

## A Note on Egyptian Units of Area in the Old Kingdom

Klaus Baer

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 15, No. 2 (Apr., 1956), 113-117.

Stable URL:

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28195604%2915%3A2%3C113%3AANOEUO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-N

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## A NOTE ON EGYPTIAN UNITS OF AREA IN THE OLD KINGDOM

## KLAUS BAER

T HAS already been noticed by several scholars, among them Sethe,1 that the measures of area used in Egypt during the Old Kingdom differed from those current in the Middle Kingdom.2 From such examples as Urkunden, I, 241, line 5, 244, line 14, and 245, line 2 [1], it follows that the units of area used at that period were, from largest to smallest: st3t (aroura), h3 (thousand), t3, rmn, hsb, z3 (reading very uncertain) and mh (cubit).3 The various writings of these units as used in actual measurements during the Old Kingdom are given in Figure 2. The sequence of these units, with the exception of the last two, follows directly from the three examples quoted and numerous similar ones. No example with z3 and mh in the

same measurement has been preserved. However, the cubit was smaller than the hsb, and since, to my knowledge, one never finds more than one z3 in measurements (that is: the hsb probably equals two z3), while up to twelve cubits are written after a hsb,4 it follows that the cubit was in any case smaller than a z3. Presumably also the z3 was larger than 12 cubits. Otherwise one would have expected to find the former unit used in the example quoted.

The following list gives the references to all the multiples of the various units, with the exception of the st3t, from the statements of definite areas known to me from published texts of the Old Kingdom.

UNIT	MULTIPLE	REFERENCES				
1. mh	4	Urkunden, I, 244 line 16				
	10	Urkunden, I, 245 line 2				
	12+	Urkunden, I, 242 line 10				
2. z3	1	Urkunden, I, 240 line 13; 241 line 5; 244 line 14; 286				
3. hsb	1	Urkunden, I, 240 line 13; 241 line 5; 242 line 10; 244 lines 14, 16, and				
12000 1 \$60001		18(?); 245 line 2; 247 line 2				
4. rmn	1	Urkunden, I, 240 line 15; 241 line 5; 242 line 10; 247 line 2; 286				
5. t3	1	Urkunden, I, 164 line 7 (cf. the discussion of the will of Tjenti)				
	2	Urkunden, I, 5 line 2; 247 line 2				
	3	Urkunden, I, 164 (three times); 241 line 5				
	4 5	Urkunden, I, 244 line 8; 245 line 17; 249 line 7(?)				
	5	Urkunden, I, 25-26 (twelve times; cf. the discussion of the contract				
		of Nikacankh); 240 l. 15				
	6	Urkunden, I, 244 line 16				
	8	Urkunden, I, 240 line 13; 244 line 14; 245 line 15(?)				
6. $b^3$	1	Urkunden, I, 5 line 2; 242 line 10				
14871200 <del>-</del> 40-1	2	Urkunden, I, 244 lines 8, 14, 16 and 18(?); 245 lines 2 and 17; 246				
		line 15 (cf. the following paragraph); 247 line 2				
7. st3t	1704 +	Urkunden, I, 242 line 10 (the largest figure known to me)				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> From marginal notes on his copy of the verso of the Palermo Stone, which was collated with the original by Breasted, Gardiner and Farina. The papers are now in the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. I was enabled to use these notes through the kindness of Professor J. A. Wilson. Sethe suggested that the aroura equalled 10,000 cubits of land.

<sup>2</sup> Gardiner, Egyptian Grammar, § 266. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The transliterations and translations are intended purely for reference and do not indicate any preference on my part in the case of doubtful readings. The numbers in square brackets refer to the texts copied in Fig. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Urk., I, 242 l. 10 [2].

Breasted's reading, supported by the photograph, Schäfer, <u>Sin</u> <u>Bruchstück altägyptischer Annalen</u>, Pl. ii.

Till I

- (a). Here the photograph shows a blob much too large and wrongly placed for the head of a b;
- (b). The line is here clearly shorter than the stem of a h;.

常型

Reading corrected according to Sethe's note.

Fig. 1

Urkunden, I, 246, line 15 reads with Farina 3  $\underline{st}$ 3t and 3  $\underline{h}$ 3. However, according to Breasted's collation, the reading 4  $\underline{st}$ 3t and 2  $\underline{h}$ 3 seems more probable [3], and the published photograph<sup>5</sup> appears to confirm it.

For the smaller units, the system here is apparently the same as that of the

<sup>5</sup> Schäfer, Ein Bruchstück altägyptischer Annalen, pl. ii.

Middle Kingdom (1 aroura=2 rmn=4 hsb=8  $z^3=100$  cubits), except that here the unit of 100 cubits is called  $t^3$  rather than  $s\underline{t}^3t$ , which latter term is applied to a much larger entity.<sup>6</sup> It also seems clear

<sup>6</sup> I am rather uncertain whether this unit of 100 cubits was read  $s_i^3t$  in the Middle Kingdom. The writings tend to use the long, narrow  $\theta$ -hieroglyph with rounded ends. While the hieratic equivalents are generally transcribed by a rectangular sign, they actually resemble the  $\theta$  much more closely. See Möller, Hieratische Pallographie, I, p. 65.

		OLD KINGDOM UNI	ITS OF AREA					_
	Introductory phrase	St;t	<u>#:</u>	<u>T;</u>	Rmn	Heb	<u>z;</u>	Юh
Metjen ( <u>Urk</u> . I, 2-5)		8	g.	ı				
Nika'ankh ( <u>Urk</u> . I, 24 ff.)	Mi	0		1				
Tjenti ( <u>Urk</u> . I, 163 ff.)	or nothing	stit ndst(!)  Of. discussion in text		0 7				
Kaemhezet ( <u>Urk</u> . I, 207)	Ϊħ	· C						
Annals (Urk. I, 240 ff.)	th omitted once in Urk. I, 249 1. 7 (?)	omitted in Urk. I, 247	Note that 1000 is a written is	-	٠,	×	3	الم
Coptos decrees of Pepi II. (Urk. I, 286)	1 July	_					×	

Fig. 2

that the  $h^3$  was probably 1000 cubits or 10  $t^3$  as in the Middle Kingdom. The main question to be decided here is the relation between the  $st^3t$  and the  $h^3$ . As already mentioned above, the only suggestion known to me sets the aroura equal to  $10 \ h^3$ . I think, however, that the relation can be demonstrated to have been  $1 \ st^3t = 3 \ h^3 = 30 \ t^3$ , quite apart from the dangerous argumentum ex silentio that no more than two  $h^3$  have so far been found in any measurement.

One of the contracts of Nikacankh<sup>7</sup> deals with the division of the two arouras

' Urk., I, 24 ff.; Fraser, "Early Tombs at Tehna," ASAE, III, 122 ff., pl. iv.

donated by Mycerinus for the support of the priests of Hathor, the Lady of Raonet. into twelve equal portions of five units of land each [4]. As published, the writing of the unit involved is not quite clear (the sign has rectangular ends), but the long. thin shape resembles a t3 much more than a st3t. For the introduction of measurements of area by 3ht st3t (the bolt and coil). even where the area involved was smaller than an aroura, compare Urkunden, I. 244, line 8, or even better, though from an earlier period, Urkunden, I, 5, line 2 [5]. where the word st3t written after the measurement indicates quite clearly that we are dealing with part of the introductory phrase and not with a specific unit of area. That the reading must be t3 also follows from the consideration that each of these lots should be only a sixth of an aroura. We thus obtain: two st3t equals sixty t3 or one st3t equals thirty t3.

An objection could be raised here that the land distributed by Nikacankh might have included areas other than the two arouras donated by Mycerinus. I think, however, that such documents as the juridical stela from Karnak<sup>8</sup> show that pains were taken to establish in the deed itself the legal right of the vendor or testator to dispose of the property. This is done here for the above-mentioned two arouras; but no other land is referred to. If there had been any, one might have expected that its origin would also be stated.

The other pertinent text is the will of Tjenti. Here two  $s\underline{t}3t$  formerly belonging to his mother Bebi are disposed of. One of these  $(ir\ igr\ sn\cdot nw\ n\ 3ht\ s\underline{t}3t\ [2])^{10}$  is given to his wife and then divided among four ka-priests, with a schedule giving the area assigned to, and the amount of barley due

<sup>8</sup> Published in P. Lacau, Une Stèle juridique de Karnak, Suppl. aux ASAE, Cahier 13 and discussed by Ibrahim Harari, "Essai sur la Terminologie Juridique du Moyen Empire Egyptien," ASAE, LI, 273 ff., especially pages 274-75. The will of Tjenti establishes at some length (Urk. I, 163-64) his right to the two arouras he is disposing of.

9 Urk., I, 163 ff.

10  $Sn^*nw\dots sn^*nw$  apparently means "the one ... the other." Later on in the same text we read:  $ir sn^*nw n^3 jt sit \ell pw \dots iw^*f n \dots$  "As for the other of these two arouras ... it shall belong to ..." The pw shows that we are still dealing with the same two arouras. Here, as in the previous passage, the aroura involved is referred to by an f, showing that only one is being disposed of in each section. On the other hand, in p. 164 l. 1, where Tjenti refers to the origin of both the arouras, he states:  $ink \ dbh \ sn \ br \ nswt$ , "It is I who requested them from the king," using the plural pronoun.

The masculine gender of  $^3ht$  introducing measurements is also found in one of the unpublished Hekanakht papers. Cf. also Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, II, 79 n. 1. When used alone, however, the word  $^3ht$  was feminine, for instance in the page of the Hekanakht letter published in Bull. Metr. Mus. Art, XVII, suppl., p. 49, fig. 40, Il. 1 and 8 (nth sh³ s(y);  $^3ht$  nt rmt nb).

from, each of them [6]. The areas have not all been preserved, but we have the amounts of grain in all four cases. The first three priests each owed three measures. In the case of the fourth, Sethe saw only a 1 but emended it to 3 to agree with the others. It would seem safer, however, to leave the text as it was. It is clear from the first two cases, which are better preserved, that each unit of land owed one measure of barley. The units of land are here written with an idb-sign, twice facing to the right and twice to the left. Since a unit smaller than the st3t is wanted, I think it safe to read a t3 here also. After the schedule, the text continues, "The fields, etc.] which shall be delivered to them [prr n'sn] from the property of Tepemnefret. I have made over her property to these ka-priests, amounting to a small aroura [m st3t ndst]." In other words, in addition to the usual stit of thirty  $t^3$ , there was a smaller unit of only ten  $t_3$ , usually written with a  $h_3$ -sign and perhaps so read (at least in later times11), that was also called the "small aroura."

We thus obtain the following relationship of units of area for the Old Kingdom:  $1 ext{ st} ext{3}t = 3 ext{ h} ext{3} = 30 ext{ t} ext{3} = 60 ext{ rmn} = 120 ext{ hsb} = 240 ext{ z} ext{3} = 3000 ext{ mh}$ . Assuming that the cubit of land had roughly the same value as in later times, that is 100 square cubits or 27.35 square meters, the  $ext{st} ext{3}t$  of the Old Kingdom was about 8.205 hectares or 19.53 feddans.

In general, this seems to give somewhat better values to various quantities of land mentioned in Old Kingdom texts. Metjen states in his biography<sup>12</sup> that he inherited, bought, or was granted a total of 266 st3t plus a small vineyard. Using our result, this amounts to an estate of over 5195 feddans, a very substantial figure for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Spellings such as in Tylor, The Tomb of Sebeknekht, Pl. 7, point to a reading of b<sup>3</sup>-t<sup>3</sup> for this unit in the Second Intermediate Period.

<sup>12</sup> Urk., I, 2, Il, 8, 9, and 13; 4, 1, 2; 5, 1, 2.

Egypt and one that agrees much better with the splendor of his tomb and his obvious status than the 172 feddans obtained by using the smaller value. Likewise in the case of Nikacankh's contracts, 39 feddans seems a much more reasonable source of income for a priesthood than about one and a third, particularily considering that the land was divided into twelve portions.

The donation made by Userkaf to Re in the year after the third numbering is of somewhat greater historical importance.<sup>13</sup> It was at least 1704 arouras and 87 cubits of land, in modern terms over 33,280 feddans, an enormous and quite unparalleled gift for the Old Kingdom.

13 Urk.AI, 242, II. 9-10.

The system here described did not survive into the Middle Kingdom, where the largest unit is the \$h\frac{3}{2}-t\frac{3}{2}\$ of 1000 cubits. At some time before the New Kingdom, the term \$s\frac{3}{2}t\$ came to be applied to the unit of 100 cubits, the aroura of later times. The total of \$\frac{3}{h}t\$ \$s\frac{1}{2}t\$ 864,168\frac{1}{4}\$ given by Papyrus Harris, 11, 9 for the lands belonging to the Theban temples certainly precludes any other interpretation. Even with the aroura at only 0.651 feddans, that figure becomes about 561,709 feddans, or roughly one tenth the arable land of modern Egypt.

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

 $^{14}$  W. Erichsen,  $Papyrus\ Harris\ I$  (Bruxelles, 1933), p. 14.