



BULLETIN DE L'INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ORIENTALE

en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne en ligne

BIFAO 86 (1987), p. 307-352

Anthony Spalinger

Baking during the Reign of Seti I.

Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

9782724710540 *Catalogue général du Musée copte*
9782724711233 *Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études
orientales 40*
9782724711424 *Le temple de Dendara XV*

9782724711417 *Le temple de Dendara XIV*
9782724711073 *Annales islamologiques 59*
9782724711097 *La croisade*
9782724710977 *???? ??? ???????*
9782724711066 *BIFAO 125*

Dominique Bénazeth
Emmanuel Pisani (éd.)

Sylvie Cauville, Gaël Pollin, Oussama Bassiouni, Youssef
Hamed
Sylvie Cauville, Gaël Pollin, Oussama Bassiouni

Abbès Zouache
Guillemette Andreu-Lanoë, Dominique Valbelle

BAKING DURING THE REIGN OF SETI I

Anthony SPALINGER
(Auckland University)

The detailed and often troublesome baking accounts dated to the reign of Seti I are noteworthy for their complicated arithmetical reckonings. Indeed, this group of papyri, first translated and commented upon in detail by Spiegelberg, are evidence for the sophisticated nature of the ancient Egyptian economic system ⁽¹⁾. As this point will be stressed in the conclusion of this analysis, I will make only a few general remarks at the outset concerning Seti's account papyri and their importance for understanding the high development of the Egyptian economic system at this date.

It has become somewhat common for modern scholars to compare the Pharaonic economy to an immense redistributive system wherein goods (staples such as food and clothing as well as rare and costly non-essentials) are produced or manufactured and then are cycled by means of a system of exchanges (via the temples or a more primitive barter system with a measure of value at its base) ⁽²⁾. As a result, recent modern Egyptological

⁽¹⁾ The research for this study was done with the help of an Alexander von Humboldt Fellowship of the Federal Republic of Germany. In addition, I would like to thank the kind assistance of Professors Hartwig Altenmüller and Wolfgang Helck of Hamburg for their support during 1984-1985 when I was a von Humboldt Fellow.

The basic study of these papyri is by Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen aus der Zeit Setis I.*, Strassburg (1894) with the modern compendium of KRI I, 243 ff. Additional analyses are : Helck, *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reiches* IV, p. 437-45; Barns, *JEA* 34, 40-3 and Plate XI; Janssen, *SAK* 3, 168-9 and his *Commodity Prices from the Ramessid Period*, p. 465, n. 8; Gardiner, *AEO* II 228*-29*; and Megally, *Considérations sur les variations et la transformation des formes hiératiques du Papyrus E. 3226 du Louvre*, passim (for the hieratic signs) with his *Recherches sur*

l'économie, l'administration et la comptabilité égyptiennes à la XVIII^e Dynastie, and *Notions de Comptabilité à propos du papyrus E. 3226 du Musée du Louvre*, p. 101-8 for the hieratic signs for grain measures.

After this work had been finished I checked the unpublished notes of B. Gunn in the Griffith Institute in Oxford and therefore I would like to thank Dr. J. Málek for his kind assistance as well.

⁽²⁾ In general : Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 539-62, *SAK* 3, 137-9 and 183-85, *GM* 48, 59-77; « The Role of the Temple in the Egyptian Economy during the New Kingdom », in *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East* II, Leuven (1979) (= *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 6), 505-15, and *Royal Anthropological Institute News* 15, 17-9; Gutgesell, *GM* 56, 95-109; and Kemp, « Temple and Town in Ancient Egypt ». in *Man, Settlement and Urbanism*, p. 658-66.

scholarship has not been adverse to borrowing many of its ideas from the field of anthropology and in particular American Economic Anthropology. However, as much of economic anthropology is founded upon the supposed non-rationality of economic exchange (the famous Gift Exchange of Mauss and his followers being the most well-known), one wonders whether such a methodology is readily transferable to a highly developed state such as Egypt — a state with cities, markets, a system of value allowing a rational system of exchange, complicated and well developed methods of measure (area, weights, arithmetic, and geometry)⁽¹⁾. Since the superstructure of Pharaonic civilization remained the state, temples, and interrelated bureaucracies — not to mention the royal court itself — the question may be posed as to whether American anthropological traditions, or indeed those of Mauss or Godelier and his followers, can serve to any great extent⁽²⁾. It must not be forgotten that although the masses of physical laborers remained the kernel of productivity for Egypt — and therefore indispensable for the

⁽¹⁾ For markets, see now Janssen, *De Markt op de Oever*. In general, Helck, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des alten Ägyptens*, and Gutgesell, *Die Datierung des Ostraka und Papyri aus Deir el-Medineh und ihre ökonomische Interpretation I*, p. 533-74.

⁽²⁾ For the use of Mauss : Liverani, *Or. Antiq.* 11, 297-317 and his students : Zaccagnini, *Lo Scambio dei Doni nel Vivino Oriente durante i Secoli XV-XIII*, *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 3, 3-65, and *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano* « Vittorio Scialoja » 82, 203-21; and Pintore, *Il Matrimonio Interdinastico nel Vicino Oriente durante i Secoli XV-XIII*. The problem with some of these works is the overstress on ritualized commercial dealings between nations : i.e., situations paralleled by the modern « Panda Trade » between the Republic of China and the USA. Neither the present example nor the ancient ones provide much data on the normal mundane commercial relations among the powers that be. This is not to deny the fresh and interesting work that this school of Rome has done but I question its application to the bases of economic behavior.

For a Soviet approach to the problem I will cite only the Western surveys of that vast litera-

ture : Dunn, *The Rise and Fall of the Asiatic Mode of Production*, Boston, Melbourne, and Henley (1982) with Bailly and Llobera, *The Asiatic Mode of Production*, London (1981). There are two useful summaries by Pečírka, *Eirene* 6 (1967), 141-74 and Pečírková, *ArOr.* 47, 111-22. By and large the research of Diakonoff looms large and I can best cite his survey, now translated into English, in *Oikumene* 3, 7-100. Other studies by him are scattered in the Assyriological literature. One advantage that the modern Russian scholarship has is the concentration on economics and the nature of corporate ownership.

Additional works worth mentioning are : Herkovits, *Economic Anthropology*, New York (1965); Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, New York (1974); and Niedenzu, *Die Entstehung von herrschaftlich organisierten Gesellschaften*, Frankfurt (1982). For Godelier : *Un Domaine contesté de l'anthropologie économique*, Paris (1974); *Rationality, and Irrationality in Economy*, trs. Pearce, London (1972); and most recently *Le Problème des formes et des fondements de la domination masculine*, Paris (1976). The last study reveals the strengths of Godelier's arguments as well as the weaknesses.

development of intellectual pursuits (art, science, writing, literature, etc.) — it equally cannot be denied that the unique contribution of Egypt to the world remains precisely within those categories of thought. Neither a materialistic approach nor an aesthetic one serves to elucidate the full range of objective expressions that Egypt gave to human development.

If the above paragraph appears somewhat abstract, especially in comparison to the expressed aims of this discussion, namely, the account papyri of Seti, this is not unintended. Any analysis of Egyptian written material must interconnect the mundane results (such as the percentage of bread lost in baking) with a more general theme : i.e., that of the Egyptian economy in toto and its importance in revealing to us certain facets of the ancient Egyptian mind and its mechanism of thought. Spiegelberg's edition will remain the basis for all future research; however, a reading of his translations and commentary demonstrates the necessity for further clarification and explanation of what, precisely, is occurring within the accounts. The recent re-edition of Kitchen has furthered the *editio princeps* by providing corrections in transcriptions together with new readings, and in most cases his copy is to be preferred. For the most part the following discussion will follow the arrangement of Kitchen in volume I of his *Ramesside Inscriptions*, 244 ff., albeit with alterations ⁽¹⁾.

I. — P. B.N. 206, col. I (KRI I, 244, 11 ff.) ⁽²⁾.

Year 2 4 šmw day 23

King of Upper and Lower Egypt Menma'at-Re, l.p.h.,
son of Re, Sety Merenptah, l.p.h., who lives for ever
and ever like his father Re every day.

⁽¹⁾ For the study of bread in these papyri : Währen, *Brot und Gebäck im Leben und Glauben der alten Ägypter*, a work which is abbreviated from his detailed studies in *Brot und Gebäck* 14.5 (1960), 86-96, 15.1-2 (1961), 1-18, 16.1 (1962), 12-20, and 16.2 (1962), 30-38. In fact, some of the inconsistencies in the first work should be compared to the more careful reasoning in the latter studies. The entries of « Backen », « Brot », « Gerste » and « Getreide », in *LdÄ* vols. I and II, should be consulted as well as p. 205-8 in Helck's *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Additional comments may be found in *Egypt's Golden Age*, Boston (1982), p. 112-13. For the accounts of Seti I the most

useful work that I have found regarding baking loss of weight is by Moritz, *Grain-Mills and Flour in Classical Antiquity*, Oxford (1958). The reader must consult Part II of the work for his scientific calculations. Handy, too, is the standard *A Primer on Bread-making*, Oxford (1951) by Bennion. The reader will also find the recent work of Verhoeven, *Grillen, Kochen, Backen*, a mine of pertinent information.

⁽²⁾ Helck, *Materialien* IV, p. 633; Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, Pls. V-VI and p. 15; for the storehouse : Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 456-7; note that the arrangement in KRI follows that of the regnal years of Seti.

This day. One was in Memphis in the estate of A'a-kheper-ka-Re.

Missive. Receiving the emmer from the granary of Pharaoh, l.p.h., in Memphis in order to make it into breads in the bakery (*h³yt*)⁽¹⁾ which is placed under the authority of the Mayor of Memphis, *Nfr-htpw*.

Transferred to the storehouse of Pharaoh, l.p.h.

The day accounts then follow. Note that the emmer wheat is here called « grain », *šš*, old *ššr*, as it is in some of the later accounts (KRI I, 260, 13 & 15; 261, 11; probably also 269, 16)⁽²⁾. The above text indicates that the grain came in from the granary and was immediately placed under the supervision of the mayor of Memphis. It was sent in its final state to the *wḏḏt* which I have translated as « storehouse »⁽³⁾. The order of processing is therefore : granary to bakery to storehouse. The following fragmentary lines indicate the actual deliveries :

[4] <i>šmw</i>	day 23	Grain	100
[4] <i>šmw</i>	day 28	«	150
.....		»	180
[1 <i>ḥt</i>]	day 14	»	180
.....		»	190
.....		»	180
.....		»	180
.....		»	180
.....		»	[260?]

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 640; Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 44-5; and Meeks, *ALex* III, 177 with *Wb.* II, 476, 14. The word appears to be derived from *h³yt*, « portico », *Wb.* II, 476, 4-13 and *ALex* I, 226, II, 229 and III, 177.

⁽²⁾ In these cases the word for « grain » is connected with emmer.

⁽³⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 640; note that the person in charge is the mayor of Memphis: Helck, *Materialien*, p. 440 and Megally, *Notions de comptabilité*, p. 39. For '*k_w*' as « breads »,

or « rations », see : Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ship's Logs*, p. 22-3; Scharff, *ZÄS* 57, 55 and n. 4; Müller, *JNES* 34, 255-7; *ALex* I, 74, II, 80 and III, 56; and the general study on Egyptian rations by Janssen in his *Commodity Prices*, p. 460-6 and *SAK* 3, 166-70. See also Le Clerc, *et al.*, *Journal of the American Society of Agronomy* 10, 215-7 on the milling and baking of emmer wheat. They note on p. 215 that it was difficult to remove the chaff from the grain with emmer.

The measure used at the outset is the $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$, which I will discuss in detail on pages 340-2 in Sections III and IV below. For the moment it is sufficient to note that 1 $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$ weighed 720 deben. As this small section of accounts merely deals with the arrival of sacks of emmer, nothing is related regarding the actual baking. The following passage deals with the deliveries and weighing of the baked breads.

II. — P. B.N. 206, col. II (KRI I, 245, 13 ff.)⁽¹⁾.

1 3ht day 7

One promenaded on the western shore.

Receiving the breads ('kw) for/of the bakery (h3yt) which is under the authority of the Mayor of Memphis, Nfr-htpw , from/in the storehouse of the Residence.

This day. Receiving from the storehouse of the Residence via the scribe of the altar Hwy , the son of P3-hw , and the scribe of the altar of the Residence, S3k3l3
Small bread (?! sic) 1800 Each one 13 1/2 deben making 21500 deben.

This simple example reveals that the items weighed 13 1/2 deben apiece. If so, at first there appears to be a problem. As $13 \frac{1}{2} \times 1800 = 24300$, 2800 deben are clearly lost. Per unit this comes to 1 5/9 deben. However, as is clear from the subsequent accounts of baking, there was the natural loss of weight in cooking to take into consideration⁽²⁾. For example, with 15 deben unbaked breads one normally lost ten per cent of the weight through the cooking, leaving 13 1/2 deben at the end. Here, however, the original unbaked loaves could not have weighed 15 deben apiece with an expected cooking loss of ten per cent as the first figure itself makes the final result in excess of the given 21500 deben. From the summary lists of the next account (see III below : KRI I, 250, 2-10) it is clear that 1800 large loaves weighed 12 deben apiece. With a little rounding off for this example (21500 to 21600), we arrive at the same result. In fact, the scribe probably made an error in writing 21500 for 21600 (although Spiegelberg's plate may be read otherwise)⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 636-7 and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, Pl. VI and p. 10-11, 44-7. Megally has presented some discussion in his *Recherches*, p. 17-8 as well as his *Notions*, p. 20 and 59. For the term šsp m- see also Posener-Kriéger, *Archives Neferirkare*, p. 223.

⁽²⁾ Barns, *JEA* 34, 42 with *Wb.* I, 21, 20. The modern compendium in Part II of Moritz, *Grain-Mills*, parallels perfectly the Seti I accounts : namely, the loss of 1/8 is standard. See in particular, his remarks on p. 195-209.

⁽³⁾ See n. 2, p. 312.

If both accounts coincide, we may then hypothesize that these large breads weighed 13.5 deben before cooking — as recorded here — but at the end lost about 11 per cent of their weight. The only problem with this attractive hypothesis is, why did the scribe note an incorrect deben total for breads a. 13 1/2 apiece. If they were baked, then the multiplication would have to be $13.5 \times 1800 = 21500$ (or even 21600). If, however, they were unbaked, beginning at 13.5 deben a piece, the same question remains. Finally, if they are unbaked but were reckoned a. 12 deben apiece from an original 13.5 deben size, why mention 13.5? I can only offer the following debatable reasons for this: (1) unlike the subsequent deliveries, there is no note that the loaves were actually weighed. Perhaps their final cooking weight was estimated, whereas the others were weighed; and (2) the later account does mention 1800 « large loaves » which come to 21600 deben: i.e., exactly a. 12 deben apiece. If the two references indicate the same loaves then the first is purely descriptive: i.e., it represents the type of bread by weight per loaf on the outset.


There is one additional problem to be mentioned here. The reading in line 2,3 appears to be « small bread » but it is clear that, a. 13.5 (or even 12) deben apiece, these breads were large ones⁽¹⁾. The smaller types, described in the following lines, are the common kyllestis breads weighing normally c. 3.5 deben apiece after baking. Their large counterparts, called 'kk loaves in Seti's accounts, were 15 deben before baking and normally 13.5 after. The hieratic itself is odd and perhaps « soft » or « weak » (*gnn*) was intended although this is a somewhat risky interpretation⁽²⁾.

The next line refers to deliveries on 1 *ḥt* 14:

1 *ḥt* 14

Receiving from the storehouse via the scribe of
pure storehouse (?)⁽³⁾ *R'-ms* and the scribe *Nḥt*.
Kyllestis bread 6000 making 18000 At the fixed
rate of kyllestis bread 10 making 30 deben.

⁽¹⁾ See n. 3, p. 310 above, under 'kw and add Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 41; Jecquier, *BIFAO* 19, 87; Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 344-46; Barns, *JEA* 34, 42 and for the two types of breads: (a) *kršt*: *ALex* I, 399 and III, 311; Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ship's Logs*, p. 31; and Peet, *The Great Tomb Robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*, p. 56; and (b) 'kk: *ALex* I, 75 and II, 81; Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 344-5; and Helck, *Materialien*, p. 667.

⁽²⁾ The hieratic reads:  and 600 instead of 500 seems most reasonable.

⁽³⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 636, reads « Wab und Schreiber ». However, it is probable that *w'b* is an adjective. For *w'b* attributed to the *šn'*, see *KRI* V, 119.10 and VI, 8, n. 5; Nelson, « The Calendar of Feasts at Medinet Habu », in *Work in Western Thebes*, 1931-33, p. 41; and Wiedemann, *PSBA* 7, 110.

The latter phrase makes it easy to solve this problem for it indicates that a sample of 10 breads was chosen to estimate the entire load ⁽¹⁾. This was done with the subsequent three deliveries but thereafter the entire number of breads was weighed. Here, the kyllestis breads weigh 3 deben apiece. However, in the later deliveries these breads could weigh in excess of 3 deben per unit. Omitting the introductory comments concerning the deliveries, the figures are as follows :

1	ꜥht	15	2400	kyllestis breads	7400	deben	10	kyllestis breads	31
1	ꜥht	16	1400	»	»	4590	»	10	»
1	ꜥht	18	2790	»	»	9795	»	10	»
									35

The calculations are almost exact : the bread can weigh 3.1 deben; 3.35 deben and 3.5 deben per unit. Note the increase in weight from the first delivery. Let us now turn to the subsequent deliveries, all of which are rather mundane.

1 ꜥht 21 1090 + x (= 2090) kyllestis breads 8155 deben. He measured all of it.

The restoration of 2090 fits, as the final quotient becomes c. 3.9 deben for one bread.

1 ꜥht 22 2200 kyllestis breads 7800 deben. He measured all of it.

These come out to 3 6/11 (= 3.5454.....).

1 ꜥht 25 1600 + x (2600?) kyllestis breads 9453 deben. He measured all of it.

Here the most probable figure is 2600 (= 3.64 deben for one bread) but 3600, 4600, and 5600 are possible ⁽²⁾.

1 ꜥht 28 668 + x (3668?) kyllestis breads 13800 deben. He measured all of it.

This fits best : 3.76 deben apiece.

2 ꜥht 1

This day [his majesty, l.p.h.,] departed [for The]bes.

3710 kyllestis breads 13745 deben. He measured all of it.

Result : 3.705 (3 523/742).

⁽¹⁾ The «at the fixed rate of» : Gardiner, *JEA* 27, 49-50, n. 2; Megally, *Notions*, p. 112-3 and *Recherches*, p. 107; and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*,

p. 45-6. See also *ALex* I, 157.

⁽²⁾ See *KRI* I, 246, n. 8 a to line 8.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 4 4100 kyllestis breads 13580 deben. He measured all of it.

Result : 3 $\frac{69}{205}$ (= 3.336585.....). The remaining days merely confirm the calculations above : viz., that the kyllestis breads range between 3 and 4 deben and average out to a bit less than 3.5. This is partially supported by a later account of the *Rechnungen* wherein these same breads occur : see III below.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 8 3715 kyllestis breads 17880 deben. He measured all of it.

There is a problem with the reading here and significantly Kitchen, Spiegelberg, and Helck disagree concerning the first figure : the result would be 4.8 if it is 1715, but this seems too high ⁽¹⁾.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 9 1200 + x kyllestis breads 4200 deben. He measured all of it.

The maximum must be 3.5.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 12 3000 + x kyllestis breads 10230 deben. He measured all of it.

The maximum must be 3.41.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 17 4000 + x kyllestis breads 15700 deben. He measured all of it.

The maximum is 3.925 (= 3 $\frac{37}{40}$).

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 20 4000 kyllestis breads 13620 deben. He measured all of it.

This is our first example over 4 deben per bread : 4 $\frac{21}{50}$ (= 4.42); it indicates that the correction for day 8, wherein one can read 1715, is not improbable.

2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 22 3000 + x	10000 (Maximum = 3 $\frac{1}{3}$)
2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 26 3820	13421 (= 3.53)
2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 29 3870	12550 (= 3.24)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 2 3843	12700 (= 3.305)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 6 4986	16350 (= 3.27)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 8 2390	7870 (= 3.292)

⁽¹⁾ KRI I, 246, 12 (= 1715); Helck, *Materialien*, p. 637 (= 3715 with a query); and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 11 (= 37(?)1(?)5).

3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 10	2440	8050 (= 3.299)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 14	3790	12630 (= 3.33)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 16	2300	7850 (= 3.41)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 19	2880	9500 (= 3.298)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 22	2600	8900 (= 3.42)
3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 27	5266	17440 (= 3.31)
4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 8	11702	37220 (= 3.18)
4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 13	1000	3710 (= 3.71)
4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 17	1001	3090 (= 3.09)
4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht 30	4205	18350 (= 4.36)

The average is interesting to calculate. By and large for the months of 2 and 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht, the median is c. 3.3 deben for 1 kyllestis bread. The days on which no breads were delivered unfortunately do not fit in neatly with the known festival days at this time⁽¹⁾. However, since most of those known to us were associated with Thebes, the reasons for the omitted deliveries must be sought elsewhere. It is not too speculative to view the absence of the breads as dependent upon the various festivals in Memphis and, of course, the individual demands of her Mayor. In addition, even though the amounts recorded do not correlate nicely with the intervals between two days, it is probable that all of these intermittent deliveries fulfilled the state demands. Thus for the month of 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht around 33000 breads were baked whereas for the following month the total comes to 30495.

Before leaving this section the question regarding the significance of these deliveries must be tackled. Each entry points out that the breads were delivered from the storehouse; none notes anything concerning baking : i.e., there is no description of weight before or after baking nor any notation concerning expected and real weight loss in cooking. From the entries in Section I, I feel that this account deals solely with the arrival of the baked items direct from the storehouse. Instead of stating « received from the bakery », these entries state « received from the storehouse of the Residence » or something similar. The process has moved from the stage of baking as well as from the final one of storage. The weighing was performed in order to determine accurately the loaves and to check any unexpected weight loss. This also probably explains the problems with the first entry of the 13.5 deben loaves with the measure of c. 12 deben apiece. In sum, this lengthy entry describes the work after transportation to the bakery.

⁽¹⁾ These can be calculated from Schott, *Altägyptische Festdaten*, and Parker, *BiOr* 9, 100-3.

III. — P. B.N. 204 « Col. II a » (KRI I 250, 2 ff.) ⁽¹⁾.

In this small account a more meaty approach may be taken with the complex arithmetic of the breads. The first half of the text is located at the top right and top of Plate III a of Spiegelberg; it corresponds to the account at the bottom right and top. The first reads (KRI I, 250, 2-5) :

1601 1/4 392325
 Total Small breads 107893 making 364371 deben
 Small breads 6171 Large breads 1800 Making 21600 deben
 Total 385971
 Remainder 6354 deben.

As a first-level analysis the above figures can be interpreted as follows : the small breads weigh 3.377 deben apiece and the large 12. This is about the same as the deliveries in the previous account except that the larger ones appear to have gone from 13.5 deben to 12. Such cooking weight losses were normal, as the following sections will show. Second, the total of the two do not enter into the accounting : i.e., the third line is merely an equivalence between the number of small and large breads : both come to 21600 deben and the latter are not added to the final weight. In $\text{deben } 364371 + 21600 = 385971$. In the first line the second figure must be in deben : the first refers to the number of sacks (ḥ) as seen from the complementary account (KRI I, 250, 7) where the amount ('ḥ') of emmer wheat is equated with 1601 1/4. The final remainder matches $392325 - 385971$. The difference cannot reflect the loss in cooking as the percentage is too low (1.6 %) ⁽²⁾.

The complementary account corresponding to the last one reads :

Total Emmer wheat 1601 1/4 sacks (ḥ) Making
 small bread 112090
 Coming to the storehouse Small bread 114000 + x
 (= 114265) Making 385971 deben
 Remainder Small bread 6335 deben Making small
 bread 1825.

If the 1601 1/4 sacks of emmer are equal to 112090 small breads the latter a. 3 1/2 deben apiece come to 392315 deben. This must be used to correct the figure in line 1 of the

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 637-8 and 640-1; and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 12 and 44-9.

⁽²⁾ See the next section.

previous account. Divided by $1601 \frac{1}{4}$, it gives $245 \frac{1}{183}$ deben for one sack (\mathfrak{A}). (If the incorrect figure be used, then the quotient becomes $245 \frac{5}{247} = 245.020242914$ instead of $245.0054645 \dots$). In any case, after considering the minute remainder involved in both cases, it is reasonable to conclude that one \mathfrak{A} of emmer was 245 deben in weight ⁽¹⁾.

The second account also tells us that the small breads were delivered to the storehouse. Hence, at least this list reflects the real state of affairs wherein one grand of small breads is counted. The first specifies two separate sums (reflecting two independent deliveries ?) in which some of the breads were a. 3.5 deben apiece and others a. 3.377. The remainder deben in the second account converted into small breads fits nicely : 6335 (instead of 6354) divided by 1825 gives 3.47, again about $3 \frac{1}{2}$. The restoration of Peet in the third line (*KRI* I, 250, 9) seems most reasonable as he read 114[2]65 (?). The small breads in the first account total to 114064 ($107893 + 6171$). The deben loss in the second account matches the first : both come to c. 1.6 per cent, clearly too small to be considered as a normal cooking loss.

The two accounts therefore reflect two separate ways of determining the same results. The second begins with the total emmer wheat in sacks whereas the first does not name the grain employed. The number of small breads that were actually brought in was 114265. The per cent involved is : 114265 a. 3.37 deben apiece. In account one the scribe lists one group of breads, the small ones, a. 364371 deben total for 107893, that is a. 3.377 apiece. The third line with its equation of small and large breads reduces to 3.5 deben for 1 small bread. The question surrounding this line is explained in the next section. That is, why are the small breads valued at a higher rate than the first? The answer : different deliveries owing to different bakers or perhaps more precisely two separate weighings. The final remainder in account one of 6354 deben is the recorded weight loss.

The second account appears to contain a problem with respect to the number of small breads in line 1. $392306 \text{ deben} / 3.5 = 112087.4 \text{ loaves} (= 112090)$. This, however, merely indicates the possible number of 3.5 deben loaves than can be made from $1601 \frac{1}{4} \mathfrak{A}$ of emmer. Turning back to the first account for a final word, the mathematics are :

$$(107893 \text{ a. } 3.377 = 364371) + (6171 \text{ a. } 3.5 = 21598.5) = 385971$$

This is the same figure as in account two allowing for the rounding off of the second number to 21600.

⁽¹⁾ See n. 2, p. 311 above. For the term «remainder» associated with this entry : Megally, *Notions*, p. 82-4 with *Recherches*, p. 118 and 150.

In sum, then, account one is theoretical based on two separate rates for small breads whereas account two represents the actual deliveries based on one average rate for the breads :

	I	II
TOTAL :	392315 (corrected)	392306
	= 107893 a. 3.377 = 364371	= 114265 a. 3.377 = 385971
	6171 a. 3.5 = 21600	
	114064	385971
LEFT	6354	6335

The fact that the two remainders are approximately rather than exactly the same is due to the minor difference of 6171 loaves a. 3.5 deben apiece entering into the equation of account one. This alteration was not important as they only came to a little over 5.3 per cent of the total weight at the outset. (The final weight in account two has summed all the variegated breads together whereas the first has not). The double reckoning in both accounts wherein inputs = outputs (after some detailed arithmetic) resembles a kind of double entry bookkeeping, a situation that repeats itself in other sections of Seti's accounts.

The question remains as to the precise stage in the cooking process reflected by these two reckonings. The mention of arrival at the storehouse appears to support the previous idea that the breads were manufactured from the emmer after arrival from the granary and later baked. Hence, the above two accounts — in my opinion the first being more detailed than the second — report on the storehouse activities. The sacks of emmer wheat are mentioned and so is the storehouse : i.e., the first and last stage in the cooking process. Finally, the remainder at the end of both accounts is definitely not a cooking loss as it is only c. 1.6 per cent. As normal losses ranged from 1/8 to 1/10, this remainder must refer to debens of emmer left over. The required number or weight was manufactured by the storehouse but some emmer still remained in its sacks.

IV. — P. B.N. 204, Col. III, 208, Cols. I-II and 207, Cols. I-III (K R/ I, 250, 12 ff.)⁽¹⁾.

This lengthy account will help to clear up some of the presuppositions in the previous ones. The text reads at the beginning :

Regnal year 2, 1 *3ht* 2

One was in Memphis in the temple of *3-hpr-k3-R*.

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 634-6 and 640; Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 16-9, and 36-43 and Megally, *Notions*, p. 59.

Account of commands ⁽¹⁾ to the bakers with flour for baking.

The *šn* for the breads via *D³d³* Flour ⁽²⁾ 3 1/2 $\text{𐎗} \bullet \text{𐎓}$

Come from him 'kk bread 168 Each one 13 1/2 deben

1/10 for cooking ($\text{𐎗} \text{---} \overline{\text{𐎓}}$) ⁽³⁾ 1 1/2 deben.

As this is quite easy to work with, the following remarks concerning the complex reckoning apply to all of the baking procedures in these accounts. Leaving off a discussion of $\text{𐎗} \bullet \text{𐎓}$ which both Gunn and Barns left untranslated, the following is clear : beginning with a weight of 15 deben per loaf, after baking the final product weighed ten per cent less (by 1 1/2 deben) ⁽⁴⁾. Whereas this example incidentally reveals the normal loaf weight of such 'kk breads to be 15 deben it also computes the final result. The flour is measured in this which is based on a sack of some sort. The sign 𐎗 does not mean the normal *psw* measure. Rather, in these accounts, it indicates a loss through cooking and the heat sign is most apropos ⁽⁵⁾. The total weight of the baked loaves came to $168 \times 13 \frac{1}{2}$ deben : 2268 deben. The ten per cent loss comes to 252. The total at the start was therefore 2520 deben. In terms of expected loaves we must have 2520 divided by 15; i.e., 168. QED.

The second, and perhaps more significant result of this single entry is the following : $2520 \text{ deben} / 3.5 = 720 \text{ deben}$. That is, $1 \text{ 𐎗} \bullet \text{𐎓} = 720 \text{ deben}$. Comparing this account with the previous one, this means that the 𐎗 of emmer wheat is approximately one third of the $\text{𐎗} \bullet \text{𐎓}$ of flour. In addition, if the estimate of one deben at 91 grams be followed, then $1 \text{ 𐎗} \bullet \text{𐎓} = 65.52 \text{ kilograms}$ ⁽⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁾ For *tp n* : Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ship's Logs*, p. 72 and *Commodity Prices*, p. 19, n. 18; Vernus, *RdE* 33, 110-11, n. b; Gardiner, *JEA* 27, 32, n. 4 and 38, 21, n. 3.

⁽²⁾ For the *šn* : *ALex* I, 374; II, 378; III, 292-93; Hayes, *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, p. 107; Helck, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des alten Ägypten*, p. 47-9 and 96; Bakir, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt*, p. 41-7; Janssen, *SAK* 3, 168 and n. 183; and Berlev, *The Workforce of Egypt during the Epoch of the Middle Kingdom*, p. 12-3, 21, 85-6, 101, 116-19, and 218-20.

⁽³⁾ The best discussion remains that of Barns, *JEA* 34, 42, n. to 9 ff. He refers to the unpub-

lished notes of Gunn in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford. These I have checked in May 1985 with the kind courtesy and assistance of Dr. J. Málek and his assistants.

⁽⁴⁾ The actual scientific study presented in Moritz, *Grain-Mills* is quite close to the accounts of Seti : see p. 195-209 for extraction rates of bread and his chapters on grades of flour.

⁽⁵⁾ For this problem : Barns, *JEA* 34, 42, n. 1 and 2 with Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 42.

⁽⁶⁾ See note 2 above. For the grades (?) or types of flour as well as the words *nd* and *wdyt* : Gunn, *JEA* 12, 135 with Peet, *The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus*, p. 114.

loss in weight was 78 deben. One final problem is the entry of 5 and the dough remainder of 3 : did, in fact, H^3rw deliver the required number minus 5 loaves' worth of weight (= 75 deben)? This is, in fact, what the beginning of line 3,4 appears to indicate. If so, then the remaining 3 deben's dough makes sense : H^3rw simply did not use it. As no dough can exist at the end of cooking, this conclusion seems more reasonable.

The next entry is :

*The šn' for the breads via Nw-Imn Flour 3 1/4 ($\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$] =) <
Come from him 'kk bread 156 Each one 13 1/2 deben
1/10 for cooking 1 1/2 deben.*

The line continues with the total for the three separate bakings on this day. Let us first work out *Nw-Imn's* cookery. 156 breads a. 13 1/2 deben apiece were produced. The two figures multiplied give 2106. The latter is 9/10 of 2340, the original weight at the start. This fits : $3 \frac{1}{4} \times 720 = 2340$. QED. *Nw-Imn* performed his job correctly. As for the total :

*Total on this day large loaves 480 Come for a
cooking loss (?) 5 Grand total [48]5.*

The three sums of 168, 156, and 156 correctly add to 480; note that the debit of 5 is also indicated. Furthermore, we learn that these 'kk breads were also designated by the term « large breads »; the latter occurs in the last account wherein 1800 « large breads » a. 12 deben apiece were equated with small breads.

Line 3,7 continues the baking series of deliveries :

*1 3ht day 3 One was in Memphis.
The šn' for breads via D^3d^3 Flour 3 1/2 $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$]
Come from him 'kk bread 168 Each one 13 1/2 deben
1/10 lost for cooking 1 1/2 deben.*

This is the same as the first entry for D^3d^3 .

*The šn' for breads via H^3rw Flour 3 1/4 $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}] =)$ <
Come from him 'kk bread 151 15 Each one 12 1/2 deben
1/10 lost for cooking 1 1/2 deben Remainder 1 deben
Making 'kk bread 10 Dough deben 6 (?).*

In this case *H3rw* delivered less than the total required in loaves by 5 (156-151) as well as incurring a deficit in weight by 1 deben (13 1/2 — 1). The reading of Spiegelberg for 12 1/2 is correct ⁽¹⁾. 10 + 5 is 15, the number written some time after the main entry, above and to the left of 151. The figure of 10 has been crossed out as in line 3,4 where the 5 (also the number of extra breads) has been corrected in the same manner. In deben this account can be interpreted as follows : $3 \frac{1}{4} \times 720 = 2340$. $151 \times 12 \frac{1}{2} = 1887.5$. 156 (the expected number of loaves a. 13.5) $\times 13.5 = 2106$. (Remember 2340 deben — $1/10$ loss (2340) = 2106). $2106 - 1887.5 = 218.5$. The loaves were off by 1 deben apiece. $1 \times 151 = 151$ deben or 10 loaves a. 15 deben plus 1 deben dough remaining. $218.5 - 151 = 67.5$. $67.5 / 13.5$ (the final weight) = 5. The 15 entered after 151 is now located : it is equal to 10 loaves a. 15 deben plus 5 a. 13.5 deben. They are the separate losses in weight.

The šn' for breads via Nw-Imn Flour 3 1/2 $\mathbf{A} (\bullet \text{𐎶}) =$ \blacktriangleleft
 Come from him 'kk bread 156 Each one 13 deben
 1/10 lost for cooking 1 1/2 deben
 Remainder 1/2 deben Making 'kk bread 5 Dough 3.

Again with the above in mind, *Nw-Imn*'s entry is simple to work out. The expected weight of 13 1/2 deben per loaf was not achieved, *Nw-Imn* producing only 13 deben breads. The figure of 5 was crossed out at the end and entered after the initial figure of loaves cooked, 156. With 2340 deben to be worked upon and the 9/10 of 2106 after cooking, the following results : $156 \times 13 = 2028$. The last subtracted from 2106 gives 78. This equals $15 \times 5 (= 75)$ plus a dough remainder of 3. The account is verified. QED.

In line 3,9 we have the sum for this day's delivery :

*Total of this day Large bread 480 Come for a cooking
 loss 15 Total 495.*

The three deliveries of 168, 156, and 151 (with 15 lost in baking) total 175; the 15 is added in later. The missing 5 derives from line 3,9 wherein the extra 5 is noted after 156. This was not done in the summary of line 3,5.

I 3ht day 4 One was in Memphis.
The šn' for breads via D3d3 Flour 3 1/2 $\mathbf{A} \bullet \text{𐎶}$

⁽¹⁾ No *sic* is needed in *KRI* I, 251, 7. The 15 fits the arithmetic perfectly and is probably to be read above and next to the figures for 151.

<https://www.ifao.egnet.net>


For the summary :


*Total this day Large breads 479 Come for a cooking
loss 5 Total 484.*

This matches : $167 + 145 + 156 + 11$ (remainder) = 479, which with the remaining 5 = 484. The 5 is listed separately as in the previous day summary.

The day summaries therefore list separately the loss due to baking but all add it to the total. Moreover, the first figure includes the breads delivered plus those expected as a normal effort. To put this in another way, the first figure includes the sum of the breads actually baked and delivered plus those which were expected to be baked. Owing to a reduction in number the accounts list both independent of each other under the individual entry. In the summary, however, the two figures are added together and entered first. The second figure in the summary is merely the amount of weight lost in cooking expressed in terms of loaves; this weight is not the expected percentage loss. The two sums are then added : breads in number desired (delivered plus deficit) and bread weight loss. This gives the required total in number : output = input. This is almost like a system of double entry book-keeping.

The final line (3.14 = KRI I, 252, 2-3) is a summary of the preceding :

*Total flour 30 
Come as large breads 1460 Each one 15 deben
Completed 13 1/2 deben in coming forth from cooking.*

This grand total is partially inaccurate as clearly many breads did not « come forth from cooking (*m*  » being 13 1/2 deben apiece. Although the 30 corresponds to $3 \times (3 \frac{1}{2} + 3 \frac{1}{4} + 3 \frac{1}{4})$, the total for the breads is 4 short (i.e., $485 + 495 + 484 = 1464$). Even a simple calculation following the facts in line 3,14 would convince any Egyptian scribe : 30×720 deben = 21600. $1/10$ of 21600 = 2160. The subtraction = 19440, which divided by 13.5 = 1440. Did the scribe confuse this ideal sum with the real one of 1464 and write instead of the latter a combination of both? i.e., did he forget the 4 owing to the 1440 but retain the 60 instead of the more correct 40? The problem cannot be resolved.

The second half of this account is even more interesting ⁽¹⁾. It involves the same three men, although a fourth, 'nh·tw, enters at the end.

⁽¹⁾ Spiegelberg, Pl. VIII and p. 16-7; Helck, *Materialien*, p. 634-6.

1 *3ht* day 5

Account of commands ⁽¹⁾ to the bakers with flour
in order to make kyllestis bread Each one 4 deben
Finished 3 1/2 deben.

Before continuing, the reader will now see the justification for our supposition in account III above : namely, the description of small breads as kyllestis bread and their expected weight after cooking = 3.5 deben. However, in this case the alteration is from 4 to 3.5 deben, i.e., 12.5 per cent (1/8). This heading to the following entries was necessary as the bakers now had different commands from the state.

This day

The baker *D3d3* Flour 3 1/2 *A* ● *W*
Come kyllestis bread 602 Remainder 28
Remainder lost for cooking 78 3/4.

If it is kept in mind that 720 deben = 1 *A* ● *W*, what then results ? $3 \frac{1}{2} \times 720 = 2520$ deben. $\frac{1}{8}(2520) = 315$. $2520 - 315 = 2205$. This divided by $3 \frac{1}{2}$ deben gives us the expected number of breads at the end as 630. The figures match : *D3d3* actually brought 602 and that plus the missing 28 is 630. The other 315 deben when calculated into breads a. 4 deben apiece (beginning loss) = $78 \frac{3}{4}$. In other words, the first remainder is loss in number and the second is loss in weight (converted back to number). Now *D3d3* delivered 28 less than he was supposed to, but the total weight loss (third column) indicates that each loaf of the delivered 602 was actually less than 3.5 deben apiece ⁽²⁾. How is this? The answer is simple : if the expected weight loss per loaf in the baking process was 1/2 deben then with 630 loaves we get the required figure of 315. *D3d3* had an additional weight loss of 315 ($78 \frac{3}{4} \times 4$); hence, each of the 302 loaves delivered had to weigh < 3.5 deben apiece.

The baker *H3rw* Flour 3 1/2 *A* ● *W*
Come [kyllestis bread 605] Remainder 25
Remainder lost for cooking 75.

⁽¹⁾ For *tp n hnw* : see n. 1, p. 319 and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 36-7.

⁽²⁾ That the final remainder (unexpected cooking loss) is not the normal 1/8 lost by cooking can

be seen from the following entries. This is the only occurrence wherein a baker incurred an unexpected cooking loss equal to the normal percentage loss (= $78 \frac{3}{4}$ deben).

Since we know that 630 was the expected number of loaves, the fragmentary listing in line 1,5 is easily restored. The final figure ought to have been $78 \frac{3}{4}$ if all went right. However, when it is remembered that incomplete deliveries could use up more weight per loaf than expected owing to the rather unscientific nature of the cooking process at this date, this is reasonable. Then too, the previous entries for D^3d^3 , et al., have revealed that the loaves could weigh less than the prescribed amount. As $75 \times 3.5 = 262.5$, the 605 breads weighed 262.5 deben less than they should have; per unit, this would be $262.5 / 2117.5$ or 12 per cent. (The $2117.5 = 2205 - [605 \times 3.5]$ and $2205 = 2520 [= 3.5 \times 720] - 1/8 [2520]$).

The next two lines (1,6 and 1,7) are missing, so it is impossible to determine with certainty the delivery of *Nw-Imn* or the grand total. (But see below, pp. 329-30).

[1 3^{ht} day 6]

[The baker D^3d^3 Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$]

Come kyllestis bread 430 Remainder 10 (sic) ⁽¹⁾.

Remainder lost for cooking $53 \frac{1}{4}$

The baker H^3rw Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}) =$ <

Come kyllestis bread 450 Remainder 10 (sic) ⁽¹⁾.

Remainder lost for cooking 67

The baker *Nw-Imn* Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}) =$ <

Come kyllestis bread 430 Remainder 20

Remainder lost for cooking $37 \frac{3}{4}$

Total Flour $7 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 1310 Remainder 40

Remainder lost for cooking 158 Total 198.

Note the double form of book-keeping. As there is some difficulty with the first two entries, and the first is in fact restored from the day summary, let us turn to the report of *Nw-Imn*. If $720 \text{ deben} = 1 \text{ A} \bullet \text{Z}$, then $2 \frac{1}{2} \text{ A} \bullet \text{Z} = 1800$. $1/8 (1800) = 225$ and $7/8 (1800)$ is 1575. $1575 / 3.5 = 450$. Hence, the total of the first and second columns (i.e., breads delivered and remaining) must be 450. This locates an error in H^3rw 's account (and presumably also in D^3d^3 's : in both cases the entries

⁽¹⁾ This error will be explained below in the text.

go above 450). With *Nw-Imn* the sums are correct ($430 + 20 = 450$). At 3.5 apiece they total to 1575, which is $7/8$ of 1800. (The $1/8$ expected loss of $225 = 56 \frac{1}{4}$ breads). QED.

The report of *H³rw* is inaccurate since he delivered either 440 breads with 10 remaining or 450 with none outstanding. As the 450 is secure, I will henceforth read 450 0 and for *D³d³* 430 20. Only by checking with the final grand totals in lines 2,10 - 2,12 (*KRI* I, 255, 3-5) will this problem be resolved. In the day's total the first two figures are accurate : for $7 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{𐎧} \bullet \text{𐎶}$ we get 1350 ($= 1310 + 10$) breads a. 3.5 deben apiece or 5400 deben. $5400 - [1/8 (5400) = 675] = 4725$ which, divided by 3.5, is 1350. The ideal case therefore has 168.75 ($675/4$) breads normally lost by the baking.

The next account is identical in format to the last :

1 𐎧ht day 7

The baker *D³d³* Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{𐎧} \bullet \text{𐎶}$

Come kyllestis bread 430 Remainder 20

Remainder lost for baking 59

The baker *H³rw* Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ ($\text{𐎧} \bullet \text{𐎶}$) =) ◀

Come kyllestis bread 430 Remainder 20

Remainder lost for baking $57 \frac{3}{4}$

The baker *Nw-Imn* Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{𐎧} (\bullet \text{𐎶}) =) \text{◀}$

Come kyllestis bread 430 Remainder 20

Remainder lost for baking $35 \frac{3}{4}$

Total Flour $7 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{𐎧} \bullet \text{𐎶}$

Come kyllestis bread 1290 Remainder 60

Remainder lost for baking $171 \frac{1}{2}$ Total $232 \frac{1}{2}$.

The entries follow those of the previous day and they are all accurate : the expected delivery of 450 loaves was met with a loss of 20 loaves in all three cases. The final line total (1,17) spells out « total », *wḡṣt*. The slip of the numeral « 50 » in line 1,15 can be checked; it must be restored ⁽¹⁾. I will omit the actual weight of the loaves as the fractions are insignificant.

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 634 and *KRI* I, 235, 2. No correction in Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 17.

1 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht day 9

The baker D^3d^3 Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 365 Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost for baking $52 \frac{3}{8}$

The baker H^3rw Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}) =$ \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 365 Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost for baking 28

The baker $Nw-Imm$ Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}) =$ \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 365 Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost for baking $36 \frac{1}{2}$

The baker $'nh\cdot tw$ Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 365 Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost for baking $22 \frac{3}{4}$

Total Flour $8 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 1460 Remainder 70

Remainder lost for cooking 139 Total $209 \frac{3}{8}$.

The final summary total slips in an error for the loss in cooking and therefore the grand total is off as well : the first should read $139 \frac{5}{8}$ and the second $209 \frac{5}{8}$. There are even more serious problems with this section as well as the one following which hitherto have baffled scholars. Before I justify my readings on the hieratic signs for the fractions $2 \frac{1}{8}$ and the summary, let us first turn to the previously accepted interpretation of $2 \frac{1}{4}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$. If this were true, then $2 \frac{1}{4} \times 720 = 1620$. $\frac{1}{8} (1620) = 202.5$. $\frac{7}{8}$ is 1417.5 and the latter divided by 3.5 is 405. Hence, the final ideal output should be 405 kyllestis breads per man with $50 \frac{5}{8}$ breads lost in baking (a. 4 deben apiece). However, the first two figures in these examples add up to 382.5, leading to the conclusion that the presupposition of $2 \frac{1}{4}$ must be in error. (The only other possible mistake would be the equivalence of $1 \text{ A} \bullet \text{Z} = 720$ but this is not the case). Turning to the final sum of 382.5, this must be $\frac{7}{8} \times (3.5 \times \text{another figure})$. 382.5×3.5 is 1338.75, which is $\frac{7}{8}$ of 1530. 1530 deben must be equal to $720 \times \text{an unknown number}$. It is $2 \frac{1}{8}$.

Now a close check on the plate of Spiegelberg reveals that instead of $2 \frac{1}{4}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$ we actually have the desired $2 \frac{1}{8}$; the arithmetic fits perfectly. That is to say, $2 \frac{1}{8} \times 720$ is 1530; $\frac{1}{8} (1530) = 191.25$; $\frac{7}{8} (1530) = 1338.75$; $1338.75 / 3.5 = 382.5$; $382.5 = 350 + 17.5$. QED.

The calculations fit, as does the hieratic (see Plate VIII of Spiegelberg) :

The baker D^3d^3	Flour	<u>𐎃𐎊 𐎁 𐎓 𐎓</u>
The baker H^3rw	Flour	<u>𐎃𐎊 𐎁 <</u>
The baker $Nw-Imn$	Flour	<u>.𐎊 𐎁 <</u>
The baker $'nh\cdot tw$	Flour	<u>𐎃𐎊 𐎁 𐎓 𐎓</u>
Total	Flour	<u>𐎓 𐎓 𐎓 𐎓</u> (The 𐎁 is missing!)

Note that the total itself is, indeed, $8 \frac{1}{2}$ ($= 4 \times 2 \frac{1}{8}$). Except for the entry of $Nw-Imn$, each sign following the hieratic for « 2 » is not a dot : i.e., it is not $\frac{1}{4}$ sack (◊). Rather, it is < : i.e., a $\frac{1}{2}$ of the quadruple hekat. That is to say : $\frac{1}{8}$. The scribe has made a slip in $Nw-Imn$'s account as there — and only there — can $2 \frac{1}{4}$ be read. As a solace to Egyptologists it may be worthwhile to note the parallel mistakes of ancient and modern scholarship.

There is a final grand summary that should help us in these matters. Lines 2,9 - 2,13 present the final totals for the four bakers (KRI I, 255, 2-6). The sums are divided into two sections but let us look only to those that total the above day entries. According to the recent edition of Kitchen, we have $10 \frac{3}{4}$, which would fit a $2 \frac{1}{4}$ 𐎁 𐎓 𐎓 for day 9. Is this correct? The first half of lines 2, 10-13 actually reads (omitting the number of breads baked, lost, or otherwise) :

The baker D^3d^3	Flour	<u>𐎃 𐎓 𐎓</u>
The baker H^3rw	Flour	<u>𐎓 𐎓</u>
The baker $Nw-Imn$	Flour	<u>𐎓 𐎓</u>
The baker $'nh\cdot tw$	Flour	<u>𐎃𐎊</u>

These figures represent the sum of the deliveries for the first four days (1 $\frac{3}{4}$ 5, 6, 7 and 9). The next group of figures deals with 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ 10 and they will be covered below. For $'nh\cdot tw$ there is $2 \frac{1}{8}$ again. The first for D^3d^3 is $10 \frac{1}{2}$ plus $\frac{1}{8}$ or, $10 \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$ quadruple hekat ($= 10 \frac{5}{8}$). The accounts of H^3rw and $Nw-Imn$ seem to come to $10 \frac{3}{4}$. This is where the error of modern scholars has crept in : one should expect 𐎓 as, indeed, in Louvre

E 3226 (Megally, *Considerations sur les variations* . . . , Pl. XXXIII)⁽¹⁾. Clear hieratic forms for $3/4$ are given in the second half of these total lines (2, 10-13) where the variants of 𐎃 and 𐎄 may be noted. In conclusion, we must read $2 \frac{1}{8} \text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$ for the accounts on day 9 and in the summary totals of the first half of lines 2,10 - 2,12 $10 \frac{5}{8}$; for line 2,13 read again $2 \frac{1}{8}$.

We have now reached the point where it becomes imperative to understand more correctly the unit of measure $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$. From the previous arithmetic correlations it was shown that for flour, $1 \text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔} = 720$ deben. It was therefore 3 times the sack (𐎃) of emmer, itself appraised at c. 245 deben. Unfortunately, this measure is known from only one other papyrus, which is also dated to the reign of Seti I. Gunn preferred to leave the meaning aside, a choice followed also by Barns, although in one place he calls the $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$ a quadruple sack, albeit with no justification⁽²⁾. One might translate $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$ as hekat, sack-head, following a train of thought parallel in English to the « hogshead ». As the fractions following the measure are the same as those employed with the normal sack (𐎃), this has some justification in Egyptian as well as in English. However, this leaves open the real significance of \bullet . From the final summaries in lines 2,10 and the subsequent accounts, a second similar measure, the $\text{𐎃} \circ \text{𐎔}$, occurs. As in this case the \circ clearly replaces the \bullet , it is reasonable to see the \bullet as an adjective modifying the first words (« hekat-head ») or joined as a substantive to the following 𐎃 . I do not see how a translation of « quadruple hekat » can be proved. Therefore, I will follow the method of Barns and leave the phrase in hieratic; fortunately, its significance in deben is secure.

The next section opens with the new measure :

1 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht day 10

The baker D^3d^3 Flour $[1 \frac{3}{4}] \text{𐎃} \circ \text{𐎔}$ [.....]

The baker H^3rw Flour $[1 \frac{3}{4}] \bullet$ [.....]

⁽¹⁾ On the hieratic of this papyrus and of a similar time : Peet, *The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus*, 26; Megally, *Notions*, 101-8; and Gardiner, *The Wilbour Papyrus* II, p. 60-5.

⁽²⁾ *JEA* 34, 40. He reads a quadruple sack for : $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$; a quadruple hekat for $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$ $\text{𐎔} \circ \text{𐎔}$ and $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$. . . $\text{𐎔} \circ \text{𐎔}$ $\text{𐎔} \circ \text{𐎔}$; and 𐎃 . . . $\text{𐎔} \circ \text{𐎔}$ with hekat. I have preferred to leave the translation open, following Gunn.

The following discussion is speculative; see pages 339-430 below. Do the different measures reflect the different grades of flour? I.e., is $\text{𐎃} \bullet \text{𐎔}$ a. 720 deben worse than $\text{𐎃} \circ \text{𐎔}$ a. 800 deben? See Moritz, *Grain-Mills*, 168-76 on varying grades. Good flour depends upon the quality of the grains, the removal of the bran coat, and on the homogeneity of the product. Fine meal produces a better cooked loaf and one that is of better texture as well.

[The baker *Nw-Imn* Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ ◀]

The baker [r 'nh·tw Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ ◀]

I have left off the restorations in lines 2,4 - 2,7 for the moment. The first question is whether the $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$] is = 720 or another figure, and the second is the correct reading of the hieratic. From a look at Spiegelberg's plates there is little doubt that \mathfrak{P} does not match \circ , the difference being $\circ = \circ$ for $\bullet = \mathfrak{P}$. This crucial difference has been overlooked by previous researchers. Finally, one must keep in mind that the accounts of *Hr³w* and *D³d³* contain errors in lines 1,9-10. Hence, it would be best to turn to a complete entry with this new measure (2,15):

1 3ht day 11

The baker *D³d³* Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$]

Come kyllestis bread 350.

I have chosen this example because no remainder occurred : i.e., *D³d³* delivered the correct number of loaves (350), each of the correct weight. By the previous computations we have $350 \times 3.5 = 1225$. $1225 = 7/8$ (1400). $1/8$ lost in baking = 75 deben or $75/4 = 43 \frac{3}{4}$ loaves. In other words, $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$] = 1400 deben; therefore, $1 \mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$] = 800 deben. The measure is thus different from the earlier one. This is in fact why in the summary lines of 2,10-13 the $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$] is listed separately and after the $10 \frac{5}{8}$ $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$] : the two being different, they cannot be totaled together.

We are now ready to begin the restorations in lines 2,4-7. *Nw-Imn* is impossible to fill in, owing to a further loss in line 1,6; 'nh·tw is the easiest, so he will be chosen. The final summary of line 2,13 reads :

The baker 'nh·tw Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$]

Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ ◀ (= $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$])

Come kyllestis bread 715 Remainder 17 $\frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost to baking 46 $\frac{1}{2}$ Total 64.

Line 2,1 has for 'nh·tw :

The baker 'nh·tw Flour $2 \frac{1}{8}$ $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$]

Come kyllestis bread 365 Remainder 17 $\frac{1}{2}$

Remainder lost to baking 22 $\frac{3}{4}$.

Hence, for the missing line 2,7 the restoration is :

The baker [er 'nh·tw Flour $1 \frac{2}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} (\circ \mathfrak{Z})$] =) ◀

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 23 $\frac{3}{4}$].

For D^3d^3 the totals are (line 2,11) :

The baker D^3d^3 Flour $10 \frac{5}{8}$ $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$
 $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\text{A} \circ \text{Z}$
Come kyllestis bread 2177 *Remainder* $85 \frac{1}{2}$
Remainder lost to baking $260 \frac{7}{8}$ *Total* $350 \frac{3}{8}$.

The total of the first two figures is 2262.5. The individual entries of D^3d^3 are :

602	Remainder 28	Remainder lost to baking $78 \frac{3}{4}$
430	Remainder 10 (sic = 20)	Remainder lost to baking $53 \frac{1}{4}$
430	Remainder 20	Remainder lost to baking 59
365	Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$	Remainder lost to baking $52 \frac{3}{8}$

The sum of column one is 1912.5. $2262.5 - 1912.5 = 350$. This holds, as was noted on page 331. Column two adds up to 75.5 which, with the 10 from the error of 10, gives 85.5. $85.5 - 85.5 = 0$. Regarding the final column : the sum is $243 \frac{3}{8}$. $260 \frac{7}{8} - 243 \frac{3}{8} = 17 \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, line 2,4 must read as follows :

The baker D^3d^3 Flour $[1 \frac{3}{4}] \text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$
 [Come kyllestis bread 350
Remainder lost to baking $17 \frac{1}{2}$].

For H^3rw there is a correction to be made. The summary of line 2,11 reads :

The baker H^3rw Flour $10 \frac{5}{8}$ $\text{A} (\bullet \text{Z}) =$ ◀
 Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\text{A} \circ \text{Z}$ ◀
Come kyllestis bread 3075 (sic = 2075)
Remainder $137 \frac{1}{2}$ *Remainder* lost to baking
 $251 \frac{3}{4}$ *Total* $389 \frac{1}{4}$

For the complete entries of H^3rw :

605	Remainder 25	Remainder lost to baking 77
450	Remainder 10 (sic)	Remainder lost to baking 67
430	Remainder 20	Remainder lost to baking $\langle 5 \rangle 7 \frac{3}{4}$
365	Remainder $17 \frac{1}{2}$	Remainder lost to baking 28

The total of the first two columns (without the 10) adds up to 1912.5. We therefore would expect 2262.5 minus 1912.5 to be contained in the lost entry of line 2,5 : i.e., 350

kyllestis breads as with the others. Is this the case? Clearly not, as the scribe has entered a too high figure of 3075 in the total line. Altering 3075 to 2075 (not a major problem) leads to $2075 + 137.5$ (remainder) = 2212.5. This is 50 short of the expected figure. The 50 may be found in line 1,15 where it was omitted (see page above). Unfortunately, this figure is from the « remainder lost to baking » section and should be added in the third column above. Regarding the remainder loss through baking, column three totals $229 \frac{3}{4}$ (if the missing 50 is not entered). The total being $251 \frac{3}{4}$, this leads to 22. Hence, the 50 belongs to the regular remainder column as it cannot be entered into the total of the unexpected baking losses. Line 2,5 can be restored :

The baker $H\bar{3}rw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\bar{A} (\circ \bar{\omega}) =) \quad \blacktriangleleft$
[Come kyllestis bread 350
Remainder lost to baking 22].

As the summary entries have already been covered, I will translate only the introduction to them in lines 2,8 - 2,9 :

Come as these kyllestis [breads] x *Remainder* x + 108
Remainder lost to baking 788 + x
Remainder Small bread 160 + x 2.
Their specification Total for the baker according
to his name.

The list totals then follow; the previous two lines are too fragmentary for analysis.

The next has :

1 3ht day 11

The baker $D\bar{3}d\bar{3}$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\bar{A} \circ \bar{\omega}$
Come kyllestis bread 350

The baker $H\bar{3}rw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\bar{A} \quad \blacktriangleleft$
Come kyllestis bread 350
Remainder lost to baking $17 \frac{1}{2}$

The baker $Nw-Imn$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ $\bar{A} \quad \blacktriangleleft$
Come kyllestis bread 350
Remainder lost to baking $8 \frac{3}{4}$

The baker 'nh·tw Flour 1 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◀

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 17 1/2

Total Flour 7 \mathbb{A} ◦ \mathbb{Z}

Come kyllestis bread 1400

Remainder lost to baking 43 3/4.

The correct numbers of breads were delivered by all four men : no bread remainder number is recorded. The next account is :

1 3ht day 12

The baker D3d3 Flour [1] 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◦ \mathbb{Z}

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 15 ⁽¹⁾

The baker H3rw Flour [1] 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◀

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 25 1/2

The baker Nw-Imn Flour [1 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◀]

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 15

[The baker 'n]h·tw [Flour 1 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◀

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking x]

Total Fl[our 7 \mathbb{A} ◦ \mathbb{Z}

Come kyllestis bread 1400

Remainder lost to baking 55 1/2 + x].

Here the entries are easy to restore. Note that the first loss remainder for D3d3 has been subsequently crossed out and entered above and next to the figure of 250 as in account III. The next group also follows the same format :

1 3ht day 14

The baker D3d3 Flour 1 3/4 \mathbb{A} ◦ \mathbb{Z}

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 20

⁽¹⁾ KRI I, 255, 14 : $\underline{\Delta} \circ \circ \circ \mathbb{A} \circ \mathbb{Z}$ \mathbb{M} \mathbb{N} \mathbb{O} \mathbb{P} \mathbb{Q} \mathbb{R} \mathbb{S} \mathbb{T} kyllestis bread.

The baker $H\bar{3}rw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 6

The baker $Nw-Imn$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 10

The baker $'nh\cdot tw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 350

Remainder lost to baking 6

Total Flour 7 $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 1400

Remainder lost to baking 42.

The next sequence :

1 3ht day 15

1 3ht day 16

The baker $D\bar{3}d\bar{3}$ Flour $2 \frac{1}{4}$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 360 *Each one* 4 deben
when coming forth baked

The baker $H\bar{3}rw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 255 (sic = 250) *Each one*
4 deben when coming forth baked *Remainder* 30

The baker $Nw-Imn$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 280 *Each one* 4 deben
when coming forth baked

The baker $'nh\cdot tw$ Flour $1 \frac{3}{4}$ \mathfrak{A} \blacktriangleleft

Come kyllestis bread 280 *Each one* 4 deben
when coming forth baked

Total Flour 7 $[1/2]$ $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$

Come kyllestis bread 1175 *Each one* 4 deben
when coming forth baked *Remainder* 30.

The hieratic in the total line (1,19) is clear : 30 instead of 10 ⁽¹⁾. This figure as well as the remainder of 30 in the entry of *H³rw* has been crossed out in checking. This day's entry is interesting in that the measure of $\text{𐎢} \circ \text{𐎢}$ is employed with $2 \frac{1}{4}$ as well as $1 \frac{3}{4}$; the arithmetic supports the value of 800 deben = $1 \circ \text{𐎢}$. $2 \frac{1}{4} \times 800 = 1800$. If each bread for *D³d³* was baked at 4 deben apiece, this would mean 1440 deben, leaving 360 lost in the process. The per cent loss would be 20 (= 1/5). Hence, the original unbaked breads must have weighed 5 deben apiece at the start. For the others let us take the easier accounts (*Nw-Imn* and *'nh·tw*) : $1 \frac{3}{4} \times 800 = 1400$. $280 \times 4 = 1120$. The result is 280. $280 / 1400 = 1/5$ or 20 per cent. Again, the original breads were 5 deben apiece. The entry for *H³rw* is therefore inaccurate and we must read 250 instead of 255. Perhaps the red ink used for the « ditto » after the figure of 255 indicates a check here. Note that there was no delivery on 1 *ḥt* 15.

1 ḥt day 17

The baker *D³d³* Flour $2 \frac{1}{4}$ $\text{𐎢} \circ \text{𐎢}$

Come kyllestis bread 120 *Each one* 4 deben
when coming forth baked

Again (?) kyllestis bread 313 *Each one*
 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ deben when coming forth baked

The baker *Nw-Imn* Flour $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\text{𐎢} \blacktriangleleft$

Come kyllestis bread 130 *Each one* 4 deben

Again (?) kyllestis bread 210 *Each one*
 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ deben when coming forth baked

The baker *'nh·tw* [Flour ... $\text{𐎢} \blacktriangleleft$]

Come [kyllestis bread ... *Each one* 4 deben

Again (?) kyllestis bread] 50 *Each one*
 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ deben when coming forth baked

Remainder 50

[*Total* Flour $4 \frac{3}{4}$ + x $\text{𐎢} \circ \text{𐎢}$]

Come kyllestis bread 250 + x *Each one* 4 deben

Again (?) kyllestis bread 575 *Each one*
 $3 \frac{1}{2}$ deben when coming forth baked

Remainder 50].

⁽¹⁾ KRI I, 256, 12 (line 1,16) and 15 (line 1,19).

<https://www.ifao.egnet.net>

The next entry also poses no problems :

1 3^{ht} day 21

The baker *D³d³* Flour 2 *A* ◦ *𐎢*]

Come kyllestis bread 400

The baker *H³rw* Flour 1 1/4 *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllestis bread 250

The baker *Nw-Imn* Flour 1 3/4 *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllestis bread 350

The baker *'nh·tw* Flour 1 1/2 *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllestis bread 300

Total Flour 6 1/2 *A* ◦ *𐎢*]

Come kyllestis bread 1300.

The following :

1 3^{ht} day 22

The baker *D³d³* (Flour) 2 *A* ◦ *𐎢*]

Come kyllestis bread

[The baker *H³rw* Flour 1 3/4 *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllestis bread

[The baker *Nw]-Imn* Flour 1 3/4 *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllestis bread

[The baker *'nh·tw* Flour *A* ◦ ◀

Come kyllsetis bread

Total Flour 5 1/2 + x]

If there was no remainder then the first three entries may be restored with the number of kyllestis breads at 400, 350, and 350 respectively; the total would be 1100 + x.

1 3^{ht} day 24

The baker *D³d³* Flour 2 *A* ◦ *𐎢*]

Come kyll[estis bread]

The baker *H³rw* Flour 1 1/4 *A* ◦ ◀

Come [kyllestis bread]

concomitant evaporation through cooking must be one cause. However, this factor should have been easy to determine arithmetically and I suspect that the expected loss through the cooking process was empirically well enough understood by the Egyptians : their baking losses of 1/8 and 1/10 bear witness to this ⁽¹⁾. An even more significant factor may have been the varying quality of the flour itself. Indeed, this factor would affect the rate of water retention : i.e., finely ground flour absorbs more water than one of a coarsely ground character, thereby weighing more. Similarly, a volume measure of coarsely ground emmer wheat would actually possess less wheat than the same measure of a finer brand. Some indications that these may have been determining factors can be observed in the accounts of this section. One case points out that dough was left over although the original weight was the same. In summary, using physical terminology, the mass of the prepared mixture varied even though the same amount of flour in weight was always added. Modern second grade ice cream poses a good parallel : the volume is increased through aeration. Likewise, an increase in the water content would extend the number of loaves.

In view of the last paragraph it might be useful to turn to the absolute determination of the various measures of wheat and flour employed in these accounts. The three are :

- (1) 1 \mathfrak{A} of emmer = 245 deben = 22.295 kg;
- (2) 1 $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$ of flour = 720 deben = 65.52 kg;
- (3) 1 $\mathfrak{A} \circ \mathfrak{Z}$ of flour = 800 deben = 72.80 kg.

As a sack (\mathfrak{A}) is 76.65 liters we arrive at 1 liter of emmer = .29 kg or 291 grams. This is considerably lighter than what one would expect; because of this I checked my readings with the unpublished notes of Gunn located in the Griffith Institute only to find that he, too, arrived at identical conclusions ⁽²⁾. From the standard modern study of Percival the following is recorded ⁽³⁾ : for wheat, taking the lightest weight per 100 grains (mealy wheat) and the equivalent smallest volume per 100 grains (also mealy wheat), the equation is :

$$100 \text{ grains} = 3.1 \text{ cc}; 100 \text{ grains} = 4.04 \text{ grams.}$$

Or 3.1 cc = 4.04 grams. 1 gram = .7673 cc and as a liter is 1000 cc, this means that there

⁽¹⁾ For varying weight losses and their reasons : Moritz, *o.c.*, p. 197 (Tables X and XI : weight absorption and bread yield). Also, see his chart on p. 222 : wholemeal versus 70 % flour.

⁽²⁾ These were checked with his unpublished

notes. I am frankly still surprised at the weight of 245 deben per \mathfrak{A} .

⁽³⁾ John Percival, *The Wheat Plant*, London (1921), p. 19. Note that I am using wheat at this point.

are 767.3 grams per liter; per sack this is 58744.488 grams or 58.74 kg, more than twice the 1 \mathfrak{A} of emmer as calculated from Seti's accounts. Notwithstanding the more heterogeneous character of the emmer in the Ramesside Period than the wheat of today (i.e., the greater air spaces among the grains in antiquity as compared to today), the two figures remain quite distinct. However, if the emmer in the \mathfrak{A} was composed of thrashed ears, i.e., the « husked » grain (or Wesen), itself consisting of 73-75 % of caryopses and 21-25 % of chaff (botanically defined as glumes plus the rachis, not the stalk), the weight would be 40-49 kg per hectoliter or .4 to .49 kg per liter ⁽¹⁾. This leads to 400-490 grams/liter

⁽¹⁾ *Ibidem*, p. 191. In his notebooks Gunn listed his observations on the varying weights : (a) 1 liter of wheat grain (this I suspect is emmer but Gunn does not specify) weighs 895 grams; (b) 1 liter of flour ground by natives in a native mill weighs 725 grams; and (c) 1 liter of barley weighs 673 grams. Converting to an Egyptian sack, the \mathfrak{A} , which I take to be 76.56 liters (yet see Janssen, *Commodity Prices*, p. 109 with Reineke, *MIO* 9, 159 and 162 on the sack as 76.88 liters), we have : (a) 1 Egyptian sack of wheat = 68.52 kg; (b) 1 Egyptian sack of flour = 55.506 kg; and (c) 1 Egyptian sack of barley = 51.53 kg. (Note that Černý, in *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* 1 (1953/54), 914 ff. also employs the lower estimate). I also follow the standard 1 deben = 91 grams (Gardiner, *Eg. Gr.*³, § 266, 4).

Percival's estimates of emmer weight clearly do not equate with Gunn's observations. Baer's estimate in *JARCE* 1, 42-3 comes to 1 Egyptian sack = 39.27 kg. (Insofar as he uses American measures, for which there is no justification, the conversions are : 1 hekat = 4.78 liters; 1 bushel of emmer = 40 lbs.; 1 hekat = .135 bushels; 1 bushel = 7.407407... hekats; 1 bushel = 18.1818... kg.; therefore 18.1818... kg. = 7.407407... hekats. The result is 1 hekat = 2.4545... kg.; or 1 Egyptian sack = 39.27 kg.). This result, based on H. Wilson's *Grain Crops*, New York (1955), p. 201 and 235, is close to Percival and further away from Gunn. A third

estimate can be drawn from Moritz, *Grain-Mills*, p. 185. There, we are given the weight of modern wheat as 47-50 lb./foot³ and that of flour as 30-35 lb./foot³. Making the necessary conversions, the results are : 1 Egyptian sack of wheat weighs 57.73 kg. and 1 Egyptian sack of flour weighs 36.90 kg.

The conclusion regarding these differing results is hard to find. I suspect that the variation in wheats is partly to blame but perhaps the method of packing (i.e., storing) may be at fault as well. I.e., wheats, but especially flour, when packed tightly increase in weight per unit measure. This is known to all cooks, who handle flour when measuring in a very careful manner lest more flour be added to the batter. In essence, Percival's emmer estimate is closest to our measure with Baer's next. Moritz is not employing emmer wheat; nor is Percival in his first estimate. This leaves Gunn's empirical observations to be reconciled. Must we therefore regard the \mathfrak{A} of emmer as equal to a quadruple sack? : Barns, *JEA* 34, 40, line 4 to text. If so then the \mathfrak{A} would = 89.18 kg. It is for these reasons that I believe the two measures $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ and $\mathfrak{A} \circ \text{𐎗}$ must be separated from the word for « sack ». I.e., they must represent something else. Clearly, they are not a quadruple of the sack (\mathfrak{A}) as they are not 4 × 245 deben. In the text I tentatively assume that they refer to varying degrees of flour, perhaps caused by better sifting.

and 30.624 kg per sack, taking the lower figure. This is roughly the same as in our accounts, again taking into consideration the considerably greater homogeneity of wheat in our age. I think, then, there can be no difficulty in presupposing the presence of the glumes in the sacks under consideration; when baked they would make the final product a bit crunchier; the same may be said regarding the rachis although the results would have been even rougher.

Regarding the second and third measures, it will be shown in the subsequent account that 1 $\text{A} \circ \text{𐎗}$ of flour is to 1 $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ of emmer as 1 : 2.5. Given the above two weights this means that 1 $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ of emmer weighs 320 deben. Hence, we have further confirmation that the sack measure (A) is not that same as the $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$, even though both were used with emmer. Can one assume that in these accounts the A of emmer was the more unprocessed product and the $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ a later more processed one, with flour being the final product? i.e., were the $\text{A} \circ \text{𐎗}$ and the $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ employed as measures for processed grains such as emmer? However, this moves us into the realm of speculation and it is perhaps best to stop here ⁽¹⁾.

V. — P. B.N. 205, 1,1 ff. (= KRI I, 259, 6 ff.) ⁽²⁾.

This short albeit interesting entry presents at the beginning fifteen lines dealing with the equation of amounts of flour with amounts of emmer wheat. The basic pattern is repeated in every line although an error has crept into line 1,10. The days run from 3 ḫt 21 to 4 ḫt 5 in one day intervals. The first line (1,1 = KRI I, 259, 6) may be taken as a paradigm for all :

3 ḫt day 21

Which was given to the bakers Flour 7 1/2 $\text{A} \circ \text{𐎗}$

Making emmer wheat 18 3/4 $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$

The ratio of flour to emmer is 1 to 2 1/2, i.e., this line gives the equivalence of emmer and flour in their separate measures. (Note that the copies of Spiegelberg and Kitchen are in error). Since 1 $\text{A} \circ \text{𐎗}$ of flour = 800 deben, 1 $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ of flour = 720 deben, and 1 sack (A) of emmer = 245 deben, some equivalences may be made. Following the equation from this account : 800 deben = 2.5 \times $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ of emmer; 1 $\text{A} \bullet \text{𐎗}$ of emmer = 320 deben. Now as 1 sack (A) of emmer = 245 deben, it is readily clear that the A ,

⁽¹⁾ See the previous note.

in line 1, 10 (= KRI I, 259, 15) wherein 5 1/2

⁽²⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, 638 and Spiegelberg,

is written for 7 1/2.

Rechnungen, p. 12-3 and 49. There is a mistake

in lines 2,2 ff. : « grain $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\mathbf{A} \bullet \mathbf{Z}$ $54 \frac{2}{3}$ ». As the dot represents $\frac{1}{4}$, ten days would represent $2 \frac{1}{2}$. This is what we have in the lists from lines 2,1 ff. (KRI I, 260, 14 ff.).

The problems with the final two figures in line 1,24, i.e., $1 \frac{1}{2} 4 \frac{2}{3}$ cannot be resolved. $10 \times 5 \frac{2}{3} = 56 \frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{4} \times 10 = 2 \frac{1}{2}$. For the first, I assume that a 1 has been incorrectly omitted⁽¹⁾. Regarding the other, it is reasonable to read $\langle 5 \rangle 4 \frac{2}{3}$, following the subsequent entries (lines 2,2 ff. : see below) wherein each decade coincides with $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{A} \bullet \mathbf{Z}$ $54 \frac{2}{3}$. I cannot resolve why the accounts have switched by 2. However, as the $54 \frac{2}{3}$ is connected to the preceding $2 \frac{1}{2}$ in a ratio of $21 \frac{13}{15}$, I can only think that the smaller number (not the more correct ratio $22 \frac{2}{3}$: per day $2 \frac{14}{75}$, 2.1866.... instead of $2 \frac{4}{15}$, 2.266....) was reasonable. Perhaps the accountants wished to have a number as close to $56 \frac{2}{3}$ as possible, but one that, when divided by the $2 \frac{1}{2}$, left no fraction. By an upward rounding off of $54 \frac{2}{3}$ this was obtained. Note that the overseer of the granary could alter the ratio as line 2,13 (KRI I, 261, 10) states : « ... day of fixing the ratio by the overseer of the double granary $2 \frac{1}{2} 50$ »⁽²⁾. This ratio can only be the *psw* ratio and therefore the account gives the cooking ratio for each interval of ten days. Since the *psw* ratio could only be a whole number, the idea of rounding off to 55 and reducing the $56 \frac{2}{3}$ by 2 makes some sense ($56/2.5$ or $57/2.5$ do not produce an integer).

The first sequence of decades begins with the same day as the previous account. Each delivery matters for the subsequent days :

Year 2 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht day 7.

Day of extracting emmer from the granary Abundance-
is-in-Memphis in order t[o make it into breads.]

This day. Grain $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\mathbf{A} \bullet \mathbf{Z}$
 $54 \frac{2}{3}$

4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht day 14 Grain $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\mathbf{A} \blacktriangleleft$
 $54 \frac{2}{3}$

4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ht day 24 Grain $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\mathbf{A} \blacktriangleleft$
 $54 \frac{2}{3}$

1 prt day 4 Grain $2 \frac{1}{2}$ $\mathbf{A} \blacktriangleleft$
 $54 \frac{2}{3}$

⁽¹⁾ If not, the text is insoluble as recognized by all previous scholars.

⁽²⁾ For the term « value », « ratio », see n. 1, p. 313 above.

- 1 *prt* day 14 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3
- 1 *prt* day 24 Grain 3/4 \mathfrak{A} «
16 1/2
- 1 *prt* day 27 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3
- 2 *prt* day 7 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3
- 2 *prt* day 17 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3
- 2 *prt* day 27 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3
- 3 *prt* day 7 Grain 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A} «
54 2/3

Let us stop here for a moment. Note that the intervals are the expected decade with one exception, line 2,7 (*KRI* I, 261, 4), and that 93 days have passed. That the two figures of 54 2/3 and 2 1/2 form a ratio is clear : 54 2/3 over 2 1/2 gives 21 13/15. A three day ratio should then be 3/10 of 54 2/3. $3/10 \times (54 \frac{2}{3}) = 16 \frac{2}{5}$, very close to the 16 1/2 in the text. In fact, I would argue that the 16 1/2 derives from the upward rounding off of 54 2/3 to 55, a point that will bear upon the subsequent analysis. A second way to check is to determine the ratio 16 1/2 to 3/4. It is 22, close to the 21 13/15 for the higher numbers, the difference coming from the rounding off (downwards) of 16 2/5 to 16 1/2. With the former number, 16 2/5 divided by 3/4 = 21 13/15.

Further support for our understanding of the two given numbers as a ratio and not as a list of barley and emmer is presented in the following line, 2,13 :

- 3 *prt* 17 Day of fixing the ratio by the over-
seer of the double granary 2 1/2 \mathfrak{A}
50

In this case the \mathfrak{A} must represent the $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$. Note that another decade has passed. The text continues :

- 3 *prt* day 27 Grain 2 1/2 $\mathfrak{A} \bullet \mathfrak{Z}$
50

4 <i>prt</i> day 7	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
4 <i>prt</i> day 17	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
4 <i>prt</i> day 27	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
1 <i>šmw</i> day 7	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
1 <i>šmw</i> day 17	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
1 <i>šmw</i> day 27	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
2 <i>šmw</i> day 7	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
2 <i>šmw</i> day 17	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
2 <i>šmw</i> day 27	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
3 <i>šmw</i> day 7	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
3 <i>šmw</i> day 17	Grain 2 1/2	𐎢	◀
50			
3 <i>šmw</i> day X	Grain X	𐎢	◀
X			

Total 56 1170 (?)

The last figure underlined in red shows 1170 in Spiegelberg's plate; others argue for 1175⁽¹⁾.

The sums, excluding the broken last line (2,25 = KRI I, 261, 8), come to 55 3/4. Therefore, we restore 1/4 as the first figure. We want 1/4 to X as 1 to 20 (20 being 50/2.5).

⁽¹⁾ See KRI I, 262, 8 and Helck, *Materialien*, 639. Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, 15, has 117 4 2/3 with flour at 11 1/2 (?). On his Plate IV no 5

is present after 1170; however, the papyrus is cut off at this point.

X must be $1/4$ of 20 or 5. The missing day must be one day later than the previous entry of 3 *šmw* 7 as $1/4$ is $1/10$ of $2\ 1/2$. Unfortunately, the grand sum then becomes $1168\ 1/6$ instead of 1170. Where is the error?

Turning to the first account of 2 *ḫt* 7, the interval between that date and the following (2 *ḫt* 14) is only 7 days. Hence, the figures must be changed to $7/10 \times (2\ 1/2)$ and $7/10 \times (54\ 2/3)$. They are : $1\ 3/4$ and $38\ 4/15$. The latter would probably have been written as $38\ 1/2$ since, in line 2,7, $16\ 2/5 (= 16\ 6/15)$ was reduced to $16\ 1/2$. As the latter figure is exactly $3/10$ of 55 and not of $54\ 2/3$, $7/10$ of 55 is exactly $38\ 1/2$ ⁽¹⁾. With this in mind, the grand sum in the first column comes to 55 [i.e., $21 \times (2\ 1/2) + (3/4) + (1\ 3/4)$]. The missing day must be 3 *šmw* 11, 11 being 4 days later than the previous entry. That this is so is determined by the ratio : 1 is to $2\ 1/2$ as X is to 10; $X = 4/10$ or 4 days later. Finally, for the second column we must have $4/10$ of 50 or 20. Restore in line 2,25 :

3 *šmw* day [11] Grain [1 ḫt <
20]

The second column can be checked from the preserved grand sum of 1170. Do the remaining entries add up to the latter figure? $600 (50 \times 12) + 16\ 1/2$ (instead of the more correct $16\ 2/5) + 492 (54\ 2/3 \times 9) + 38\ 1/2 = 1147$. Clearly, $1147 + 20$ does add up to 1170, or any higher figure. We are therefore left with a dilemma : if either entry is chosen for the first delivery on 4 *ḫt* 7, the final amount in column two does not match the preserved traces on the plate. Even if it is granted that the restoration of 117[5] by Kitchen, Helck, etc., is correct, this only makes the situation worse⁽²⁾. Certainly, the proposal to read $31\ 1/2$ cannot be accepted since the addition of column one to 56 precludes such a possibility.

However, at this point the earlier comment on the rounding off of $16\ 2/5$ for the 3 day interval enters. There, it was indicated that the fraction $16\ 1/2$ was derived from $3/10$ of 55 and not of $54\ 2/3$. With this in mind the following sums can be computed to arrive at the desired figure of 1170 :

50 \times 12 (normal)
55 \times 9 (instead of $54\ 2/3$; this implies a rounding up to 55)
 $16\ 1/2 \times$ 1 (for the 3 day interval; derived from 55)
 $38\ 1/2 \times$ 1 (for the 4 day interval; also derived from 55)

⁽¹⁾ The argument assumes that this is the correct rounding off for all of the decade intervals.

⁽²⁾ The final sum becomes too great : see n. 1, p. 346 above.

The total becomes 1170 as on Spiegelberg's plate. If the earlier interpretation be chosen, i.e., taking the first interval as ten days as is written instead of seven, the sum becomes $1171 \frac{1}{2} : (50 \times 12) + (55 \times 10) + (16 \frac{1}{2} \times 1) + (5 \times 1)$. Unfortunately, the plate is cut at this point and it is impossible to verify if the figure was higher as, indeed, Spiegelberg has written in his text; Kitchen and Helck chose 1175 but the text will not allow for the addition of 5 units.

VII. — P. B.N. 209 (KRI I, 262 ff.)⁽¹⁾.

This fragmentary reckoning concerns women and then follows with some of the bakers that were met on previous occasions.

2 prt day 18

Delivery via ...-Mwt	Women 10 6 1/2	making flour 3 1/4	𐎢
Delivery via T ³ -nfrt	Women 8	1	making flour 2	𐎢
Delivery via li-ḥtp-ti	Women 8	3	making flour 2	𐎢
Total 20 + x (= 24) heads.				

The first group may represent the 𐎢 𐎠 𐎡 of emmer as it is equated with flour. The ratio of the first is : emmer to flour as 2 : 1; the second 1 : 2 (a mistake?); and the third 3 : 2. Unfortunately, it is not a consistent 2.5 and I doubt if the equivalence of 1 𐎢 𐎠 𐎡 of flour = 2.5 𐎢 𐎠 𐎡 of emmer applies here.

The following lines deal with the input of the bakers :

.....

[The bake]r	D ³ d ³	3	𐎢
[The baker]	R'-ms	1 3/4	𐎢
[The baker 'nh-]	tw	3	𐎢
[The baker	D ³ d ³	Flour X	𐎢 𐎠 𐎡 (?)
Come	kyllestis]	bread 214	Remainder 1
Each one	12	deben	
[The baker	R'-ms	Flour X	𐎢 𐎠
Come	kyllestis]	bread 280	Remainder 10

⁽¹⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 639 and Spiegelberg, *Rechnungen*, p. 20 and 53 with Pl. IX.

Each one 10 deben Remainder 360 deben

[The baker 'nh·tw Flour X 𐎢 𐎠

Come kyllestis bread 2]44 Remainder 75

Each one 11 deben 1 kite Remainder 213 deben

Total 738.

The final figure is equal to the sum of breads actually delivered. I cannot resolve any of the computations except to note that in the entry for D^3d^3 if we read « kyllestis bread 214 Remainder 2 », with an input of $4 \frac{1}{2}$ 𐎢 𐎠 𐎠 the figures match : $216 \times 12 = 2592$; $2592 = 4/5$ of the input which is 3240. (15 deben at the start becoming 12 deben means a standard cooking loss of $1/5$). As 720 (the expected input for 1 𐎢 𐎠 𐎠) $\times 4 \frac{1}{2}$ is 3240, $3240 - (1/5 \times 3240) = 2592$. This slight alteration in the figures might just be supported by the somewhat poorly written hieratic « 1 » in the remainder column ⁽¹⁾. The other entries are impossible to solve.

VIII. — P. B.N. 209 (KRI I, 268, 10 ff.) ⁽²⁾.

This is the final significant baking account in the *Seti Rechnungen*. It deals with the standard deliveries of three bakers :

2 prt day 21

Account of instructions (*tp n hnw*) to the bakers

The baker D^3d^3 Flour 3 𐎢 [𐎠 (?) 𐎠]

The baker $R'-ms$ Flour $2 \frac{3}{4}$ 𐎢 𐎠

The baker 'nh·tw Flour 3 𐎢 𐎠

2 prt day 22

The baker D^3d^3 Flour 3 𐎢 [𐎠 𐎠 (?)]

The baker $R'-ms$ Flour $2 \frac{3}{4}$ 𐎢

The baker 'nh·tw Flour 3 𐎢

[.....] ⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ This is a very tentative supposition; the text reads : 𐎠.

⁽²⁾ Helck, *Materialien*, p. 639-40 and Spiegel-

berg, *Rechnungen*, p. 22, 66 and Pl. X.

⁽³⁾ This is probably a sub-total.

2 prt day 23

The baker D^3d^3 Flour 3 Π

The baker $R'-ms$ Flour 3 Π

The baker $'nh\cdot tw$ Flour 3 Π

Total $25 \frac{3}{4}$ Making $51 \frac{3}{4}$ Remainder $25 \frac{1}{4}$ Total 77

The grand total for the three men ought to be $26 \frac{1}{2}$ instead of $25 \frac{3}{4}$. In addition, there remains the problem of the $51 \frac{3}{4}$ which minus $25 \frac{3}{4} = 26$. I assume that this is a running total and incorporates the previous grand total.

2 prt day 24

The baker D^3d^3 Flour 3

The baker $R'-ms$ Flour $2 \frac{3}{4}$

The baker $'nh\cdot tw$ Flour 3

Total $[3]4 \frac{1}{2}$ Making ... + 9 Remainder 8.

The first total entry might have been derived from a grid such as :

D^3d^3	3	3	3
$R'-ms$	$2 \frac{3}{4}$	$2 \frac{3}{4}$	$2 \frac{3}{4}$
$'nh\cdot tw$	3	3	3

This grid adds up to $26 \frac{1}{4}$, which is also different from the desired first entry in the total line ($25 \frac{3}{4}$) even though I have altered one of $R'-ms$'s deliveries from 3 to $2 \frac{3}{4}$. Unfortunately, another $\frac{3}{4}$ must be removed from this grid to satisfy the first figure of the summary.

For the second preserved summary it seems better to restore thirty instead of forty in the opening figure. $34 \frac{1}{2}$ is $8 \frac{3}{4}$ more than $25 \frac{3}{4}$, the last input in the previous total line (for day 23 of 2 prt). Anything more regarding this section moves us even further into the realm of speculation.

Column three of the same papyrus presents the final baking account (KRI I, 269, 15-270, 4) :

2 prt day 28

Received from the bakery

Grain 75 $\Pi \bullet \text{𐀓}$

which is via the bakers Flour 14 3/4

Large (?) bread 'kk 1000 g³y-vessels ⁽¹⁾

2 pr[t day 2]8

Received f[rom the] storehouse of the Residence

Large bread 1740 (= 'kk bread?) [.....

making?] deben 570 Each one 11 deben 4 kite

Making 1916 + x deben.

Here the large (?) loaves weighed 11.4 deben apiece. The measure at the beginning is $\text{A} \bullet \text{Z}$; i.e., $1 \text{ A} \bullet \text{Z} = 720$ deben.

Therefore, the total in deben is 10620 ($720 \times 14 \frac{3}{4}$).

IX. — CONCLUSIONS.

The reader, having followed Seti I's baking accounts through to this point, must realize by now the detailed and intricate nature of these reckonings. The Egyptian scribes who stood by their sacks of grain used many complex formulae, the result of which gave them the exact weight (per volume) of their product. Every stage in the baking process, from delivery of emmer wheat to the single baked loaf, was subject to rather precise arithmetical analysis. Such a precise and determined survey cannot but impress the modern viewer — whether he be Egyptologist or not — with the sophisticated nature of ancient Egyptian mathematics and the related problem of actual cooking of these breads. Such arithmetical ability is, of course, witnessed by the extant mathematical papyri. However, for this study the most outstanding conclusion is that relating to measure. By measure I mean the exact determination of volume and weight, both related in this case. Such a precise determination was naturally based on an exact system of measure (deben, sack, etc.) as well as a bureaucracy capable of doing the required work. Solely from these accounts I find no indication of the naive economic and mathematical approach common to those civilizations that one labels «primitive». By this I mean that, given such developed scientific methods of reckoning simple breads (albeit empirically based), it is difficult to establish an analogy between the economy of ancient Egypt and elementary economic societies. As I stated at the beginning of this study, it has become commonplace for recent scholars on Pharaonic economics to borrow ideas

⁽¹⁾ Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ship's Logs*, p. 25; *ALex* I, 402; III, 312; and a more detailed study in Janssen's *Commodity Prices*, p. 426-8.

from economic anthropology. However, most of those societies, the study of which has given rise to theories of economic anthropology, lack the specifics of ancient Egypt : i.e., a precise system of measurement (in our case dry measure a. volume and weight). My own feeling is that when one deals with economics the best method is to turn to that field itself, remembering Plato's comments on doctors and politicians — In this light I cannot pass by a recent comment concerning the lack of inflation in Egypt by a scholar well versed in economics without noting that his supposed example proves the contrary of what he is actually proposing. — It must not be forgotten that economics at least has a system of measure and rational evaluation, although granting that there are problems with a theory of value. Anthropology has yet to agree on specific terms and no science can exist without a proper system of definitions⁽¹⁾. Hence, I prefer to let the above detailed and intricate accounts speak for themselves for in my opinion they lay bare the highly developed nature of Egyptian economics.

One further comment : it is necessary to separate accounting practices from a study of economy no matter how interesting the former may be. Bookworms of themselves do not make literature nor sapless aesthetes art. Whether or not the accountants and scribes of Seti's baking accounts were drudges is not the question. Rather, what one must ask is how such accounts reveal the system of Egyptian measuring and how the latter is connected to a rational system of prediction. Considering the complications of baking with its inputs of grain of various types, differing in volume and weight, and its outputs of cooked items, also with its varying results, I think it clear that the ancient Egyptians performed a quite sophisticated and high level technology for their time. Neither rude farmers nor hunter gathers were they.

⁽¹⁾ M. Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*, New York (1968).