
UCLA ENCYCLOPEDIA *of* EGYPTOLOGY

LAW COURTS

المحاكم

Sandra Lippert

EDITORS

WILLEKE WENDRICH

Editor-in-Chief

University of California, Los Angeles

JACCO DIELEMAN

Editor

University of California, Los Angeles

ELIZABETH FROOD

Editor

Area Editor Individual and Society
University of Oxford

JOHN BAINES

Senior Editorial Consultant

University of Oxford

Short Citation:

Lippert, 2012, Law Courts. *UEE*.

Full Citation:

Lippert, Sandra, 2012, Law Courts. In Elizabeth Frood, Willeke Wendrich (eds.), *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, Los Angeles. <http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002djg21>

8016 Version 1, December 2012

<http://digital2.library.ucla.edu/viewItem.do?ark=21198/zz002djg21>

Gerichte
Cours de justice

Egyptian law courts originated as councils of officials, which, besides acting as judges, also had other administrative tasks. Accordingly, they were known by the rather unspecific terms $d3d3t$ (Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom) or knbt (Middle Kingdom until the beginning of the Late Period), which simply means “committee.” Their members are usually referred to as srw , “officials,” although more specific designations also occur. From the 26th Dynasty onwards, the members of the courts seem to have been mainly, if not exclusively, priests with a specific juridical education, called $wptjw$, “judges.” From the New Kingdom onwards, a division into smaller local courts and great courts located in the capital(s) can be observed. Local courts dealt with minor cases of disputed property and petty crimes, which were punished with beatings, while the great courts attended to trials about land ownership, cases concerning officials, and crimes entailing heavier punishments like mutilation or the death penalty. This double system probably remained in action until the Ptolemaic Period when the local courts were integrated into a new system and the great courts were finally abolished and their role was taken over by Greek officials. Native Egyptian judicature fast declined under the Roman rule. Legal procedure changed little over time. Several laws about court procedure survive, which show that the conduct of cases was established in detail and that the judges had little scope for arbitrariness.

نشأت المحاكم بمصر القديمة علي هيئة مجالس من الموظفين ، الذين كان لهم وظائف إدارية إلى جانب كونهم قضاة، ولذا كانوا معروفين تحت مسميات غير محددة وهي $d3d3t$ (خلال الدولة القديمة والدولة الوسطى) أو knbt (من الدولة الوسطى وحتى بدايات العصر المتأخر) والذي ببساطة يعني لجنة وأعضاء اللجنة كان عادة يشار إليهم بمسمى srw موظفين على الرغم من وجود مصطلحات أدق لتعريفهم. وبداية من الأسرة السادسة والعشرون فصاعدا ، أصبح غالبية أعضاء هذه المحاكم أو حتى جميع الأعضاء من الكهنة اللذين درسوا دراسة قضائية متخصصة، وكان يطلق عليهم $wptjw$ أي ضاة . وبداية من عصر الدولة الحديثة فصاعدا ، يمكن ملاحظة تقسيم المحاكم إلى محاكم محلية صغيرة ومحاكم عظمى متواجدة بالعواصم. واختصت المحاكم المحلية بالقضايا الصغيرة مثل نزاعات الملكية والجرائم الصغيرة، والتي كانت عقوبتها الضرب، في حين اختصت المحاكم الكبيرة بقضايا ملكية الأراضي والقضايا المرتبطة بالموظفين العموميين، والجرائم التي تستتبع عقوبات أشد مثل التشويه الجسدي أو الإعدام، وفي أغلب الظن أن هذا النظام المزوج ظل مطبق حتى العصر البطلمي حين دمجت المحاكم المحلية إلى نظام قضائي جديد وتم إلغاء المحاكم الكبيرة والتي حل محلها الموظفين اليونانيين. تدهور النظام القضائي المحلي في ظل الحكم الروماني. لم تتغير الإجراءات القانونية إلا قليلاً عبر الزمن ، العديد من القوانين الخاصة بالمحكمة ظلت باقية مما يؤكد أن المحاكم كانت تطبق قانون إجرائي مقنن بالتفاصيل يحد من سلطات القاضي و يضيق من سلطته التقديرية و تحديد العقوبات.



ancient Egyptian law courts are attested in textual sources from the Old Kingdom onwards. The earliest references to courts are in non-royal titles. The range of sources expands from the 6th Dynasty to include documents recording legal disputes and judgments, as well as sources which are not specifically legal but use judicial settings or terminology, such as tales, biographies, and letters. Courts originated as councils of officials, who adjudicated legal disputes, determined punishments, and held administrative, often notarial, functions, including witnessing legal documents and decisions and administering oaths. The composition of the courts, procedures and processes of judgment, terminology, as well as oracular proceedings will be discussed in the following in chronological order. A bibliography for the key primary sources treated in this entry is given at the end.

Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period

1. Composition of courts.

Although a number of Old Kingdom titles seem to indicate a juridical office, very little is known about the precise functions of their bearers: *s3b* is often translated as judge and can be found on its own and in combination with other titles (Helck 1954: 73 - 74, 82 - 83; Jones 2000, Vol. II: 909, no. 3533). *Wdꜥ-mdw*, literally “divider of words,” is also found as a designation for officials in a judicial capacity (Strudwick 1985: 195). The judicial titles combined with *hrj sšt3* seem to refer to positions of special confidence within the court system: *hrj sšt3 n wdꜥ mdw* (and similar), “privy council of decision,” *hrj sšt3 n sdmt wꜥ*, “privy council of solitary examination,” *hrj sšt3 n hwt wrt*, “privy council of the court” (Jones 2000, Vol. II: 613 - 616, nos. 2252 - 2259, 635, no. 2326, 643, no. 2357; cf. also Helck 1954: 74; and Strudwick 1985: 195).

Old Kingdom courts were composed of several members, sometimes perhaps ten, as the titles *wr md hwt wrt*, “greatest of the 10 of the court house,” and *wr md Šmꜥw*, “greatest of the 10 of Upper Egypt,” suggest (Jones 2000, Vol. I: 388 - 389; cf. also Strudwick 1985: 197). Common designations were the rather unspecific terms *srw*, “officials,” or

d3d3t, “council.” In the tombs of nomarchs of the 9th/10th Dynasty, the term *knbt* first appears for local councils (e.g., the tomb of Ankhtifi in el-Moalla, see Vandier 1950: 5.IIδ,1; and the tomb of Itibi in Siut, see Brunner 1937: l. 13). The tasks of these committees seem to have extended over notarial as well as juridical duties.

Like other sectors of the administration, jurisdiction was headed by the vizier who, in this function, bore the title *jmj-r3 hwt wrt 6*, “supervisor of the 6 great houses” (Jones 2000, Vol. I: 165, no. 630; Strudwick 1985: 178, 188). Philip-Stéphan (2004: 148; cf. also Philip-Stéphan 2008: 35 - 36) translates “great court of the six,” which is grammatically quite unlikely: if a direct genitive were intended, the adjective *wrt* should not stand between *regens* (*hwt*) and *rectum* (*T*)—although a few exceptions to this rule have been collected by Edel (1955/1964: 136, §321)—and the persistent ellipsis of the genitival adjective *nt* before *T* would be highly unusual at that period. The “six great houses” are traditionally interpreted as law courts because people who violated royal decrees were sent there to be condemned (Boston MFA 03.1896); the accused could also be jailed and beaten there (Inscription of Akhet-hotep). It remains unclear where they were situated; at least one of them probably was within the royal residence. Information about provincial courts is rather scarce, but it can be assumed that the local *d3d3t* councils, which appear in a notarial capacity (e.g., Inscription of Serefka[?]), also had juridical functions (cf. also Philip-Stéphan 2008: 47 - 49, who, however, assumes that the provincial and local *d3d3t* councils only advised the nomarch and respectively the mayor).

As locations where courts convened, the *rwt hwt wrt*, “the doorway of the great house” (cf. van den Boorn 1985: esp. 8), and the *wshꜥ (Hrw)*, “broad hall (of Horus),” are also mentioned (cf. the title *srw nw rwt hwt wrt*, Strudwick 1985: 178).

2. Procedure and process of judgment.

A single fragmentary document of the 6th Dynasty informs us about court procedure (Papyrus Berlin P 9010). The beginning is lost, therefore it remains unknown what court was involved and how the lawsuit concerning inheritance was initiated. Both

parties seem to have been present in court, with the plaintiff making the first move by producing a document on which he based his claims, i.e., that the deceased had made him the trustee for his heirs. The defendant countered with the allegation that the document was a forgery and that therefore he (presumably as eldest son) should remain the sole heir. The judges decided that the plaintiff had to produce three witnesses who would confirm the authenticity of the document on oath—the oath was drafted by the court and included an invocation of divine wrath (*b3w*) against the perjurer. If he could not do so, he would lose the case. The decision of the court therefore could consist of a conditional judgment, which made the final outcome dependent on the result of a proof of authenticity (later parallels to this procedure make the interpretation by Goedicke [1974: 92 - 95] that the defendant and not the judges proposed this authentication of the document highly unlikely). There is no reference to the consultation of written law, nor to a discussion among the judges. The sketchy style and fragmentary state of the sole source do not permit us to draw any more general conclusions.

The *Autobiography of Weni*, although often cited in this context, is not relevant since the procedure mentioned there is not a normal trial but a special examination probably in connection with a conspiracy involving a royal wife; moreover, no details about this case are divulged.

Although not a documentary text, the *Story of the Eloquent Peasant*, which takes place during the 10th Dynasty, might also be used in order to elucidate court procedures—possibly before the vizier—in the First Intermediate Period (Shupak 1992: 1 - 18).

3. Terminology.

Juridical terminology can also be gathered from sources that are not specifically legal, e.g., the *Autobiography of Pepiankh-bery-ib* or the letter Papyrus Berlin P 8869 (for further references to the lemmata, cf. Hannig 2003):

Šnj originally means “to quarrel” but is also used for “to dispute, to litigate” (Mrsich 1968: 57, § 64), especially in the idioms *šnj ht r*, “to litigate with,” and *šnj m-b3h srw*, “to litigate in front of the

(court) officials.” *Spr*, “reach,” has the additional sense of “to complain, to file a suit,” with the derivations *sprt*, “complaint, petition,” and *sprty*, “complainant, plaintiff.” *Jrj* ⸙, “to draw up a document,” might also be used for “to draw up a complaint” (Goedicke 1970: 45). The action of the judges was referred to as *wḏꜥ* or *wḏꜥ-mdw*, the last, as a noun, can also designate “judge” and “judgment.” *Wpj*, “to judge, to arbitrate,” has a similar meaning; the root of both *wḏꜥ* and *wpj* lies in “separating, dividing” the parties.

ʿj r, “to have a title on something,” is derived from ⸙, “legal document” (Boston MFA 03.1896; *Decree Coptos R*). The winner of a case was called *m3ꜥ* or *m3ꜥ-hrw*, “justified” (cf. also Anthes 1954: 21 - 51), the one who was acquitted *b3k*, “innocent, cleared (of accusations).”

Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period

1. Composition of courts.

As in the Old Kingdom, committees of officials designated as *d3d3t* or *knbt* acted as courts while, at the same time, being responsible for administrative and notarial duties. The expression *m3b3yt*, “the Thirty” seems to refer to a panel of thirty judges but is attested only in titles (Quirke 1990: 53 - 54). The term *hnrt* or *hnrt wrt* has variously been interpreted as “court house” and “penal compound”; perhaps it was a mixture of both. Court sessions at the gate (*ꜥrryt*) probably of a public building recall Old Kingdom practice (van den Boorn 1985: 6 - 10, 12 - 13; Quaegebeur 1993: 201; cf. also *Eloquent Peasant* B₁ 185 - 186).

Again there are a number of most likely juridical titles, the exact meaning of which remains unclear, like those formed with the element *tm3*, “mat(?)/cadastre(?)”: *hrj tm3*, *sh n tm3*, *d3d3t nt tm3* (Jasnow 2003b: 264; cf. also Ward 1982: 167, no. 1450). For the examining judges, *sdmy*, literally “hearer,” is attested since the 13th Dynasty, sometimes in combination with other terms (*sdmy rmt*, “judge of the people,” *sdmy šnꜥ*, “judge of the labor camp(?).”). The heralds (*wḥmww*), local administrators, were also involved in juridical action; they seem to have collaborated closely with

the bureau of the vizier, sending in their cases for directives (Stèle Juridique, leather scroll Berlin P 10470). Philip-Stéphan (2008: 66 - 68) additionally claims a juridical function for the title *jmj-r3 šnt* based on her etymology as “directeur de querelles,” but has to admit to a total lack of evidence for this.

2. Procedure and process of judgment.

Information about procedure is still scarce for the Middle Kingdom. The fragmentary Papyrus UC 32055 contains the evidence of the plaintiff in which he describes an earlier transaction of his deceased father, either a sale or a loan against security. The father seems to have fallen ill or even died without ever receiving the price/loan, so the son now charges the other party in his stead. Beginning and end are lost, therefore it is impossible to decide whether the text is a writ (thus proving that written claims were used) or part of a protocol of proceedings.

Unfortunately, the only two completely preserved sources for a court procedure could possibly be exceptional, since both ended not with a judgment but with a settlement between the parties; it is also possible that in both cases the procedure was notarial rather than juridical. The Stèle Juridique tells the whole involved history of a proceeding that resulted in drawing up an *jmjt-pr* document about the position and income of the mayor of Elkab from one brother to another as compensation for a loan or deposit that could not be paid back. The documents presented in court are copied as well as those that resulted from the proceeding.

The leather scroll Berlin P 10470 also concerns a transfer, namely of a slave woman from her former owners to the city of Elephantine. Even if these two documents concern notarial procedure disguised as law suits, the fact that both parties (or their representatives) had to be present, that the “plaintiff” started by stating his claims to which the “defendant” responded, and that the judges then viewed the relevant documents and questioned both parties resemble Old Kingdom procedure and can therefore be considered as basic elements of trials.

3. Terminology.

A number of juridical terms are preserved in the Stèle Juridique and the leather scroll Berlin P 10470, some even in both. *Spr* is still the common word for “to file a complaint.” *Rdj m hr*, “to put before someone,” is used for the action of presenting the plaintiff’s evidence to the defendant, who may acknowledge (*shnn*) the facts. *Wšd* means “to interrogate” by the judges. The parties’ consent is expressed by *hrw*, “to be content,” the taking of an oath by *ʿrk*, “to swear.”

New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period

1. Composition of courts.

After the Middle Kingdom, the term *m^cb3yt*, although still attested in religious (BD 115 and 125) and literary texts (Admonitions of Ipuwer, 6.11; Teachings of Amenemope, 20.18; Contendings of Horus and Seth, 3.9; Dispute between Head and Body, 1), occurs only rarely in documentary texts (Ostrakon Toronto A11, possibly a scribal exercise); it may be considered archaic and therefore somewhat highbrow by that period. In the New Kingdom, two levels of jurisdiction can be clearly distinguished. The great courts (*knbt ʿ3t* or *knbt wrt*), presided over by the vizier(s), were situated in the capitals Memphis and Thebes and, at least during some periods, at Heliopolis (cf. *Decree of Horemheb*, Inscription of Mes, Papyrus Turin 2021 + Papyrus Genf D 409). Their members were high court officials usually selected by the vizier and occasionally by the king; the king sometimes was even present himself and gave judgment (Papyrus Genf D 191). The great courts were concerned with litigation about land (cf. Inscription of Mes and *Instruction for the Vizier* R 18 - 19), law suits involving officials (van den Boorn 1988: 315 - 317), and trials for crimes which demanded heavy corporeal punishments, i.e., mutilation or death penalty (Ostrakon BM 65930, Ostrakon IFAO 1277). Even direct pleas to the king during public ceremonies seem to have been possible (Ostrakon Ashm. Mus. 1945.37 + 1945.33 + Ostrakon Michaelides 90).

On a regional level, small *knbwt* composed of at least three local dignitaries—according to the *Decree of Horemheb* D Z.6 - 7, from among the prophets

(*ḥmw-ntr*), priests (*wꜥbw*), and mayors (*ḥꜥtjw-ꜥ*)—adjudged cases of theft, property damage, overdue loans and payments, personal injury, and rape/sexual intercourse with married women. We are best informed about local jurisdiction at Deir el-Medina, but unfortunately, due to the exceptional character of this village, it is impossible to use this evidence generally. In trials for perjury, lèse-majesté, murder or similar, the local courts only decided on whether the crime actually had been committed by the accused but then had to transfer the case to the vizier (i.e., the great *knbt*). Perhaps a system like the one assumed for the Middle Kingdom according to which local courts had to refer their cases to the bureau of the vizier in order to receive information about the applicable laws was still in use at the beginning of the New Kingdom (*Instruction for the Vizier*, R 25 - 26). On the other hand, the great courts could delegate on-site investigations and the enforcement of their decisions to the local court. Very small villages might have been served by mobile courts (Bedell 1979: 8).

Neither the great nor the local courts were permanent institutions; they assembled for court sessions only. A selection of judges for each session of each local court by the vizier seems improbable; therefore a procedure like the drawing of lots among the potential candidates is likely. At least the court of Deir el-Medina had a bailiff (*šmsw n knbt*), who executed orders by the judges (Ostrakon IFAO 1277), as well as a scribe, who recorded the proceedings and might have been responsible for putting down the judgment in the proper legal phrasing. Since Deir el-Medina was under direct supervision of the vizier, the scribe could possibly also have acted as a representative of the bureau of the vizier (Allam 1991: 112). As in the Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom, courts of the New Kingdom also fulfilled notarial duties like authenticating documents (cf. Papyrus Ashmol. Mus. 1945.97) and continued to convene (at least occasionally) in the gateways of official buildings, cf. Papyrus Berlin P 3047 Z. 3 - 4 (Quaegebeur 1993: 201 - 220; cf. also van den Boorn 1985: 1 - 25). In the Third Intermediate Period, court might also have been held at the *ḥꜥ n shw*, “bureau of documents,” perhaps a record office where legal

documents were filed (Papyrus Louvre E 3228d, stela Cairo JE 66285).

Besides the great and local courts, special committees for the investigation of major crimes like tomb robbery (Papyrus Amherst 6 col. 3.7 - 9) or conspiracy against the king (Papyrus Turin 1875, Papyrus Lee, Papyrus Rollin, cf. Vernus 1993: 141 - 157) could be set up.

In the course of the expansion of personal piety in the 19th and 20th Dynasties, oracles of various gods were addressed in order to judge legal affairs (usually of the same categories as those brought before local courts), for the procedure, see below *New Kingdom and 2nd Intermediate Period*, under “3. Oracular procedures.”

Some changes seem to have occurred during the Third Intermediate Period, although due to the small number of sources it is difficult to assess them. Allam (1991: 119) assumes that the courts were restructured from all-purpose administrative bodies to strictly juridical committees with quasi-professional judges.

During the 25th Dynasty, the role of the vizier as president of the great court(s) seems, at least in part, to be taken over by another official with the archaizing title *ḥrj sh n tmꜥ*, “chief scribe of the mat/cadastre(?)” (cf. the *ḥrj tmꜥ* and *sh tmꜥ* of the Middle Kingdom). Other ancient juridical titles were also revived, e.g., *smsw ḥꜥyt*, “elder of the portal” (Meeks 1979: 648, n. 195), and *wr md šmꜥw*, “greatest of the 10 of Upper Egypt” (Vernus 1973 - 1977: 216 - 218, 222).

2. Procedure, terminology, and process of judgment.

Some regulations for legal procedures before the vizier are preserved in the *Instructions for the Vizier*: both parties had to be heard (R 2 - 3). Decisions about fields in the vicinity of Thebes had to be made within three days, about those in other regions within two months (R 18 - 19). If a law existed for a certain case, the vizier had to judge accordingly and not use his own discretion (R 19 - 20).

Law courts became active on application of a plaintiff. There was no institutionalized public

prosecution, although officials were under oath to report illegal actions they witnessed (Baer 1964: 179 - 180; McDowell 1990: 202 - 208). Although some scholars assume that plaintiffs had to address an official in order to try for an extrajudicial settlement before going to court (e.g., Seidl 1951: 35), there is no evidence for this. The great courts probably had to be approached through a petition to the vizier or the king himself.

A large number of ostraca from Deir el-Medina contain notes, sketches, or drafts for transcripts of court proceedings, but few of them are complete. Often only the date, names of the parties and the judges, and the judgment are mentioned, while the statements of plaintiff and defendant are missing. However, since the status of Deir el-Medina was not comparable to that of other villages of this size, caution should be used in assuming this evidence as typical (for specialized studies on the legal system of Deir el-Medina, see Allam 1973a and McDowell 1990; additional information on proceedings can be derived from papyri: Papyrus Cairo CG 65739, Papyrus Munich 809, Papyrus Berlin P 3047, Papyrus Berlin P 9785, Papyrus Ermitage 5597, Ostrakon Cairo CG 25556, and the Inscription of Mes).

At least in some cases, plaintiffs handed in a written claim (cf. Papyrus Turin 188, Papyrus BM 10055), but viva voce complaints may have been possible as well before the local courts (cf. Papyrus DeM 27). New Kingdom juridical terminology stresses the oral element, cf. *mdw hr/m*, “to litigate” lit. “to speak about something” (Ostrakon Florence 2620), and *šm r mdwt hnꜥ*, “to go to court with someone” lit. “to go in order to talk with someone” (*Instruction for the Vizier* R 27). From the 25th Dynasty onwards, “to litigate with (someone)” is expressed as *jrj knbt jrm* (Papyrus Louvre E 3228c) or *dd knbt jrm*, lit. “to make/talk court with,” which remains the standard phrasing in Demotic texts. Plaintiff and defendant had to be present before the court. The plaintiff commenced with his presentation of the case (*smj*, “to complain, to plead”: cf. Ostrakon DeM 672, Papyrus Berlin P 3047 l. 7), sometimes he presented documents (*mtrww*, “witness documents”) to substantiate his claim (Ward 1981: 366). Then the defendant gave his statement. If necessary, the judges posed

questions to the parties (*šnj*, “to interrogate,” *smtr*, “to investigate,” *šsp rꜥ*, “to take evidence”), viewed the documents, interrogated witnesses, sent agents off to investigate (Ostrakon BM 65930), or even went to visit the location themselves (Papyrus Berlin P 10496, Papyrus BM 10221 col. 7.11). Statements of both parties and witnesses had to be sworn to, only rarely witnesses were sworn in before they gave evidence (Papyrus Cairo CG 65739; Inscription of Mes, N 21 and 27; Papyrus BM 10052 *passim*). During the tomb robbery trials, witnesses and defendants were also beaten (*smtr m knkn/m bꜥn*, “to investigate by beating/with a stick”; cf. Bedell 1979: 82 - 142; Booche 1989: 22 - 23; Müller-Wollermann 2004: 209 - 216, 267; and Peet 1930: 20 - 21). The judges then decided (*wꜥj*, “to judge, to decide”) and judgment was given in the standard formula *mꜥty X ꜥꜥs Y*, “X is right, Y is wrong.” The setting free of acquitted defendants (called *wꜥb*, “pure”) in criminal proceedings was phrased as *rdjt tꜥw*, lit. “to give breath” (Papyrus BM 10052 col. 16.17; Donker van Heel and Haring 2003: 162 - 178; McDowell 1990: 13 - 39).

The protocols also might contain how the judgment was to be effected: punishment by beating was sometimes administered without delay (Papyrus Munich 809 col. 2.4). Sometimes the one who lost the case had to take an oath on the king or a god (*ꜥnh n nb*, “oath of the lord”) drafted by the court to comply with their judgment by paying his debts, not repeating his illegal actions, or never acting against the judgment. These oaths usually included the punishment applicable in case of noncompliance. The prephrasing of oaths is shown by the later procedural parallels, see below *Late Period*, 2. Procedure and process of judgment (cf. also Booche 1986: col. 70, n. 5). It is highly unlikely that the judgments should not have been effective without these oaths, as Seidl (1951: 38) assumes; they merely put more pressure on the culprit by making him realize the possible effects of his recalcitrance in public. The sometimes drastic punishments—which, although threatened by the local court, could not be executed except by vizierial or royal decision (see above)—did not always deter the condemned from repeating their crimes (cf. Papyrus DeM 27).

3. Oracular proceedings.

Oracle proceedings used the same system as other oracles: the answer of the god was derived from the movements his cult statue made during a festive procession. A forward motion, called *hnn*, “nodding,” was considered as affirmative answer, a backward motion, called *nʿj n ḥz=f*, “receding,” as negative (Černý 1931: 491 - 496). Oracular proceedings are best attested from Deir el-Medina (McDowell 1990: 107 - 141; Römer 1994: 287 - 301).

The procedure for oracular trials resembled normal procedure inasmuch as the plaintiff gave his statement, sometimes probably in writing, including the presentation of documents. Oracles were approached for mainly the same types of suits as local courts. But the presence of the defendant seems not to have been necessary, especially since oracular procedures were quite common in cases of theft when the culprit was unknown. Three basic methods to address the god can be distinguished: 1. oral yes/no questions like “Is A’s claim correct?” or “Is B the culprit?” which the god answered with “yes” or “no” movements; 2. orally presented lists of possibilities (e.g., of possible thieves or prices for disputed goods) during the reading of which the god gave his assent at a certain point; 3. double written statements (positive and negative versions of a statement or the statements of plaintiff and defendant) between which the god chose, possibly by moving towards one of them. Like normal court sessions, oracle sessions were recorded. In the transcripts, the participants and onlookers were put down as witnesses for the judgment. The movement was usually translated directly into the standard judgment formula (see above), e.g., “X is right, Y is wrong.” The condemned was able to appeal at another god’s oracle (cf. Papyrus BM 10335). It remains unclear whether oracular trials took place on days when there were religious processions anyway or whether special processions had to be arranged for them: the fact that in Deir el-Medina most oracle trials are dated to the 10th, 20th, and 30th day of the month when the workers had their day off cuts both ways.

During the 21st and 22nd Dynasties, when Amun became nominally head of the Upper Egyptian state, oracles also took over the notarial functions

of courts, i.e., the authentication of documents (stela Cairo JE 31882, stela Cairo JE 36159).

Late Period (Dynasties 26 - 31)

1. Composition of courts.

It seems likely that the two levels of jurisdiction—centralized great courts at the capitals versus small local courts in towns and perhaps even villages—either survived into the 26th Dynasty or were resurrected. The revival of judicial titles reminiscent of the Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom, e.g., *jmj-r3-sh-hnty-wr*, “chief scribe of the great prison” (cf. *sh hnt wrt*: Ward 1982: 163, no. 1412) and *jmj-r3-sh(w)-ḏ3ḏ3t-wrt*, “chief (of) scribe(s) of the great court” (cf. *sh n ḏ3ḏ3t ʿ3t*: Ward 1982: 167, no. 1454), extended into the 26th and in some cases even the 30th Dynasty (Guernier 2009: 178 - 179). The Saite kings as judges are mentioned in Papyrus Rylands 9 col. 11.19 and col. 15.8—in the last instance, Psammetichus II would have held court if he had not become ill. A court presided by the vizier occurs in col. 15.9.

The term *knbt*, “court,” is used only in cursive hieratic documents while Demotic ones employ *n3 wptjw*, “the judges.” Not much is known about the background of the judges, but it may be assumed that, as in the New Kingdom, they consisted mainly of local officials, and, as in the Ptolemaic Period, especially of priests.

During the Persian Period, the *satrap* (provincial governor) residing in Memphis gave judgment as well as local administrators (Persian *frataraka*, Aramaic *prrk*) and, for the soldiers, the chief of their garrison. Councils of judges are also mentioned in Aramaic documents from the 27th Dynasty, but their composition remains unknown (Bresciani 1958: 155 - 156; Yaron 1961: 27): perhaps the *dyny mlk*’, “judges of the king,” were the successors of the great courts while the *dyny mdnt*’, “judges of the province,” those of the local courts. Papyrus Rylands 9 recounts court sessions by several local officials (col. 19.21 - 20.19) as well as the *snty* (col. 3.4; for the last, cf. Vittmann 1998: 296 - 298).

2. Procedure and process of judgment.

There are hardly any sources for court proceedings during the Late Period. The proceedings in Papyrus Rylands 9 (see above) are described in a very general way. No transcripts of trials before small local courts survive from that era. However, some information about the rules of procedure can be gained from the law collection compiled under Darius I (cf. Papyrus Bibl.nat. 215 vso col. c.6 - 16), which gives detailed instructions for the handling of different cases by the judges, e.g., in which order the parties have to give evidence, who has to prove his claims and how, who is to be questioned and about what, which party has to take an oath, etc. (Codex Hermupolis, Zivilprozeßordnung).

3. Oracular proceedings.

The evidence for oracular proceedings in the Late Period is sparse and indirect. A lavishly illustrated transcript of an oracular proceeding of the 26th Dynasty with an exceptionally large number of witness copies (Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3) concerns the transfer of a priest from one priesthood to another and is therefore more administrative than judicial in nature. Herodotos II, 174 reports that king Amasis of the 26th Dynasty had repeatedly been acquitted from quite legitimate accusations of theft in his youth by the oracles of some gods but condemned by others, with the effect that, as king, he esteemed only the latter and did not take the first seriously any more. There is no evidence for real oracular proceedings after the 26th Dynasty—what Seidl (1966: 59 - 65, esp. 62) supposes to be writs in an oracular trial are letters to gods containing prayers for protection against injustice (e.g., Papyrus OIC 19422, Papyrus Cairo CG 31045, and Papyrus Cairo CG 50072). Although oracle questions with legal content, usually concerning cases of fraud or theft with unknown perpetrator, are still to be found in the Roman Period and, in Christianized form, continue into the seventh century CE, these are no longer part of a proper trial.

Ptolemaic Period

1. Composition of courts.

The Ptolemaic king was the highest judicial authority but limited his personal performance to legal matters of state importance (Seidl 1962: 73 - 74; Taubenschlag 1955: 479 - 480; Wolff 1962: 5 - 6). Although petitions to initiate a law suit were formally addressed to the king, they actually were attended to by the *dioiketes* (minister of finance) or the *strategos* (governor) of the nome (Seidl 1962: 74, 79; Wolff 1962: 10).

At the beginning of the Ptolemaic Period, the Greek *poleis* in Egypt seem to have had their own juridical systems; in the case of Alexandria, it was based on the Athenian legal constitution, including *dikastêria* (courts), *kritêria* (arbitration boards), and *diatêtai* (arbiters) (cf. Papyrus Hal. 1 l. 26, and Seidl 1962: 69). The Greek population in the rural areas turned to *dikastêria* of frequently ten judges (*dikastai*) in the larger settlements.

For the native Egyptians, the local courts of judges (*nꜣ wptjw*) continued to exist and were known by the Greek as *laokritai*, “judges of the (native) people.” They consisted of three judges, usually priests of the local main god, who had obtained a legal education in the temple and based their judgments on the Egyptian law code collected under Darius I and sanctioned by Ptolemy II as *nomoi tês chôras*, “law of the land” (Lippert 2004: 175, and also 2012). Since only very few transcripts of court proceedings before the *laokritai* survive, our main source for the scope of their jurisdiction are the temple oaths (see below). They concern cases of divorce, inheritance, sale, loan, securities, guaranties, lease, work contracts, fraud, theft, but rarely also damage to property and assault (Kaplony-Heckel 1963), thus showing that the competence of the *laokritai* was limited to civil cases and minor criminal ones by the Ptolemaic Period.

For litigation between Egyptians and Greeks, a “common court” (*koinodikion*), probably composed of Egyptian and Greek judges, existed in the third century, later such cases were adjudged by the *epistatês*, a nome official (Papyrus Tor.Choach. 11, Papyrus Tor.Choach. 11bis, Papyrus Tor.Choach. 12).

Ptolemy II is most likely to be credited with integrating the two parallel systems into a state-approved (and, to a certain degree, state-controlled) comprehensive judicial system (Wolff 1962: 56 - 58). To initiate a law suit, the plaintiff had to write a petition (*enteuxxis*)—nominally to the king, but in fact to the *strategos* of the nome who, after a short investigation, decided which court was to be approached. A Greek official, the *eisagogeus*, was assigned to the Greek as well as the Egyptian local courts; he introduced the cases, was responsible for the summoning of the defendant, supervised the suitability of documents as evidence (only if they contained a tax receipt and were properly recorded), issued the court orders, and had them executed (Seidl 1962: 77). At least for the *dikastèria*, he also selected the judges (probably by drawing lots) from a list of candidates, possibly local honoraries (Wolff 1962: 31 - 32, 39 - 44).

Ptolemy II also introduced a new court system, the *chrèmatistai*, who were initially sent out into the countryside on special orders to judge particular cases and later constituted permanent courts situated in the larger towns of the nomes. The *chrèmatistai* consisted of three judges, selected by the *archidikastês* (the highest judicial official) probably from the Alexandrian upper class, appointed by the king and supervised by the *dioiketes* (Seidl 1962: 75 - 76; Wolff 1962: 75). An *eisagogeus*, a scribe (*grammateus*), and a bailiff (*hyperètês*) accompanied them. The judges had a comparatively short term of office, probably only two years (Wolff 1962: 68). In the second century BCE, the *chrèmatistai* completely took over the role of the *dikastèria* as courts for the Greek population and later even diminished the importance of the *laokritai* because even Egyptians chose to bring their cases before them instead of their native courts (cf. Papyrus Tor.Choach. 8). The advantage consisted in the fact that the *chrèmatistai* could be applied to either through *enteuxxis* or directly (Hellebrand 1934: 115 - 116, 122; Wolff 1962: 73.), and that there was no appeal against their judgments (Ostrakon Bodl. I 277). The disadvantage for Egyptians was that Egyptian documents had to be translated into Greek before they could be used as evidence and that the Greek judges had no profound knowledge of the Egyptian law.

Until 118 BCE, the case was presented to a Greek or an Egyptian court according to the nationality of the parties. Afterwards, the language of the document on which the case was based decided whether Greek or Egyptian law was to be applied and therefore whether it fell under the jurisdiction of *chrèmatistai* or *laokritai* (Papyrus Tebt. I 5 l. 207 - 220).

In addition to these boards of judges, high district officials like the nomarch, the *strategos*, and the *epistatês* (cf. Papyrus Strasbourg WG 18) had a certain judicial power by themselves. From about the middle of the third century BCE, the nomarch was obliged to call in the *strategos* at least for cases concerning lease and sale (Papyrus Petr. III 26 l. 1 - 3; cf. also Seidl 1962: 72, 78). Suits concerning taxes were administered by financial officials instead of normal courts. For soldiers, their commander or, if they were outside of their garrison, the chief of the Alexandrian police (*ho epi tês poleôs*) acted as judge. Cult associations required their members to apply for the association's decisions and to refrain from suing each other before public courts (Papyrus Lille 29 l. 23, Papyrus Cairo CG 30606 l. 18).

The Greek courts and officials acting as judges had no comprehensive law code but based their judgments primarily on royal prescriptions (*diagrammata*), if these did not exist for the case, on the laws of the particular town (*politikoi nomoi*) or, if these did not apply either, on their personal sense of justice (cf. the *diagramma* cited in Papyrus Gurob 2). Despite this obviously very complicated situation, neither the judges of the *dikastèria*, the *chrèmatistai*, nor the officials with judicial authority were obliged to receive proper legal training.

2. Procedure and process of judgment.

Procedure varied according to the judicial organ. Before the Egyptian judges, the procedure began with the plaintiff handing in a written plea (*hrw*), which was also delivered to the defendant who wrote his response to it. To this, the plaintiff commented again in writing, and finally the defendant gave his view to the second statement as well. A full set of four writs is preserved in Papyrus BM 10591 rto. After the writs were completed and had been handed to the court, the judges summoned both parties and questioned them. No

evidence that was not in the original writs was accepted, and no documents that were issued after the trial had started could be used as evidence (Papyrus Berlin P 23757 rto F 1.2 - 5). If documents were presented in court, their authenticity had to be proved by hearing the signatories or their children as witnesses (Papyrus Berlin P 23757 rto A col. 2.7 - 15) and, after the introduction of the registration in a notary archive, also through the records (Papyrus Tor.Choach. 12 col. 4.11 - 15). No lawyers seem to have been present: the parties presented their cases themselves, although sometimes obviously after having taken legal council; women could ask a man to speak for them (Papyrus BM 10591 rto col. 6.11 - 12). A prohibition of lawyers before the Egyptian court as stated by Diodorus I, 76 is therefore possible, but not verifiable. The judges were well trained in the Egyptian legal code and cited the applicable laws in their judgments (cf. Papyrus Cologne 7676). As can be seen in the so-called Siut trial (Papyrus BM 10591 rto), they did not let themselves be hoodwinked by parties who tried to conceal a law to their disadvantage by putting forward another, more favorable one that in reality did not fit the facts. The judgment was quite often given conditionally, dependent on whether one of the parties did or did not take the oath that the judges had imposed on him, as evidenced by temple oath texts including the possible judgment in both cases (Kaplony-Heckel 1963: passim).

Before the Greek courts and officials, lawyers (*sunēgoroi* or *sunkatastai*) were quite common (cf. Papyrus Tor.Choach. 12). They were controlled by the state and a tax (*sunēgorikon*) had to be paid for them. Only in cases of fiscal interest, lawyers were forbidden by a decree of 259 BCE (cf. Papyrus Amh. II 33, l. 28 - 37). Contrary to the Egyptian procedure in which the main evidence of the parties was given in writing, the Greek procedure was dominated by the oral pleas of the parties, respectively their lawyers. As in the Egyptian court, legal documents were the most important evidence, followed by entries in official land registers and oaths of the parties and witnesses.

Roman Period

1. Composition of courts.

Although the term *laokritai* is not attested after the end of the second century BCE, Egyptian courts might still have existed during the first century of Roman rule. This is indicated by the existence of transcripts of Demotic temple oaths from that period—such oaths are never attested in connection with suits before the *chrēmatistai*—and although courts of cultic and other associations used temple oaths as well, the number and scope of the surviving examples make it unlikely that all of them should derive from procedures before these courts. The *chrēmatistai* last appear in the second century CE (BGU IV 1038, BGU XV 2472), but their duties seem to have changed by then (Calabi 1952: 419 - 420).

The main judicial authority in Roman Egypt was the *praefectus Aegypti* as deputy of the emperor. He held court on his annual convents (*dialogismoí*) in selected towns of the country. Since the prefect was usually not a jurist, he had legal advisors probably from Rome. However, the prefect usually only took on criminal cases and others of higher importance, e.g., concerning fiscal matters or liturgies, while minor cases without state interest were delegated to subaltern officials. The *iridicus Alexandriae* (*dikaiodotēs*) was responsible for inheritance and bankruptcy as well as voluntary jurisdiction (Kupiszewski 1953 - 1954: 187 - 204). Cases concerning state finances or temples and priests were managed by the official responsible for the *idios logos* (special exchequer) and later by the *dioiketes*. Other officials like the *epistrategos* and the nome *strategos* could also be charged with judicial functions and thus became *indices pedanei*, i.e., delegate judges, rendered in Greek papyri as *dikastai* or *kritai* (Rupprecht 1994: 144; Seidl 1973: 100 - 105, 110).

2. Procedure and process of judgment.

To initiate a law suit, the plaintiff had to write a petition to the prefect including his statement (Rupprecht 1994: 144 - 147; Seidl 1973: 93 - 128). If the prefect decided to hear the case himself, it was put on the agenda of the next convent, if not, it was delegated to another official. The defendant was

informed about the plaintiff's claim; if the plaintiff did this himself, he needed witnesses, but the notification could also be given by the judicial organ. Both parties then received a summons and had to give a sworn declaration about their appearance at the hearing. If the defendant did not appear for the third appointment at the convent, judgment in absence was given in favor of the plaintiff. If both parties were present, the law suit started with the plaintiff stating his claim and then the defendant replying. Parties often relied on lawyers to present their cases. They or their lawyers were also responsible for collecting and presenting the applicable laws, including Greek and Egyptian ones, the latter in Greek translation, decrees of Ptolemaic kings or Roman prefects, the opinion of legal experts (*nomikoi*), and precedents excerpted from the court journals of the prefects (*upomnêmatismoî*), cf. Papyrus Oxy. II 237 col. 8.2 - 7 (Anagnostou-Canas 2004: 47; Seidl 1962: 85).

Depending on the case, the taking of evidence followed, including the reading of legal documents, which could also be copied into the transcripts; Demotic documents had to be translated into Greek (Schentuleit 2001: 127). In an edict of 138 CE, the prefect ordered that the authenticity of documents presented as evidence had to be contested immediately in order to be considered (Papyrus Oxy. II 237 col. 8.13). Declarations of witnesses probably had to be in the shape of an affidavit deposited beforehand since there are no references to oral testimonies. Evidence could include expert opinions, especially for medical conditions (Papyrus Oslo III 95). The parties were not normally put under oath by Roman officials, and a conditional judgment dependent on an oath is attested only once—perhaps influenced by Egyptian practice (Papyrus Oxy. I 37 col. 2.4). Personal investigation by the Roman judges is rarely attested. The prefect could also cut short the proceedings before the parties appeared in court as in Papyrus Oxy. II 237 when he dismissed the complaint after having the defendant's evidence checked by the local *strategos*. Another shortcut, which made judgment unnecessary, was the confession of the defendant.

The transcript of the proceedings contained the date, the name of the judge, the important steps of the process, and the judgment and was entered into

the journal of the official. If a case was not decided by the prefect on the convent, the judgment was announced later on public display both in Alexandria and the home town of the plaintiff.

Roman officials acting as judges were not bound by either Greek or Egyptian law and, because Roman law at that period was not very comprehensive, quite often judged by their own discretion. Although Egyptian laws were sometimes cited by the lawyers of the parties (see above), Egyptian legislation seems to have been followed only if this was profitable for the state, but completely ignored if not. The most striking example for this is the so-called trial of Nestnephis, in which the official of the *idios logos* convicted the Egyptian defendant of appropriation of ownerless land although he possessed a valid Demotic sales document and the vendor declared under oath that he had inherited the land from his father. The completely innocent defendant, who had been slandered by a colleague, was fined 500 drachmas (Schentuleit 2007: 103 - 107; Swarney 1970: 41 - 49).

Theoretically it was possible to appeal against a judgment of the prefect, although this would have involved sending to the emperor himself at Rome. Appeal was impossible if the party already had acknowledged the judgment by his reactions.

The Account of Diodorus Siculus

Diodorus Siculus, who visited Egypt around 50 BCE, also described the Egyptian judicial system (I, 75.3 - 4), but his account most likely derived from the (almost completely lost) *Aegyptiaca* of Hecataeus of Abdera, a contemporary of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I. He depicts a single central court with thirty judges (ten each from Memphis, Heliopolis, and Thebes), presided by a high judge who wore a piece of jewelry (*agalma*) called Truth (*Alêtheia*) made from a blue gemstone (*sappheirou lithon*) around his neck and had the laws of Egypt on eight scrolls before him.

It is impossible to reconcile this picture with the early Ptolemaic, let alone late Ptolemaic judicial system; we have no evidence for a central court of native Egyptian judges at that time, and Diodorus' account lacks the local courts for which there is evidence. But the individual elements recall earlier

conditions: the thirty judges resemble the *mꜥbꜣyt* of the Middle Kingdom (see above *Middle Kingdom and 2nd Intermediate Period*: 1. Composition of courts), the three cities of origin of the judges correspond with the three sites of the great *knbt* courts of the New Kingdom, which might have survived into or been revived in the Late Period. The pendant of Truth (i.e., the goddess Maat) is well attested on statues from Dynasty 26 onwards, and even original pendants of lapis lazuli have been discovered; Maat is called “who is on the neck of the (chief) judge (*sꜣb* or *tꜣtytꜣ sꜣb*)” in temple inscriptions of the Ptolemaic Period (Grdseloff 1940: 187 - 207; Möller 1920: 67 - 68). The Maat pendant (*tꜣs dikaisunꜣs*

parasēmon, “emblem of Justice”) is still mentioned as ensign of the chief judge in BGU V 1210 (l. 194), the so-called *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, a Roman collection of instructions for the administration of Egypt, which incorporated among other things a number of earlier Egyptian priestly regulations—although not from any Roman interest in the proper execution of Egyptian cult but for the sake of collecting the fines in case of nonobservance. All in all, it seems that either Hecataeus or Diodorus assembled chronologically disparate and incomplete bits and pieces to make up an ostensibly consistent account of the Egyptian legal system.

Bibliographic Notes

For the Old Kingdom courts, cf. Martin-Pardey (1994: 157 - 167), for law courts of the Old Kingdom and Middle Kingdom, cf. Philip-Stéphan (2008), but caution is advised in following her conclusions, often based on quite tenuous evidence or fanciful etymologies, cf. the reviews by Vittmann (2010) and Lippert (fc.). The *knbt* courts of the Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, and New Kingdom are treated by Allam (1995: 11 - 69). An overview is given by Jasnow (2003a: 105 - 112, 2003b: 264 - 269, 2003c: 302 - 315, 2003d: 791 - 795), Manning (2003: 828 - 832), as well as Lippert (2008: 28 - 31, 44 - 46, 77 - 84, 179 - 189).

Sources

Admonitions of Ipuwer (Papyrus Leiden I 344 rto)

19th Dyn. Gardiner (1909), Enmarch (2005, 2008), Burkhard and Thissen (2008: 123 - 136)

Autobiography of Pepiankh-hery-ib

6th Dyn. Sethe (*Urk. I*: 221 - 224)

Autobiography of Weni

6th Dyn. el-Khadragy (2002: 61 - 72), Hofmann (2002: 225 - 237), Sethe (*Urk. I*: 98 - 110), Simpson (2003: 402 - 407), Tresson (1919)

BGU IV 1038

c. 144 CE Königliche Museen zu Berlin (1912: 42 - 43, no. 1038), Mitteis (1912: 266 - 269, no. 240)

BGU XV 2472 (BGU I 239 rto + Papyrus Berlin 21883a+b)

160 CE Königliche Museen zu Berlin (1895: 236, no. 239 rto), Nelson (1983: 32 - 38, no. 2472)

Boston MFA 03.1896 (Decree of Neferirkara)

5th Dyn. Goedicke (1967: 22 - 36), Leprohon (1985: 49 - 53), Sethe (*Urk. I*: 170 - 172)

Codex Hermupolis (Papyrus Cairo JdE 89127 - 89130 + 89137 - 89143 rto)

third c. BCE Donker van Heel (1990), Mattha (1975), Stadler (2004: 185 - 207)

- Contendings of Horus and Seth (Papyrus Chester-Beatty I)
20th Dyn. Burkhard and Thissen (2009: 35 - 47), Gardiner (1931: 8 - 26, pls. 1 - 16,8)
- Decree Coptos R
9th Dyn. Goedicke (1967: 214 - 225), Sethe (*Urk. I.* 304 - 306)
- Decree of Horemheb
18th Dyn. Helck (1955: 109 - 136), Kruchten (1981)
- Dispute between Head and Body (writing board Turin N. 58004)
20th Dyn. Burkhard and Thissen (2009: 137 - 140), Lopez (1984: 50 - 51, pls. 184, 184a)
- Eloquent Peasant
12th Dyn.? Lichtheim (1973: 169 - 184), Parkinson (1991), Simpson (2003: 25 - 44)
- BGU V 1210 (Gnomon of the Idios Logos)
150 - 200 CE BGU V (Seckel and Schubart 1919 - 1934), Riccobono (1950)
- Inscription of Akhet-hotep
OK Hassan and Iskander (1975: 38 - 41, fig. 17, pl. 28 c)
- Inscription of Mes
19th Dyn. Allam (1989: 103 - 112), Gaballa (1977: 22 - 27, pls. 50 - 63), Gardiner (1905: 89 - 140), Kitchen (1980: 424 - 434, §192:1.)
- Inscription of Serefka(?) (Cairo JE 42787)
OK Menu (1998b: 271 - 287), Sethe (*Urk. I.* 157 - 158)
- Instruction for the Vizier
18th Dyn. Sethe (*Urk. I.* V, 1103 - 1117), Van den Boorn (1988)
- Leather scroll Berlin P 10470
Second IP Smither (1948: 31 - 34, pls. 7 - 8), Vittmann (1996: 35 - 40, no. A2)
- Ostrakon Ashm. Mus. 1945.37 + 1945.33 + Ostrakon Michaelides 90
19th/20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 20 - 24, no. 3), Kitchen (1979: 380 - 383, § 134 C.I.)
- Ostrakon BM 65930 (Ostrakon Nash 1)
19th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 214 - 217, no. 217), Černý and Gardiner (1957: pl. 46.2), Kitchen (1982: 315 - 317, § 55 A.12)
- Ostrakon Bodl. I 277
c.100 BCE Tait (1930: 46, no. 277)
- Ostrakon Cairo CG 25556
19th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 61 - 63, no. 30), Černý (1935: 44*, pl. 28), Kitchen (1982: 302, § 53 A.4), McDowell (1988: 17 - 22)
- Ostrakon DeM 672
20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 146, no. 141), Černý (1970: pl. 19), Kitchen (1983a: 449, § 215 A.12)
- Ostrakon Florence 2620
20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 147, no. 143, pls. 34 - 35), Kitchen (1983a: 467, §217 A.40)
- Ostrakon IFAO 1277
19th/20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 196, no. 197, pl. 57)
- Ostrakon Toronto A11
19th Dyn. Gardiner (1913: 16b, f-g), Kitchen (1980: 40 - 41, 2000: 29 - 30)
- Papyrus Amherst 6
20th Dyn. Peet (1930: 45 - 51, pl. 5)

Papyrus Amh. II 33

c. 157 BCE Edgar and Hunt (1934: 244 - 249, no. 273), Grenfell and Hunt (1901: 38 - 41, no. 33), Hengstl (1978: 81 - 83, no. 27)

Papyrus Ashmol. Mus. 1945.97

20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 268 - 274, no. 262), Černý (1945: 29 - 36, pls. 8 - 9 [doc. I]), Kitchen (1983b: 236 - 240, § 20 A.1)

Papyrus Berlin P 3047

19th Dyn. Helck (1963: 65 - 73), Kitchen (1979: 803 - 806, § 285), Théodoridès (1980: 11 - 46)

Papyrus Berlin P 8869

6th Dyn. Manassa (2006: 151 - 163), Smither (1942: 16 - 19)

Papyrus Berlin P 9010

6th Dyn. Goedicke (1974: 90 - 95), Sethe (1926: 67 - 79)

Papyrus Berlin P 9785

18th Dyn. Gardiner (1906: 38 - 45), Théodoridès (1968: 39 - 104)

Papyrus Berlin P 10496

20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 277, no. 265; pls. 80 - 83), Černý (1945: 29), Kitchen (1983a: 476 - 478, § 218 A.61)

Papyrus Berlin P 23757 rto

third c. BCE Lippert (2004), Quack (2005: 171 - 174)

Papyrus Bibl.nat. 215 vso

third c. BCE Spiegelberg (1914: 23 - 34)

Papyrus BM EA 10052

20th Dyn. Kitchen (1983b: 767 - 803, § 25), Peet (1930: 142 - 169, pls. 25 - 35)

Papyrus BM EA 10055 (Papyrus Salt 124)

19th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 281 - 287, no. 266), Černý (1929: 243 - 258, pls. 42 - 46), Kitchen (1982: 408 - 414, § 54 A.26), Théodoridès (1981: 11 - 79)

Papyrus BM EA 10221 (P. Abbott)

20th Dyn. Kitchen (1983b: 468 - 481, § 18), Möller (1935: 16 - 24), Peet (1930: 37 - 45, pls. 1 - 4)

Papyrus BM EA 10335

19th/20th Dyn. Blackman (1925: 249 - 255), Dawson (1925: 247 - 248), Kitchen (1989: 416 - 418, § 143)

Papyrus BM EA 10591 rto

171/170 BCE Seidl (1968: 96 - 117), Thompson (1934: 1 - 33, pls. 1 - 10)

Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3

26th Dyn. De Meulenaere (1997: 243 - 249), Parker (1962)

Papyrus Cairo CG 30606

157 BCE de Cenival (1972: 45 - 58, pl. 4)

Papyrus Cairo CG 31045

26th/27th Dyn. Migahid (1986: 45 - 53, no. 3, pl. 1), Spiegelberg (1906: 237, pl. 80)

Papyrus Cairo CG 50072

fifth/fourth c. BCE Seidl (1966: 63 - 65 [with errors!]), Spiegelberg (1932: 60, pl. 32)

Papyrus Cairo CG 65739

19th Dyn. Gardiner (1935: 140 - 146), Mrsich (1995: 291 - 310)

Papyrus Cologne 7676

115/114 BCE Thissen (1994: 283 - 287)

- Papyrus DeM 27
19th/20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 301 - 302, no. 272, pls. 98 - 99)
- Papyrus Ermitage 5597
19th/20th Dyn. Allam (1992: 33 - 41)
- Papyrus Genf D 191
19th/20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 303 - 307, no. 273, pls. 100 - 101)
- Papyrus Gurob 2
227/226 BCE Edgar and Hunt (1934: 190 - 195, no. 256), Smyly (1921: 11 - 18, no. 2)
- Papyrus Hal. 1
third c. BCE Graeca Halensis (1913)
- Papyrus Lee
20th Dyn. Baer (1964: pp. 179 - 180), Kitchen (1983a: 361 - 363), Vernus (1993: 141 - 157, esp. 151 - 152)
- Papyrus Lille 29
223 BCE de Cenival (1972: 3 - 38, pls. 1 - 2)
- Papyrus Louvre E 3228c
25th Dyn. Kaplony-Heckel (1982 - 1985: 227 - 230), Malinine (1951: 157 - 178, pls. 4 - 6), Menu (1985: 78 - 79)
- Papyrus Louvre E 3228d
25th Dyn. Malinine (1953: 43 - 49, no. 7, 1983: 17 - 20, no. 7, pl. 6)
- Papyrus Munich 809 (Papyrus Mook)
18th Dyn. Spiegelberg (1928: 105 - 115)
- Papyrus OIC 19422
27th Dyn. Hughes (1958: 1 - 12, pl. 1), Migahid (1986: 38 - 44, pl. 2)
- Papyrus Oslo III 95
96 CE Eitrem and Amundsen (1936: 96 - 98, no. 95), Hengstl (1978: 103 - 104, no. 37)
- Papyrus Oxy. I 37
49 CE Arangio-Ruiz (1969: 521 - 523, no. 170), Edgar and Hunt (1934: 194 - 197, no. 257), Grenfell and Hunt (1898: 79 - 81, no. 37), Masciadri and Montevicchi (1984: 115 - 118, no. 19)
- Papyrus Oxy. II 237
a. 186 CE Anagnostou-Canas (2004: 49 - 51), Grenfell and Hunt (1899: 141 - 180, no. 237)
- Papyrus Petr. III 26
246 - 242 BCE Jager and Reinsma (1965: 114 - 115), Mahaffy and Smyly (1905: 56, no. 26)
- Papyrus Rollin
20th Dyn. Goedicke (1963: 72 - 78), Kitchen (1983a: 360 - 361), Posener (1976: 147), Vernus (1993: 141 - 157, esp. 151)
- Papyrus Rylands 9
27th Dyn. Vittmann (1998)
- Papyrus Strasbourg WG 18
133 BCE Gradenwitz, Preisigke, and Spiegelberg (1912: 49 - 57, pl. 4)
- Papyrus Tebt. I 5
118 BCE Edgar and Hunt (1934: 58 - 75, no. 210), Grenfell, et al. (1902: 17 - 58, no. 5, pl. 3), Jördens (2005: 377 - 382), Pestman (1985: 265 - 269)
- Papyrus Tor.Choach. 8
126 BCE Pestman (1992: 89 - 99, no. 8, pl. 22)

- Papyrus Tor.Choach. 11
119 BCE Pestman (1992: 130 - 139, no. 11, pls. 29 - 30)
- Papyrus Tor.Choach. 11bis
119 BCE Pestman (1992: 141 - 154, no. 11bis, pls. 31 - 33)
- Papyrus Tor.Choach. 12
117 BCE Mitteis (1912: 28 - 39, no. 31), Pestman (1992: 155 - 197, no. 12, pl. 34)
- Papyrus Turin 1875 (Papyrus Turin judiciaire)
20th Dyn. de Buck (1937: 152 - 164), Kitchen (1983a: 350 - 360, no. 148), Koenig (2001: 293 - 302), Vernus (1993: 142 - 149)
- Papyrus Turin 1887
20th Dyn. Gardiner (1948: 73 - 82), Peet (1924: 120 - 127), Pleyte and Rossi (1869 - 1876: pls. 51 - 60), Vittmann (1996: 45 - 56, A5)
- Papyrus Turin 2021 + Papyrus Geneva D 409
20th Dyn. Allam (1973b: 320 - 327, no. 280, pls. 112 - 119), Černý and Peet (1927: 30 - 39, pls. 13 - 15 [only pTurin 2021]), Kitchen (1983b: 738 - 742, § 20)
- Papyrus UC 32055 (Papyrus Kahun II.1)
12th Dyn. Collier and Quirke (2004: 102 - 103), Ganley (2003: 37 - 40, 43, fig. 3), Griffith (1898: 36 - 38, pl. 13), Logan (2000: 59 - 60), Ray (1973: 222 - 223)
- Stèle juridique (Cairo JE 52453)
17th Dyn. Ganley (2004: 57 - 67), Lacau (1949), Seidl (1952: 47 - 56), Théodoridès (1957: 33 - 52)
- Stela Cairo JE 31882
22nd Dyn. Erman (1897: 19 - 24), Jansen-Winkel (1992: 254 - 259), Legrain (1897: 12 - 16), Menu (1998a: 183 - 207)
- Stela Cairo JE 36159
22nd Dyn. Kuhlmann (1992: 367 - 372, pl. 22)
- Stela Cairo JE 66285
Blackman (1941: 83 - 95), Jansen-Winkel (2007: 159 - 162, no. 7)
- Teachings of Amenemope (Papyrus BM 10474)
20th Dyn. Budge (1923: pls. 1 - 14), Burkhard and Thissen (2009: 108 - 123), Laisney (2007)
- Tomb of Ankhtifi
9th/10th Dyn. Breyer (2005: 187 - 196), Schenkel (1965: 45 - 57), Vandier (1950: 1 - 264)
- Tomb of Itibi
9th/10th Dyn. Brunner (1937: 42 - 51), Schenkel (1965: 74 - 82)

References

Allam, Schafik

- 1973a *Das Verfahrensrecht in der altägyptischen Arbeitersiedlung von Deir el-Medineh*. Untersuchungen zum Rechtsleben im Alten Ägypten 1. Tübingen: Self-published.
- 1973b *Hieratische Ostraka und Papyri aus der Ramessidenzeit*. Urkunden zum Rechtsleben im Alten Ägypten 1. Tübingen: Self-published.
- 1989 Some remarks on the trial of Mose. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 75, pp. 103 - 112.
- 1991 Egyptian law courts in Pharaonic and Hellenistic times. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 77, pp. 109 - 127.
- 1992 Hieratischer Papyrus Ermitage 5597 (ein Gerichtsprotokoll). In *Gegengabe. Festschrift für Emma Brunner-Traut*, ed. Ingrid Gamer-Wallert, and Wolfgang Helck, pp. 33 - 41. Tübingen: Attempto-Verlag.

- 1995 Quenebete et administration autonome en Égypte pharaonique. *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3. series, Vol. 42, pp. 11 - 69.
- Anagnostou-Canas, Barbara
2004 La valeur des précédents judiciaires dans l'Égypte romaine: État de la question. *Droit et Cultures* 47, pp. 47 - 66.
- Anthes, Rudolf
1954 The original meaning of *mꜣꜥ hrw*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 13, pp. 21 - 51.
- Arangio-Ruiz, Vincenzo
1969 *Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani, pars tertia: Negotia (FIRA III)*. 2nd edition. Florence: Barbèra. (Reprint with appendix. First edition 1943.)
- Baer, Klaus
1964 The oath *sdfꜣ-tryt* in Papyrus Lee, I, 1. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 50, pp. 179 - 180.
- Bedell, Ellen
1979 *Criminal law in the Egyptian Ramesside Period*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Microfilms Internat.
- Blackman, Aylward
1925 Oracles in ancient Egypt I. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 11, pp. 249 - 255.
1941 The stela of Shoshenq, great chief of the Meshwesh. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 27, pp. 83 - 95.
- Boochs, Wolfgang
1986 Strafen. In *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, Vol. 6 (columns 68 - 82), ed. Wolfgang Helck, and Wolfhart Westendorf. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1989 Das altägyptische Strafverfahren bei Straftaten von besonderem staatlichem Interesse. *Göttinger Miszellen* 109, pp. 21 - 26.
- Boorn, Guido van den
1985 *Wdfꜣ-ryt* and justice at the gate. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 44, pp. 1 - 25.
1988 *The duties of the vizier: Civil administration in the early New Kingdom*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Bresciani, Edda
1958 La satrapia d'Egitto. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 7, pp. 132 - 188.
- Breyer, Francis
2005 Die Inschriften des Anchtifi aus Moalla. In *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte*, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments Neue Folge 2, ed. Bernd Janowski, and Gernot Wilhelm, pp. 187 - 196. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.
- Brunner, Helmut
1937 *Die Texte aus den Gräbern der Herakleopolitenzeit von Siut*. Ägyptologische Forschungen 5. Glückstadt, Hamburg, and New York: Augustin.
- Buck, Adriaan de
1937 The Judicial Papyrus of Turin. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 23, pp. 152 - 164.
- Budge, Ernest A. Wallis
1923 *Facsimiles of Egyptian hieratic papyri in the British Museum* 2. London: Longmans.
- Burkhard, Günter, and Heinz-Josef Thissen
2008 *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte: Altes und Mittleres Reich*. Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 1. 3rd edition. Münster: LIT.
2009 *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte II: Neues Reich*. Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 6. Münster: LIT.
- Calabi, Anna
1952 *L'ἀρχιδικαστής* nei primi tre secoli della dominazione romana. *Aegyptus* 32, pp. 406 - 424.

- Cenival, Françoise de
1972 *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques*. Bibliothèque d'étude 46. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Černý, Jaroslav
1929 Papyrus Salt 124 (Brit. Mus. 10055). *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 15, pp. 243 - 258, pls. 42 - 46.
1931 Une expression désignant la réponse négative d'un oracle. *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie* 30, pp. 491 - 496.
1935 *Ostraca hiératiques*. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
1945 The will of Naunakhte and the related documents. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 31, pp. 29 - 53, pls. VIIIa - XII.
1970 *Catalogue des ostraca hiératiques non littéraires de Deir el-Medina VI*. Documents de fouilles 14. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Černý, Jaroslav, and Alan Gardiner
1957 *Hieratic ostraca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Černý, Jaroslav, and Eric Peet
1927 A marriage settlement of the Twentieth Dynasty: An unpublished document from Turin. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 13, pp. 30 - 39.
- Collier, Mark, and Stephen Quirke
2004 *The UCL Labun Papyri: Religious, literary, legal, mathematical and medical*. British Archaeological Reports International Series 1209. Oxford: Archaeo-Press.
- Dawson, Warren
1925 An oracle papyrus: B.M. 10335. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 11, pp. 247 - 248.
- Donker van Heel, Koenraad
1990 *The legal manual of Hermopolis [P. Mattha]: Text and Translation*. Uitgaven vanwege de Stichting "Het Leids Papyrologisch Instituut" 11. Leiden: Papyrologisch Instituut.
- Donker van Heel, Koenraad, and Ben Haring
2003 *Writing in a workmen's village: Scribal practice in Ramesside Deir El-Medina*. Egyptologische Uitgaven 16. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Edel, Elmar
1955- *Altägyptische Grammatik*. Analecta Orientalia 34/39 (1955 and 1964). Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum.
- Edgar, Campbell, and Arthur Hunt
1934 *Select papyri with an English translation II: Non-literary papyri public documents (SelPap II)*. London and New York: The Loeb Classical Library.
- Eitrem, Samson, and Leiv Amundsen
1936 *Papyri Osloenses III (P.Oslo III)*. Oslo: On commission by Jacob Dybwad.
- El-Khadragy, Mahmoud
2002 Some palaeographic features of Weni's biography. *Göttinger Miszellen* 188, pp. 61 - 72.
- Enmarch, Roland
2005 *The dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*. Oxford: Alden Press.
2008 *A world upturned: Commentary on and analysis of the dialogue of Ipuwer and the Lord of All*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erman, Adolf
1897 Zu den Legrain'schen Inschriften. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 35, pp. 19 - 29.
- Gaballa, Gaballa Ali
1977 *The Memphite tomb-chapel of Mose*. Warminster: Aris Phillips.

Ganley, Andrew

- 2003 The legal deeds of transfer from 'Kahun,' part two. *Discussions in Egyptology* 56, pp. 37 - 44.
- 2004 A fresh look at the Karnak Legal Stela. *Discussions in Egyptology* 58, pp. 57 - 67.

Gardiner, Alan

- 1905 *The Inscription of Mes: A contribution to the study of Egyptian judicial procedure*. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Ägyptens 4/3, pp. 89 - 140.
- 1906 Four papyri of the 18th Dynasty from Kahun. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 43, pp. 27 - 47.
- 1909 The Admonitions of an Egyptian Sage from a hieratic Papyrus in Leiden (Pap. Leiden 344 rto). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- 1913 *Theban Ostraca ed. from the originals, now mainly in the Royal Ontario museum of archaeology, Toronto, and the Bodleian library, Oxford I: Hieratic Texts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Library.
- 1931 *The library of A. Chester Beatty: Description of a hieratic papyrus with a mythological story, lovesongs, and other miscellaneous texts: The Chester Beatty Papyri No. 1*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 1935 A lawsuit arising from the purchase of two slaves. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 21, pp. 140 - 146.
- 1948 *Rameside administrative documents*. London: Oxford University Press.

Goedicke, Hans

- 1963 Was magic used in the harem conspiracy against Ramesses III? *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 49, pp. 71 - 92.
- 1967 *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 14. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1970 *Die privaten Rechtsinschriften aus dem Alten Reich*. Beihefte Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 5. Vienna: Orientalisches Institut.
- 1974 Zum Papyrus Berlin 9010. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 101, pp. 90 - 95.

Gradenwitz, Otto, Friedrich Preisgke, and Wilhelm Spiegelberg

- 1912 *Ein Erbstreit aus dem ptolemäischen Ägypten: Griechische und demotische Papyri der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft zu Strassburg i. Els.* Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Straßburg 13. Strassburg: Trübner.

Graeca Halensis (ed.)

- 1913 *Dikaionmata. Auszüge aus alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle (Pap. Hal. 1) mit einem Anhang weiterer Papyri derselben Sammlung (P.Hal.)*. Berlin: Weidmansche Buchhandlung.

Grdseloff, Bernhard

- 1940 L'insigne du grand juge égyptien. *Annales du service des antiquités de l'Égypte* 40, pp. 187 - 207.

Grenfell, Bernard, and Arthur Hunt

- 1898 *The Oxyrhynchus papyri: Part I (P.Oxy I)*, Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch 2. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- 1899 *The Oxyrhynchus papyri: Part II (P.Oxy II)*. Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch 2. London: Egypt Exploration Fund.
- 1901 *The Amherst Papyri I: New classical fragments and other Greek and Latin papyri (P.Amh. II)*. London 1901.

Grenfell, Bernard, Arthur Hunt, and J. Gilbert Smyly (eds.)

- 1902 *The Tebtunis papyri: Part I (P.Tebt I)*. London: Univ. of California Publications.

Griffith, Francis Llewellyn

- 1898 *Hieratic papyri from Kahun and Gurob (principally of the Middle Kingdom): The Petrie Papyri*. London: Quaritch.

Guermeur, Ivan

- 2009 Les monuments d'Ounnefer, fils de Djedbastetiouefânk, contemporain de Nectanebo I^{er}. In *Verba manent: Recueil d'études dédiées à Dimitri Meeks par ses collègues et amis*, Cahiers de l'Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne 2, ed. Isabelle Régen, and Frédéric Servajean, pp. 177 - 199. Montpellier: Institut d'Égyptologie François Daumas.

Hannig, Rainer

- 2003 *Ägyptisches Wörterbuch I: Altes Reich und Erste Zwischenzeit*. Hannig-Lexica 4. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

- Hassan, Selim, and Zaky Iskander
1975 *Excavations at Saqqara 1937 - 1938, Vol. I: The mastaba of Neb-Kam-Oer*. Cairo: General Organisation for Government Printing Offices.
- Helck, Wolfgang
1954 *Untersuchungen zu den Beamtentiteln des ägyptischen Alten Reiches*. Ägyptologische Forschungen 18. Glückstadt, Hamburg, and New York: Augustin.
1955 Das Dekret des Königs Haremhab. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 80, pp. 109 - 136.
1963 Der Papyrus Berlin P 3047. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 2, pp. 65 - 73.
- Hellebrand, Walter
1934 *Das Prozeßzeugnis im Rechte der gräko-ägyptischen Papyri, part 1: Die Funktion der Zeugen im ptolemäischen Verfahrensrecht*. Münchner Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 18. Munich: Beck.
- Hengstl, Joachim
1978 *Griechische Papyri aus Ägypten als Zeugnisse des öffentlichen und privaten Lebens*. Munich: Heimeran.
- Hofmann, Tobias
2002 Die Autobiographie des Uni (𓆎𓆏𓆑) von Abydos. *Lingua Aegyptia* 10, pp. 225 - 237.
- Hughes, George
1958 A Demotic letter to Thoth. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 17, pp. 1 - 12.
- Jager, Marga, and Marijke Reinsma
1965 Ein mißverständenes Gesetz aus ptolemäischer Zeit. In *Studia Papyrologica Varia*. Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 14, ed. Ernst Boswinkel, Pieter Pestman, and Pieter Sijpesteijn, pp. 114 - 115. Leiden: Brill.
- Jansen-Winkel, Karl
1992 Zu einigen religiösen und historischen Inschriften. *Chronique d'Égypte* 67, pp. 240 - 259.
2007 *Inschriften der Spätzeit, part 1: Die 21. Dynastie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jasnow, Richard
2003a Old Kingdom and First Intermediate Period Egypt. In *A history of ancient Near Eastern law*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 72.1, ed. Raymond Westbrook, pp. 93 - 140. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
2003b Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period. In *A history of ancient Near Eastern law*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 72.1, ed. Raymond Westbrook, pp. 255 - 288. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
2003c New Kingdom. In *A history of ancient Near Eastern law*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 72.1, ed. Raymond Westbrook, pp. 289 - 359. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
2003d Third Intermediate Period. In *A history of ancient Near Eastern law*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 72.2, ed. Raymond Westbrook, pp. 777 - 818. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Jördens, Andrea
2005 Griechische Texte aus Ägypten. In *Staatsverträge, Herrscherinschriften und andere Dokumente zur politischen Geschichte, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments Neue Folge* 2, ed. Bernd Janowski, and Gernot Wilhelm, pp. 369 - 389. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.
- Jones, Dilwyn
2000 *An index of ancient Egyptian titles, epithets and phrases of the Old Kingdom*. British Archaeological Reports International Series 866. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kaplony-Heckel, Ursula
1963 *Die demotischen Tempeleide*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1982- *Ägyptische Dokumente*. In *Texte aus dem Umfeld des Alten Testaments 1: Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden: Historisch-chronologische Texte* (1982 - 1985), ed. Otto Kaiser, pp. 220 - 246. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.
- Kitchen, Kenneth
1979 *Ramesseid Inscriptions: Historical and biographical II*. Oxford: Blackwell.
1980 *Ramesseid Inscriptions: Historical and biographical III*. Oxford: Blackwell.
1982 *Ramesseid Inscriptions: Historical and biographical IV*. Oxford: Blackwell.
1983a *Ramesseid Inscriptions: Historical and biographical V*. Oxford: Blackwell.
1983b *Ramesseid Inscriptions: Historical and biographical VI*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- 1989 *Rameside Inscriptions: Historical and biographical V*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 2000 *Rameside Inscriptions: Translated and annotated III: Ramesses II, his contemporaries*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Koenig, Yvan
 2001 À propos de la conspiration du harem. *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale* 101, pp. 293 - 314. Königlische Museen zu Berlin
 1895 *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden 1 (Nos. 1 - 361) (BGU I)*. Berlin: Weidmann.
 1912 *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden 4 (Nos. 1013 - 1209) (BGU IV)*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Kruchten, Jean-Marie
 1981 *Le décret d'Horemheb*. Brussels: Université de Bruxelles.
- Kuhlmann, Klaus
 1992 Ein eigentümliches Orakelverfahren aus der 22. Dynastie: Zur Schenkungsstele Kairo JdE 36159. In *The intellectual heritage of Egypt: Studies presented to László Kákósy by friends and colleagues on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. Ulrich Luft, pp. 367 - 372, pl. 22. Budapest: Chaire d'Égyptologie de l'Université.
- Kupiszewski, Henryk
 1953- The Iuridicus Alexandreae. *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 7 - 8 (1953 - 1954), pp. 187 - 204.
- Lacau, Pierre
 1949 *Une stèle juridique de Karnak*. Supplément aux Annales du service des antiquités de l'Égypte 13. Cairo: Conseil Suprême des Antiquités de l'Égypte.
- Laisney, Vincent Pierre-Michel
 2007 *L'enseignement d'Aménémopé*. Studia Pohl Series Major 19. Rome: Ed. Pontificio Ist. Biblico.
- Legrain, Georges
 1897 Deux stèles trouvées à Karnak en février 1897. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 35, pp. 12 - 19.
- Leprohon, Ronald
 1985 *Stelae I: The Early Dynastic Period to the Late Middle Kingdom*. Corpus Antiquitatum Aegyptiacarum, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 2. Mainz: Zabern.
- Lichtheim, Miriam
 1973 *Ancient Egyptian literature I: The Old and Middle Kingdoms*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Lippert, Sandra
 2004 *Ein demotisches juristisches Lehrbuch: Untersuchungen zu Papyrus Berlin P 23575 rto*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 66. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
 2008 *Einführung in die altägyptische Rechtsgeschichte*. Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 5. Münster: LIT.
 2012 Law: Definitions and Codification. In *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology*, ed. Willeke Wendrich, and Elizabeth Froid. Los Angeles: University of California. (Internet resource: <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0mr4h4fv?query=law>.)
 fc. Review of A. Philip-Stéphan: Dire le droit en Egypte pharaonique: Contribution à l'étude des structures et mécanismes juridictionnels jusqu'au Nouvel Empire. *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 38.
- Logan, Tom
 2000 The *Jmyt-pr* document: Form, function, and significance. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt* 37, pp. 49 - 73.
- Lopez, Jesus
 1984 *Ostraca ieratici N. 57450 - 57568: Tabelle lignee N. 58001 - 58007*. Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino 2.3. Milan: Ed. Cisalpino - La Goliardica.
- Mahaffy, John, and J. Gilbert Smyly
 1905 *The Flinders Petrie Papyri III (P.Petr. III)*. Cunningham Memoirs 11. Dublin Royal Irish Academy.

Malinine, Michel

- 1951 Un jugement rendu à Thèbes sous la XXV^e Dynastie. *Revue d'Égyptologie* 6, pp. 157 - 178, pls. 4 - 6.
 1953 *Choix de textes juridiques en hiéroglyphes "anormal" et en démotique (XXV^e - XXVII^e dynasties) I*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 300. Paris: Champion.
 1983 *Choix de textes juridiques en hiéroglyphes "anormal" et en démotique (XXV^e - XXVII^e dynasties) II*. Recherches d'archéologie, de philologie et d'histoire 18. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

Manassa, Colleen

- 2006 The crimes of count Sabni. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 133, pp. 151 - 163, pls. 34 - 36.

Manning, Joseph

- 2003 Demotic law. In *A history of ancient Near Eastern law*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 72.2, ed. Raymond Westbrook, pp. 819 - 862. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Martin-Pardey, Eva

- 1994 Richten im Alten Reich und die *sr*-Beamten. In *Essays in Egyptology in honor of Hans Goedicke*, ed. Betsey Bryan, and David Lorton, pp. 157 - 167. San Antonio: VanSiclen Books.

Masciadri, Mariadele, and Orsolina Montevicchi

- 1984 *I contratti di balatico*. Corpora Papyrorum Graecarum I (C.Pap.Gr. I). Milan: Istituto di Papirologia dell'Università del S. Cuore.

Mattha, Girgis

- 1975 *The Demotic legal code of Hermopolis West*. Bibliothèque d'étude 45. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale. (Preface, additional notes, and glossary by George R. Hughes.)

McDowell, Andrea

- 1988 Een schijnproces in het Egyptische strafrecht? *Phoenix* 33.2, pp. 17 - 22.
 1990 *Jurisdiction in the workmen's community of Deir el-Medina*. Egyptologische Uitgaven 5. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

Meeks, Dimitri

- 1979 Les donations aux temples dans l'Égypte du 1er millénaire avant J.-C. In *State and temple economy in the ancient Near East II: Proceedings of the international conference organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 10th to the 14th of April 1978*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 6, ed. Edward Lipinski, pp. 605 - 687. Leuven: Department Orientalistik.

Menu, Bernadette

- 1985 Cessions de service et engagements pour dette sous les rois kouchites et saïtes. *Revue d'Égyptologie* 36, pp. 73 - 87.
 1998a La stèle dite de l'apanage, In *Recherches sur l'histoire juridique, économique et sociale de l'ancienne Égypte, Vol. II*. Bibliothèque d'étude 122, ed. Menu, Bernadette, pp. 183 - 207. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
 1998b Vente de maison sous l'ancien empire égyptien, In *Recherches sur l'histoire juridique, économique et sociale de l'ancienne Égypte, Vol. II*. Bibliothèque d'étude 122, ed. Menu, Bernadette, pp. 271 - 287. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.

Mitteis, Ludwig

- 1912 *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, Vol. 2: Juristischer Teil, Part 2: Chrestomathie*. Leipzig: Teubner. (Reprint Hildesheim 1963.)

Meulenaere, Herman de

- 1997 Le papyrus oraculaire de Brooklyn, trente ans après. In *Essays on ancient Egypt in honour of Herman te Velde*. Egyptological Memoirs 1, ed. Jacobus van Dijk, pp. 243 - 249. Groningen: STYX Publications.

Migahid, Audel Gawad

- 1986 *Demotische Briefe an Götter von der Spät- bis zur Römerzeit: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des religiösen Brauchtums im alten Ägypten*. PhD thesis: Würzburg University.

Möller, Georg

- 1920 Das Amtsabzeichen des Oberrichters in der Spätzeit. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 56, pp. 67 - 68.

- 1935 *Hieratische Lesestücke für den akademischen Gebrauch III: Musterbriefe und geschäftliche Texte des Neuen Reiches*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (Reprint 1961.)
- Mrsich, Tycho
 1968 *Untersuchungen zur Hausurkunde des Alten Reiches: Ein Beitrag zum altägyptischen Stiftungsrecht*. Münchener Ägyptologische Studien 13. Berlin: Hessling.
 1995 Erenofres Verteidigung. In *Gedenkschrift für Winfried Barta: Htp dj n hzj*. Münchener Ägyptologische Untersuchungen 4, ed. Dieter Kessler, and Regine Schulz, pp. 291 - 310. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.
- Müller-Wollermann, Renate
 2004 *Vergehen und Strafen. Zur Sanktionierung abweichenden Verhaltens im alten Ägypten*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
 Nelson, Carroll
 1983 *Financial and administrative documents from Roman Egypt*. Ägyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden 15 (BGU XV). Berlin Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz.
- Parker, Richard
 1962 *A Saite oracle papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum [Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3]*. Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press.
- Parkinson, Richard
 1991 *The tale of the Eloquent Peasant*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Peet, Eric
 1924 A historical document of Ramesside age. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 10, pp. 116 - 127.
 1930 *The great tomb robberies of the Twentieth Egyptian Dynasty*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pestman, Pieter
 1985 The competence of Greek and Egyptian tribunals according to the Decree of 118 B.C. *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22, pp. 265 - 269.
 1992 *Il processo di Hermias e altri documenti dell'archivio dei choachiti (P. Tor. Choachiti)*. Turin: Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali.
- Philip-Stéphan, Alexandra
 2004 Juger sous l'Ancien Empire égyptien. *Droit et Cultures* 47, pp. 139 - 152.
 2008 *Dire le droit en Egypte pharaonique. Contribution à l'étude des structures et mécanismes juridictionnels jusqu'au Nouvel Empire*. Brussels: Safran.
- Pleyte, Willem, and Francesco Rossi
 1869- *Papyrus de Turin*. 2 volumes (1869 - 1876). Leiden: Brill. (Reprint 1981, Wiesbaden LTR-Verlag.)
- Posener, Georges
 1976 Notes de transcription. *Revue d'Égyptologie* 28, pp. 146 - 148.
- Quack, Joachim
 2005 Review of S. Lippert: Ein demotisches juristisches Lehrbuch: Untersuchungen zu Papyrus Berlin P 23575 rto. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 51.1, pp. 171 - 174.
- Quaegebeur, Jan
 1993 La justice à la porte des temples et le toponyme Premit. In *Individu, société et spiritualité. Mélanges égyptologiques offerts au Professeur Aristide Théodoridès*, ed. Christian Cannuyer, and Jean-Marie Kruchten, pp. 201 - 220. Brussels and Mons: Association Montoise d'Égyptologie.
- Quirke, Stephen
 1990 *The administration of Egypt in the Late Middle Kingdom. The Hieratic documents*. New Malden: SIA Publication.
- Ray, John
 1973 A consideration of Papyrus Kahun 13. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, pp. 222 - 223.
- Riccobono Jr, Salvatore
 1950 *Il gnomon dell' Idios Logos*. Palermo: Palumbo.

Römer, Malte

- 1994 *Gottes- und Priesterherrschaft in Ägypten am Ende des Neuen Reiches: Ein religionsgeschichtliches Phänomen und seine sozialen Grundlagen*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 21. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Rupprecht, Hans-Albert

- 1994 *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schenkel, Wolfgang

- 1965 *Memphis, Herakleopolis, Theben. Die epigraphischen Zeugnisse der 7. - 11. Dynastie Ägyptens*. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 12. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.

Schentuleit, Maren

- 2001 Die spätdemotische Hausverkaufsurkunde P. BM 262: Ein bilingues Dokument aus Soknopaiu Nesos mit griechischen Übersetzungen. *Enchoria* 27, pp. 127 - 154.
2007 Satabus aus Soknopaiu Nesos: Aus dem Leben eines Priesters am Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit. *Chronique d'Égypte* 82, pp. 101 - 125.

Shupak, Nili

- 1992 A new source for the study of the judiciary and law of ancient Egypt: "The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51, pp. 1 - 18.

Seckel, Emil, and Wilhelm Schubart

- 1919- *Der Gnomon des Idios Logos, Vol. I: Text (1919), and Vol. II: Kommentar (1934)*. Ägyptische Urkunden aus den staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden 5 (BGU V). Berlin: Weidmann.

Seidl, Erwin

- 1951 *Einführung in die ägyptische Rechtsgeschichte bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches I: Juristischer Teil*. 2nd edition. Ägyptologische Forschungen 10. Glückstadt, Hamburg, and New York: Augustin.
1952 Eine neue Urkunde aus Ägypten zum Prinzip der notwendigen Entgeltlichkeit. In *Studi in onore di Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz nel XLV anno del suo insegnamento*, ed. Mario Lauria, pp. 47 - 56. Naples: Jovene.
1962 *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*. Ägyptologische Forschungen 22. Glückstadt, Hamburg, and New York: Augustin.
1966 Die Gottesentscheidungen der Saiten- und Perserzeit. In *Essays in honor of C. Bradford Welles*. American Studies in Papyrology 1, ed. Alan Samuel, pp. 59 - 65. New Haven: American Society of Papyrologists.
1968 Der Prozess Chrateanch gegen Tefhape im Jahre 170 v. Chr. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft einschl. der ethnologischen Rechtsforschung* 69, pp. 96 - 117.
1973 *Rechtsgeschichte Ägyptens als römische Provinz (Die Behauptung des ägyptischen Rechts neben dem römischen)*. Sankt Augustin: Richarz.

Sethe, Kurt

- 1926 Ein Prozeßurteil aus dem Alten Reich. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 61, pp. 67 - 79.
1927- *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie (Urk. IV)*. Leipzig: Hinrichs (1927/1930).
1933 *Urkunden des Alten Reiches I (Urk. I)*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.

Simpson, William Kelly (ed.)

- 2003 *The literature of ancient Egypt: An anthology of stories, instructions, stelae, autobiographies, and poetry*. 3rd edition. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Smither, Paul

- 1942 An Old Kingdom letter concerning the crimes of count Sabni. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 28, pp. 16 - 19.
1948 The report concerning the slave-girl Senbet. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 34, pp. 31 - 34, pls. 7 - 8.

Smyly, J. Gilbert

- 1921 *Greek papyri from Gurob (P. Gurob)*. Cunningham Memoirs 12. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm

- 1906 *Die demotischen Denkmäler (30601 - 31270; 50001 - 50022) II: Die demotischen Papyrus*. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Strasbourg: Elsässische Druckerei und Verlagsanstalt.
1914 *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque nationale zu Paris nebst den auf der Rückseite des Papyrus stehenden Texten*. Demotische Studien 7. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

- 1928 Ein Gerichtsprotokoll aus der Zeit Thutmosis' IV. *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 63, pp. 105 - 115.
- 1932 *Die demotischen Denkmäler (50023 - 50165) III: Demotische Inschriften und Papyri (Fortsetzung)*. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire. Berlin Reichsdruckerei.
- Stadler, Martin
- 2004 Rechtskodex von Hermupolis (P. Kairo JE 89.127-30+89.137-43). In *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments, Neue Folge Vol. 1: Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben*, ed. Bernd Janowski, and Gernot Wilhelm, pp. 185 - 207. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn.
- Strudwick, Nigel
- 1985 *The administration of Egypt in the Old Kingdom. The highest titles and their holders*. London: KPI.
- Swarney, Paul
- 1970 *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos*. American Studies in Papyrology 8. Toronto: American Society of Papyrologists.
- Tait, John
- 1930 *Greek ostraca in the Bodleian Library at Oxford and various other collections I*. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 21. London: Egypt Exploration Society.
- Taubenschlag, Raphael
- 1955 *The law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the light of the papyri: 332 B.C. - 640 A.D.* 2nd edition. Warsaw: Panstwowe wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Théodoridès, Aristide
- 1957 Le "procès" dans la Stèle juridique de Karnak. *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3/4, pp. 33 - 52.
- 1968 Procès relatif à une vente qui devait être acquittée par la livraison d'un travail servile (Papyrus Berlin 9785). *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3/15, pp. 39 - 104.
- 1980 Le jugement en cause Neferabet contre Tyia (Pap. Berlin 3047). *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3/27, pp. 11 - 46.
- 1981 Dénonciation de malversations ou Requête en destitution? (Papyrus Salt 124 = Pap. Brit.Mus. 10055). *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 3/28, pp. 11 - 79.
- Thissen, Heinz-Josef
- 1994 Zwei demotische Prozeßprotokolle. In *Acta Demotica: Acts of Fifth International Conference for Demotists, Pisa 4th - 8th September 1993*, Egitto e Vicino Oriente 17, ed. Edda Bresciani, pp. 283 - 288. Pisa: Giardini.
- Thompson, Herbert
- 1934 *A family archive from Siut from papyri in the British Museum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tresson, Paul
- 1919 *L'inscription d'Ouni*. Bibliothèque d'étude 8. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Vandier, Jacques
- 1950 *Mo'alla: La tombe d'Ankhtifi et la tombe de Sébekhotep*. Bibliothèque d'étude 18. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale.
- Vernus, Pascal
- 1973- Inscriptions de la Troisième Période Intermédiaire (IV): Le texte oraculaire réemployé dans le passage axial du IIIe pylône dans le Temple de Karnak. *Cahiers de Karnak* 6 (1973 - 1977), pp. 215 - 233, pl. 53.
- 1993 *Affaires et scandales sous les Ramsès*. Paris: Pylion.
- Vittmann, Günter
- 1996 Hieratic texts. In *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three millennia of cross-cultural continuity and change*, ed. Bezael Porten, pp. 30 - 73. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: Brill.
- 1998 *Der demotische Papyrus Rylands 9*. Ägypten und Altes Testament 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 2010 Review of A. Philip-Stéphan: Dire le droit en Egypte pharaonique: Contribution à l'étude des structures et mécanismes juridictionnels jusqu'au Nouvel Empire. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 100, pp. 273 - 279.

Ward, William

1981 Lexicographical miscellanies II. *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 9, pp. 359 - 373.

1982 *Index of Egyptian administrative and religious titles of the Middle Kingdom*. Beirut: American University of Beirut.

Wolff, Hans

1962 *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*. Münchner Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 44. Munich: Beck.

Yaron, Reuven

1961 *Introduction to the law of the Aramaic papyri*. Oxford: Clarendon.