

## A DEMOTIC EMBALMERS' AGREEMENT

(Pap. dem. B. M. 10561)

BY

A. F. SHORE and H. S. SMITH

In contrast to the large number of demotic documents concerned with the family affairs of necropolis workers, there is as little in demotic as in the earlier stages of the language which bears directly on the method of mummification, the ritual accompanying it, and the organization of the professional bodies. The following documents are known to us. There are two examples of receipts relating to expenses incurred in individual cases of mummification. In one case the receipt is given by a certain Pawon to Thotortais in respect of the delivery of or payment for materials to be used in the embalming of the latter's son; it is followed by a promise to hand over the body to the choachyte on the seventy-second day on pain of a penalty.<sup>1</sup> In the other case, the receipt is given by Pikos son of Psenminis to his sister Tateathyris for her one-third share of the expenses of the burial (*kšj*) of their father, and the document includes the declaration that Pikos will have the mummification completed and the body laid to rest (*hṭp*) without making any further claim against Tateathyris.<sup>2</sup> Another document contains a petition to the

<sup>1</sup> B. M. 10077, a double document from Thebes, dated year 16 of Ptolemy II Philadelphos (270 B. C.). See Revillout in *Ä. Z.* 18/79; Reich, *Papyri juristischen Inhalts*, Tafeln XI-XII and pp. 38-42; Spiegelberg in *Ä. Z.* 54/111.

<sup>2</sup> Pap. Turin, Deir-el-Medineh 25, unpublished, from Thebes dated year 12 of Cleopatra III = year 9 of Ptolemy Alexander I. We owe the reference and summary of the document to the manuscript notes of Sir Herbert Thompson. There is reference to this payment in a receipt for a lease given by Pikos to his sister, two years later, in which he admits that he had still not completed the burial of his father (Pap. Turin, Deir-el-Medineh 28).

priests of Hathor to bury the petitioner's father at the cost of the temple in consideration of the dead man's benefactions to the temple.<sup>3</sup> A fragmentary contract from Deir Rifeh also appears to deal with an individual case of mummification.<sup>4</sup> Lists of expenses in connection with individual burials are contained in two other demotic papyri.<sup>5</sup>

As to the actual ritual of mummification, the brief but valuable description of the obsequies of Nenerkaptah from the first story of Setne Khamwas will be quoted below.<sup>6</sup> A fuller description of some of the ceremonies and processions occurs in a late funerary book.<sup>7</sup> There are interesting parallels to be found in a ritual for the mummification of the Apis bull.<sup>8</sup>

Proof that the necropolis workers had formal agreements between them strictly defining what areas and groups of persons they were each individually to serve is contained in the well-known series of records, written in Greek, of proceedings before a number of royal officials at Thebes to decide disputes between two  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\chi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  with Egyptian names.<sup>9</sup> Necropolis workers may also have been organized in guilds. In a demotic document from Memphis a group of embalmers (*sqwtj-ntj*) promise to transfer the bodies brought to them to a second group of embalmers

<sup>3</sup> Pap. Cairo 30960 from Gebelein, dated year 13 of Cleopatra III = year 10 of Ptolemy Alexander I (105/4 B. C.).

<sup>4</sup> Thompson in Petrie, *Gizeh and Rifeh*, p. 36 para. 92.

<sup>5</sup> Pap. Florence 3667 from Thebes, dated year 6 of Ptolemy Soter II (112/1 B. C.), see Revillout in *Ä. Z.* 18/110 and Botti, *Testi Demotici*, I Tavola V and pp. 23-32. Also Pap. Mond, unpublished; quoted from Thompson's manuscript materials, where it is described as "fragmentary accounts of an embalmers' society, perhaps from Aswan, dated to year 15-17 of an unnamed king, middle to late Ptolemaic". Present whereabouts not known to us.

<sup>6</sup> I Khamwas 4/24-25. See Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, pp. 29-30 and 114-117.

<sup>7</sup> Pap. Rhind I 2/7-3/10. See Möller, *Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 16-23. For the important hieratic rituals contained in Pap. Boulaq III and Pap. Louvre 5.158, see Sauneron, *Le Rituel de l'Embaumement*, Cairo, 1952.

<sup>8</sup> Pap. Wien 27. See Bergmann, *Hieratische und hieratisch-demotische Texte der Sammlung ägyptischer Altertümer des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, Wien, 1886, Tafeln X-XVII. Translated by Spiegelberg in *Ä. Z.* 56/1-33.

<sup>9</sup> Turin 8, 9, 12, 14, dating from 119-116 B. C. See Wilcken *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit* II, 2 Nos. 194-197, pp. 200-213.

within four days, on pain of a fine.<sup>10</sup> It is notable also that the regulations for an association of choachytes of a stipulated seniority, called the club of Amenemope, contain clauses apparently making restrictions on what should be provided by them for the dead.<sup>11</sup> The choachytes, however, were principally concerned with the mortuary offerings and libations offered to the dead after they had been buried. A number of receipts for burial tax,<sup>12</sup> and a clause, fairly frequently appended to bequests in the Ptolemaic period, placing the responsibility for the funerary ceremonies of the testator or testatrix upon the heir or heiress, seem to complete the demotic material with any direct relevance to mummification.<sup>13</sup>

The demotic document which we edit here in honour of Professor Wolja Erichsen on the happy occasion of his seventieth birthday is an addition to this meagre material, being unlike any of the sources quoted above. It is preserved in the Department of Egyptian Antiquities at the British Museum. We are grateful to the Trustees of the Museum and to Mr. I. E. S. Edwards, Keeper of the Department concerned, for their kind permission to publish the text.

Pap. B. M. 10561 is a rectangular piece of papyrus measuring 30.5 cms. in height and 23.2 cms. in width. It is made of two sheets of approximately 16 cms. and 9 cms. in width respectively, with an average overlap of 1.5 cms. On the true recto are 29 full lines of writing, underneath the centre of which is the signature

<sup>10</sup> Leiden 374 a/b, from Memphis, dated year 40 of Ptolemy Euergetes II (130 B.C.); see Leemans *Monuments Egyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays Bas à Leide* II, Pls. CXCIII-CXCIV. Also Revillout in *Revue Égyptologique* 2/91 note 2; Sethe *Bürgschaftsrechtsurkunden* 735 ff. The title is perhaps to be read *h̄tmw-ntr*, see Sauneron in *B.I.F.A.O.* 51/137.

<sup>11</sup> Berlin 3115, from Thebes, dated years 8-10 of Ptolemy Alexander I (107-104 B.C.); see Spiegelberg *Demotische Papyrus Berlin*, 18-19 and Tafeln 38-41.

<sup>12</sup> Lichtheim *Demotic Ostraca from Medinet Habu*, Nos. 63 and 64; see also references on pp. 19-20.

<sup>13</sup> For examples of burial expenses clauses, see Strassburg 1 in Glanville *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum* I, p. xxx, and B.M. 10026 (Glanville in *Essays and Studies presented to S. A. Cook*, p. 65) among many others. The complaint contained in Louvre E. 3334, dated year 7 of an unnamed king, may refer to the embalming of a sacred ibis at Memphis, see Revillout in *Revue Égyptologique* 2/75 ff., but a new edition is required.

of an assenting party (see Pl. V). On the verso is a list of witnesses containing four names only, written one below the other approximately in the centre of the papyrus (not reproduced). There has been considerable loss in the lower part of the papyrus. The arrangement of the fragments as shown on the plate is as correct as the warping of the papyrus allows, except that the second fragment from the left at the bottom of the papyrus should be moved a little to the left so as to touch its left hand neighbour.

The papyrus was acquired by the Trustees of the Museum from Professor F. W. Kelsey in 1924. The date protocol was used by Sir Herbert Thompson in his list of eponymous priests,<sup>14</sup> and by Glanville and Skeat in their revision thereof.<sup>15</sup> Apart from a mention of the text in a review by Sir Harold Bell from information supplied by Thompson<sup>16</sup> it has remained unknown. We should ourselves like to acknowledge here our indebtedness to the manuscript notes of Sir Herbert Thompson on the text.

The document is dated 15 Payni of year 24 of Ptolemy VI Philometor (12 July, 157 B. C.). Internal evidence shows that the document comes from Siut or its neighbourhood. An extensive archive concerned with the affairs of a family of lector-priests of the necropolis of Siut was acquired by the British Museum from another source in 1923.<sup>17</sup> The latest documents in the archive are two petitions, B.M. 10599 and 10600, dated to year 12 of Philometor, and a text on the verso of B.M. 10591. B.M. 10561 is dated 12 years later and none of the parties mentioned in it are known from the archive. But one of the four witnesses named on the verso, Pekusis son of Pybes, is probably the same man as the Pekusis son of Pybes and Teteesis who in year 9 of Philometor married Teteimouthis, the sister of Tefhape the defendant in the trial,<sup>18</sup> The scribe of B.M. 10561, Harekuis son

<sup>14</sup> In *Studies presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, Oxford, 1932, p. 21 No. 53 and p. 31 No. 19.

<sup>15</sup> In *J.E.A.* 40/52-3, No. 35.

<sup>16</sup> In *Asiatic Review*, XXI, 163.

<sup>17</sup> Sir Herbert Thompson, *A Family Archive from Siut*, Oxford, 1934. Two further papyri from the Archive are edited in *J.E.A.* 45/52 ff.

<sup>18</sup> See Thompson, *Family Archive*, genealogical table, p. x.

of Imouthes, is not attested elsewhere in the Siut texts; his hand is not dissimilar from some of those in the archive, but is more crabbed and hurried.

*Transliteration*<sup>19</sup>

H3.t sp 24 ibt-2 pr.t sw 15 n Pr-<sup>c</sup> Ptwlmj3 irm t3 Pr-<sup>c</sup>.t Klwptr3 t3j=f sn.t n3 hr.t.w Ptwlmj3 (2) irm Klwptr3 n3 ntr.w ntj prj r Ptwlmj3 p3 w<sup>b</sup>st<sup>c</sup> Pr-<sup>c</sup> Ptwlmj3 irm t3 Pr-<sup>c</sup>.t Klwptr3 n3 ntr.w mr-mw.t=w (3) n w<sup>b</sup> 3lgsntrws irm n3 ntr.w sn.w n3 ntr.w mn3.w n3 ntr.w mr-3t=w n3 ntr.w ntj prj n3 ntr.w mr-mw.t=w (4) r Njg3 t3 Hjrwmws fj3 n<sup>c</sup>šj m-b3h Brnjg3 t3 mn3.t r 3rsjn3 t3 Khrmrtws (5) fj3 tn m-b3h 3rsjn3 t3 mr-sn r Tmr3n (t3) Mtrwphns n w<sup>b</sup> 3rsjn3 t3 mr-3t=s (6) r Lwsnj3s sj Hjrwmws n w<sup>b</sup> Ptwlmj3 p3 Swtr r Ptwlmj3 sj Tjnss n w<sup>b</sup> (7) Ptwlmj3 p3 mr-sn r Ptwlmj3 sj Hrgls n w<sup>b</sup> Ptwlmj3 p3 mn3 r Ssjbws (8) sj Ssjbws n w<sup>b</sup> Ptwlmj3 p3 mr-3t=f r Jswj<sup>2</sup>) t3 Ssjbws n w<sup>b</sup> t3 Pr-<sup>c</sup>.t Klwptr3 (9) r Th3s t3 Ptwlmj3 sj Hjlws fj3 tn m-b3h 3rsn3 t3 mr-sn<sup>a</sup>)

Qd (10) hr-hb n t3 h3s.t n T3-<sup>c</sup>n3 n Sjwł P3-tj-3mn-3py sj H<sup>c</sup>-w-s-n-3mn-3pj mw.t(=f) . . . . .<sup>b</sup>) mj-nn<sup>2</sup>) Wn-nfr sj P3-tj-3mn-3pj (11) mw.t(=f) Sj-p3-mwt r s 2 n w<sup>c</sup> r3 n hr-hb n t3 h3s.t n T3-<sup>c</sup>n3 n Sjwł P3-tj-3mn-3pj sj Mtl(j) (12) mw.t(=f) . . . . .<sup>c</sup>)

st mtw=k <sup>c</sup>.wj=n tw=n š r.r=k irm Mtlj sj P3-tj-3j-m-3tp mw.t(=f) T3-tj-3j-m-3tp irm Wp-w3.wt-3w sj P3-3j (mw.t(=f)) (13) 3rsjn3 n3j=k sn.w<sup>d</sup>) p3 rmt n.3m=n<sup>e</sup>) ntj 3w=w 3j n=f r.lb3 rmt 3w=f mwt n Sjwł irm n3j=f sn.w<sup>f</sup>) 3y p3 hrw r hrj š<sup>c</sup>) dt (14) 3w=f tj hbs<sup>2</sup>) 10<sup>g</sup>) n n3j=f rmt.w hbs 3j<sup>c</sup> k 1<sup>h</sup>) sšn 1 p3 rmt ntj 3w=f šms r.r=f<sup>i</sup>) hbs 2 p3 hrw mh-4 hbs 5 p3 h(rw) mh(-. .)<sup>k</sup>) (hbs . .) (15) p3 hrw mh-16 10<sup>l</sup>) p3 hrw mh-35 hbs 10 p3 hrw n ks hbs 10 p3 rmt ntj 3w=w 3j r wrh=f<sup>m</sup>) hbs (. . . . .) (16) šm n p3 g3 rmt p3 t3 n.3m=w<sup>n</sup>) p3 rmt ntj 3w=w 3n=f p3 bnr n p3 tmj hbs 10 p3 rmt ntj 3w=w pn<sup>c</sup>=f n p3 3tn<sup>o</sup>) (hbs . . . . .) (17) 3r-hb n p3 hrw mh-35 p3 hrw n ks p3 bnr n3j<sup>p</sup>) n.mtw=n tm rh tj n3 hbs.w ntj 3w=n 3r(-h)b n (18) n3 hrw.w ntj hrj<sup>q</sup>) g3 rmt n p3 t3 š(m<sup>2</sup>) . . . . .g)<sup>2</sup>) rmt n.3m=w<sup>r</sup>) n.mtw=n tm rh tj hbs 3n- . .<sup>2</sup>) gtn<sup>s</sup>)

<sup>19</sup> We have used the system of transliteration employed by Professor Erichsen in his *Demotisches Glossar*, Kopenhagen, 1954. The superlinear numerals here refer to the beginnings of the lines of the text, the superlinear letters to the notes following the translation. Restorations are in brackets.

(. . . . .) ḥbs.w ntj ḥrj<sup>1)</sup> (19) n.mtw=n tm rḥ tj glg gnrḫ šlj  
 s.t-sḏr<sup>u)</sup> n rmt iw=f ḫs n.m(. . . . .) wšḥ-shn<sup>v)</sup> (20) pḥ rmt  
 ntj iw=f gyl<sup>w)</sup> r.iw=n (. . . . .)<sup>2)</sup> lw 'š r.ḥr=n ḥr.r=f iw=n ln pḥ  
 šb.t<sup>2)</sup> pḥ 'š<sup>y)</sup> mtw=f (ir) 'nh (21) ḏd pḥ ḥbs pḥjzj ḥbs rmt-nmh  
 pḥj<sup>2)</sup> pḥ (. . .)<sup>a)</sup> Wp-wj.wt ntj iw=f mwt ḥn<sup>c)</sup> pḥ ntj iw=w ḫs=f-s<sup>bb)</sup>  
 ḥn<sup>c)</sup> nḥj=f 35 (. . . . .) . . . (22) r pḥ ḥr-ḥb ntj iw=f n.tr.ḫ=f  
 . . (. . .) 35 (. . . . .)<sup>co)</sup> iw=f ḥpr pḥ ḥr-ḥb n pḥj=f irj . . (. . . . .)  
 mtw=f ir w<sup>c)</sup> pr-ḥt (23) w<sup>c)</sup>.ḫ=f iw=f ir r-ḥ mt nb ntj ḥrj n.m(. . . . .  
 . . . . .) r.r=f<sup>ad)</sup> bn.p=f ir r-ḥ m(t nb ntj ḥrj irm it)  
 mw.t sn sn.t šr.t<sup>te)</sup> (24) šr.t ḥm.t šm šm.l rmt nb pḥ tḥj pḥ hrw  
 r ḥrj š<sup>c)</sup> ḏt iw=f tj ḥt 1,500 n ḥmt . . . . 24 (r qt 2<sup>ee)</sup> n) nḥ grrlj.w  
 nḥ wtn.w (25) n Pr-ḥ Ptwlms ntj ḥrj irm tḥj Pr-ḥ.t Klwptrḥ ḥn  
 hrw 2 r.iw=n (. . . . .)<sup>ff)</sup> r tj ir=f r-ḥ mt nb ntj ḥrj (26) 'n  
 n ḥtr iwḫ mn

lw=n ir 'nh m-bḥh Pr-ḥ Ptwlms irm tḥj Pr-ḥ.t (Klwptrḥ) tḥj=f  
 sn.t irm nḥ ntr.w sn.w (27) nḥ ntr.w mnḥ.w nḥ ntr.w mr-ḥt-w nḥ  
 ntr.w ntj prj nḥ ntr.w mr-mw.t-w irm ḥs.t irm Wsr-ḥp irm (nḥ  
 ntr.w n Km)j tr=w iw=n ir (28) r-ḥ mt nb ntj ḥrj tḥj pḥ hrw r  
 ḥrj (š<sup>c)</sup> ḏt iw=n ir pḥ 'nh ntj ḥrj n 'nh mḥ<sup>c)</sup> iw(. . . . . iw=n)<sup>gg)</sup>  
 ir=f n 'nh (29) 'ḏḥ lw=n ḥn pḥ l<sup>c)</sup> n Pr-ḥ

sh Ḥr-igš sj Ḥj-m-ḥtp ntj (sh) n Sjwḫ irm nḥ(j=f m<sup>c)</sup>.w n rn n  
 nḥ w<sup>b)</sup>.w Wp-wj.wt irm nḥ) ntr.w ntj ḥtp irm=f<sup>hh)</sup> (30) sh Pḥ-tj-  
 ḥmn-ḥpj<sup>ii)</sup>

#### Witness List on the Verso

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Ḥr sj Tḥj-nfr    | 3. Twt sj Pḥ-tj-ḥmn-nsw-ntr.w                 |
| 2. Pḥ-igš sj Pḥj-bs | 4. Wn . . . . . <sup>?)</sup> sj Thwt-ir-rḥ-s |

#### Translation<sup>20</sup>

Year 24, Payni day 15 of King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra his sister, the children of Ptolemy (2) and Cleopatra the Gods Epiphancis: Ptolemy, the priest<sup>st)</sup> of King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra the Gods Philometores, (3) being priest of Alexander and the Gods Philadelphoi and the Gods Euergetai and the Gods Philopatores and the Gods Epiphaneis and the Gods Philometores: (4) Nike daughter of Hieronymos being Athlophoros

<sup>20</sup> Many of the restorations suggested in the translation are very tentative, and have therefore been omitted in the transliteration. See notes following translation.

before Berenice Euergetis: Arsinoe daughter of Charimortos being (5) the Canephoros before Arsinoe Philadelphos: Timarion daughter of Metrophanes being priestess of Arsinoe Philopator: (6) Lysanias son of Hieronymos being priest of Ptolemy Soter: Ptolemy son of Dionysios being priest of (7) Ptolemy Philadelphos: Ptolemy son of Herakles being priest of Ptolemy Euergetes: Sosibios (8) son of Sosibios being priest of Ptolemy Philopator: Isias<sup>?)</sup> daughter of Sosibios being priestess of Queen Cleopatra<sup>s<sup>10</sup></sup>): (9) Thais<sup>?)</sup> daughter of Ptolemy son of Helios being Canephoros before Arsinoe Philadelphos<sup>a)</sup>.

(10) The lector-priest of the necropolis of To-anch at Siut Petamenophis son of Chawesenemenope, his mother being . . . . .<sup>b)</sup>, and Onnophris son of Petamenophis, (11) his mother being Siepmous, of the same profession, being two men say with one voice to the lector-priest of the necropolis of To-anch at Siut Petamenophis son of Matlaios, (12) his mother being . . . . .<sup>c)</sup>:

It is owing to you from us, we promise you and Matlaios son of Petimouthes, his mother being Tetimouthes, and Wepweteu son of Paes, (his mother being) (13) Arsinoe, your brethren<sup>d)</sup>:

the one of us<sup>e)</sup> who is approached concerning a dead man of Siut - together with his brethren<sup>f)</sup> - from today henceforward for ever, (14) he shall give ten cloths<sup>g)</sup> to his men (and) one cloth-of-taking-entry (and) one lotus<sup>h)</sup>;

(to) the man who follows him <sup>j)</sup> . . . . .	2 cloths;
the fourth day . . . . .	5 cloths;
the (. . . . . th) day <sup>k)</sup> . . . . .	(. . cloths);
(15) the sixteenth day . . . . .	10 (cloths) <sup>l)</sup> ;
the thirty-fifth day . . . . .	10 cloths;
the day of coffining . . . . .	10 cloths;
(to) the man who is approached <sup>?)</sup> to anoint him <sup>m)</sup> . . . . .	(. .) cloths;

(and we shall not be able<sup>?)</sup>) (16) to go to any other man on earth of them<sup>n)</sup>;

(to) the man who is brought from the town 10 cloths;

(to) the man who is turned over<sup>?)</sup> on the  
ground<sup>o)</sup> . . . . . (. . cloths);

(and no-one shall be able<sup>?)</sup>) (17) to do the mourning ceremonies on the 35th day (or) the day of confining other than these (men<sup>?)</sup>)<sup>p)</sup>. We shall not be able to give the cloths (with<sup>?)</sup>) which we do the mourning ceremonies on (18) the above days<sup>q)</sup> to any other man on earth, (nor shall we be able<sup>?)</sup>) to go<sup>?)</sup> to any other<sup>?)</sup> man of them<sup>?)</sup>. And we shall not be able to give a cloth (or) an *in . . .* garment (or) a cloak<sup>s)</sup> (apart from<sup>?)</sup>) the above cloths<sup>t)</sup>. (19) And we shall not be able to give a bed (or) a *gnrt* (or) a cushion<sup>?)</sup> (or) a bier<sup>u)</sup> to a coffiner. And (we shall not be able<sup>?)</sup>) to appoint<sup>v)</sup> (20) a winder<sup>w)</sup>, we (having a lien on you<sup>x)</sup>) to guarantee us concerning him<sup>?)</sup>; we will bring the exchange<sup>?)</sup> of the guarantee<sup>y)</sup>, and he shall make an oath (21) saying: "The cloth is my private cloth"<sup>z)</sup>. The (priest<sup>?)</sup>)<sup>aa)</sup> of Wepwawet who shall die and the one who shall be buried<sup>bb)</sup>, together with his 35th (day ceremonies<sup>?)</sup>, shall be accorded<sup>?)</sup>) (22) to the lectorpriest in whose charge he is<sup>?)</sup> (. . . . .) 35th (day . . . . .)<sup>cc)</sup>. Should it happen that a lector-priest share with his fellow (. . . . .), and he make his own storehouse, (23) he shall do according to every word which is above. And (we shall not be able to bring an action<sup>?)</sup>) against him<sup>dd)</sup>. If he shall not have done according to every word (which is above, he, his father), mother, brother, sister, son, (24) daughter, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, (or) any man on earth (of his) from today henceforward for ever, he shall give 1,500 (*deben*) in copper (at the rate of) 24 *obols* (to 2 *kite*)<sup>ee)</sup> to the burnt offerings and libations (25) of the above King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra within two days; we (having a lien on you<sup>?)</sup> in respect of) him<sup>ff)</sup>, to make him continue to do according to every word which is above, (26) compulsorily and without delay.

We are making an oath before King Ptolemy and Queen (Cleopatra) his sister and the Gods Philadelphoi and (27) the Gods Euergetai and the Gods Philopatores and the Gods Epiphanis and the Gods Philometores and Isis and Sarapis and all the (gods of Egypt), (that) we will (28) do according to every word which is above from today henceforward for ever; if we carry out the above oath as a true oath, (we) shall be (among the favoured ones of Pharaoh<sup>gg)</sup>; if we carry it out as a (29) false oath, we shall be subject to the curse of Pharaoh.



Harekuis son of Imouthes, who writes at Siut and its (suburbs in the name of the priests of Wepwawet and the) gods who dwell with him<sup>hh</sup>), wrote (it).

(30) Signed Petamenophis<sup>ll</sup>).

#### Notes

a) On the protocol and the reading of the names, see Thompson in *Griffith Studies*, p. 21 No. 53 and p. 31 No. 19, and Glanville and Skeat in *J. E. A.* 41/52-3, No. 35. "Day 15", although rather differently written in other Siut papyri of this reign (B.M. 10591 3/13, 4/23; B.M. 10599/18; B.M. 10600/19) seems the best reading. Cairo 30606 reads *Ptwlmjs sj Pr-ʿ; Ptwlmjs* et cetera for the name of the priest of Alexander and the Ptolemies, doubtless correctly. The θεοι σωτηρες are omitted in this priest's titulary, though they are present in Cairo 30606 (*nj ntr.w ntj nhm*) and B.M. 10513 (*nj ntr.w ntj lg hb*) of the same year. B.M. 10618 (b) is broken at this point. In line 7 *Ptwlmjs p; mr-sn*, suggested by Thompson as an alternative to *p; mr-mw.t*, is certainly the correct reading. *Iswnj* (Ἰσιωνη?) and *Iswbj* are other possible readings of the name of the priestess of Cleopatra Philopator at Ptolemais; the omission of *t; mr-it-s* in this title and the lack of any reference to either Alexandria or Ptolemais are perhaps indications of the haste in which the document was written.

b) Reading uncertain; Thompson suggested *Wse*.

c) Thompson suggested *Bre*. Perhaps *Ḳrr*, though this is normally a masculine name.

d) From the affiliations given *njk sn.w* clearly cannot mean "brothers" in the literal sense; presumably therefore "companions, associates", see *Wb.* IV 150/11, 151/4. Note that ἀδελφοί "brethren" is used in reference to one another by members of associations of choachytes in Greek documents, though Wilcken thought that this was because they were for the most part actual blood relations (*Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit* II, 1/72).

e) This phrase is regular in regulations for priestly associations (see references in Erichsen, *Die Satzungen einer ägyptischer Kultgenossenschaft*, København, 1959, p. 5), where the plural suffix *-n* refers to the whole membership of the association. In the

present case, however, it follows directly on the phrase *st mtw-k* 'wy=n tw=n § in which the first person suffixes always refer to the first party or parties only (see references listed in J.E.A. 45/57); logically *p; rmt n.im=n* should then also refer to the first parties exclusively.

f) In strict grammar the suffix *=f* in *nj=f sn.w* should refer to *rmt iw=f mwt*, the last noun antecedent; but this seems hardly sensible, for (i) the whole purpose of the document appears to be to regulate what should be provided in the case of a single hypothetical burial; (ii) it would mean that the lector-priest was being approached concerning the mummification of one dead and several living members of a family at the same time. We have therefore preferred to take the suffix *=f* of *nj=f* as referring to *p; rmt n.im=n*, despite its position. It is tempting to read *Sjwł irm nj=f m'.w* "Siut and its suburbs" (Thompson, *Family Archive Vocab.* No. 124), but the writing does not support this.

g) The sign is here made very differently from that read *hbs* in the following lines, but no other reading seems to us so probable. For the meaning of *hbs* in this text, see p. 291.

h) *Tj-ḳ*: Coptic Ⲡⲓ-ⲁⲉⲓⲠ "consecrate, consecration" (Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* 3a); see Griffith *Dodecaschoinos Vocab.* Nos. 7, 35; Griffith *Stories*, p. 116 note; and Glanville *Instructions of Onchsheshonqy*, 23/19 where *n; inf.w n; ntj bj-jk* is to be read (private letter from Prof. G. R. Hughes). The reference must be to some special ceremonial cloth, perhaps used on the day of the ceremonial entry to the *pr-nfr*.

j) The resumptive pronoun in *r.r=f* might equally well refer to *rmt iw=f mwt* or *p; rmt n.im=n*; the former seems more probable.

k) *mḥ* certain; below it unidentifiable traces of a figure, presumably between 4 and 16.

l) Supplying *hbs*, carelessly omitted.

m) *p; rmt ntj iw=w ij r wrḥ=f*: literally, "the man who they came to anoint him", which should mean the dead man. However, this accords very ill with what has gone above, where it is clear that the cloths are being given by the lector-priests to persons employed to attend the dead man during the funerary ceremonies, *not* to the dead man himself (pp. 289-90). We think

therefore that *n=f* should be supplied after *ij* on the model of *pj rmt n.im=n nj iw=w ij n=f r.lb; rmt iw=f mwt* in line 13 above. If so, the phrase will mean 'the man engaged to anoint the body'.

n) Restoring a figure after *hbs* followed by *n.mtw=n tm rh* (cf. line 17), for which there is probably room. *n.im=w* perhaps refers vaguely to other men qualified to perform the anointing.

o) *pn'* "overturn, upset", and so "turn, change", Wb. I, 508-9; Crum 263-5. The reading *itn* "ground" seems certain, cf. Erichsen *Glossar* 47. The meaning of the phrase is obscure to us; it can hardly refer to actual burial. The restoration of *hbs* and a figure seems required by analogy.

p) Our suggested translation requires some such restoration as *n.mtw rmt pj tj tm rh*, for which there would be at the most bare room at the end of the line. However, *pj bnr njj* "other than these" almost demands a negative auxiliary, and the scribe frequently crowds the end of his lines (cf. lines 2, 8, 24-6).

q) Presumably a resumptive pronoun has been carelessly omitted from this relative clause.

r) We have restored *š(m n pj g); rmt* from the beginning of line 16; our translation of this requires the sense of *mtw=n tm rh* at the beginning of the previous clause to be carried on, which is hardly satisfactory. It is possible that *bnr* should be read; but *b(nr w) rmt n.im w* "except a man of them" will not fill the gap, and the scribe uses *pj bnr* in lines 16 and 17.

s) On the reading and meaning of *in . . . (?)* see Hughes in J.N.E.S. XVI/57, where there are also some remarks on *gtn*. Whether *hbs* should here be treated as a separate item is uncertain.

t) The suggested translation requires the restoration (*pj bnr*) *n; hbs.w* or (*m-sj*) *n; hbs.w*.

u) *glg* as a funerary couch also in Berlin 3115 2/3, 4/6-7. *gnrξ* occurs in Berlin 13593/5 in a list of paraphernalia, and again in B.M. 10557 2/28 in a set of accounts, but the context does not help to decide the meaning. *štj* follows *gnrξ* in Berlin 13595/5 as here, and also in Berlin 6848 b/11; Berlin 8023 λ/11, o/12; Ostr. Florence 8089/6; and in a list of garments and furniture from Oxyrhyncos, Petrie 1922/β. 31, ζ. 10. Botti *Testi Demotici* I/55 note 5 suggested identity with Copt. *ⲱⲟⲣ* "cushion"

(Crum 590a); Černy kindly refers us to Dévaud in *Rec. Trav.* 39/155-6, and to his *Études d'Étymologie Copte* 34-5. *s.t sdr* occurs in Mythus 5/16, where Spiegelberg translated 'Ruheplatz'. However, the phrase is better attested in N.K. texts, see Wb. IV 392/6, where the meaning 'Bahre' is suggested.

v) Restore *n.m(tw=n tm rh) w3h-shn?* For *w3h-shn* meaning "empower to act, appoint" see references under ⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛⲁⲓⲛⲉ in Crum 385 b.

w) Or *gyl hbs*; but the 'cloth' sign is regularly used to determine *gyl*, see Erichsen *Glossar* 589 under *gl'*. Note *rmt ntj iw=f gyl* but *rmt iw=f ks* (Copt. ⲡⲉⲢⲚⲟⲩⲉ).

x) Restore *r. iw=n m-s3=k iw 's?*

y) *sb.t* probable but not certain; *p3 's* fairly certain (the papyrus has flaked away here as in line 19 above and line 21 below). We are very uncertain exactly what these words mean.

z) For (*ir*) 'nh, cf. line 26. For *rmt-nmh* "free-man, private individual", see J.E.A. 26/74; *mt.t-rmt-nmh* seems to mean "private property".

aa) This sentence seems likely to be a new clause of the undertaking, not a continuation of the oath of the *rmt ntj iw=f gyl*. The presence of the god's name *Wp-w3.wt* appears to demand some priestly title before it; *w'b* or *hm-ntr* might fit the gap.

bb) *hn'* badly rubbed, but reasonably certain. The sign before it is a puzzle; we can only interpret it as a redundant 3rd person object pronoun -s.

cc) We cannot restore with conviction. For the use of the figure 35 alone without *hrw* to indicate the ceremonies of the 35th day, see Berlin 3115 7/15; I Kh. 4/25; Lille 29/18.

dd) For the general sense of this passage see p. 293.

ee) See Lichtheim *Demotic Ostraca from Medinet Habu* 1-5, and Erichsen and Nims in *Acta Or.* 23/132-3.

ff) The obvious restoration *r. iw=n (m-s3)=f r tj ir=f* is clearly too short for the gap; perhaps *r. iw=n (m-s3=k iw-ir.n)=f r tj ir=f*.

gg) To correspond with *iw=n hn p l' Pr-'3* one might expect either *iw=n hn n3 hs.w Pr-'3* (cf. Spiegelberg *Dem. Pap. Zenon* 4/12-13) or *r/iw p3 š3j Pr-'3 r sm r.hr=j* (cf. Erichsen *Demotische Lesestücke* II, 2/181). Both seem considerably too long for the lacuna, but the sense must have been analogous.

hh) For the restoration, cf. Thompson *Family Archive* B ix/12, B x/16, 10597/16.

jj) It seems more probable that this is the signature of the first party, Petamenophis son of Chawesenamenope, who is making the undertaking, than that of the second party, Petamenophis son of Matlaios.

### *Commentary*

B.M. 10561 is a formal undertaking introduced by the words "It is owing to you from us, we promise to you". This form of words was regularly used when it was desired to make private obligations or agreements legally binding. In the cases we know of,<sup>21</sup> a penalty clause is always included as a sanction against the contravener, who continues to be bound by the terms of the undertaking. In the present case, the first parties further solemnize their undertaking by swearing an oath by Pharaoh and the gods that they will abide by its terms on pain of the curse of Pharaoh. An undertaking of this nature may or may not have been the result of a quarrel between the parties concerned, but provided a clear basis for the settlement of any subsequent disputes in court.

In B.M. 10561 two 'lector-priests of the necropolis of To-anch at Siut' gave certain undertakings to a third 'lector-priest of the necropolis of To-anch at Siut', with whom were associated two other men of unspecified profession.<sup>22</sup> These undertakings became operative whenever the first parties were approached professionally about the obsequies of a citizen of Siut. To attempt to understand their effect, we need first to discuss certain difficulties of interpretation.

The opening clause "The man of us who is approached concerning a dead man of Siut . . . . . shall give ten cloths to his men" makes it quite clear that these cloths are being given *by* the lector priests *to* certain other persons. There follows a

<sup>21</sup> Listed in J.E.A. 45/57, with references.

<sup>22</sup> In either party, it is possible that a father and son may have been associated; but the names are common ones at Siut, and in neither case is the affiliation expressly stated.

list of quantities of cloth allotted to certain stipulated persons and certain numbered days; logically, these must also have been given *by* not *to* the lector-priests. Against this it is possible to argue that the expressions "the man whom they come to anoint (?)",<sup>23</sup> "the man whom they bring from the town", "the man whom they turn over (?) on the ground" refer to the dead man. In this case it would be necessary to consider that the cloths listed against these persons were given, not *by* the lector-priests, but *to* the lector-priests on behalf of the dead man, presumably in payment for anointing his body, bringing his corpse from the town, et cetera. We have rejected this interpretation on two grounds: (i) it seems improbable that in a legal document a single list should embody transfers of cloth from and to the same party without explicit statement of the fact; (ii) in the phrase following the end of the list "(no-one shall be able) to do the mourning ceremonies on the 35th day (or) the day of coffining except these men", "these men" can only refer to some or all of the listed persons, who must therefore (if the passage is correctly restored) be persons taking part in the funerary rituals and not the dead man himself.

If this reasoning be correct, the first part of the contract states that the first parties have an obligation to the second party whenever they are professionally approached concerning a corpse, to provide stipulated quantities of cloth to certain persons taking part in the funerary rituals and in respect of certain stated days. These days were clearly stages in the process of mummification, which as we know from Herodotus and various hieroglyphic inscriptions was in theory and usually in practice seventy days in length.<sup>24</sup> The fourth day appears from the inscription of Anemher to have been the day on which the corpse of the deceased was given in charge to the necropolis workers.<sup>25</sup> We have

<sup>23</sup> See note (m) on the translation.

<sup>24</sup> For references to the 70-day period, see Griffith's note, *Stories* pp. 29-30. The 70-day period was presumably modelled on the 70-day period of the invisibility of Sothis, thought of as the time between the death and resurrection of Osiris. The ceremonies on particular days may correspond to mythical events during the mourning of Isis for Osiris and her triumphal re-assembly of his dismembered body.

<sup>25</sup> Brugsch *Thesaurus* 893 correcting *Ä.Z.* 24/36; retranslated by Griffith, *loc. cit.*

no evidence about the identity of the day with the number missing. The nature of the ceremonies on the sixteenth day, the thirty-fifth day and the day of coffining is clear from the description of the obsequies of Neneferkaptah: 'Pharaoh caused there to be performed for him a festive entry (*ḥj-w n-f 'k*) into the embalming place (*pr-nfr*) on the sixteenth day, wrapping on the thirty-fifth day, coffining on the seventieth-day; and he was put to rest in his sarcophagus in his tomb'.<sup>26</sup> "Day 16" is also mentioned in a broken context in the Vienna Apis burial ritual,<sup>27</sup> while members of priestly associations often pledged themselves to carry out ceremonies for a deceased colleague on "day 35" and the "day of coffining".<sup>28</sup> These were presumably the principal ceremonies which took place during the course of mummification.

It is now clear that the 'cloths' (*ḥbs*) to be provided by the lector-priests on or for these days cannot all have been mummy-bandages, though the word can bear that interpretation among many others.<sup>29</sup> For the wrapping of the mummy only began on the 35th day, after the body had been thoroughly desiccated; but certain of the 'cloths' are provided for ceremonies on the 4th and 16th day. Indeed, we think it very doubtful whether any of the 'cloths' given by the lector-priests were to be used for wrapping the mummy, as the 'winder' (*rmt ntj iw=f gyl*) is called upon to swear an oath that the 'cloths' he is using are his own private property (lines 20-21). Probably the cloths were to be used as wearing apparel or for such purposes as ritual anointing by the persons to whom they were provided.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>26</sup> I Khamwas 4/24-5. For *ḥj-f-k*, see note (h) on translation.

<sup>27</sup> Pap. Wien 27, XVIII/21-22, see *Ä.Z.* 56/33.

<sup>28</sup> Berlin 3115 3/2,11, 4/4; Lille 29/18. Rhind I 3/1 tells us that eight *wn-pr* ceremonies were done for the deceased up to the 36th day, and nine *wn-pr* ceremonies from the 36th to the 70th day. Diodorus I 91/6 says that the embalmers "having washed the whole body, first diligently treat it with cedar oil and other things for over thirty days".

<sup>29</sup> As in Pap. Wien 27 and Pap. Florence 3667. Cf. Wb. III, 65-66; Crum 659b-660a.

<sup>30</sup> The possibility that the cloths were given as a simple payment in kind for services rendered, that is wages, seems to be confuted by the presence of a lotus and a 'consecration cloth' in the list; these can only have been for a ceremonial purpose.

The precise functions of some of these persons remain obscure. In the opening clause the lector-priest promised to give ten cloths "to his men". The expression is very vague, but the fact that they were also apparently to be given a lotus and a 'cloth-of-taking-entry'<sup>31</sup> suggests that they may have composed the cortege escorting the mummy from his house to the embalming-place. If so, it seems probable that "the man who follows him" was also a participant in this procession. The next group of persons in the list follow "the day of confining", and appear from line 17 to have been concerned in the ceremonies from the 35th to the 70th day. That an anointer should have been required is understandable, but the functions of "the man who is brought from the town" and "the man who is turned over (?) on the ground" are a complete mystery to us. It must be remembered, however, that for religious reasons Egyptian tomb paintings and reliefs depict only the final ceremonies of the embalming ritual; yet we know from the Greek authors and the few surviving Egyptian ritual texts that the ceremonial during mummification was very elaborate. It is not surprising that there were persons concerned in these ceremonies whom we cannot identify.<sup>32</sup>

The clauses already discussed appear then to stipulate that the lector-priests who form the first party should provide certain articles required in the mummification ceremonies to certain persons taking part in them; thus they either employed these persons or stood in some sort of contractual relationship with them. The clauses which follow define what the first parties are not to be obliged or not to be allowed to undertake. The interpretation of these clauses is somewhat uncertain owing to lacunae, but we think that their gist is as follows. The first parties are not to give more than the specified amounts of material to the men employed, nor are they to employ or give material to persons other than those mentioned. They are not to give to the man responsible for the final placing of the body in the coffin

<sup>31</sup> See note (h) on the transliteration.

<sup>32</sup> In view of the passage in Diodorus I 91/4 about the *παρ᾽ ὄχλου* being stoned and driven off into the desert after having slit the body, it is perhaps legitimate to wonder whether these imprecise expressions may not be euphemisms to avoid naming the impure.



his various requirements.<sup>33</sup> Nor are they to appoint a 'winder', i. e. the man who actually wrapped the body; but they are to receive some sort of promise concerning him, for which they are apparently to give an 'exchange'. It is clear then that when a corpse was brought to them, the first parties were responsible only for a certain portion of the mummification ritual, not the whole of it; they were beholden to some other person or persons to negotiate with the 'coffiner' and the 'winder'. This other party was presumably also a lector-priest, and, if our restoration be correct, was in fact the second party.<sup>34</sup> Whoever he or they may have been, it seems probable that the two did not trust one another, as in the next sentence the 'winder' is called upon to make an oath that the cloth (*hbs*) which he was using, presumably for wrapping the body, was his own private property. This suggests that the lector-priests concerned may have had a common store or stock. Perhaps this receives some slight confirmation from what follows; for after a much broken sentence which seems to define who was responsible in the case of the death of a priest (?) of Wepwawet, a final clause runs: "Should it happen that a lector-priest share with his fellow . . . . ., and he make his own storehouse (*pr-ht*), he shall do according to every word above". This seems to us to mean that should either party co-opt a further lector-priest as a partner, and should that person have his own store or stock-room, he is to continue to be bound by the terms of the undertaking as though he were still operating from the common stock. The document is terminated, as mentioned above, by a penalty clause and royal oath.

The fact that this undertaking, made by one set of lector-priests of the necropolis to another, concerns what should and should not be provided by the first parties in the case of *each and every* corpse brought to them, seems to us strongly in favour of our suggestion above that these lector-priests were carrying out functions that were in some sense complementary. The purpose of the undertaking would have been to define in the second party's interest precisely what persons the first parties should be called upon to employ, and what materials they should provide

<sup>33</sup> See note (u).

<sup>34</sup> See note (x) and translation.

them with (possibly out of a common stock). If this was so, it is not impossible that the second party made a similar undertaking defining their obligations to the first party in the matter, which is no longer extant. However that may be, if B.M. 10561 was drawn up as the result of some dispute between the parties, that dispute cannot have been over the exclusive rights of one or other party to any particular corpse; it must rather have concerned the demarcation of their respective functions, and their responsibility to each other in the matter of providing the requirements of employees. In this connection it would be interesting to review the evidence concerning the functions of the lector-priest in Ptolemaic times, and to try and establish (i) how far his functions in funerary matters co-incided with those that he fulfilled in New Kingdom times;<sup>35</sup> (ii) his relationship with other officials connected with embalming met in demotic and greek papyri.<sup>36</sup> For these delicate tasks we have no space here.

In conclusion, we should admit how many of the views we have expressed on the meaning of this tantalizing document depend on inferences, in some cases from damaged passages; they are for the most part at the best tentative. Our main object in offering so difficult a text to Professor Erichsen on this happy occasion was to enlist his encyclopaediac knowledge and great skill in decipherment towards its elucidation. For it is to Professor Erichsen that every young demotist naturally turns in his perplexities; no man has done more to make this esoteric script accessible and intelligible to the student.

<sup>35</sup> See most recently Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica* I 48\* ff. and II 269\*.

<sup>36</sup> Though several of his conclusions have since been challenged or rejected, the articles of Revillout on this subject in *Ä.Z.* 17, 83-92 and *Ä.Z.* 18, 70-80, 103-120, 136-148 are still a valuable collection of demotic material, containing much not since republished. On the *h̄tmw-ntr wyl*, whose functions in the Memphite region and the Fayum may perhaps have co-incided with those of the *hr-h̄b.t* at Thebes, see most recently Nims in *M.D.A.I.K.* 16, 240 note a; we may hope that Professor Erichsen will be able to further elucidate this matter when he publishes the Hawara archive on which he is at present working.

10561

*[Faded handwritten text in a medieval script, likely Latin or Greek, arranged in columns. The text is significantly obscured by ink bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]*

Pap. dem. B.M. 10561 recto.

