A new publication of pTurin N. 766 is offered here with a commentary and the first complete facsimile. Several improvements are made upon the prior edition by G. Botti in *JEA* 54 (1968) 223–230. In part II the text, which the scribe labelled ‘Book of Breathing’ is placed in the context of contemporary and earlier mortuary and funerary texts and a Theban provenance in the 1st century AD is assigned to it.

### A. Description

#### I. The Papyrus

The Demotic papyrus Turin N. 766, first published by Giuseppe Botti, bears a shorter funerary composition of 36 lines on its recto divided into two parts called recto A and B by Botti, whose nomenclature shall be maintained here to avoid confusion, and a short inscription of one line on the verso. It was inscribed, probably in the first century AD, for pa-rmwt, son of t2-srt-hnsr (recto A 20 and 29 f.).

---

1 I would like to thank Dr. Anna Maria Donadoni-Roveri, Soprintendente al Museo delle Antichità Egee, and Dr. Elisabetta Valtz of the Museo Egizio di Torino for granting the publication rights of the papyrus and their help and hospitality during my time in Turin. Furthermore I am indebted to my supervisor Dr. Mark J. Smith for his supervision and support during my work, Prof. Dr. Karl-Theodor Zauzich for discussing with me various problems, Christina J. Riggs, M. A., for checking and correcting my English, Dr. Mark Depauw and Susanne Woodhouse, M. A., for references, the Old Members’ Trust of University College Oxford and the University of Oxford for travel grants making the trip to Turin possible, my parents for financing my studies and the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes for partial financial support towards the costs of my studies in Oxford.

The present article and its continuation are short versions of works submitted to the Faculty of Oriental Studies of the University of Oxford in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Studies in Oriental Studies (Egyptology) in 1998. Although already quite abbreviated the length of the works made a distribution in two parts necessary and therefore it might be useful to give an outline of the topics I intend to cover in the two parts: Part I contains a description of the papyrus and its script, the texts’ transliteration and translation and the commentary, alongside a glossary. Part II will discuss there the function of its texts.


3 See below for details.

4 For the dating see part II (*Enchoria* 26, 2000).
For the description the following terminology is used: Unless stated otherwise, 'right' and 'left' always denote the papyrus' right and left when looking at text A on the recto. With respect to the verso, 'top' and 'bottom' are used when looking at the verso's text, i.e. recto's right is verso's bottom and verso's top is recto's left and the shorter edges are the right and left respectively. Reference to the verso is always marked as such.

Nowadays the papyrus is kept between two glass plates so that both sides of the papyrus are well visible. It is no longer one sheet as it was in antiquity, but consists out of eight fragments of different sizes, to which I have given the letters A to H as can be seen in the sketch (fig. 1) below. A long vertical break runs through the middle of the papyrus, apparently the result of a fold. Parts of fragments A, B and C are only loosely connected with the main body of each respective fragment. In its present state of conservation the papyrus measures 30.9 cm in height (maximally) and 22.5 cm in width, but, as pointed out further below, fragment G has to be moved to the right, increasing the maximum width to approximately 24.5 cm. The colour is a homogenous light yellowish beige with the exception of the distinctly different fragment H, discoloured grey. Looking at the papyrus against light shows its poor quality, for one can see the different degrees of thickness and the crossed layers of papyrus fibres: Parts of the papyrus are quite thick, others quite thin. The sheet apparently had holes already in antiquity, because in recto A 29 the distance between \( rm \) and \( wt \) in the name \( pa-rmwt \) is filled by four little holes which do not affect any sign and around which the scribe appears to have written the text.

The edges at the top, the bottom and the left show in the undamaged areas a fairly straight line which must be taken as a cut made by the Egyptian scribe. In contrast, the right edge’s rather irregular shape is due to damages, mainly the loss of the right corner at the top. In general the right hand third of the papyrus is more poorly preserved than the rest with major lacunae between fragments A, F, G and H and between fragments B, E, F, G and H. Otherwise numerous smaller holes are scattered over the entire sheet, including some caused by worms.

The papyrus had been rolled until 1948 according to Botti and resembled a 'Tuscan cigar'.\(^5\) The rolling is to be reconstructed as follows: The sheet was first rolled with the text of the recto to the interior so that the back of the right margin was the last layer to the outside, explaining the higher degree of damage in this area. Afterwards the papyrus was folded in the middle, as suggested by the horizontal break in the middle of the papyrus running over the whole width and the inscription of the verso running over the whole

\(^5\) **BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 224.**
length of the verso’s bottom. This text must have been intended to be seen in the rolled and folded state, what could not have been achieved by folding the papyrus before rolling it.

As mentioned above, the placement of fragment F+G is to be rethought on the basis of four observations:

1. In the current position the beginnings of the lines in recto A are not flush, as one would expect.
2. For the determinative of $hnt$ in recto A 26 more space is required. Likewise the length of the mother’s name in recto A 30 is considerably shorter than in recto A 20.
3. The two parts of the verso’s inscription are astonishingly not in one line, but their positions differ about 2 cm from each other.
4. In the same area, below both parts of the verso’s writing the papyrus is equally thick, whereas the lower part of fragment G (when looking at the verso’s script) is distinctly thinner and does not match with the neighbouring part of fragment A.

The only objection against a repositioning of fragments F+G is the fairly straight edge of fragment A, which appears to be a cut and which would not then align with the edge of fragment G, resulting in a stepped edge instead. Nevertheless the points listed above are, to my mind, very much in favour of a repositioning. Perhaps the right hand edge of A is, after all, a modern cut or a break and not due to cutting.

II. The Script

The text is written in Demotic in a rather careful hand. The verso bears just one line running over the length of the papyrus (parallel to the long fibres on the surface of this side). The recto’s text is formed by two parts: On the right 30 lines (recto A) parallel to the short fibres on this side and – turning the sheet 90° to the right – six lines running over its whole length, thus perpendicular to the short fibres. On the right a margin of 2.3 to 3 cm and on the left of 2.5 cm is left empty. Apart from these texts there are illegible traces of ink in the left corner on the bottom below recto B 6 and on the verso’s top. The lack of further traces within the inscribed parts indicates that the papyrus is not a palimpsest. However, the sheet could have been cut off a previously inscribed longer roll preserving some of the other text’s ink.
Fig. 1. The fragments of pTurin N. 766 (recto without ink, reduced to 70% of the original size)
Fig. 2. Repositioning of the fragments (reduced to 70 % of the original size): recto
Fig. 3. Repositioning of the fragments (reduced to 70% of the original size); verso
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The writing is careful, with only one scribal error, and does not pose too many problems. Indeed most of the difficulties are due to damage, which affects the readings in the following parts:

Recto A

1–5 The beginnings are lost and the lines start with *rn*.

6–7 The first sign is mutilated on its right.

10–15 The beginnings are lost in the lacuna or not visible on the surface. Most parts are unreadable.

16–18 The text is repeatedly interrupted by holes. But in line 18 only determinatives are lost.

22–25 A large hole causes losses of text in each of these lines.

Recto B

3–6 Signs are lost in holes in the initial quarter.

Verso

Severe abrasions impede reading.

On the recto small-scale abrasions are discernible but do not lessen the legibility. The intensity of the ink’s black varies and the writing-instrument runs out of ink usually every 3.5 cm with normal density of signs. Sometimes the scribe had to refill with ink only after 4, 4.5 or even 6 cm, when the signs were rather distant from each other. The only slightly varying thickness of the strokes leads me to assume that a reed was the writing-device.

B. Transliteration and Translation

[] marks lost text, sometimes restored from the context.

[ ] marks an attempt to restore text on the basis of traces.

<> marks emendations.

* marks an uncertain reading of the directly following word.

---

6 See the commentary on line 9.

I. Recto A

(1) [nḥt] řn n ṣnsr ḫnt ʾmnṭ nṯr ʿ nb ḏdw

(2) [nḥt] řn n ṣnsr nṯr ʿ nb ḫḥt ḫnt ḫt-tṣr

(3) [nḥt] řn n ṣnsr nṯr ʿ nb ṭp ḫḥt ṣḥ- nṯr

(4) [nḥt] řn n ṣnsr nṯr ʿ nkwl ḏdw

(5) [nḥt] řn n ṣnsr nṯr ʿ m ḫw nw

(6) nḥt řn n ṣnsr-ṣkr ḫḥt n rṣ-sṭw

(7) nḥt řn n ṣnsr sp ṣḥ ḫw nw

(8) nḥt řn n ṣnsr ḫḥt ṣḥdm ḫḥt ḫmh

(9) nḥt řn n ṣnsr ḫḥt ʾmnṭ nṯr ʿ nb ṣwṯ

(10) řn n ṣnsr nb řn-nṯr

(11) řn n ṣnsr nb ḫḥt ḏḏy

(12) řn n ṣnsr nb *wḥn-ṛʾ

(13) nḥt řn n ḫw.t-hṛ ḫḥw.t ḫmṭn

(14) nḥt řn n ḫw.t-hṛ ḫḥw.t ḫn pr pṯḥ

May the name of Osiris, foremost in
the West, the great god, the lord of
Busiris, protect.

May the name of Osiris, the great
god, the lord of Abydos, the foremost
of the sacred land, protect.

May the name of Osiris, the great
god, the lord of Upoke, the foremost
of the god’s booth, protect.

May the name of Osiris, the great
god of Naref and Busiris, protect.

May the name of Osiris, the great
god in Heliopolis, protect.

May the name of Osiris-Sokar, the
foremost of Rosetau, the protect.

May the name of Osiris-Sepa, the ba
of Heliopolis, protect.

May the name of Osiris, great one of
Djeme, the foremost of the nether-
world, protect.

May the name of Osiris, the fore-
mest in the West, the great god, the
lord of Asyut, protect,

the name of Osiris, the lord of Ra-
nefer,

the name of Osiris, the lord and
foremost of Mendes,

the name of Osiris, the lord of
*Wen-Re.

May the name of Hathor, mistress of
the West, protect.

May the name of Hathor, mistress of
the house of Ptah, protect.
May the name of Ptah-Sokar-Osiris in the house of Re, protect.

May [... of] Anubis, the great, the son of Osiris.

May [... of] Anubis, the embalmer, the foremost of the god’s booth, be equipped,

May [... of] Anubis, the foremost of the sacred land, be equipped,

may [... of] the gods and [the] goddesses who are in the West, be equipped,

may [... of] Pa-Remuti, born of Ta-sheret-Khensu, be equipped,

may [... of] Anubis, the foremost of the West, be equipped,

may [... who are in the South, be equipped,

(23) (and) the gods [..., and] who are in the netherworld,

who are in [...]. O Anubis, o

Hat[hor ...] nswg,

o foremost ones, o you [who act righteously], o (you)

in the presence of the *ten of Pre, o you gods of the offering-table,

the gods and goddesses: May you place

rejuvenation in the body of Pa-Remuti,

born <by> Ta-sheret-Khensu,
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II. recto B

(1) \( mtw=f \ swr \ wnm \ irm \ n^3 \ ly<\cdot:w \ 3kr.w \ hr \) \( t^3 \ htp.t \ 3^2.t \ n \ qm^3-ib \ mtw=f \ 8<m> \ ly \ irm \)

(2) \( n^3 \ ht\text{m}.w \ h\text{ft} *h^m-\cdot^n\text{h}^l \ p^2-r^c \ 'py \ hw\text{y} \)
\( mtw \ in\text{mn} \ in\text{py} \ w\text{h}^3-n=f \ mw \ n \ p\text{3y}=f \ hr\text{w} \ n \)
\( ly \ r^3 \ in\text{y}.t \)

(3) \( mtw=f \ 8p \ t^3 \ 3^0w.t \ h\text{n} \ p^3 \ w \ n \ h\text{h} \ n \ p\text{3y}=f \)
\( hr\text{w} \ n \ y\text{r} \ d\text{m}^c \ mtw=w \ t\text{i}-n=f \ hr\text{t}=f \)

(4) \( hn \ im\text{n}\text{t} \ hr \ 8\text{m}.t \ iy \ h\text{n} \ t^3 \ w\text{h}^3\text{t} \ m^2^c\cdot^4\text{.w} \)
\( mtw=w \ <ti> \ 8\text{m}=f \ n-\text{gr}.4 \ d\text{h}\text{w}\text{t} \ hr \)

(5) \( n^3 \ mn\text{h}<.w> \ r.\text{i}r=f \ hr \ p^3 \ t^3 \ mtw=w \ ti-n=f \)
\( 3 \ ph\text{t} \ m-b\text{3h} \ p^3 \ nb \ n\text{tr}.w \ mtw=f \ 'q \ r \ p\text{3} \ m^2^c \)

(6) \( nt \ 8^c\cdot^c \)

III. Verso

[I\( s \ 8^c\cdot^c \ t^1 n \ sns\text{n} \ nt \ iy \ hr \ d3d3 \ [n \ pa-\text{rmw}]]

\[1\] The Book\(^1\) of Breathing that goes beneath the head [of Pa-Remuti]
C. Commentary

I. Recto

Line 1

Botti reconstructs $\textit{tl<e=y>}$ in lines 1–5 comparing lines 6–10 and 13–15. The translation ‘rivolgo (io) preghiera a (...)’, however, is not convincing. Taking the sign as the proclitic pronoun of the first person singular, reflecting the actual pronunciation of the Coptic $\textit{f-}$, causes some problems: ‘I am the name of Osiris in ...’ is odd in respect to both grammar and meaning, even if one assumes that $\textit{rn}$ is the Demotic expression for $\textit{k3}$. I have considered the reading $\textit{nht}$ (as an unattested and therefore debatable short form): ‘may the name of ... protect.’ But looking at the general structure of the Second Book of Breathing, ‘May my name flourish as the name of god NN flourishes in ...’, I find it difficult to fit in the rendering proposed here, because it does not involve the deceased at all, as it is the case in the hieratic texts. Alternatively $\textit{f-}$ could be a rare form of $\textit{n}$ and $\textit{rn}$ as an expression for $\textit{k3}$. If so, then lines 1–15 would be an offering-litany and they would not follow the Second Book of Breathing as a pattern. Because of the semi-hieratic writing of the toponym for ‘Busiris’ I transliterate $\textit{ddw}$, although $\textit{twtw}$ is more usual.

Line 3

$\textit{wpqw}$ (< $\textit{wpqr}$ ‘district of Poker’, Coptic $\textit{o\nuwke}$) is to be read and not $\textit{wp-hwn}$, interpreted as an epithet of Osiris.

---

8 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 228.
9 SPIEGELBERG, W., Demotische Grammatik (Heidelberg 1925) 68.
10 E.g. pRhind I 7 h10, d10, 9 h10, d10, 10 h5, d6 und II 9 h7, d8 (MÖLLER, G., Die beiden Totenpapyrus Rhind des Museums zu Edinburgh, Demotische Studien 6 (Leipzig 1913) 36f., 42f., 46f., 68f., pls. 7, 9, 10, 20). Cf. BLACKMAN, A. M., „The Pharaoh’s Placenta and the Moon-God Khons“, in JEA 3 (1916) 242 n. 3.
12 ERICHSEN, W., Demotisches Glossar (Kopenhagen 1954) 198.
15 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 228.
A funerary monument of Osiris with his funerary bed was thought to be in the area of Poker at Abydos. In imitation of this, similar Osiris-sanctuaries at other sites (Sais, Buto) were given the same name. The importance of Upoke in the Graeco-Roman period is proved by the prophecy of the lamb of Bokchoris (pVindob. D 10000 II 17), where it is mentioned together with six other Egyptian cities (Heliopolis, Bubastis, Nilopolis, Sebennytos, Memphis, Thebes, Letopolis) with whom the ‘great trees of Upoke’ are in grief because of the miseries occurring in Egypt.

Botti read the last word in this line and line 17 as ssnw and interpreted it as a Demotic transcription of the Late Period hieroglyphic writing of hmnnw ‘Hermupolis’ written with two folded-cloth-s-sign, derived from the hieratic writing of the double four strokes.

The context in line 17 where the name of Anubis replaces that of Osiris in the combination with this epithet suggests the reading sh-ntr (see below). In all attestations of this word known so far it is written with ⲟ as first letter, with the exception of the unetymological writing of Bodl. Eg. Inscr. 1374 a+b as sȝ-hw.t-ntr lit. ‘son of the temple’, sometimes with an additional y as syȝ-ntr. The signs ⲙ before ⲝ may be a corruption through the writings for sh ‘mummy, deceased’ attested with this s and a group like ntr at the end.


19 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 227, 228.


21 E. g. MOLLER, G., Hieratische Paläographie. Die ägyptische Buchschrift von der fünften Dynastie bis zur römischen Kaiserzeit I (Leipzig 1909) 63 no. 663.

22 SMITH, M., „A Demotic Formula of Intercession for the Deceased“, in: Enchoria 19 / 20 (1992 / 93) 134, 140, pl. 34.

23 For the quotation of other references in Demotic see SMITH, Liturgy 39. Cf. ERICHSEN, Glossar 445.

24 ERICHSEN, Glossar 445.
The deity connected with the god's booth since the fourth dynasty, whereas Osiris or the deceased identified with Osiris is the 'foremost of the god's booth', and it is attested for the Graeco-Roman period. In a hymn to Osiris in Dendera one finds in 'Are you in Dunanui in the god's booth?' with 'in etw. (einem Raum, Ort u. s. w.) befindlich', the most frequent use of this idiom corresponding to the older 'imy. Therefore I think that in the Graeco-Roman period 'in the god's booth' was reinterpreted as 'foremost of the god's booth', and in pTurin N. 766 a Demotic attestation is found. Alternatively one may see the transformation of Osiris into Anubis as a reason for Osiris' assumption of the Anubis-epithet.

Line 4

nnwlf is a writing of the toponym nṣrf. Further attestations of nṣrf (possibly to be read nnṣrf) in Demotic are found in pRylands 9 XX 10 and 18 (wšlr nṣrf). Botti gives an m after nnwlf. The m-like sign may well be a part of nnwlf's determinatives, since Naref is not in Busiris. Naref seems to be a place in the 20th Upper Egyptian nome (Heracleopolis Magna – n r.t hnt.t), because it is often mentioned together with Heracleopolis. Like Busiris, Ro-

---

29 Wb III 302, 11.
33 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226.
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setau and other places with Osirian associations, Naref was thought to be the location of a
grand tribunal before which Osiris or the deceased was justified against his enemies. 35 As a
burial place of Osiris (or rather his umbilical cord) 36 it was consecrated to him and was the
setting of 'mysteries', sepulchral rites and ceremonies of resurrection. 37 This explains the
important role of this toponym in the Book of the Dead, whereas it is rarely attested outside
religious texts. 38

Line 5
For the solar aspect of Osiris probably expressed in the epithet 'great god in Heliopolis' see
the commentary on line 7 and cf. wsir s ph.t m iwnw 'Osiris great in might in Heliopolis'
of pBerlin 6750 V, 4 f. 39 See also the caption of a Minia-coffin 40 and pBerlin 8351 III 1
and M. Smith's remarks on that line. 41

Line 6
For the interpretation of the first sign in the line see the commentary on line 1.
R2-st3w should be read 42 instead of Pr-sdr. 43
Sokar is written here m.w.sr and in line 15. 44

35 GOYON, J. C., Rituels funéraires de l'ancienne Égypte (Paris 1972) 250. NAVILLE, É., Das Ägyptische
Totenbuch der XVIII. bis XX. Dynastie aus verschiedenen Urkunden II (Berlin 1886) 81, 29–82, 31.
36 BLACKMAN, A. M., "Emblem upon the Head of an Egyptian Birth-Goddess", in: JEA 3 (1916) 204.
37 GOYON, J. C., "Le cérémonial de glorification d'Osisris du papyrus du Louvre I. 3079 (colonnes 110 à
111)", in: BIFAO 65 (1967) 113, 127. MOKHTAR, M. G. E.-D., Ihnasya el-Medina (Herakleopolis
38 ASSMANN, Liturgische Lieder 69, and the references cited there.
39 SPIEGELBERG, W., Demotische Papyrus aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin (Leipzig / Berlin 1902)
pl. 78.
40 KURTH, D., Der Sarg der Tedris. Aegyptiaca Treverensia 6 (Mainz 1990) 33. As Kurth points out, the
inscriptions on this coffin seem to be fixed phrases added by the artist who had a very basic or rather
rudimentary knowledge of hieroglyphs. This would indicate how common the connection of Osiris with
Heliopolis was.
41 SMITH, Liturgy 26, 31, 50, pl. 3.
42 SMITH, "An Abbreviated Version of the Book of Opening the Mouth for Breathing (Bodl. MS Egypt, c.
9 (p) + P. Louvre E 10605) (Parti)", in: Enchoria 15 (1987) 61–91. Id., Liturgy 37. SPIEGELBERG, W.,
Zu R2-st3w, "Nekropolis", in: ZÄS 59 (1924) 159 f.
43 BOTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 228.
44 For other attestations of this writing cf. MALEK, J. / SMITH, M., "Henry Salt's Egyptian copies and
drawings", in: GM 64 (1983) 48 f. and SPIEGELBERG, W., Ägyptische und griechische Eigennamen aus
Mumienetiketten der römischen Kaiserzeit. Demotische Studien 1 (Leipzig 1901) pl. 16 no. 46.
Ro-Setau, denoting the Memphite necropolis (including Saqqara and Giza), was also a region in the netherworld where the deceased wished to see the sun-god and a place of judgement where Osiris was justified against his enemies. Since the Pyramid Texts, Ro-Setau was primarily associated with Sokar, its lord, who was then superseded, but never entirely eliminated in this respect by Osiris in the course of the increasingly frequent syncretism of the two gods. The text examined here reflects the original association of Sokar with Ro-Setau.

Line 7

`sp (< spS):` See M. Smith’s discussion of `sp`. Cf. the similar writing on the stela CG 31122 and in pLouvre E 3452 V 10 with just the divine determinative.

`byn: `The photograph suggests the reading `byn ‘phoenix’, but in fact `by ‘soul’ is written. The papyrus is undamaged at this point and no traces of an `n are visible. The sense is not really affected, because the concepts of Osiris both as a phoenix and as a soul in Heliopolis are closely related.

Osiris-Sepa is found e. g. in BD sp. 142 and pBM 10569 IV 1 and VI 20. In pBM 10569 IV 1 Osiris-Sepa is called the ‘most august of the spirits of Heliopolis’, and in the same papyrus in VII 7 simply Sepa the ‘most august of Spirits of Heliopolis’. The chthonic millipede Sepa had his sanctuary near the Heliopolitan harbour and was the only

---

46 GOYON, Rituels funéraires funéraires 250. BD sp. 18 (NAVILLE, Todtenbuch II 82.).
47 Pyr. 445b.
49 SMITH, Liturgy 65.
50 SPIEGELBERG, W., Demotische Denkmäler I. 48, pl. 11.
51 LEGRAIN, G., Le Livre des transformations (Paris 1890) pl. 5.
52 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226.
53 For the writings of `by with a round element (bird determinative) between the y and the divine determinative cf. ERICHSEN, Glossar 111, and the even more similar ones of pBerlin 1522, 5 (SPIEGELBERG, Demotische Papyrus Berlin pl. 84) and the inscription of the coffin Edinburgh L. 224/ 3002, 51. 3 (BARNES, J., „A Demotic Coffin Inscription in Edinburgh", in: Diatribae ... Lexa 1. ArOr 20 (1952) 69–71).
54 KEES, H., Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter (Berlin 1926) 63.
55 NAVILLE, Todtenbuch II 366.
56 FAULKNER, Book of Hours 2, 4.
57 FAULKNER, Book of Hours 4.
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deity of this region with whom Osiris could be amalgamated to be integrated into the Heliopolitan system. 58

In the Book of the Dead, spell 17, shortly after an allusion to the soul (b3) of Re, the great phoenix (bnw) in Heliopolis is explicitly identified with Osiris. 59 Later on, paralleled in CT spell 335, 60 the double-soul is explained as the unification of Osiris and the soul of Re after Osiris entered Mendes, found the soul of Re there and embraced it. 61 Osiris-Phoenix is sometimes called the 'soul of Re in the bark of millions' (pLouvre I. 3079 CX II 15) 62 and Osiris is explicitly denoted as Re's soul in Dendera. 63 The Demotic papyrus studied here seems to share the same idea in referring to the solar nature of Osiris as the soul in the main cult-centre of Re.

Line 8

Without giving a reference Botti transliterates zm and explains it as a locality in the Memphite area or a holy place in the netherworld. 64 The reading zmh proposed here, Botti's second m being read as h by comparison with the m-like h in sh-ntr in lines 3 and 16, takes the word as a descendant of the older imh.t, 'Name der Unterwelt, Nekropole verschiedener Orte, Teil des Tempels von Dendera', 65 which might be – but not necessarily – the necropolis of Memphis 66 and which denotes, in the Book of the Two Ways, the home of Osiris in the sky. 67 It is attested in Demotic as following:

---


59 NAVILLE, Todtenbuch II 38–41.


64 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 229.

65 Wb I 88.

66 GOYON, BIFAO 65 (1967) 133 nr. 213. EL-SAYED, R., „Un document relatif au culte dans Kher-Aha (Statue Caire CG. 682)“, in: BIFAO 82 (1982) 195 nr. 3.

Djeme (\(\text{\textit{is.t \textit{tm.t > dm}}}\)), the modern Medinet Habu, is the burial place of the Hermopolitan ogdoad and Amun in his manifestation as the \(\text{\textit{km-\textit{t}=f}}\)-serpent. This very serpent is identified with Osiris, turning Djeme into a burial place of Osiris, possibly not before the Saite period. In Demotic \(\text{\textit{wsir \ 'n \ dm}}\) is also found in pCairo 31170, l. 8–9 and in pLouvre E 3452 II 2.

Line 9

As in the next two lines, the first word in this line is \(\text{\textit{rn}}\), without any traces of the sign that I read \(\text{\textit{nhf}}\) on the undamaged surface of the papyrus here. In lines 12 f. the latter reappears, possibly due to the change of the divine name from Osiris to Hathor.

Here the scribe’s only correction of a mistake is found in \(\text{\textit{nfr}}\). Apparently misled by the divine determinative of \(\text{\textit{imnt}}\) he wrote \(\text{\textit{t}}\) as the next word, leaving out \(\text{\textit{nfr}}\), but he immediately realized the mistake, corrected it to \(\text{\textit{nfr}}\) and then added \(\text{\textit{t}}\).

---

68 Griffith, Rylands I pl. 47, III 328.
69 Spiegelberg, Demotische Denkmäler I 41–44, pl. 9.
70 Brugsch, H., Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum. Fünfte Abtheilung (Leipzig 1891) 990 no. 65, l. 5.
72 Gauthier, DG VI 66.
73 Sethe, K., Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis. APAW 4 (Berlin 1929) 55.
74 Cf. Urk. VIII 59, § 72d and pWien 3865, l. 29 (Herbin, F. R., „Une liturgie des rites décennaires de Djemé. Papyrus Vienne 3865“, in: RdE 35 (1984) 106–126, who cites references to Osiris’ burial in Opet 91, and Opet III 44. These are ambiguous, since they actually refer to Amun-Re — who is admittedly identified as the ‘noble soul of Osiris’.)
76 Spiegelberg, Demotische Denkmäler II 281, pl. 112. In the transliteration the lines 8 and 9 are inadvertently inverted.
77 Legrain, Transformations pl. 2.
Although Upuaut was the main deity of Asyut, Osiris is attested as the ‘lord of Asyut’ from the time of the Pyramid Texts\textsuperscript{78} until at least the Persian period (pCairo 50059, 2).\textsuperscript{79} and the cult-place of Anubis in Asyut’s necropolis r3-\textit{nfr}.\textit{t} became the site of a tomb of Osiris through the identification Anubis-Osiris.\textsuperscript{80} A reference in pCairo 50058, 5\textsuperscript{81} proves the existence of a temple of Osiris in Asyut.\textsuperscript{82}

Line 10
The dot at the beginning before \textit{rn} is either part of \textit{rn} or, alternatively, the scribe inadvertently started to write the \textit{nht}-sign that he just had decided to leave out for the rest of the Osiris-names.

The unattested \textit{QwsbS}\textsuperscript{83} looks like \textit{rn nfr} plus a very faint determinative for a toponym. In pBM 10569 VIII 11 and in the inscription of Louvre E 7689 Osiris is called the lord of \textit{RZ-nfr}.\textit{t} also occurs as one of Osiris’ districts in a decree of Amun-Re for Osiris, written \textit{p*n}.\textit{t} \textit{nfr}.\textit{t}.\textsuperscript{85} On the basis of the homophony of \textit{rn-nfr} (\textit{rn} being in Coptic \textit{p*n}, thus vocalized in the middle)\textsuperscript{86} and \textit{r3-nfr}.\textit{t} I take the first as an unetymological writing for the latter.\textsuperscript{87} Probably there was a town \textit{r3-nfr}.\textit{t} in the nome of Mendes,\textsuperscript{88} mentioned in the next line, another one in the Hermopolitan nome.\textsuperscript{89}

Line 11
The two \textit{dd}-pillars and the signs after them that are transliterated \textit{y} here, plus the determinatives (a sun and a divine determinative) cannot be read \textit{Tt-pr-R }\textsuperscript{c} and understood as an unattestated toponym in the Memphite area.\textsuperscript{90} The word seems not to be

\textsuperscript{78} Pyr. 630 and 1634.
\textsuperscript{79} SPIEGELBERG, W., \textit{Demotische Denkmäler} III. 42 f, pl. 18–20.
\textsuperscript{80} Urk. VII 56 f.
\textsuperscript{81} SPIEGELBERG, \textit{Demotische Denkmäler} III 40 f., pl 17.
\textsuperscript{82} BEINLICH, H., in: LÄ I (Wiesbaden 1975) 489–495 s. v. Assiut.
\textsuperscript{83} BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 229.
\textsuperscript{84} FAULKNER, \textit{Book of Hours} 5, 12*. Cf. GAUTHIER, \textit{DG} III 121. LEFEBVRE, G., „Textes égyptiennes du Louvre“, in: RdE 1 (1933) 88f.
\textsuperscript{85} DARESSY, M. G., „Un décret d’Amon en faveur d’Osiris“, in: \textit{ASA}E 18 (1918) 220.
\textsuperscript{86} CRUM, W. E., \textit{A Coptic Dictionary} (Oxford 1939) 297.
\textsuperscript{87} Cf. SMITH, M., „Lexicographical Notes on Demotic Texts“, in: \textit{Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens}. Fs W. Westendorf 1. Sprache (Göttingen 1984) 390, and id., Liturgy 58, for \textit{r3-nfr} in pBerlin 8351 IV 5, written as \textit{rn-nfr}.
\textsuperscript{88} GAUTHIER, \textit{DG} III 121.
\textsuperscript{89} However, the reading for that place in pLoeb 10, 6 is as uncertain as its location, see SPIEGELBERG, W., \textit{Die demotischen Papyri Loeb} (München 1931) IX f., 34, 5*, pl. 8.
\textsuperscript{90} BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 229.
'Busiris' either, because that toponym is written differently in lines 1 and 4. 'Mendes' is not in ERICHSEN's Glossar, but the y – for its transliteration cf. the similar y in by (recto A 7) – might reflect the vowel that is a relic of the lost feminine t of dd.t.\(^91\) The Ram, lord of Mendes, was assimilated to Osiris as his soul from very early times onwards, as well as an incarnation of the souls of Re, Shu and Geb.\(^92\) Hence the ram was four-headed and four naoi were built for him.\(^93\) According to pJumilhac IV 21 f. and V the Mendesian nome was the place where the phallus or – according to another tradition – the backbone of Osiris was found.\(^94\) For the unification of Osiris and the soul of Re cf. the commentary on line 8.

Line 12

Cf. the uncertain wn-r'c in pCairo 31169 recto I 20.\(^95\) All signs are clearly separate and look like nt ti r'c in the original (cf. ti at the end of recto B 3), but the 'lord who gives Re' is not convincing either.

Line 13

Botti's pth-skr-wsir n s.t imnt seems to be impossible. In line 14 he read the same signs before his pr sw as part of pth-skr-wsir, while he transliterated them as n s.t in line 13.\(^96\) But pth-skr-wsir is written in the normal way (with skr written as srk, see commentary on recto A 6) in line 15. In fact hw.t-hr hnw.t is written in both lines, followed here by imnt.

Line 14

Botti transliterates pr sw instead of pr pth, but cannot quote another attestation for this toponym.\(^97\)

For Hathor as mistress of Memphis cf. the hw.t-hr nb.t inbw in e. g. pLouvre I 3079, 52, 65\(^98\) and pBM 10188, XX 10.\(^99\)

---

\(^91\) Cf. SPIEGELBERG, Grammatik §§ 21–24, esp. Anmerkung on p. 21 f.


\(^93\) SOGHOR, C. L., II. „Inscriptions from Tell el Rub’a“, in: JARCE 6 (1967) 16–23.

\(^94\) VANDIER, Papyrus Jumilhac 136 f.

\(^95\) SPIEGELBERG, Demotische Denkmäler II 270, pl. 109. See DARESSY, G., „La liste géographique du papyrus no. 31169 du Caire“, in: Sphinx 14 (1911) 158.

\(^96\) BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226.

\(^97\) BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 229.

\(^98\) GOYON, RdÉ 20 (1968) 68, 78, 80, 93 n. 45.

Line 15
In connection with a toponym or building *m-bśh* 100 is rather uncommon. Normally, that preposition is only used with kings and gods101 and occasionally with the deceased.102 I prefer to read *m*.

\( R^c \) appears here in a semi-hieratic form.

For Ptah-Sokar-Osiris in the House of Re (\( \textit{hw.t n r^c} \)) cf. \( \dd m \textit{dw} \in \textit{pth rsy} \in \textit{bw} \leftarrow \textit{f} \) \( \textit{ntr} \) \( \textit{s} \) \( \textit{hry-ib} \) \( \textit{twn.t tnw} \) \( \textit{m} \) \( \dd t=f n \) \( \textit{pr-r} \) \( (...) \) 'Spell by Ptah who is south of <his> wall, the great god dwelling in Dendera, the august one in his image of the house of Re (...)'103

Line 16
Perhaps *nht r\( n \) n* is to be restored at the beginning.

For the restoration and Anubis as *s3 wsir* cf. e. g. pHarkness IV 18104 and – outside Demotic, but in contemporary contexts – pCairo 58007 I 3, 58009 I 7, 58011 recto 3 and 58017 recto 10,105 pLeiden T 33, 3,106 the mummy masks CG 33129 and 33135107, a caption in a tomb at Tuna el-Gebel,108 the reference to Anubis' father in pHarkness V 19109 and \textit{An\textit{otn ci otcipe}} in the Old Coptic pSchmidt.110 Anubis, originally a son of Re,111 was perceived as the son of Osiris since the 19th dynasty,112 because he as the god of burial buried Osiris and thus carried out typical duties of a son.113

100 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 226.
101 Spiegelberg, Grammatik 148 § 326.
102 E. g. pBM 10507 II 1 (Smith, Mortuary Texts 36.), pHarkness III 6, 25, 33, 37, IV 3, 6 (Smith, Mortuary Texts 52, pl. 11. Logan, Th. J., „Papyrus Harkness“, in: Studies in Honor of George R. Hughes. SAOC 39 (Chicago 1976) 154 f.)
104 Logan, P. Harkness 155 f.
105 Golénischeff, W., Papyrus hiératiques Nos. 58001–58036. CGC (Le Caire 1927) 23, 35, 46, 58, 73.
106 Stricker, B., „De lijkpapyrus van Sensaos“, in: OMRO 23 (1942) 30–47.
108 Gabra, S. / Drioton, E., Peintures à fresque et scènes peintes à Hermopolis-Ouest (Touna el-Gebel) (Le Caire 1954) pl. 29.
109 Logan, P. Harkness 158 f.
113 Grenier, Anubis 18 f.

Enchoria 25, 1999
Line 17
Botti transliterates mhl, which he connects with mhl ‘bald’, interpreting the shaving of the head as a ceremony of purification. On reflection I have abandoned my first reading mw rt, suggested by the recurrent formula of the Second Book of Breathing ‘may the name of NN flourish in Thebes and the nomes forever as the name of god NN flourishes in XY’. The first part of this formula is missing in our text, and the deceased is not mentioned until line 20 among the gods. If the nḥt of rt. A 1–16 were taken as the first part of the Second Book’s formula, the problem arises that the divine names of the first part shall be as strong or protective as the divine names of the second part flourish. This, however, involves the impossible implicature that e. g. Osiris’ name is less strong or protective than Anubis’.

Mw as a variant of the imperative of my ‘cause, give’, used to express the optative from Late Egyptian onwards (Coptic ṭa[p]ey), is otherwise unattested. The reading mwr seems secure. However, a verb mwr is not found elsewhere and unfortunately all occurrences of the word in this papyrus are damaged. I suspect a meaning ‘to be equipped’ and would be inclined to translate the sentences of recto A 17–22 as ‘May NN be equipped (with offerings and nourishment?) …’ with ṭa[p]ey ml ‘to gird’ of pKrall in mind showing a similar determinative. That verb, with the Fayumic change r > l, is always used there in the sense of ‘to equip oneself’ or ‘to be equipped’ with weapons or armour. It is normally written mr in Demotic as in older stages of the Egyptian language and developed to Coptic motp showing the vowel or weak consonant between m and r, possibly indicated in mwr here.

The repositioning of fragments F+G leads to more space and makes thus the restitution of another word after mwr necessary. Given mwr is really a verb as proposed here this missing word must be a noun connected with the following in the genitive on grounds of grammar.

114 ERICHSEN, Glossar 171
115 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 229.
117 See part II on that problem.
120 Wb II 105, 1–8. ERICHSEN, Glossar 166. WESTENDORF, W., KHWb 99. CRUM, CD 180–182.

Enchoria 25, 1999
The vertical dark line visible in the photograph is not ink, but a very dark shadow of a crack.

After Botti’s *mhl*, my *mwr*, I am unable to see an *n* in lines 17–22.\(^\text{121}\)

Botti reads [\(imy\)] *wyt* (< *imy* *wt* ) ‘he who is in *wt*’. *M wyt* ‘embalmer’ alone seems to be preferable, since this is the normal form of that epithet in Demotic, but the gap before the *m* is quite big so that a word must be missing after *lmn*.

For the *\(sh\)-ntr* see the commentary on line 3.

Line 19

The reading *mhl n n\(^3\) ntr.w hn c ht.w ip m *lmnte*\(^\text{122}\) cannot be matched with the traces on the papyrus at all.

Line 20

The deceased’s name among the names of deities is probably the result of the idea that the deceased becomes a divine being.\(^\text{123}\) This is also found in the litanies of pHarkness V 16–28 and VI 18–29\(^\text{124}\) and paralleled with the representation of the deceased in a row with gods and goddesses on some coffins of the Roman Period.\(^\text{125}\)

Line 21

Neither a *k\(^2\)* nor an *iw* is visible.\(^\text{126}\) The gap may be filled with the restitution suggested here.

Line 22

Botti reads *\(smh\)* in this and the following lines instead of *\(smw\)* (< *\(imy.w\)*) interpreting it as a toponym.\(^\text{127}\) In pHarkness III 1 *\(smw\)* is attested three times.\(^\text{128}\)

\(^{121}\) Contra BOTTI, *JEA* 54 (1968) 226.

\(^{122}\) BOTTI, *JEA* 54 (1968) 226


\(^{126}\) So BOTTI, *JEA* 54 (1968) 226.


Line 23
The line is a continuation of the preceding one so that ntr.wt must be restored in the lacuna. Also in support of this are the remains after the gap resembling the last two signs of ntr.w, as in line 28, plus a feminine .t.

Line 24
The traces after the hole are clearly those of an n and nt swg must therefore be abandoned. Is wg the older wg? ‘Altersschwäche, Herzschwäche’ or wg3.t ‘Schädliches, Schädigung’ or should one read nswg related to nsq ‘bildlich von boshafien Reden’?

Line 25
Botti connects wy.w with ‘w ‘great’, because ‘w ‘stretch out; to be, become happy’ can be so written, but the w looks more like an ir than other examples of w in the text (recto A 3, recto B 3). Cf. the ir in recto B 4. The proposed translation assumes an archaizing participle of ir formed with –y.

Line 26
After m-bəš a divine name is expected. For nkt ‘potenza’ I could not find any trace in the original, but I am unable to give a satisfying explanation for . Is it ‘10’ and thus referring to an assembly of 10 gods?

Line 27
After ntr.w, ntr.wt is written, not if.w-nfr.

Line 28
Behind he.t again an ink-like shadow of a crack appears in the photograph.

---

129 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 229.
130 Wb I 376, 13–14.
131 Wb I 376, 15–377, 1.
132 Wb II 336, 16.
133 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 226, 229. Erichsen, Glossar 57, 78.
135 For the construction of m-bəš plus word for ‘council’ or ‘assembly’ cf. m-bəš g3t nsw 3.t of e.g. the contemporary pCairo 58007 I 15, 58008, 18, 31, 58009 II passim (Golénischeff, Papyrus hiératiques 23–54.) and pLeiden T 33 (Stricker, Omro 23 (1942) 30–47.).
136 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 226.
II. Recto B

Line 1

The conjunctive may have final sense especially after verbs of command and wish and I interpret it here as a final clause continuing the text of recto A: ‘May NN be equipped (...) Place rejuvenation (...) so that he will drink ...’

There is no t between 3 and qms-ib, the sign in question is instead the feminine .t of 9.t.

S <ij as an unetymological writing of šm-iy is questionable, whereas the reading š<m> iy is supported by the Late Egyptian šl, another instance in pBM 69008+pBerlin 13381, the Coptic wē, reflecting the loss of the last consonant in the neighbouring stages of the Egyptian language and the well attested wish of free movement in the netherworld expressed in Demotic through the opposition of šm and iy (iw). After the š a stroke is written, as in the two phonetic writings of šm in recto B line 4, and the word ends with the walking legs as determinative.

Line 2

The reading given here instead of nt m-šb c n špe n after piz-rc assumes that htm.w is an archaizing participial form of htm ‘vernichten, vertilgen u.ä., Personen vertilgen, bes. die Feinde, die Bösen’, and that hm- nh is identical with the name of a necropolis on the Theban west bank hm- nh in pRhind II 9 d 5. However, the abrasions and cracks in the present line make this interpretation problematic and it should only be

137 SPIEGELBERG, Grammatik 72 §§149 f.
139 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 227, 230.
140 ERMAN, Neuägyptische Grammatik 195 §§257,406.
142 CRUM, CD 544b.
143 WESTENDORF, KHWb 301. ČERNY, CED 235.
144 E. g. pHarkness III 23 (šm- iw), IV 15 (šm - iy, šm - iw) (SMITH, Mortuary Texts pl. 11, LOGAN, ‘P. Harkness’ 156 f.) and pRhind 14 d 13 (šm - iw), 6 d 8 (šm - iy) (MÖLLER, Totenpapyrus 24 f., 32 f., pls. 4, 6).
145 BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 227.
146 Wb III 197.
147 MÖLLER, Totenpapyrus 68 f., 76*, pl. 20.
regarded as hypothetical. The reading ḥft, referring to the Apophis-serpent that must be killed during the nightly journey of Re through the netherworld, is especially doubtful. The ‘py ‘winged beetle’ (not recognized by Botti)\(^{148}\) is a manifestation of the sun-god.\(^ {149}\)

The Glossar lists ḡwy ‘schützen. Auch: heilig, ehrwürdig’ with a similar writing, but without the divine determinatives supporting the translation given here.\(^ {150}\)

Considering other writings of ti in this text (e. g. recto B 3 and 5) ti r-r=f mw.\(^ {151}\) is to be corrected to \(\text{wšn}=f\) mw.

The reading \(\text{imn}\) ipy requires fewer emendations than the grammatically, palaeographically and theologically somewhat problematic \(\text{tš ntr}\) py ‘the goddess of Pe’,\(^ {152}\) as a male god (Horus) is usually associated with Pe, whereas the goddess of Buto (Wadjit) is connected with Dep, the other part of Buto.\(^ {153}\) The mention of a libation here and of the feast of traversing the river in the next line matches with the well attested travel of Amenope to Djeme at the beginning of every decade.\(^ {154}\)

**Line 3**

\(\text{Wis (n)}\) hh is a name of the sun-bark since the Book of the Dead. The Demotic form of this name is \(w\) n hh.\(^ {155}\)

After \(w\) n hh, I see \(p\) z=f written and not \(p\) z.\(^ {156}\)

For the feast of crossing the river to Djeme see the commentary on the preceding line.

---

149 For other attestations in Demotic see Smith, Liturgy 63.
150 Erichsen, Glossar 352. See also Wb III 244 f.
151 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 227.
152 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 227, 230.
155 Wb I 271, 11. The reading in Demotic is discussed by Hoffmann, Enchoria 23 (1996) 39–51, with reference to this text on p. 40 and 49.
156 Botti, JEA 54 (1968) 227.
To be in the sun-bark is highly desirable: In BD sp. 175, Atum points out that he has done more for Osiris than for every other god, e.g., iri.n = i s.t = f m wi' = h h iw rdi.n = i h ; b = f wr.w 'I have made his <throne> in the bark of millions. I caused him to send the grandees.'\(^157\) For the Roman period the funerary bed Berlin Inv. 12442 can be cited (ds = w wstn m wi' = (n) h h 'They will allow (you) free movement in the bark of millions.')\(^158\) In the Grande Inscription Dédicatoire Ramesses II addresses his deceased father in the manner of a mortuary liturgy: '(...) wy = k <y> hr st = i tm m p. t m t3 mi ihm.w-wrd ihm.w-sk i w = k m imy h 3 t n wi' n h h (...) '(...) your arms draw Atum in the sky and on earth like the unwearing stars and the imperishable stars, while you are at the prow rope of the bark of millions. (...)'\(^159\) I. e., it is hoped that Ramesses' father Seti will carry out a task in the sun-bark – like the owner of pTurin N. 766 – and be among its deities, whose presence there is mentioned in pHarris 157, 3\(^160\) and BD sp. 186 (Ani).\(^161\) Like royal persons every deceased individual wished to enter the sun-bark and to be a member of its crew,\(^162\) for which purpose the Book of the Dead provided special spells such as BD sp. 100 ('Book to make a spirit excellent and to let him descend to the bark of Re together with them who are in his following'), and 129 (a variant to 100)\(^163\) and 102 ('Spell to enter the sun-bark').\(^164\) The same idea is found in pHarkness V 30: 'l = t r sgty.t irm p3-r < n tw3y ir = t mne.w mnj 3 t n p3 rse 'You will go on board to the morning-bark together with Re at dawn, you will carry out the moorings of the evening-bark in the evening.'\(^165\)


\(^{162}\) Cf. CT II sp. 151. For the Graeco-Roman period: GOYON, Rituels funéraires 255, 259, 261.

\(^{163}\) NAVILLE, Todtenbuch II 233–236.

\(^{164}\) NAVILLE, Todtenbuch II 237–239.

Botti transliterated the unattested šš<ij and šš< without commentary. For a phonetic writing of šm as a new reading, cf. pLouvre E. 3452 III 11, V 7, VI 8, VII 8, IX 7, 8, XIII 2, 3, 5 and pLouvre 10605, 18. The first sign after the stroke is the determinative (walking legs) followed by a t, thus an infinitive of šm with t is used here as an archaism.

Mte=w šš<tf does not take into account the two suffix-pronouns with just one verb, and an emendation seems to be required.

The text alludes to Thoth’s role as the scribe of š< t n sns n ‘a Document of Breathing’ and as a secretary of the gods’ assembly. In pParis BN 149 I 9 reference is made to š< t n sns n dhwty m s< k nt sh n db< f h< t ‘a Document of Breathing of Thoth which is written with his own fingers’. According to pRhind II 8 d 1 Thoth has made a Document of Breathing ‘to be a protection for you (i. e. the deceased) to prevent you from standing outside of the hall of Osiris’ (tš š< t sns n l)r-n=t dhwty r l)r-n=t sš r tm tš ‘h< t pš h< t wsh< t n wstr, similarly in pRhind I 8 d 1), and pRhind II 8 d 4 states ‘they will receive the document which Thoth has written in front of you, so that you may go to the gateways of the netherworld’ (šp=w tš š< t r.sh dhwty hš< t= t mš< t r nš sb.w n tš t wš< t ). These references show that the documents were thought to be passports for free movement in the netherworld, and allow us to see the significance of n-dr.t dhwty in pTurin N. 766.

Apparently Thoth does not act on his own initiative. Like a secretary he executes an order to issue a document. In the same manner the content of the Books of Breathing,
although written by Thoth, is not determined by him. In pHarkness IV 15 another hint is found that an assembly is in charge of issuing documents for free movement in and out of the netherworld: \( i.r=t \ mr \ &m \ iy \ hb=w \ h3.t=t \) ‘If you want to go and to come, they will write in your presence.’ To my mind the Righteous Ones are the divine members of the court judging the deceased in the Hall of the Righteous Ones (the classical dual ‘Hall of the Two Truths’ is in Demotic reinterpreted as a nisbe of \( m3 \ <t \) from which the plural was formed). Sometimes they are called \( n3 \ hsy.w \) in \( wsh.t \ n3 \ hsy.w \) in the Demotic sections of the Rhind papyri, where the hieratic gives \( wsh.t \ m3 \ <ty. \) In pCairo 58012 recto 10 the wish is expressed that the deceased will have free access to the Hall of the Righteous Ones and sit next to them (\( pri=k \ h3.i=k \ r \ wsh.t \ m3 \ <ty \ iri=k \ s.t=k \ r-gs \ m3 \ <ty. \)). Therefore in pTurin N. 766 an assembly of gods appears to order the divine secretary Thoth to compose a document allowing free movement to the deceased.

Line 5

After \( ti \) I read -\( n=f \) \( 3 \) \( ph^{183} \) rather than -\( r-r=f \) \( ti.t \) \( ph nh.t. \) \( ^{184} \)

The line closes with -\( mtw=f \) \( q \) \( 185 \) \( r \) \( p3 \) \( m3 \ <r \) rather than with -\( mtw=f \) \( ir \) \( sr \) \( n \) \( p3 \) \( m3 \ <r. \) \( ^{186} \)

III. Verso

The second part of the line, transliterated by Botti as \( m-tj \ sH \) \( P3-bj-n-ti.wy \) with the name not included in the Demotisches Namenbuch, \( ^{187} \) is very mutilated. The traces, however,


\[ ^{178} \text{LOGAN, „Papyrus Harkness“ 157. For the expression \( hb \ h3.j \) cf. pRhind II 8 d4 (quoted above) and SMITH, M., Review of RAY, J.D., The Archive of Hor, in: JEA 64 (1978) 180f.}

\[ ^{179} \text{In pCairo 58008, 4 for instance are gods in the Hall of the Righteous Ones mentioned (GÔLÈNISCHIEFF, Papyrus hiératiques 36–44.}.}

\[ ^{180} \text{See SMITH, Mortuary Papyrus 161 n. 1. Cf. pParis BN 149 I 16 f., 24 ff. (LEXA, Totenbuch pl. 1.).}

\[ ^{181} \text{pRhind I 4 d 2, 5 d 10, II 7 d 8 (MÔLLER, Totenpapyrus 22 f., 28 f., 64 f., pls. 4, 5, 18.).}

\[ ^{182} \text{GÔLÈNISCHIEFF, Papyrus hiératiques 59–62.}

\[ ^{183} \text{Cf. ERICHSEN, Glossar 138, 226.}

\[ ^{184} \text{BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 227.}

\[ ^{185} \text{Cf. ERICHSEN, Glossar 72.}

\[ ^{186} \text{BOTTI, JEA 54 (1968) 227.}

\[ ^{187} \text{Demot. Nb.}

\[ Enchoria 25, 1999 \]
suggest a phrase specifying where to place the papyrus on the mummy, a reading which finds support in other late funerary papyri. 188

D. Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>lmw</code></td>
<td>they who are in netherworld</td>
<td>rt. A 19', 22, 23, 24 see commentary on 1. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lmh</code></td>
<td>netherworld</td>
<td>rt. A 8 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>skr</code></td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>rt. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>i</code></td>
<td>vocative particle</td>
<td>rt. A 24 (twice), 26 (thrice), 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ltw.t</code></td>
<td>office</td>
<td>rt. B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ly</code></td>
<td>come</td>
<td>rt. B 1, 2, 4 vs. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ly&lt;h&gt;.w</code></td>
<td>akh-spirits</td>
<td>rt. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lnw</code></td>
<td>Heliopolis</td>
<td>rt. A 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ibt</code></td>
<td>Abydos</td>
<td>rt. A 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lnn </code></td>
<td>Amenope</td>
<td>rt. B 2 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lnm</code></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>rt. A 1, 9, 13, 19, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lnw.t</code></td>
<td>valley</td>
<td>rt. B 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lnpw</code></td>
<td>Anubis</td>
<td>rt. A 16, 17, 18, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lr</code></td>
<td>do, make, act</td>
<td>rt. B 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>lry.w</code></td>
<td>they who do, act</td>
<td>rt. A '26' see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>r.lr</code></td>
<td>done</td>
<td>rt. B 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>irm</code></td>
<td>together with</td>
<td>rt. B 1 (twice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

188 For other attestations of this sort of instruction see COENEN, OLP 26 (1995) 37 f. Add pCairo 58013 and 58014, perhaps 58017 and 58023 (GOLÉNISCHEFF, Papyrus Hiératiques 65, 68, 74, 92.)
yr  river  rt. B 3
q  great  rt. A 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 16  rt. B 5
$^ta$  (feminine)  rt. B 1
'py  winged beetle  rt. B 2 see commentary
'q  enter  rt. B 5
w  bark  rt. B 3
wi$n$  put, pour  rt. B 2
wyt  embalmer  rt. A 17 see commentary
wpqw  Upoke  rt. A 3 see commentary
wrm  eat  rt. B 1
w$^fr$  Osiris  rt. A 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (in wsfr-skr), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 (in pth-skr-wsfr), '16'
wsh$t$  hall  rt. B 4
by  ba, soul  rt. A 7
p$t$  sky, heaven  rt. A 21
p$^i$  definite article  rt. B 3, 5 (thrice)
mascuine singular
p$^iy=f$  his  rt. B 2, 3
pa-rmw$^t$  Pa-Remuti  rt. A 20, 29
pr  house  rt. A 14
p$h$  power  rt. B 5
pth  Ptah  rt. A 14, 15 (in pth-skr-wsfr)
\[ \text{pth-skr-wsir} \quad \text{Ptah-Sokar-Osiris} \]
\[ =f \quad \text{suffix pronoun third person masculine singular} \]
\[ m \quad \text{in, as} \]
\[ m-bih \quad \text{before, in the presence of} \]
\[ m^3 \quad \text{place} \]
\[ m^3.t \quad \text{righteousness} \]
\[ m^3.f.w \quad \text{righteous ones} \]
\[ m^3.f.w \quad \text{righteous ones} \]
\[ m-w \quad \text{give!, place!} \]
\[ m^w \quad \text{water} \]
\[ m^w.r \quad \text{*be equipped} \]
\[ m^w.h \quad \text{efficacious} \]
\[ m \quad \text{of} \]
\[ m \quad \text{by, for, on} \]
\[ -n=f \quad \text{for him} \]

rt. A 15
rt. A 21
rt. B 3, 4, 5
rt. A 5, 15, 17, 21, 27, 29
rt. A 27
rt. B 5
rt. B 5
rt. A '26'
rt. B 4
rt. A 28
rt. B 2
rt. A '17', 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 see commentary on 1. 17
rt. B 5
rt. A 20, 30
rt. B 2
rt. B 1 (twice), 3, 5
rt. B 3, 4, 5
rt. A 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (twice), 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 (twice), 15 (twice), 16 vs.
rt. A 20
rt. B 2, 3
rt. B 2, 3, 5

Enchoria 25, 1999
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ni$</td>
<td>definite article</td>
<td>rt. A 19 ([twice]), 23, 27, 28 rt. B 1, 2, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$nb$</td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>rt. A 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 rt. B 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n\text{ni}w\text{lf}$</td>
<td>Naref</td>
<td>rt. A 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n\text{ht}$</td>
<td>to protect</td>
<td>rt. A [1], [2], [3],[4], [5], 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15 see commentary on l. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$nswg$</td>
<td>a negative term</td>
<td>rt. A 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$nt$</td>
<td>relative converter</td>
<td>rt. B 6 vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n\text{tr}$</td>
<td>god</td>
<td>rt. A 1, 3 (twice, second instance in $sb\cdot n\text{tr}$), 4, 5, 9, 17 (in $sb\cdot n\text{tr}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n\text{tr}.w$</td>
<td>gods</td>
<td>rt. A 19, 23, 27, 28, rt. B 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n\text{tr}.w.t$</td>
<td>goddesses</td>
<td>rt. A '19', 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>to, towards</td>
<td>rt. B 2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r\text{i}\cdot s\text{jt}w$</td>
<td>Ro-setau</td>
<td>rt. A 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^e$</td>
<td>Re</td>
<td>rt. A 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p\text{i}\cdot r^e$</td>
<td>Prê</td>
<td>rt. A 27 rt. B 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$rn$</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>rt. A 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$rn\text{py}$</td>
<td>rejuvenation</td>
<td>rt. A 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$rn\cdot n\text{fr}$</td>
<td>Ranefer</td>
<td>rt. A 10 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$rsy$</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>rt. A 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rt</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>rt. B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrw</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>rt. B 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hw.t</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>rt. A 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hw.t-hr</td>
<td>Hathor</td>
<td>rt. A 13, 14, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnwt</td>
<td>mistress</td>
<td>rt. A 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br</td>
<td>at, for, because of, on</td>
<td>rt. B 1, 4 (twice), 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb</td>
<td>millions</td>
<td>rt. B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>htp.t</td>
<td>offering-table</td>
<td>rt. A 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rt. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>htm.w</td>
<td>exterminators</td>
<td>rt. B '2' see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hw</td>
<td>holy</td>
<td>rt. B 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bft</td>
<td>enemy</td>
<td>rt. B '2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnt</td>
<td>foremost</td>
<td>rt. A 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hnt.w</td>
<td>(plural)</td>
<td>rt. A 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be.t</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>rt. A 21 (be&lt;.t&gt;, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>rt. B '3', 4 (twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>rt. A'16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sns</td>
<td>breath</td>
<td>vs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swr</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>rt. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>Sepa</td>
<td>rt. A 7 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh-ntr</td>
<td>god's booth</td>
<td>rt. A 3, 17 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skr (srk)</td>
<td>Sokar</td>
<td>rt. A 6 (in wsr-sk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>št</td>
<td>book, document, letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šš</td>
<td>be glorious</td>
<td>rt. B 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šp</td>
<td>receive</td>
<td>rt. B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šm</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>rt. B 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š&lt;m&gt;</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>rt. B 1 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šm.t</td>
<td>go (archaic infinitive)</td>
<td>rt. B 4 see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qml-lb</td>
<td>the one who invents with the heart</td>
<td>rt. B 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definite article feminine singular</td>
<td>rt. B 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tqa</td>
<td>Ta-sheret-Khensu</td>
<td>rt. A 20, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tlb</td>
<td>earth, land</td>
<td>rt. B 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tla</td>
<td>sacred land</td>
<td>rt. A 2, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tl</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>rt. B 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twn.t</td>
<td>netherworld</td>
<td>rt. A 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tw=tn</td>
<td>dependent pronoun second person plural</td>
<td>rt. A 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>take; here: cross</td>
<td>rt. B 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>head</td>
<td>vs. see commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dm</td>
<td>Djeme</td>
<td>rt. A 8 see commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problematic readings

\[ n-dr.t \] by the hand of,  
\[ dbwty \] through  
\[ gdy \] Thoth  
\[ gdw \] Mendes  
\[ Bw-r' \] Busiris  
\[ *hn-\text{nh} \] Wen-Re  
\[ *10 \] Khem-ankh  
\[ *10 \] beneath, under  

rt. B 4  
rt. B 4  
rt. A 11 see commentary  
rt. A 1, 4  
rt. A 12 see commentary  
rt. B '2' see commentary  
rt. A 27 see commentary  
vs.

Enchoria 25, 1999
P. Turin N. 766 recto (7:10)
(zu Stadler, The Funerary Texts, S. 76–110)
P. Turin N. 766 verso (7:10)
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