mentioned was perhaps a subordinate ‘Keeper of the Prison’ (sa’wty en khureet). In Dynasties XII—XIII ‘Scribes of the Great Prison’ are especially attested. Hayes cites six ‘Directors’, ten ‘Scribes’, and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison in his book. One official, on British Museum Stela 828, tells how “...His Majesty made me Scribe of the Prison Trial!”, later on “...Scribe of the Great Prison!”, and eventually “Scribe of the Royal Records ...” The prison scribes would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.

In the Criminal Register of the Great Prison at Thebes, the Brooklyn Papyrus names seventy-six citizens who had absconded from state corvee or like service. It systematically files each person under seven headings, giving as follows: (1) name; (2) distinguishing epithet; (3) sex; (4) resume of government directive, citing the charge and calling for proceedings under the appropriate clause of the law code; (5) a note, ‘Here!’, ‘Brought!’ or something similar; (6) the offender is safely in prison or soon will be; (6) statement of completion of the case from the scribe of the Vizier; (7) a final check-mark, ‘Case closed’. No doubt this final laconic note would conclude the records of the whole batch and Joseph when they left prison over a century later.

The Egyptian authorities seemed invariably to have tracked down their criminals and to have kept long-standing cases open with dogged persistence. The verso of the Papyrus is equally intriguing, for it lists seventy-nine names in the Brooklyn list of special interest. One is identical with the name of midwife in Ex. i: 15, who thus bore in her time a name already venerable. A third is etymologically comparable with that of Job.

“The whole ‘frame up’ against Stephen is highly suggestive. Why is it that in the Gospel story (Lk. xxii. 66 ff.) no mention is made by Luke of the false witnesses and yet, if the ten ‘Scribes’ and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison were there, they would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.”

Hayes cites six ‘Directors’, ten ‘Scribes’, and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison in his book. One official, on British Museum Stela 828, tells how “...His Majesty made me Scribe of the Prison Trial!”, later on “...Scribe of the Great Prison!”, and eventually “Scribe of the Royal Records ...” The prison scribes would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.

In the Criminal Register of the Great Prison at Thebes, the Brooklyn Papyrus names seventy-six citizens who had absconded from state corvee or like service. It systematically files each person under seven headings, giving as follows: (1) name; (2) distinguishing epithet; (3) sex; (4) resume of government directive, citing the charge and calling for proceedings under the appropriate clause of the law code; (5) a note, ‘Here!’, ‘Brought!’ or something similar; (6) the offender is safely in prison or soon will be; (6) statement of completion of the case from the scribe of the Vizier; (7) a final check-mark, ‘Case closed’. No doubt this final laconic note would conclude the records of the whole batch and Joseph when they left prison over a century later.

The Egyptian authorities seemed invariably to have tracked down their criminals and to have kept long-standing cases open with dogged persistence. The verso of the Papyrus is equally intriguing, for it lists seventy-nine names in the Brooklyn list of special interest. One is identical with the name of midwife in Ex. i: 15, who thus bore in her time a name already venerable. A third is etymologically comparable with that of Job.

“The whole ‘frame up’ against Stephen is highly suggestive. Why is it that in the Gospel story (Lk. xxii. 66 ff.) no mention is made by Luke of the false witnesses and yet, if the ten ‘Scribes’ and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison were there, they would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.”

Hayes cites six ‘Directors’, ten ‘Scribes’, and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison in his book. One official, on British Museum Stela 828, tells how “...His Majesty made me Scribe of the Prison Trial!”, later on “...Scribe of the Great Prison!”, and eventually “Scribe of the Royal Records ...” The prison scribes would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.

In the Criminal Register of the Great Prison at Thebes, the Brooklyn Papyrus names seventy-six citizens who had absconded from state corvee or like service. It systematically files each person under seven headings, giving as follows: (1) name; (2) distinguishing epithet; (3) sex; (4) resume of government directive, citing the charge and calling for proceedings under the appropriate clause of the law code; (5) a note, ‘Here!’, ‘Brought!’ or something similar; (6) the offender is safely in prison or soon will be; (6) statement of completion of the case from the scribe of the Vizier; (7) a final check-mark, ‘Case closed’. No doubt this final laconic note would conclude the records of the whole batch and Joseph when they left prison over a century later.

The Egyptian authorities seemed invariably to have tracked down their criminals and to have kept long-standing cases open with dogged persistence. The verso of the Papyrus is equally intriguing, for it lists seventy-nine names in the Brooklyn list of special interest. One is identical with the name of midwife in Ex. i: 15, who thus bore in her time a name already venerable. A third is etymologically comparable with that of Job.

“The whole ‘frame up’ against Stephen is highly suggestive. Why is it that in the Gospel story (Lk. xxii. 66 ff.) no mention is made by Luke of the false witnesses and yet, if the ten ‘Scribes’ and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison were there, they would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.”

Hayes cites six ‘Directors’, ten ‘Scribes’, and one ‘Keeper’ of the prison in his book. One official, on British Museum Stela 828, tells how “...His Majesty made me Scribe of the Prison Trial!”, later on “...Scribe of the Great Prison!”, and eventually “Scribe of the Royal Records ...” The prison scribes would be expected, close links with the Department for Agriculture and the Labour bureau (literally, ‘Office of the Provider of People’), as reflected in the new papyrus.
mentioned was perhaps a subordinate ‘Keeper of the Prison’ (sa’ wty en lbhrt). In Dynasties XII—XIII ‘Scribes of the Great Prison’ are especially attested. Hayes cites six ‘Directors’, ten ‘Scribes’ and one ‘Keeper’ in his book. One official, on British Museum Stela 828, tells how ‘... His Majesty made me Scribe of the Prison of Trial!’, later on ‘... Scribe of the Great Prison!’, and eventually ‘Scribe of the Royal Records’.

In the Criminal Register of the Great Prison at Thebes, the Brooklyn Papyrus names seventy-six citizens who had absconded from state corvee or like service. It systematically files each person under seven headings, giving as follows: (1) name; (2) distinguishing epithet; (3) sex; (4) resumé of government directive, citing the charge and calling for proceedings under the appropriate clause of the law code; (5) a note, ‘Here’, or ‘Brought!’, or something similar; (6) the prisoner is safely in prison or soon will be; (6) statement of completion of the case from the scribe of the Vizier; (7) a final check-mark, ‘Case closed’. No doubt this final laconic note would conclude the records of the burglary of Joseph and Joseph when they left prison over a century later. The Egyptian authorities seemingly invariably to have tracked down their criminals and to have kept long-standing cases open with dogged persistence.

The verso of the Papyrus is equally intriguing, for it lists seventy-nine household servants. Nearly forty of these people actually bear a (usually) Semitic name followed by the epithet ‘who-is-called’ and a second, Egyptian, name. This provided a powerful contemporary parallel for the construction of Joseph’s Egyptian name Zaphenath-Paaneah, (to be the subject of a forthcoming study). One or two more close parallels between Stephen’s death and Jesus’ death may now be noted.

One or two more close parallels between Stephen’s death and Jesus’ death may now be noted.

Stephen’s accusation against the Jews (vii. 51—53) is very reminiscent of Jesus’ woes against the Lawyers (Lk. xi. 45—52): (a) The persecution of the Prophets—the attitude of the Jews compared with that of the fathers.

(b) The charge of not keeping the Law.

(c) The hint in xi. 49—51 of the yet greater murder about to be laid to their charge. This is expressed in Acts vii. 53.

(d) It may be argued that the Gospel passage, placed as it is in the ‘Travel Document’, has little outward connection with the Passion; but the words of Jesus in Mt. xxiii. 35, which thus bore in hera time a similar association with the Law are to be expected in Stephen’s trial and its sequel. For this, I suggest, is the significance of Acts vii. and viii. — Luke sees in them the working out of the prophecy with reference to Jesus Himself made, and so the realization of what was implicit in His death from the start.

The whole ‘frame up’ against Stephen is highly suggestive. Why is it that in the Gospel story (Lk. xxii. 66 ff.) no mention is made by Luke of the ten witnesses against Jesus? Or is it that the ‘ten Scribes’ and one ‘Keeper’ are rather inconsequentially in v. 71? Both Matthew and Mark make much of them at the trial (Mt. xxvi. 59 ff. Mk. xiv. 56 ff. and cf. the taunt of the bystanders, Mt. xxvii. 39). The prison pleased itself with the implication that the witnesses were incompetent and apparently did not succeed in establishing their accusation. Luke omits the false witnesses in the Gospel but introduces them in Acts in order to condemn Stephen for his own assertions, but to condemn him as quoting Jesus’ declaration against the Temple and the Law. Surely this is not accidental. I suggest that this is the first implicit declaration by Luke of his understanding of Stephen’s death and the expansion recorded in Acts viii. Looking back from beyond Pentecost, after the Church had extended throughout the whole world, Luke sees that Jesus’ words quoted by false witnesses were not substantiated till later—he therefore holds over this parallel to demonstrate that the words were not false because the words were in the prison trial and its sequel. For this, I suggest, is the significance of Acts vii. and viii. — Luke sees in them the working out of the prophecy with reference to Jesus Himself made, and so the realization of what was implicit in His death from the start.

The beginning of the attack on Stephen is necessarily but a brief sketch, but some references to the religious exclusivism and legalism of the Jews. But even after Stephen’s death the break out is only latent. The death of Stephen makes it possible for John to say (John viii. 59) and Lk. xxiv. 53 that the Jews pass through the religious exclusivism and legalism of the Jews. But even after Jesus’ death the break out is only latent. The death of Stephen makes it possible for John to say (John viii. 59) and Lk. xxiv. 53 that the Jews pass through