



An Exceptional Event at Deir El-Medina (P. Turin 1879, verso II)

Author(s): Jac. J. Janssen

Source: *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*, Vol. 31 (1994), pp. 91-97

Published by: American Research Center in Egypt

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40000671>

Accessed: 02-08-2019 20:51 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Research Center in Egypt is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*

An Exceptional Event at Deir El-Medina (P. Turin 1879, verso II)*

JAC. J. JANSSEN

Recently Harrell and Brown published an interesting study on the famous mine-map in Turin.¹ The authors describe the papyrus, relate its history and the results of previous studies, but their main points are: a new arrangement of the fragments, a discussion of the topographical and geological properties of the map, and a suggestion as to who was its author.

As regards their rearrangement of the sixteen larger and smaller fragments of which the papyrus at present consists, the main suggestions of the authors are: the placing of three pieces, designated by them H, I, and J, between D and F, while removing E from this place to a new position at the right-hand side of F. Moreover, fragment L should join E at its bottom, and K is to be moved to the right of M. Finally, the gaps between the fragments are narrower than in the current reconstruction.²

Whether these alterations are correct could be proved from studying the various texts and the jottings on the verso. Do they fit in their new positions? The authors present a synopsis of three of them (p. 89),³ based, they state, on

translations by F. Yurco, while for the others they mainly indicate in whose handwriting they think they are.⁴ According to Harrell and Brown they indeed show that the rearrangement of the fragments is correct, but for this essential point one has to take the authors at their word. No photograph is published that verifies their arguments. On p. 93 they state that these verso texts continue across two or even three fragments, which means that there are lacunae in the middle of them. How the authors could calculate the widths of these gaps remains a mystery, and, therefore, why they placed the fragments as they did in fig. 3.

All one is able to control are the summaries of texts 1–3 as given on p. 89.⁵ Of these that of text 1 seems correct,⁶ while text 2 (verso I and the first six lines of vs. II), dealing with a wooden statue of Ramesses VI, is fairly well known.⁷ Leaving them aside, I will here concentrate my attention on the third text, which seems to me to have been badly misinterpreted in the synopsis; so badly, that it is hard to believe that it was based on a translation of

* I wish to thank Dr. R. J. Demarée for his critical remarks on the first draft of this paper, as well as for providing me with xeroxes of photographs of the verso of the papyrus.

¹ James A. Harrell and V. Max Brown, "The Oldest Surviving Topographical Map from Ancient Egypt (Turin Papyri 1879, 1899, and 1969)," *JARCE* 29 (1992), 81–105.

² Cf. their figure 2 (the old arrangement) with figure 3. I retain the capitals they use to indicate the fragments as presented in the latter figure. It should be noted that there are in Turin still a number of small fragments which belong to this papyrus but are yet to be placed. That the total length should be 2.82 m. (Harrell and Brown, p. 83) is, of course, an error. This is the length of the present state of arrangement with the gaps. The original measurements are unknown.

³ All three occur on the verso of Pap. Turin 1879 = Fragm. A, by far the largest part. One column has been published

in facsimile by Pleyte and Rossi, pls. 32 and 33 (the latter contains the lower half of col. I), while col. II has been transcribed by Černý in his Notebook 150, 7–10. See now *KRI* VI, 335–39. A very short and fragmentary notice above the first column and part of the second, also partly in Pleyte-Rossi, pl. 32, is to be found in *KRI* VI, 377.

⁴ For this subject, see below, p. 96.

⁵ The authors themselves point out (p. 104) that it is necessary "to complete the translations of the verso texts." I take it that they mean: to publish them with transcriptions and translations, and particularly with photographs.

⁶ So far as this is preserved it seems to record an oath sworn by the scribe Amennakhte in his house, in the presence of his wife Twertemhab.

⁷ Translated by Helck, *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte* II, 197. Mentioned i.a. by Amer, *JEA* 71 (1985), 68.

Mr. Yurco.⁸ As comparison with my translation below will show, the authors have added some ideas (particularly that about the ‘worn’ tools) which find no justification in the Egyptian words and are, I think, simply mistakes, by which the exceptional matter here related completely disappears from view.

The text under discussion begins in the middle of col. II, in line 7. There is no clear gap between this and the last line of the text concerning the statue, but the two are not quite aligned, although written in the same hand. Line 7 begins with a date in year 6. Since the statue is explicitly said to represent Ramesses VI, it is more than likely that “year 6” belongs to the reign of that Pharaoh.

Translation⁹

7. Year 6, III 3^{ht} 20. This day, taking^a the scribe of the necropolis Hori before the High Priest of Amun[-Re^c],
8. while he was seated in the Great Hall^b of the House of Amun-Re^c, King of the Gods, together with. . . .^c,
9. and he let us^d write down the (quantity of) copper^e of the copper spikes^f of the necropolis. . . . [saying]^g:
10. “Let one collect ^h the 550 *deben* of copper from the three captains [of the necropolis]ⁱ
11. and let one collect 50 *deben* of copper from [the scribe] Hori, the son of Khonsu.”^j And he sent^k the servant^l Pnekhemope,
12. together with the chief guard of the Treasury Pay[nudj]em^m and the guard of the Treasury Amenmose, the son of Tjewenany,ⁿ
13. after^o the captains of the necropolis in order to collect them (i.e., the *deben*). Then, on IV 3^{ht} 1,^p
14. they collected them and took them to the City.
15. Year 6, IV 3^{ht} 7. This day, receiving the 600 *deben* of copper by the High Priest of
16. Amun-Re^c, King of the Gods, Ramsesnakht, in the Great Hall of the House of [Amun-] Re^c, King of the Gods,

⁸ For instance, the person whom Harrell and Brown call “the son of the ship captain Any” is actually (Amenmose), son of Tjewenany. They read *nfw* instead of *t3w*.

⁹ For a transcription of the text, see KR/VI, 338–39.

17. the scribe Khonsumose,^q the scribe of the necropolis Hori, the chief workman Anherkhew, dhuti,^r
18. the guard of the Treasury Paynudjem, the guard of the Treasury Amenmose. . . .,^s
19. received^t from the captains of the necropolis: copper, 280 *deben*;
20. the chief workman Nekh[emmut]: copper, 60 [*deben*]; the chief workman Anherkhew: --- --;^u the scribe Hori: copper, 73 *deben*.
21. Total(?):^v copper, 219 *deben*.^w
22. ^x

Notes to the Translation

a) *it3*. The scribe obviously did not cross the river on his own accord; he was summoned by the High Priest.

b) *wsht* 3^t. Cf. P. Spencer, *The Egyptian Temple* (London, 1984), 71ff. It was the Hypostyle Hall at Karnak that is here meant (op. cit. 77).

c) Here, as also in the two following lines, one or more words are lost.

d) As happened in other texts (e.g., Turin Strike Papyrus, rt. 2, 17 = RAD 55, 13–14), the scribe suddenly introduces himself and his companions, here probably the captains of the necropolis. This does not in itself prove that Hori was the author and the scribe of the text, but that is certainly likely. That it was Amen-nakhte, the son of Ipu, seems less probable. The handwriting looks decidedly different from that of the Turin Strike Papyrus. Moreover, he was at this moment either just deceased, or at least very near to the end of his life (see below, p. 96). Note that he is nowhere mentioned in this text.

e) Lit. “the coppers.” Cf. P. Brit. Mus. 10100, vs. 3 (= LRL 51, 5). See also *n3 it*, e.g., in O. DeM. 149, 1.

f) *hnr* (also written *h3*) designates the typical tool of the necropolis workmen, the ‘spike’, as we see it, e.g., in the hand of the man in O. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge EGA 4324.1943. Whether *hnr* was also used as a generic word for copper tool is not clear. Wooden tools, or those partly consisting of wood, are called *h^cw* (e.g., Turin Strike Papyrus, 4, 20 = RAD 54, 9; O. DeM. 435, 1; cf. my *Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period*, Leiden, 1975, 312 note 5). See also below, note 21.

g) Probably something like *r dd* was lost, as an introduction to the words of the High Priest.

h) *šd m-di*; also in line 10. Clearly the copper was demanded from the workmen, not, as normally, delivered to them by the authorities.

i) This seems the most likely restoration. Usually “the three captains” are the two chief workmen and the (senior) scribe. Whether the latter was present seems, however, doubtful (see note d). Perhaps his son Harshire or another of his sons was substituting for his father, as they did in other instances.

j) See for Hori below, p. 96.

k) *dīt*. Lit. “he gave,” followed by *m-s3* in line 13. “He put. . . after them” is also a possible rendition.

l) *šmsw*. This humble functionary may have been the main carrier of the metal.

m) For the name, see line 18, where he is simply called *s3w*.

n) A common name in the New Kingdom. See, e.g., the gardener in the Turin Strike Papyrus, vs. 1, 9 (= *RAD* 45, 9); the policeman in O. Col. Campbell 1 (= *Hier. Ostr.* 66, 1), 4 and 8; the workman in O. DeM. 670, 1 and O. Nims (= *Hier. Ostr.* 62, 1) vs. 5.

o) *m-s3*. Beside the colloquial “behind, after,” the preposition has a specific meaning in a juridical context (see Andrea McDowell, *Jurisdiction in the Workmen's Community of Deir el-Medîna*, Leiden, 1990, 29–32). It seems not improbable that this was here also the case.

p) This is eleven days after the session of the High Priest.

q) Certainly the same scribe as occurs in the unnumbered IFAO papyrus published by Ivan Koenig in *Hommages Sauneron I* (Cairo, 1979), 185–220, with an addition in *BIFAO* 83 (1983), 249–55. Koenig suggests (op. cit., 204, note p) that he was the scribe of the Treasury of the Karnak Temple, and identical with the owner of TT 30. In that case he will have been responsible for the actual receipt of the copper, being one of the high officials of the temple.

r) In the papyrus quoted in the preceding note a scribe Nesdhuti is mentioned (II, 12; III, 13), who was responsible for the incoming goods. It seems not impossible that it is the same person who is recorded in the present text, for the same reason. Whether between his name and that of

Anherkhew yet another man was mentioned (the other chief workman ?) is uncertain.

s) These are the two men who accompanied the copper to the East Bank. It is not clear whether after Amenmose again, as in line 12, his father's name was written. Kitchen (*KRI* VI, 339, note 2^{a-a}) thought that possible.

t) The words *ⲁⲙⲙⲟⲩ ⲙⲁⲩⲁ*, written before line 19, that is, filling the space between line 19 of col. I and the present col., are, according to Černý, “added” afterwards; see *KRI* VI, 339, note to line 2. I believe that this holds true for *šsp* only, while *iri* belongs to the first text. This *šsp* repeats that of line 15. It is actually redundant, but after the series of names the scribe lost the thread in his sentence.

u) The amount of copper received from Amenkhew is not filled in. If the three captains together brought 219 *deben*, the quantity delivered by Anherkhew was 86 *deben*.

v) The signs *ⲟⲩ* seem not to be clear, according to Černý's transcription. What else other than “total” it could mean I fail to see.

w) The figures are confusing. Assuming that 219 *deben* is what the three captains of the necropolis brought as their own share, the 280 *deben* of line 19 could be the amount collected from the ordinary workmen. Together this would be one less than 500 *deben*.

x) What Kitchen presents as line 22 is actually part of a long line written beneath cols. I and II. Černý rightly omitted it.

Commentary

The gist of the matter related in the text is that, on order of the High Priest Ramsesnakht, the necropolis workmen handed over to the Karnak Temple a considerable quantity of copper. That it was, as Harrell and Brown state, because the tools were ‘worn’, is pure fantasy, and that the men “received new ones in return” is in contradiction to the words of the papyrus. The spikes were collected and received from (*m-di*) the captains of the necropolis, not by them.

This is completely contrary to the normal procedure, whereby the workmen, being at the receiving end of the redistribution system, were provided with copper for the tools they needed for their work in the royal tomb. Several texts tell

us about this, e.g., O. Cairo 25629: "Giving the spikes to the crew, each 6 spikes," or O. Cairo 25568: 52 spikes are received from the hand of the scribe of the necropolis Hori, the same man as the protagonist of the present text. In O. Cairo 25521,¹⁰ we find a record (rt. 12a–22a) concerning spikes, old, blunt, and renewed ones. O. DeM. 693 mentions the receipt of spikes that have been renewed,¹¹ together with eight chisels and an axe (*krđn*). Previously, 20 spikes had been delivered, together weighing 160 *deben*, that is, 8 *deben* each. Usually the spikes were lighter, 7 *deben* or less.¹² They consisted, at least in some cases, of bronze, as appears evident from O. DeM. 625, where the coppersmith Ptahpehapy is ordered to mix 140 *deben* of copper with 2 *deben* of tin. It was to these coppersmiths that the tools were given when blunt,¹³ a purely administrative matter, which needed no intervention by a high authority.¹⁴

The tools, distributed by the authorities among the workmen, normally remained state property, controlled under the supervision of the scribe by the guards of the necropolis.¹⁵ They were called *h3 n Pr-ε3*.¹⁶ On the other hand, it appears clear from some texts¹⁷ that the workmen also possessed such tools themselves, doubtless for work in their own tombs. The

blunt spike of O. Petrie 81¹⁸ which was to be made into a knife (*sft*) belonged to the chief workman Nekhemmut, perhaps the same person as occurs in our text, or else his grandfather. Other tools are also stated to belong to the workmen.¹⁹ Paneb acquired them by theft,²⁰ but more legal means of obtaining them will have existed. From the mid Twentieth Dynasty onwards we hear that copper tools were sometimes distributed among the men, probably not as a substitute for their grain rations, as has been suggested,²¹ but as extra remunerations called *hsw*, "favours," of Pharaoh.²²

Against this background the unique event described in Pap. Turin 1879 stands out. Two sessions of the High Priest are recorded, the first in which he was informed about the quantities of copper in the possession of the workmen, which resulted in an order to deliver 600 *deben* of it, and, more than a fortnight later, a second, after the metal had been carried across the river, in which representatives of the workmen's community handed over the copper officially. It is conspicuous that it was received by personnel of the Treasury of Amun, headed by its chief administrator Khonsumose. The representatives of the workmen, Hori and one of the chief workmen (or perhaps both of them), were also present at the session, although strictly speaking they did not "receive" the copper.

Was this what were formerly called "spikes of Pharaoh"? Very probably not. For these a simple

¹⁰ Translated by Černý, *ASAE* 27 (1927), 192.

¹¹ Only the words *n m3wt* remain after a lacuna. Cf. for them: O. Cairo 25521, 17a and O. IFAO. 1083bis, 2 and 3 (unpubl.).

¹² Pap. Turin 1883 + 2095 (= *KRI* VI, 431–32), rt. 8; O. Gardiner 264 + O. Cochrane, palimpsest text, 3 (unpubl.); O. Gardiner 285, 3 (= Valbelle, *Poids*, nr. 5306). See also my *Commodity Prices*, 315, Table LII, for lower weights.

¹³ O. Cairo 25581, vs. 3: "the smiths who forge the tools of the crew, 2 men." O. Cairo 25285 (= *KRI* VII, 453) records that blunt spikes are handed over to a scribe.

¹⁴ The exchange (*sbw*) of a *h3*, evidently for a sharper one, is recorded in O. Varille 26, 4 and 7 (= *KRI* VII, 236).

¹⁵ Černý, *Workmen*, 159.

¹⁶ Cf. Pap. Geneva MAH 15274, vs. I, 1–2 (Massart, *MDAIK* 15, 1957, 181–82). See also Pap. Salt 124, rt. II, 9 (*JEA* 15, 1929, pl. 44), and O. Nash 2 (= *Hier. Ostr.* 47, 1), rt. 5; 8; etc., especially 2–3: "do they (i.e., the spikes) belong to Pharaoh or to himself?"

In O. Berlin 11239 (= *Hier. Pap. Berlin* III, pl. 38) the question is raised as to whether some copper belonged to a *sem*-priest or to the necropolis.

¹⁷ See the preceding note.

¹⁸ = Valbelle, *Poids*, nr. 5132.

¹⁹ E.g., *poids* nr. 5130 and 5133.

²⁰ Pap. Salt 124 (see note 16).

²¹ This was the opinion of Gutgesell, on account of O. DeM. 435 (see *LdÄ* III, col. 1076). That here a substitute for wages is meant he concluded from the documentary character of the record: 10 *deben* for each of the 3 captains, 5 *deben* for each of 40 men, 2 *deben* for each of 21 others. This indeed resembles the records of grain distribution. Yet, there is no indication that this copper, termed *h3w*, "tools, utensils" (line 1), came instead of grain rations.

²² O. Gardiner 264 + O. Cochrane (see note 12). Cf. also Pap. Turin 1881, V, 1 (= *KRI* VI, 613): *p3 εkw hsw dît Pr-ε3 (n) n3 rmt (n) p3 hr*, with IV, 9: *hry hsw n3 rmt (n) p3 hr, dît n.w Pr-ε3*, consisting of copper, garments, and oil. In both cases the *hsw* do not include the regular deliveries. *Hsw* seems to be used as, in earlier times, *mkw* (see *Commodity Prices*, 489–90) or *fk3w* (O. Cairo 25552, 2).

order to bring them from the storeroom to the temple would have been sufficient—at least, in so far as this fell within the authority of the High Priest²³—and such an official show in the Great Hall of the Karnal Temple would have been superfluous. That would have been different if the copper had been private property. There are more details that point in that direction. Hori is individually recorded as having to bring his portion, and at the end it also appears that the two chief workmen each delivered a fair amount. A significant point is further that Hori brought 73 *deben*, 23 more than he was assessed for. All this creates the impression that it was indeed private copper that the workmen handed over. Moreover, the procedure seems not to have gone smoothly. It took eleven days before the metal could be transported to the East Bank; an improbably long time if it had been deposited in a state storeroom. Was it only grudgingly that the inhabitants of Deir el-Medina delivered up their tools, urged by their leaders, who themselves contributed a relatively large quantity?

The High Priest had demanded 600 *deben* of copper—of which 50 should come from Hori—and when they were officially presented they are called (line 15) “the” (*t3*) 600 *deben*. Yet, if my interpretation of lines 19–21 is correct, it was only 499 *deben* that was handed over. This should not surprise us too much. The High Priest can hardly have expected that he would receive all he asked for; it was, as we saw, the workmen’s own copper that they had to surrender. Still, it seems that the men, and particularly their captains, acknowledged the good reason for the demand on the part of the High Priest. What could that have been?

One might suggest: punishment, and even that this was perhaps because of tomb robbery. However, there is not the slightest indication for it in the text, so that we should discard this as too fanciful. Yet, without using a bit of imagination the event remains a mystery. At the risk of making a bad error we should try to find a solution.

²³ During the second half of the Twentieth Dynasty the High Priest of Amun gradually superseded the civil authorities in Thebes, particularly the vizier, who was until then the actual superior of the necropolis workmen.

One real possibility seems to be that the authorities needed valuable materials in order to provide the workmen with their grain-rations. The later years of Ramesses VI had seen surging grain-prices,²⁴ at least in Thebes.²⁵ That in some instances, when there was not enough in the granaries, grain was acquired in exchange for valuables is shown in Pap. Turin 1881, rt. 2a,²⁶ although unfortunately nothing is known about the details of the transaction.

It might very well be that the crisis was the result of political unrest which blocked the transport of grain to the Theban area, either from the South or from Middle Egypt. That reminds us of the movements of the Libyans through the country during the second half of the Twentieth Dynasty.²⁷ Admittedly, almost all our evidence dates from the reign of Ramesses IX and his successors. However, the famous statue of Ramesses VI from Karnak, grasping a Libyan captive, can be interpreted as an indication of a Libyan invasion or revolt during his reign.²⁸ The foreigners may have threatened the City, and Ramsesnakht as the leading local dignitary may have tried to defend this area. For that he needed weapons, that is, particularly, copper and bronze. A parallel is found in the Late Ramesside Letters, where Dhutmose orders Butehamun to let the smiths produce javelins,²⁹ certainly at the request of the general Piankh. Perhaps Ramsesnakht acted years earlier in the same fashion, collecting copper where he could find it, namely in the necropolis, in order to provide his followers with the means to repel an attack. If this was indeed the situation,

²⁴ See Černý, “Fluctuations in Grain Prices,” *Arch. Or.* 6 (1934), 173–78. Cf. also *Commodity Prices*, chapter 2.

²⁵ We possess at present no information to decide whether it was a purely local crisis or a national one.

²⁶ = *KRI* VI, 612.

²⁷ For this subject, see now B. Haring, “Libyans in the Late Twentieth Dynasty,” in: *Village Voices* (Leiden, 1992), 71–80.

²⁸ See Amer, *JEA* 71 (1985), 67. It seems not impossible, however, that Ramesses VI usurped the statue (cf. Vandier, *Manuel* III, 404). See also Černý, *CAH*, 3rd ed., II, part 2, 613. Whether Pap. Turin 2044, recording the fear of foreigners, dates from the reign of Ramesses VI, or from that of his predecessor, is uncertain. Anyhow, the text is dated to a year 1, that is, earlier than our papyrus.

²⁹ Pap. Brit. Mus. 10326, vs. 10 (= *LRL* 19, 14–15).

one can understand why the workmen, although not gladly, handed over their private property. Or is this suggestion too far-fetched?

Some attention should be devoted to the question as to who was the author of the text. Its most prominent figure is clearly the scribe of the necropolis Hori. Was he also the man who composed and wrote down the report? An indication that it was indeed he may be seen in the use of “us” in line 9 (see note *d*). However, it is not easy to prove it. What are the characteristics of his handwriting which distinguish it from that of his contemporaries? How Harrell and Brown are able (table 3, p. 89) to ascribe some of the verso texts to Hori, others to Amennakhte, escapes me. How difficult it is to recognize an individual hand has recently been demonstrated by Mme Gasse.³⁰ It can be done, but requires a lot of experience and careful study of many originals—not of their transcriptions. It is only when the text itself indicates who was its author, as is the case with the short note on top of vs. I (text 1), that we can be fairly certain. In other instances at least clear photographs are required before we can make a decision.³¹


Who was that scribe Hori? In line 11 he is called “the son of Khonsu.” As far as I know, this is the only place where his father’s name is recorded, although he himself may be the most

frequently mentioned member of the community of necropolis workmen.³² The name was a common one, and could, therefore, easily cause confusion—probably the reason why Amennakhte’s son Hori is usually called *Hri-šri*, “Hori the Younger”—but it was evidently sufficient to call him *šš n p³ hr*. Yet, he was not the senior scribe³³ of his time, for that position belonged to Amennakhte. Hori may have been important, but he was not of that rank. An indication in this respect occurs in O. DeM. 381, where in rt. 3 “the four captains” are recorded, but on the verso first “the three captains,” and in the next line “the scribe Hori.” Although in the first case reckoned among the *hwtiū*, he was evidently not quite equal to the others, namely the chief workmen and the (senior) scribe Amennakhte.

Probably Hori was in charge of the “personnel” of the necropolis (the *smdt n bnr*). At the end of the Twentieth Dynasty there were two of those scribes, besides two scribes of the workmen.³⁴ Earlier there seems to have been one man for each office, eventually assisted by his sons and others. That was clearly still the case during the reign of Ramesses VI.

Although Amennakhte was the most important official of the workmen in his time, he does not occur in the present text, possibly as suggested above (note *d*), because he was at the end of his life or already deceased.³⁵ That may be the reason why Hori acted as the main representative of the workmen’s community.

³⁰ A. Gasse, in: *Village Voices* (see note 27), 56–68.

³¹ In one of the sections of their article Harrell and Brown discuss the possible author of the map. They believe that it was the scribe Amennakhte, and that seems to me indeed the most plausible suggestion. As possible but rejected alternatives they mention two scribes, Neferhotep and Amenhotep (pp. 102–3), who according to the Hammamat Inscriptions took part in the expeditions of year 1 and year 2 of Ramesses IV. However, there is no reason why these men should be connected with the workmen’s community; the names are extremely common. That a Neferhotep was a junior scribe of the necropolis “in the latter half of Ramesses III’s reign and at least part of Ramesses IV’s” is incorrect. The only dates we know of him are year 16 of Ramesses III, and a year 10, but that should very probably be emended into year 16. As regards the name Amenhotep in Hammamat Inscr. CM 234 and 235, it is oddly written with  at the end (was Amenhotep-em-hab meant?). Moreover, in the former text he is called *p³ Sunr*, “the son of Sunero / Sul” (for *p³* = “the son of,” see Cruz-Urbe, *JNES* 37, 1978, 243). There is no reason to identify him with the son of Amennakhte, the (chief) draughtsman Amenhotep.

³² Černý, *Workmen*, 216. It is conspicuous that Černý does not mention his father’s name, apart from, at the end of his lengthy note, raising the possibility that he was the son of the scribe Nebnufe. There were more scribes called Hori, though not one of them seems to have been *šš n p³ hr*; see, e.g., Pap. Turin 1881, rt. I, 7 (= *KRI* VI, 610): the *šš n tm³* Hori and the *šš n p³ hr* of that name in one entry. The former occurs also in O. Cairo 25305, 5, where he is indicated as “the scribe of the mat of the City.”

³³ The designation is modern, not based on any Egyptian term.

³⁴ This appears most clearly from Pap. Turin 2018 (= *KRI* VI, 851–63), of year 8–10 of Ramesses XI: Pwer^co, the son of Dhutiemhab, scribe of the right side, and Dhutmose, son of Kha^cemhedje (and great-grandson of Amennakhte) of the left side; the *smdt* were administered by Wennofre (right) and Efenamun (left).

³⁵ See Černý, *Workmen*, 343. The division of Amennakhte’s property (not his last will, as Harrell and Brown write, p. 102)

This is my reconstruction of the events related in Pap. Turin 1879, vs. II. It may not be correct in all details, but without doubt what is

took place in year 7, very probably that of Ramesses VI. Since it clearly happened after, but not long after the scribe's death, it seems not too wild a supposition that he died either in year 6 or early in year 7.

described is not a normal procedure, namely handing in blunt tools and receiving in exchange new ones, as the authors of the article believed. The transfer of private copper tools belonging to the workmen to the Treasury of the Karnak Temple is exceptional and certainly requires some attention.

London