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INTRODUCTION

The British Museum Papyrus No. 10188, also known as the Bremner-Rhind Papyrus, was acquired by the Museum in 1865. No definite information as to its provenance is available, but it appears to be of Theban origin; at any rate its last owner, the priest Nasmin, appears from his titles to be attached in the first place to the service of the Theban circle of gods. The history of the manuscript, so far as it is known, is recounted by Sir E. A. W. Budge in Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, p. ix, although, as is pointed out by G. Möller in his Hieratische Palaeographie, Bd. III, p. 10, n. 1, it is impossible to accept Budge's view that the papyrus came from the cache of royal mummies at Deir el Bahri.

An admirable photographic facsimile of the document is to be found in Pls. I-XIX of the above-mentioned publication by Sir E. A. W. Budge, accompanied by a printed transcription into hieroglyphic on pp. 1-33 (of transcriptions) and a translation on pp. 1-22 (of translations), replacing an earlier edition by the same author in Archaeologia, Vol. LII, under the title « The Papyrus of Nesi-Amsu ». These editions, however, are not in a very convenient form, and, moreover, necessarily suffer from the defects inherent in printed transcriptions from hieratic, so that it is hoped that the present edition of the text, the undertaking of which was first suggested to the author by Dr. A. H. Gardiner, will fill a want. Since the manuscript is preserved in London, I have been able to consult the original throughout, and a number of fresh readings have been obtained. In this connection I have to express my deep gratitude to Mr. Sidney Smith, Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, for his permission to republish the papyrus, and for the readiness with which he and Mr. S. R. K. Glanville have afforded me every facility for studying the original. I am also greatly indebted to M. J. Capart for publishing my work in the Bibliotheca, and to Dr. A. H. Gardiner for reading through a considerable portion of the first part of this book with me.

In copying the text for publication, the principles adopted in the previous
volumes of this series have been followed; i.e. the direction and relative positions of the signs in the original have been preserved, and, where necessary, the text has been divided into sentences or sentence-like groups of words. In transcribing, I have endeavoured to adhere as far as possible to the general lines laid down by Dr. Gardiner in his article The Transcription of New Kingdom Hieratic in Journ. Eg. Arch., XV, 48 ff. In this regard, however, there are two points which call for mention. In the first place, a certain difficulty has been experienced in distinguishing between and . In cases of the large as in (e.g. 5, 4) or (e.g. 14, 11), or of the small open as in (e.g. 1, 1), there can be no doubt as to which sign is intended, but there are many instances where it is impossible to be certain whether the sign in question is a large closed or a small , the two forms tending to merge the one in the other. Apart from this similarity in shape, the confusion between and is assisted by two converging influences. Firstly, there is a tendency, already observable in manuscripts of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties, for two signs written one above the other to be made equal in length (cf. ERMAN, Neuägyptische Grammatik, § 20), so that where, for example, comes above or below it is often lengthened out until occasionally it becomes a veritable , while conversely above a short sign is sometimes reduced to . Examples of this from our papyrus are on the one hand a clear for the genitive exponent (but 23, 8. 12), and on the other hand (a mediating form 24, 16). Secondly, by the time the manuscript was written, and had undoubtedly coalesced in the spoken tongue, both being pronounced alike as , with the result, well shown in Ptolemaic inscriptions, that or could be used indifferently in writing one and the same word. Thus in the present instance the verb is clearly written with initial (1st and 3rd examples); 24, 6. 10, but with (last example but one); other cases where in my opinion should be read are 24, 14; 30, 3 (3rd example); 31, 11.

Faced with this problem of transcription, three courses are possible. The first is to admit as only the open forms. This would lead to a gross misrepresentation of the original, since a large number of closed forms
also undoubtedly represent this sign. A second possibility is to adhere strictly to the etymologically correct spelling, but this again is open to the same objection as the previous plan, though perhaps in a lesser degree. The third course, which is that which has been adopted in the present work, is to judge each doubtful case independently on its own merits, the editor endeavouring as far as possible to interpret the intentions of the scribe. Even if a slight sacrifice of consistency be involved, this plan seems preferable to the other two, since it reflects much better the character of the original manuscript. In any case, no difficulty should be experienced by the reader, in view of the practical equivalence of \( \equiv \) and \( \bowtie \) to which allusion has been made above.

The second point which calls for remark is the peculiar rendering of the sign \( \text{\textcopyright} \) in the original. In a few cases, e.g. 8, 2, the scribe uses a special hieratic equivalent for this sign, but usually he writes a group indistinguishable from \( \equiv \) (e.g. 5, 14 ; 22, 8), and occasionally has even the form of \( \equiv \) (e.g. 29, 23 ; in 26, 19 he has corrected \( \equiv \) into \( \equiv \)). Here I have preserved the distinctions of the original, transcribing \( \equiv \) or \( \equiv \) or \( \equiv \) as the case required, and, when necessary, have indicated the true reading in a footnote.

Lacunae, restorations, traces of signs, etc. have been indicated in the same manner as that already employed in this series. Restorations have been made in the text only when practically certain; more conjectural restorations have been confined to the footnotes. Marginal and interlinear corrections have been inserted in their proper places in the text, with a corresponding note at the foot of the page, but scribal deletions have been represented as in the original (e.g. 5,12 at \( g \); 25,8 at \( d-e \)). Erasures have been indicated in the notes. Words and sentences written in red ink in the original manuscript are underlined.

The footnotes have been confined mainly to such purely textual matters as corrections, erasures, restorations, lacunae and the like. Emendations of corrupt passages have been suggested only where fairly obvious; more difficult corruptions have been reserved for discussion in a translation and commentary which the editor hopes to prepare in due course.
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The papyrus appears to have been written originally as a collection of religious works for some temple library. It contains four separate texts, the end of each being marked by the expression Δ Ω = Ω. The first, to which I have given the title « The Songs of Isis and Nephthys », extends from the beginning of the papyrus to 17, 12. An introductory rubric occupies the first five lines, and is followed by seventeen narrow columns of text so arranged that each line is devoted to a single sentence. The columns vary in length from 31 lines in col. 16 to 12 lines in col. 17, the usual length being 27 or 28 lines. The arrangement of the text in short sentence-lines suggests its hymnal character, which is confirmed by the title « The Stanzas of the Festival of the Two Kites » in 1,1. This text has been known hitherto as the « Festival Songs of Isis and Nephthys, » in distinction from the similar but much shorter text in Pap. Berlin 3008 known as the « Lamentations of Isis and Nephthys. » Since, however, the « Songs » in our papyrus are more in the nature of lamentations than rejoicings, the word « festival » has been dropped from the title as being somewhat of a misnomer.

According to the introductory rubric, these « Songs » were intended to be sung in the temple of Osiris from the 22nd to the 26th day of the month of Khoiak, so that they doubtless formed part of the ritual of the Osirian mysteries which were celebrated in that month. The singing was performed by two virgin priestesses, shorn and bewigged, who represented the goddesses Isis and Nephthys in their mourning for the dead Osiris. The actual performance appears to have consisted partly of duets by the two priestesses and partly of solos by the woman who represented Isis. Thus, after a preliminary invocation of Osiris by them and by the chief lector-priest (1,6.7), the women join in calling upon the departed Osiris to return to them. In 3, 13-16, however, Isis alone is speaking, Nephthys apparently joining in again at 3,17. At 3,23 a rubric marks the commencement of a fresh duet. Another rubric in 6,23 marks the beginning of yet another duet, but in 6,27 a change to the first person singular suggests that again Isis alone is invoking her departed brother and husband; this is confirmed by allusions in 7,14 ff. to the flight of Isis to hide in the Delta swamps. The alternation between solo and duet, as indicated by changes from the 1st person singular to the plural and back again, continues until at 9, 13 the sequence is interrupted by a hymn to Osiris recited by the lector-
priest which continues until 11,6 where the priestesses join in. At 11,19 a final rubric marks a resumption of the performance by the two women, which goes on until the end of the « Songs » at 17,12.

The second text, entitled « The Ritual of Bringing in Sokaris, » is similarly arranged in four narrow columns (cols. 18-21) varying in length from 33 lines in col. 20 (including two vertical lines one down each side of the main column, see p. 39, notes a-b and c-d) to 31 lines in cols. 18 and 19 and 6 lines in col. 21. This « Ritual », which probably also formed part of the Osirian mysteries, commences with an invocation of Sokaris under divers epithets, among which should be noted an identification with Amen-Re in 19,4. In 19, 15, however, the text changes unexpectedly into a hymn to Hathor, in the course of which the goddess is identified with Tayt, Bašt, Satis, Uto, Sakhmet and Neith. This is followed in col. 20 by a list of cult-centres in which Hathor was worshipped, in the form « Hathor, Mistress of... ». At 20,16 comes a hymn to Osiris, an image of whom is brought in by nine « Companions » (20,15), and finally, in 21,2 ff. we read: « As for any servant who serves his lord, there shall be no prophet of Bašt against him, (but as for) the froward one who hates the temple, death shall strike at his throat; the Lord of Upper Dedu has come and has smitten the froward. Recite sixteen times and make music. »

The third and longest text, the « Book of Overthrowing Apep, » occupies 10 1/2 columns from 22,1 to 32,12. The lines here run continuously, and do not consist merely of single sentences as heretofore, the columns of text varying in width from 20 cm. in col. 24 to 29 cm. in cols. 26 and 28, and in length from 23 lines in cols. 23 and 24 to 27 lines in cols. 28, 29 and 31, apart from the final half-column of 12 lines in col. 32. This « book » itself consists of a collection of lesser texts, the beginning of each being marked by the words 𓊚 𓊠𓊞 𓊡 𓊠 𓊠. Such titles are found in 22,1; 23,16-17; 26,7-11.21; 28, 20; 29, 16; 32, 3,6. The texts commencing at 26,21 and 28,20 contain variant versions of a monologue by the Sungod in which he describes his creation of all things. He tells how a multitude of creatures came into being at the utterance of his mouth « ere heaven existed, ere earth existed » (26,22). He spat out Shu and Tefenet (27,1), who in their turn begat Geb and Nut, from whom sprang the remainder of the Great Ennead (27,4-5), and men came into existence through the tears of his...
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Eye, which had been far away, and on its return was wrathful and wept because he had replaced it by another in its absence: « They (scil. Shu and Tefênet) brought to me my Eye with them after I had joined my members together. I wept over them; that is how men came into being through the tears which came forth from my Eye; it was enraged with me when it returned and found that I had made another in its place » (27,2-3). In general, however, the various compositions collected in this « book » consist of spells for the protection of the Sungod from the assaults of the demon Apep and his myrmidons, with a secondary purpose of protecting Pharaoh from his foes. In this connection it is interesting to note that Seth appears here in his role of defender of the Sungod (23, 21, 22; 30, 5.10; cf. Nagel in Bull. de l'Inst. franç. d'Archéol. orient., XXVIII, 33 ff.), although in the « Songs of Isis and Nephthys » (2, 19; 4, 5; 6,21) he is the evil foe of Osiris.

The fourth and last text, entitled « The names of Apep, which shall not be », fills the lower half of col. 32 and the whole of col. 33. The portion in col. 32 consists of three narrow columns, the first two of which (lines 13-27 and 28-42) contain a list of the names of Apep; while the third (lines 43-54) gives instructions for making images of Apep and similar demons. The remainder, which fills col. 33 with 18 lines of about 14 cm. average length, consists of a hymn to Ré; which is to be recited after the above-mentioned images have been made.

It should be noted that cols. 32 and 33 are written on the verso of cols. 30 and 29 respectively; otherwise the verso is blank.

The so-called « Colophon, » which will be found in the present work on p. 32, following col. 17, as in the original, is in a different and much poorer hand from that of the main text, having been added by a priest named Nasmin. This addition is dated in year 12 of Pharaoh Alexander, son of Alexander, i.e. 312-1 B.C., thus giving a terminus ante quem for the writing of the papyrus. The first 24 lines of the Colophon, which are squeezed in between cols. 17 and 18, state the parentage and the extremely numerous priestly titles of Nasmin, while the remaining 15 lines, which are inserted in a blank space between cols. 21 and 22, conclude with a curse (lines 33-38) against « any foreigner, negro, Ethiopian or Syrian »
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who shall injure the book, and with a blessing (lines 38-39) on him who shall regard it with due respect.

* * *

The hieratic text, apart from the Colophon, is written in a small but clear uncial literary hand, ligatures being almost entirely absent, and is the work of the same scribe throughout. Judging from the comparatively frequent erasures and corrections to which the footnotes to the following pages bear witness, the scribe has taken considerable pains to ensure the accuracy of his copy, so that the majority of such corruptions as exist were probably already present in his originals. Abnormal writings such as are found in late hieroglyphic are few, but the following may be quoted:

\[ \text{hp « Nile » 9,26; 12,5,6; wnn « be » 10,13, cf. p. 19, note a; s « man » 23,16; pw 28,22; 32,54; var. Nh 26,24; 32,46.47; } \]

for older \[ \text{« belongs to thee » 10,24; 11,4.5. There is also frequent confusion of and , cf. p. 1, note c; p. 46, note a; p. 55, note a. To show the place where marginal corrections are to be inserted a special diacritical mark is used, cf. p. 38, note d-g; in 16,19 two such marks indicate a correction of the word-order, cf. p. 30, note a-b. In the case of the marginal corrections on cols. 25 and 30 (25,8 at f; 30,7 at b; 30,8 at c) the scribe has appended the number of the line to which each refers. Deletions are marked either by a stroke through the signs to be deleted, as in 5,12 at g, or by a dotted line over (e.g. 32,11 at f) or around (25,8 at d-e) the faulty group.} \]

The idiom employed in this manuscript is Middle Egyptian throughout, but with certain clear signs that it is an artificial Middle Egyptian with which we have to deal, and not a lineal descendant of a Middle Kingdom original. Thus the negation \[ \text{is almost entirely replaced by (an exception 9,13, compare Urk. IV, 57,4-5), and the old construction } n \text{sdtf} \]

is here written \[ m sdm.f, e.g. 26,22; 28,22.23, while } \]

has everywhere displaced the old \[ pw \] as an expression of the vocative. Here and there, also, Late-Egyptian expressions have crept in, as in \[ « they are not » 22,16; the use of the Late-Egyptian dependent pronoun 26,17 (at end).]
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18; 30,13; the suffix-pronoun 3rd. plur. c = 28, 11; 32, 43. 54; the pronominal compound t as subject of the pseudo-verbal construction 25,1; the constructions c c 25, 19 ff.; 26, 1.2; c c 32, 43; c c 18, 31; c c 7, 7.16; 15,20; the late word c c o « evening » 23, 8; and the writing c c 25, 3. One is left with the impression that the archetypes of the texts in this papyrus were originally composed in Late Egyptian, and then translated into the earlier idiom, although, in comparison with the bulk of the whole, such evidences of the later vernacular are but sporadic occurrences. The writer of the Colophon, the priest Nasmin, also employs Middle Egyptian, but he too has not entirely emancipated himself from the influence of current speech, as the expression c c « who are not with them » (line 16) bears witness.
The Papyrus Bremner-Rhind

I. The Songs of Isis and Nephthys

a) The apparent tick above ☓ in the published photograph is a fortuitous marking.

b) Reading certain; for this writing of Ἄβυδος cf. Urk. VI 15, 3; 31, 3.

c) Late writing of the preposition ἐν, Coptic ἐ; frequent in this papyrus.

d) Lacuna of 4 mm. The restoration [34] is demanded by the context; for the writing with ☓ cf. I 10, Urk. VI 63, 3; 5111111 Urk. VI 55, 14. A tiny trace of red is visible on the bottom right.

e) The dot which nearly always precedes ☓ in this papyrus is probably the relic of ☓ in the group ☓ of N.K. orthography.

f) Reading certain; for the form of ☓ cf. I 13, 3.

g) 10 mm. The reading ☓ is doubtful.

h) The dot represents a tambourine.

i) Read in "name"; the stroke is borrowed from the group ☓ "spell for .......", cf. 22, 2.


Bill. Aegypt C1.
a) A horizontal line above  which apparently represents the initial  in this writing again 1,18; 3, 4, 9; 7, 24; 8, 3, 14.  b) Reading  not absolutely certain.  c) Sic; read  as 11, 19; the word refers to the two priestesses of 1, 2, 4.  d) In this writing of the dep. pronoun 2 m. sing. cf. also 13, 26; sim. but without stroke, 13, 7.  e) On cf. Möller, *Hier Pal. III* No. 120, note 1.  f) Also possible (so Budge), but cf. 6, 19.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 1,20 - 2,2

a) Read probably $\theta$ only; there seems insufficient space for $\Delta$ at the bottom of the line. Note also the absence of determinatives. b) i.e. this writing again 7,26, but $\text{Rira} \underline{\text{5,26}}$. The original form of this word was $\text{Rira} \underline{\text{12,48c}}$. d - e) 12 mm. Prv. 1a suggests the restoration $\text{Rira} \underline{\text{12,49a}}$; this word occupies 15 mm. in 1,19. f - g) 10 mm. For the restoration $\text{Rira} \underline{\text{12,50a}}$ of 9,11, where this group occupies 12 mm.; there is a clear trace of $\Delta$ and a possible trace of $\Omega$. Budge's restoration $\underline{\text{Rira}}$ is not admissible. h - i) 6 mm. For the restoration $\text{Rira}$ of 4,24, where this group occupies 7 mm.; I think to see a trace of $\Delta$. Budge restores similarly, but with the addition of $\Delta$. f - k) 40 mm., of which the first 10 mm. are destroyed and the remainder obscured by a heavy black stain along the top of which obscure traces are visible; the only ones identifiable are of $\text{Rira} \underline{\text{2,7}}$; compare 6,3,18; 14,2,6.
a) The dot preceding \( \kappa \) is in contact with \( x \). b) Read \( \gamma \) for \( \lambda \), cf. 114. c) \( \psi \) for \( \zeta \), see p. 1. d) Late writing for \( \Delta \), again 1, 14, 5, 3, 15, 7, 21. e) For this writing of \( \mu \) "sky" cf. Urk. VII 47, 1; Pap. Berlin 3008, 2, 12. f) Reduced to a mere dash. g-h) Insignificant traces.
a-b) emend probably $\text{\textcopyright}$ into $\text{\textcopyright}$; for the corruption of $\text{\textcopyright}$ into $\text{\textcopyright}$ see Gardiner, Egyptian Hieratic.

b) Texts I p. 3a, note 3c; p. 16a note 2b. The writing of $\text{\textcopyright}$ with det. $\text{\textcopyright}$ is apparently due to a confusion of $\text{\textcopyright}$ 'fat' with its homophone $\text{\textcopyright}$ 'slaughter'.

c) Illegible trace; read perhaps $\text{\textcopyright}$.

d-e) the end of the line is lost in a break of 37 mm., but the extent of the loss is uncertain.

f) the reading $\text{\textcopyright}$ is palaeographically possible, but $\text{\textcopyright}$ is undoubtedly to be understood; the verb $\text{\textcopyright}$ is intended, cf. 13.2.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 3, 23–4, 11

a. See p. 2, note c.  b. See, read $$.  c. See, read $$. Hieratic $x$ (**) is regularly written for $a$ in this papyrus also in group 3, e.g. 5, 8; 14, 16; 23, 2, and in 4, e.g. 23, 7, 14, 16; cf. also 28, 16 beside 28, 15, d–e) 4 mm., probably nothing lost. Apparently a defective patch in the papyrus left vacant by the scribe.
a) A preposition, either m or hs, omitted.  
b) Erasure of f. 
c) The preposition m omitted.  
d) A tiny trace of s.
a-b) 20 mm. Space insufficient for Budge's restoration \(\frac{\sqrt{a}}{c} \times \frac{\sqrt{d}}{e} \) which fills 30 mm. in b, 18. c) Preposition \(m\) omitted, cf. 4, 9–10. d) Read \(\frac{f}{g} \). e) Amend \(\frac{h}{i} \) as 2, 19. f) See p. 1, note c. g) \(j\) deleted by a vertical stroke. h) See, read \(k\), for the form of the latter see § 2.

a) Crammed in irregularly owing to the scribe having left insufficient space for the subsequent insertion of the word in red ink. b-c) The restoration fits the space (13 mm) exactly, cf. 11.15.7-8, 11.12, and the traces agree. d-e) A break of 19 mm. Apparent trace visible on right of break is perhaps fortuitous, as according to 11.22 nothing is lost. f) Without cross-strokes; similarly in text 7, 114.
a) w omitted and inserted later. b) Transcribe thus rather than 𓈖𓈖; the group is taken over from the writing of geographical terms, e.g. 𓊃𓊃 𓊂 3.24. c) Late writing of 𓊃𓊃𓊃, cf. A.Z. 59,63. d) For reading as ḫy cf. 5.26. e) The sense demands the reading ḫwš. f-g) A combined writing of ḫš; older ḫy, + ḫš; doubtless to be read ḫš.
a) The tick over ḫ is a space-filler; again 4, 3 and often. 
b) sic; emend ḫ as 2, 19. 
c) Reduced almost to a dot. 
d) late writing of 𐏂𐏂. 
e) trace of deleted 𓊱 in 𓊱𓊱. 

Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 4, 3-17

a) The group transcribed R used regularly in this papyrus also for ḫ; cf. Möller, Hier. Pal. III no. 52. b) This writing of qmr "find" already in Apanāki Mela 92 = Unk. III, 32. c) Without diaritical dot; so regularly in this papyrus. d) No cross-strokes.
a) Over an erasure. b) Reading is certain; the diacritical dot is in contact with main portion of the sign. c) Over a partly erased sign. d-e) Mend, $x? f) Mend, $x.
a) Preposition has omitted.  b) The dotted line over = indicates that the signs beneath are to be deleted; another instance 25, 8.  c) Mend  as 9, 2.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 9, 10–24

1) Read 2 10 25. 2) Read probably "10", cf. p. 11 note d. 3) a deleted by vertical stroke.
4) Altered from original in 2. 5) Over an erasure. 6) sic; this spelling again 10 24.
Pap. Bremner–Rhind, 9.25-10.11
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\[ \text{Text in ancient Egyptian hieratic script} \]

\[ 9.25, 9.26, 9.27, 9.28, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.8, 10.9, 10.10, 10.11 \]

\[ \text{Annotations: a) Read } \frac{\text{v}}{\text{x}}(\text{v}) \text{, cf. Sethe in Northampton–Spiegelberg–Newberry, Ineban Necropolis, p. } q.\text{ b) Amend } m.\text{ c) 3 mm. Illegible traces under stain.} \]
a) This writing of wmn again 16, 27; 24, 12, 13; Ukh. 19, 13, 25, 11, 24, 6. b) is smudged; an attempt at erasure? c) Emend — ḫ. d — e) A late writing of nfr ḫmr "belongs to thee; again 11, 4, 8."
a - b) see p. 19, note d - e. c) Read quast "mournings"; for the determinatives see the examples quoted by Gardiner, Notes on ... Amulets, 10. d) Reading ḫm is also permissible.
(Material from page 5 of the document)

- Mend ṭunu as 5, 4; for other examples of this corruption see my article in the forthcoming volume of essays to be presented to Prof. I. H. Griffith.
- Mend probably μμ as 5, 4.
- Mend ṭḥ for “illumine.”
a) Read 𓊑 𓊋 “male”, cf. 1,23. b) Emend 𓊖. c) A preposition, 𓊗 or 𓊑𓊙, omitted. 
d) The stroke above 𓊑 is a spacefiller; again 13,19; 19,30; 26,2.
a) $\mathfrak{a}$; a quite abnormal form, perhaps due to a correction. Possibly the scribe may have written $\mathfrak{a}$ (for $\mathfrak{b}$), and perceiving his error, emboldened the $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{a}$. The $\mathfrak{a}$ preceding might well be read as $\mathfrak{a}$, but compare $\mathfrak{a}$ in stb. 14.13.
a) Or 2. b) Or 2. c) "eg., cf. 5, 2b + 6, 12. d) The second was smudged in an attempt at erasure.
a) Emend ηη, cf. 15,4, 6-10. b) The usual abbreviation of ξυ ειδο. c) Emend probably to ιπ. d) O corrected over ι; for the word cf. 15,14; id., I 483.
a-b) As corrected by the scribe; original has $\frac{\text{神}}{\text{天}}$, the two $\text{神}$ being here clearly the equivalent of our "tr. $\text{日}$." c) Read $\text{日}^2$; on the confusion of these two signs see Möller, Annu. Pet. III no. 302, n. 1; 4th n. 1. d) Emend $\text{日}$; the det. $\text{日}$ and the context alike show that "darkness", not "rays", is intended. For the converse error ($\text{日}$ for $\text{日}$) of J.E. A. V. 27, n. 3.
II The Colophon.

N.B. The Colophon was added after the whole of the text was written, being crowded in wherever a blank space of papyrus was available; the lines thereof being clearly not consecutive with those of the main text, they have been given separate numeration. Lines 1-15 fill the space below 14, 12, hence the position of the Colophon here instead of at the end of the present book; lines 16-24 lie between cols. 14 and 15, and the remaining portion follows col. 21. The Colophon has been studied by Spiegelberg in Rec. de l'Univ. XXXV 35 foll.

a) Confusion between but "abominate" and 44 "issue forth", both words having a fish-determinative; the latter is clearly the correct reading. The form of 44 is abnormal, and appears to have been corrected out of 45.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, Colophon, 2-26

---

a) lacuna of 4 mm. b-e) Read mn mk.w, Coptic MNTAY. d) Abbreviation of dd.tj; for full writing see in like context of Pap. Berl. 3008 (‘Lamentations’), 1.12.

Bill. Egypt. C5
a) see p.11, note a.  b) sic, error for stroke 1.  c) Read 𓊲𓊲𓊲𓊲, cf. Rec de l'Égypte XXXV 37 n.4; the writing with 𓊲 probably under influence of 𓊲 𓊲 𓊲 𓊲 𓊲, "claw".  d) Apparently No. 472 in Möller, Tier. Pal. III with top portion much exaggerated. 𓊲 (shieq) seems impossible.

(Shieq) a blank space follows before the next column (cl. 12).
The Ritual of Bringing in Sokaris.

The name "Sokaris" written in black in the middle of the rubric for superstitious reasons.

Read phr, cf. Wb. I 549; Ill 438.
a) From here to the end of col. 19 the scribe has abandoned his previous arrangement of one line to each sentence and has divided his lines without regard to the sentences.
b) An erasure. c) The det. ꜱꜣ is due to a confusion with ḫrsy “The Two Rivals”, i.e. Horus and Seth. The error is probably due in part to a reminiscence of the title of ḫḥḥu ḫrsy, and in part to a confusion of ꜱ with ḫ; for the latter cf. the L-E. writing ꜱꜣ hr · ḫḥḥu (e.g. Pet. Beatty I, recto 6, 12; 7, 12) for sm ḫḥḥu “weep.” d-g) [19, 33]
is a correction on the lower margin; the place where it belongs is indicated by a diacritical mark ꜱ above the det. ḫ of ḫḥḥ. d-e) About 15 mm. with obscure traces.
Eudge has ꜱꜣ ꜱꜣ ꜱꜣ ꜱꜣ without any sign of restoration, but traces do not suit, and ꜱꜣ, not ꜱꜣ, would be required. f-g) Corrupted out of the well-known title of ḫḥḥu ḫḥḥu “Lady of the Red Mountain”, cf. Gardiner, Notes on Sinuhe, 19.
a-b) Widely-spaced vertical signs covering 20, 3-14, on the right of the column

-c-d) A similar vertical column on the left of 20, 3-14.

e-f) Read waw desc. of p. 39 note 4-9.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 20, 13-24

(20,13)

(20,14)

(20,15)

(20,16)

(20,17)

(20,18)

(20,19)

(20,20)

(20,21)

(20,22)

(20,23)

(20,24)

(20,25)

(20,26)

(20,27)

(a) Read 考舞, cf. 20, 30, 31.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 20, 28 - 21, 6

a) Mere mechanical repetition of §. b) See p. 34, noted; here the sign is assimilated to ḫ, the vertical stroke being lacking. c) Mark of deletion, see p. 16, note 3. d) A quite obscure sign.

bib. Aegypt. 66.
IV The Book of Overthrowing Apep.

a) Written in black. b) See p. 11, note a. c) See, for "a. d) An error marked but not corrected. Roeder, "Urkunden zur Religion des alten Ägypten," p. 100, reads "Ptolemaic," but the emendation "will joy" seems more in accord with the context, for "PPP as a miswriting for "a. cf. 5.14; 22,8; the true form of 22,8. e) Read "swf. f) Emend "swf. g) Abbreviation of "swf."
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 22,6-13

a) Read XXX. b) Δ was written for 55 under influence of 55, i.e., "which not."
Pap. Bremner–Rhind, 22, 20–23, 3

a) A mere tick. b) Ditto graph or passing to a fresh line. c) Over erasure in red. d) Corrected over a.
2) Older —, compare fgr. 23f. 4126. 4306. f) Added as correction above the lines. g) Reduced to a mere dot. h) a is also a possible reading.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 23, 3-11

a) For 9|, as not uncommonly in this text, e.g. in the construction in 26m. n.f. 27, 10 (bis). 11(bis). 18; 28, 5. 6) 9| corrected over 1. 9) Emend 111.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 24,2-10

a-b) Emend $\alpha$ to $\alpha.\alpha.\alpha$; the expression rkn nn.t also 30,1; Vak. VI 7,11. $\kappa$ and $\alpha$ in this group have identical forms in hieratic at this period, but the reading $\lambda$ is necessitated here by the flesh-determinative. The suffix in rkn-$k$ is an error. c) Read $\lambda$ without $\kappa$. d) Read $\lambda\alpha$, see above note a-b.

a) Erasure of 9. b-c) Emend wnm-s hkr.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 25.8-14

a) Read [word] without suffix. b) Read as "name." c) Read [word]. d) Error for a, cp. 25.14. e) Reading of det. uncertain owing to attempt at correction.
a) A late writing of the name of Thoth, see Boylan, Thoth the Hermes of Egypt, p.3.
b) sic, not ».c) a corrected over ». 
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 25, 19 - 26, 1

\[ (25, 20) \]

\[ (25, 21) \]

\[ (25, 22) \]

\[ (25, 23) \]

\[ (25, 24) \]

\[ (26, 1) \]

\[ sic \]

\[ sic \]

a) For \( w \) as in \( w \) shr. n. 25, 19. b) Correction above the line. c) Correction above the line. d) Written almost like \( \leq \). e) Reading doubtful; original has \( \geq \).
a) corrected over [X].
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 26, 6-11

(a) Shortened form; reading confirmed by \(\text{w}^3\) in 26.6. b) \(\text{dc}\), read \(\text{h}\) (for \(\text{ht}\)). c) Corrected over \(\text{h}\); error was due to confusion of hieratic \(\text{h}\) with \(\text{h}\).

Bibl. Aegypt. 8.
a) Blank space of 9 mm. b) Subsequent insertion. c) Budge reads $g$, but $\delta$ is clear on the original.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 26,16-21

a) Corrected out of M.  b) Blank space of 8 mm.
a) late writing of ḫ(m), cf. above 26.21. b-c) ⲥ ⲫ corrected over Ⲥ ⲥ and Ⲩ ⲥ added above the line. Probably the scribe wished to emend to Ⲥ ⲥ Ⲩ. c) on this verb see 32. 57,116. d) or ḫ; the diacritical point is well over the main sign.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 27, 2-7

[Hieroglyphic text]

5

[Hieroglyphic text]

10

[Hieroglyphic text]

15

a) A correction. b) Over an erasure. c-d) Read as one word h2r. e) Sic, read 2. f) Error for 2. g) For 2. h) Lacuna of 5 mm, with illegible traces.
a) The is meaningless. b) Omission of preposition in. c) Over an erasure. d-e) Confusion of 𓊚 and 𓊛; the latter is the true reading.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 29.12.17

a) Read to phr.  b) Omission of 10.  c) Read di śu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>66</th>
<th>Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 28, 1-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 28, 1 | | |
| 28, 2 | | |
| 28, 3 | | |
| 28, 4 | | |
| 28, 5 | | |
| 28, 6 | | |

---

a) A correction added above the line. b) A later insertion. c) Over an erasure. d) In black.
a) sic; read nik'r.  b) 'Im omitted.  c) is rather than  추진.  d-e) Read why, the
first h is written partly over the נ as if to correct it. The det. מ is superfluous.
f) Not מ, which would require the further det. מ, see p. 49, note a-b.  g-h) Ṣ over
an erasure. For מ is doubtless מ, "veins."  i) מ is superfluous.
a) In black. b) Read in (n). c-d) The second sl t is not a ditto graph; the sense is "all foes (lit. strikers), male and female." e) Suffix is omitted. f) In black.
9) Later insertion.
a) error for . b) do, not or but is a very open form, close to .
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 28.26 - 29.4

---

a-b) g mm., of which A A requires 6 mm. as in w6, w6 just before. The traces visible are doubtful, but the reading proposed is strongly suggested by the following 32 32.
c-g) Text obscured by a horizontal fold, due to defective mounting. c) Observe trace, not g. d) Slight trace below c. e) Restoration not absolutely certain. f) Only bottom of vertical stroke visible. g) Possibly 4                                                                only.

---
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 29, 10-16

a) Emend [\textasciitilde] as 29, 15. b) Sic; read now "names."

Bill. Aegypt. c 10
a) Blank space of 6 mm.  b) Reading doubtful, but certainly not 777 (Budge).  c) ḫ is merely a space-filler.  d) ḫ is a space-filler.  e) A correction over another sign.  f) Suffix omitted.  g) 6 mm; ? restore [∅∅] as 29,9.  Space insufficient for [∅∅∅∅], which takes 70 mm. 28,9.  h) Corrected over ? , the latter being inappropriate in a word referring to "rep.  i-j) Amend 75,9.  k) Serpent in unusual posture.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 29, 21-26

a-b) Read ḫp[tw irty for. c) Sic, error for 𓊦. d) No lacuna; the edges of the break should join, but they have been parted by warping of the fibres.
a) Without 𓊰.  b) Insignificant traces, but restoration certain.  c) Read 𓊦𓊦𓊦𓊦𓊦𓊦.  d) Lacuna of 4-8 mm. with obscure traces. Restore probably 𓊰𓊰, a possible alternative is 𓊰𓊰𓊰, but this text prefers the reduplicated form of the latter.  e) Without 𓊰.  f) Suffix not required.  g) Suffix 𓊦 is omitted.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 30, 4-9

1) lacuna of 5 mm. The restoration suggests itself; for this word cf. 114, 15, 29f.
2) [omitted and inserted on top margin, its position in the text indicated by V.]
3) [added from top margin, its position being marked by V.]
4) lacuna of 7 mm., from which 1-2 mm. must be deducted for defective mounting. The restoration is certain; [occupies 5 mm. in 30, 6 and a tiny trace of the cross-stroke is visible on the left.
a) Reduced to a slanting tick.  b) Read "heir".  c) Tiny traces.  d) Read mtw.  e) The upper preceding ก is derived from the horizontal stroke in NK forms of ก which in its turn is derived from the group ก, see Möller, Hier.Pal. II No. 112 with note 1. This horizontal stroke tends to become detached already in Dyn. 22, see op. cit. III No. 112 with note 2; in the present instance it is separated from ก by an appreciable interval.  f) Almost a dot.  g) Originally written before ล as ล, and then deleted.  h) A correction.  i) Apparently so; not ต.  j) "mind ของ", cf. 22, 9, 10.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 30, 14–19

a) Corrected over b. b) Added above the line. c) Budge omits. d) Budge’s reading $\frac{\pi^2}{\pi} \approx \pi$ seems impossible to me. e–f) Partly hidden under fold. g–f) Clear traces visible. g) Sef. read $\frac{\pi}{\pi}$ (or $\frac{\pi}{\pi}$ as 29, 27); the error is due to the similarity of $\pi$ and $\pi$ in late hieratic; compare Müller, Hier. Pat. III No. 195 with if. 227. h) Correction above the line. i–j) Traces only; obscured by fold.
a) Omission of mn hpr-k. b) Stroke inserted in error owing to confusion of the r of hpr with the word for "mouth" which follows. c) sic; emend hpr-k.
d) corrected over o. e) Omission of mn hpr-k. f) sic; emend hpr-k.
g) corrected over o. h) The upper sign is hidden under a fold, but the restoration □ seems certain. i) Added from the left margin; emend hpr-k.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>31.9-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>In red; the scribe has forgotten to change to black for the name of the god.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Over an erasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Without 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Read 31.16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Mend 31.16.; the corruption is due to the assimilation of the suffix to that of slain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 31, 14–20

5

10

15

a–b) Corrupt version of 𓊡𓊡𓊡𓊡𓊡. c) mend shr. sn. d) This reading is queried in Wb IV, 559, but seems certain. e) mend 𓊠𓊠𓊠, see p. 19, note a–b. f) Read 𓊡𓊡𓊡.
Pap. Bremner - Rhind, 31, 20-26

a) A mere dot. b) Omission of shes £ m.k.
a) Hidden by detached fragment. b) A quite abnormal form. c) Obsolete trace. If reading be correct, it must be a ditto-graph due to change of line and page, but it is difficult to imagine any alternative. d-e) Correction above the line. f) fauna of 4 mm. This fills the space exactly, cf. 31, 8 in this word. Budge's restoration would require at least 7 mm, and the slight traces do not suit. g) Blank space of 5 mm.
a-b) Repeated in error; Shu and Iefnet are invoked already in 32.3.  c) Tie. The scribe has, however, observed his error and has left the O unfinished. d) Over an erasure.  e) Obverse traces, probably due to erasure, since nothing appears to be lost.  f) Omission of plural ending = 9.  g) Uncertain traces, but Budge’s reading 25 seems not improbable.  h-i) 18 mm., of which the first 7 mm. are lost through rubbing, the last 7 mm. in a break, the damaged sign in the middle occupies 4 mm. Budge’s reading 2 is impossible, as the trace exhibits only one cross-stroke.
Pap. Bremner-Rhind, 32,8-12

a) 3 mm. b-c) 10 mm., with obscure trace on right. d) Ditto graph. e) Corrected over 9. f) See p. 78, note e. g) Read P. h) Omission of A; i) Sign of deletion over 9., cf. 9, 1, 21, 4; 25, 8. j-k) Corrupt; perhaps mends A C 97. l) Ditto graph. m) Abnormal form of C. n) Omission of C. o) This writing of new "king" also in Pap. Chester Beatty I recto 2, 12; 11, 10; 16, 12.
V The Names of Apep.

a) The remainder of the text on fol. 32 is divided into three columns. The two right-hand columns (ll. 13-24 and 28-42) contain a series of epithets of Apep, while the left-hand column (ll. 43-51) contains instructions for making images of Apep in various forms. b) Without line at end of line.
a) — corrected out of mm.  b) so, rather than 35 as read by Budge and (with query) Wb. V 135. It is possible, however, that 35 should be understood; the cursive form of this (Möller, Hier. Pal. III No. 81B) is not unlike X (ib. No. 197). c) Uncertain trace. d-e) Probable; traces show X. There has been some displacement of the signs through warping.
a) omitted. b) Clear traces; the restoration seems certain. c) In black ink. d) A strange form?; possibly due to an attempt at correction.
Pap. Brenner-Rhind, 33,10-18

\[ \text{Hieratic text} \]

\[ \text{Translation} \]

1. (33,11) 2. (33,12) 3. (33,13) 4. (33,14) 5. (33,15) 6. (33,16) 7. (33,17) 8. (33,18)

\[ \text{Notes} \]

a) Sic, error for \( \mathfrak{A} \); the two signs are closely alike in hieratic of this period, compare Möller, \textit{Hier Pal. III} no. 151 with id. no. 2334. b) Sic, error for \( \mathfrak{B} \). c) In black ink. d) Read \( \mathfrak{C} \). e) mm \( \mathfrak{D} \) corrected out of \( \mathfrak{E} \). f) 6 mm; \( \frac{3}{27} \) fills 5 mm in 33,15. g) 40, not 60; a hieroglyphic example in Chassanat, \textit{Edfou II} 94.
Additions and Corrections.

Page 1, note 4 (1,2). The restoration [MN] is confirmed by Pap. Berlin 3008 (Lamentations), 5,114.

Page 33, line 9 (Clp. 14). The defectively printed abbreviation over ḫ in ḫ š .extern should read "lig." (= ligature).

Page 37, line 2 (18, 31, end). The beak of ḫ in ḫ.extern has not printed out well, so that the sign appears like ḫ.

Page 43, line 6 (22, 9). Dr. Gardiner has pointed out to me that the group ḫ Im "harpoon" is descended from ḫ l, the cross X being derived from the old hieratic form of the numeral 30 and the spear ṭ being the descendant of the New Kingdom hieratic form of ḫ. The transcription ḫ Im, however, not only represents the hieratic forms actually used in this text, but is also found in hieroglyphic, e.g. ḫ Junker, Onurislegende, p. 58.

Page 72, line 16 (29, 10). With the writing ḫ ḫ compare ḫ ḫ Pap. Berlin 3162, 1, 7, similarly 2, 5; 3, 2; cf. O. L. Z., 1914, Pl. 1.

Page 79, note a should read "Corrected over preceding 9."