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The six demotic inscriptions published here are engraved on limestone objects, or on limestone blocks (nos 1, 2, 6) or stelae (nos 3, 4, 5). They were found in Tuna el-Gebel necropolis. The first two objects (nos 1, 2) were found during Cairo University excavations carried out by S. Gabra and others, while no. 3 was found during the excavations of the joint archaeological mission of Cairo and Munich Universities in season 2004. Nos 4, 5, 6 were found during the excavations of Munich University in seasons 1980 and 1983. The original place where nos 1, 2 (Inv. no. 1728/258, Inv. no. 1489/774, 29/s.s.) were found is unknown. According to the acronym s.s. — “south-sector” — registered on the second object, they might have been found in the area of the funerary houses to the south of the tomb of Petosiris. They are kept now in el-Ashmonein magazine. As for TG 5275 (no. 3), it was found in a secondary Roman stone tomb (tomb no. 3) to the west of the wall of the tomb no. 1, and at the north eastern corner of the tomb of Djed-Djehuty iw=f’nḫ on the eastern side of the galleries, and kept now in Tuna el-Gebel magazine. As for TG 433, TG 109 and TG 428 (nos 4, 5, 6), they were
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2 For blocks of stone with demotic inscriptions, see A. Farid, *op. cit.*, p. 199-200.

3 For stone stelae with demotic inscriptions, see ibid., p. 216-223.

found in the subterranean galleries (gallery C- C- 4) of the sacred animals (Ibiotapeion), and kept also in Tuna el-Gebel magazine.

Owing to the bad condition of these pieces, some strokes in the inscriptions could easily be confused during the preparation of the facsimiles with the natural faults of the stone surface.

I. **Limestone block**

*Inv. No.:* 1728/258.

*Provenance:* Tuna el-Gebel necropolis, area of the funerary houses (?).

*Material:* Limestone.

*Dimensions:* Height: 9 cm; Width: 25.5 cm; Thickness: 6 cm.

*Bibliography:* Unpublished.

*Content:* Votive inscription.

*Dating:* Late Ptolemaic period or early Roman period according to the script, but the early Roman period is more plausible here on account of the place in which the block was found.

*Description:* Rectangular block of limestone with an engraved demotic text of four lines; the text on the block is in a good state of preservation.

![Limestone block Inv. No. 1728/258.](image)

1. Limestone block Inv. No. 1728/258.

\[\begin{align*}
[1] & \text{nȝ ntr.w pȝ ʿ.wy-ḥtp dỉ.t ṭ nh n swrd (n) pȝ hb} \\
[2] & \text{Pȝ-dỉ-pȝ-hb sȝ Pȝy-Wsỉr (?) {pȝ} ỉrm nȝy=f rmt(.) w ḏr=w ḏr=w} \\
[3] & \text{pȝ ʿ(.wy)-p⟨s⟩y m-bȝḥ pȝ hb Ḏst n-tr.t Ḏḥwty-mn} \\
[4] & \text{pȝ wʿb n Ḏy-m-ḥtp wr sȝ Ptḥ}
\end{align*}\]

[1] *The gods (of) the resting place give life to caretaker (of) the Ibis.*

[2] *Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb son of Pȝy-Wsỉr [the] and all his people who have let that*

[3] *the bakery be made before the Ibis (and) Isis, by Дd-hт son of Дhwt-y-mn*

[4] *the priest of Ьy-m-htп, the Great, son of Ptah.*

**Commentary**

- **Line 1**
  
  $\text{pȝ ʿ.wy-ḥtp, [pȝ ʿ.wy n ḥtp}, \text{the resting place, see W. Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar, Kopenhagen, 1954, p. 340; J. Ray, The Archive of Hor, EES Texts 2, 1976, p. 139-140; P. W. Pestman, The Archive of the Theban Chaos-}
  


  $\text{nȝ ntr.w pȝ ʿ.wy-ḥtp, the gods of the resting place. In the subterranean galleries of Tuna el-Gebel large numbers of the sacred animals are buried (baboons, falcons, snakes, shrews, etc.); they are all referred to as pȝ ntr,6 while the official name of the subter-}
  
  ranean galleries in Tuna el-Gebel necropolis is “the resting place of the ibis, the baboon, the falcon and the gods who rest with them”.*


---

6 M. Ebeid, “Demotic Inscriptions from the Galleries of Tuna el-Gebel”, *BIFAO* 106, 2006, p. 88; as for the various sacred animals and birds which were bur-}


7 D. Kessler, M.A. Nur El-Din, op. cit. p. 137; as well as the previous name and others, in dem. Pap. Cairo 24/11/62/2, r.6, dem. Pap. Cairo 24/11/62/3, r.6, another name of the subterranean galleries in Tuna el-Gebel necropolis is mentioned as follows: *pȝ ʿ.wy-ḥtp n pȝ hbt pȝ “n nty ir imnt n ḥmnw, the resting place of the Ibis and the Monkey, which is in the west of Hermopolis, see A. Farid, “Two Demotic Annuity Contracts”, in Studies in Honor of Ali Radwan, *CASAE* 34/1, 2005, p. 326, p. 342.
As for the formula $nȝ ntr.w pȝ ʿ.wy-htp di.t ŭb n swrd (n) pȝ bb Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb sȝ Pȝ-y-Wsir (?) $irm nȝy=f rmt(w) $r=w, the gods (of) the resting place give life to caretaker (of) the Ibis Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb son of Pȝ-y-Wsir and all his people. [God X gives life to N.N.], as a formula of the votive inscriptions, see S. P. Vleeming, op. cit, § 1, p. 250-253.

1. **Line 2-3**

- As for the personal name Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb see Demot. Nb. I/5, p. 306; for the personal name Pȝ-y-Wsir (?) although the first element of the name resembles the article pȝ, the reading $pȝ$ seems more likely here especially that the article pȝ occurs in each line of the text in a rounded form; as for the name Pȝ-y-Wsir, cf. Pȝ-Wsir, Demot. Nb.I/5, p. 360; Demot. Nb. I/8, fragilisches, p. 549; and cf. Pȝ-y-Wsir (?), Demot. Nb. I/8, fragilisches, p. 566 (for the corrected hand facsimile of this name, see Demot. Nb. I /18, p. 180).

  Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb son of Pȝ-y-Wsir and all his people are the owners and donors of the dedicatory object.

- The sign $\mathfrak{m}$ which follows the personal name Pȝ-y-Wsir (?) is written in a rounded form like the rounded forms of the article pȝ in the text, so it could be read as $\{pȝ\}$ which ought to be inserted here.

  $i.ir \ di.t \ tr=w \ pȝ ʿ(.wy)-p(s>y \ m-bb) \ pȝ \ bb \ Ỉs.t$, who have let the bakery be made before the Ibis (and) Isis; $i.ir \ di.t \ tr=w \ pȝ ʿ(.wy)-p(s>y$ is a relative clause followed by passive form, in which the antecedent – $Pȝ-di-pȝ-hb$ son of $Pȝ-y-Wsir$ and all his people donors of the dedicatory object – is identical to the subject.

  In this text the vivifying gods are “the gods of the resting place”, while the gods to whom the bakery was donated are the Ibis and Isis, for further information on this formula in the votive inscriptions see, S.P.Vleeming, op. cit, § 3, p. 254-255.

- As for the writing way of $pȝ ʿ(.wy)-p⟨s>y$,$,$ the bakery$, see W. Erichsen, Demotisches Glossar, p. 53, p. 139.\(^8\)

  As for the writing way of $pȝ ʿ(.wy)$ - $p(s>y$, one can observe that $｡$ was written without the house determinative $\mathfrak{m}$ at the end, and the oblique stroke on the vertical sign is a natural fault on the stone surface. The determinative of the word $p(s>y$ $｡$ depicting the brazier with flame rising from it $｡$ runs in favour of the meaning bakery.

  The inscription on this block commemorated erection of this bakery – the dedicatory object – for the production of the bread used for offerings in the necropolis.

---

\(^8\) The reading $pȝ ʿ.wy-psy \ [pȝ ʿ.wy (n) psy]$, the bakery, the bake house, the house of baking, the house of cooking, was first established by G. Matthä, see G. Matthä, “The Word for ‘Bake House’ in the Demotic Texts”, Miscellanea Gregoriana, 1941, p. 133-134; G. Matthä, “The αρτοκοπεῖον in Demotic Texts”, BIFAO 45. 1945, p. 59-60; and see also Fr. De Cenival, Papyrus démo- tiques de Lille (III), MIFAO 110, 1984, p. 49-50,41.

As for the vertical sign $\ddagger$ and its variant forms, it is problematic in Tuna el-Gebel demotic inscriptions, because it could be read $sb$ and $n-tr.t$. But the exact reading and meaning of the sign depends on the nature and the context of the text.

In the votive inscriptions preposition $n-tr.t$ is usually followed by the name of the donor of the votive object. In this text $Dd-br$ son of $Dhwty-mn \ddagger$ who bears the rank “the priest of $I-y-m-htp$, the Great, son of Ptah” who made the dedicatory object for the donors, is mentioned after $n-tr.t$. He might be one of the responsibilities for the Ibis organization in Tuna el-Gebel necropolis. As for the personal name $Dhwty-mn$, see Demot. Nb. 1/17, p. 1303.

**Line 4**

$\ddagger$ $I-y-m-htp wr sȝ Ptḥ$, Imhotep, the Great, son of Ptah, see A. Farid, “Sieben Metallgefäße mit demotischen Inschriften aus Kairo und Paris”, RdE 45, 1994, p. 120-122; Chr. Leitz, LGG I, p. 124-125, s.v. $I-y-m-htp$.

2. **Limestone block Inv. No. 1489/774, 29/s.s.**

*Material:* Limestone.
*Provenance:* Tuna el-Gebel (area of the funerary houses (?)).
*Dimensions:* Height: 17 cm; Width: 29 cm; Maximum Thickness: 5 cm.
*Bibliography:* Unpublished.
*Content:* Votive inscription.
*Dating:* Early Roman period.
*Description:* Rectangular block of limestone with an engraved demotic text in three lines with some traces of red colour; the text on the block is not very clear in some parts.

---

10 M. Ebeid, “Demotic Inscriptions from the Galleries of Tuna el-Gebel”, *BIFAO* 106, 2006, p. 60. In his fruitful commentary on my previous article, Dr M. Chauveau suggested reading the vertical sign $n-tr.t$ “la main de, par”, instead of $sb$. I agree with him now.

[1] ḫȝ.t-sp PTR 35.t  tabindex-2 pr.t ⟨sw⟩ 5 ⟨t⟩> b.t n
[2] Twtw (⟨s⟩) Hr-nd-īt=f pr2 Mr …… pr2 rmt
[3] Ḥmnw n nfr n nfr

[1] Year 35, Mechir, ⟨day⟩ 5, ⟨the⟩ tomb of
[2] Twtw (son of) Hr-nd-īt=f, the overseer ……, the inhabitant of

Commentary

• Line 1
  As for the dating “Year 35, Mechir, ⟨day⟩ 5”, it might refer to the year 35 of the reign of Emperor Augustus [30 Jan.-31 Jan. 5-6 AD] who ruled between 30 BC-14 AD.12

• Line 2
  – As for the name Hr-nd-īt=f, see, Demot. Nb. I/11, p. 825-826.
  – , a title beginning with pȝ mr, the overseer, the leader, while the determinative of the word represents the symbol, but the reading of the word is not clear.13

• Line 3
  n nfr n nfr as a thing of real goodness. For the expression n nfr n nfr, a thing of real goodness, in the votive inscriptions almost written in hieroglyphic, see S.P. Vleeming, op. cit, § 4, p. 255.

3. Limestone tomb stela14 TG 5275

Provenance: Roman tomb no. 3 (to the east of the galleries), season 2004.
Material: Limestone.
Dimensions: Height: 27 cm; Width: 25 cm; Maximum Thickness: 8 cm.
Bibliography: Unpublished.
Content: Votive inscription.
Dating: Early Roman.
Description: Limestone stela bearing four incomplete lines of a demotic text partly damaged. Apparently the block was reused for other purposes.

13 Prof. S.P. Vleeming suggested to me that this title might be read as pȝ in’ (?), “the baker” (see G. Vittmann, “Zwei Spätzeittitel”, SAK 21, 1994, p. 338-343), or pȝ ḫn (?), “the oarsman (?)”.
14 For the tomb stelae, see A. Farid, op. cit, p. 245-266.
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Commentary

- Line 1
  The traces following the title Wsir are probably the first element of the name of the owner of the stela which continues on the next line.

- Line 2
  The group $\frac{\text{Ns-p\-hb}}{\text{Ḫʿ(?)}}$ could be read $\text{Ḫʿ}$ or $\text{Ḫʿ\.w}(?)$.

- Line 3
  As for the dating, year 42 is more likely although the text is damaged and is not clear in this part. It might refer to the year 42 of the reign of Emperor Augustus (Feb.-.... March 12th – 13th AD)\textsuperscript{15}, especially that the stela has been reused and the archaeological proof denotes an early Roman dating to this tomb. The rest of the dating which comprises the day is broken.

4. Limestone stela TG 433

Provenance: Tuna el-Gebel. Gallery C-C-4.\textsuperscript{16} Season 1983.
Material: Limestone.
Dimensions: Height: 23,5 cm; Width: 24,5 cm; Maximum Thickness: 9 cm.
Bibliography: Unpublished.
Content: Votive inscription.
Dating: Early Ptolemaic.\textsuperscript{17}
Description: Incomplete limestone stela. The upper part of the stela shows the figure of a god, probably Osiris, standing before an offering table. On the lower part, three demotic lines. The scene and the text are both engraved on the surface of the stela.

\textsuperscript{15} P.W. Pestman, op. cit., p. 91.
\textsuperscript{17} The dating here depends on the place in which this piece was found as well as on the palaeographical characteristics.
Commentary

• Line 1
As for the personal name Ns-nhm-‘n, see Demot. Nb. I/9, p. 684. The following traces are probably a brief name or title following Ns-nhm-‘n.

• Line 2
  – The traces at the beginning of the line might be the first element of a personal name, it could be restored as [Dd-hr(?)] as Prof. S.P. Vleeming proposed.
  – As for the personal name Hr-nfr, see Demot. Nb. I/11, p. 824. The Group ḫy.t which followed the name with the definite article pȝ might denote a title or profession. I have no satisfactory reading for this group.

• Line 3
  – The traces preceding smȝ-tȝ.wy are probably the first element of the personal name. As for the personal name Smȝ-tȝ.wy, see Demot. Nb. I/12, p. 924-925.
  – pȝ ḫy.t: The word pȝ ḫy.t after the personal name [……]-smȝ-tȝ.wy could be taken as a title or as a profession. For further information on pȝ ḫy.t, see W. Eriksen, Demotisches Glossar, p. 350; G. Vittmann, Der demotische Papyrus Rylands IX, I-II, ÄAT 38, 1998, p. 539-540 (P. Ryl. IX, col. XVIII, 1). As Prof. S.P. Vleeming suggested to me, this is probably to be taken as the noun discussed by G. Vittmann.

5. Limestone stela TG 109

Provenance: Tuna el-Gebel, gallery C-C-4, season 1980.
Material: Limestone.
Dimensions: Height: 24.5 cm; Width: 22 cm; Maximum Thickness: 6 cm.
Bibliography: Unpublished.
Content: Votive inscription.
Dating: Early Ptolemaic.
Description: Part of incomplete limestone stela, in a bad state of preservation; it bears two lines of demotic text which are partly damaged.

[3] [Dd-hr(?)]-pȝ-hb son of Hr-nfr the.....
[5] Osiris Ns-nhm-‘n......
[6] [Dd-hr(?)]-pȝ ḫy.t; the......
Commentary

• Line 1

• Line 2
  For the personal name *Pȝ-di-Wsir*, see *Demot. Nb. I/5*, p. 298-299. The personal name *Nfr-smȝ-tȝ.wy* is not attested in *Demot. Nb. I*. Prof. S. P. Vleeming reads the first name *Pȝ-di-ts.t* instead of *Pȝ-di-Wsir* and considered the god’s determinative at the end of the name as *mw.t⟨=f⟩*: <his> mother, followed by the woman’s name *Nfr⟨t⟩-smȝ-tȝ.wy*.


*Provenance:* Tuna el-Gebel, gallery C-C-4, season 1983.
*Material:* Limestone.
*Dimensions:* Height: 25 cm; Width: 34 cm; Maximum Thickness: 10 cm.
*Bibliography:* Unpublished.
*Content:* Unclear.
*Dating:* Early Ptolemaic.
*Description:* Incomplete block of limestone in a bad state of preservation bearing six lines of bilingual Greek and demotic text, four Greek lines, and two lines of demotic text at the end. The demotic text is lost, except for two lines partly damaged.

The demotic text

[1] *Wṯ b.t n [ ]
[2] *Wr sȝ Mȝʿ-Dḥwty [ ]

The tomb of [ ]

Wr son of Mȝʿ-Dḥwty [ ]
The first element of the personal name could be read also ḫḥ; as for the personal name Maʿ-Ḏḥwty, see Demot. Nb. I/8, p. 583.

The Greek part

As for the Greek part of this text, the rough surface of the stone does not allow a coherent reading.

The reading: Πτ[ο]λεμαῖ[ος] or αἰ[ου] seems possible. The space for ο is a little bit too large.

The traces are weak; the reading γυνη or similar can not be proved.

It is seducible to read ἓτων in combination with the age of the person following. But it is not possible to define the inscription as a tomb inscription.

It is uncertain if these are traces of another line above. In this case the stone must have been cut above secondary.

Indexes

I. Personal names

1. Wr s. of Maʿ-Ḏḥwty [ ] ......................... 6, 2
2. Wr-dl-w-[l?] .................................... 5, 1
3. Pȝⲧ- Ṽl (s. of) Nfr-sm2-tȝ.wy .... 5, 2
4. Pȝ-dl-pȝ-hb s. of Pȝy-wsỉr (?) ............ 1, 2
5. Ns-nhm-[n–r–]................................. 4, 1
6. Tutw (s. of) Ḥr-nd-[t=f ...................... 2, 2
7. Dd-br s. of Ḥwȝy-ḥn ............ 1, 3
8. [Dd-br-?] pȝ-hb s. of Ḥr-nfr .......... 4, 2
9. .......-ns-pȝ-hb (s. of) [Ḥ?] .......... 3, 1-2
10. [.....]-sm2-tȝ.wy .......................... 4, 3

II. Gods

1. ḫḥ-m-ḥtp ........................................ 1, 4
2. ḫts .......................................... 1, 3
3. Ṽl (s. of) Ḥwȝy-ḥtp .......................... 3, 1; 4, 1

III. Titles

1. ṽw b ḫ ḫ-m-ḥtp ................................. 1, 4
2. ṽw [mr?] ........................................ 2, 2
3. ṽw ḫy(t?) ...................................... 4, 3
4. ṽw .............................................. 4, 2
5. swrd (n) ṽw ḫb .............................. 1, 1

IV. Toponyms

1. ṽw ḫt-wy-ḥtp .................................. 1, 1
2. ḫmnw .......................................... 2, 3
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