

A DUPLICATE VERSION OF THE DEMOTIC *KUFI* TEXT

BY

W. J. TAIT

Christ's College, Cambridge

I publish here three papyrus fragments of Roman date from Tebtunis, which preserve in part twenty lines of a duplicate version of the well-known demotic text containing animal-fables, *Kufi*. The new fragments have prompted a reconsideration of the entire fable (the conversation between the two vultures, Sight and Hearing) to which they belong, and I hope in a subsequent article to discuss the story and its place in the text: here I confine myself to the points raised directly by the new fragments.

The fragments belong to the Egypt Exploration Society of London and are housed in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford.¹ I am satisfied that their provenance is Tebtunis.² The demotic text is written across the fibres on the original verso surface of the roll. There are three fragments: *fr.* 1, 6.5 × 11 cm; *fr.* 2, 2.5 × 7.5 cm; *fr.* 3, 3 × 9 cm. *Fr.* 2 joins with *fr.* 1, and the position of *fr.* 3 is certain.³ The three fragments represent a vertical strip, measur-

¹ I am most grateful to the Society for having allowed me to work upon these fragments for the purposes of my doctoral thesis in the University of Oxford and for now permitting me to publish them. I am also glad to thank The Revd Professor J. W. B. Barns (who supervised my thesis), Dr R. A. Coles, Professor J. R. Harris, and Professor H. S. Smith for their help.

² There is no record of how the fragments, part of a considerable parcel of Tebtunis material, came to be among the Society's papyri at Oxford. In my thesis I set out the reasons for supposing that this material was from Tebtunis, and suggested that it had been purchased by Grenfell and Hunt in Egypt, at some date after their 1899/1900 excavations at Tebtunis.

³ The correspondence of the fibres is sufficient to fix the position of *fr.* 3, apart from the obvious correspondence of the demotic text. The greek recto text is too badly rubbed at this point to provide similar proof, but the lines of the text can be seen to correspond.

ing altogether 6.5×19.5 cm, from the central portion of a column: neither the beginnings nor the ends of lines are preserved. Up to 2.5 cm of blank papyrus stands at the head of *fr.* 1, and this is clearly the top margin of the column. No bottom margin is preserved, and there is no way of telling how many lines, if any, are missing after the 20 or 21 lines that survive.⁴ The papyrus has discoloured unevenly to a light brown. It is just thick enough to be quite opaque. Both sides of the papyrus have been slightly rubbed, and some signs have almost disappeared from one or two places on the demotic verso; but over most of the papyrus the ink, which is a full black colour, remains quite clear.

The original recto surface of the fragments bears a greek text, written along the fibres the same way up as the demotic text. It is part of a register of tax-payments in wheat. I assume on general grounds that it was written before the demotic text, and that, as in the case of many other demotic literary texts from roman Tebtunis, the priests have employed the blank verso of a discarded official register.⁵ What survives of the greek text does not contain any date. The hand is small, rapid and very cursive. It cannot be dated with any precision: it is what would often be called 'a second century hand', and might belong anywhere from the late first century A.D. onward. I should judge that it would not come from after A.D. 150, and most probably dates between A.D. 90 and 120.

The hand of the demotic text belongs to a class of literary hand from Tebtunis of which many examples survive. The only text in this type of hand so far published is Pap. Carlsberg 14.⁶ My opinion is that texts written in these hands are to be assigned to

⁴ The height of the columns of comparable literary texts from Tebtunis is exactly the same kind of hand as the present papyrus and similarly written on the verso of greek registers varies considerably. The lowest number of lines per column of which I am aware 21, and the highest 34. The greek recto text does not provide any clue to the original height of the present papyrus.

⁵ This is true of the published papyrus Pap. Carlsberg 14, mentioned below.

⁶ A. Volten, *Demotische Traumdeutung (Pap. Carlsberg XIII und XIV verso)*, Kopenhagen, 1942 (Analecta Aegyptiaca consilio Instituti Aegyptologici Hafniensis edita, vol. 3). The hand of Pap. Carlsberg 14 is so precisely similar to that of the present text that I suspect they are the work of the same scribe. For Volten's comments on the date of Pap. Carlsberg 14, see pp. 3-4.

the first half of the second century A.D.⁷ I think that the register on the recto supports such a date for the demotic text, but, as I have pointed out, one cannot insist on a precise date for the greek hand. There are no rulings for the lines of the demotic text, or to frame the columns: this appears always to be the case with texts written in this kind of hand.

The demotic text corresponds to a passage in the text edited by Spiegelberg in 1917 as 'Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge'.⁸ The passage in his publication is *col.* 14, *ll.* 8–32. Various names have been employed to refer to the text, the most common being 'Mythos', 'Sonnenauge', and 'Kufi'. I do not wish to invent yet another name, and use *Kufi* here, not because it is particularly apposite, but because it conveniently serves to distinguish the text from any other. The papyrus is Leiden Demotic Papyrus I. 384. It is thought to have come from Thebes.⁹ Concerning its date, Spiegelberg argued that the hand lay between that of Pap. Insinger and that of Pap. London-Leiden, and that the presence on the verso of the papyrus of a magical text in every way similar to Pap. London-Leiden provided a *terminus ante quem* for the recto *Kufi* text. He continued 'Danach wird für denjenigen, der noch eine genauere Datierung verlangt etwa die Wende des 2. nachchristl. Jahrhunderts in Betracht kommen.' (p. 1). I assume that this means the *beginning* of the second century A.D., and such a date may well be right.¹⁰ A hand-copy of the papyrus was published among the plates of Leiden Hieratic and Demotic Papyri,¹¹ and another in Krall's *Demotische Lesestücke*.¹² Spiegel-

⁷ In my thesis, I suggested dates for the various types of demotic literary hand from roman Tebtunis, but I cannot summarize my arguments here.

⁸ W. Spiegelberg, *Der ägyptische Mythos vom Sonnenauge (Der Papyrus der Tierfabeln—"Kufi") Nach dem Leidener Demotischen Papyrus I 384*, Strassburg, 1917.

⁹ See the note on the second side of the unnumbered text-page accompanying the fascicle of hand-copies of the papyrus published at Leiden, for which see n. 11 below.

¹⁰ As there are still few Upper Egyptian texts available for study, Spiegelberg's arguments cannot be greatly refined today. However, his point that the magical text could not have been written on the verso until the *Kufi* text had ceased to be of interest seems to me to have no substance.

¹¹ C. Leemans & W. Pleyte, *Aegyptische Monumenten van het Nederlandsche Museum van Oudheden te Leyden*, Leiden, 1842–1905, II^e Afd., plate 215–25. The

berg's edition included a further set of hand-copies, and photographic reproductions of two columns.¹³ Erichsen gave a hand-copy and transcription of col. 15, ll. 6–14 among the passages from *Kufi* he included in his *Demotische Lesestücke*.¹⁴

A greek translation of the *Kufi* text is preserved in a papyrus of the third century A.D. in the British Museum (Inv. no. 274) identified and published by Reitzenstein in 1923,¹⁵ and most recently studied and re-edited by West: details and bibliography of the greek text may conveniently be found in her introduction.¹⁶

The present passage belongs to the conversation between the Seeing-bird and the Hearing-bird, Leiden Kufi 13.24–15.7. (For an explanation of these two names, see the note on l. 2, p. 29 below). This conversation, on the inevitability of the retribution for murder, guaranteed by the sun-god Rē, is retold by 'Kufi' to the goddess Tefnut, apparently to dissuade her from killing him in a sudden fit of anger. The conversation features a fable, in which each of a series of creatures is swallowed in turn by the next larger, until a griffin acts as the final instrument of divine punishment. I postpone a full discussion of the story as a whole and its place in the text until my subsequent article, which will contain a full transcription and translation.

relevant fascicle appeared as 'Papyrus Égyptien Démotique I. 384 du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays-bas à Leide Publié dans la 17^e Livraison, ou la 10^e de la II^e Partie des Monuments Égyptiens du Musée d'Antiquités des Pays-bas à Leide, 1856'. The numbering of the columns is the same as Spiegelberg's. For the magical verso text, see plates 226–7.

¹³ J. Krall, *Demotische Lesestücke*, Wien and Leipzig, 1897–1903, I Theil. The plates are unnumbered: the numbering of the columns is the same as Spiegelberg's.

¹³ Spiegelberg's two photographic plates are plate 16a and 17a, reproducing columns 17 and 18. He explains the difficulties of photographing the papyrus in n. 4, p. V. The hand-copies were the work of Hess, slightly modified (see p. V).

¹⁴ W. Erichsen, *Demotische Lesestücke I. Literarische Texte mit Glossar und Schrifttafel*, Leipzig, 1937, 1. Heft, p. 68 and p. 72.

¹⁵ R. Reitzenstein, 'Die Griechische Tefnutlegende', *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Jahrgang 1923, 2. Abhandlung. This study incorporates some further ideas of Spiegelberg's on the demotic text.

¹⁶ S. West, 'The Greek Version of the Legend of Tefnut', *JEA* 55 (1969), pp. 161–83. For the bibliography, see pp. 161–2.

fr.1

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Hebrew or Aramaic, on a fragment of parchment. The text is arranged in approximately 10 horizontal lines. The fragment is irregularly shaped with some missing portions.

5

10

fr.2

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Hebrew or Aramaic, on a fragment of parchment. The text is arranged in approximately 10 horizontal lines. The fragment is irregularly shaped with some missing portions.

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely Hebrew or Aramaic, on a fragment of parchment. The text is arranged in approximately 10 horizontal lines. The fragment is irregularly shaped with some missing portions.

15

20

fr.3

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

Transcription

top margin

rw[h]y[̄]x r t[̄]l(=y) s[̄]s[w]y[̄]x šw[̄]w[x

] d̄d n=s nw l-ir=t sby [

] l̄l n[̄]s=y l(w)=s ww n t[̄] p[̄]t[̄]x [

] * d̄d p[̄]s 'f-syl r-wn-n[̄]s-w [

5] * d̄d=f 'm p[̄]s sgyns p[̄]s h[n]tws

] * l-ir s n=f * d̄d=f t[̄]l p[̄]s n[̄]l [

] p[̄]s ym r-m-dr-ir=t sw[̄]n[̄]x [

] d̄d n=s nw mdt m[̄]s't t[̄]l mdt nb [

] * st hpr n m[̄]s't dr=w tw-[s

10] w' syt r r[̄]s=f tw-[s

] * l̄w=f [mn]x̄ r n[̄]s q[̄]l[̄]s.w

] x̄ p[̄]s n' l[x r p[̄]s] 't tw-s w' [

n[̄]s]l=f yb.w [n]-l̄m=w w[̄]s[̄]h=f f[̄]s[y

] r hly [w[̄]s[̄]h=f] h[̄]l[̄]h[̄]x[x

15 l̄w]=f hpr l̄w=y d̄d [mdt]x n 'd̄.t [

] wsf n-[l-ir]-h[̄]r=f f[̄]s[y

r]-d̄d=w r mdt m[̄]s'.[t dr]x=w n[̄]s-[w

m]-s[̄]s t[̄]l m̄tw=w s[̄]h[̄]n=[s n] t[̄]s l̄h[y.t

b[̄]n].t m-m̄l̄t-t[̄]l [m-s[̄]s] hpr l[̄]h]*[

20] g[̄]m' [

] * [?

— — — — —

Commentary¹⁷

l. 1 r The construction here is a circumstantial clause, introduced by *r* (for 'historical' *lw*), with nominal subject and stative. See Spiegelberg DG, principally §§ 208–12 (Das partizipiale 'wε); and Bresciani NEGD pp. 68–9 (Presente III). The Coptic would be ε-τα-ⲁϥⲟⲩⲩⲓ ⲙⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ. We might translate '... and I (regularly) settle myself to sleep at evening, with my crop dry.' The emphasis of the second *l-lr-hr sdr=y* form would be better reproduced by '... and so my crop is dry when I settle myself to sleep at evening.'

3swy Erichsen DG 11.4 gives the occurrence in the Leiden text, and reproduces the translation suggested by Spiegelberg, 'Kehle'. I know of no other instance of the word in this sense. In both the present papyrus and the Leiden papyrus the middle of the word is damaged.

Leiden ⲁⲩⲱⲩⲓ ⲙⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ

Oxford ⲁⲩⲱⲩⲓ ⲙⲟⲩⲱⲟⲩ

It is reasonable to understand the word as another form of *asw(s).t*, 'bag' (Erichsen DG 11.5, 'sswa.t Beutel o. ä.': Coptic ⲁϥⲟⲩⲩⲓ, Crum CD 18 b, 'purse, wallet'): that is, to take it as the same word written with the flesh-determinative, and meaning the crop of a bird. The expected Fayyūmic form *aswy* for the 'bag' word, hitherto unattested, is found in an unpublished Tebtunis text in the same type of hand as the present text, Pap. Lange 45: ⲁⲩⲱⲩⲓ.

šww The trace after the first *w* (ⲩ) would suit the foot of a second *w* very well, and we may be confident that, as in the Leiden text, the stative form is here written with two *ws*. Erichsen DG 494.2 gives one such writing of the stative which is clearly taken from the Leiden text. Compare the stative of *way*, *ww*, which itself occurs in *l.3* below.

I do not find this kind of writing of the stative discussed by the grammars. (For the stative see Spiegelberg DG §§ 96–100 and the following sections on Die Verbalklassen, §§ 101–11; and Bresciani NEGD pp. 58–61.) The common demotic indication (more often there is none) of a stative form follows the determinative and could be argued, like the fem. *.t* and plur. *.w* endings of nouns, not to represent any sound. Apart from the 'irregular' verbs (Spiegelberg DG §§ 108–11; and Bresciani NEGD pp. 60–1) where a difference in writing is clearly accompanied by a difference of sound, Spiegelberg DG § 98, Anm. discusses the verb *thr*, which tends to be written *thr* in the stative and *th*, etc., in other forms (cf. Erichsen DG 653.1). I take *šww* and *ww* to be an attempt to represent the sound of the

¹⁷ The standard dictionaries and grammars are referred to by abbreviations, which I think need no clarification. References to the views of simply 'Spiegelberg' are naturally to his edition of the Leiden Kufi text, as I hope is clear from the context in each case: for this, see n. 8, p. 25 above.

2) We might try to analyse the phrase into separate words. Because of the variation between the form *l-ir-y* in the Leiden papyrus and *l-ir* in the Oxford papyrus, this part of the phrase is probably best explained as the imperative of *lir*, 'do'. Spiegelberg took it as an imperative in 13.25 and in 14.14. One possibility is that the phrase consists of words spoken, giving instructions for revenge to be taken; but in that case how is the snake at the end to be explained? We cannot make any of the occurrences mean 'to whom it was said "Do it to him!"' Further, I think it could not be a phrase spoken by each animal in turn, because it first occurs before the first animal has been introduced (Leiden papyrus 14.12). It seems quite impossible to take the snake-sign as *paš*; however, it might be explained

as an unusual writing of some word. Spiegelberg takes it to be a writing of *nfr*, 'good', 'well' (see his Glossar no. 413). This I find impossible to accept, because 1) his translations of all the present passages in the Leiden papyrus are unconvincing, and it seems even less likely that the two further examples in the Oxford papyrus could be explained along the same lines; 2) the evidence he offers in the Glossar for other such writings of *nfr* is unsatisfactory. The snake as a determinative after a full writing of *nfr* might be acceptable, although in the Serapeuminschrift example given by Spiegelberg I would rather take it as a determinative of the whole expression *md-nfr*; and, if the reading is correct, I would take the same view of *šp-nfr* at Leiden Kufi 9.15; but the snake as a complete writing of *nfr* is a very different matter. At 12.14, the snake is clearly a determinative of *hbr*, as often. At 8.33, 'šrj nfr', 'in unklarer Verbindung', is surely wrong. Of Spiegelberg's parallels there remains *𐤎𐤏𐤓* at 16.8, 'md.t nfr.t(?)' as he transcribes it. I do not find the sense of this one passage at all clear, and it does not make me accept the snake as a writing of *nfr* in the present passage. I cannot suggest any other word as a reading of the sign.

dd This seems most likely to be *dd* introducing a quotation. The Leiden papyrus is transcribed by Spiegelberg '*dd r pā 'f n sir*', although the *r* does not seem a certain reading. It is not clear how Spiegelberg understood the *r*.

'f-syl The Leiden papyrus writes *𐤎𐤏𐤓-𐤔𐤕*, '*f n syr*', with the determinative of an animal after *syr*, whereas the present papyrus has the determinative of a bird (no doubt used for an insect) after both elements: *𐤎𐤏𐤓-𐤔𐤕*. '*f*' is the regular word for 'fly' or 'insect', and the compound expression '*f n syr*' is paralleled by the demotic '*f n iby*', 'bee', which itself occurs in the Kufi text (cf. Erichsen DG 59.10), and by several expressions in Coptic (see Crum CD under ⲁϥ, 23b). The compound in the demotic text is translated in the greek version by μῦα (μύια), 'fly' (LSJ⁹ 1151b: see *fr.* D, col. 1, l. 48—the passage corresponding to the present occurrence is not preserved). The demotic expression clearly signifies a kind of fly or insect.

Spiegelberg (Glossar no. 101) explains the expression as 'die *sir* (. . . .)—Fliege (= Hunds(?)—Fliege)'. This suggests that he understood *syr* as the name of an animal. (I should point out that there is no regular german compound 'Hunds-Fliege', nor one similar.) I think that *syr* need not necessarily be taken as the name of an animal, nor even as that of an insect.

It seems most unlikely that *syr* could be the same as *sr*, 'ram' (Erichsen DG 441.3), because of the overwhelming number of writings *šw* (cf. Coptic ⲉϥⲟⲟϥ, Crum CD 61a): if here an old egyptian writing *sr* were being copied, as possibly is the case in Pap. London-Leiden (Index no. 761: note the gloss *cpo*), despite a contemporary pronunciation along the lines of ⲉϥⲟⲟϥ, one would not expect the forms *syr* and *syl* with a *y*, nor perhaps the Fayyūmic *l* in the present text. Two further possibilities are 1) *syr/syl* might be connected with Egyptian *srt*, 'thorn', etc. (cf. German *Stechfliege* and English *gadfly*), although I cannot satisfactorily

explain the form of the demotic word: 2) *syr/syl* might be an adaptation of the Greek ψύλλα, 'flea' (LSJ⁹ 2026a), from which the initial *p* had been dropped through confusion with the egyptian definite article: the change of Greek *l* into Demotic *r* in an Upper Egyptian text can be paralleled by *k'r'ynl* (καλάνη) at Pap. London-Leiden Verso 4.8, and *g'rbān'* (χαλβάνη) at Verso 3.6.

l. 5 For the first trace at the beginning of this line, see the note on the similar trace at the beginning of *l. 4*.

'*m* This is the verb used for four of the stages in the chain of killings. In agreement with the basic meaning given by Erichsen DG 60.6, 'a) schlucken', I take it to mean 'to swallow' as opposed to *wnm*, 'to eat' (Erichsen DG 91.2, 'essen'), which itself occurs at Leiden 14.20.

sgyns: 'skink'. See Spiegelberg's Glossar no. 726, 'sknks'; and LSJ⁹ 1610b, 'σκίγγος or σκίγκος, ὁ, skink'. The sign 𐀢 to write the final *s*, instead of 𐀢, is unexpected.

l. 6 The trace at the beginning of the line is presumably the tail of the determinative of *sgyns*, written as in *l. 5*.

*l-r s n=f * dd=f* These words are discussed in the first note on *l. 4*.

t3l The corresponding word in the Leiden papyrus is almost completely lost, and Spiegelberg cautiously enough transcribed '[hwi(?)]'. In fact the space in the Leiden papyrus is rather small for *hwl*. The space and the traces would just suit *t3l*. I suggest that this is the correct reading in both texts. The greek version (*fr. D, col. 1, ll. 1-2*) is not an exact translation, but certainly does not support *hwl*.

nšl: semitic loan word, 'bird of prey'. See Spiegelberg's Glossar no. 442, 'nšr'. He lists all the possible translations without choosing between them, 'Geier, Falke, Adler': in the translation he gives 'Falke'. The greek version (*fr. D, col. 1, l. 6*) has ἀετός, which is definitely 'eagle'. Erichsen DG 229.4 gives 'Geier, Falke'. Cf. Crum CD 237a, 𐀎𐀢𐀢, 'vulture, falcon'.

The editors of Pap. London-Leiden took the word as 'vulture' in their Index (no. 477), but their translation has 'falcon'. It occurs in the formula *hb šps nšr bk šps r-phl.t*, which they translate 'Noble ibis, falcon, hawk, noble and mighty'. As *hb* and *bk* form a natural pair, and there is no adjective qualifying *nšr*, one wonders if *nšr-bk* might not be one expression, 'hawk-nšr', in which *bk* qualifies *nšr*.

l. 7 p3 ym: 'the sea', Erichsen DG 50.1, 'das Meer'. However, the word is used of lakes: cf. *pa lš n pa ym*, used of the Fayyūm (as is often pointed out, the arabic name derives from *pa ym*): see also Griffith's note on the 'Sea of Coptos' in First Setna.¹⁸ The mention of 'sea' here does not suggest that the original setting of the

¹⁸ F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis, The Sethon of Herodotus and the Demotic Tales of Khamuas*, Oxford, 1900, p. 21, n. on *l. 17*.

story was not Egypt. There is a general confusion in Egyptian among the words for sea and fresh water: cf. *wad-wr* (Wb. 1.269.12ff.); and see Herzog's remarks on these words in connection with the route to Punt.¹⁹

r-m-dr-lr=t swm: '(and) since you know'. The Hear-bird is taking the See-bird up on her boast in *col.* 13, *ll.* 29-30 of the Leiden text.

I know of no parallel in Demotic to the initial *r-* of *r-m-dr-lr=t* (ⲡⲣⲉⲣⲉ-). I can suggest only that it might be connected with the *lr* that precedes an initial *m-dr-stp=f* in Late Egyptian.²⁰

(The reading *r-m-dr* is, I think, uncertain. A reading *r-š* for ⲡⲣⲉⲣⲉ is possible: apart from the difficulties of explaining such a formation, *š* is consistently written ⲡⲣ in hands of this type.)

swm The damaged determinative is ⲟ .

l. 8 **t3l** This is the ⲡ form, as regularly for the copula.

l. 9 The very small trace at the beginning of the line is too indistinct to read. There is no reason to suppose that it is not a trace of *nht*, the relevant word in the Leiden text.

hpr The writing of *hpr*, ⲡⲣ, with the determinative, is very rare. The present papyrus does not employ it in *ll.* 15 or 19. The only other text I know to use this writing is P. Krall, where it occurs 5 or 6 times among over 50 examples of *hpr*: at 9.10 (twice, in parallel phrases), 14.21 (here the reading of the determinative is not certain), 20.10, 22.5 & 24.25. I cannot suggest anything that these might have in common, and suppose that the use of the determinative is of no significance for grammar or sense. I presume that the one writing with a determinative in Erichsen DG (355.1) is taken from P. Krall.

l. 10 **3yt** For the 't-fish, see Wb. 1.240.5; and Brugsch Wb. 1.227; and see the discussions of Montet²¹ and (Gamer-)Wallert.²²

r r3=f *rs* is unclear in the photograph, as it is split by the break between *fr.* 1 and *fr.* 2: it is written ⲣⲓⲥ.

There is a small space before *rs* and after the preposition *r*, which might be thought suspicious. However, this may be explained by an unevenness in the

¹⁹ R. Herzog, *Punt*, Glückstadt, 1968, pp. 79-80.

²⁰ See Erman NG § 810; and S. I. Groll, *The Negative Verbal System of Late Egyptian*, London and New York, 1970, § 43, pp. 145-8.

²¹ P. Montet, 'Les poissons employés dans l'écriture hiéroglyphique', *BIFAO* 11 (1914), pp. 39-48: see p. 40.

²² I. Wallert, *Fische und Fischkulte im alten Ägypten*, Wiesbaden, 1970, pp. 40-1.

papyrus at this point, which the scribe seems also to have avoided in the two previous lines.

The Leiden papyrus has $n\ r\bar{s}=f$, 'an *'ty* ate them *with its mouth*' (cf. Spiegelberg's translation 'mit seinem Maul'). The phrase seems to emphasize the use of the verb *wnm* instead of '*m* here (cf. the note on '*m*', l. 5): the small '*t*-fish nibbled at the carcasses of the snake and the bird of prey.

The $r\ r\bar{s}=f$ of the present papyrus is problematic. I think it is not sufficient to say that it must mean the same as the $n\ r\bar{s}=f$ of the Leiden papyrus. I can find no parallel in Demotic, and certainly none is mentioned in the grammars. Could it mean 'in its mouth'? It seems most unlikely that so simple a phrase would have been miscopied. Perhaps the scribe had the compound preposition $r-r\bar{s}$ in mind: this would presumably have been an unthinking mistake—the only sense that could be made of $r-r\bar{s}=f$ would be 'at it', i.e. 'at sea', and this is implausible.

l. 11 The small trace at the beginning of the line could be of the tail of the determinative of $n'l$, as the Leiden papyrus suggests, but is too slight to be read.

$lw=f\ mn$ As in the Leiden text, this is clearly a circumstantial form. Although in this case we could interpret the sentence that the catfish, when it swallowed the '*t*-fish, was on its way to the shore, it seems better to take the circumstantial form exactly as in the parallel sentence that follows: the catfish swallowed the '*t*-fish, and approached the shore: a lion came down to the sea, and pulled the catfish onto the bank.

l. 12 The damaged sign at the beginning of the line is presumably π , a determinative of πh , the relevant word in the Leiden text.

$n'l$ See Wb. 2.209.1ff.; and see the discussions of Montet,²³ Thompson²⁴ and (Gamer-)Wallert.²⁵

l. 13 $w3h=f$ The auxiliary verb is perfectly clear in the present papyrus, and the traces of $f\bar{s}y$ that follow are decisive. The Leiden papyrus has $r-lw=f\ f\bar{s}y$, the circumstantial. Here and in the following lines the Leiden papyrus employs $wsh=f\ stp$ verb forms (helped out by circumstantial verb forms) as its narrative tense: I hope to discuss this phenomenon in my subsequent article. In this particular case, the circumstantial in the Leiden papyrus is of precisely the same kind as those mentioned in the note on $lw=f\ mn$, l. 11: neither reading is in any sense better than the other.

l. 14 $h\bar{h}=w$ Restore 𐤥𐤥𐤥𐤥 The last, damaged sign is certainly 𐤥 , as in wsf in l. 16: it could not be a second l , and so the reading cannot be $h\bar{h}l$ (Erichsen

²³ P. Montet, 'Les poissons . . . (see n. 21, p. 34), p. 44.

²⁴ D'A. W. Thompson, 'On Egyptian Fish-names used by Greek Writers', *JEA* 14 (1928), pp. 22–33: see pp. 27–30.

²⁵ I. Wallert, *Fische und Fischkulte* . . . (see n. 22, p. 34), pp. 31–2.

DG 367.2, 'ḥrḥr, zerstören, Zerstörung'). However, I suggest that this is in fact the same word. The Leiden papyrus has *ḥal=w* (Erichsen DG 347.3 → 368.5, 'ḥl, rauben').

l. 15 'd.t The writing is $\langle \text{1} \overline{\text{2}} \rangle$: there is a trace of the .t ending after the determinative.

l. 16 *wsf*: 'to stink', or in a less precise sense, just as the English 'to be foul'. The Leiden papyrus has *ws*, 'to saw'—perhaps in this context 'to be dismembered'. The $\overline{\text{6}}$ -determinative in the present papyrus is proper to *wsf*, and so does not suggest that *wsf* is here a straightforward mistake for *ws*. Both words are apt in the context, and I should not care to have to say which originally stood in the text.

l. 17 *r mdt m3't dr=w n3-w* The forms are all exactly as in the Leiden papyrus. This is the 'Nominalsatz mit demonstrativer Kopula hinter Subject und Praedikatum' of Spiegelberg DG § 461, here introduced by circumstantial *r* (*lw*) after the verb *gm*: 'They found that everything they had said was entirely true.' Compare the passage from Second Setna 4.24 (quoted by Spiegelberg DG)

md.t nb ntl l-lr=k dd n-lm=w md.t m3't dr=w n3y
'Everything that you have said is entirely true.'

For this in Coptic, see Till KG §§ 328-9 & §§ 413-20.

l. 18 Lines 18 and 19 of the present papyrus help us correctly to understand the corresponding passage in the Leiden text: 'Nothing happens upon the earth save that which the god orders in heaven. He who does good, it shall return unto him; and evil likewise.' (14.29-31)

shn Spiegelberg read the corresponding verb in the Leiden papyrus as 's[mn].te=s' (i.e. *smn.t=s*). In view of the reading of the present text, I propose to read the Leiden papyrus *s[hn].t=s*.

I see no reason to restore *r* before the verb in the Leiden text, as Spiegelberg did; he translated 'das, was der Gott in Himmel bestimmen wird'.

pa ntr as the subject of *shn* seems quite clear in the Leiden papyrus, and I should not suggest reading anything different there. This might lead us to try to restore the present papyrus *m-s3 tal mtw shn=s pa ntr n ta lhy.t*, or possibly ... *mtw shn pa ntr* ... , but I think that there is insufficient room for either of these. I therefore suggest for l. 18 the restoration




] 6 1 4 - 2 4 | 2 3 4 3

in which 2 3 is to be read *mtw=w*, and is to be taken as equivalent to *ntl lw=w*. Neither step I think raises any difficulties (cf. Spiegelberg DG § 541 & § 151). We might translate 'save that which is ordered in heaven.'

In Coptic this kind of relative clause in the present tense would have to be expressed by a First Present, *lw=w sdm* no longer being possible. This would be

the ⲉⲧⲱⲧⲟⲩⲙ form, the 'First Present with Relative Pronoun' of the grammars. But, in contrast to the normal 3rd plur. forms of the First Present (ⲉⲉ, etc.: cf. the Conjunctive ⲛⲉⲉ) the 3rd plur. form we find is ⲉⲧⲟⲩ, and this is surely nothing other than *nī lw=w*.

t3! The end of *tāl* has almost completely been rubbed away, but slight traces of it can be discerned. *tāl* is naturally used here, and not the article *tā: pā nī* (which occurs at the end of Leiden papyrus 14.20) is 'Anyone who', 'Someone who', Coptic ⲛⲉⲧ, as opposed to *pāl nī*, 'the one who', or perhaps simply 'who', Coptic ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲧ-, etc. (for the Coptic expressions see for example Till KG §§ 476-81).

l. 19 m-młt-t3! The end of *tāl* has almost completely been rubbed away (just as, by coincidence, in *tāl* in the preceding line). However, the traces are quite distinct. For the expression, 'likewise', see Erichsen DG under 152.1, 'mj.t'. The -sign in Demotic is generally accompanied by a vertical stroke, as for example . It seems to me an imponderable question whether the curved stroke in the present writing should be taken as deriving from this stroke (compare the writing in hands of this type of the relative word *mlw*, ) or as a conscious writing of *t*.

The very small high trace at the end of the line is too indistinct to read.

l. 21 (?) There is a very slight trace, apparently of ink, which may or may not be of writing. As I indicated in the introduction, we are left with no way of telling whether or not any lines of text are missing after l. 20.

