

“CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS.”

No. XI.

ON THE FLINDERS PETRIE PAPYRI. BY REV. J. P. MAHAFFY, D.D., S.F.T.C.D.

(With Autotypes I. to VII.)

[Read FEBRUARY 27, 1899.]

THE following Memoir has for its object, in the first place, to present to the Academy the remaining documents of the Petrie Papyri, which have remained hitherto unpublished; in the second, to record all the corrections and improvements suggested by a great body both of home and foreign critics. Many puzzles in the former Memoir have been solved by the help of new fragments, which have been attached to their proper places by the care of Mr. Smyly. Sometimes a small correction in a figure has enabled him to restore the arithmetic of a whole account; and indeed it is in this direction that the following Memoir adds most to our previous knowledge of official life among the Greek settlers in the Fayyum. Many of these fragments had been passed over by the original editor, as affording less interest than the rest, in a collection too vast for the first publication of its treasures: and, when selection must be made, it seemed to him that these documents, which he understood but imperfectly, and therefore found of lesser interest, were those to omit from the former Memoirs. This defect will be remedied by the present instalment, which contains the labours of Mr. Smyly on this special question, and will, we trust, satisfy the critic who was bold enough to assert that both documents and facsimiles were deliberately suppressed because they conflicted with the first editor's theories, or were likely to support the speculations which he regarded with disfavour. But that editor had very few theories, and all of them were merely

ROYAL IRISH ACADEMY.—CUNNINGHAM MEMOIRS, NO. XI.

[1]

tentative. He was, and is, perfectly ready to abandon them whenever they are proved groundless; and nothing could be more wanton than to charge him with preconceived notions, and a desire to force them upon scholars by means of defective or misconstrued evidence.

It was, however, not owing to his rashness, but to his caution, that he incurred censure from this solitary, but eminent French critic. It was not because he advanced theories of his own, but because he hesitated to accept those of M. Revillout, that he incurred the blind hostility of that scholar. This hostility, however, is so indiscriminately expressed towards several serious and learned men, that the editor might fairly sit down content to be in such good company, were it not that M. Revillout's challenge, and his publication of a good many of the Petrie texts in a new and would-be revised form, make it a duty, in reviewing and correcting the published texts, to adopt or reject the improvements made by M. Revillout, and also to state why, in the original edition, a general suspicion of his demotic decipherings was the ground for receiving them with caution, if not for disregarding them altogether. It was probably this tone in the former Memoirs which so disturbed M. Revillout's mental balance as to make him see nothing but ignorance and malevolence in the work of a first decipherer, who rather disregarded than refuted his many theories, based upon demotic texts.

Such a disregard of a man's life-work is naturally irritating; and M. Revillout's passionate outbursts are to be condoned so far as they express the disappointment that he has failed to convince his colleagues in this field of discovery. But when he proceeds to charge the man who hesitates to follow him with deliberate suppression of evidence, with downright mendacity, with habitual impudence, he puts himself beyond the pale of decent controversy, and should now deem himself honoured if any opponent takes the trouble of justifying his own suspicions, and of showing to the learned world why scholars ignorant of demotic, but understanding Greek, should hesitate to adopt M. Revillout's theories. An uncontrolled first decipherment, even of a Greek text, is not always trustworthy, though all scholars who have essayed the task (except M. Revillout) are ready to make large allowances, and treat with leniency the pioneer who labours out the original edition. This is what M. Revillout expected regarding his own *editio princeps* of a speech of Hypereides, *à propos* of which, com-

REV. J. P. MAHAFFY.—*On the Flinders Petrie Papyri.* 3

plaining of MM. Reinach's and Weil's criticism, he says—"La science est et doit être toujours en mouvement; et ceux qui viennent après ne doivent pas pour cela se croire beaucoup plus que ceux qui les ont précédés, qui ont presque tout fait et qui leur ont ainsi mâché la besogne—besogne légère en vérité."—(*Mélanges*, p. 251). It is only when he himself comes second, that the original decipherers have done nothing, as may be learned from him in his Introduction to the commentary on Pap. 63 of the Louvre: "Nous nous trouvons venir ici après bien de savants célèbres [Letronne, Brunet de Presle, Egger, Lumbroso, etc.]. Et cependant nous croyons qu'après tous ces efforts il restait presque tout à faire pour l'intelligence du document, et beaucoup à faire pour son déchiffrement matériel."—(*Mélanges*, same page). He then invites the reader to compare his translation and notes with those of his predecessors. If he had given us an autotype of the original, we could do so satisfactorily; as it is, we can only criticise his transcript and translation, as they stand; and even so, shall show them to be teeming with extraordinary blunders.

This we are now obliged to do in detail, as upon such study of M. Revillout's Greek was founded the original editor's lawful suspicion that the man who showed great ignorance of elementary Greek, where he could be generally and safely criticised, was no guide in demotic, where he professes to have the field all to himself. There has not yet arisen another scholar who ventured to translate demotic fluently except the late H. Brugsch, and he, as is well known, was at open war with M. Revillout as regards his decipherments. Such being the condition of the question, what honest editor could adopt, *in globo*, M. Revillout's versions, seeing that this scholar publishes, without hesitation or compunction, readings and restorations in Greek, which, when presented to the reader, will make him scream with laughter?

M. Revillout may possibly have become accustomed, in his constant reading of late Greek and Roman papyri, to many inaccuracies and blunders in the texts, which are often written by ignorant scribes. But even such scribes could not possibly be credited with the monstrosities which he sets down as Greek, and he might have learned from the editor of the Petrie Papyri, if not from the reading of the texts themselves, that the Greek of these early Fayyum papyri is very correct, and seldom contains a bad blunder or a false form.

[1²]

When we come to analyse, in detail, M. Revillout's notions of Greek, we find some errors made on general principles, which reappear constantly throughout the *Mélanges*, and of course other particular blunders, which we can enumerate separately.

Foremost in his general errors, we may note his imperfect knowledge of the alphabet. He has no feeling that \omicron and ω , κ and χ , π and β , etc., belong to separate forms or separate words, and are not to be interchanged indiscriminately. Here are some instances: *κομηι* for *κομηι*, *Mélanges*, p. 351; *ταλαιπορων*, p. 256; *ερρωσω*, pp. 270, 303, 343; *ιασωνος*, p. 365; *φιλαμμωνος*, p. 408; $\omega = 70$, p. 373; *συνπλερον*, p. 254; *διομεδης*, p. 364; *Βουπαστηι*, p. 407; *κοιακ*, p. 275; *τετραχοινηχοι*, p. 410; *διακωμα*, p. 310. He has a very hazy notion of declensions, as the forms, *τελωνιους*, p. 287; *ευεργετους*, p. 307; *τραπεζην*, p. 308; *διωρυγαι* (nom. pl.), p. 374; *τον πλωθον ουσην*, p. 394, sufficiently show. We may discount *πωσω* (sc. *πτωσω*, mistranslated *deficit*) and *λημα* (le lème sc. *λημμα*) as possibly oversights. But when oversights appear on every page, they point to psychological causes. He cannot even write Dr. Viereck's name correctly, but always as "Wiereck".

It will already have been anticipated by the reader, that in the parsing of verbs, M. Revillout shows to no better advantage. Here are some specimens: *εξαγωγειν*, p. 280; *πιστευειε*, p. 255; *επιγραφεισθαι*, p. 268; *κατασκευσει*, p. 388, are suggested by him as "leçons nouvelles." They are certainly novel to any Greek scholar; so is *τριακισχιλιας*, p. 211 (to mean 3000); so is *κατεδικασθη*, in the sense of an *acquittal* (p. 363). When he comes to constructions with prepositions, his suggestions, put forward with the most serene confidence, are truly amazing. In a Petrie fragment, wherein *Πυρρου Μακεται* stands quite clear, and is evidently: "I bequeath to X., son of P]yrrhus, the Macedonian"—*Μακεται* being, like *Μακεττια*, an interesting dialectical form for Macedonian and Macedon, what is his suggestion? *ος παρα Πυρρου μαχεται*, "qui combat auprès de Pyrrhus." Similarly (as regards prepositions) we find *συν του προεκθειςθαι*, p. 322; not much better, *τικτομενων υιων υπο μου*, p. 403, "enfants qu'elle a de moi"; *οινου π[αλ]αιου ωστε υπο σκηνην*, p. 335, "vin vieux, semblable à celui qu'on prend sous la tente," of which text we should much like to see an autotype.

But here we touch another very remarkable feature of M. Revillout's

REV. J. P. MAHAFFY.—*On the Flinders Petrie Papyri.* 5

controversial methods. His main grief as regards the Petrie papyri is that the editor has not given, nay, has even suppressed, after promising them in his text, all the autotypes which were of any interest or value to M. Revillout. As a matter of fact, the production of autotypes being costly, and undertaken by the Royal Irish Academy, it was found that all the texts which the editor desired to reproduce were beyond the means at the Academy's disposal. A selection being therefore necessary, the principle adopted was to give the preference (1) to fragments of classical texts, all of which were given to the public in 15 Plates; (2) specimens of palaeographical interest, which, seeing that dated Greek writings of the third century were then unknown, and of interest to all students of Greek, were the most important novelty in the whole discovery. Upon the selection of these, the editor's judgment varied, according as more texts were cleaned and examined, and so he replaced (in Part II.) lesser and worse specimens by better at the last moment. This was the only reason that certain fragments announced as autotyped were withdrawn in his Preface. (3) Economic texts and accounts which, being of interest only to specialists, like M. Revillout, and to no one else, might very well take the third place. But from the whole collection, 51 Plates, giving over 60 distinct texts, were given to the public.

Now let us compare the procedure of the man who complains so bitterly that everything which he desired to see in facsimile was withheld from him. The *Mélanges* which we are now criticising, and which contains a large number of Greek texts, some published in hand-drawn facsimile, and before the use of photography (in 1862) by the French Academy, many others since brought to Paris, and known only to M. Révillout, *does not contain a single facsimile!* If it be imagined that this want was caused by the modest claims of the volume, and the avoiding of expense, such a reasonable assumption is overthrown by the cost of the book, £4, whereas the Cunningham Memoir VIII., with 30 excellent Plates, is to be had for £2 10s. On the other hand, the student has to pay £4 for the *Mélanges*, because M. Revillout has had the whole of his own MS. (522 pp.) lithographed. This was perhaps desirable, so far as he was discussing demotic texts, for which there is no type to be had, and gives him also the opportunity of substituting what he imagines for the real texts. But why not *print* his essay on the Greek texts, and give us some notion, by autotypes,

of the “textes inédits” in the Louvre? When we consider the nature of his transcriptions, his procedure is truly deplorable. Any reader of his *Mélanges* (though there are not many) would willingly have subscribed another £1 for two or three Plates containing these texts. At all events, his attacks against the R.I.A. publication are not only in themselves ridiculous, but afford the most crushing retort against himself:

“*Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam.*”

Having now exposed the quality of M. Revillout's Greek studies, merely as the reason why we hesitated to follow him in his translations and assertions concerning demotic, we shall consider some of his suggested improvements in the reading and understanding of the Petrie Papyri. He has devoted a special chapter in his *Mélanges* to these and other documents which he declares to be *mal publiés*. No doubt they were, in many instances, imperfectly read, as is the case with every *editio princeps* of such work. But when he goes on to charge the editor with wild theories, and with the suppression of documents which disproved them, it will be sufficient to repeat that every theory put forward in the original memoir was stated to be tentative, and that in many cases the editor expressed himself unable to explain the texts. It is probably because M. Revillout seldom, if ever, feels or expresses such doubts upon any Greek text however fragmentary, but supplies the gap in the text or in his knowledge with wild theories, that he is disposed to attribute this procedure to his supposed adversaries, viz. to all those who do not follow him blindly. This peculiar fancy of attributing his own defects to others may be seen in a dozen instances. Thus he censures Wessely (p. 143) for reading as a proper name (instead of *πασις*) *παστις*, gen. *παστιος*, “nom de fantaisie qui ne se trouve pas plus là que nulle part ailleurs.” What then shall we say to his reading *Εσθαλδας* for the sound Greek *Εσθλαδας*? *Πυθειου* as gen. of *Πυθειος*, p. 405; *Παντιγεως*, p. 398; *Δαγγος*, p. 401; *Κοπου*, p. 393. Are not these indeed *noms de fantaisie*, being given as Greek names?

The ordinary uses and meanings of Greek words are indeed strangely violated in his proposed emendations of the Petrie texts. He thinks (p. 266) that *μισθος* = ferme. Again, he suggests (p. 405), *ο ειχεν χαζετω*, ‘qu'elle quitte ce qu'elle detenait,’ as if *χαζομαι* ever appeared in ordinary prose; *παιδοκομον εμου*, ‘mon precepteur’, in the sense of *παιδαγωγος*; and *εμου*

REV. J. P. MAHAFFY.—*On the Flinders Petrie Papyri.* 7

for *εμαντου*, the usual form. Can any emendations possibly be worse? *υπομνημα Νικοκλει και τοις μετοχοις χρηματισταις*, ‘to Nicocles and his fellow assize judges.’ Was *μετοχοι* ever used in such a sense? He is quite right to add in this case (p. 367), as he has no autotype: “Je fais donc toutes mes réserves pour les corrections que j’ai tentées ci-dessus et ci-dessous.” He would have done well if he had also made the same remark wherever the autotypes were under his hand. Thus on the autotype I. XXI. (last line), he reads, *μυστωι το δευτερον* (it is really *Μυσται* to *Μυστα*, *το δευτερον*, but the rest, &c.), and translates ‘l’initiateur pour la 2^e fois’!!!

These citations of single blunders, which are by no means complete, will prepare the reader for some further criticisms (1) on his suggestions regarding sundry of the Petrie Papyri which he regards as *mal publiés*; (2) on the elaborate Papyrus 63 of the Louvre. In performing the former task we shall not fail to adopt some real improvements which he has made or suggested. For his work is really not altogether worthless, as the catalogue of his flagrant errors might readily imply.

Here is M. Revillout’s revised copy of PP. I., xxviii., 2 (*Mélanges*, p. 350):

- (A) βασιλευοντος Πτολεμαιου του Πτολεμαιου
 και Αρσινοης θεων Αδελφων Λια ως δ αι εισ-
 οδοι Λιβ εφ ιερεως Σελευκου του Αντεμιδου [Αλε]
 ξανρου και θεων Αδελφων και θεων Ευεργετων
 κηφορου Αρσινοης Φιλαδελφου της 5
 μηνος Φαμενωθ κε εγ κομηι
 Λυσιδικωι του Αρσινοιτου της εμαντου μεριδος
 εγγυας επ εκτεισιω Διονυσιου της [ων]ης του φορου
 ετων τεταρτων του ταριχου της απο
 το ηL εις το ιβ παρ Ενδοξου κ ιστεου 10
 προς ετων εξειληφοτων
 μαχου και Ασκληη

Deductions: We remark that certain taxes were already farmed out for four years under Euergetes I., e.g. le droit (de douane?) qui portait sur les

poissons salés et sur les salaisons en général; and with an assumption of this theory, the beginning of line 10 is restored. But the whole theory rests on a gross mistranslation in line 9. M. Revillout reads *ετων τεταρτων*, which he mistakes for *τετταρων*, and translates four years!

Here is the properly revised copy of this text (the upper scrap on the plate is from a different document in exactly the same hand):

(B) β[ασ]ι[λ]ευουτος Πτολεμ[αιου]
 και Αρσιωνης θεων Αδελφων Λια ως δ[αι προσ-
 οδοι Λιβ εφ ιερεως Σελευκου του Αντι . . . ου Αλε-
 ξα[ν]δ[ρ]ου και θεων Αδελφων και θεων Ε[υερ]γετων
 κ[ανη]φ[ο]ρου [Α]ρσιωνης Φιλαδελφ[ου Ασ]πασιας τ[ης] 5
 Αθηνιω[νο]ς μηνος Φαμενωθ κε[ε]γ κωμηι
 Αυτοδικηι του Αρσινοιτου της [Θ]εμιστου μεριδος
 εγγυωντος εκτεισιω Διονυσιου του εξειληφο-
 τος τ[ην] τεταρτην του ταριχους της κω-
 [μης ει]ς το ιβL παρ Ευδοξου και [Αρ]ιστεου 10
 και Θεωνος των εξειληφοτων [την] ωνην(?)
 . . .]μαχου και Ασκλη[ηπιαδου των εξ]ειληφ[οτων]

The corrections and additions in (A) are made without any hint to the reader that they are not in the papyrus, but only in M. Revillout's imagination; and thus the student who desires to attack the remaining difficulties of the text is left quite in the dark as to its real condition. The original transcription and autotype, though very defective, did not mislead in this way. There are also mistakes in line 2, *εισοδοι*, which he elsewhere repeats as *εξοδοι*, being of course *προσοδοι*; errors of transcription, viz. *αντεμιδου*, *κηφορου*, *κομηι*, and two important words *λυσιδικωι* and *εμαντου* in line 7. These I had read long ago from the autotype, though too late for the first publication. Again, *ταριχου*, line 9, *ενδοξου*, line 10, not to speak of *απο το ηL εις το ιβ*, lines 9–10, which is not only wholly imaginary, but is also bad grammar. This is indeed an improvement upon a text *mal publié*! I can find no suggestion of the

REV. J. P. MAHAFFY.—*On the Flinders Petrie Papyri.* 9

smallest value in his whole transcription save that *εγγυας εις*, in line 8, is possible, though highly improbable.

We come now to the text in PP. II. [2] not autotyped, which he writes out (p. 272) with supplements at the beginning of each line, calling them his *restitutions*, and giving no hint to the reader that the majority of them are borrowed from the much-maligned first editor. The passage consists of 22 lines, with the beginnings lost. Of these latter the first editor proposed to restore sixteen, leaving the rest blank. Of the sixteen suggestions, M. Revillout has adopted, without acknowledgment, *fourteen*! Two only he has altered, while adding suggestions for the eight commencements left blank in the first edition, and one of them (line 15) consists of *οψ εκ*, with a note that the imagined *οψ* must here have stood for *οψωνιον* (for which there is no room), an abbreviation absolutely unknown in the Petrie papyri.

The whole theory of reconstruction, and the assumption that the missing portion only contained four or five letters, is borrowed from the first editor. But here is a specimen of the improved edition: *οπως του χρονου [. .] προελθοντος αναγραφη ημειν του ε[κλε]λυμ[μ(sic)ενον δεσμ]ον*, afin que le temps marchant, il pût nous écrire que *le lien du contrat de location est brisé*. Was there ever such stuff proposed as Greek in any known publication? In a footnote to the same page, he describes another fragment (II. xxix.) in which he corrects nothing, but brings a new and serious blunder into the name Achoapis. The first editor read it Acholpis, as no one will wonder who knows the long hesitations of decipherers between Cholchytæ and Choachytæ. But Revillout gives us *Acholpitos* which is quite a *nom de fantaisie*, and cannot possibly be tortured out of the papyrus. Here again the first edition is not improved, but seriously deteriorated.

In xxxi., which he copies out with some wild suggestions, he has omitted line 3 altogether, and constructs his sense without it. The translation, or would-be translation, of II. xxii. may be passed by, as M. Revillout calls it *très provisoire*. But he may as well be informed that most of his suggestions will not fit the vestiges of the text before us. He has, however, so totally disregarded this *sine qua non* of true deciphering in many cases where the originals or autotypes were before him, that he seems incapable even of understanding the objection.

We proceed to II. iv. 7, of which we have a “revised” text and translation on p. 280. Most of the Ed. Princeps readings are silently adopted. But in line 2, instead of οἶδα[ς] καὶ σὺ—there is ample room for the final *ς* in a fracture of the papyrus—M. Revillout reads οἶδα καὶ σὺ, and translates: *Je sais, .et tu sais aussi*, which is indeed wonderful Greek. Then line 4–5, ὑπολαβὼν σὺν σοφίᾳ διανοοῖαι (ὑπολαβὼν may possibly be right), *soupçonnant que c'est à ta connaissance*. Then he gives ἐξαγωγῆν for the correct ἐξαγαγὼν, and translates οὐ [possibly σὺ] γὰρ μὴ βλάβης οὐθεν, *en qui il n'y a rien de fautif*, and omits altogether the final word εὐτυχί (ἐκδηγῆς may be in line 7, but not ἐγδεγῆς). Was ever an original edition more thoroughly ruined in the revision? It is a *Verschlimmbesserung*, if ever there was one. And what translations! What would become of M. Revillout were he a schoolboy under the control of an old-fashioned head-master in England?

On p. 291, he gives us *une lettre inédite* from the Louvre—to use his own words—of course, without autotype; but, even on his own showing, he was unable to either read or interpret it correctly. Here is the conclusion as he gives it:—

ορθῶς ποιήσετε καὶ
κεχαρισμένως ἐτοιμοὺς γενεσθαι
ὡς ἀμὰ ἡμῖν συνεξορμησῆτε
εἰάν τε μὴ ἐχῆτε πλοῖον σὺνεν
βῆσῆτε ἀμὰ ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν ῥωσίν
καὶ ἑαυτῶν δ' ἐπιμελομένοι γλοῦτ/
ἀγνοῆτε
ερῶσο Λιτ̄ χῶιαχ̄ κῆ

Here is his translation:—“Vous ferez bien d'être joyeusement dispos en sorte de vous élaner avec nous.” (The Greek of course means: “you will do well and oblige us by being ready to start along with us”). “Or si même vous n'avez pas de navire vous entrerez avec nous dans le courant (on the meaning of this word he expresses a doubt) et, prenant soin de vous-même, vous ne vous occupez pas de ce *croupion*.” Here he not only expresses no doubt of his reading, but founds a whole theory of the unpopularity of Ptolemy IX., at this moment, on the ridiculous γλοῦτ/.