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Series of articles published by Wolfgang Brunsch in the last decade made several hundreds Greek and Coptic inscriptions from Christian Egypt accessible to the scholarly world.¹ The basis for these publications were photos of the stones executed by Brunsch, in co-operation with Erich Lüddekeens and Dieter Johannes at the beginning of the eighties in Coptic Museum at Cairo as well as in Graeco-Roman Museum in Alexandria. The quality of Brunsch’s publications has often been doubted.² Two major objections have been put forward: (1) Brunsch did not make attempt to establish whether the inscriptions he was dealing with had already been published or not; (2) in his edition there is amazingly large number of inaccuracies and clear mistakes, even in these places where the text is well preserved and the reading certain. The present ar-

¹ We would like to thank Dr. Johannes DIETHART for all his help.

ticle deals with several Coptic inscriptions published inaccurately by Brunsch. We also identify some Coptic inscriptions and give basic bibliographic data for them. The following abbreviations are used in our article:

- Cat. Maspero = G. Maspero, Guide du visiteur au Musée de Boulaq, Kairo 1883
- CG = Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire
- Crum, Monuments = W. E. Crum, Coptic Monuments (= Catalogue Général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Nos. 8001-8741), Cairo 1902
- Gayet, Mémoires III = A. Gayet, Les Monuments Coptes du musée de Boulaq (= Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire III, 3), Paris 1889
- Heuser, Personennamen = G. Heuser, Die Personennamen der Kopten (= Studien zur Epigraphik und Papyruskunde 1), Leipzig 1929
- JE = Journal d’entrée du Musée du Caire
- Kamel/Girgis = Ibrahim Kamel with the collaboration of Girgis Daoud Girgis, Coptic Funerary Stele (= Catalogue Général des Antiquités du Musée Copte, Nos. 1-253), Le Caire 1987
- NW = C. Wietheger, Das Jeremias-Kloster zu Saqqara unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inschriften (- Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten 1), Altenberge 1992

   11. The photo shows that in the dating clause at the beginning of the line we have a three-letters lacuna. Possibly we should reconstruct:

   \[ \text{Å-} \]
   10 \[ \text{аНозан} \]
   \[ \text{ητ(γ)φς} \] ΤΑ.\(,\)

   The year according to the era of Diocletian is introduced by a Greek expression and this speaks in favor of the above reconstruction.


   The dating clause in lines 8-11 reads as follows:
8 ΜΠΟΥ
 nikη (ο(η)) Μεσ(ωρή) α' Μεσ(όμυος) Ι.
10 ετό(γ) ΡΙΑ ΔΙΟΙΚ(ΗΣΙΑΙΟΥ)
γφ

9. It should be noted that the indication of the month is given in Greek cursive hand rather than in Coptic majuscules as the rest of the inscription.

9-11. The year is given according to three dating systems of which the first and the third are easily identified as the indiction and the Diocletian Era. The second must be the Saracene (Higra) year. However, as far as the year number is concerned, the data supplied by this inscription are contradictory. The year 499 of the Diocletian era corresponds to the period of 29th August 782 – 28th August 783. The year 164 of the Higra era falls between 6th September 780 and 25th August 781. The first indiction of the Egyptian type begun on the 1st July 778 A.D., this of the Constantinopolitan system on 1st September 778 A.D. Mesore the 1st is 25th of July. To resolve one of this contradictions we suggest to read the indiction number as 3 (4th indiction) which would agree with the Higra year (on condition that indiction is of the Egyptian type). The number 499 of the Diocletian era might be a mistake of the stonemason who possibly was influenced by the well known cryptogram γφ = ΔΑΙΜΗ. We suggest that the date of the inscription might be 25th July 781.


4-5. The name of the deceased woman was in fact ΔΗΛΑ ηνυ as read correctly by Brunsch. Quibell, followed by Wietheger, read ΑΙΔΑ ηνυ in this place. It was the source of a ghost name ΑΙΔΑ ηνυ listed in Heuser, *Personennamen*, 20 (however, on p. 125 he suggested the place in question be read ΔΑΙΜΗ).

3. ΜΙΑΟC Brunsch; read ΜΗΑΟC

5. ΜΗΑΟC Brunsch; read ΜΗΑΚΥΜΟC

6. Brunsch, *WZKM* 84 (1994) 13, no. A 11722 = *Rec. Trav.* 5 (1884) 68, no. 18 = *KSB* I 582. The photo of the stone published by Brunsch shows that the lower part of the stone (lines 6-10) has been lost since the *editio princeps.*

---

3 This cryptogram immediately follows the year number γφ.

4 In our opinion the lower apex of the the right-hand stroke of η is visible on the photo of the inscription published by Brunsch.
3. ικάκος ικάκος ικάκος Brunsch, read ικάκοιος

11. Μ. Ν. [Brunsch; read Μ. Ν. [Μος]

7.-8. Εμπιστοσθητικό Brunsch; read Εμπιστοσθητικό

5. ενηκον καούςανε Brunsch; read ενηκον καούςανε

2. εσφόρισι Βρούσι; read εσφόρισι

15. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 66, no. 261. The inscription seems to have been previously unknown.

1. μωτ πεζεμ [πε] -
πιά έντοφα
μίχαν Καβρι-
4 ΝΑ ΤΕΜΑΓΑ
ΜΑΡΛΑ ΑΠΑ ΑΝ-
ΟΥΠ ΑΠΑ ΑΝΟ-
8 ΕΝΚΟΝ ΑΝΟΥ-
ΒΙΝΗ ΔΑΚΑ Σ-
ΓΙΜΑ ΕΓΡΑΩΛ
ΚΟΥ ΖΟΥΠΤ-
12 ΕΝΟΥΣ ΚΩΤ-
ΖΑΚ ΑΝ ΟΥ[ΕΙΡΗ]-
NE [ΑΜΗΝ]
1. μώμος [μός] Βρούσι

2. σοφον τροσιν Βρούσι; read σοφον τροσιν
3. ΜΙΧΑΗΛΙΟΣ Brunsch

5-6. The last two letters of line 5 were not read by Brunsch. At the beginning of line 6 Brunsch reads φιπ

8. ΠΩ ΠΩ Brunsch

8-9. ΔΙΩΝΙΩΝΙΟΣ Brunsch

10. ΕΡΜΙΩΝΙΟΣ Brunsch

13. ΓΝΟΤΙΣΘΗ ΠΡΟ ΠΡΟ ΠΡΟ ΠΡΟ ΠΡΟ ΠΡΟ Brunsch

16. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 67, no. 262. The inscription seems to have been previously unknown.

17. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 67, no. 264. The inscription seems to have been previously unknown.

4. ΜΗΝΙΑΚΟΣ Brunsch. If our reading of the deceased name as ωφ is certain it belongs to a woman what is indicated by feminine praefix in the following verb. Hor is not
with certainty attested as a woman’s name in Coptic, but, it was sometimes borne by women in pharaonic times; cf. Ranke, *Aegyptische Personennamen* 245, 18. However, ḫwjp xnwjp (KOW 126, 6), "Hor, (son/daughter) of Tschenhor", or perhaps rather ḫwjp x nswjp, "Hor, the daughter of Hor", may refer to a woman. Or, possibly, we should read in lines 3-4 nswjo q1swn. The name cwn (fem.) is on record in *KSB* I 581, 3.

5-8. The lines were not read by Brunsch.

The inscription contains numerous Fayyumic dialectal forms (Δω, Δκε-, έρφη). This indicates the provenance of the inscription from the Fayyum.

18. Brunsch, *EVO* 18 (1995) 68, no. 269. The inscription seems to have been previously unknown.

\[\text{[NN]εεπαι Δ[yw]}\]
πξεc Νσζ[ζ Νμ]\nεκετη Ντον Ντμ Ι . Ι\nx+4 . Δη restores Μυμησ Νη Ντ[ο]\nον Νταλαναγς[ζ]c\nηκονξη έκανυν Ν-\nΝενειαλα Μπατρια[p]-\nx+8 Χς Αγαζάμ ΜΗ [1]-\nΣΑΚ ΜΗ ΕΑΚΔΒ ζ[θ]\n
x+3-4. We are uncertain as to the reading of this particular place, the more so as the stonemason has surely made a mistake at the beginning of line 4. We suggest to read: Ντμα[ζ]ζ [α]ρα. Possibly the inscription was originally much longer, the whole upper part being now lost. It probably contained name(s) of the deceased(s). For a similar construction see *KSB* I 463.

x+4-5. ηοc Brunsch. For the request to rest the soul of the deceased in “the place of the rest” see R. G. Coquin, M.-H. Rutschowscaya, *BIFAO* 94 (1994) 116f., 1. 8-11 and S. Sauneron & R.-G. Coquin, *Catalogue provisoire des stèles funéraires coptes d’Esna (= MIFAO* 104), Le Caire 1980, 159f., no. 57 and 239 ff. For Ψγχη Νη Ντομοc s. Quibell IV, p. 85, no. 270 and Quibell IV, p. 77, no. 245 (particularly ft. 1, with further bibliography).


† Μνογες Ννενηα\nΔυς Πνοςες Ν-\nΣαρξ Νη Απι Ου-\n4 Ν[τ]α [Μ]η Τψγχη\nΝτμ[α]καρια\nΔμα [Η]αρια.
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ΝΜΟΣ ὈΨΟ
ἀ ἰναιο/ζ ἈΜ

Μartisan

†

1. †π...ἐν.

2. ἰναιο[ε] ἘΝ Brunsch.

3. ἰναιο Ἡ Brunsch. At the end of the line there is ου in ligature and not χ.

4. Ἡ...ΜΕΨΥΧΤ Brunsch.

5. ΑΜΑ...ΧΡΙ Δ Brunsch. One can read [Μ]ΛΙΑΘ as well.

6. Brunsch reads α as the day of the month.

20. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 71, no. 308. The inscription seems to have been previously unknown.

1. Brunsch prints ιε ΝΕΧΕ ΔΡΙ Π, probably by mistake.

2. ΝΕΧΕ ΔΡΙ Brunsch. Curiously enough he does not see the letters πι at the end of the line. The name ΤΑΥΡΙΝΗ we reconstruct is very well attested in Christian Egypt, both in Greek and Coptic sources.

3. Brunsch does not read the letter τ after the lacuna.


1. †P Brunsch.
2. mîn †P Brunsch.
3. mîn Brunsch.
4. nîtoc (nîton) nîmos Brunsch.
5. The name nîwgyy seems not to be attested till now. Most probably it is of Nubian origin (as suggested also by Brunsch). One can connect it with the Old Nubian stem ex- = "now"; cf. the compound nîwgyy "from now on" on record in J. M. Plumley & G. M. Browne, Old Nubian Texts from Qasr Ibrim, I (= Texts from Excavations, 9), London 1988, no. 9 ii 14.
7. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 84, no. 4543 = Gayet, Mémoires III, pl. XXVIII, fig. 33 (only the photo) = Crum, Monuments, no. 8703 = Lef. no. 84 = Kat. Kairo (1967) 93, no. 222 = Kamel/Girgis, no. 110. Coptic Museum Cairo, inv. 8020 (the number 4543 given by Brunsch is false), earlier Egyptian Museum Cairo. Provenance: Fayyum (according to the Catalogue Général).

5. This inscription was also identified by K. A. WORP who communicated this to Adam Łajtar in an e-mail dated July 1st, 1999.
2. negoo Hasitzka.

4. This line was added later when the stonemason realised that he had omitted the epithet μακροις otherwise belonging to the form of the epitaphs from Deir Anba Hadra. The line seems squeezed in between lines 3 and 5. If it had been finished, we would read e.g. μ[μακροις], μ[πεγεμον] etc. Brunsch does not see this line.

5. mCON m [Brunsch.


27. Brunsch, EVO 18 (1995) 85f., no. 6743 = Monneret de Villard, Sakinya, no. 208 = T. Mina, Nubie, no. 308. Sandstone. Funerary inscription. Coptic Museum Cairo, inv. 6843 (the number 6743 given by Brunsch is false; the correct number 6843 written in Arabic numbers towards the lower edge of the stone is visible on the photo published by Brunsch), earlier Egyptian Museum Cairo JE 63423. Provenance: Nubia, Sakinya.

13. γαμην: Brunsh reads γαμεν


10. εκσων Brunsh. there is γράµµη on the stone.

11. ικακ Brunsh. On the stone stays ικακ.


1. εις θεος ο νομοθετήριος μετρίος εις χρ.

31. Brunsch, _EVO_ 18 (1995) 91, no. 8095 + Brunsch, _Aegyptus_ 73 (1993) 170, no. 35 = Quibell IV (1912), 74, no. 233 (photo: pl. XLV, 2) = Kamel/Girgis, no. 168 = Wietheger, 367, no. 166. The inscription in broken into two parts. The right-hand-side has been edited by Brunsch in _EVO_ 18, the left-hand-side in _Aegyptus_ 73. Coptic Museum Cairo, inv. 8595 (the number 8095 given by Brunsch is false), earlier Egyptian Museum Cairo, JE 41494. Limestone. Funerary inscription. Provenance: Saqqara.

left-hand side                               right-hand side
пеммергт ῥυτ                    о ἀγος μιχάνη.
ετούαδας αλα 1ε-                  о ἀγος φάβρινη.
phemiac аля εινωχ                   τίμāδυ μαρία.
4 пегράμματος                      8 τίμαδυ σβυλλάα.

1. ῥυτ Brunsch in _Aegyptus_ 73; ἴοτ o Brunsch in _EVO_ 18.
2. аλα [. . . . .]ε Brunsch in _Aegyptus_ 73; ίε o Brunsch in _EVO_ 18.
3. εινωχ Brunsch in _Aegyptus_ 73; ἴοτ o Brunsch in _EVO_ 18.
4. пегράμματος Brunsch in _Aegyptus_ 73; νόć Brunsch in _EVO_ 18, пегράμματος Quibell.

32. Brunsch, _EVO_ 18 (1995) 92, no. 8324 = Brunsch, _Aegyptus_ 73 (1993) 148 f., no. 24 = _Bessarione_ ser. IV, vol. 26 (1899) 110, G (Coptic text of lines 1-4) = Crum, _Monuments_, no. 8320 = Kamel/Girgis, no. 187, pl. LXXVIII = Wietheger, 331 f., no. 74. The stone comes from the Jeremias monastery at Saqqara. It should be noted that earlier publications of this inscription were inaccurate (see remarks of Wietheger, loc. cit.), it is then not unreasonable to give here its complete text. It was established on the grounds of the photo published by Brunsch in _EVO_ 18. This photo consists in fact of three different pictures of which the left one is slightly larger in scale than the other ones. Furthermore the left and the central picture partly overlap.

πυρτ πυρηρε πεπηγε ετούαδας αμμιν
аль κερμάνε πηρας аля εύργοςу аля кερη
nimαι аля ονίως аля аλπαλαοςι] аля σαρματα
4 алю тαχάριας пеоувнре аεκкто ммоο и
сου сооу сαλιονις ervice ουσεπνυ παμμιη
а εκαξ κενκοс фοιβαμμνη аεκкто ммоο и
сου аεουτομενε σαλιονις кенκοс ερλιλαс аεκкто
ммоο κэоу митоуε σαλιονις кенκοс εαντε
αεκκто ммоο κэοу сαυφι ы σαλιονιес кенκοс гε-
ωκτε εοαουμνη ы αεκκто ммоο κεοу κо πκαδ

2. αλα [. . . . .]ε Brunsch in _EVO_ 18. ἴοτας is possible as well.
3. The word ἀνα before ἀπολλω is omitted by Brunsch.
6. φοιμαμμον Brunsch.
7. ηπαυμον Brunsch.
10. ημοσ Brunsch. The letters ημ in ημοσ are in ligature as are also the letters ηκ in ηκας. In the word ηκου “ο” is placed over “γ”.


The inscription is either in Coptic or in Greek.

2. \(\text{ο ΒΟΗΘΟΝ}\) Brunsch.

3. \(\text{ΠΕΛΛΑΗΑ}\) Brunsch.


[1. \(\text{γτοη γνύ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) \(\text{οι}\) Crum, Brunsch; \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) Crum.

2. \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) Brunsch.

4. \(\text{τωι}\)

1.-2. \(\text{γτοη γνύ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) Brunsch; \(\text{γτοη γνύ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) \(\text{οι}\) \(\text{μμλ}\) Crum, *Monuments*. Brunsch, contrary to Crum, published this inscription as if they were only 2 lines. Lines 1-2 are on the left side of gable with floral decorations inside, 3-4 were carved on its right side.


\(\text{σενχαρεμο} \)\(\text{οι}\) Brunsch \(\text{σενχαρεμο} \)\(\text{οι}\) Schmid.. We are unable to find another attestation for this name. If Brunsch’s reading were correct, then the stonemason must have forgotten \(\text{οι}\) at the end of the name, the article \(\text{οι}\) before \(\text{οι}\) and the name of the village!


Brunsch published three objects with the number 8636. These are: \textit{EVO} 18 (1995) 98 (two objects) and \textit{EVO} 18 (1995) 99 (one object).


1. \textit{εκνηνο[η] καὶ άτ-}
   \textit{έτεκευσεντε ο μακ-}
   \textit{άριος χρυσός κοιν}
2. \textit{νταφύλον αμ-}
   \textit{οι επί μινος μις-}
   \textit{ορν ηηομηνια υπο-}
   \textit{κνηνον ειδεκ κα-}
3. \textit{άκι πιουτε αρι}
   \textit{ουην κη τηεψη-}
   \textit{χηρ απα τριας}
   \textit{φαι χαιρ}
4. \textit{πνωυτε (sic) Brunsch.}
5. \textit{κχρωκος Brunsch; Κυραιος Łajtar; a vertical stroke between а and к is not the letter i but only a crack in the stone surface.}
6. \textit{μιςορυ Brunsch; мιςορυ is also possible.}
7. \textit{ινα κι Brunsch.}
8. \textit{πιουτε (sic) Brunsch.}

8 ΔΡΕΝΟΗ ΝΤΑΚΙΤΩΝ ΕΜΟΣ
ΝΗ ΧΑΙ ΙΙΝΟΘ ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΔΩΜΗ
ΔΩΜΗ ΕΥΘΥΜΗΣ Τ†

2. ΝΚΑΡΖ Βρους.
3. ΝΤΟ Βρους.
9. ΝΙΧ Βρους.


4. Nicholas Brunsch, read NIM.
5. Δήμος ΟΥΝΟΣ Brunsch.
8. "Lies viktum" Brunsch.
11. "νοού für νοού" Brunsch.


\[\text{XMFY} \]
2. \[\text{ΜΩ \ ΜΝ} \]

1–2. τιμή Brunsch. The numeral is to all probability e. The fact that the horizontal cross-bar is not seen on the photo is most probably due only to enlightening during photographing. Brunsch's translation "Heilige Dreifaltigkeit! Tybi 8, 9. Indiktion" is wrong. For χμγ see Derda, *JJP* 22 (1992) 21 ff. and Wietheger, p. 202 ff.

2. \[\text{ε \ ΜΝ} \]


\[\text{πρωτή παρακάτω} \]
2. \[\text{ΠΝ ΠΝΗΜ ΑΓ ΤΟΥ-} \]
3. \[\text{ΔΑΒ ΤΕΤΡΑΣ} \]
4. \[\text{ΕΠΗΚ ΕΠΗ \ ΕΤ-} \]
5. \[\text{ΓΙ \ ΓΙ ΠΑΡ-} \]
6. \[\text{ΧΑΠΕΛΟΣ ΜΩ-} \]
7. \[\text{ΧΑΝΗ ΠΑΡΧΗΛΑ-} \]
8. \[\text{ΓΕΛΟΣ ΓΑΦΡΗΣ} \]
9. \[\text{ΠΧΟΥΤΑΤΕ ΜΠ-} \]
10. \[\text{ΡΕΒΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ ΡΕ-} \]
11. \[\text{ΠΕΡΗ ΜΠ\...} \]
12. \[\text{ΤΟΥΔΑΔ} \]

2. \[\text{ΕΤ\...} \]
3. \[\text{ΤΕΤΡΑΣ} \]
4. \[\text{ΕΠ\...} \]
5. \[\text{ΡΕ\...} \]
10. \[\text{ΡΕ\...} \]
11. \[\text{ΡΕ\...} \]
11–12. For the supplement see e.g. *KSB* I 792, 4.
12. This line is missing in the *editio princeps* by Brunsch.


60. Brunsch, *EVO* 18 (1995) 104-106, no. 9651 = H. Munier, *Aegyptus* 11 (1930-31) 452 ff., no. 116 = *KSB* I 614. Sandstone slab broken horizontally in the middle and obliquely at the bottom to the right. The lower right-hand corner was evidently not known to the first editor followed by Hasitzka, hence her reconstructions of the ends of lines 25-32 differ from the real ones. The stone contains three inscriptions by three different hands, separated by horizontal lines.
1. *τί σω *† τικσ**ν** † Brunsch.

3-4. The stone has clearly *ιωαννηλο* (a mistake of the stonemason for *ιωαννηλη*). Hasitzka prints *ιωαννηλη*.

4. Read *πλακ(ω)*.

5. *μοναχος* Brunsch.

6. *δαψη* † Brunsch.

7. *ιωακ* and *ιωκα* Brunsch, both without the abbreviation mark. The date is 13 November 884. Brunsch converts the year according to the Diocletian era to 885 A.D. what is incorrect.


12. *ηροου* Brunsch.

15. *μη ποου νεου* Hasitzka; *μη ποου νεου* Brunsch.

16. *τηλακοκ ο απο ιωκα* Brunsch. The reading of the indiction number makes difficulties. Brunsch gives the impossible “ο” (= 70), Hasitzka has “ς”. The date of the inscription is July 15th, 888 A.D. (and not 889 A.D. as given by Brunsch). On that day we are in the 6th indiction according to the Constantinopolitan system and in the 7th indiction according to the Egyptian system. There are two possible solutions: either (1) the redactor of the inscription made use of the Constantinopolitan system; or (2) he used the Egyptian system but mistakenly gave the number of the old indiction that had finished only several days ago (most probably on June, 30th).


20. *τεκμητεον* Brunsch (print mistake?).


25. *ιωκα* Hasitzka, *ιωκα παρχημ ευ*(sic) Brunsch; read: *ιωκα(ος παρχημ(εσ- 

υτερος)).
26. *προεστ/* Hasitzka; *προεστ/β* Brunsch; read *προεστ(υ)*.

28-29. *Ἀυχ. Χη* Hasitzka. The date as converted to the Julian calendar is November 15th, 895 A.D. (and not 896 A.D. as given by Brunsch).


---

**Monika R. M. Hasitzka**

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
Papyrussammlung
Josefsplatz 1
1015 Wien
ÖSTERREICH

e-mail: hasitzka@onb.ac.at

---

**Adam Łajtar**

Department of Papyrology
Institute of Archaeology
University of Warsaw
Krakowskie Przedmieszce 26/28
00-927 Warszawa 64
POLAND

e-mail: alajtar@venus.ci.iiw.edu.pl

---

**Tomasz Markiewicz**

Chair of Egyptology
Institute of Oriental Studies
University of Warsaw
Krakowskie Przedmieszce 26/28
00-927 Warszawa 64
POLAND

e-mail: tmark@mercury.ci.iiw.edu.pl