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Among the many contributions Ola el-Aguizy has made to Demotic studies, her work on Demotic paleography is of particular significance. The work of el-Aguizy on paleography brings to mind the prolific Demotic scholar Wilhelm Spiegelberg, who attempted to assemble a Demotic paleography of his own, but his papers reveal little beyond initial progress. However, the analysis of Demotic paleography necessitates the close examination of original sources and like Spiegelberg and so many Demotists, much of el-Aguizy’s career has focused on primary text publication. In that regard I offer the following study of a collection of Demotic votive texts in her honor.

The Oriental Institute Museum (OIM) of the University of Chicago holds a significant collection of Demotic ostraca among which there is a small corpus of votive texts. Directors of the Epigraphic Survey acquired this group from 1929 to 1939 and shipped the artifacts to Chicago in June 1939 where the lot was given the accession number 3289. Registration numbers OIM 18876-19419, 24303-24307, and 25040 were subsequently applied to this accession, which includes hieratic, Demotic, Coptic, and Greek ostraca. Further details about their acquisition are lacking, including their provenance or from whom they were purchased.

1. I would like to thank the following for their help and comments during the preparation of this article: Rozenn Bailleul-LeSuer, Jackie Jay, Janet Johnson, Brian Muhs, Robert Ritner, Nigel Strudwick, and Emily Teeter. Responsibility for errors in content or logic remains solely with the author.


3. These papers are held by the Chicago Demotic Dictionary. I would like to thank Janet Johnson for permission to cite this material here.


5. I would like to thank the Oriental Institute, Gil Stein, and Geoff Emberling for permission to publish the ostraca contained in this article. I would also like to thank Helen McDonald for her assistance in examining the objects, Anna Ressman for the photographs, Alison Whyte for her conservation efforts, and Miller Prosser for his expertise with high resolution and infrared photography using Better Light technology. For previous work on the Demotic material in the Oriental Institute Museum, see the introductions of Lichtheim 1957, Kaplony-Heckel 1992, Hughes, Jasnow 1997, Muhs 2005, and Scalf, Jay 2014.


7. The ten texts published here were selected based on their unifying content. However, further Demotic texts belonging to this corpus probably exist among accession 3289, as there are many large ostraca similar to those presented below, although their fragmentary contents cannot be connected to such votive texts with certainty.
The Demotic inscriptions presented below were made on the exterior of large ceramic vessels when they were still whole and therefore the remaining fragments do not constitute ostraca in the strict sense, i.e. fragments of ceramic vessels or flakes of stone which were reused as media for written documents. The corpus is characteristically distinguishable from typical corpora of ostraca, which normally include receipts, accounts, oaths, and lists, in the following ways. The jar fragments are very large. Broken edges have no apparent connection to the texts and do not serve as delimiters for the area in which the texts were written. The textual material is relatively short, consisting of only one to two lines, often written in an unusually large script. Finally, the content of the Demotic texts indicates that the jars had been inscribed as votive offerings placed within a catacomb.

All the texts consist of elements of the votive formula \(\text{rn nfr mn}'\), "the good name remains." The formula asserts that the "good name" (\(\text{rn nfr}\)) of an individual "remain" (\(\text{mn}\)) before a deity and is attested at sites throughout Egypt, most commonly discussed in association with the graffiti of pilgrims traveling to sacred sites in order to pay their respect to regional divinities.\(^9\)"[T]he physical act of writing a graffito,' notes Eugene Cruz-Uribe, "would directly link the devotee with the sacred site.'\(^{10}\)" The deities invoked in the OIM Demotic votive texts are "Thoth, the great god, the ibis" (\(\text{Dhwty pJ nfr s pJ hb}\)),\(^{11}\) "the gods of the house of rest" (\(nJ\ ntr.w n pJ .'wy n htp\)),\(^{12}\) and "Pishai(?)[PJ-sy(?)].\(^{13}\) With the exception of Pishai, the gods invoked therefore link these texts with one of the many sacred animal shrines where the rearing, mummification, and interment of ibises and falcons played significant roles within either regional or national cults of Thoth and Horus.

Catacombs dedicated to sacred animals including the ibis have been excavated at numerous sites,\(^{14}\) such as Saqqara, Theadelphia, Tuna el-Gebel, Abydos, Dendera, Thebes, and Bahariya.
Oasis\textsuperscript{15} and associated Demotic texts have been discovered at many of them.\textsuperscript{16} Examples of the \textit{rn nfr mn} formula have been discovered in inscriptions from Thebes,\textsuperscript{17} Kom Ombo,\textsuperscript{18} Athribis,\textsuperscript{19} and possibly Tuna el-Gebel.\textsuperscript{20} As votives offered to “Thoth, the ibis,” the texts reveal that these jars were deposited in one of the ibis catacombs\textsuperscript{21} and contained either offerings\textsuperscript{22} for the god or more probably the mummified remains of the ibis itself.\textsuperscript{23}

Based on the content of these texts, determining the exact origin of the Oriental Institute jar fragments is difficult. The lack of specific information means that they could derive from virtually any \textit{ibiotapheion} in Egypt. However, as purchased acquisitions, presumably from nearby workmen, but also potentially from other archaeological missions,\textsuperscript{24} the Theban area where the


16. The Demotic texts from the animal catacombs at Saqqara are due to be published by Ray, Smith, Andrews, Davies 2011 published the mother of Apis inscriptions. For the Demotic texts from Tuna el-Gebel, see Thissen 1991; Nur el-Din 1992; Ebeid 2006, 2008, and 2010. An interesting ibis coffin from Tuna el-Gebel with both a hieroglyphic and Demotic text was recently published by Coussement, Depauw 2010. For the Demotic texts from Tuna el-Gebel, see Spiegelberg 1908. Several difficult Demotic graffiti from Bahariya are shown in Fakhry 1950, p. 34-35, fig. 22-26.

17. Spiegelberg 1908.


19. Farag, Kaplony-Heckel, Kuhlmann 1985, p. 2. These inscriptions have been re-examined by Sandra Lippert as announced in her paper “Ostraca, Graffiti and Dipinti from Athribis in Upper Egypt” at the 10th International Congress of Demotic Studies in Leuven, Belgium. The statues of Djedhor the Savior provide further evidence for the falcon cult of Athribis, for which see Sherman 1981.

20. From published material, it is unclear whether the formula appears at Tuna el-Gebel. Von den Driesch et al. (2005, p. 239) state: “We have demotic graffiti of the cult groups at the \textit{Ibiotapheia} in Tuna el-Gebel and Thebes, who invoke a group of gods, Osiris-ibis, Osiris-falcon, and all the other resting gods, combined with the wish that their beautiful (nfr), i.e. rejuvenated, name may last forever.” They go on to cite Chauveau 1991, who, however, provides a re-edition of texts from Thebes only.

21. Referred to in Demotic as \textit{'wy n htp} “house of rest,” for which see Ray 1976, p. 140; Martin 1981, p. 9; Kessler 1989, p. 109; or \textit{tp\textsuperscript{2}}\textit{w fbn} in the Kom Ombo ostraca, for which see Preisigke, Spiegelberg 1914, p. 11, no. 18, line 1.


23. The nearly complete rim and shoulder of OIM 19051 parallels the “egg-shaped” ibis containers ME from Tuna el-Gebel published in Von den Driesch et al. 2005, p. 208-212 and Steinmann 2003, p. 104. The rim of OIM 19030 (no. 4) preserves remnants of the plaster used to seal the jar. Fragments of ibis burial vessels with Demotic inscriptions were noted in Kessler 1998.

24. One can compare a group of 49 ostraca pictured in photographs from the Metropolitan Museum of Art excavations at Deir el-Bahari directed by Herbert Winlock, discussed by Brian Muhs, “New Demotic Texts from Deir el-Bahari,” in a paper presented at \textit{60th Annual Meeting of the American Research Center in Egypt}, April 24, 2009, Dallas, Texas. Despite the photographs in the MMA archives examined by Muhs, a majority of the ostraca
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Chicago Epigraphic Survey had ready access appears as a reasonable possibility. At the outset, two known locations on the west bank near the Survey's work at Medinet Habu carried out from 1929 to 1939 offer promising options for the find spot of these jar fragments.

Two hundred meters to the south of Medinet Habu stands the temple of Qasr el-Aguz dedicated to Thoth Teephis (Ḍd-br-pj-ḥ-hb) and Thoth Sotem (Dhwty-sdm). This temple may have housed an oracle delivered by Thoth in his guise as the ibis. While it is possible that these objects derived from this temple, there is little evidence so far attested for the presence of ibis interments at this site, which the contents of the texts and forms of the vessels imply. Thus, although the proximity of Qasr el-Aguz to the Epigraphic Survey's work makes it a tempting provenience, there is no known evidence associating the fragments with that site. In contrast, on the northern side of western Thebes in tombs (TT 11-12) re-used as a falcon and ibis necropolis among the cliffs of Dra Abu el-Naga during the Ptolemaic Period, similar Demotic texts were discovered. The physical proximity between Medinet Habu and these tombs in addition to the common Demotic formulae found between them led to the proposal that the jars derived from Dra Abu el-Naga.

The votive formula from the Oriental Institute jar fragments parallel the Demotic graffiti from the ibis and falcon tomb at Dra Abu el-Naga. This formula (rn nfr mn) differs from the published texts from the Tuna el-Gebel ibis galleries, which consist of the formula: Date p̣j ntr PN r-in-w n GN sb PN “Date, the god of PN, which was brought from GN, written by PN.” Despite these similarities, there are important distinctions. The ibis and falcon mummies interred in TT 11-12 were not placed within jars; rather, they were simply wrapped in linen themselves now reside in the Oriental Institute Museum, having been acquired as part of accession 34,447 in September 1959. According to accession records, the objects were “removed from map case in room 216 in July 1959, unmarked. Provenience unknown, possibly purchased during excavation at Medinet Habu, according to Dr. Hughes.”

25. Traunecker 2009 provides an overview of the site, a history of previous campaigns, epigraphy, decoration, and function.


27. Scalp, Jay 2014, introduction to no. 15-16. The initial discussion and inscriptions from the Dra Abu el-Naga tombs were published by Spiegelberg 1908, which formed the foundation for the more detailed treatment of Kessler 1989, p. 159-167. Two of the texts published by Spiegelberg have been re-edited by Chauveau 1991, p. 129-134. See Pestman 1977, p. 75-78, for a discussion of papyri referencing the ibis and falcon shrines and catacombs at Thebes, e.g. pBM Reich 10330, 3-4 “the house of rest of the ibis (and) the falcon which is in the necropolis of Djeme” (p̣j ḫḥ bht p̣j ḫm btk nty hr t2 b3st ḫm), the location of which Pestman (1977, p. 77) concludes: “L'emplacement de ce lieu de repos de l'Ibis sacré est inconnu, mais on peut admettre qu'il était situé tout près des tombeaux des ibis, à Dra Abou'l Naga par conséquent.”

28. If the faded text as been interpreted correctly, no. 10: OIM 19051 indicates the date (šb n ḫbt.t 3 ṭpy lbt pr.t 12 […] at the end of the text, unlike the placement of the date at the beginning in the Tuna el-Gebel corpus. Within the Dra Abu el-Naga tomb inscriptions published by Spiegelberg 1908, the rn nfr mn formula is found in nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30; dates following the text are found in nos. 3, 8, 15, 27; references to the “house of rest” are found in nos. 1, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15.

prior to deposition in the tomb. Without further evidence it is premature to pinpoint the exact tomb from which the Oriental Institute artifacts derived. Any of the many discovery sites of ibis and falcon mummies referred to by early campaigns on the west bank of Thebes could constitute a potential provenience.

The vast amount of unpublished material from the Saqqara and Tuna el-Gebel animal necropolises makes any attempt at reconstructing the cultural context of the Oriental Institute votive texts tentative at best. Although a wealth of archaeological and textual evidence is available for the animal cults at Saqqara and Tuna el-Gebel, the detailed logistics of administering these enterprises remain elusive. Comparable data for the ibis and hawk cults from the Theban region is even more problematic, being scattered, less cohesive, and little studied, although members of the priesthood are known and descriptions of the location of tombs and chapels are attested. Only a preliminary sketch can be offered in the following analysis based on comparable evidence. A detailed reconstruction of the procedures involved in maintaining the sacred animal cult at Thebes awaits further study.

The most often cited mechanics for the administrative processing of bird mummies occurs in the Hor ostraca, based on which John Ray and others have concluded that large numbers of mummies were buried simultaneously on an annual basis. Prior to entombment, the mumified birds were kept in a “house of waiting” (ḥwy n ḫrṣy), where the bundles may have been stored after having been prepared in the “embalming chamber” (wšt ḫr) and potted. Considering the scale of the task of burying thousands of ibis mummies at an annual festival, for pragmatic reasons inscribing the jars would have presumably taken place prior to storage. If the texts were inscribed concurrently upon deposition, one would expect a certain amount of consistency. The attestation of multiple scribal hands demonstrates that the inscriptions were not the product of a single scribe, but no evidence exists to determine if they were made at a single time and place.

30. In a personal communication to the author, director of current excavations in TT 11-12 José Galán indicated that only Demotic graffiti from the tomb walls have been discovered and that the ibis and falcon mummies so far uncovered were not placed in jars, but wrapped in linen only. GALÁN 2007 provides an introduction to the excavations, but there is only a brief mention of the Demotic graffiti (p. 782).
31. KESSLER 1989, p. 159; ASTON 2003, p. 163. Strudwick (2003, pl. 95) shows a broken egg-shaped vessel with the remains of a bird mummy from TT 99 in the Sheikh Abdel Qurna area. In a personal communication with the author, Nigel Strudwick mentioned that two such vessels with bird mummies were discovered in TT 99, but their placement near the tomb entrance suggests that they may have been from disturbed depositions and not originally intended for interment in TT 99.
32. See KESSLER 1989, p. 159-167.
33. See inscription no. 11 in SPIEGELBERG 1908, which provides a list of men holding cultic offices.
34. E.g., pBM Reich 10230, 3-4, for which see REICH 1914, p. 77-82 with pl. XV-XVI; FELBER 1997, p. 7-15; and the discussion in PESTMAN 1977, p. 75-78.
35. Strudwick (2003, p. 172) notes that “There were also ibis and hawk galleries in this part of the necropolis ... attested primarily from Demotic graffiti and the remains of a stela in at least one large and three smaller tombs (two of the latter were those of Djejuty [TT 11] and Heray [TT 12]). The location of the large tomb is not certain, but it would seem from the description that it cannot have lain far from the two numbered tombs ...”
36. oHor 19, v. 8-11, RAY 1976, p. 73-80, pl. XXI; SMELIK 1979, p. 234; DAVIES, SMITH 2005, p. 66 with note 93. For less regular interments, see the Kom Ombo ostraca published by PREISIGKE, SPIEGELBERG 1914.
Determining the agents and patrons of the votive formula found in the OIM corpus is a matter of controversy and debate. Proposals concerning the creation of such texts conflict with each other, focusing either on the economic activity of travelers making pilgrimage to the sacred site or the responsibilities of professionals within the priesthood. Fortunately, these views need not be mutually exclusive. Considering that the vast majority of our evidence derives from sacred precincts managed by priests from an upper class who held a virtual monopoly on literacy and who themselves participated in the cult procedures, it should come as no surprise that the priesthood figures prominently in the corpus. However, methods for popular participation existed, even if the material remains are less reflective of such pursuits. Inscriptions were often made by or on behalf of a donor sponsoring the burial of the ibis. Evidence for sponsorship can be found in the Demotic texts from ibis containers discovered at Tuna el-Gebel. The formula shows clearly that the sacred animal (pJ ntr) was brought (r-in-w) to the necropolis of Tuna el-Gebel on behalf of a patron and received by those involved in the administration of the cult procedures. The majority of these inscriptions provide no information on the titles of the donors for further identifying the individuals involved. Reference to a “craftsman” (hm) shows that at the very least these donors have a more diverse background than the direct priesthood.

Next to the accounts of Herodotus, Diodorus, and Strabo, the most definitive evidence cited in favor of the assumed role that local travelers, tourists, or pilgrims played in these cults is the oracle pleas discovered at the sacred animal necropolises in Saqqara and Hermopolis. H.S. Smith observes that “[d]espite their relative scarcity and their condition, these documents show very vividly that the deities of the Sacred Animal Necropolis were appealed to to obtain help, guidance, and redress in many different sorts of official and private matters” and that “they were a focus of individual devotion among the populace, reflecting the ‘personal piety’ which emerged...”


39. Popular interaction with the cult may have left little overt evidence. Reciprocation for fiscal donations may not have been necessary, i.e. receipts need not be issued and the product purchased need not be physical (e.g., prayer). In this regard, the amuletic decrees serve as examples of cult products for economic consumption (EDWARDS 1960; FISCHER-ELFERT 1996; BOHLEKE 1997; LUCARELLI 2009). Likewise, Horus cippi “were doubtless manufactured for sale to individuals who desired protection or ‘insurance’ for themselves and the members of their household” (SEELE 1947, p. 49).

40. Pottery Coffin TG 2468, for which see EBEID 2006, p. 63 and 72, specifically indicates that the ibis was mum­mified on site in Hermopolis (r-qs-w T2 hy.y.t py sjt).

41. Out of the 18 inscriptions edited by EBEID 2006, only seven titles are attested. One of those attestations does not involve the donor, but rather the “Great One of Thoth,” a leading member of the priesthood whose “order” (n bn n) is referenced in the text (Pottery Coffin TG 4051 in EBEID 2006, p. 65). Only two personal names, without titles, are preserved in the OIM corpus. Comparison can be made with the amuletic decrees, about which Bohleke (1997, p. 155) observes: “No titles are borne by those named and no one named can be connected for certain with documents or artefacts from other sources.” Seele (1947, p. 49) also mentions the common lack of “inscriptions containing the names and titles of their owners” in the corpus of Horus cippi. Lucarelli (2009, p. 231) speculated about the economic class of amuletic decree owners: “…the addressees of the OAD [Oracular Amuletic Decrees] do not belong to the highest rank of the priestly circle of Amun but seem to be part of a lower class of society.” However, the wealth of some owners is demonstrated by examples of finely worked, gold amuletic cases such as Fitzwilliam E.12.1940 (RAY 1972, p. 251-253, pl. XLIII; OGDEN 1973, p. 231-233; BOHLEKE 1997, p. 165-167).

in the Ramesside Period.\textsuperscript{43} Requests presented to oracles are attested in large numbers from the late New Kingdom into the Byzantine Period from all areas of Egypt, demonstrating the widespread participation in such activities.\textsuperscript{44} The related corpus of letters to gods mentions promises of payment towards the burial of the ibis (\textit{qs.t n pj hh}) for favorable resolution of various social conflicts or maladies.\textsuperscript{45} To accommodate such popular participation, the cult topography of the sacred animal complexes included open spaces incorporating statues on public display.\textsuperscript{46} The meager evidence does not negate the potential significance of “pilgrims” in supporting these religious institutions despite being focused through a priestly lens. Participants in rites and festivals made contributions for services rendered or divine protection.\textsuperscript{47} Even priests themselves can take on the role of pilgrim during sacred visits or financier through private donation.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{43} Smith 2002, p. 370, citing Kessler 1989, p. 299-303, to which add Kessler 2010, p. 269-270, who views the animal cults as extensions of the royal cults involved in the annual renewal of royal power.

\textsuperscript{44} Over one hundred hieratic oracle questions are known from Deir el-Medina. See Černý 1935, p. 41-58, 1942, p. 13-24, 1963, p. 45-46; Roeder 1960, 242-247. Two documents with complementary petitions, i.e. one for each competing party, addressed to “Horus-of-the-Camp” from the 20th-21st dynasty have been published in Ryholt 1993, p. 189-198. A collection of oracle pronouncements in favor Ikeni are preserved in pBrooklyn 16.205 (see Parker 1962, 49-52, pl. 17-19), now dated to the Third Intermediate Period (von Beckerath 1994). The famous Saite Oracle Papyrus (pBrooklyn 47.218.3) relates the oracular procession of Amun-Re and Pamaou’s subsequent petition, accompanied by a beautiful illustration and a long list of witness copies (Parker 1962). For publication of Demotic oracle petitions, see Botti 1955, p. 11-26, pl. 3-4; Brecciani 1965, p. 195-199, pl. 7, 1975a, p. 2-11, 1975b, p. 25-26, and 1979, p. 57-68; Erichsen 1942; Kaplony-Heckel 1972, p. 79-90; Martin 2004, p. 413-326; Smith 2003, p. 367-375; Zauzich 1992-1993, p. 227-229, and 2000, p. 1-25. Over 200 Demotic oracle questions have been excavated at Tebtunis, see Gallazzi 1999, p. 16-17 and 2002, p. 3-31. Recently two papyri from Qasr Ibrim have been published which include requests for oracles to be made, see Ray 2005. An overview of the Demotic evidence can now be found in Quack 2008, p. 331-385. See also Jay 2007, p. 99 and Frankfurter 1998, p. 143-197.

\textsuperscript{45} For payment for the burial of the ibis, see pBM 10857; published in Migahid 1987, p. 122-129, pl. 10. An interesting plea to “the ibis, the falcon, the baboon, and the gods who rest with them in the house of rest of the ibis” (\textit{pj hh pj bk pj “n irm n tw nrw nty htp irm-w pj .wy htp pj hh}) seeks justice for two children against the mistreatment of their father. No mention is made of payment for the service, see Hughes 1969. On letters to gods, see Hughes 1958, 1968 and 1969; Lüdeckens 1971; Migahid 1987; Vittmann 1995; Migahid, Vittmann 2003.

\textsuperscript{46} Badawy 1956, p. 263-264: “Les pèlerins qui montaient de la vallée, après avoir accompli le rituel du culte dans le temple de Thot à Hermopolis (Ashmounein), venaient faire offrande à l’animal sacré du dieu (“âme du dieu sur terre”) et peut-être contribuer aux frais de l’entretien ou de l’embaumement des ibis ou babouins, dépendant du temple.” Cf. now Kessler 2007, p. 150: “In Tuna it is not possible for one to have his own burial by the cult, and this is a very widespread practice in the Egyptian world.” Sherma (1981, p. 84) notes the possible location of the cult of Thoth, a deity of at least 20th to 21st Dynasty. See further, Daressy 1919, p. 157-158; Badawy 1956, p. 262-263; Jelinkova-Reymond 1956, p. 100-108, n. 1 and p. 87, n. 3; and Vernus 1978, p. 424 and 450.


\textsuperscript{48} See Rittner 1993, p. 192-233 for the elastic affiliations of members of the priesthood.
Unfortunately, some ambiguity pervades how participants outside of the priestly apparatus contributed to the sacred animal festivities, further hampered by the difficulties presented by pilgrimage inscriptions, as Ian Rutherford observes:

"Of all areas of the Ancient World none had older or richer religious traditions than Egypt, and one might expect that there would be old and entrenched traditions of pilgrimage as well. In fact, the evidence is inconclusive and inconsistent. In the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, Egypt offers more evidence for pilgrimage than any other part of the ancient world, mainly in the form of visitor-graffiti left by Greek-speakers at sanctuaries, which record the 'acts of adoration' (proskunêmata) of the pilgrims, but tell us little about the nature of the pilgrimage itself, or the geographical provenance of the pilgrims." 49

The notoriety of various spectacles and rites was memorialized in the accounts of various Greek and Latin authors. For the foreigner, the animal cults became "... une des principales originalités de la vie religieuse égyptienne. Elle est, pour les voyageurs grecs et latins, une curiosité touristique que le clergé local ne se fait pas faute d'exploiter." 50 Roman tourists especially noted the visit to the Serapeum in Memphis to see the Apis bull and the tamed crocodiles of the Sobek cult centers in the Fayum known for eating from the hands of the priests. 51 It is difficult to assess the explicit relevance of such "tourist" visits for the ibis associations.

How pilgrimage affected the economy of the animal cults has substantial implications considering that the administrative personnel necessary for the annual capture 52 or incubation, 53 rearing, 54 mummification, and burial of 10,000 birds would have been substantial. 55 Royal subsidies to the ibis cult are alluded to in the Êhor archive 56 and are spelled out specifically in the Edfu donation texts, 57 thereby confirming the account given by Diodorus that "... there has been consecrated a portion of land which returns a revenue sufficient for their care and sustenance." 58 An income would have been drawn from the produce of reserved fields (tu br.t n n: bhw) in

50. Meeks 1972, p. 67. Cf. the plea to Oserapis known as the Curse of Artemisia. See also Dil1 2000, p. 119.
51. Huhlw1n 1940, p. 274.
52. Capture of wild birds is demonstrated by the diversity of preserved species in the Tuna el-Gebel necropolis (von den Driesch et al. 2005, p. 234-235). Ray (1976, p. 136) assumes at least some capture of wild birds, but his implications for ibis extinction in antiquity require substantiation: "Anyone surveying the remains of known ibis-cults... will understand ruefully why the sacred ibis, with its characteristic black head and tail-feathers and shining white body, is now extinct in Egypt."
53. Meeks 1997, p. 132-134. I would like to thank Rozenn Bailleul-LeSuer for this reference.
54. Brescian1 1980. I would like to thank Rozenn Bailleul-LeSuer for this reference.
55. Ray (1976, p. 138) estimates "a burial rate of ten thousand birds a year." Kessler, Nur el-Din (2005, p. 156) estimate a rate of "about fifteen thousand ibis mummies a year were brought to the galleries from ten to fifteen local ibiotropheia."
56. Ray 1976, no. 3, p. 21-29 and pl. IV.
57. Meeks 1972, p. 66-70.
58. Diodorus 1.83, following the translation of Oldfather 1968, p. 283. Cf. the reference in the Teho statute base inscription (OIM 10589) to "I made the provisions for the living falcons who are in this land" (ir.n(-l) br.w(t) n: bik.w 'nfb.w imy.w s pn), see Sherman 1981, 87 and 90. According to pBM Reich 10230, 4-5, fields belonging to the Theban ibis cult were located to the east of the dromos of the temple of Amun at Djeme (see Pestman 1977, p. 78).
addition to fees associated with leasing such plots. A reference to the “provision of pharaoh” (ςἡρτην Πρ’ς) in the Hor archive, consisting of a single loaf, along with a reference in the same text to the meals of cult staff, probably confirms that supplemental income was produced through the reversion of offerings originally placed before the god and subsequently kept by the personnel. Donations, perhaps by pilgrims, are implied by a cryptic reference in pTebt 1086 to an account expenditure “for the ibis” (τῶν ἒβει), but specifics concerning the potential purchase of votive items (e.g., mummies or bronzes) are unknown. Future studies involving the calculation of a rough estimate of maintenance may improve our understanding of how the sacred animal cults functioned. An approximate evaluation of the field holdings, potential surplus, and leasing revenue would determine if the cultic activities were self-sufficient or whether further income derived from the investment or donation of pilgrims was a necessity.

Caution should be taken in reconstructing one-dimensional scenarios for complex cultural interactions since the meager documentation probably hides a multi-faceted set of social circumstances. Nevertheless, the available evidence shows that, while pilgrim participation certainly did occur, in many instances the priests charged with administering the cult created these inscriptions for their own benefit. Among the demotic texts edited by Spiegelberg from the ibis and hawk tomb of Dra Abu el-Naga, several were written on behalf of priests and administrators of the cult, among whom figure “the great one of Thoth” (π‘ηρ Δηντή = πορθότης), “the great

59. Ray 1976, p. 139; Smelik 1979, p. 230; Kessler, Nur el-Din 2005, p. 124: “The income from special field endowments, called ‘Fields-of-the-Ibis’ was attributed to sustain the local institution of the ibiotropheion, and partly used for the feeding of the sacred animals, and partly for the group of priests and servants responsible for the animals’ upkeep.” In pBM Reich 10230, Amenothes, son of Horos, a “prophet, priest, and pastophoros of every office and everything conferred (?) of the resting place of the ibis and the falcon which is in the west of Thebes” (βμ-ετρ w‘b wn lw.τ nb sbn nb π‘ ηρ wτ πι bη bη bη bη nτ y τη τη λεη τη Dmρ) leases (sbn) his share of “high land” (ιη χαι) near the “water (?) of the resting place of the Ibis” (τη πι: mυ(?) πι . wτ hτ πι bη), see Felber 1997, 17-15.

60. The text in question is no. 33 in Ray 1976, p. 104-107 and pl. XXXII, discussed on p. 139.


62. E.g., the costs assessed in no. 21 of the Hor archive, Ray 1976, p. 81-84 and the ration lists from the Mother of Apis catacombs, Smith, Andrews, Davies 2011, p. 261-267. A complaint concerning the “collection of payments due to the ibis” (λογενεία των ἒβει τά καθήκοντα) is preserved in pTebt. 965, 5-6 (Hunt, Smyly, Edgar 1938, 203). A series of wooden tablet receipts (UPZ 153-155) demonstrates that control over an ibis cult — the associated priestly office (της προφητείας), land (του ἡμίου της δοτείας γῆς), and sanctuary (του ιεροτεφείου) — could be bought and sold for a significant sum (Smelik 1979, p. 238-239; I would like to thank Brian Muhs for bringing these receipts to my attention). Rozenn Bailleul-LeSuer is currently working on a dissertation for the University of Chicago entitled “The Exploitation of Avian Resources in Ancient Egypt: A Socio-Economic Study,” which may answer some of these questions.

63. One of these individuals from Thebes, Khonsudjehutry, wrote two votive inscriptions, in one case signing both his and his father’s name, Dra Abu el-Naga inscriptions no. 14-15, published by Spiegelberg 1908, p. 21 and pl. XXVII; re-edited by Chauveau 1991, p. 129-131. As these Demotic graffiti were placed inside the sacred catacomb, it is not surprising that they were primarily, if not exclusively, the work of priests who had access to this sacred site. Cf. the votive texts from the Mother Apis catacombs, about which Smith, Andrews, Davies 2011, 253 state: “This formula thus expresses the main purpose in erecting their monuments in the Mother of Apis Catacomb on behalf of themselves, their families, and their colleagues, namely to be close to their patron deities throughout eternity.”

64. This title was initially interpreted by Spiegelberg 1908 as a personal name in Dra Abu el-Naga inscriptions nos. 1, 5, 6, 8, 11, 20, 21. It was first noted as a title by Sottas 1921, p. 35-36, followed by Kessler 1989, p. 161-162. Inscription no. 15, line 1, from the Theban inscriptions published in Spiegelberg 1908, should be added to Kessler’s
one of the falcon" (pJ wr pJ bik = πορεύμβηγις), "overseer of the necropolis" (mr h2s.t), "lesonis of Thoth" (mr in Dhwty), and "pastophoroi" (wn.w). In addition, the Demotic texts from Tuna el-Gebel, Saqqara, and Kom Ombo likewise point towards administrators within the cultic association. The occurrence of priestly titles following some of the names of donors mentioned in the Tuna el-Gebel corpus could also point to religious communities associated with the ibis cult operating either inside or outside of Hermopolis who were eager to make a dedication to the revered sanctuary of the national cult of Thoth. Among the very few Demotic pleas attested from the Saqqara community as well as among the letters to gods, a significant portion concerns grievances among the priestly staff rather than popular consultations. Although divine consultation

list. In Kessler's statement "An ihrer Spitze stand der Porthotes (pJ wr Dhwty) mit seinen Leuten (Inschr. 38)" on p. 161, the inscription reference should presumably be corrected to Inschr. 11 as there is no inscription 38 and the Porthotes is listed at the head of a series of cultic positions in no. 11. At least four separate individuals are attested in the Demotic inscriptions from TT 11-12 holding this title (no. 3: Iy-m-htp, no. 6: PJ-šr-PJ-mt, no. 8: Hr-š-m-ž, wt, no. 11: PJ-šr-Ḥnsw). De Cenival (1973, p. 162-164) discusses further the function of the wr-office in relation to animal cults.

65. Based on the titles of Amenhotep, son of Horos found in pBM Reich 10230, 4 (Festman 1977, p. 75-76; Felber 1997, p. 8-9), it seems that the cults of Amenhotep, son of Hapu at Deir el Bahari and the sacred ibis could be administered jointly.

66. In the Demotic texts published by Ebeid 2006 from Tuna el Gebel, we find: "great one of Thoth" (pJ wr Dhwty) in Pottery Coffin TG 4051; "priest of Thoth" (w'b n Dhwty) in Pottery Coffin TG 2468; "priest" (pJ w'b) in Pottery Coffin TG 4051; "choachyte" (wjh-mw) in Wooden Coffin TG 3282 (the final signs unread by Ebeid); "pastophoros" (wn) in Wooden Coffin TG 3306; "craftsman" (hm) in Wooden Coffin TG 3162. These individuals demonstrate the nature of religious associations formed to provide "... religious solidarity to villagers already involved to varying degrees in the functioning of the temple" (Frankfurter 1998, p. 72). Quack (2006a, p. 70, n. 2) mentions an unpublished papyrus (pBM 10945), perhaps from Hermopolis, that contains an opening of the mouth ritual for "Osiris the Ibis" and "Osiris the Falcon."

67. A number of assumptions have been promulgated concerning the prominence of female dedicatees within a cult of the deity Thutmose as Saqqara. Nicholson (2005, p. 50) states: "Some cults seem to have been particularly venerated by certain sections of society; thus at Saqqara the cult of an otherwise unknown deity known as Thutmose, who took the form of a young ibis, seems to have been particularly popular amongst women." Nicholson cites an entry in the Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt, where Ray (2001, p. 347) explained: "Some of these items were extremely costly, and most were offered to the cult of a young ibis deity, otherwise unknown, named Thutmose. ... Many of these dedications were by women from the nearby township of Abusir, and in one case the occasion was a personal festival, perhaps a marriage. The cult of Thutmose was clearly a favorite with these women, some of whom had considerable wealth to spare. Perhaps they too felt excluded from more conventional forms of worship." Although Ray cites Insley Green 1987 on this point, one must assume that he finds further support for these claims from unpublished documents, for Insley Green's observations are far from conclusive: "Out of fifteen inscribed items, three were dedicated by women (nos. 58, 94, 127) and two by servants of the cults (nos. 58 and 104). The other dedications were by male persons, either pilgrims or cult employees" (Insley Green 1987, p. 3). Evidence for the direct involvement of women in the ibis cult, even at very high levels, can be found in p.Lille 31, cited by de Cenival 1972, p. 163, where the title w'jt is found. On "Thutmose, the ibis," see Kessler 2010, p. 268-272.

68. Cf. no. 23 in Preisigke, Spiegelberg 1914, p. 12-13 for an ostracon with the rn nfr mn formula; no. 23, 25, and 26 in Preisigke, Spiegelberg 1914, p. 12-16 for mention of the embalming workshop (w'bt). For the officials present in the Greek texts from the Kom Ombo ostraca, see the commentary of Preisigke in Preisigke, Spiegelberg 1914, p. 37-64.

69. As Smith 2003, p. 370 notes. E.g., pOIM 1942, the Demotic letter to Thoth involving a dispute among members of the ibis cult published in Hughes 1958.
is well-represented throughout Egyptian history and provides some evidence for the generation of revenue from external sources, the direct connections between oracle petitioning, potential pilgrimage, and the sacred animal cults remain frustratingly vague. The priestly influence over these artifacts contradicts the traditional view that presumes the ibis votive mummies would have been produced largely for the need of a robust pilgrimage industry. It is generally believed, as Dieter Kessler and Abdel-Halim Nur el-Din describe, “that the thousands of pilgrims visiting the temples must have purchased on the spot, or brought with them, the millions of animal mummies interred in the animal cemetery,” although “[t]he well organized transfer of the bundles to their central burial place seems not to have involved the general public.” However, the excavators of the Tuna el-Gebel galleries now view the cult outside of the pilgrimage framework:

“We are convinced that these gods were not handed over to the common people, except to those Egyptians belonging to the group of cult servants, who collected the animals, treated their corpses and transferred them to a building near the burial place, to be brought down into the galleries at a later stage by another group of servants, the ‘bearers of gods.’ To assume that millions of pilgrims bought and/or brought their personal animal mummies as a form of a personal medium god – a model proposed until now to explain the presence of millions of mummies in the animal necropolis of Egypt – can hardly be valid for sites such as Tuna el-Gebel...”

In addition to the mummified ibises, a range of bronze votive items have been discovered in connection with the sacred animal cults, which scholars also correlate with pilgrimage activity. These origins have been questioned as well, referring to the placement in areas of restricted sacred space to which only cult personnel would have had access, such as in the catacombs, but also sealed within the ceramic vessels themselves beside the mummies.

70. For general accounts of oracle consultation, see Černý 1962; Ritner 1993, p. 214-220; Frankfurter 1998; Von Lieven 1999; Quack 2006b.
71. Reconstructions of this pilgrimage industry have had at their core the purchase of bird mummies, e.g., “The animals were mummified and sold to pilgrims who dedicated them to the god as a sign of their piety. The payment (in kind) from the pilgrims provided upkeep for the temple and its staff” (Teeter 2003, p. 102). Further, cf. the comments of Martin 1981, p. 9: “…a range of specimens was available for purchase, perhaps from booths or shops in or near the temple enclosure, their treatment and cost varying according to the wealth of the intending purchaser or dedicant. … Although there is no documentary evidence to support it, the probability is that the mummies were displayed for selection by the dedicant … The examples of pots containing a few bones only may reflect pious acts on the part of humble folk unable to afford more elaborate offerings. The pots, being mass produced, must have been comparatively cheap.” See also Smelik 1979, p. 236-237; Rutherford 2005, p. 144-146.
73. Von den Driesch et al. 2005, p. 239. See also Kessler, Nur el-Din 2005, p. 150-152.
74. Insley Green 1987, p. 66, concerning the situlae, states: “From their context it would appear that the situlae were votive, being dedicated commonly by visiting pilgrims. Whenever the shrines became too overcrowded the situlae were removed and buried within the sacred precincts of the temple.” This was cited by Nicholson 2005, p. 50 for the following statement: “As sacred objects they could not legitimately be recycled, and so were buried within the sacred precincts, sometimes within the catacombs themselves.”
75. Von den Driesch et al. 2005, p. 239; Kessler, Nur el-Din 2002, p. 36: “These small votive objects seem to have been given by those cult servants in Tuna whose job it was to place the animal bundles, sent by local ibis organizations from all over Egypt, into the locally made containers.” Nasr el-Dine 2010, p. 243: “On peut aussi..."
It seems reasonable to assume that the OIM texts were produced in Thebes by members of the personnel associated with an ibis cult. The ibis and hawk catacomb of Dra Abu el-Naga is the best known locale, but the connection to this site is uncertain. Future investigations may reveal their ultimate place of origin. Their date of production, however, can be estimated based on internal textual criteria in correlation with the style of ceramic vessels. *Ibiotapheia* are attested in Egypt for well over half a millennium, although the comment that “[t]he Greek historian Herodotus is quite correct when he states that in his time Hermopolis (ie, Tuna) contained the only *Ibiotapheion* in Egypt” needs qualification. The veneration of particular animals extends back into Egypt's predynastic period as attested by early sacrificial texts and burials. The earliest evidence for interment of mummified ibises dates to the late New Kingdom. Pottery used to bury mummified ibises from Abydos, some of which include inscriptions with the *htp-di-n(y)-sw.t* formula, have been dated to dynasties 22-24. Demotic texts from the sacred animal centers of Saqqara and Hermopolis have also been dated to the pre-Ptolemaic Period. The lack of abundant evidence for ibis catacombs outside of Hermopolis prior to the late 4th century BCE suggests a *terminus post quem* for the Theban corpus. Paleography, prosopography, and the style of the ceramic vessels suggest a date in the late Ptolemaic or even the early Roman Period (late 2nd-early 1st century BCE). However, considering that the Tuna el-Gebel ibis catacombs were in use for over 500 years and that multiple scribal hands are attested in our corpus, it should not necessarily be assumed that all of the texts edited below were contemporaneous.

A brief note on the editions: Anyone who has attempted to produce hand copies of Demotic texts will appreciate the difficult decisions faced by the editor in the attempt to determine how to present an uncertain, fragmentary, or faded sign. Often, it is at the sole discretion of
the editor to choose when to fill in a faded stroke and when not to. In that regard, the result is open to interpretation and others may have chosen a different manner in which to present the data. However, the hand copy is not the object or text itself, but a first layer of interpretation presented by the editor for the benefit of his or her colleagues. The organization of this article, it is hoped, attempts to fulfill that aim. Reduced hand copies are presented along with the text edition so that readers can easily refer to the text while larger hand copies are presented along with photographs in the plates. In some cases, especially with questionable or difficult signs, I have chosen to copy only the visible traces of ink on the object itself. In other cases, especially with securely identified signs and traces, I have chosen to fill in faded or fragmentary traces. 84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Content:</th>
<th>Votive Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory Number:</td>
<td>OIM 19024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>12.7 x 16.6 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[...] ‘wy h[tp(?)] 85</td>
<td>‘[...] house of r[est(?) ...]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Content:</th>
<th>Votive Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory Number:</td>
<td>OIM 19026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>19 x 21.5 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | [... P2]-‘hm-pa-by 86 s2(?) 87 | [... P2]choumpachois, son of(?) Harsiese [...]
|     | Hr-s2-3s.t 88 | of(?) Harsiese [...]
| 2   | [... m]-bhb Dwhty p3 ntr ‘3 | [... be]fore Thoth, the great god, the ibis [...]
|     | p3 hb 89 | |

84. The hand copies presented below are shown at a scale of 1:4 unless otherwise indicated.
85. For ‘wy htp, see notes to OIM 19051 below.
86. For orthographies of the name P2-‘hm-pa-by, see Dem. Nb., p. 171 (Dem. Nb. = Lüddeckens 1980-2000). In OIM 19026, there seems to be a more elaborate set of determinatives. The personal name P2-‘hm-pa-by is only attested from the early Roman Period. See Prissigke, Spiegelberg 1915, no. 212; Menu 1979, no. 20 (OIFAO 277); Menu 1980, no. 2 (OIFAO 320), corrected reading in Zauzich 1984, p. 75; Wängstedt 1969, A (oVienna 329).
87. Many faded traces here suggest that the scribe smeared his ink. In order to assist interpretation while maintaining some of the original ambiguity, the outlines of what seemed to be distinct characters have been indicated in black in the hand copy, while indistinct smears of ink have been indicated in grey.
88. The writing of s2 in Hr-s2-3s.t is characteristic of later Demotic. See Dem. Nb., p. 834-835.
89. Fading has rendered the final signs uncertain. The hand copy attempts to convey the surviving visible traces. In typical orthographies of this group, the divine determinative precedes the avian classifier. See EG 272; CDD H (29 June 2001): 01.1, p. 35-36.
No. 3

Content: Votive Text

Inventory Number: OIM 19028

Size: 15.5 x 18 cm

Transliteration

1. [... mn ty m-b3h n3 ntr.w]90

Translation

[... remain here before the gods

2. [...]91 s2 P3-tl-n3-ntr.w(?)]92

[... son of Petenenteris(?)

---

No. 493

Content: Votive Text

Inventory Number: OIM 19030

Size: 15 x 15.2

Transliteration

1. [...] mn ty

Translation

"[...] remain here."

---

No. 5

Content: Votive Text

Inventory Number: OIM 19044

Size: 8.4 x 7.9 cm

Transliteration

1. [...] n fr n(?)[...]

Translation

[... good [na]me off(?)[...]

90. The final diagonal stroke is errant and does not indicate a writing of 't. A similar orthography of ntr.w is found in OIM 19051 where two plural determinatives appear. Cf. EG, p. 234.

91. Based on OIM 19051, perhaps restore [n ps wpy btp n-tr ...].

92. The reading of this line is far from certain. Cf. the orthographies in Dem. Nb., p. 316.

93. Previously discussed in SCALF, JAY 2014, no. 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Content:</th>
<th>Inventory Number:</th>
<th>Size:</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Votive Text</td>
<td>OIM 19045</td>
<td>11.8 x 20 cm</td>
<td>[...] m-bḥḥ ḫḥwy pṣ nṯr ['...']</td>
<td>[...] before Thoth the [great] god [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7    | Votive Text | OIM 19047a-b | a = 20 x 24.8 cm | [...] mn ty m-bḥḥ Pḥ-sy | [...] remain here before Pishai [...]
| 8    | Votive Text | OIM 19048 | 19 x 17.2 cm | [...] m-bḥḥ ḫḥwy pṣ | [...] before Thoth the [...]

94. The hand copy is shown at a scale of 1:5.
95. OIM 19047a-b clearly belong together, but the space between the fragments implies a very elongated form of bḥḥ. The expected formula is certain, although the initial elements of the group at the left of OIM 19047a could be mistaken for sb.
97. The traces of the initial signs may suggest a reading [...] Pḥ-sḥ-..... However, one expects here the appropriate section from the formula and can probably be restored as [...] mn ty m-bḥḥ ḫḥwy pṣ [...].
No. 9  
Content: Votive Text  
Inventory Number: OIM 19049

Size: 10.2 x 18.4 cm  
Transliteration:  
Translation: 

[... mn t]ly m-bj$b Dhwty p$b
h[b]

"[... remain here before Thoth, the Ib[is ...]."

No. 10  
Content: Votive Text  
Inventory Number: OIM 19051  
Size: 
a = 12.5 x 14.5 cm
b = 9.5 x 13 cm  
Transliteration:  
Translation: 

[... ty n-m-bj$b n2 ntr.w n p3 'wy n btp 'n-tr(t)]
'b$3'-ti-Wsir s2 'Hr'-p3-bik
'h$b't 3 tpy ibt pr.t sw ..."

"[...] here before the gods of the house of rest, 'by Pe'tosiris, son of 'Har'pbechis, forever, here forever. Written in 'year' 3 Mecheir ... [...]."

98. Previously discussed in SCALF, JAY 2014, no. 15.

99. The hand copy to the right is shown at a scale of 1:3. The hand copy below is shown at a scale of 1:2. Since the preparation of this article, the two fragments of this jar have been separated and cleaned of adhesive by Oriental Institute Museum conservator Alison Whyte and subjected to infrared photography by Miller Prosser. The infrared photography revealed traces of ink as shown in the plates. These traces were taken into account to produce the hand copies.

100. For a discussion of 'wy n btp in reference to the animal cults, see Ray 1976, p. 139-140; Verhoogt 1998, p. 11-12, with n. 31; Smith, Andrews, Davies 2011, p. 252-253. For 'wy n btp in reference to tombs used for human burial, see Pestman 1993, p. 466 and the references to p2 'wy n btp 'lb-wret irm Mr-ib in Setna I, 6.9-17 (cf. also 4.25). Cf. "the house of rest (lit., lying down) of Osiris" (p2 'wy n stf n Wsir) in pBerlin 8251, 3.10, published in Smith 1993, p. 26, 32.


102. There are faded traces toward the edge of the fragment, some of which are difficult to distinguish from potential abrasions.
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Pomegranate, Persea or Sycamore Fig in the Love Song of P. Turin 1966/I?

The first love song preserved on P. Turin 1966, column I, begins with a lacuna that is generally (but probably incorrectly) restored for the song to be vocalized by a pomegranate tree. It has also been suggested that the tree whose identity is lost in the lacuna is a persea. These suggested restorations seem to be conditioned by an assumption that the break at the beginning of line 1 of this column, which ends with a word whose determinative refers to speaking or speech and a masculine singular pronoun, should be interpreted to mean that a grammatically masculine tree-name occurred in the missing portion. However, these suggestions not only assume that line 1 of column I of the papyrus is the first line of the love song, but also ignore other information in the following verses describing the tree assumed to intone this song, as is the case in the two others following it on the papyrus. If one takes this information provided by the ancient poet into consideration, it seems virtually certain that the tree which describes itself in the first song is a sycamore fig (*Ficus sycomorus*, Egyptian *nh.t*i), as in the third song; the second song involves the common fig (*Ficus carica*, Egyptian *nh.t*i *d(3)b*).

The papyrus on which the text of these three love songs is written was re-used. Traces of an earlier text on the recto are visible at the ends of lines 4, 5 and 14 of column II, but otherwise the recto seems to have been well washed before reuse. The papyrus, most probably from Deir el-Medina, in its present condition is dark brown and measures 39.5 × 72 cm (with fragments 1 and 2), and has three sheet joins (the text of columns I and II is written across the

---

1. According to B. Mathieu (1966, p. 85, n. 275), W.M. Müller (1913, p. 38) was the first to suggest that the tree in P. Turin 1966 was a pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.), Egyptian *jnhmn*, a tradition that was followed by most until Fox 1965, p. 49, n. 5b, suggested the persea, *Mimusops laurifolia*, Egyptian *nh.ti* (followed by L. Popko, see n. 11 below). W.M. Müller gave no reason to support his restoration. Nevertheless, B. Mathieu concluded that the comparisons in the first two verses preserved suit the pomegranate better than the persea fruit. The most recent transcription of the papyrus is by J. López (1992, p. 138-139) reproduced as plates 15 and 16 in Mathieu 1966. A very small photograph of P. Turin 1966 with the additional fragments placed by J. López is available at the Turin Egyptian Museum collections search website http://collezioni.museoegizio.it/eMuseumPlus by typing 1966 into the Inventory Nb. box and then clicking on the image.

2. G. Maspero (1886, p. 214) suggested that, in contrast to the young sycamore fig of the third song, the tree speaking in the first song was an old sycamore fig, but without making a restoration in the lacuna, while the tree of the second song was a fruiting sycamore fig.

Mélanges offerts à Ola el-Aguizy