tribes of this confederacy are entirely different from those who attacked Menephtah and Ramesses III, see *JEA* 25 (1939), 149.

⁷ Kuentz, *La Bataille de Qadesh*, 213(4). 342(45). This has already been noted by Gardiner, *Onomastica*, I, 128*.

with Luka' twice, thus linking them together in a way he does not connect any of the others. On one occasion he lists the two names next to each other.¹ Their name must be that of the Lycians, as is generally accepted, of whom there were at that time two branches. Homer says there was a Lycia in the north-eastern Troad on the Aisepos river whence came Lycaon's glorious son Pandaros,² and also far distant Lycia whence came Sarpedon and Glaukos.³ Though the river Xanthos is named as the home of this latter pair of heroes, the Hittite records make it improbable that their Lycia could have been more than the head waters of the river, for the Lukka Lands seem to have stretched across central Caria and presumably into northern Lycia.⁴ However, this added to the ending of their companions' name in -šš would make the Carian neighbourhood more probable than a country in the Troad.

Besides having been intimately connected by Ramesses II with one -šš tribe, the Kerekesh, it is noticeable that apart from the Sherden the Luka's other companions in the attack on Menephtah were entirely members of the -šš group—Ekwesh, Teresh, Shekelesh, Meshwesh.⁵ Of these peoples the Ekwesh would no doubt have belonged round about Miletus in northern Caria and the Teresh, if they were the Tyrsenoi, would have been living not far off in Lydia.⁶ In this way we are once more brought back to the Carian neighbourhood for the homeland of the Luka.

As the Ekwesh only attacked Menephtah we have no pictures, but are practically certainly given the remarkable information that they were circumcised.⁷ In spite of this

¹ Kuentz, op. cit. 227 (45). On several occasions they appear together in the Hittite records (Garstang and Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*, 108). In Ramesses II's list of prisoners (Kuentz, 385(65)) Ms-Masa intervenes between the two. This provides striking evidence that Ramesses' lists were not drawn up haphazardly but from authoritative sources. This is exactly how Muwattallis speaks of them in his treaty with Alaksandus where he lists them as Karkisa, Masa, Lukka (Garstang and Gurney, op. cit. 102, § 14). However, for various reasons (pp. 107 f.) the authors separate Karkisa in their map from Lukka and Masa and put it doubtfully away in the Troad.

² *Iliad*, v, 105. 173. For the Aisepos see II, 825-7; IV, 89-91. Kukun, son of the Ruqq-Lukki-Lycian, has just been mentioned as bearing the same name as Kukunnis, king of Wiluša and predecessor of the famous Alaksandus in the Hittite records; Albright, loc. cit., gives the necessary references. Wiluša is coming to be recognized more and more as Ilios-Troy. A certain Kukullis was son of a king of the neighbouring country Assuwa, the Roman province of Asia, Garstang and Gurney, op. cit. 122.

³ *Iliad*, II, 876-7; v, 479; XII, 312-13. See also Phythian-Adams in *Bull. Brit. School of Archaeology in Jerusalem*, 1, *Hittite and Trojan Allies*, 4.

⁴ Garstang and Gurney, op. cit., map facing p. 1, but see the discussion on pp. 75-82.

⁵ Breasted, op. cit. III, §§ 574. 579. 588. 600. That the Sherden also joined them is hardly surprising, for they were on the move during a couple of hundred years. In this article references are given to Breasted, as the various documents are there conveniently collected together in the one publication which also has an index. Menephtah's Great Karnak inscription is published by Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, I, pls. 17-32, and his Athribis stela by Lefebvre in *Ann. Serv.* 27 (1927), 19-30.

⁶ See p. 84 below.

⁷ Smolenski in *Ann. Serv.* 15 (1915), 73-75. 87, records the various views held about them, and Denys L. Page gives the still more recent views held about them on the classical side (*History and the Homeric Iliad*, 22). The difficulty in accepting them as Achaeans has always been that they are stated to have been without a *krnt*, a word that has been much discussed (for instance, Breasted, op. cit. III, 247, n. h. 249 n. a; Bissing, in *ZAS* 72 (1936), 74-76; Hölscher, *Libyer und Ägypten*, 45; Edgerton and Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, 14, n. 24a. 15, nn. 6-30). It clearly means 'foreskin', a thing the Ekwesh are said to have been without, who were, therefore, circumcised. It is three times stated of them (Max Müller, op. cit., pl. 27, ll. 52. 54 and evidently once again at the bottom of this last line) distinguishing them sharply from the other Sea-Raiders of whose condition nothing is said.

they are now regularly accepted as Achaeans of some sort, and, as Odysseus informs us (*Od.* xiv, 246 ff.), Achaeans did indeed carry out a raid on Egypt and were defeated.¹ The Ekwesh would no doubt have been the people of Ahhiyawa of whom the Hittites have much to say,² and in this case would no doubt have come from Miletus which was an Achaean colony, if not actually an Achaean city.³ They are the only people of whom Meneptah specifies the homeland and to their name he twice adds 'of the countries of the sea'.⁴




FIG. 1

It is remarkable that with the exception of the Lukka-Luka and the Ahhiyans-Ekwesh all the peoples mentioned in this study were unknown to the Hittites.⁵ Strangely enough we have the same state of affairs with regard to Keftiu-Caphtor before them, for that is another country which does not appear in the Hittite records.

Apart from the Meshwesh whose name, however, ends in -š like so many of them, the Sea-Peoples form one general group. Thus, they all carry the circular shield with the central handle. Then again, they all wear the kilt that falls to a point in front, and is generally divided into panels by a series of lines which follow the curve of the lower edge. It is also generally decorated with bunches of tassels, three in each bunch.⁶ Thus,

¹ It has been noted before that this story would be a Greek account of the Sea-Peoples' attack on Meneptah, for instance, A. R. Burn, *Minoans, Philistines and Greeks*, 183.

² See, for instance, most recently, G. L. Huxley, *Achaeans and Hittites* (Oxford, 1960).

³ Stubbings, *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*, 23; *Anatolian Studies*, 8 (1958), 30 f.; Huxley, *op. cit.* 13 ff.

⁴ Breasted, *op. cit.* III, §§ 588. 601.

⁵ The Hittites did, however, know of a country called Taruiša which might perhaps be thought to represent the Tursha-Teresh. But this is improbable, for it would put them right away in Troyland (Garstang and Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*, 105), and if they were the Tyrsenoi, as they clearly were, they would not have come from Lydia as Herodotus says they did and for which there is so much confirmatory evidence, Wainwright, in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 197-208.

⁶ Some of these Northerners occasionally wear tassels falling from the belt behind (Nelson and others, *Medinet Habu*, I, pl. 44, two men in the top row and the last man in the bottom row. They are named Philistines and Denyen; II, pl. 114, left, a Shekelesh. Yet others wear them though they were Egyptianized and serving in the Egyptian navy (*op. cit.*, pl. 39, top left (enlarged on pl. 40 B. C) and in each of the ships below). Rekhmirē and Menkheperre'sonb, 300 years earlier, each show a Keftiu with this appendage which, however, is very

they are sharply differentiated from the other enemies of Egypt and are immediately recognizable, though differences are observable among themselves. These differences of costume separate the Sea-Peoples into three distinct groups, and they are (a) the Philistines, Tjekker-Tjekkel, and the Denyen-Dainiuna, (b) the Shekelesh and Teresh, (c) the Sherden. But, as stated above, the Sherden cannot be treated here. *Medinet Habu*, I, pl. 17, from which our fig. 1 is reproduced, shows two regiments of these three peoples each clearly distinguished by their costume.

The Philistine group

The first-mentioned peoples, the Philistines, Tjekker-Tjekkel, and Denyen-Dainiuna, form a well-defined group, for their head-dresses are very alike and at times identical.¹ That of the Philistines (fig. 2), as is well known, is a cap with an ornamental



FIG. 2



FIG. 3

band from which a circle of feathers stands up, and the cap itself comes down to fit round the back of the head as a neck-guard. It is tied under the chin. That of the Denyen is shown as being identically the same on pl. 44 of *Medinet Habu*, I, where both are named. On the previous pl. 43 the Tjekker are named and their head-dress again is identical with that of the other two. There was, however, liable to be some variation in this head-dress, for that of the captive chief of the Tjekker shows no sign of a tie where the cheek is preserved and apparently no neck-guard (fig. 3).² *Medinet Habu*, II pls. 118c and 125c = 98 again show a man with this head-dress but without a tie. Both of these latter men are bearded like the captive chief, but on pl. 125b = pl. 98 the head-dress is worn by a man who is beardless. In all these cases except pl. 43 the band from which the feathers stand up is plain instead of being decorated and the feathers are not shown individually as are those of the Philistines. The closeness of the resemblance between the head-dresses of the two peoples is clearly shown by the figure, pl. 118c, which would have been taken for a Tjekker had it not been labelled 'Philistine'. Actually, how-

much longer (N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-re' at Thebes*, II, pl. xviii, the first man in the top row, and I, 25; Nina and Norman Davies, *The Tomb of Menkheperresonb, Amenmosé, and another*, pl. v, top row, last man but one), but they also wear loops at the belt which Ramesses III's men do not. Keftiu was Caphtor whence came the Philistines. See p. 77, n. 5; p. 79, n. 10.

¹ PELESET, *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 44, bottom row of prisoners from which our fig. 1 is taken; TJEKKER-TJEKKEL, *ibid.*, pl. 43, top row of prisoners and the inscription above them; DENYEN, *ibid.*, pl. 44, middle row of prisoners.

² Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, pls. 160 a. b = Meyer, *Darstellungen der Fremdvölker*, no. 499 from which our fig. 3 is taken.

ever, the man is representative of the whole group, for he is labelled 'the countries of the Peleset'. Another thing which unites the Peleset and Tjekker is that neither of them are ever said to be 'of the sea'. This also differentiates them from the Teresh,¹ from the Ekwesh,² and from the Weshesh,³ on the one hand, and from the Sherden,⁴ on the other, all of whom on one occasion or another are said to be 'of the sea'. The Denyen, however, that other member of the Philistine group, are said to have been 'in their isles',⁵ a valuable statement and one which shows them to have stood apart to some extent from the Philistines and the Tjekker, as, it will be seen on p. 81, indeed they did.

Then again, the tribesmen of the Philistines and Denyen are all clean shaven which distinguishes them sharply from the Shekelesh-Teresh, though curiously enough, as has just been mentioned, the Tjekker chief and two of his tribesmen are bearded.⁶ The Tjekker wear the same armour as the Philistines,⁷ though, of course, so do the Sherden. It was no doubt common to the whole company of the Sea-Peoples.

As with the others of the Sea-Raiders the Philistines' characteristic weapon was the pair of spears, but like so many of them they were not averse to using swords and these at times are full sized.⁸ These full-sized swords were used as a rapier for stabbing not, as has so often been said, for slashing whether by the griffin-slayer of Sea-Raider type at Enkomi in Cyprus,⁹ or by the Sherden,¹⁰ or on one occasion by a Shekelesh-Teresh.¹¹ On one other occasion a Philistine is shown stabbing with what looks as if it would be a fair-sized sword.¹² One full-sized sword has been found in Philistine territory at Beit Dagin very near Gaza.¹³

More evidence of the close connexion of the Philistines, Tjekker, and Denyen comes from Enkomi in Cyprus. Here was found an ivory carving (fig. 4),¹⁴ showing a man wearing the head-dress of these peoples as shown on the Egyptian monuments including the neck-guard. He also wears the panelled kilt of the Sea-Peoples which falls to a point in front, though this point is of a shape less like those of the Sea-Peoples than that of Puyemrē's northerner of 300 years earlier from 'the ends of Asia (*phw styt*)',¹⁵ of which it is a replica. It has no tassels, and the man is bearded like the captive



FIG. 4

¹ Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* IV, § 129.

² Ibid. III, §§ 588. 601.

³ Ibid. IV, § 403.

⁴ Ibid. § 129.

⁵ Ibid. § 403.

⁶ Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, pl. 160 a = Meyer, op. cit., no. 499.

⁷ *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 43, where the men are named.

⁸ Ibid., pl. 34, top right corner. Cf. also pl. 39, a man in the top middle boat, another fallen out of the boat, and a man just below the inscription.

⁹ A. S. Murray, *Excavations in Cyprus*, pl. ii, fig. 872A.

¹⁰ *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 34, top centre.

¹¹ Ibid., pl. 18, bottom left.

¹² Ibid. II, pl. 72, bottom right.

¹³ Hall, in *Proc. Soc. Antiquaries*, 27 (1914-15), 127 ff., and fig. It is 39½ in. (1.05 m.) long including the tang of the hilt.

¹⁴ Murray, op. cit., pl. i, top right, from which our fig. 4 is taken. He carries an axe, a weapon not shown among the Sea-Peoples, but then they are fighting whereas he is hunting. He also has a sword. The ivory dates to about 1200 B.C., the time of the Great Migrations.

¹⁵ N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemrē at Thebes*, I, pl. xxxi, top right, and pp. 80. 81. The man also wears a medallion which brings him into the discussion again on p. 86.

Tjekker chief and two of his tribesmen. We may therefore say at once that the man at Enkomi is a Tjekker or, as Bossert thinks, a Denyen.¹ Actually there is evidence that he is a Tjekker, for it is commonly accepted that they were at least a portion of the people known to the Greeks as the Teukroi.² The evidence is this: Salamis claimed to have been founded by Teucer and was ruled by Teucrid princes,³ and Enkomi where the ivory was found is the modern name of ancient Salamis.⁴ Hence, the man was not a Denyen but definitely a Tjekker or in other words a Teucrid; a complete confirmation of the belief in the identity of the two peoples. Valuable as is the information already supplied by this ivory from Enkomi-Salamis there is yet more to come, for it provides a similarity with the Philistines themselves. This is, that contrary to the Egyptian and Assyrian custom or that of the Hittites at Kadesh and unusual in Mycenaean drawings⁵ the charioteer leans forward over his horses just as those of the Philistines do.⁶

Seeing that one of the Sea-Raider tribes who fell upon Egypt also occupied and founded Salamis in Cyprus, it will perhaps not be out of place to recall some remarks of Ramesses III. It has been thought that he mentions Salamis as one of the places whence they came, but hitherto this has seemed almost too good to be true. Anyhow, he certainly calls them Haunebut.⁷ Those names which might be of interest to us here are, nos. 7 *srmsk*, 8 *ktyn*, 9 *ymr*, 10 *sr*, 11 *itr*, as we must read them cut down to the mere consonants. However, the vocalization suggested by the syllabic writing is, as it used to be read, *sarameski*,⁸ *kathiin*, *aymar*, *sari*, *itil*, and these Brugsch identified with the well-known towns in Cyprus, Salamis, Kition, Marion?, Soloi, and Idalion.⁹ The period and the collocation of the names is striking, appearing here as they do for the first and only time when the Great Migrations were in progress and when a Tjekker was living at Salamis.

¹ *Mitt. altorientalischen Gesellschaft*, IV (1928/29), 280 f. He bases his view on the later name of Cyprus, Iadnana 'Isles of the Denyen', for which see p. 81 below.

² First identified as such by Lauth in 1867 (Maspero, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'orient classique*, II, 464, n. 3, where he gives full references). Otherwise attempts have been made to identify the Tjekker with the Σικελοί. But if this were accepted what would become of the Shekelesh?

³ Gjerstad, 'The Colonization of Cyprus in Greek Legend', in *Opuscula Archaeologica*, 3 (1944), 108.

⁴ Salamis shows yet another connexion with the Sea-Peoples. It is in their characteristic segmented armour which is worn by a man on another ivory carving (Murray, op. cit., pl. II, fig. 872A). He also carries their round shield and wears a kilt much like theirs in that it is patterned and falls to a point in front. It is, however, more like some of those worn by the Keftiuans of 250 years earlier, N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Rekh-mi-rê at Thebes*, pl. xix, top row, more particularly the seventh man. Cf. also some of the kilts in Nina and Norman Davies, *The Tomb of Menkheperresonb, Amenmosê and another*, pl. v, top row. The kilt of the Syrian, the third man in the bottom row, is also worth consideration. He is shown in colour on pl. i. They and the Salamis kilt are all of a general type. I have brought much evidence to show that Keftiu-Caphtor was the Philistine country up and down the Calycadnus River in western Cilicia, see pp. 77, 79 below.

⁵ Furumark, in *Opuscula Atheniensia*, I (1953), 61 and fig. 7, 63 with some references, 65 of Late Cypriote II C date, and 48, fig. 1.

⁶ *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 34, right hand, two charioteers.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, pl. 101, l. 7 = Edgerton and Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, 106, 109.

⁸ It has been suggested that the *-ki* at the end of the first name has been copied from a cuneiform original in which script *-ki* is the determinative of a country. If so, this would leave Salames as the real name of the place. This error, if it be one, the scribe corrected in the following names.

⁹ *Geschichte Ägyptens* (1877), 603. *sr* might well be the Assyrian *sillu* which is similarly taken to be Soloi, cf. Sir G. F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, I, 107.

But further than this, the name Haunebut which Ramesses applies to all the peoples among whom these names appear is interesting from our point of view. By the New Kingdom the name had definitely come to mean a collection of peoples occupying the coastlands of Asia ever more and more distant towards the north-east. Finally, in the Twenty-sixth Dynasty it specially meant the Greeks of Asia Minor and at last not only them but just Greeks in general.¹ What an excellent description of the hordes of mixed and related tribes who descended out of Asia Minor on to Ramesses III and included representatives of Teucer who founded Salamis!

Opposite Cyprus, in Asia Minor, the Teukroi were closely connected with Cilicia Tracheia, or western Cilicia, at least after the Great Migrations if not before, and the next paragraphs provide much evidence that this country was Caphtor whence came the Philistines. Thus Olba, east of the lower course of the Calycadnus River, was said to have been founded by Ajax son of Teucer, the priest kings there claimed to be descended from Teucer and most of them bore the names of Teucer and Ajax, and the country was called the Domain of Teucer.² It has been shown that this tradition is independent of the Homeric one³ and may, therefore, go back to before the age of the migrations. Indeed, Professor Denys L. Page has recently shown that Ajax must have lived a long time before the Trojan War and that he used a shield of a type made in the sixteenth century B.C. This of course carries his brother, Teucer, with him.⁴ Thus, it may well be that the Teukroi-Tjekker had arrived in Cilicia Tracheia as long ago as 1500 B.C. Certainly we know that the Philistines had, and similarly we know that that other member of the group, the Denyen, were already established in eastern Cilicia before about 1375 B.C. But even if the Tjekker had not arrived as early as that they did at least arrive in Philistine country there in western Cilicia just as they did at Ziklag in Palestine. For it can hardly be doubted but that their name is enshrined in that of the Philistine city, Ziklag, in spite of the Hebrew spelling with a *k* instead of a *k*. Certainly Wenamun assures us that they had got at least as far as Dor on the Palestinian coast just south of Mount Carmel for he calls it a Tjekker town, and he also says that the Prince of Byblos, a good deal farther to the north, was a certain Tjekker-Baal.

It has already been seen from the Egyptian records that the Tjekker and Philistines stood somewhat apart from that other member of their group, the Denyen, and here we find that the two former peoples actually came from the same country and even accompanied each other in their conquest of Philistia.

It was from Caphtor⁵ that the Philistines set out on this conquest and I have brought

¹ Vercoutter in *BIFAO* 48 (1949), 193-6. For the various little islands off the coast of Cilicia see p. 81 below, and the fact that the Denyen were 'in their isles' has just been mentioned.

² Strabo, xiv, v, 10.

³ Gjerstad, op. cit. 117.

⁴ *History and the Homeric Iliad*, 234, 235.

⁵ The idea that Caphtor must have been Crete was originally based on nothing more than that in the translations of the Bible that land is spoken of as 'the isle of Caphtor' and Crete is a large and suitable island. However, the Hebrew word 'î translated 'isle' means primarily 'coastland' and is applied for instance to the coast of Palestine (Isa. xx, 6). So this argument proves to be without cogency. All this is worked out in full detail in *Vetus Testamentum*, 6 (1956), 199-210. The view was naturally strengthened by Sir Arthur Evans' discovery of the splendid Minoan civilization in Crete and by the fact that on the Egyptian monuments the gifts brought by the men of Keftiu (Caphtor) and by those of the Isles include some Minoan-Mycenaean

much evidence to show that that was Cilicia Tracheia, i.e. western Cilicia up and down the Calycadnus River,¹ the very country that was the Domain of Teucer. In the first place the Philistine pottery of Palestine is of a quasi-Mycenaean style the prototypes of which are to be found in the regional Myc. iii C 1 style of Cilicia,² and this is only a beginning. Thus, the king of Gath and Ziklag was 'Akîš (Achish, 1 Sam. xxvii ff., 2 Kings ii, 39. 40) and the woman's name Ακκισις occurs at Palaia Isaura on beyond the sources of the Calycadnus.³ It is the Keftiuan name *ikš*, *ikš-t* which occurs in the masculine and feminine on the Egyptian writing board of not later than 1500 B.C.⁴ Again, at Palaia Isaura once more, there is a name Ταρκυνδβεppας including the same curious combination of consonants -νδβρ as the Keftiuan name on the writing board, *bndbr*.⁵ Another name of similar formation Ρωνδβεppας is found in the Corycian Cave a little to the east of the mouth of the Calycadnus River.⁶ Thus, it is already evident that Caphtor-Keftiu was the country up and down that river, and this is shown once more by the Septuagint's translating Caphtor by Cappadocia. This it does twice (Deuteronomy ii, 23; Amos ix, 7), for at the time that the translators were at work⁷ the Kingdom of Greater Cappadocia extended down to the coast including the island of Elaeussa a little to the east of the mouth of the Calycadnus.⁸ In conclusion, there is the Greek tradition that Kabdêros was king of Cilicia.⁹ Kabdêros is clearly the eponymous king of Caphtor, which is thus equated with Cilicia.¹⁰ The Philistines, therefore, clearly

objects. But, although a confirmed pro-Cretan, Miss Kantor has now shown the difficulties of this easy acceptance ('The Aegean and the Orient in the Second Millennium B.C.', in *AJA* 51 (1947), for instance on pp. 48. 49. 74. 102. The article has been reprinted as a monograph under the same title). The insistence on the belief that Caphtor-Keftiu must have been Crete has produced endless confusion. A number of fallacies in that idea is exposed in detail in my article, 'Keftiu: Crete or Cilicia?' in *JHS* 51 (1931), 1-38.

¹ For further references to my studies of this question see p. 79, n. 10.

² Furumark, in *Opuscula archaeologica*, 3 (1944), 264 f.; id., *The Chronology of Mycenaean Pottery* (1941), 118 ff.

³ Sterrett, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, no. 165 (vol. 3 of the *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*). Indeed, Philistine relationships reach back farther than this. The Calycadnus is in western Cilicia and in the *Iliad* there were Cilices living at Thebe in the southern Troad. Andromache herself was one of them (*Il.* vi, 395-7. 415-16). Again, the name Achish which becomes Ἀχχίσις in the Septuagint has been likened to that of Ἀγχίσις father of Aeneas (Bonfante, in *AJA* 50 (1946), 254). The Philistine sending away the golden mice with the models of their emeralds is reminiscent of the mice sacred to Apollo Smintheus, the disease-god of Hamaxitus, again in the southern Troad and not far from Thebe. Hamaxitus was a Teucric city (Strabo, xiii, i, 48), and the Tjekker were companions of the Philistines. In fact the Philistines are widely accepted as having been of Illyrian stock (Kretschmer, in *Glotta*, 30 (1943), 152-4; Bonfante, *ibid.*, *passim*). Of this stock the Dardanians form part, and seeing that Anchises was a Dardanian presumably the Philistines were also. Dardanians did go away, eastwards in their case, for certain Drdny had appeared at Kadesh among the Hittite allies.

⁴ Published by Peet, in *Essays in Aegean Archaeology presented to Sir Arthur Evans*, 90 ff. For the date see pp. 98, 99.

⁵ Sterrett, *ibid.*, no. 181; Peet, *ibid.*, 97.

⁶ Heberdey and Wilhelm, *Reisen in Kilikien*, 76-77, ll. 69. 100 (*Denkschr. kais. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Vienna, 1896).

⁷ The translation was begun under Ptolemy II (285-247 B.C.) and had been finished before the beginning of the Christian era, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. 'Bible Translations, The Septuagint', 186.

⁸ Strabo, xii, i, 4: xiv, v, 6.

⁹ Höfer, in Roscher, *Ausführl. Lexikon d. griech. und röm. Mythologie*, s.v. 'Pamphyle'. Furumark in *Opuscula Archaeologica*, 6 (1950), 243.

¹⁰ Under the influence of the Caphtor-Cretan idea Barnett, in *JHS* 73 (1953), 142, takes this as evidence for

occupied western Cilicia and, more accurately, the country up and down the Calycadnus River in the eastern part of which lived the Teukroi-Tjekker.

Achish, king of Gath and Ziklag, has directed us back to Palaia Isaura near the headwaters of the Calycadnus river. It is, therefore, worth observing that all over an area of country behind and round Isauria there is a number of names which might perhaps have been the originals whence was derived the unexplained name of Achish' father Mā'ōk (Maoch, 1 Sam. xxvii, 2) or Ma'ākāh (Maachah, 1 Kings ii, 39).¹ Thus, in Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Lycia there is the name *Mayas* as it appears in its Greek form and as *Μαχα* in Lycia again.² In Lycaonia again there is also a form *mika* reproduced in Greek letters as *Μικκα* (F) *Μικκος* (M).³ A form *muka* seems to exist but the simple name has not been reported. It enters into the composition of a number of names mostly in Caria.⁴

There is also contributory evidence for the invasion of Palestine from Cilicia Tracheia and its coastlands. It is provided in the first place by Perseus who delivered Andromeda from the sea-monster at Joppa on the Philistine coast. He was actually worshipped at Ace-Ptolemais, in other words Acre,⁵ on the other side of Mount Carmel from the Tjekker town of Dor. Back in Asia Minor he was an important figure, whither he brought an image of Medusa to Iconium. At that place he figured as one of the chief types on the coinage.⁶ To the south-west Karalia put his figure on its coins. This was on beyond Isaura and the headwaters of the Calycadnus, and down the river itself Koropissos did likewise, as did Iotape on the coast,⁷ and, also on the coast, Anemourion used his figure as one of its most important coin-types.⁸ Sites dating to the second half of the second millennium, the time of the Philistine migration, exist along the Calycadnus and they belong to the Konya (Iconium) complex.⁹ Thus, once more the Calycadnus country was not only the land of the Tjekker but also that of the Philistines.¹⁰ Perseus was not the only hero to pass that way to Palestine, for Mopsus did so as well, and like Perseus left his mark in Karalia, where a town, Moxoupolis, was named after him.¹¹

a Cretan settlement on the coast of Asia Minor. But archaeological evidence shows this view to be untenable, for there are no signs of habitation along the coast before the Iron Age. It was not until the Hellenistic and Roman times that Pamphylia and its neighbourhood became prosperous (Mellaart, in *Anatolian Studies*, 4 (1954), 177-178). The same Caphtor-Cretan idea causes Schachermeyr to dislike the conclusion that the story of Kabdēros would place Keftiu-Caphtor in Asia Minor, *Archiv f. Orientforschung*, 16 (1952/3), 82 f.

¹ In *AfO* 13 (1939-41), 227 Bork discusses the name but can only say that it is of foreign origin.

² Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier*, 138 (*Klio* (1913) Beiheft xi. Many compounds are also formed upon it in this area.

³ Id., op. cit. 148, and again a number of names are compounded with it.

⁴ Id., op. cit. 152.

⁵ G. F. Hill, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia*, pl. xvii, 3 and p. 134, nos. 35-36; Willesen, in *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 3 (1958), 335. Cf. also Wainwright, in *JEA* 21 (1935), 155.

⁶ Hill, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycaonia, Isauria and Cilicia*, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

⁷ For all these cities see *ibid.*, pp. xxxvii-lvii, and p. 47, n. 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xli.

⁹ Seton Lloyd, in *Antiquity*, 28 (1954), sketch map on p. 217. For modern connexions between Konya and the Calycadnus see *Anatolian Studies*, 4 (1954), 45.

¹⁰ For all this and more see my studies 'Caphtor-Cappadocia' in *Vetus Testamentum*, 6 (1956), 199-210; 'Some Early Philistine History' in *ibid.* 9 (1959), 73-84. For companion studies of Keftiu, see 'Asiatic Keftiu' in *AJA* 56 (1952), 196-212; 'Keftiu and Karamania (Asia Minor)' in *Anatolian Studies*, 4 (1954), 33-48.

¹¹ Götte, *Madduvattaš*, 140 (*MVAeG* 32 (1927), Heft 3).

Greek tradition tells how he captured the Philistine city of Ascalon,¹ only some 30 miles south of Joppa, the scene of Perseus' activities. Mopsus set out from Clarus, a city of Lydia.² It would, therefore, have been through him that the Philistines acquired the title, *seranim*, which they gave to their rulers 'the lords' of the Philistines. *seranim* is accepted as being the same word as the Greek *τύραννος*³ and the Greek word is accepted as being of Lydian origin.⁴ In between Clarus and the Calycadnus river there is a place in Pisidia called, at least in Roman times, Prostanna,⁵ which name can be broken down into the native forms *prusttā-(a)ñna*.⁶ It seems possible that *prusttā* might be the word from which the Egyptians got the name *prst*, *plst*, and we Philistine. Could Prostanna have been a stage on Mopsus' route?

Of Mopsus Greek tradition also tells that his people 'were scattered in Cilicia and Syria and even as far as Phoenicia'.⁷ Thus, again like Perseus, he passed through Cilicia according to tradition. This is clearly correct, for eastern Cilicia called two of its towns after him, Mopsouestia and Mopsoukrene, and this brings us round to the Denyen-Dainiuna. For from Karatepe in eastern Cilicia we hear that Mopsus was the progenitor of the royal family of the Dananiyim.⁸ The Denyen-Dainiuna were the other

¹ Athenaeus, VIII, 37 (C. and T. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, I, 38, fragment 11). Ascalon and Philistia had many connexions with Lydia, more of which have been studied in my article 'Some Early Philistine History' in *Vetus Testamentum*, 9 (1959), 79 ff. A. R. Burn treats of this subject, giving much collateral information in his *Minoans, Philistines and Greeks*, 151-4. Mopsus was a real person, for under the form Mukšuš he is mentioned as a contemporary in or near Lydia of the Hittite king Tudkhaliyas IV, c. 1250-1220 B.C. (Götze, op. cit. 37). For a study of the name Mopsos-Moxos, see Heubeck, *Lydiaka*, 43 f. It appears in the Linear B tablets as Mo-qo-so.

² Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s.v. 'Mopsos' (2).

³ R. A. Macalister, *The Philistines*, 79; Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. 'Philistines', 845. The root also reached Italy, supplying Turan as the name of the Etruscan Venus and Turnus, the name of the king of the Rutuli. His ancestress, Danae, was otherwise said to have been ancestress of certain Danaans, who must in some way have been connected with our Denyen-Dainiuna, see Wainwright, 'The Teresh, the Etruscans and Asia Minor' in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 205 f., where references are given.

⁴ G. Radet, *La Lydie et le monde grecque* (1893), 146. 147. W. Prellwitz, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1905), 471, would see in it a Phrygian root, but Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique* (1923), 992, considers this conjectural. But in any case Phrygia borders on Lydia. J. L. Myres, *Who were the Greeks?* (1930), 118, returns to the old correlation with *κοίπavos*, equating both words with the Hittite *kuirvanaš*. For a study of this latter word see Götze, op. cit. 140-2.

⁵ For an account of the place see Ballance in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 125-9. On p. 129 he says: 'The general characteristics of the site suggest that in origin it was a pre-Hellenistic foundation, more a stronghold than a city.'

⁶ Sundwall, *Die einheimischen Namen der Lykier* (*Klio* (1913), Beiheft XI), 187.

⁷ Strabo, XIV, iv, 3.

⁸ O'Callaghan, in *Orientalia*, 18 (1949), 177-9 and 199 f. for the discussion; Barnett, in *JHS* 73 (1953), 142. On pp. 193-9 O'Callaghan gives a summary of the history of the Dananiyim. On p. 195 he points out that the name Danuna might be Dana+the Anatolian ethnic termination *-na*. This seems probable, for on one occasion (Edgerton and Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, 53) Ramesses III drops off the final *-na*. This causes Gardiner (*Onom.* I, 126*) to suggest among other possibilities that it may be only an ending, leaving Dene as the real name of the people. This is singularly like the Greek Dana-oi. To this we may add that after all Danaos was not a native of Argos in the Peloponnese but was an immigrant who ought to have gone to Libya but did not. He was said to have been a son of Belus-Baal and twin brother of Aegyptus. His oriental origin was confirmed by Schaeffer's discovery that the punishment inflicted on his daughters for the murder of their husbands was only to carry out everlastingly the funeral rites practised at Ras Shamra-Ugarit in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries (Schaeffer, *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit* (Schweich Lecture, 1936), 54-56 and figs. 12, 13).

member of the Philistine group and Mopsus unites the two peoples in that besides being the progenitor of the Denyen-Dainiuna royal family he was also husband of a daughter of a king of Cilicia, Kabdêros,¹ that is to say Caphtor whence came the Philistines. Hence, through Mopsus we find that the Denyen-Dainiuna-Dananiyîm were not only closely connected with the Philistines, but that they were similar to that other member of the group, the Tjekker-Tjekkel, as well, for like them they also got to Syria and even as far as Phoenicia. Moreover, all of them got down into Palestine.

Besides all this they were all alike in having to do with Cilicia, though in the case of the Denyen-Dainiuna it was eastern, not western, Cilicia. Thus, they would have been somewhat apart from the other two, and Ramesses III notices this, for of them he says that they were 'in their isles',² a thing he never says of the Philistines and Tjekker. Karatepe provides still more information about the Dananiyîm, and that is that they controlled the plain of Adana in eastern Cilicia.³ This is in conformity with that statement of Ramesses III's that the Denyen-Dainiuna were 'in their isles', for it is now many years since Luckenbill pointed out that Sargon of Assyria's Iadnana-Iadanana was a cuneiform rendering of the 'Isles of the Danaans'.⁴ Now, recently, Sidney Smith has further pointed out that in view of the Karatepe inscriptions Adnana must have been primarily the plain of Adana, that it was occupied by the Dananiyîm, and that 'Ia', a district of the land of Adnana was 'in the midst of the western sea'.⁵ He further shows that there are long narrow promontories along the eastern Cilician coast which would satisfy the description as 'isles'. Even in the Middle Ages we are told that the inhabitants of Ayas, one of the towns there, 'had fled to the sea and had gone into a new fortress which they had built out in the sea'. Hence, these 'isles' of which Ramesses III speaks would have been those of eastern Cilicia and had nothing to do with the Aegean and its islands.

Now that we know from the Karatepe inscriptions that there were Dananiyîm in eastern Cilicia, Abimilki's knowledge of the Danuna shows that they would already have been there at the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁶ Thus, it would have been thence that the Denyen-Dainiuna would have attacked Ramesses III along with their western neighbours, the Philistines and the Tjekker.

Thus, all three of those in this group, the Philistines, Tjekker, and Denyen-Dainiuna who show themselves to be so closely related by their dress in the Egyptian sculptures

¹ Höfer, loc. cit.

² Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* IV, § 403.

³ Leveen and Moss, in *Iraq*, 10 (1948), 64 f. several times; O'Callaghan, in op. cit. 175 ff. often, and for the discussion see p. 198. At Karatepe in passages where the Hittite text speaks of the city of Adana five times, the Phoenician version has *Dnnym* four times and once *'dn* (Mellink, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 7 (1950), 146). Adana, of course, is an ancient name going back to Hittite times when it was called Adaniya (Götze, *Kizzuwatna*, 56, 58; Garstang and Gurney, op. cit. 61).


⁴ *Zeits. f. Assyriologie*, 28 (1914), 92-99. By Esarhaddon's time (680-669 B.C.) Cyprus had become the most important of them. For good accounts of Yadnana see Sir G. F. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, I, 104 ff.; Casson, *Ancient Cyprus*, 146.

⁵ Sidney Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi*, 79. 80. It was in the early fourteenth century that Idri-mi speaks of *Ia* under the form *I-e*.

⁶ O'Callaghan, op. cit. 194, cannot agree that there is reason to divorce the Danuna of the el-'Amarna Letters from the Dainiuna of Ramesses III, as in Gardiner, op. cit. I, 125*. Similarly, in *AJA* 54 (1950), 171, Albright considers that Danuna is clearly the vocalization of Denyen.

prove to have been closely connected by quite other evidence. That evidence shows them to have formed a congeries of tribes in Cilicia; the Philistines and Tjekker in the western part of the country and the Denyen-Dainiuna in the eastern.

Before leaving this group notice should be taken of the use made of the *manu cornuta*, the well-known magical gesture designed to ward off evil. It consists in stretching out the hand with two of the fingers extended against the feared evil, the others being folded down (fig. 5).¹



This apotropaic gesture is made quite commonly by the Philistines in the Land-Battle.² To what extent it may have been used by the other Sea-Peoples is not apparent for, with the exception of the Sherden in the Sea-Battle, it is only Philistines who are shown in the fighting. Anyhow, the Sherden do not make use of it. It is, however, perhaps significant that here in the Sea-Battle they both implore mercy from the Pharaoh merely by holding out to him the full hand in the ordinary way,³ as indeed do the Philistines not only here but occasionally in the Land Battle as well.⁴

On the other hand, the immigrant portion of the Meshwesh very commonly make use of this gesture,⁵ and, though much Libyanized, they originally came from Asia Minor like the Philistines themselves. This is true of them whether they were the Maxyes as has so generally been supposed, or whether they had settled in the Cyrenaica as is supposed by Bates and, since then, by Rowe.⁶ The Maxyes told Herodotus (IV, 191) that they were descended from men from Troy, and in Cyrenaica there was a tradition of an immigration of strangers from Troy, identified with the sons of Antenor.⁷ Troy and the Trojan War was the Greek way of speaking of the turmoil in Asia Minor in the thirteenth century, the time at which the Meshwesh first appeared against Meneptah.

Thus, by their habit of making the *manu cornuta* the immigrant part of the Meshwesh associate themselves with the Philistines, and in so doing provide one more scrap of evidence that these people also came from Asia Minor.

¹ F. T. Elworthy, *Horns of Honour*, figs. 27, 70, 71, 80, 103-5, etc. In *Man*, 1905, p. 12 Myres publishes a photograph of an Italian boy protecting himself in this way against the camera.

² *Med. Habu* 1, pl. 34, right-hand side, three men in the top corner, two men in the chariots, and one below them, several men at the bottom of the plate. Normally they extend the thumb and little finger, fig. 5 is taken from the front man in the chariot, pl. 34.

³ *Ibid.*, pl. 39, SHERDEN, one man in the top right-hand ship; PHILISTINES, one man in the top middle ship. In the middle of the plate one man in the right-hand ship holds up both hands, while another extends the forefinger only.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pl. 34, one man on the left-hand side of the lower part.

⁵ *Ibid.* II, pls. 70. 72. 85. 113. 114. 121a. Contrary to the habit of the Philistines, the Meshwesh normally extend the thumb and forefinger. Fig. 5b is taken from pl. 114.

⁶ Bates, *The Eastern Libyans*, map on p. 50; Rowe, *Supplément aux Ann. Serv. Cahier*, no. 12, pl. 1.

⁷ Pindar, *Pyth.* v, 81-83.

The Shekelesh-Teresh group


We now come to the second group, that of the Shekelesh and Teresh, and here in the first place it is necessary to decide the nationality of a man who appears at Medinet Habu¹ among a row of Ramesses III's prisoners (fig. 6). His name is unfortunately damaged, there remaining nothing but the first two signs , and the problem is how it is to be completed. Is it to be taken as Shasu (Bedouin) and the man grouped with the chief of Amor who comes second in the row, or is it to be taken as Shekelesh and so classed with the Hittite who comes first and all the rest of the Peoples of the Sea, Tjekker, Sherden, Teresh, and Philistine, who make up the rest of the row?



FIG. 6

Lepsius supplied the man with the pointed kilt and tassels of the Sea-Peoples.² Brugsch reproduces this drawing and takes the name to have been Shasu (Bedouin).³ Max Müller follows Brugsch in calling the man a Shasu,⁴ and Breasted follows on again.⁵ But others, such as Mariette,⁶ Maspero,⁷ and Wreszinski⁸ have taken the name to be restored as Shekelesh, as Lepsius⁹ and Daressy evidently did also.¹⁰

The lacuna at the end of the man's name is so small that it must remain a mystery whether so long a name as Shekelesh could ever have been fitted into the space. For, as will be shown, there can be no doubt that that was the name. Apparently the sculptor misjudged his spacing and had to leave the name unfinished. Fortunately, some of the man's dress is absolutely decisive. The head-cloth is held in place by a fillet above the forehead, while a medallion hangs from his neck. He also wears a beard. These are all features which definitely belong together, for they occur elsewhere along with the unmistakable kilt of the Sea-Raiders.¹¹ This ensures that the name must be read as Shekelesh, which in its turn provides the name for the other wearers of the head-cloth and medallion and beard who are unnamed.

¹ Meyer, *op. cit.*, no. 498, from which our fig. 6 is taken.

² *L.D.* III, 209b, the fifth man, but of these details there is no sign in reality. He also gives the pointed kilt to the Tjekker but without the tassels.

³ *Geographische Inschriften*, II (1858), pl. iii, fig. 6.

⁴ *Asien und Europa*, 139. 393. He also compares the coiffure to a number of Syrian head-dresses and it was this that decided him that the name would have been Shasu. See further pp. 85. 88 below.

⁵ *Anc. Rec.* IV, § 129.

⁶ *Voyage dans la Haute Égypte*, II, 45.

⁷ *Histoire ancienne*, II, 465. 471, n. 2.

⁸ *Atlas*, II, pl. 160b, where he calls the man a Si[kilier], i.e. a Sicilian.

⁹ Lepsius's addition of the Sea-Peoples' kilt and tassels shows that he thought the man to be a Shekelesh.

¹⁰ In *Ann. Serv.* II (1911), pl. iv, no. 13 and pp. 58. 59 in discussing those glazed tiles purporting to represent Peoples of the Sea Daressy gives the name Shakalash to the man who wears the head-cloth and medallion and beard of our figure.

¹¹ *Med. Habu*, I, pls. 17, left bottom, 18, bottom left centre. No medallion, I, pl. 35, bottom centre, II, pl. 98, centre row of prisoners = pl. 125b, 114, left. Medallion but no fillet, II, pl. 99. Fillet but the places of the beard and medallion are destroyed, II, pl. 62, middle row of soldiers. For the head-cloth, beard, and medallion on those fanciful glazed tiles from Medinet Habu see Daressy, in *Ann. Serv.* II (1911), pl. iv, no. 13; beard and medallion but head-cloth broken away, no. 14; head-cloth but no medallion, beard broken away, no. 15. E. Meyer's photographs in his *Darstellungen der Fremdvölker*, nos. 5. 9. 11, are larger and even brighter. Medallion, beard, and fillet on what is evidently intended for the ribbed head-cloth, *L.E.R.*, in *Bull. MFA* 6 (1908), 48, second figure from the left, but the kilt is not of the usual Sea-Raider type.

The man, therefore, is a Shekelesh, and now we come to the next in the row, and he is labelled Teresh quite distinctly. He wears a head-cloth exactly like that of the Shekelesh, except that it is not so long, and also wears the beard,¹ but is distinguished from him by the absence of the medallion. The head-cloth is peculiar to these two tribes, separating them from all the other Sea-Peoples. Thus, they form a group within the general horde of invaders from the north, and Meneptah recognizes this, for on one occasion he picks them out from the others in the list, setting them together thus, 'Shekelesh and Teresh who came as enemies of (belonging to) Libya'.² But within this group our evidence, for what it is worth, suggests that perhaps they may be distinguished the one from the other by the wearing of the medallion by the Shekelesh and not by the Teresh. But, of course, this may be carrying refinement of criticism too far. At present they can only be treated as a combined Shekelesh-Teresh group. Their wearing of beards³ is another custom which distinguishes them sharply from the Philistines, Dainiuna, and usually the Tjekker, on the one hand, and from the Sherden, on the other, of whom all the tribesmen are almost invariably clean-shaven.⁴

The Shekelesh and the Teresh are also united in bearing names ending in -š; which differentiates them from the Philistine group and from the Sherden. In fact apart from the Sherden and the Luka, who had always been in evidence ever since el-'Amarna times, the attack on Meneptah was entirely by these -š peoples, Ekwesh, Teresh, Shekelesh, and Meshwesh.

It was pointed out on p. 72 that of these peoples at least two, the Ekwesh and the Teresh, are likely to have been neighbours, and of these the Teresh now seem likely to have been neighbours of the Shekelesh seeing that the two are so similar in their dress. It was also pointed out that as the Luka accompanied them the homeland was likely to have been not far from central or northern Caria. Here the argument can be carried farther. Miletus was an Achaean colony if not actually an Achaean city,⁵ and it lies in northern Caria on the borders of Lydia. At the time of Meneptah an Ahhiyan, accepted by many as an Achaean,⁶ was devastating Arzawa-Lydia⁷ and it was from Lydia that the Tyrsenoi-Teresh migrated to Etruria.⁸ The Ekwesh, therefore, would have come from Miletus or its neighbourhood. Thus, it becomes apparent that all these peoples who attacked Meneptah were neighbours living on the borders of Caria and Lydia.⁹

¹ L.D. III, pl. 209b, the fifth and sixth men in the row. Meyer, op. cit., no. 498, shows the Teresh to be badly damaged here, but the shape of the damage suggests a beard.

² Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, I, pl. 28, l. 56 = Breasted, *Anc. Rec.* III, § 588.

³ To those instances mentioned in n. 11, p. 83 should be added pl. 31, bottom left, where men are shown who are no doubt Teresh-Shekelesh by what remains of their head-dresses. They wear no medallion.

⁴ On one occasion a Sherden is bearded and is also peculiar in that his helmet is laminated, *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 34, top right, between the two ox-carts. On pl. 38 the same type of helmet is worn by those slain Sherden on whom Ramesses tramples.

⁵ Stubbings, *Mycenaean Pottery from the Levant*, 23; *Anatolian Studies*, 8 (1958), 30 f.

⁶ Garstang and Gurney, op. cit. 81.

⁷ Götze, *Madduwattaš*, 3 ff. (*MVAG* 32 (1927), Heft 1) and p. 40 for Lydia.

⁸ Herodotus I, 94; Wainwright, in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 197 ff.

⁹ See also Wainwright, in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 202. If, as seems likely, the Taruisa of the Hittites is Troy (Gurney, op. cit. 56 ff.; Garstang and Gurney, op. cit. 105; Denys L. Page, op. cit. 106 and notes), the evidence adduced here for their position makes it unlikely that the Teresh of the Egyptians could have been they.

The Sherden, of course, are a different problem, for they were always on the move. Thus, the migration of 1219 B.C. was due to local causes operating just there. The district was disturbed again in 1162 B.C., but the trouble then was a much wider one, for it affected the Philistines, Tjekker, and Denyen-Dainiuna in Cilicia, as well as such peoples as the Weshesh and, of course, the Sherden.

People with the Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth had already been encountered by Sethos I in his battle against the Shasu in his first year.¹ Ramesses III employed a certain number of Shekelesh-Teresh in his army. It is probable that they would have been mostly Shekelesh, for in his time the Teresh had become of so little importance that he does not mention them in his records but only shows their chief among his captives.² These people are easily recognizable by their dress,³ and when armed generally carry the two spears (*Med. Habu*, I, pls. 17. 31. 35; II, pl. 62) and round shield (pls. I. 18. 35?) just like any other Sea-Raiders such as the Philistines and the Sherden.⁴ In the Egyptian army they are often given a weapon which looks like a throwing stick (pls. 17. 62) but on pl. 35 approximates to a *khopesh*, though when shown in battle, still on behalf of Egypt, they use a sword along with the spear (pl. 18). On I, pl. 62 the carrying of this *khopesh*-like weapon marks them off very sharply from the Sherden mercenaries whom they accompany, for these latter are armed with spear and sword. However, as has just been remarked, the Shekelesh-Teresh also carry the two spears of the Sea-Peoples, and, if a shield, it is the round one of the Sea-Peoples. At Beit el-Wāli Ramesses II shows this *khopesh*-like weapon carried by Asiatics who also wear the Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth and the turban of some other Sea-Peoples,⁵ as will be discussed on p. 88 below.

The dress of the Shekelesh-Teresh has largely been described in a previous paragraph and it only remains to remark on a few details. On vol. I, pl. 18 of the Medinet Habu sculptures the fringe to the head-cloth is shown such as was worn by various Syrians.⁶ Sometimes the head-cloth is shown as ribbed.⁷ The fillet has already been mentioned, but here it should be added that the ends are occasionally shown above the

¹ Meyer, *op. cit.*, no. 200 = *L.D.* III, 127a. One of them has a pair of tassels hanging from his kilt but otherwise there is no resemblance between these kilts and those of the Sea-Peoples.

² In Menepthah's time, on the contrary, the Teresh had been the more important of the two. In the Great Karnak inscription he says he took from the Teresh 742 men and 790 hands, but from the Shekelesh only 222 men and 250 hands (Max Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, I, pl. 27, l. 53). These figures are confirmed by the Athribis stela which gives Teresh 722 + x men against 200 men from the Shekelesh (Lefebvre, in *Ann. Serv.* 27 (1927), pl. II and p. 28, l. 14 = Maspero in *ZÄS* 21 (1883), 67, l. 14). In *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 199 f., I ventured to suggest that this implied that by Ramesses III's time the main endeavour of the Teresh had been directed to the colonization of Etruria.

³ *Med. Habu*, I, pls. 17. 18. 31. 35; II, pls. 62. 99. 114, left. They do not appear in his (undated) Nubian War, though a couple of Philistines do, *op. cit.* I, pl. 9.

⁴ See I, pl. 35 for the Sherden with two spears.

⁵ Meyer, *op. cit.*, nos. 133. 134.

⁶ Similar head-dresses are worn by the Shasu of Pa-Kana'n in the time of Sethos, and again by some of the allies of the Hittites at Kadesh (Meyer, *op. cit.*, nos. 200. 202. 425). At Beit el-Wāli Ramesses II also shows some Syrians wearing head-cloths with fillets but without fringes (*Id.*, *op. cit.*, nos. 133, 134).

⁷ *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 35, bottom register, and on one of those fanciful glazed tiles (Daressy, *loc. cit.*, pl. IV, no. 13 and p. 58. Cf. no. 15 whom Daressy calls a Toursha, p. 60 = Meyer, *op. cit.*, nos. 9. 5. Cf. also *Bull. MFA* 6 (1908), 48, where the ribbed head-cloth is probably intended, though there seems to be a confusion between it and the upright feathers of the Philistines.

forehead (I, pl. 35; II, pls. 62, 114, left), evidently having been brought round and tied in front. They invariably wear the beard, and, of course, the standard kilt of the Sea-Peoples, which is divided into panels, falls to a point in front, and is normally adorned with bunches of tassels.

We now come to the medallion which ought to separate the Shekelesh who wears it in the named picture from the Teresh who does not. It is worn on I, pl. 17 and by one man on I, pl. 18, but not by his companion, though if it were there it would probably be hidden by his arm. It is not worn by the troops on I, pls. 31, 35; II, pl. 62, nor by the prisoners on II, pls. 98, 114, left, but is worn by the last prisoner in the upper row on II, pl. 99 who is apparently a poorly drawn Shekelesh-Teresh. It is also worn on the glazed tiles.¹

A few words must be devoted to these medallions. They were very generally worn by Syrians.² At the time of Hatshepsut, just before people from Keftiu were visiting Egypt, a man is shown wearing one.³ He is dressed in a kilt which approximates to those worn by the Keftiuans of his time and those of the Peoples of the Sea⁴ 300 years later, and is identical with that worn at that time by the Tjekker at Enkomi-Salamis in Cyprus, fig. 4. He is unique and comes from the *phw šty-t* 'the ends of Asia', that is to say from somewhere in the direction of Asia Minor. This was about 1500 B.C. and already by about that time west-central Asia Minor at any rate had been much influenced by Syria.⁵ Among these Syrianizing elements of civilization the wearing of a medallion was introduced, for instance at Gordion,⁶ and though this is still a long way from the western end of the country no doubt in due time other nearer examples will be found. Actually, however, perhaps we need not look to Syrianizing influences at all, for in

¹ Daressy, loc. cit., nos. 13, 14 and *Bull. MFA* 6, 48.

² Ras Shamra, Schaeffer, in *Syria*, 18 (1937), pl. xviii; *ibid.* 19 (1938), 320, fig. 48. Montet, *Les reliques de l'art syrien dans l'Égypte du Nouvel Empire*, 45 ff. and figs. 34-36. Dussaud, *L'Art phénicien du deuxième millénaire*, 42 ff. and figs. 9, 10. The wearing of medallions was an ancient custom in Asia; BYBLOS of Old Kingdom date. Montet, *Byblos et l'Égypte*, pl. lxiii, fig. 411 and pp. 117 f. 128; PERSIA AND BABYLONIA, end of the third millennium, Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East*, 145, fig. 261, and pl. xxx; MARI, early eighteenth century, Parrot, *Mission archéologique de Mari II, Le palais, peintures murales*, frontispiece, pl. vi and colour plate Ba. One of the curious copper (not bronze) statuettes of the forest-dwellers in the SOUTHERN LEBANON wears one in the early second millennium, Seyrig, in *Syria*, 30 (1953), pl. ix, fig. 2 and p. 47.

³ N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Puyemré at Thebes*, I, pl. xxxi and p. 81. His manner of hairdressing is quite different from that of either the Keftiuans or the Shekelesh, and unfortunately he is not named.

⁴ We clearly still have much to learn of the inhabitants of northernmost Syria and the approaches to Asia Minor. On his chariot Tuthmosis IV shows men wearing kilts patterned all over and falling to a point in front. Thus, the kilts are not unlike those of the Keftiuans and except that they have no bunches of tassels they are not unlike those of the Sea-Peoples, for those were divided into coloured panels. The list of the peoples which accompanies those scenes includes such far northern names as Naharain, Sangara, Tunip, and Tikhsi, see E. Meyer, op. cit., nos. 13-27; Carter and Newberry, *The Tomb of Thoutmosis IV*, 32. The Memphite tomb of Horemheb shows how very mixed was the population of Syria, a number of very definitely different types being shown (Boeser, *Aeg. Sammlung*, IV, pl. xxi, part of which is given by Vandier, in *Revue d'Égyptologie*, 8 (1951), 203, 205, figs. 3, 4). Not only were there the usual Semites, but we also know at least of Hurrians and Indo-Europeans as well and, as shown on p. 88, there were Hittites who had penetrated as far south as Palestine. The situation was then just what it is today when in north Syria and Mesopotamia Arabs, Turks, Kurds, and Armenians all live there together side by side.

⁵ Mellink, *A Hittite Cemetery at Gordion*, 55, 56.

⁶ *Id.*, op. cit., pl. 23, figs. h-j, and p. 41.

north-central Asia Minor at any rate, the wearing of medallions was a very ancient custom going back to about 2100 B.C.¹

Though so often shown on drawings of Syrians, the medallion was also considered by the Egyptians as a characteristic of the Shekelesh-Teresh, as has already been seen on p. 83, n. 11. Yet the wearing of such things was not absolutely confined to this group, for they are at times worn by others of the Sea-Peoples.² The two men who wear them are recognizable by their kilts though otherwise they are peculiar. In the first place they have their bodies bandaged,³ and then the one whose head is visible wears a cap



FIG. 7

(*Med. Habu*, I, pl. 98 = 125 = our fig. 7a) which, while not identical with, is not unlike one worn by another of the Sea-Raiders (fig. 7b).⁴ Unfortunately, nowhere is their name given, so we cannot tell to which of the tribes they belonged. Both men with the medallion and bandages are bearded in which they resemble the Shekelesh-Teresh.

The bandages are not the armour of the Philistines and Sherden, for they do not conform to the shape of the ribs but are horizontal. In one case at Medinet Habu (I, pl. 100) they are coloured blue, red, and pale blue, and on both tiles⁵ the alternate folds are shown as patterned. These wrappings are just what many of the sons of

¹ Remzi Oğuz Arik, *Les Fouilles d'Alaca Höyük*, 1935, pl. clxxv, 246-53, eight medallions; Hâmit Zübeyr Koşay, *Les Fouilles d'Alaca Höyük*, 1937-9, pl. ccvi, three medallions; Tahsin Özgüç and Mahmut Akok, *Horoztepe*, pl. xiv, fig. 4 and p. 52, where it is said to be a type common in these tombs.

² *Med. Habu*, II, pls. 98 = 125. 99 = 100.

³ The bandages definitely belonged to at least some of the Sea-Peoples for they are shown on two of those glazed tiles from Medinet Habu (Daressy, op. cit., nos. 14. 15) of which no. 14 wears the medallion while no. 15 dresses his hair in the Shekelesh-Teresh manner.

⁴ *Med. Habu*, I, pl. 62, second row, top left, where it looks more like a turban, the ends having been brought round and tied in front. The man wears the tasselled kilt and carries the two spears of the Sea-Peoples, and the *khopesh*-like weapon which has just been mentioned. He accompanies a Shekelesh-Teresh who also carries that weapon and the two spears, and there are several Sherden there as well. Though damaged he does not appear to wear the medallion or perhaps a beard.

⁵ Daressy, loc. cit.

Ramesses III wear.¹ They had been worn by the Shasu of Pa-Kana'n in Sethos I's time 150 years before, one of whom carries the two spears of the Sea-Peoples, but none of them wears the tasselled kilt or carries the round shield.²

The cap or turban worn by these two unusual Sea-People had already appeared in Ramesses II's reign when it was worn by certain Syrians in company with others who wear the Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth.³ Both of these Syrians carry the *khopesh*-like weapon which Ramesses III shows in the hands of the Shekelesh-Teresh (*Med. Habu*, I, pls. 17. 35; II, pl. 62) and again in those of a turban-wearer (II, pl. 62). Actually this was a Hittite weapon, for it is carried by each of the men running in procession at Yazili Kaya near Boghaz Köi,⁴ though, of course, it was very much older in Syria.⁵ Further, the turban was worn by certain of the Hittite allies at Kadesh where the Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth was also worn.⁶ But none of these people have the tasselled kilt or round shield of the Sea-Peoples, though at Beit el-Wāli two of the turban wearers carry their two spears.⁷ The shield that is carried by one of them and also by one of the men with the Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth is the unique one of the Hittites with its concave sides and convex top and bottom.⁸ Such a shield lasted on late in the far north among the ninth-century neo-Hittites at Senjirli (Zincirli) close to the eastern border of Cilicia.⁹

On a number of occasions in the previous paragraphs similarities have been remarked between the Sea-Peoples and certain inhabitants of Syria and some of the Hittites and their allies at Kadesh. This was noted with the weapon like a throwing-stick or *khopesh*, with two forms of head-dress and with the wearing of bandages. At first sight this might seem the mere confusion that has so often been charged against the Egyptian artist. But as a matter of fact there actually was much 'Hittite' influence even as far south as Palestine.¹⁰ Thus, Abraham purchased the Cave of Machpelah from a Hittite (Gen. xxiii), and Esau took two Hittite wives (Gen. xxvi, 34; xxxvi, 1-3). Further than that, Hittites are stated to have dwelt in the mountains (Num. xiii, 29) as late as the time of Joshua, or in other words that of the Nineteenth Dynasty. The Hittite texts also tell us that just before this, in the time of Suppiluliumas (1380-1340 B.C.), there had been a migration of people from the northern or north-eastern part of Asia Minor into the 'land of Egypt', i.e. into Egyptian-held Palestine and Syria.¹¹ It is not

¹ L.D. III, pl. 214 a. b. c.

² Ibid., pl. 126a = Meyer, op. cit., nos. 192. 193. Champollion shows these bandages as being worn at Abu Simbel (*Mons.*, pls. xiv. xviii), but he has supplied this detail himself, for actually they are non-existent, see Wreszinski, *Atlas*, II, 183. 171.

³ Meyer, op. cit., nos. 133. 134.

⁴ See, for instance, Bossert, *Altanatolien*, fig. 543.

⁵ Three were found at Byblos dating to the Twelfth Dynasty, see Montet, *Byblos et l'Égypte*, pls. xcix. c. ci, no. 653, and pp. 173-80.

⁶ Meyer, op. cit., no. 425, turban, first and seventh men; Shekelesh-Teresh head-cloth, fourth and last men.

⁷ Id., op. cit., no. 134, bottom right-hand corner and higher up on the right-hand side.

⁸ Id., op. cit., no. 425, the first and fourth men. It is commonly to be seen carried by Hittites in almost any picture of the Battle of Kadesh, most noticeably perhaps in L.D. III, pls. 157. 165.

⁹ von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, III, pl. xl. The figure has often been republished, for instance, Garstang, *The Land of the Hittites*, pl. lxxv; Bossert, *Altanatolien*, fig. 927.

¹⁰ O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites* (2nd edn.), 59-62.

¹¹ Ibid. 61.

surprising, therefore, that some of these peoples of Palestine and Syria should show resemblances to the Shekelesh-Teresh and other Peoples of the Sea.

But to return to the relationship of the Teresh and Shekelesh. Not only are the two peoples dressed alike, but there can be little doubt that they both reappear as colonizers in the west—the Teresh as the Tyrsenoi-Etruscans in Italy,¹ and the Shekelesh as giving their name to Sicily.² In Sicily the Thapsos Period corresponds roughly to the Mycenaean III A and III B Ages (1425–1230 B.C.) after which time this main site seems to have been abandoned.³ The same state of affairs is to be seen in the numerous little villages of this culture which are scattered along the coast in positions generally not chosen for defence. They suddenly disappear during the thirteenth century, judging from the Mycenaean pottery found in their necropoleis. The people abandoned the coastal plain and took refuge in the least accessible hill-country with an eye to the defensive possibilities.⁴ Thus, at the very time that the Shekelesh and other Sea-Raiders were attacking Egypt, and be it remembered were approaching from the west and had, therefore, got out well westwards, serious raids from the sea were taking place elsewhere in the west; on the east coast of Sicily. Fortunately, we have actual material evidence as to the area whence came the danger. It is provided by the arrival in Sicily of the lugged axe, for a mould for the casting of this type has been found in the VII B city of Troy,⁵ a period which began about 1230 B.C., the very time of the ruin of the Thapsos culture. Moreover, we have a suggestion that it came via Egypt, for at Syracuse, again on the east coast of Sicily, there has been dug up one of the few pre-seventh-century Egyptian objects found in the central and western Mediterranean. It is the remains of a small vase of 22 cm. diameter of grey porphyry bearing, significantly enough, the figure and cartouches of Ramesses II.⁶ It seems, therefore, not unlikely that this had been part of some loot carried off in Egypt by some Shekelesh who finally moved on to Sicily taking his treasure with him. What can all this mean but the invasion of the island by the Shekelesh?

The Teresh-Tyrsenoi clearly came from Lydia, just as it has been shown here that that other member of the -š group, the Ekwesh-Achaean, no doubt came from Miletus in the near neighbourhood. Hence, it becomes probable that the Shekelesh also would have come from that neighbourhood. Indeed, we have the additional evidence of their alliance with the Luka, for these people would have been living close to there. Moreover, the Luka themselves had been specially joined by Ramesses II to yet another member of the -š group, the Kerekesh. There is, thus, much to show that the -š

¹ Wainwright, in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 197–213.

² The similarity of the names Sicily and Shekelesh has regularly been noticed ever since de Rougé, in *Revue archéologique*, 16 (1867), 92, first remarked on it, but it is only recently that archaeology has been able to put substance into the theory.

³ Lord William Taylour, *Mycenaean Pottery in Italy and Adjacent Areas*, 56 and cf. 184.

⁴ L. B. Brea, *Sicily before the Greeks*, 149. This resulted in the Pantalica Period which succeeds the Thapsos one.

⁵ Maxwell-Hyslop, in *Iraq*, 15 (1953), 79. This, of course, is the city of Aeneas, the hero who finally wandered to many countries in the west including Sicily.

⁶ Orsi, in *Monumenti Antichi (Reale Accademia dei Lincei)*, 25 (1918), cols. 605. 606 and fig. 201. He is making an offering to Hathor.

confederacy originated from somewhere in southern Lydia, northern Caria, and all that area.

All this cumulative evidence for a Lydian-Carian origin of the Shekelesh puts out of court the old suggestion of Sagalassos in Pisidia. That was nothing but a guess by Maspero based only on the similarity of the two names.¹ Moreover, Sagalassos and its neighbourhood have recently supplied evidence that such an origin is improbable. Civilization came late to all this part of the sub-continent. Almost without exception everything found there is of Roman Imperial date,² and Sagalassos itself was not founded before the Hellenistic Age.³ It is curious that the names of so many towns of Caria and Lycia ending in *-assos* do not help us, though they are in our very area. They again are much later than the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, though not so late as Sagalassos. They were all founded not before the Middle Iron Age, *c.* 850 B.C., many of them not until well into the classical period.⁴

¹ Maspero, *Études de mythologie et d'archéologie*, III, 196. This is the reprint of an article published in 1875, and reprinted in *Bibliothèque égyptologique*, 7 (1898).

² Bean, in *Anatolian Studies*, 9 (1959), 70.

³ Mellaart, in *AJA* lxii (1958), 27, n. 195.

⁴ Ibid. 22. Mellaart also says here that in the Bronze Age the Carian and Lycian area appears to have been one of the poorest and least civilized in the whole of western Anatolia.

POSTSCRIPT

On page 84 the medallion has been doubtfully taken as the mark distinguishing the Shekelesh from the Teresh. But men wearing the longer Shekelesh head-cloth do not invariably wear a medallion, and the pictures do not show men wearing the shorter head-cloth of the Teresh. Hence it will probably be better to consider the people as Shekelesh only and to read the expression Shekelesh-Teresh (pp. 84 ff.) as simply Shekelesh. As pointed out on page 85 this would be a state of affairs in agreement with other information as to the unimportance of the Teresh in Ramesses III's time.

Page 89: Invaders of the Thapsos villages. Since writing this paragraph I have been informed that the swords from such sites as Thapsos, Cozzo Pantano, Plemmirio, Matrensa and Dessucri are a problem, for they are not quite like the Aegean originals and do not look like direct Aegean imports. If this should really be the case, it would be one more piece of evidence for the invasion of Sicily by the Shekelesh coming from the west coast of Asia Minor.

THE EGYPTIAN MEMNON

By SIR ALAN GARDINER

THE strange phenomenon which brought fame to the Theban colossus known as the Vocal Memnon has tended to throw into the shade another associated problem of lesser, but yet considerable, interest. How came the Greek and Roman tourists who visited this broken-down statue to identify it with the hero whom the *Odyssey* presents as the slayer of Nestor's son Antilochus and as himself slain by Achilles, and to what date ought that identification to be ascribed? To these questions the well-documented articles in the great encyclopedias of Roscher and Pauly-Wissowa give only hesitant answers. More precise, but unfortunately contestable, assertions will be found in the essay with which that great scholar A.-J. Letronne introduced his well-known commentary on the inscriptions carved upon the statue.¹ That Letronne's theories still exert an influence upon the minds of scholars is evident from the opening chapter of a monograph by A. Bataille which is mainly devoted to the activities of the priestly persons and undertakers employed in the Theban necropolis.² In venturing to express dissentient views I would ask my readers to remember that the celebrated French Hellenist's work belongs to the very earliest stage of Egyptological studies, indeed to a time when Champollion's decipherment was barely a decade old. Since that time we have come to rely upon the papyri and ostraca much more than upon the mostly very confused assertions of obscure classical or post-classical authors. For my present purpose it will be unnecessary to discuss much that those authors have to tell about the Memnon of Greek legends; for instance, next to nothing will be said here about his connexions with Susa or about the ambiguities of the ethnic term 'Ethiopians'. Even within my own restricted field of inquiry there is much that must remain conjectural, but at least I may hope to shed some light on certain details about which erroneous opinions are still current.

It will be found useful to take the topographical expression τὰ Μεμνόνεια as our starting-point. In Ptolemaic times this was purely a Greek term, the demotic papyri and ostraca giving *Dimy* (Coptic ⲃⲓⲙⲓ) as equivalent or even as a direct translation;³ in one bilingual text the demotic scribe has found it sufficient to render 'the West of Thebes'.⁴ From a mass of evidence it is clear that τὰ Μεμνόνεια embraced the entire necropolis on the left bank, the place where the embalmers carried on their work⁵ and where the humble priests called Pastophori and Choachytes busied themselves with the funerary rites in temples and in tombs.⁶ A papyrus of 112 B.C. records a dispute concerning two houses of which the one was situated ἐν Διὸς πόλει τῇ Μεγάλῃ, while the second was ἐν τοῖς Μεμνονείοις.⁷ There is no need to pursue farther the antithesis

¹ *La Statue vocale de Memnon*, 1833, reprinted in *Œuvres choisies de A.-J. Letronne*, II (Paris, 1881), 1-97.

² *Les Memnonia*, Cairo, 1952.

³ Griffith, *Rylands Papyri*, III, 123, n. 2.

⁴ Wilcken, *UPZ* II, p. 132.

⁵ A. Bataille, *op. cit.* 198 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.* 142 ff.

⁷ *UPZ* II, no. 189 (p. 191).

between the main city on the east side of the Nile, and the Memnonia on the west side. But what then was the origin of the expression here under discussion? One has only to scan the relevant section of Preisigke's dictionary (III. 256 ff.) to find a large number of names all showing the termination *-εῖον*, on the very first page *Ἀμμωνεῖον*, *Ἀνουβιεῖον*, *Ἀντινοεῖον* and no less than eight others.¹ All these names clearly referred to shrines, chapels, or temples devoted to the cult of the deity or personage specified. On this analogy the singular word *Μεμνόνιον* must obviously be explained as referring to a building where the hero called Memnon was in some way commemorated and in point of fact there is excellent authority for such a Memnonium exactly where we should expect to find it. That authority is Strabo, far the most trustworthy of all the classical writers on Egyptian geography. After quoting what Homer has to say about Thebes he continues as follows (XVII, 1, 46):²

And others also say things of this kind, making this city the metropolis of Egypt. Even now traces of its magnitude are pointed out, extending as they do for a distance of eighty stadia in length; and there are several temples, but most of these were mutilated by Cambyses; and now it is only a collection of villages, a part of it being in Arabia,³ where the city is,⁴ and a part on the far side (of the river), where the Memnonium is.⁴ Here there are two colossi, which are near one another and are each made of a single stone; one of them is preserved, but the upper parts of the other, from the seat up, fell when an earthquake took place, so they say (*ὥς φασι*). It is believed that once each day a noise, as of a slight blow, emanates from the part that remains in the throne and the base.

Strabo goes on to tell how he himself, travelling with the Prefect Aelius Gallus and his retinue, heard the noise, but was unable to explain it. After this Strabo adds:

Above the Memnonium (*ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μεμνονίου*) in caves, are tombs of kings, which are stone-hewn, are about forty in number, are marvellously constructed, and are a spectacle worth seeing.

As descriptions of fact the above could hardly be bettered, though there is a final statement about inscriptions on some obelisks among the tombs which must be due to a lapse of memory or confusion of some kind. One is astonished to read Letronne's comments on this whole passage. Among other things he wrote: 'La statue prétendue vocale n'était pas même encore distinguée par un nom particulier; Strabo ignore tout à fait celui (i.e. the name Memnon) qui devint depuis si fameux.'⁵ In other words, Letronne failed to see any connexion between what Strabo had to tell about the broken statue and the immediately preceding mention of the Memnonium, though he ought to have deduced that connexion from the significant link afforded by the word for 'here' (*ἐνταῦθα*).⁶ The recognition that the passage forms one continuous, consecutive whole carries with it two important consequences: first, that Strabo's Theban Memnonium was none other than the great temple of Amenophis III for which the two colossi provided so magnificent a frontage; and second, that Strabo's supposed omission of a name for the northern speaking figure was an illusion on Letronne's part, the name Memnon being present as a constituent element of the word *Μεμνόνιον*. Both consequences require further elaboration.

¹ Also often spelt *-ιον*, and in Latin *-eum*, *-ium*. Jones (see n. 2) *Μεμνόνιον*; Wilcken too proparoxytone.

² I have used the translation by H. L. Jones in the Loeb edition, with but small changes.

³ I.e. the region east of the Nile.

⁴ Jones, 'was'.

⁵ Letronne, *op. cit.* 42.

⁶ Bataille, 12, curiously uses this very word to argue the exact opposite to what is here maintained.

(1) That the sacred edifice referred to by Strabo's expression τὸ Μεμνόνιον—note the definite article—was no mere chapel, but a particular temple of imposing size is shown by the use of the same expression in the paragraph (xvii, 1, 42) devoted by him to the city of Abydos. No one doubts that the Abydene Memnonium was the great temple founded by Sethos I and completed by Ramesses II, the appended description of the adjacent 'well' (κρήνη) clearly referring to the remarkable monument for which some Egyptologists have coined the name 'the Osireion' (see below). A graffito from the actual temple speaks of a Menelaos son of Dikaïos who had arrived at τὸ Μεμνόνειον.¹ Farther on, Strabo weighs the possibility that the famous Labyrinth at Hawwāra might be 'a Memnonium and the work of the same man who built both those in Abydos and those in Thebes; for there are said to be some Memnonia there also'. Here the word Memnonia, in the plural but without the definite article, clearly means royal buildings or palaces of which Memnon was the builder; so too in Diodorus II, 22, 3, where Memnonia in Susa and Egypt are spoken of and qualified as βασιλεία 'palaces'. Now, however, we must return to τὰ Μεμνόνεια of the papyri, and inquire what is the relationship of this expression to τὸ Μεμνόνιον which we found to be the name given to the great Theban temple of Amenophis III. To answer this question we must envisage the physical facts. All along the fringe of the western desert were the ruins of the great funerary temples of the Pharaohs of the New Kingdom. Many of them were doubtless completely buried in the sand, but in others, as shown by their hieroglyphic inscriptions, a priesthood must still have performed their religious functions. Only in such an exceptional case as that of the so-called Ramesseum will the Greek settlers have possessed enough antiquarian interest to have inquired the name of the founder. The Memnonium was different: the sheer size of the colossi made them a landmark which no one could ignore, and it is also possible that there were visible in Ptolemaic times sufficient remains of the temple itself² to warrant its being accorded a pre-eminence above all the neighbouring sanctuaries. What more natural than that it should have secondarily lent its name to the whole range of temples and chapels from Medinet Habu in the south to beyond Dra' Abu 'n-Naga on the north. No one will ever have believed that all of these were built by Memnon, but the importance of the great temple of Amenophis III will have made its Greek name suitable to become a general term firstly for all the neighbouring temples as well as itself, and secondly for the entire region in which they were situated. Perhaps the first more concrete usage may still be seen in the words ἐν ταῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν γινομέναις τοῦ Ἀμμωνος διαβάσεις εἰς τὰ Μεμνόνεια 'in the annual crossings of Amūn to the Memnonia'³ which are found in a papyrus of 117 B.C. and which refer to festivals when the great god of Karnak was carried across the Nile to visit the shrines and burial-places of the illustrious dead.⁴ But possibly even here the term was intended in a purely topographical sense. It would be irrelevant to

¹ P. Perdrizet and G. Lefebvre, *Les Graffites grecs du Memnonion d'Abydos*, no. 563.

² Much more than now remained to be seen in Wilkinson's day; see his *Topography of Thebes*, London, 1833, 31-32.

³ UPZ II, p. 85.

⁴ See Černý in *Bull. Inst. fr.* 27, 182 ff.; Sethe in *Amon und die Acht Urgötter von Hermopolis*, p. 11, n. 1; Schott in his essay entitled *Das schöne Fest vom Wüstentale*, Mainz, 1952.

attempt any further definition of τὰ Μεμνόνεια,¹ but I hope to have made it practically certain that this collective term was ultimately derived from the name given by the Greeks to the Pharaoh of the colossus. It must have taken many years, perhaps even centuries, for this extension of meaning to have come about. I reserve my conjecture on that point for a later page.

(2) It seems then clear that for Strabo, as for the later Greek tourists, the vocal colossus was Memnon, or at least had been an image of Memnon. This, however, is not all; it is evident that he recognized an etymological relationship between the word Μεμνόνιον (Memnonium) and the personal name Μέμνων. In a passage translated above he weighs the possibility that the Labyrinth at Hawwâra might be a Memnonium like the Memnonia at Abydos and Thebes and reveals the fact that he thought of a Memnonium as a temple built by Memnon, meaning of course by this name the hero about whom his native folk-lore had so much to tell him. Letronne was of a very different opinion, as is shown by the headings of the first two sections of his argument; these read as follows:²

§1. Le Colosse n'a jamais été pour les Égyptiens que celui d'Amenophis; il n'a été celui de Memnon que pour les Grecs et les Romains.

§2. Que la dénomination de palais ou quartier Memnonien est égyptienne, et n'a primitivement aucun rapport avec Memnon.

Seduced by the authority of Letronne, the earliest Egyptologists sought in the hieroglyphs for a word which might be the origin of the Greek Μεμνόνιον and needless to say did not find one.³ Among other objections to the existence of such a similar-sounding Egyptian word is the fact that it would have to be applicable, not to great temples generally, but only to a restricted few among them, namely, to those on the west bank at Thebes. It is deplorable that some modern scholars should still be toying with the thought of such a phantom word, and ignoring the plain etymology to which the termination -ειον points. It is all the more astonishing that Letronne and his contemporaries should have denied that etymology to Μεμνόνιον, since they did not hesitate to use the names Amenophium⁴ and Ramesseum⁵ where the terminations -ium and -eum are the Latin equivalents of the Greek -ειον, -ιον. It has not, I fear, been realized that those names are purely artificial inventions of the early nineteenth century and have no ancient authority behind them at all.⁶ Even Osireion is very poorly attested and apparently was never applied to the remarkable building at Abydos which has

¹ See, particularly, E. Otto, *Topographie des thebanischen Gaus*, in H. Kees, *Untersuchungen*, Berlin, 1952, 77-79.

² Letronne, op. cit. II, 598.



³ Ibid. 57; modern attempts, Bataille, op. cit. 6. This seems the proper place to mention an argument based by Peyron, with Letronne's strong approval, on the expression οἱ παστοφόροι Ἀμενώφιος τοῦ ἐν τοῖς Μεμνοείοις. But this argument assumes that Ἀμενώφιος here is the name of the king, whereas Wilcken, translating *Pastophoren des Amon von Opet*, takes the proper name to refer to a cult in the Memnonia, i.e. on the West of Thebes, of the minor deity Amūn of Opē (Luxor), see *UPZ* II, pp. 6, 39, 194 ff.

⁴ Besides Letronne, op. cit. 53, see, for example, A. Peyron, *Papyri graeci*, II (Turin, 1827), 38.

⁵ Champollion, *Lettres écrites d'Égypte et de Nubie* (Paris, 1833), 261; so too Letronne, op. cit. 53, 55.

⁶ Bataille (p. 121) has enriched us with Osymandyeion. Bucheum is another suspect name, though it perhaps occurs misspelt on a Greek mummy ticket translated by Hunt in Mond, *The Bucheum*, II, 27.

Letronne's claim that for the Egyptians the colossus was only Amenophis and for the Greeks and Romans only Memnon is certainly much exaggerated. Living side by side the native and the alien population cannot have failed to know a good deal about each other's modes of expression. The Egyptians, or rather the more educated among them, will have indignantly repudiated the contention that their colossus portrayed a warrior who was either an Asiatic from Susa or an Ethiopian from Meroë; but they doubtless knew that the Greeks called it by a name recalling such an origin. The Greeks and Romans, for their part, will have heard from the priests and other learned men that the statue was the monument of an old Egyptian king whose name, as pronounced by themselves, had assumed the forms Amenophis or Amenoth. Thus the poetess Julia Balbilla who heard the voice of the colossus in the company of the Empress Sabina in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 130), had no doubt whatever that she had been listening to the Memnon whose father was Tithonus and whose mother was Eös; but in addressing him in that role she added the words 'or Amenōth, the Egyptian king, as those priests say who are acquainted with the old myths'.¹ The wrangle over the two names was evidently due to nationalistic rivalry. Pausanias, who visited Thebes only a little later, wrote (I, 42, 3): '... a seated image which gives out a sound. Most people name it Memnon, for they say that Memnon marched from Ethiopia to Egypt and onwards as far as Susa. The Thebans, however, say that the image represents, not Memnon, but a native called Phamenoth.'

The dispute between the partisans of Memnon and the partisans of Amenophis is disposed of by a fact of which Letronne in his generation could not have been fully aware. All but the oldest Pharaohs had two names,² a Prenomen and a Nomen, each of them habitually inscribed in a cartouche. The hieroglyphs on the back of the vocal statue give  *Nb-mrt-Rr* as the Prenomen of its owner and  *Imnḥtp ḥkꜣ Wꜣst*, i.e. 'Amenophis prince of Thebes' as his Nomen.³ Exactly how the Prenomen was pronounced in the sixth century before our era is unknown, but if the pronunciation roughly approximated to the Nimmuria or Mimmuria which was used for Amenophis III in the el-'Amarna letters then this would sound to the ear of a Greek nearly enough like the name of his own hero Memnon for him to jump at the identification. Both parties would thus be right; the dedicator of the statue would be both Amenophis and Memnon. This is undoubtedly the correct answer to the first of the two questions with which we started, but to classical scholars and perhaps even to some Egyptologists this solution might seem to be too venturesome to be accepted without closer discussion. To begin with, were the Egyptians in the habit of referring to their kings by their Prenomens? We have seen that the Mitanni correspondents of Amenophis III did so, but was this habitual among the learned Egyptian scribes of later times as well? Such a custom seems highly probable. The Prenomen was much more precise than the Nomen.

² In point of fact they had other names as well, but these are of considerably less importance.

² In point of fact they had other names as well, but these are of considerably less importance.

³ Gauthier, *Livre des rois*, II, 316, nos. XXVII, XXVIII. See, too, Porter-Moss, *Top. Bibl.* II, 166.

There is, however, another piece of evidence which renders the derivation of the Greek name Memnon from the Prenomen of Amenophis III practically inevitable. In Roman times the visits of Greek-speaking tourists to the tombs of the Kings at Thebes were almost as popular as visits to the Vocal Memnon himself. Many of the visitors wrote their names upon the walls, often expressing their admiration of what they had seen. J. Baillet collected and published¹ more than 2,000 of these graffiti, half of them coming from Tomb 9, that of the Twentieth-Dynasty king Ramesses VI. This was certainly the most beautiful of those then accessible, and that might well be the reason why visitors flocked to see it. But there was another reason as well, namely, because it was considered to be the tomb of Memnon himself. This belief comes to expression only in a few of the inscriptions, they being as a rule very laconic. There can, however, be no mistake about the matter, since it is only in the tomb of Ramesses VI that Memnon is directly mentioned, though in one or two other places the writer, speaking of the tombs collectively, describes them as Memnonian (*Μεμνόνειας*).² The most explicit reference to Memnon is in the graffito of one Bēsas, who says that 'he had seen the marvels of the tombs, but this one, the splendid syrinx of Memnon, was that which he most admired.'³ But why was Tomb 9 ascribed to Memnon? Let Baillet himself give the answer; he wrote, 'Les Grecs et les Romains l'attribuait au légendaire Memnon, trompés par ce fait que Ramses VI et Amenophis III portaient le même prénom Nibmarē.' This was a true answer, and it is clear that to Baillet belongs the priority for one of the main conclusions of my article, though he did not argue out the case in detail, as I have found it desirable to do.⁴

It remains to inquire the date at which the colossus first disclosed its identity with Memnon. This question hangs closely together with that as to when it first exhibited its vocal attainments, and the two will have to be discussed together. It must now be evident that the association of Memnon with particular temples at Thebes and Abydos depended upon the names of their builders as reported by the Egyptians, and that no mythological reason need be sought. Nevertheless, such a reason might have been operative as well; some of the visitors appear to have imagined that the sound emanating from the vocal colossus was the voice of Memnon complaining to his mother Eōs ('Dawn') about the indignity done to him, the more plausibly since the mysterious noise was heard shortly before the break of day.⁵ It is not unlikely, however, that the recognition of the temple of Amenophis III as a Memnonium long antedated the catastrophe which befel one of the great images, so that to some extent my two questions may be regarded as independent of one another. We saw that the topographical expression *τὰ Μεμνόνεια* was attested as early as the second century B.C. But it might have

¹ J. Baillet, *Inscriptions grecques et latines des tombeaux des rois ou syringes*, Cairo, 1926.

² Ibid., nos. 604 bis. 999. 1278.

³ Ibid., no. 1277. Somewhat similarly, nos. 1283. 1394. 1732. 1762. According to Letronne II. 223 Salt had found in the tombs a graffito that has not been rediscovered beginning with the words *τὸ προσκύνημα Μέμνονος σὺν . . . παρὰ Ἀμενώθῃ*.

⁴ Kees in Pauly-Wissowa (xv, 652) likewise quotes the Prenomen of Ramesses VI. Bataille (p. 6) follows suit (with a bad misstatement), but fails to make any use of Baillet's observation.

⁵ See the evidence of the inscriptions quoted by R. Holland in Roscher's *Encyclopedia*, 2664, bottom.

gained currency far earlier. I am personally inclined to believe that the intrusion of Memnon on the Egyptian scene dates from the days of the first Greek settlers. It was then that those travellers in a still unfamiliar land were most busy discovering there homonymous counterparts to their own localities, deities, and legendary persons. This, however, is a mere guess, and it seems desirable to consider whether any light is thrown upon the matter by the history of the strangely talkative headless figure.

No one but the most hardened sceptic could doubt that some sort of sound was really heard issuing from the broken statue. The fact is attested by some sixty Greek and forty Latin inscriptions¹ carved on the legs and on the pedestal, and there were doubtless hundreds of persons who refrained from leaving any written testimony. A gap of ninety years separates the earliest inscription in A.D. 65 from Strabo's visit. It seems to be generally agreed that the noise which so many tourists heard was the result of the disastrous mutilation which had befallen the northern colossus.² When the damage was ultimately repaired, probably by Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211), the sound was heard no more. It was a plausible conjecture on the part of Strabo's contemporaries that the loss of all portions above the waist had been caused by an earthquake. Letronne, recalling Eusebius's report of an earthquake that had occurred in 27 B.C., ventured the suggestion that this was the very earthquake which had brought about the ruin.³ In that case Strabo would have been one of the first persons who ever heard the mysterious sound. Letronne, however, overlooked the words 'so they say' (*ὡς φασι*) with which Strabo reported the conjecture that had been voiced to him; those words clearly imply that this was merely a traditional explanation and that the earthquake in question had not taken place within living memory. Letronne, however, was not unwilling, as an alternative, to place the first manifestation of the miraculous voice a little farther back, namely, within the forty years separating the voyage of Diodorus from that of Strabo.⁴ Farther than that Letronne was not prepared to go, the reason given by him being that it was unthinkable that Diodorus and Herodotus, if they had known about the sound, should not have mentioned it.⁵ This argument *ex silentio* is, however, clearly fallacious: the sphinx, no less of a marvel, had been ignored by all writers before Pliny, and if Diodorus found no space to speak of the wonder-working colossus, Strabo in his turn had completely neglected the superb Ramesseum, the sculptures of which were described at such length by his only slightly earlier predecessor. Is there then no evidence to indicate the date at which the northern colossus received its so loudly resented mutilation? Two more possibilities must be mentioned, but only to be rejected. In Manetho as presented in the abbreviated versions of Africanus and Eusebius there are added to the name of Amenophis, the eighth king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, i.e. Amenophis III, the words 'considered to be Memnon and a talking stone' (*ὁ Μέμνων εἶναι νομιζόμενος καὶ φθεγγόμενος λίθος*). If these words had stood in the original Manetho, the damage done to the statue, as well as the resultant noise, would have gone back as far as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. But Letronne rightly points out⁶ that no such statement is to be found in the account of the Eighteenth Dynasty given by Josephus, an account

¹ Bataille, *op. cit.* 154.

² *Ibid.* 160 f.

³ Letronne, *op. cit.* II. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.* 41.

⁵ *Ibid.* 38-41.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

wherein the Jewish historian claims to be quoting Manetho's own words. The statement may, therefore, well be a later addition, and in this incertitude cannot be used as evidence of date. Lastly, the accusation found a number of times in the inscriptions of the statue that the damage done to it had been due to the malice of Cambyses¹ is completely unworthy of credence; that the Persian invader was guilty of acts of that kind was an often repeated charge,² and as may be seen from the passage of Strabo translated on p. 92, was one brought in connexion with several Theban temples, though the statue of Memnon is not mentioned in the same connexion. No deduction can be based on this hackneyed slander except that the persons who repeated it were convinced that the injury done to the colossus was done a very long time ago.

To sum up, neither of the two questions which we put to ourselves can be given a positive answer. The date at which some imaginative Greek first dared to identify the subject of the damaged colossus with his own fabled Memnon so renowned for his beauty can only be insecurely guessed and equally uncertain is the date when that same colossus suffered the losses inadequately compensated for by the gift of speech.

¹ Roscher, 2664.

² G. Posener, *La Première Domination perse en Égypte*, 171-5; also my own *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 364-5.

THE ALLEGED SEMITIC ORIGINAL OF THE WISDOM OF AMENEMOPE

By RONALD J. WILLIAMS

THE manuscript containing the text of the *Wisdom of Amenemope* found its way to the British Museum in 1888, but its contents remained unknown until E. A. W. Budge published it in 1922. In so doing, he pointed out a striking similarity to part of the Hebrew Book of Proverbs.¹ In a volume published soon after, he raised the question of the possibility of Asiatic influence on the Egyptian work.² In the same year, Adolf Erman claimed that Prov. xxii, 17-xxiii, 14 were based directly on *Amenemope*.³ His view has been followed by the majority of scholars since. However, D. C. Simpson⁴ and W. O. E. Oesterley⁵ each recognized the possibility of a common Semitic source for both works. The fiercest attack on Erman's thesis came from R. O. Kevin,⁶ who attempted to make *Amenemope* dependent on Proverbs. His work, however, did not meet with acceptance, since his superficial knowledge of Egyptian rendered his arguments valueless.

The complacency of Old Testament scholars in the accepted view of the priority of *Amenemope* was rudely shattered in 1957 when Étienne Drioton published a paper in the Robert *Festschrift*,⁷ for in it he once again championed a common Semitic source. Because of his eminence as an Egyptologist, it behoves us to examine his arguments with care.

F. Ll. Griffith, in his remarks on the text in 1926, noted that it contains many scribal errors and swarms with rare expressions and unusual constructions.⁸ Drioton goes far beyond this in saying that the work, 'puisqu'elle est si étrange et si maladroite du double point de vue du vocabulaire et de la syntaxe égyptiennes, pourrait bien ne pas

¹ E. A. W. Budge, 'The Precepts of Life by Amen-em-Apt, the Son of Ka-nekht', in *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à la mémoire de Jean-François Champollion* (Paris, 1922), 431-46; also his *Facsimiles of Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum*, 2nd series, 9-18, 41-51; pls. i-xiv.

² E. A. W. Budge, *The Teaching of Amen-em-Apt, Son of Kanekht*, 103.

³ A. Erman, 'Eine ägyptische Quelle der "Sprüche Salomos"', *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl. 15 (1924), 86-93.

⁴ D. C. Simpson, 'The Hebrew Book of Proverbs and the Teaching of Amenophis', *JEA* 12 (1926), 232.

⁵ W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament in the Light of the Newly Discovered Teaching of Amen-em-ope*, 105.

⁶ R. O. Kevin, 'The Wisdom of Amen-em-Apt and its Possible Dependence upon the Hebrew Book of Proverbs', *JSOR* 14 (1930), 115-57.

⁷ É. Drioton, 'Sur la Sagesse d'Aménémopé', in H. Cazelles, ed., *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* (Paris, 1957), 254-80. This was soon followed by a second article, 'Le Livre des Proverbes et la Sagesse d'Aménémopé', in J. Coppens, A. Descamps, É. Massaux, eds., *Sacra Pagina. Miscellanea biblica congressus internationalis Catholici de re biblica [Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium, xii]* (Paris/Gembloux, 1959), 1, 229-41.

⁸ F. Ll. Griffith, 'The Teaching of Amenophis the Son of Kanakht. Papyrus B.M. 10474', *JEA* 12 (1926), 191-231.

avoir été composée en égyptien, mais n'être que la traduction malhabile, parce que trop mot à mot, d'un texte en langue étrangère.¹ In this he certainly overstates the lexical and syntactical peculiarities. He concludes his study with the comment that this work, though written in Egyptian, 'parle hébreu', and is a rather maladroit word-for-word translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original.² The scribe Senu was admittedly careless, but such difficulties in the text are by no means unexpected; we need only think of the *Maxims of Ptahhotpe*, a work notoriously bristling with difficulties, even though we possess three manuscripts, one writing tablet, and two ostraca, whereas for *Amenemope* only one manuscript and a few lines on a writing board and one ostrakon are extant.

Drioton then proceeds to give a detailed demonstration of the Semitic character of the language of *Amenemope*. Some of his examples arise from a misinterpretation of the Egyptian. For instance, in the phrase 'all directions for consorting with magnates' (1/3), he misreads 𓂏𓂛𓂏𓂛 *wrw* as *iw*, and regards the latter as a rendering of the Hebrew אֱלֵדִים 'elders', and as evidence of a social structure which is Asiatic rather than Egyptian. His treatment of line 25/21 is a case of mistranslation: *m-bšh p* *Rc* is not to be rendered 'before the sun', equivalent to Hebrew לפני השמש (Num. xxv, 4; 2 Sam. xii, 12); the whole passage runs:

A youth who curses one who is senior
Is something very painful to (*lit.* before) *Rc*.

There are also four cases where Drioton has mistaken the syntactic construction. In 1/5 he renders *rh hsf wšbt n dd sw* as 'pour que quelqu'un sache rendre réponse à qui l'interpelle', and compares the last two words with Hebrew $\text{אָמַרְוּ$ or מְדַבְּרֵוּ , in which the person addressed may be expressed by a suffix. However, the Egyptian means simply 'him who has spoken (*lit.* said it)', since the object is normally required to be expressed with the verb 𓂏 ; cf. Coptic ⲁⲩⲣⲟⲩⲥ . The second case is found in two passages: 𓂏𓂛𓂏𓂛 (4/18) and 𓂏𓂛𓂏𓂛 (7/8). In both examples he believes that a pronoun is followed by a participle, a construction which he correctly describes as 'totalement étrangère à l'égyptien normal'.³ He renders the passages respectively into Hebrew as $\text{הוא מְבִיא צַעֲקָתוֹ}$ and הִקְמָה אֲמָרִים . What we actually have, of course, is pure Late Egyptian—the ancestor of the Coptic I Present (Erman, *Neuäg. Gramm.*, § 479). The third case occurs in 1/12 where Drioton sees the Semitic construction of a nominal clause dependent on the preposition *r* in the preceding line, failing to recognize that 𓂏𓂛𓂏𓂛 is Old Perfective, to be rendered 'being praised in the mouth of the people'. Finally, Drioton insists that an equational sentence introduced by the anticipatory particle *ir* requires the copula *pw*, and hence regards as of Semitic origin the sentence *ir šri n hb dbr n sš*, 'The scribe's finger is the beak of the Ibis' (17/7). This construction, which occurs in four other passages in *Amenemope*,⁴ is found elsewhere in Late Egyptian, e.g. *ir sš Hwcy šri n Wrnr*, 'The scribe Hui was the son of Urnero' (*Mes*, N 22 f.); *hr ir p nty iw-k r ir-f n-i p-ry-k iyt r nwy-t-i*, 'What you are to do for me is to come and take care of me' (*Two Bros.* 8/3). It continues into Demotic without *ir* (Spiegelberg, *Dem. Gramm.*, § 444).

¹ Op. cit. 257.

² Op. cit. 279.

³ Op. cit. 264.

⁴ 15/17 f., 18/23, 21/5, 24/13 f.

Let us now turn to the idioms and concepts which Drioton thinks to be Semitic rather than Egyptian. The work opens with an expression *mtrw n wdj*, 'testimony for prosperity' (1/2) which Drioton equates with Hebrew עֲדוּת שְׁלוֹם, an expression unknown to Biblical Hebrew. He denies that *mtr* or *wdj* can have these meanings in Egyptian. There are, however, many examples of *mtr* in the sense of 'precept, instruction': *kny iry-i nwy-k mtrw*, 'Then I would carry out your precepts' (*Ani*, 9/14); *sdm nwy-f mtrw*, 'Listen to his precepts' (*Anast.* v, 23/6); *iw bw sdm-k mtr nb*, 'Without your listening to any precept' (*Bologna* 1094, 3/8); *hsty-i ft-t(i) m dd mtrw*, 'My heart is sick from speaking advice' (*Sall.* I, 7/10); *hr p: h: i-ir-w n: mtrw nfrw*, 'Because they forsook the good instructions' (*Tur. Jud. Pap.* 6/1). Furthermore, for *wdj* as 'well-being' issuing from instruction, we may cite the following: *ir·tn nn wdj h·w·tn*, 'You are to do this that your body may prosper' (*Sehtepibre*, 41 f.); *ir·tn nn sh n·tn wdj·tn*, 'You are to do this that it may be well with you and that you may prosper' (*Urk.* iv, 1033/2-4).

A few lines further on we encounter the phrase *r sck:f r mit n cnh*, 'to set him on the path of life' (1/7). According to Drioton, *sck r mit*, 'to set on a path', is without parallel, and he postulates the Hebrew דִּקְךָ which never means 'to direct (a person on the road)', but only 'to direct (one's own way)' (2 Chron. xxvii, 6). However, *Wb.* knows two instances of this idiom (albeit with *hr* rather than *r*): *sck·w hr mt·i*, 'Direct them on my path' (*Mariette, Abydos*, II, 55/33); *imi rdwy-i hr mt·k* ^{sic} *wi hr wt·k*, 'Set my feet in thy path and direct me on thy way' (*Brugsch, Grosse Oase*, 22/21).

Drioton goes on to say that the expression 'ways of life' is found in Egyptian only in the texts in the tomb of Petosiris which show clear Jewish influence.¹ However, not only do we find *wt* used metaphorically with 'god', as in 'Say to the god, who has given you prudence, *imi sn (sic) hr wt·k*, "set him on thy way!"' (*Ani*, 10/11), and *mk rdi·n-i tw hr wt ntr*, 'I have set you on the way of the god' (*Kheti*, [L] 11/1 f.), but we also encounter *wt* used with 'life': *ddy hr wt nt cnhw*, 'He being set on the way of the living' (*Kheti*, 11/4); 'I spread out instruction before you. [I] testify [to you] concerning the way of life (*wt n cnh*)' (*P.Ch. Beatty* iv, vs. 6/3 f.); *hsty·c m sbryt mtyw tisw n wt n cnh*, 'Beginning of the preceptual teaching, sentences for the way of life' (*Instr. of Amennakhte*, 1).

In 1/8 and in three other passages (4/2, 7/10, 8/1) the phrase *hr tp t*, 'upon earth', occurs. Drioton maintains that this phrase is found only in funerary texts to describe survivors, whereas in Hebrew עַל-הָאָרֶץ refers to this world as opposed to Sheol. Various forms of this expression, however, are used in the latter sense from Middle Egyptian times on through Demotic: *hs·t(i) mr·t(i) tp t*, 'Being favoured and loved upon earth' (*CT* II, 326c); *ir ht·k tp t m wd ib·k*, 'Fashion your affairs on earth after the command of your heart' (*P.Harr.* 500, 6/12); *nn hm·n·k m t*, 'There is nought of which thou (Rē) art ignorant on the earth' (*P.Ch. Beatty* iv, rt. 11/1); *sh n ir s(t) hr tp t m hrt·ntr*, 'It goes well with him who does them on earth or in the necropolis' (*Bremner-Rhind*, 28/19 f.); *iw nn ptr st rmt nb nty m p: t r dr·f*, 'Without any man in

¹ It is significant that all the examples of אֶרֶץ חַיִּים (Ps. xvi, 11; Prov. v, 6, xv, 24; pl. Prov. ii, 19; cf. Prov. x, 17) and דֶּרֶךְ חַיִּים (Jer. xxi, 8; Prov. vi, 23) are from later or Wisdom passages in books which reveal Egyptian influence.

the entire land having seen it' (*Horus and Seth*, 13/6); *r bw-ir-s hpr n kṣ gl hr p: t: (n) bnr-f n*, 'Since it does not ever happen to any other food on earth except it' (*Mythus*, 5/7).

The locution *imi cnhwy-k*, 'give ear' (3/9), Drioton describes as unknown to Egyptian but common in Hebrew in the form הָאָזְנוּ . The writer knows of four examples in Late Egyptian texts: *imi msdr-k*, 'Give ear!' (*Anast.* II, 8/5); *imi n-i cnhwy-k nb ntrw*, 'Give me thine ears, O lord of gods' (*P.Harr.* I, 3/3); *imi n-i wd-k cnhwy-k nb-i Pth*, 'Give me thine eye and thine ears, O lord Ptah' (*P.Harr.* I, 56b/1); *di n-i cnhwy-k*, 'Give me thine ears!' (Pleyte and Rossi, *Pap. Turin*, 133/12).

The metaphor *dr n mdy*, 'a gale of speech' (3/15), can be found elsewhere only in 5/13 f.: 'Sleep before speaking; a gale breaks out like a flame in straw.' Drioton compares the Hebrew of Job viii, 2; here, however, the metaphor is not a storm but רוּחַ , 'wind'. The use of the same Egyptian word in a metaphorical sense occurs in the saying *dr-s pw irt-s mṣ-s*, 'Her eye is a (*lit.* her) gale when she looks' (*Ptah.*, 333).

In 4/1 𓂏𓂐𓂑 'storehouse' is used metaphorically as a treasury of spiritual values. This, says Drioton, is without parallel in Egyptian, but is the meaning of אוצר in Isa. xxxiii, 6. Yet it should be noted that in *Merikarē*, 33 a damaged word ending in 𓂏𓂐𓂑 can hardly be read in any other way than *wd*. Sir Alan Gardiner supports this reading, which would mean: 'A knowledgeable man is a storehouse for nobles.'

A third metaphor which Drioton describes as 'un genre de métaphore inconnu à l'égyptien' appears in 3/13: *imi htp-w m hnw n ht-k*, 'Let them (i.e. the sayings) rest in the coffer of your body'. With the word 𓂏𓂐𓂑 Drioton compares the Hebrew expression סְדֵרֵי-בֶטֶן 'the chambers of the body', i.e. the innermost parts.¹ But the same word, written 𓂏𓂐𓂑 , is found in the injunction *hpr pw mi hny n ssw*, 'Become like a coffer of books' (*Instr. of Amennakhte*, 12), and again, mistakenly written 𓂏𓂐𓂑 for 𓂏𓂐𓂑 , in a description of a court official as *hn n nsu hr shrw tswy*, 'coffer of the king containing the counsels of the two lands' (*Urk.* IV, 1015/17).

The sentence *wd hr-k hr tp t:*, 'your body will prosper on earth' (4/2 = 7/10) uses *hr(w)*, 'body', in an impossible way, according to Drioton, who points to the use of בָּשָׂר in Hebrew (where, however, it is unusual and confined to late passages in Ps., Prov., and Eccles.). But Egyptian examples of the same usage can easily be cited: *mi ph-k wi hsw-k wd*, 'According as you reach me, with your body sound' (*Ptah.*, 637); *Hnmw hr swd hsw-f*, 'Khnum made his body prosper' (*Westc.*, 10/14); *hsw wd*, '(Your) body being sound' (*Urk.* IV, 1023/2); *iw hsw-f wd hr m nfrw-k*, 'His body prospers at the sight of thy goodness' (*Bibl. Aeg.* VIII, 25/10 f.); *ir-tn nn wd hsw-tn*, 'You are to do this that your body may prosper' (*Sehtepibre*, 41 f.).

In the sentence 'Do not stretch out your hand to touch an old man' (4/6), the phrase *awi drt* seems to Drioton to be rare and Semitic, and he compares Hebrew יִשְׁלַח (although *awi* does not mean 'to send' as the Hebrew verb does). There are several equivalent idioms in Egyptian, e.g. *dr-f r s*, 'He would stretch out (his) hand against it' (*Ipuwer*, 12/2); *hc-n dwn-n-f drt-f r hn n hrt-r*, 'Thereupon he stretched out his hand to the box of writing materials' (*Neferti*, 15 f.). The expression also occurs with *awi*:

¹ Prov. xviii, 8; xx, 27. 30; xxvi, 22.

mt-k tm isw n-f drt-k r p: kkw, 'And you not stretch out your hand to the food for him' (*Ani*, 8/4); *iw swy n: itw drt-w r-r-w*, 'The thieves having laid their hands on them' (*P.Abbott*, 3/5; cf. 3/6). Drioton insists that this locution requires the preposition *r* in an adversative sense ('against'). But note the following: *chr-n sw-n n-f s: nsu Hr-dd-f cwy-fy chr-n sch-n-f sw*, 'Then the king's son Hardjedef stretched out his hands to him [Djedi] and raised him up' (*Westc.*, 8/1 f.); *swy-i cwy-i ds-i nwh-i n-k st*, 'I stretch out my own arms and tie them up for you' (*Urk.* IV, 612/13 f.).

The one instance cited by Drioton which at first seemed to the writer to suggest Western Asiatic influence in *Amenemope* was the reference to the north wind in the passage 'The north wind has descended that it may end his hour' (4/14). Here it is destructive rather than cool, refreshing, and beneficent as regularly in Egyptian texts. Even this unusual concept, however, is attested earlier, for in *Lebensmüde*, 72 the peasant, 'having seen the coming of the darkness of a north wind, keeps watch in the boat.' It should be noted that $\neg \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$ is also a word for 'flood' (*Wb.* II, 122, 15 f.).

Another un-Egyptian expression, according to Drioton, is *p: kry hy*, 'the thunder is loud' (4/16). Again Drioton sees this use of *hy*, 'high', as unique, and compares Hebrew רָם in such phrases as בִּיד רָמָה . Yet not only is the synonym *k:* used of the voice, e.g. *m k: hrw-k*, 'Do not raise your voice' (*Peas.*, B1, 26), but it also occurs with the same word for storm: *mi htp pt r-s: d^r k:*, 'As when the sky is peaceful after a high storm' (*Peas.*, B1, 244 f.); *d^r k: m itrw*, 'A high storm in the river' (*Urk.* I, 183/5).

One of the most typically Egyptian concepts is that of the $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$, 'the silent man', which can be traced back as early as *Ptahhotpe* and the *Instructions for Kagemni*. Contrasted with this is the term *trw*, 'the hot-head' (*Ipuwer*, 5/3; *P.Ram.* I, B iii 7), expanded to *t: ib* (*Ptah.*, 378), *t: ht* (*Ptah.*, 352; contrasted with *kb ht* in 323) and *t: r* (*Amenemope*, 5/10, 12/16). Note also the expression 'to answer a speech heatedly (*m nsr*)' in *Ptah.*, 376. Drioton objects that the word $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$ *šmm* in 4/17, usually rendered 'passionate', is a strange one in Egyptian, and can best be explained as an attempt to render a Semitic term such as רָם , 'boiling, insolent'. Yet this same word, ungeminated, is found in the passage 'It (i.e. the well) is open to the silent one; the silent one came and found the well. O you passionate one (*p: šm*), you are . . .' (*Sall.* I, 8/6).

The injunction *h^r sw cwy p: ntr*, 'leave him in the hands of the god' (5/4), in the words of Drioton, 'n'est conforme ni à la mentalité, ni à la phraséologie courantes de l'Égypte'. He is troubled, first of all, by the use of *h^r* in the sense of Hebrew אָבַד 'abandon'. Yet there are many examples of this use: *bw rh-i h^r-f n c-f*, 'I cannot leave him to his fate' (*Anast.* IV, 13/7); *mnw h^r n c-sn*, 'Fortresses are left to themselves' (*Israel Stela*, 23); *bw hpr (n) s iw-f h^r c-f*, 'It does not happen to a man that he is left to himself' (*Ani*, 10/8). Even the reference to the 'hands of god' which Drioton believes to be Hebraic (although this use of נָתַן in Ps. xxxi, 6 is unique) is found on an ostrakon from the time of Ramesses II: *nn sf mi p: hrw hr cwy ntr*, 'Is not(?) yesterday like today upon the hands of god?' (*O. Petr.* II, rt. 1).

The advice in 7/9, *i-mh tw n gr*, is rendered by Drioton as 'fais-toi silencieux', since he sees it as a literal translation of Hebrew לִשְׁכֹּחַ . The latter, however, always

¹ MS. $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$ for $\text{𓂏} \text{𓂏}$.

means 'take someone to become something', never 'take oneself'. We must regard *n* as the common late writing of *m* and render 'Lay hold on (i.e. cleave to) the silent man'. There are other clear examples of this idiom: *mḥ·tn m nry·i wdḥw*, 'You laid hold of (i.e. adhered to) my commands' (P.Harr. I, 79/4); *mḥ·n·i m tp·rd n ḥry·tp*, 'I have laid hold on the regulation of the chief' (Urk. IV, 530/4); *i·mḥ tw m wd·k*, 'Lay hold on your command' (Pleyte and Rossi, *Pap.Turin*, 73/6).

The word *tš*, 'boundary' (7/15; also 7/12, 8/12, &c.), always refers to national borders and does not have the wider range of meaning of Hebrew גְּבול, in Drioton's view. In reply to this we may cite the following: *ir sprty nb nty r dd mnmn tš·n*, 'As for any petitioner who will say, "Our boundary is violated"' (Urk. IV, 1111/9 f.); *m ir h(s)d ky ḥr tš·f*, 'Do not encroach on another in respect of his boundary!' (P.Ch. Beatty IV, vs. 1/1).

Another word which Drioton regards as being used in *Amenemope* with a wider usage than is normal in Egyptian is *pr*, 'house', in the sense of 'family, household' (8/5), a common meaning of Hebrew בית. But from earliest times we find the word *pr* so used. In addition to the idiom *grg pr*, 'establish a household' (*Hardjedef*, ODM 1206/4; *Ptah.*, 191, 197 (L2), 325, 383; *Cairo Bowl*, 6), we may mention the Old Kingdom example *prw itw tw·w m dd·k pr s· sp 2*, 'The paternal estates (lit. houses of fathers) are to be sustained; when you said, "Son's house and then son's house"' (*Cairo Linen Text*, 12). Especially noteworthy is the O.K. *Cairo Bowl* spelling of the word with the determinatives $\frac{1}{2}$, frequent also in the M.K.¹

Drioton states that the phrase *ḥr ḥsty* in the sentence *m ir ḥr n·k ḥsty·k m rwy*, 'Do not set your mind on externals' (9/12), is without parallel in Egyptian, and compares Hebrew לֵב לַיִם (Isa. xli, 22; Ezek. xlii, 5). Although it is true that no other example of the idiom with the verb *ḥr* is known to the writer, there are several with the synonym *rdi*: *m rdi ib·k m·s·f*, 'Do not trouble yourself about (lit. set your heart after) him' (*Merikare*, 97); *dd·k ib·k m·s· sšw*, 'You should set your mind in pursuit of writing' (*Kheti*, 4/2); *m rdi ib·k n ibw*, 'Do not set your mind on pleasures' (Anast. III, 3/10); *di ib·f n sbryt*, 'Set his mind on the instruction' (*Bibl. Aeg.* VIII, 5/5 f.); *m di ḥsty·k m·s·i*, 'Do not be anxious about me' (Anast. v, 13/1); *m dy ḥsty·t² m·s·w*, 'Do not be anxious about them' (Bologna 1094, 8/10).

In the injunction 'Do not discover the will of god for yourself' (21/15), the word *gmi*, 'find', in the sense of 'acquire, appropriate', is considered unique by Drioton, and an imitation of Hebrew אָצַק (Num. xxxi, 50; Judges v, 30). Compare, however, the following: *št· m ḥr·i gmt inm·s*, 'It was difficult, it seemed to me, to acquire the (right) skin (i.e. colour) for it' (*Sinai*, 90, 6); 'Lo! as for him who slept a bachelor through poverty, *gm·f špsšw tm·n·f m·s* he acquires riches which he never saw (before)' (*Ipuwer*, 7/14-8/1).

Finally, Drioton draws attention to the fact that the word *ršg* (7/17; 6/14; 18/12, 15) is Semitic רָשָׁע. This loanword is not confined to *Amenemope*, however, but occurs

¹ E.g. $\frac{1}{2}$, *Heḳanakhṭe Papers*, I, vs. 19; II, 2, vs. 6. I am indebted for these references to Mr. T. G. H. James who is publishing the letters of Heḳanakhṭe.

² Manuscript has $\frac{1}{2}$ in error for $\frac{1}{2}$.

also in P.Harr. I, 3/9 and *Med. Habu*, 108/4. It should be further noted that other Semitic loanwords appearing in our text likewise are found in texts of the New Kingdom: *it* = 𐤓𐤕 (15/3, 18/2) in Anast. I, 11/2, 18/8, 21/5; Anast. V, 20/4; *Kuban*, 15; *ktm* = 𐤏𐤕𐤓 (18/12) in *Med. Habu*, 107/15; P.Harr. I, 5/12, 6/3; *mdkt* = Akkadian *maššiqtu* (26/11) in *Pap. Turin*, 68/2, 10, 103/2, 20. The presence of numerous Semitic loanwords in Egyptian texts of this period is evidence of extensive cultural contact, not of translation from Semitic originals.

We have now passed in review all the significant arguments of Drioton, and though in most cases only a selection of possible Egyptian examples has been adduced, it must be admitted that his thesis of translation from Hebrew or Aramaic has little to recommend it. Moreover, the fact that paronomasia occurs at least three times in *Amenemope*, involving words which are not amenable to word-plays in Semitic, is strong support for an original Egyptian text. The relevant passages are the following: 'The ship of the covetous is left in the mud-flats, while the boat of the silent man sails' (*msr*, a pun on *msw*, 'breeze', suggesting 'sails with a favourable breeze') (10/10 f.); 'It is sealed with his finger' (*dbt*, a pun on *dbt*, 'seal') (19/21); 'Poverty is not made for a man when he says what is pleasant, nor(?) riches when his utterance is straw' (*dhry*, a pun on *dhry*, 'be bitter') (25/12 f.).

The more one studies the language of *Amenemope*, the more aware does one become of its similarity to that of the *Wisdom of Ani* which was probably produced in the latter half of the Eighteenth Dynasty. The problem of the date of *Amenemope* is notoriously difficult. The dates ascribed to the manuscript have ranged from the Twentieth to the Twenty-sixth Dynasty.¹ A copy of part of the text is preserved on a writing tablet in Turin dated by Gardiner to the end of the Twentieth Dynasty,² but regarded by Griffith as later.³ However, a broken and unpublished ostrakon in the Cairo Museum containing portions of 3/8-4/10 must be dated to the late Twenty-first Dynasty according to Černý. Since its use as a school text indicates that it had been current for some time, we may well regard the work as originating as early as the Nineteenth Dynasty. Drioton's reference to the Jewish colonies at Elephantine and Aswân during the Persian period as a possible source for the original Semitic work thus loses its cogency.

¹ Budge first suggested the Twenty-second Dynasty (*Precepts of Life*, 431), but subsequently preferred the Twentieth or Twenty-first Dynasty (*Teaching of Amen-em-Apt*, 94). Spiegelberg agreed with a dating in the Twenty-second Dynasty (*OLZ* 27 (1924), 185). Erman argued for the beginning of the first millennium B.C. (*Sitzb. d. pr. Ak. d. Wiss.* xv (1924), 86). Griffith, after advocating the Twenty-sixth Dynasty (*JEA* 9 (1923), 208), later extended this to a date between the Twenty-fifth Dynasty and the reign of Darius (*JEA* 12 (1926), 226).

² As quoted by Griffith, *JEA* 12 (1926), 193.

³ *Ibid.* 193, 226.

NOTES ON PTOLEMAIC CHRONOLOGY

By T. C. SKEAT

II. 'THE TWELFTH YEAR WHICH IS ALSO THE FIRST':
THE INVASION OF EGYPT BY ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

IN *Chronique d'Égypte*, 27, no. 54 (1952), 396-403, M. Bikerman has set out, with his usual clarity, some of the historical revisions necessitated by the publication of P.Ryl. 583, a contract from Philadelphia in the Faiyūm dated 9 Phaophi (November 12, 170 B.C.) in the first year of the joint reign of Ptolemy (i.e. Ptolemy VI Philometor), Ptolemy the Brother (Ptolemy VII, the later Euergetes II), and Cleopatra the Sister (Cleopatra II). In particular, Bikerman emphasized how history has been falsified by propaganda which, for example, attempted to legitimize Euergetes' seizure of power in opposition to his brother, and how this falsification has hitherto obscured the progress of events: 'le terrain déblayé', he concludes, 'il sera possible un jour, à l'aide de documents nouveaux, ou de meilleures conjectures, de préciser la chronologie de cette guerre' (i.e. the Sixth Syrian War). It is hoped that the papyrus here published for the first time, and the inferences drawn from it, may constitute a step in that direction.

Until the appearance of P.Ryl. 583 it had been commonly believed that the joint reign of the three children of Ptolemy Epiphanes was the direct outcome, and indeed the formal expression, of the reconciliation between Philometor and Euergetes which took place after Antiochus had withdrawn from Egypt on the conclusion of his first invasion. The researches of W. Otto, in his magisterial *Zur Geschichte der Zeit des 6. Ptolemäers*, Abh. Bayer. Akad., Phil.-hist. Abt., N.F. 11 (1934), appeared at the time to have fixed the date of the first invasion of Antiochus securely in the year 169. Yet we are now faced with a document which, if we maintain the accepted view of the sequence of events, implies that the invasion, and Antiochus' subsequent withdrawal, took place *earlier* than November 12, 170 B.C. This supposition involves great chronological difficulties. But in fact, as Bikerman first pointed out, there is no compulsive reason why the establishment of the joint régime should have followed on the evacuation of Egypt by Antiochus; on the contrary, it may even have taken place before the outbreak of war.

The question has been more recently considered by Prof. Hans Volkmann in his invaluable article *Ptolemaios* in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, XXIII, 2 (1959), coll. 1705-8. He begins, indeed, by appearing to declare his adhesion to the hitherto accepted explanation of the genesis of the joint reign: 'Die in der Geschichte der Ptolemaier einzigartige Samtregierung der drei Geschwister ist wohl nur durch den Angriff des Antiochos IV auf Ägypten zu erklären' (col. 1705); but he goes on to stress the chronological difficulties of this view, which if correct virtually necessitates a return to the theory of three invasions of Egypt by Antiochus, in 170, 169, and 168 B.C.

He then gives what he himself admits is no more than a tentative reconstruction of events, in the course of which he suggests, following Bikerman, that the proclamation of the joint reign preceded the outbreak of war, and was motivated by the need to consolidate the régime for the attack on Antiochus planned by the eunuchs Eulaios and Lenaïos, into whose unworthy hands the government of the country had fallen.

I am inclined to think that Bikerman was right in suggesting, and Volkmann in concluding, that the proclamation of the joint régime preceded the outbreak of hostilities. On the other hand, it then appears at first sight to be less readily explicable. After Antiochus' withdrawal in 169 B.C. the still critical position of the Ptolemaic dynasty might well have prompted desperate and extraordinary measures. But why should such an unparalleled step have been taken in time of peace? And why, in any case, was it necessary, not merely to extend the sovereignty to Euergetes and Cleopatra, but to inaugurate a new series of regnal years?

The answer, I suggest, lay in the political situation. The conquest of Syria has been the dream of rulers of Egypt throughout the ages. It dominated the Pharaohs, from Tuthmosis III in the Eighteenth Dynasty to Teos in the Thirtieth Dynasty, and the Ptolemies not merely inherited the idea, but realized it and successfully maintained it for over a century, until expelled by Antiochus III in 201–200 B.C. The declared aim of Eulaios and Lenaïos was the recovery of Syria, and there was even bombastic talk of conquering the entire Seleucid empire; and I suggest, as a working hypothesis, that the 'new year' which brought in the joint reign was intended to signalize the prospective Ptolemaic domination over Asia.

We can attempt to test this theory by examining the results. P.Ryl. 583 is the only known example of a date in year one of the joint reign, which suggests that it was of very short duration—possibly only a few weeks. The joint reign must have been proclaimed on some date *after* 1 Thoth = October 5, 170 B.C., and P.Ryl. 583, of November 12, 170 B.C., cannot therefore be much more than a month later. On the other hand, all other papyri which I can identify as having been written in the Egyptian year 170–169 B.C. are dated, not by the joint reign, but in the twelfth year of Philometor. They are:

- P.Teb. 909. 6 Hathyr = December 9, 170.
- P.Paris. Bibl. nat. 236. 9 Choiak = January 11, 169.
- P.Mich. 173. *After* 5 Mecheir = *after* March 7, 169.
- P.Brit. Mus. 10513. 25 Mecheir = March 27, 169.
- P.Lond. Inv. 1974 (see below). 16 Phamenoth = April 17, 169.
- P.Brit. Mus. 10599, 10600. 15 Pharmouthi = May 16, 169.
- O. Tait Bodl. 48. 30 Pharmouthi = May 31, 169.
- O. Tait Bodl. 355. 21 Mesore = September 19, 169.
- Bucheum Inscr., vol. II, p. 6, no. 8. 3 Epagomene = October 1, 169.

The three following papyri dated in the twelfth year *may* belong to this reign:

- P.Fay. 13. 4 Choiak = January 6, 169.
- P.Ryl. 258. Mecheir = March 3–April 1, 169.
- P.Grenf. I, 39. 12 Pachons = June 12, 169.

I know of no dates of any kind in the thirteenth year.

The foregoing list may not be complete, but it is sufficient to indicate that after November 170 B.C. the whole of Egypt (at any rate outside Alexandria) reverted to dating by the twelfth year of Philometor. This change must be the result of political causes, which it remains to establish.

Let us consider briefly the course of events. The Syrian and Egyptian armies met at a place between Mount Kasion and Pelusium, and the Egyptians were utterly defeated, so much so that further resistance in the field seems to have been regarded as impossible. Under cover of an armistice, Antiochus succeeded in obtaining possession of Pelusium, and Egypt lay wide open to the invader. At this juncture Eulaios and Lenaus drop out of history, their places being taken by two distinguished citizens of Alexandria, Komanos and Kineas, who resolved to open negotiations with Antiochus. To them it must have been obvious from the first that the very most they could hope to obtain was a reversion to the *status quo*; and it follows that, even before negotiations could be thought of, everything connected with the Ptolemaic claim to Syria had to be discarded. If, therefore, as suggested above, the joint reign, with its new enumeration of regnal years, symbolized Ptolemaic rule over Syria, it must now have been officially abrogated forthwith, not only in Alexandria, but throughout the country. On my view, this consideration amply suffices to explain the general reversion to dating by the twelfth year of Philometor. As a corollary, we may now date the decisive battle between the two armies to the second half of November 170 B.C.

Formal negotiations now began, and Antiochus succeeded in persuading Philometor to leave Alexandria and meet him in a personal interview, perhaps at his advanced headquarters at Naukratis. Agreement was reached between the two kings, and Antiochus could now pose as supporting the legitimate government of the country in opposition to the Alexandrines, who in the meantime had thrown off their allegiance to Philometor and proclaimed Euergetes king. We can now see that, since Euergetes had actually shared the throne for a brief period, his seizure of power had some legal colour. But if his action stiffened the resistance of the Alexandrines, it also had the less happy result of throwing Philometor into the arms of Antiochus, who could now draw upon the whole resources of the country outside Alexandria for the support of his army.

With this situation as a background, I now print the text of an unpublished papyrus in the British Museum. For the reading of the text I can claim no credit; the original rough copy which lies before me is in the hand of Sir Harold Bell, but the page is covered with pencilled notes and readings in the nervous, sprawling hand of that incomparable decipherer, B. P. Grenfell. This is fortunate, since the whole of the document is written in an extraordinarily cursive hand, some of the letters being hardly formed or even non-existent. I have not dotted such letters, as it would be difficult to supply dots consistently, so the reader must be content with this general warning.

P.Lond. Inv. 1974

30.5 cm. × 10 cm.

Provenance unknown

- Λιβ Φαμ(ενὼθ) ιε̅. κ(ριθῆς) ἀν(ηλωτικῶ) (ἀρτάβαι) ιβ.
 Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίωι
 χαίρειν. μετρήσατε
 μετὰ τοῦ ἐπακολουθοῦντος
 5 ἀπὸ τῶν γενη(μάτων) τοῦ ιβL Ἀπολλωνίωι
 ἐφόδωι εἰς τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἄλλους ζ
 ὥστ' εἶναι ἡ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ
 Ἑρ(μο)πολίτου συναπεσταλ-
 μένοις τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
 10 νομοῦ πορείοις τοῖς
 μεταγομένοις εἰς τὸ μετὰ
 τοῦ βασιλέως στρατόπεδον
 τὴν καθήκουσαν τροφὴν
 τοῖς ἵπποις ἀπὸ ις̅ τοῦ Φαμενῶθ
 15 ἕως ε̅ τοῦ Φαρμουῦθι, τῆς
 ἡμέ(ρας), εἰς ἕκα(στον) ἵπ(πον) ^γχ, ^δΛχ, τὰς πάσας
 κριθῆς ἀν(ηλωτικῶ) (ἀρτάβας) δεκαδύο / ιβ, καὶ σύ(μβολον)
 πο(ίησον) πρὸς αὐ(τόν) ὥς εἴθισται.
 ἔρρ(ωσο). Λιβ Φαμενῶθ ις̅.
 20 Ἀπολλώνιος. μέ(τρησον) κ(ριθῆς) δεκαδύο,
 / ιβ. Λιβ Φαμ(ενὼθ) ις̅.

Verso

. . .

Ἀπολλωνίωι.

Notes on the Text

1. This note, and that in ll. 20–21, are presumably in different hands from that of the main text, but the writing throughout is so cursive that it is difficult to decide the point.

Φαμ(ενὼθ) ιε̅. The figure should be ις̅, and this may in fact have been intended, but the surviving traces strongly suggest ιε̅, and this has accordingly been printed.

4. For the phrase μετὰ τοῦ ἐπακολουθοῦντος cf. the expressions ἐπὶ or διὰ τοῦ ἐπακολουθοῦντος (or τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων) in P.Teb. 722, 4–5, and P.Teb. 835, 5–6 and note.

8. Ἑρ(μο)πολίτου. The writing is so cursive that Ἑρμο(πο)λίτου could almost equally well be printed. If, as suggested below, the στρατόπεδον to which the carriages were proceeding was Antiochus' encampment somewhere in the Delta, it is unlikely that the convoy would have passed through the Faiyūm, and the present papyrus is therefore more likely to come from some site in the Nile valley, e.g. Oxyrhynchus or Memphis.

9–10. τοῖς πορείοις. I take the dative to be governed by the συν in συναπεσταλμένοις.

11–12. τὸ μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατόπεδον. On the significance of this expression see below, and contrast ἐν τῷ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατοπέδῳ in W., *Chrest.* 107, 3, 7.

16. Grenfell read the abbreviations following εἰς as κ(αθ') ἵπ(πον) or κ(αθῆκον) ἵπ(ποις), but I am satisfied that the reading printed above is correct.

The calculation is as follows: 3 choenices per horse per diem, for 8 horses = 24 choenices per diem. The artaba of the μέτρον ἀνηλωτικόν standard contained 40 choenices (cf., e.g., P.Cair. Zen. 59292, introd.), and 24 choenices is therefore written as $\frac{1}{2}$ artaba 4 choenices. The total amount for the period of 20 days (i.e. 16 Phamenoth—5 Pharmouthi, both inclusive) thus comes to $24 \times 20 = 480$ choenices = 12 artabas on the μέτρον ἀνηλωτικόν.

22. Grenfell read the traces of writing at the beginning of the line as δός, but I cannot see this.

Translation

Year 12, Phamenoth 15(?). Barley, by the measure of issue, 12 artabas.

Apollonius to Apollonius, greeting. Measure out, in company with the assessor, from the harvest of the twelfth year, to Apollonius, *ephodus*, both for himself and for 7 others, making 8 in all, who have been dispatched from the Hermopolite nome together with the carriages from the same nome, in transit to the camp with the King: the proper amount of fodder for the horses, from 16 Phamenoth to 5 Pharmouthi, at 3 choenices per horse, making a daily rate of half an artaba and 4 choenices, altogether twelve artabas of barley by the measure of issue = 12; and make out a receipt against him, as is customary. Farewell. Year 12, Phamenoth 16.

Apollonius. Measure out 12 of barley = 12. Year 12, Phamenoth 16.

Verso: To Apollonius.

The first point to be discussed is the date of the document. With only the mention of the twelfth year as a guide there are several possibilities. Grenfell has, however, jotted down on the copy '2nd cent. B.C. Certainly not earlier than Epiphanes', and, in another place, '?Philometor or Soter II'. Soter II is, however, excluded since he was exiled before the end of his eleventh year, and the choice really lies between Epiphanes and Philometor. In the former case the date would be April 23, 193 B.C., in a period when we know of no hostilities in progress in Egypt. I therefore conclude that the document dates from the reign of Philometor.

The subject of the papyrus—an order for the issue of barley—is commonplace enough. What is remarkable is the destination of the carts—'to the camp with the King'. Since the document is dated in the twelfth year, the king in question can only be Philometor. But, on our hypothesis, Philometor cannot have been conducting any military operations at this period, at any rate outside Alexandria; and even had any Ptolemaic forces remained in the field with Philometor, their encampment would certainly have been designated τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατόπεδον, 'the King's camp', and not 'the camp *with* the King'. This latter expression is, to my mind, not merely unusual, but of the utmost significance: I suggest, in fact, that though the king was Philometor, the camp was that of Antiochus, and that the expression perfectly exemplifies the ambiguous position of Philometor who, while nominally retaining his sovereignty over Egypt, was really little more than a prisoner, helpless in the power of his adversary.

If the foregoing argument is correct, it follows that right up to the end of the twelfth year Antiochus behaved with outward correctitude, and made no move to dethrone Philometor or formally impugn his authority. His alleged coronation as Pharaoh at Memphis must therefore have taken place, if at all, during the second invasion, in 168 B.C. We can also see that so long as Antiochus continued to recognize Philometor as the legal sovereign of Egypt, documents dated in Philometor's twelfth year will not,

in themselves, indicate whether the Egyptian or the Syrian authorities were in local control. After Antiochus had retired, late in 169 B.C., Philometor's reconciliation with Euergetes and return to Alexandria forced the Seleucid to define his position. When, in the early spring of 168 B.C., he again invaded Egypt, he was faced with two alternatives: either he could pose as a purely military commander conducting hostilities, or—a bolder step—he could claim the throne of Egypt by right of conquest. Tradition and P.Teb. 698 suggest that he chose the latter; and it may well have been this step, as much as the imminent peril of Alexandria, which at long last galvanized Rome into decisive action.

THE DEATH OF CLEOPATRA VII

By J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

I

By common consent it was Spiegelberg¹ who first illuminated the symbolism involved in the traditional account of the death of Cleopatra VII Philopator; and his success, partial though it can be shown to be, illustrates the importance of Pharaonic ideas in the make-up of Ptolemaic Egypt.

According to Spiegelberg the queen deliberately chose to be killed by the poison of a serpent because this serpent was the uraeus, the distinctive emblem of the Pharaohs, which raised itself on the royal diadem, threatening the king's enemies and placing its bearer in the special protection of his divine father, the sun-god. In choosing this mode of death she was choosing, according to Spiegelberg, an end which was not indeed the easiest, but yet the most sacred, and which was also 'becoming to the successor of so many kings', *πρέποντα τῇ τοσούτων ἀπογόνῳ βασιλέων* (Plut. *Ant.* 85). So far it is easy to agree, save that the reference to the sun-god is questionable. Spiegelberg is referring to Rē, and he maintains (p. 5) that the uraeus-serpent² was the sacred animal of Rē and so stood in a special relation to the Egyptian kings, who were the god's 'sons' and representatives on earth. In origin, however, the uraeus is the embodiment of Wedjoyet, the goddess of Buto, and it is likely that its use as a royal symbol arises from the conception of the living king as Horus.³ This god was, of course, identified at an early stage with the sun-god Rē.

Such an association of the incident with the uraeus as an ancient royal symbol seems preferable to the suggestion that the serpent was one which derived its symbolism from the cult of Isis. Cleopatra VII was certainly represented as Hathor-Isis;⁴ and she affected the title of *Νέα Ἰσις*.⁵ Erwin Herrmann,⁶ while believing that the queen was

¹ 'Weshalb wählte Kleopatra den Tod durch Schlangenbiss?' in *Ägyptologische Mitteilungen, Sitzungsber. München*, 1925, 3-6.

² It was not the horned viper, as he claims, but the hooded cobra; cf. Sir H. Idris Bell, *Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab Conquest* (Oxford, 1948), 141, n. 39, and his *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Liverpool, 1953), 63. Sir Alan Gardiner in his Sign-list, I 10, follows Keimer in identifying this cobra as the *Naja haje*; Dr. M. A. Murray, *JEA* 34 (1948), 117-18, identifies it as the *Naja nigricollis*. The great dilation of the neck would seem to favour Keimer's view, but some early hieroglyphs show black lines on its neck, as Dr. Murray points out.

³ Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 845. For a discussion of Wedjoyet see Anthes, *ZÄS* 83 (1958), 81 ff., and cf. Rundle Clark, *Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt* (London, 1959), 242.

⁴ Otto and Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches* (Abh. München, 1938), 74, n. 1 with refs.

⁵ Plutarch, *Ant.* 54, 9, cf. Dio Cassius, 49, 40; A. von Sallet and K. Regling, *Die antiken Münzen* (Berlin, 1922), 52; Vandebek, *De Interpretatio Graeca van de Isisfiguur* (Louvain, 1946), 75; W. W. Tarn in *JRS* 22 (1932), 139. Arsinoë II had also been called Isis: v. *SB* 601-2 and *OGIS* 31 (restored; Strack in *Mitt. Athen.* 19 (1894), 234 ff. suggests *Θεᾶ*, but admits *Ἰσιδι* as a possibility). Cleopatra III had a priest as *Ἰσις μεγάλη μήτηρ θεῶν*: v. P.Dem.Leid. 185 (publ. E. Revillout in *Rev. Égyptol.* 1 (1880), 91; cf. Spiegelberg, *ZÄS* 37

footnotes continued on p. 114.

compelled by Octavian to commit suicide, argues that the story of her death by serpent-bite may be an aetiological legend deriving from the role of the serpent in the cult of Cleopatra as Isis.¹ The serpent, indeed, figures in the Roman cult of Isis² and occasionally in Hellenistic sculpture from Egypt the goddess appears herself as a serpent,³ probably through her identification with the serpent-goddess Renenutet or Thermuthis. Two serpents in a shrine (a limestone relief of about 150 B.C.) are explained by Erman⁴ as 'Isis und Osiris'. I recently examined this object at the Berlin Museum and in my opinion, although the explanation is correct, the typological origin of the group is the double uraeus used territorially to symbolize Upper and Lower Egypt. An attractive marble figure of Isis in Greek dress in the same collection (c. A.D. 180) shows her holding a cobra in her right hand.⁵

In Egypt itself, therefore, Isis is occasionally assimilated to the serpent-goddess Thermuthis, but the serpent rarely appears in her cult. It is outside Egypt, and in the Roman cult of the goddess, that this development becomes palpably evident.⁶

Spiegelberg's view, it may be observed, has won wide acceptance.⁷

(1899), 38, and Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, 1, 158). For the possible reference of a title *θεὰ νεωτέρα* to Cleopatra VII see C. Bonner and A. D. Nock in *Harv. Theol. Rev.* 41 (1948), 213-15. L. Moretti, *Aegyptus* 38 (1958), 203-9, identifies Neotera with Nephthys; cf. P. M. Fraser, *JEA* 46 (1960), 96, no. 13.

⁶ 'Kleopatras angeblicher Schlangentod' in *Phil. Woch.* 1931, 1100-2. That Octavian had her killed is also the view of Th. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 39 (1885), 349, n. 4; cf. E. Bevan, *A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 382, n. 2.

¹ Herrmann cites Virgil, *Aen.* 8, 696 ff.; but with the possible exception of the phrase *latrator Anubis*, these lines do not relate specifically to the cult of Isis.

² See Engelmann in Roscher, *Lex.* II, 275 (a wall-painting in which Isis is shown holding a serpent in her left hand); on a marble altar from Caligula's temple of Isis at Rome a serpent is depicted rising from a basket, v. Gressmann, *Die orientalischen Religionen*, figs. 14 and 15, also fig. 16 (a relief in the Vatican Mus., second century A.D.); cf. the description of the hydreion in Apuleius, *Met.* 9, 9 ff. and W. Wittmann, ad loc., in *Das Isisbuch des Apuleius*, 66. Matteo Della Corte has argued, in his *Cleopatra, M. Antonio e Ottaviano* (Pompei, 1951), 35 ff., that the famous silver plate from Boscoreale, now in the Louvre, depicts Cleopatra and that the uraeus-serpent in her right hand is the instrument of her death. J. Carcopino, in *Rev. ét. anc.* 55 (1953), 196-7, agrees to a great extent, but thinks it involves Cleopatra in the divine form of 'Isis-Panthea'. Previous views see in this figure a symbolic representation of Alexandria or Egypt or Africa. The packed symbolism of the work makes interpretation difficult, but I believe Della Corte to be right in his main point, even though the meaning of some of the concomitant details (e.g. the lion and the panther) remains in doubt. The figure's facial expression is not one of pain, but cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1, 37, 32 *non humilis mulier*.

³ Weber, *Die ägyptisch-griechischen Terrakotten*, II, pl. 3 and pp. 42 ff. Here the head is human. On p. 44, n. 19 Weber refers to P. Amherst, II, 128, 56 (Eshmunên, A.D. 128) where Isis is honoured as *Ἰσις*; cf., too, Erman, *Rel.*, fig. 161 (a statuette in the Ashmolean Mus.). C. C. Edgar, *Greek Sculpture* (CCG, 1903), no. 27528, p. 60 is a group which he describes as 'a Uraeus and a serpent or Agathodaemon'; the Uraeus wears the head-dress of Isis or Hathor; his no. 27571, p. 56, a small relief, includes a female figure which he states to be 'probably a serpent-bodied Isis'. Her attributes (a torch and cornucopia) do not make this indubitable. Wittmann, *Isisbuch*, 20, with notes 69-70, is somewhat too dogmatic about these identifications. His statement in n. 69, that Isis' name is already in the New Kingdom determined with a uraeus means little, since the names of other goddesses bear the same determinative.

⁴ *Rel.*, fig. 163 = Berlin Mus. no. 8164.

⁵ Berlin Mus. no. 1240. Provenance is presumably unknown.

⁶ See Drexler in Roscher, *Lex.*, s.v. Isis, 537 ff. On that page he refers to silver armbrands from Naucratis depicting Isis and Sarapis with human heads and serpent bodies. This recalls Spiegelberg's opinion, cited by Friedlaender ad Juvenal, 6, 538, that Isis only receives the serpent as an attribute at the hands of the Greeks, and that this was a result of their identifying her with Demeter.

⁷ Sir Wm. Tarn, *CAH* 10 (1934), 110-11: 'the creature deified whom it struck, for it was the divine minister of the Sun-god. . .'. Sir H. Idris Bell, *Egypt*, 64, and *Cults and Creeds*, 63; Hans Volkmann, *Cleopatra* (tr.

II

I turn now to what I regard as the weaknesses of Spiegelberg's view. He believes that such a death was thought to imply both felicity and apotheosis. His evidence for this is a statement in Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 2, 7 (86), where it is said that the Egyptians deemed death by crocodile or asp to be followed by these happy states: *Nos itaque asinis neque honorem neque potestatem aliquam damus, sicut Aegyptii crocodillis et aspidibus, quando eos qui ab istis mordentur et a crocodillis rapiuntur felices et deo dignos¹ arbitrantur*. The question arises, however, whether Josephus (A.D. 37-c. 93) can be regarded as a cogent witness to the prevalence of an Egyptian belief in earlier times, unsupported as his statement is by any other classical or Egyptian source except with reference to death by crocodile.² Spiegelberg suggests that this is either because of a fortuitous gap in our earlier sources³ or because the belief in apotheosis by snake-bite only developed in the 'Spätzeit' to which Cleopatra belonged.

A second objection is more serious. The reference to apotheosis (*deo dignos*) has force when applied to commoners, but is meaningless in an Egyptian royal context. Certainly Cleopatra had no need of apotheosis, for she was already, *qua* sovereign, a goddess, a daughter of Rē.⁴ She was also, as we have seen, Nea Isis. Further, she was worshipped in her life-time as Aphrodite.⁵ Therefore she was thrice a goddess.

As a daughter of Rē she would be deemed to achieve union with the sun-god at her death, whatever its manner or cause might be.⁶ When she chose to kill herself through the poison of the royal uraeus, she was not achieving any additional glory. Her death was, therefore, a true suicide, albeit in a manner especially befitting an Egyptian queen.

According to an idea frequently expressed,⁷ the uraeus was an instrument of death

T. J. Cadoux, London, 1958), 207. F. Sbordone, 'La Morte di Cleopatra nei medici greci', *RIGI* 1930, fasc. 1-2, 1-20, examines the evidence for the physical aspect of the death. T. C. Skeat, *JRS* 43 (1953), 98-100, advocates 17 Mesore 30 B.C. as the date of the death, but he is not concerned here with its manner or meaning. M. A. Levi, 'Cleopatra e l'aspide', *Parola del Passato*, 9 (1954), 293-5, describes the mode of death as typically ritualistic, arising from an admiration of the uninterrupted descent of the Egyptian sovereigns and involving the return of the monarch to his father, while in the successor a Horus continues on the throne.

¹ Both Spiegelberg (p. 4) and Hopfner, *Fontes*, 217 print *digni*, but clearly *dignos* is necessary, cf. Thackeray, Loeb, 1926, p. 328. Perhaps *θεοπρεπής* was the adjective in the Greek original, as Eduard Schwartz suggests (Spiegelberg, op. cit. 4-5).

² Herodotus, 2, 90; cf. Kees, 'Apotheosis by Drowning', in *Griffith Studies*, 402-5, where it is claimed that only with 'the bigotry of the late period' did this idea prevail. During the Twenty-first Dynasty, as he shows, drowning was a punishment at Thebes.

³ Cf. Wainwright, *The Sky-Religion in Egypt*, x (on the classical authors as sources for Egyptian religion). Later in this work (p. 88) Wainwright describes the death of Cleopatra as both suicide and apotheosis, and he fits it into the pattern of the 'sacrifice of the king' which he finds in the 'Old Religion'. That it was suicide, I agree; but I do not find the other points convincing.

⁴ A concept keenly followed by the Ptolemies; cf. Otto, *Priester und Tempel*, II, 270, referring to the representations at the temple of Hermonthis which show Caesarion, son of Cleopatra VII, as the true offspring of Rē; cf. Jéquier, *Les Temples ptolémaïques et romains*, pl. 57. Cleopatra's allegiance to Egyptian religion is also shown by her presence at the installation of a Buchis bull: see Tarn, *JRS* 26 (1936), 187 ff., and Fairman, *The Bucheum*, II, 13.

⁵ Otto and Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges*, etc., 74, n. 1 with refs.

⁶ Cf. 'She has united herself with Rē', of 'the Majesty of the *hst*-cow' in Cairo Stela no. 22180 (Ptol.), 3, ed. Spiegelberg, *ZAS* 43 (1906), 129 ff.; and *Sinuhe*, R 6.

⁷ See esp. Erman, *Hymnen an das Diadem der Pharaonen* (*Abh. Berlin*, 1911), p. 35, section 9, 1; p. 47, section 15, 2 f.; p. 51, section 19, 1; p. 53, section 20, 2-3. Cf. Kees, *Götterglaube* (2nd ed.), 53.

and destruction threatening the Pharaoh's enemies. This instrument Cleopatra turned on herself.

III

It can also be shown that Cleopatra probably used two cobras and not one, and that the traditional emblematic apparatus provided a suitable symbolic urge, although the initial prompting was doubtless a desire to bring death more swiftly and more effectively.

That more than one cobra was used is indicated by the following classical authors¹ who refer to her death:

- (1) Virgil, *Aen.* 8, 697:

Necdum etiam geminos a tergo respicit angues. gelidos coni. Burm.

(Cleopatra at Actium is the subject, but the allusion is probably to her subsequent death.)

- (2) Horace, *Carm.* 1, 37, 26-28:

*fortis et asperas
tractare serpentes, ut atrum
corpore combiberet venenum.*

- (3) Propertius, 3, 11, 53-54:

*Brachia spectavi sacris admorsa colubris,
et trahere occultum membra soporis iter.*

(Butler and Barber, ad loc., think the allusion is to the image of Cleopatra carried in Augustus' triumph (Plut. *Ant.* 86), so that the poet's *spectavi* may be taken literally.)

- (4) Florus, 4, 11, 11 (= 2, 21, 11 ed. E. S. Forster, Loeb):

admotisque ad venas serpentibus sic morte quasi somno soluta est.

Now these four testimonia are in a minority. One asp is mentioned by the great majority of sources, including Plutarch, *Ant.* 85-86 and Dio Cassius, 51, 14, and this tradition has been generally accepted in literature and art.² But it is striking that the first three authors quoted above are those nearest in time to the event in question. Also, although their testimony has been overwhelmed and almost submerged by that of the majority, it has the cogency of a *difficilior lectio*. It is Virgil only who mentions two serpents, but there is reason to believe that this is the authentic tradition; and, of course, it is not refuted by the testimonia which use a plural.

That the tradition has provided difficulties for commentators is abundantly, even pathetically, clear. In the Virgilian allusion Burman boldly conjectures *gelidos* for *geminos*, but is still left with a plural. T. L. Page thinks the use of *geminos* is 'very peculiar' and tends to the view that any reference to the queen's death by asp-poison is excluded; he goes on to approve Henry's interpretation that the *angues gemini* are a regular symbol of death, comparing *Aen.* 2, 203; 7, 450; and 8, 289; and also an old carol about Dives and Lazarus:

As it fell out upon a day,
Dives sickened and died,
There came two serpents out of hell,
Thereto his soul to guide.

¹ The fullest survey of the evidence seems to be that of Stähelin in *PW* (1921), s.v. Kleopatra, 777-8.

² E.g. the colourful interpretation of Guido Cagnacci at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

The glaring objection to all this is the fact that Virgil's adjacent lines refer to the sistrum, to *omnigenum deum monstra*, and to *latrator Anubis*. An Egyptian allusion is plainly demanded in *geminus angues*. C. G. Heyne (4th ed., rev. Wagner, 1883) does come close to an admission that possibly two serpents caused the queen's death, but he does not discuss the background. Conington says somewhat cryptically: 'The number "two" has caused some difficulty to commentators; but it is merely the numerical precision of an emblematic picture.' It would be interesting to know what precisely he meant by his second clause. Did he have an inkling of the emblematic detail supplied all too easily by the Egyptian *mise-en-scène*? As for the other passages, it would be pointless to discuss the evasions and the improbabilities advanced by annotators.¹

It may be submitted with some confidence that the true explanation lies in the Egyptian role of the double uraeus as a royal symbol. It is common in iconography and royal symbolism generally, and it is frequently mentioned in texts. In using two cobras the queen was realistically applying a special form of the emblem mentioned by Spiegelberg.

The earliest use of the double uraeus appears to be in connexion with the winged disk, which was a symbol intimately bound up with royalty and probably with the person of the king.² In the New Kingdom, however, the double uraeus sometimes appears on the royal diadem³ instead of the single cobra.⁴ It becomes common with the Ethiopian kings,⁵ and persists in the Ptolemaic era.⁶ The allusions in Ptolemaic texts show that the double uraeus was interpreted in much the same way as its single, and more usual, counterpart. These uraei are, for instance, instruments of terror by which Horus of Behdet intimidates his enemies.⁷ Osiris is said to be their lord.⁸ 'Wedjoyet of the Two Uraeus-goddesses' is the 'great mother' of Horus.⁹ In the Ptolemaic era the

¹ One method is blissfully to ignore the presence of the plural; cf. T. E. Page and J. Gow on the Horatian passage. What is surprising is that they do not adduce the convenient grammatical refuge of 'plural for singular'.

² Alan H. Gardiner, *JEA* 30 (1944), 48, citing examples from the Fifth Dynasty.

³ Th. M. Davis, *The Tomb of Queen Tiye*, pl. 33 (in an unusual crown); Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, no. 5979 (with the atef-crown).

⁴ A fashion which may in origin have been influenced by the Libyan style of forelock; cf. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion*, 245.

⁵ K. Bosse, *Menschliche Figur . . . der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, no. 155, p. 58 (= Breasted, *Hist. of Egypt*, fig. 184); also nos. 144, p. 55; 147, p. 56; 211, p. 76 with n. 3; and no. 135A, pp. 52-53, for which cf. K. Bosse, *ZAS* 72 (1936), 131-5. A recently published example is *Bull. MFA* 57 (1959), 48, fig. 2, described by Edward L. B. Terrace, *ibid.*, as 'probably Taharqa'.

⁶ Junker, *Der grosse Pylon des Tempels der Isis in Philä*, figs. 4 and 25 (flanking the crown of Ptolemy XIII); Berlin Museum, no. 10114 (c. 300 B.C.); a statuette which I recently saw in Leningrad (L'Ermitage, no. 136) shows Arsinoë II with three uraei on the crown.

⁷ Chassinat, *Edfou*, VI, 114, 3-4: 'He (Horus of Behdet) brought Nekhbet and Wedjoyet with him as the two uraei who terrify the enemies in their limbs, both crocodiles and hippopotami.' Cf. Fairman, *JEA* 21 (1935), 29. This is an allusion that indicates the origin of the double uraeus; cf. *Urk.* II, 28 and Gardiner's comment, *JEA* 30 (1944), 48, n. 2. According to *Edfou*, I, 149, 4-5, the *Wrt*y (the two uraei) are on the forehead of Horus.

⁸ Mariette, *Denderah*, IV, pl. 68, cf. E. Lefébure, *Sphinx*, 5 (1902), 218 and *Edfou*, I, 186, 5.

⁹ *Edfou*, VI, 89, 10; cf. Blackman and Fairman, *JEA* 30 (1944), 14. In the stela of Ankhafemmut (seventh century B.C.), line 4, a 'prophet of the two uraeus-goddesses' is mentioned: v. *JEA* 43 (1957), frontispiece, and E. P. Uphill, p. 2.

sun-disk flanked by two uraei is a common writing of *n-sw-bit*.¹ Queens and princesses are usually depicted wearing the long feminine wig and often they have the 'vulture head-dress' as well. The exquisite statuette in the Cairo Museum of a Ramesside princess shows two uraei on the front of the wig (here without the 'vulture head-dress') and the whole is surmounted by a circlet of disk-topped uraei (see pl. IX, 1). A relief in Hathor's temple at Dendera² shows Cleopatra as Hathor-Isis; beneath the symbols of these goddesses she has the 'vulture head-dress' topped by a chaplet of uraei, but no uraeus or double-uraeus in front.³ When she was dressed βασιλικῶς, as Plutarch puts it, she probably wore a crown with the double uraeus in front; compare the 'Ptolemaic queen' in the Berlin Museum, No. 10114 (see pl. IX, 2).

Of the origin of the double uraeus there can be little doubt. They are mentioned already in the Pyramid Texts⁴ as identified with the king's eyes (where the king is probably regarded as Horus). The duplication derives, as often, from the concept of the 'Two Lands' as forming the national state, but it is not a mere doubling of the single uraeus; it involves, in origin, the uraeus-goddess and the vulture-goddess, the latter being assimilated to the guise of the former.⁵ Wedjoyet and Nekhbet are sometimes specifically mentioned, as we have seen, as the component deities.⁶ Occasionally the uraeus and vulture appear on the front of the head-dress.⁷

If she was thinking, then, in terms of the royal uraeus—and Spiegelberg was probably right in this—Cleopatra used two cobras in conscious alignment with the symbolism in question. The basket of figs mentioned by Plutarch (*Ant.* 85) could easily have been big enough to carry two snakes.⁸ Since her attendants, Iras and Charmion, were also killed, the use of more than one snake might be thus confirmed; but in their case it is more likely that they took poison.⁹

¹ *Wb.* II, 331. Gardiner, *JEA* 30 (1944), 48, notes two examples from the time of Ramesses II. The two uraei appear in several other decorative connexions: v. Newberry, *Scarabs*, 76 (with the Hathor head); *Les Merveilles du Louvre*, I, 117 (P. of Neb-ked, showing two uraei hanging from Osiris' necklace); Petrie in Hastings, *Encycl. Rel. Eth.* v, 245b ('bracelets or finger-rings ending in two uraei were the commonest ornament'); Calverley, *Abydos*, III, pl. 28 (attached to the *djed*-pillar).

² Jéquier, *Les Temples ptolémaïques et romains*, pl. 57.

³ Bevan, *Hist. of Egypt*, fig. 62, describes it as the 'conventional figure of Egyptian queen, here standing for Cleopatra'. While this is the right approach to the figure, the curve of the nose seems rather unusual. Otto and Bengtson, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges*, etc., 74, n. 1, point out that the name of Cleopatra in the cartouche must be ascribed to a keeper in the Cairo Museum. Even so, the reference is clearly to her, and the figure may exceed the limits of the conventional.

⁴ 1287b: 'Thine eyes have been given to thee as thy two uraei.' I owe this ref. to Helck and Otto, *Kleines Wörterbuch der Ägyptologie*, 388.

⁵ Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 507; Erman, *Hymnen an das Diadem*, 13-14.

⁶ *Edfou*, VI, 114, 3-4; *Urk.* II, 28; cf. *Edfou*, I, 47, 18: 'I (Hathor) give to thee the *Wrt* (the two uraei) of south and north that they may make their seats on thine head!' *Wb.* I, 332 seems to be slightly misleading in its rendering of *Wrt* as 'die beiden Diademe', although by synecdoche the uraei may well have the wider connotation.

⁷ E.g. the gold mask of Tutankhamun: see W. S. Smith, *The Art and Architecture of Ancient Egypt*, pl. 137.

⁸ Cf. Bevan, *Hist. of Egypt*, 383, n. o: 'I have seen snake-charmers carry about cobras in baskets of quite a moderate size.'

⁹ Since a snake does not emit poison for a second time until a lengthy interval has passed, three cobras would have been necessary to cause the death of the three. Bevan, *op. cit.* 382, n. 2 suggests that the attendants may have imbibed poison in order to share the suicide of their mistress.



1. A Ramesside Princess
(By courtesy of the Cairo Museum)



2. A Ptolemaic queen
*(Berlin no. 10114; by courtesy of
the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin)*

TWO ROYAL LADIES



‘Ο “ΚΑΡΑΚΑΛΛΟΣ” ΚΟΣΜΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ

‘Ο “ΚΑΡΑΚΑΛΛΟΣ” ΚΟΣΜΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ

By ABD EL-MOHSEN EL-KHACHAB

To the memory of Marcel Jungfleisch, Pioneer in Egyptian Numismatics

‘La métamorphose du pouvoir impérial est le triomphe du génie oriental sur l’esprit romain et de l’idée religieuse sur la conception juridique.’—FRANZ CUMONT¹

THE gulf separating the principate of Rome from the absolutism of Egypt was so great that it was not possible for the Roman people to bridge it at a single attempt. Since the Republic the magistrates had seized every opportunity of expanding their power and of advancing along the path of autocratic rule.²

Cicero declared that today more than ever before, in one party as much as in the other, the only dream is that of becoming master; ‘*dominatio quaesita ab utroque est*.’³ This development, which produced such notable victims as Pompey and Caesar, resulted in the Principate constituted by Augustus. It was the ‘forme adoucie du césarisme absolu pour lequel le peuple romain n’était pas encore mûr’,⁴ and it was by means of constitutional fictions that, as Dio Cassius put it, ‘the power of the people and the Senate passed completely to Augustus, and, beginning from this time (i.e. 27 B.C.) a pure monarchy was established’.⁵

In fact, the victory of Actium and the support of the Roman army propelled imperial rule forward towards personal power.⁶ The result was that the conquest of the East invested Augustus with two different personalities, the one being that of the supreme

¹ F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 1, 282. Cf. L’Orange, *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture*, 54.

² Cumont, loc. cit.; L’Orange, op. cit. 53.

³ *Ad Att.* VIII, 11; Léon Homo, *Les Institutions politiques romaines de la cité à l’état*, 222. Cf. the accumulation of divine honours received by Octavian Augustus, L. Cerfau and J. Tondriau, *Un Concurrent du Christianisme. Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, 314 f.

⁴ L. Homo, op. cit. 247-249.

⁵ *LIII*, 17, p. 288; cf. Strabo, vi, 4, p. 288; xvii, 3, p. 840; L. Homo, op. cit. 260.

⁶ L. Homo, op. cit. 263.

magistrate of Rome, 'le premier citoyen', *princeps*, and the other, for the orientals and particularly the Egyptians, that of king and god, βασιλεὺς καὶ θεός, that is to say, the successor of the Pharaohs.¹ This second personality was the origin of the idea of Caesarism which finally imposed itself on Rome,² and made the emperor a *deus et dominus*. This despotism which was a new experience for the Roman people, enlarged the ambition of the emperors who then turned to the East, looking for the means of realizing their autocratic intentions.

Right from the beginning, the master of the empire under the modest form of the principate, had in his hands the three fundamental constituents of temporal and of spiritual power, 'du trône et de l'autel';³ these were tribunician power, proconsular rule, and pontifical sovereignty.⁴ But with the development of power, the first emperors sought to obtain the ratification of public opinion so that the principate could rest legally on the delegation of power by the people. This overriding consideration led them to seek for justification for their despotic intentions.⁵

In Egypt the Ptolemies, who were considered as the successors of the Pharaohs, were βασιλεῖς καὶ θεοί, and were themselves looked on as gods temporarily inhabiting the earth, their home (οἶκος) being the temple. This thinking in religious terms had an important influence on the theory of power in Roman times, and it became the ideal of the emperors. The Ptolemies possessed a simple and precise principle which served religion and politics equally—that of a single god and of a single king to represent him on earth. The Greeks themselves, under the Ptolemies, had gradually come to accept this theory. The official cult was established about 271/270 B.C. at the same time as the cult of the dead king.⁶ According to Rostovtzeff, this was an attempt under the Ptolemies to provide a religious sanction for their despotism which would be admissible for the Greeks⁷ who, consequently, acknowledged the king as their divine ruler. At the same time the philosophy of the period spread the theory that 'kingship was the best form of government', and this supported the politico-religious conception of the Greek kings. Many schools of philosophy, which helped in forming Greek thought in the Hellenistic

¹ For the provinces the emperor was the supreme military chief, the *imperator*; cf. L. Homo, loc. cit. Similarly, the Asiatic cities conquered by Augustus were eager to set up temples in his name, and establish his cult, cf. Mattingly, *Roman Imperial Civilisation*, 221.

² L. Homo, loc. cit.; Cerfau and Tondriaux, op. cit. 338. 353, for the situation in the case of Nero; also *ibid.* 356 for Domitian, and, in particular, 344.

³ *Ibid.* 273.

⁴ *Ibid.* 276.

⁵ *Ibid.* 265. 283: 'Auguste, en raison de nécessités supérieures, a cru devoir rompre avec le système césarien et ces mêmes nécessités le contraignent à en maintenir l'esprit. Il est, en effet, aussi puissant que le seront, trois siècles plus tard, un Dioclétien ou un Constantin. La seule différence réside dans la forme. Les premiers, à la fois par politique générale et prudence personnelle, s'efforcent de dissimuler leur puissance; les derniers se plaisent à l'étaler.'

This would seem to be the case not only because the emperors at this late time 'se plaisaient à étaler leur puissance', but also because, through their opportunist politics and practical system, they had reached during this period (from the beginning of the first century up to the third and fourth centuries A.D.) the summit of their despotism, as we shall show later. The other difference between them is that the first emperors 'revêtus d'une dignité à la fois personnelle et viagère, n'avaient le droit de transmettre leur puissance ni par hérédité, ni même par désignation formelle. En vertu du principe juridique, la souveraineté pouvait se déléguer, non s'aliéner, les Romains ne concevaient pas cette délégation sous la forme héréditaire.'

⁶ Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 1, 268.

⁷ *Ibid.*

Period, thus sought to prove that monarchy was the best form of government, and that the king represented the living law which it was the duty of his subjects to obey. The Ptolemies adopted the principle of ‘the best man’, who was the king.¹

It was possible at this period to put forward, and finally to have accepted and acknowledged, the idea of the deification of the king in his lifetime, a new idea which was quite contrary to Roman tradition. This cult of the king, which was established quite quickly in the provinces, progressively won over Rome and the whole of Italy.

The resistance shown by Roman opinion to this theocratic policy was weakened and overcome by religious ideas from the East, and particularly those coming from Asia, which were spreading throughout the Roman world and especially in Rome itself. The ambitious emperors who were aiming at autocracy,² did not fail to encourage this movement with a view to spreading throughout the Empire the political principles of Ancient Egypt. These principles influenced Roman political and even administrative ideas through the intermediary of the Hellenistic monarchy which served as a model.³

In fact there was a very great difference between the two conceptions of power at Alexandria and at Rome, and it was due to the religion of Asia that these two principles were reconciled. Among the cults propagated at Rome that of Mithraism was the most widespread; it was, moreover, encouraged by the emperors who found in its doctrine support for introducing an absolute monarchy.

Mithraism was a cult of the sun. The sun (*Sol*) was regarded as the βασιλεὺς τοῦ κόσμου, he who was *invictus* and *aeternus*, and who, together with the other heavenly bodies, determined the destiny of everything.⁴ The sun was in fact the royal planet *par excellence*.⁵ The king, who was under his protection, was united to him by ‘des effluves surnaturels qui, descendant du Helios au roi, conduisaient peu à peu à leur consubstantialité’.⁶ The spirit on its journey down from the sky to become incarnate in the king, passed by the planets and the sun which imparted to the soul of its chosen representative a sacred element and the virtues of kingship.⁷ Thus, the kings reigned by means of grace which came from ‘the creator of heaven and earth’.⁸ From the moment of their coming into the world they were destined for the throne, and since they possessed certain elements of *Sol*, they were divine;⁹ they were truly *dei et domini nati*.¹⁰ At their birth they were sent by the stars (*sideribus demissi*) and at their apotheosis they were received back by the stars (*sideribus recepti*).¹¹ The common belief was that the dead emperors like Mithras were raised up by Helios on to his shining chariot.¹² We

¹ Rostovtzeff, loc. cit.

² Cumont, op. cit. 281.

³ Cf. L. Homo, op. cit. 264. 407; Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 343. 440; also see the description given by Philo the Jew, *Leg. ad Caium*, 79. 149-51.

⁴ Cumont, op. cit. 286; cf. id. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*, 130. Among the Chaldaean *Sol* was considered καρδιά τοῦ κόσμου.

⁵ Cf. Cumont, *Textes et monuments*, I, 288.

⁶ Ibid. 290.

⁷ Ibid. 291.

⁸ Ibid. 284.

⁹ Ibid. 292.

¹⁰ Cf. Beurlier, *Culte des emp.* 51; also p. 291 and n. 5. See also Cohen, *Méd. Imp.* (1861) v, 146, no. 170, for a bronze coin of Aurelian:

Obv.: DEO ET DOMINO NATO AURELIANO AUG. Bust of emperor with rays of light, facing right, holding sceptre.

Rev.: RESTITUT ORBIS. Woman standing, facing right, presenting wreath to Aurelian.

Cf. Mattingly, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, v, pt. i, 299, no. 306, struck at Serdica.

¹¹ Beurlier, op. cit. 292, no. 1.

¹² Ibid.

shall see how, later on as the doctrines developed, this relationship between the emperor and the deity was clearly confirmed under Diocletian and his colleagues, who were called Jovii and Herculii, as is also shown by the inscription τῶν θεῶν ὁμογένων ὑμῶν.¹

The emperors, seizing every opportunity, made use of these Mithraistic doctrines in order to realize their notions of theocracy. Those elements in the king which were from the sun made him divine and raised him above the human race; but he was not himself a god like the Egyptian kings who were brothers or sons of the gods of heaven.² Even the supernatural relationship between *Sol* and the emperor did not result in complete identification. The emperor, like Mithras, was merely an intermediary between the people and *Sol*; he was the representative of god on earth.

As we have seen above, the emperor reigned by grace of the creator of heaven and earth; he was successful in replacing the *fortuna populi romani* by that of the *fortuna Caesaris* or *Augusti*, or that of the *fortuna regia* (τυχὴ βασιλείως) that watched over the person of the emperor.³ This cult of the spirit (*daimōn*) of the king or, as it was in Rome, the *genius Caesaris*, was the worship of that divine spark which exists in every man and forms a part of his soul. But the king's majesty was unique, because it came from Ahura-Mazda (*Sol*) who of his own volition had placed his earthly image on the throne of the king.⁴

The essential point about these Asiatic cults is that the emperors increasingly made use of their mysteries to achieve their political ends, and in encouraging them they sought to justify their autocratic proclamations. They began, in a proper official manner, by assuming divine titles, so that in the end they would actually become gods themselves; they took the customary epithets used in the East for the gods of the heavens, particularly *invictus* (ἀνίκητος), the common epithet of *Sol*, so as to bring themselves closer to the sky-god and to make known their close union with the sun, with whom they were trying to associate themselves.⁵

The triumph of these eastern cults, particularly the mysteries of Mithras, dates from the reign of Commodus. From this time onwards the emperors officially took the titles *pius*, *felix*, *invictus*, which were imported from the East, and which became regular from the time of Caracalla.⁶ The cult of sun-worship which spread in Italy from the beginning

¹ Beurlier, op. cit. 291, no. 5; cf. also *Arch. Epigr. Mitt.* xvi, 94—the inscription of Arycanda.

² Maspero, *Histoire de l'Orient*, I, 263: 'Selon le cérémonial imposé par la coutume en pareil cas, consacrent l'adoption en lui présentant le sein afin de l'allaiter, comme elles auraient fait à leur propre enfant.' Loc. cit., n. 1: 'La formule *ses pères les dieux ou ses frères les dieux* est appliqué couramment au pharaon dans les textes de toutes les époques.' Also cf. Taubenschlag, *The Laws of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, 567; Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 82. 87.

³ Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, I, 284. 287.

⁴ Ibid. 284 and n. 7; cf. τιμὴν βασιλεία καὶ προσκυθεῖν εἰκόνα θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα σώζοντος, Plutarch, *Themist.* xxvii. For the *Genius Caesaris* see also Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 338.

⁵ Cumont, op. cit. 288–9. For the titles granted to Caligula, see Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 345; for Nero, ibid. 352; for Domitian, ibid. 356.

⁶ Cumont, op. cit. 287, n. 7; *Κόμμοδος* . . . εὐσεβής, εὐτυχής . . . ἀνίκητος; cf. also ibid. 288; Dio Cassius, lxxii, 15, 5; Aymard and Auboyer, *Rome et son empire*, 563 (*Histoire général des civilisations* II); Mattingly, op. cit. 215; Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 352 (on Nero as Mithras).

of the first century A.D. was placed in the forefront of the official religions by the emperor; in this way he could prepare the Roman people to accept the absolute despotism of Egyptian theocracy.

The conception of *Sol* illuminating the universe and ruling over the stars, as Mithraism propounded, made him, as we have said, the only god of the heavens, after the model of the monarchy on earth.¹ Here we find established, in opposition to the regular Roman principle of nationalism in cults, the idea of universal dominion assimilated to the conception of the unconquerable sun. By these special means each emperor allowed himself to be called by names connected with the sun; thus Caligula was *ὁ νέος Ἥλιος Γαῖος Καῖσαρ*² while Nero was *νέος Ἥλιος ἐπιλάμψας τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν*.³ Dio Cassius tells us that the same emperor allowed himself to be worshipped under the guise of Mithras: *προσκυνήσων σε (Nero) ὡς καὶ τὸν Μίθραν*.⁴



FIG. 1

These official gains, however, were not enough to satisfy the ambitions of the emperors who wanted to go still farther. That is the reason why, in the third century, the emperors encouraged the Alexandrian cults. In spite of the resistance of the Romans to the Egyptian cult, 'l'histoire n'enregistre plus que des triomphes pour le culte alexandrin. C'est à peine si la voix moqueuse de Juvenal lui lançait, en passant, quelques sarcasmes'.⁵

In fact it was in this century that these religions were most successful, and the cults of the Egyptian gods Isis and Serapis, and of the Asiatic gods Cybele and Mithras in particular reached their apogee, 'non plus seulement par la tolérance, mais par l'adhésion personnelle des empereurs'.⁶ Thus we find the Egyptian god Serapis represented on Roman coins in the same manner as on Alexandrian coins struck locally for Egypt. One gold coin (*aureus*) has the following legend (fig. 1):

¹ Aymard and Auboyer, op. cit. 337.

² Dittenberger, no. 279, l. 4; Cumont, op. cit. 290, n. 2; J. Charbonneaux, *Hommage à Waldemar Deonna* in *Collection Latomus*, xxviii (1957), 140, n. 3; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 162; L'Orange, *Apotheosis*, 62.

³ Cumont, op. cit. 290, n. 2; also, *Inscr. gr. gr. sept.* 2714. For Nero and his sympathy with eastern religions, see L'Orange, op. cit. 60; Cerfau and Tondriau, op. cit. 353 (see pp. 342-7 for Caligula in this respect). For the embalming of Poppaea like an Egyptian queen, see L'Orange, op. cit. 61-63; and for the rotunda built by Nero, the emperor Helios who is cosmocrator, cf. id., *Expressions of cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*, 487-8 (*La Regalia sacra—The Sacred Kingship*, 1955).

⁴ Dio Cassius, II, 12; Cumont, loc. cit., n. 4; ibid. 288.

⁵ G. Lafaye, *Histoire du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie, Serapis, Isis, Harpocrate et Anubis, hors de l'Égypte*, 61.

⁶ Aymard and Auboyer, op. cit. 563; cf. also Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, 78-79. From the time of Domitian, Isis and Serapis enjoyed the favour of all the imperial dynasties—the Flavians, the Antonines, and the Severi; the gods of Egypt had become quite Roman, as the apologist Minucius Felix claimed (*Octav.* 22, 2).

Obv.: ANTONINUS PIUS AUG. GERM. Bust of Caracalla, wearing a laurel crown, facing right, with breast-plate.

Rev.: P. M. TR. P. XVII. IMP. III. COS. IIII. P. P. Pluto (Serapis) seated, facing left with right hand outstretched over Cerberus; in left hand, a staff.¹

It was under the Antonines that the cult of the Egyptian gods reached its peak, and particularly under the emperor Caracalla 'qui célébra aussi ces mystères et ajouta à la pompe des cérémonies du culte qu'on ne faisait pas avant lui'.² This happened in spite of the old-established rivalry which was the result of the religious hostility between Egypt and Persia in the Rome of the emperors. This is how Caracalla came to build a Serapeum, and had a sanctuary of Mithras laid out in the vaults of his great baths.³

We have so far examined the political development from the time of the principate up to this intermediary stage when the Roman people were governed by emperors who officially held the title of *deus noster* and the Mithraic epithet *invictus*, which became a part of the imperial titulature. Now we come to the point when the Roman emperors, in the reigns of Caracalla and his successors, attained their ideal, a theocracy after the Egyptian pattern, with the official title of *cosmocrator*. The identification of Caesar and god became absolute as in Egypt. This is the essential difference between the cult of the king as practised by the Romans and the Egyptians. The Romans considered that it was only the spirit of the emperor that was sacred, making him a supernatural being, or an intermediary, *μεσίτης*, like Mithras, between the god and the people. In consequence, his deification took place after his death, whereas the Egyptians looked on the Pharaoh as god himself and made him a divine king in his lifetime.

So it was through Egypt and Egyptian religion that the emperors reached the goal to which they aspired. Caracalla was the first to arrive at this stage, as is proved by a small coin of billon, as yet unpublished, which we shall study later on together with a small group of his coins from the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria. The type on the reverse of this piece (pl. X, 1) shows that the emperor Caracalla, here portrayed as the god Serapis, is now *cosmocrator*, with dominion over both heaven and earth.

Like the Pharaohs and the Ptolemies before him, and in imitation of Alexander the Great in particular, Caracalla wanted to become a god of the Romans and of all the other inhabitants of his empire. Indeed, his religious system for the unification of the Roman world was closely linked with his other political and social programmes. In A.D. 212 he conferred the rights of citizenship (*civitas romana*) on all his subjects, except the *dediciti*: Δίδωμι, τοί(ν)υν ἅπα[σι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν 'Ρωμαϊκ]ήν οἰκουμένην π[ολιτ]είαν 'Ρωμαίων [μ]ένοντος [δὲ ξένου οὐδενὸς τῶν ταγμ]άτων χωρ[ὶς] τῶν [δε]δειτικίων.⁴ Whatever his

¹ Mattingly, op. cit. iv, pt. i, 246, no. 242 (pl. xii, 14). Commodus and his successors represented oriental gods. After the time of the Severi the empire of the Syrian god *Sol* began. The tetrarchy revived the Roman Empire of Jupiter; Licinius was followed by Constantine who renounced *Sol* for Christ, cf. L'Orange, *Apotheosis*, 86; Mattingly, op. cit. 214 says: 'Sun disappeared from coins after about 317. Julian the Apostate inherited the family-worship of *Sol* and tried to make him the centre of his restored Paganism. But Julian died and sun-god worship died with him.'

² Lafaye, op. cit. 62; cf. also, for the cult among the Romans, J. Marquardt, *Manuel des antiquités rom.* xii, *Le Culte chez les Romains* (tr. Brissaud), 97.

³ Aymard and Auboyer, op. cit. 563.

⁴ F. M. Heichelheim, *JEA* 26 10 ff. (col. I, 7-9 of the text); for another reading, see A. N. Sherwin-White,

motive may have been, by this edict Caracalla made all his subjects equal Roman citizens, all with the same rights, and all placed under the same obligations.¹ This edict was a very efficient and powerful instrument for the unification of the Roman world.²

Together with this praiseworthy act came the doctrine which made the emperor into a god for all the Roman citizens. This idea which had been formulated at the very beginning of the Empire and which had spread throughout nearly the whole of the ancient world, was not finally realized until the third century A.D. A cult of the emperor, valid for all Romans, was another very effective method of bringing about the political unity of the Empire. Christianity weakened this unity politically by creating a religious unity, and in abolishing the cult of the emperor, it gave rise to the nationalism which was to bring about the end of the Roman Empire. This opposition of ideas was the principal reason for the mortal struggle that developed between Roman paganism and Christianity.

By the concession of citizenship Caracalla showed his desire to see all his subjects united under one religion.³ It was to safeguard the unification of the empire that together with it he laid down the doctrine proclaiming the divinity of the emperor in his lifetime, thus becoming a theocrat. To this end he turned to the Egyptian gods whom not only the Egyptians, but also the Greeks and the Romans held in great devotion; their cult was spread throughout the empire. The emperor himself was very zealous in his devotion to them, and in his position as brother or son of the gods he is the only Roman emperor who has left us a statue of himself portrayed as a Pharaoh (fig. 2).⁴ It was his foremost wish to establish this conception which was at once religious and political.



FIG. 2

Thus Caracalla, in his policy of theocracy and universality, took his support from the triad of Egyptian deities, Isis, Serapis, and Harpocrates, but especially from Serapis

The Roman Citizenship, 224, and for the meaning of *dediticii*, 224-5. See also P. Jouguet, *La Domination romaine en Égypte aux deux premiers siècles après Jésus-Christ*, 57-59; id., *Précis de l'histoire de l'Égypte*, 1, 394; id., *La Vie municipale en Égypte*, 193; Rostovtzeff, op. cit. 605, n. 37; id., *A History of the Ancient World*, 11 (Rome), 318; *CAH* XI, 657. 670. 812. 829; M. Cary, *A History of Rome down to the Reign of Constantine*, 713; Aymard and Auboyer, op. cit. 537 ff.; A. Piganiol, *Histoire de Rome*, 339-400; Mattingly, op. cit. 68.

¹ Dio Cassius, LXXVIII, 9, 5, says that Caracalla issued this edict to ensure that everyone paid taxes, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ξένους τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν μὴ συντέλεω, ἀπέδειξεν.

² Cf. Jouguet, *Domination*, 57; Homo, op. cit. 408-10; Sherwin-White, op. cit. 221, says of the text contained in P. Giss. 40 that 'there was a completion or assimilation or unification, ἐξάπλωσις or ὁμάλωσις or ὅλωσις'; cf. also p. 223; *CAH* XI, 82: 'This law was a step towards unification.'

³ Cf. Wilcken, *Archiv*, v, 291 f.; Sherwin-White, op. cit. 222; Piganiol, op. cit. 403; Mason Hammond, *The Antonine Monarchy*, 140-2 (see 142 for the meaning of the term *dediticii*).

⁴ This statue, in the Cairo Museum, is undoubtedly of Caracalla, although the Museum authorities make the attribution with much uncertainty, cf. Maspero, *Ars Una*, 256. From its close relationship with other statues which certainly belong to this emperor, we can be sure that it does represent Caracalla.

(Osiris-Apis, or Osorapis), the eponymous god of Egypt, for whom the emperor had a passionate admiration.¹ M. P. Hombert, in a very interesting article, questions whether there might not be a connexion between Serapis and Caracalla.² We think that we have been able to establish this connexion.

In fact many of the coins of Caracalla, specimens of which are very few in number, carry representations of Serapis. Indeed, the proportion of types portraying this god is quite considerable when compared with other types. Among these representations of Serapis there are two types showing the god and the emperor together, which are of exceptional political significance. Feuardent mentions in his catalogue a bronze piece which shows:³



FIG. 3

Obv.: K MAYPCE ANTΩNINOC. Head of Caracalla, wreathed with laurel, facing right.

Rev.: Caracalla standing, turned to the left, facing right; behind him Serapis, facing left, his hand raised, crowning with laurels the head of the emperor who holds a sceptre; in the left hand field, LKA (fig. 3).

The interpretation of this representation is very significant. In crowning the emperor with laurel, Serapis has bestowed his grace on him. He has made a wise decision,⁴ for the emperor is *εὐσεβής*, *εὐτυχής*, and *ἀνίκητος*, and has received grace from Serapis inasmuch as he is *pius*, *felix*, and *invictus*.⁵ The king, who is thus judged and honoured by Serapis, must therefore be *κοσμοκράτωρ*, ruling over the whole universe, receiving grace from the sun, the shining star which lights the universe, and which establishes monotheism in the heavens like the monarchy which holds dominion over the earth.⁶ By virtue of this grace, as though aided by the light from heaven which illumines the universe and orders the destiny of all things, nothing happening in the inhabited

¹ Dio Cassius, LXXII, 15, mentions a statue in gold of Commodus weighing 1,000 pounds; the emperor was represented with a bull and a cow. L'Orange, *Apotheosis*, 72 claims that this 'can only be understood as Commodus-Horus between Osiris-Apis and the cow Isis, having its natural place with the many manifestations of Commodus' Egyptian religiosity'. Cf. Cerfau and Tondriau, *op. cit.* 367: 'Commode fut avec Néron le seul empereur vivant reconnu par le sénat parmi les dieux publics.'

² P. Hombert, 'Serapis, *κοσμοκράτωρ* et Isis, *κοσμοκράτειρα*. A propos de quelques terres cuites inédites' in *Antiquité classique*, XIV (1946), fasc. 2, 319.

³ F. Feuardent, *Numismatique—Égypte ancienne*, Coll. Giovanni di Demetrio, pt. 2, *Domination romaine*, o. 2309.

⁴ Cf. *infra*.

⁵ Beginning from the third century A.D. these titles became part of the protocol and they are regular from the time of Caracalla; cf. Cumont, *op. cit.* 287, n. 4, 8. The designation *invictus* was one applied to the solar gods of the East, e.g. *Jovi soli invicto Serapidi* and *invicto deo Serapi*.

⁶ Cf. Cumont, *op. cit.* 337.

world can escape the notice of Caracalla . . . λέληθεν οὐδὲν τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς οὕτως οὐδέ σε τῶν δρώμενων. . . .

This idea is not found expressed anywhere before the reign of Caracalla, either in ancient texts or in inscriptions. We find it, however, in a representation on another coin in billon, as yet unpublished, from Caracalla's reign, which is in the Department of Coins and Medals in the Cairo Museum (pl. X, 1). The reverse of this coin shows Serapis standing, facing left, with a modius on his head, and before him the emperor standing, facing right, receives the globe from him; between them in the middle is a serpent. This representation is also very significant. In Egypt Serapis is the eponymous god, he is Helios himself. He is shown on Alexandrian coins as Helios,¹ standing, facing left, his one hand raised, the other holding the sceptre, his head surrounded with rays of light and wearing a modius, and with the inscription ΗΛΙΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΠΙΣ (fig. 4).²



FIG. 4



FIG. 5

For the Greeks and Romans he is Zeus-Serapis. He also united in himself all the qualities and all the strength of the other gods, Helios, Asclepios, Zeus, Amen-rē, Poseidon, Dionysius, and the Nile god. Thus on another Alexandrian coin (fig. 5a),³ a bust of him is shown facing right, a modius on his head, with light rays and the two horns of Zeus-Amūn; in front, in the field, is a serpent-headed rod, the symbol of Asklepios, and a trident. On another piece we see in the field, a cornucopia, symbol of the Nile (fig. 5b).⁴ Like *Sol* he is the first and only being in whom all things resolve and come into harmony with each other; his oneness is a form of pantheism which comprehends polytheism.⁵

¹ In ancient times the sun was variously named and represented: 'Soit comme Apollon, soit directement sous le nom grec Helios ou le nom latin Sol, Jupiter, Sarapis ou Mithra', Aymard and Auboyer, op. cit. 563.

² A piece in billon struck in the sixth year of Domitian (A.D. 87). The obverse has: AVTKAΙΣΑΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣΣΕΒΓΕΡΜ and head of Domitian crowned with laurel, facing right; S. Poole, *Cat. of Greek Coins of Alexandria and the Nomes in the Brit. Mus.*, no. 284.

³ Bronze coin dated in the eighth year of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 145):

Obv.: AVTKTAΙΑΔ . . ., with head of Antoninus crowned with laurel, facing right; *Num. Augg. Alexandrini*, I, no. 2868.

⁴ Bronze coin dated to year seven of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 146):

Obv.: AVTKTAΙΑΑΔΡ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟC ΕΥCΕΒ, with head of emperor crowned with laurel, facing right; *Cat. BM*, op. cit., no. 1102.

⁵ Cf. Piganiol, op. cit. 564; also Chapot in Hanotaux, *Histoire de la nation égyptienne. L'Égypte romaine*, 349; H. I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Greco-Roman Egypt*, 19-21; J. Marquardt, op. cit. 105, n. 3; P. Roussel, *Cultes égyptiens à Delos*, 151, no. 126 and pp. 274-5; P. Perdrizet and G. Lefebvre, *Les Graffiti grecs du Memnonion d'Abydos*, p. xvi. In fact, by the third century, worship of the sun had absorbed all other deities and become a monotheism in which the supreme being was adored in many aspects and with many names, cf. Macrobius, *Saturnal.*, I, 17; Cumont, op. cit. I, 337.

The type represented on our coin shows Serapis as Helios presenting the globe to Caracalla (as shown by a bronze coin of the time of the emperor Probus—fig. 6):¹



FIG. 6

Obv.: IMP CMAUR PROBUS P FAUG. Bust with rays of light around head and wearing breastplate.

Rev.: IOVICONSERVAT. Emperor standing, facing right, receives globe from Jupiter, standing, facing left and holding a sceptre.

According to Cook, this globe was the symbol of the heavens: 'it was delegated by Jupiter to his human representative'.² We may note here also two coins on which the bust of Serapis is shown on the globe. The first (fig. 7) is a lead coin of Alexandria:



FIG. 7

Obv.: Bust of Serapis, wearing modius, on globe.

Rev.: Horus of Heracleopolis standing, facing right, crowned with the *atef*-crown, holding a sceptre in both hands. On the right, Nike approaches him, holding a wreath; on the left, a griffon, facing right.³

The second is a bronze coin of Trajan in the collection of the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria, on which the bust of Serapis on a globe is raised up by two Nikes (fig. 8). Strong puts forward the proposition that the globe should be taken 'as a cosmic symbol implying when it is given to the emperor not deification merely but assimilation to Jupiter himself'.⁴

¹ Cook, *Zeus*, 1, fig. 18—an example struck at Ticinum.

² Cook, *op. cit.* 46; cf. also Strong, *Apotheosis and After Life*, 34.

³ Milne, *Alexandrian Coins in the Ashmolean Museum*, no. 5332.

⁴ Strong, *op. cit.* 35. *Sol* is represented on the coins, under the mystical name *ἐπτάκτις*, holding the whip and the globe which is the symbol of universal dominion.

This conception of Zeus presenting the globe to the emperor is to be found (with Zeus in the form of Serapis), on a bronze coin of Alexandria which shows, on the reverse, Hadrian in the temple of Serapis which is distyle and has Corinthian columns and a disk on the pediment; in it Serapis, standing, with a modius on his head, holds a sceptre and presents the globe to Hadrian who stands, wreathed with laurel, with one hand resting on a stela bearing the inscription Α Δ Ρ, and the other hand holding a sceptre (fig. 9).¹

I A
N O N



FIG. 8



FIG. 9

This idea of presenting the globe to Hadrian in the temple of Serapis proves that the globe is the symbol of *aeternitas*, and that Serapis, by giving it to Hadrian, his representative, offers him spiritual dominion.² To this image of Serapis giving the globe to Caracalla, our coin adds that of the serpent, who is the symbol of *Magna Terra*. These are the two principal worlds, the world of the stars belonging to Helios who rules destinies, and illuminates the world and the darkness of evil, and the world of the earth represented by the serpent, the sacred creature of Ancient Egypt and the symbol of terrestrial divinity in Graeco-Roman times, who remains under the hand of the god and of the emperor. The earth, which always had the serpent as its symbol, is represented, in the group of primary bodies or four elements (*στοιχεῖα*, which Helios or Serapis governs, and which Mithraism deified,³ and which, according to the physical theories of the ancients, made up the universe) by a serpent in the allegorical group in which the lion represents fire and the dish represents water (fig. 10).⁴ This earth or *οἰκουμένη*, the emperor's dominion and the globe, symbol of the dominion of Serapis,

¹ Milne, *op. cit.*, no. 1380. This coin was struck in year 17 of Hadrian (A.D. 134).

² On the globe as the symbol of *aeternitas*, see Cumont, *op. cit.* 85; Strong, *op. cit.* 34.

³ After a dedicatory inscription found in the Mithraeum in the Baths of Caracalla (*εἰς Ζεὺς Μίτρας κοσμοκράτωρ ἀνείκητος*) where the name of Mithras is surcharged on that of Serapis. Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, 79 (with fig. 5) gives the primality of the Egyptian Serapis over the Persian Mithras; cf. also *id.*, *Mithra ou Sarapis Cosmocrator* (Acad. des Inscr. et Belles Lettres 1919), 322; *id.*, *Monuments I*, 108. 298. On the Egyptian gods and Mithras as the gods of the four elements, see *Manuel des antiquités romaines*, XII, 105.

⁴ The group of serpent, dish (or vase), and lion occurs on the stela illustrated in fig. 10 below; it is shown beneath the body of the bull being slain by Mithras. The stela was found in 1826 in the first discovered Mithraeum at Heidenfeld, near Hedderheim, cf. Cumont, *Monuments*, II, no. 251, pp. 362-5, and pl. vii; M. G. Vermaseren, *Corpus Inscr. et Mon. religionis mithriacae*, no. 908, p. 328, and fig. 238. For the serpent as a chthonian symbol, see Cook, *Zeus*, II, 111; Perdrizet, *Les Terres cuites grecques de l'Égypte*, 74.

both given to the emperor, illustrate the conception which underlines the emperor's intention: the universal rule of παντοκράτωρ or κοσμοκράτωρ,¹ of one who is *omnipotens*, as the imperial titulature proclaimed; he was κύριος or σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, or κτίστης τῆς οἰκουμένης.² Caracalla was the first Caesar to hold this dignity.



FIG. 10

This coin agrees entirely with the texts which call Caracalla κοσμοκράτωρ; texts which first appeared in his reign. We should particularly note that inscription in which Caligula is 'τὸν κοσμοκράτορα Marcus, Aurelius, Severus, Antony. . . εὐτυχῇ εὐσεβῇ σεβαστὸν τὸν φιλοσάραπιν', cited by Gauthier, and dated in the year 24 of his reign, day 15 of the month Phamenoth.³ Another inscription describes Caracalla as saviour of all the inhabited world . . . [Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα] Μάρκον Αὐρήλιον Σεουήρον Ἀντωνῖνον Εὐτυχῇ Εὐσεβῇ Σεβαστὸν τὸν σωτήρα τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης, etc., dated in the 21st year of his reign, day 12 of the month Athyr.⁴

One of the numerous representations of Caracalla as κοσμοκράτωρ found not only on coins⁵ but also on other objects, is that on a clipeus, where his bust is shown on a shield with rays surrounding his head in the manner of an *imago clipeata* (fig. 11). Thus, as l'Orange says, 'the rays of the sun surround his head, he is adopting the word of Tertullianus *Sol in suo clipeo*'.⁶

¹ Cf. Cumont, *Mithra ou Sarapis Cosmocrator*, 320 (CRAIBL 1919).

² Ibid. 323.

³ Gauthier, *Le Livre des rois*, v, 204, no. XXVI. This inscription was found at Alexandria and is now in the Graeco-Roman Museum there; cf. Botti, *Cat. du Musée d'Alexandrie*, 282, no. 105; Breccia, *Cat. gén. Musée d'Alexandrie*, *Inscr. gr. et lat.* 59, no. 83; Preisigke, *Samm. griech. Urk. aus Aegypt.* 1, no. 4275.

⁴ Gauthier, *op. cit.* v, 201, no. XIII.

⁵ L'Orange, *Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*, 144, cf. fig. 101b—a representation of the emperor Caracalla on a solar chariot as a 'heaven soaring cosmocrator'.

⁶ Ibid. 98, fig. 70; cf. *id.*, *Expressions of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World*, 488 ff., particularly 490 and 491-2.

An enthusiastic admirer of Alexander the Great, Caracalla wanted himself to become a hero like him;¹ he dreamed of unifying the ancient world as Alexander had done. According to the history of the Pseudo-Callisthenes, which was compiled in Alexandria probably during the imperial period, Alexander was *πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης κοσμοκράτορα βασιλέα*.²



FIG. 11

After Caracalla, at the end of pagan times, texts mention emperors who turned to the great Serapis, foremost among the gods (*ἐν πρώτοις δὲ ὁ μέγας Σάραπισ*) so that they might take the title *κοσμοκράτωρ*; we can cite Julian the Apostate who wrote to the Alexandrians that all the gods, and foremost among them Great Serapis, had judged him worthy of governing the universe: *‘Ημεῖς οὓς οἱ θεοὶ πάντες, ἐν πρώτοις δὲ ὁ μέγας Σάραπισ ἄρχεν ἐδικαίωσαν τῆς οἰκουμένης*.³

There is a striking coincidence between this text and the representations on two coins. The first coin, which has been mentioned above (fig. 3), shows Serapis crowning Caracalla; it signifies that the emperor is judged worthy by the great Serapis to be *εὐτυχῆς*, *εὐσεβῆς*, and *φιλοσάραπισ*.⁴ The second coin (fig. 12) shows Serapis giving the globe to Caracalla with the serpent beneath their hands; here is expressed the idea which completes the meaning of the text *ἄρχεν τῆς οἰκουμένης*. By putting the representations on these two coins together, we obtain a pictorial version of the same idea as that expressed in Julian's text. Caracalla wanted to unify and Romanize the ancient

¹ ὁ Φιλαλεξανδρότατος Ἀντωνῖνος, Dio Cassius, LXXVIII, 9. Caracalla believed that Alexander was reincarnated in himself so that he could live again in him, after having lived such a short time formerly. For Caracalla's Alexandrian aspirations, cf. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 373; M. Cary, *A History of Rome down to the reign of Constantine*, 718; Jouguet, *Précis de l'histoire d'Égypte*, I, 70; Cerfau and Tondriaux, op. cit. 369.

² Pseudo-Call. (ed. Müller) I, p. 7; III, 21 (p. 130). Cf. Cumont, op. cit. 323 and n. 4. For Alexander as *cosmocrator*, assimilated to *Sol*, see pseudo-Call. I, 20 (p. 29).

³ Julian, Epist. 10, p. 378; cf. Cumont, loc. cit.

⁴ Cf. the consecration of the emperor Gordian III made by the town of Gaza: *Αὐτοκράτορα καίσαρα Μ. Ἀντωνίου Γορδιανόν Εὐσεβῆ Εὐτυχῇ Σεβαστὸν τὸν θεοφιλέστατον κοσμοκράτορα ἢ πόλις ἢ τῶν Γαζαίων . . . ἐξ ἐνκελεύσεως τοῦ πατρὸς θεοῦ . . .* I.G. xiv, 926 (= CIG 2892).

world just as Alexander had tried to Hellenize it, and as Darius, King of the Persians, had tried to make it Persian. It was in the East, and above all in Egypt, that the emperors found their religious, political, and administrative ideal. It was the theocratic principles of Egypt which formed the kernel of the unity and the grandeur of the Roman Empire.



FIG. 12

Can we draw any conclusions from the relation between Serapis *κοσμοκράτωρ* and Caracalla *κοσμοκράτωρ*, established from these texts and these coins? All that we can say is that, after Caracalla, the emperors were assimilated to the god Helios, and that, by means of this assimilation, the domination of the whole universe, and the quality of invincibility passed to the emperors who became gods living, for the time being, on earth.

Description of the plate

On pl. X are illustrated six Alexandrian coins of Caracalla. The little coin in billon (1) belongs to a large group of coins of several emperors, found in the Delta and now in the Cabinet des Médailles in the Cairo Museum. It is the only piece in the group coming from the reign of Caracalla. The five larger coins are all of bronze and form part of the collection of Alexandrian coins in the Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria.

1. Obv. Inscription worn. Bust of Caracalla, crowned with laurel, facing right.
Rev. Serapis, standing, facing left, crowned with modius (obscure), giving the globe to the emperor Caracalla, who stands opposite, facing right (head lost). In between, below their hands, a serpent.
Date worn. 24 mm. Billon.
2. Obv. Inscription worn. Same bust.
Rev. Serapis, seated, facing left, crowned with the modius, holding a sceptre and with one hand stretched over Cerberus (?).
Reverse very worn. Date worn. 32 mm. Bronze.
Cf. Dattari, *Numi Augg. Alexandrini*, no. 4073 (not illustrated).
3. Obv. . . . TK MAYPCEANTΩNINOC . . . (worn—inscription very vague). Same bust.
Rev. Entrance of a building with three doors; in the biggest door in the centre reclines Euthenia, facing left, crowned with wheat (?); in the right-hand door, Harpocrates (?), standing *en face*, looking left, crowned with the *hemhem* (?) and holding a sceptre; in the left-hand door, a figure (?), standing, facing left, holding a sceptre and with uncertain head-dress. Above the building is a figure of Serapis, reclining, facing left, crowned with the modius, one hand raised with crown; then Harpocrates, facing left, seated on Serapis' legs, finger to mouth, crowned with *hemhem*; then Isis, seated, facing right, one hand raised (?), with head-dress; next, Tyche, seated, facing right, crowned with the modius, holding a cornucopia (?); lastly, Hermanubis (?), seated, facing right, crowned with the modius, holding . . . (?). In the exergue, [L]KA.
Reverse very worn. 34 mm. Bronze.
Cf. *BM Cat.* 1478 (not exactly the same).



ALEXANDRIAN COINS OF CARACALLA

4. Obv. ΑΥΤ[Κ]ΜΑ[ΥΡΕ]CΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟ[Σ] . . . ΕΓΕΥCΕΒ. (inscription vague). Same bust.
 Rev. Tyche seated, facing left, crowned with the modius, holds a rudder and a cornucopia;
 before, to the left, [Λ]ΚΑ.
 35mm. Bronze.
5. Obv. Inscription worn. Same bust.
 Rev. Orpheus seated, facing right, holding a lyre and surrounded by animals. Date worn.
 34mm. Bronze.
6. Obv. . . . ΜΑΥΡΕCΑΝΤ . . . Inscription worn. Same bust.
 Rev. Hercules standing, facing left, without beard, holds victory (?) in a raised hand, with a
 club in the other; on his shoulder, the skin of a lion. Date worn. Reverse worn.
 34 mm. Bronze.

THE ΔΙΟΛΚΟΣ OF ALEXANDRIA

By P. M. FRASER

Two fragments of Xenocrates of Aphrodisias, the Greek doctor of the first century A.D. renowned for his work on drugs (sometimes of the most repellant kind) and dietetics,¹ refer to a δίολκος, a slipway for ships, at Alexandria. These passages have never, to the best of my knowledge, been utilized for the topography of the city, and since recent excavations have revealed the remains of the diolkos at Corinth,² it is worth while drawing attention to its Alexandrian counterpart, even though we cannot learn anything about its construction.

The two passages are preserved by Oribasius, the physician of Julian the Apostate, in his *ιατρικὴ συναγωγή*, 'Medical Compendium', the work to which we owe much of our knowledge of Greek medical writers whose treatises are otherwise lost. They are both concerned with dietetics.

The first passage is *Coll. Med.* II, 58, 54-55 (*CMG* VI, 1, 1): γίνονται δὲ καὶ γένη πελωρίδων τε καὶ χημῶν διάφοροι δὲ ποικίλαι καὶ στρογγύλαι ὡς αἱ ἐν Δικαιαρχίᾳ ἐν τῷ Λουκρίνῳ λάκκῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ λιμένι· γλυκεῖαι γὰρ καὶ εὐχυλοι. αἱ δ' ὑπὲρ Φάρον καὶ τὸν Δίολκον τήν τε γέφυραν καὶ τὴν νῆσον ἐπιμήκεις, τραχεῖαι, βαλάνοις ἐοικυῖαι δρυίναις, ἐμπερὶ φηγοῖς τὸν ἐχίνον φερόμεναι.

The second is *ibid.* II, 58, 129: αἱ δὲ γλυκυμαρίδες χαριέστεραι τῶν λειοστράκων κογχῶν, ἥττους δὲ πελωρίδων. διαλλάττουσι δὲ κατὰ τόπους τοῖς εἶδεσι, ὡς πελωρίδες καὶ χημαί, ποικιλία καὶ σχηματισμῶ· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ λιμένι ἄρισται, αἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Δίολκον καὶ Φάρον καὶ γέφυραν ἐπιμήκεις καὶ τραχεῖαι.

The first passage may be translated thus:

'And there are (different) species of both mussels and clams; some are spotted and round as are those in Dicaearchia [Puteoli] in the Lucrine Lake and in the harbour of Alexandria: these are sweet and succulent. But those beyond Pharos and the Diolkos and the Bridge and the Island are longish and prickly, resembling acorns of the oak, with a calyx like that of the acorn of the wild oak'.

The second thus:

'And the glycyumarides [a kind of cockle] are more pleasant than the smooth-shelled cockles, but are inferior to the pelorides [the mussels mentioned in the previous passage]. Like the pelorides they vary in respect both of colour and shape in different localities. Those in the harbour of Alexandria are the best, while those in the neighbourhood of the Diolkos and the Pharos and the Bridge are longish and prickly.'

These passages contain a number of difficulties, but before we can attend to them we must remove one possible source of confusion. Apart from the Diolkos of Corinth only

¹ For Xenocrates see Allbutt, *Greek Medicine at Rome*, 382, and for his use by Pliny see Wellmann, *Hermes*, 42 (1907), pp. 614-29.

² For the Corinthian diolkos see Verdelis, *Ath. Mitt.* 71 (1956), 50-59.

one other diolkos is known, namely, the False Mouth (Ψευδοστόμιον) of the Nile recorded by Ptolemy (IV, 5, 10) as lying between the false mouth of Pineptimi (otherwise unknown) and the Pathmetic mouth. The same Διολκος is recorded by Stephanus of Byzantium in two different places (s.vv. Ἀβδηρα and Ὠρεός), in each case to instance the ethnic derivation Διολκος-Διολκίτης. To judge by its name (as we must surely do, when the name is so descriptive) this Διολκος was a strip of land at the silted-up mouth of some small branch of the Nile (Ptolemy does not record by name a branch which flows through Diolkos), across which ships were transported to the neighbouring Mediterranean coast.¹ Stephanus's Διολκίτης is a purely grammatical form, and gives no ground for supposing that there was an urban settlement there. It is, in any case, quite clear that Xenocrates's διολκος is somewhere in the neighbourhood of Alexandria (a point to which we shall shortly return), and that it has nothing whatever to do with the false mouth of the Nile. We may therefore consider Xenocrates's statement without paying further heed to Ptolemy or Stephanus.

As to the reliability of Xenocrates's statement there can surely be no doubt. The information it provides is obviously based on intimate knowledge of Alexandria (though not necessarily knowledge at first hand), and the places named self-evidently real. Their introduction would otherwise be pointless.

In other respects, however, the passages, so simple at first sight, are far from clear. There are difficulties both of orientation and specific identification. First, the word Φάρος. This can itself equally well refer either to the island as a whole or to the lighthouse at its eastern extremity, the two meanings being distinguished by gender, ἡ Φάρος denoting the island and ὁ Φάρος the lighthouse.² Here no article is used in either passage, and this would in itself rather lead us to expect that the reference is to the island. However, the first passage contrasts νῆσος and Φάρος, and since νῆσος by itself in Alexandria refers invariably to Pharos,³ this determines that the reference is to the lighthouse, and it is further legitimate to conclude that the same meaning is valid for the second passage. What bearing this has on the general orientation of the description we shall consider later.

Next, what is meant by γέφυρα, the Bridge? This is evidently so well-known as to need no further identification, and one would be inclined on this account to regard it as a synonym for the Heptastadion, the embankment linking the city and the island, which Strabo describes as a dike or embankment (χωμα) serving as a bridge (γέφυρα).⁴ However, the matter is not so simple as this. The embankment, as we know from various writers, and in particular from Strabo, was pierced at either extremity (that is, at a point close to the city and another close to the island) by two covered waterways

¹ Ball, *Egypt in the Classical Geographers*, 127-8 does not consider the literal meaning of the term when he says of the mouth that it was 'doubtless the place of outflow of only a minor stream'.

² Cf. Wachsmuth, *Rh. Mus.* 42 (1887), 462.

³ See, e.g., Strab. 792c; Aristaeas, 301; Joseph. *Ag XII*, 103; *Bell. Alex.* 17 and passim.

⁴ Loc. cit. 1, οὗτοι (the two harbours) δὲ συνεχεῖς ἐν βάθει ἐκείνῳ, τῷ ἑπτασταδίῳ καλουμένῳ χώματι διεργόμενοι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ παράκεινται· τὸ δὲ χωμά ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡπείρου γέφυρα ἐπὶ τὴν νῆσον κατὰ τὸ ἐσπέριον αὐτῆς μέρος ἐκτεταμένη, δύο διάπλους ἀπολείπουσα μόνον εἰς τὸν Εὐνόστου λιμένα, καὶ αὐτοὺς γεγεφυρωμένους· ἦν δ' οὐ γέφυρα μόνον ἐπὶ τὴν νῆσον τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑδραγωγίον, ὅτε γε ὠκεῖτο.

(διάπλους) giving passage from the one harbour to the other. Either of these bridges might be described as a γέφυρα, and the northern one was in fact specifically so called. A passage in the *Letter of Aristeas*,¹ no mean authority on local Alexandrian matters, while establishing this latter usage complicates the matter still further. Describing the journey of Demetrius of Phaleron and the Translators from the mainland to the island he says διελθουσῶν δὲ τριῶν ἡμερῶν παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὁ Δημήτριος καὶ διελθὼν τὸ τῶν ἑπτασταδίων ἀνάχωμα τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν νῆσον, καὶ διαβὰς τὴν γέφυραν καὶ προσελθὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰ βόρεια μέρη . . ., that is, 'Demetrius crossed the seven-stade embankment of the sea to the island, and crossed the bridge and came to the northern parts'. Here, unless the author is guilty of a gross tautology, the γέφυρα is distinct from the Heptastadion. Furthermore, the version of the letter given by Josephus,² which is admittedly not free from misunderstandings and errors, makes the distinction even clearer, for he says διαβὰς πρὸς τὴν γέφυραν. Here the preposition πρὸς surely indicates that the bridge is regarded as a separate structure from the embankment, and would justify the supposition that the embankment itself terminated in another bridge which formed the actual link between it and the island. This γέφυρα, 'the bridge', would then probably be that referred to by Xenocrates.

However, this is not certain. The author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*³ suggests that the γέφυρα may in fact refer to the bridge over the διάπλους at the northern end of the embankment, rather than to a separate bridge. He invariably calls the Heptastadion itself the *moles*, and refers continually both to the διάπλους and to the bridge over it as *pons*.⁴ Had there been an entirely separate bridge, such as the *Letter of Aristeas* at least permits us to suppose, it is difficult to see how he could have avoided mentioning it either for its own sake or so as to distinguish it from the other bridges. The most probable explanation of the words of Xenocrates, therefore, seems to be that he is referring to the bridge over the διάπλους at the northern end of the Heptastadion, and that it is to this bridge that the *Letter of Aristeas* also refers. It is not difficult to imagine that the 'bridge' at the northern end would in the course of time acquire an independent notional existence from the Heptastadion itself, which consisted otherwise, with the exception of the corresponding opening at the southern end, of an unbroken dam. In any case, it is clear from Aristeas that the γέφυρα, whether we regard it as a separate structure or not, is at the northern end of the Heptastadion, and this is sufficient for our present purpose.

Finally, the 'island', ἡ νῆσος. As already noted, in Alexandria ἡ νῆσος is invariably used of Pharos,⁵ and there is no likelihood that it refers to any other island, for example Antirrhodos.

The places named are, then, the lighthouse, the diolkos, the bridge at the northern end of the Heptastadion and the island itself. The more general question of orientation

¹ Arist. Ep. 301.

² Loc. cit.
³ Bell. Alex. 17-21, the account of the battle for Pharos and the Heptastadion. There is now a useful edition of the Bell. Alex. by J. Andrieu (Les Belles Lettres, 1954); the standard critical account of the whole campaign is that of Graindor, *La Guerre d'Alexandrie* (Rec. Trav. publ. par la fac. des lettres, Univ. Égypt., 7, 1931); for the battle for the Heptastadion see *ibid.* 107 ff.

⁴ See chs. 17-21, *passim*.

⁵ See above, p. 135 n. 3.

remains. In both passages Xenocrates contrasts the marine creatures of the harbour with those of the Pharos–Diolkos–‘Bridge’–island area. In the first he says that, in contrast to the sweet and digestible mussels to be found in the harbour, those ‘beyond’ (ὑπέρ) Pharos, etc., are longish and prickly; and in the second that the cockles in the harbour are very good, whereas those ‘in the neighbourhood of’ (περί) the Diolkos, Pharos, and the Bridge are longish and prickly. Evidently Xenocrates did not regard the second region which he describes as being in the harbour, while the ὑπέρ and νῆσος of the first passage suggest that he had in mind an area out to sea beyond Pharos. If so, the natural interpretation would be that the series of points, Diolkos–Pharos–Bridge, was on the north side of the island, where substantial harbour-works have been traced.¹ This, however, seems quite out of the question for the points named: there is no place here where a δίορκος would fulfil any function, and the ‘Bridge’ is certainly not in this area. Of course, Xenocrates may have had two quite different areas in mind—one out to sea north and west of the island and the lighthouse, and the other in the area designated by the terms of reference Diolkos and the Bridge—but it seems more likely that he is speaking, however vaguely, of a single area. We may rather suppose that he is, as it were, looking west from the Great Harbour and regarding Eunostus, the western harbour, together with a vague north-western extension, as the area ‘beyond’ the island, lighthouse, diolkos, and bridge. This seems the most probable explanation of both passages; the relative unimportance of the western harbour at this time being probably sufficient reason for the periphrastic phraseology.² Xenocrates, then, is thinking particularly of the western end of the δίορκος and of the bridge as the habitat of the inferior molluscs in question. The close connexion of the bridge and the diolkos being further assured by the copula τε linking them in the first passage, the most probable site for the latter is at the southern tip of the island, close to the northern end of the Heptastadion, where the distance to be traversed was about 700 metres. This seems as far as we can go with regard to location.

The question now arises of the date of construction of the diolkos. Here we find ourselves involved in arguments from silence which are particularly difficult to evaluate in the face of the general uncertainty of detail. Nevertheless it is difficult to feel that they are wholly lacking in force. The Heptastadion is described by Strabo as consisting of an embankment which acted as a bridge from the mainland to the island, and it carried an aqueduct (ὕδραγωγίον), ‘when it (the island) was inhabited’ (ὅτε γε ᾤκεῖτο).³ It contained in his day the two bridges which we have seen to have been placed one at either end of the embankment, by which ships passed between the Great Harbour and Eunostus. If the δίορκος was closely associated with the Heptastadion it is surely strange that he does not proceed to mention it at this point, and his silence at least raises the possibility that it did not exist at the time. Again, no reference to the diolkos

¹ See Jondet, *Les Ports submergés de l'ancienne île de Pharos* (Mémoires présentés à l'Institut égypt., 9, 1916), passim; Kees, *RE*, s.v. Pharos (1), cols. 1857–8.

² This is shown very clearly by Josephus, a contemporary of Xenocrates, for in his account (*B^J* IV, 607–15) of the harbour of Alexandria he ignores altogether Eunostus, and two generations earlier Strabo, though he duly records its existence and its relation to the great harbour, gives no details at all regarding it.

³ See p. 135 n. 4.

occurs in the detailed description of the fighting on the island and the Heptastadion given by the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*. This too is very surprising if the slipway was located somewhere close to the island and the Embankment, both of which were scenes of bitter fighting. The silence both of Strabo and of this author raises the presumption that the diolkos existed neither at the time of the Alexandrian War nor in that of Strabo's residence in Alexandria twenty-five years later.

Strabo tells us that the aqueduct operated when the island was inhabited, and goes on to say that the island had been laid waste by Julius Caesar, and was now inhabited only by a few fishermen.¹ Nevertheless, there was evidently some improvement in its condition in the course of the first century A.D.,² and it is possible that the construction of a slipway at the northern end of the Heptastadion was part of this improvement. It is probably useless to speculate why this was done. Certainly it would be rash to assume that the northern bridge of the Heptastadion had ceased to operate: the alternative route provided by the diolkos would enable small craft to avoid currents round the bridge when seas were high, or when large craft were using the waterways.

¹ Strab. in continuation of the passage quoted on p. 135 n. 4: νῦν δ' ἡρήμωσεν αὐτὴν ὁ θεὸς Καῖσαρ ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀλεξανδρείας πολέμῳ τεταγμένην μετὰ τῶν βασιλέων· ὀλίγοι δ' οἰκοῦσι πρὸς τῷ πύργῳ ναυτικοὶ ἄνδρες.

² There was an important fiscal post on Pharos in the Roman period: see Calderini, *Dizionario*, 160. For the statue in honour of Claudius erected there (as also at Taposiris and Pelusium) see P.Lond. 1912, 47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT

GREEK INSCRIPTIONS (1960)

By P. M. FRASER

I. *Bibliography*

(1) A survey of Greek epigraphy by J. and L. ROBERT appeared in the period covered by this bibliography: *REG* 73, 134-213.

(2) My own survey of the year 1959 appeared in *JEA* 46, 95-103.

(3) A bibliography of the writings of the late G. Lefebvre appeared in *BIFAO*, 58, xi-xxiii.

II. *Corpora etc.*

(4) In *Les Inscriptions grecques et latines du Colosse de Memnon* (Inst. franç. d'Arch. orient., Bibl. d'Étude, T. xxxi), A. and E. BERNARD, pupils of Professor L. Robert, have produced a definitive edition of the inscriptions (107 in all, both Greek and Latin), based on a study of the monument, for which both the editors and the publishers deserve our warmest thanks. Every text on the Colossus has been copied, and each reproduced both in photographs either of a larger ensemble (e.g. a leg or a foot bearing several separate inscriptions) or of the individual inscription (either a squeeze or the actual stone, or occasionally both), which are a model of epigraphical photography. The inscriptions, almost all of which have been previously edited (except the rather insignificant pieces, 52 (a fragmentary duplicate of 51), 63, 64, 77, 80-82, 88-89, 91, 104-6; to the exhaustive tables of concordance a brief list of *inedita* might have been added), are published according to chronological order, with lengthy lemmata giving the history of the publication of each item, and a very detailed palaeographical apparatus followed by a general discussion of the subject-matter. This is an exemplary publication: the editors' own supplements are few, cautious, and convincing, and I have only a few comments, based, it must be confessed, on a far from exhaustive scrutiny of the material. The presentation of the texts is excellent, and I have only two observations: (a) it is unfortunate that the three chronological divisions into which the texts fall (pre-Hadrianic, Hadrianic, and post-Hadrianic) are not typographically marked on pp. 57 and 130; the only indication given to the reader that he has passed from one group to another lies in the change in the running-title; the undated group, on the other hand, is clearly separated from the rest; (b) it is also regrettable that words, letters, etc., lost since the original publication of an inscription are not underlined in the customary way. As it is, although the information is given in the introductory lemmata in general terms, for exact information one must refer to the plates and back again: those who possess this book will find it convenient to do their own underlining.

The introduction contains a valuable conspectus of both technical and historical matters: the layout of the inscriptions on the monument, the change of attitude towards the Colossus revealed by the inscriptions in the course of time—the climax in religious feeling being reached in the reign of Hadrian under the stimulus of the emperor's own well-commemorated visit—, problems of chronology and sequence. I miss a section on the palaeography; the magnificent photographs provide an almost unique collection of dated semi-cursive, or at least non-documentary, hands of the first two centuries of the empire, and an analysis of this would have been a great help (for Latin no less than Greek texts). The editors' final judgement on the significance of the texts is worth quoting: it lies, they maintain, in the expression they (and particularly the epigrams) give to Hadrian's desire to use the miraculous phenomena to the glory both of Rome and of Greek culture: 'la statue chantante lui [Hadrian] a permis d'affermir la foi civique de tous ceux qui travaillaient avec lui à asseoir la puissance de l'Empire romain et la pérennité de la culture hellène, et qui, aux accents de Memnon, comprenaient que leur œuvre était bénie des dieux' (23-24).

A few points of detail may be noted. Nos. 13-14 exemplify the difficulty already mentioned, that of missing words not being underlined; 20: the photograph proves this to be one inscription (for the contrary view see *JEA* 43, 106, no. (33)), and shows how ensemble-photography is essential for the proper understanding of graffiti and all inscriptions spread over large areas. Similarly, the photograph (pl. xli) shows immediately

that the last line of 22 has nothing to do with the inscription immediately below it, 21, to which it has usually been assigned and printed as the first line (nor indeed does it seem to have much to do with ll. 1-2 of 22: see p. 71). 26, l. 2, VCRPITIANVS, which Mommsen (*CIL* III, 59) suggested might be Lucritianus: is the L, and particularly the horizontal stroke of it, not visible on the stone? 28, the first of Balbilla's poems, raises a slight problem of method. The mysterious 'Hefter' of the lemma and commentary is in fact Alphons Hecker. The same error, with the identical reference, occurs in Letronne's commentary on this inscription, *Rec.* II, p. 352. On the other hand, title and author of this work are given correctly, from Kaibel (1000), in the lemma to 72, but here too the authors have followed their secondary source without checking it, for they repeat the page-reference from Kaibel, who gives it as 63, which is the reference in the second edition of Hecker's work (1852) in which he proposed not, as Kaibel said, *Αὐρήλιος*, but *Ἀστεύλιος*; he proposed *Αὐρήλιος* in the first edition (1843), p. 10, but apparently withdrew it. Letronne, who saw only the first edition, rightly (*Rec.* II, p. 403) gave 'p. 10'. This is both confusing and alarming: evidently the authors saw neither edition of Hecker's book, but they should at least have noticed the inconsistencies, and at some point added clearly 'non vidimus'. In the commentary on the same 28 printing flaws in the note on l. 9 make this note difficult to follow without recourse to Kaibel; at the beginning of the line read *χάρε* and at the end *χ[ήρ]αις*. On p. 83, eleven lines from the end, for '28' read '38'. Page 101, end, a full-stop is inconveniently omitted at the end of this commentary. 41: the inscription referring to Fides Aquila from Antinoopolis is not in Cairo (though it once was), but in Alexandria (in the garden of the Museum). 61: I do not understand why Wescher's *ἀξία* is explicitly kept (see textual note on l. 6) when his *σοφία*, with which it presumably agreed, is discarded in favour of *σοφισ[τής]*. With the latter reading *ἀξία* must surely agree with *[τ]αῦτα* (so Kaibel). 67, ll. 6-7: it is difficult to believe that these two lines are actually part of the inscription. 68: the reference to the frequency of the name Heliodorus in Egypt seems irrelevant, since the bearer of it in question is a Syrian.

These are small points which detract little from the merits of this book, which will remain a standard work.

(5) W. PEEK's *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Akademie-Verlag) contains a selection of 482 epigrams from his *Griechische Versinschriften*, I (*GV*), in a form adapted for a wider public (standardized orthography, etc.), with a German prose translation, a few notes, an appendix containing verse translations, and numerous indexes. These latter include (379) a list of variants from the texts as published in *GV*, and (ibid.) a list of the few additional items (including some from Egypt) not in *GV*. Egypt is represented by about twenty-five pieces: 139 (Alexandria; cf. *JEA* 42, 106, no. (6)); 145 (Memphis: not in *GV*; see *JEA*, 41, 116, no. II); 163 (Karanis); 164-5 (Apollonopolis Magna); 176 (Alexandria); 180 (ibid.); 192 (ibid.); 193 (Naucratis); 194 (Memphis; not in *GV*; see *JEA* 41, 115, no. I); 263 (prov. unknown); 306 (prov. uncertain; see *JEA* 42, 105, no. (4), under 1089-90, and Peek's note ad loc.); 322 (Memphis); 326 (Hermopolis); 374 (prov. uncertain); 397 (prov. unknown; see *JEA* 45, 89, no. (14), for the difficulties of reading. In l. 1 Peek now reads 'Ομάρας for his previous 'Ομάρης, but the tau, whence the original editor's *όμαρτη*, seems clear on the photograph (*Meander*, 10, 79). His reading in l. 4 also seems to me to be excluded by the surviving marks on the stone, unless we are to assume a considerable lapicidal error: see *JEA* loc. cit.); 420 (Antinoopolis); 426 (prov. unknown); 427 (Saqqāra); 429 (Leontopolis); 437 (Herakleopolis); 439 (Alexandria); 450 (Hermopolis); 458 (Faiyūm; cf. *PCZ* 59, 532); 466 (Hermopolis); 473 (Memphis).

III. New Texts

(6) In *BIFAO* 60, 131-50, 'Épigraphes métriques d'un Pédotribe', ET. BERNARD publishes four epigrams of the late second or third century A.D. from a funerary chapel at Hermopolis Magna (Tūna el-Gebel) from photographs and copies of R. Remondon and others. They all concern a παιδοτρίβης, 'Ερμοκράτης' Ερμαίου, who died aged thirty-two. The second poem is of interest as stressing the pride of the paidotribe in his pupils: *ἐνθαδ' ἀπορ(ρ)ήξας ψυχὴν ὁ παροίθε(ν) πολέτας | πολλοὺς ἀλλήσαντας ἐφεξείης <σ>νεφέβους | οὐκ ἀπέληγον ἔθρους*. (He incidentally, 142, n. 2, corrects Peek's description (no. 1153) of a funerary stele from Terenuthis, and quotes (144, n. 6) the Naucratis epigram, *GV* 1002, l. 2, *ἐσβέσθη δ' ἐπτακαίκοσέτης*, for *σβέννυμι* in the sense of 'die'; and, on the general theme of consolation, *ibid.* 1198, 9 (Thebes) and 1975, 30 (Hermopolis Magna), and for the joys of family life *ibid.* 1680, 9-12). In the third poem the tomb speaks, employing the language of the palaestra to describe the victory of death (ll. 9-10; *ἀλλὰ πεσών [α]ντὸς θανάτου κρατερὰς παλάμαισι | κέῖται νικηθεὶς . . .*), and B. compares with this the use of technical metaphors in a

similar context in the Hermopolis epigram of the architect Harpalos (*GV* 1846), *πρὸς θάνατον δ' οὐδεὶς μάγγανον εὖρε σοφῶν*. The lacuna in 12 looks as if it ends — *υ αωνος ὅδε*. The fourth poem is more fragmentary, but like the others it clearly refers to Hermokrates' profession and to the death of his mother.

(7) In *Liber Annuus* (Studi biblici franciscani), 6, 324–5, L. POIRIER publishes a Christian funerary plaque seen by him at Luxor: *+ εἰς θεὸς ὁ βοηθῶν· μὴ | λυπηρῆς* (read by P. as a proper name; *Μυλυπηρῆς*). *οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατο(ς)* (ν lapis), *Μάρθα· Τῦβι ιη, ἰνδικ(τίωνος) τρίτης*.

(8) In *Oudheidkundige Mededelingen*, 41, 18–31, B. H. STRICKER publishes two very similar Graeco-Egyptian statues of a female figure (Isis?), one of which bears a Greek inscription on the dorsal pillar, dated by H. W. Pleket to the first or second century A.D.: *Ἰσιδι Ἀκοαῖς Διονύσιος υἱὸς Ἀπαυηρ εὐχαριστῶ*. The inscription is not discussed (in any case the article is written in Dutch, and it is to be hoped that it will be repeated or developed in an international language). The word *Ἀκοαῖς* is interesting. It probably has the same meaning as in the dedication from Apollonia-on-Rhyndakos, republished and discussed by B. KEIL, *Hermes*, 45, 474–8: *Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ | ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τῆς | θεοῦ· Ἐ(ρ)μῆνος . . . | ζήσας ἀπέδωκε[εν] | εὐχαριστήριον | τὰ ὦτα καὶ τὸν βωμόν*. Keil maintained that the *Ἀκοαί* here mentioned were the 'Healing Spirits' (from *ἀκούω*, not *ἀκούω*), associated with the goddess (whom MENDEL, *BCH* 25, 326, had already suggested was Isis). If this is correct (and it seems to be so, quite independently of the meaning of *πρὸς ταῖς ἀκοαῖς* and *κατὰ τὰς ἀκοαῖς* in *Syll.*³ 1170 = *IG* IV², 126, ll. 9–10 and 18, and *Ael. Arist.*, p. 379, Keil, discussed by Keil, loc. cit.), then *Ἰσιδι Ἀκοαῖς* will mean either 'Thanks to Isis for (the action of) her healing spirits' (or, if it is from *ἀκούω*, her 'Hearing Spirits') or 'Thanks to Isis (and) her Healing (Hearing) spirits'. For *εὐχαριστῶ* in thanks given to deities cf. *εὐχαριστήσας τῷ [Σαράπιδι] καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι κτλ.*, of *OGIS* 717, and the detailed discussion of the phrase by L. ROBERT, *Hellenica*, 10, 58 ff. (cf. *JEA* 42, 109, no. (24)). The name may perhaps be *Ἀπαυηρ* (omicron seems to have been inscribed): cf. the common *Ἀπαθης*. The inscription is probably of imperial date, though a late Ptolemaic one cannot be excluded.

(9) In *RA* 1960, 77 ff., J. SCHWARTZ publishes (without facsimiles or photographs, except for no. 16) some Greek inscriptions from the necropolis of Hermopolis Magna (Tûna el-Gebel) and Tôd, partly from his own collation and partly from photographs provided. 1. A funerary imprecation inscribed on a marble plaque, uttered by M. Aurelius Ammonius, *νεώκορος | τοῦ μεγάλου Σαράπιδος . . . ? . . .* . . . *ης | ξυστάρχης γεόμενος[ς ἀρχιδ]ικαστής | τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεως [τῶν Ἀλ]εξανδρέων*. The oath runs: *ὀρκίζω σε, ἄνθρωπε, το . . . εα . . . ατα | θεοὺς καὶ θεὰς καὶ δαίμονας[ς κρατ]ίστους | τὸν χώρον κατέχοντας μήτ[ε γ]ράμμα | ἀφανίσαι τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων μήτε λρον (i.e. ὄλον) | ἀφελεῖν*, followed by a list of those buried within, and a wish which repeats the normal formulae of Greek oaths (save for the use of *παρακούω* for the regular *ἐπιορκέω*): *ταῦτα σοὺ δέομαι, οὕτως τυχεῖν γένοιτο τῶν ἐν βίῳ ἀγαθῶν εὐορκοῦντι, παρακούοντι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία*. S. rightly says that this formula is in contrast with the normal funerary imprecations from Asia Minor, which conclude with the statement of the fine payable in the event of contravention, but it should nevertheless be noted that this non-financial formula is paralleled, e.g. in the inscription from Rhodiapolis (*TAM* II, 923) in which there is no fine: *εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμαρτωλὸς ἔστω θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις*: cf. PARROT, *Maledictions*, 107 ff., for other examples, and cf. also now the inscription noted below, no. (38). At the same time it should be noted that Pharaonic practice in this matter was to curse the transgressor in very strong terms (see PARROT, *ibid.* 91 ff.). Egyptian influence, then, was perhaps not at work here to the extent that S. supposes. 2 is a fragment of a plaque dedicated by nine persons. 3–13 are funerary (in the lemma to 5 S. either exemplifies the letter-forms by two different forms of upsilon, though there is only one in the text, or else uses the plural for the singular). 14 is an insignificant fragment, and 15 refers to a τόπος. 16 (a) is a fragment (sandstone?) of a version of the trilingual decree in honour of Ptolemy IV (*SEG* VIII, 464 and 504a), containing the left part of ll. 1–6 of the Greek text below the left part of the last twenty lines of the Demotic version. The main interest of this copy of the Greek text (though S. makes no comment on the point) is that in l. 1 he reads *βασιλεύοντος Π-*, which, if correct (the photograph is obscure at this point) gives *βασιλεύοντος Π[τολεμαίου τοῦ Πτολεμαίου]*, in place of the *[τοῦ νέου τοῦ ἰσχυρόντος]* of Gauthier and Sottas. Difficulty had been felt (see Gauthier and Sottas, 72) in applying to Philopator the *νέος* used of Epiphanes in the Memphite decree of 196 (Rosettana), and this is now obviated, though the variation between the demotic and Greek is considerable. The new supplement, which is longer, fits the requirement of the length of line better. The second piece, 16 (b), contains the debris of thirteen lines of a similar synodic decree, of the reign of Euergetes I, which is not part of a version of the Canopus decree, and which S. suggests may be a part of the

πρότερον γραφὲν γράμμα mentioned in that decree (*OGIS* 56, l. 33), and possibly to be associated with the Upsala fragments and the unpublished Elephantine trilingual decree. The loss of these two important fragments from Tôd is much to be regretted. 17 and 18, also from Tôd, are trivial epitaphs of Christian date, and 19 is a fragmentary dedication from Karnak on behalf of Tiberius and his House, to Ammon. S. finally gives a critical note on *IGRR* 1, 1170, a Trajanic dedication from Koptos, confirming the reading *Ἰσιδι Τριχώματος*.

See also nos. (39), (49).

IV. *Studies of previously published inscriptions*

(10) In *RA* 1960, 91-101, A. BADAWY gives an account of the excavations in the Necropolis of Hermopolis which reproduces his article in *Archaeology*, 11, 117-22. 97, fig. 6, shows the funerary graffiti which are transcribed in *JEA* 45, 89, no. (6).

(11) In *AJA* 64, 51 (and n. 14) G. M. A. HANFMANN and K. Z. POLATKAN discuss (and reproduce, pl. 10, 6) the Alexandrian funerary relief, MILNE, *Cairo Cat.* 9259, p. 46, pl. 6, *Νικῶ Τίμωνος ἀσπὴ*, in connexion with their publication of a similar relief from Sardis.

(12) In his publication of an interesting defixion of the third or fourth century A.D. in Istanbul Museum, *Mem. Acad. Roy. Belge*, 54, 2, P. MORAUX discusses the nature and identity of the Egyptian gods so plentifully invoked in this type of document: note particularly his discussion of Nephthys (identified by him under the form *Νεϋθι*) and her cult in Athens (*IG* II², 1367, quoted by M. as *IG* III, 77); cf. *JEA* 46, 96, no. (13). He quotes (48, n. 1) apropos of the prayer for forgetfulness either in regard to, or on the part of, rivals in a love-affair, which occurs frequently in defixions, the Alexandrian *defixio*, Audollent 38, where in ll. 9-10, on the advice of L. Robert, he understands *Ἡωνικοῦ* as = *Ἰωνικοῦ*, and interprets the phrase *ἐπιλάθοιτο Ἀννιανὸς τῆς ἰδίας μνήμης καὶ Ἡωνικοῦ μόνου μνημονεύετω* to mean that Ionicus is seeking to gain the affections of Annianos and make him forgetful of all other lovers. There are analogies for such situations in the defixions (M. quotes Aud. 68A, 9-11; 198, 24-25; 266, 15-19; 268, 3), but it is to be observed that all these refer explicitly to the feeling of love, whereas this does not, and suggests a possibility of violence: l. 24, *ἵνα μὴ δυνήθῃ Ἡωνικῶ ἀντίος ἐλθεῖν*.

(13) In *Choix d'Inscriptions grecques*, J. POUILLOUX reproduces (17-18) the decrees of the Cretan mercenaries of Philometor (*Inscr. Délos*, 1517/8), and (45) the recently published epigram concerning Magas (cf. *JEA* 46, 100, nos. (33-34)).

(14) In *Cahiers Archéol.* 11, 92-119, H. STERN describes the scriptural paintings of the 'Chapel of Exodus' at el-Bagawat (Kharga Oasis; cf. A. Fakhry, *The Necropolis of El-Bagawat in Kharga Oasis* (*JEA* 40, 127, no. (16)), many of which bear descriptive legends (*Θέκλα*, *Ἀβραάμ*, *Ἀδάμ*, *Ζωή* (i.e. Eve), *Μωυσῆς*, *Ἰσραηλεῖται*, etc.), the precise significance of some of which (*Παρθένου, ποιμήν*), and their relations to the paintings, S. discusses in detail.

V. *Religion*

(15) In *Journ. Jew. Stud.* 22, 215-37, L. H. FELDMAN discusses 'The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt', and refers (232-3) to some inscriptions which seem to indicate infiltration of pagan ideas (*OGIS* 73-74; Frey, *CIJ*, 1508, 1511, 1530, all from Tell el-Yahûdiya).

(16) In *Jahrbuch für Antike u. Christentum*, 2, 30-69, 'Der Nil und die Christen', A. HERMANN examines the changes in ideas and iconography of the River God from Constantine's edict against the priests of the Nile in A.D. 331 down to the seventh century. Epigraphical evidence is secondary, but a few items may be noticed (52, n. 151, the Isidore-epigram, *SEG* VIII, 474, is invoked as evidence for the notion of activity beneath the Nile waters). 56 ff., he discusses the representations of the Nile in late classical art (Alexandrian coins, mosaics, Coptic textiles, etc.); 62 (and cf. pl. 6a), the Nile-mosaic from Lepcis Magna which portrays a Nile landscape with Nile himself riding on a river-beast, and a Nilometer with the inscription ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ (cf. no. (17) below, for H.'s further observations on this), and 61-63 (and cf. pl. 6b) a silver washing-bowl from Perm (now in the Hermitage) with an interesting scene showing a carefully marked Nilometer and putti at work, and the Coptic tapestry-medallions with representations of *Νεῖλος* and *Γῆ*. He also discusses in this connexion the worship of Nile with Geon, the River of Paradise, and refers to the mosaics of Qasr el-Lebia, where Geon (*Γήων*) appears in the traditional guise and posture of Nile. As an Alexandrian example of Nilotic scenery he describes the mosaic from Thmuis (Breccia, *Musée Gréco-*

Romain, 1925-1931, 101, pl. 52) which has a largely destroyed metrical inscription beneath it, and discusses the possible significance of such representations in later Christian art. This is an interesting article in a little-investigated field.

(17) A good deal of the same material also occurs in the same writer's more strictly Egyptological study, *AZ* 85, 35-42, 'Die Ankunft des Nil', in which he illustrates by the same pieces as those discussed in the other article the 'Hymn to the Nile' of the Middle Kingdom. In this context he examines the meaning of ΑΓΑΘΗ ΤΥΧΗ on the Lepcis Magna mosaic which he interprets as a nominative with an ellipse, 'It is Good luck (when the Nile reaches twelve cubits)'. I think this is unlikely; although this formula occurs very often without iotas adscript, they are probably normally to be understood, and the phrase is simply an exclamation 'With Good Luck'. H. suggests that the scene represented on the mosaic is a procession of the Νεῖλωα.

(18) In *Mus. Helv.* 17, 185-8, E. HEITSCH republishes *PSI* 844, and identifies it as a fragment of a hymn to Isis, quoting parallel expressions from the aretalogies.

(19) In *Chron. d'Ég.* 34, 103-19, L. KOENEN discusses the phrase θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός Ἀρσιέσις in *UPZ* 199, l. 4, of 132/1 B.C. He maintains that Harsiesis is a rebel king of the region north of Thebes, and that θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός is a phrase used traditionally of rebels, like ἀσεβεῖς. He collects a number of passages in support of his interpretation of ἀσεβεῖς (particularly the Memphite decree of 196 (Rosettana), ll. 23 ff.). In this connexion he gives especial significance to the cult-title Philopator, proclaimed in the synodic decree after the victory of Raphia (cf. no. (9)): through his victory, the king, as Horus, revenges his father, Osiris, killed by Seth, and thus Philopator gives proof of his love for his father. K. adds (109, n. 2) that the other names of the Ptolemies similarly permit both Greek and Egyptian interpretations, and promises to bring proof of this in a work on Ptolemaic kingship. After a digression on the reception of Pharaonic notions in Callimachus, which I suspect would have surprised that poet very much (cf. 111, n. 2), K. discusses the history of the phrase θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός in Greek tradition as an epithet of the scapegoat (φαρμακός), whence, he claims, it was taken over into Egyptian thought to express the hatred felt for the rebel in the Ptolemaic period. He finally returns to the papyrus and describes the negotiations recorded there with particular reference to Harsiesis. It seems quite likely that K.'s interpretation of Harsiesis as rebel-king is sound, and there may be some truth in his view that θεοῖσιν ἐχθρός is rather in the nature of a technical term than simply a descriptive phrase, but it is a great pity that this has been obscured by so much improbable and speculative matter.

(20) In *Archiv.* 17, 108-9, R. MERKELBACH discusses *P.Mil.* 21, the account of the foundation of the Serapeum in Alexandria by Alexander, offers a few new supplements, and emphasizes the Egyptian elements in Alexander's prayer to Sarapis to occupy the temple.

(21) In *Bull. Soc. Arch. Copte*, 15, 126-49, A. PIANKOFF describes 'The Osireion of Seti I at Abydos during the Graeco-Roman period and the Christian occupation', an article written in the early thirties following the E.E.S. excavations at Abydos in 1927-8. He refers to unpublished inscriptions, including 'a Homeric Hymn' written by two Italians, dated to the third century A.D., to be published by M. Guéraud. In general terms he refers (130) to the other graffiti there, which are largely published by J. G. MILNE in M. A. MURRAY's *The Osireion* (Eg. Res. Ac. 1904), 35 ff. 134 ff. he discusses the drawings, including, fig. 1, an interesting representation of the martyrdom of a female.

(22) In *JNES* 19, 269-87, J. SAUNERON publishes a new stele with a representation of Tithoes (Tothou), the composite sphinx, in the Brooklyn Museum, and in this connexion discusses and illustrates the entire group of monuments, reliefs, etc., of this class, and proposes a new explanation for this type of Sphinx with multiple animal-head, who is frequently accompanied by attendant spirits which have precisely the same heads as those worn in different reliefs by the sphinxes themselves. He suggests that the sphinx groups round him the evil spirits of which he is himself the leader, and that the reliefs either are propitiatory or else express gratitude to the god for having recalled his minions (e.g. after an illness), and in this context cites the ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ of one such relief recently published (see *JEA* 43, 102, no. (11)). He points out (286) that there is no evidence for the deity earlier than Euergetes II, and that most of the evidence is imperial, and emphasizes the connexion of the deity with Koptos, with particular reference to the two inscriptions from there, PERDRIZET, *Coll. Fouquet*, pl. 55 (whence *Ann. Serv.* 35, p. 5), a relief of such a sphinx, which bears the inscription, ἡ σύνοδος Τιθόητος θεοῦ μεγάλου θ]εῶ Α[μ]ωνίῳ, ἐπὶ Κομάρου ἀρχιερέως, ἐποίησεν εὐσεβείας χά[ριν] ἔτους] ιη, Θῶθ τρισκαίδεκάτη, and *SB* 305 (*IGRR* 1, 1185), a lengthy and lacunose dedication on

behalf of Severus, Caracalla, Geta, and Julia Domna, by [δ ἀν]δρ(ι)ὰς [? surely this must be the dedicating group: e.g. ἡ σύνοδος?] τοῦ κυρίου Τιθοῦ[ς]... υἱοῦ Τρήσεως, ἀρχιερέως | [Τι]θοῦς καὶ Ἀμμωνος θεῶν, | ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ Σαραπίωνος Οὐετιαν[οῦ]... οντος. L η, Φαρμουῦθι κ. 274, and n. 5, he discusses the distribution of the Greek theophoric names Τοτοῦς, Τιθοῦς, etc. (On this class of monument see also the articles of CH. PICARD, noted *JEA* 45, 97, no. (48).)

(23) In *L'Ant. Class.* 28, 98-106, 'Alexandre-Dionysos et Diogène-Sarapis', J. SERVAIS discusses the story in D.L. VI, 63, ψηφισαμένων Ἀθηναίων Ἀλέξανδρον Διόνυσον, "κάμει", ἔφη, "Σάραπιν ποιήσατε". He suggests that the anecdote may owe its origin to the close links between Dionysos and Sarapis, and quotes in this connexion *IG* XI, 4, 1224 (not 1124) and *SB* 5863, the Alexandrian dedication Σαράπιδι Διονύσῳ Ἰσιδι Ἀφροδίτῃ, emphasizes the Dionysiac element in the dromos of the Memphite Serapeum, and suggests that the story originated in the early third century, when the cult of Sarapis enjoyed particular popularity.

(24) In *Charisma*, II (for vol. I see *JEA* 45, 93, no. (28)), the late F. TAEGER has less occasion than in the first volume to discuss Graeco-Roman Egypt, since this volume deals with the Imperial cult as a whole. In general this part, even more than its predecessor, is a vast synthesis and repertorium of information on all aspects of imperial cult (other than the administration of the cults), and it will long be of service on this account. It naturally follows that there is very little detailed discussion of individual documents, though they are referred to in abundance (in this connexion it is unfortunate that there is no index of inscriptions).

VI. Political and Social History

(25) The problem of the parentage and date of birth of Caesarion has attracted considerable attention recently, and I note the items together. (1) In his review of the English translation, by C. J. CADOUX, of H. VOLKMANN's *Kleopatra*, J. P. V. D. BALSDON, *CR* 74, 68-71, discusses the evidence on this topic (see already *id.* *Historia*, 7, 86-87) and provides a very useful analysis of the various problems connected with it. He publishes some new suggestions (from Professor M. Malinine and Mr. T. G. H. James) as to the possible interpretations of the controversial date in the demotic stele from Memphis, previously discussed in this connexion by MEIKLEJOHN (*JRS* 24, 194) and CARCOPINO (*Annales Gand*, 1937, 35 ff., and see below, under (2)). The interpretation of this date is central to the whole problem, but it is quite evident from the opinions quoted by Balsdon that it cannot be entertained as an unequivocal witness. (2) In *Gnomon*, 31, 178-9, H. Volkmann reviews Carcopino's *Passion et Politique chez les Césars*, which contains a slightly enlarged version of his previous paper. Volkmann makes an important suggestion in regard to *OGIS* 194, the trilingual stele in Turin, dated by Cleopatra and Caesarion and assigned on internal evidence to 43 B.C. This has hitherto provided the only anomaly in respect of the usual formula of the joint rule, in that the certain dates, in which no restoration is involved, carry the names of both sovereigns but the regnal year of Cleopatra alone, whereas the prescript of this stone has regularly been restored as 'the tenth year of Cleopatra, which is also the second (or third) of Caesarion'. Volkmann now suggests that the second dating-factor should be omitted from the restoration, and that we should restore [ἐτους δεκάτου] written in full. This would suit the length of line equally well, and is surely right, for although normally in Ptolemaic decrees issuing from a Greek source the year is abbreviated by the sign L, followed by the year indicated alphabetically, it is precisely in trilingual decrees that the year is written in full (Volkmann quotes the wrong parallels for this usage, but that is by the way). By this improved restoration the surviving texts of the double reign become uniform in exhibiting the regnal year of Cleopatra only (perhaps Skeat had already seen the weakness of the traditional supplements of the date of *OGIS* 194, when he says, *Reigns*², 42, 'the monuments shew Caesarion as co-ruler, again without separate numeration of his own years'; cf. Balsdon, *op. cit.*, 71, top). Of course, the improvement of reading does not assist in the crucial problem of the date of the birth of Caesarion, since the document is of 43 B.C. after the death of Caesar. As an additional item it may be noted that *P.Ryl.* 582 also belongs to the eleventh year of Cleopatra, and has a dual titulature, and should be added to the list given by Balsdon, 70, top.

(26) In *Gymnasion* (Biblioth. des écoles franc. d'Ath. et de Rome, 196), which is both an architectural study of the buildings in the classical and Hellenistic periods and also a history of the gymnasion as a social phenomenon, F. DELORME makes full use of the relevant epigraphical material, including that from Egypt. 90, he notices the Naucratis palaestra, the dedicatory inscription of which survives, *Naucratis*, I, p. 63, pl. xxx, no. 4 (= *SB* 355) of the fourth century (or early third? At least, not early fourth). 137-9 contains the Egyptian evidence of the third century, 199-201 of the second century, and 220 of the first century

(also, 241, two Egyptian monuments of indeterminate date, at Adulis (!) and Sebennytyos). These few pages show how meagre our knowledge of the monumental remains is: a vague sentence or two in Appian and Plutarch, and something more precise from Strabo (note on text, 137, n. 6, where, however, the correction favoured by D. should be assigned not to C. Müller but to Koraes). D. says (137) that all three authors speak of one gymnasium only, and that there was probably no more (but see 465, where he admits 'at least' one), but even if one accepts his efforts (138) to explain the suggestions to the contrary in other sources (notably *P. Teb.* 700) it is hard to believe that one gymnasium sufficed for the Greek population of Alexandria, though, of course, there may have been one *par excellence*. Compare the status of the various Serapeia, of which there was one major temple, called 'The Serapeum', but there were several other shrines also. Gymnasia founded by private benefactors are attested (for one in Faiyûm see *Ἐντελεύσεις* 8, which concerns one dedicated to the king by a cleruch in Samareia).

To turn to details. As evidence for the third-century gymnasium D. refers to the metrical epitaph *SB* 4314 (Peek, *GV* 1827; *Gr. Grabged.* (see above, no. (5)), 192), which he says may not be from Alexandria, though his scruples seem excessive (it appears that it is only the precise neighbourhood of Alexandria which is in doubt). He also discusses (139) the evidence for palaestrae at this period. I may mention here, in advance of a fuller report, that *Berytus*, 13, 142, no. 7, is a dedication (163-145) of *βάθρα* in a *γ[υμνάσιον]* in Alexandria by an *ἀγωνοθέτης*. D. also discusses the honorific decree of the members of a gymnasium (for which, however, a third- or even a second-century date seems very unlikely) from Luxor, *SEG* VIII, 694; from Philadelphia *PSI* 391a; and from Samareia *Ἐντελεύσεις* 8 (cf. above), the privately built gymnasium. From the second century D. cites (199-200) the decree of Omboi, *Archiv*, 5, 141 ff. of 136-5; the dedication for Philometor of a 'Ptolemaion' and a throne to the gymnastic tutelary deities, Hermes and Herakles, by Areios, strategos of the Pharbaithite nome (*SB* 1164; for thrones in gymnasia see Picard, below, no. (48)); the two decrees (on one stele) of the georgoi from Psenamosis, *SEG* VIII, 529, of the fifteenth and eighteenth years of an unnamed Ptolemy which should on palaeographical grounds be dated as late as possible in the Ptolemaic period: I would myself date it to the reign of Auletes (the eighteenth year of Cleopatra would presumably involve the double date 'eighteen and three'); and the fragmentary decree of a gymnasium, *SEG* VIII, 641, perhaps from Ptolemais (D.'s doubts on this seem unsound (200, note 4): the decree mentions a *βουλή*, and Kortenbeutel consequently said that it must be either from Alexandria, Ptolemais, or Naucratis, preferring the second, and added that if this was so it was interesting since all other evidence for the council of Ptolemais was of the third century: D. uses the second-century date as an argument against Ptolemais, because all other decrees mentioning the *boule* are of the third century!). Also from the second century are the architraval inscription from Theadelphia, *SB* 6157-8, dated 150-149 (on 201, l. 6, for 'Philadelphia' read 'Theadelphia'), and the statue-base from Thmuis, *SEG* VIII, 504. From the first century (220) there is the fragmentary decree of 58-55 from Aphroditopolis in honour of the hipparch Herodes, *SEG* VIII, 531 (cf. also D. 325), and, of uncertain date, (241) *SB* 1106, from Sebennytyos, the dedication (not decree!) in honour of a benefactor. I cannot go into further detail here, but this is a very interesting and comprehensive investigation of a central aspect of Greek life, particularly in the Hellenistic age, and repays careful study (see, for the relation of the sovereign to the gymnasium, 342 ff.; and, for the cultural significance of the gymnasium, the last section (421-80)—427 ff. refer to the situation in Ptolemaic Egypt, and in this respect D. shows convincingly, against Launey, that non-Greeks (but not Egyptians) were admitted to the gymnasium in the Ptolemaic period; 469 ff. he disputes Launey's theory of a close link between army and gymnasium).

(27) In *Acta Archaeol.* (Copenhagen), 30, 147-65, E. GJERSTADT writes on 'Naucratis again', in an article largely concerned with the stratigraphical interpretation of the earliest period, and the excavations of the temple of Apollo and the pottery therefrom. I must leave this to others, and need only note the emphasis he lays, for dating purposes, on the regular appearance of omega in the epigraphical material: see also on this point COOK and WOODHEAD *BSA* 47, 163-4. Also on the history of early Naucratis see D. VAN BERCHEM, *Mus. Helv.* 17, 27-29, who argues that Amasis granted Naucratis the right of *asylia*, extended in this instance to a complex economic structure.

(28) In *Archiv*, 17, 11-16, L. KOENEN discusses 'Die "demotische Zivilprozessordnung" und die philanthropia vom 9 Okt. 186 vor Chr.' In this document (*Münch. Abh.* F. 4, 1929) reference is made to the month 'Thot of 'year 20', i.e. the beginning of year 20, as a *terminus post quem* for thefts concerning which actions may be brought, and K. regards this as the 20th year of Epiphanes, when, he claims, the king issued philan-

thropa to celebrate both the defeat of the native king Anchmachis and the birth of Philometor. This latter event he seeks to date to the period September–October 186 (end of 19th year), rather than to the accepted approximate date 183–4, on the ground that Cleopatra, his mother, receives greater honours in the (hier. and dem.) synodic decree of Memphis of 185/4 than in the Alexandrian synodic decree of September 6, 186 (also hier. and dem.), and this change he would attribute to the birth of the heir. This is certainly a possibility.

(29) In *Par. Pass.* 15, 432–46, D. MUSTI writes on 'I Successori di Tolomeo Euergete II', and rejects the thesis of OTTO and BENGTON, *Niedergang*, 112–44 (cf. SKEAT, *Reigns*², 35 (14)), that Cleopatra II continued to rule for a brief period (until the end of 116) along with Soter II and Cleopatra III. He maintains that this is an error of a not unusual type in the demotic prescript of the only document (*P.Ryl. Dem.* 20) invoked in support of this brief triarchy, and that *P.Lond. Inv.* 2850, which is said to refer to a joint second year of Euergetes II and the two Cleopatras cannot be pressed into service on behalf of a joint second year at the beginning of the reign of Soter II. In both these points M. has common sense on his side, and the triarchy reconstructed by Otto and Bengtson seems to lack that unequivocal documentary support without which the literary evidence cannot stand.

(30) Mention may also be made of *Chron. d'Ég.* 34, 120–3, in which J. SCHWARTZ discusses the chronology of Caracalla's stay in Alexandria (A.D. 215–17).

(31) In *JEA* 46, 91–94, T. C. SKEAT publishes the first of 'Some notes on Ptolemaic chronology', supplementary to his *Reigns of the Ptolemies* (Münch. Beit. z. Papyrusforsch. 38 (1954)). In this note he discusses 'The last year which is also the first' (dates of the type "ἔτος x τὸ καὶ α'"), in which the last year of the deceased ruler is coupled with the first of the successor, with particular reference to the year 52–51 B.C., described as the 30th year of Auletes and the 1st of Cleopatra VII. He shows that this is a recognized (though not, of course, universal) contemporary usage from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D., thus refuting the view of OTTO and BENGTON, *Niedergang*, that such double dates were only used retrospectively.

(32) The second volume of TCHERIKOVER and FUK's *Corpus papyrorum Judaicarum* covers the period from Augustus to the Jewish revolt of 117. It contains sober and objective discussions of many difficult problems (the Jews in the early Roman period, the Alexandrian Martyrs, the Jewish revolt in Egypt) and some notable papyri—the Boule-papyrus (no. 150), Claudius' Letter to the Alexandrians (no. 153, with an admirable commentary), the pagan Acts (nos. 154–9)—and also the Jewish ostraca from Apollonopolis Magna (160–408, with an important introduction). This is an excellently prepared volume.

(33) In *Chron. d'Ég.* 34, 124–38, J. D. THOMAS examines the office of *exactor* in Egypt from the fourth to the sixth century A.D. (list of *exactores*, 139–40).

(34) In *Rev. Int. des Droits de L'Ant.* 7, 191–223, H. J. WOLFF writes on 'Plurality of laws in Ptolemaic Egypt', in which he attempts to explain the curious phenomenon 'that notions and institutions of diverse origin, and often widely differing in shape and character, were equally observed as valid at the same time and in the same country'. He emphasizes that the codification of a 'Ptolemaic system of law' was the work of Philadelphus, and gives (199 ff.) an outline of his views of the nature of Ptolemaic judicial organization (a full discussion is promised in his forthcoming monograph, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*) which contains some new suggestions (note, 201, n. 29 the important evidence for the dependence of Alexandrian Law on Royal Law): especially the view that the structure of the plurality of law was established by the vesting of the respective jurisdictions in the two courts of the *dikasteria* and the *laokritai*; and that this whole system was regulated and established in an enactment (or series of enactments) known as τὸ διάγραμμα, which together with a less definable enactment concerning the Egyptian population determined not only procedure but much substantive law as well. He emphasizes that circumstances ultimately led to the narrowing of the gap between the two codes as people 'took advantage of such institutions as best suited their intentions, irrespective of their provenance'.

VII. Prosopography

(35) The fourth volume of *Prosop. Ptol.* (nos. 8041–12459) contains the names of all persons engaged in agriculture and breeding of livestock, and, as might be expected, inscriptions are not involved. The bulk of the work consists (8551–10060) of a list of holders of cleruchic land, listed according to the size of their holdings (hekatontarouros, etc.); note also the list of holders of *δωρεαί* (10061–108).

(36) In *Eos*, 50, 81-89, 'A la cour alexandrine d'Apollonios le dioecète', A. ŚWIDEREK collects prosopographical material regarding the Alexandrian staff of Apollonius (Amyntas, Artemidorus ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας and the homonymous doctor, Criton, Metrodorus, Hierocles, Ctesias, Nicander, Pasicles, Philon, and a number of less important persons).

(37) In *Eos*, 50, 127-45, L. WINNICZUK writes on 'Cornelius Gallus, Poet and Statesman', and discusses the evidence for his career as Prefect of Egypt and his subsequent downfall, quoting in full (131, n. 15) the Latin version of the Philae bilingual inscription (OGIS 654; CIL III, 14147).

VIII. Lexicography

(38) In his publication of a funerary curse from Neocaesarea (Niksar) in Pontus *Une Imprécation funéraire à Neocésarée* (Bull. Arch. et Hist., L'Inst. franç. d'Arch. d'Istanbul, 4) which closely resembles the group of similar documents erected by Herodes Atticus (IG II², 13188-13208), P. MORAUX quotes (24) the πάριζος (i.e. πάρριζος) of Coll. Froehner, 77 (Peck, *GV* 1875; id. *Grabged.* 439) from Alexandria to illustrate the word πρόριζος, and the notion of 'root and branch', used in curses, to indicate the complete extermination of the family of the transgressor; and for μετέρχομαι, in the sense of 'pursue' a malefactor, SB 1323 (with reference to which note also Bickerman's article, *Rev. Int. des Droits de l'Ant.* 5, 157-8; cf. *JEA* 45, 93, no. (24)).

IX. Nubia, Ethiopia, etc.

(39) In *Par. Pass.* 14, 458 ff., S. DONADONI publishes (unfortunately without a photograph or facsimile) a Christian building-inscription found in a church at Ikhmindī (Mehendi), just south of el-Maharraqa. The text, of the second half of the sixth century, commemorates in an orthographic words the building of the church, in formulae familiar from similar inscriptions found in Syria and Egypt. Its main interest lies in the personages mentioned as rulers and officials in the region: ἐπὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου κ(αὶ) εὐσεβεστάτου ἀγαθοῦ δεσπότη κ(αὶ) φιλοχρ(ίστου) βασιλέως Τωκιλτωετου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Νοβάδων κ(αὶ) ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐγενεστάτου Ἰωσηφίου ἐξάρχου Ταλμ(έως). ἐπλήροσεν τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τὴν πόλιν, ἐπὶ κᾶ ἰνδ(ικτίωνος) γ' δι' ἐμοῦ Ἀβρααμίου κοράτωρος ἐγράφη· ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ. Ἰσὰκ κ(αὶ) Ἀππνεσσι κ(αὶ) Σικνουε οἱ τεχνῖται. This inscription adds to our knowledge of the Nobad kings and petty princes of the area, for Tokiltoeton is hitherto unknown (cf. Donadoni, ad loc.). The *nobilissimus exactor* of Talmis (Kalābsha) Joseph, is known from a Coptic inscription from Dendūr, S. of Kalābsha, which also mentions Theodore, Bishop of Philae, whose own building-inscription for the Church of St. Stephen (Lefebvre, 584), which he constructed within the Temple of Isis at Philae, is dated to 577. This provides an approximate date for the inscription. The *curator* Abraham is also perhaps mentioned in the same Coptic document. Donadoni discusses the status of the king, *exactor*, and *curator*, and, in addition, he assesses the general significance of the document in the framework of Nubian history.

(40) In *JA* 248, 75-97, 'Les Premiers Rois d'Axoum', H. DE CONTENSON discusses the little-known period of Axumite history before the conversion of the kingdom to Christianity in the middle of the fourth century, and utilizes the available Greek epigraphical evidence. 82: the Adulis-inscription (OGIS 199); 82-83: the royal dedication to Ares (SB 6947); 84: the Aizanas inscription (OGIS 200 (SB 6949)). 85 ff. give a brief survey of the excavations carried out at Axum by the archaeological department of the Ethiopian government.

(41) In *Kush*, 7, 181, F. HINTZE makes a preliminary report on the German expedition to the area of Butana, in which he includes a description of the remains at Musauwarāt es-Sofra (179 ff., pls. xli-xlix), the most important site in the island of Meroe after Meroe itself and Nagat, and records inscriptions from the Great Enclosure there, including 'the only definitely Greek inscription', ἀλλαξανδορσι | δικης | βασιλευδημων, in which it is tempting to see a reference to a Nubian king. A photograph of this piece would have been advantageous.

(42) In *Studien zur meroit. Chronologie und zu den Opfertafeln aus den Pyramiden von Meroe* (Berl. Abh. 1959 (2)), F. HINTZE quotes (26) in his discussion of the chronology of Petronius' Nubian campaign and the subsequent relations of the Kingdom of Meroe with Rome, the dedication at Dakka (IGRR I, 1359) of 13 B.C., made by the returning Meroitic ambassadors from Augustus (there are a few minor errors of transcription in H.'s text; the true readings are readily recoverable from the clear photograph in *Tempel von Dakke*, II, pl. 25b); and in connexion with the reconnaissances of the reign of Nero, to the Latin inscription

CIL III, 83; Supp. 6583. In an appendix (69–71) he gives excerpts from classical writers concerning the history of Meroe. This is a useful guide to problems of Meroitic chronology under the empire.

(43) In *Kush*, 8, 163–73, L. P. KIRWAN writes on 'The decline and fall of Meroe' on the basis of the Ethiopic inscription of Aizanas, which he translates from Littmann's German version (*Misc. Acad. Berol.* II (2) (1950), 97–127; surely at least a direct translation from the Ethiopic text might have been procured.) In the context of possible Axumite control over Meroe he discusses *SB* 2005, the fragmentary dedication of an Axumite king from Meroe (probably not Aizanas; cf. above, no. (40)). He describes the hostile relations between the Nubadae, as masters of Meroe, and the Axumite kingdom, and Aizanas' Meroitic campaign. He also refers (171–2) to the Adulis inscription, *OGIS* 199; cf. also *JEA*, 46, 102, no. (43).

X. The Ptolemaic Empire

(44) In *Samothrace*, 2, i, *The Inscriptions on Stone*, P. M. FRASER republishes some Ptolemaic inscriptions in improved, or better authenticated form: Appendix 1 (39 ff.) gives a new text of *IG* XII, 8, 156 = *Syll.*³ 502, which differs hardly at all from the previous editions, since much of the left part of the front face of the stone is now lost and what survives of the related text on the verso is largely illegible: *IO* is an improved text of the dedication of the 'Arsinoeion' (*IG* XII, 8, 227 = *OGIS* 15), and *II* of the Propylaea of Ptolemy Soter (*ibid.* 228 = *ibid.* 23). The introduction (5–11) discusses Ptolemaic control of the island.

(45) In *Rev. Int. des Droits de l'Ant.* 6, 209–25, M.-TH. LINGER discusses the question, 'Comment les Ptolémées ont-ils fait la loi dans les territoires non-égyptiens de leur obédience?', in the light of the epigraphical evidence available from the various regions, which she analyses (209 ff., nn. 1–9). Most of the points made at some length seem obvious and natural, and I do not think that anything new emerges from this study.

(46) In *JEA* 46, 109–11, 'Ptolemy son of Pelops', T. B. MITFORD discusses the dedication *Lindos*, II, 139, by οἱ ἀπὸ γυ[μνασίου], which Blinkenberg regarded as being probably of Cypriot origin, but set up in Lindos by the dedicants, to Ptolemy son of Deinon. In l. 2, after a study of the squeeze, M. reads [Π]έλοπος for Blinkenberg's Δείνωνος. The base thus commemorates Ptolemy, son Pelops, and is one further testimony to his father Pelops, the important Ptolemaic official already known to have been Governor of Cyprus and familiar from several other inscriptions (most recently at Cyrene, *Berytus*, 12, 111, no. 4; cf. *JEA* 46, 101, no. (35)). Mitford's re-reading of the stone, which must have been transported casually from Cyprus to Rhodes, adds a son, Ptolemy, to the family-tree, which now extends for four generations.

(47) In *Annali di sc. norm. di Pisa*, 26, 282–4, D. MUSTI discusses the significance of *SEG* IX, 5, ll. 61 ff., with reference to the meaning of the debated κατη(ι)ταμένα, commonly held to refer to 'goods claimed by the State'. M. maintains that they are goods contested between private parties. This avoids the difficulty of private persons (οἱ ἄλλοι, l. 63) being concerned in claims for State goods. He also (284, n. 3) discusses the date of l. 45, Θεωδασίω εἰκάδι, which he seeks to attribute to the following royal letter (ll. 46 ff.) on the ground that the space on the stone between ll. 45 and 46 is less than that between 44 and 45. The letter then has two different dates, the internal date in ll. 59–60 and this date above, but referring to, it, which M. suggests may represent (e.g.) the date of entry of the document into the city archives. The observation regarding the space is certainly correct.

(48) In *BCH* 83, 409–29 (cf. also *id. CRAI*, 1959, 151–8), 'Un Monument rhodien du Culte princier des Lagides', CH. PICARD discusses the Rhodian monument in the form of a throne on which are seated, as it were, two cornucopiae, now in Naples museum (formerly built into a wall in Rhodes, it was apparently removed to Naples after the last war: it has also been studied by De Franciscis, *Bollet. di Storia dell'Arte dell'Istit. Universit. di Salerno*, 1951, 109–15 (*non vidi*)). The throne, empty of a human figure, is paralleled by the empty throne of Alexander, which Eumenes placed in the dead king's tent to witness to his presence there (*Diod.* XVIII, 60, 4–61, 3; cf. PICARD, *Cah. Archéol.* 7, 1–17). P. claims that the Rhodian piece belongs to the Ptolemaic ruler-cult, in which the image of the throne played a considerable part (cf. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, above, no. (27), p. 200) and the Ptolemaic link seems assured by the double cornucopiae, the symbol of Ptolemaic kingship. On the cult of the Ptolemies at Rhodes see *Opusc. Arch.* 3, 29–30, esp. 30, n. 2. 416–29 of P.'s article are concerned with the subsequent history of this type of monument in East and West.

(49) In *Εφ. Αρχ.* 1956, 34–72, CHR. CHRESTOU publishes a new fragment of fifty lines of *IG* VII, 540, the inscription of the early first century B.C. (see especially 66–67) referring to the Sarapeia at Tanagra. The

previous fragment contained the list of victors in the literary and musical contests, while the new fragment (which joins the other, and completes the lacunae of ll. 14-18 on the left) contains the accounts of receipts and expenditure of the agonothetes of the festival, consisting principally (ll. 23-48) of payments for crowns awarded to the victors mentioned in the earlier part; also noted are the cost of sacrifices to Isis, etc. (48-49), second prizes (49-53), and other minor expenditure (53-56), followed by a statement of the interest (at a very low rate, the reason for which is discussed by Chr. 65 ff.) on loans from a fund established by a private citizen, by means of which the expenses for the festival were met, recorded annually along with the capital taken over from the previous year. Chr. gives a valuable detailed commentary on the inscription, to which I may refer in general. From the point of view of the Egyptian cults one of the most interesting features of the inscription is that the administration of the festival seems to be in the hands of a very small circle—in fact one family, which also administers the funds and is represented among the victors: see the stemma drawn up by Chr. 44. The same phenomenon has been noticed elsewhere, combined with another feature, the possession of Egyptian theophoric names by those serving as priests: see *Opusc. Arch.* 3, 40, n. 4.

(50) In *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Müller's *Handbuch der Alt.* v (4)), K. LATTE discusses (282 ff.) the establishment of the cult of Isis at Rome, and (362 ff.) its later history.

(51) In *Roman Ostia*, 366 ff., 387-8, R. MEIGGS discusses the evidence for the Egyptian cults at Ostia, describes the temple of Serapis there, and makes the interesting point that most of the Ostian inscriptions concerning the Egyptian cults are in Latin (368) and those at Portus in Greek (387; *IG* XIV, 914-21, briefly described 387-8): 'probably the association with Egypt was less strong [at Ostia]'. The *Fasti* record the building of a temple to Serapis in A.D. 127, and M. supposes that the cult did not really establish itself in Ostia until about that time. If correct, this is very striking since the cult was established in Puteoli 200 years earlier and in Rome by the middle of the first century B.C.

(52) In *Sächs. Akad.* 52 (1), 'Untersuchungen zur Rolle des Schicksals in der ägyptischen Religion', S. MORENZ discusses (29 ff.) the question of the relation of Fate to the gods in Egypt, and points out that when the Egyptian gods in the Greek aretologies are stronger than Fate this is an Egyptian and not a Greek concept, and quotes in this connexion the Serapis-aretalogy, *P.Berl.* 10-525, ll. 11 ff. (Serapis loquitur), [οὐ]χ ὡς ἤθελε μοῖρα, παρὰ δὲ μοῖραν, [τῆς] μοῖρας γὰρ ἐγὼ μεταμφιάζω, and the Isis-aretalogy from Kyme (Peck, *Isishymnus von Andros*, 122 ff.), ll. 55-56, ἐγὼ τὸ ἱμαρμένον νικῶ, | ἐμοῦ τὸ εἱμαρμένον ἀκούει, and from Andros (ibid. 15 ff.), ll. 170-3, ἐμοῖ δ' ὅ[π]ρ[ε]κεν ἄ μοῖρας | [ἐκλωθ' ἡλακ]ατα(ς), τὰν Ἄτρο[π]ο[ρ]α[ς] ἀέ[ν]δ[ι]σσει | [χεῖρεσιν ἐνδ]ί[νοισα περιρ]οί[βδητον] εἰ[λιγμ]οῖς.

(53) In *Stud. și Cerc. Ist. Vech.* 10, 469-73 (Ruman. with Russ. and French summ.), A. POPA publishes a terracotta mould, 11 cm. in diam., from Apulum, one face of which shows Aesculapius and Hygeia, and the other a bust of Sarapis. The work is crude and probably of a late imperial date.

(54) In *Stud. și Cerc. Ist. Vech.* 11, 408 ff. (Ruman. with Russ. and French summ.), I. I. RUSSU republishes with facsimile the votive-plaque now in Cluj, *CIG* 6814: εἰλεώς μοι ὁ Σέραπης καὶ οἱ θεοὶ πάντες.

(55) In *Acta Archaeol.* (Budapest), 11, 265-82 (cf. id. *Archaeol. Értes.* 86, 20-31), V. WESSETZKY writes on 'Die Probleme des Isis-Kultes in Ober-Pannonien', and emphasizes the regular and established nature of the cult, not only at the newly excavated Iseum at Savaria (see *Acta Antiq.* (Budap.) 7, 195-200), but throughout the province, against the thesis of E. Schweditsch, *Die Umwandlung ägyptischer Glaubensvorstellungen auf dem Weg an die Donau* (Diss. Graz, 1951) that there was no genuine, broadly based cult, and that Egyptian objects found in the region were private imports acquired mainly for their ornamental value. He accepts the thesis of Alföldi that there was a close connexion between the Egyptian cults and the imperial cult, and argues that the former was encouraged by officials anxious to promote the latter. He discusses the significance of the hydria and patera from Egyed in the history of the cults, dates them (with Zahn) to the Roman and not the Ptolemaic period, and suggests that they were part of the cult-furniture of the Iseum at Savaria. This article is of considerable interest not only for its thesis, but also on account of the monumental evidence it brings in support of it, consisting of little-known Egyptian cult-objects found in and around Savaria at the end of the eighteenth century and largely ignored since then.

Cf. also no. (12).


BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

Note on the supposed beginning of a Sothic period under Sethos I

SINCE, according to the well-known statement of Censorinus,¹ one Sothic period ended and a new one began in the second year of Antoninus Pius, that is in A.D. 139,² the beginning of the period just expired must have fallen 1461 years earlier, that is in 1320 B.C. Our knowledge of the chronology of the latter part of the New Kingdom is still very inadequate, but for all we know this date should lie not very far from the beginning of the Nineteenth Dynasty; if it could be identified with a regnal year of a king, we should acquire a valuable fixed chronological point. Sethe thought that he was in a position to make such an identification and attempted to show that the date in question—to be more precise, 1318 B.C. (which he considered to be the beginning of that Sothic period)—coincided with the accession by Sethos I to the throne.³ For such an assumption he believed to have good reasons based on evidence drawn from the monuments of this king.

On the one hand, Sethe was able to point out two cases of dating from Sethos I's reign, in which the regnal years 1 and 2 were separated from the name of the king by a most unusual expression *wḥm mswt* 'repeating of birth',⁴ which, like the first part of the *nbtj*-name of Sethos I (also *ḥmḥw mswt* 'repeater of birth'), recalled an identical expression that occurs in certain datings towards the end of the Twentieth Dynasty.⁵ As Peet had argued, this expression could not possibly be there a royal name, but a designation of some era.⁶ Sethe was aware that this era could not be connected with the Sothic period; on the other hand, he thought that under Sethos I the expression 'Repeating of birth', while again marking an era of a special kind, did refer to the Sothic period, or rather to its first four years, during which the heliacal rising of Sirius fell on the first day of the Egyptian civil year, the 1st Thoth. As a corroboration of this view he was able to adduce two more dates from year 1 of Sethos I, both equally unparalleled in form and very curious in meaning.

As to the first, from the Nauri decree of Sethos I published in this *Journal*⁷ it will suffice to quote from Griffith's translation with minor modifications: [*Yea*]r 1, first month of winter, day 1, beginning of perpetuity, receiving happiness, hundreds of thousands of years of peace, millions of jubilees upon the throne of the Horizon-god, an eternity of the reign of Atūm.'

The other date, from the inscription of Speos Artemidos, runs as follows:⁸  etc. (names of Sethos I follow), 'Year 1, beginning of perpetuity, receiving eternity, celebration of millions of jubilees and of hundreds of thousands of years of peace, a life-time of Rē [in heaven (?), the king]ship [of Atūm on earth (?)] under the Majesty of Horus', etc.

¹ Reprinted in E. Meyer, *Äg. Chronologie*, 23.

² The correctness of this date (against E. Meyer and others) was made very probable by Borchardt, *Die Annalen und die zeitliche Festlegung des Alten Reiches der äg. Geschichte*, 55.

³ *ZÄS* 66, 1-7.

⁴ L. D. III, 128a, and Cairo ostracon Cat. 25704 (now published in Černý, *Ostraca hiératiques*, CCG, p. 85* and pl. lxxvii); Sethe, op. cit., 4.

⁵ As a result of Nim's article in *JNES* 7, 157-62, we know that the years 1 to 7 of this *wḥm mswt* coincided with years 19 to 26 of Ramesses XI.


⁶ Peet, *The Mayer Papyri A & B*, p. 5, and again *JEA* 14, 65-72.

























































⁷ *JEA* 13, 196.

⁸ Sethe's copy, *ZÄS* 66, 3, corrected from *JEA* 33, pl. VII, and p. 21, with notes and commentary on pp. 25-26.

⁹ Original has falcon wearing double crown.

The expressions which in these two cases follow the date marked it for Sethe 'als Anfang einer langen Zeitfolge oder geradezu gesagt als eine Epoche' and he regarded the '*beginning of perpetuity*' as a renewal of the Sothic period.

Unfortunately, this interpretation of the meaning of these expressions cannot be maintained in face of further evidence and we must take them as being nothing more than flowery phrases wishing Sethos I at the beginning of his reign many more years to come on the throne of Pharaoh. In so doing we only return to Griffith's interpretation in the case of the example in the Nauri decree. Polotsky¹ has pointed out an instance of  in an inscription of Merenptah,² but in this case the words stand as an epithet of Atūm and not in a date. I can, however, quote one example of the use of these words in a date which to my mind must invalidate Sethe's interpretation. The statue of the 'scribe in the Place of Truth, Ramose' found by Bruyère within the precinct of the temple of Deir el-Medīna holds a stela with an unusual record of offerings established for the temple of Hathor.³ The inscription opens with the following date:

- (1) {  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  |||  ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| ||| |||

We find here the '*beginning of perpetuity, receiving eternity and celebration*⁴ of millions of jubilees', in fact the same expressions as at Speos Artemidos, used in year 9 of Ramesses II, and also inserted between the date and the king's name. It is clear that if they are a *cliché* in this instance, no special significance should be attributed to them in the dates of year 1 of Sethos I.




This invalidation of Sethe's interpretation in no way proves that the beginning of the Sothic period did not fall in the reign of Sethos I; it only implies that there is no inscriptional evidence for such an assumption. It must be admitted, however, that there is nothing elsewhere to support it except the fact that the date of the accession to the throne of Sethos I obtained by independent means falls not much short of 1320 B.C. The highest attested regnal year of Sethos I is year 9⁵ and if we accept 1304 B.C. as the date when Ramesses II ascended the throne—a date which now seems to be generally favoured—1313 B.C. becomes the first year of the reign of Sethos I. It is of course possible, likely even, that Sethos I reigned more than 9 years; thus Breasted assumed for him a reign of 21 (+x) years,⁶ a highly speculative estimate.⁷ But if we assign to him only a few more years, it will follow that the short reign of Ramesses I will also come within the range of the beginning of the Sothic period, and this Pharaoh will then have an equal right with Sethos I for the placing of the beginning of this period in his short reign.

The Sothic period starting in 1320 B.C. has, probably rightly,⁸ been identified with the era ἀπὸ Μενόφρεως of Theon. It is natural to see in *Μενόφρηης the name of an Egyptian king and Struve⁹ with Sethe's approval¹⁰ identified Menophrēs with the epithet $\overline{\text{mr-n-Pth}}$ 'beloved of Ptah', which Sethos I bore in his cartouche after his personal name $\overline{\text{Sty}}$ (or *Stly*?). It is, however, hard to believe that posterity in this case replaced the real name of the king, known then as Σέθως, by a mere epithet. Rowton¹¹ justly opposed this explanation, but his own return to the old

¹ In Fairman's and Grdseloff's article, *JEA* 33, 25, n. 1.

² *Ann. Serv.* 8, 217.

³ Bruyère, *Rapport sur les fouilles de Deir el Médineh (1935-1940)*, II, pp. 56-57; pls. xii and xxxv. Now in Cairo J. 72000.

* Bruyère, op. cit. 56, prints , but the rather indistinct photograph on pl. xxxv admits of damaged  and .

⁵ Three inscriptions, all listed by Gauthier, *Le Livre des rois*, III, 13.

⁷ *Op. cit.* III, § 74.



⁶ *Ancient Records*, 1, § 67.

⁸ See Sethe, *Die Zeitrechnung der alten Ägypter*, I (Nachrichten der K. Ges. d. Wiss., Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1919), 309.

⁹ ZĀS 63, 45 ff.

¹⁰ ZÄS 66, 1-2.





















¹¹ *Iraq* 8, 108-9.













interpretation of **Μενόφρεως* as the name of the town Memphis in its ancient pronunciation is not more felicitous. For who could believe that in this case, and in this case only, the Egyptians of the Graeco-Roman period reverted to the old pronunciation of some 2,000 years before their time, though the general practice was to pronounce the old names in accordance with the changes which the language had undergone? It seems to me that if **Μενόφρεως* has to be explained, it should be a king's name and that it would better suit the prenomen of Ramesses I often written only . If this was read *Mn-ph-r*, instead of the correct *Mn-phty-r* (with ) , the correspondence of consonants *M-n-p-h-r* and *M-v-φ-p* (*h* not being expressed in Greek transcriptions) is complete.













JAROSLAV ČERNÝ

A supplement to Janssen's list of dogs' names

In *MDAIK* 16 (Junker Festschrift), 176–82, J. M. A. Janssen published an extensive compilation of dogs' names in a study entitled 'Über Hundenamen im pharaonischen Ägypten'. When this appeared I had a similar collection in hand, which proved to contain a few items that did not appear in Janssen's list. Most of these additions date to the Old Kingdom and derive from unpublished material. To avoid confusion I have continued Janssen's numbering, but have arranged the new items alphabetically rather than chronologically, as he has done. The sex is indicated as (f)eminine in a few cases where the accompanying representation recognizably depicts a bitch. A reference to Ranke's *Personennamen* is given wherever possible, and in such cases I have followed Janssen's practice in placing an asterisk before the entry; the asterisk is enclosed in a parenthesis if *PN* contains an example that is only approximately similar.






49.   = *ist*. O.K. Relief fragment shown by a dealer in 1958. Perhaps this is the feminine equivalent of   (Junker, *Giza*, v, fig. 18 = Janssen's no. 14), in which case the two names might be analysed as *ist-t-s-t* and *ist-k-s* respectively, i.e. 'thou praisest the woman', 'thou praisest the man'. For the verb *ist* see Edel, *ZAS* 79, 86–87.
- *50.   *ty(?)*. (f.) Late M.K. Cairo J. d'E. 66340; Bisson de la Roque, *Tôd*, 134. *PN* 1, 7. 17.
- (*)51.   *id*. O.K. Saqqâra, tomb of *Ny-~~nh~~-pht*, beside Unis causeway, on south. Cf. *D*, *PN* 1, 404. 7.
- (*)52.   = *wit-nfrt*. (f.) O.K. False door from Dendera, Cairo J. d'E. 38551. Cf. *Nfr-wrt*, *Nfr-wrt*, *Nfr-wrt-s*, Junker, *Giza*, VII, 221; v, 153; VI, 179.
- 53(?)   = *mht*. O.K. Quibell, *Excavations at Saqqara 1907–8*, pl. 62. This possibly refers to the entire scene rather than to the dog alone (cf. Montet, *Rec. trav.* 35, p. 119, n. 6), but if so, the word *mht* 'beat a tempo' does not particularly suit the context.
- *54.   *mw*. (f.) First I.P. Painted false door from Upper Egypt, seen in hands of dealer, and subsequently said to have been destroyed. *PN* 1, 147. 4.
- (*)55.   *rh*. Late M.K. Cairo J. d'E. 66340; Bisson de la Roque, *Tôd*, 134. Cf. *Rhy*, *PN* 1, 225. 14; II, 374.
56.   *h-n-i(?)*. Late M.K. Cairo J. d'E. 66340; Bisson de la Roque, *Tôd*, 134. *H* is presumably the older *hy* (*Wb.* II, 483): i.e. 'I have joy'.
57.   = *hbn*. M.K.(?) Relief fragment formerly in the collection of Philip Lederer; photograph provided by B. Bothmer; cf. Janssen, *Bibliog.* 1958, no. 58333. A similar name *Hbny* is attested for the New Kingdom (Janssen's no. 41).

58.  *hmn-ty*. Dyn. VI. Tomb of *Nhbw*, Giza 2381, seen in records of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Cf. the word  *Wb*. III, 283, 5.
- *59.  *snb*. M.K. Louvre C186; de Rougé, *Notice sommaire des monuments égyptiens*, p. 146. PN 1, 312. 15.
- *60.  *snb-nb-f*. Late O.K. Saqqâra, tomb of *Wnis-hr-ist-f*, for which see Zaki Saad, *Ann. Serv.* 40, 685-6. PN. 1, 313. 11.
- *61.  *snb-nb-f*. Late O.K. Aswân, tomb of *Šbni*, adjacent to secondary tomb of *Hkz-ib*; cf. L. Habachi, *Archaeology*, 9, 8-15. Same as preceding.
62.  *tp-f-nfr*. O.K. Saqqâra, on re-used stone from tomb of *Kz-irr*, beside Unis causeway. Cf. *Tp-nfr*, Janssen's no. (25).
- (*)63.  *trw-n-rnh-n-Šnbi*. Dyn. XII. Blackman, *Meir*, 1, p. 33 and pl. 11. Perhaps intentionally omitted from Janssen's list. Cf., however, names such as *Trw-n-Tptw*, etc., PN II, 330. 25-27. Blackman (ibid., p. 33) is probably right in interpreting this legend as the name of the dog represented beneath it.
64. (Incomplete)  Dyn. I. Stela in Louvre, Amélineau, *Nouvelles Fouilles d'Abydos 1895-96*, pl. 37, bottom, second from left.
65. (Incomplete)  *-nfrt*. (f.) Dyn. VI. Tomb of *Nhbw*, Giza 2381, seen in records of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.
66. (Incomplete)  (f.) Late M.K. Cairo J. d'E. 66340, Bisson de la Roque, *Tôd*, p. 134.
- (*)67. (Incomplete)  Dyn. XVIII. Davies, *Five Theban Tombs*, pls. 25 and 28 (cf. Janssen's reference for his item 39). Perhaps to be restored . For this writing of the name *Kny*, see PN 1, 335. 6.

A few observations may be made concerning the items previously listed. Janssen's no. (17) is not in the Louvre but in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, no. 22. 422. Nos. (24) and (25) are in the museum of University College, London, and no. (37) is in the Cairo Museum, J. d'E. 36445. The reading of no. (2) is more probably *hmn-t-hm* than *try-hm*; for the *hmnt*-sign (kneeling woman with × above knees) see Junker, *Giza*, XII, 121-2. There is no lacuna at the end of no. (8), as may be seen from the photograph published in *Bull. Inst. d'Ég.* 35 (1953), pl. 1 facing p. 368. Conversely, a lacuna should be indicated before items (4) (as seen from a photograph in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) and (9). In the latter case  is perhaps to be restored [*s*]dm; cf. the name  *sdmt-yf* 'one who will be eye-painted', on an unpublished late Old Kingdom false door at Saqqâra. Items (27) and (30) are probably rightly listed as *hapax legomena* in *Wb*. III, 230. 12 and v, 434. 12. In relating  to *hst* 'measure' and  (with some reservation) to *db-t* 'female hippopotamus', Janssen evidently regards  as equivalent to the generic determinative . But aside from the improbability of this equation, no such determinative is to be expected in the names accompanying representations of dogs (cf. subsequent remarks on no. 24). In both (27) and (30) the hair-determinative has a closer connexion with the preceding words, which evidently refer to the appearance of the dog's pelt. Perhaps  is related to  'lock of hair', *Wb*. v, 438. 15. In  (no. 24) the final determinative similarly does not belong to the entire name; if it did, this would have appeared in the form , or the like, as in Janssen's nos. (1-3, 10, 18-22, 36, 39) and nos. (64) and (67) above, but in most cases such a determinative is omitted entirely, since its function is supplied by the accompanying representation. It therefore may be concluded that  belongs to the word  'lion', and the name might accordingly be interpreted as *Hmw-(m)-m* 'The steering-oar (i.e. tail) is that of a lion', or simply *Hmw-m* 'steering-oar of the lion'.

HENRY G. FISCHER


Hry-r a word for 'infant'

IN the Semnah Dispatches¹ a group occurs twice (2, 11; 4, 7) which Smither renders  and once (2, 11) a similar group for which he gives . Concerning the latter he² points out that 'the sign before "4" resembles that transcribed  in Kah. Pap. 9, 20. 21. 29; 10, 16. 17. 20; 13, 17. 8'. In both instances *hry-r* follows a reference to a certain number of Medjay-people and is clearly connected with the latter. *Hry-r*, meaning literally 'the one who is upon the arm', is apparently a term for the infant child carried on the arm. Smither's reading of the determinative confirms this explanation of  as an expression for the male and  for the female infant. The depiction of foreigners carrying their children on their arms is a good illustration of the term.

HANS GOEDICKE

Seth as a fool

THE different contests described in the 'Contendings of Horus and Seth' aim at demonstrating the capacities of Horus in different ways.³ Not only is physical strength ascribed to him,⁴ but with even greater emphasis is his superior intellect compared with that of his contestant Seth. This tendency is apparent in the homosexual attempt of Seth⁵ when Horus, with the help of Isis, outwits his older relative in turning the plot against its inventor.

Although recognizing his defeat in this intrigue, Seth is still not willing to accept the verdict of the court and he therefore proposes another contest.⁶ This time the competition is to be concerned with boats, probably planned as a race in vessels built by the contestants.⁷ Seth's suggestion is very specific, namely, to make some . The applied expression is as ambiguous as English 'stone-boat' or German *Steinschiff* and can be understood as 'transport-vessel for stone' as well as 'transport-vessel of stone'. The ambiguity of the expression leads anew to Seth's defeat. Horus, cleverly, interprets the pun the first way and makes his boat of cedar covering it with plaster. Seth, assuming the other meaning, makes his boat of stone and it promptly sinks the moment he tries to launch it. Horus, by using timber, does not intentionally deceive Seth but proves his superior judgement by properly understanding the ambiguous phrase. The entire scene is certainly no competition of magic power⁸ and no such indication is contained in the text. The author of the story uses a pun to demonstrate the intellect of Horus and to let Seth appear as a fool.

HANS GOEDICKE

¹ Smither, 'The Semnah Dispatches', *JEA* 31 (1945), 3-10, pls. II-VII.


² Loc. cit. 8, n. 1.

³ Despite the different origin and the aetiological nature of the elements used in the composition, the tale is, nevertheless, a unit. It demonstrates the maturity of Horus who claims the right of succession as an infant against his grown-up relative. Normally, the latter would be the heir and legal successor of his brother if there were no mature son. This is evident from the refusal of the Master of the Universe to give Horus the inheritance of Osiris (Horus and Seth, 3, 7-8: 'You are weak in your limbs. This office is too great for you, the lad, the taste of whose mouth is still bad'). Disregarding a possible historical explanation of this point in the way Spiegel (*Die Erzählung vom Streite des Horus und Seth*, 70 ff.) sees it, we find here allusions to a specific form of inheritance; it is the legal succession of the deceased by his brother in the absence of a mature descendant. The institution of the *sn-dt* in the Old Kingdom as found in the regulations of *Tnti* (*Urk.* 1, 163-5) points in the same direction. There the *sn-dt* shares the inheritance with the widow of the deceased while no children are mentioned.

⁴ Horus and Seth, 8, 10 ff.; 9, 8-9.





⁵ Ibid. 11, 2 ff.


⁶ Ibid. 13, 4 ff.


⁷ The rendering follows *Wb.* v, 319, 2 while Gardiner (*The Chester Beatty Papyri*, no. I, p. 23) translates *trr* 'to sail around'. Spiegel (op. cit. 53) explains the entire passage as a reference to a fight between boatmen as represented in the decoration of the mastabas of the Old Kingdom. The determinative  of *trr* is against such an explanation. For *pl m* 'to surpass', cf. *Chester Beatty*, II, 5, 1; Klasens, *The Socle Behague*, 93.

⁸ So Lefebvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens*, 198. The following transformation into a hippopotamus is not related to the preceding event and should be separated.


A sportive writing of the interrogative *in+m*



As soon as the interrogative *in+m* was no longer considered as a compound of two independent elements, a conflated writing could be used, such as .¹ In its phonetic value this spelling comes close to Late Egyptian  and Coptic . While this form points to a fusion of the two original elements into one syllable, another highly sportive writing of the Middle Kingdom preserves the original *in+m* but no longer considers them two independent elements. The spelling in question is , and as such is identical with that of the word for 'skin'. So far I have been able to find this spelling three times, twice in the inscription of *Hr-wr-Rr*²:

ll. 9-10.  'There is turquoise in the mountain for ever. Who is it who searches at this time?'

ll. 11-12.  'Who really is in need of it at this miserable time of summer?'

A further occurrence dating to the Eleventh Dynasty is contained in the stela of *Mntw-htp*, son of *Hpy*:³

l. 13.  'Who is alone? O men!'

The defining of the object of the question appears to be influenced by the vernacular. It corresponds to Late Egyptian  'Who is the one to whom one shouts?'⁴ Although  is clearly used as a writing of the interrogative *in+m*, it can hardly be considered more than a sportive spelling.

HANS GOEDICKE

¹ Cf. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*³, §§ 227. 3; 496. Hatnub Gr. 20, 10.

² Gardiner-Peet-Černý, *Inscriptions of Sinai*, I, pl. xxvA; II, 97 f. Other commentaries: Breasted, *Ancient Records*, I, §§ 733-8; Sethe, *Aegyptische Lesestücke*, 86; Loret, *Kémi*, I (1928), 109-14; Blackman, *BIFAO* 30 (1930), 97-101; Wilson in Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, 229 f.

³ Griffith, 'Stela of Mentuhetep son of Hepy', in *PSBA* 18 (1896), 195 ff. It is hoped to offer a discussion of this badly neglected text in the next volume of this *Journal*.

⁴ *Amarna*, VI, 30.

REVIEWS

Ägyptische Religion. By SIEGFRIED MORENZ. Die Religionen der Menschheit, ed. C. M. Schröder, Bd. 8. Stuttgart, 1960. Pp. xvi+309. DM. 27.

Professor Morenz, who holds the chair of Egyptology and of Hellenistic Religions at the Karl-Marx University of Leipzig, is already well known to students of Egyptian religion both for his numerous studies in learned journals and for his books, among which are *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann*, *Der Gott auf der Blume* (with J. Schubert), and *Heilige Schriften*. As an Egyptologist and Coptic scholar who has also been trained in the classics and in theology, he comes to his present task with a formidable equipment, and he has succeeded in providing a fully documented introduction to Egyptian religion in which the results of his own recent researches have been embodied as well as those of many other scholars (in several cases in studies as yet unpublished).

Morenz begins by making appreciative references to the books of Erman, Kees, Bonnet, and others; here it is only to be regretted that he omits the name of Sethe, whose *Urgeschichte* remains an important work, although few are now prepared to accept its conclusions *in toto* even if *in singulis*. Still, he makes a courteous bow to Sethe on p. x, and he refers several times to this work, so that the omission is perhaps not intentional. Morenz thus describes his own approach (if the reviewer may freely translate):

'I have tried to comprehend Egyptian religion as the belief of the Egyptians. Political, economic, and social events have been for me, if I may speak with Goethe, only the "conditions under which the phenomena appear". It appeared to me, however, that the centre of the phenomena was the relation between man and deity. Therefore I begin with expositions of the gods and their circles of worshippers, and then I present researches concerning the way in which the gods operate and the way in which men behave.'

The second sentence of this quotation is significant in its indication of a swing away from an emphasis which has been strong in previous works by other scholars. Morenz reiterates it after a discussion of sources, saying that he has ordered his material according to the phenomena themselves and not in a sequence of historical development. His phenomenological plan, as he points out, has the advantage that the choice, arrangement, and interpretation of the material are decided by aspects of the subject itself. To make up for the inevitable lack of historical perspective in such a treatment he adds at the end a time-chart indicating the main developments and the related sources.

It should not be inferred from this that the book is rigidly 'phenomenological' in the sense which the word bears in relation to a school of writers on comparative religion, still less in the philosophical sense. A striving after a psychological interpretation there certainly is, and a search for 'inner meaning' of doctrines, myths, and rites; but these qualities are not presumably the monopoly of the school in question, although G. van der Leeuw and other members of it have undoubtedly exercised a beneficent influence in the matter.

In a brief but illuminating chapter on 'the religious origin of Egyptian culture' Morenz finds in religion the roots of Egyptian art, literature, drama, medicine, astronomy, geography (the earliest maps are those of the afterworld), and linguistics; physics and philosophy he sees permanently embedded in the matrix of religion and thus powerless to develop in their own right; history revolves around the God-King, and so do conceptions of government and administration, a consideration that reminds the author that the Egyptians had no word for 'state', just as they had none for 'religion' itself; and, finally, law is rooted in religion: compare the title 'Priests of Ma'at', ascribed to the viziers in their juridical role. In the growth of all these activities, with the exception of physics and philosophy, a progressive secularization is observed. But the all-pervading influence of the religious outlook means that a knowledge of it is indispensable for the understanding of any aspect of ancient Egyptian life. Morenz is eager to supply a corrective to the view, popular ever since it was propounded by Xenophanes, that it was man who created God in his own image. While admitting that the view has some validity with regard to the form and function of the gods (e.g. the judgement of the dead must derive its external pattern from jurisdiction empirically observed), yet he finds

religion to be the basically determining factor: it is the society bound together by religion, in other words it is the all-presence of God in the world of men, that determines the nascent phases of culture.

If Morenz would thus appear to be turning the tables on any political or economic determinism, his interpretation is far from being an attempt to consider religion in a vacuum. He lays stress, for instance, in his third chapter and elsewhere on the fact that Egyptian religion was a 'national religion', adding the *caveat* (p. 44, n. 1) that the ancient Egyptians were scarcely at any time a nation in the modern sense. That they became conscious of being a nation among other nations is, however, unquestionable, and there seems no valid reason for withholding the term 'nation' from them, nor indeed for not applying the term 'nationalism' to obvious manifestations of their national feeling during, for example, the periods of Persian domination; one must, at the same time, be wary of projecting modern doctrines about nationhood into the ancient world.

Of especial value among the many riches of this book are the discussions of topics which Morenz has investigated with some elaboration in previous studies. These include the themes of divine election (p. 112), holy writs (chapter X), the Egyptian derivation of the Orphic idea of the cosmic egg (p. 259), the significance of the divine triads (pp. 150 ff.), the role of fate (pp. 69 ff.), and several aspects of the *interpretatio Graeca* (chapter XI). The Greek Isis-Aretalogies are denied an Egyptian original (p. 264), and here Dr. Dieter Müller's *Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien* is relied on, a painstaking piece of work which the present reviewer has been privileged to see in proof. The possible influence of Egyptian ideas on the formal aspects of Christian Trinitarianism (pp. 270 f.) is an exciting theme which Morenz has been, perhaps, somewhat bold in pressing. His argument, nevertheless, is carefully constructed and it is hoped that his thesis will receive the attention it deserves.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

Myth and Symbol in Ancient Egypt. By R. T. RUNDLE CLARK. London, 1959. 8vo. Pp. 292. Pls. 18. Line drawings 40. Chart of Religious Symbols. Map. Price 30s.

This book is one of a series on religions which is entitled *Myth and Man*. It is thus addressed to the non-specialist, although in this case that term must inevitably tend to mean non-Egyptologist, for the book will undoubtedly be read by students of religion who have no Egyptian, the more so in that the religion of Ancient Egypt still exercises a perennial attraction for many persons.

The religion of Ancient Egypt is a vast and still comparatively unworked field. Naturally a book of this kind must be highly selective if it is to be more than a catalogue. The author has chosen to treat of the cosmogonical schemes originating in the Old Kingdom and in the time of the First Intermediate Period, and then of the development of the religion of Osiris, rounding off his work with some detailed myths connected with these same themes. The worship of Amūn as a cosmic deity from the Middle Kingdom onwards and the Aten-heresy are both ignored.

The analogy of modern religions suggests, and the researches of modern psychologists, especially Jung, make possible of investigation, the idea that what the texts and pictures show us of the religion of Ancient Egypt is not to be interpreted literally but in a psychological sense symbolically. This must not be thought of as a return to the nonsense of the days before the hieroglyphs could be read, but as an intelligent use of the information now available about the human mind in general and the primitive mind in particular.

The present book seeks to use such methods and is, in consequence, refreshingly different from the average book on Egyptian religion. The author warns the reader that his work is a personal interpretation. He endeavours to show that the religion with which he is dealing is not without a logic of its own, although one which, coming as it does from the days before the development of philosophy, is strange to us. In a way the book is a pioneer investigation, pointing to a road by which it may ultimately be possible to understand what the religion of Ancient Egypt meant to the Egyptians themselves and how it appeared to them.

Throughout it has been sought to make the Egyptians speak for themselves by quoting from the original texts, especially the Pyramid Texts and the Coffin Texts. In itself this is an excellent and irreproachable method. In his preface, however, the author uses the following words: 'The moving rhetoric of the hymns and prayers cannot be conveyed in flat literal translation. . . . But the rhetoric and underlying excitement may be the most important thing that should be expressed, at least to the non-specialist reader. Hence there is need to paraphrase in some places; in others excessive caution leads to complete misunderstanding.' Now this is a most dangerous practice. If the results of anthropology and psychology are to be applied to Egyptian religious texts, the translations must be as exact as possible, especially when they are to be used

by non-specialist readers. The translations are vigorous, seductive, colourful; they read very well indeed. Nevertheless, difficulties are glossed over, words of unknown or uncertain meaning are confidently rendered, and the final result owes far too much to the subjective ideas in the author's own mind.

There is a final chapter on symbols concluded by a list entitled 'Major Religious Symbols'. This list is comprised of a heterogeneous collection of very badly drawn signs, some of which could scarcely be described as of a major religious character. As a guide to the symbolism found in Egyptian religious pictures and on innumerable Egyptian objects it would be of little use.

As is so often the case with books of a semi-popular kind the notes are relegated to the end and numbered by chapters with the result that the maximum difficulty is occasioned to those who wish to refer to them. These notes are very brief and include references for the texts translated. So far as was possible with the resources immediately to hand I have checked these references and have found a number to be wrong. Some I have succeeded in tracking down, but others have eluded me. My comments on the references I list below:

- Note 24 (ch. I, p. 52.) This should read 'R. Anthes, *Die Felseninschriften von Hatnub*' and not 'R. Anthes, *Graffiti von Siut*'.
- Note 29 (ch. I, p. 55.) 'CT v, 166 h' not 'CT v, 116 h'.
- Note 37 (ch. I, p. 57.) 'Pyr. § 446 ff.' not 'Pyr. § 466 ff.'
- Note 41 (ch. I, p. 59.) 'CT iv 239 b.' This is wrong.
- Note 42 (ch. I, p. 59.) 'CT iv 79 b.' This is wrong.
- Note 49 (ch. I, p. 67.) '*Annales du Service*, 1943, 290.' This is wrong.
- Note 1 (ch. II, p. 69.) The page number should be '78' not '32'.
- Note 2 (ch. II, p. 69.) A better reference would be 'Volten, *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften*, p. 69'.
- Note 4 (ch. II, p. 70.) A better reference would be 'Volten, *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften*, p. 76'.
- Note 7 (ch. II, p. 71.) The page number should read '46' not '45'. A better reference would be 'JEA 42 (1956) p. 30'.
- Note 17 (ch. II, p. 77.) 'CT III, Sp. 261' not 'CT IV, Sp. 261'.
- Note 20 (ch. II, p. 80.) 'CT II, 160 ff.' not 'CT I, 161 ff.'
- Note 24 (ch. II, p. 80.) 'CT I, 320 d.' This is wrong. It is probably 'CT II, 152 e'.
- Note 30 (ch. II, p. 85.) 'CT II, 240 e ff.' This is wrong.
- Note 34 (ch. II, p. 86.) 'CT VI, Sp. 554' not 'CT v, Sp. 554'.
- Note 53 (ch. II, p. 95.) 'CT IV, 75 a ff.' not 'CT IV, 98 g ff.'
- Note 4 (ch. III, p. 100.) 'CT II, 104.' This is wrong.
- Note 10 (ch. III, p. 103.) The volume number in this note should be '30' not '3'.
- Note 12 (ch. III, p. 105.) " " "
- Note 13 (ch. III, p. 106.) " " "
- Note 22 (ch. III, p. 117.) The paragraph number should be '628' not '629'.
- Note 20 (ch. VII, p. 232.) A better reference would be Žába, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep*, p. 26.
- Note 21 (ch. VII, p. 232.) The line number should be '204' not '344'. A better reference would be Žába, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep*, p. 32.

In addition the Coffin Text spell number given on page 110 as '37' is wrong.

C. H. S. SPAULL.

Joseph en Égypte: Genèse chap. 37-50 à la lumière des études égyptologiques récentes. By J. VERGOTE. Louvain Publications Universitaires, 1959. *Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia*, III. Pp. xi+219; figs. in text, 8. Price, francs belges 160 (wrappers) or 200 (bound).

Among the very few books on Egypt and the Bible issued in recent years, this one stands out as a cautious, thorough, and constructive treatment of its theme. This work began as a lecture given at various meetings of the Netherlands Oriental Society *Ex Oriente Lux* in 1947-8 and at the Louvain Journées Bibliques in 1955. When Professor Vergote decided to round out and publish his study, his Old Testament colleague Professor Coppens suggested that he should take into account the documentary hypothesis of the composition of the Pentateuch. When Vergote dutifully did so, he came to the remarkable conclusion that Moses was the likeliest author of the basic Joseph narrative.

The purpose of the book is to illustrate and explain the Egyptian features in the story of Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xxxvii-1) in the light of modern Egyptological knowledge. After a brief introduction to the documentary hypothesis, Vergote divides his material into eight chapters plus an epilogue, 'Conclusions'. At the head of each chapter, de Vaux's French translation of the portion of Genesis to be treated is printed in romans, italics, and small capitals to distinguish the supposed J(ahwist), E(lohist), and P(riestly) documentary sources respectively. Vergote puts his own occasional changes in translation into square half-brackets. The Egyptological commentary then follows.

The content of each chapter is here briefly outlined, with some relevant supplementary observations, one or two Western Asiatic sources in particular help to fill in the picture.

Ch. I. Trade in gums and resins, use of camels in second millennium B.C., and Semites in Egypt (Gen. xxxvii). In common with most commentators V. identifies *lof* as *ladanum*, *š^eri*, 'balm of Gilead', as gum of *pistacia lentiscus*, and *n^ekōt* as gum tragacanth from the bush *astragalus*. Whether the Genesis references to camels in the early to middle second millennium B.C. are anachronistic or not has been warmly debated for almost a generation now. V. considers the mention of them as authentic, that camels were sparingly used long before c. 1200 B.C., and commonly thereafter. The reviewer endorses this view and would draw attention to the occurrence of camels (GAM·MAL) in a cuneiform tablet list of domestic animals supplied with fodder, from Alalakh level VII in the Syria of the eighteenth century B.C.¹ V. makes good use of the New Kingdom evidence for Semitic slaves in Egypt, but curiously dismisses P. Brooklyn 35. 1446 edited by Hayes² with one sentence and a note (p. 19 and note 4). Much fuller use could have been made of this document and Hayes's commentary. One also misses any reference to Posener's important review-article,³ published in 1957, which notes among other things the evidence for Asiatics in Egypt reaching positions of trust under their masters⁴—a good parallel to Joseph's advancement under Potiphar in Gen. xxxix.

Ch. II. on Gen. xxxix: Potiphar's wife, Joseph's post under Potiphar (*imy-r pr*), and the prison in which he was incarcerated. With reference to the last point, V. rightly rejects Yahuda's erroneous identification of Heb. *sohar*, 'prison', with Eg. *ṭ^rrw* (*ṭl*), Tjaru, Sile. He makes effective use of the Egyptian literary evidence on the fate of adulterous wives, showing that Potiphar's wife (Gen. xxxix) and Anup's wife (*Tale of Two Brothers*) both had to lie their way out of a grim death penalty, unsuccessfully in the latter case. The fate of Webaoner's wife is a clear example (P. Westcar) as V. brings out.

Ch. III. The titles and functions of Pharaoh's officers in Gen. xl: 2. 3 (English versions, 'captain of the guard', 'chief butler', 'chief baker'); the mode of their imprisonment (virtually house-arrest); and the word *sāris* used of these men, usually rendered 'officer', but in Semitic very often taken to mean 'eunuch'. V.'s precise identification of the 'chief butler' as the royal cupbearer (New Kingdom *wbr*, as defined by Gardiner, *Onomastica*, 1, 43*) fits perfectly. Although V. can produce a variety of bakers, he does not offer a *chief* baker. Such must have existed, but the reviewer has so far failed to find one despite much search; the function is perhaps hidden under a less obvious title.⁵ V. proposes to replace the 'captain of the guard' (*šar-hattabbāhim*) by 'officier de bouche', English butler (p. 33), the Eg. *wdprw*. This is very attractive but not completely convincing. If the rendering 'captain of the guard' were retained, referring to the commander of Pharaoh's bodyguard of 'retainers' or 'braves', then in Middle Kingdom terms Potiphar might

¹ See Wiseman and Goetze, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 13 (1959), 29. 37. The Alalakh reference is now disputed by Lambert, *BASOR* no. 160 (1960), 42-43, who instead offers evidence for knowledge of the camel in Sumero-Akkadian lexical lists that originated early in the second millennium B.C. One may also mention camel bones excavated within house ruins at Mari of the pre-Sargonic age (c. 2400 B.C.), Parrot, *Syria*, 32 (1955), 323; and the kneeling camel-figurine from Byblos of about the eighteenth century B.C. in Montet, *Byblos et l'Égypte* (1928), 91 and pl. 52, no. 179. Albright's captious objection that it has no hump, hence is no camel (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 64 (1945), 288) is overruled by the simple fact of a clear socket in the back of the figure by which a separate hump and load were once attached, as already seen by de Vaux, *Revue biblique*, 56 (1949), 9, notes 4, 5. Other evidence in the reviewer's forthcoming study (p. 161 n. 7 below).

² Hayes, *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, New York, 1955.

³ 'Les Asiatiques en Égypte sous les XII^e et XIII^e Dynasties', in *Syria*, 34 (1957), 145-63. Perhaps V.'s dating of Joseph to the Eighteenth Dynasty is the cause of his concentration on the N.K. data.

⁴ Even performing the funerary rites of offering on some stelae, Posener, *op. cit.* 154-5.

⁵ Helck-Otto, *Kleines Wörterbuch d. Ägyptologie*, 163, suggested 'Tischschreiber des Königs', i.e. *šf wdh^{rw} nsw*, which is possible but not an exact equivalent or without difficulties.

have been a *šhd-šmst* like Sebekkhu¹ or in New Kingdom usage an *idntw n knyt* (*nstw*) like Amenemhab.² The reviewer cannot believe that *sārīs* really means 'eunuch' in the Joseph narrative; as V. points out, these are not commonly attested in Egypt. Hebrew *sārīs* is commonly identified with Akkadian *ša-rēš-šarri* or *ša-rēši*.³ The latter is a general term for 'courtier, dignitary, official', but took on the specialized meaning of 'eunuch', particularly in the first millennium B.C.⁴ After Joseph, *sārīs* never recurs in the Pentateuch,⁵ but (apart from the indecisive 1 Samuel viii, 15) only in books of the eighth to fifth centuries B.C. and later,⁶ then clearly as eunuch. The semantic development in the Old Testament would then be parallel with that in other Near Eastern texts. The Joseph narrative would appropriately exemplify the early, general meaning, while the later books, i.e. Kings, Jeremiah, etc., give the later, narrower interpretation.⁷

Ch. IV. This and chapter V are the longest, the heart of V.'s book. In a detailed treatment of the title Pharaoh, V.'s earliest example of its application to the king's person is that of Akhenaten's reign (Kahun papyri). However, Gardiner, *Eg. Gramm.* p. 75, cites two possible earlier examples under Tuthmosis III (?)⁸ and Tuthmosis IV,⁹ while Hayes has recently published an ostrakon from the joint reign of Hatshepsut and Tuthmosis III that twice refers to the latter simply as 'Pharaoh'.¹⁰ The rest of the chapter covers: interpretation of and allegory in dreams;¹¹ 'āhū borrowed into Hebrew from Egyptian *ahy*, 'papyrus-thicket'; Heb. *ḥartummim*, 'magicians', from Eg. *ḥry-tp*; relation of latter to the House of Life and his place in the priestly hierarchy. All are ably dealt with and comment would be superfluous.

Ch. V. Joseph's appointment to high office by the king, his investiture (royal seal, fine linen, and gold collar), 'Abrech', and the Egyptian names of Joseph, wife, and father-in-law. After noting one or two Egyptianisms like *sn-t* underlying Heb. 'kiss' for 'pay homage',¹² and 'lift hand or foot', V. endeavours to show that, according to the Hebrew narrator, Joseph was appointed Vizier and High Steward of Pharaoh (*imy-r pr wr n nb-ttwy*) with the honorific title *it-ntr*, 'father to Pharaoh', Gen. xlv, 8. V. is able to put up a good case, though Janssen¹³ would make Joseph Chief Mouth (*r-ḥry*) directly responsible to the king, and very recently Ward has sought to make Joseph a minister for Agriculture directly under the king.¹⁴ By putting Joseph in the Eighteenth Dynasty (cf. pp. 106-7, 211-12), V. involves himself in the very thorny question of multiple viziers in the New Kingdom, a discussion probably more useful to Egyptologists than to Old Testamentarians. That 'father to Pharaoh' reflects *it-ntr* as honorific 'king's counsellor' is very likely—but as Joseph is addressing his own purely Semitic brethren at the time, it is at least as likely that this is actually a Semitic idiom or at least a Semitic turn of speech to which the Egyptian could be assimilated. For 'father' as metaphor in Semitic at a later date for provider or counsellor (Joseph being both of these), compare the Phoenician and Hittite Hieroglyphic texts of Asitawa(n)das in Cilicia (late eighth century B.C.). As provider, 'Baal made me father and mother to the Danunites. I have restored the Danunites . . . (who) . . . had every-

¹ Compare Faulkner, *JEA* 39 (1953), 38-39.

² Faulkner, *op. cit.* 44, 46.

³ Jensen, *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, 7, 174, and many others since; Sumerogram, LÚ.SAG.

⁴ Compare Ebeling-Meissner, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, 1, 453 (§ 19) and 459 (§ 5); also *ibid.* II, 485, where 'eunuch' in the early second millennium is expressed directly by *girseqūm* (GIR.SE.GA, also originally 'courtier'), and only usually later (e.g. Neo-Assyrian Empire) by *ša-rēši*, this passing on into Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic with the meaning 'eunuch' (Brown, Driver, Briggs, *Hebrew-English Lexicon*, 710). It is not at all certain whether any or some of the *ša-rēši* at the Hittite court in the fourteenth-thirteenth centuries B.C. were eunuchs; against it, E. von Schuler, *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen* (Graz, 1957), 34-35 and Goetze, *Kleinasien* (1957)—ed., 169; in favour, Güterbock, *Oriens*, 10 (1957), 361 (LÚ.SAG), cf. Goetze, *J. Cune. Stud.* 13 (1959), 66.

⁵ Castrated persons are there denoted by other terms, cf. Brown, Driver, Briggs, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Isaiah, Kings, Jeremiah, Daniel, Esther, etc.

⁷ The fact that the *sārīs* Potiphar has a wife would support this early general meaning.

⁸ Mond-Myers, *Temples of Armant*, 160 and pl. 93, 5.

⁹ B.M. stela 148, *Hierog. Texts B.M.* VII, pls. 43-44.

¹⁰ *JEA* 46 (1960), 41, 42; no. 14, *rt.* 8 and 11, pls. XI-XIA.

¹¹ One may add a reference here to the valuable study by Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, 1956, and to the essays on dreams in Egypt and elsewhere published in *Sources Orientales II. Les Songes et leur interprétation*, 1959.

¹² That Vergote, pp. 96-97, and the reviewer (*Expository Times*, 69, 1 (1957), 30) reached the same solution independently is gratifying, though other, Hebraic, possibilities still exist.

¹³ *JEOL* 14 (1955/6), 66 ff.

¹⁴ *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 5 (1960), 144-50.

thing 'good and plenty to eat and well-being'.¹ As counsellor, 'Yea, every king considered me his father because of my righteousness and my wisdom and the kindness of my heart'.² Much earlier (eighteenth century B.C.) it is just possible that these usages were attested in the Mari texts.³ V. makes a good case for interpreting the old *crux* 'Abrech' (Gen. xli, 43) as imperative with prothetic *i* from the Semitic verb *brk*, 'kneel', 'pay homage', borrowed by Late-Egyptian.⁴

For the Egyptian names, V. naturally retains the universally admitted *Pi-di-pi-r* for Potiphar/phaera, and adopts Spiegelberg's *Tw-s-n-Nt* for Asenath, relying like him on the doubled *n* of LXX (Asenneth). The Hebrew, however, is only pointed for a single *n*, and the reviewer will present Egyptian equivalents for this elsewhere. V.'s explanation of Zaphenath-paaneah is a real *tour de force*, but does not convince this reviewer. Of the many previous attempts,⁵ V. discusses only two: Steindorff's (*Dd-pi-ntr-kr-f-nh*) and Yahuda's (*Dfi-n-ti pi-nh*). Yahuda's suggestion was not only unparalleled but also grammatically open to objection. Steindorff's explanation has become standard in many commentaries almost to the point of unjustifiable dogmatism; though phonetically and grammatically good, it is unsuitable semantically (a birth-name) and chronologically is too late; and it is refreshing that V. is prepared to challenge it. Noting the discordances between Heb. and LXX, he assumes that they are both partly corrupt and produces his own eclectic form from them (*p-s-n-t-r-m-p-n-h*) which gives him a good Late-Eg. *Pi s nty r m f n i ih(t)*, 'the man who knows things'. V. admits that this is unparalleled but counters this by pointing out that many of the names in Ranke are likewise unique.⁶ A more serious objection is that V.'s explanation depends so heavily on subjective emendation of both Heb. and LXX. A satisfactory solution requiring little or no emendation is always preferable; I hope in the near future to propose⁷ new equivalents for Zaphenath-paaneah and Asenath that are at once good Egyptian in form, grammar, and application and yet stick close to the Hebrew text.

Ch. VI. Competently covers Gen. xlii-xliv, including Eg. and Heb. terms for spies, forms of address, forms of oath (a useful contribution), the interpreter, payment in silver, and cup-divination.

Ch. VII. V. supports Gardiner and Couroyer against Montet that Goshen is not yet attested in Egyptian texts. But the phrase 'land of Ramesses' is not really an anachronism as is so often alleged (e.g. by V., p. 186) because it is the wording of the later narrator and is *not* put into the mouth of either Joseph or the Pharaoh. V. gives brief consideration to the Egyptian dislike of foreigners (shepherds); on Joseph's agrarian policy (Gen. xlvii, 13-26) he rightly observes that the text does not state that the priests paid no taxes but only that they were exempt from Joseph's 20 per cent. levy.

Ch. VIII. V. quickly disposes of the embalmment of Jacob and the Egyptian ideal life span of 110 years as exemplified by Joseph.

¹ Phoen. text, Rosenthal in Pritchard, *Anc. N.E. Texts* (1955), 499; Hittite Hieroglyphic, Bossert, *Oriens*, 1 (1948), 170, etc. Compare also King Kilamuwa of Sam'al who was 'father', . . . 'mother', . . . 'brother', in *Anc. N.E. Texts*, 500-1.

² Phoen., *Anc. N.E. Texts*, 500; Hitt., *Oriens*, 2 (1949), 90, etc.

³ The 'fathers of Idamaraš' (Dossin, *Syria*, 19 (1938), 109) are probably tribal rulers, perhaps also counsellors of king of Idamaraš? Perhaps also compare Dossin, *Archives Royales de Mari*, 1, 1950, letter 12, line 8: 'this man is a member of the house of the wise' (lit. 'fathers'), though one should note that von Soden, *Orientalia*, 21 (1952), 77, reads slightly differently.

⁴ His objection to Spiegelberg's *ib-r-k*, 'attention!' (*Randglossen*, 14-18), following Breasted, that it would be a singular imperative addressed to people in the plural is not so serious as at first appears. The imperative singular can readily be used in addressing a crowd to emphasize the individual responsibility of each one present to respond to the command(s). The judicious mingling of singular and plural imperatives in Deuteronomy is a classic example. The real advantage of *i-brk*, 'do homage', over *ib-r-k*, 'attention!', is that it is a clear command to *do* something, not just a vague ejaculation of warning (as partly seen by V., p. 140).

⁵ Of which the main ones are listed by V., pp. 151-2.

⁶ However, V.'s name is not just unique but has no good partial parallels even (no *pi s-* names or *pi s nty-* names); Ranke, *Personennamen*, I, 278-9. 247 and II, 311-12, has names beginning with *s* (no article), but nearly all short and theophorous, hardly any sentence-names except one or two of Old Kingdom date (much too early).

⁷ A little study entitled *The Joseph Narrative and its Egyptian Background* will, it is hoped, be published shortly after the appearance of this review.

Subjects not dealt with by V. include the coat of many colours or long tunic; wagons and chariots; horses in the Nile valley; these points will be treated by the reviewer elsewhere.

Conclusions. V. reviews his findings to see whether they indicate a date for the Joseph story. Most of these would fit most appropriately into the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. Therefore V. very reasonably considers that the Nineteenth Dynasty would be a suitable date of composition for the basic Joseph narrative; as this is—for a multitude of reasons that cannot be gone into here—also the general date of Moses, the suggestion of V. that he was the author concerned is in itself unobjectionable.¹ But, as V. admits, several of his 'indicators' cannot exclude a later date, either because they survive into the Late Period of Egyptian history, or because there is insufficient evidence to show whether they survived or were supplanted. That 'Abrech' is specifically New Kingdom and replaced by *r-t* in the Late Period would be one point in V.'s favour.² Certain subtleties in the narrative best explained by the assumption that the author had lived in Egypt would be a further such point.³ V. devotes about a page to the date of Joseph himself; he rather favours the Eighteenth Dynasty. The reviewer prefers to place Joseph in the Second Intermediate Period, but his detailed reasons, both Egyptian and Western Asiatic, must be given elsewhere.

One last point cannot be passed over here without at least a brief comment: the documentary theory of literary criticism on the composition of the Pentateuch.

Vergote is one of the very few Egyptologists to have seriously concerned himself with the documentary theory. When confronted by its intricacies, most Egyptologists understandably either pass it by (not wishing to be damned by the pious for propagating 'higher criticism', or to incur ostracism of the Old Testament scholars by opposing it), or else give it the benefit of the doubt.⁴ The purpose of the theory is to explain the origin of supposed repetitions, doublets in the narrative, and variations in style by conflation from prior 'documents'.⁵ The criteria whereby these 'documents' are distinguished are largely lexicographical: e.g. differing terms for deity (YHWH/Elohim), persons (Israel/Jacob),⁶ groups (Ishmaelites/Midianites,⁷ places (Sinai/Horeb),⁸ and common nouns (*šp̄hāh* 'āmāh, 'bondmaid/handmaid');⁹ varying use of two forms of the first person singular pronoun (*ʾnī*/*ʾnōkī*).¹⁰

It is much to be regretted that this theory has been accorded uncritical credence by Egyptologists and other Orientalists not concerned with the details of Old Testament studies, instead of its being subjected to close critical scrutiny. The theory has been developed in a vacuum without any reference to the relevant contemporary literatures of Canaan, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the rest of Western Asia, to see how they

¹ A conclusion, in fact, reached entirely independently by the reviewer in his own unpublished study.

² A point overlooked, e.g. by Eissfeldt in his opposition to V.'s Moses-hypothesis, *OLZ* 55 (1960), 39-46.

³ Again not noted by Eissfeldt (Mosaiphobia?). A third point, not invoked by V., is that the term 'land of Ramesses' for Goshen (in the general region of Tanis and Qantir) would be inappropriate after the Twentieth Dynasty, when the 'fields of Tanis' became customary both in Egyptian (*št-Dʿn*) and in Hebrew (*šēde-Šoʿan* Ps. lxxviii, 12. 43).

⁴ Simply accepted by Peet, *Egypt and the O.T.* (1922), 18-19, 29-32, and Spiegelberg, *Der Aufenthalt Israels im Aegypten*, 1904.

⁵ In point of fact, virtually all these supposed doublets, etc., are like things that occur in Egyptian and other texts, are often complementary not duplicative, and sometimes merely the illegitimate product of the theory itself. On the imaginary clashes in the Flood-Story (S. R. Driver, *Genesis* (Westm. Comm.) (1920), iii; A. Bentzen, *Introduction to O.T.* II (1952), 24) compare the reactions of Assyriologists and Semitists; Heidel, *Gilgamesh Epic and O.T. Parallels* (Chicago, 1954), 245-7, and W. J. Martin, *Stylistic Criteria and Analysis of the Pentateuch* (1955), 15-16. Abraham and Isaac's repeated deceit over their wives has been taken as otiose repetition with multiple narratives (Oesterley-Robinson, *Intr. to Books of O.T.* 30, on Gen. xii, 13; xx, 2 ff.; xxvi, 7), blandly ignoring the verse Gen. xx, 13 (Abram's set policy) and the para-repetitions of history—are Tuthmosis I and III 'doublets' because they both raided to the Euphrates and both left stelae there? It is perversity to invent difficulties to prop up a theory.

⁶ These pairs are J(ahwist) and E(lohist) respectively; V., 5; Driver, op. cit. xiii; Bentzen, op. cit. 27-28, 47 (Reuel/Jethro).

⁷ North in Rowley, *Old Testament and Modern Study* (1951), 80; Driver, op. cit. 325; also Canaanites and Amorites, Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das A.T.* (1956), 217, and Driver, *Intr. to Lit. of O.T.* (1913), 119.

⁸ Driver, *Genesis*, xiii; Bentzen, op. cit. 47.

⁹ See refs. in preceding note.

¹⁰ Driver, loc. cit.

work—a regrettable omission of some magnitude, because Hebrew literature shows very close external stylistic similarities to the other Near Eastern literatures, even when linguistically unrelated.

The artificiality of the criteria used becomes apparent as soon as one moves from the Hebrew to the other parallel texts and literatures. If we take the various suggested criteria and confront them with the evidence, their validity is shown to have little if any support:

(a) *Multiple terms for deity.* Ikhnofret in his well-known Berlin stela¹ refers to Osiris by *three* names and a fixed epithet (*Wsr, Wnn-nfr, Hnty-Imntyw, Nb-jbdw*) besides various combinations of these; and other vocabulary can be associated with the names. But any Egyptologist who attempted to use these to find four conflated documents or strata embedded in whole or in fragments in Ikhnofret's narrative, say O, W, K, N,² would be greeted with derision by his colleagues, and rightly so.

(b) *Double personal names.* In Egypt, of course, these are legion. An appropriate example is the late Nineteenth-Dynasty High Priest of Amūn, Rome-Roy, once thought by some early Egyptologists to be two different people until Lefebvre clearly showed³ that 'they' were but one, some monuments bearing one name, others the other, and some using both alternately⁴ or inconsequentially.⁵

(c) *Group names.* The Palestinian foe of Sebekkhu and his master Sesostri III⁶ is called *Mntyw-Stt*, 'bedouin of Asia', *Rtnw*, 'Syria(ns)', and *ʿmtw*, 'Asiatics', three terms in a few short lines.

(d) *Places.* Meneptah's Israel stela⁷ uses four terms or five for Memphis (*Mn-nfr, Inbw, Inb-hd, Inb-hk*; *Hwt-kj-Pth*), and two for Egypt (*Kmt, Ti-mri*).

(e) *Common nouns.* Mention of the five terms for boats, some general, some specialized, in the new Kamose stela should suffice.⁸

(f) *Personal pronoun.* Compare the mixed use of Middle-Eg. (*i*) and Late-Eg. (*p/y-i*) possessives in *Horus and Seth* (P. Chester Beatty I).⁹ These might indicate an incomplete Late-Eg. revision of a Middle-Eg. version—but could never serve to separate the constituent elements of conflated Middle and Late Egyptian versions. Nor is all this peculiar to Egypt. In the Babylonian 'Creation'-Epic, three deities bear double names;¹⁰ in a text about Gyges, Assurbanipal of Assyria happily uses two terms, *rakbu* and *mār-šipri*, for 'messenger', 'envoy'.¹¹ But these facts, and many others, do not force our Assyriologists to look for corresponding 'documents'. And in Ugaritic (N.-Canaanite), just as in a Hebrew text, two forms of the first person singular pronoun can occur in a single tablet¹²—a mere stylistic or deictic variation to the Ugaritist. Similar observations can be made about all such phenomena, severally *and* in conjunction. Nor is the reviewer alone in his scepticism;¹³ the well-known Orientalist C. H. Gordon has, quite independently, reacted similarly.¹⁴

The patience of readers of the *Journal* must not be further trespassed on here; suffice it to remark that

¹ Sethe, *Aeg. Lesestücke*, 70–71.

² O for Osirist, W for Wennofrist, K for Khentamentist, and N for the Neb-Abdjuist. The reviewer possesses a very neat 'analysis' of Ikhnofret's text to 'account for' its repetitions and doublets.

³ *Histoire des Grands Prêtres* (1929), 140–3.

⁴ Idem, *Inscriptions, Romé-Roy et Amenhotep* (1929), texts nos. 1, 5, 13.

⁵ Op. cit., text no. 16. ⁶ Sethe, op. cit. 82–83; Peet, *Sebekkhu*. ⁷ Petrie, *Six Temples*, pls. 13–14.

⁸ The words *hwt, imw, bwt, mk*, and *qst* respectively; the stela, Habachi, *Ann. Serv.* 53 (1955), 195–202; Hammad, *Chron. d'Ég.* 30/no. 60 (1955), 198–208.

⁹ Gardiner, *Library of A. Chester Beatty* (1931), 11; Old Testament scholars would profit from Gardiner's comments on the inconsistencies of this essentially unitary tale, pp. 10–13.

¹⁰ Ea is also Nudimmud (tablets I, IV), Tiamat is 'Mother Hubur' (tablets I, II, III), Marduk is Bel (tablet IV); non-Babylonists can still observe this, e.g., in Heidel's rendering in *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, 1954).

¹¹ Ungnad, *Grammatik des Akkadischen* (1949), 138–9, or with English translation, King, *First Steps in Assyrian* (1898), 81–87.

¹² Texts 49, 51, 67, in Gordon's numbering, *Ugaritic Manual*, 11, 1955.

¹³ An example of the arbitrariness of documentary methods can be seen on p. 9 of Vergote with n. 1. He would substitute 'Judah' for 'Reuben' in Gen. xxxvii, 21 purely in the interests of the theory. If the text does not willingly provide two different main actors for J and E, then it must be forced to! In point of fact, there is no shred of textual evidence to support any such emendation.

¹⁴ In his *Ugaritic Literature* (1949), 6–7, 132; *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 26 (1955), 67. 96–97; *Christianity Today*, 4 (1959), 131–4.

even the most imposing and respected theories (as this one certainly is) are but stepping-stones to higher things, and must give way to facts; Old Testament studies cannot be exempted from this inexorable law of change any more than the other, more objective, Near Eastern disciplines.

Tribute must again be paid to Professor Vergote for producing a useful study that will benefit not only Old Testament students but also his Egyptological colleagues.

K. A. KITCHEN

Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte. Fouilles à Saqqarah. La Pyramide à Degrés. Tome IV. Inscriptions gravées sur les vases. 1^{er} fascicule: Planches. By P. LACAU and J.-PH. LAUER. Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1959. vii+25 plates; ix+20 pp. No price given.

The present fascicule contains the plates of the publication of the engraved vessels found in the Step Pyramid. This publication was first envisaged in 1939, but owing to the illness and death of Macramallah, its first editor, and the upheavals of the last war and of the Suez crisis in 1956, its appearance has been much delayed. As pointed out by Lauer in the preface, the commentary on the inscriptions, by the hand of Lacau, should have appeared in the same volume, and it was already set up in type at the Institut printing-works in Cairo when the Suez affair put a complete stop to printing and proof-correcting. The authors have therefore wisely decided to publish the plates of the new volume at once, so as to make them accessible to scholars; the commentary on the inscriptions is to appear in a second fascicule.

The generic term 'vases' covers a series of stone jars, bowls, and stands, intact, reconstructed, or fragmentary, of which the prevailing shapes are set out on pls. I and II; it should be remarked here that pls. I-VII consist of line-drawings, while pls. 1-25 are photographic. Pls. III-VII are devoted to the inscriptions engraved on the vessels, of which a large number includes the names of various kings of the First-Second Dynasties; some hitherto unidentified royal names also occur, as well as those of various private persons. The photographic plates are excellent. This publication provides us with a few more documents relating to the earliest dynasties, as well as posing fresh problems as to the historical position of the unidentified monarchs, and it is to be hoped that the promised commentary by Lacau will not be long delayed. There is yet much to be learned about the early days of the Egyptian monarchy, and the enforced interruption in 1956 not only of this work, but also of our Society's excavations at Saqqāra, is greatly to be deplored.

R. O. FAULKNER

The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon. By RICARDO A. CAMINOS. *Analecta Orientalia*, vol. 37. Rome, 1958. 4to. Pp. xxiv+218. Price \$17.

The Twenty-second Dynasty, which is said by Manetho to be of Bubastis, although on what grounds is not known, is composed of a line of kings who are of Libyan extraction. The records of this dynasty are few and the accounts inscribed on the Bubastite Gate at Karnak are amongst the most important of them. They record the activities of a certain Prince Osorkon who flourished during the reigns of Takelothis I and Shoshenq III, and have hitherto been referred to as 'annals', but Caminos now much more aptly describes them as 'chronicles'.

Prince Osorkon, the eldest son of Takelothis II and Queen Karomama, was born before this pair inherited the throne. In year 11 of Takelothis II (837 B.C.) he was already governor of Upper Egypt, high priest of Amūn, and a general, while fifty-two years later he is recorded in the 39th year of Shoshenq III (784 B.C.) as still being high priest of Amūn, so that he must have attained high executive office while still in his twenties and have lived to be at least 70.

Prince Osorkon appears to have exercised his functions from a fortress, known to be closely connected with the Twenty-second Dynasty, situated on the eastern bank of the Nile opposite el-Ḥiba some 32 kilometres south of Ninsu or Herakleopolis Magna. Here he commanded the army of Ninsu, doubtless a body of Libyans on whom his real power depended. His function of high priest of Amūn he exercised by going to Thebes on all necessary occasions, and in fact he is described as being as regular in his attendance upon his priestly duties as the moon in its course. The prince had to suppress a rebellion in Thebes in the year 11 of Takelothis II and another in year 15, which seems to have dragged on for years and to have involved fighting

all over Egypt. Even his tenure of office as high priest of Amūn was not without interruption, for at one period a certain Harsiese held the office. I get the impression that, in Thebes at least, native claimants, perhaps with hereditary rights to the high-priesthood, were at the bottom of the rebellions.

The prince certainly had a long career, but it had many ups and downs, and despite being the eldest son clearly expecting to succeed to the throne, he suffered the disappointment of being passed over for reasons that are unknown to us but which Caminos suggests may be connected with the settlement of the troubles associated with the rebellion of the year 15. Despite the disappointment, the records indicate a loyalty to the dynasty on the part of Prince Osorkon which has an unusual ring of genuineness.

Such, briefly, are the important historical aspects of this chronicle, which was published by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in 1954 under the title of the Bubastite Portal, and is now translated in full for the first time by Caminos.

The text is in a terribly mutilated state, but Caminos has spared no effort to overcome the difficulties consequent upon this and has undoubtedly extracted the last ounce of meaning possible. To do this he has not only brought to bear every resource of grammatical analysis, but has not been content merely to rely on the Chicago text. Instead, he has subjected the actual wall to an exacting examination both by day and by light at night, and has ransacked the published and unpublished records of the last 150 years for older copies of parts of the inscriptions. This has resulted in the text used by Caminos as the basis of his translation being a not inconsiderable improvement over the Chicago facsimile. Caminos prints all his improvements or variant suggestions in hieroglyphs so that it is possible for the reader to gather them together, write them into the published facsimile, and so obtain a copy of the improved text as used for the translation. This I have found myself compelled to do, but I cannot help feeling that it is a pity that Caminos did not himself provide his book with plates containing this text which would open out so as to be visible while studying the translation.

The translation is made section by section and is the subject of a most painstaking commentary. It leaves nothing to be desired in that every difficulty is fully discussed. Particularly excellent is the ingenious way in which parallel sentences and phrases from other texts have been sought out to elucidate and defend the interpretations adopted. A wealth of references is provided at every point and often adds considerably to those available from other sources. The book is indeed a mine of information and help for all students of late texts. In this respect its value is enhanced by the provision of a vocabulary equipped with meanings and full references.

The book is also provided with a consecutive translation and a concluding general historical essay giving the author's conclusions as to the significance and context of the events narrated in the chronicle. In addition there is an excellent general index, a list of contents, an extensive list of bibliographical references, and a preface.

In my opinion Caminos has produced a book thoroughly to be recommended and one that it is no exaggeration to say is even indispensable to all who work with late texts.

C. H. S. SPAULL

The Rock Tomb of Irw-k1-Pth. By BORIS DE RACHEWILTZ. Leiden, 1960. Pp. 30, with 28 plates and a coloured frontispiece. Price 25 guilders.

The subject of this volume is a tomb of unusual interest, to be dated, probably, to the late Sixth Dynasty or the early First Intermediate Period. It lies to the south of the Unas causeway at Saqqara and is one of a group of rock-cut tombs discovered in the early years of the last war. It was made for a royal butcher, Irukaptah, who was also called Khenu. The decoration of the tomb contains a number of unusual scenes, including one of boats and one of butchery showing the flaying of an ox. The artistic quality of the representations is for the most part poor, but the scenes possess a certain liveliness and a wealth of colour which makes them particularly interesting. An unusual feature of the tomb is a series of high relief representations of the deceased set in shallow niches.

A monument as interesting as this tomb deserves a full and careful publication, but the present volume in no way provides what is wanted. In the first place the plates are inadequate. They are entirely photographic and, as the tomb is narrow, many of the photographs have been taken at oblique angles. Some of the plates therefore present a distorted effect. Furthermore, as the decoration of the tomb is often faint or

damaged, the details of the various scenes are not easily to be seen. Only careful line-drawings would provide the student with the important information contained in the painted representations. It must be admitted that it would not be easy to make line-drawings in a tomb in such poor condition as this, but the task is not impossible and infinitely worthwhile.

The texts in the tomb are not very extensive and provide little information beyond the titles of the owner of the tomb. They are reproduced in the main body of the volume in line-drawings which give the impression of being facsimiles, but which are in fact not such. Comparison between the drawings and the photographs is not always easy because the piecemeal character of the plates rarely allows a whole text to be seen in one and the signs are not always clearly visible on the plates. The following corrections, however, have been noted:

Page 10: The = in the title ir-r nsw (omitted in the drawing) is clearly visible on pl. VIII, 2.

Page 25: In the name of the deceased on the right jamb of the false door, the sign I (omitted in the drawing) is clearly visible on pl. XXIII.

In a number of places de Rachewiltz has misunderstood the texts or omitted words in his translations. The titles of the deceased are wrongly given in a number of particulars. The principle title, kbhw hwt-rhs (perhaps hwt-ds might be a better reading of [𓆎]) pr-r is 'butcher of the slaughter-house of the palace', not 'butcher of the main property of the palace'. In using the latter translation the author has accepted the translation of the title kbhw hwt-rst given by Junker, *Giza*, xi, 146. The group [𓆎] = does not mean 'royal overseer' and is not to be read iry nsw but ir-r nsw . The group ir-r , normally meaning 'breakfast' (literally 'washing the mouth'), is not known to me as a component element of titles. As such it most probably means literally 'he who washes the mouth', i.e. 'the provider of breakfast', and the two titles held by Irukaptah, ir-r nsw and ir-r nsw hwt-rhs (or ds) probably mean 'provider of the king's breakfast' and 'provider of the king's breakfast, of the slaughter-house'. In the collocation ir-r nsw kbhw , two titles are probably to be read, not one: 'provider of the king's breakfast and butcher'.

On page 14, nfr in the phrase $\text{hp-f nfr hr wwt nfrt hppt imih}$ has been overlooked. Translate: 'that he may walk beautifully upon the beautiful roads which the honoured one walks' (not 'on which the Honoured Ones walk'). On page 20, a group has been omitted from the translation, and other improvements can be made. From hrs-ti-f , translate: 'that he may be buried in the necropolis, in the western desert, when he has grown old beautifully, the one honoured by the Great God, etc.'

The west wall of the tomb contains a false door stela with conventional texts for Irukaptah, and for someone called Khenu. De Rachewiltz takes this Khenu to be a member of the family of Irukaptah, but it is more likely that Khenu and Irukaptah are one and the same person. The name Khenu occurs on the upper lintel, the lower lintel, and the left jamb; that of Irukaptah on the panel between the lintels, on the drum, and on the right jamb. All the titles accompanying the name Khenu are ones held by Irukaptah and the identification is clinched by the fact that the representation at the bottom of each jamb contains a standing figure of a man accompanied by a smaller figure of a boy named 'his eldest son Ptašshepses'. The man shown on the right jamb must be Irukaptah and the man on the left jamb must be Khenu. As they share Ptašshepses in common as 'eldest son' it must be concluded that Khenu is another name of Irukaptah.

The volume contains a reasonably detailed description of the decorations in the tomb, but lacks references to comparative material elsewhere. There is no proper account of the colours which are preserved to a large extent in the scenes. The texts are presented with no commentary and there is no index. It is a great pity that an important tomb which has waited twenty years for publication after discovery (and which has deteriorated considerably during this time) should be so indifferently treated.

T. G. H. JAMES

Die Stellung des Königs im Alten Reich. By HANS GOEDICKE (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, Band 2). Wiesbaden, 1960. Pp. 95. No price given.

The method of inquiry employed by Dr. Goedicke in this interesting monograph is unusual, and although it initially appears to be uncertainly based, it turns out to be unexpectedly fruitful. His purpose is to discover whether the different ways by which the king is referred to in texts of the Old Kingdom, throw any light on the nature of kingship during that period. In an introductory section he points out that the king with the concept of kingship occupies a central position in the Egyptian concept of state. The nature of this kingship received its first formulation during the Old Kingdom and it would be profitable to examine in

what this formulation consists. Goedicke notes that the king was in himself an expression of divinity and that this idea was inherent in the conception of Egyptian kingship, although it was not necessarily a part of the individual king himself as a living, human person. By making an inquiry into the relations between the king and his subjects, useful facts might emerge about the nature of the kingship. Such an inquiry, however, could not be undertaken with the divine-royal Pyramid Texts as its subject-matter, because the king in these texts is a dead king who is already beyond any possible relationship with his subjects. Other texts do not contain explicit statements about this relationship, but something useful might emerge from an examination of the inscriptions of private persons and from the references they contain to the kings. In these texts the king is referred to in a number of different ways, such as *nsw*, *nb*, *hm*, and by the name in a cartouche. Can any distinctions be drawn between these usages? Do any apply only to the king in respect of his 'earthly sphere' (which is personal) and others only to his divine aspect (which is more abstract)? Goedicke's method is to examine in detail the various terms used to refer to the king and he concentrates his inquiry on those examples to be found in *Urkunden* 1, with only occasional references to inscriptions published elsewhere. The summary results of his inquiry are worth noting in detail:

1. *n-sw-bity* NN. This method of referring to the king is used when the intention is to speak of him not as an individual, a simple human person, but as the embodiment of ruling power. In this respect the king is raised above the limits of ordinary human life and is shown to be the lord of Egypt and the incorporation of divine kingship.

2. *nsw*. The king in his function as *nsw* is not only the ruler but also the representative of justice and legal order (*mnt*); at the same time he is god incarnate on earth. Apart from the simple uses of *nsw* in texts which illustrate this aspect of royalty, the use of the word in the titles of officials provides further indication of its significance. Such officials have duties connected with the exercise of sovereign rights *per se*. The significance of the word is the same in a phrase like *wꜥd (n) nsw*. The king as *nsw* is the centre of the administration of the state; the word *nsw* does not, however, include within its meaning the physical person of the king.

3. *kr*. This term is rare in non-religious private texts, but in its occasional uses in such texts it represents the divine immanent power of the king. It is determined by the divine determinative 𓅓 . This sense covers to a large extent the same scope as *nsw*, but the two terms are not precisely the same.

4. *ntr*—a very rare term for the king in private texts, one very significantly never used for the living king. It is, on the other hand, constantly used in the Pyramid Texts to refer to the dead king. One possible use of the term is in the inscription of Isy, a nomarch of Edfu (published by Edel, *ZAS* 79, 13), where the king referred to as *ntr pn* is certainly dead.

5. *nb*. Clear cases of the use of this word to refer to the king are not common. It is found both undetermined and determined by 𓅓 , the latter form occurring from the reign of Isesi and becoming more frequent in the Sixth Dynasty. It is another term not used of the human person of the king but of him as lord of Egypt. In this it is parallel in usage to *nsw*. Its use in the late Old Kingdom seems in some way to be connected with the change in the concept of the king which became particularly marked in the Sixth Dynasty. From an examination of its uses it seems to have apparently some connexion with Lower Egypt.

6. *ity*. Cases where this word is used of the king seem to be confined to inscriptions of the Sixth Dynasty. Examples are always determined by 𓅓 and again the emphasis seems to be not on the personal, human character of the king, but on his general, divine nature. It seems to be used in a manner similar to *nb*.

7. *hm*. This is the principal term used to refer to the king as an individual person. The king as *hm* is the king who does things. Goedicke cites an instructive example from the inscription of Senedjemib-inty (*Urk.* 1, 60, 3-6) in which that official describes various favours conferred by the king (*hm*) and in the presence of the king (*hm*) and then adds 'never was the like done for any man in the presence of a king (*nsw*)'. Here *nsw* is used in a general sense of king and not of any particular king. On the other hand, *hm* is always used of particular kings and always when the king is referred to 'in action'. It is therefore the term always used with verbs of specific action like *gd*, *rdi*, *hwb*. It is a word that never occurs in the Pyramid Texts, for it refers to the bodily manifestation of the king as an individual.

8. *hm* in combination with another word is used in two ways:


(a) *hm n* NN (with or without *n-sw-bity*), which may be used of living or dead kings, in the case of the former the name being followed by *ꜥnh dt*. It is again a form used when specific royal acts are being described. The usage seems to start in the Sixth Dynasty and although there are cases in which Fifth

Dynasty kings are so referred to, it can be shown that the inscriptions concerned were composed during the Sixth Dynasty and that the references are retrospective. Goedicke considers it is significant that this development should have occurred when it did, because it was during the Sixth Dynasty that the Egyptian king came to be regarded more as an individual and less as the human embodiment of a divine order.

- (b) *hm n nb*, a usage first employed in the Fifth Dynasty in cases where *nsw* might well have been used. Its significance therefore seems likely to be the same as or similar to that of *nsw*, that is, of the king as god incarnate.

9. The king's name by itself in a cartouche occurs not infrequently in earlier inscriptions and it is not easy to see any common reason for this use. From an examination of the examples it emerges that this method of reference is reserved for dead kings and for pre-Sixth Dynasty kings. It is used of the king as a ruler and as an individual rather than as the divine embodiment of the idea of kingship. It is, in fact, apparently the precursor of the form *hm n NN*, which, as has been seen above, became common in the Sixth Dynasty. No simple reason for the change is apparent.

In a final section Goedicke concludes that different ways were used to refer to the king, depending on the period and on the intention of the writer. If his conclusions are valid they may prove to be of considerable value both for reconstructing damaged texts and for understanding texts in general. He further claims that the different ways were employed according to strict rules and not for stylistic purposes. Three concepts of kingship emerge from the study. In the first place there is that of the dead king who has, by the nature of things, become divine. The other two concepts are of the living king: the king may be referred to as a particular person or as the holder of the office. The king as a person is *hm* and this term is that most commonly used in Old Kingdom private inscriptions. It is never used in the plural. Its common use reveals that the king in this period was in general regarded not as divine but as an individual and human. *nsw* is the word used mostly when the writer wished to mention the king as the holder of the office rather than as an individual. At first it too is never used in the plural, for the basic idea is singular. The king is not himself divine, but the office of which he is the holder is. He is the representative of order and justice on earth and these are divine emanations.

These two latter concepts are clearly distinguished throughout the Old Kingdom and together they make up the single concept of Egyptian kingship. In the early Old Kingdom the person of the king was subordinate to his office, but a change took place, starting from the middle of the Fifth Dynasty and reaching its height in the reign of Pepi II, by which the person of the king became more prominent (*hm*), although it did not extinguish the divine aspect (*nb* with ) . At this time the two aspects of Egyptian kingship were properly emphasised and united—the divine office and the human character of its bearer.

These conclusions are superficially not very remarkable because they reassert what is already generally accepted about the nature of the kingship during the Old Kingdom. What is remarkable, however, is the revelation of the extent to which private persons were able to regard the king as an individual and to speak about him in their inscriptions as a basically human agent. When the Egyptian king becomes divine he is very largely depersonalized and this change is demonstrated by the method by which he is referred to in the texts. Dr. Goedicke's treatment of the evidence is full, but at times somewhat discursive. In so inflating his discussion he treats many small points of particular interest (e.g. the meaning of the term *šhm-irf*, pp. 24 ff.) which are likely to be missed because no index of words discussed is given. A list of passages from *Urkunden* 1, cited in the text is provided, but it would have been more useful to have had in the case of each royal appellation a full list of all the examples to be found in *Urkunden* 1. These small criticisms, however, in no way detract from the interest and value of this stimulating monograph.

T. G. H. JAMES

Les Inscriptions du Temple d'Opet, à Karnak. By CONSTANT DE WIT. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, XI. Brussels, 1958. Pp. xvi+328. No price given.

As early as 1894 Maspero called for the publication *in extenso* of the texts in the temple of Opet at Karnak. Until Professor De Wit took the matter in hand in 1954, only partial attempts had, however, been made. Aspiring copyists, it is true, faced discouraging obstacles such as the darkness of the rooms and the odour of innumerable bats—an odour which, it may be gathered, has nothing pleasantly Tennysonian about it.

Rochemonteix died before he was able to verify the squeezes made by him. Sethe's notebook was unfortunately destroyed during the Second World War. All the more, then, must one welcome M. De Wit's presentation of the texts in this accessible and relatively cheap publication.

In its present state the temple dates from the second half of the second century B.C. The pylon is dated by an inscription of Ptolemy XII, Neos Dionysus, as is the western gate. A striking feature is the depiction on the exterior walls of the procession of nomes and of Niles or protecting genii. This is dated by the name of Augustus Caesar. The representation is not, of course, reproduced in the present volume since the series in which it occurs is concerned only with texts; but it is the subject of some valuable remarks appended to the editor's introduction by M. Jean Yoyotte.

In his own introductory observations M. De Wit concerns himself mainly with the hippopotamus-goddess to whom the temple is dedicated. He states that about the middle of the nineteenth century certain Egyptologists were inclined to see in this deity a goddess of evil. His references for this statement are a little puzzling. He cites Lepsius, who is said to have written on the subject in 1851 (but not, apparently, in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy for that year, as stated), and Hopfner's commentary on the *De Iside et Osiride*, I, 107, a work which was published in 1940. Further, in the course of his remarks, Hopfner says (p. 108), after quoting from the Metternichstele, 'So erscheinen also Thueris und Rert und die anderen Nilpferdgöttinnen als gute, "osirianische" Gottheiten'; he goes on to show that Thoueris was brought into association with Typhon by the Greeks.

M. De Wit refers to some predynastic palettes where the hippopotamus is represented, but he wisely refrains from positing a cult of Thoueris-Opet for this early period. It may be worth noting here that Seligman, in *Anc. Egypt*, 1916, 53, is too confident in assigning a 'prehistoric' origin to an ivory comb bought from a dealer in Luxor; the object may be compared with the examples in Brunton, *Qau and Badari*, II, pls. 95-96, but none of these is earlier than the Sixth Dynasty: see Brunton's remarks on p. 10. M. De Wit alludes to an example from the Belgian excavations at el-Kâb, but does not, unhappily, supply a reference.

M. De Wit appears to believe that Opet became an important goddess because she was eventually confused with the other Opet, who was a personification of the temple of Luxor. Certainly, some of her subsequent epithets, as De Wit shows, seem to derive from this association. Whether her designation as the mother of Osiris comes from the same source is more doubtful, for in *Pyr.* 381a ff., as De Wit points out, the goddess Ipy is called on to suckle the deceased king ('Mother of the King, O Ipy, give this king that breast of thine . . .'), and Sethe in his *Pyr. Komm.* II, 111, rightly pinpoints the goddess's role here as supplying the prototype of Opet's function as 'Kinderfrau' of the gods. Another basic consideration has been propounded by Säve-Söderbergh in his penetrating study of hippopotamus-hunting where it is shown (p. 46) that from the start the female hippopotamus 'was practically always a benign and good divinity, a form of mother goddess', whereas the male animal was viewed differently.

A reviewer cannot, in the nature of things, test the accuracy of the texts presented by M. De Wit. He has obviously gone to considerable pains and has sought the aid of Fairman, Firthow, and others. He has still to query a number of the readings; but his annotations are concerned not only with the readings as such, but also occasionally with the elucidation of the text. This is to be welcomed, for Ptolemaic texts, in spite of the pioneering work of Fairman and others, still remain a difficult terrain. One can feel confident that M. De Wit has completed his task competently.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

Les Mammisi des temples égyptiens. By FRANÇOIS DAUMAS. Annales de l'université de Lyon. Troisième série—Lettres—Fasc. 32. Paris, 1958. Pp. 537+14 pl. No price given.

This comprehensive and systematic study of the *mammisi* has two main sections of which the first is devoted to the archaeological data and the second to the relevant religious ceremonies. Professor Daumas begins by explaining why he wishes to retain the term *mammisi*, although it derives from a non-existent Coptic word, one coined in fact by Champollion. On this point M. Daumas shows that Bonnet, *Reallexikon*, 209, errs in calling the word an 'arabische Bezeichnung'; fortunately it is not often that Bonnet's valuable work needs correcting. *Mammisi* is certainly more convenient than *le lieu de l'enfentement*, and hallowed as it now is by usage, it need not be replaced either by *birth house* or *Geburtshaus*.

The *mammisi* is shown to have been dedicated usually to the triad of the temple, but the mother-goddess and her child have special importance. The mother is Hathor or Isis, the child is Horus and Ihy or Harsomtut.

In one case (*Mam. Dendera*, 20) *Ihy* is described as *wšh mrtwt*, which M. Daumas translates 'qu'on aime sans cesse'; an active interpretation, 'enduring in love', is perhaps preferable; cf. the phrase *bnr mrtwt* which M. Daumas cites; *Wb.* II, 102, 6. 7, takes the comparable phrase *mn mrtwt*, however, as 'dauernd beliebt', which doubtless supports M. Daumas. He shows that as the infant is regarded as one born to be king, or as one identified with the king, the *mammisi* is bound up with the royal cult.

Architecturally the development is shown to have been a process of elaboration and expansion. The first and basic stage, exemplified in the original edifice at Philae, or in the monument of Nectanebus at Dendera, was a chamber fronted by a pronaos and an approach. Elaborations of this scheme included two lateral chapels at Dendera, corridors and an offering chamber at Kôm Ombo, and, at Edfu and in Philae's second stage, a surrounding ambulatory in the form of a colonnade. Daumas shows that Borchardt's definition of a *mammisi* as a temple with an ambulatory of plant-shaped columns is too rigid and narrow, doing justice neither to the variety of architectural development nor—what is more important—to the religious purport of the buildings. The plans in this section might have been bigger and more numerous; otherwise the discussion is well managed. A point which emerges clearly is that the *mammisi*, as a temple, is not paralleled by the arrangement made in a domestic household when a confinement occurred. Chassinat and Borchardt were anxious to suggest, in an effort to establish an analogy with the *mammisi*, that confinements took place outside the house proper. Daumas (p. 74) is manifestly right in maintaining that the passage describing the confinement of Redjedet in P. Westcar contains no such hint; and he has the authority of Mme Desroches-Noblecourt for pointing to the confirmation of archaeological evidence: in her study of domestic architecture she has not found a suggestion that the women's quarters were constructed, in any epoch, outside the house.

In his chapters on the cult Daumas deals with the service of offerings, the festivals held at the *mammisi*, and 'the mystery of the divine birth'. To his concluding remarks he adds a brief discussion of possible survivals. There follows a useful appendix on the names of the *mammisi*. These are often related in a fairly obvious way to the purpose of the sanctuary, e.g. *Ht swht*, 'the house of the egg' and *Ht wtt*, 'the house of procreation'. The plates vary in quality (pl. V is not of much use), but they exemplify well the characteristic reliefs that are relevant.

One of the chief merits of the second part is the frequent quotation and elucidation of texts which are given in hieroglyphic and have in many cases been collated by the author. The treatment of philological detail and of matters relating to the religious theme amounts to a very valuable commentary. In his discussion of the ritual which was performed in order to symbolize the divine birth and its antecedents, Daumas on p. 400 raises the question of whether any act of real sexual union occurred. He shows that with regard to the union of Amūn and Hathor the texts and reliefs indicate that the priest who played the role of Amūn presented the breath of life (*šw n nh*), which he rightly compares with the *πνεῦμα* of Plut. *Num.* 4, 62B) in the form of the *ankh*-sign to Hathor's nose, thus causing her to conceive the god's offspring. The texts contain scarcely any carnal expressions, unlike the Eighteenth Dynasty temple inscriptions from Deir el-Bahri describing Amūn's union, in the form of the king, with Queen Aḥmes; but even there, according to Daumas, the ceremonial was purely symbolic. He certainly makes a strong case for believing that in later times, when the king's divinity was assumed by the infant god of the local triads, it was only the mystic union of Amūn and the goddess that was evoked. What took place in the earlier ceremonies referred to is perhaps a more open question. Professor Fairman,¹ it may be noted, is of the opinion that in the great festival of Min, a fertility rite linked with the king, 'the king and queen may have had intercourse.'

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS

Prosopographia Ptolemaica. IV. *L'Agriculture et l'élevage*, nos. 8041–12459. By W. PEREMANS and E. VAN'T DACK. Publications universitaires de Louvain 1959. Pp. xxviii+403. Price not stated.

The Ptolemaic prosopography of the Louvain school (see *JEA* 43 (1957), 127) has now reached the end of its fourth volume, devoted to agriculture and stock-raising. It is the longest yet, and contains the largest number of entries. Hints at various points show that the original plan of five volumes will be exceeded:

¹ 'The Kingship Rituals of Egypt', in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford, 1958); this on p. 85.

'transport' and 'commerce' (p. xxi), 'the profession of doctor' (p. 179) will be reserved for volume six. I do not find any statement whether the promised general alphabetical index will now begin at volume five or be postponed till volume seven.

The editors of this undertaking are both learned men and deserve our gratitude for the enormous amount of work they have put into the collection and evaluation of a large number of difficult texts, and for their arrangement and accurate printing. Everyone will welcome their list of *doreai*. But not all the sections will be so useful, for the defects and difficulties of the analytical method are particularly marked in this volume. The editors have penned an introductory essay of some length to explain their methods of categorization, and the exclusion of the non-professional element from their lists of cultivators. The rigorous logic with which this principle is applied will benefit statisticians working over these lists, but render them useless to an historian who tries to start from them in assessing the extent and scope of, say, pig-farming in Ptolemaic Egypt, or the papyrologist who turns to them for help in restoring a broken name.

A curious confusion has occurred at no. 10070a. A *dorea* of Galaestes is quoted, on the strength of an alleged payment by him of mercenaries ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίας (for which the reference given is *Prosop. Ptol.* II, 2155, where Diodorus, xxxiii, fr. 23 is cited). According to my reading of the Diodorus passage, it was Hierax who paid mercenaries in this way; and I should interpret the Greek phrase to mean 'out of his own pocket' (I see this is also Edwyn Bevan's translation) and suppose that it had nothing to do with οὐσία in its technical Egyptian sense of 'a large estate'. Nevertheless, Galaestes may well have had a *dorea*. This is the implication of Diodorus' statement *ibid.*, fr. 20 (ed. Dindorf, 1868): 'Πτολεμαίου (i.e. Physcon) τὰς δωρεὰς ἀφελομένου καὶ χαλεπῶς διακειμένου πρὸς αὐτόν, he (Galaestes) went off in terror to Greece.'

E. G. TURNER

The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus. Edited by ARTHUR E. R. BOAK (and) HERBERT CHAYYIM YOUTIE. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1960. Pp. xviii+478, 7 photographic facsimiles. \$ 17.50.

The papyrologists of Michigan are well known for the excellence of their work, and this important volume fully maintains the high standard of its predecessors. The editors have spared no pains to produce accurate texts and to present them in the clearest and most acceptable form: no difficulty is shirked, no problem, however baffling or however apparently unimportant, is ignored, and each is handled with commendable caution, all possibilities being weighed, and mere probability never translated into certainty. Add to these qualities the fine production and the clearness of the plates (more would have been welcome, but one's demands must be reasonable), and the volume can be recommended as a model for every editor whose financial resources are adequate. Little room is left for improvement, at least by the present reviewer, but some of the many points of interest may be referred to.

It must be mentioned that the original owner of the archive, Isidorus, was a resident of Karanis, a large village in the north of the Arsinoite nome or Faiyûm, the modern Kôm Ushim, or Aushim as the editors of this volume spell it. His paternal grandfather, Pancrates or Pancratius, was an officer in the Roman army, where he attained the rank of *speculator*. There is no evidence that either his son Ptolemaeus or his grandson Isidorus ever served in the army, but the care with which the family papers were preserved may indicate the influence of military method. Ptolemaeus appears to have died between A.D. 283 and 297. Seven at least of his sons reached manhood, and an Isidora, daughter of Ptolemaeus, may be their sister. (A useful family tree is printed on p. 6.) Isidorus perhaps 'acted as head of the family' (p. 5). He must have died in or not long after A.D. 324. A return of his land in September 299 shows that he then owned nearly 54 arouras, but in 310 he gives his property as 140 arouras; perhaps, the editors suggest, the increase was due to inheritance, for it is clear that much of the land was unproductive. In addition he leased land belonging to others, perhaps owing to the poor quality of his own land; in a petition (no. 78) to the *praepositus* of the 5th *pagus* in A.D. 324 he states that he was cultivating only 7 out of the 80 arouras he then owned. So too in 3, of the land there declared 30½ arouras are *ἄβροχος* (uninundated) and only ¼ aroura (an olive grove) was productive. Not the least interesting point which emerges from this as from other contemporary collections of papyri is the agricultural crisis which led eventually to the abandonment and desiccation of so much land in the Faiyûm, allowing a great part of that once productive province to relapse into desert. Incidentally, this volume provides useful evidence on the meaning of some terms commonly used of land: see the introduction to 6, where it is pointed out that though *ἀσπορος* is properly different from *ἄβροχος*, the

two terms were frequently interchanged; *ἄστροπος* (so too *ἄβροχος*) was land not actually sown but capable of cultivation; *χέρσος* was land which had become permanently desert.

No. 9, a report of *sitologi*, offers some interesting points. For example, it illustrates the rigidity of the tax system. Originally the best land had, in general, been retained in the hands of the state and leased as royal or demesne land. Naturally, being better land, it was more highly taxed. Conditions had changed by the fourth century, the royal land had passed into private hands, but, though private land was now, in general, the more profitable, the old 'royal' land still continued to be the more highly taxed. This unintelligent rigidity (cf. also the editors' remarks on p. 109) is typical of land policy in later times. Moreover, whatever the actual crops might be, the wheat and barley taxes were both levied, even though the tax-payers were growing no barley and had to buy it in order to pay the tax in kind. The same rigidity appears (p. 123) in the indifference, for the chaff tax, alike to crop (e.g. wheat or barley) and to comparative productivity. Diocletian's reforms, designed to simplify a system grown too cumbrous for the diminished resources of the Empire, only contributed an additional factor to the process of decay. We meet here also a new tax, *ἐπικουρία*, levied at the rate of $\frac{1}{18}$ artaba per aroura. The editors suggest that this 'assistance' was for the handling of the grain collected or for the military escort during transit. It may be noted (p. 108) that the official price for wheat was still the same in 311 as that fixed in 301 by the edict on prices. There is also in the introduction to this document a discussion on *πιστίκιον*, which the editors explain as 'hulled emmer', fresh *πιστίκιον* being 'unhulled emmer'. They suggest further (p. 108) that the *modius castrensis* and the *modius xystus* (see P.Lond. v, p. 157) may be identical. In l. 9 of this document the singular, *δηλῶ*, though there are several persons concerned, may be noted as betraying the use, as a model, of a document concerning a single person; but the following participle is plural. In 12 the use of *ἐπινέμησις* as a technical term in place of *ἐπιμερισμός* is to be noted. From 13 comes evidence for the capacity of the *σαργάνη*, viz. 150 lb. In this report by chaff collectors it is interesting to find that copies of their receipts are included. The list of taxpayers in 14 includes masculine names ending in -*ις*, and it may be asked whether, at this period, they should not be regarded as names in -*ιος* in which, as often, the omicron has dropped out, and be accented accordingly, in defiance of the usual rule (not *Ἀτίσις* but *Ἀτίσις*). The doubt is strengthened by (e.g.) a comparison of l. 35, nom. *Ατίσις*, and l. 104, gen. *Ατίσιον*. At an earlier date such a name as this would have formed its genitive in -*εως*; -*ίου* shows that it was thought of as = -*ιος*.

No. 17 (A.D. 314) brings fresh evidence of economic decline: of 88 tax-payers whose names are legible in the daybook published as no. 10, 43 are entered in 17, a list of persons in arrears for the chaff tax. In 38 (November 7, 296) and 39 (November 13, 296) we have documents to be added to those dated by the regnal years of the usurper L. Domitius Domitianus. In 44, 12 is *μόνα* or an abbreviation possible at the beginning? In 57, 16 the reference to barley *χωρούσης Ἡφαιστίωνι* is interesting, for 58 shows that Hephaestion was the head of the faction of the Blues at Alexandria. In 61, 40 the spelling *ἐξαρίσιον* for *ἐξαρίσιον* gives an interesting indication of the pronunciation of *tio* as *sio*. The petition, 62, is a notable example of vulgar Greek; indeed, the Greek is so incorrect that the editors print the text twice, first as spelled in the papyrus, then in a correct form. This document, which mentions the Corrector Achilles, is important both legally and historically. In l. 3 the use of *ἐκδικος* as equivalent to *tutor mulieris* may be noted. In 64, 10 is a new instance of the rare word *πρωτοστάτης*, which it is now clear is not to be corrected to *προστάτης*. In 68 we have an addition to the now plentiful evidence for the heavy burdens imposed by the liturgical system; it is an (unsuccessful) attempt by Isidorus to escape from a liturgy. It is probably unnecessary to accept his statement that his nomination as *sitologus* was due to malice on the part of his nominators; the position was now so desperate that officials were almost forced into piling on contributors who had means heavier burdens than they could well bear. In 69 is an improved text of an interesting petition twice previously published which concerns an exaction of *τὸν χρυσὸν καὶ ἄσημον*, perhaps the *aurum tironicum*. Nos. 71-73 form an interesting series, for the two former seem to be notes made in preparation for the writing of the petition numbered 73. On 71, 10, *οὔτε γραμματέως οὔτε κλήρω* (l. -*ον*) *οὔτε τῷ δικαίῳ* (l. *τοῦ δικαίου*) *φροντίζουσιν*, the editors remark that *κλήρω* is obscure here. Is the meaning perhaps 'they pay no heed to the (authority of) the (village) scribe or to (assignment by) lot or to justice'? In 73 the muddled sentence in ll. 4-5 is rendered 'while we pay them due respect, (they) do us the greatest mischief.' This is possible, but perhaps a better interpretation would be, 'although they ought to be afraid (of doing such a thing) they do us', etc. (taking *φοβηθέντας* as an error for *φοβηθῆναι*).

In a note on 74, 6, commenting on the puzzling ἐπὶ πλείον, the editors remark that it 'would have been in place in l. 5'. May not the simple explanation be that the scribe, copying from a corrected draft, has misplaced an interlineal addition made there? In 75, 10 f., μετα.ρα.ικων, would it be altogether too daring to suggest a loan word from the Latin *agrarius*, μετὰ ἀγραρικῶν, 'along with rustics'? This petition is interesting for its mention of the alarm given by the women: 'if our people, who were women, had not raised an outcry.' In 89 occurs one of several pieces of evidence for the inflation characteristic of this period, 15 talents as the price of 100 artabas of beans; cf. nos. 91 and 92, 6-7 note. The text of 97 is so worded as to show that the document must have been rather unintelligently copied from another contract or contracts used as a model: the borrowers, over seven in number, are described as οἱ πάντε, and in l. 13 μου is used instead of ἡμῶν. So too in 98, where at least three persons are concerned, singulars are employed in ll. 15, 17. Another interesting point here is that the scribe apparently subscribed for both (illiterate) parties. In 103, where the lessees agree to discharge all taxes on land leased without rent, there is further evidence of the agricultural depression. So too in 104 land is held 'free of rent in return for payment . . . of public dues and *annonae*'. An interesting linguistic point here is the use of the nominative absolute in l. 15. A misprint may be pointed out in 105, 13: σῶσης for οὔσης. In 114 occurs a gymnasiarch called Αὐρήλιος Ἰωάννης. Was he a Jew (or even a Christian) converted to paganism? The editors leave the question open. In 123, 8, a receipt, occurs the late vulgar (and modern) form ἐσέ for σε; cf. ἐσοῦ in 133, 12, a private letter. An interesting note on 125, 14 points out, with examples, how untrustworthy may be the statements of age in papyrus documents. Those who have worked on papyri of the late Byzantine or early Arab periods will note with interest the references to fugitives in 126 and 128; in all periods of Egyptian history flight has been the refuge of the overburdened peasant. In l. 6 of the former does the unread portion contain χωρίς, 'without authorization'? but I can make nothing of what follows ριγ. In l. 11 it seems preferable, as suggested in the commentary, to correct τοῖς to τοὺς rather than to the (αὐ)τοῖς (τοὺς) of the text; the parallel cited from a Theadelphia papyrus does not really justify so drastic an alteration. In 128, 7-9 would not 'since we have from (sc. of) our village certain men who are fugitives' be preferable to the translation given? Finally, reference may be made to an interesting note on the word πασκαῦλιν in 137: Latin, British, Egyptian, or Jewish?

SIR H. I. BELL

Die Koptischen Ostraka der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Texte, Übersetzungen, Indices, by WALTER C. TILL. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 78. Band, 1. Abhandlung.) Wien, 1960. Price not stated.

Coptic ostraca are not the most rewarding texts to edit. The present editor has no illusions about this. Their contents are necessarily short and not usually of much importance. Most of them are letters written in an allusive style, intelligible no doubt to the recipient, who was familiar with the matter in question, but not so readily to us. The people who used this cheap notepaper were often illiterate and there are many vagaries of grammar and spelling. Add to this that most of them are fragmentary and, furthermore, that the writing has often faded or been rubbed off.

Yet, as the editor points out, they are valuable in several ways; and, like the stones that go to make a mosaic, though each taken by itself is insignificant, yet together, when fitted into place, they build up a picture of the ordinary life of the people such as Coptic literary texts, so preoccupied with religion, do not provide.

All credit, then, to those who undertake the laborious task of editing these *disiecta membra*, especially when it is done with such care and competence as here.

The present collection comprises: nos. 1-6, Biblical texts; 7-22, non-Biblical, literary; 23-33, I.O.U.s; 34-54, various documents; 55-67, protection promises; 68-102, tax receipts; 103-17, documents of doubtful import; 118-51, lists; 152-325, letters; 326-418, small fragments of letters; 419-73, small, undefined fragments. According to the editor they all belong to the seventh and eighth centuries; and many are stated to come from the neighbourhood of Thebes.

A few comments may be made on some of them. No. 8, when complete, gave the names of the four evangelists and professed to say where each wrote his gospel. So μαθθαιος . . . πταγεραι νεμεγα[ν]ελιον εν c. 5, 6]. Here ΘΙΛΗΛ or ΘΙΛΗΛ, i.e. Jerusalem, may be the missing word. The subscriptions to Tischendorf's

Greek manuscripts of the New Testament suggest this.¹ μαρκος . . . ἡταφραει πεφρατ[τελιον ρη c. 5, 6] ετε ται τε φρωμη. Here ἡαφγλων seems likely if it can be fitted in.² λογικας . . . ἡταφ[ραει πεφραττελιον] ρη τερρια ετε πα[ι] πε c. 12]. One is left speculating vainly about this.

No. 9 is a refreshing change, an aphorism from Menander in the original Greek with an attempt at a Coptic translation. Cf. W. E. Crum, *The Monastery of Epiphanius*, II, 320, no. 615.

No. 10 seems to be a quotation from the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa. It begins: μαρπιστεγε ποε ἡντα ἡνειοτε ταας ετοοτῆ ἀπον ρε[η]ακρενς . ταρ . αν ποε [η]ησαρ. The word ακρενς is corrupt and perhaps stands for ακριενς. Cf. Budge, *Mis 123* (Matthew the Evangelist) πειακριενς ετροτετ ἡαμγς-τιριον εοηη.

No. 15 is a part of the Canticle of the Three Youths in the Furnace in Greek of barbarous spelling. It comprises Dan. III, 61-66.

Leaving the literary ostraca we come to the legal ones and the letters. In many of these, after the statement of who is writing to whom, the substance of the document begins with the word επειραν. Till never translates this word, not even in the index, which has for it merely, 'Einleitung des eigentlichen Inhalts des Schriftstückes'. While occasionally in these texts the word may be a meaningless survival, much more often its natural meaning of 'whereas', 'since' is wholly appropriate in the context; and there seems no good reason for not translating it.

In No. 37 we have the mysterious monetary unit called the λικνον and in no. 38 its equally mysterious relative, the ψε, which the note describes as a small, copper coin probably less than a *keration*. There is no doubt that it was much less. In no. 275 an *oipi* of lentils is offered for 8 ψε. As M. Lichtheim has pointed out,³ if a ψε equalled a *keration*, this would mean 2 *solidi* for 1 *artaba* of lentils; and such a price would be absurdly high. Probably she is not far from the mark in estimating the ψε at $\frac{1}{10}$ or $\frac{1}{12}$ *keration*.

C.O. 174 seems a key text for both the ψε and the λικνον but unfortunately its exact import is not clear. As I understand it, a man is offering to buy clothes at a price of 5½ λικνα. He hands over 1 *tremis* and wants 40 ψε change. The vendor's agent speaks of a rate of 9½ λικνα to the *tremis*. According to this 40 ψε would equal 4 λικνα or 10 ψε 1 λικνον. Also there would be 95 ψε to the *tremis* and, therefore, approximately 12 ψε to the *keration*.

This seems a simple, logical process but unfortunately the vendor's agent does not find it so, is unwilling without further authority to give 40 ψε change, and C.O. 171 is his letter referring the matter to his client. So, until further confirmation is forthcoming, these values for λικνον and ψε must remain conjectural. One suspects that the ψε is the same as the φόλλις.

To proceed. No. 127 would be better divided μογρενς ηρη ερμιοητ ογχερατι cia ογχιρατι, 'Moses, the man of Ermont, a *keration*, Sia a *keration*'. For the name Sia cf. no. 41, l. 14.

No. 151, which seems a school piece or exercise, equates αρτοκολλιον with ημα ητωσ (bakery) in the style of a glossary. Perhaps αρτοκολλιον is a mistake for αρτοκοπειον or αρτοπωλιον. Over it is the word αρτοκολλητης, presumably 'baker', without Coptic equivalent.

In No. 257 the context suggests that the word σαμη.τ in l. 4 is a kind of trap for catching doves. It is probably the σαμητ of Crum's Dictionary, 339b, since two of the quotations given there connect the word with doves, though the meaning which they suggest is rather 'dove-cote'.

No. 452 is a list of the patriarchs of Alexandria such as is found in the liturgical diptychs.

The above remarks are mostly *addenda* to the book. I have noticed very few slips or misprints. The following is my meagre harvest. No. 46, l. 3, 'If you send', l. 'If I send'; no. 58, l. 2, α^η/ (αηλη), l. α^η/ (αηαηη)?; no. 62, ll. 1, 2, 'of Longine' (place), l. 'son of Longine'. Cf. Hall, 18 λοκικη παπαρεας; no. 131, η., 'paenut', l. 'peanut'; no. 181, ll. 2, 10, αα, 'give', l. 'about'?; no. 286, l. 4, σκουδη, l. σπουδη; index of places, 'Nyassa', l. 'Nyssa'. In the index of places ταχαια (i.e. Αχαία) and τερρια would come better under the letters α and ε than under τ.

J. DRESCHER

¹ C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Lipsiae, 1869), I, 212.

² Cf. 1 Pet. v, 13; Rev. xvii, 5.

³ E. Stefanski and M. Lichtheim, *Coptic Ostraca from Medinet Habu*, 3.



Recent Publications of The Egypt Exploration Society

A complete list may be had on application to the Secretary at 2 Hinde Street, Manchester Square, London, W.1

EXCAVATION MEMOIRS

- XLIV. THE CITY OF AKHENATEN, Part III. By J. D. S. PENDLEBURY, with chapters and contributions by J. ČERNÝ, H. W. FAIRMAN, H. FRANKFORT and others. Vol. I, Text; Vol. II, Plates (one hundred and twelve). 1951. £9. 15s.
- XLV. THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SINAI, Part I. By ALAN H. GARDINER and T. ERIC PEET. Second revised edition, by J. ČERNÝ. One hundred and two Plates. 1952. £5. 15s.
- Part II, Translations and Commentary. Four Plates, twenty Text-figures. 1955. £7. 7s.

SERVICE DES ANTIQUITÉS DE L'ÉGYPTÉ

- EXCAVATIONS AT SAKKARA: GREAT TOMBS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY, Part II. By WALTER B. EMERY. Sixty-six Plates. 1954. £6.
- GREAT TOMBS OF THE FIRST DYNASTY, Part III. By WALTER B. EMERY. One hundred and twenty-five plates. 1958. £7. 7s.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

- XXVIII. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part V. By A. M. BLACKMAN and M. R. APTED. Sixty-six plates (one coloured). 1953. £8.
- XXIX. THE ROCK TOMBS OF MEIR, Part VI. By A. M. BLACKMAN and M. R. APTED. Thirty-five plates (three coloured). 1953. £4. 12s. 6d.
- XXX. THE MASTABA OF KHENTIKA CALLED IKHEKHI. By T. G. H. JAMES, with the collaboration of M. R. APTED. Forty-three Plates. 1953. £5. 5s.

GRAECO-ROMAN MEMOIRS

- XXXII. THE HIBEH PAPYRI, Part II. By E. G. TURNER. Four Collotype Plates. 1955. £6. 6s.
- XXXIII. GREEK OSTRACA IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY AT OXFORD, Vol. II. By J. G. TAIT and C. PRÉAUX, 1955. £3. 15s.
- XXXIV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XXIII. By E. LOBEL. Eleven Collotype Plates. 1956. £4.
- XXXV. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XXIV. By E. LOBEL, C. H. ROBERTS, E. G. TURNER and J. W. B. BARNES. Sixteen Collotype Plates. 1957. £6.
- XXXVI. THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI, Part XXV. By E. LOBEL and E. G. TURNER. Fourteen Collotype Plates. 1959. £5. 10s.
- XXXVII. THE ANTINOOPOLIS PAPYRI, Part II. By J. W. B. BARNES and H. ZILLIACUS. Four Collotype Plates. 1960. £6. 10s.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS

- JOURNAL OF EGYPTIAN ARCHAEOLOGY (from 1914). Vols. i-v, 25s. each; the rest, 50s. each.
- THE THEBAN TOMBS OF THE 18th DYNASTY, Part I. By A. H. GARDINER, with Plates by NINA DE G. 1951. 20s.
- Vol. V. THE THEBAN TOMBS OF THE 18th DYNASTY, Part V. By N. DE G. 1952. 20s.
- THE TOMB OF ANKHESNEPHEM, Part I. By N. DE G. 1953. 20s.
- SEVEN PRIVATE PAPYRI, Part I. By N. DE G. 1954. 20s.
- WHO WAS WHO IN THE THEBAN TOMBS, Part I. By N. DE G. 1955. 20s.

JOINT
THE

- THE TEMPLE OF
BROOME; ed
Vol. I. For
Vol. II. For
Vol. III. Six
Vol. IV. Eig

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

Vol. I. By N. DE G.
Vol. II. By N. DE G.
sts from the year 1700
SON. 1951. 20s.

RYEY AND MYRTLE F.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY
AND PUBLISHED BY

THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
2 HINDE STREET, MANCHESTER SQUARE, LONDON, W. 1

ALSO SOLD BY BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON ST., NEW BOND ST., W. 1;
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., 43 GREAT RUSSELL ST., W.C. 1

