

## THE JUDICIAL PAPYRUS OF TURIN

By A. DE BUCK

YEARS ago Gunn and Gardiner began in this *Journal*<sup>1</sup> 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, perhaps even trifling significance taken separately, but together enabling us to transpose an Egyptian writing into our own tongue with ever greater force, colour and sensitiveness—in a word, with greater truth. It may safely be said that there is no version whatever more than ten years old which cannot be greatly improved upon. In ideal conditions Egyptologists would be compelled to retranslate 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 1865, 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 villainies 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 Rê drags 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<sup>2</sup> no philological commentary has ever appeared. Breasted published a complete translation of the document in his *Ancient Records* (iv, §§ 423-53), 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 these 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<sup>3</sup>—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<sup>4</sup> that in the *Lee Papyrus*, a document bearing upon the same conspiracy as the Judicial

<sup>1</sup> *JEA* 4, 241.

<sup>2</sup> See the bibliography in Breasted, *Anc. Rec.*, iv, § 416, to which may be added an article by Erman in *ZAS* 17, 76, in which several passages were translated and discussed.

<sup>3</sup> *Aeg.* 7, 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Anc. Rec.*, iv, § 455.

Papyrus, Ramesses 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,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> that Rê 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.' 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 Pentawère and the rise to power of all concerned had not been attained? Surely not. Struve 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.

Struve's idea has met with considerable success. Ed. Meyer,<sup>3</sup> for example, quotes him with unrestricted approval, and it must be admitted that Struve 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 Struve'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 Erman's *Neuägyptische Grammatik* and a recent article by Spiegel<sup>4</sup> follow 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-copy published by Devéria.<sup>5</sup> Red writing in the original is represented by small capitals.

## TRANSLATION

(I, 1) [King Usermarê-Meriamün, l.p.h., son of Rê: Ramesses] Ruler of Heliopolis [l.p.h. said]<sup>a</sup>  
 . . . (2) . . . . . the land . . . . . (3) . . . . . the who[le] land . . . . . (4) . . . . .  
 [thei]r cattle . . . . . (5) . . . . . to bring them . . . . . (6) . . . . . all . . . . . before  
 them . . . . . (7) . . . . . the . . . . . (8) . . . . . people, saying: . . . . . (9)

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, iv, § 418.

<sup>2</sup> Breasted refers to the following passage in *P. Rollin (Anc. Rec., iv, § 454)*: 'the evil (deeds) which he did, in which Rê did not permit that he should succeed'.

<sup>3</sup> *Gesch. Alt.*, II, 1, 800, n. 2: 'Die volle Konsequenz hat dann Struve . . . gezogen; sie ist in der Tat ganz unabwiesbar'.

<sup>4</sup> See the notes on the translation.

<sup>5</sup> In *Le Papyrus judiciaire de Turin et les papyrus Lee et Rollin*, in *J. as.*, 1885-8 = *Bibl. Égyptologique*, vol. v, pp. 97 ff.

... they being (II, 1) the abomination of the land. I commissioned<sup>b</sup> the overseer of the treasury Montemtowe; the overseer of the treasury Pefrowe; (2) the standard-bearer Kara; the butler Paibese, the butler Kedendenna; the butler Basalmahar; (3) the butler Peirswene; the butler Dhutrekhefer; the king's adjutant Pernerute; the clerk Mai; (4) the clerk of the archives Pretemhab; the standard-bearer of the infantry Hori; (5) saying: 'As for the matters which the people—I do not know who<sup>c</sup>—have plotted, go and examine them'. (6) And they went<sup>d</sup> and examined them, and they caused to die by their own hands<sup>e</sup> those whom they caused (so) to die.<sup>f</sup> (7) though [I] do not know [wh]o, [and they] also punished [the] others,<sup>g</sup> though I do not know who. But (8) [I] had charged [them strictly],<sup>h</sup> saying: 'Take heed, have a care lest you allow that [somebody] be punished (9) wrongfully [by an official] who is not over him'.<sup>i</sup> Thus I spoke to them again and again.<sup>j</sup>

(III, 1) As for all this that has been done, it is they who have done it.<sup>k</sup> (2) May (the responsibility for) all that they have done fall upon their (own) heads, (3) while I am consecrated and exempted<sup>l</sup> for ever, while I am (4) among<sup>m</sup> the just kings who are before (5) Amen-rē, King of the Gods, and before Osiris, Ruler of Eternity.

(First List of Accused)

(IV, 1) PERSONS 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 Montemtowe, the overseer of the treasury Pefrowe, the standard-bearer Kara, the butler Paibese, the clerk of the archives Mai, the standard-bearer Hori; they examined them; they found them guilty; they caused their punishment to overtake them; their crimes seized them.

(2) The great criminal, Paibekkamen,<sup>1</sup> who was (then)<sup>n</sup> chief of the chamber. HE WAS BROUGHT IN<sup>o</sup> because he had been in collusion with Teye and the women of the harem;<sup>p</sup> he had made common cause with them;<sup>q</sup> 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 Mesedsurē, who was (then) butler. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had been in collusion with Paibekkamen, 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<sup>r</sup> in the suite. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had made common cause with Paibekkamen and Mesedsurē 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 Pendua, who was (then) clerk of the royal harem in the suite. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had made common cause with Paibekkamen, Mesedsurē, and this other criminal,<sup>2</sup> who was (then) overseer of the royal harem, and the women of the harem to make a conspiracy with them to make rebellion against their lord. He was placed before the 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 Ptewenteamūn, 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.

(7) The great criminal Kerpes, who was (then) inspector of the harem in the suite. HE WAS

<sup>1</sup> It has often been pointed out that many of these criminals are fictitious.

<sup>2</sup> The title shows that this is not in apposition to Mesedsurē, but a third criminal, perhaps Penok of the preceding line.

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.

(8) The great criminal Kha'emôpe, 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.

(9) The great criminal Kha'emmale, 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 Sethoyemperdhowti, 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 Sethoyemperamûn, 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 Weren, 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 Ashahesaed, who was (then) assistant of Paibekkamen. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had heard the matters from Paibekkamen 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 Peluka ('the Lycian') who was (then) butler and clerk of the treasury. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had been in collusion with Paibekkamen; 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 Libyan Inini, who was (then) butler. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had been in collusion with Paibekkamen; 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.

(V,1) 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 Faiere, son of Ruma, who was (then) overseer of the treasury. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had been in collusion with the great criminal Penhuiôyen; 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 Beyenemwêse, who was (then) captain of archers of Nubia. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because his sister 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 Kêdendenna, Batamahar, Peirswêne, and Dhutrekhnêfer; 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 Paibekkamen, Patis, and Pentawêre. 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.<sup>1</sup>

(5) The great criminal Pais, who was (then) commander of the army; the great criminal Messui, who was (then) clerk of the university; the great criminal Prékamenef, who was (then) magician;<sup>2</sup> the great criminal Iroi, who was (then) overseer of the priests of Sakhmet;<sup>3</sup> the great criminal Nebdjefa, who was (then) butler; the great criminal Shâedmasdjer, who was (then) clerk of the university; total 6.

*(Third List of Accused)*

(6) PERSONS brought in because of their crimes to the Court of Examination, before Kedenenna, Ba'almahar, Peirawéne, Dhutrekhefer, and Mertusiamün. They examined them concerning their crimes; they found them guilty; they left them where they were;<sup>4</sup> they took their own lives.

(7) Pentawère, to whom had been given<sup>5</sup> that other name.<sup>1</sup> HE WAS BROUGHT IN because he had been in collusion with Teye, 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 Henutenamün, who was (then) butler. HE WAS BROUGHT IN because of the crimes of the women of the harem among whom<sup>2</sup> 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 Amenkha'u, 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 Paiera, 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)*

(VI, 1) PERSONS punished by cutting off their noses and their ears because they had forsaken the good instructions given to them; the women had gone; they had reached them at the place where they were; they had caroused with them and with Pais. Their crime seized them.

(2) The great criminal Paibése,<sup>3</sup> who was (then) butler. This punishment was executed upon him; he was left alone; he took his own life.

(3) The great criminal Mai,<sup>2</sup> who was (then) clerk of the archives.

(4) The great criminal Tainakhte, who was (then) officer of infantry.

(5) The great criminal Nanai, who was (then) captain of police.

*(Fifth List of Accused)*

(6) PERSON who had been connected with them. He was scolded<sup>4</sup> sternly with bad words; he was left alone, no harm having been done to him.

(7) The great criminal, Hori,<sup>2</sup> 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 Ramesses III stood here. In all

<sup>1</sup> According to Breasted this means that not Pentawère but 'that other name' was his real name. It is, however, more probable that Pentawère was his real name and that 'that other name' refers to the royal titulary which was given him by the conspirators when they proclaimed him king.

<sup>2</sup> These three men were members of the Court! See II, 2-4.





'now when he had completed many years . . . his Majesty flew', etc.; ZĀS 59, 108, l. 5, *tw ḡḡ-j n-k* 'I had said to you . . .'; *ibid.*, l. 21, 'Go to the scribe' *tw ḡḡ-k ḡḡ ḡḡ* 'after you have taken this letter'; *Aeg. Inschr. Berlin*, II, 161, l. 14, 'I shall make this stele . . .' *tw ḡḡ-k N.N.* 'after you have saved N.N.'; *Horus and Seth*, 7, 8, *tw ḡḡ-s ḡḡw-s* 'after she had changed herself into a girl, she said to me'; *ibid.*, 9, 12, 'This is Isis' *tw ruḡ Hr* . . . *ḡḡr-s* 'after Horus has removed her head'; *ibid.*, 10, 10, 'Horus has been found' *tw ḡḡ sw Sḡḡ m ḡḡ-f* 'after Seth had deprived him of his eyes'. A particularly good example is the passage *Wenamūn* 1, x+5 ff., where the forms  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$  and  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$  follow one another alternately: 'as the prophet was raging (*tw ḡḡ pḡ ḡḡw ḡḡw*) in this night, when I had (already) found (*tw ḡḡj*) a ship, when I had loaded (*tw ḡḡj*) it with all my possessions, and as I was awaiting (*tw ḡḡj n-w*) the darkness . . . the harbourmaster came to me', etc. It is clear that *tw ḡḡ-f ḡḡm* is here the clause of circumstance referring to something which is contemporaneous with the principal sentence, i.e. that it has the function of, and very likely is Coptic  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$ ,<sup>1</sup> whereas *tw ḡḡm-f* is relative past tense, i.e. has the function of Middle Egn. *ḡḡm-n-f*<sup>2</sup> and Coptic  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$ . Another instructive example is to be found in the passage *P. Br. Mus.* 10054, rt. 2, 8-10: '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 (*tw ḡḡ-n*) my chisels of copper in our hands and opening (*tw ḡḡ-n w*) the outer coffins with the chisels of copper which were in our hands'. A comparison of *P. Léopold 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. (*tw wḡ-w ḡḡ*); the latter, 'he belonged to the seventeen thieves who were found (in the act of) robbing (*tw ḡḡ-w ḡḡw*) the tombs'. See also the examples of *tw ḡḡm-f* in Erman's *Neuäg. Gr.*, §§ 521, 523, 524. Only one of these examples seems to demand a translation as relative present tense, namely *Doomed Prince*, 5, 2: 'He travelled in the desert' *tw ḡḡ-f m ḡḡ n ḡḡw nḡ n ḡḡst*: '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 *tw ḡḡm-f*. Gardiner, in a note on this passage in his *Late-Egyptian Stories*, says that *ḡḡ-f* is a correction of *ḡḡw*. Is it not possible that the *f* was inserted in the wrong place and that *tw-f ḡḡw* is what was intended? Or if *ḡḡ-f* be correct, *ḡḡ* may be the substantive 'nourishment' as in the expression  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$ , 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 *tw ḡḡ-j* 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 did 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.

<sup>1</sup> The passage is therefore even more interesting for the difficult problems connected with the *ḡḡ-f ḡḡm* than for the much simpler *tw ḡḡm-f*. Though a discussion of the former is not within the scope of this article, it may be pointed out that all the examples of *tw ḡḡ-f ḡḡm* quoted by Erman, *Neuäg. Gr.*, § 523 allow of translation as the relative present tense. [After writing the above I discovered that Erman gives more examples of this construction in § 551, where he also remarks on its connexion with the Coptic circumstantial  $\text{ⲉⲓⲛⲓⲛ}$ . His view is rather different from that which I am inclined to take.]

<sup>2</sup> See *Sup. Gard. Eg. Gr.*, p. 15 (ad p. 389, § 408, l. 16).



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.

(o) Note that in Late Egyptian the verbal form *šm:f* (used here) seems to be employed to state a fact in the past ('I have heard'), while the construction *tw:f hr šm* 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 similar 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 shades 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 *Neuäg. Gr.*, very clearly in §§ 721, 722, but he does not seem to attach enough importance to it in other parts of his book. Thus he writes, e.g., *op. cit.*, § 284, 'Das so ausgesagte ist oft eine abgeschlossene Handlung'. And in § 286 he attributes the use of *šm:f* on the stela which the prince of Byblos is urged to erect (*Wenamün*, 2, 55 ff.) to its being 'altertümlich und feierlich'. The real reason is that the contents of the stela are not conceived of as narrative but as a series of statements, 'Amonrê has sent . . . , I have felled', etc.<sup>1</sup> In the same way Ramesses III in *P. Harris I*, 8, 11 ff., makes a long series of statements, all in *šm:f*, about his benefactions to the gods, 'I have multiplied . . . , I have made . . . , I have built', etc.

The negative counterpart is *bwpw:f šm*, as Erman rightly observes, *Neuäg. Gr.*, § 779, 'Man braucht die Negation  $\text{Je} \bar{\text{e}}$  in verneinenden Aussagen, die sich auf die Vergangenheit beziehen, nicht aber in der Erzählung'. Hence also the similar function of *tw šm:f* and *tw bwpw:f šm*, see note (h) above.

The negative construction corresponding to the narrative *tw:f hr šm* is *tw:f hr tm šm*. A comparison of *d'Orbiney*, 4, 9, 4, 10, and 5, 2 is instructive. 'The wife of the elder brother did not pour water (*tw:s hr tm rdjt mw*) on his hands', etc. 'She said to him: "Nobody has talked with me (*bwpw w mdî mdj-j*) except your younger brother.'" This is an answer to a question, a very common case in which *šm:f* is used. Narrative again, 'I did not listen to him' (*tw:j hr tm šm n-j*).

(p) The papyrus uses two expressions, *pr-hnr* and *lpt nsw n pr-hnr*. Their relation and exact meaning are unknown. See *Wb.*, III, 297. The latter expression is followed by *hr šms*, for which Gardiner suggests 'itinerant'.

(q) It seems necessary to translate thus ('he had made', 'he had begun', etc.), though the original uses the same construction (*tw:f (hr) šm*) 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 (o).

(r) I owe the suggestion that *tw:f (hr) hwp:w* be translated as a second relative to Gunn. He proposes to take it as a circumstantial clause (so also Erman, *Neuäg. Gr.*, § 495) and

<sup>1</sup> So Erman rightly in his *Literatur der Aegypter*, 235, 'Amon Ro . . . hat . . . geschickt . . . Ich habe es gefällt', etc., whereas he translates in his *Neuäg. Gr.*, 'Amun sandte . . . ich fällte es', etc.



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 Coptic 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 diffidence in the hope that the point may attract other scholars to further study of Gunn's interesting suggestion and the related problems.

(s) *Wnwf* (here and 4, 18; 5, 7-10), is of course relative form. See the examples Erman, *Neuäg. Gr.*, § 393.

(t) For the construction see Edgerton's article in *AJSL* 48, 29.

(u)  $\text{𓂏𓂐𓂑}$ , doubtless the old  $\text{𓂏𓂐}$ ; see Spiegelberg, *Demotica*, I, 4 ff., and for its identity with the  $\text{𓂏𓂐𓂑}$  of the Old Testament see Stricker's article in *Acta Orientalia* 15, 6. *Ibid.*, p. 20, he quotes a good example from *P. Harris Mag.*, 6, 10. Magical expedients are very prominent in *P. Rollin* and *P. Lee*. The priest of Sakhmet, the doctor, is also a kind of magician.

(v) Literally 'on their place' and similarly ll. 7-10 below.

(w) Apparently he was not quite innocent. For the meaning of  $\text{𓂏𓂐𓂑}$  cf. *d'Orbigny*, 10, 9; *Bol.* 1094, 4, 9.

#### CONCLUSION

Let us now hark 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 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 Ramesses 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 convince 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 Ramesses 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.<sup>1</sup> Thus Ramesses 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 Ramesses 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-rê and Osiris. Both Ramesses III and his son were very religious men, and this reconstruction of the background

<sup>1</sup> Is it by mere chance that a poem on the coronation of Ramesses IV describes with much detail a general amnesty proclaimed on this occasion? The text is to be found in *Rec. Trav.* 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 Ramesses 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 Ramesses 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 Ramesses III himself ordered the composition of the long letter of introduction to the gods of the Netherworld in the short interval<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> While correcting the proofs of this article Černý's discussion of the date of the death of Ramesses III (*ZAS* 72, 109 ff.) came to hand. He proves that Ramesses III died on the 15th 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 Černý 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.