STUDIES IN THE PETITION OF PETEÉSI.

By G. A. WAINWRIGHT.

Peteési's petition forms the subject of Papyrus No. IX of Griffith's Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, III, pp. 60-112, and the references in the following study are to those pages.¹

As it stands the story is most involved and difficult of comprehension. It will, therefore, simplify matters to set out at the beginning the tale which Peteési III is trying to tell us. What appears to be his story is told in the next paragraphs stripped of all the verbiage and irrelevancies, whether mere details or even whole stories, with which it is encumbered to the bewilderment of the reader.

Peteési I had found the derelict temple of Teuzoi, the modern El Hibah on the east bank of the Nile opposite Fashn in Middle Egypt. With the help of his first cousin, another Peteési, the local Governor, he had taken advantage of the new decree of Psametik I, and had reconstituted the temple with its estates, income, personnel, ornaments, etc. He had got himself appointed priest there, and had extorted not only the four stipends belonging to that office, but sixteen more. In this way he had appropriated to himself one-fifth of all the temple revenues, see p. 235, infra. His arrangements worked well for some twenty-seven years from the fourth year of Psametik I, 660 B.C., when the temple was re-established, p. 78.

Then, in the thirty-first year of this king, 633 B.C., the animosity of the priests broke out against Peteési I. They refused to let his agent collect his dues for him and murdered the agent's two sons, who were also Peteési's grandsons, pp. 86, 87. Peteési hurried to Teuzoi from Thebes, whither he had retired, and so arranged things that for some forty-five years more he and his son and grandson after him continued to receive one-fifth.

¹ Capart has published a popular French adaptation of this work entitled Un roman vécu il y a xxv siècles, Brussels, 1914. A page or two of précis is added at the end.
of the temple revenues as before, and the priests dared do nothing, but had to submit to the family's extortions.

Then, about 590 B.C. the priests saw a chance and took it. They persuaded Petëesi II, who then held the prophetship, to represent their temple in Pharaoh's retinue on his expedition to Syria. It was foolish of him to fall into the trap, for the family had by that time lost the local Governorship, and so were no longer protected in high quarters. Moreover, he only held the office by the custom of inheritance, and had never been officially confirmed in it. During his absence the priests went to the new local Governor, who was not a member of the Petëesi family, and pointed out to him his rights as to the prophetship. He immediately dispossessed the holder and installed his own son, pp. 96, 97. Thus, at last the priests had gained their point and had recovered the sixteen shares that had been squeezed from them, for the son had only been given the four shares belonging to the prophetship. This son held the office for the rest of his lifetime and passed it on to his son, p. 101.

Thirty-five years later, about 555 B.C., p. 98, the son of the Petëesi (II) who had lost the prophetship, and who himself had never enjoyed it, had to flee secretly from the priests, when they wanted him to sign away any rights he might still possess, p. 102. Up to this time it seems that the priests had been the aggrieved party, but from now onwards they seem to have become the unprovoked aggressors. Probably by this time there had been so much ill-will and quarrelling between the two parties, that the priests were thankful for any opportunity of injuring the Petëesi family. They were the better able to do this, for they were now definitely in the ascendancy and they evidently hoped utterly to wipe out the memory of their ancient opponents. Anyhow, when the family fled they plundered its house in the town and pulled it down and its temple-place as well; they defaced one of the original tablets recording the founder's benefactions of one hundred years earlier; they tried to deface the

1 As indicated by the different set of names used by his family, Haruoz, Pтаhnυυ, and Nekumosi, instead of Petеёσι and Essemteu; also by his action in dispossessing the Petеёσи family.

2 The original document granting this temple-place will be found on pp. 47-49.
other, but could not because it was of granite; finally, they threw the two statues of the founder into the river, pp. 102, 103. They finally agreed to pay compensation for the damage they had done to the house, which was rebuilt, but the temple-place was left in ruins, p. 105.

The family had now sunk from the height of power and influence to a position of extreme unimportance, and had not enjoyed the office of prophet for seventy-eight years, but still the priests would not leave it alone. In 512 B.C., forty-three years after having driven out the family and destroyed their house and monuments, the priests made another opportunity against them. An important official came to Teuzoi to enquire why his stipend had not been sent as usual. The priests pleaded poverty, and added that, if he wanted to know anything about the reason, he had better apply to Peteēsi III, p. 66. This information Peteēsi dared not give except finally under torture, and then his revelations resulted in the imprisonment of himself and his male relatives. Also, for the sake of decency and impartiality, it resulted in the dismissal and in the imprisonment for a short time of the le-shoni who represented the priests. As soon as the le-shoni had been allowed to escape, his successor, who is likely to have been of the same family, and the priests

1 Peteēsi III began life in exile in no better position than an assistant clerk in the Treasury, p. 103. At the end of his life, back at Teuzoi, he is described as only 'that scribe of the temple' and as being 'not a man (of weight)', p. 66.

2 The cause of this is not given. In note 3 Griffith makes one suggestion. Another, and this seems the more probable to me, might be the sarcasm usual in these cases. It suggests that the victim is not the victim, but the cause, of it all. It puts him into the position of attacker, and gives the other side later on the excuse of taking vengeance on him for his 'attack' on them, as indeed Peteēsi feared and his interlocutor readily appreciated, and as the priests actually did, p. 67. It also implies 'We are so utterly in the right that we are not afraid to recommend you to him, though we know only too well the "lies" the evil-natured rogue will tell about us.' At the same time the priests would controvert each statement as he made it, and overwhelm him with all sorts of counter-accusations. It also saves them from making a statement. To do so would be undesirable, if for no other reason than that something might always slip out, which would be better kept quiet until forced out. See further, pp. 248, 249, infra.

3 Posts are likely to be kept in the one family, and the new man's name, Ienharōū, is the same as that of his predecessor's father. This man may, therefore, have been the new le-shoni's grandfather, so that the new le-shoni may have been nephew to the old one. Anyhow, the new le-shoni takes his predecessor's part very strongly.
broke into the prison and practically murdered the Petëesi prisoners, p. 67. They had intended to do so entirely, but were finally persuaded from going to that extreme. Petëesi III was unconscious for four days, and was under medical treatment for three months. He then escaped by night to Memphis, p. 68, where for seven months friends of the priests prevented his getting an audience, and then prevented his obtaining satisfaction, p. 69. On his way home he heard that the priests had this time burned down his house. On this occasion he got no redress beyond a flogging for the le-shoni and a vague promise that the priests should right him in everything. As might be expected, the last we hear of him is his piteous remark, 'But I was not (truly) righted; (nay) I was taking people to them to cause them to be reconciled to me', p. 70. Such I gather is Petëesi's story.

As a legal document Petëesi III's petition is deplorable, but as a picture of life in a village or small country town 2500 years ago it is beyond price. The majority of it is utterly irrelevant to the purpose for which it was drawn up. This purpose was to obtain redress for the petitioner for damage done to him by the priests in 512 B.C.

He does not merely say, as he should, that they did this and that to me, the reason being that I had been forced into telling of their misdeeds. Instead, he indulges in this immensely long history from its beginning, one hundred and fifty years before. Even this is not enough. He works in, and elaborates in the fullest detail, all sorts of stories which can have no conceivable bearing on the case which is up for judgment, except on some occasions a general blackening of the priests' character. It is a failing that is still all too common in Egypt to-day.

Thus, he finds occasion to mention the murder of Petëesi I's two grandsons. This should have taken no more than a single line of print. But no, he gives the complete story of how Petëesi I had happened to meet the man who was to become his son-in-law, who the man was, and how he promised to establish his identity, how he asked for the hand of Petëesi I's daughter, the discussions that ensued, and the consideration shown by the future father-in-law to the future son-in-law, pp. 82, 83, and how,
finally, the suitor brought his papers establishing his identity, and was at last given his bride, p. 84—all this occupying twenty-five lines of print. Then, when Peteesi I was going to detail the duties of his son-in-law whom he was leaving as his agent, we are told that they spent the day drinking beer at the son-in-law’s house. This occupies three long lines of print to no purpose whatever, and never ought to have been mentioned at all. Then in eleven more long lines of print we are told of the grief of the daughter when she was left behind at Teuzoi with her husband, how she was comforted by her kind father with the gifts of the house and a priesthood, how her father took the rest of the family up to Thebes, and how he settled them there in his ancestral house, p. 84. All this is introductory to the murder of the two grandsons, and in this wilderness of detail the perhaps somewhat less unimportant point that they were ever born gets forgotten. Suddenly we find that some sixteen years later there are two fine boys who were acting as agents for their father, who himself was agent for their grandfather, and that they got murdered, pp. 86, 87.

Then Peteesi III indulges in long glorifications of Peteesi I in his capacity as Government servant: how under him Upper Egypt was exceedingly prosperous, and how he was a man whom Pharaoh delighted to honour, and how he became priest of a large number of gods other than Amun of Teuzoi. This occupies twelve long lines of print on p. 83. Even this did not do justice to Peteesi I’s virtues. On pp. 84-86 we read in forty-four more long lines of print how he had become Pharaoh’s right-hand man, how he got his first cousin once removed appointed as the new Master of the Shipping, how they buried the old one who had just died, how the country prospered under his administration, how Pharaoh wanted to load him with rewards—all of which he magnanimously declined, only desiring the privilege of a well-earned peace in his old age. It is hard to see how any of this has any bearing on the facts that more than one hundred and thirty years later Teuzoi had been ruined, and the priests had had his great-great-grandson, Peteesi III, imprisoned, had nearly murdered him and his family, and had finally burned down his house.
Another of these rambling stories is recorded with infinite detail in the document. The story itself does not even touch on the family affairs, and we should never have heard of it, but for one of its after affects. The priests had given away the prophetship as a payment for services rendered, and the recipient thought it would be well to have the signature of the then head of the Peteesi family. This he refused and fled, and it is only after this that the story comes to concern our case. It was brought about by the priests taking the opportunity of destroying the Peteesi house and practically all evidence of Peteesi I's benefactions to the temple. The facts relevant to Peteesi III's lawsuit occupy fifteen lines of print, pp. 102, 103, whereas the completely irrelevant story leading up to them occupies ninety-four lines of print, pp. 99-102, and ought to have been condensed into a couple of sentences, such as 'A newly appointed prophet needed Essemteu's signature to his title. This Essemteu refused to give, and fled, when the priests etc., etc.' After these gigantic irrelevancies it is bathos to point out a few of such unnecessary details as the following with which the reader's attention is diverted from the essentials of the story. Peteesi says that on arrival at the island they 'moored at its extremity', p. 100. Similarly, we are told that they came 'in two ships', which is quite unnecessary, p. 104, and when Peteesi III wants to tell us that he rebuilt his house he has to say that he 'caused bricks to be moulded', p. 105. The modern petitioner still confuses his hearer with a wealth of such details, each of which has to be kept in mind, because for all he knows it may later on prove to have some bearing on the case.

And so it goes on, wearisomely, unendingly, and all expressed with the utmost diffuseness. Much more prolixity could be pointed out, but it could only weary the reader as much as the writer, and the foregoing are outstanding examples of how the petitioner becomes 'intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity'. The Governor has our sympathy when he said to Peteesi III, 'These events that you are telling are many'—please go away and submit it all in writing, p. 69. Everyone has been plagued in Egypt with these endless stories which have no particular purpose, but are a recitation of all the woes to
which the narrator is a victim, how undeserved they are, and how excellent a person he is. The hope is partly no doubt to create a sympathetic atmosphere. But I think it is more than that, and is the result of the photographic memory which unrolls before the narrator’s mind a picture of the story detail by detail, each one leading on to the next. That is what he sees and knows, and he wants his troubles put right for him. He has never trained himself to see a point in his life, and is utterly incapable of picking out the essentials. That is for the hearer to do. He has been overwhelmed with the whole grievous rambling story concerning people of whom he has never heard and whose names are only too commonly the same, and places, conditions, and things of which he has no knowledge. When at last it comes more or less to an end the trustful finale is wa dilwaqte sa‘ādukt ak ārif kull el hikāyah, wa ārif yafrađ el hakīkah, ‘And now your Excellency knows all the story, and will be able to distinguish the truth’. Unfortunate sa‘ādītuḥ and to give satisfaction the truth must be in favour of the speaker. If the judge has trained himself no better than the petitioner to pick out the essentials of the story, we can imagine the chaos that ensues.

The Governor of course had innumerable other rambling stories of the same sort waiting to be unravelled. We can appreciate the sigh of relief with which he must have welcomed his courtier’s suggestion that as some punishment had been inflicted on the priests, ‘their affair is a failure here: let the Governor dismiss them’, p. 68. It was a similar state of affairs at Corinth which made Gallio take the stronger line, when ‘he drave them from the judgment seat’. True, it was of little use, for it only resulted in the beating of Sosthenes before the judgment seat, but still, ‘Gallio cared for none of those things’ (Acts, xviii, 16, 17), and so he at least was left in comparative peace from an affair which passed comprehension.

Maddening as this long, rambling, mostly irrelevant, story must have been to the judge, it is of the greatest interest to us who are students of life in ancient Egypt. The document is the result of a long feud between the Peteësi family and the priests, and we have to discover for ourselves the original cause, and
even what Petessi III wanted, for he does not make any definite statement about either of them.

It is only parenthetically in his indignation at having been sold that we happen to hear that he wanted the Governor to ‘prevent my ever being driven (?) from my city again’, p. 69. Probably he also vaguely hoped that, if the Governor’s pity were sufficiently moved, he might restore to him the prophetship which the family had originally held. But he leaves the judge, and us, to discover all that for ourselves.

One of the original causes, I think, is self-evident, and another can be dimly seen. In the beginning it seems to me that Petessi I was definitely in the wrong and the priests were the injured party. But by the end the feud had grown to such proportions that the original cause was probably almost forgotten, and the priests had definitely become the aggressors.

The quarrel originated in and revolved round the prophetship of Amûn at Teuzoi, and, to begin with, the amount of stipend the prophet was entitled to. There is plenty of evidence that the priests had no objection to having a prophet of Amûn. After they had got rid of the Petessi family they lived happily under Ptahnuas, p. 97, and for some time under Nekumosi, his son, p. 101, and again for some time under a certain Psammetkmenempe, p. 101, and finally under a man named Pshenah, p. 105, until the Governor, the Persian Satrap (?), himself took the prophetship, p. 65. Their quarrel originated with the restorer of their temple, Petessi I, and here we must note the fact that he and his son and his grandson were taking the fifth part of the temple revenues. It is emphasized on many occasions. On appointing his son-in-law as his agent in Teuzoi Petessi I says, ‘But thou art he that shall perform service to Amûn and his Ennead of deities, and the fifth part of the endowment revenues of Amûn shall be given to thee’, p. 84. What caused the priests to murder Petessi I’s two grandsons was their demand, ‘Let the fifth part be measured’, pp. 86, 87. Again, it is emphasized, ‘And Essentheu (I) son of Petessi dwelt in Teuzoi doing service to Amûn and his Ennead of gods, and the fifth part of the divine endowment of Amûn was given to him’, and it is repeated that he enjoyed this all his life, p. 92. Of his son
also, until the priests got him superseded, it is said, 'and Peteësi son of Essemteu, his son, succeeded him. He performed service to Amûn and his Ennead of gods, and the fifth part of the divine endowment of Amûn was given to him likewise', p. 92.

The priests endured this imposition for twenty-seven years, and then refused to deliver the stipends any longer and murdered his agents, his two grandsons, when they demanded them. They said, 'Shall he still take the fifth of the divine endowment? this outcast (?) of a southerner is in our power (?)', p. 86. Here the reason of the quarrel is clearly stated. It was solely and only over the amount of the revenue that he was taking from the temple.

We are told quite clearly how this fifth part, that the priests objected to, was made up. In re-establishing his position with the priests Peteësi I said, 'I have stipend of (?) four in the name of the share of the prophet of Amûn, and I have besides sixteen stipends in the name of the gods to whom I have been prophet, making in all twenty stipends', p. 90. In reporting his own situation Peteësi III says again, 'The share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi used to (belong to) my father, together with another share of the prophet of sixteen of the gods of Teuzoi, so that they gave him sixteen stipends in their name', p. 69.

When at last the priests were able to supplant the Peteësi family as prophets of Amûn, we find that the arrangement was that for the new incumbent they wrote the title for him to the share of the prophet of Amûn. The priests took the other sixteen shares and divided them between the orders: they amounted to four shares to each order', p. 69, and in repeating the story almost identically the same words are used on p. 97. Yet again the statement as to how these arrangements were working under the new incumbent runs, 'The priests did not give stipend for the sixteen shares which the priests had divided to the orders, . . . and stipend of four was given to Ptañûši (the new prophet) in the name of the share of the prophet of Amûn', p. 98.

1 This was the usual share of the prophet of the chief god of a sanctuary. Peteësi I quotes other cases, saying 'Four stipends is that which is given to the prophet of Hûr, lord of Hnûs, and the prophet of Anûp, lord of Hartai', p. 90.
2 Twenty being the fifth of the hundred stipends into which the temple revenues were clearly divided, as Griffith says, p. 84, n. 4, p. 90, n. 5.
Thus, it was not the four shares, the stipend of the prophet, that the priests were worrying about, but the excessive squeeze by which Peteesi I had taken those extra sixteen shares from them. Now at last, after some seventy years, they had got them back again for themselves, and distributed them to their lawful owners, and the new prophet was reduced to his rightful position of prophet of Amun only and not prophet of Amun and his Ennead of gods. Amun's song might just as well have been directed against Peteesi I as against the priests against whom it was made to apply. Peteesi III got him to sing 'they are as just men in their own hearts: but they have walked with crime in their bosoms. They have oppressed the weak in the presence of the strong.' They have done thine abominations which thou hatest . . . they took thy divine endowment', p. 112. Though Amun's further remark, 'The robber doth not enjoy his robbery, the oppressor (?) doth not prevent a protector', p. 112, did not apply in the case of the robber himself, Peteesi I, it certainly did as regards his descendants. Such well-known maxims as the following apply very forcibly to the Peteesi family, 'the mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small', 'the sins of the fathers shall [be visited] upon the children unto the third and fourth generation'; 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge', or, as Amun seems to have put it, 'the proofs (?) of evil men are in the bellies (?) of their children', p. 110.

By this time there may have been yet another reason which would have made the priests still more anxious to be rid of the Peteesi family. It had now lost the local Governorship, so that the prophet was no longer able to get so much protection for the priests in their shady transactions, and of this they had great

1 Besides taking so much of the temple endowment for himself, Peteesi I had also given his daughter the emoluments of the prophetship of Khonsu as a dowry, p. 84. As Griffith says, presumably her husband performed the duties for her. Her brother, Essemteu I, had also purchased for himself three minor offices in the temple, pp. 44 ff.

2 Still far too common a fault to-day. For instance, there was some question about land between the village and a family whose name meant something like 'oppressor, grinder'. To my reproachful question, 'How did you get so terrible a name?', there came the unblushing reply in the midst of the assembled villagers, 'Because we oppress the poor.'
need. It comes out clearly later on. They had been found out in appropriating double the amount of land they were entitled to. They asked their then prophet, Nekumosi, 'Art thou able to protect us? If not, behold, when we went to a (certain) magnate he said to us, "Write me a title to the share of the prophet of Amûn that I may protect you in every affair of yours".' Nekumosi was not able to protect them, and they immediately took away the prophetship from him and gave it to the man who was, p. 101. By so doing they not only got help, though largely unavailing, in this transaction, but also when they had destroyed the Peteësì house, temple-place, and monuments, pp. 104, 105.

We now have to consider the means by which Peteësì I set up this claim to one-fifth of the temple endowment, and it will be seen that the family had stretched a point in its own favour. As will be seen later on, they had found this derelict temple at Teuzoi and had seen a chance of establishing themselves as beneficiaries there. On hearing about it from his cousin, Peteësì I, the Master of the Shipping in Hnês had said to him, 'Thou knowest the fact that the share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi and his Ennead of deities\(^1\) belongeth unto me, and since thou hast chosen it as a dwelling I will write a title for thee to the share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi and his Ennead of deities. And the Master of the Shipping caused a school-scribe to be fetched, and wrote a title for him to the share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi and his Ennead of deities', p. 82.

It is a clear, straightforward statement, but a study of the rights of the local Governor shows that the Master of the Shipping had overstepped his rights by including 'and his Ennead of deities', that is to say by including those sixteen stipends that were to cause all the trouble. All that he had a right to was 'the share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi'; in other words, the four stipends to which the priests took no exception. This is made abundantly clear in a number of statements, and also the fact that he exercised this right only as representative of Pharaoh, to whom the office belonged in law. Thus, we find that the priests pointed out to the new Governor in Hnês, 'The share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi is a share belonging to

\(^1\) The italics are mine.
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Per‘o’, p. 69. Peteési II also states that ‘This share which Ptaḥ-nūfī hath taken, his father being Master in Hnēs, is Per‘o’s share’, p. 97. Under the Persian kings the Satrap (?), who was filling the position of Pharaoh, secured the prerogatives of Pharaoh to himself. In fact he went one better, and seems to have kept the prophetship for himself instead of presenting it to someone else, p. 65. In the ordinary way Pharaoh did not make the appointments himself in a small temple like that of Teuzoi, but delegated his powers to the local Governor. Thus, the priests said, ‘Doth his Honour know the fact that the share of the prophet of Amūn of Teuzoi is Per‘o’s share, and it belongeth to his Honour?’, p. 96.

Thus, it is clear that the Master of the Shipping in Hnēs had seriously exceeded his rights in claiming the prophetship of the Ennead of deities as well as that of Amūn as part of the patronage which he was entitled to dispense.

Here we can go a step further in understanding the document. The prophetship being in Pharaoh’s own gift he naturally had it in his power to override a gift made by his representative, the local Governor, if he could be induced to prefer some other claimant. This was Peteési II’s hope when he found that the new local Governor had superseded him by his own nominee. Peteési II went up to Court to see Pharaoh, p. 97, hoping of course to get him to appoint him personally. Up to that time he had only held the office by succession, and unlike his father had never got himself appointed officially. The action of the priests and the local Governor shows how precarious was such a position. But Pharaoh was on his death-bed and could do nothing. Peteési then tried the law-courts, but naturally he had no legal, but only customary, standing and so he ‘was worsted in the House of Judgement’, p. 97. He and his relatives then

1 Though when they want to be rid of his grandson they go back on this, and say that they wrote the title when his grandfather ‘was ruler of Hnēs; though it is not a share that belonged to him’, p. 101. As the grandfather was only called the ‘ruler of Hnēs’ possibly his rank was not sufficiently high to confer upon him the right to appoint the prophet on behalf of Pharaoh, but the priests stretched a point in making him believe that he had that right. Something of this sort is also suggested by the way in which the grandson, Nekumosi, gave up his emoluments, when asked, without a struggle. But see further, p. 101, n. 3.
proposed to try bribery, but were persuaded from such a course, p. 98. This was not from any sense of honesty, but merely on
the ground that 'thy adversary in speech is richer than thou. If there be a hundred pieces of silver in thy hand, he will defeat thee', p. 98.

The legal position seems perfectly clear. Like other priestly offices, that of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi was in the gift of Pharaoh himself, though this gift was often bestowed through the local Governor. To what has already been seen may be added the fact that Petêsê I's claim to the prophethship was only valid from the moment he had received his title in writing from the local Governor, p. 103.

However, custom did not always correspond with the law, and families, as would be natural, were in the habit of retaining offices in their possession as long as they were strong enough to keep them. This had evidently always been so. For right back in the early Old Kingdom most of Neferma'at's priesthoods descended to his son Hm-i'wnw. Similarly, in the Twelfth Dynasty Sehetepibire-ankhedjem passed on his high priesthood of Ptah to his son Nebpu, as at the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty Ptahmosy did to his son Pahemneter. Again in the Nineteenth Dynasty Nebunenef had inherited his high priesthood of Hathor at Denderah from his father, and Rameses II confirmed Nebunenef's son in the succession. At Thebes the Pharaohs of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties and

---

1 All through the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties the Pharaohs appointed whom they would to be high priests (first prophets) of Amûn at Thebes. Rameses II even brought Nebunenef from Denderah, where he had been high priest of Hathor, Lefebvre, Histoire des grands prêtres d'Amûn de Karnak, pp. 26, 27 and passim. For Nebunenef see further, pp. 118-122. In those days the Pharaoh's writ ran even to the smaller clergy, for Amenhotep III, having preferred Nebnefer to the high priesthood, proceeded to appoint Huy to the post thus left vacant of 'chief measurer of the granary of the offerings of Amûn', id., op. cit., p. 98. But at Teuzoi in the seventh century B.C. minor offices in the temple were baldly bought and sold, Griffith, op. cit., pp. 44 ff.
2 Junker, Giza, I, p. 151.
3 Boreux, Guide-catalogue sommaire (Louvre), p. 52, A 47.
4 Schiaparelli, Mus. Arch. di Firenze : Antichità Egizie, I (1887), pp. 197-206, No. 1505 (1790). The statue was made for him by his son Pahemneter, p. 200.
5 Boreux, op. cit., p. 55, A 72, and Piehl, Inscc. hiérogl, I, No. xvi B.
6 Lefebvre, op. cit., pp. 120, 248.
Rameses III had at their own pleasure appointed men to the high priesthood of Amûn of Karnak, and these men had sometimes not even belonged to the service of that god. But, as soon as the central power began to weaken under Rameses IV, the high priest Ramesesnekht made the office for the first time a family affair to be transmitted from father to son. When at last the high priests ascended the throne as the Twenty-first Dynasty they made this custom the regular thing. As each became king he appointed his son to the high priesthood. The kings of the Twenty-second Dynasty did likewise. Though after this the office was suppressed, the system was continued in that of the divine adoratrices during the Twenty-third Dynasty, the Ethiopian period, and the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. In these cases the daughter to be adopted by these virgin priestesses was provided by the king. So, at the end the two customs, that of appointment by the sovereign and that of inheritance, were amalgamated through the Pharaoh appointing his own son, or at last his own daughter. The Persian Satrap (?) finding this state of affairs in existence seems to have improved on it by appointing himself, at least at Teuzoi, see p. 235, supra. Returning to Teuzoi we find that the system of inheritance was in vogue there. It will be seen immediately how the Peæesi family had originally claimed the prophetship of Amûn on the strength of its having been held, as they claimed, by their ancestors. They had then managed to keep it till the third generation. Similarly, the next family held it for two generations, Ptañûfi passing it on to his son Nekumosi, pp. 97, 101.

This custom of inheritance constituted some definite claim on the office, even though not a strong one. Essemteu II preferred flight from his town to signing away the family’s claim, p. 102, though it seems strange that he was not prepared to accept a douceur for signing away something that he had never enjoyed. On his appointment to the prophetship Psammetkmenempe was advised that to be perfectly secure in his tenure he needed not only a document from the previous holder resigning his claim to him, but even documents from the earlier holders, the Peæesi

1 Lefebvre, op. cit., pp. 26 and passim.
2 Id., op. cit., p. 177.
3 Id., op. cit., pp. 219, 220.
family, who had not enjoyed it for thirty-five years, p. 102. He had taken legal opinion on his position. That opinion was ‘It is invalidated, because of the fact that these priests will say to thee, ‘Had this share no owner?’ Its owner can come to thee another time and say, ‘It is mine’, and he will be justified against thee’, p. 102. But this view is clearly the standard type of legal opinion, which seeks to guard against even the remotest possibility of trouble, for we have just seen how Peteësi II, relying on such a claim, ‘was worsted in the House of Judgement’, p. 97. On pp. 44-47 we have an example of the kind of document which had been given to Psammetkmenempe, and of which he required Essemteu’s ratification.

It was the custom of inheritance that Peteësi I invoked at the very beginning as the reason why he should be appointed to the prophetship. He said that he was told at the temple, ‘No man was priest here except the priests of Amenra’sentër; but your ancestors were priests here’, p. 80. He immediately went back to Hnês and reported this to his cousin, the local Governor. They then started restoring the fortunes of the temple, and the local Governor exercised his undoubted right, and installed his cousin, Peteësi I.

The custom of the son having a lien on the priesthoods of his father, or at least being given a preference when priests were being appointed, was not confined to the prophetship. Peteësi I claims a number of priesthoods that had been held by his father, and letters of authorization were issued ‘to the temples of which Peteësi son of Ieturoü shall say, “My father was priest in them”, saying, “Let Peteësi be priest in them, if it were fitting”, p. 83.1 In the same way Peteësi I’s son-in-law, Haruoz, proved that his father had been a priest at Teuzoi, and so he was made one also, pp. 83, 84.

In any case the tenure of the prophetship was precarious, for the right of patronage passed from local Governor to local Governor, as one died, or was transferred, or retired. To be secure the title to the prophetship ought really to be renewed to

1 They were priesthoods of Amon-re at Thebes, and elsewhere of Harshèf, of Sobk, of Osiris of Abydos, of Anhûret of Thinis, and of Min. Griffith points out that these were ‘priesthoods’ not ‘prophetships’, but clearly the system was the same.
the holder himself by the new local Governor, or better still by
Pharaoh himself, as Petëësi II hoped for. For the local Governor
had it in his power to appoint his own nominee, and, as we see
in the case of Petëësi II, he did not feel it necessary to wait for
the holder’s death before installing his own man, pp. 96, 97.
Petëësi II’s father, Essemeëu I, had taken the precaution of
having his tenure renewed when his father had handed on the
prophetship to him, p. 92.

But no doubt as long as a prophet’s family held the local
Governorship he was quite safe. The danger came when the
family lost the local Governorship, for the new family would
want as many lucrative posts as it could get. The art is to get as
many of your own protégés as possible into key positions, then
the holders of the high offices of state are all interlocked and play
into each other’s hands; mutshabakin ma’ ba’dhum, ‘all netted
together’, is the modern phrase for this state of affairs. In
Psametik I’s reign the Petëësi family had secured the positions of
Master of the Shipping, and under him the inspectorship of all
Upper Egypt, and also the prophetship of Amûn at Teuzoi.
Petëësi I had also made his children priests of Amûn of Teuzoi,
p. 81 and n. 8, including his daughter, p. 84, and his son,
Essemeëu I, had bought for himself three minor offices in the
temple, pp. 44-47. The office of the Master of the Shipping was
retained by the son of the first holder, and he also extended his
protection to the holder of the prophetship. In due time the
prophetship was assumed by the son of the first holder, and then
by the grandson, p. 92. But by this time the Petëësi family
had lost the local Governorship, and the loss of the prophetship
was not long delayed. As we have seen, Petëësi II was supplanted
by Ptahnuši, son of the new local Governor.

We have seen what the law was, and that it was the custom
of families to keep possession of the prophetship as long as possible.
But there was evidently yet another custom which came into
play in the appointment to priestly offices. The priests them-

1 Though a powerful king like Amenhotep III did not ask whether an
appointment would be fitting or not, but merely issued his instructions to the conclave
of priests, and they had to instal his nominee, Breasted, Anc. Rec., II, §§ 929-
931. No doubt as the central authority weakened the priests’ wishes came to
acceptability of a candidate. This appears in the letters of
authorization which were issued to the temples by Pharaoh for
Peteēsī I to be appointed to various other priesthoods that his
father had held before him. The wording ran, 'Let Peteēsī be
priest in them, if it were fitting', p. 83. Consonant with this is
the action of the priests at Teuzoi when they themselves gave
away five stipends, p. 68. Much the same evidently held good
for the appointment of the prophet at Teuzoi, for when the
local Governor appointed his son, Ptahēnūfī, the appointee had to
come to Teuzoi for the priests to write him his title, p. 97.¹

This desirability of getting the priests' approval of an ap-
pointment probably goes far to account for their ability towards
the end of the story to write the share of the prophet to anyone
they pleased. Moreover, the curious variation in the titles of the
Governors ² towards the end suggests that by that time there
may have been no one of sufficient standing to exercise the pre-
rogative of patronage in Pharaoh's name. It seems that the priests
then appointed and dismissed prophets just as it suited their
own convenience, without any reference to the local Governor or
to Pharaoh. Thus, when they wanted to be rid of Nekumosi
they told him, 'For thou knowest the fact that we were they who
wrote thy father Ptahēnūfī son of Harouz a title to the share of
the prophet of Amūn', p. 101. Then the priests 'wrote a title
to the share of the prophet of Amūn to Psammetkmenempe',
p. 101. Later on, when they were tired of this prophet, or
perhaps at his death, 'They (the priests) went to Pshenah . . .
and wrote him the title to the share of the prophet of Amūn of
Teuzoi', p. 105. After that the Satrap seems to have been
appointed himself, p. 65.

¹ For a description of the ceremony under Amenhotep III, see Breasted,

² They are no longer called the Master of the Shipping, but 'a priest of
Sobk, who was ruler of Hnēs ', p. 96, also called 'master in Hnēs ', p. 97. The
expression 'ruler in Hnēs ' is applied to Peteēsī son of Leturoī, p. 96, which must
be intended for his cousin Peteēsī son of 'Ankhsheshonk, who was Master of the
Shipping. The title 'ruler in Hnēs ' or 'of Hnēs ' thus refers to the local Gover-
nor. Later there was a 'prince of Hnēs ', p. 104. The last man in authority
there of whom we hear is called 'the (Sheikh) of Hnēs ', p. 104.
Teuzoi was founded in the Twenty-first Dynasty by Menkheperre’ and Istemkheb, c. 1074-1025 B.C. In the Twenty-second Dynasty Sheshonk I, 952-930 B.C., and Osorkon I, 930-894 B.C., had embellished the temple.¹ Some time afterwards had come the three generations of utter confusion under the princelings, then the Ethiopian Dominion, and, finally, the Assyrian invasions ending in the sack of Thebes and the governance of the country by princes subject to Assyria.

In these disorganized times the various rulers had turned for their finances to the vast resources of the temples. Hitherto of course these, including the accumulated riches, their incomes, their lands, and their serfs and other personnel, had been exempt from any claims whatever by the Crown. We are told that 'the manner in which this town hath been destroyed' was that 'When that evil time came the great fanes of Kêmi were made to pay taxes, and this town was burdened with heavy taxes: the people could not pay the taxes with which they were burdened, and they departed away. And behold, though discharge hath been made unto the great fanes of Kêmi, they come to us, saying, "Produce (your) taxes until now', p. 80. Thus, the taxation of the temple is said to have been the cause of the depopulation of the town and the emptying of the temple of its priests except one aged one and a (shrine)-opener, p. 79.

At first the connexion is not easy to see. The sending away to Pharaoh out of the town of a proportion of its income could not have impoverished the place, for much income was regularly sent away each year to absentee beneficiaries, pp. 65, 68, 86, 101, 105.² The mere fact that the absentee it went to was Pharaoh and not someone who held an office in the temple could have made no difference. The explanation must be sought elsewhere, and no doubt is as follows:

When the tax-gatherers came to the temple, we may be sure the priests refused to deliver up a single handful of corn from their income. The tax-gatherers had to get their taxes, and so they had to go to the source whence the temple drew its income

¹ Pp. 40, 42. For a study of the reasons for founding the city see Wainwright, Ann. Serv., XXVII, pp. 78-93, 103, 104.
² As indeed was done by other temples, pp. 78, 83.
—the fellaheen who cultivated its fields. From them, no doubt, they extorted what was necessary, but in the meanwhile the temple would not recognize this and would not abate one fraction of its rents. We may be sure that it extracted them to the uttermost farthing.\(^1\) So, although the old priest makes a sad tale about the heavy taxation of the temples, yet in the beginning it was not the temple that suffered but only the patient oxen, its serfs, the fellaheen as usual. But these double charges meant that there was not enough left for the fellaheen to live on, and so they did the only thing possible to them, and 'they departed away'.\(^2\) This would have gone on progressively, until at last there would have been no one left to till the fields whence came the priests' income. Thus, it would have been the priests themselves who had ruined their own temple, town, and estates.

Then came the reorganization of the country by Psametik I about 660 B.C., and the country's prosperity increased by leaps and bounds, pp. 78, 79. This enabled him once more to relieve the temples—in actuality no doubt the fellaheen—of taxation, p. 80. But of course it is impossible to carry on for long the affairs of a country of which a great proportion of the land and...

\(^1\) From the hundred years between the end of the Nineteenth Dynasty and that of the Twentieth we have several life-like descriptions of the difficulties under which the fields were tilled and of the manner in which the taxes were extracted at that time (Anast. V, 15, 6-17, 1; Sall. I, 6, 1; Cardiner, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies* (Bibl. Aeg., VII), pp. 64, 65; and Erman, *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (trans. Blackman), p. 193; Blackman and Peet, 'Papyrus Lansing: A Translation with Notes', in *JEA, XI*, pp. 289, 290). This was not a period of advancing, but of declining, prosperity. Hence one fears that the official's boast at Bilgai is evidence of brutal extortion rather than of good administration. He claims to have produced ten times the amount of the taxation for which his district was assessed, Cardiner in *ZAS, L*, pp. 51, 52. No doubt he gained much credit thereby, and no questions were asked. In Roman times the extortion of the fantastic taxes was evidently just as brutal, Lewis in *JEA, XXIII*, pp. 63-75. In the nineteenth century A.D. the methods of tax-collecting were the same as those of the Twentieth Dynasty and worse, Wainwright, in *JEA, XXIV*, pp. 63, 64. Even the throwing of the tax-payer into the canal survived till recently. In one of the Memphis villages the present writer knew a charming old man who had employed this means of persuasion. But by his time conditions had somewhat ameliorated and he had been unfortunate enough to lose his position of *Omdah*, because two of his victims had been so inconsiderate as to drown in the operation.

\(^2\) In Roman times this flight had reached vast proportions, Lewis, *loc. cit.*, and it had done so again in the nineteenth century A.D., Wainwright, *loc. cit.*
its inhabitants is exempt from any taxation or duty to the State.\(^1\)

About a hundred years later the Demotic Chronicle of Paris tells us that Amasis had found it necessary to re-impose the taxation of the temples, and then in his third year Darius confirmed Amasis’ arrangements.\(^2\) The priests had evidently learned

\(^1\) Using the figures of the Great Harris Papyrus and of the Census for 1902, Breasted computes that the temples in the Twentieth Dynasty probably owned over 15 per cent. of the land, Anc. Rec., IV, § 167. On the other hand, with a clearer understanding of the meaning of the figures, Schaedel, Die Listen des grossen Papyrus Harris, p. 57, calculates that at this time 30 per cent. of the land and 15 to 20 per cent. of the population was attached to the temples. He reckons on the population then being about eight or nine millions. This seems excessive, for in the first century B.C. Diodorus, I, 31, 6, puts the number at seven millions, and a century later Agrippa says that the poll-tax figures showed it to be seven and a half millions, excluding Alexandria, Josephus, Jewish War, II, 16, 4, § 385. After a detailed study Wachsmuth concludes that this was probably about right, ‘Die Ziffern der Bevölkerung Ägyptens’, in Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, III, pp. 272-280. The population has varied greatly. After the centuries of Mameluke and Turkish chaos an estimate of two and a half millions was made under Muhammad Aly in the early nineteenth century, E. W. Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians (1871), I, pp. 26 ff. Another estimate made in 1861 gave a total of nearly four millions, Schnepf in Mémoires de l’Institut égyptien, I (1862), p. 531. Since then the population has increased by leaps and bounds, until it is now something just under fifteen millions. The belief that the temples owned one-third of the land is stated twice by Diodorus, I, 21, 7; 73, 2. There would be nothing improbable in such figures, for in England the monasteries are believed to have got hold of this proportion of the land by the time of their suppression, cf. Cambridge Modern History, II, p. 467. As is well known, the Church until then had formed an imperium in imperio. The system of exemption from duty to the State was still in force in Egypt in the nineteenth century A.D., when the great landowners kept their tenants at home, thus causing the whole burden of the corvéé to fall on the rest of the population. Willcocks, Egyptian Irrigation, pp. 273, 279, 281, cf. pp. 285, 287, 288; A. Colvin, The Making of Modern Egypt, pp. 163, 164.

\(^2\) Spiegelberg, Die sogenannte demotische Chronik, pp. 30-33. Three temples, those of Memphis, Hermopolis Parva (?), and Babylon (?) were exempted. Reich discusses some features of the papyrus, though not the question of taxation, in Mizraim, I, pp. 178-185. It should be noted that Darius did not decree that the tax-gatherers should take anything from the temples year by year. The terms of his decree saved much trouble, for they were simply that certain classes of income should no longer be paid to the temples but to the State. Hence, the diminished income which the temples still received would have continued free of State taxation. The legal position continued to be what it had been before, and what, four hundred and fifty years later, Diodorus, I, 73, 5, says it was in his time, i.e. that the temples paid no taxes, cf. also Hdt., II, 168. But the state of affairs at Teuzoi was evidently different from this.
nothing, and allowed the previous disaster to develop once again. By the ninth year of Darius, 512 B.C., the Teuzoi temple was bankrupt again and there was no stipend for one of the officials, and 'though it is (now) Pamenhotp, there is no corn (?) in the granary of Amûn, there is no silver in the chest of the temple. To seek (a loan of) silver (?) at interest to give to the khôrê of the . . . is the thing which we shall do from now (onward)', and the town was ruined, pp. 65, 66.

Once again it is quite evident that the paying away of part of their income to the absentee Pharaoh, instead of to an absentee priestly beneficiary, could not have ruined the temple and the town. It was that the priests, not being willing to forgo anything of their rents from their tenants or forgo anything of their income to the State, had merely caused a double payment to be made by the fellaheen. Thus, in due time they had again killed the goose that laid the golden eggs, and no doubt the fellaheen had once more 'departed away'.

Yet, needless to say, none of this deterred the priests from turning the situation to account in their feud against the Petêesi family, and claiming that it was they who had ruined the town. It is of course in no way evident how a poor old man of no position, p. 66, a mere scribe in the temple, p. 66, could do so much damage, nor does Petêesi's petition suggest that he had had anything to do with it.

One would like to know what it was that Petêesi III divulged in that other document that he was forced to write at Hnês. He says that in it 'I wrote every thing that was done to ruin Teuzoi', p. 66. Unfortunately it has not come down to us, but it must have shown something very like the above suggestions, and have shown up the priests for rogues, or rather for selfish, obstinate fools. For Petêesi III was too frightened of the priests to tell it, and on reading the statement his interrogator replied, 'I have learnt the fact that it is thou that wast correct (?) in (?) saying "If I tell thee the things that happen unto [it (Teuzoi ?)], these priests will slay me"',¹ as indeed, when they heard of it, they intended to do and practically did do, and not only him but all the other men of his family as well, p. 67.

¹ The quotation is Griffith's improvement of his original translation written into his own copy.
The outstanding feature of the story is the latent enmity of the priests which breaks out at any opportunity over a period of one hundred and fifty years. Though no doubt the origin of the priests' enmity was the exorbitant squeeze of the sixteen stipends which has been discussed above, there was yet another original cause which will be discussed below. But neither of these was the direct reason of each of the outbreaks. For instance, the cause of their final attack on the family when they burned down its house is fairly clear; it was no doubt the flogging that the priests got for ignoring four of the Governor's summonses. Though it was entirely their own fault, their attitude would have been, 'Ah-h-h Petēēsi ibn el kelb, son of the dog! Look what he has done to us! We must pay him back for this.' The line of argument that produces this result is that if Petēēsi had not gone and complained to the Governor, we should not have been sent for, and we should not have got flogged. To the argument, 'But of course he complained, for you had almost killed him and his', they would have replied, 'But we only did that because he had attacked us in the statement he wrote at Hnēs', although it was they who had made him do it, cf. p. 239, n. 1 supra, and p. 251 infra. Once a family feud has been started in Egypt it may last indefinitely, and flare out on any pretext, and before long all connexion with the original cause is lost. There is the famous one to-day in Mudiriyet Kena between two villages, whose names I can no longer remember. It has lasted for one hundred and fifty years in spite of the efforts of various mudirs and others at reconciliation. After periods of quiescence it breaks out now and again just like the Petēēsi feud.

From the document before us, this second cause of the origin of the feud can be clearly seen, if we carefully study the details and do not allow ourselves to be led astray by Petēēsi III's tale of woe. In this way I think we shall find there was a flaw in the claim of the Petēēsi family to the prophetship.

We have already seen the way in which Petēēsi I had wrung from the temple twenty stipends instead of the legitimate four, pp. 235, 236, 237 supra. We now come to consider what appears to be a weakness in his claim to the prophetship. Petēēsi I
himself seems to have been aware of this flaw, p. 91. It is noteworthy that neither Peteësi I himself nor his cousin the local Governor seem in the beginning to have known anything about their family’s claim to that office. Peteësi I had to hear of it from the aged priest who with a shrine-opener was the only man left in the deserted temple at the time of the reorganization of the country under Psametik I, p. 80. Peteësi immediately went over to the local Governor and told him all about it. A point of importance here may lie in the variation with which Peteësi I reports the story. The old priest is supposed to have said, ‘No man was priest here except the priests of Amenra’sentër; but your ancestors were priests here.’ But Peteësi I simply reports it as ‘No man was priest here except the priests of Amenra’sentër’, omitting all reference to the family. His cousin the local Governor, delving in his memory, replies to the effect, ‘Oh, yes! I have heard of that before’, and then begins to take action to re-establish the temple revenues, p. 80. But his enquiries from the priests do not touch upon the question of whether his family really had held the office there in earlier days.

This slight discrepancy may indicate the chance which Peteësi I saw. It is true that his family belonged to Thebes, and that his ancestors had been, and his relatives still were, priests of some sort of Amenra’sentër at Thebes, pp. 78, 97. It looks, therefore, as if the family had stretched a point in their own favour by taking it for granted that the Theban family of priests who had officiated at Teuzoi must have been their own. Anyhow, with the high positions the two cousins held they were able to make good their claim, fictitious or not. Consonant with such an idea is the undue haste with which Peteësi I set up the granite stela recording the family’s benefactions to the temple of Teuzoi. He did not even wait until he had been appointed prophet, pp. 81, 82, 91, and some hundred and five years later the priests used this fact to the detriment of his great-grandson, and of the family’s claim on the prophetship, p. 103.

The papyrus is an ex parte statement showing up the crimes of the priests during one hundred and fifty years. What it does not intentionally show is that the Peteësi family had given any
cause for the enmity they incurred. We have to find out that for ourselves. In fact Petéesi III leads us very much astray with his tale of woe. To begin with he makes out his ancestor Petéesi I to have been a paragon of virtue, but we have already seen, and shall see more, reason to believe that he was anything but that. When Petéesi I retired from official life, Petéesi III says that Pharaoh offered him various rewards, all of which he refused. Pharaoh is said to have asked whether he had not a son he would like to succeed him, and though he had at least three sons he declined to advance them. Pharaoh is supposed to have asked whether there was any property he would like, but no, he already has everything he could wish for, p. 86. While his having no need of any more property may be credible, his refusal of his chance to keep the inspectorship of Upper Egypt in the family certainly is not. Especially is this so since it is claimed that he had got his young first cousin once removed appointed to succeed as local Governor, p. 85. The way in which we are led astray by the document comes out clearly in the remark of Petéesi I’s son-in-law when he called the priests ‘rascals’, p. 86. This was before they had made any trouble, and, if it had any basis in fact, was probably due to objections they had already raised to paying away those extra sixteen stipends.

Anyhow, these rascals of priests made no trouble for another twelve years. Then after this lapse of time they refused to send Petéesi I his fifth part of the temple revenues, and murdered his two grandsons who came to collect it for him, pp. 86, 87. For this outrage Petéesi had to come all the way from Thebes to Teuzoi, where he was only able to capture and take off to be punished by Pharaoh two aged priests, p. 87. Yet he sent round the neighbouring nomes whither the rest had fled with their families, and had them brought back, pp. 88-90. As they were, not unnaturally, afraid to come right back to Teuzoi and completely within his grasp, he went to Hartai to forgive them and to persuade them to come back. To this end he swore to them

1 P. 81, n. 8. This was in Psametik I’s nineteenth year, and it might be that they were hardly grown up at the time, though two years later they were all serving as priests in the temple, pp. 45, 47. In any case there must have been young nephews and cousins available.
on oath, ‘I will not cause a thing to be done unto you on account of a thing that is past’, p. 90. He re-instated them all with a threat or two, expressing his realization of the fact that sooner or later they would rob his family successfully, p. 91, or in reality would be successful in getting back for themselves what he had robbed them of. Then he went back to Thebes where he was living and left them all to their own devices. It becomes evident that Peteëši I was not the self-sacrificing kindly old man his descendant, Peteëši III, would have us believe. He was on the contrary a very unpleasant character. He secured for himself five times as much revenue as he had a right to, and was quite ready to overlook the murder of his two grandsons, provided that he got back his full income. No doubt he was able to use the priests’ ‘mistake’ with regard to his grandsons as a threat to ensure their compliance with the re-imposition of his exactions. The probable flaw in his title may have had something to do with his contenting himself with securing the various stipends and saying little about the rest. Also of course he would have been anxious to get the temple going once more so that it would produce the necessary income.

Though the priests had objected very strongly to being robbed themselves, they had no compunction in robbing others as soon as they got their chance. Seventy-eight years later it is found that they had taken possession of the whole nine hundred and twenty-nine aruras of an island, in which only four hundred and eighty-four aruras rightfully belonged to them. They had, moreover, secured another one hundred and twenty aruras as well, pp. 99, 100. They rushed off to Court, and with the gift of the prophetship they paid a man to defend them before Pharaoh, but to Pharaoh’s credit they lost their case, p. 102. It is all the sort of thing that the Unmerciful Servant would have done, Matt. xviii, 23-35.

We are now able to estimate at its true value, and see for the sickening hypocrisy it was, the well-sounding sentiments exchanged between the two cousins, Semtutefnakhti the local ruler and Peteëši I the prophet of Amûn. Discussing the

¹ Though of course this may be his great-great-grandson, Peteëši III the petitioner, emphasizing the course that events proved to have taken.
priests and their crimes, Semtutefnakhti sympathizes with his afflicted (?) cousin saying, 'I have heard the things that have been done unto thee by these outcasts (?) of evil men, scum (?) of men of Teuzoi, whom thou didst make rich ', but does not mention the fact that Peteesi I had enriched himself very greatly at the expense of these same evil men and scum. Naturally nothing is said about this, for both of them are polite people, and it would be very rude to bring up ugly facts like that, even though it might help towards peace and even justice. Peteesi I, full of righteous indignation and self-pity, replies, 'Hath not the detector of crime (?) heard that he who nurtures the wolf (?) shall die by it ?', p. 87. He would have come nearer the mark if he had said something to the effect that ' he who pinches the wolf shall die by it '. The character of the conversation appears again in Semtutefnakhti's remark, ' Thy love that thou hadst to Teuzoi it hath not yet ceased '. But Peteesi was going to get back his income. Yet nothing is said of that. It is on the contrary all put down to his uncrushable goodness and affection for a graceless town, p. 88. Again on p. 91, when forgiving the priests and insisting on the payment of all his stipends, Peteesi keeps up the role of righteous man who had magnified Amûn.

Another case of this politeness is to be found in the other Semtutefnakhti's behaviour after he had taken a bribe to forsake his client, Peteesi III, in favour of the priests. Externally he showed no sign of his change of patronage. But, confusing two issues, he hinted to the Governor that the priests had received some punishment and now they had better be dismissed, p. 68. But in the evening of the same day he still took Peteesi to plead before the Governor, and next day gave him a sheet of papyrus and let him write out the whole long story. Then he told Peteesi that he did not think it would be much use for him to bother the Governor further, as he had already dismissed the priests, and would hardly be likely to fetch them back again, p. 69. However, what he omitted to say was that it was he himself who had persuaded the Governor to dismiss them. Peteesi was left to sense that in due time. Semtutefnakhti was still very urbane, and comforted him saying that he would write the priests a polite letter himself, and would get another man to
write a similar letter, and that these would be more effectual than any orders from the Governor. When the horrid truth began to dawn on poor Peteæsi, he broke down entirely, but he realized that he would have to make the best of what he could get, p. 70.

The upshot of it all proved to be that Semtutefnakhtti had profited by a big bribe from the priests, and no doubt fees from Peteæsi. Moreover, everything would go on exactly as before, except that the priests were even more enraged against Peteæsi than they had been hitherto. The East overlooks the crookedness of this sort of thing and the utter demoralization it brings about, so long as it is covered over by an external suavity of manner. The one thing it cannot stand is any sort of abruptness.

It is extraordinary how steep could be the fall of a family. At the beginning, while the family held the local Governorship, we find Peteæsi I a very important man, favourite of Pharaoh, inspector of all Upper Egypt, reconstituting a temple, and extracting a large income from it, pp. 78, 79, 85, 86. His son and grandson succeeded him at the temple. But by that time the family had lost the local Governorship, there was no one to protect it, and Peteæsi's grandson was cast out of his office. After this the family became so unimportant that it could no longer stand before the other faction. The son of the man who had been cast out had to flee the town, p. 102, and in his exile the best he could do for his own son, Peteæsi III, was to get him taken on as an assistant clerk in the Treasury, p. 103. At the end of his life this Peteæsi III was described as nothing more than 'that scribe of the temple' which used to pay out one-fifth of its income to his ancestors. He was also told by a Government official ' [Thou wilt] be [made to tell it] unto me, for thou art not a man (of weight) ', p. 66.

Thus we see a family drop from the height of power and importance to a condition of mere nobodies, and it may always be that they had risen originally from that estate. Oriental history is full of such cases, and so are the stories in the Arabian Nights, which reflect true conditions. Thus, it was extremely interesting to see how my little carpenter in Shubra was quite happy sitting on the kerbstone gossiping endlessly with my own
servant and the others in the neighbourhood. On one occasion when my own man had to go into hospital the carpenter was glad to help by acting as servant to me for a few days. Yet, by origin he was what answered to a gentleman; Government school education, followed by a commission in the Egyptian Army. Thence he had been cashiered, for, having been reprimanded by his commanding officer one day on parade, he had replied with heat.

The appalling uncertainty of life comes out very clearly in a number of cases. Semtutefnakhti had supported Peteësi III for seven months, and had almost succeeded in winning his case for him. Yet at the end he accepted a bribe from the priests and deserted him, and ruined his whole case for him, pp. 68-70. Although the decree had gone forth that the temples were no longer to be taxed, yet the Government officials continued to collect these taxes. Had they ceased to provide that amount of taxes until someone prevented them, they would no doubt have been in trouble with their own superiors. It is always as well to have some surplus money in hand. As it was, they got a severe flogging from the man who happened to have become interested in the temple for private family reasons, and therefore implemented the new law, p. 80.1 After murdering Peteësi I's two grandsons the priests with their families, and apparently everyone else, had fled from Teuzoi, p. 90. Peteësi could only find two aged priests and one shrine-opener. It is highly improbable that they had had anything to do with the murder, owing both to their age and to the fact that they risked stopping on in the town. Nevertheless, Peteësi had them seized, taken off to Pharaoh, and punished, p. 87. The Master of the Shipping obliged his cousin, Peteësi I, by giving him a veritable lettre de cachet. On Peteësi putting his agent under his protection the Master of the Shipping said to him that any man who was obnoxious to him 'let him be brought to me that I may cause him to die in the prison in Hnês', p. 88. Again, the youths had murdered Peteësi's grandsons on instructions from the priests. Yet when it came to the point the priests made no attempt to

1 It would be interesting to know how energetic he had been in the affairs of the other great temples in his jurisdiction.
protect them, but in order to save themselves calmly offered to deliver them up to Petēnī, saying, 'These youths who left the path, let his Honour cause them to be brought, let them be cast into a furnace', p. 91. Petēnī I had extorted too much from the priests, and they lay in wait for the family for three generations until at last their chance came in the time of his grandson, p. 96. They persuaded Petēnī II to go abroad on an official mission with Pharaoh, and on his return he found that they had got him deprived of his office and that his successor was already installed, p. 97.

Such being the condition of affairs, it is not surprising that the country was very unsettled. Owing to the weight of the taxes the people had 'departed away' from Teuzoi and left the place deserted in the eighth century B.C., p. 80. By the end of the sixth century B.C. the bankruptcy of the temple, pp. 65, 66, suggests that the same situation was materializing again. Anyhow, it is exactly what happened in Ptolemaic and Roman times, and again in the nineteenth century A.D., and no doubt at other periods of misrule also.1 After having murdered Petēnī I's two grandsons the priests fled from Teuzoi apparently accompanied by all the inhabitants, p. 87. They had scattered throughout the nomes of Pemze and Hartai, and even as far away as Khmūn (Hermopolis), pp. 88-90. Similarly, three generations later the whole Petēnī family fled to Khmūn and lived there, when it no longer dared to stay in Teuzoi, p. 102. Then, after having destroyed the Petēnī house and temple-place, the leader of the riot thought it best to make himself scarce. He, therefore, went off to Buto at the northern fringe of the Delta, p. 104.

Besides all this it is extraordinary how much travelling was done up and down the country by private people apart from official inspectors and messengers. Petēnī I came from the capital to Teuzoi and thence went to Thebes, p. 86. Haruoz went up to Thebes, and Petēnī I and his family all came back to Teuzoi, and thence Petēnī went to the capital (Memphis or Sais), and thence back again to Hnēs, p. 87, and then on to Teuzoi, p. 88. Finally, he went all the way back to Thebes. Petēnī II went down to the capital from Teuzoi, and then up to

1 Lewis in JEA, XXIII, pp. 63-75; Wainwright in Id., XXIV, pp. 63, 64.
Thebes, p. 97, and back again to Teuzoi, p. 98. The priests went off to Memphis, p. 100, and Nekumosi happened to be there also, p. 101. Khelkhons' brother came to Teuzoi (from Buto (?), p. 104), p. 102. Peteessi III went from Memphis to Hnês, crossed to Teuzoi, and back again to Hnês, p. 104. Then he went up to Khmûn and brought his family back to Teuzoi, p. 105. He went down to Memphis, p. 68, and back, p. 70. He was met by other travellers going north and turned back to Memphis, a messenger was sent to bring the accused to Memphis, and then both he and Peteessi II went back to Teuzoi, p. 70. As for running backwards and forwards between Teuzoi and Hnês, the capital of the nome, no one seemed to think anything of that, although Hnês is a long way north of Teuzoi and a long way back from the Nile.

The excuse is delightful that the le-shoni gave for decamping when orders were sent to arrest the men who had destroyed the house and temple-place. He went all the way to Buto in the northern Delta, not to escape justice be it observed, but to mourn for the father of the man whom the priests had set up as prophet, p. 104, cf. p. 102. It is even flimsier than the proverbial funeral of his grandmother that the office-boy has to attend when he wants to go to a football match.

In Peteessi's petition we see pluralism and absenteeism still rampant. Peteessi I got his stipends for twenty-seven years though living at Thebes, p. 86, and no doubt he duly got them from his other priesthoods which were scattered throughout the country, p. 83. His cousin, the Master of the Shipping, held priesthoods in several different towns, p. 78. It is not clear whether Ptañûpi and his son Nekumosi came to live at Teuzoi when they filled the office of prophet, but it was at Memphis that the priests found Nekumosi, p. 101. Psammetkmenempe, the new prophet, did not come to Teuzoi, 'but what he did was to send men to fetch his property' for twenty-nine years, p. 105. He was probably living at Buto, p. 100, cf. p. 104, or of course possibly at the capital, Memphis. Though his brother, Khelkhons, was 'priest of Hôr in Puto', yet he was Pharaoh's favourite at Court, p. 100. At the end of the story Ahmosi was an absentee, for he had to come to Teuzoi from the
Upper Country to know what had happened to his stipend, p. 65.

The way in which high officials held priesthoods all over the country had always been one of the remarkable things about Egypt. They must have been absentee's from most of them, and one presumes that the temple services were conducted by vicars. Certainly this is what happened at Teuzoi, where Peteeisi I appointed his son-in-law, Haruoz, as his vicar to 'perform service to Amun and his Ennead of deities' and to collect his stipends for him when he went to live at Thebes, p. 84. As he was living there Peteeisi I was also an absentee from all his other priesthoods except that of Amon-re' at Thebes. The others whose duties he could not have carried out personally were priesthoods of Harshefi no doubt at Hnês-Heracleopolis, of Sobk in the Fayyum, of Osiris at Abydos, of Anhûr at Thinis, and of Min no doubt either at Akhmim or Koptos, p. 83. Similarly, Peteeisi's cousin, the Master of the Shipping, was priest of Amûn and priest of Sobk. His other priesthood was that of Harshefi, but as that would have been at Hnês, where he was living, he could have carried out the duties in person when he was not travelling up and down the country, p. 78. At the other end of Egyptian history, in Snefru's reign, Neferma'at is as good an example of this pluralism and absenteeism as any. He evidently lived somewhere near Meydûm, where he was buried. Yet he was priest of Bastet, presumably at Bubastis; priest of the Ram of Mendes; high priest of Thoth at Hermopolis, or perhaps as Junker supposes at Heliopolis; high priest of Min at Koptos; priest of Šsmsmt, whose sanctuary was with little doubt at Saft el-Henneh, not far from Bubastis.

In Egypt things go on satisfactorily until it occurs to someone that he can benefit himself by upsetting them. Peteeisi's story shows that the stipends were safely delivered to such absentee's, however far away they lived, so long as they were powerful enough for it to be too dangerous for anyone to stop them. No doubt Neferma'at got his safely, for he was 'eldest son of the king', as would his son Hm-’iwnw probably.

1 Junker, Giza, I, p. 149, no. 15. 2 Petrie, Medum, Pls. xvi, xx, xxi. 3 Newberry, in Griffith Studies, pp. 319, 322. 4 Petrie, Medum, Pl. xvi.
Drunkenness seems to have been terribly common in ancient Egypt, and that is a thing that Islam has entirely stamped out. "Peteësi spent the day in drinking beer with his women and children and with Haruoz son of Peftu‘ubasti '*, p. 84. Later on at ‘the festival of Pshoüi, every one that was in Teuzoi was drinking beer, and the warders who were guarding us drank beer and went to sleep. (Then) Zeubestef‘onkh son of Ienharoü (i.e. one of the prisoners) departed. (When) the warders awoke they found not Zeubestef‘onkh, and the warders who were guarding us departed ', p. 67. Griffith rightly recalls the similar stories of the drunkenness of the guards in the stories of Rhampsinitus and of Phanes. He might have added that of the guards in Diodorus", I, 57, version of the Sesostris story. Tethmosy III tells us at the end of his fifth campaign that it had been so profitable that ‘the army of his majesty was drunk and anointed with oil every day as at a feast in Egypt '. An illuminating bit of information as to conditions at festivals ! Elsewhere, in the Twentieth Dynasty, one of the pleasures of a fine house is said to be that ‘one is drunken in its courts '. The evil results of drunkenness are reprobated in the Nineteenth Dynasty, and Erman and Ranke have collected a great deal of information on this subject in their Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Altertum, pp. 288, 289.

Peteësi’s story shows that the ill-nature which is still so terribly widespread in the country is no new thing. In this case a Government official had a grudge against another man. He went round the nomes enquiring whether this other man had not some property there, through which damage could be done to him. He knew, of course, very well that sooner or later he would find some questionable transaction, which it would give him the greatest pleasure to drag out to the light. He found one at Teuzoi. The official was quite open about his malevolence. At Teuzoi he found a man who was quite willing to help him, and said, ‘There is no s'anakh belonging to (?) Harmakher son

1 Breasted, Anc. Rec., II, § 462.
3 Gardiner, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum (Third Series), I, Text, p. 20.
of Ptahertais in this nome. But if the Superintendent of Farm-
land desires to cause a mischief to be done to Harmakah I can
cause a thing to be done to him for which he will be more ardent
(?) than for his s‘anakh’, p. 99. Then he proceeded to tell about
the priests having appropriated the whole of the island, whereas
only half of it belonged to them by rights. Infinite trouble
ensued, lawsuits, bribery, etc., and in the long run justice was
done, and the land the priests had unlawfully been occupying
was taken away from them. But judgment was not brought
upon them out of a sense of justice, but of a desire to damage
quite another party, who would feel the unpleasant effects.

It is evident that the law of the land was definite, and well
administered, when bribery did not come into play. Peteēsī II
failed to get custom to override the law in his attempt to get
back the prophetship, p. 97. Pharaoh’s favourite, Khelkhons,
failed to get back for the priests the land they had unjustly
occupied, though he got them the same amount of land elsewhere.
He also got back for them the harvest which had been con-
fiscated, p. 102. Khelkhons’ brother was able to get a legal
opinion on the validity of his claim to the prophetship, p. 102.

But unfortunately already in those days the law was leaden-
footed; el ĥükûmah ā‘rag ‘the Government is lame’, as the
expression is to-day. Quite apart from mere bribery or intrigues
we have several instances of the delays that were put in the way
of justice. They are still common in Egypt to-day, where the
difficulty of collecting the people concerned in a case is one of
the chief causes of the endless dragging out of lawsuits. The
Governor in Memphis sent for the priests, and one would have
thought that a summons from the highest authority in the land
would have been obeyed instantly. But no, the Governor has
to send five times before the priests begin to feel that things
are getting too serious to be ignored any longer, p. 68. Another
habit which defeats the working of justice is still for the accused
to deny everything, and to accuse people who are absent and
cannot be found. This happened at Teuzoi, for the leader of the
riot, the le-shoni, had decamped, and the priests accused their
prophet of having done the damage, p. 104. He lived at Buto,
well away in the Delta, p. 100 and cf. p. 105, at a safe distance
from Teuzoi, and moreover, being the brother of Pharaoh's favourite, was not a man who could be easily punished. The procrastination of Ahmosi is true to life. He 'spent several days, saying, "I am going south with thee".' But he did not go, and finally sent 'a blind (?) man' to arrest the priests. The priests bribed this man with five &iti of silver, and so he only brought the le-shoni, p. 70, and the le-shoni probably only came because Ahmosi was his patron through whom he had been appointed, p. 67.

The fact that there were properly constituted law-courts and that the law was fairly well administered makes it the more extraordinary that Pharaoh and the Governor of the country in Memphis were willing to be worried by everyone who wanted justice. Peteesi I took the two old priests to Pharaoh to get them punished, p. 87. Similarly, it was to Pharaoh himself that the priests took their complaint against the Superintendent of Farmland, pp. 100-102. Peteesi III pleaded his case against the priests before the Governor in Memphis, p. 68, and it was to the Governor again that he went back the second time, p. 70. Peteesi II was in a different category, for he had a perfectly good reason for applying to Pharaoh as has been seen on p. 239 supra. Why were not all these plaintiffs referred to the law-courts?

An interesting detail of the modernity of the story is the way in which the official journeys up and down the country were used for one's own private business. Thus, Peteesi I inspected Elephantiné officially and took the opportunity to place an order for a stela and two blocks of stone for statues, p. 81. It was on one of his inspections in the nome of Permze (Oxyrhynchus) that he found the man he made his son-in-law and agent, p. 82. Much later the Superintendent of Farmland used his official inspection of the nome of Hnés (Heracleopolis) to ferret out the misdeeds of a private enemy whom he wished to injure, p. 99.

This private use of official opportunities goes on everywhere in Egypt to-day, even down to so small a transaction as the trade in kullahs carried on by the guard of the north-bound Luxor-Cairo express. At the station of Kena he takes in a number of these bottles, which, as one of them quite truthfully explained to
the present writer, can be bought very cheaply there but are very expensive in Cairo. Another case is that of Peteësi III's being put into the Treasury. He did not go in with a view to doing his duty or even earning a living for himself. He had been put there for the express purpose of ingratiating himself with someone in authority and then pestering him with his private affairs, p. 103. This is still one of the troubles of life in Egypt, where probably everyone at some time or another has been plagued with the attempts of his subordinates to embroil him in their private quarrels. On one occasion I was induced to see the mudir of the province about a patch of land out of which one of my men was being swindled. The mudir was kindness itself; telephoned to the omdah of the village, who assured him that no one was oppressing the man in question. Even after my return to England the mudir had the kindness to write to me 'that Fulani was happy in his village, no one oppressing'. But Fulani lost his patch of land all the same. How very like Peteësi III and the priests! 'And Ahmosi the prophet of Hôr caused Ienharoûi son of Petehapi to swear to me, saying, “I will go and right thee in every matter of thine”... But I was not (truly) righted; (nay) I was taking people to them to cause them to be reconciled to me', p. 70.

The description of Khelkhons as 'a man who petitioneth (?) Per'o (even) in the closet', p. 100, is reminiscent of innumerable troubles upon which one has had to adjudicate. While never having been petitioned in the closet, one has before now been awakened about dawn by the petitioners sitting outside one's bedroom window and loudly continuing the arguments of the previous day.

There is a familiar ring about Peteësi I's recommendation to Pharaoh of his young first cousin once removed. He says that he is 'a marvel of a man exceedingly' and that 'Per'o will find that he is a marvel of a man'. On being questioned the nobles all agreed, no doubt because they were afraid to do otherwise, or because such an answer had been 'arranged' for. They also said, 'he is a marvel of a man', p. 85. One is completely helpless in such a situation, but still, hoping that the 'marvel' will prove to be no worse than anyone else, one agrees to his
appointment. The recommendation to-day runs, 'I know a nice fellow; he is a good man, Sir', but omits to state that he is the recommender's nephew or cousin. An extraordinary thing is that anyone is quite prepared to fill any position that comes his way, whether he has any qualification for it or not. Then, if he fails too hopelessly, he is not the least ashamed but reproaches you for having put him there.

It is always necessary to get someone to recommend an applicant. When the priests had heard that Khelkhons was the best man to plead their cause, they did not go to him direct. They got a friend to go to his friend, Khelkhons' eunuch. He proved willing, no doubt for a consideration, to hear their suggestions, and he in his turn put them forward to Khelkhons. No doubt it is better so, for Khelkhons was able to refuse their offer and to insist on more and also on payment in advance, p. 100, while at the same time keeping up that external politeness which is so necessary. In the same way when Peteësi III wanted the Superintendent of the Treasury (?) to write a letter on his behalf, he did not go to him direct, but got his chief, Imhotep, to go for him, p. 103.

Haruoiz had his papers by which he was able to establish his identity, pp. 83, 84, just like any modern fellah. In fact it is owing to the habit of the families keeping their documents that we owe the papyrus at present under discussion. In actuality it is extraordinary that any of them have survived, seeing the way in which they are often found stuffed into holes under the tread of the stairs, in the wall, or elsewhere. In modern Egypt there being no safes or safe deposits this is often done still. Sometimes a brick is taken out, the valuables put in behind it and the whole plastered over again. I met one unfortunate from Bibah who had come to Cairo over such a disaster. He had sold some land for £E50, and had been paid with five £E10 notes. These he had rolled up and had poked into a convenient hole in the wall, but unfortunately a mouse owned that hole, and during the night it nibbled its way out right through the middle of the obstructing roll of paper. Next morning there remained of the £E50 nothing but a handful of tiny scraps of paper, of which only one was recognizable as having formed part of a
The Bank was good enough to accept the man's story and to pay him for that one.

We have already noted, p. 253, supra, the polite manner of well-bred people in not mentioning each other's dubious proceedings, but in sympathizing with each other on the misfortunes which their actions have brought upon them. We have also noted the gradual way in which the man who had sold Petehler III let it become apparent that he had abandoned him. The way in which Petehler I gracefully refused Pharaoh's offers is completely modern. Pharaoh asked whether Petehler had a son he would like to succeed him. Petehler did not decline the offer outright, but indicated that he had no wish to accept it in the words, 'Many are the servants of Per'o who shall be able to administer; they will administer, etc., etc.' Pharaoh then offered to enrich him, his refusal of which Petehler indicated by saying, 'May Per'o be enriched! There is no good thing that Per'o hath not caused to be done unto me', p. 86. This last is especially in the Arabic manner of acknowledging a courtesy by returning the same to the well-wisher. Some examples of this are wahashitina, 'You have made us lonely (by your absence)', to which the reply is Allah la yehush minak, 'May Allah not make us lonely through you'; hinyan, 'May you be pleased', to which one answers Allah yuhinnik, 'May Allah cause you to be pleased'; best known of all is the salutation es-salam 'aleykum, 'Peace be upon you', on which the reply improves in the words, 'aleykum es salam wa rahmet Allah wa barakathuh, 'Upon you be peace and the mercy of Allah and his blessings'.

Similarly, entirely Arabic is the manner in which Haruoz thanked Petehler I, 'And Haruoz blessed (him) and said, "It is well"', p. 83. This is the regular Arabic tajiib; kattar kherak [Allah], which is not thanks but approval and a blessing, 'Good; may Allah increase your prosperity'. In fact it is Semitic, for the Hebrews also returned thanks, even to Jehovah, by blessing the donor, as in Deut. viii, 10, 'When thou hast eaten and art full, then shalt thou bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he hath given thee', or in Psalm c, 4, 'be thankful unto him and bless his name'.

Again, how often has one heard the expressions of devotion
used by the Chief of Police, p. 88. He said, 'Is not his Honour he that hath nurtured us?' To-day it is kullu shē yigi min ganābak; nākul ‘eysh min īd ganābak, 'Everything comes from your Honour; we eat bread from your Honour's hand'. The Chief of Police continued, 'If his Honour say to me, "Come even unto Ne", can I refuse to come?'. The modern version runs wallāhi, izašan ganābak tīb'at li, āgīk lihadd Maṣr, and then to a foreigner like myself there is added lihaddi bilādak, 'By Allah, if your Honour send for me, I will come to you as far as Cairo—as far as your own country'.

Other modern turns of expression are to be found. Griffith has already noted that the expression, 'slew me (sic) with beating', p. 67, and n. 11, is still a common hyperbole in Egypt to-day. Curiously enough it is also a Hibernianism. When the Irishman makes such a remark as 'Och, Sorr, ye have me intoirly killt', he only means that he is tired out after an exhausting expedition.² Peteēsi III not being satisfied with the punishment of fifty lashes meted out to the priests refers to them as 'these two strokes of the lash', p. 69. To-day 'two' is still the standard expression of an unimportant number, mafīsh ulla kurbāgeyn, barghūteyn, darbateyn turyah, etc. 'Nothing but a couple of lashes, a couple of fleas, a couple of hacks with the turyah (hoe)', etc., etc., as the case may be. Elsewhere we read that 'the Superintendent of the Treasury (?) spake a good word to him', p. 103, just as an effendi will tell you to-day that 'He spoke good words to me' or 'bad words' as the case may be.

The northerner's modern terror of the south with the accompanying disparagement of it, which is so well known to-day, is apparent in our papyrus. The use of the term 'Southerner' is much more than a definition of the people's dwelling-place, which is all that Griffith intimates, p. 86, n. 6.

¹ This is clearly another example of the Hamitic mode of expression so characteristic of the Welsh and Irish languages. It no doubt originates in the pre-Celtic population of these lands. For a detailed study showing the identity of the non-Aryan syntax of these languages with that of Egyptian, see John Rhys and D. Brynmor-Jones, The Welsh People (1902), 617-641, Appendix B, and cf. pp. 19, 22, 23. The 'have' in the sentence quoted is used, not as part of the present perfect tense, but in the colloquial sense that you 'have got me into the state of being—'.

²
It is a definite disparagement from a safe distance. Thus, in contemptuously rejecting the offer of the men of Teuzoi, the inhabitant of Memphis speaks of them as ‘These southerners’, p. 100. In their turn, when the priests at Teuzoi are tired of paying out far too much to Peteësi I, they refer to him as ‘this outcast (?) of a southerner’, p. 86, because he was of Theban origin and lived at Thebes. The terror of the Upper Country was already ancient in the sixth century B.C., for Sinuhe says of a misfortune that it is ‘as if’ in a dream ‘a man of the Delta should see himself in Elephantiné, a man of the Swamps in Nubia’.¹ With the extension of geographical knowledge the horror is to-day extended to the Sudan, and no greater misfortune can be imagined than to be sent up there on duty—to a country inhabited by Niam-niam, cannibals. No doubt the innate feeling was greatly strengthened in the nineteenth century by the tearing away of sons and brothers from their families. They were put into the army and drafted up to the Sudan with no sort of organization, and the family was lucky if it ever saw them again.

As well as being afraid of the Upper Country the northerner also jeers at the southerner’s speech, though for this he has no good reason. The Sa’idi’s speech is fuller and rounder, and his pronunciation of the ʒ is nearer to that of Arabia than is the gasp of the Cairene. He also normally uses many classical words now employed only by the educated in Cairo. Mr. Smither has kindly reminded me that in Rameses II’s time the Delta and Elephantiné did not speak the same dialect.² Did the northerner of those days ridicule the southerner’s ‘confusing’ speech?

The northerner’s ignorance of Upper Egypt is abysmal. An effendi in the train soon discovered by my speech that I belonged to the Sa’id, the Upper Country. Not to be outdone, he said, ‘And I also have been to the Sa’id—to its very end.’ To the question, ‘How far is that?’ he replied, in all seriousness, ‘As far as Wasta!’ Yet on reaching Wasta the traveller has only covered fifty-seven of the five hundred and fifty miles which

¹ A. M. Blackman, Middle Egyptian Stories, p. 34, ll. 225-226.
² Gardiner, Literary Texts of the New Kingdom, Anastasi, I, l. 28, 6.
separate Cairo from Aswan at the southern end of the Sa‘idi!
Wasta is a long way north of Teuzoi, so that this effendi, like his
predecessor at Memphis, would have called the men of Teuzoi
‘These southerners’.

A half patronizing, half chaffing, mode of address to a small
southern boy by a northerner is *ya Sa‘idi, ya sughaiyar*, ‘Oh
Southerner, Oh Little One’. Though the northerner would not
dare to address a full-grown man as *ya Sa‘idi*, he would certainly
refer to him as such in conversation with other northerners.

This deep-seated aversion may be founded in jealousy, for
the Sa‘idi is a much finer man than the northerner, handsomer,
better built, better dressed, cleaner, and altogether with more of
an air about him. The southerner returns the contempt and
with more reason. He says, ‘Our blood is red, but theirs (the
northerners) is only yellow’.

The following is an extraordinarily interesting and life-like
scene. The Peteesi family’s house had been destroyed for the
first time and looted, their temple-place destroyed, and the chief
culprit had decamped. The affair was finally referred to the
Sheykh of Hnês, and he proved to be a good old soul. He
explained to Peteesi III that it was no good going to law, for
Khelkhons, whose brother had been appointed one of them-
selves by the priests, would stand by them. It would be much
better to forgo any thoughts of punishment but to make an
amicable settlement. He undertook the task of go-between
himself, and privately agreed with Peteesi that ten pieces of
silver would cover the damage done to the house. Then the
battle was joined and the bargaining began. It is a passage well
worth reading, p. 105. The Sheykh went to the priests and
suggested that they should pay twenty pieces of silver. But of
course they expressed the utmost indignation at such an idea and
‘they cried aloud, saying, “We cannot give him five pieces of
silver”’. Peteesi then joined in, swearing that they had carried
off ten pieces of silver’s worth of beams and binding, and had
spoilt another twenty pieces worth of stone-work. The Sheykh
then frightened the priests with legal proceedings, saying that,
if it came to that, ‘fifty pieces of silver shall not bring you out.
Let ten pieces be given to him and I will make him forgive you
C. A. WAINWRIGHT

the other ten pieces.' In the end it was arranged for the ten pieces that the Sheykh and Petesii expected to get, and the priests gave one piece of silver to the messenger who had brought the orders for their arrest. Characteristically enough Petesii had to allow them to swear to him that they had not done any damage to his house in spite of the fact that they had been willing to pay him compensation. Petesii was no doubt metaphorically, and probably actually, patted on the back, and the priests told that he was a 'good man' in not being too hard on them. Petesii in his turn was no doubt told that the priests were 'good men' in being prepared to pay all that money for their 'mistake', and everyone except Petesii and the priests felt that a good day's work had been accomplished and that peace had been restored.

Another detail that is still true to life is the Sheykh's friendly action in taking Petesii's hand, while putting forward his solution of the difficulty. Yet another is his remark, 'I love thee more than these priests', which is exactly the Arabic, ahebbak inta ziada 'anhum', 'I love thee more than them'.

In the ninth year of Darius Petesii III was put to the minor torture of being stretched out in the sun, p. 66. This is still a common punishment in Persia, often with a weight on the victim's chest, but I have not heard of its being done in Egypt except in this case. Was it a Persian idea? There was of course more in Petesii's submitting to this torture than mere obstinacy. He would then be able to plead with the priests afterwards, when they prepared to take vengeance on him for having spoken, that he had had no wish to damage them but had had to submit to force majeure, cf. p. 66, n. 9 and p. 67. Similarly, one should note the way in which the witness was browbeaten in the hope of driving him into giving evidence. In examining Petesii III Ahmosi began quite politely, but soon took up an accusing, threatening, attitude in the hopes of making him say something in self-defence. Ahmosi accused him in the words, 'It is thou that art [ruin?]ing the town more than the men who ruin it', and says that he will be made to tell because he is not a man of weight, p. 66. This is exactly the way a fellah is dealt with to-day.

There are several more pictures that one can see so well in the mind's eye. One is that of the youths whom the priests put
to guard the heap of corn and to drive off Peteësi I’s grandsons, p. 86. They slept on top of the pile and hid their staves, i.e. the modern nebbut, in it, both of which are done to-day. Also when the youths had done their work so thoroughly that they had killed the boys, we may be sure that the priests reproached them in some such words as ‘Did we tell you to kill them!’

Then again, there are the scenes in which one man takes the hand of another. In introducing his agent Peteësi I ‘took the hand of Haruoz and brought him before the Master of the Shipping’, p. 88. Later on ‘Peteësi [I] took the hand of the Chief of Police and took him into the dromos (?) of Amûn’, p. 88. This friendly confidential action has just been seen when the Sheykh of Hnês persuaded Peteësi III to content himself with payment for damage done rather than insist on punishment for the offenders. In like circumstances people still take the other man’s hand when being very persuasive and emphatic. Men also take each other’s hand merely as a result of friendship. One continually sees two friends walking hand in hand in the streets and public gardens of Cairo. Peteësi I also probably held the hand of the Chief of Police again when ‘he bound himself by oath before him’, p. 88, just as ‘the hand of the priests was taken for the ten pieces of silver, they made the oath to me, etc.’, p. 105. This of course had, and has, a different significance from the previous cases just quoted.

Another interesting detail is the statement, ‘we caused bricks to be moulded, and our house to be built. They finished (?) its street front (?) and we dwelt in it’, p. 105. In his own copy Griffith has corrected ‘street front’ to ‘lower storey’, so that Peteësi III did exactly what is done to-day in every town and village of Egypt. A man starts building as soon as he has saved up a little money and lives in that part which has been built, while he saves up a little more with which to carry the process a little further. An example of this which might be seen by any one was for many long years, and still may be, one of the houses just outside Cairo railway station on the east side of Nubar Pasha Street. In its lower stories it was a large handsome house, but it was crowned with empty spaces through which one saw the sky above, as that storey was neither glazed nor roofed.
Another picture of what might be enacted any day in any village is the complete ignoring of Hôr, son of Psammetkmenempe, by the priests when they had no intention of installing him in his father’s office. ‘Hôr son of Psammetkmenempe, the prophet of Amûn, came to Teuzoi, and stood with the priests: but they spake not with him as to any man on earth, and they did not let rations (?) be taken to him. They went to Pshenah son of Ienharoeû, the brother of Harkhebesikem, and wrote him the title to the share of the prophet of Amûn of Teuzoi’, p. 105.

It must be a most painful experience to be so completely cold-shouldered, and a most convincing proof that your candidature is not acceptable. As with the driving away of Peteësi’s grandsons, Egypt does this sort of thing thoroughly.

Again there is the scene of the priests crowding the street outside the house where Peteësi III was writing his history of the case. They had been flogged for ignoring the Governor’s summonses and then dismissed, so that Peteësi’s case against them was ruined. Seeing that they had thus cheaply disposed of him they came there to ridicule him publicly. They pointed out that he need not think that he had gained anything, for it was not on his account that they had been punished. How they must have enjoyed his calm reply promising them far worse punishment to come, for they knew what he did not, that the affair was finished, p. 69.

A modern custom which has come right through from ancient Egypt is the sealing of documents instead of signing them. The custom is no doubt due to the fact that the vast majority of the nation was, and is, illiterate. However, Peteësi III was literate as was Ahmosi, for the one wrote the document at Hnês and the other read it, p. 66, yet ‘(Then) he sealed the papyrus, he caused me to seal it with him’, p. 67. A special virtue is ascribed to the seal to-day. Some years ago in Cairo a lawsuit turned on the point that a door had only been locked instead of being sealed. This was held by the court to constitute negligence, in spite of the protest that it was less easy to break open a properly locked door than one that was only secured by a strip of calico and some sealing wax. Seals, however, might be forged or stolen, hence, although contracts were called štm.t, ‘sealed things’, they were secured in safer but much more laborious
fashion. Instead of being sealed they were attested by a number of witnesses, each of whom made out and kept a copy, as may be seen on pp. 44-48. The normal number of witnesses was fifteen or sixteen.

In Petëesi III’s time, just as to-day, someone was generally kind enough to report anything that might concern you. ‘A man came to Essemteu, saying, “They are coming unto thee to make thee write a title, etc., etc.”‘, and so, being forewarned, Essemteu was able to forestall the priests by his flight’, p. 102. Even when he was right away at Khmûn he still ‘heard everything that the priests had done to him in Teuzoi’, p. 103. Unfortunately, being a stranger in Memphis there was no one to tell him of Semtutefnakhti’s betrayal of him, p. 69. His hearing of the burning of his house was in another category. That was due to a chance meeting with friends, p. 70.

We have seen in our own time how amazingly a few years of good government enables Egypt to recover from misery and bankruptcy, and to become one of the rich countries of the world. Petëesi III gives an idea of the speed with which this same happy state of affairs came about under Psametik I’s reorganization of the country. In this king’s fourth year the prosperity increased by a half, p. 79; in his fifteenth year it was doubled, p. 83; in his eighteenth year it is said that the silver and spelt had been added to yearly, p. 85; in his nineteenth year the account of the land was good, p. 85. But alas! Petëesi also shows us the speed with which the relapse may come. We have seen, p. 248, supra, that within a hundred and fifty years conditions had fallen back again into the chaos and bankruptcy from which Psametik I had rescued them. This sequence of a new efficiency and force in the administration resulting in increased prosperity and then a steady and progressive decline is characteristic of Egyptian history. Before Petëesi’s time it is visible in the Old Kingdom, in the Middle Kingdom, and in the New Kingdom, and after Petëesi’s time Mr. Bell has remarked it all through the Ptolemaic, Roman-Byzantine, and Arab periods. In his booklet, The Revolutions of Civilisation, Professor Sir Flinders Petrie showed many years ago how this state of affairs is reflected in the arts and crafts of the country.

1 Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXVII, p. 176.