

Durham E-Theses

*A study of social and economic factors operating in
ancient Egypt from the death of harnesses III to the
commencement of the XXV dynasty*

Haycock, Bryan G.

How to cite:

Haycock, Bryan G. (1962) *A study of social and economic factors operating in ancient Egypt from the death of harnesses III to the commencement of the XXV dynasty*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/8094/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

A Study of Social and Economic Factors operating
in Ancient Egypt from the Death of Ramesses III
to the Commencement of the XXVth Dynasty.

by

Bryan G. Haycock B.A.

(St. John's College, Durham)

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

1962.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

LIST OF CONTENTS

- Introduction. Page I - VIII.
- Section 1. Page 1 - 25.
"Egypt in the International Scene".
- Section 2. Page 26 - 61.
"A Consideration of the Material available
for the Reconstruction of the Economic and
Social History of Egypt from the late XXth to
the XXVth Dynasty".
- Section 3. Page 62 - 96.
"A Fuller Consideration of the Economic
Data available from Papyrus Wilbour and other
Evidence of the Period under Study".
- Section 4. Page 97 - 116.
"The Social Structure of Ancient Egypt from
the middle XXth Dynasty to the Commencement of
the XXVth."
- Section 5. Page 117 - 123.
"Conclusions".
-

REFERENCE INDICES

1.

Page 125 - 127.

"Index of References to other Authors cited
in this Treatise".

2.

Page 128 - 131.

"Reference List of Egyptian and other
Ancient Personal Names".

3.

Page 132 - 135.

"Reference List of Names of Places and
Peoples".

4.

Page 136 - 138.

"Reference Index of Technical Terms used in
this Work."

Bibliography

Page I - VI.

and List of Abbreviations.

A STUDY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS OPERATING IN ANCIENT EGYPT
FROM THE DEATH OF RAMESSES III TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE XXVTH DYNASTY.

INTRODUCTION

The need for a collation of the mass of published material concerning the structure of Egyptian social and economic organization might at first sight appear somewhat questionable. There are excellent works which deal very satisfactorily with particular sectors of the social structure and administration of ancient Egypt at periods near to or including that under study. Indeed their treatment of these particular aspects of the wider subject is far more thorough than anything which can be attempted here. However, though no doubt scholars who have worked on the problems posed by ancient Egypt at this period have their ideas fully evolved regarding the salient characteristics of and changes undergone by Egyptian society, the present writer believes that there is a clear case for attempting to treat the subject as a whole in a single written work.

Only in this way can such important sectors of the Egyptian social structure as the priesthood, which have been well treated in isolation in other works, be seen in their proper context as parts of the whole of Egyptian society and against the background of a changing economic structure. Only this kind of investigation can make fully intelligible the rise and fall in importance of certain families and sections of the priestly classes. Their prosperity and rights as priests depended intrinsically on the degree of contact which they maintained with men of influence in other fields of administration, and on their own more secular interests. * Kees in his

* KP (see Bibliography)

brilliant work on the priesthood fully appreciated this, but the specific limitations imposed upon him by the detailed character of his investigation into that limited topic prevented him from pursuing this side of the subject very far though he repeatedly brings out the very strong tendency, particularly manifested in the Late Period, for holders of important priesthoods to hold these merely for their emolument, while their main activities were military and political.

* Meyer in his analysis of the character of the so-called divine state of Thebes treated the subject on a much wider plane, but at that time the economic data which would have enabled him to describe more closely the economic basis of the Theban religious oligarchy were lacking or not appreciated at their true value. It is really only the publication of P. Wilbour which has given us sufficient data to describe in detail the real character of Egyptian land management prior to the Hellenistic period. As can be seen from the work of Mlle^o Préaux and of Rostovtzeff, the general impression was that before Ptolemy II the economy was largely uncontrolled, and Egyptologists such as Breasted had no idea of the elaboration of the system in which the great estates of the temples were integrated. Since

 * GMS (see Bibliography)

+ WP (see Bibliography) is the abbreviation henceforth used to describe this work of Sir Alan Gardiner, not the Papyrus itself.

o PER (see Bibliography): see for instance page 80 for an expression of the view that the "monopolistic" system of the Ptolemies was of recent origin.

o M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, Oxford, 1941. (see particularly Volume 1)

no compendious work has been written since P. Wilbour and the other important economic documentation became available, there seems to be a definite gap which should be filled in Egyptological literature, and the writer hopes that the present short study will do something to bridge it. The main work of Helck^{*} deals with particular aspects of the administration but it does not entirely cover the role envisaged for this work, and finishes at the end of the XXth Dynasty.

Though the earlier Egyptologists were unwilling to recognize the detailed and pervasive control exercised by the machinery of state over the operation of the economy, particularly in the great periods of national vigour and expansionism, the publication of WP by Gardiner has made it necessary to devote proper attention to this aspect of Egyptian civilization, and to recognize that, although Egypt in the Pharaonic period was still primarily an agricultural country, it had evolved an extremely elaborate and durable form of social organization based on a centralised bureaucracy functioning around the "superhuman" figure of the divine king. This regime was always nominally dependent on the will and initiative of the Pharaoh himself, and the reader will soon see that throughout this treatise the view is consistently stressed that because the economy and very stability of the state depended to a considerable degree on the ability of the ruler and the control that he exercised over his people, the great ages of Egyptian prosperity and influence could only occur in conjunction with periods during which all the resources and reserves of Egypt were concentrated under the control of the central administration of the country.

* Wolfgang Helck. VMNR (see Bibliography)

The period under study was not of course such a time in more than a very limited degree: indeed during the later part of it it seems certain that the king was little more than primus inter pares. However, this detracts nothing from its interest for sociological and economic study. Until almost the very end of the period a kind of central control - though perhaps more nominal than real - continued to function, and it is possible to reconstruct fairly accurately the relationships which obtained between the rather decadent kingship and the leading families. This cannot be done at all satisfactorily in regard to the two earlier Intermediate Periods which also followed great ages of Egyptian power and culture.

This study of the gradual but fundamental change in the social and economic structure of ancient Egypt to meet the needs of a feudal rather than bureaucratic state is particularly rewarding since the mass of economic documentation of the later XXth^{*} Dynasty permits the almost complete understanding of the bureaucratic structure of the last phase of New Kingdom centralism, even as centrifugal forces became more active in the state. It is possible to some degree to trace the mechanics and stages of the subtle transition thereby, and to relate it to political developments, thus constructing the skeleton of a proper economic history for this period.

Furthermore the period under study is sufficiently far advanced in Egyptian history for it to be possible and prudent, in many cases where documentation of a strictly contemporaneous nature is lacking or insufficient in itself, to make use of material derived from the Saite, Persian and

* For the publication of most of this material see primarily Sir Alan Gardiner, RAD.

the Ptolemaic periods to supplement and complete the picture of Egyptian society. Fuller details will be found in the main body of the work concerning the degree and circumstances in which this has been regarded as legitimate.

The reservations expressed by Mlle Préaux in the introduction^{*} to her work on the Ptolemaic economy, in which she doubts the legitimacy of regarding economic facts only established for one area as necessarily typical for the whole of Egypt, are plainly of some cogency, but the present writer does not regard this line of argument as invalidating the attempt made on slender evidence below to reconstruct the general Egyptian economic pattern. It should be noted that Mlle Préaux thought not so much in terms of the post-Napoleonic state of Europe with its unified institutions, as of a less centralized state where local custom, which might differ widely from the national pattern, was likely to be supreme. However, the belief that the Ptolemies somehow imposed a centralized control on an economy which had hitherto enjoyed a great deal of freedom is not supported by the ancient Egyptian evidence collected since that time, which shows conclusively that at all times the economy was closely directed by state and local authorities. Though there is some evidence tending to show that different types of holding may have been more common in various areas, within broad lines there can be no doubt that the main forms of landownership were regulated at the national level. Probably then the reservations made in "L'Économie royale" were somewhat excessive, and even the more scanty material of earlier times may be taken with confidence as giving a picture likely to have been generally

* See PER, Introduction, pp. 10-23.

true throughout Egypt. In this work the view will be taken that the control over agricultural and other production exercised by the authorities meant that there could be little capitalism of a private character. Most major projects were undertaken either at the instance of, or to some degree for the benefit of the king. In this sense the state authorities were concerned as one of their primary objects to oversee the development of trade and internal prosperity.

This conception of ancient Egyptian social organization should, however, be strictly qualified. The subject being social and economic factors operating in Ancient Egypt, it will be necessary to lay continual emphasis on the material side of Egyptian civilization, and to express everything in terms of economic cause and effect. Nevertheless it should be borne in mind that the administration of the ancient Egyptians — though their highly organized economy in many ways resembled modern totalitarian state organization was by no means purely materialistic. None of the ancient oriental monarchies was in any way a secular state, but the ancient ideas of real priorities even in everyday affairs were greatly conditioned by the current view of life, and in particular by the religious conceptions then generally accepted. In a sense the whole of Egyptian civilization was extraordinarily practical in that Egyptian foresight extended not only to securing welfare in this life, but also to attempting to do so in the next. However, it should be recognized that the holding of concepts of utilitarianism which embraced the next world as well as the present, almost precluded the growth of a narrow irreligious materialism.

While in this study the reasons for the origins and special characteristics of the Egyptian system will be scarcely touched upon, since we are in no way directly concerned with Egyptian religious belief, there can be no doubt that the growth and survival of the Egyptian system depended on their religious concepts as much as on any economic factors. In early times the king was regarded as a god on earth possessing the supernatural characteristics of his equals (e.g. P. Westcar^{*} narrates the supernatural birth of the first three kings of the Vth Dynasty), and this aura of divinity hovered about the person of the king for the rest of Egyptian history until the coming of Christianity. Undoubtedly it was largely this belief in the character of the king as one set apart from his fellow men which led to the replacement of the primitive tribal kingship by the absolutism of the fourth dynasty, and thus to the growth of an all-powerful bureaucracy. As a result of this almost all land-owning rights passed into the hands of the king and his immediate entourage. The enduring power of kingship was guaranteed as much by religious belief as by its economic suitability.

While the survival of the great estates of the temples throughout Egyptian history owed much to their usefulness as a method of administering land, there can be no doubt that the reason that large areas of land were transferred from the royal estate to those of temples was frequently something much more than because this was an expedient way of buying the loyalty

* P. Westcar 9.25 - 11.19

of the priesthood. No one who has read P. Harris I or the Abydos[†] Stela of Ramesses IV can doubt the genuineness of the religious feelings of at least certain kings though their motives may not have been very high by modern standard, in that they aimed for their own prosperity. There can be no doubt that the reason for giving endowments to the temples was in many cases simply to secure the perpetuation of the rites of the gods, since this was for the general good. As a result of this outlook on life many of the architectural works of the kings were undertaken for reasons that would not to-day be regarded as utilitarian, though in the context of the Egyptian view of life temples and pyramids were of the first importance.

The truth would then seem to be that while the ancient Egyptian state, like contemporary organizations in Mesopotamia, Hatti and Achaea had as one of its major functions the channelling of labour and skill and the providing of resources to accomplish engineering, architectural and military feats, nevertheless the idea of the state as a secular organization working for purely materialistic ends was not current. To this extent it is misleading to compare ancient economic priorities and aspirations with modern.

* Text published in transcription in *Biblio, Aegypt.* 5. Brussels, 1933.

Facsimile published by S. Birch for BM in 1876.

+ E. de Rouge. *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques* p. 156 ff. Also BAR IV p. 227-9.

♠ See Gordon Childe, *What Happened in History.* page 104, for a full exposition of the Egyptian outlook on life, and on such subjects as the importance of the pyramid.

SECTION 1Egypt in the International Scene

From the point of view of modern economics it may seem rather strange, though by no means unexampled, to start a review of the ancient Egyptian economic and social structure by considering the position of the country in the international sphere. It may, therefore, not be out of place to commence with some justification of this procedure. A primary reason for following this line is to stress what cannot be too strongly emphasized, but is frequently almost ignored, in relation to the ancient economies of the Near East and Egypt; that the king was the personification of the state and in a sense the owner of all its resources as these concerned both the development of internal trade and agricultural production within the country, and the maintenance of international commerce with other countries. In different terms the power and effectiveness of the central authorities of an ancient state were much more closely related to the general welfare and prosperity of the people, as well as to the development of external trade than is the case in the economies of modern capitalist states, where at least in theory much of the commercial practice is not directly dependent on the operations of the state and its power in the international world. The close relationship between a strong and effective administration and economic prosperity is clearer and more generally recognized in those countries which have "planned" economies under state auspices.

Though it is dangerous to apply modern terminology too closely lest implications be conveyed that were not really present in ancient times, the ancient Egyptian state together with the state corporations (temples and other land-owning institutions) more or less dependent on it, may be said

to have pursued a policy approximating closely to what is now known as state capitalism: that is to say that the central administration ("the king") alone had sufficient resources to support large scale internal development and external trade. The vesting of all the economic potential of an ancient state in the person of its ruler is by no means a phenomenon found only in ancient Egypt, but is amply attested in all the areas of ancient higher civilization.* It would appear that only in the more backward areas such as Europe — apart from Mycenaean Greece, which seems to have modelled itself closely on the oriental states — was the craftsman a freelance independent agent able to move from the service of one chief to another, and probably enjoying a fairly high social status.

Like most other activities in the Valleys of the great alluvial rivers Nile, Euphrates and Tigris, the exploitation of gold and other mineral resources in the surrounding mountain areas, frequently lying at a great distance, was necessarily dependent on military protection, and a great organized corporate effort since ordinary peaceful trading relations with the inhabitants of these regions were unsatisfactory to the pride of great kings. This need for corporate effort in so many fields of human endeavour led to the early evolution of developed forms of state government which claimed the absolute possession of all the wealth that they created and exercised close control over all the people of their lands, quite unlike earlier loose tribalistic societies.

Most of the metals in Egypt naturally then became the possession of the state, which employed full-time craftsmen to make ornaments, and other luxury

* G. Childe. What Happened in History, particularly pages 117-118 and pages 126-127.

goods, for the ruling class and the decoration of the sanctuaries of the gods who watched over the Egyptian state. The craftsman was incorporated thoroughly into the pattern of the service of the king, or into the service of one of the great corporations which administered the estates of the gods, and had little or no freedom of movement or economic independence. The inclusion of all the producing classes in the lower menial orders of the state system, and the concentration of the vast bulk of national wealth into the treasuries of gods and kings, and the hands of a small administrative class, meant that the development of any form of individual capitalism was greatly discouraged, and since all forms of economic activity continued generally to be departments of state, only the administrative class could obtain any substantial purchasing power. From the point of view of "Keynesian" economics this was undoubtedly a weak feature of the ancient Egyptian system, since this theory postulates that the development of the economy of a state is necessarily dependent on the existence of expanding markets for an increasing quantity of goods produced, but theories of that kind relate strictly to modern conditions where the manufacture and selling of luxury goods has come to play a fundamental part in the preservation of even the basis of economic well-being.

While the Egyptian system was opposed to the development of the mass of the population into anything but peasants eking out a mere subsistence existence by farming under a paternalistic state, it appears certain that until considerable economic development took place in lands outside Egypt and more developed techniques and skills became known, no other form of state could have functioned in the Nile Valley. In the initial stages of civilization the state authorities had to continue to provide an economic focus

for the country, taking an active part in the organization of all commercial ventures, though individuals would increasingly find the means to improve their economic lot outside the framework of corporate enterprise by their private endeavours.

The degree of economic activity of the ancient Egyptian state is amply instanced from all periods. From the earliest times the king is found setting up new agricultural settlements, as did the great officers of state,^{*} and probably the earliest duty of the nomarch was to carry out agricultural administration.⁺ Even so late as the Ptolemies, when, under Greek influence, some measure of individual capitalism had been introduced into the economy, the king is found carrying out all large scale drainage works and irrigation operations. Moreover, all external trading on a large scale, whether voyages to Pwani or Lebanon or land expeditions to the Sudan,[‡] from the Old Kingdom to Ptolemaic times, were always carried out at the instance of the state under the guidance of the Ruler, and to some degree for its benefit.

Another factor which makes it expedient to consider the international position of Egypt before considering other aspects of its economy is the basic difference which exists between ancient and modern economics. The writer on the economics of recent times is entitled, if he wishes, to make

* See the inscription of Meten of the early fourth dynasty.

+ For a sketch of developments see Wolfgang Helck, VMNR pp. 89-92.

‡ The Zenen letters for instance show that the king arranged for the basic development of land for the clerouchy at Philadelphia.

‡ See for instance inscription of Herkhuf, Urkunden 1, pp. 120-131.

certain assumptions implicitly rather than explicitly about the background of political history underlying economic history, provided that the relationship of the historical facts to the economic development is well-known and established. For instance a historian studying the economic development of England in the 18th and 19th centuries does not need to refer at length to the expansion of Europe by exploration and conquest which made for the trading prosperity of England. In the case of the Near East at the period under study: even the political information is scanty and controversial in interpretation, no assumptions of that sort may be made, and consideration of historical facts, in so far as they are known, must precede any theorization based upon them.

Sir Alan Gardiner is inclined to^{*} see a complete break in the continuity of ancient Egyptian history at the accession of the XXIst Dynasty, which is clearly presaged by the Journal of Wenamun, written in the declining years of the XXth Dynasty. No one could deny that there certainly were changes of fundamental importance taking place in Egypt at about that time, in that from this time for centuries the Thebais almost always lay outside the direct control of the kings in the north, and great priestly and military families managed to gain hereditary control of many of the highest offices of state. The present writer, however, who prefers to think in terms of continuous historical evolution, does not see that in any real sense the passing of the sceptre from the defunct XXth Dynasty to the XXIst marks any very great change in Egypt itself, but rather merely the consecration of changes which

* GEP page 313 for the strongest statement of this view.

had already taken place. The process whereby Thebes was able to become an almost entirely autonomous district had been completed under the XXth Dynasty, and, as will be seen below, there is every reason to believe that at the same time the foundations of the feudalistic state had been well laid.

The belief that the advent of the XXIst Dynasty had no great economic or social significance, and the view that the decline in Egyptian national consciousness (at once exemplified and aggravated by the withdrawal of the Egyptian military presence from Asia during and soon after the reign of Ramesses III) played a major part in setting afoot the internal centrifugal tendencies which led to the decline of cohesion and organization within Egypt, have prompted the writer to choose the death of Ramesses III as a far more suitable point to commence this study. However, there are other and even more compelling reasons for including the latter part of the XXth Dynasty, in that most of the economic data we possess regarding Egypt before the Saite period are derived from the latter half of the XXth Dynasty.

It has been progressively recognized that to regard the Egyptian New Kingdom conquests in Asia as an empire in the full sense of the term is misleading, but it may well be that the present tendency to regard these lands as a mere hegemony over which Egypt exercised some control is to go too far in the opposite direction. The Amarna Letters, though they show some local princes preying upon others, make it clear that, while local princes were for the most part left to rule their own city states, there were higher officials, usually of Egyptian origin, who ruled the provinces into which the empire was divided. The tombs of such great officials as Rekhmirē of the XVIIIth Dynasty make it evident that at least for a time the investment in empire

was profitable. Furthermore, there can be no doubt that to set up waqf-domain in Asia for Egyptian temples, as P. Harris shows was done by Ramesses III, was to attempt to incorporate certain parts of the Asiatic Empire within the administrative structure of metropolitan Egypt though the attempt was perhaps only made with the more strongly Egyptianized parts, such as Lebanon. Incidentally, it should be noted that the inscription in the tomb of Pennē⁺ at Aniba shows that the area round Aniba was similarly apportioned between "fields of Pharaoh" and the estates of various temples. Indeed so close had the bonds between Egypt and its Asiatic provinces become by the end of the imperial age that the Egyptian court normally resided in the region of Tanis, which stood almost half way between Egypt and Asia, and the Harem Conspiracy documents make it quite clear that the court of Ramesses III had a highly international flavour in that many of the officials were certainly of Syrian origin, and others appear to have been other than Egyptian.

However, although Ramesses III managed to drive back the Peoples of the Sea from the boundaries of Egypt itself, it seems to have been impossible to prevent the Thekel and the Philistines settling all along the coast of Palestine, and it was perhaps this which led to the rapid abandonment^δ of the Egyptian settlements such as Beth-Shan in Asia. Nevertheless, though the actual control exercised by Egypt over happenings in Asia had temporarily

* P. Harris 8.13-9.3. Also 11.11. Nine towns of Syria and Cush are there donated to Amūn.

+ G. Steindorff, Aniba pp. 242-248.

δ This is the opinion expressed in DVE page 439.

become slight, there seems no reason to affirm that Egypt became less part of Mediterranean culture, that her traditional prestige suffered greatly, or that her trade was seriously impaired.

The papyrus which relates the story of Wenamūn, whether it be a strictly historical tale, or no more than founded on fact, gives a detailed picture of the relationship between Egypt and the Levant in the days which immediately followed the final abandonment of the Syrian provinces. The document is dated to an unnamed year 5, but there is fairly conclusive evidence that this must refer to the whm-mswt^{*} era at the end of the reign of Ramesses XI. Though nominally Ramesses XI still reigned, this document makes it quite clear that the rule of the country was really in the hands of Smendes who later succeeded as Pharaoh at Tanis, and of Hrihor who had seized control of Thebes. Wenamūn describes both as the regents whom Amūn has given to their respective portions of Egypt, and there is scarcely any reference to Ramesses XI.⁺

The withdrawal of the Egyptian military presence from Byblos was then perhaps comparatively recent, since the Gyblite ruler was at great pains to state that he no longer regarded himself as the vassal of Pharaoh, and to point out that the older kings of Egypt (presumably since these payments had continued up to his father's time, i.e. until at least the reign of Ramesses IX)

* The inscription published by Nims in JNES VII pp. 157-162, makes it fairly clear that this must be so, since Hrihor was apparently dead by year 7 of whm-mswt. See GEP p.305 for discussion. 306-313 for translation of "Wenamūn".

+ There is a reference to the Shadow of Pharaoh falling on the ruler of Byblos.

had paid his ancestors most generously for cedarwood. Apparently every time that cedarwood was required five ships loaded with the produce of Egypt had been sent to Byblos, whose cargo was valued at a thousand deben. Though the inhabitants of Byblos had thrown commissioners of Ramesses IX or XI into gaol and kept them there for seventeen years until they were murdered — plainly all the time if Wenamūn made a false move he was in danger of a similar unhappy fate — for all his blustering show of independence the ruler of Byblos made it clear that his respect for Egypt as the fountain head of civilization was unbounded.* He appears to have been genuinely astonished that Wenamūn, the envoy of the great Egyptian state, should arrive in such an undignified manner aboard a merchant ship with virtually no money, and not to have conceived that Egypt could have become a poor and weak state. Indeed so real was the Gyblite ruler's regard for Egypt and also his superstitious respect for her state god Amūn — who had once held considerable estates in Asia and who appears still to have been worshipped at Byblos in Wenamūn's day despite the collapse of the Egyptian empire and even influence — that by skilfully playing on his beliefs Wenamūn, armed with his cultus-figure of Amūn of the Road, was able to obtain the timber that he required for the Amen-user-he barque, in return for what could scarcely be considered more than a token payment.

* Wenamūn 2, 19 - 2, 22. Numerous commentaries have been written on the story of Wenamūn, and fairly recently G. Defebvre published a commentary in his "Romans et Contes égyptiens". Gardiner also translates the story in GEP.

The story of Wenamūn shows clearly that during the transitional period from the XXth to the XXIst Dynasty Egypt, through internal weakness and division, was undergoing a stage during which her political influence in Asia was negligible. One might well suppose from the account, however, that a great deal of the trouble suffered by Wenamūn occurred because Smendes, who maintained close commercial relationships with Phoenicia, did little to secure the success of his mission, which was inspired by his rival Hrihor at Thebes, though he took no positive steps to oppose it, and indeed gave a limited degree of help to show his respect for Amūn who was the leading god at Tanis as well as at Thebes.

Nevertheless, the rulers of Phoenicia, who were noted as businessmen of considerable acumen, realized that Egypt continued to be a great power, and that she was well worth trading with. The prince of Byblos^{*} remarked that twenty ships belonging to Smendes lay in his harbour, and that from Sidon, most likely the dominant city of Phoenicia at this time, fifty ships traded with the house of Berket-El, which from the context must have been in Egypt. Probably many of these ships, like that on which Wenamūn travelled, were manned by Phoenicians. This did not affect the importance of the commercial contacts established, and during the energetic period of Egyptian government at the beginning of the XXIInd Dynasty the rulers of Egypt seem to have had little difficulty in bringing Phoenicia within their sphere of influence. The collapse of Egyptian influence before the Assyrians in the eighth century in western Asia would seem to a large extent to have been the result of internal disunity inside Egypt and of the immense

* See Wenamūn i, x + 23 - 2,2.

expansion of the civilized world between the XVIIIth Dynasty and the end of the XXIIInd, which had converted Assyria from a vassal state of the Mitannians and Kassites on the fringe of civilization into the centre of an enormous military empire of unparalleled extent and efficiency, rather than of any decline in the economic potential of Egypt.

It will be best now to leave the re-establishment of the Egyptian hegemony in Asia until later, and to consider what is likely to have been the character of international trade in our period. The first observation that must be made is with regard to the extremely tenuous nature of the evidence: apart from that provided by the story of Wenamūn and by archaeology there is very little to go on. Towards the beginning of our period the high civilizations of the Mycenaeans and the Hittites seem gradually to have given way to more primitive social organizations. Meanwhile, nevertheless, civilization was spreading in the Mediterranean as the Tuscans and Sikels, who had long descended on Egypt as raiders, began to settle in the Italian^{*} region and to establish somewhat oriental cultures.

* M. Pallotino in his work "The Etruscans" published in English, Penguin 1955, like most Italian historians, disagrees partially with this view, but has to admit that contacts with Lemnos by land or sea are proven, and that classical Etruscan civilization was strongly orientalizing.

There is also evidence, though from Greece not Egypt, that late in the second millenium or at the beginning of the first, if not before, ships were built capable of undertaking the direct voyage from Crete to Egypt though the return route would seem to have been the long coastal voyage via Phoenicia. It might appear dubious then, since means of communication were continuing to improve, how far the view of Meyer⁺ is altogether tenable that in the period after the invasions of the Sea Peoples civilization was increasingly falling into insular units.

Probably the best study of the character of ancient trade in the Mediterranean before the classical period is the admirable little work of Vercoutter Essai sur les Relations entre Égyptiens et Préhellènes where

* In the Odyssey Books 4 and 14 references are made to voyages before the wind direct from Crete to the Egyptian Delta; the context tends to show that such journeys were rare, but Egypt was definitely known as a distant and strange land, but of very great wealth, where Greek adventurers could easily make a fortune. The date of composition of the Homeric poems is of course dubious, and their historicity more so, but the attested presence of the Sea Peoples and others from the Greek area as well as Asia Minor, who frequently served in the Egyptian armies, makes the general credibility of this type of journey certain.

+ Meyer. Geschichte des Altertums: II, 2. Introduction pages 3-4.

It is noteworthy that the body of the text does not appear to accept the decline of international contact.

he admirably characterizes the nature of ancient trade*. In the earlier periods of Egyptian history, when the population of the Mediterranean lands was very small, most communities would have been very near self-sufficiency. Many of the goods that were traded were wanted just as much for magico-religious as for utilitarian reasons (e.g. a special type of incense was imported from Arabia), while some items were sought as mere curiosities (e.g. monkeys and giraffes' tails from the Red Sea). Generally speaking at that time it seems that there would have been no need for Egypt to export grain: indeed the only definite need that can be postulated, apart from that of small supplies of tin for the making of bronze in Egypt, was for cedarwood from Lebanon, since in spite of all the efforts that the kings probably made to grow trees in⁺ Egypt, the country was always desperately short of good quality wood suitable for temple and ship-building.

Even with the coming of the New Kingdom, when modern knowledge of Egyptian history becomes much more detailed than for earlier periods, it is difficult to descry the nature and extent of Egyptian trade. It is far from proven that Egypt habitually imported corn from the Syrian provinces during the imperial age, and though during the XXth Dynasty, as the Asiatic provinces were being lost, shortages of corn occurred from time to time in Egypt, these can be quite easily explained by supposing that some official

* VEP pp. 19-22.

+ The Ptolemies seem from slight evidence to have attempted this, and many of the location bearings in P. Willbour are by trees which may very well have been deliberately planted.

of the state granaries was negligent in seeing that adequate supplies of Egyptian-grown corn were sent to Thebes, and not by assuming that corn supplies no longer came from Syria. This could well be the explanation of the circumstances which led to the famous strike^{*} of year 29 of Ramesses III when even the comparatively privileged class of necropolis workmen were left without rations. Moreover, though we only possess information of this kind on the XXth Dynasty, such domestic crises could easily have occurred from time to time earlier in the New Kingdom; the surviving evidence of this sort is much more abundant for the XXth Dynasty than any earlier dynasty. Furthermore it is known that though the Asiatic provinces no longer paid tribute trade continued, and if the Egyptian authorities were accustomed to purchase corn in Syria, they could probably have continued to do so. The existence of domains in Asia belonging to Amūn suggests that some revenues in kind from these lands were brought to Egypt to the main cult centres of the god, which could well be regarded as a form of limited international trade, but it is right to point out that the only specific reference to the import of corn from Syria is when Tuthmosis III,[†] during his Megiddo campaign of year 22, carried off all the crops of the city. However, this was a wartime measure, and any dues of corn taken in peacetime were plainly on a more limited scale.

* Pleyte and Rossi, Papyrus de Turin, Pls. XXXV to XLVIII. Transcription in RAD pp. 45-60. See Edgerton JNES x. no. 3, 138-145.

† Urkunden IV, p. 667.

An interesting sidelight on the growth of international trade is that in a sense the forced contributions of the Palestinian princes, which were probably gifts of craftsmanship in precious metals rather than everyday goods, could be regarded as a form of trade, and would stimulate real trade: if the king set the fashion of having foreign imported goods in his Palace, there is little doubt that the notables would acquire similar ones. No doubt from the Egyptian point of view the price that the XXth Dynasty kings sent to Byblos for cedarwood was regarded as an ex-gratia gift, and from this one example it can be seen how near the exchange of gifts on a regular basis between crowned heads, the owners and regulators of their respective economies, could come to real international trade. Though only a very favoured Palestinian sheikh, whose help was necessary, could expect to receive presents from Pharaoh in the great days of the Egyptian Empire, the great world rulers like the kings of Greece, the Hittites and the Babylonians, undoubtedly expected magnificent gifts on occasion without having to make the first move (there is an example in the Amarna letters where the king of Babylon demands a present of gold from Amenophis IV on his accession). Furthermore, while Egyptian colonies grew up outside Egypt, the New Kingdom had seen the growth of a substantial alien quarter at Memphis which was probably duplicated in all the towns of the Delta, and a large part of the army was composed of foreign mercenaries from distant lands. Though probably many of their requirements were produced in the alien colonies in Egypt rather than imported,

* See e.g. The Bearers of tribute in the tomb of Rekhmirê.

+E.Sallier IV, 1, 6 and 2, 9 to 3, 1.

and they themselves rapidly became Egyptianized, there can be little doubt that their settlement encouraged foreign trade.

The intention in the above paragraphs with regard to the trade of Egypt in periods before the death of Ramesses III has been to show that, without in any way stretching the all too sparse information that is available, one is fully justified in the strong presumption that by the beginning of the period under study international trade was passing out of the nascent stage sketched by Vercoutter, no doubt accurately for the earlier periods, and beginning to assume the characteristics of Mediterranean trade as it is found only a few centuries later at the beginning of classical Greek times, and was becoming of importance to the economies of nations. This would imply that though royal expeditions to Lebanon were still important for the traditional cedar-wood, nevertheless a trade in more everyday goods was rapidly eclipsing this form of trade. To a great extent this presumption seems to be confirmed in the story of Wenamūn where, as well as ^{*}gold and silver vessels, Smendes sent the prince of Byblos byssus, 500 ox-hides, 500 rolls of papyrus (one of the most important Egyptian exports of the Hellenistic period), and even lentils and dried fish. This information is very important for since we know that Smendes was a great trader with Phoenicia, we are warranted in assuming that this was the sort of cargo that his ships usually carried to Byblos.

Nevertheless though already at the period of Wenamūn the cities of Phoenicia may well have depended on external trade for their prosperity, as they certainly did a few centuries later, international trade, if now

* For full list of the goods sent see Wenamūn 2, 40 - 2, 42.

possessing a certain importance for Egypt, can only have had a marginal effect on her economy. When eventually under the early Ptolemies the whole economy was run on a basis of "export or die" (the great aim of the rulers being to export as much corn as they possibly could), this position was brought about not so much by the needs of Egypt as by the Ptolemies' wish as good Hellenistic kings to maintain the maximum possible influence outside Egypt. Plainly for Egyptian or thoroughly Egyptianized Libyan kings the needs of Egypt had to come first; it is noteworthy that under the later Ptolemies the corn export trade became of much less importance as they realized their destinies were irrevocably connected with Egypt rather than the wider Hellenistic world. Whether the corn trade in return for iron, silver and other metals, which was certainly in full operation by the Saite period, had yet begun is rather problematical, but intrinsically probable, though J. G. ^{*}Milne thought that at least as far as Greece was concerned, it was not fully organized until the seventh century, when Aegina took the initiative in importing cheap Egyptian corn in return for silver, this being valued at much above the international rate in Egypt. Probably the great prosperity of the Delta cities, beginning, it seems likely, under Ramesses II, and continuing throughout our period, was a result of the development of the lands of the Delta for agriculture ⁺instead of mere grazing, and not primarily the outcome of external trade; but a side effect must have been to connect Egypt ever more closely with Mediterranean civilization.

* JEA 25, 177-183

+ H. Kees, *Raumordnung und Landplanung im alten Aegypten*. Vol. 10, pp. 19-23 (see bibliography)

One further point should be mentioned in connection with international trading in the age immediately succeeding the invasions of the Sea People. There is definite evidence from the story of Wenamūn that some of the kings, even of the invading peoples, realized the importance of external trade and took active measures to protect traders against theft by their subjects, even being willing to give compensation in certain circumstances. Thus it was that while Wenamūn was at Dor, a major city of the Thekel, his goods for the purchase of cedar were stolen by one of the crew of the ship in which he was travelling: Wenamūn told the prince what had happened, and was informed that since an alien was responsible no compensation could be given, but that if a subject of the ruler had been responsible this would have been given. It seems probable that the obligation to make good losses incurred by travellers as the result of their subjects' actions was generally recognized at least in theory by state authorities, rather than that this was a special offer made to Wenamūn, whose mission the prince of Dor had no reason to favour.

The picture of external trade at the beginning of the Late Period emerging from the above shows that trade was to a large extent closely dependent on the enterprise of the authorities of various states. The maintenance of a reasonably strong and efficient state and economic structure in Egypt of the XXIst Dynasty, the continued existence of which there is no reason to deny in the economically significant North, though unrest and tomb robberies in the South undoubtedly show that there was no effective central administration in that region, allowed Egyptian trade to continue to flourish.

* This part of the story commences at Wenamūn 1, 10.

Possibly indeed the massive experimental projection of the Egyptian state into Asia attempted in the New Kingdom, though it had brought quick rewards of booty, had proved a long-term economic failure, since it seems to have caused the gradual impoverishment of the Palestinian^{*} princes. Probably the affluent and influential kings of the Philistines, and later of the Jews and Syrians, proved a far more satisfactory market for Egyptian goods. However, the misfortunes of Wenamūn, from which only a large measure of luck, his supreme self-importance and his companion deity saved him, testify to the fact that if the trading agents of a state were to enjoy protection and free passage, that country had to be not only internally organized and an attractive market for foreign goods, but had also to make its influence felt externally by a certain measure of political or military aggression, though probably this should not imply an attempt at the permanent occupation of a large area.

Unfortunately apart from the story of Wenamūn information about Egyptian policy towards Asia during the later part of the XXth Dynasty and the XXIst Dynasty is extremely scanty, and almost all derived from foreign sources, but it is fortunately possible to reconstruct the salient points of Egyptian policy from what little is known. The records of Tiglath-Pileser I, who seems to have been contemporaneous with the period Ramesses XI to Psusennes I in Egypt, show that when his Assyrian armies penetrated west of the Euphrates, they were met by an Egyptian embassy which presented him with a crocodile and other gifts. Presumably such an embassy was intended to show the intruder that he was trespassing on an Egyptian zone

* Cf. W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine*, Published in the Penguin Library, 1949, pages 99-101, for a similar opinion.

of influence, and at least shows that the Egyptian government retained a considerable measure of interest in what happened in this distant region.

On this occasion the Assyrians soon withdrew across the Euphrates, and the next period saw the growth of the Hebrew monarchy in place of the suzerainty of the Philistines, which had extended over all Palestine. The control exercised by the kings of all Israel, David and Solomon, seems at times to have extended over the whole area from the Philistine frontier to the Euphrates. Egyptian evidence continues to be non-existent, but the Hebrew records in the books of Kings and Chronicles show that Egypt became a safe refuge for the dispossessed chieftains of the conquered peoples. When Joab the ferocious general of King David crushed Edom, prince Hadad^{*} of Edom was taken to Egypt as a baby, and later greatly honoured at the court of Pharaoh, one of whose daughters he was allowed to marry. By that time, as will be seen below, Pharaoh stood on friendly relations with Solomon, the new king of Israel, and was not anxious to let Hadad leave Egypt, but he insisted on returning home, and successfully set up a schismatic movement in Edom.

It appears clear that during the troubled period from Saul to David, which saw the meteoric establishment of the Hebrew hegemony over Palestine, Egyptian intervention was negligible, though their relations with the Philistines may well have been friendly, and scattered references⁺ tend to show that Egyptian auxiliaries were fighting in the Philistine armies. On the

* 1 Kings 11, 14-22.

+ 2 Samuel 23, 21.

accession of Solomon, however, relations changed dramatically. Solomon was anxious to be a real king, not just a tribal chief like his father and Saul, and immediately set about building an impressive^{*} palace and temple as other kings did, and constructing fortresses. Arrangements were made for Solomon to marry⁺ a daughter of the Pharaoh (who must almost certainly have been king Siamun since there is no evidence to show that Psusennes II reigned more than four years, while Sesonchis I lived a number of years after Solomon though contemporary with his latter years), and he received as dowry the Canaanite town of[♯] Gezer which had been heavily enough fortified not to have fallen to the Hebrews, but which was seized and burned by the Pharaoh. For Egyptian armies to be able to operate at Gezer it would have been necessary to have access through Philistia, which must therefore at this stage have been tributary to Egypt.

Solomon became a collector of wealth such as no later Jewish king could amass and seems from all accounts to have indulged in extravagant display. This annoyed the Hebrew warrior class, who for the first time found themselves being taxed, but Solomon at the same time built up a strong standing army, constructed fortresses and bought large numbers of chariots and horses from Egypt[♯]. His fleets sailed to Ophir in search of gold, and there is probably every reason to think that Egyptian traders found the Jewish kingdom a very useful market. Nevertheless when, in the middle of the reign of Solomon, the ambitious and energetic Sesonchis I became king of Egypt,

* I Kings, 6 and 7.

+ I Kings 3, 1.

♯ I Kings 9, 16.

♯ I Kings 10, 28-9

relations would seem to have rapidly worsened, and the rebel Jeroboam, having sought to seize the throne from Solomon, was well received in Egypt^{*}, and after his death, when the kingdoms of Judah and Israel began to fall apart, was sent back to see that this disaffection became permanent schism. Finally in year 5 of Rehoboam of Judah, son of Solomon, Egyptian armies appeared in Asia, and to prevent attack Rehoboam handed over most of the wealth that his father Solomon had amassed and became a client king of the Egyptians. Egyptian armies seem to have penetrated as far as the north of Galilee, but avoided the centre⁺ of Israel, where perhaps Jeroboam had also agreed to become a client king.

Temporarily the effect seems to have been almost all that the Egyptian kings desired. The Hebrew kingdoms had been humbled, and Byblos returned to its status of being almost an Egyptian colony in[♠] Asia which it always assumed during periods of Egyptian power. The later kings of the XXIIInd Dynasty, however, do not seem to have been competent to carry on the great schemes of the ambitious Sesonchis I and Egyptian power in Asia seems to have faded out gradually over the following hundred years. One doubts the reality of the allegedly great victory that Asa king of Judah is said to have won over

* I Kings 11, 26-40.

+ See I Kings 14, 25-6. The vague Egyptian records of the campaign which contain some place-names mostly unknown are on the Bubastite gate at Thebes constructed by Sesonchis I.

♠ Dussaud. Syria V. (1924) p. 145ff.

*
 "Zerah the Ethiopian" since it is plain that by this nomenclature the writer is confusing the Libyan kings of the XXIInd Dynasty with the Cushite kings of the XXVth, and is inclined to wonder whether Zerah could not be a perversion of the name of the much later Taharqa. Nevertheless, it is plain that the Egyptian kings exercised no real control over events in Palestine, and the Hebrew and Syrian kinglets were left to carry on a series of destructive internecine wars. From Assyrian records it would appear that an Egyptian army was sent to aid the princelets of Palestine during the reign of Ahab in Israel; the result of the battle against the Assyrians was indecisive, but Ahab, and after the downfall of Ahab's family, Jehu, became tributary to Assyria. In Phoenicia, however, from the ninth century there sprang up a school of ivory-making, the material for which must almost certainly have been imported from Egypt, as also was to some extent the technique with which the figures were made, but this cannot be taken to show that Egypt exercised real political control.

It will have been noticed that in the above remarks only the relationship between Egypt and the states of the north has been considered, and no remarks have been made about relationships with the south. The reason for this is that virtually nothing is known of what happened in this region until the invasion of Egypt by the XXVth Dynasty. The Nile fortresses appear to have been occupied as such until the reign of Ramesses XI, whose cartouche is the last to occur⁺ there. The letters of Dhut^φmoose, however, make it clear

* 2 Chronicles 14, 9-15. The final syllable of Taharqa's name was probably not an integral part of it. See Macadam, Kawa I, 73-4, 124 n.1.

+ His cartouche occurs at Buhen and elsewhere.

φ Published by J. Černý in LRL (Bib. Aeg.9).

that the High Priest Piankh, son of Hrihor, carried out a campaign there nominally on behalf of Pharaoh (presumably either Ramesses XI or his successor Smendes). At the beginning of the XXIInd Dynasty Sesonchis I seems to have carried out campaigns in the Sudan as well as in Asia, but nothing whatever is known of any trade that may have taken place between Egypt and Cush.^{*} However, the apparent strong Egyptian character of the Sudan during the XXVth Dynasty, though partially caused because the sculptors of the stelae of that period were mostly imported from Egypt, tends to show that fairly close contact must have been retained during the period from the XXth to the XXVth Dynasty.

The position throughout the Late Period until the decadence which set in with the triumph of internal schism in Egypt in the last part of the XXIInd Dynasty, seems to have been that Egypt managed to retain the position of a great power in the Near East, though at the changes of dynasties envoys like Wenamun were in a very difficult position. During the whole of this period the Egyptian government, though rather weak internally, managed to maintain some degree of control over the whole of Egypt, and the country was spared the ordeal of foreign invasion. It appears that during this period the state-centred economy fell in very well with the needs of the Egyptians. The remainder of this work will be directed to an examination

* The finding of a small trinket bearing the name of a son of a king Sesonchis (?I) in the tomb of the wife of king Aspelta of Napata cannot be taken as evidence since it might well have been brought to the Sudan during the XXVth Dynasty.

of the character of the Egyptian economy as it functioned within Egypt, and of the social institutions which grew up as a result of the changes in the character of the Egyptian system between the XXth and XXVth Dynasty when Egypt gradually changed from a highly centralized bureaucracy to a somewhat feudalistic state. The view will be taken that there were no sudden or dramatic changes, and that the modifications within the Egyptian structure were subtle as well as gradual, but nevertheless the change which took place was profound, and is well worth study.

Section 2A Consideration of the Material available for the Reconstruction of the Economic and Social History of Egypt from the late XXth to the XXVth Dynasty.

The aim in the first section above, which can be regarded as to some extent introductory to the main body of the work dealing with the internal economy of Egypt, has been to show that in so far as one can tell from what is known of Egyptian foreign relations at the period under study, at least until the internal disintegration which set in with the later XXIVth Dynasty, there is no reason to believe that Egypt was in any way becoming a cultural or economic backwater. Unfortunately the information available is extremely limited and leaves many questions unanswered, but it appears certain that the rulers of Egypt of this period maintained a strong interest in the external world. Egyptian policy gradually underwent an enforced modification from the outright attempt at the complete military domination of the surrounding lands characteristic of the earlier New Kingdom, which Sesonchis I partially sought to revive, to a much more limited form of influence essentially based on the fact that the rulers of Palestine would recognize Egypt as a powerful protector against absorption by the great new state of Assyria in the north.

To this extent it can be said that a changed situation in the external field brought a new and effective answer from Egypt. This and the following sections are to deal primarily with the internal structure of Egypt, and obviously one of the main objectives must be to discover whether in this field also the picture is one of logical social development to meet new needs, or whether the view must be taken that the period is one of gradually in-

creasing decadence, when the great achievements of the New Kingdom were at best lamely imitated.

Several initial observations should be made with regard to the sources of modern knowledge. A commonplace in the study of Egyptology often * mentioned is to what an excessive extent modern appreciation of the roles of various dynasties is determined by the number of buildings which they built at Thebes, where many of the temples have been preserved, rather than at other places where they have not. Thus although, for instance, thanks to the excavations of Montet⁺ at Tanis, there is some reason to believe that king Psusennes I may have been a not inconsiderable builder, virtually nothing else is known of him, since Thebes lay largely outside his direct control and the area of his works. Perhaps the Bubastite Gate at Thebes and its surrounds were by no means the most important constructional work undertaken by king Sesonchis I. His inscriptions^φ mention what must be a funerary temple at Memphis and probably one at Thebes, but the site of neither of these is known.

* This has already been treated briefly in the introduction; the remarks of Mlle. Préaux perhaps have less point than she thought, but are still very important: see PER p. 10-23.

+ B. Montet. Tanis Vol. 1 (Psusennes) pages 10-14.

φ Gebel-es-Silileh 100 published by R. Caminos in JEA 38, page 46ff.

For name of Memphite mortuary temple, "The House of Millions of Years of Hedjkheperre Sheshong-Meriamun which is in Hikuptah" see Porter and Moss II, 34.

Thus the position seems established — at least as far as the present state of our knowledge is concerned since very little excavation has been done in the northern part of Egypt — that the information available concerning the careers of kings who resided in the north and carried out most of their building there, is necessarily strictly limited. The vast majority of the papyrus documents of the late Ramesside age coming from Thebes may ultimately be derived from various caches of material from the record office of the Medinet Habu temple^{*}, which in itself is sufficient to show how greatly what has been preserved depends on sheer chance.

However, when all these necessary reservations have been made, there can be no doubt that a great deal of material is available for study and evaluation concerning social and economic matters. The early Egyptologists were quite rightly interested in the first place in building up a framework of Egyptian history of a fairly complete and reliable nature, rather than in the social and economic research which could only come after this groundwork had been established. Accordingly research in these fields has come to fruition only in fairly recent years. Erman and Breasted long ago realized the intrinsic importance of the Harris Papyrus I as a source of information on some aspects of ancient Egypt, but neither was able to devote sufficient time and energy to make it give up all its information, nor was much of the auxiliary material available which has played such an important part in its elucidation.

* H. D. Schaedel. (SLPH) p. 10 bottom, following the opinion of Samuel Birch suggests that P. Harris I and some tomb robbery papyri were found in the same place.

The brilliant work of Schaedel,^{*} who was the first to treat seriously the claim of P. Harris I to be the record of the gifts of one king Ramesses III to the gods rather than a sadly incomplete inventory of all the possessions of the gods of Egypt -- which would necessitate the assumption that P. Harris was prepared with the most extraordinary carelessness since some great temples and their estates were not mentioned at all --, laid the foundation for the study of ancient Egyptian economic institutions by showing that this type of document should be accepted very largely as what it claimed to be.

However, it was the work of Sir Alan Gardiner which shed so much light on the hitherto little explored field of social economics, in the four volumes of the Wilbour⁺ Papyrus, and by the mass of related documents that he has also published. Indeed it is now difficult to appreciate what was the state of knowledge before Gardiner published P. Wilbour, so profoundly has it modified the current ideas of Egyptology on economic questions. As Professor Fairman has put it in his review of the work,[♠] "If one day we may be able to produce a proper economic history of Ancient Egypt, this will be due to a large extent to Sir Alan's monumental work and his preparatory studies".

Obviously, however, a pioneer work, for all its excellence, could not exhaust the potentialities of such a vast and hitherto little explored field

* SLPH for this side of the study showing that only some of the Egyptian temples are named, see particularly pp. 41-44.

+ Hereinafter the abbreviation WP will be used to refer to this work of Gardiner, not the papyrus itself.

♠ JEA 39, p. 123.

of study, and many writers have devoted themselves to adding to this side of Egyptological knowledge. Kees and Helck have studied respectively the priesthood and the administrative structure of ancient Egypt, and have produced extremely interesting and important results. Professor H. W. Fairman in his review of WP has produced a number of new suggestions with regard to the interpretation of P. Wilbour. In Russia Mme Lourie reviewed the work and made a few interpretations of her own, while an important advance in the study of the document has undoubtedly been made by I. A. Stuchevsky in his article, "Towards the Interpretation of the Data in the Papyrus Wilbour on Land-Tenure and Tax Assessment in Egypt at the Time of the ^{*}Ramessides" (in Russian).

The present section will not be aiming so much to break new ground with detailed elaboration on particular problems — these will be investigated more fully in the two succeeding sections — so much as attempting to give a concise guide to what is known of the social and economic structure of ancient Egypt. Hitherto as mentioned in the introduction, this has been partially lacking for any period other than the Ptolemaic where the material is in some cases of very controversial interpretation. The intention will be to evaluate in outline how far and in what fields, on the evidence we at present possess, it is possible to gain a reasonably certain and complete knowledge of ancient Egyptian practice at the period in question. Where material of a strictly contemporaneous character is lacking or inadequate in our period,

* Hereafter abbreviated SIPW, published in VDI (1958), No. 1 pp. 77-93: see Bibliography.

a brief consideration may be made of what earlier or later material bearing on the subject is available from the New Kingdom or the Ptolemaic period. As mentioned in the introduction, the writer is convinced that there was a much greater degree of institutional continuity between the Ptolemaic period and earlier parts of Egyptian history than most Ptolemaic studies have supposed, a contention which will be vindicated below. Such information, however, from a much later period, must be treated with extreme caution both because changes may have occurred, and because a number of the conclusions which previous writers have reached concerning the Ptolemaic state may well be wrong on some matters of economic practice where the material is slight.

Thanks to the survival of the fragmentary document, the so-called Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus^{*}, as well as of P. Tebtynis 703, workers on Ptolemaic Egypt have long been acquainted with the guiding principles of the Ptolemaic economy, and the strictly centralized control in force both for agricultural production and for the production of manufactured goods such as linen. Unfortunately no similar document giving details of the regulations controlling production has survived from earlier times, but the data of P. Wilbour are only comprehensible if understood as reflecting the operation of a somewhat similar highly centralized and directed economy.

The preserved portion of the Revenue Laws deals mainly with the system of virtual state monopoly and control of production applied to the manufacture of vegetable oils, but it is quite clear that the same paternal

* J. P. Mahaffy and B. P. Grenfell, Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Oxford, 1896.

planning extended to almost all forms of production*, though the ways in which control was enforced varied enormously. As Mlle Préaux, in her detailed discussion of the Ptolemaic economy, points out, no regular system was employed, but each problem was met in the cheapest way, though this was sometimes haphazard and lacking theoretical efficiency. Mlle Préaux appears rather inclined to the old view that most of the Ptolemaic system was new with the Hellenistic period, if not with Philadelphus, but at a slightly earlier date Andréadès gave a brilliant exposition on general historical grounds of the fact that the economic system of the Ptolemies must have been in operation long before their time. The main basis of his argument, which the subsequent publication of P. Wilbour has shown to be well-founded, is that it is a generally accepted view in economics that when institutions are unsystematized, though reasonably efficient for practical purposes, this is a reliable indication that they have been naturally evolved over a long period rather than created wholesale. Though more recent evidence shows that basically the term "monopolistic" is a less accurate description of the Pharaonic and Ptolemaic economies of Egypt than "regulated", monopolies being only one result of the state direction of the economy, the article of Andréadès still remains immensely valuable as a piece of clear, shrewd, historical argument.

While it does not fall within the terms of reference of this study to consider the characteristics of the Ptolemaic economy as such, it is very

-
- * See PER pp. 94-371 for an elaborate disquisition on the Ptolemaic system.
 - * *Mélanges Maspéro* II (1935-7) pp. 289-295.

instructive for our purposes to bear in mind that many Ptolemaic institutions can be directly related to those of an earlier age, though they may not correspond exactly. "Fields of Pharaoh" are attested in the great Edfu donation inscription and in Demotic documents as well as in P. Wilbour and throughout the New Kingdom, while the *διαγραφὴ ἐπόρου* of the Ptolemaic period corresponds closely to the ts prt of P. Wilbour, as Gardiner has shown[†]. The tax farmers of Hellenistic times appear to have been a new development, but government officials such as the *οἰκονόμοι* retained agricultural and other duties essentially concerned with the administration of the controlled economy like their Egyptian predecessors, and continued to be financially responsible for the payment of a fixed amount of produce. Ptolemaic farmers had to obtain the necessary animals for ploughing from herdsmen controlling the cattle of the temples or the king, and P. Lansing shows that a similar procedure was usual in the New Kingdom.

The present writer is also convinced that historical parallelism can properly be used in other ways to broaden our appreciation of the nature of the ancient Egyptian economic structure of the Pharaonic period. For instance P. Tebtunis I, published long before the discovery of P. Wilbour, shows that in the early Ptolemaic period royal land (*γῆ βασιλική*),

-
- * Sethe and Partsch. Demotische Burgschaftsurkunden. p. 13. WP. Comm. p. 167.
 + WP Comm. p. 115. For discussion of the nature of the *διαγραφὴ ἐπόρου* see PER p. 117, U. Wilcken, Urkunden der Ptolemaerzeit, I, 110,42 (page 490).
 † P. Lansing 6, 3-4 published in Late Egyptian Miscellanies (Biblio. Aegypt. 7) by Sir Alan Gardiner.

temple land (γῆ ἱερὰ) and γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει, that is land "released" from direct royal control, which was composed of private holdings and apparently sometimes temple lands, could be treated together in the same administrative document, implying that to some degree they came under the control of a centralizing agency.

Unfortunately, however, the erroneous impression was prevalent at the time when that papyrus was published that the very nature of Ptolemaic institutions of an economic character was fundamentally different from those of Pharaonic times. Egyptologists like Breasted preferred to continue to think of the New Kingdom temples as more or less independent and self-governing bodies, and not to recognize the probability that in the New Kingdom likewise all lands secular or sacred fell within the scope of a single state administrative body, though naturally great land-owning corporations like the temple of Amenrasonter had elaborate internal administrative hierarchies also. Indeed even in WP when Gardiner recognized that incontrovertible proof was now available showing the existence of a centralized fiscal body controlling all forms of land, he expressed surprise* that this should be found to be so, and elsewhere makes it clear⁺ that he considers that there is a great gulf fixed between the institutions of the New Kingdom and those of the Ptolemaic period. The contention will be advanced in this work that his curious reluctance to make use of fuller material only available from later periods does much to prevent Gardiner realizing exactly how much can be established about the late New Kingdom.

* WP Comm. p. 25.

+ e. g. WP Comm. p. 167.

Historical comparisons between the information contained in P. Wilbour and documents of later date bring out many points which are not obvious if P. Wilbour is considered in isolation. In WP Gardiner draws attention to a New Kingdom inscription,^{*} making it clear that many of the leading administrators of the temples, if not all, were appointed by the king, but the ⁺Petition of Petiēse is far more revealing in showing the continuous intrigue going on around the king and how all the great courtiers sought to secure the prosperity of their relatives by obtaining rich preferments for them. This background makes it readily intelligible how during the later XXth Dynasty the higher posts in the immensely wealthy temple of Amūn at Thebes could be almost monopolized by the relatives of Merybaste, a high official of Ramesses III, and shows how easily central control could evaporate under a line of kings who could not keep the rapacity of their favourites within bounds.

Helck has shown how during the XIXth Dynasty there is reason to suppose that the High Priesthood of Amūn was sometimes conferred on officials of the highest rank as a form of pension, when they were too old for active duties, and that Herihor⁺ appears to have acquired the post in order to add a veneer of respectability to his military rule at Thebes. By this kind

* W. M. F. Petrie, Tarkhan I and Memphis V, Pls. 79-80.

+ Publ. F.Ll. Griffith, "Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the Rylands Library at Manchester".

♯ cf. KP page 97-101. The aspect of "pensionierung" is much more developed by Helck in VMNR pp. 311-315, and his views here appear well justified.

♯ KP page 130.

of means the position which we considered in the Introduction was maintained, whereby the enjoyment of all posts of emolument was kept within the small circle of people who had influence either in the local administration or with the central government, since anyone who fell from favour would be evicted from his position. Nevertheless, though in so many ways the temple corporations were closely dependent on the state administration, the opinion of Stuchevsky^{*} that there was a single temple-royal economy, into which all the revenues of the lands of the great corporations were paid for use as thought fit, does not appear to be in accord with attested facts. There appears no conceivable doubt or question from the whole tone of P. Harris I, as well as from the mass of other donation inscriptions, that when the king presented real estate to a deity, he was conferring a benefit, in order that the temple corporation in question might derive extra income from the presentation of the land, receiving either the whole of the revenues or a substantial portion. Thus the estates of deities corresponded closely to the wagf of modern Egypt, which is a trust territory set aside for the maintenance of a particular family or institution. The idea that the revenues of temple estates were not primarily destined for use exclusively by that particular institution, but for any use that the state thought fit, appears quite untenable. The Amiens Papyrus⁺ shows that the dues of the great temples were collected by their own fleets, and the Griffith Fragments⁺

* SIPW page 91 top.

+ These are published in transcription in RAD. The Amiens Papyrus pp. 1-13. The Griffith Fragments pp. 68-71. see JEA XXVII, 64ff.

appear to indicate that — at least in the first place — all the takings were sent to the temple treasuries. A large number of decrees of all periods from the late Old Kingdom to the downfall of the Ptolemies give temples and their staff immunity from the attentions of royal officials, who were not allowed to seize either personnel or goods — rights which the Egyptian official possessed when dealing with ordinary citizens. Indeed these decrees are usually framed in such generous terms and so vaguely, that any official even of the highest rank would hesitate to interfere.

The situation of the temple corporations, then, was that they were corporate administrative bodies set up to take care of the endowments of deities, while the secular corporations were established to provide specific revenues for particular purposes rather than general use. Thus, as the decree of Haremheb at Karnak appears to state, the "landing-places of Pharaoh", which comprised small groups of fields, were intended to provide food for the king on his annual journey to Thebes (this had been a regular practice since the days of Tuthmosis III), while no doubt the Harem holdings were intended to give an assured source of income apart from whatever subventions from the Treasury might be available. Why this method of administering revenues by granting real estate instead of drawing on central funds was so much in vogue is not immediately obvious, but there can be little doubt that it arose in connection with the extremely ancient custom of giving donations of land to secure funerary endowments for the services on behalf of the dead,

* Cf. Sir Alan Gardiner, "The Nauri Decree" in JEA 38, 24 ff.

+ Published by Wolfgang Helck in ZAS 80, pp. 109-136. See Plate 10.L.27ff.

and was directed towards the permanent security of the deities or persons affected. Thus the view expressed by Mme ^{*}Lourie is basically correct that the temple or other institution at the head of each paragraph in Text A of P. Wilbour must have been the primary recipient of the dues of the lands in that paragraph.

To leave our conclusions at that would, however, be to paint a false picture. In addition to giving charters of immunity from molestation by the officers of state to the temples, any good king was expected to lay⁺ down strict rules concerning the way temple revenues should be administered, and the divine services carried out. In this the strongly theocratic and religious character of the ancient Egyptian state comes to the fore: the king was regarded as a god himself, and one of his most important duties to the community was to act as a link with the divinities, seeing that the interests of the gods were protected on earth so that they in their turn would be gracious to Egypt. Moreover, favoured or very important temples were not expected to live on their endowment lands entirely, but could expect to receive bountiful donations from the king from the revenues of lands presumably not belonging to any waqf, i.e. from the general state revenues. Some of these donations of corn and other goods were specifically made to allow the lengthening of festivals, and so it would appear probable that

 * Review of WP by I. M. Lourie in VDI (1955) No. 1, pp. 102-107.

+ Ramesses III in his record of benefactions in P. Harris I makes repeated references to the way in which he laid down regulations for the proper administration of the temples (see e.g. Harris Pl 57, line 9).

♯ For complete list of these donations of Ramesses III see P. Harris Facsimile Pl. 70, L.3 - Pl. 74.

succeeding kings would find themselves under a strong obligation to continue them.

Furthermore, the very existence of comprehensive lists of waqfs in particular areas of Egypt — it will be seen below that Text A of P. Wilbour is virtually such — shows quite incontrovertibly, as mentioned above, that in addition to their administration being subject to rules laid down by the state, they were partially administered by a central co-ordinating body. Perhaps waqf lands like other lands in Egypt were subject to taxation, or to irregular levies by this administrative authority. In any event one can be confident that the allocation of the ts prt or sowing-order, laying down what crops temple lands were to grow, as was also done with other lands, was arranged at this national level, though no doubt persons of very great importance in the administration of waqf lands, such as Usimarēnakhte, the Steward of Amun, would have a great say in making the arrangements. One can be certain also that the arrangements whereby local magnates, prophets, mayors of towns, and army officers stationed in that area were appointed to look after the far-flung estates of the great temples, were made at this highest level. We have no means of knowing exactly what officers of state constituted the central economic planning board, but the view of Gardiner that the whole of the taxation system was under the direction of the official

* It is rather difficult to see how Gardiner in WP Comm. can be so confident that this was so. See p. 207.

+ Cf. P. Harris Pl. 57, L. 8 end.

known as p3 '3 n St does not seem ^{*}tenable, though probably this officer was of very great importance and certainly had much wider duties than the task of erecting obelisks. In any case the weight of the evidence would seem to suggest that the central authority was concerned with the whole organization of the agricultural economy, and not simply with the taxation of the land.

One further fact showing clearly that temples were far from totally independent of each other should be mentioned. In one out of three instances in P. Wilbour, as Sir Alan Gardiner has demonstrated⁺, where an institution is found holding non-apportioning domain — that is land run for the benefit of the institution itself, not by arrangement with tenants whereby they work the land in return for a share in the proceeds — a final clause is found stating that another institution is entitled to an amount of corn equivalent to 7.5% of the figures given. Such lands also occur accredited to the estate (pr) of the institution entitled to the smaller share by a type of double book-keeping.

* See discussion in VMNR pp. 143-145. The fact that the title was borne by Usimarēnakhte, who was also steward of the king and of Amūn, and one of the most influential people in the country, fully demonstrates its importance.

+ Pōsh-entries of Type A in Gardiner's terminology, WP Comm. p. 58.

∅ Pōsh-entries of Type B of Gardiner, WP Comm. p. 59. These entries do not treat this category of land quite as if it were fully in the possession of the temple receiving the smaller share of the proceeds, but rather as if it were made available to the temple receiving the larger share.

During the earlier part of this section a fairly complete picture has been built up of the role of the temples in the higher economy and politics of ancient Egypt, and of the coterie of persons of wealth and power centred around the family of the great Merybaste, a favourite of Ramesses III and administrator of his funerary temple, who managed to obtain for themselves the right to participate in the administration of the wealth of Egypt. To such men, who stood high in the favour of the kings, and held important positions in the central administration, the great temples and the funerary temples of the kings, set up as land-owning corporations within but nevertheless apart from the main mechanism of the directed economy, offered welcome stipends, both for themselves and their relatives. During the energetic reign of Ramesses III the ambitions of these courtiers had probably been kept in check, but it appears likely that during the next two reigns their hold on the country was consolidated, and by the time of Ramesses IX the High Priest of Amūn Amenhotpe, son of the High Priest Ramessenakhte, of the period of P. Wilbour, could indulge in ^{*} gestures which showed that he considered himself almost the equal of the king. No doubt this assertion of a degree of independence was greatly helped by the autonomous position of Thebes which from the Middle Kingdom had a separate administration and ranked as a second capital. The influence of the house of Merybaste in the person of the High Priest Amenhotpe seems to have persisted some while into the reign of Ramesses XI when military intervention (which will be studied below) brought a new factor into the situation.

* See G. Lefebvre, "Inscriptions concernant les Grands-prêtres Rome-Roy et Amenhotep". See Inscriptions 11 and 12 for his unprecedented pride in having himself depicted at Karnak on the same scale as Ramesses IX.

So far it has been clearly established that in Text A of P. Wilbour there occur domains belonging both to all kinds of temples, from great national fanes like that of Amenrasonter to small chapels, and to various secular corporations such as the royal Harem and the "landing-places of Pharaoh". The one common factor uniting all these lands (with the problematic exception of small quantities of khato-land of Pharaoh discussed below in the more detailed consideration of P. Wilbour in Section 3) is that all can be regarded as wagf, devoted to the needs of one particular institution rather than to the general requirements of the national exchequer. Realization of this point brings out one of the great problems in the study of ancient Egyptian agricultural economics, which, however, no writer so far has adequately appreciated, namely the degree to which the whole land of Egypt was parcelled out into wagfs designed for the maintenance of particular institutions sacred or profane.

Professor Fairman has demonstrated^{*} that the lands catalogued in Text A of P. Wilbour can only be a very small portion of the entire cultivable area within the zone covered by the survey, but avoids the problem whether this was the sum total of wagf land in the area, by his observation that on occasion the ancient Egyptians practised summer cultivation on the most suitable lands. For him Text A is only a record of the lands on which a second harvest could be raised. The implication that if P. Wilbour was a record of the ordinary winter harvest, all the cultivated land within the area would be included, is nowhere made explicit, but is plainly fundamental to Fairman's view of the document.

* JEA 39 pp. 119-120.

Though the dates at the head of each section of Text A appear to favour the view of Fairman, there are almost insuperable arguments against his theory. Gardiner has established* that the vast majority of the lands of Text A consist of k3yt-land, which is by definition land lying high above the Nile floods, unlike the small quantities of m3wt-land mentioned, which would have been the land annually "renewed" by the river. Stuchevsky, moreover, has gone far to show that the small plots of land named in "apportioning"⁺ domain in text A must usually have been of a much lower quality than the ordinary arable land. It would appear almost certain that it would have been totally impracticable to raise a summer harvest on such land. The logical conclusion to reach would seem to be that Text A is intended to be a complete register of wagfs in the area concerned, but not to include other types of land which were not under this form of entail, whose revenues went for the general purposes of the state. The correctness of this conclusion seems to be established, since only small quantities of khato-land of Pharaoh, most of which seem to have a definite connection with a wagf, are mentioned in Text A, whereas in Text B, which is an exclusive register of khato-land in much the same area, vast extra quantities of this type of land occur. Furthermore it seems infinitely preferable to assume that "fields of Pharaoh", the royal estate proper,

* WP Comm. p. 28. m3wt and k3yt lands are never contrasted in P. Wilbour, Text A, but the Ptolemaic parallel cited there from Brugsch seems to confirm that the same type of contrast existed in earlier times.

+ SIPW pp. 92-3.

seldom became part of waqfs, rather than to suppose that all that remained^{*} of this estate were a few plots on "landing-places of Pharaoh" (in any case this is disproved by Text B, where "fields of Pharaoh" are often mentioned).

From this discussion one almost inescapable conclusion of the greatest importance emerges. Since "fields of Pharaoh", khato-land of Pharaoh, and miné-land of Pharaoh are almost completely omitted from Text A except where they stand in demonstrable connection with some waqf, while Text B is an exclusive survey of khato-land, a specialized form of royal estate, there can be no reasonable doubt that when land surveys, like that of which P. Wilbour forms a part, were decided upon, all types of land were not measured by the same team, but separate registers of each of the main qualities of land were made. This interpretation of the nature of Text A as only including waqf lands, and Text B as only including khato-land, explains why the fields cited in P. Wilbour should only be so small a proportion of the whole cultivable area, and finally disposes of the unlikely argument of Helck⁺ that because "fields of Pharaoh" are hardly mentioned in P. Wilbour, the royal estate must have almost disappeared before this period. Such fields are mentioned in the inscription of Penné at Aniba of the reign of Ramesses VI, and the magnificent donations of corn made by Ramesses III to the temples only some ten years before the date of

* Helck VMNR pp. 111-115 makes the assumption that in the reign of Ramesses V royal estate had almost disappeared, but this view is difficult to justify by factual evidence.

+ see previous note.

P. Wilbour can only suggest that large estates were at his disposal. Indeed the survival of considerable royal estates under the same name until the Ptolemaic period argues extremely cogently against the supposition that this type of land had ever virtually disappeared.

The separation of royal land from khato-land and from the waqf domains accredited to various land-owning corporations for survey purposes can only suggest that, under the Ramessides as under the Ptolemies, the royal domain proper was administered by special officials, and gives some indication of the complex structure required to keep the ancient Egyptian "regulated" economy in operation. This view of the function of P. Wilbour as an administrative rather than a tax document may also add plausibility to the theory that the figures in the papyrus are rather estimates of expected yield than assessments of tax. However, since so little is known concerning the functioning of the ancient system, such speculations cannot pass beyond mere hypothesis.

From this point it will be valuable to move on to consider more fully the data given by P. Wilbour concerning land tenure on the estates of the great land-owning corporations and in the khato-land of Pharaoh. Gardiner uses a complicated terminology to describe the different types of holding in Text A, but here for the sake of uniformity the simplified

terminology of Stuchevsky will be generally followed.

In view of what has been said earlier in this section concerning the way in which high posts within the administration of the temples were used as extra rewards for favoured officials and their relatives, one is not surprised to see that the same system of appointment extended apparently to the choice of administrators to take charge of the scattered "domains" of temples and other institutions, which sometimes, particularly in the case of the wealthiest of the temples, like that of Amenrasonter, were spread all over Egypt. Sometimes a group of officials was placed in charge of domains, but usually a single prominent person was given this kind of charge; there can be little doubt that this type of appointment was essentially personal, and not attached directly to the main office of the holder, though

-
- * SIPW pp. 79-80. Some explanation of this terminology may be useful here. Type A paragraphs of Stuchevsky correspond to the non-apportioning domain of Gardiner (see WP Comm. p. 55) including pōsh-entries of type A where these occur (WP Comm. p. 57). Type B paragraphs correspond to the pōsh or "apportioning" entries of type B of Gardiner (WP Comm. p. 58). Type C paragraphs in this work correspond not only to the pōsh-entries of type C of Gardiner, but also to the holdings on "apportioning domain" or "apportioned harvest-taxes" in the hands of private persons which as Gardiner established, on page 59 of WP Comm., are treated in a very similar way.
- + Gardiner after discussion decides to use this term to describe these administrative groupings of fields. It should be understood that the fields were not necessarily contiguous.

on the death of an administrator of this sort the charge would devolve^{*} on his deputy in office until the land could be re-allocated. Naturally the High Priest of Amun Ramessenakhte (during the reign of Ramesses III known as Usimarēnakhte) and his son Usimarēnakhte (to be identified with the steward of Amun Ramessenakhte of the Amiens Papyrus) recur prominently in this context in P. Wilbour, where in Text B Usimarēnakhte is found in control of considerable quantities of khato-land of Pharaoh. Other high officials in the central administration, either serving or retired, also occur in this context, but generally appointments of this sort seem to have gone to local worthies such as mayors of towns and prophets of local temples.

Generally speaking, however, people of considerable influence did not take direct charge of the management of the land, which was under the charge of subordinates of lower social status. Probably these people were appointed by the controller of the land, and they appear on some occasions to have controlled a considerable amount of land in different plots⁺. Probably the main function of the greater personages was supervisory and to protect their subordinates[♯]. Perhaps also they served as guarantors for the harvest like the tax farmers of Hellenistic times. There appears to be no evidence to justify the conclusion of Stuchevsky that Type A and B holdings belonged to the persons named at the head of each paragraph, or

* See e.g. P. Wilbour, Text A 29, 2-3.

+ SIPW p. 82-3.

♯ For an account of the hazards that could beset a subordinate see the model letter Anastasi VI, 7 ff. Such dependents might not only administer land, but control workshops etc.

that they were leased to the people of lesser degree who carried out the work. Indeed the attested fact that when administrators of these types of land died the lands temporarily passed to their deputies and not to their children, presumably until it was re-allocated, whereas the rights to the small plots of type C passed to the holders' children,^{*} seems to show clearly that in spite of the similarity in form between holdings of type B and type C, there was a fundamental difference in the form of land tenure. Holders of type A and B plots remained administrators whether they were of the higher or the lower rank, and worked the land on behalf of temples perhaps very largely by serf-labour. Most of the proceeds of the land seem to have gone to the owning corporation and probably the officials were in some way salaried for their services. Holders of small plots of Type C land were tenants working the land for a share of the proceeds, and paying comparatively light taxes.⁺ The difference of status between the great administrators of land together with their subordinates who supervised the cultivation of the land, and the holders of Type C plots is further indicated by the occasional evidence^δ showing that the supervisory functions of the officials included not only holdings of Types A and B, but also extended to the control of the holders of Type C plots.

* See e.g. P. Wilbour, A. 56, 40.

+ The details of the assessment system will be treated below in Section 3.

δ for examples of the same functionary supervising non-apportioning domain of Types A and B and also "apportioned harvest-taxes" (sinw) - for Stuchevsky of type C - e.g. P. Wilbour, A 12, 20 - 15, 16 & 38, 40-39, 14. For an administrator of Apportioning Domain see id. 55, 10-27.

Though the indications are that the holders of Type C plots were perhaps only "service-tenants" on temple land with restricted rights, the evidence of P. Wilbour makes it quite clear that they had established the right to hereditary possession of their little plots, whether or not this had originally been theirs. It should here be observed that Stuchevsky regards their rights as falling far short of private ownership in the Marxist terminology, since in his view they did not have full rights to dispose of their land, but all this side of the question is very obscure, and attempts to compare the exceedingly different ancient system with modern practices do not produce useful results.

Probably the holders of type C lands were generally referred to as nmhy, that is, freemen or freeholders, but there is a certain amount of evidence showing that there was also another class of private landowner enjoying many more rights and probably holding larger amounts of ground in spite of the strong tendency in the ancient Egyptian system for privately held plots to be swallowed up. Probably most of these holdings had been granted by the king in return for services from the royal estates or lands which had lapsed from the domains of the land-holding corporations, and it would seem that they were subject to some form of taxation. Frequently such grants of land appear to have been entailed in one family "from son to some and heir to heir" implying that they could not be disposed of, and in the event of the extinction of the family would presumably revert to the

* SIPW p. 85 Note 37.

+ Cf. VMNR pp. 122-123.

Crown. The Inscription of Mes^{*} gives a considerable amount of information about one such family possession which was entailed in the family of one Neshi, who lived in the reign of Amasis I, and the quarrels of his descendants over possession of the property between the reigns of Akhnaten and Ramesses II, when the writer Mes managed to conclude the affair by successful legal action.

The independent character of these holders of land is shown by the inscription, since apparently all the cases in the long legal proceedings, and certainly the lawsuit of Mes, were taken direct to the Vizier without any officials of the landowning corporations being involved. It would appear that the only records of tax paid in past years, which were called for, were kept in the Taxation Department at Tanis, and this, coupled with the fact that P. Valençay I⁺ states explicitly that certain nmhy resident at Elephantine at the end of the XXth Dynasty paid their taxes direct to the Treasury, leads to the supposition that direct payment of taxes was the regular procedure. Unfortunately there is no means of estimating how great was the area of this 1ht nmhy held by private persons in relation to the domains of the great corporations, but the rarity of references to this type of freeholding, possessors of which were in a much more independent position than the holders of Type C plots in P. Wilbour, can give some presumptive evidence to suggest that they were rather uncommon in the New

* Published by Gardiner in Sethe, Untersuchungen 3, Leipzig. 1905.

+ Gardiner, A Protest against unjustified Tax-Demands. in RE 6, 15 ff.

^A Also translated in WP Comm. Postscript.

Kingdom. However, the Dakhla Stela^{*} of the reign of Sesonchis I, very capably studied by Gardiner, shows that a few centuries later, at least in the region of that oasis, the water sources were recognized as being clearly divided between those belonging to the king and those belonging to nmhy, who had full rights of possession. It is probable that the comparative decline of the controlled economy of the New Kingdom had allowed some tenants to shake off the control of the corporations which owned their land, and by the Ptolemaic period private farms were becoming very common, while in other cases the control of the temple probably amounted to no more than the right to demand a tithe⁺. However, there is no lack of material to show the abiding importance of the land-owning corporations, and the royal estates in the period under study, and though nmhy might manage to acquire plots larger than those of type C in P. Wilbour, on land of better quality, there are indications that only a few managed to shed their obligations completely.

The tenant-farmers described by the stela^δ of Ewerot, son of Osorkon I and High Priest of Amun at Thebes during the last part of the reign of his

* Spiegelberg, RT 21, pp. 12-21; Gardiner, The Dakhleh Stela, JEA 19.p. 19 ff.

+ Cf. The London Bilingual Papyrus, published Griffith, PSBA 14, p. 63 ff. where the Demotic text mentions the dependence of a property on the temple of Amen-Rē^c, but the Greek text ignores it as unimportant. See also the Greek docket to P. Rylands XV for same impression.

δ Legrain, ZAS 35 pp. 13-16; Erman ib. 19-24 BAR. IV § 795. Breasted dates Ewerot to the XXIIIrd Dynasty, but W. Hayes has shown convincingly that he must have been the son of Osorkon I. See JEA 34 pp. 47-50.

father and the earliest years of the reign of his brother Takelot I, appear certainly to have enjoyed considerable holdings, and were mostly members of the priesthood of Amen-Rē.⁶ This exceedingly interesting inscription records that in year ten of his father the young prince Ewerot, then presumably a junior prophet of Amūn assisting his brother, the High Priest Sheshonq, received from his father a personal donation of land in the estate of Amūn in which his father had bought him perpetual* rights. At the time of purchase all of the land, which was partially of good quality and partially st tni, apparently meaning "bushy and not of the best standard", was held by a number of priestly tenants holding considerable acreages of ground whose value is quoted in the inscription. These people were allowed to remain in possession after the whole area was made over to Ewerot, who presumably received a portion of the yield for himself, perhaps the part which had been paid to the temple before his father bought it out. The occasion of the erection of the Stela was when Ewerot felt the approach of old age, and wished to give permanent form to his bequest of the land in question to his son Khamwise to the

* The idea of kings purchasing rights in temple corporations for their relatives does not appear to have been strange to the Egyptians, but does not imply in the judgement of the writer that temple land was saleable to ordinary people. Cf. I. Harari. La Nature de la Stèle de Donation de Fonction du Roi Ahmôsis à la Reine Ahmès-Nefertari, ASAE 56 (1959) pp. 139-201.

+ Cf. WP Comm. p. 29. Note 1 particularly Gardiner's bracketed reservation. There seems no reason why tni land should be of extremely bad quality.

exclusion of his other sons and his brothers. Presumably this was to stop the land passing with the high priestly possessions to his successor in office, his brother Smendes.

Stuchevsky, as mentioned above, though accentuating unduly the character of the administrators of Type A and B plots in P. Wilbour as private land-holders, is inclined to minimise the rights of possession enjoyed by holders of Type C plots. Although he admits that P. Wilbour shows conclusively that land of this kind could change hands, he denies^{*} that the evidence is sufficient to prove that this was by some form of sale. The Ewerot Stela, however, in which each of the pieces of land mentioned is quoted with its value in silver, seems to prove that already at that time land-rights were regarded as a saleable commodity even if in ordinary transactions, unlike the donation made to prince Ewerot, there could be no question of buying out the rights of the owning temple, which would continue to be the ultimate possessor of the land with a claim to a share in its revenue. Perhaps the apparent tendency, demonstrated in the Ewerot Stela, for "apportioned" lands to find themselves in the hands of a comparatively few prosperous farmers at the beginning of the XXIIInd Dynasty, rather than in the hands of the numerous subsistence farmers of scanty plots attested in P. Wilbour, can be explained on economic grounds. It may have been the case that, as in the troubled years of the later Ptolemies, the ordinary fellahin with little stake in the land were inclined to decamp at the slightest provocation, leaving

* SIPW pp. 85-86.

vast areas of land uncultivated. Then the only way to have the land tended at all would be to offer sizeable portions on easy terms to whoever was willing to undertake the responsibility with the attendant burden of taxation, which it might be by no means easy to meet if the land was in a very bad state, or farm-labourers in short supply.

The theory of Stuchevsky^{*} that since the land-rights of temples were more fundamental than the rights of individuals and took precedence over them, holders of temple lands were not allowed to dispose of them to persons not in the service of the same temple-complex, is interesting, and no doubt it was general practice not to do so. However, the evidence proves that this cannot be turned into an universal principle. The temples by no means enjoyed complete administrative autonomy: their fields were often managed by persons such as prophets of small temples, mayors of towns, and military men, who stood outside their own administrative framework. Moreover, many soldiers are found in P. Wilbour in possession of Type C plots, which were presumably allocated to them for their services to the state, not to the land-owning corporations. It seems certain then that allocation of plots of land was done on a general basis rather than by each temple, and dependence on a particular temple was not a necessary condition for holding land on its estates. To this extent Stuchevsky's appellation "conditional service-tenants", applied to holders of Type C lands, is a misnomer.

This part of section 2, dealing with the general character of ancient Egyptian institutions and the materials which make possible their reconstruction, would not be complete without some brief reference to the

* SIPW page 85.

position of movable goods. Here, in spite of the highly developed controls which directed land-tenure and usage and all forms of production, keeping craftsmen in strict dependence on the state and the great landed institutions, the principle of private ownership seems to have been fully accepted at all periods of ancient Egyptian history, perhaps because any other system would have been impossible to operate. The Will of Naunakhte^{*} shows clearly that at the beginning of the period under study any free citizen had the right to bequeath his goods by will, and that they were his absolute possession. As Černy[†] points out, however, in his article, there are points in the Will of Naunakhte which suggest that regulations were drawn up by the omnipresent paternal state laying down that sons were entitled to a share of their parents' estate, and daughters also had a claim if they had helped to support their parents in old age. Černy draws attention to the fact that Herodotus[‡] says that such a system was in operation during the Persian period in Egypt, and suggests that the practice was already followed in Ramesside times. One may suspect also that the complicated procedure for dividing house-properties, attested in many Demotic documents, so that each child would have somewhere he could live or build a house, if he wished, on his father's establishment, was already in operation; but no written records of what was essentially a very transitory arrangement seem to have been kept in the period under study.

* Černy, The Will of Naunakhte and other Related Documents, JEA 31, pp. 29-53.

+ Herodotus, Book II, Euterpe.

In this section the economic and social framework of ancient Egypt has been treated in a general way to show what source materials are available, and what basic conclusions may be reached concerning its nature. The details of the assessments in P. Wilbour and of other related documents will be considered much more fully in Section 3. Section 4 will treat the factors of an order more specifically social than economic in greater detail than has been attempted here. It would, however, be inappropriate to conclude this section without some brief reference to the social changes which occurred between the reign of Ramesses XI and the end of the XXIIInd Dynasty.

During the study of the position in the period immediately subsequent to the death of Ramesses III the impression has come very much to the fore that while such people as the High Priest Amenhotpe nominally continued to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Ramessides, the real ability of the royal house to exercise control in the south was gradually evaporating, apparently owing to their lack of any active interest in what happened at Thebes. Under Ramesses XI the decline of national consciousness and unity which had been proceeding quietly over the years since the great age of foreign wars drew to a close, becomes suddenly more obvious, and the failure of any attempt to counter the separatist tendencies led immediately to the growth within Egypt of regional governors, more or less independent of the king, who backed their claim to power with the possession of private armies. Penhasi, the King's Son of Cush, who removed the High Priest Amenhotpe from office by force in or about year 12 of Ramesses XI, though nominally loyal to the king, may well have done this

at his own initiative, and certainly installed himself as military dictator of Upper Egypt for a number of years. Hrihor, who perhaps drove Penhasi from Thebes at the wish of the king,^{*} appears similarly to have used the opportunity to advance his personal position, taking for himself also the heritage of Amenhotpe by becoming High Priest of Amun, and calling himself on occasion by the titles King's Son of Cush and Vizier. Indeed his arrogance eventually became so great that he had himself depicted at Karnak as king. By the time of his death in or before year 7 of whm-mswt, his power was so far consolidated that he was able to hand on his posts as High Priest and military ruler of Thebes to his son Piankh, though the latter never claimed royal honours.

The history of the period between the XXIst and XXVth Dynasties can only be understood if it is realized that during this time the notion became generally accepted even by the kings themselves that the great cities of Egypt should be governed by semi-hereditary high priestly rulers rather than by officials directly dependent on the central authorities. No attempt seems to have been made to stamp out of existence these petty

* Cf. GEP pp. 302-3 and 313-4. In the latter pages Gardiner, following the opinion of J. Černy, concludes that in all probability the foe that Piankh, the son of Hrihor, was fighting in Nubia was the recalcitrant governor of Cush Penhasi, who had earlier rebelled and presumably been removed from Thebes by force. There is, however, no definite evidence to show whether this rebellion really occurred, or that Penhasi was the opponent of Piankh, and one is well advised to be extremely cautious in making conjectures in the scanty light of modern knowledge of this particular subject.

it had been for two centuries. The position of strength of the kingship was not, however, very durable. Osorkon II seems to have been worried at the possibility of conflict between his descendants, and under Takehot II a long series of civil wars broke out, interspersed with temporary settlements. Already, following the practice of the Theban High Priests of the XXIst Dynasty, the High Priest Harsiese had used the royal cartouche during the early part of the reign of Osorkon II, and during the last part of the XXIIInd Dynasty various claimants to royalty are found using the full titular⁺. It is perhaps, however, a mistake to take royal titles too seriously at this time in Egyptian history, and many of the supposed kings of the period may really have acknowledged the rule of the main house of the XXIIInd Dynasty. The real end of the period did not come until the process of dissolution had gone so far as to make Egypt legitimate prey for an able warrior to seize power by rebellion within the country or for external invasion. This happened when Tefnakhte brought the long rule

* See R. Caminos. Chronicle of Prince Osorkon p. 172. The inscription concerned is in the Festival Hall at Bubastis discovered by Naville. in "The Festival Hall of Osorkon II at Bubastis", pl. 6. frag. 9.

+ This is to accept the commonly held view that the XXIIIrd Dynasty kings were largely contemporary with the late XXIIInd Dynasty. Unfortunately, apart from chronological arguments which can be notoriously misleading, no real proof of this is available. The state of the question depends very largely on the number of years which must be allotted to the XXIIIrd Dynasty.

♠ Cf. The remarks of Gardiner on the claims of Hrihor to be a real king, GEP p. 304. This approach can be adopted to all the "rois fainéants" of the end of the period under study.

of the XXIIInd Dynasty to an end at Memphis, and Kashta and Piankhi invaded the country from the South.

In this section an attempt has been made to give a fair yet sympathetic outline of the social and economic structure of ancient Egypt, particularly as manifested in the period under study. This investigation is specially interesting since the Pharaohs were the first rulers to attempt organization of human society on the grand scale. Since Egypt was still a rather primitive agricultural country, the controls were frequently of a crude character certain to lead at any period of weak government to the wholesale oppression of the primary producers, whose only claim to consideration rested on the fact that if they were not protected, the revenues of the land would suffer. The illiterate and backward character of the vast mass of the population meant that the revenues of the country were managed with one primary object, namely to secure the maximum income for the king and the small literate administrative class which carried on the government of Egypt. There were, however, many compensating factors, though the fellahin might be the victims of rapacious tax-collectors, or be carried off without warning to do military service or forced labour, it was in the interest of the authorities to control gratuitous oppression, since it would lead to a loss of productive capacity and the danger of rebellion. The Charters of Immunity granted to temples were, as has been seen, intended to protect their staffs from the officers of the king, and one may be certain that the operations of these persons on the royal domains were similarly kept in check.

Despite the corruption which has surrounded oriental government from time immemorial, the ancient Egyptians had a developed ethical sense quite apart from any economic considerations, and kings and magistrates recognized their obligation to deal justly with all classes of the populace rich or poor, though it was generally realized that at law the man of influence had the great advantage. Moreover, the system gave internal peace for long periods, and kept away the danger of foreign conquest for centuries. The conclusion then seems to be obligatory that the ancient Egyptian system, which derived its exceptional stability from the institution of the divine kingship, was well suited to meet the needs of Egypt by providing the means whereby an educated governing class could grow and be maintained, a large measure of protection and security for the mass of the population be guaranteed, and the proper use of the agricultural resources of Egypt be secured. The abuses were those which are characteristic of primitive societies today, and which can never be wholly eradicated in any form of social organization.

Section 3.A FULLER CONSIDERATION OF THE ECONOMIC DATA AVAILABLE FROM PAPYRUS WILBOUR
AND OTHER EVIDENCE OF THE PERIOD UNDER STUDY

Since this section will consist largely in the further investigation of the economic phenomena touched upon in the preceding Section, in the light particularly of P. Wilbour, before proceeding with further more detailed study it may be of advantage to consider briefly what facts have been clearly established in this work with regard to the ancient Egyptian economic structure, so that fuller enquiry may be made on that basis. Section 2 has drawn upon material of all sorts both of a strictly contemporaneous period with that under study, and from earlier and later periods where this appeared appropriate, in an effort to build up a compendious picture, so far as that may be possible. Plentiful use has been made of the Ptolemaic evidence in building up this picture, though the view has been taken throughout that the published works on the Ptolemaic economic system need considerable rethinking in the light of the vast new amounts of Egyptian material of earlier periods now available. Resurveying of the Ptolemaic period as such would undoubtedly yield a great deal more than has been noticed above, which would be of great value for the better understanding of ancient Egyptian institutions, but that would be a separate study in itself, which could not well be undertaken in this work. Instead, an attempt has been made to show only that the theory of institutional continuity to a high degree between Pharaonic and Ptolemaic times is fully tenable, although this has not been generally recognized. Following upon this it has been taken as legitimate to use Ptolemaic

material with due circumspection, bearing in mind the changes that must certainly have taken place over the centuries, to fill in some gaps in our knowledge of the earlier Egypt.

By the use of all this material it has been possible to build up a picture of the ancient Egyptian system which is in broad outline satisfactory, though as yet no attempt has been made to discuss what may be learnt in greater detail. This section is designed to contain a much fuller discussion of the data particularly of an economic order available from P. Wilbour and the other documentation.

Sir Alan Gardiner recognized that the P. Wilbour showed that in the reign of Ramesses V such great estates as that of the temple of Amen-Ré^c at Karnak were treated for assessment purposes, presumably for the purpose of taxation, essentially like those of the smallest shrines of Egypt, though there were certain differences in the method of calculating the revenues. This implied to him that the fields of all the great corporations must have been under the eye of the same taxing authority, which must have been the government, since P. Wilbour includes fields belonging not only to ecclesiastical corporations, but to secular ones such as the Harem at

* Gardiner, WP Commentary, page 59, Fōsh-entries type C, thinks that small shrines were allotted small holdings on the estates of the great temples on the same basis as private persons. It certainly appears clear that they did not maintain estate administrations like those of the great temples. For a new discussion of the position of these small holdings on estate land see below in this section.

Mi-wer, which are treated in the Papyrus on a similar basis.* Stuchevsky took the matter further by averring that there was an integrated temple-royal economy,⁺ implying presumably by this that at least in theory the land-owning corporations were regarded as in a sense part of the machinery of government. In this study it has been found necessary to modify and qualify somewhat this rather sweeping statement of Stuchevsky by drawing to attention the indisputable fact that the wagfs of the temple-corporations formed fiscally a specialized category of land whose revenues were entailed primarily for the maintenance of particular institutions. The view that there was an integrated direction of the whole economy is, nevertheless, undoubtedly broadly correct.

The above conclusions of Stuchevsky have in general been accepted in this study, but the matter has been taken somewhat further, in that the basic sense in which the lands could be regarded as belonging to a certain institution has been investigated. The conclusion has been reached that any land under an obligation to supply a fixed revenue of some kind to a particular institution or body could be regarded as belonging to its

* SIPW p. 91. top.

* Gardiner, WP Commentary, page 207, Postscript, affirms his final belief that "it may now be affirmed with complete assurance that the 20th Dynasty temples did pay taxes out of the produce of their fields". This ultimate conclusion is mainly based on evidence outside P. Wilbour, but is fully in accord with the phenomena met with in it.

estate (pr). The matter of the nature of the relationship between the institution and its lands will be carried further below.

An interesting factor to emerge has been the importance in the economic system still enjoyed in the period of P. Wilbour, as in the period of the Dakhla Stela, by the institution of kingship and the various state authorities directly dependent upon it. The establishment of the fact that kingship for the ancient Egyptians was not only a religious convention which kept them on the right relationship with the gods, but was also a potent factor in the organization of the economy on efficient lines, goes far to explain why Egypt, in spite of upheavals and invasions, always remained a monarchical state, and why that monarchy always sought to model itself on traditional lines.*

The most important point, however, which it is hoped has been clearly established, is that the three main types of land known from Ptolemaic times were already in existence at least in embryonic form, though the forms of Ramesside land tenure may have been considerably more complicated than was the case later. Reasons have been advanced for equating the

* The Saite kings of the XXVIth Dynasty are well known for their outward favour for an artificial archaism, but certainly the Cushite XXVth Dynasty were attempting to revert to what they considered old time Egyptian kingship. The Piankhi Stela shows that Piankhi refused to receive some of the Libyan kings because they were ritually impure. Even the Libyan kings of the XXIIInd Dynasty, as the Asiatic Hyksos, attempted to adopt many of the outward mores of Egyptian kingship.

so-called "fields of Pharaoh" of the New Kingdom closely with the $\gamma\eta$ βασιλική of Hellenistic times^{*}, for equating the wagf-lands belonging to corporations with the $\gamma\eta$ ἱερὰ of the Ptolemaic period (though only religious holding bodies seem to be attested from the Ptolemaic period) and for equating holdings of private persons with $\gamma\eta$ ἐν ἀφέσει or ἰδιωτικὸς $\gamma\eta$ of Ptolemaic times, though it should be noted that the Ptolemaic terminology is characteristically vague, and this so-called "released land" may include all land on occasion not under direct royal control, even the estates of temples.

The attempt in Section 2, and in the above synopsis of the conclusions reached in that section, to establish that the estates of the great corporations religious and secular of Ramesside times and later were the equivalent of modern wagf-land, upon which they had some claim for their maintenance, has not been intended as a separate study from the problem posed by P. Willbour, but is intended to help in the understanding of its real character. If this point be taken as proven, it will allow a far more definite conclusion to be reached concerning the nature of the document, and in particular of Text A.

* A. H. Gardiner. WP Commentary, page 167, takes the equivalence between $\gamma\eta$ βασιλική and $n3$ $z\eta\omega(t)$ n $P\tau$ - ϵ^3 of Demotic documents as established. He notes the occurrence of the latter term in P. Willbour as relating to a particular class of royal land, but does not investigate the matter further, as has been seen, was done by W. Helck in VMNR pages 111-115, where he reaches the conclusions about its nature that have been accepted above.

The present writer believes that this new understanding of P. Wilbour, Text A, as an exclusive register of waqf-land, within which there was never any intention of including the whole cultivable area of the land in the region surveyed, solves one of the major problems still clouding full comprehension of the nature of the document. This view certainly makes unnecessary the hypothesis^{*} of H. W. Fairman that Text A can only include the berm-lands subject to summer cultivation, against which very strong arguments have been brought above, and also rules out of court any theory like the unfortunate conjecture⁺ of J. H. Breasted on P. Harris I that a vast quantity of land was simply omitted from the document through carelessness or for unexplainable reasons. The efficient nature of the survey in P. Wilbour and the modern improved understanding of the nature of P. Harris I make it quite clear that Egyptian revenue documents did not indulge in vagaries of that kind, and should be treated as serious and methodical works without large unexplainable omissions.

* JEA 39, p. 119, in the Review of WP by H. W. Fairman.

+ J. H. Breasted in BAR IV p. 85-110 commenting on P. Harris I, never states clearly how he reconciles the evident omission of a number of important smaller temples with the supposition that P. Harris I is intended to be a record of all temple possessions in Egypt at the death of Ramesses III. This is brought out clearly in H. D. Schaedel, SLPH, pp. 41-44. His failure to fully consider this is very regrettable since Adolf Erman had already noted the omission of these temples in "Zur Erklärung des Papyrus Harris" published in SPAW (1903) p. 456ff.

The interpretation of Text A as a register of waqfs thus avoids many formidable difficulties, but certain problems still remain. The main guiding principle behind the document seems to have been to exclude all lands whether royal or privately-held which were not under an obligation to contribute to the maintenance of particular institutions: doubtless such land would have had to pay ordinary taxation. There are, however, a small number of entries referring to lands which it is difficult, and in a very few cases apparently impossible, to regard as waqf-lands financially tied to a particular institution, as mentioned in Section 2. Although Sir Alan Gardiner approached Text A from a very different angle to that adopted here, and did not appreciate that Text A was really a register of waqfs, he fully realized that the inclusion of a small quantity of khato-land of Pharaoh in the Text presented a major problem, and he was quite unable to explain why any of this type of land was allowed to appear in the document, when it could be demonstrated that there were substantial areas of this type of land lying in the zone surveyed which were not recorded there. On page 165 of WP Commentary he writes, "Text A devotes in all only eighteen paragraphs to khate-land, and when once the tax-assessors had undertaken to include this kind of land in their survey, it is something of a puzzle why they did not enumerate more lands of this sort".

* H. W. Fairman also states on page 121 of his review of WP in JEA 39 that he has no explanation to offer why so few plots of khato-land are cited.

Fortunately the theory that Text A of P. Wilbour is meant basically to include only lands standing in some kind of dependent financial relationship to specific institutions goes a long way to solve the question why only this amount of khato-land of Pharaoh was included. Where khato-lands of Pharaoh, or the similar lands, mine-lands of Pharaoh, or even "fields of Pharaoh", which, it has been postulated above, was land not apportioned to any particular institution par excellence, came under an obligation to pay a small portion of their revenue to specific institutions as pōsh-entries of type B or C (where the land was apportioned among small tenants), it was natural that this land should be recorded in P. Wilbour in the normal way. This type of entry is, however, very rare since "fields of Pharaoh" only occur as contributing to "landing-places of Pharaoh", which stood in a particularly close relationship to the personal needs of the king, and the other types of land seem but seldom to have come into this relationship with the great corporations. It is in no way surprising that fields appertaining to the royal estate could readily become dependent on institutions concerned primarily with the welfare of the king, but not on others.

It would then appear that the occurrence of khato-land in this connection needs no very complicated explanation, seen in the light of the new theory, but the occurrence of khato-land at the ends of sections 1, 2 and 3 of Text A, along with plots of mine-land, needs more explaining. The difficulty is that, although the majority of these entries of khato-land are readily explainable as merely the counterparts of the entries

of type B mentioned above -- by the usual double book-keeping* of P. Wilbour, Text A -- certain plots are found which have no concluding "apportioning" entry of type A, and would thus appear from all the evidence not to be wagf-lands intended for the maintenance⁺ of a particular institution.

The evidence available does not permit a full answer to the problems posed by the inclusion of such holdings of khato-land, but some attempt may be made to evaluate the probabilities. In P. Wilbour Text A 74, 11-27, for instance, a number of plots are enumerated; all are, "khato-land of Pharaoh under the authority of (r-ht) Hui, prophet of the House of Seth, lord of Spermeru". Some of these plots have "apportioning" entries of type A, destined for the maintenance of particular institutions, and so their inclusion in P. Wilbour is fully explicable[♯], others do not[♯]. The conclusion can be reached that where an administrator of khato-land had several plots in the area surveyed, a number of which were subject to "apportioning" tax for the benefit of particular institutions, all would be named, simply to show which were subject to this tax, which not. P. Wilbour shows no objection to duplication in the interests of clarity,

* See particularly WP Commentary pp. 57-8 for the working of this double book-keeping.

+ For instances of paragraphs containing no "apportioning" entries see e.g. WP Translation § 46. § 115. § 200. § 202.

♯ Examples with "apportioning" entries of type A, P. Wilbour 74, 12-14; 74, 19-21; 74, 22-24; 74, 25-27.

♯ Examples without "apportioning" entries. P. Wilbour. 74, 15-16; 74, 17-18.

inferior to that of real private property in the modern sense of the ^{*} term, while, as has been seen in Section 2, he is inclined to treat the holders of "non-apportioning" domain generally as much more like private landholders than as mere administrators. In pursuit of his idea that the holders of the land found in "apportioning" entries of types A and B were almost the real owners of the land, Stuchevsky reaches a most interesting, but problematic, conclusion, that the "apportioning" tax implied in entries of these kinds was an extra levy payable by the tenant of the land in addition to the basic assessment found in the main paragraph above "apportioning" entries of type A. Entries of type A are regularly equivalent to 7.5% of the total yield above (which fact Gardiner had already gone far to establishing.)+

Since Stuchevsky approached the problem of the "apportioning" entries with the strong preconception that the holders of lands in entries of Types A and B were virtually the complete owners, and there can be little doubt that the holders of the small plots in Type C entries had rights approximating to ownership, though these were not absolute, it is not surprising that he reached the conclusion that entries of Type C were comparable with entries of type B in that both in his view represented implied taxation payable by the holder of the land rather than the owning-corporation. One may doubt, however, the validity of his line of argument when he tries to substantiate this contention by a passage in P. Anastasi V,

 * SIPW pp. 81-85 for discussion of basis of land-holdings.

+ See particularly WP Commentary page 72.

27, 3ff. which he translates rather inaccurately as follows^{*}, "Also with regard to one of my companions who came to inform me, saying, 'You imposed on me numerous assessments of grain as a portion for my lands which are in the region of the settlement Rai. What are your actions? I am the one whom you found to exclude from the number of all who pay tax'." The point in question is whether m pš in Anastasi 27, 4 "as a portion" really refers to some form of supplementary taxation, as Stuchevsky claims it must, or whether the imaginary person in the model-letter is merely complaining that all the taxes imposed on him, including the basic dues, have been apportioned unfairly, and he alone of all the tax-payers is being victimized by being taken to court (s^ch^c must have that meaning, not "exclude" as Stuchevsky translates). It should be noted that Sir Alan Gardiner apparently takes the passage in this much more general sense⁺.

Plainly, then, since the understanding preferred by Gardiner appears a priori infinitely the more probable, bearing in mind the very general character of the complaint of excessive taxation in the passage cited, the theory that pōsh-entries A and B represent supplementary taxation falls far short of proof. The theory cannot, however, be completely dismissed,

* See SIPW page 91 middle, for Stuchevsky's Russian rendering of this passage. The quote given here is translated from this, not the Egyptian text.

+ Gardiner in WP Commentary page 57 appears to treat this as a very general reference to the apportionment of taxation rather than in any connection with the pōsh-entries of P. Wilbour.

but it should be noted that there are many other factors which militate against such a conclusion, though the evidence available does not permit the final solution of the problem whether or not the taxation implied in "apportioning"-entries A and B was deductible from or supplementary to the basic assessment. For example the form of the entries of Types A and B following immediately on a figure apparently stating the grand total for the assessment is in itself sufficient to suggest that the "apportionment" to another institution was made from the figure cited immediately above. It is of great importance to pay a proper regard to the form of formal documents like P. Wilbour since it is an attested fact that all such compositions, which have to possess a legal standing, have always been phrased in all civilizations in stereotyped formulae chosen for their clarity and conciseness. The argument of Stuchevsky^{*}, moreover, that only the owning corporation, not the cultivator, would be penalized by the imposition of "apportioning" taxation if this was deductible from the basic assessment, and that therefore this taxation payable to another body must be supplementary to, not deductible from, the basic dues of the cultivator, carries little weight if one assumes, as Stuchevsky himself does elsewhere⁺, that an integrated royal-temple economy existed organized on behalf of wider interests than these of particular institutions. The very existence of "apportioning" entries B in paragraphs of non-apportioning domain shows that arrangements were definitely made for the transfer of revenues from one corporation to another.

* SIFW page 93.

+ SIFW page 91 top.

Stuchevsky himself derives his concept of "apportioning" tax as something supplementary, payable by the cultivator as a personal due on top of his basic assessment, from the belief that, as seen above and in Section 2 of this study, the status of holders of ordinary non-apportioning domain to which "apportioning" entries B may be appended, was comparable to that of the small semi-private land-holders who are here being called holders of Type C land. Strong reasons have, however, been found in Section 2 for rejecting this supposition of substantial identity of tenure, and supposing that while holders of Type C land closely resembled private landowners, the great non-apportioning holdings were in no sense personal possessions, but were administered directly on behalf of various institutions by administrators who were appointed for the job, possibly in theory by the king. Plainly, if the view be adopted that the holders of rmnyt-domains were mere administrators, whether the great notables or the lesser men who carried out the actual supervision on their behalf, then the idea of a personal tax imposed on them rather than on the estate makes little real sense. This is not, however, to deny that the tax could have been supplementary to the basic taxation enumerated above: the great readiness of the Ptolemies to impose onerous, but petty, supplementary taxes of all kinds shows clearly that this sort of tax was an established feature in ancient Egypt. It has been noted in Section 2 that there is occasional evidence showing that the holders of Type C plots came under the supervision of an appointed administrator similar to those who administered non-apportioning domain, but not himself being held directly responsible for the payment of taxes.

* See Section 2.

Hitherto we have directed attention almost exclusively at Text A of P. Wilbour apart from occasional general references to Text B in Section 2, principally since Text A seems more immediately rewarding to study; but now Text B must be subjected to close investigation since, although it is concerned exclusively with one category of land, khato-land of Pharaoh, it provides the only basis for the proper understanding of the assessment figures in Text A. For instance, though Text A provides examples of three different rates of assessment for different qualities of land, the text nowhere makes it possible to determine what these three types of land in fact are. Gardiner, however, has shown that this information can be derived through manipulation of the different format of Text B, though he leaves many of the details connected with these assessments obscure. It should be noted that Text A, in describing the location of plots, regularly names them by reference to other types of land (e.g. mwt land; db-land). However, these categories of land unlike k'yt land, which is also used in a similar descriptive sense, are not used as the official categories of land for assessment purposes.

Text B which is considerably shorter than the main text, covers a considerably wider area on the north, though apparently ending at a similar point on the south. As mentioned above all the land enumerated is khato-land, and it reasonable to assume that this Text was intended to contain all the khato-land within the zone covered by the record, as opposed to Text A which one has been inclined to believe contained only those few

* WP Commentary pages 28-29. For proof that njb-land equals twice the value of k'yt-land see for instance B 10,9. The relative values for assessment purposes are: k'yt-land, 5 measures of corn per aroura; tni-land, 7.5; njb-land, 10.

portions of khato-land which were, or had been, tributary to particular institutions. Once the idea has been accepted that Text A was in no sense intended as a complete record of land, but only of waqfs, it is scarcely surprising to find that registers concerned only with other particular types of land were composed. Presumably one must believe that there were also separate registers of miné-land of Pharaoh, "fields of Pharaoh", private land in so far as this was separate from either the institutions or the royal estates, and perhaps other types of land.

At this point it will be worthwhile to see whether any new contribution can be made towards the understanding of the position of khato-land of Pharaoh. As Griffith saw long ago^{*}, its regular designation "of Pharaoh" must mean that it was some form of royal estate. "Fields of Pharaoh" seem to correspond much more closely to γῆ βασιλική, however, than does this type of land, as has been seen in Section 2, and the data of P. Wilbour make it quite clear that khato-land was a specialized form of estate. Examination of Text B shows that khato-land lay "on the fields" of some particular body. As Gardiner has shown⁺, most of the very small number of plots of khato-land named in Text A can also be plausibly identified in Text B though the areas given are frequently different, and their geographic location is sometimes given in a different way. Moreover, if they are contributory land in Text A, they are sometimes attributed to a different institution. This can only rank as unequivocal proof that some interchange of land was continuously

* F. Ll. Griffith, PSBA 14, 415ff.

+ Gardiner. WP. Commentary pp. 169-172 for full discussion of this relationship between Texts A and B.

taking place between different landowning institutions, since the date of the two portions of P. Wilbour cannot be much apart, though some explanation is available in some cases on the grounds that one section is more precise in its attribution to a part of a temple-complex organization than the other.

Nevertheless, the really important thing to discuss is what is meant by "on the fields of" a body in Text B. The bodies cited include not only the land-owning corporations attested from Text A, but also the "fields of Pharaoh" which appear to have been in the fullest sense royal or "state" fields. Since not only the khato-lands parallel to those in Text A (which are either known to be contributory, or suspected formerly to have been so), are cited as "on the fields of" or more often literally as "fields of" an institution, this phrase must clearly have implied a much wider and looser relationship than "pr" in Text A which has been conveniently translated as "estate". There is every reason to deny that these lands were contributory since they are not included in what we regard as the register of waqfs, and no reason to suppose that the phrase is intended to indicate the geographical location of the land as being surrounded by the farm lands of the temple mentioned, since P. Wilbour makes it quite clear that waqf lands generally consisted not of large unitary farms, but of small scattered strips, frequently, at least in the case of the larger temples, the whole length of the country away from the owning institution. It would seem then that the

* This can be shown for instance from the Bilgai Stela published by Gardiner in ZAS 50 and from the Elephantine "Scandal" Papyrus translated also by him in JEA 27, quite apart from the ample evidence contained in P. Wilbour.

only implication which can be conveyed by the term "on the fields of", is that administratively their management was undertaken by the same persons as those who were appointed by a central authority to run the estates of the temples. It need scarcely be said that if this is really so, the theory of an integrated royal-temple economy is justified in a far wider sense than its originator Stuchevsky intended. When, however, land is recorded as being "on the fields of Pharaoh" instead of "on the fields of" some particular institution, this would imply that this particular holding came administratively under the surveillance of the managers of the royal estate itself, though it was not necessarily contributory to it. The observation of Gardiner^{*} that, "on fields of Pharaoh" occurs in Text B only in connection with fields which in Text A have no pōsh-entries' ties in well with many of the ideas expressed here.

At this juncture it should be noted that there is further solid evidence from Text B in support of the view that the connection of the various plots of khate-land with particular estates was simply through a common administration rather than through any form of fiscal identification. In Text A the regular heading runs on the line exemplified for instance by A 45, 40 - 43, which reads, "The Funerary Temple of King Usimare^t-skheperenrē^t in the House of Amūn/ Domain of this house under the authority of the High Priest of Amūn Ramessenakhte/ Measurement made to the north of the houses of the grooms/ Land cultivated by him 10, measures of corn (sacks) 5, mc. 50". In Text B the regular format is very different; for instance B 16, 9 - 12 reads, "KHATO-LAND of Pharaoh under the authority of the mayor

* WP Comm. p. 172.

of Heracleopolis by the hand of the scribe Sebekhotpe /ITS FIELDS:
 Region north west of the Mound of Wadj (?) (on) fields of Pharaoh, arable
 land (kjyt) 60 / Region of the riparian land (on fields of the Mansion)
 in the House of Amūn Funerary temple of Ramesses III, arable land,
 arouras 60." Since in ancient Egyptian, as in all other legal writings,
 the form of the document is of great importance, this very different
 phraseology must conceal a different economic position. Since the form
 of the headings in Text B carefully avoids referring to khato-land as
 actually belonging to the estate of any particular institution as Text A
 does, it is reasonable to see this as further confirmation that the phrase
 "on fields of" did not necessarily imply a contributory relationship to a
 particular institution, though of course, as is known from the occurrence
 of parallels between Texts A and B, this was by no means precluded.

It should now be emphasized that Text B is only important for the
 understanding of the assessments in P. Wilbour through comparisons which
 can be made with Text A, which make the import of that document clearer.*
 Text B, however, though doubtless somehow concerned with the tax departments
 and taxation, is not itself a record of tax payable, but simply of areas of
 land expressed in terms of various qualities of productivity. † Sporadically,

* For instance it has been seen above that Text B, by giving land in terms
 of two qualities of productivity, makes it clear what are the types of
 land used for assessment purposes in Text A.

+ For a slightly different opinion see WP Commentary page 161 where
 Gardiner notes by comparison with the Griffith Fragments that Text B
 must have been compiled with an eye to the revenue the lands produced.

figures of sacks of corn are appended to certain entries, but this is irregular and uncommon, and probably a later jotting, as established by Gardiner, since Text B shows numerous additions and corrections.

An immediate problem which occurs when lands apparently cited in both Text B and Text A are compared is, as mentioned above, that the areas of land given are frequently different, though the descriptive matter makes the substantial identity of the lands probable, or in many cases virtually certain.* An important fact to note is that the area of land given in Text B is frequently, though by no means invariably⁺, twice the area given in Text A for khato-land, as Fairman observes.[♠]

Plainly if these lands are really the same as in Text A, which seems completely undeniable in some cases, this must rate as a most puzzling fact for which some explanation must be sought. Only three explanations

* Gardiner WP Commentary pages 169-171 for a list of these lands.

+ For examples where Text B does not show khato-land as twice the size that it is in Text A, see for example A 20, 18 = B 15, 8, A 20, 35 = B 16, 6. For some examples where the lands in Text B do equal twice those in Text A, see e.g. A 74, 15 = B 19, 30. A 20, 35 (Pōsh-A) = B 18,6.

♠ JEA 39, p. 121. Considering that the whole of the theory which Fairman subsequently expounds to explain this phenomenon depends exclusively on the figures in Text B equalling twice those in Text A, he does not appear justified in ignoring the fact that there are many apparent correspondences where this ratio does not occur, which would tend to weaken fatally his theories on the assessments.

come to mind (1) That in Text A only a part of each area of khato-land, generally one half, is cited since only that portion of each became contributory to a particular institution, whereas in Text B the whole area of each is given (2) That the supposition of Gardiner is correct, that the extent of khato-land was continually altering^{*}, which would deprive this ratio of all significance. (3) That Stuchevsky rightly regards the ratio as coincidental[†], though he admits it is difficult to explain why the figures in Text B are so regularly twice those in Text A. There is, however, a fourth possibility which should be considered, if only to be rejected in due course on the ground of implausibility, which could be developed by an elaboration of the opinion of Fairman that there is a great amount of fictitious or schematic book-keeping present in P. Wilbour. For the purpose of this fourth theory it would be necessary to assume that the apparent difference in area between the two Texts is not real, but the result of fictitious book-keeping whereby the areas of land heading each assessment paragraph in Text A should be understood as expressed in terms of njb-land (of twice the value of kjyt-land for assessment purposes), though in the rest of the assessment rated in terms of kjyt-land.

The present writer, who treats Text A as a register of wags, is inclined to see in that an explanation of how in many cases apparently only half the area was, or had been, contributory in Text A. It can easily be seen how it could be a regular though by no means invariable practice to make only one half of each area of khato-land contributory,

* WP Comm. p. 183, bottom.

+ SIFW p. 87.

when on rare occasions this type of land was added to a wagf. It is clear, moreover, as has been seen above, that land could pass from one administration to another from time to time, and thus the area of a piece of khato-land might well be altered between the dates of composition of Texts A and B by the transfer of a portion to another administration.

The first three possibilities are based on the supposition that the difference is real, and are attempts to explain how this might have arisen, whereas the fourth theory is based on completely different premises. Hitherto in this study certain assumptions have been made, the validity of which will now have to be considered in conjunction with the assessment figures in Text A, which are closely concerned in the theory of Fairman. The most basic assumption has been that the figures of arouras at the beginning of assessment lines in non-apportioning domain (entries of type A) refer to the real area of the land.* Pursuant to this it has been considered that the following figure, when "five", shows that the type of land concerned is k'yt, when "7½", tni[†], and when "10", nhb[‡]. The final figure which is the multiple of the two preceding figures, gives the amount of corn payable by the holding. The other theory, however, would demand the conclusion that all the areas of land at the beginning of each assessment are not expressed normally in terms of their own real area or productivity value, but in terms of nhb-land, so that only the very small

* See A 9, 12 - 9, 15 for an example of all three possible rates of assessment cited together.

+ WP Comm. p. 28 makes it almost beyond dispute that this is the real value of each quality of land as assessed for revenue purposes.

area of actual njb-land is expressed in terms of its real area. Since the vast majority of the land cited in Text A is kjyt-land to judge from its rate of assessment, this would mean that in real area Text A would include an area almost twice its apparent size.

Any such far-fetched supposition will, however, demand the establishment of the fact that P. Wilbour shows a considerable amount of fictitious rather than real book-keeping. This possibility should be considered in connection with the theories of Fairman^{*} on the P. Wilbour since there is a basic assumption made in his work that a type of schematic book-keeping does in fact occur. Stuchevsky after detailed study⁺, it should be noted, completely rejects the basis on which this portion of the article of Fairman is based. If an extension of Fairman's view is not necessary, or his theory mistaken, this idea must be abandoned.

Fairman bases his argument for his understanding of the relation of the figures in Text A to those of Text B very largely on three passages which are certainly parallel, but where the apparent area of the land in Text B is twice that found in Text A. These are as follows:-

A 74. 34-37.

(34) KHATO-LAND of Pharaoh under the authority of the prophet of Amon-Tjay in the district (wht) of Tjay.

(35) MEASUREMENT made to the south of Sapa.

(36) His plot (of land) 10 (arouras) at 5 (khar) = 50 khar

(37) Divided for Amon-Tjay in the district of Tjay $3\frac{3}{4}$ khar

* H. W. Fairman. JEA 39. pp. 121-122.

+ I. A. Stuchevsky. SIPW p. 86 ff.

A.64, 35-37

- (35) HARVEST-DUES assigned to this House (of Amon-Tjay see above).
 (36) MEASUREMENT to the south of Sapa.
 (37) "Cultivator" Nesamun, apportionment of land of khato-land of Pharaoh
 l.p.h. under his authority - 10 (arouras), $2\frac{1}{2}$ (arouras) at $1\frac{1}{2}$ khar
-

B 23, 31-32.

- (31) KHATO-LAND of Pharaoh under the authority of Qenyamun, prophet of
 the House of Amon-Tajyna.
 (32) ITS FIELDS; Division (ps) south of Sapa, fields of the House of
 Amon-Tjayna "kjyt-land", arouras 20, BALANCE*, ARABLE LAND (kjyt) 5,
 MAKING $2\frac{1}{2}$ (arouras).
-

For Fairman it is obvious and beyond doubt that the last figure of
 the assessment in B 23, 32 " $2\frac{1}{2}$ " corresponds to the second figure in the
 Type B entry in A 64, 37 which is also " $2\frac{1}{2}$ ". This would then mean that
 since the last figure in the Text B line must be the 5 arouras preceding,
 transmuted into terms of nbb-land, then the $2\frac{1}{2}$ of A 64, 37 must also
 represent five arouras of kjyt-land. This would imply for Fairman that
 in fact half the areas of kjyt-land paid the "apportioning" tax at $\frac{3}{4}$ khar
 per aroura and not a quarter of them at $1\frac{1}{2}$ khar per aroura. Plainly it
 is extremely hazardous to make this suggestion, since at first sight it
 appears clear that whereas 5 sacks per aroura is the general rate for non-
 apportioning domain of kjyt-land, $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks per aroura is the rate for the
 apportioning tax on this quality of land (as it is for entries of type C
 which should be considered in association with this), unless it can be

* Gardiner. JEA 27, page 49, note 2. WP Comm. p. 183 treats the sign "L" as meaning "balance". Stuchevsky, however, regards it as meaning something more like a sign of equivalence. See discussion below under Entries of Type C.

clearly established that the last figure in the Text B entry really does correspond to the second in the Text A entry. In this connection it should be noted that Stuchevsky very cogently points out that the formula which Fairman establishes for determining the yield of n**h**b-land $2(a \times 1\frac{1}{2})$, where "a" equals a quarter of the entire area, presupposes in fact that the rate of assessment for k**l**yt-land was $a \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ since it is known that k**l**yt-land in non-apportioning domain was assessed at half the value of n**h**b-land.

Accordingly Fairman's theory is not accepted by Stuchevsky with regard to the method of assessment of k**l**yt-land, and he refuses to admit the real existence of an equation between the "2 $\frac{1}{2}$ " of the Type B entry and of Text B: for Stuchevsky the figure of the Type B entry is definitely in terms of k**l**yt-land, that of the Text B entry a conversion into n**h**b-land. In his view the important fact to notice is that the relationship between the first and second figures of the Type B entry (in Text A) is the same as the relationship between the same two figures of the Text B entry (4:1).

The present writer would draw attention to the fact that the view of Stuchevsky is strongly supported by internal textual evidence in Text B from several of the other parallel entries which Fairman cites⁺, in that

* For the final stages in Stuchevsky's discussion which led him to this conclusion as opposed to the conclusion of Fairman on the method of assessing k**l**yt-land, see SIPW pp. 89-90.

+ See for examples of entries in Text B which are comparable with entries in Text A, but do not show the final conversion figure into terms of n**h**b-land e.g. B 17,30 = A 58, 13 = A 74, 2-3, B 16, 23 = A 73, 31

the second figure in terms of kⁱyt-land was more important for the purposes of the Text than the conversion figure into terms of n^hb-land. This greater importance is established conclusively since in many of these entries instead of the third figure being a conversion into n^hb-land, the second figure of kⁱyt-land is simply repeated without any conversion-figure, while on other occasions the conversion-figure is only added after the second figure has been repeated.

This may well be regarded as establishing beyond any doubt that in fact only a quarter of any plot of kⁱyt-land was subject to the "apportioning" tax at $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks per aroura in entries of Type B, but one is not justified in assuming that the usual rate of taxation on entries of Text B was assessed also regularly on one quarter of the area, since there is clear evidence that this was by no means always ^{*}so.

Stuchevsky has tended to show that the method used for calculating the tax of kⁱyt-land for "apportioning" taxation was not exactly as Fairman supposed; but, nevertheless, he shows that basically the conclusions of Fairman about the methods of assessing n^hb-land and land not composed solely of kⁱyt-land (land of mixed qualities) were correct, though he advances some further suggestions with regard to the mechanics of the system. Gardiner with great perception had already done much to unravel the problem when he noticed that entry "g" of his Anomalous Entries⁺ showed 3 as the rate of apportioning assessment instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$. Unfortunately,

* See for instance B 19, 29 Cf. A 74, 12 = A 63, 46 where half of the area occurs as the second figure in the Text B entry, not a quarter.

+ WP Comm. pp. 101-103.

however, he did not think of the figure in quite these terms as being double the rate of assessment for kⁱyt-land, and therefore comparable with the fact that in non-apportioning domain -- Type A entries -- n^hb-land is assessed at double the rate for kⁱyt-land. Since the ordinary entries for kⁱyt-land suggest that the second figure should be multiplied by the third in entries of Type B to give the number of sacks allotted for "apportioning" tax in entries of Type A, it would have been reasonable to suggest that here the second figure should be multiplied by the third.

* When WP went to press Gardiner believed that the second figure (first red figure) in entries of type B was arrived at by dividing the figure of sacks in the "apportioning" entry A by 3 in "anomalous" entries. However, his own formula for determining the apportioning tax on ordinary kⁱyt-land (WP Comm. p. 101) $\frac{n}{4} \times 1\frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{4.0}$ of 5n surely presumes necessarily that the last two figures of type B entries were multiplied together to give the number of sacks, and it is only reasonable to extend this procedure to "anomalous" entries. The fact that "anomalous" entry "g" is unique in giving the rate-taxation 3, whereas the other "anomalous" entries give the ordinary rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks, added greatly to the difficulty of elucidation. The assumption there was either that the rate of taxation should be multiplied by 2, or the number of arouras multiplied by 2 to convert into kⁱyt-land. Fairman and Stuchevsky have subsequently shown that the second figure in "anomalous" entries B is in n^hb-land, as the discussion below also shows.

This would have been to imply that the second figure was in terms of n**h**b-land, since the rate of assessment was twice that for k**i**y**t**-land. This in turn would imply that where land occurs which does not consist solely of k**i**y**t**-land (anomalous entry "g" consists of t**n**i- and k**i**y**t**-land), then this land is expressed in terms of n**h**b-land (though this is not done with plots of purely k**i**y**t**-land)*.

The merit of the article of Fairman was that starting afresh from the conclusions of Gardiner, he was able to establish clearly that this second figure of Type B entries of the "anomalous" class was in fact in terms of n**h**b-land, and Stuchevsky confirmed this. Fairman approached the question solely from the point of view that the ordinary formula of Gardiner for calculating the "apportioning" tax does not work, whereas the new theory does. To solve the problem of the "anomalous" entries Stuchevsky investigated the mathematical background⁺ to the way in which the area of land and

* This is accepting the view of Stuchevsky that there is no necessity to regard the second figure in ordinary, as opposed to "anomalous", entries as being in terms of n**h**b-land.

+ As seen above Stuchevsky accepts the formula of Gardiner as the means whereby the taxation-rate for "apportioning" tax was fixed for land consisting solely of k**i**y**t**-land.

For mixed or n**h**b-land the second figure of the Type B entry was calculated on the following formula, which converts all types of land into n**h**b-land (where n = arouras of k**i**y**t**, t = t**n**i-land, and b = n**h**b-land)

$$\frac{0.5n + 0.75t + 1b}{4}$$

(see SIPW page 89 and Note 43). To obtain the correct number of sacks for the "apportioning" entry A it is necessary to multiply by 3, double the rate for k**i**y**t**-land (here unfortunately Stuchevsky is very obscure and does not appear to grasp the full scope of his own discoveries) (see SIPW page 89).

the number of sacks were calculated, and showed that the system was fair and logically in accordance with the value of the land in terms of productivity. This confirmation that, in spite of the oppression of the farmer — which is the favourite theme of the writers of model letters in the scribal schools — productivity rather than arbitrary or penal taxation was the basis of the Egyptian economic system, is welcome, though only to be expected in a great nation which depended for its prosperity on an efficient agricultural system.

To conclude the study of the data provided by the assessments in P. Wilbour it is now necessary to consider the assessment figures relating to the entries of Type C of Stuchevsky (the reader will remember that within this term are included not only the pōsh entries of Gardiner proper, but also the private land-holdings which, Gardiner

* The writer has already expressed his reluctance, in Section 2, to recognize that nḥb- and tni[?]-lands were necessarily inferior in quality (productivity) to kīyt-land (Gardiner WP Comm. pp. 28-9 and 178-181). He now feels that the figures of the assessments compel the acceptance of the view that these two types of land were of better quality.

* has shown, were administered on a similar basis in "apportioning" domain). Stuchevsky divides his Type C holdings into two classes[†], and this division of convenience will be followed here. Type I plots are generally larger than type II, and are clearly distinguished from them, since in Type I after the initial black figure or figures giving the area of the plot, there occur two red assessment figures; the first apparently gives the amount of land

* Gardiner, WP Comm. page 59. The writer would, however, disagree strongly with his note 3 on that page with regard to Text A, 76, 13 which Gardiner translates "Apportioned for the Vizier Neferronpe, in apportionment for the cultivator Pipunakhte 20, 1, mc. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ " suggesting that the "1" be amended to read "5". As Gardiner himself says above the introductory formulae could be varied for honorific reasons, and though in appearance this entry resembles a combination of Type B and C holdings, apart from the more fulsome phraseology to distinguish the vizier from ordinary mortals, the entry is of the ordinary Type C. In spite of this outward similarity to entries of Type B, there appears no reasonable ground for amending to "5" and thus making the Vizier liable to much heavier taxation than his fellows. The reader should here be reminded that those Type C entries which deal with lands allotted to small shrines, instead of private persons, have a different and more elaborate introduction, though under exactly the same regimen. This is a timely reminder that where questions of social status enter in, the criterion of form has its limitations.

+ SIPW pages 92-93. for his discussion of the Type C entries.

subject to taxation, the second the rate of assessment which is invariably $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks per aroura. In Type II entries no red assessment figures occur, but sometimes a terse comment such as "dry" or "it was not seen (?)" is added after the black figure. Generally these Type II plots are exceedingly small, being measured in "land-cubits" (ht t) rather than arouras, though this is not invariably so.

Since entries of type II never show any assessments, our concern in the study which follows will be exclusively with entries of the first type. Stuchevsky, it should be observed, sees a strong resemblance between these entries and "anomalous" entries of Type B. For him the first red figure in such entries as Text A 27, 36 should be understood as being a conversion into nbb-land of the first black figure which he regards as being an area of land of a much lower quality than kiyt. When instead of a single black figure two occur at the beginning of the assessment between which stands the sign which Gardiner transcribes —, this is for Stuchevsky a sign of conversion into another quality of land.

To the present writer these two suppositions seem completely incompatible, since if the second black figure represents a standard quality of land into which the first is converted,^{*} it seems reasonable to suppose that this standard quality must have been one of the three attested elsewhere in both

* The widely varying ratios between the two black figures prove fairly certainly that one is really dealing with the conversion of real areas of land of greatly different productivity into terms of some standard quality. See e.g. A 56, 47 - A 58, 10 & A 95, 39 - A 96, 25.

texts of the papyrus. This should logically mean that where there is no conversion sign and only a single black figure, then this figure is expressed in terms of that same standard quality of land. Since, moreover, the invariable rate of assessment is $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks, it seems reasonable to suppose that the conversion between the two black figures was made into terms of kjyt-land not njb since, though it is easy to see how a mechanical scribe could write $1\frac{1}{2}$ regularly instead of 3 as the rate of assessment in a few "anomalous" entries of Type B, it appears unreasonable to believe that $1\frac{1}{2}$ could be written in the extremely numerous Type C entries, if 3 were really meant. If the fact is then that the type of land represented in the black figures (or the last black figure where two occur) was expressed in terms of any one of the known standard qualities of land, it is plainly impossible to suppose that the first red figure, which generally varies between 33.3% and 5% of the black figure immediately preceding, could be a conversion of the black figure into njb-land, since the ratio between kjyt and njb-land is only 2:1. The reasonable conclusion demanded by the facts seems to be that the first red figure is that part of the plot in arouras which was subject to taxation at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ sacks. Since Stuchevsky accepts an explanation of that sort for the second figure of entries of Type B in Text A (following Gardiner), whether the entry be "anomalous" or otherwise, and explicitly notes a strong parallelism between Types B and C entries (save that in Type C entries generally a lower portion than $\frac{1}{4}$ is assessed --

* Stuchevsky says this is always so, but as seen above, this is not exact), it is difficult to see why he does not adopt that interpretation here also.

* SIPW page 93 top.

The present writer sees no reason whatever to compare Type C entries with the "anomalous" entries rather than with the ordinary Type B entries, and so is inclined to regard the first red figure like the black figure as being in kjyt-land, which tallies well with the recorded rate of assessment. If one supposes with Stuchevsky that these people were what he calls "service-tenants", or persons working marginal land more or less at their own initiative, then it is not surprising to find that they were allowed to keep the vast majority of the produce of their land, and only pay light taxes.

It has been noted above that C-entries of Type II never show assessment figures, and it seems reasonable to suppose that because of the poor quality of this land or the small size of the plots they never paid any form of taxation. Gardiner notes, it is true, that a few Type II entries display two black figures, and supposes that while one portion paid tax, the other did not. Stuchevsky seems, however, fully justified in assuming that since no red assessment figures occur, neither portion paid taxation; the division would simply be made because the plot was in two separate portions, or devoted to different uses.

By way of conclusion to Section 3 and the part of this study dealing with the specifically economic rather than social, it will be well to summarize what may be gleaned about the period in which P. Wilbour was written.

* SIPW page 84.

+ See SIPW p. 84 where Stuchevsky uses the phrase *условный служитель-бий земледельца* "a conditional service-tenant of land".

♠ SIPW page 93.

Following upon the studies of Gardiner (assisted by R. Faulkner), Fairman and Stuchevsky, it now seems possible to gain a fairly clear idea of the system of land tenure and land administration in Egypt, at least as far as the wagf-lands of the land-owning institutions and khato-land of Pharaoh are concerned. Quite clearly as γῆ βασιλική in Ptolemaic times came under the supervision of a special οἰκονόμος, so these lands were under strict centralized bureaucratic supervision. Section 2 has, however, clearly shown that such land by no means formed the whole of Egypt, but that, as in later times, large areas of land existed which were to some degree free of this control, though probably no lands were completely free of centralized planning.

It seems, then, that the key factor for the understanding of the workings of the ancient Egyptian economy of our period, as well as an important guide to the reasons leading to the decline of Egypt as a major expansionist power in the XXth Dynasty, may be provided by P. Wilbour in conjunction with the other evidence, and this will compel the revision of many older ideas on the social and political history of the times. This subject has been considered shortly in Section 2, but will be studied at greater length in Section 4.

All that need be said by way of concluding this chapter is that our increasing understanding of the way in which the assessments in P. Wilbour were compiled forces us to admit that a highly developed planned economy, based on the productivity of land, is to be envisaged as in operation under the XXth Dynasty, administered by a highly powerful and centralized bureaucracy built up during the New Kingdom, in so far as it was not of

much earlier origin. The problem which has to be considered is how the effete and rather ineffective kingship of the later XXth Dynasty can be reconciled with the continued existence of such a system, which had in the past few centuries permitted a tremendous concentration of national effort under the auspices of the great rulers of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties. The probable solution is, as has been suggested in Section 2, that the departments of state had over the course of the centuries come to have an existence independent of the kingship which originally they were created to serve. Such a phenomenon is attested many times in the history of kingship in various lands, including medieval Britain. At the same time great families continued to flourish in Egypt, as they had done throughout the New Kingdom, deriving their power and influence from the service of the state in different aspects, administrative, religious, military. An important change was, however, taking place in the attitude of these great families to the king, in that as the various departments of state became more independent, so did they. The power of these great families was not yet centrifugal in the reign of Ramesses V, but the passing of direct power at the southern capital from the king into the hands of hereditary High Priests of Am^{*} holding also numerous secular posts, presaged clearly how in the next few centuries the interests of great families would increasingly take precedence over the national interest, and lead to the gradual disintegration of the administrative system.

* This point will be developed more fully in the next section.

SECTION 4.THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF ANCIENT EGYPT FROM THE MIDDLE XXTH DYNASTY TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE XXVTH.

In Section 2 the attempt has been made to delineate in broad outline the characteristic features of the ancient Egyptian system, particularly as manifested in our period. The strict dependence of every other institution on the institution of monarchy at all periods of wise and good government has been brought out, though it is clear that the worst dangers of absolutism were mitigated by the customs of officialdom, which insured that the great administrative functionaries had a wide measure of independence and discretion within their own fields of activity. Although it has been seen that household and temple industries were probably in a flourishing state during the New Kingdom, and Section 1 has demonstrated fairly clearly that the foundations of real international trade were being laid, Egypt still depended very largely for its prosperity and power on the efficient management of its large agricultural potentialities, which, with the help of the Nile floods, made it possible to maintain a population huge by the standards of the time.*

* In Egypt as elsewhere there are of course no real population statistics for Pharaonic times, but the estimate of Diodorus that in early Roman times there was a population of six million is likely to be based on proper census figures; the view has been taken that this is likely to have been less than in the Pharaonic period since the prolonged troubles of the Ptolemaic period would have led to a decline rather than increase in population. This point cannot of course be treated as certain, but it can be taken that the Pharaonic inhabitants of Egypt were much more numerous than the population in 1800 A.D. It is most unlikely that with the primitive agricultural knowledge of the time any other country had an equivalent population until the Assyrians welded Western Asia into one empire.

Section 3 has passed from the consideration of generalities to detailed investigation of the economic data provided by P. Willbour, and has established conclusively that the system of the paternalistic and highly bureaucratic centralized monarchy survived into the beginning of our period, not only as a survival of a period of great expansionism based on a strongly militant and militaristic monarchy, but as an efficient and functioning organization. However, it is clear that the system demanded to an undue extent that the king himself should remain the ultimate dynamism, and for this reason it was liable to fail rapidly under even a short succession of weak or ephemeral kings. The great danger which always lurked behind the scenes was that the leading officials of state would manage to entrench themselves in the various departments, and by intermarriage establish a loose oligarchy exerting an effective control over the king. In the first generation such people were no more than favourites of the king dependent upon him for their promotion and duly respectful, but naturally once their posts became more or less hereditary they became less conscious of their duties to the king, and more conscious of their own power and importance in a particular area. Where these people held posts of eminence in great cities such as Thebes which was in many ways a second capital, the danger was acute of the development of a local aristocracy caring more for family ambitions than the welfare of the country as a whole. The Nile made easy communication possible between the regions of Egypt, but once the power of Egypt had ceased to exert effective control in the northern Sudan, a condition which

the letters of Dhutmose^{*} show to have been rapidly coming about in the last years of the XXth Dynasty or the early years of the XXIst, it was natural that the Thebais should revert to its old state as a buffer province enjoying a great amount of autonomy, as it had been during the First and Second Intermediate Periods.

In Section 2 the attempt has been made to trace the growth of the feeling of independence of the High Priests of Amūn at Thebes during the XXth Dynasty, which the present writer is inclined to attribute to the lack of initiative on the part of the kings, who seem seldom or never to have visited Thebes during their reigns to see what deference or lack of it was being shown on public monuments erected there. It is notable that in the great inscription of year 10 of Ramesses IX, made by the High Priest Amenhotpe, the king himself is not depicted as making the presentation to the High Priest, but officials were sent from the northern capital to act on his behalf. It was not unnatural then that a certain disrespect should creep into the attitude of the High Priests, but perhaps their attitude amounted to no more than this.

We have been inclined to consider that the intervention of the King's Son of Cush Penhasi in Upper Egypt, which probably brought Thebes under military government from about year 12 of Ramesses XI to year 19, whether or not this intervention was carried out at the request of the king, marked the beginning of a new age, during which the Theban principality was a

* LRL These letters published by J. Černý are mostly between Dhutmose and his family, particularly Butehamun his son, or great Theban officials such as Piankh son of Hrihor.

military zone under the control of generals whose loyalty to the Crown might be frequently suspect. Hitherto in this work no real study has been made of the new state of affairs which this created, and it will now be well briefly to consider this subject, since though it is directly concerned with political history, it is vital to the proper understanding of the evolution of the social history of the time.

Gardiner has recently done much to out down the High Priests of Amūn to their proper size,^{*} indeed some may think with the present writer that he has slightly under estimated their real importance in Egypt. Gardiner's statement that because High Priests of Amūn in our period frequently made use of a single cartouche they were not necessarily claiming to be Pharaoh was certainly very timely, but the corollary is even more cogent that the very toleration of the use of any form of cartouche by subjects implied that the position of the Crown was greatly enfeebled, and its sacred and aloof dignity diminished. Such usage of the cartouche had only been tolerated at the end of the First and Second Intermediate Periods when the suzerainty of the leading dynasty over all Egypt was scarcely even nominal. The sweeping statement of von Beckerath⁺ that by the time that the Theban principality was established, Thebes had played out its political role is of course an attempt to look through the eye of centuries, and is thus disqualified as a realistic historical observation. Though Thebes and

* GEP page 304 ff. Also pp. 316-9.

+ BTT page 102. Von Beckerath here unfortunately indulges in the somewhat unscholarly habit of saying that all the history of Egypt after a selected date is insignificant after the end of what he regards as the great period.

with it the whole of the ancient Egyptian system was becoming somewhat a symbol of the past, certainly many more centuries were to pass before Thebes ceased to be one of the most important cities of Egypt, and it is clear that the Theban High Priests were of outstanding importance among the highest Egyptian officials.

The letters published by Černý^{∨*}, with regard to the scribe of the tomb Dhutmose and his family for the most part, give a graphic impression of the real state of affairs at Thebes at the extreme end of the XXth Dynasty or the commencement of the XXIst. Comparison of the formulae of different letters makes the position absolutely clear. In one⁺ the scribe Butehamun son of Dhutmose addresses the real ruler of Thebes, Piankh the son of Hrihor, in the most cowering terms by his full titles, "Fanbearer on the Right of the King, Royal Scribe, General, First Prophet of Amenrasenher, King's Son of Cush, Superintendent of Southern Lands, Superintendent of Granaries of the Granaries of Pharaoh, Piankh, Governor of the Bowmen of Pharaoh". Elsewhere when Piankh himself sends letters[∅], he refers to himself simply as "General of Pharaoh", showing clearly that except in fulsome official descriptions his character as a military man overshadowed everything else. It would plainly be a mistake to think of such a political and military figure as in any real sense the priestly ruler of a theocracy,

* J. Černý. Late Ramesside Letters (Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 9)

Henceforth abbreviated LRL. (see Bibliography)

+ Pap. B. M. 10375 lines 1-3, published LRL page 44.

∅ See e.g. P. Bibl. Nat. 196, I, and P. Bibl. Nat. V, published LRL page 35.

though Piankh was High Priest of Amūn for the influence that it conveyed. The letters make it quite clear that at this time Piankh had moved south into Nubia with an army in an attempt to subdue the region which seems to have revolted some years before, perhaps, as Gardiner suggests, under the leadership of Penhasi who while being King's Son of Cush had for a time taken over the governorship of Thebes. Among the requests of Piankh is one for the provisions for his Meshwesh soldiers⁺, and there are references to Sherden[♯], proving that the Theban army of this time was much like all the armies of the late New Kingdom, an Egyptian army heavily strengthened by soldiers of foreign origin. It has been frequently stated[♯] that in all probability the colony of Libyan soldiers at Thebes was not founded until the extremely late date of the beginning of the XXVIth Dynasty, but the above mentioned passages seem to prove fairly conclusively that Thebes at this time already had its share of alien soldiery. This was not unnatural since the armies guarding the south always played an important part in the defence of Egypt. There is clear evidence, which Gardiner cites[♯], that Piankh had little real loyalty to the Pharaoh of the time, and regarded the army at Thebes as in some sense a private army.

* GEP page 313.

+ LRL page 35, P. Bibl. Nat. 196, I, line 4.

♯ LRL page 45., Pap. B. M. 10375; line 11.

♯ GMS pages 33-34 for a full statement of this view.

♯ GEP page 314.

The evidence seems thus to justify the belief that already at the beginning of the XXIst Dynasty the king was in some sense primus inter pares among the leaders of Egypt, though Smendes seems to have been able to make his influence strongly felt at Thebes, and his contemporary Piankh never uses even the single cartouche, the outward symbol of high aspirations. Meanwhile, the continued existence of a local dynasty at Thebes was guaranteed by its control of a considerable degree of armed force, perhaps comparable to that of the king, whose military strength may well have been derived from forces provided by other local dynasts. Von Beckerath ^{*} assumes that already in the late XXth Dynasty local Libyan military dynasts existed in the western Delta, and this view finds strong support from the stela of Harpason ⁺ which apparently traces back the ancestors of the Libyan XXIIInd Dynasty for six generations before this family attained the throne. From this it would appear clear that for several generations right through the XXIst Dynasty, one Libyan family had been hereditary military governors of Heracleopolis, as well as holding the local chief priesthood, and other evidence shows them establishing marital connections with the high priestly house of Memphis and ultimately with the royal house of the XXIst Dynasty which they were to succeed. The Sheshonq ^φ Stela makes it quite clear that Sesonchis I had "messengers of the great chief of Meshwesh" comparable to the messengers of the king even before his accession, and gives the strong impression that Heracleopolis at that time was in almost every way a state within a state.

* BTT pages 79-80.

+ BAR IV, page 395.

^φ Most recently published in JEA 27, page 83ff. by A. M. Blackman who identifies the Sheshonq of the inscription with Sesonchis I.

Gardiner is inclined to treat it as without real significance when Pinudjem, the son of the general Piankh, alone of all the High Priests of Thebes frequently uses the royal titulary in its full form with both a proper prenomen and nomen^{*} (unlike his grandfather Hrihor who showed no proper prenomen, but only the name of his office enclosed in a cartouche). The present writer believes, however, that this is a clear indication that while still resident at Thebes, Pinudjem was recognized by his Tanite contemporary, probably Psusennes I, as co-regent and prospective successor to the throne at Tanis. This acceptance of a powerful military leader as his destined successor by Psusennes I would be fully in accord with the close relationship which is known to have existed between the ruling families of Thebes and Tanis, and comparable both with the way in which Psusennes II in the absence of a male heir seems to have selected Sesonchis I as his successor, and the way in which Haremheb, also childless, seems to have chosen Ramesses I and Sethōs I as his eventual successors. Unfortunately the single block discovered by Montet at Tanis[†] bearing the name of Pinudjem as king of all Egypt is not in itself conclusive proof of this interpretation of events. The present writer believes that after a

* See particularly GEP page 317 for the statement of Gardiner's most recent views on the relationship between the High Priests of Amūn and the kings at Tanis, which are simply that at all times the Tanite sovereigns were recognized as the sole legitimate Pharaohs, and no more kings were of Theban extraction.

† Bull. de l'Institut français d' Egyptologie. April 1951. page 29-30.

co-regency lasting at least eight years and probably somewhat longer during which Pinudjem resided at Thebes and carried out works there, Pinudjem moved to Tanis as sole king of Egypt, leaving the post of High Priest of Amūn first to his son Masaherta, and then after the latter's death to another son Menkheperre^c.

Other interpretations have frequently been made of the evidence now cited, but the style of the great inscription of Menkheperre^c,^{*} the High Priest of Amūn, the son of Pinudjem, seems to suggest strongly that there was some real difference in status between the position of Menkheperre^c himself and his father Pinudjem I. In this inscription Menkheperre^c does not himself use even the single cartouche (which he rarely uses at all except at El Hiba), but refers to his father explicitly as king. The inscription is dated simply in year 25 of an unnamed king; but, in the absence of any reference to any king but Pinudjem I, it can only be considered extremely attractive on a priori grounds to attribute this date to his reign if possible. If this scheme is correct, it would appear that Pinudjem reigned at least 40 years, including his co-regency with his Tanite predecessor, while the High Priest Menkheperre^c lived on a few years into the reign of another king, presumably Amenope, who was perhaps his elder brother. The fact that both Pinudjem I and Menkheperre^c made a stronghold at El Hiba on the extreme northern limit of the Theban sphere of influence, shows clearly their interest in events in the north, and

* Translated BAR IV, page 317-320. The inscription is dated to year 25 of an unnamed reign.

reminds one irresistibly of the king's son and High Priest of Amūn Osorkon, son of Takelet II of the next age, who seems to have made this his refuge when driven from Thebes by political trouble. It certainly appears clear from the inscription mentioned above that the period of office of Menkheperre² also had its political and probably military troubles in full measure.

In the above paragraphs the purely political history of the earlier part of our period has been discussed at length, though the aim throughout this treatise has been to use the study of political events for the better understanding of social and economic developments, since it seemed that only by doing this could the gradual but definite and basic change affecting the Egyptian state at that time be properly understood. The present writer has maintained the opinion in many places in this treatise that the older views on changes in the Egyptian state structure simplify the picture to an undue extent. The prosperity and good government of Egypt depended not so much on the ruler possessing absolute control over every single thing that happened, as on a proper balance between the royal authority and the legitimate independence which officials could be permitted to enjoy without harm to the state. Under a line of strong rulers this balance could be achieved and maintained, even if the state took a feudalistic character (e.g. Under the early part of the XIIth Dynasty), and even if certain very important offices were more or less hereditary (e.g. The vizierate near the commencement of the XVIIIth Dynasty). Undoubtedly, however, the state administration was much more stable when the independence of functionaries was curtailed by the fact that high office and promotion depended in the last resort on a measure of royal goodwill rather than on inherited rights

or other claims. There was a continual danger of civil war and the collapse of central authority if powerful subjects controlling their own forces, and no more than formally dependant on the king for their positions, were in a situation to exert pressure on the monarch, and subvert the normal working of the administrative machine. It has been shown clearly that such persons had emerged by the end of the XXth Dynasty, and the shadowy rulers of the XXIst seem to have taken the view that it was better to co-exist with great military magnates, winning their goodwill by inter-marriage, than to attempt to suppress their independence.

The early XXIIInd Dynasty kings are much better known to us from monuments, and appear to have been able to control effectively all the other personages among their subjects from the reign of Sesonchis I until that of Osorkon II. However, by the time this family came to the throne the system of great feudal fiefs had become so engrained that the XXIIInd Dynasty, who seem to have modelled themselves strictly on existing Egyptian practice because they were conscious of their alien origin, made no attempt to suppress them, but simply replaced the old ruling house at Thebes by scions of the new dynasty. Heracleopolis which had been the original seat of the XXIIInd Dynasty became a fief for younger sons of the family, and at Memphis the old family of High Priests, which was closely connected to the new kings by marriage and allegiance, was allowed to continue in office until the reign of Osorkon II. During the early years of the Dynasty such an arrangement seems to have worked well, but the difficulty rapidly emerged that the sons of holders of such fiefs were naturally desirous of claiming their rights under Egyptian custom and succeeding to their father's

position. When this was allowed it frequently happened that the holders began to show signs of seeking undue independence. The disastrous fillip which the family policy of Osorkon II gave to the feelings of importance and independence of the great families is well-known and has been mentioned already at the end of Section 2, and there is no need to consider it again here.

To conclude our study of the social structure of ancient Egypt it will now be necessary to extend the survey so as to consider the economic basis on which the social structure rested. The writer has already expressed the view above that, though the outward form of the Egyptian state system social and economic changed only very gradually and within certain limits, certain subtle changes did in fact take place which are very interesting and worthy of study.

When in Sections 2 and 3 we were studying P. Wilbour we saw that portions of the wagf-domains of gods and secular institutions were apportioned among small-holders from all kinds of professions, including priests, soldiers, and a few slaves. It was noticed that a similar system was still followed in Ptolemaic times whereby the vast majority of the army were allotted plots of land for their own maintenance when not on active service. Generally speaking the social status of ordinary soldiers appears to have been comparatively low at the period of P. Wilbour, and most of the soldiers would seem to have had to be content with three arouras per head, though the foreign Sherden auxiliaries, who were perhaps élité troops, frequently held five arouras apiece. So far as one can judge, it was usual for the holdings of soldiers to be widely dispersed throughout the countryside.

* From Herodotus it would appear clear that in the centuries intervening between the end of the New Kingdom and his own age the social position of the military class had considerably advanced in relation to the other classes of Egyptian society. The more or less hereditary character of the class had come to the fore, and there were a number of regular military colonies almost all lying in the northern part of Egypt apart from a single colony at Thebes. Apparently the two divisions of the army, the Hermotybies and Calasiries, were entitled to a first and automatic share in all lands allocated and each soldier received a regulation portion of twelve arouras of land. From the remarks of Herodotus in the same place it would appear certain that the other classes still enjoyed the right to hold apportioned domain on the great estates, but their claims took second place to those of the military, and their holdings were probably smaller. Probably the rather depressed economic condition of the army at the end of the New Kingdom had arisen as the result of centuries of almost continual internal peace. Egyptian model letters dwell with depressing frequency on the horrors of being a soldier in a foreign and hostile⁺ land. The rise in the economic and social status of the soldier must be directly traceable to continued internal unrest and the growth of private armies whose loyalties had to be

* Herodotus II, 164-8.

+ See for example Anastasi III, 5,5 - 6,2 (which is closely matched by numerous parallel texts). The letters to Dhutmose who was supplying provisions to the army in the Sudan, show that his family were acutely conscious of the dangers of the military life, as well as their utter dependence on his safe return.

purchased with the gift of largesse, as well as to the threat of foreign invasion which always overshadowed Egypt towards the end of our period and after it, when Egypt had to endure the humiliating experience of the restoration of order and unity by the Cushites, whose land had long been a mere province of the Egyptian empire.

The position of the lesser folk then does not appear to have changed materially during the period under study, save that, as was natural in the frequently troubled character of the age, the economic status of soldiers seems to have become much higher. The changing titles of the XXIIInd Dynasty personages of Thebes which no longer mention the funerary temples of the New Kingdom kings, can only suggest that some gradual liquidation of their lands was taking place at this stage, while no doubt a substantial portion of their revenues had been diverted to other purposes within a decade or two of their foundation. However, there is plenty of evidence from throughout our period that the kings continued to think it right to make donations of land to the gods^{*}, and so there seems no reason to suppose that the amount of "sacred land" in Egypt underwent any substantial diminution during the Late Period. The Petition of Petiēse from a somewhat later date gives a graphic illustration⁺ of the ways in which even in insecure times the priesthoods of temples could secure the safety of their lands

* See e.g. Donation stela year 19, Sesonchis V (Okheperrē) publ.

W. M. Müller, *Egyptological Researches*, plate 88, page 55., or two donation stelae of year 10 of Peftjaudibaste publ. by G. Daressy in *ASAE* XVII. p. 43, and *ASAE* XXI p. 138 ff.

+ Petiēse 16, 9 - 18, 4 (P. Rylands IX)

by playing one magnate off against another. Moreover, at least some of the kings of the XXIIInd Dynasty seem to have followed the practice of building funerary temples of their own^{*} which would have needed endowment lands. There appears no doubt whatever that within the waqf lands of the various institutions some of the land continued to be allotted into small plots on a more or less hereditary basis.

Similarly the position of the great administrators of land does not appear to have undergone any great alteration at least in theory, but it is clear that in practice there had been a noticeable change closely connected with the nature of the tenure of office itself. In the New Kingdom as later, as has been mentioned above in various places, the right to administer domains on the great estates, whether worked by servants of the temples or made available to private individuals, appears to have stood in a close relationship to the holding of important public office, whether religious or secular. It appears that in a state-capitalist country like ancient Egypt the ruling classes were inevitably the only persons to hold large areas of land. During the New Kingdom, however, apart from survivals into the XVIIIth Dynasty from the Second Intermediate Period, when the position of the kingship seems to have been extremely weak in relation to other offices, few posts were in any sense hereditary, though as usual important officers managed to provide posts of substantial emolument for their sons. During the Late Period, though few offices were inevitably

* The great Gebel-es-Silsileh Inscription of Sesonchis I among others refers to such a temple it would appear, as other inscriptions seem to do also. (see earlier note).

or completely hereditary, there appears no doubt that, generally speaking, a son considered it his right to succeed his father in office, no matter how important the function might be. In the case of the very highest office political considerations frequently proved sufficiently powerful to stop this happening, but the principle remained strong.

The inevitable result of this outlook was that in practice the lands which were customarily administered by the holder of a particular post came to resemble a family possession much more closely than lands simply administered on behalf of a particular temple or of the king. There is no reason, nevertheless, to doubt that normally the link between the tenure of high office and the right to hold large areas of land remained strong.

The Petition of Petiēse shows that even at the era of the XXVith Dynasty, when foreign influence was becoming strong, if a man was deprived of his office,^{*} he was automatically deprived of the emoluments that went with it.

The Ewerot Stela⁺ is more difficult to interpret since we are not fully aware of what functions the son of the High Priest Khamwise in fact fulfilled, though one may be sure that he had several posts, but it is clear that although Ewerot's son received a perpetual endowment, the lands in question continued to form part of the estate of Amūn as they had done at the time when king Osorkon I, the father of Ewerot, presented them to him.

Furthermore there is no reason whatever to suppose that the strips of land mentioned formed an unitary farm; instead they were probably scattered portions of land from which Khamwise received part of the revenues, while

* Petiēse 15, 3 - 11.

+ A. Erman in ZAS 35 pages 19 - 24. G. Legrain transcription p. 13 - 16.

the priests who actually worked them received another part, and so presumably did the owning temple of Amūn. There can be no doubt that, in fact if not formally, the continued possession of these lands by Khamwīse was dependent on the duration of the power of his family.

The point has now been reached when it is necessary to sum up what has been established with regard to the economy of ancient Egypt, and the social structure which depended upon it. It would be difficult to describe the system still in full operation at the beginning of the period under study more succinctly or comprehensively than to include the New Kingdom system also in Rostovtzeff's words concerning the Ptolemaic period, "The economic system was inspired by one motive, the organization of production, with the main purpose of making the State, in other words the king, rich and powerful. All the energies of the people were concentrated on this principal object. Every one was required to work first and foremost for the State, according to a plan devised by the government, carefully worked out by the administration, and strictly enforced by all kinds of sanctions, material responsibility and personal responsibility being judiciously combined." In the foregoing pages the attempt has been made to give a balanced evaluation of the ancient Egyptian system of economic control, without bestowing undue praise or condemnation, as it existed under the New Kingdom and at the beginning of our period. Any appraisal of the value of the system is bound to be essentially subjective to a considerable extent, since many of the economic problems of policy that the ancient Egyptians faced are perennial, and still have to be solved today. Indeed for better or worse there seems no doubt that modern societies in both

* Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. Volume 1, p. 316.

East and West are at present moving rapidly away from the idea of a free economy motivated largely by the capitalism of individuals, to favour a system of state capitalism, or capitalism motivated by giant companies, which are almost written into the structure of government, within the framework of controls physical or indirect.

Provided that the governmental system was not too inefficient or corrupt the idea of large administrative units and the country-wide planning of production, agricultural and manufacturing, had much to commend it, as did the concentration of all power in the country into the hands of a small governing class, which directly or indirectly administered almost all the resources of the country, making possible the maintenance of internal organization and a consistent policy of external imperialism, aimed at external dominance, though not at thorough conquest. The weaknesses of the system were almost as great as its merits, however, and did much to counterbalance its theoretical excellence. The profoundest and most inevitable weakness was that whatever restraining ordinances the kings might issue,^{*} the system was run by (and for practical purposes almost on behalf of) a small class which was in a position to see to its own welfare even at the expense of the rest of the population. It was all very well to make officials personally and materially responsible for the delivery of a fixed amount of tax, but it was always the easiest thing in the world for high officials to make up any deficiencies in the year of a poor harvest

* See the Karnak Decree of Haremheb, published by W. Helck in ZAS 80, page 109-136. The Revenue Laws of Philadelphus, and P. Tebtynis 703 appear to be similar regulations of conduct.

by practising extortion on the peasants or their own subordinates^{*}, and possibly leaving them to starve. As a result of this characteristic of the Egyptian system the incentives of the producing classes were practically nil, and their purchasing capacity very small, which meant that a prolonged period of firm central government and control like the New Kingdom could very easily lead, not to a better general standard of living, but to apathy and stagnation. In consequence the producing classes would be resentful and sullen, and land which could be cultivated would tend to be abandoned.

Seen in this context the Strike Papyrus[†] show that at the beginning of our period there was a considerable degree of feeling against a government which was not only distant and impersonal, but also lacked the justification of being efficient. Plainly the Egyptian system had by stages become top-heavy and over-centralized, and there was a definite need for more delegation of powers to local officials. To this extent the changes under the later XXth and XXIst Dynasties were necessary and inevitable.

Another great and inevitable weakness of the bureaucratic system was that the leading agents of governmental control could very easily become local dynasts in their own right, and part of the gradual collapse of the structure of government is to be explained in that way. The danger became more acute when the kings of the XXIst, and more particularly of the XXIIInd Dynasty, instead of replacing provincial dynasts by mere officials dependent on the throne, decided to try to purchase the loyalty of these important offices by installing relatives of their own as incumbents:

* P. Sallier l. 6, 5ff.

† Published in facsimile by Pleyte and Rossi. Papyrus de Turin. Plates 35-48. In transcription in RAD pp. 45-60. For translation and a short commentary see W. Edgerton in JNES 10, p. 137 ff.

the inevitable effect was the reverse of what had been intended, namely that many of these collateral feudal branches of the royal house rapidly began to claim some of the outward symbols of royalty. The position of these local worthies was even stronger in that the national army of the New Kingdom had become completely regionalized, and each of them had at his command what amounted to a private army. Ultimately the continued existence of these rivals, many of whom fortified their position by possession of the local priesthoods and thus by the control of a great part of the land in their areas, meant the complete dissolution of the kingdom under the later XXIIInd Dynasty. Tefnakhte, despot of Sais, tried to seize all Egypt from the north, while the kings of Cush rapidly spread all over Egypt from the south, though their control of the north was never very secure. By the end of our period the centrifugal tendencies within Egypt were almost spent, and from the ruins of the Libyan feudal monarchy, a new unified national state could emerge.

SECTION 5. CONCLUSIONS.

A study of this kind would not be complete without some attempt being made to summarize the main points of importance and interest which have emerged in trying to tie down the various threads of evidence. In the following brief exegesis it is hoped to show clearly and simply the main facets of the Egyptian economic and social structure as it has emerged from these researches. Anyone having any acquaintance with Egyptology appreciates the extraordinary quality of permanence and changelessness that the Egyptian artistic schools attained early in the Old Kingdom, and maintained with but slight adaptations throughout the rest of ancient Egyptian history, and the same is undoubtedly true of the main institutions of state like the kingship which persisted on traditional lines. The period in which ancient Egyptian economic and social practice is under intensive study in this thesis is comparatively short and falls late in the course of that civilization, and the changes studied here have been the minor and subtle, but nevertheless interesting, adaptations brought about by the end of the imperial aspirations and status of the New Kingdom monarchs, not startling new innovations; but in order to allow the nature of the ancient controlled economy as an integral and essential part of the whole structure of the Egyptian state to emerge clearly, it has been necessary to emphasize again and again that, like so much else in Egypt, the beginnings of the economic system were coeval with the first unification of Egypt under the rule of one king. The kings of the Old Kingdom rapidly developed from tribal chiefs into the god-kings of a highly organized and mature civilization, who had at their command all the energies of their subjects and watched

over the welfare of the Egyptian people both in religious matters and the more prosaic matters of economic organization. As mentioned above, the inscription of Meten shows that already under the early IVth Dynasty much of Egypt was administered as estates more or less closely dependent on the king. As a result of this concentration of political and economic power in the hands of the state authorities in this early formative period of Egyptian civilization, the view became general that economic life must revolve around the institution of kingship, and not even the various periods of national decline, when the kingship was weak or divided, could shake this fundamental link between officialdom and the control of economic affairs.

The bureaucratic structure of the central administration in the Middle Kingdom was, as Helck has shown in many places in VMNR, much more complicated, and divided into more specialized departments, than was the case in the New Kingdom. This need not mean, however, that the control over the economy which the authorities were able to exercise in the later period was less effective or thorough. In at least the earlier part of the Middle Kingdom it would appear probable that there was only one vizier in office at any one time, though this cannot be regarded as certain, whereas in the New Kingdom it would appear certain that there were almost always at least two, one stationed at Thebes, the other resident in the north either at Memphis or the royal capital which lay in the eastern Delta from the early XIXth Dynasty. The administration of Nubia was entrusted to a King's Son of Cush, a function which did not exist during the Middle Kingdom. This increased regionalization of the administration made it less necessary to have complicated departmental divisions in the machinery of government, but there can be little doubt from the data of P. Wilbour that the reduced governmental staff

were helped out by the use of officials whose main duties lay to the land-owning waqfs, mostly temples, which seem to have gained a much greater importance in the economy of the New Kingdom than they had held at any earlier period. One may suppose with the greatest verisimilitude that the High Priests and Stewards of Amūn, in addition to acting as supervisors of large quantities of land outside the estate of Amūn, had an important voice in determining the allocation of the national sowing-order, and the texts in the Tomb of Rekhmirē^{*} show that already in the XVIIIth Dynasty the granary administration of Amun stood in close connection with the vizier's administration at Thebes. It should, however, be pointed out that many of the Texts in the vizier tombs of the middle XVIIIth Dynasty appear to be traditional, and were perhaps drawn up under the petty princelets of the Theban XVIIth Dynasty: plainly the highly patriarchal and simple situation described in these texts no longer existed under the Theban empire -- kings like Tuthmosis I and III, who frequently resided at Memphis or campaigned in Asia, could not have had daily conferences with the Theban vizier though no doubt they kept in close touch with developments inside Egypt.

The perpetuation of the age-old system whereby the king and the administrative classes were the only literate persons who possessed lands or accumulated capital (private holdings given by royal grant like that of Mes seem to have been rare and of limited extent) meant that all commercial ventures depended very largely on the initiative of the kingship. It also meant that when, as happened in the period under study, the temporal power of the kingship faltered, the bureaucrats who were responsible to the king

* Davies. Tomb of Rekhmirē. The son of the Vizier who was an official in the temple of Amūn is shown working under the direction of his father. This would seem perhaps too specific to be merely a copy of a late Middle Kingdom scene.

for the efficient management of the controlled economy were so deeply entrenched in control of the regional administrations that there was no more than a marginal tendency for individuals to use the opportunity to shake off the control of officialdom or of the great corporations, which were generally sufficiently wealthy or respected to look after their own interests even in times of disorder. In these circumstances naturally the close nexus between position in the administration and the right to hold property and undertake commercial ventures was fully maintained, and there was little tendency for the growth of any form of individual capitalism.

The great change which Egyptian society underwent at the end of the New Kingdom did not therefore concern so much the economic system as the method whereby its administrators held office. During the New Kingdom there had naturally been families of officials who had managed to maintain great influence for generations, and to transmit the same office from one generation to another, but there can be no doubt that this procedure was comparatively rare, and it would be generally true to say that, during the imperial period of the New Kingdom, office, at least of the highest rank, was not primarily hereditary. During the Late Period, however, the reverse seems generally to have been true, and, though probably the theoretical status of office in the state or local administration as something given by the king had not changed, even the greatest offices often in practice became heritable in the same family for several generations. This growth of a local aristocracy, having at its command both military force and priestly respectability, struck at the very heart of royal power, namely

the ability of the king to control promotion to high office, and obliged the kings of the XXIst and XXIIInd Dynasties to indulge in a complicated game of political intrigue designed to maintain royal influence by marital connections with some great families, replacing political undesirables by close relatives of the royal family, playing one person off against another, and trying where possible to prevent the hereditary principle of succession to office from operating, for it was seen that this would lead to the complete subversion of the power of the kings, as in fact it eventually did in the late XXIIInd Dynasty. The character of ancient Egypt as a purely state-capitalist country does not seem to have been affected by the political upheavals of the time, and when national unity was at length fully restored under the XXVIth Dynasty the monarchy preserved its old socio-economic as well as purely political character. Basically the system of state enterprise and planning and of great landed waqfs was maintained in full operation until the Roman period.

Where appropriate the present writer has been inclined to take the wider view, and regard the ancient Egyptian experiment in ordered social and economic living as of the greatest importance to the general history of economic thought and practice - a position from which it has frequently been excluded through the ignorance displayed by most modern economists about pre-classical times. Generally a very sympathetic view has been taken of this first experiment in the large scale organization of society, whose very permanence goes far to show to what an extent it satisfied the real needs of the Egyptians, and which was probably the only form of socio-economic planning that could have functioned in the then state of human

development. The reader's attention has been drawn, however, to the fact that the ancient Egyptian government, as all other totalitarian regimes depending on the implementation of planning from the top by a bureaucracy, was unable to resolve the fundamental contradiction between the idea of an all-powerful and controlling bureaucracy, and an administration responsible and sympathetic to the rest of the population. As a result the doctrine of maintaining the power of the state could very easily become an excuse for turning the country into a benefit society for the scribes, and exploiting the peasants in the name of the king. There was not, however, in Pharaonic times the incentive to oppression that the racial and cultural differences between the governing and the governed presented in Ptolemaic times, and probably a good standard of official rectitude and competence was usually maintained. Everyone knew that a surly and rebellious peasantry who would go on strike or murder offensive officials certainly did nothing to render the bureaucrat's task easy or make the king rich and powerful, and probably the edicts of the kings and the customary heritage of law and tradition which allowed the bureaucracy to maintain its peculiarly pervasive power in Egypt also prescribed definite limits to the way in which this power could be used.

Economic and social histories must from their very nature tend to give a jaundiced and mechanistic view of historical development, in terms of universal trends rather than in terms of innumerable cross-currents, but the present writer has been anxious to stress that, although in the Late Ramesside period there was undoubtedly a general reaction away from the extreme absolutism and centralism that Ramesses II had practised, the

individual weakness or ineffectuality of the later Ramesside kings, not an inexorable economic and political fate, played a very large part in bringing to an end the high international status which Egypt enjoyed during the New Kingdom. Similarly it was not inevitable that the Egyptian state should take on the undesirably feudal character that it assumed under the XXIst Dynasty, even if it was purely a natural and healthy reaction for officials to win a greater measure of administrative independence from the Crown.

As a study of social history this thesis has had largely to dispense with such reference to the characters and aims of the personages involved as would be thought essential in any modern social history, since the reticence of the Egyptian monuments is almost absolute with regard to matters of this kind, and it would be totally unscholarly to turn Egyptology into a branch of fiction. Nevertheless, fuller appreciation of historical events, which have been here sketched as a backcloth to the study of social and economic factors, provides much information which makes the outlook and ambitions of the great men of the time clearer. One can easily see the motives which led Hrihor, who could well see the extreme weakness of the central government and was very conscious of his new importance, to usurp all the high-sounding titles that he could possibly claim, in the belief that this would consolidate the political situation at Thebes as well as strengthen his own position. Similarly the motives which led Harpason to trace his aristocratic and royal family-tree back for twenty-two generations in the Serapeum, as ruin closed around the old official families which surrounded the XXIIInd Dynasty, can be easily conjectured.

REFERENCE INDICES

1). Index of References to other Authors cited in this Treatise

- Albright (W.F.) (19). (impoverishment of Palestinian princes)
- Andréadès (A.) (32).
- Beckerath (J. von) (100), (103).
- Birch (S.) Introduction VIII: (28).
- Blackman (A.M.) (103).
- Breasted (J.H.) Introduction II: (28), (34), (51), (67).
- Brugsch (H.) (43).
- Camino (R.A.) (27), (59).
- Černý (J.) (23), (55), (57), (99), (101).
- Childe (G.) Introduction VIII: (2).
- Daressy (G.) (110).
- Davies (N. de G.) (119).
- Diodorus (97).
- Drioton (E.) and Vandier (J.) (7).
- Dussaud (R.) (22). (Byblos almost an Egyptian colony in Asia under
Sesonchis I).
- Edgerton (W.) (14), (115).
- Erman (A.) (28), (51), (67), (112).
- Fairman (H.J.) (29), (30), (42), (43), (67), (68), (81), (82), (83),
(84), (85), (86), (87), (88), (89), (95).
- Gardiner (Sir Alan) Introduction II, III, IV: (5), (8), (9), (14),
(29), (33), (34), (35), (37), (39), (40), (43), (45),
(46), (50), (51), (52), (57), (59), (63), (64), (66),
(68), (71), (72), (73), (76), (77), (78), (79), (80),
(81), (82), (85), (87), (88), (89), (90), (91), (92),
(93), (94), (95), (100), (102), (104).
- Griffith (F.Ll.) (35), (51), (77).

- Faulkner (R.O.) (95).
- Harari (I.) (52).
- Hayes (W.C.) (51).
- Helck (W.) Introduction III: (4), (30), (35), (37), (44), (114), (118).
- Herodotus (55), (109).
- Kees (H.) Introduction I: (17), (30), (35).
- Lefebvre (G.) (9), (41).
- Legrain (G.) (51), (112).
- Lourie (Mme. I.M.) (30), (38).
- Macadam (M.F.L.) (23). (The forms of the names of Taharqa and Shoshenqo
ending in -qu.)
- Mahaffy (J.P.) and Grenfell (B.P.) (31).
- Meyer (E.) Introduction II: (12).
- Milne (J.G.) (17). (Trade in silver with Greece.)
- Montet (P.) (27), (104).
- Müller (W.M.) (110).
- Naville (E.) (59).
- Nims (C.F.) (8).
- Pallottino (M.) (11). (on the origin of the Etruscans).
- Petrie (W.M.F.) (subsequently Sir William) (35).
- Pleyte and Rossi (14), (115). (with regard to the Strike Papyri).
- Porter (B) and Moss (R.) (27).
- Préaux (Mlle. C.) Introduction II, V: (27), (32).
- Rostovtzeff (M.) Introduction II: (113).
- De Rougé (E.) Introduction VIII.

Schaedel (H.D.) (28), (29), (67).

Sethe (K.) (33) (with Partsch), (50).

Steindorff (G.) (7). (Tomb of Pennē)

Stuchevsky (I.A.) (30), (36), (43), (46), (47), (48), (49), (53), (54),
 (64), (71), (72), (73), (74), (75), (79), (82), (84),
 (85), (86), (87), (88), (89), (90), (91), (92), (93),
 (94), (95).

Vercoutter (J.) (12), (13), (16). (All with regard to early trade).

Wilcken (U.) (33).

2). Reference List of Egyptian and other Ancient Personal Names

Ahab (King of Israel). (23).

Ahmès-Nefertari. (52).

Amasis I. (50), (52) in form Ahmôsis.

Amenhotpe (High Priest of Amūn) (41), (56), (57), (99).

Amenope (Pharaoh). (105).

Amenophis IV. (15), (50) under his other name Akhnaten.

Amūn. (7), (8), (9), (10), (35), (40), (41), (42) in form Amenrasonther,
(46) in form Amenrasonther, (47), (51), (52), (57), (79), (80),
(84) in form Amon-Tjay(na), (85), (96), (99), (100), (101) in
form Amenrasonther, (104), (105), (106), (112), (113), (119).

Asa (King of Judah). (22).

Aspelta (King of Napata). (24).

Berket-El. (10).

Butehamūn (son of Dhutmose). (99), (101).

David (King). (20).

Dhutmose (Scribe of the Tomb). (23), (99), (101), (109).

Ewerot. (51), (52), (53), (112).

Hadad (Prince of Edom). (20).

Haremheb. (37), (104), (114).

Harpason. (103), (123).

Harsiēse (I) (High Priest of Amun). (59).

Herkhūf. (4).

Hrihor. (8), (10), (24), (35), (57), (58), (59), (99), (101), (104), (123).

Hui (Prophet of Seth of Spermeru). (70).

Jehu (King of Israel). (23).

- Jeroboam I (Jewish Rebel and King of Israel). (22).
 Joab (Jewish General). (20).
 Kashta (Ruler of Cush and Thebes). (60).
 Khamwise (Son of Ewerot). (52), (112).
 Masaherta. (105).
 Menkheperre^f (High Priest of Amūn). (105), (106).
 Merybaste (Father of High Priest Ramessenakhte). (35), (41).
 Mes. (50), (119).
 Meten. (4), (118).
 Naunakhte. (55).
 Neferronpe (vizier). (91).
 Nesamūn (cultivator). (85).
 Neshi. (50).
 Osorkōn I. (51), (112).
 Osorkōn II. (59), (107), (108).
 Osorkōn (High Priest of Amūn). (59), (106).
 Peftjaudibaste. (110).
 Penḥasi (King's Son of Cush). (56), (57), (99), (102).
 Pennē (Deputy of Wawat). (7), (44).
 Petiēse. (35), (110), (112).
 Piankh (General, Son of Hriḥor). (24) (High Priest of Amenrasonther), (57),
 (99), (101), (102), (103), (104).
 Piankhi (Cushite conqueror of Egypt). (60), (65).
 Pinudjem I (High Priest of Amūn - perhaps Pharaoh). (58), (104), (105).
 Pipunakhte (cultivator). (91).

- Psusennes I. (19), (27), (104).
- Psusennes II. (21), (58), (104).
- Ptolemy II (Philadelphus). Introduction II: (31), (32), (114).
- Qenyamūn (prophet of House of Amon-Tjayna). (85).
- Ramessenakhte (High Priest of Amūn). (41), (47), (79).
- Ramesses I. (104).
- Ramesses II. (17), (50), (122).
- Ramesses III. Introduction I: (6), (7), (14), (16), (29), (38), (41), (44), (47), (56), (67), (80).
- Ramesses IV. Introduction VIII.
- Ramesses V. (44), (63), (96).
- Ramesses VI. (44).
- Ramesses IX. (8), (9), (41), (99).
- Ramesses XI. (8), (9), (19), (23), (24), (41), (56), (99).
- Rehoboam (King of Judah). (22).
- Rekhnirē^c. (6), (15).
- Saul (King). (20), (21).
- Sebekhotpe. (80).
- Sesonchis I. (21), (22), (24), (26), (27), (51), (58), (103), (104), (107), (111).
- Sesonchis V. (Okheperrē^c). (110).
- Seth (Lord of Spermeru). (70).
- Sethōs I. (104).
- Sheshonq (High Priest of Amūn). (52).
- Siamūn (Pharaoh). (21).
- Smendes (Pharaoh). (8), (10), (16), (24), (103).

- Smendes (High Priest of Amūn in XXIInd Dynasty). (53).
- Solomon (King). (20), (21), (22).
- Taharqa. (23).
- Takelot I. (52).
- Takelot II. (59), (106).
- Tefnakhte. (59), (116).
- Tiglath-Pileser I. (19).
- Tuthmōsis I. (119).
- Tuthmōsis III. (14), (37), (119).
- Usimareⁿnakhte (Steward of Amūn). (39), (40), (47).
- Usimareⁿ-skheperenrēⁿ (Ramesses V). (79).
- Wenamūn. (5), (8), (9), (10), (11), (16), (18), (19), (24).
- "Zerah the Ethiopian". (23).

3). Reference List of Names of Places and Peoples

- Abydos. Introduction VIII.
- Achaea. Introduction VIII.
- Aegina. (17).
- Amarna. (6), (15).
- Aniba. (7), (44).
- Arabia. (13).
- Asia. (6), (7), (9), (10), (11), (14), (19), (22), (24), (97), (119).
- Assyria. (11), (26).
- Assyrians (The). (10), (20), (23), (97).
- Babylon. (15).
- Babylonians. (15).
- Beth-Shan. (7).
- Bilgai. (78).
- Britain. (96).
- Bubastis. (59).
- Buhen. (23).
- Byblos. (8), (9), (10), (16).
- Crete. (12).
- Cush. (7), (24), (56), (57), (99), (101), (102), (116), (117).
- Cushites. (110).
- Dakhla (Dakhleh) Oasis. (51).
- Delta. (12), (15), (17), (103), (117).
- Dor. (18).
- Edfu. (33).

- Edom. (20).
El Hiba. (105).
Elephantine. (78).
England. (5).
Etruscans. (11).
Euphrates. (2), (20).
Europe. Introduction V: (5).
Gebel-es-Silsileh. (27), (111).
Gezer. (21).
Greece. (2), (12), (15), (17).
Hatti. Introduction VIII.
Heracleopolis. (58), (80), (103), (107).
Hittites. (11), (15).
Israel. (20), (22), (23).
Jews. (19).
Judah. (22).
Karnak. (37), (57), (63), (114).
Kassites. (11).
Kawa. (23).
Lebanon. (4), (7), (13), (16).
Lemnos. (11).
The Levant. (8).
Libyan. (58), (102), (103), (116).
Manchester. (35).
Medinet Habu. (28).

- Mediterranean (The). (11).
- Megiddo. (14).
- Memphis. (15), (27), (35), (60), (103), (107), (117), (119).
- Meshwesh. (102), (103).
- Mesopotamia. Introduction VIII.
- Mitannians. (11).
- Mi-wer. (64).
- Myceneans. (11).
- Napata. (24).
- Nauri. (37).
- Near East. (5), (24).
- Nile. (2), (3), (23), (97), (98).
- Nubia. (57), (102), (117).
- Ophir. (21).
- Palestine. (7), (19), (20), (23), (26).
- Philadelphia. (4).
- Philistia. (21).
- Philistines (7), (19), (20).
- Phoenicia. (10), (12), (16), (23).
- Pwani. (4).
- Rai. (73). (N.B. Stuchevsky translates "the settlement Rai" from the Egyptian tj wht R^e).
- Red Sea. (13).
- Russia. (30).
- Sais. (116).

- Sapa. (84), (85).
- Sea Peoples. (12), (18).
- Serapeum. (123).
- Sherden. (102), (108).
- Sikels. (11).
- Sudan. (4), (24), (98), (109).
- Syria. (7), (14).
- Syrians. (19).
- Tanis. (8), (10), (27), (50), (58), (104), (105).
- Tarkhan. (35).
- Tebtynis. (31), (114).
- Thebais (The). (5), (99).
- Thebes. Introduction II: (6), (8), (10), (14), (27), (28), (35), (37), (51), (57), (58), (99), (100), (101), (102), (103), (104), (105), (106), (107), (109), (110), (117), (119), (123).
- Theckel. (7), (18).
- Tigris. (2).
- Tjay. (84).
- Tuscans. (11).
- Upper Egypt. (57), (99).
- Wadj (?). (80).

4). Reference Index of Technical Terms used in this Work

ihk nmhy (50).

Anomalous Entries. (87), (88), (89), (93), (94).

"apportioned harvest-taxes". (46), (48).

"apportioning" domain. (43), (46), (91).

Calasiries (A section of the Egyptian army in the time of Herodotus). (109).

"conditional service-tenants". (49), (54), (94). Elsewhere mentioned in a non-technical sense simply as "service-tenants".

διαγραφὴ ἐπόρου (33).

"fields of Pharaoh". (43), (44), (66), (69), (77), (78), (79), (80).

γῆ βασιλική (33), (66), (77), (95).

γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει (34), (66).

γῆ φερά (34), (66).

Hermotybies (A section of the Egyptian army in the time of Herodotus). (109).

hk-ks (land-cubits). (92).

idb-land. (76).

ιδιωτικός γῆ (66).

ksyt-land. (43), (76), (80), (82), (83), (84), (85), (86), (87), (88), (89), (90), (92), (93), (94).

Khar (sack). (84), (85).

"khato-land of Pharaoh". (42), (43), (44), (45), (47), (68), (69), (70), (71), (76), (77), (78), (79), (80), (81), (82), (83), (84), (85), (95).

"landing-places of Pharaoh". (37), (42), (44), (69).

mꜣwt -land. (43), (76).

"minē-land of Pharaoh". (44), (69), (77).

m pš. (73).

nꜣ ꜥꜣwt n Pr. ꜥꜣ (66).

nꜣꜥ-land. (76), (82), (83), (84), (85), (86), (87), (88), (89), (90),
(92), (93).

nmꜣy (49), (50), (51).

"non-apportioning domain". (40), (46), (48), (72), (74), (75), (83),
(86), (88).

οἰκονόμοι (33), (95) in singular.

"on the fields of" (as technical term). (78), (79), (80).

pꜣ ꜥꜣ n šꜣ (40).

pš (translated "Division"). (85).

Pōsh-entries (without further particularization). (79), (90).

Pōsh-entries of Type A = Entries of Type A. (Sometimes translated as
"apportioning" entries.) (40), (46), (48), (53), (71),
(72), (73), (74), (81), (83), (88), (89).

Pōsh-entries of Type B = Entries of Type B. (Sometimes also translated
as "apportioning"-entries.) (40), (46), (48), (53), (69),
(71), (72), (73), (74), (86) called Type B entry, (88),
(89), (91), (92), (93), (94).

Pōsh-entries of Type C = Entries of Type C. (Sometimes translated as
"apportioning"-entries.) (46), (48), (49), (51), (53),
(54), (63), (69), (71), (72), (75), (85), (90), (91),
(93), (94).

pr (65), (78).

rmꜣyt-domain. (75).

schꜣ (73).

stꜣ kni (52).

tni-(land). (52), (76), (83), (89), (90).

ts prt (33), (39).

waqf (7), (36), (38), (39), (42), (43), (44), (45), (64), (66), (67),
(68), (70), (77), (78), (82), (83), (95), (108), (111), (119),
(121).

wht (84).

A STUDY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS OPERATING IN ANCIENT EGYPT
FROM THE DEATH OF RAMESSES III TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE XXVTH DYNASTY.

Bibliography and List of Abbreviations.

This bibliography is intended to list only the main works consulted which have been found of use in the preparation of this thesis. Naturally, however, a large number of others have been consulted for background material though not contributing directly to this work. For the convenience of the reader in referring back from the text to the bibliography the works are here cited alphabetically. Where abbreviations are employed works are cited alphabetically according to the form of the abbreviation; where works are quoted in full they are cited alphabetically under the name of the author. Some abbreviations employed in this work are compounded from the name of the author and the title of the publication: others are simply derived from the initial letters of the work. Where the first type of abbreviation is used, the portion referring to the title only, not to the name of the author, is underlined. Where the second type is employed, the whole is underlined.

W. F. Albright. The Archaeology of Palestine. London
(Pelican Library) 1949.

A. Andréadès. De l'Origine des Monopoles ptolémaïques. in
Mélanges Maspéro II pp. 289-295. Cairo 1935-7.

A. Arkell. History of the Sudan until 1821. London 1955.

ASAE Annales du Service des Antiquités d'Égypte. Cairo.

BAR J. H. Breasted. Ancient Records. Egypt. IV. Chicago. 1906.

S. Birch. Facsimile of an Egyptian Hieratic Papyrus of the
Reign of Rameses III, now in the British Museum. London. 1876.
(Handcopy of P. Harris I.)

BTF J. v. Beckerath. Tanis und Theben. i.e. Volume 16 of *Ägyptologische Forschungen* herausgegeben von Alexander Scharff. Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York 1951.

R. A. Caminos. The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon i.e. Volume 37 of *Analecta Orientalia*. Rome. 1958.

R. A. Caminos. Gebel-es-Silsileh No. 100. in JEA 38, pp. 46ff.

J. Černý. The Will of Naunakhte and Related Documents. in JEA 31, pp. 29-53.

G. Childe. What Happened in History. London (Pelican Library) 1942.

G. Daressy. Inscriptions inédites de la XXII Dynastie. in RT 18, pp. 46-53.

G. Daressy. Two Hieroglyphic Stelae of Pefstjaudibaste. in ASAE XVII, p. 43ff. and ASAE XXI, p. 138 ff.

N. de G. Davies. The Tomb of Rekh-mi-Re at Thebes (Two volumes) New York. 1943.

DVE E. Drioton and J. Vandier. L'Égypte i.e. Volume 2 of *Les peuples de l'Orient méditerranéen* (in "Clio" - Introduction aux Études historiques) Paris. 3rd Edition. 1952.

W. F. Edgerton. The Nauri Decree of Seti I. in JNES 6, pp. 219-30.

W. F. Edgerton. The Strikes in Ramses III's Twenty-ninth Year. in JNES 10. p. 137 ff.

W. Eriksen. Papyrus Harris I. (Hieroglyphische Transkription) i.e. *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* 5. Brussels 1933.

A. Erman. Zur Erklärung des Papyrus Harris. in SPAW 21, p. 456ff.

H. W. Fairman. The Wilbour Papyrus (review) in JEA 39, pp. 118-22.

A. H. Gardiner. The Bilgai Stele. in ZAS 50, pp. 49-57.

Sir Alan Gardiner. The Dakhleh Stele. in JEA 19, pp. 19-31.

A. H. Gardiner. Four Eighteenth Dynasty Papyri from Kahun. in ZAS 43, pp. 27-47.

Sir Alan Gardiner. Late Egyptian Miscellanies i.e. *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca* 7. Brussels 1937. Translated by R. A. Caminos as *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*. London 1954.

Sir Alan Gardiner. A Protest against Unjustified Tax-Demands. in RE VI, pp. 115-31.

Sir Alan Gardiner. Ramesside Texts relating to the Taxation and Transport of Corn. in JEA 27, pp. 19-74.

Sir Alan Gardiner. Some Reflexions on the Nauri Decree. in JEA 37 pp. 24-33.

GEP Sir Alan Gardiner. Egypt of the Pharaohs. Oxford. 1961.

GIM A. H. Gardiner. The Inscription of Mes. in K. Sethe. Untersuchungen III. Leipzig. 1905.

GMS E. Meyer. Gottesstaat, Militärherrschaft, und Ständewesen in Ägypten. Zur Geschichte der 21 und 22 Dynastie. in SPAW XXVIII. Also issued as special offprint.

F. Ll. Griffith. Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the Rylands Library at Manchester. (particularly Volume I. Atlas of Facsimiles.) Manchester and London. 1909.

I. Harari. Sur la Nature de la Stèle de Donation de Fonction du Roi Ahmôsis à la Reine Ahmès-Nefertari. in ASAE 56. pp. 139-201.

W. C. Hayes. The Writing Palette of the High Priest of Amun, Smendes. in JEA 34, pp. 47-50.

Herodotus. Part II. Euterpe.

JEA The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology. London.

JNES The Journal of Near Eastern Studies. Chicago.

H. Kees. Raumordnung und Landplanung im alten Ägypten etc. in Volume 10 of Forschungs- und Sitzungsberichte der Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung. pp. 19-23. 1957.

J. A. Knudtzon. Die El-Amarna Tafeln. Leipzig. 1915.

KP H. Kees. Das Priestertum im Ägyptischen Staat vom Neuen Reich bis zur Spätzeit. i.e. Volume 1 of Probleme der Ägyptologie. Leiden-Köln 1953. Indices and Addenda. Leiden-Köln 1958.

G. Lefebvre. Inscriptions concernant les Grands-Prêtres Rome-Roy et Amenhotep. Paris 1929.

G. Lefebvre. Histoire des Grands-Prêtres d'Amôn de Karnak. Paris. 1929.

G. Legrain. La Stèle de l'Apanage. in ZAS 35 pp. 13-24.
Also comment on Ewerot Stela by A. Erman.

IRL J. Černý. Late Ramesside Letters i.e. Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 9.
Brussels. 1939.

I. M. Lourie. Legal Documents on the social and economic History of Egypt in the New Kingdom (in Russian) in VDI (1952) No. 1 pp. 209-280. (The writer wishes to thank Professor Thacker for his help in translation.)

I. M. Lourie. Slave-Holders of Temple Lands (in Russian) in VDI (1955) No. 1. pp. 16-26.

I. M. Lourie. Review of WP (in Russian) in VDI (1955) No. 1. pp. 102-7.

J. P. Mahaffy and B. P. Grenfell. Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Oxford. 1896.

E. Meyer. Geschichte des Altertums. Volume II, Part 2. Stuttgart and Berlin 1931. Volume III. Stuttgart. 1937.

MIFAO Mission de l'Institut français d'Archéologie orientale. Cairo.

P. Montet. Byblos et l'Égypte. Quatre Campagnes de Fouilles à Gebeil 1921-4 (Two volumes) i.e. Volume II of Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique. Paris 1928.

Mission Montet. La Nécropole royale de Tanis. (Two volumes) Paris 1947-51.

C. F. Nims. An Oracle dated in the "Repeating of Births". in JNES 7, pp. 157-62.

W. Otto. Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus (Two volumes). Leipzig-Berlin 1905-8.

M. Pallottino. The Etruscans (in English) London 1955.

PER C. Préaux. L'Économie royale des Lagides. Brussels 1939.

W. M. F. Petrie. Tarkhan I and Memphis V. London 1913.

J. Pirenne. Quelques Observations à propos du Papyrus Harris et de la Stèle de Osorkon Ier. in Mélanges syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud, pp. 783-8. Paris 1939.

B. Porter and R. Moss. Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings. Oxford. From 1927.

PSBA The Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology. London.

RAD Sir Alan Gardiner. Ramesside Administrative Documents. London 1948.

RE Revue d'Égyptologie. Paris.

RT Recueil de Travaux. Cairo.

M. Restovtzeff. Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. (particularly Volume I) Oxford 1941.

E. de Rougé. Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques copiées en Égypte. Paris 1877.

SIPW I. A. Stuchevsky. Towards the Interpretation of the Data in the Papyrus Wilbour on Land-Tenure and Tax-Assessment in Egypt at the Time of the Ramessides. (in Russian). in VDI (1958) No. 1. pp. 77-93. (The writer wishes to acknowledge the kindness of Professor T. W. Thacker in preparing an English version.)

SLPH H. D. Schaedel. Die Listen des grossen Papyrus Harris. i.e. Volume 6 of Leipziger Ägyptologischer Studien. Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York 1936.

SPAW Sitzungsberichte des königlich preussischen Akademie des Wissenschaftens. Phil-Hist. Klasse. Berlin. (From 1928 known as Berliner Akademie).

W. Spiegelberg. Drei demotische Schreiben aus der Korrespondenz des Pherendates mit dem Chnumpriestern von Elephantine. in SPAW (1928) XXX. Also issued as special offprint.

G. Steindorff. Aniba. Glückstadt and Hamburg 1935.

G. Steindorff. Die Ägyptischen Gaue. in Abhandl. der königl. Söchs. Gesellsch. des Wissenschaftens. 27 (1909) p. 865ff.

P. Tresson. Inscription de Chéchanq Ier. etc. in Mélanges Maspéro I. i.e. MIFAO Vol. 66. II. pp. 817-40.

VDI Vestnik Drevnei Istorii. Moscow. (periodical)

VEP J. Vercoutter. Essai sur les Relations entre Égyptiens et Préhellènes. i.e. Volume 6 of L'Orient ancien illustré. Paris 1954.

VMNR W. Helck. Zur Verwaltung des mittleren und neuen Reichs.
i.e. Vol. 3 of Probleme der Ägyptologie. Leiden-Köln 1958.

WP Sir Alan Gardiner. (assisted by R. Faulkner). The Wilbour
Papyrus (Four volumes) London 1946-52.

ZAS Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde. Berlin.
