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TO TAKE an oath and to present evidence are two important legal procedures, in the Graeco-Roman Period, when concluding any dispute at court. Therefore, any legal registered deal includes at its end a formula stating:

\[ p \mathfrak{n} \mathfrak{b} p \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{r} \mathfrak{b} r d (w j t) n t j h w = w r d j t st m s k (n) p \mathfrak{r} ^ { \mathfrak{r} } . w j w p j n m p \mathfrak{h} p \mathfrak{s} \mathfrak{b} n t j b r j r i r j n s k r d j t r i r s j i w s j r i r f \]

“The oath or the confirmation that shall be imposed on you in the court of justice in the name of the right conferred by the above writing which I have made to you to cause me to make it, I shall make it”.2

It is clear from this sentence that the judges (referred to by the suffix \( \mathfrak{w} \) after \( \mathfrak{m} \)) are those who impose the oath and the confirmation, and that these are sworn at court3 and presented to the judges.

But our knowledge of oaths, is not limited to these indirect hints, since records of the oath itself have reached us in great number.

Demotic oaths in the Graeco-Roman Period, are of two kinds:

1. The King’s oath \( \mathfrak{n b} p r ^ { \mathfrak{r} } \mathfrak{z} \),4 where the king and the gods are invoked. Usually written on papyrus, their formula runs as follows:

2. The oral oath in the Middle Kingdom was known as \( \mathfrak{r} \) with the meaning to swear or literally: to bind oneself with, a term which equals the modern Arabic expression بِعَطَنَة. FL.I. GRIFFITH, The Petrie Papyri, Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob, London, 1898, Pap. Kahun, pl. IX, l.9; pl.XI, 4a; pl.XI, l. 3; pl.XIII, l.27ff. The parties would swear \( \mathfrak{r} n b = i l ^ { \mathfrak{r} } \) “as my lord lives” which is the royal oath used since the Old Kingdom. The real written contracts including an oath were not known before the New Kingdom where they were also termed \( \mathfrak{r} n b (i) ^ { \mathfrak{r} } \) “the oath of the (my) lord”, see J. ČERNÝ, Catalogue des Ostraca hiératiques non-littéraires de Deir-el-Médineh III, O Deir el-Med. 57, pl. 45 l.2 and the expression used was: \( w c h \ h m n \ h c h \) p: h k = m “As Amun endures and as the ruler endures” see, ibid., O. Deir el-Med. 61 l.3. For a complete judicial comment on oaths in the Old, Middle and New Kingdoms, see B. MINOU, Recherches sur l’histoire juridique, économique et sociale de l’Ancienne Égypte, Versailles, 1982, pp. 221-250. For the king’s oath in the Ptolemaic Period see E. SIEV, Der Eid im Ptolemaischen Recht, Munich, 1929, chapt. 3, p. 12.
The oath (before) the king which was taken by... They speaking in accord, they binding themselves by oath while saying the oath before the king, they are saying the oath before the king Isis, Serapis and all the gods of Egypt... If we make the oath (before ) the king aforesaid truly (var. As a true oath) we are in his favor (var. In the favor of the king). If we make it falsely (var. As a false oath) we are in his displeasure (var. In the curse of the king)".

The second type of Ptolemaic oaths are the temple oaths well known to us from the valuable study of Ursula Kaplony-Heckel, *Die Demotischen Tempeleide*, ÄgAbh 6, Wiesbaden, 1963.6

Except for the oaths which form part of an archive and are written on papyrus, all other oaths are written on Ostraca. All oaths which have reached us up till now, are either from Thebes or the neighboring Gebelen,7 with very slight differences in formulae. The dating of these oaths does not usually include the name of the reigning king; but it is well known that there are no early Ptolemaic oaths, the oldest dating to the reign of Ptolemy the sixth, while most of them date to the reigns of Ptolemy the eighth and the joint reign of Cleopatra the third and Ptolemy the tenth, then the individual reign of Ptolemy the tenth and finally Ptolemy the eleventh, (i.e. The Ptolemaic oaths range between 158 B.C. and 87 B.C.). Roman oaths are also very frequent during and up to the end of the reign of Emperor Augustus.8

Temple oaths used to take place at the gates of the temples generally known as the *rwt-di-M"et* “gate of giving justice” or “gate where justice is given” or on the temenos *hft-br* of a temple.9

The gods normally invoked differ according to the provenance of these oaths. They are usually, the gods Sobek and Hathor in Gebelen, while in Thebes we find the bull of Montu god of Medamud, the god Khonsu and the god Amon.

The two temple oaths published here, are preserved in the Cairo Museum under the J.E. number 13/7/22/2 A and B. (A) bears the registry number 12467 which represents

---


6 Since U. Kaplony-Heckel’s study in 1963, other oaths have been published, among which, the study of G. Bitri, Arch. Deir el-Medineh Pap. n° 40, pl. XLVIII, p. 193 ff. Another article by U. Kaplony-Heckel in 1968 in Forschungen und Berichte 10, p. 135 ff. In 1974, Prof. Nur el-Din published among his Leiden Ostraca 45 temple oaths 24 of which have been dealt with, either fully or partly, in Kaplony’s study in 1963. Some differences in translation and readings have been pointed out by Nur el-Din; see, M.A.A. Nur el-Din, *The Demotic Ostraca in the National Museum of Antiquities at Leiden*, Leiden, 1974, pp. 221-256, nos 278-322. A new temple oath has been published recently by S.P. Vleeming in *Ostraka Varia, Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava* 26, Leiden, 1994, pp.129-135.

7 Only one example has been found from Dendara, in which the god Geb is invoked, see U. Kaplony-Heckel, *Tempeleide*, pp. 22 and 26.

8 For this chronological study, see, ibid., pp. 18-20.

a box containing 17 Ostraca found by Pillet in 1922 at Karnak.\(^{10}\) (B) found the same year by the same archaeologist on the same site, bears the registry number 12468 in a box containing 19 other ostraca.

\[\text{Ostracon 12468 [fig. 1 and 2]}\]

Reddish brown. 9.8 cm × 12.3 cm; thickness 7 mm. Provenance: Thebes (Karnak).

Date: Late Ptolemaic.

**TRANSLITERATION**

1. \(hp:\ 'nb\ ntj\ [iu]-Ir\ Pa-Hnm\ s:\ Hr-pa-bb(?)...\ r\ in=ef\ n\ p:\ r:\ n\ Dm:\)
2. \((n)\ pr\ Mntw\ nb\ M^3tn\ r\ P^2-rt\ (s)\ Ns-p^2-nmj\ (?)...\)
3. \(ib\ t\ 4...,\ dd\ 'nb\ p:\ k:\ M^3tn\ ntj\ htp\ [dj]\ irm\ ntr\ nb\ ntj\ htp\)
4. \(irm\ =f\ bnp^w-j\ [j]\ sw\ bnp\ p:\ \$m\ stksnt\)
5. \(bnp^w-j\ dj\ [j]\ w\ n\ p:\ bj\ r\ sw\ 1\ ntj\ iw-ir=km\)...\ [tw\ w\ p:\ 'nb\ r]\)
6. \(dt\ Pa-p^2-dj.\)

**TRANSLATION**

1. Text of the oath which \(Pa-Hnm\ son of \(Hr-pa-bb\ (?)...\) will swear [at the gate of Jeme]\(^{11}\).
2. at the temple of Montu lord of Medamud\(^{12}\) to \(P^2-rt\) son of \(Ns-p^2-nmj...\)
3. 4th month of... By the Bull of Medamud who dwells here and every god who dwells
4. with him\(^{13}\) I did not take wheat from the harvest (of) the syntaxis.
5. I did not cause them to be taken more than the amount of one (artaba of) wheat which
you... the oath is placed
6. in the hand of \(Pa-p^2-dj.\)\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Karnak (and sometimes Karnak North) is the main site in which were found most temple oaths from Thebes. See U. Kaplony-Heckel, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

\(^{11}\) \(Dm:\) : older \(d:\$m\), Greek \(ta\ Memnoneia\) : name of the Medinet Habu temple. This name was first given to the small temple of Medinet Habu, built by Hatshepsut and Thoutmosis the third on the foundations of the temple of the Middle Kingdom. It was known in the 18th dynasty as \(j:\$m\ ntJ\), \(j:\$m\) “real mound of the west” (M. Dorese, “Le dieu voilé dans sa châsse et la fête du début de la décade”, *Revue d'Égyptologie* 32, 1980, p. 41). Since the 21st dynasty it was called the \(j:\$m\) : “the Mound of Djeme”. The importance of this temple increased in the Late and Ptolemaic periods on account of the rituals inaugurated by Achoris in the 29th dynasty in order to revive the rituals of the feast of the Valley. The god Amon known since Ptolemy the third as \(lrm-jpt\) of Jeme (living image of the god \(ntr\) : \(nh\ trj\ ntrw\) ) used to travel every ten days to the Mound of Jeme, to pay his respects and present offerings to his ancestors the primeval gods buried there (the primeval snake god \(Km-tj\) : “he who has completed his time” (dead image of the primeval Amon) and the eight primeval gods (the Ogdoad of Achnacone), his heirs. The \(r^2\ n\ Dm:\) : in front of which the oath is being sworn is a small chapel at the southern side of the Eastern high gate of the Medinet Habu temple where lies the small temple of the eighteenth dynasty, see, Ch.F. Nims, *JNES* 14, 1955, p. 120; and *The Excavations of Medinet Habu VIII, Chicago*, 1970, p. XII.

\(^{12}\) \(pr\ Mntw\ nb\ M^3tn\) does not refer here to the temple of Montu at Medamud, known also by this name, but to the small temple of Medinet Habu, since it is in this temple that the oldest mention of Montu Lord of Medamud occurs dating to Achoris; see Ch. Sammin, *BIFAO* 92, p. 175.

\(^{13}\) \(N:\ ntrw\ ntj\ htp\ dj\ irm-f\) : refers to the primeval gods who where buried in the Mound of Jeme among whom is the god Montu as a creator god assimilated to Nun “he rejuvenates the bodies of the gods every day, he is Nun who came into being at the beginning, he is Osiris... Atum, Amun, the father of the fathers \(Km-tj\)... the four male gods of the Ennead are united in him, he is the snake god \(Ir-t\) : who came into being the first time, \(T^2-nt\) : the old who creates beings”; K. Sethe, *Amun und die Acht Urgötter von Hermopolis*, 1929, § 106 ff.

\(^{14}\) For this name see E. Ludeckens, *Demotisches Namenbuch I/5*, p. 366.
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NOTES

The formula of this oath, (name of the temple - name of plaintiff - date), is characteristic of both the Theban region and Gebelen. But we can not doubt its Theban provenance because of the god’s name and the temple where the oath is to be sworn.

1. The name of the defendant’s father is not certain, $Hr-(m)bb$ is the usual reading of this name, but here the element $Pa$ is present and the plant determinative of $bb$ ($Tb-bit$) is obvious.\(^{15}\)
   The space at the end of the line is sufficient for the group $r_1r_2r_3r_4$ which is the usual sentence preceding $n_pr_Mntw_nb_Mtn$.\(^{16}\)

2. $Pr-rt$ “the representative” as an occupation used as a proper name is attested in some demotic texts.\(^{17}\)
   The empty space at the end of the line should have included the date which is continued in the following line.

3. Only traces of $ibt$ 4 could be perceived, while the season and the day do not show.

4. With $bn-pw=j$ begins the subject of the oath. The formula $bn-pw=j_tj...$ $bn-pw=j_tj.w$ $r_bj$ $n...$ “I have not taken... I have not caused them to be taken more than...” is frequently repeated in oaths with different types of items.\(^{18}\)
   $Sm$ $stksnt$\(^{19}\) “the harvest of the syntaxis”: The syntaxis is the demotic rendering of the Greek $suntaxi$.\(^{20}\)
   The writing of the word here is quite unusual, but the few examples in which the word appears are very different:

   ![Image of demotic script]

---

\(^{15}\) For this name see Ranke, PN I, p. 247; Luddecke, Namenbuch I/11, pp. 830, 831.

\(^{16}\) See U. Kaplony-Heckel, op. cit., p. 21.

\(^{17}\) See Luddecke, Namenbuch III, p. 198; Greek Perhd, Perht, being different than the proper name $Pa-rt$ (diminutive of $P-tj-Îr-p-ßrd$), see E. Bresciani, “Una Mandebola di cammello con testo demotico di epoca Augustea”, RoE 24, 1972, p. 30.

\(^{18}\) For the formula $bn-pw=j_tj...$ $bn-pw=j_tj.w$ see, U. Kaplony-Heckel, op. cit., nos 25, 89, 112; and nos. 105, 106, 115, 116, 120, 123, 125 for the formula $bn-pw=j_tj...$ $bn-pw=j_tj.w$.

\(^{19}\) For the syntaxis, see G. Mattha, Demotic Ostraka, Cairo, 1945, pp. 59-60, Ost. N. 175 -180; M. Lichtheim, Demotic Ostraca from Medinet Habu, Chicago, 1957, p. 11, Ost. N. 6 -9; S.V. Wångstedt, Ausgewählte Demotische Ostraka, Uppsala, p. 44, Ost. N. 51,52.

\(^{20}\) For the Greek $suntaxi$ see Grenfell, Hunt, Fayum Towns and their Papyri, London, 1900, p. 107.
The syntaxis is known to be a contribution to the Egyptian temples paid as a tax by the tenants to whom the crown or temple land has been leased. This contribution is paid from the harvest of these lands for religious purposes such as offerings and worship of the gods. Whenever specified, the temples to which the syntaxis is assigned are the temples of Thebes.

It seems from the occurrence of the syntaxis as subject matter of the oath, that Pa-hnm was accused of having taken an amount of wheat from the harvest which was meant for the syntaxis.

5. The end of this line is not very clear. According to the sentence r-drt Pa-p2-dj “in the hand of Pa-p2-dj” beginning the sixth line, one would expect tw.w p2 `nh “they place the oath” at the end of the line.21

Ostracon 12467 [fig. 3-6]

Red potsherd. 11.4 cm x 6.7 cm; thickness 1.2 cm written on recto and verso.22 The surface of the recto is coarser than that of the verso with three uneven vertical stripes of darker colour. Provenance: Thebes. Dating: Late Ptolemaic (probably 103/102 B.C.).

TRANSLITERATION

Recto

1. h p2 `nh ntj iw-ir Ta...
2. r ir=t n Hr-m-hb n h2.t-sp 15 (ntj) ir h2.t-sp 12...
3. n pr Hnsw-m-W2st - Nfr-htp
4. dd `nh Hnsw ntj htp dj
5. irm ntr nb ntj htp irm=f p2j bd 5...
6. [ntj iw-ir=k md irm=sj m- db2.t-f] (?)...

Verso

1. bnpw=k dj st nsj iw=s r
2. ir p2 `nb ntj hrg mtw Hr-m-hb
3. dj bd 5 k 5 iw=s r tm ir=f mtw=s
4. wjr Hr-m-hb mn md `d
5. n p2 `nh

21 For a similar formula see, U. Kaplony-Heckel, op. cit., nos 32 and 43v.
22 Such cases, known as “opisthographs” are somewhat frequent in cases of oaths written on ostraca; see, G. Matthä, Demotic Ostraca, Cairo, 1945, p. 7. 29 out of the 224 of the oaths published by Kaplony-Heckel are opisthographs.
TRANSLATION

Recto
1. text of the oath which *Ta*
2. shall swear to *Hr-m-bb* in year 15 making year 12...
3. in the Temple of Khonsu in Thebes - *Nfr-htp*
4. saying: by Khonsu who dwells here
5. and every god who dwells with him, these 5 silver pieces...
6. [about which you spoke to me ] (?)...

Verso
1. you have not given it to me. If she
2. swears the oath above mentioned then *Hr-m-bb*
3. will pay 5 silver pieces 5 kite. If she does not swear the oath then she
4. will be far from *Hr-m-bb*. There is no falsehood
5. in the oath

NOTES

The formula of our text follows the order common to both Theban oaths and oaths from Gebelen (name of the plaintiff - date - temple where the oath is to be sworn); but the Theban provenance of this oath is incontestable since:
The god Khonsu invoked in the oath is characteristic of the Theban region.
The formula *mn md ḫd n pz ḫnb* at the end of the text, is only found in oaths from Thebes.23

Recto
1. The verbal form *ntj lw-hr*... *r ir* (*ntj iir*... *r ir*) is the relative future tense.24 Proving that the oath was, first, prepared in writing, then sworn later on. A scribe probably dictated the written text to the accused who, standing at the gate of the temple would repeat it after him.25

The name of the first party who will swear the oath is not clear, only the first sign and the last can be guessed. The first sign indicates that it is a woman’s name, while we can deduce from the last sign which is not the divine determinative, that the name is not theophorus. The reading of the name as *Ta-dd-ḥr* might be possible.

25 U. Kaplony-Heckel, op. cit., p. 29; Cl. Traunecker, “La porte de donner la justice de Coptos”, OLA 43, p. 377 the accused standing, together with the court representatives at the gate of the temple, swore the oath orally.
Fig. 3. Ostraca 12467 recto.

Fig. 4. Ostraca 12467 verso.
Fig. 5. Ostraca 12467 recto.

Fig. 6. Ostraca 12467 verso.
2. The presence of more than one sign after the number 10 in the dating, leads us to think of a double dating; in which case the joint reign of Queen Cleopatra the third and king Ptolemy the tenth directly comes into mind, since it is the only double dating known during the span of years in which Ptolemaic temple oaths are frequent. Although the writing is not very obvious, the only possible double dating would be: year 15 making year 12 (103/102 B.C.). The month and day are not clear.

3 The oath would be sworn either m-bjn Hnsw or n pr hnswe as in our case. The usual epithets of the god Khonsu in Thebes are either: Hnsw nb 'h “Khonsu lord of time” or Hnsw-m-Wst Nfr-htp “Khonsu in Thebes - Nfr-htp”. The writing of the title in our text is not very clear, but would rather point out to the reading Hnsw-m-Wst - Nfr-htp who represents the local figure of the god Khonsu at Thebes. His role in temple oaths is well attested in his temple at Karnak in a text inscribed on the gate of Ptolemy the third where it is said $shm b:jw$m $d dgr$m $bft-br$n Bnt “His might takes possession of the one who says falsehood at the dromos of the Bnt temple.”

5. The subject matter of the oath begins at the end of this line. We read p3j bd 5 which should be followed by kt 5 since it is the sum which is contested from the plaintiff, (see, line 2,3 of the verso) in case the oath is sworn by the defendant.

6. The signs in this line are hardly recognizable, but the formula ntj iw-ir$sk (ej) md irmr$ji (ej) m-dj$tref is to be expected since there must have existed a previous agreement between both parties concerning this sum of money.

Verso

1-4. Here ends the oath which has to be sworn by the defendant. Then begins the judicial formula, probably added to the oath by a court official stating the consequences of the oath.

26 After the death of Ptolemy VIII (117/116 B.C.) both Cleopatra II (his first wife) and Cleopatra III (his second wife) rule together with Ptolemy IX the latter’s eldest son. Two years after the death of Cleopatra II in 116/115 B.C. Ptolemy X begins to rule with them (114/113 B.C.); first on temporary basis, then he definitely replaces his eldest brother in 107/106 B.C. This joint reign is marked by a double dating. (Ptolemy X first year of reign = third year of Cleopatra III) See P.W. Pestman, Chronologie égyptienne d’après les textes démotiques (332 av. J.-C. - 453 apr. J.-C.), Papyrologica Lugduno Batava XV, 1967.

27 Ptolemaic temple oaths where not known before king Harmachis (Hr-m-Jbt) after the nation wide rebellion against Ptolemy the fifth Epiphanes and the Greeks in general.

28 For oaths written on the same date, see U. Kaplony-Heckel, op. cit., nos 32, 124, 129, 135, 145, 175.

29 Khonsu is closely related to the god Montu, bull of Medamud, and plays a similar role in the rituals of Jeme. As a creator god, shaped as a crocodile, he pays a daily visit to the eight primeval gods in Jeme; (H. Brunner, LA I, 962; K. Sethe, op. cit., § 117). The presence of Montu Lord of Medamud in Khonsu’s temple at Karnak, and the representation of Khonsu as a bull, also proves the close relation between Khonsu and Montu, who as a rejuvenated bull $kz: rnpj symbolizes the moon god. In the temple of Qasr el-Agoz built by Ptolemy the third at the south of Medinet Habu, he is said to be resting on his throne with his children in the Mound of Jeme. (Mallet, Le Qasr el-Agoz, MiFAO XI, 1909, p. 82). So, he is one of the primeval gods buried in the Mound of Jeme.


31 Bnt: name given to the temple of Chonsu at Karnak since the twentieth dynasty, Wd I, 460.
5. This confirmation of the validity of the oath is probably pronounced by the person who swore the oath. Vleeming in his publication of a temple oath from Jeme\(^{32}\) reckoning the number of occurrences of this phrase before or after the description of the consequences of the oath, and its occasional absence from some Theban oaths, concluded that, whether written in the oath or not, it was regularly placed “in the oral enactment of the oath”.

Finally, it is worth noting that the great number of temple oaths found at Karnak is due to the fact that the gates related to the rituals of Montu and the Mound of Jeme were not only located in Medinet Habu. The god did not always actually cross the river in order to present offerings to his ancestors. The gate of Montu at Medamud (Ptolemy IV) and that of Ptolemy the third at Karnak were good substitutes for the enactment of the rituals, and consequently for the promulgation of oaths.

\(^{32}\) S.P. Vleeming, *Papyrologica Lugduno Batava* 26, p. 133 f.