# THE FABLE OF SIGHT AND HEARING IN THE DEMOTIC KUFI TEXT

BY

#### W. J. TAIT

Christ's College, Cambridge

In the previous issue of these Acta, I published three papyrus fragments belonging to a duplicate version of the well-known demotic text containing animal fables, Kufi.¹ That article was confined to the presentation of the new fragments, and discussion of the numerous problems of reading and philological questions raised by them. I have examined the relevant portion of the Leiden version of the text,² and various new readings have emerged. I offer here a straightforward transliteration and translation, briefly annotated, of Kufi 13.24–15.28, the entire fable of the conversation between the two vultures Sight and Hearing, together with the following passage in which Kufi develops its moral.³

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  'A duplicate version of the demotic Kufi text', Acta Orientalia 36 (1974), pp. 23-37, here referred to by AO 36 + page nos. The new fragments are to be catalogued briefly in a forthcoming publication of other papyri from Tebtunis belonging to the Egypt Exploration Society that came to light with them at Oxford, and there they will receive the numbering P. Tebt. Tait 8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> I am most grateful to the Director of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden, Professor Dr. A. Klasens, for permission to discuss the papyrus here, and I thank him and his staff for extending every facility to me on my visit to the Rijksmuseum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> My aim in this article is to establish the demotic text and its meaning. I have kept comment to a minimum, and a number of aspects of the text of more general interest remain to be discussed. I have assumed that specialist readers will hardly require to have their attention constantly drawn to what has been written by the previous editors of the demotic and Greek texts, and the more technical notes here will naturally be taken as glosses upon their work: for information on the various papyri and bibliography, see AO 36.23–6: a translation of the fable appears in G. Roeder, Altägyptische Erzählungen und Märchen (see pp. 302ff.) and E. Brunner-Traut, Altägyptische Märchen (see pp. 128 ff.). I am glad to thank Mr J. R. Baines, Professor J. R. Harris, Professor R. H. Pierce, Professor A. F. Shore, Professor H. S. Smith, and Mrs N. Tait for their help and encouragement.

# Kufi 13.24 — 15.28<sup>1</sup>

- --- sdm r p3 sdy [ n in] nw.t irm sdm.t
- r-h]-wn-n3-w in-nw.t r rn n \*[....]\* kt 5 hpr w hrw dd
  in-nw.t
- n sdm].t n3-w-<u>dq</u> irt.ţ=y r [ n3i=t 6 n3-w] nfr n3i(=y)
- t3i ] [nti] hpr n-im=y bw-ir=s hpr n kt m [3hy ] r-iw=s h1 bnr=y dd n=s
- sdm].t ih t3(y) dd in-nw.[t hr in]-nw=y st p3 h(3 n p3
- 13.30 kky ] hr-1r=y swn [ p3 y1]m st p3 nwn dd n=s
- sdm].t i-ir=s hpr n-im=t r-db3 [ ih dd=s ] n=s i-ir=s hpr n-im=y r-db3
- hpr ] hr 3sq=y n p3 pr-hd hr \*[....] fy t3i(=y) wnmy.t dd
- ..]<sub>\*\*</sub>.t <sup>9</sup> nti-r-iw=y r-ir=s r-iw=y <sub>\*</sub>[....]<sub>\*\*</sub>=s <sup>10</sup> r-iw=y syn n-im=y
- 14.1 n p3 [pr-hd] 11 bw-ir=y wnm m-s3 p3 \*[..]\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 12

  [n3-w-dq irt.t=t r]

irt.t=y n3-w-nfr 5n3i=t nw.w r n3i-t=y 'n t3i nti hpr
n-im=y h=y bw-ir=s

hpr n kt <sup>13</sup> m3hy r-lw=s h1 bnr=y tw-st hr phr=y t3 pt

dd mtw=y sdm r n3l ntl hn=s hr sdm=y r t3l ntl-lw p3-rc
p3 h3y

14.5 p3 \*\*[...] 14 n3 ntr.w wpy-t=s hr p3 t3 n-mny hn t3

dd n=s în-nw.t î-îr=s hpr n-îm=t r-db3 îh dd=s n=s î-îr=s
hpr n-îm=y r-db3 hpr bw-îr=y în-qdy.k<sup>7</sup>n mtrî bw-îr=y wnm
m-s3 [p3 h3y kî dm ] p3-r (15 dd î-îr-hr sdr=y n3=y
n rwhy r t3î(=y)

3sw.t sww h3 cin-nw.t n[3i] mdt.w hn h3t.t=s hpr wct

14.10 shy sdm.t dd in-nw.[t] i-ir=\langle t \rangle 16 s3by r-db3 in dd n=s

sdm.t md.t m3 t t3(y) wt sdm.t n htr t3i-ir 1117 n3=y
r-iw=s ww n t3 pt

r p3 ytn 1-1r=f 1r (n-smy n-1m=s 1-1r-1pr=y 1-1r-y-s-n=f

dd r 18 p3 (f n syr r-h-wn-n3-w n p3 phww n p3 kky 19 (m-s

p3 hntws

- dd n=f 1-ir-y-s-n=f<sup>20</sup> (m p3 sknks p3 hntws (m p3 hf p3 sknks
- 14.15 <u>t</u>31<sup>21</sup> p3 nsr p3 hf r p3 ytm <u>d</u>d sdm.t n in-nw.t
- r-hr in-nw=t hn p3 y m mtw=[t] nw 22 r n3i nti hn p3 mw
  ih p3 i-ir hpr n p3 hf irm p3 nsr dd in-nw.t md.t m3 tt
  t3(y)
- ir=y p3i=w nhty.t
- st hpr i-ir-hr=y<sup>23</sup> n m3(t dr=w tw-st p3 hf irm p3 nsr r-ir hy
- 14.20 r p3 y m wnm-s w ddy n r3=f  $\{$  tw-st p3 nwr m=f p3 dyd $\}$  24
- tw-st p3 (d (m-s ki n3r r-iw=f mn r n3 qr(3.w tw-st

  iw w m3i r-nr p3 y m r-iw=f 3d[n ] p3 n3r r p3 (d tw-st

  w srrf w3n-r-iw=f hnmm r-r=w w3n-iw=f q1d n3i=f yb.w

  n-im=w n p3 s 2 r-iw=f 25 f3y n-im=w hr p3 h1 [ n ] n3

  yn3v.w n t3
- 14.25 pt tw-st w3ḥ-iw=f b3 =w r-hry w3ḥ-iw=f b3[r]=w 26
  hr p3 27 dw i-ir-hr=f r-iw=f

- ir hr3.t r-r=w iw=f hpr r-iw=y dd md.[t] n [d].t im
  irm=y r p3 dw-hri.t
- diey in-nwet r-rew r-iwew har [ r]-iwew ws 28 i-ir-href
- ir hrj.t r-r=w 29 f3y t3 nry.t 2.t r [ p3 ] dw gm=w md.t nbt r-dd=w n
- t3 ht 2.t 30 r md.t m3(t dr=w n3-w dd in-nw.t n sdm.t (s
- 14.30 md.t hpr hr p3 t3 m-s3 t31 nt1 r-1r p3 ntr

  shn-t=s 31 n t3 1hy p3 nt1 1r
- md.t nfr.t r-iw=s st3.t=s r-r=f md.t bn.t m-mit-t3(y) 32
  m-s3 hpr sdm.t 33
- ih p3 nti r-iw=f r hpr hr p3 hdb n \*\* p3 [ m3]i 34 r ktmy
  p3 srrf
- r-r=f r-iw=w h3 t=f dni dd sdm.t n in-nw.t md.t m3 t t3(y)
- 15.1 3n bw-ir-rh=t <u>d</u>d p3 srrf p3 s\{mn n nti-nb.w nti}
- ḥr p3 t3 p3i p3 db3 nti-iw bw-ir db3 db3=f p3i fnd=f
  n n\$r irt.t=f
- n rmt n3i=f (ty.w n m3i n3i=f msdr.[w ..] hnfy 36 n 3b3h n y(m

- st.t=f n hf p3 5 nti hr t3w nti hr \*[..]\* 37 i-ir=f ir=f n p3y smt hpr hr-
- 15.5 dr=f dr syb3. t n ntd-nb ntd br p3 t3 [ m-qd]y p3 mwt p3 db3 ntd-dw p3
- mn n nti-nb.w nti ḥr p3 t3 '(n' p3i n x[.. 38 i ] '(nḥ=s
- hdb=w-s p3 ntl shn hdb r-lw=[w shn ] t3l=f wdy.t l-lr=y dd n3 md.t.w
- n rn=w r-db3 dit ph=s n h3t.t=t dd bn \*[...]3 39 r-iw=s r-rh hp r p3 ntr p3-rt
- p3  $\underline{h}$ 3y p3  $\underline{d}$ b3  $\underline{u}$ 0 n n3  $\underline{h}$ 1 n  $\underline{u}$ 3  $\underline{u}$ 1 [=f  $\underline{m}$ 5y]  $\underline{v}$  n  $\underline{u}$ 1 n  $\underline{u}$ 2 n  $\underline{u}$ 3 n
- 15.10 p3 (f n syr nti-iw bn p3 nti n3-w-dlh[=f r-r=f]

  § ( p3 ph r-ir p3i=f btw
- r p3 srrf nti-lw bn p3 ntl n3-w-t3=f r-r=f hr p3 t3 tn dd t3 md.t nfr.t t3 md.t bn.t
- nti r-iw=w r-ir=s hr p3 t3 p3-r p3 nti dit sp n=s dd my
  hpr=f iw=w dd tw=y dlh
- n hdy.t r-hr=t p3-r c r-lw=f nw r-hr=y m-qdy p3 nw r-hr=t
  ntl r-lw=f lr=f
- n3i=f hnmm.w n3i=f sdm.w n nti-nb.w nti hr p3 t3 \*\*\*\*\*=s

  (n 41 r-iw=f nw

- 15.15 r p3 nti <u>h</u>n t3 swhy.t r-iw=s 42 p3 i-ir \*\*\* 43 swhy.t m-qdy p3 i-ir <u>h</u>db
- bw-ir p3i=w mdn yt m-s3=w tn sp-2 iw=f hpr r-iw=y dd md.t n-twd
- lw-nw r-r=f p3 3d.t r p3l=f mdn 44 hr n3l=t 45 hbs.w tw-st p3 snf
- mwt=w ir=w hdhd m-s3 n3i=w qs.w.r ir n=w msys m-s3 mwt
- 15.20 r-r-w r-iw-w mdn n hbs.w n3 ntr.w irm n3 rmt.w
- ndm h3t.t=w dd hr dd p3 db3 p3 msyh n p3i r-db3=w-s i-ir=f
- mdn n3i=w hbs.w r dit hr-st n3w p3 t3 r-r=w dd bw-ir p3
- hdb y dt r-iw=f m-s3 p3 i-ir ir=f r-iw=f tnh r-iw=f.

  mwt.t
- bw-lr=f w3y r-r=f (n sp-2 tw=y lr-rh=s dd t3 my.t n rn=t lr 47 t3l ntl-lw bw-lr
- 15.25 p3 db3 ir syb3.t n-im=s t3(y) tw=y ir-rb=s dd t3

  (ty.t n mwt irm t3 kt
- 3 Acta Orientalia, XXXVII

nti-iw bw-ir=s mwt on sp-2 t3(y) mtw=t t3 oty.t n p3 db3
irm p3 my 48 dd t3 sr.t

n p3-rt i-ir=w dd t3 imy.t n 49 qsqs r-ḥr=t dd t3i nti n qsqs r p3 msdr

n n3-w p3 t3 t3(y) ---

## Notes to the transcription

- <sup>1</sup> The portions of the text preserved in P. Tebt. Tait 8 are indicated here by underlining, Unread signs and traces are represented by asterisks \*\*\*.
- <sup>2</sup> The traces of r ps sdy are slight, but ps sdy seems certain. This introductory phrase varies in Kufi: for sdm r, not sdm=t, cf. 16.14 and 17.8, but also 2.6-7.
- <sup>3</sup> The roll is torn from top to bottom in the middle of col. 13, and a narrow strip of papyrus is completely lost. The hand-copies published by Spiegelberg naturally reproduce the inadequate gap left when the fragments were mounted. Although the correct size of the lacuna can readily be estimated, the space occupied by words in Kufi varies considerably, and it is not possible to be dogmatic about some restorations.
- <sup>4</sup> For i-ir=f restored here cf. 14.12. The possible interpretations of i-ir=f and i-ir-g-s-n=f, probably the proper names of two creatures, were fully discussed in AO 36.30-2: cf. n. b.
- $^{5}$  r rn n is certain. Although the following word might begin m, the lacuna is probably too large for Spiegelberg's rn n mtl kt.
- <sup>6</sup> There is probably no room to restore here  $irt.\dot{t}=t$ , as stands in 14.2. t = i = t might be the best restoration.
  - <sup>7</sup> For the use of the plural, cf. 15.14.
- \* The traces permit hr ir, but certainly do not demand it: they do not suggest hr wnm=y.
- <sup>9</sup> Probably restore qdy.t, 'sleep': part of the y is preserved, a 'sun-disk'-determinative, and .t. One objection to restoring the plausible sense 'Great is the seeing that I shall do', is that the sun-disk is not preceded by the 'eye'-determinative.
  - <sup>10</sup> The restoration of this entire phrase, r-iw=y ..... =s is quite uncertain.
- <sup>11</sup> The restoration  $pr-h\underline{d}$  here is strongly suggested by the traces, and the room available precisely matches that occupied by the writing in 13.32: cf. n. c.
- <sup>12</sup> It is necessary to restore in this limited space the end of a phrase parallel to that in 14.7–8, followed by a sentence meaning 'Hearing said to Sight'. Although the latter takes several forms in the text (the shortest are dd=s or dd sdm.t) and might be written defectively (cf. 14.31), it is highly improbable that there is room for any restoration of the noun following m-sa pa longer than r—exactly as in 14.8.

- $^{13}$  kt is corrected, apparently by the first hand, from ks, a masc. form. Conceivably there is a connection with the problem discussed in n. b, although the slip was more probably made because m(s)hy, 'feather' was masc. (see Crum CD 211a: in Egyptian mht, 'feather' is fem.: Wb. 2.123.6 ff.).
- <sup>14</sup> 15.9 suggests here the restoration ps dbs n ns ntr.w, but the epithet is especially appropriate in the later context, and conceivably a different word stood here. The space suits dbs n, the traces are inconclusive.
- <sup>15</sup> The words ps hay ki dm' formed part of the text as originally written, and have been cancelled, apparently by a later hand. ki dm' is a phrase specifically used to introduce glosses, and generally has the sense *scilicet*: it is therefore not good evidence that the text was collated in antiquity. Here the obvious explanation is that a gloss has been incorporated into the body of the text, and a second hand has removed the intrusion, but in such a way as to leave the simpler, explanatory word in the text, while excising the original hay, 'light', 'sunlight'.
  - <sup>16</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8 has  $\frac{dd}{dt}$  n=s (as also in 1.8=14.17), and writes the =t.
  - 17 it is the reading of P. Tebt. Tait 8, and clearly should be restored here.
  - <sup>18</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not write the r after dd.
- <sup>19</sup> The reading kky, 'darkness', etc., is virtually certain: apart from the y and the determinatives, the right-hand ends of the two horizontal strokes of the two ks are quite clear.
- <sup>20</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8 apparently had this phrase in the form i-ir-s-n=f  $\underline{d}d$ =f, and, unlike the present text, repeated it after the swallowing of the lizard and again after that of the skink: all these differences between the texts were fully set out in AO 36.30 (cf. n. b).
- $^{21}\,fsi$  is the reading of P. Tebt. Tait 8, and the traces strongly support the same reading here.
- <sup>22</sup> In place of the conjunctive form mtw=t here, P. Tebt. Tait 8 has a second example of a 'habitual' verb-form introduced by circumstantial r, in the typical Roman Tebtunis writing r- $\delta$ '-lr=t. It also uses the verb swn rather than nw (cf. swn in 13.30).
  - <sup>23</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not contain i-ir-hr=y.
- <sup>24</sup> Although this whole clause plainly should be excised from the text (see n. k), calculation of the extent of the lacuna between l. 10 and l. 11 of P. Tebt. Tait 8 shows that it too must have contained a corresponding clause.
- $^{25}$  P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not contain n ps s 2, and reads wsh=f fsy, not iw=f fsy.
  - <sup>26</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8: hlh[=w].
- <sup>27</sup> Apparently the scribe began to write something else—possibly l-lr-hr—which he at once corrected to hr ps.
  - <sup>28</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8: wsf.
- <sup>29</sup> P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not contain the clause r-lw=f ir <u>hrs.</u>t r-r=w, which is here repeated from 14.25-6.
  - 30 P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not contain n to ht 2.t.
- <sup>31</sup> The reading is quite clear, and is confirmed by P. Tebt. Tait 8, which reads  $tai\ mtw=w\ shn[=s\ (or\ [.i=s):\ see\ AO\ 36.36-7.$

- $^{32}$  The plainly correct reading m-mit-tsy is certain in P. Tebt. Tait 8, and suits the traces here.
- 33 Probably the text should be restored  $\langle dd \ in-nw.t \ n \rangle$  sdm.t. P. Tebt. Tait 8 does not contain the phrase, reading ... m-sə  $ipr \ ih$  ..., which yields an intelligible text, as Sight is resuming her speech. sdm.t standing alone here might be taken as a vocative expression, but as the only example in the fable this is unlikely to be correct.
- <sup>34</sup> There can be no doubt that the sense to be restored is 'the murder of the lion' (cf. also the Greek  $\tau$ ] $o\tilde{v}$   $\lambda \acute{e}orvo[c$ , Fr. D, col. I, l. 33), but the space is too large to assume that merely ps hdb n ps msl was written. The determinatives of msl, although not specific to the word, are clear after the lacuna: the space available and the last faint traces before the lacuna suggest ps msl; but before that there stands one large damaged, complicated sign, or the equivalent—only the unsatisfying solution that a sign has been written in error and cancelled suggests itself.
- <sup>35</sup> The Greek (Fr. D, col. I, 1. 36) provides the strongest grounds for restoring  $p_3$  sšm n  $p_3$  mwt, which fits admirably. The writing of sšm will have terminated in a 'divine'-determinative, preceded by a dot.
- <sup>36</sup> There can have been very little room, if any, between msdr.w and linfy—certainly not enough for a full writing of tal=f or for lrm: cf. n. o.
  - 37 Almost certainly restore nti hr ps ts, although the traces are very slight.
- <sup>38</sup> n  $\lceil p_{\beta} \rceil$  [ is a plausible reading of the traces. It is perhaps debatable whether or not n  $p_{\beta}$  hrw, 'today' would make sense in the context (cf. n. 41).
- 30 Almost certainly restore bn nkt gs, 'there is nothing yet', i.e. 'nothing at all'.
- 40 ps dbs is glossed above the line (possibly by the first hand) kl dm' ps ntr, 'scilicet the god'.
- <sup>41</sup> Several kinds of restoration are possible here, and nothing lends any special probability to the reading \*\*\*\*\* dd=s 'n, '... She said again' (cf. 15.33), which is incompatible with Kufi's being the speaker (cf. n. p). The s pronoun might be dependent or suffix. The first traces do not favour n ps hrw (cf. n. 38).
- <sup>42</sup> Spiegelberg suggested r-iw=s db, 'that is sealed', but this is not entirely convincing.
- 43 Spiegelberg's reading of &'d.t, although not set beyond doubt by the traces, presumably must be correct. The word matches the Greek cυντρίψαντα perfectly (Fr. D, col. I, 1. 64). The writing is very cramped: there is scarcely room for any other word, except perhaps for a short writing of mh.t, which would suit the traces no better, and implies a pointless variation in the Greek.
- 44 The only sign that is not certain here is the blurred trace immediately after the .t of sd.t. This might be a second 'flesh'-determinative of sd.t, hardly a .t or =t. The reading r adopted here is possible, but by no means certain. See n. s.
  - 45 nsi=t is corrected, apparently by the first hand, from nsi=s.
- <sup>46</sup> A restoration n-drt. $t^{\dagger} = w r$ - $tw = 1w t^{\dagger}nt^{\dagger}$   $nt^{\dagger}$ -tw would suit the very slight traces. The first = w, which appears certain in Spiegelberg's hand-copy, is far from clear on the original, but the traces of the second = w are conclusive.

- <sup>47</sup> The sign is distinctively ir, which gives no sense: the correct sign is obviously is(y), which is similar in shape.
- <sup>48</sup> Kufi contains one example of a word written exactly as my here, with the addition of the 'spread-sail'-determinative, used of wind. This is plausibly explained as deriving from ms'(w), Wb. 2.23.15 ff. (cf. Spiegelberg's Glossar 304; Erichsen DG 151.3). There need therefore be no doubt of the reading of my here, or that it is a masc. substantive from the ms', 'right', 'true' root (Wb. 2.12 ad fin. ff.), written exactly as pronounced.
  - Presumably the senseless n before both occurrences of qsqs is purely phonetic.

### TRANSLATION

'Listen to the story of Sight and Hearing; a (13.25) [i-ir=f] and  $i-ir-y-s-n=f^b$ , vultures [....] the peaks of the mountain, while Sight ..... name ..... another. One day, Sight said to Hearing "My eye is keener than yours, and my vision is better than yours. What happens to me does not happen to any other bird that flies except me." Hearing said to her "What is it?" Sight said "I can see unto the limit of (13.30) Darkness and I can observe the sea as far as the encircling Ocean (nwn)." Hearing said to her "Why does this happen to you?" She said to her "It happens to me because I remain in the chamber,c and I [eat] my food, and therefore great is the [sleeping] that I do, as I ..... it, as I refresh myself (14.1) in the chamber, and I do not eat after the [sun."d Hearing said] "Your eye is keener than my eye, and your vision, too, is better than mine. What happens to me does not happen to any other bird that flies except me either. Lo, I can enchant the sky, so that I can hear what is in it. I can hear what Parē', the shining, (14.5) the [avengere] among the gods, ordains daily in heaven concerning the earth." Sight said to her "Why does this happen to you?" She said to her "It happens to me because I do not sleep at mid-day, and I do not eat after the sun,f and so I can settle myself to sleep in the evening with my crop dry." Sight pondered these things in her heart.

"There came an hour, (14.10) Hearing laughed. Sight said "Why are you laughing?" Hearing said to her "It is true, a hearing-birds of god came to me, when she was far in the sky from the earth. {i-ir=f reports it before me: i-ir-y-s-n=f says:}h The syr-fly, which is at the limit of obscurity, the lizard swallowed it. {i-ir-y-s-n=f said to him:}h The skink swallowed the lizard. The snake swallowed the skink. (14.15) The eagle took the snake to the sea." Hearing said to Sight "If you can look into the sea, and observe what is in the water, what has happened to the snake and the eagle?" Sight said "It is true, I believe everything that you have said or have related; I regard them all as true. Lo, the snake and the eagle that fell (14.20) into the sea, an 't-fish ate them with his mouth. Lo, a cat-fish swallowed the 't-fish in turn, and

approached the shore. Lo, a lion came down to the sea, and pulled the cat-fish onto the bank. Lo, a griffin has caught their scent. He has hooked his claws into them both, and carried them beneath the brightness of the circuits of the (14.25) sky. He has laid them down and has torn at them upon the mountain before him, and made his meal of them. If (you think) I am telling a lie, come with me to the desert ridge. I (shall) let you see them torn and dismembered before him, as he makes his meal of them." The two vultures took themselves to the mountain. They found that everything they had said together was entirely true. Sight said to Hearing "Indeed, (14.30) nothing happens upon earth except that which God orders in heaven. He who does good, it returns to him, and evil likewise."

'Then <Sight said to> Hearing "What will happen about the murder of the lion that the griffin committed? How will it be settled?" Hearing said to Sight "It is true, (15.1) do you not know that the griffin is the creature<sup>m</sup> of [Death]? He is the herdsman of everything that is upon the earth. He is the avenger upon whom no avenger can take vengeance. His beak is an eagle's,<sup>n</sup> his eye is a man's, his limbs are a lion's, his ears [...] scale<sup>o</sup> are an abah-fish's of the sea, his tail is a snake's—the five that draw breath that are upon the [earth]—this is the form that he takes. It is the case that (15.5) he wields power over everything that is upon the earth, like Death, the avenger, who is also the herdsman of everything that is upon the earth . . . . . Truly, he who kills is killed, and he who orders a killing, his destruction is ordered."

'I have told you this particular story, in order to make you realize that there is nothing at all that can hide from God, Parē', the shining, the avenger among the gods. He inflicts punishment upon everything that is upon the earth, from (15.10) the syr-fly, than which there is nothing that is smaller, until its murder came to (the attention of) the griffin, than whom there is nothing greater upon the earth either. So Parē' requites the good and the evil that are done upon the earth. So, even if I am said to be smaller in size than you, Parē' looks upon me just as much as he looks upon you. His sense of smell and his sense of hearing are in everything that is upon the earth . . . . . , too: He sees (15.15) what is in the egg that is . . . . . . He who breaks an egg,

40 W. J. TAIT

like him who kills, their mark does not wash from them ever. If (you think) I am telling a lie, look at it, the . . . . . , s the mark of which is upon your clothes. Lo, (it is) the blood of the enemies who have done murder that has not been brought home to them while alive, and who have died—their bones were sought out, for vengeance to be worked upon them for them after death. (15.20) The clothing of gods and men are marked with their blood, in order to make their hearts rejoice, because (they see that) the avenger speaks the punishment of him upon whom vengeance is taken—he marks their clothing, in order to make the inhabitants of the earth wary of them—(and) because (they see that) the mark of murder does not wash away for ever, and he is after anyone who does it (murder), alive or dead, and he does not ever leave them.

'I know that "the she-cat" is your name. She is one (15.25) over whom the avenger does not have power. I know that she is the limb of death and the other that does not ever die. You are the limb of vengeance and justice, namely the daughter of Parē'. You are called "the whispering cat", because she is the one who whispers in the ears of the inhabitants of the earth.'

#### Commentary

- a 'Sight' and 'Hearing' are the names of the two female vultures whose conversation is here retold by Kufi. They were fully discussed in AO 36.29-30. Renderings such as 'Seeing-bird' or 'Seer' have been avoided here as inelegant and misleading (but see n. g). 'Parë' is the name, normal in demotic, of the sun-god, whom the Kufi text regards as the supreme deity, and frequently refers to as 'the god', an expression here translated 'God'. Kufi's delicate task is to bring Parë's daughter, called by the text 'the Ethiopian cat', back to Egypt. In 12.13 ff. the goddess has threatened to kill him. After a passage in which sheer flattery restores her good humour (13.1 ff.), Kufi employs the present fable (one of several in the text) to persuade her that it would not be wise to kill him.
- b These two creatures play their only part in the fable in 14.12–14, where the text does not seem continuously intelligible, and where there is reason to suppose that the scribe himself did not understand what he was writing. All these problems of reading and interpretation were fully discussed in AO 36.30–2. On any interpretation, the start to the story, 13.25–6 (after its 'title', written in red ink: 'Listen to the story of Sight and Hearing'), must be rather stilted, but there is no reason to suppose that this portion of the text could not be restored to make good sense. As will be clear from the translation alone, there is an obvious case for arguing that  $l \cdot lr = f$  and  $l \cdot lr \cdot y \cdot s \cdot n = f$  are alternative names, either for the Sight- and Hearing-birds, or, much more plausibly, for the two Hearing-birds (for the second Hearing-bird, see 14.11 and n. g). However, in this case, the disruption of the text, the sudden appearance and disappearance of the alternative names, and above all the conflict of the genders must suggest that  $l \cdot lr = f$  and  $l \cdot lr \cdot y \cdot s \cdot n = f$  belong to a different version of the story. It is not apparent whether their source is another version of the entire Kufi text, or a different tradition of all or part of the embodied fable.
- c Demotic pr-hd has a wide range of meanings from '(Royal-)treasury' to simply 'room', and it is difficult to decide what is meant here. Although pr-hd is emphasized by being repeated in 14.1 (if the reading is correct: see n. 11), neither the word nor the contexts seem sufficient to indicate any very peculiar source or type of food for Sight. The distinction between the birds is perhaps quite simple: Sight stays at home (possibly at her 'food-store'), and eats and sleeps well, while Hearing does not; and Hearing proves to be the more highly rewarded. All that should be looked for is a clear opposition between the two birds, not the mechanism by which their powers are acquired. For a remaining problem, see n. d.
- d It is surprising that Sight, as well as Hearing (14.7–8: see n. f), should claim not to eat after sun-down (for the restoration here, see n. 12: apart from this technical point, other restorations do not seem to offer any better, or even plausible sense). It might tentatively be suggested that this clause is appended rather awkwardly to the end of Sight's explanation, and has been wrongly transferred from 14.7–8. Possibly an ancient reader understandably felt that Sight lacked any substantial claim to special powers, and provided her with one of those proper to Hearing.

- e 'avenger' is restored here from 15.9 (see n. 14). The translation is intentionally ambiguous between 'divine punisher' and 'punisher of the gods'. However, in both cases, it is plausible to see an opposition between punishing gods, and giving judgment upon or punishing mortals (cf. 'gods and men' in 15.20), and 'punisher of the gods' is probably meant. Both Death and the griffin, by contrast, are stated to have power over only the earth (15.1-6; cf. 15.11).
- f This phrase might conceivably be translated 'I do not eat, except the sun', or 'I do not eat-up the sun'. These interpretations are rejected here, not because they are fantastic, but because they would make Hearing's explanation implausibly elliptical, and would preclude a straightforward contrast with Sight's similar explanation in 13.32–14.1. Hearing simply claims not to stay up late feasting.
- g The demotic word used for this bird is the same as the name of Hearing, but is here more cautiously translated 'hearing-bird'. The sense of 'of god' is not obvious, perhaps 'divine': at any rate, the reading is not 'hearing-bird of Parē', nor 'hearing-bird of God' (ps ntr, i.e. Parē').
- h For these phrases, see AO 36.30-2 and n. b above. The text almost makes perfect sense without them: in place of the first two perhaps 'and she related to me, saying' is to be expected.
  - i i.e. 'scarcely visible'.
- j The demotic word *nšr* merely signifies 'bird of prey' (see AO 36.33), but it is reasonable to follow the Greek (Fr. D, col. I, l. 6) in understanding 'eagle'. *nšr* is also used in the description of the griffin (15.2), where 'eagle' is to be expected. There the Greek also apparently had 'eagle' (Fr. D, col. I, l. 40,  $\alpha\varepsilon$ [), although the description as a whole differs from that in the demotic text.
- k Before the capture of the 4-fish by the cat-fish, the demotic text (probably both the demotic texts: see n. 24) has a sentence Behold, the (male) vulture—he ate the 4-fish, which is plainly an isolated intrusion into the text, and is here omitted from the translation. It is not clear whether its presence is simply due to corruption or misguided tinkering with the present text, or in some way derives from a different version of the story. The mention of a male vulture might just conceivably be relevant to the problem discussed in n. b.
- 1 Although kl makes perfectly good sense here with the meaning 'in turn', it is perhaps more likely that the word has been inserted into the text in its commonest sense of 'another (of the same kind)', in an unsuccessful attempt to improve a text reduced to nonsense by the intrusion discussed in n. k.
- m sšm, with the specific 'animal'-determinative, here translated 'creature', is used in demotic texts of monsters that are the manifestations or agents of (harmful) divine beings. Until more demotic evidence is published, it seems best to avoid translating it by a precise term; but it is not intended to suggest here that the Greek did not or would have been wrong to translate sšm by εἰκών (or εἴδωλον): cf. Barns apud West, JEA 55.175. For the restoration of 'Death', see n. 35 above.
- n See n. j.
  o Barns (apud West, JEA 55.175, n. 1) upheld, surely correctly, the view discussed and rejected by Spiegelberg (Glossar 608) that hnfy, like its Coptic derivative, means 'scale'. The use of a 'fish'-determinative for scales is nicely paralleled by

the use of 'bird'-determinatives for feathers (Erichsen DG 174.3). However, in order for the phrase to make grammatical sense, and to match the four parallel phrases, and because the griffin plainly takes his attributes and not just his appearance from the other creatures (the word translated 'beak' in 15.2 is literally 'nose', and refers to the griffin's sense of smell, by which he locates his prey, not to the rapacity of his beak: cf. 14.23: the three senses sight, smell, and hearing, although not listed in parallel, occur in 15.13–14), it is necessary to understand either 'his ears and scales are an abab-fish's (the use of the singular, 'scaling', is perhaps quite acceptable; however, irm or tab=f or both might be expected before bnfy, and there is no room for either of these) or 'his scaly ears' (nab=f) msdr.w n bnfy). Either view assumes the existence of a fish that might be described as possessing 'ears', which does not seem implausible.

For other differing opinions on this passage, see G. Roeder, Altägyptische Erzählungen und Märchen 306; J. Leibovitch, BIE 26.244-6; I. Wallert, Fische und Fischkulte 37-8; and W. Barta, Ex Oriente Lux 23.335-6.

p The reasons for placing the end of the Hearing-bird's speech as early as this point are that 'I have said to you the aforesaid things' seems a strong and natural beginning for Kuff's resumption of propria persona, and that the Seeing-bird wished to know about the fate of the griffin, not that 'nothing at all can hide from God', which is precisely what Kufi wishes to impress upon the goddess. Obviously 'Even if I am said to be smaller . . .' (15.12) is part of Kufi's own speech, so the only alternative places for ending the Hearing-bird's speech are in 15.11 and in 15.12. However, both the new sentences there are introduced by dd. Although this could have several senses (e.g. 'because', 'therefore', 'namely'), it specifically serves to link one clause on to the next, and it seems impossible that a speech could end at either point. Equally certainly, the Greek text began Kufi's speech with the emphatic opening καὶ νῦν ἐγώ, μεγαλότιμε, (Fr. D, col. I, ll. 56-7), which corresponds to 15.12. There is nothing in the Greek that corresponds to what is here taken to be the resumption of Kufi's speech in the demotic (15.7), because the Greek has condensed and rearranged the material, omitting a section of text from 15.6-8, and bringing the 'from the fly to the griffin' clause forward so as to apply it, not to Pare, but to Death and/or the griffin-a transposition that has of course required that the griffin be changed to the lion (see n. r).

- q See n. e.
- r Literally 'until the arriving that its (the fly's) fate did at the griffin'. The bw(t): btw words in demotic (hatred/abomination: crime/execution/destruction) present a lexicographic problem, but here it is clearly plausible to take the fly's btw as the 'doing of a dreadful thing to him'. ('From the fly... to the griffin' expresses in a general sense the extent of the workings of justice: neither of them is 'punished').
- s The word left untranslated here is written precisely like st, 'back', but the gender and the context both indicate that this word cannot be in question. It seems best to understand st, Erichsen DG 13.1: this word or words are not clearly defined in demotic, but plainly can signify 'harm', etc. It is uncertain whether 'crime', 'destruction' is the meaning here, or possibly 'stain'. Where words of very

44

similar pronunciation are found written for one-another, it is often unclear whether a mistake has been made or the writing was considered adequate by the scribe: in effect, it is difficult to say whether or not the scribe who wrote st, 'back' here, without even adding a determinative to clarify the meaning, will have understood the text he wrote.

t The individual clauses that make up this final passage on the stain of murder each make perfectly good sense, but the overall sequence of thought is hard to follow, and it seems necessary to admit that, for whatever reason, several different ideas on the subject are in the text. The goddess is told to look at her own clothing, for evidence of the existence of a permanent stain arising from murder: it is plausible that as the 'limb of vengeance' (15.26) she should bear—with impunity—the stain of slaughter. The way in which the next clause begins, 'Behold, the blood of the enemies ...', suggests that it proceeds to explain in detail the stain on her clothes. It is acceptable in demotic that the explanation, instead of continuing to refer to the goddess herself, should be expressed in 'passive periphrasis'. Nevertheless, the impression remains that the text has been pieced together from separate gnomic remarks on the topic, and, if the sense is regarded as continuous down to the end of 15.19, it is especially difficult to see the connection with the following sentence. It is tempting to try to excise particular clauses from the text or to rearrange it, in order to give a consistent and logically connected text, but any results are purely speculative.

u It would be of great interest if it were possible to understand here the notion that the clothing of all gods and men, innocent and guilty, are marked, not as evidence of their own guilt or punishment, but as a general sign that vengeance is at work; but it seems more likely that we should assume that the text is incoherent, and paraphrase: 'People in general rejoice when they see that the clothes of the guilty, whether they be gods or men, are marked with their (victims' or crimes') blood, because...'. This sentence could well be made to follow immediately after 'their mark does not wash from them ever' in 15.16. Possibly the translator into Greek realized that the demotic did not make continuous sense, and, viewing, as usual, the passage as a whole, tried to pursue the idea that the goddess' own clothing bears the mark of slaughter: Fr. D, col. II, ll. 6-9, θεῶν cτολlcματα χαφάcceται ἱν' εἰδό[τε]c [θε]οὶ καὶ ἀνθρωποι εὐφραίνω[νται] ὅτι..., '(Even) the robes of gods are marked, so that gods and men may see them and rejoice, that...'.