THE JUDICIAL PAPYRUS OF TURIN

By A. DE BUCC

Years ago Gunn and Gardner began in this Journal a series of new renderings of Egyptian texts, rightly defending their enterprise with the argument that workers in the field of Egyptian philology should never forget that the real end of their labours is, or should be, translation. 'Egyptian studies', so they argued, 'are rapidly progressive. Every month brings its harvest of philological discoveries, points of small importance, perhaps even trivial significance, considered separately, but together enabling us to transpose an Egyptian writing into our own tongues with ever greater force, colour and sensitivity—indeed, with greater truth. It may safely be said that there is no version whatever of more than ten years old which cannot be greatly improved upon. In ideal conditions Egyptians would be compelled to re-translate all their inscriptions and papyri as frequently as revised editions of the great European encyclopaedias are now accustomed to appear.'

The text of which a fresh translation is given in the present article offers a striking confirmation of their contention. It is a papyrus which has been known since the early days of Egyptology. Devéria published it as far back as 1885, and it is deservedly famous because its contents are such as to interest not only the pure philologist, but also the student of history and law, and above all because it is one of the few texts which afford us a glimpse into the interesting and picturesque villas that took place behind the curtain, whereas we are usually allowed to see only the stage on which the highly ceremonious but somewhat boring life of the son of the High God proceeds along from his divine birth to his heavenward flight and ultimate reunion with his father.

Small wonder that a text with such vivid contents is quoted in every history of Egyptian culture and serves to lend colour to every picture of Egyptian life. Hence the Egyptian philologist may well feel himself in duty bound to place a reliable translation at the disposal of the exceptionally wide circle of those interested in this document.

Curiously enough, philologists do not seem to have been very strongly attracted by our papyrus, for apart from the early translations and discussions of its philological commentary has ever appeared. Breasted published a complete translation of the document in his Ancient Records (iv, § 463-50), and it is this translation which is apparently regarded as the standard one by all whose work brings them into contact with our papyrus, especially the historians.

For those the papyrus, and the first three pages in particular, acquired a special interest through the remarkable article which Struve wrote on the great Harris Papyrus—an article in which he showed that famous text to have been really composed on behalf of Ramesses III's successor Ramesses IV, the son for whose benefit and welfare the dead father addresses gods and men out of his abode in the Netherworld. Now Breasted had already observed that in the Lee Papyrus, a document bearing upon the same conspiracy as the Judicial

1 JEA 4, 241.
2 See the bibliography in Breasted, Anc. Rec., iv, § 416, to which may be added an article by Erman in E.A.W. 17, 76, in which several passages were translated and discussed.
3 JEA 8, 148.
4 Anc. Rec., iv, § 455.
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Papyrus, Ramessess III was referred to as a dead person, being there called 'the great god', a name never given to the living king at this time. He had also seen that pages 2 and 3 of our papyrus presuppose that the king did not expect to see the end of the trial. 'It would almost appear', so Breasted concluded, 1 that he knew his days were numbered when he gave instructions for the prosecution of the conspirators. . . . That the plot went so far that the king was injured, and survived his injuries only long enough to direct the prosecution of his assassins, is improbable, in view of a remark in the records 2 that Rtb did not permit the hostile plans to succeed; but we may easily believe that it hastened the old king's end, even if he escaped unscathed. 3 Breasted's objection is not very strong. It is true that this statement implies that the enterprise was not ultimately successful, yet would the conspirators have succeeded if the king was wounded or even murdered, but the crowning of Pentawire and the rise to power of all concerned had not been attained? Surely not. Straube in his above-mentioned article therefore took the further step which Breasted was not prepared to take, and declared the whole situation which these pages presuppose to be a fiction. In reality Ramesses IV commissioned the court, but he had the clever idea of letting the entire proceedings emanate from his dead father. Thus the authority of the dead king, and all the support this could afford his living son, was behind it all, and the new king escaped the odium of beginning his reign with so bloody an affair. Straube's idea has met with considerable success. Ed. Meyer, 4 for example, quotes him with unrestricted approval, and it must be admitted that Straube has made out a very strong case indeed, provided that the correctness of his translation, which is substantially that of Breasted, is conceded.

Now when, some time ago, I had to study Straube's article more closely, and in this connexion had to read the Judicial Papyrus again, I was astonished to find that my impression of what the document as a whole contained could not be reconciled with his translation, which a superficial search for other renderings showed me to be the generally accepted one even in more philological quarters—both Ermann's Neuesägyptische Grammatik and a recent article by Spiegel 5 followed it, at least as regards the most important and crucial passages. Still, a more thorough consideration of my own views convinced me that my translation must be correct with respect to these points, and as it exhibited not only a few trifling corrections interesting only to a small number of specialists, but also threw a somewhat different light on the problems regarding the background of this important document, it seems worth while to publish a fresh translation of the Papyrus with a few short notes in its defence and some concluding remarks on the historical aspects of my new rendering. The translation is made from the admirable hand-copied published by Devéria. 6 Red writing in the original is represented by small capitals.

**Translation**

(1, 1) [King Usermaât-Meriamun, I.p.h., son of Rtb. Ramessess] Rules of Heliopolis [I.p.h. said] (2) (3) the land (4) the whole land (5) (6) (7) (8) the (9) people, saying: (2)

1 Ibid., iv, § 418.
2 Breasted refers to the following passage in P. Bollis (Arch. Rec., iv, § 454): 'the evil (doxxe) which he did, in which he did not permit that he should succeed'.
3 Ochsen. Ah., iv, 1, 660, n. 2: 'Die volle Kenntniss hat dann Straube ... gegeben; sie ist in der Tat genau unvollständig'.
4 See the notes on the translation.
As for the matters which the people—I do not know who—had plotted, and examined them, and they caused to die by their own hands; those whom they caused to die I do not know who. But [they] had charged [them] strictly: 'Take heed; have a care lest you allow that [somebody] be punished without [by an official] who is not over him.' Thus I spoke to them again and again.

For all this that has been done, it is they who have done it. [The responsibility for all that they have done fell upon their own heads.] While I am conscripted and exempted for ever, while I am [among the] just kings who are before Amenhotep, King of the Gods, and before Osiris, Ruler of Eternity.

(First List of Accused)

(IV, 1) Prasons brought in because of the great crimes which they had committed, and placed in the Court of Examination before the great officials of the Court of Examination in order to be examined by the overseer of the treasury Montentowa, the overseer of the treasury Pefowe, the standard-bearer Kam, the butcher Pashio, the master of the archives Meo, the standard-bearer Hor; they examined them; they found them guilty; they caused their punishment to overtake them; their crimes seized them.

(2) The great criminal, Pahekhamen, who was then chief of the chamber. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with Teye and the women of the harem; his he had made common cause with them, he had begun to bring out their words to their mothers and their brothers who were there, saying: 'Stir up the people! Incite enmity in order to make rebellion against their lord.' He was placed before the great officials of the Court of Examination; they examined his crimes; they found that he had committed them; his crimes seized him; the officials who examined him caused his punishment to overtake him.

(3) The great criminal Mes.sd.n, who was then butler. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with Pahekhamen, who was then chief of the chamber, and with the women, to stir up enmity in order to make rebellion against their lord. He was placed before the great officials of the Court of Examination; they examined his crimes; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(4) The great criminal Penok, who was then overseer of the royal harem in the suite. He was brought in because he had made common cause with Pahekhamen and Mes.sd.n to make rebellion against their lord. He was placed before the great officials of the Court of Examination; they examined his crimes; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(5) The great criminal Penuentamun, who was then inspector of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because he had heard the matters which the men had plotted with the women of the harem, and he had not reported them. He was placed before the great officials of the Court of Examination; they examined his crimes; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(6) The great criminal Kerpes, who was then inspector of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with the men who had plotted with the women of the harem; his crimes seized him.

1 It has often been pointed out that many of the names of these criminals are fictitious.
2 The title shows that this is not in apposition to Mes.sd.n, but a third criminal, perhaps Penok of the proceeding line.
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brought in because of the matters which he had heard, (but) concealed. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(9) The great criminal Khuenempe, who was (then) inspector of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because of the matters which he had heard, (but) concealed. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(10) The great criminal Khuenempe, who was (then) inspector of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because of the matters which he had heard, (but) concealed. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(11) The great criminal Sethoyemperedebwet, who was (then) inspector of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because of the matters which he had heard, (but) concealed. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(12) The great criminal Waren, who was (then) butler. He was brought in because he had heard the matters from this chief of the chamber with whom he had been together; (but) he had concealed them, he had not reported them. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(13) The great criminal Khuenempe, who was (then) assistant of Pashekkamen. He was brought in because he had heard the matters from Pashekkamen with whom he had plotted; (but) he had not reported them. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(14) The great criminal Pashukto ("the Lygau") who was (then) butler and clerk of the treasury. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with Pashekkamen; he had heard the matters from him, (but) he had not reported them. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(15) The great criminal, the Lybnyan Lui, who was (then) butler. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with Pashekkamen; he had heard the matters from him, (but) he had not reported them. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(16) Wives of men of the gate of the harem, who had united with the men who plotted the matters, who were placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found them guilty; they caused their punishment to overtake them. Six women.

(2) The great criminal Pashukto, son of Rusu, who was (then) overseer of the treasury. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with the great criminal Penhuibdyen; he had made common cause with him to incite enmity, to make rebellion against their lord. He was placed before the officials of the Court of Examination; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(3) The great criminal Bayensuwese, who was (then) captain of archers of Nubia. He was brought in because his master who was in the harem in the suite had written to him, saying: 'Stir up people, make enmity and come (back) to make rebellion against your lord.' He was placed before Khedemto, Badekeshar, Patawane, and Djedrekhefer; they examined him; they found him guilty; they caused his punishment to overtake him.

(Second List of Accused)

(4) Persons brought in because of their crimes, because they had been in collusion with Pashekkamen, Pata, and Patawane. They were placed before the officials of the Court of Examination in
order to be examined; they found them guilty; they left them on their own hands in the Court of Examination; they took their own lives, no harm having been done to them.6

(5) The great criminal Paim, who was (then) commander of the army; the great criminal Maneri, who was (then) clerk of the university; the great criminal Petkamose, who was (then) magician;7 the great criminal Iren, who was (then) overseer of the priests of Bakkenet;8 the great criminal Nebalja, who was (then) butler; the great criminal Shwedmaal, who was (then) clerk of the university; total 6.

(Third List of Accused)

6. Paim was brought in because of their crimes to the Court of Examination, before Senenmut, Naamun, Ptolemy, Banebdjeser, and Mertasaamun. They examined them concerning their crimes; they found them guilty; they left them where they were; they took their own lives.
7. Petkamose, to whom had been given9 that other name. He was brought in because he had been in collusion with Tye, his mother, when she had plotted the matters with the women of the harem concerning the making rebellion against his lord. He was placed before the butlers in order to be examined; they found him guilty; they left him where he was; he took his own life.
8. The great criminal Henesemut, who was (then) butler. He was brought in because of the crimes of the women of the harem among whom he had been which he had heard, (but) not reported. He was placed before the butlers in order to be examined; they found him guilty; they left him where he was; he took his own life.
9. The great criminal Amenkhare, who was (then) deputy of the harem in the suite. He was brought in because of the crimes of the women of the harem among whom he had been which he had heard, (but) not reported. He was placed before the butlers in order to be examined; they found him guilty; they left him where he was; he took his own life.
10. The great criminal Paser, who was (then) clerk of the royal harem in the suite. He was brought in because of the crimes of the women of the harem among whom he had been which he had heard, (but) not reported. He was placed before the butlers in order to be examined; they found him guilty; they left him where he was; he took his own life.

(Fourth List of Accused)

11. Paim was punished by cutting off their noses and their ears because they had forsaken the good instruction given to them; the women had gone; they had reached them at the place where they were; they had caroused with them and with Paim. Their crime seemed.
12. The great criminal Pabi, who was (then) butler. This punishment was executed upon him; he was left alone; he took his own life.
13. The great criminal Maneri, who was (then) clerk of the archives.
14. The great criminal Tamsbot, who was (then) officer of infantry.
15. The great criminal Nami, who was (then) captain of police.

(Fifth List of Accused)

16. Paim had been connected with them. He was scourged9 a sternly with worded; he was left alone, no harm having been done to him.
17. The great criminal Petkamose, who was (then) standard-bearer of the infantry.

Notes on the Translation

(a) What remains of the first line of the narrow strip of papyrus which is all we have of the first page is just enough to show that the name of Ramose III stood here. In all

6 According to Breasted this means that not Paim but 'that other name' was his real name. It is, however, more probable that Paim was the real name and that 'that other name' refers to the royal titulary which was given him by the pharaohs when he proclaimed him king.
7 These three men were members of the Court; see II, 5-4.
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probability some such words as we have in P. Harris I, 3, 2; 25, 2; 44, 2; 57, 2; 75, I have to be restored, and this may well have been really the first page of the papyrus.

It is of course impossible to guess from these scarce remains what this first page may have contained. Perhaps the king gave a short summary of his kind actions for the benefit of gods and men—the great Harris Papyrus in a nutshell, as an introduction to the less attractive subject of this papyrus, namely his vigorous measures against the ungrateful officials who plotted against his life.

(3) ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

Herein lies the chief difference between my translation and that of Breasted and others. Theoretically there are several possibilities, namely: 1. The narrative use, which suggests itself first of all if one reads the passage without any preconceived idea about the situation, this being by far the commonest meaning of this form in Late Egyptian. Our papyrus uses it continually, and always in this orthography without kr. 2. The Third Future, which is out of the question. 3. The Second Present, this being the view of Breasted and all the other translators. But apart from the difficulties which, as notes d and f show, their rendering entails, I am convinced that the normal expression for 'I commission' would be the First Present, hef (hr) rdjt.

(4) ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In sentences of this type I take the pronoun of as having the sense of an interrogative pronoun: 'I do not know who they are', just as the participles are sometimes used in virtual indirect questions. The construction is very common after rdjt. Besides the examples quoted by Gardner, Ep. Or., p. 496, see e.g. ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In the examples quoted by Aarne, 2, 3, 'we do not know what may happen'; ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

(5) ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In sentences of this type I take the pronoun of as having the sense of an interrogative pronoun: 'I do not know who they are', just as the participles are sometimes used in virtual indirect questions. The construction is very common after rdjt. Besides the examples quoted by Gardner, Ep. Or., p. 496, see e.g. ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In the examples quoted by Aarne, 2, 3, 'we do not know what may happen'; ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

(6) ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In sentences of this type I take the pronoun of as having the sense of an interrogative pronoun: 'I do not know who they are', just as the participles are sometimes used in virtual indirect questions. The construction is very common after rdjt. Besides the examples quoted by Gardner, Ep. Or., p. 496, see e.g. ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

In the examples quoted by Aarne, 2, 3, 'we do not know what may happen'; ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

I am not sure that the meaning of this phrase is as coherent and vague here as Spiegel thinks. The example from the treaty of Hantessu II which he quotes shows a much more impersonal wording: ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

Moreover, it would be quite superficial in 1, 6, for, as Spiegel himself points out, the words bu w rdjt mut n rdjt m w of themselves express the fact that at this moment the people concerned cannot be explicitly named. It seems likely that the phrase is used repeatedly in our passage in order to emphasize the assertion of the king that he is not to be held responsible for the sentences which the Court might pronounce.

(7) ।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।।.

Spiegel himself points out, the words bu w rdjt mut n rdjt m w of themselves express the fact that at this moment the people concerned cannot be explicitly named. It seems likely that the phrase is used repeatedly in our passage in order to emphasize the assertion of the king that he is not to be held responsible for the sentences which the Court might pronounce.
A. DE BUCK

(c) Spiegel says that 'by their own hands' must be connected with the relative sentence. It would be more correct to say that it belongs to both the principal and the relative sentence.

(1) $\sum \omega \cdot \delta \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \zeta$. These words provide us with a criterion outside the relativity of a more or less arbitrary choice between translations which are grammatically equally possible. In the present state of our knowledge of Late-Egyptian grammar we are often compelled to translate according to the needs of the moment, i.e. of what we conjecture that the meaning of a given context must be; and it is only in this way that grammatical rules can be discovered. But it needs no argument to see that this position is a dangerous one which should as soon as possible be abandoned in favour of a more rigorous procedure on the basis of sound grammatical knowledge. The present passage is a good illustration: here we find, the one almost immediately after the other, two relative forms, $\sum \omega \cdot \delta \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \zeta$ in l. 5, $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta$ in l. 6. All translators have rendered the first form as expressing past time, but the second form as referring to the present or the future: 'those who should die' (Breasted); 'die ihr sterben lassen mußt' (Ed. Meyer); 'die, welche sie sterben lassen' (Spiegel), the only reason for this different treatment of exactly the same forms being that the context was supposed to demand this, and no firm grammatical rule they knew of stood in the way of such treatment. Now I am convinced that in the case of the relative form we have reached firm ground. This form must in Late-Egyptian always have past reference, according to a rule which Gardiner put forward tentatively some years ago, and which in the course of my own reading of Late-Egyptian texts I have found corroborated again and again. This fact once recognized, we are compelled to take $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ and the others as narrative, and the right conception of the entire document follows almost automatically.

(2) Restore $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$.

Although the lacuna is rather large for $\{\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta\}$ this seems to be the only possibility: $\{\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta\}$ (so Spiegel) is highly improbable in this text with its succession of verb forms of the type $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma$. Although it is not impossible to take $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ with what immediately precedes it (Breasted; 'likewise without my knowing it'); Spiegel: 'Ich kenne es nicht, gleichfalls'), I prefer to take this adverb-identical as referring to the main verb. In my opinion this view would be necessary even if the $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ should be the vague expression which Spiegel will have it to be; in this case any additional words would make it too heavy—a phrase like seco gis cannot be amplified. It must not be argued that the word-order here assumed is unnatural, for however intolerable it is in our languages, it is quite natural in Egyptian. The postponement of adverbial phrases to the end of the sentence is indeed rather characteristic of this language, see my article in Griffith Studies, 59, and Gardiner in JEA 22, 174.

(3) Restore $\{\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon\}$ or the like. Cf., e.g., Punahi, 9. According to my experience $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ in Late Egyptian always refers to relative past time (pluperfect): 'I had heard', or 'when I had heard'. For example, d'Orbigny 19, 2, for $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$, etc.

$\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ is certainly a relative form and not, as Reiman thinks, the imperf. passive participle, which would show genitivation. See Nauw. Gr., § 260, Ann. 3: 'Sie werden sterben lassen die, die man sterben lassen muss (nicht, die man machenden, dass sie sterben)'.

* The negative counterpart of $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ is in $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$ in Late Egyptian. The examples of the latter construction quoted by Reiman, Nau. Gr., §§ 500, 781, have all relative past reference. The following is another illuminating example quoted by Reiman of this construction, it is found in d'Orbigny 19, 8: when the husband came home, his wife 'did not pour water over his hands, and she had not kindled a light before him' (te beywa $\omega \varepsilon \zeta \zeta \delta \gamma \gamma \delta \gamma \epsilon$). See also note (c).
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now when he had completed many years... his Majesty swow... etc.; ZAS 53, 108, 1, 5, ta ḫy ḫ-y.n-k 1 had said to you...; ibid., 1, 21, 1.Go to the scribal ta ḥy ḫ-y.tj ḫ-tj after you have taken this letter"; Aeg. Inschr. Berlin, ii, 161, 1, 14, I shall make this stela...; ta ḫy ḫ-y N.N. after you have saved N.N.; Horat and Setq, 7, 3, ta ḫy ḫy ḫ-ba a after she had changed herself into a girl, she said to me"; ibid., 9, 12, 1. This is Isis" ta ḫy ḫ-y... ḫ-y.a 3 after Horus has removed her head"; ibid., 10, 10, 1. Horus has been found" ta ḫy ḫy ḫ-ba 5 after Seth had deprived him of his eyes. A particularly good example is the passage Wosmud 1, x 8 5, where the forms ḫ-hr ḫ-j ḫ-ba, ḫ-r ḫ-j ḫ-ba, and ḫ-h ḫ-ba follow one another alternately: as the prophet was raging (ta ḫ-hr ḫ-ba ḫ-ba) in this night, when I had (already) found (ta ḫ-hr) a ship, when I had loaded (ta ḫhr) it with all my possessions, and as I was awaiting (ta ḫ-hr) the darkness... the harbormaster came to me", etc. It is clear that ta ḫ-hr ḫ-ba is here the clause of circumstances referring to something which is contemporaneous with the principal sentence, i.e. that it has the function of, and very likely is Coptic ṣε βατα, 1 whereas ta ḫ-hr ḫ-ba is relative past tense, i.e. has the function of Middle Egyptian ṣε βατα and Coptic ṣε βατα. Another instructive example is to be found in the passage P. D. Maat 10654, 13, 3-19: 'We brought away the silver and the gold which we had found there in the tombs, and the offering-vessel which we had found in them... having taken (ta ḫ-hr) my chains of copper in our hands and opening (ta ḫ-hr) un' the outer coffin with the chains of copper which were in our hands'. A comparison of P. Leopold II, 1, 8 with 4, 8 shows the same distinction between these constructions. The former passage reads 'The examination of the men found to have violated', etc. (ta ḫ-hr in); the latter, 'he belonged to the twenties thieves who were found (in the act of) robbing (ta ḫ-hr ḫ-hr) the tombs'. See also the examples of ta ḫ-hr ḫ-hr in Erman's Nexus, Gr., §§ 521, 528, 534. Only one of these examples seems to demand a translation as relative present tense, namely Doomed Prince, 5, 2: 'He travelled in the desert' ta ḫ-hr ṣε βατα 1 ḫ-hr ḫ-hr ḫ-hr ḫ-ba, while he lived upon game'. It is, however, very doubtful whether this passage, which would contradict the rule here advocated, is really a case of the construction ta ḫ-hr ḫ-hr. Gardiner, in a note on this passage in his Late Egyptian Stories, says that ta ḫ-hr is a correction of ṣε βατα. Is it not possible that the ḫ-hr was inserted in the wrong place and that ṣε βατα is what was intended? Or if ṣε βατα is correct, ṣε βατα may be the substantive 'nourishment' as in the expression ṣε βατα, the correct rendering then being: 'while his nourishment existed of game'. Be this as it may, this passage is certainly not of sufficient weight to throw doubt on the general rule.

The translation of the words ta ḫ-hr as pluperfect confirms my view that the commission of the Court and the king's instructions to it are events of the past which are here narrated. Moreover, it is not at all necessary, on the contrary it is rather improbable, that the king should have been already dead when he delivered these warnings to his officials. Hence Struve's reconstruction of the situation becomes very doubtful, for although the assumption that the dead king here alludes to things which he said previously, but nevertheless after his death, may not be absolutely impossible, it is much more natural to suppose that he narrates events which happened when he was still alive.

1 The passage is therefore even more interesting for the difficult problems connected with the ḫ-hr ḫ-hr than for the much simpler ta ḫ-hr ḫ-hr. Though a discussion of the former is not within the scope of this article, it may be pointed out that all the examples of ta ḫ-hr ḫ-ba quoted by Erman, Nexus, Gr., § 526 allow of translation as the relative present tense. (After writing the above I discovered that Erman gives more examples of this construction in § 521, where he also remarks on its connexion with the Coptic circumstantial ṣε βατα. His view is rather different from that which I am inclined to take.)

It is difficult to find a satisfactory restoration. The phrase ḫsr ḫṣr ṣr ṣr reminds one of P. Loc. 2, 4, where the suicide of one of the condemned is reported to ḫsr ḫṣr ṣr ṣr, 'the officials who are over him'. Whatever this may mean (perhaps: 'within whose jurisdiction he comes'), the analogy of the two passages in these related documents is too striking to be ignored. Accordingly the lacuna must have contained two substantives, designations of the official and the accused, to which the pronouns ṣr and ḫṣr may refer. Perhaps read ḫṣr ḫṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr, etc., and ḫṣr ḫṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr, etc., etc., etc.

(3) For the sense of ṣr ṣr see Gardiner's article on P. Lepetit II in this Journal, 22, 170-6.

(4) Translators follow Broasted, who himself may have been influenced by Ermann's notes on our papyrus in ZAAS II, 77. At all events, that early translation of Erman's is found in all the later renderings, and is still adhered to by himself.1 'Allis dessas was gegeben ist, sie wolche es gethan haben, muge alles was sie gethan haben auf ihr Haupt fallen' (Ermann); 'as for all that has been done, and those who have done it, let all that they have done fall upon their (own) heads' (Broasted); 'was nun dazu jener ansbetrifft was getan ist, und diejenigen, die es getan haben, so hassen' (Struve); 'alles was geschehen ist und was sie gethan haben, laßt' etc. (Ed. Meyer). Here again the supposed demands of the context have apparently overweighed the rules of grammar. The starting-point for all these translations was probably the preconceived idea that these words must refer to the conspirators. If so, the sentence, 'as for all that has been done,' it is they who have done it' makes very poor sense, if any, and there is no antecedent for 'they'. But if we take 'they' to refer to the only word to which it can possibly refer, namely 'them' (i.e. the officials) of the preceding line, there is no necessity to deviate from the rules of grammar, which are very clear in this case. Obviously ḫṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr ṣr is the participial statement, and certainly 'those who have done it' could not be rendered in Egyptian in this way, the participle being the normal Egyptian equivalent of such relative clauses in English and other modern languages.

The sentence now makes excellent sense: with the greatest emphasis the king lays all responsibility upon the members of the Court.

(2) Ṣr Ṣr Ṣr Ṣr Ṣr Ṣr, the expression denotes who and what is proper of the gods and therefore gods, exempted from ordinary life and work. A good example is found in the Eleventh dekree (Urk. 1, 287, 8), where it is used of servants belonging to a temple; also BT-Emak, pl. 29, of a cemetery; Abud, 2, 7, of the mummis of kings. In P. Lepetit II, 3, 11 it is used of a more material protection with (gypsum-) plaster.

(5) The text has Ṣr, but what else can be meant?

(6) Gardiner has convinced me that in Late Egyptian Ṣr- simple adverbal predicate has the sense of an absolute past (who was), which may sometimes be also relative past (who had been) in relation to the main verb, but is so not necessarily. From a comparison of the expression, 'N. N., who was chief of the chamber', etc., and the simple mention of the title, as in the list of judges ('the overseer of the treasury N. N.', etc.) one gets the impression that the former type is not merely a long-winded paraphrase, whereas the bare title would suffice, but that it somehow implies the additional information that the official, who was

---

1 pts. 208, Anm. 2.

2 If the conspiracy were meant the text would moreover probably refer to this as so mel, this being the term which is continually used in the rest of the papyrus.
chief of the chamber, is no longer in that office at present. Our 'who was (then) chief of the chamber' implies, I fancy, the same thing, though the expression itself does not explicitly state that the person referred to is no longer what he was.

(b) Note that in Late Egyptian the verbal form sdm f (used here) seems to be employed to state a fact in the past ('I have heard'), while the construction lerf br sdm is used for narrative ('I heard'). This distinction is unfortunately obscured by our translations in this and other cases, because English, and many other Teutonic languages for that matter, cannot say, 'He has been brought in . . . , he was placed', etc. In this particular case the distinction could be brought out in a Dutch translation, Dutch putting the first verb in the same sentences in the Present Perfect, and continuing with verbs in the Imperfect, thus saying, e.g., 'I have seen him yesterday in London, and we went and did', etc. On the whole, however, a comparison with the tenses in our own languages seems to be confusing rather than helpful. On the one hand they often have a different range of meaning in the different languages, on the other hand these distinctions are often a matter of very subtle shade of meaning; not seldom they are even uncertain. The best analogy is perhaps to be found in the Greek Perfect and Aorist and the French Parfait and Passé défini, though the Parfait has nowadays practically superseded the Passé défini.

Erman makes the distinction in his Neues Gr., very clearly in §§ 791, 792, but he does not seem to attach enough importance to it in other parts of his book. Thus he writes, e.g., op. cit., § 204, 'Das so auseinander ist oft eine abgeschlossene Handlung'. And in § 386 he attributes the use of sdm f on the stelae which the prince of Byblos is urged to erect (Wen.Aiadis, 3, 56 ff.) to its being 'aktuellst im Fussst. . . .'. The real reason is that the contents of the stelae are not conceived of as narrative but as a series of statements, 'Amor' has sent . . . I have built', etc. In the same way Ramses III in P. Harris I, 18, 11 ff., makes a long series of statements, all in sdm f, about his benefactions to the gods, 'I have multiplied . . . I have made . . . I have built', etc.

The negative counterpart is bupuf sdm, as Erman rightly observes, Neues Gr., § 779, 'Man braucht die Negation j f in vermeinten Ausnahmen, die sich auf die Vergangenheit beziehen, nicht ab in der Erzählung'. Hence also the similar function of br sdm f and lerf br sdm, see note (h) above.

The negative construction corresponding to the narrative lerf br sdm is lerf br tm sdm. A comparison of d'Orbigny, 4, 9, 4, 10, and S, 3 is instructive. 'The wife of the elder brother did not pour water (ler sdm f on his hands', etc. 'She said to him: 'Nobody has talked with me (bupuf sdm f) except your younger brother.' This is an answer to a question, a very common case in which sdm f is used. Narrative again, 'I did not listen to him' (lerf br tm sdm w).

(g) The papyrus uses two expressions, pr-far and iqt nsw n pr-far. Their relation and exact meaning are unknown. See W3, iii, 397. The letter expression is followed by br bis, for which Gardiner suggests 'intimate'.

(h) It seems necessary to translate that ('he had made', 'he had begun', etc.), though the original uses the same construction (furf br sdm) that it uses for ordinary past narrative ('he was placed', 'they examined', etc.). Apparently there is only one construction for absolute and relative past narrative. Contrast the difference between absolute and relative past statements, notes (h) and (g).

(i) I owe the suggestion that lerf (br) br bupu be translated as a second relative to Gunn, He proposes to take it as a circumstantial clause (so also Erman, Neues Gr., § 499) and

So Erman rightly in his Literatur der Altpap. 335, 'Ammon ... hat . . . geschickt . . . Ich habe es gelesen', etc. whereas he translates in his Neues Gr., 'Ammon schickte . . . ich falle es', etc.
refers to Till, *Achmimisch-Koptische Grammatik*, § 241, d, for the Coptic usage of continuing a Relative Form with a circumstantial clause. Till there writes: 'Sehr häufig ist die Fortsetzung durch einen Zustandsausdruck, e.g. *mēn qebCHEDULEX sār aš-hāru* 'wer mein Wort hör' und glaubt'. Although I accept Gunn's translation, which to my mind is obviously right, his grammatical explanation of the construction is open to several serious objections. In the first place there seems to be an objection to taking *fur* (hr) *hēm* as a circumstantial clause (τοποθετησα). Next, V, 8 ff., occurs the negative counterpart of this construction, and I doubt whether the construction there employed, *fur* (hr) *ir sām*, can be a circumstantial clause, the normal type of such a clause in Late Egyptian seems at all events to be *hēm* ir *hr sām*.* See, e.g., Deoned, *Princ. 7*, 8, 'She began to keep watch over her husband very carefully', *hēm eij hr rēq sām r bḥ*, 'not allowing him to go out of doors', as compared with the narrative *fur* (hr) *ir sām* d'Ormeil, § 9 (see note o). The second place, is it more chance that Till's examples of the Coptic construction are all in the present tense? What is stated below about relative sentences with past tense rather suggests that this usage follows a definite rule.

In view of these difficulties I would propose a different grammatical analysis, namely to take *fur* (hr) *hēm* as the narrative form, and to compare our construction with the Coptic construction recorded by Till, *op. cit.*, § 242, b: the continuation of perfective relative sentences with the 1st Perfect, e.g. *mēn rēqtemt sām* ḫūn bēh *sām* ḫiunntām. It may be noted that all Till's examples of this construction have past meaning. The same holds true of a few examples which I noted in the *Salāt* *Acta of the Apostles*. As this construction seems to have escaped all grammarians except Till, it may be useful to quote these examples here. *Acta* iv, 10, ḫēr ēm ḫašamtemt sām ḫūn bēh *sām* ḫiunntām, ḫūn bēh *sām* ḫiunntām. *Ibid.* iv, 20, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām. *Ibid.* xiv, 16, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām. *Ibid.* xiv, 16, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām, ḫēr ēm ḫuṣāmi sām ḫūn ḫiunntām. Although this Coptic construction does not offer a cognate analogy to the Late Egyptian construction here discussed, the preceding verb being a Relative Form in the latter case and a totally different form in the former, it seems nevertheless significant that Coptic does not continue a relative verb with past meaning with the circumstantial clause expressing the relative present tense.

Be this as it may, my first objection to taking *fur* (hr) *ir sām* as a circumstantial

1 Coptic seems to point in the same direction; it does not use *hēm* in the circumstantial clause with *sām*. For Late Egyptian see Bruns, *Nom. 9* (n). The only examples which Bruns gives of *fur* (hr) *ir sām* as a circumstantial clause are the cases in the *Jabalāt* *Pyramid*.  
2 We should, of course, always bear in mind that this does not alter the fact that Coptic in such cases does not use two relative sentences, but linking such a sequence of more than one relative sentence was several devices to avoid them, saying, 'he who knew my word and what he believed' in one case, 'who had died and Jesus raised him' in another, etc.  
3 Not as the result of a systematic search, be it noted, but in the course of reading the *Acta* (ed. Thompson) with some pupils.  
4 I have not been able to find a discussion of this construction except in Till, *op. cit.*, and an all too-short paragraph in the same author's *Koptische Dialektgrammatik*, § 72. (So however already *ZfdA 42*, 67.)  
5 It has also been suggested to me that *sām* ... was not thus analyzed by speakers and writers. Surely it was felt as an indivisible verb-form. And Egyptian does not as a rule like to carry on the force of words like the relative words, negations, propositions (comparisons) over more than one dependent word.
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clause remains, and it is mainly for this reason that I prefer my explanation. However, my knowledge of the facts on the sides of both Late Egyptian and Capite is regrettably incomplete. Clearly the problem needs further and thorough investigation. The publication of this translation, however, cannot be delayed until the question raised by Gunn is finally settled. Therefore my hypothesis is put forward here with due deference to the hope that the point may attract other scholars to further study of Gunn's interesting suggestion and the related problems.

(1) "What" (here and 4, 18; 5, 7-10), is of course relative form. See the examples Erman, Nest. Gr., § 295.

(2) For the construction see Edgerton's article in AJSL 44, 29.

(3) _ART_ 2, 47, doubts the old ART_ 2; see Spengelberg, Demotica, 1, 4 ff., and for its identity with the ART_ 2 of the Old Testament see Stricker's article in Ada Orientalis 16, 6.

Ibid., p. 20, he quotes a good example from P. Harris Mag., 6, 10. Magical expedients are very prominent in P. Rekhm and P. Lea. The priest of Baktet, the doctor, is also a kind of magician.

(4) Literally 'on their place' and similarly II. 7-10 below.

(5) Apparently he was not quite innocent. For the meaning of ART_ 2 ART_ 2 ART_ 2 cf. d'Orleans, 10, 9; Bel. 1934, 4, 9.

CONCLUSION

Let us now turn back for a moment to the question how far this new translation affects the historical background of the document. The principal novel point is, of course, that the accepted name 'the Judicial Papyrus' appears to be wrong. It is not a judicial document at all, but a narrative, which in the present rendering tells a clear and consistent tale. The contents may be summed up in a few words. The dead king gives an account of his dealings with the participants in a conspiracy. He tells how he commissioned a court for their prosecution, and how he lays considerable stress upon the fact that he is not responsible for the punishments which have been inflicted. He had strictly charged the Court to be careful, so that it is their responsibility, not his, if mistakes have been made.

Does this story correspond to reality, or is it fiction? The whole trend of the papyrus suggests that Ramses III died as a result of the conspiracy, or else was expecting soon to die at the moment when it occurred. But did he live long enough to appoint the court as he says he did, or is this mere invention? I see no reason to reject the historicity of this story. There is nothing impossible or illogical in the situation as the papyrus reveals it to an unprejudiced mind. It would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to survive somebody who is bent on being sceptical at all costs, but the burden of proof would lie upon those who should take the view that it is all a fiction contrived by Ramses IV. This king may indeed have been very glad that the prosecution of the conspirators had been already ordered by his father and that their punishment had been none of his business, so that he could begin his reign with clean hands.1 Thus Ramses IV may have had political reasons which made it desirable and wise to record this course of affairs. It is, however, also possible that the document had no political intention at all, but was meant to be Ramses III's vindication before the divine tribunal, so that he could appear there with a clear conscience and confident that he too would be one of the righteous kings before Amen-ret and Osiris. Both Ramses III and his son were very religious men, and this reconstruction of the background

1 Is it by mere chance that a poem on the coronation of Ramses IV describes with much detail a general amnesty proclaimed on this occasion? The text is to be found in Rec. Texts 2, 116.
of our papyrus is thoroughly in keeping with what one may conjecture about their mind and psychology.

Finally, it may be asked what light this result throws upon the problem of that related document, the great Harris Papyrus. To my mind Struve's view of that document must be modified. It seems probable that the Harris Papyrus was not a selfish fiction contrived by Ramses IV. The prayers for the benefit of this king which are so prominent in that papyrus may well be a genuine expression of the father's own wishes. The long and detailed statement of Ramses III's benefactions to the gods seems to show that the book was primarily intended to secure the favour of the gods for him and through him for his son, the object of his prayers being both his own well-being in the hereafter and the welfare of his son upon earth. Surely it is not an unreasonable assumption that Ramses III himself ordered the composition of the long letter of introduction to the gods of the Netherworld in the short interval which was apparently granted him between the moment he knew with certainty that he would die soon and the day of his death, an interval diligently used by him to adjust his temporary and eternal affairs.

1 While correcting the proofs of this article Curry's discussion of the date of the death of Ramses III (E.A. 72, 100 f.) came to hand. He proves that Ramses III died on the 16th day of the 3rd month of summer; he discusses also the discrepancy between this date and that of the great Harris Papyrus, and suggests several possible ways in which the two dates may be reconciled. My interpretation of the Judicial Papyrus seems to yield an argument in favour of the second suggestion (the assumption of such an interval), which Curry himself ultimately rejects. The third suggestion, which he prefers, requires a textual alteration which, however probable it may be, should be adopted only as a last resource.