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INTRODUCTION

A. GENERALITIES

Aim and scope of the work. The attempt has been here made to provide, within the covers of a single volume, accurate transcripts of all known Late-Egyptian stories and fragments of stories. This volume is addressed to two classes of reader, in the first place to students as yet unfamiliar with the study of the Egyptian language as written under the Ramessides, and in the second place to experts who, it is hoped, may find it a trustworthy and handy book of reference. The interests of the former class have been considered, for example, in those notes which turn upon the eccentricities of Late-Egyptian orthography, and also in the order in which the separate items have been presented. The first place has been accorded to the Tale of the Doomed Prince on account of its simplicity of diction and its relative freedom from textual errors. The Story of the Two Brothers follows, partly as a concession to the old habit of teachers of the Egyptian language, and partly because it is complete from start to finish; however, the more it is studied, the deeper-seated and more impenetrable its corruptions of reading will be found. The Tale of the Blinding of Truth, here given in its editio princeps, is a narrative closely akin to the last in style, and is good material for the beginner despite the loss of the earlier portions. The story entitled « The Contendings of Horus and Seth », recently published elsewhere for the first time, belongs linguistically and intrinsically to the most important texts we possess, and the sole reason for which it is unlikely to displace the d’Orbiney papyrus as the doorway for initiation into the mysteries of Late-Egyptian is the stark indecency of part of its narrative. The Misfortunes of Wenamun may well claim the palm as the most fascinating of all Egyptian tales, but the difficulties of its argumentative portions are beyond the powers of novices. After this follow the fragments, the Legend of Astarte at their head as the earliest, and the Taking of Joppa as the next earliest. The remaining items are but sorry scraps of stories, all the more tantalizing because of the inherent interest of their subjects. No one will question the propriety or including all the pieces above-mentioned in a book of Late-Egyptian stories. It is true that the tale of Wenamun has been claimed for actual history, but its vivid manner and its dialogues definitely forbid that view; at best this narrative is fiction founded upon fact, and the Story of Sinuhe suggests itself as an earlier parallel. Two possible candidates for admission have, I think rightly, been excluded. The fragment in Turin recounting the dispute between the Head and
the other members of the Body is not a story in the sense here intended. It narrates, indeed, the incidents of a trial, but apart from this it has no plot, and there is a complete absence of dramatic elements. The stela concerning the healing of the princess of Bakhtan is more a piece of religious propaganda than a work of fiction. Moreover, it is written in hieroglyphic upon stone, and so differs from all the other compositions here dealt with.

That class of reader to whom the texts included in this volume have long been familiar will look, and I hope will not look in vain, for improved readings and advances in interpretation. No pains have been spared to secure these ends. The present editor has been particularly well placed as regards opportunities for study, the great majority of the manuscripts being domiciled in London. There are, indeed, only two texts in this volume, namely Wenamün and the Turin fragment of Khensemḥab, which have not been consulted in the original. In the former case Russian colleagues supplied photographs which went far towards making recourse to the original superfluous, and in the second case it is unlikely that I could have improved much on the edition published by Dr. Černý, the discoverer of the fragment.

My obligations in connection with this book are manifold. In the first instance the gratitude of all is due to M. Capart, the enterprising Director of the Fondation Reine Élisabeth. Egyptologists will recognize the great merit he has acquired in shouldering the responsibility of the Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, and I myself am particularly indebted to him for conferring upon me the honour of inaugurating the series. To the Directors of the museums where I have collated papyri or ostraca, namely Berlin, Florence, Vienna, the Louvre, and Brussels, I am also deeply indebted, but above all to Mr. Sidney Smith, the new Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. He and his assistant Mr. S. R. K. Glanville have afforded me every possible facility for studying the papyri under their care. Without the photographs provided by Professor Golénischeff and Dr. Lourie, my edition of Wenamün could have improved but little upon the excellent copy published in the Recueil de Travaux by the former, though Professor Erman placed at my disposal a collation of that copy made by him many years ago when the papyrus was temporarily deposited in Berlin. To Mr. Chester Beatty I gratefully acknowledge the permission to reproduce the text of his great papyrus No. I in this cheaper form, and both he and the Trustees of the British Museum have laid me under an obligation by allowing me here to print the story of the Blinding of Truth for the first time. In connection with the Astarte papyrus, my friend Dr. Ludlow Bull of New York was good enough to intercede with Miss Greene, the librarian of the Pierpont Morgan Library, to send the original across the Atlantic for my study. Thanks to Dr. Ibscher, who re-arranged the fragments with his accustomed skill, great benefit was derived from this most liberal concession. Mr. Fairman re-collated the D’Orbiney
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papyrus with my autographed copy, and I had the advantage of examining the photographs of Wenamun together with Dr. Černý. Last of all, my personal assistant, Mr. R. O. Faulkner, has read and re-read both manuscript and proofs, hereby saving me from many a slip or worse.

The Text. The direction and relative position of the signs as found in the original manuscript have been preserved in all cases. The whole has been divided up into sentences, or sentence-like groups of words, in order to facilitate reading; but I regret to say that no very consistent practice has here been evolved. The method of transcription employed has been explained and defended in my article entitled The Transcription of New Kingdom Hieratic, in Journ. of Eg. Archaeology, XV, 48. Restorations have been admitted to the main text only when, in the Editor's opinion, they can rank as practically certain. The only other alterations of the MS. readings that have been allowed are (1) the insertion in their place of the scribe's own superlinear corrections, e. g. Doomed Prince 4, 4, and (2) the omission of signs repeated by dittography, e. g. Blinding of Truth 8, 5.

Lacunae are indicated by cross-hatching \[\]. In the case of small losses, the lacunae are shown in their actual proportions. Elsewhere, one means or another has been found to indicate the extent.

Damaged signs are likewise hatched in those portions where they are defective, e. g. \[\] indicates that the bird’s head is missing.

Restorations are in square brackets [ ].

Conjectural emendations (these, as aforesaid, are relegated to the notes) are enclosed in pointed brackets < >.

A small " above a hatched sign or simple cross-hatching indicates the presence of traces in the original. If these traces are insufficient to identify the sign, this is included in square brackets as a restoration.

A small \[\] above a sign means that the reading given is to be taken as probably correct.

A small \[\] above a sign signifies that, though unexpected, the sign stands in the original as marked.

The small letters a, b, etc. above the line refer to the notes on the right-hand pages.

Words or signs which the original MS writes in red are underlined; verse points \[\] are always in red unless otherwise stated.

The symbol \[\] is employed where there are duplicate texts (e. g. Khensemhab, p. 90 of this book) to indicate that the signs or sentences separated thereby followed one another in the original without any break.

The Notes have as their purpose two closely interconnected aims, firstly to explain what stands in the original, and secondly to indicate what ought to stand
there. Accordingly, doubtful readings are here discussed, restorations defended, and conjectural emendations proposed. Since the requirements of the student had to be borne in mind, orthographic peculiarities are not seldom commented upon, and in some cases such comments approximate to philological notes. It has not, however, been intended to anticipate here the work of commentation, which will, it is hoped, be continued ere long in another volume. I seize this opportunity of saying that a complete vocabulary of these stories is in preparation.

As regards restorations and emendations, it is right that I should put on record my scepticism as to what is possible in this direction. The late Professor Grenfell long ago told me that the Greek papyri seldom confirm the conjectures of scholars, and that the testimony from that source suggests the advisability of extreme caution. This verdict agrees with my own experience in the Egyptian field. Nevertheless, it is our duty to interpret as best we can the texts which we possess, however corrupt and unintelligible they may be. In doing so, however, I feel it imperative to distinguish carefully between the restorations which it seems safe to incorporate in the text and those more desperate suggestions which are reserved for the notes.

The abbreviated titles of books or periodicals quoted in the notes are those usually employed in Egyptological literature. The following may be noted:


**B. THE PARTICULAR STORIES**

Under this head it seems unnecessary to do more than give such information as will be immediately helpful to the reader. The books mentioned in each case will enable him, if he so desire, to follow up the literature connected with each particular piece. More complete bibliographies will be found in G. Maspero, *Les Contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne*, 4th edition, Paris (no date), in A. Erman, *Die Literatur der Ägypter*, Leipzig, 1923 (English translation by A. M. Blackman under the title *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians*, London, 1927), and in G. Roeder, *Altägyptische Erzählungen und Märchen*, Jena, 1927.
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I. THE TALE OF THE DOOMED PRINCE

From Pap. 10060 in the British Museum, more commonly known as Pap. Harris 500. The recto of this papyrus, i.e. the side on which the horizontal fibres lie uppermost, contains a collection of love-songs. The Doomed Prince is on the verso, where it is preceded by the story of the Taking of Joppa (No. VII below). G. Möller judged the date of the MS. to be the end of the reign of Sethos I or the first years of Ramesses II, see Zeitschrift für äg. Sprache, LVI, 42. The hieratic text is written in a small crabbed hand, ill-suited to the purposes of the learner. Consequently, it is only from the standpoint of the language employed that this text is desirable as an introduction to Late-Egyptian literature. The hieratic is available in the excellent photographic plates of the official publication entitled Facsimiles of Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, by (Sir) E. A. Wallis Budge, second series, London, 1923, Pls. XLVIII-LII (Pl. XLVIII, headed Column 1 in the publication, is page 4 of the verso and is so numbered in my text). A hand-facsimile made from the published photographs is obtainable at small cost in G. Möller, Hieratische Leseflücke für den akademischen Gebrauch, 2nd part, 2nd edition with corrections by K. Sethe, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 21-4. This hieratic reading-book is invaluable to beginners, who will also consult the former scholar’s Hieratische Paläographie, vol. II, Leipzig, 1909. Important new readings were given by T. E. Peet in Journ. of Eg. Archaeology, XI, 338, who simultaneously published a new translation, op. cit., XI, 227. Reference is made to these in my notes, as well as to the original edition of the text by G. Maspero in Études Égyptiennes, Paris, 1879, vol. I, p. 1. Other authorities quoted are H. P. Blok, De beide volksverhalen van Papyrus Harris 500, verso, Leyden, 1925, and for the end of the tale, W. Spiegelberg’s article in Zeitschrift für äg. Sprache, LXIV, 86.

II. THE TALE OF THE TWO BROTHERS

From Pap. 10183 in the British Museum, usually known, from its former owner, as the D’Orbiney papyrus. This manuscript was written by the scribe Ennana, who was a pupil of the scribe of the treasury of Pharaoh Kagboi, see p. 29, in the colophon. Both lived under Sethos II and his predecessor, and what is known of their personalities is recounted in the article by A. Erman, Die ägyptischen Schülerhandschriften, in the Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1925 (phil.-hist. Klasse, Nr. 2), especially pp. 20-23. The D’Orbiney papyrus was written while Sethos II was still only Crown prince. The scribe Ennana wrote a beautifully clear uncial literary hand, admirably copied by J. Netherclift in the lithographed plates of the Select Papyri in the Hieratic Character from the Collections of the British Museum, Part II, London, 1860, Plates IX-XIX, and hence reproduced in G. Möller, Hieratische Leseflücke, Part II, pp. 1-20, for which see above under I; no Ramesside papyrus is better
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adapted for the student’s first exercises in the reading of hieratic. F. Ll. Griffith published some excellent notes on the reading of damaged passages in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, XI, 161 foll., and 414 foll. These have been much utilized in my notes, where reference is made also to restorations by Møller and Sethe in the above-quoted book by the former, as well as by W. N. Groff in his Étude sur le papyrus D’Orbiney, Paris, 1888.

III. THE BLINDING OF TRUTH BY FALSEHOOD

From Pap. Chester Beatty, No. II, in the British Museum. To be published a year or two hence in facsimile and transcription by the Trustees. No account of this manuscript having yet appeared in print, some details must be mentioned here.

The complete portion consisted of a roll, 66 cm. long and only 10 cm. in height, inscribed upon both sides. Simultaneously with this was acquired a large number of fragments, mostly small, which were gradually built up into a number of new pages, in the main by my own efforts, though the final touches were given later by Dr. Ibscher. As now mounted the papyrus measures 1 m. 39 cm. The text was written in pages of from 6 to 8 lines apiece (however, probably 9 on p. 1), with rubrics and (down to 8,3) red verse-points. The beginning is lost, and of the first preserved page only the end of some lines remain. Page 2 shows numerous lacunae, but is not nearly as defective as page 3, of which very little is left. Page 4 has been reconstructed almost in its entirety. With page 5 we have already passed the beginning of the complete roll, which shows two more perfect pages on the recto, i. e. on the side where the horizontal fibres are uppermost. At the end of page 7 the text doubles back upon itself along the verso, which consists of four considerably wider pages, the last of them (page 11) being extremely defective. The conclusion of the story is marked off by a vertical line from the nearly blank portion of the papyrus to the left of it. Here there are merely a few numbers and the remains of a date, clearly part of some accounts.

IV. THE CONTENTINGS OF HORUS AND SETH

From the recto of Papyrus No. I in the collection of Mr. Chester Beatty, London. It is needless to describe the manuscript again, since full details will be found in my recent volume entitled The Library of A. Chester Beatty. Description of a Hieratic Papyrus with a mythological Story, Love-Songs, and other miscellaneous Texts, London, 1931. The Papyrus was written at Thebes under Ramesses V in an accomplished literary hand, well-adapted for students who desire to learn hieratic. The aforementioned edition exhibits the original in photographic facsimile. The transcription here given was made entirely anew for the present book, and contains a few minute improvements upon the text already published.
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V. THE MISFORTUNES OF WENAMÜN

From a papyrus formerly in the collection of W. Golénischeff, now in the Moscow Museum. It was discovered together with two other literary papyri (firstly a composition of obscure intent still unpublished, and secondly the Golénischeff Glossary, of which some account was given in Zeitschrift für äg. Sprache, XL, 101) at el-Hibeh in Middle Egypt. The date is the early Twenty-first Dynasty. Only a part of the first page has been published in photographic facsimile by Golénischeff in the volume of memoirs offered to M. de Rosen by his pupils in 1898; this article contained a translation into Russian. A hieroglyphic transcript was subsequently given by Golénischeff in Recueil de Travaux, XXI, 74, together with a French translation. Other studies of importance were those by W. Max Müller in his Studien zur vorderasiatischen Geschichte, in Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1900, 1, and by A. Erman, Eine Reise nach Phönizien im II. Jahrhundert vor Christi, in Zeitschrift für äg. Sprache, XXXVIII, 1. The present transcript is based upon small but distinct photographs given to me by Golénischeff, compared with that scholar's own publication and the collation thereof made for the purposes of the Berlin Dictionary by Erman (see above p. 2). Great assistance was afforded, at the last moment, by some larger photographs which I owe to the courtesy of Dr. Lourie, of the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad. There had been great doubt about the position of the fragmentary page which Golénischeff considered to follow the longer strips called by him pages 1 and 2. Erman had already recognized that this much damaged fragment narrated events belonging between the contents of the two separate portions remaining from page 1. A re-examination in Moscow made by Dr. Lourie confirmed Erman's view. I extract the following passages from Lourie's letter of 15th September, 1931: « All we have of this papyrus must be considered as two pages nearly equal in size, so that we must read thus: I, 1-27, then Gol. III, 1-14, then I, x+1 to I, x+24. All this makes the first page. » After explaining that II, 1-83 constitutes the second page, Lourie continues: « I have also looked at the gummed places. The papyrus consists of nearly equal pieces gummed together, each of which is about 18 cm. high. » Finally he adds « On the top of Gol. p. 3 there are the remains of such a gummed place, and all this fragment is 18.5 cm., just the size of a piece between two gummed places. » A subsequent letter made clear what I had not understood from the above remarks, namely that Lourie himself had recognized the true state of affairs as described below in the note at the foot of p. 63. Golénischeff's page 3 fits exactly into the place between 1, 24 and I, x+1, so that no single line of the long strip constituting page 1 is completely lost. Clearly the priority for this discovery belongs to Dr. Lourie, though its confirmation by so able a technician as Dr. Ibscher is of great value. Henceforth it will be advisable to adopt the consecutive numeration of the lines on page 1,
and to abandon the more complicated numbering hitherto used. Page 1 is now seen to have contained 59 lines of text, while page 2 has 83. A third page will have given the conclusion of the tale. The handwriting is clear and fine, abounding in those superfluous dots and dashes which become frequent only after the close of Dyn. XX. The text is written across the breadth of the papyrus, i.e. over the vertical fibres, instead of along its length, as in the case of all other Late-Egyptian tales. The same method is adopted in a few other papyri of about the same date, or rather earlier, e.g. Anastasi VIII in the British Museum, and the Decree in favour of Neskhons in Cairo. For the two lines on the verso see p. 76. This story differs from all others in this book in its freedom from conventional formulae and in its employment of the vernacular without admixture of traditional forms. It is extraordinarily correct in its text and orthography, and for this reason, as for many others, has the greatest possible importance for the study of Late-Egyptian idiom.

VI. THE ASTARTE PAPYRUS

Now preserved in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York. For the circumstances which have enabled me to give here as consecutive a text as the fragments permit, see above p. 2. Admirable photographic facsimiles of the fragments are given in P. E. Newberry, The Amherst Papyri, London, 1899, Pls. XIX-XXI, and an earlier transcript by W. Spiegelberg will be found in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, XXIV, 41. Full details will be found in a forthcoming article of my own in the volume of essays dedicated to Professor F. Ll. Griffith, with two colotype Plates. Here only a brief statement is necessary. The larger fragments belong to the two first pages of the tale; after this only imperfect remains of the bottom lines are preserved. Evidently the story was a very long one, consisting of at least fifteen pages on the recto and five or six more on the verso. The present height of page 2 is 27 cm., and to this a few centimeters must be added to obtain the original height. The date is likely to be the reign of Haremhab. For the student the importance of this fragmentary tale consists in the fact that it presents Late-Egyptian in its oldest and most correctly spelt form.

VII. THE TAKING OF JOPPA

This fragmentary story occupies the first three pages of the verso of Pap. Harris 500 in the British Museum. A sufficient account of the MS. and of its publications has been given above under I (The Tale of the Doomed Prince), and it is useless to repeat what was there said. Both tales are treated together in the books and articles by Maspero, Peet, and Blok enumerated in the same place.

The beginning of this tale is lost, and its middle parts are very defective. On the other hand, the end is complete, and is followed by a colophon.
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VIII. THE QUARREL OF APOPHIS AND SEK Nessene

Only the beginning of this tale is preserved, and the sole MS. to which we owe our knowledge of it is riddled with lacunae and textually corrupt into the bargain. Pap. Salier I of the British Museum collection, where it now bears the number 10185, is a miscellany of model letters and the like of a kind common in the Rames-side material. A full bibliography up to the date of that book’s appearance is given in Maspero, Les Contes populaires, 4th edition, 288-9. Since then, however, a photographic facsimile has been published in Facsimiles of Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, by (Sir) E. A. Wallis Budge, second series, London, 1923, Pls. LIII-V. Nevertheless these plates do not altogether replace the admirable facsimile made by J. Netherclift ninety years ago and published in Select Papyri in the Hieratic Character from the Collections of the British Museum, London, 1841, Pls. I-III, more especially since the papyrus itself seems to have suffered some damage in the interval. Reference is made in my notes to the transcript given by Maspero in Études Égyptiennes, Paris 1879, I, 195 foll., and to the translation, based on a careful revision of the text, by B. Gunn and myself in our article entitled The Expulsion of the Hyksos, in Journ. of Eg. Archaeology, V, 36 foll. A later translation is that of Erman, Literatur, 214 foll. For the purposes of the present edition the original has been re-studied minutely, but my efforts to deal with the much rubbed misplaced fragments have been only partially successful. The tale breaks off abruptly after the third line of the third page. A curious and inexplicable trait is the repetition, in the same handwriting, of 3, 1-3 on the verso of pages 2-3. The papyrus dates from the reign of Menephtah. All necessary details with regard to the handwriting and so forth will be found in the publications above-mentioned.

IX. KHENSEMḤAB AND THE SPIRIT

The fragments of this story are known from five potsherds in different European Museums. Of these, all but the Louvre sherd can be placed in their right relative positions, and form an almost or quite continuous text. How much is lost before the Turin fragment opens is unknown. The Turin and Vienna texts overlap, and consequently have been here taken together as section A. It will be seen from the note on Vienna, 10 that the longer Florence fragment may possibly be separated from the last word of the Vienna sherd only by a few signs, but since the matter is not certain, the Florence potsherds, which are in the main duplicates and end at the same point, have been classed as section B. Section C, consisting of the Louvre fragment, stands alone. Its narrative seems to tell how the high-priest Khensemḥab, following up the indications given by the Spirit, joyfully welcomes back the men whom he had sent to discover the latter’s tomb. This quest has been successfully accomplished, and on the next day an official of the temple of

XIII
Amun is sent for, presumably to receive instructions concerning the promised restorations. Even thus much is doubtful, however, though Erman (Literatur, 222) reaches the same conclusion, as against Maspero (Contes populaires, 296), who placed the Louvre potsherd at the beginning of the tale, and conceived it to relate Khensemhab’s search for a suitable site to place his own tomb. Long conversations may have passed between Khensemhab and the Spirit before the practical steps recounted in the Louvre text were embarked upon. If the view here advocated be correct, the last line of the Louvre potsherd cannot be far removed from the end of the tale.

Some details must now be given concerning the individual fragments, the originals of which have all, with the single exception of the Turin text, been carefully collated by myself.

1. The Turin potsherd, number unknown, measures about 17.5 by 15.5 cm., and is written in a hieratic handwriting of a not specially literary character dating from Dyn. XIX or XX. Published in photographic facsimile and hieroglyphic transcription by J. Černý in Revue de l’Égypte ancienne, I, 222.

2. The Vienna potsherd, number 3722a, was published by E. von Bergmann in Hieratische und hieratisch-demotische Texte der Sammlung ägyptischer Alterthümer des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses, Vienna, 1886; retouched photograph on Pl. IV; transcription and translation, p. vi. It is part of a large jar of red ware with a cream-coloured slip. Some lines might be lost at the top, but there is a blank space below line 10. Only the beginnings of lines are left. Rubrics in lines 2-3, but no verse-points. Written in a rough hieratic hand, probably of Dyn. XIX. Size 20 by 13 cm.

3. The Florence potsherds 2616 and 2617 are apparently copied from the same original, and presumably were discovered at the same time and place, since their readings are closely similar and 2617 contains the latter portion of the text of 2616. Both were published in hieroglyphic transcription and with hand-copies of the hieratic by W. Golénischeff in Recueil de Travaux, III, 3 foll. Some divergent readings are given by G. Maspero, op. cit., III, 7. Both are parts of buff-coloured jars, 2616 about 30 cm. high, and 2617 having a height of 27.5 cm. The former is written in a smallish literary hand without rubrics or verse-points; it is much rubbed in parts. The latter is in a large careless handwriting, with rubrics and red verse-points in the first three lines.

5. The Louvre potsherd 667+700 is of red ware covered with a buff slip. The height is 19 cm., and the breadth of the longest lines is about 27 cm., measured over the convex surface. Written in a good literary hand of Dyn. XIX. The small fragment 667, containing the beginnings of lines 1-3, has now been joined to 700, with eight more lines, of which lines 5-6 may be nearly complete, while the rest
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diminish in size as the end is approached. All beginnings of lines are preserved. Something may be lost at the top, but line 11 was the last. Though the text had often been mentioned previously, a hieroglyphic transcription was first published in 1894 by W. Spiegelberg, Recueil de Travaux, XVI, 31.

X. CONCERNING A KING AND A GODDESS

The very scanty remains of this story are found on scraps of papyrus preserved in the Museums of Berlin and Vienna. These obviously belonged to one and the same roll; both are inscribed upon the verso as well as upon the recto and both exhibit the same exceptionally angular literary hand, doubtless from Dyn. XIX; both, moreover, resemble one another in regard to their rubrics and in the fact that all numerals are written in red. It seems impossible to judge whether the Berlin fragment preceded the Vienna fragment on the recto, as I have assumed in my text; the opposite may well have been the case. But whichever alternative be adopted, it lies in the nature of things that the order of the recto will have been reversed in the case of the verso. This is a consequence of the fact that, when the scribe reached the end of the recto, he turned over his papyrus horizontally, and continued writing back in the direction of the beginning of the papyrus, as viewed from the standpoint of the recto. Hence either the present arrangement is correct, or else we must substitute for it the sequence: A, Vienna, recto; B, Berlin, recto; C, Berlin, verso; D, Vienna, verso. As usual, the name recto is given to that side on which the horizontal fibres are uppermost. The Berlin text (Pap. No. 3020) has not hitherto been published, though it is translated both in the handbook Aus den königlichen Museen, Berlin, 1899, p. 42, and in A. Erman, Die Literatur der Aegypter, 222-3. The bottoms of the pages are lost. The dimensions of the fragment are height 16 cm., breadth 18 cm. The portion of the papyrus in Vienna bears the number 36, and contains the lower parts of pages. The height is 19 cm., the greatest breadth is 14.5 cm. The fragment is very much rubbed and stained. Being fastened in a frame to the wall in a very bad light, it was very difficult to collate, and my copy cannot be regarded as wholly satisfactory. A transcription is given in E. von Bergmann, op. cit., p. v, and a facsimile of the verso (not the recto, as stated by von Bergmann) in Pl. IV of the same work.

XI. FROM AN UNIDENTIFIED TALE

A flake of limestone, probably from Dér el-Medîneh, which bears the number E 6428 in the Brussels collection, and contains some words from an unknown story. I have here transcribed as much as is still legible for the sake of completeness. Dyn. XIX or XX.
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I. The Tale of the Doomed Prince,
from Pap. Harris 500, verso.

[Hieroglyphic text]

[Hieroglyphic text]
N.B. For the purpose of estimating the lacunae, — of the original must be reckoned as requiring 5mm.

4,1. * So Pet. rightly, a miswriting of $\mathcal{N}$, cf. Orb. 1, 1. 6 Not quite of the normal shape, particularly 1; nevertheless certain.
   c - d 37mm. At the beginning \[\text{[&]}\] seems likely, since this follows the opening formula in Orb. 1, 1. Perhaps restore \[\text{[&]}\], though this seems a little too much.

4,2. a - b 26 mm. A downward turned edge has been straightened at the end of the lacuna, and now shows \[\text{[&]}\] to be impossible. The strokes are rather far apart, for \[\text{[&]}\] seemed just possible.

4,4. a - b A correction above the line, in which \[\text{[&]}\] immediately follows \[\text{[&]}\].

\[\text{[&]}\] is here without the usceus.

4,5. a - b 40mm. \[\text{[&]}\] For this restoration see 5, 4. So Blomke, slightly modifying Maspero's restoration.
4.7. "The tail of < has been improved in red. < not < ; so in this word always below, e.g. 4.9; 5.2.

4.8. "Read < as in 4.7. < These traces do not suit < very well, but no other reading seems likely. For < see 4.12; 19 for < is not possible.

4.9. < has been omitted in passing from one line to another; it is practically always written in < or < ; an exception 5.12.

4.10. "A thin red horizontal stroke below < ; probably meaningless.

5. The determinative and the upper tip of a possible < make the reading almost inevitable (det. borrowed from < ); before < a low horizontal sign ( < or < ) may have stood, but possibly there was nothing.

6. Emend < ; < >. [cf. 6,6,7]

4.11. "The < is smudged. < For the vorse-point before < not <

4.12. "Note that the Egyptian attaches < to what follows, herein differing from modern grammatical analysis; similarly below, 6.8.

6. < was originally written, but has been corrected to < without deletion of the faulty stroke. < So Peet rightly, but after < seems < more probable that <

4.13. < All certain.

5.1. < 45 mm. Perhaps restore < Peet recognized <, but his proposal < was not do full justice to the preposition <.
5.2. a Some badly deleted signs; read ōn k n ib k without lacuna, so Reit. b The space agrees and this restoration appears necessary; but before ~ there seems to be a stroke too much, see the facsimile. d A red verse-point, smudged in order to delete? e Originally 9 = 9; the 9 later corrected in red to ~ 5.3. a ~ is superfluous.

5.4. a–b Written over some badly deleted signs 5.5. a–b All a correction; for ~ superfluously before ō see Pasp. Ch. Beatty I, 13, 8; above ~ the stroke must be ~, but is unusually thick. e ~ has been written twice, thus: ~

5.6. a Read <λ> <δ> 5.7. a Read 1 <θ> b Read 1 <θ> <θ> κ λ

~ Without uraeus. d ~ not a normal ~, but certainly not ~. 5.8. a ~ with a meaningless stroke running diagonally from the top.
Doomed Prince, 5,11-6,6

5,11. a very small. b Emend to $\hat{\varepsilon} \hat{\kappa}$, cf. 6,9 and the correction in 6,11.

5,12. a Emend $\eta\zeta$ (19) as in 7,8; see too 4,9 note a.

5,13. a cf. 6,7; the space suits well. b = 70 mm.; evidently the full formula as 6,7.

5,14. a $\delta$ 80 mm. Before the lacuna the erased earlier text shows through unusually clearly. After it [\textit{tv}] $\gamma$ which cannot be $\gamma$ or $\gamma$ but might belong to $\hat{\theta} \hat{\kappa}$, for the form of $\gamma$ see in that very word 5,5. After this vocative restore perhaps: the reading of the signs immediately following $\frac{12}{10}$ [\textit{tv} \hat{\varepsilon} \hat{\kappa} \nu \delta \mu \nu \lambda \mu \iota \nu \mu \kappa \tau \nu \nu \kappa \iota \nu \mu \iota \nu \alpha \hat{\varepsilon}]$ the lacuna appears to me certain; restore similarly 8,11-2. 12 (7,13) or something similar: 25 (5,10)

6,1. a $\beta$ 47 mm. The restoration in the text is accounted for thus:

\[ \text{Below $\alpha$ was a superfluous (see 5,6).} \quad \frac{\text{12} \hat{\varepsilon} \hat{\kappa} \nu \delta \mu \nu \lambda \mu \iota \nu \mu \kappa \tau \nu \nu \kappa \iota \nu \mu \iota \nu \alpha \hat{\varepsilon}}{10 \hat{\varepsilon} \hat{\kappa} \nu \delta \mu \nu \lambda \mu \iota \nu \mu \kappa \tau \nu \nu \kappa \iota \nu \mu \iota \nu \alpha \hat{\varepsilon}} \]

\[ \text{This restoration seems better than Blok's ûwf hr dít.} \]

6,2. a cf. 7,4. This and ûwft hr dd following are certain restorations.

b For the traces see the facsimile. Peet's suggestions $\zeta$ or $\zeta$ seem to me impossible, even the traces badly. I have no reading to offer.

6,4-5. a $\beta$ The formula of 5,6-7 is shortened here and similarly again in 7,5.

6,5. a Read $\frac{9 \zeta}{\zeta}$

a This versepoint should have come after û at the beginning of 6,6.

6,6. a A complex correction. See the facsimile.
Doomed Prince, 6.1-16

(L-Eq Stories, 5)
6, 6. a For this versepoint see 4, 11, note b.

6, 7. a Delete this "
   b No versepoint.

6, 8. a For the division here see 4, 12, note a.

6, 10. a A thin red line (fortuitous?) runs between « and ».

6, 11. a $\mathbb{X}$ is corrected out of $\mathbb{E}$, see above 5, 11, note b.
   b The signs $\mathbb{X}$ and the righthand part of $\mathbb{E}$ have been improved in red
   c $\mathbb{X}$ is superfluous.

6, 12. a Thus $\mathbb{X}$ with $\mathbb{X}$ added as a later correction.
   b Doubtless on a folded back bit of the papyrus.

6, 13. a $\mathbb{X}$ is large and not improbably a correction.

6, 14. a-b Emend $\mathbb{X} \equiv \mathbb{E} \subset \mathbb{E} \equiv \mathbb{E} \subset \mathbb{E}$; homeoteleuton.
   c The scanty traces seem to suit $\mathbb{E} \equiv \mathbb{E}$ and not $\mathbb{E} \equiv \mathbb{E}$; but in this case
   $\mathbb{X}$ must be inserted after psy.

6, 15. a $\mathbb{X}$ and not $\mathbb{X}$.
   b Emend $\subset \mathbb{X}$; Under $\mathbb{E}$ trace of the earlier
   c $\mathbb{X}$ is superfluous.
Doomed Prince, 6.16-7.8  


7.1. a-2. The lower parts of many signs are visible, 29 being practically certain and 2 beverages least very plausible. If the first trace be the bottom of 2, what precedes must be [26], the space available (18 mm) being far too much for merely 26 [MM]. Before 26 the trace suits 26 quite well. After 26 and before (the supposed) m-tok-i is a space of 12 mm, too little for 26, but just right for 26. At b the trace suits 26. At c an edge that was folded back has been readjusted and shows a certain 26.

d-e. 40 mm. 26 seems not at all unlikely.

7.2. a. Recognised by Peet.

7.3. a. Read 26. The same error, but without a, below 7.3.5.11.14, etc.

* See the last note. Read 26 as in 6.9.

7.4. a. 26 which can hardly be read 26 as in 5.12.

7.5. a-2. For the formula thus shortened, see above 6.4-5, with note a-b thereon.

7.7. a. The first sign below 26 is written too small to be transcribed 26 as in the second occurrence of the same word a little farther on. In both cases one would expect 26 26 with 26. Before 26 a tiny s hardly to be read a.

b-c. 26 26 is undoubtedly right. Some fibres that are lost have carried away the tail of 26, before which is a tiny trace. For 26 see 6.12 and 26 has exactly the same form as in 9thm. 11.10 and elsewhere. Before 26 the space is insufficient for 26 [MM], the lower trace 26 might belong to 26.

d. Here and henceforth (8.8.151; 8.10) 26 has a superfluous ligature which may be borrowed from 26 26 or may be a degradation of 26. I have adopted the former view.
Doomed Prince, 7.9-8.3

7.9. a—b All certain. The paper which concealed the top of 7 of st (so Peet) has now been removed and the sign is now clear. Over the first π an inexplicable ῆ, perhaps from the earlier text. At 6 ῆ is corrected or badly formed.

7.10. a—b 50 mm., of which ῆ would have occupied about 20 mm. (4.3). The trace of 7 shows the more cursive form found in 8.11. At the end near π there is very doubtful, but there seems to have been a vertical sign between 7 and 8, which latter would otherwise be the first sign of a new phrase or clause. e—f 30 mm. Before 7 traces that might inter alia suit 7 is written low down, and the ῆ following it was perhaps added as a correction.

7.11. a For ῆ as several times above and below. See 7.3, note a.

b—c 32 mm. Scanty traces are visible throughout. I was once inclined to conjecture 7 but m—d itself is rather doubtful, and would this pop be written thus and used in this context? Hts? The traces seem favourable to 7, but the following group would suit 7 better than 16. A flat hts would be much squeezed. Without 7.

c—d Peet reads 7 but surely wrongly. The lower signs are quite indeterminate.

7.12. Grammar and sense alike demand this reading. 7 is small but nearly certain. A tall sign follows which may quite well be 7. The difficulty resides in 8.8, at the right end of which is a trace of the required diagonal stroke, but at the left end some traces descend vertically which are quite inexplicable.

7.13. a—b 25 mm. Before 7 either 9 or 8 and before this a sign which seems almost too thick and clumsy for 7. I thought of 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, for this arrangement see 4.3—but "they" is required, not "one," and this restoration would barely fill the space.

c—d Peet rightly 7, cf. 8.13, but he is wrong in declaring that the next sign is not 7. His further restoration in 5 is obviously correct.

7.14. a Probably so. The formula is shortened differently in 6.8-6.7.5. 7

7.15. a Certainly 1 not 7 as suggested VEA IV 109. 7 has usually, and also here, a double bar at the top, while 8 has mostly a single one. After one might expect 7, and 8.1—5 37 to 43 mm. The larger figure is insufficient for 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, and the lesser excessive for the same restoration without too much mb. The traces at beginning suit 7

Recognised by Peet. e—f 43 mm. probably, if we restore 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, and this restoration, substantially due to Maspero already suits my suggestions for 6.3.8. Before we are traces of red signs above the line perhaps from the earlier text. A trace which might suit 7.

8.2. a—d (so Peet rightly) is superfluous. 7 is certain, a fold having now been straightened out.

8.3. a Certainly so. 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7 yields a much more likely division than 7, 7 would be.
Doomed Prince, 8,3-12

8.3. a-b Some 43 mm. are available, see 8,1, note d-e. Maspero and others were
wrong in restoring at the end of the lacuna (cf. 8,4, note a-e), since 8,4 begins with
289- 290. The hieratic has \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \), not \( \text{\textit{\textbf{lx}}} \); \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \) is a correction.

8.4. a Just possibly \( \text{\textit{\textbf{{\textit{t}}}l}} \), \( \text{\textit{\textbf{{\textit{t}}}l}} \) is a correction.

8.5. a In the original \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \) is erroneously written twice.

b-c The upward stroke is too long for \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \), but exactly suits \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \); see 7,5. The published
collotype is apparently damaged here. A restoration like \( \text{\textit{\textbf{{\textit{t}}}l}} \) would probably fill the entire lacuna, so that when would have to be impossible. This
seems improbable. Maspero restored at the end \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \), \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \).

8.6. a Certainly so, or the like. So Peet.

b-c This restoration measures 42 mm. in \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \), \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \) is lost.

8.7. Peet follows Maspero in reading \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \) at the beginning of this word, but I am
convinced wrongly. The sign can only be \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \), though the left limb is broken, comes lower,
and is further from the right limb than one would expect. Before \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) the traces are confused,
and it is better than \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) or \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \). The determinative cannot be \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \), Spiegelberg (275, 64, 88)
suggested, and the generally accepted \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) would normally be written \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \). In these reasons
\( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) seems probable; perhaps a shortening of \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) in “diversion”, so once again Gardner,
Eg. Hier. Texts, 16.3 (parallel to Anast. I, 8,7).

b Insufficient restoration uncertain. Both \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) and \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) are
8.8. a See 7,7, note d. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) is very small.

8.9. a-d Spiegelberg’s restoration (loc. cit.) “saying, I am thy fate”, though not improbable in
itself, seems too long in the available space:

b Scanty traces, but \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) is very certain; not \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \), Maspero’s reading.

c-d Following Spiegelberg’s suggestion, one might restore \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) as \( \text{\textit{\textbf{ll}}} \), Maspero’s reading.

8.10. a-b Peet rightly. Before this, considerable traces, but I cannot read them. Poet’s
suggestion “seized” or “perceived him” seems likely. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) would not fill the space.

8.11. a Certain; a folded edge now straightened. \( \text{\textit{\textbf{\varepsilon}}} \) restored on
the basis of 7,13.
Doomed Prince, 8,2-end

II. The Tale of the Two Brothers
from the d'Orbíney papyrus.
Doomed Prince, 8, 12-end

8, 12. The scanty traces suit 𓊁 and not 𓊂.

\( \text{or else a rather large } \text{2}. \text{See above note } \text{a} \text{ on } \text{p. 7.} \)

8, 13. a-b 20 mm. Hardly a trace is visible. At the end 𓊂 this seems probable.

8, 14. a Probably the determinative of 𓊆 [𓊁𓊆].

\( \text{or else a rather large } \text{2}. \text{See above note } \text{a} \text{ on } \text{p. 7.} \)

\( \text{Quite certain traces, not previously recognized. The original shows much more than the published collotype.} \)

II. The Tale of the Two Brothers.

N.B. A normal 𓊂 measures in the original 6 to 8 mm.

1.1. a Above the remains of 𓊂 a small fortuitous stroke, not to be read as the top of 𓊂, as suggested by Griffith, Proc. S.B.A. xi. 164.

1.2. a The space suits exactly.

\( \text{or else a rather large } \text{2}. \text{See above note } \text{a} \text{ on } \text{p. 7.} \)

1.3. a Perhaps emend \( \text{𓊁𓊆𓊆𓊁} \text{𓊁𓊂𓊂𓊂} \).

\( \text{Clear traces of all signs, but the identification has been impeded by bad mounting. The tail of } \text{𓊂 is missing, but this fact is disguised by the displacement some 5 mm. to the right of the large fragment below, see 1.5, note } \text{b}. \text{𓊂 is similarly disguised by squeezing.} \)

\( \text{Not room enough for } \text{𓊂, Sethe's suggestion.} \text{Wrongly mounted in the middle of the L page.} \)
Two Brothers, 1.3-2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Egypt Stories, 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- **Page 1:** Details of the story are mentioned.
- **Page 10:** Continuation of the story.
- **Page 15:** Further details or conclusion of the story.
Two Brothers, 1,3-2,1
L. Eg. Stories, 10a

1,4. a-b Certain traces of [x] or [y], see 10,10 for this sign; not [z] (3x). Before 3D room for [u] only.
c-d Emend >> ≅ << ≅ <5> ~ <7> ≅ <8> as Pop Ch. Beatty II, 4, 6.

* On the large displaced fragment, for which see 1,3, note c-d. It seems to me clear that [p] or [q] or [r] was written, though the writing of [s] must have been very different from that sign in \[\square\] in 3,5. This is quite possible, the writing of [t] being much smaller. f Emend \[\square\] as 8, 9, 1, 4, etc. f On the wrongly placed fragment in the middle of the page. See above 1,3, note e.

1,5. a. So already Groff. b. On the large displaced fragment, see 1,4, note c above.

c. So Groff and others. Certain traces of \[\square\] not as Griffith. See 4, 4, 7 for the word, but it must have occupied less space than this. See 1, 4, note d; also 2, 3, note a.

1,6. a. So Groff, etc. See 1, 10 for the writing. b. Visible on the large fragment displaced some 5mm. to the right. Cf. \[\square\] \[\square\] \[\square\] \[\square\] 4, 4, but here \[\square\] — this perhaps rather than \[\square\] — is required to fill the lacuna.

1,7. a-b 45 mm., of which 5 mm. are needed for the rest of mistr. Griffith emended \[\square\] \[\square\] \[\square\] \[\square\] which suits the space and the sense well.

c-d Clear traces of \[\square\], see Griffith's plate. At the beginning of the lacuna traces which suit \[\square\] quite well, and even a tiny trace of the \[\square\] below it.

1,8. a-b Perhaps about 15 mm. Emend perhaps \[\square\], if not some advert like Emend \[\square\] \[\square\] d in black in the middle of the fragment for superstitious reasons.
e-f 45 mm. At end I see \[\square\] faint but complicated traces, not simply 3.

1,9. a-b Probably just room for this, which suits the context better than \[\square\] \[\square\] adopted by Griffith and Sethe. b. \[\square\] is quite certain; the \[\square\] must have been ad

2,1. a. \[\square\], not \[\square\] is favoured by the spacing. So Griffith.

b. The diagonal stroke doubtless continued rather farther downwards. No lacuna.
Two Brothers, 2.2–3.1

L.-Eq. Stories, 11
Two Brothers, 2.2-3.1

2.2. A blank space, without serious loss of fibres. The scribe seems to have omitted —, while leaving room for it. Perhaps emend 9 to —; but so too Koller, 1.1.

2-3. About 15 mm. only. I had wished to restore [21/12] but some traces near the end of the lacuna do not suit this conjecture.

2.3. a. Certainly —, not —, so Griffith. Here and extending to the next line a misplaced fragment upside down, showing part of — of the rubric in 14, and part of the determinative 128 of [who] in 1,5.

2.4. a. Emend —; cf. 4.2, end. b. No trace is left.

2.5. a. Imperative. So Sethe rightly.


2.6. a. A trace which suits ¥ well. So Sethe restores.

b-c. So Griffith, Möller, Sethe.

2.7. a. The trace suits ¥. So Griffith, etc. b. I have restored both words in their full writing, but this makes the line too long. Perhaps the scribe wrote 10 for days.


Two Brothers, 3.1-10
3.2. a For <\$> $\sim$ is. b Certain. The right side of $\sim$ has perished through the loss of some fibres. The hitherto accepted $\sim$ is impossible, for $\sim$ occurring in hieratic only in occasional writings like $\sim$.

So again in the same word 7, 3; $\sim$ fr. $\sim$ is an idiosyncrasy of this scribe; cf. $\sim$ and $\sim$ Salier II, 1, 5 (Faulkner).

3.4. a Emend $\sim$ $\sim$. b Emend $\sim$ $\sim$, as in 3.5.

3.5. a $\sim$ is corrupted out of $\sim$ through assimilation to $\sim$ in 3.4.

b-c 42 mm. Probably restore with Griffith and Setha. This fills the space fairly well.

3.6. a $\sim$. The traces of a horizontal stroke make it impossible to read $\sim$ as in 1, 4. $\sim$ seems to be the only possible alternative.

b The dot, if ever there was one, is now destroyed. c Emend $\sim$ $\sim$.

d-e Certain. The same expression Pap. Ch. Beauty II, 4, 4-5. The downward front stroke of $\sim$ approaches, but does not touch, $\sim$, and has led to the erroneous reading $\sim$ (odd). At the end of the lacuna the trace is far too large for $\sim$, and can only belong to $\sim$.

3.7. Doubtless emend $\sim$ $\sim$ as in 3.1, 6.

3.8. a Sufficient traces.

b Only traces visible $\sim$. Spiegelberg (Rec. de Trad. 191, 43) proposed to read $\sim$, comparing 7, 5. For this there is not nearly enough room, nor is such a modification as $\sim$ possible. The first sign might well be $\sim$, but that below it stands too high for $\sim$. At the end Möller and Sethe are surely right in reading $\sim$.

3.9. a Read $\sim$ $\sim$; an initial sign is similarly omitted below in $\sim$

3.10. a For $\sim$. But so again 7, 5.

12a
Two Brothers, 3.10-4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. *Emend [a] or just possibly [b]; for the latter form cf. [c] 4.6.

*b A most unusual arrangement of signs, but there is nothing to suggest that it is a correction.

4.3. *Supply here [a].

V. [a] is certain, and so too are the traces of [b]; apparently no stroke after [c]. Perhaps the correct reading is [d], etc.; the scribe may have thoughtlessly begun to write [e], etc., and have then perceived his error.

4.4. *The traces suit well.

4.5. *Insert [a].

4.6. *Supply [a] or perhaps better [b].

V. [a] and [c] are both certain. [d] is superfluous. [e] is probably a later addition.

4.9. *Perhaps add [a] as 1.5; 4.8: 5.7. *Sic, not [b].
Two Brothers, 4.9-5.7

L-Eg Stories, 14
4, 10. a Understand 𒈼.\textsuperscript{-10}

b So written for 𒈼; again below 6, 5; 13, 3; occasionally too in other MSS, e.g. Pap. Ch. Beatty I, 1, 5.

c A phonetic writing, cf. Coptic Ṇepeycwmt; similarly below.\textsuperscript{[13, 3; 15, 9]}

d is certain, the dot adjoining —.  A correct writing for <m> west, cf.\textsuperscript{[6, 10]} Millingen 1, 4;\textsuperscript{[6, 2]} Israel stela 6; cf. Coptic mashak.

e. The dot almost coalesces with the head of X.  The dot, if any, is lost

f here shows a superfluous tick ∇.

5, 3. a Shadowy traces of 𒈼, but none of initial ; emend 𒈼<š> as below and see 3, 9, note a.

5, 4. a-b 34 mm. At end a tail which suits 𒈼 better than . At beginning I see which suggests ; the upper part can hardly be 𒈼 or 𒉩. In the middle are some very vague horizontal traces.

c Sic, under the influence of 𒈼; emend 𒈼, as Griffith suggested.

5, 5. a <š> is omitted, as again in 6, 6.

5, 6. a Insert <š> as below 6, 1.

5, 7. a <š>
5.8. a Corrected out of =\( \theta \); read =\( \gamma \). The scribe has left the head of =\( \gamma \)
unerasced to serve as =\( \gamma \).

6.2. a–d Restored in a fantastic manner by some modern hand. So often below. The ink is clearly distinguishable from the ancient writing. The published facsimile marks such restorations with dots. c–d See the last note.

6.3. a So for in text also 8.57, doubtless under the influence of =\( \nu \). b Emend into =\( \delta \) =\( \varepsilon \) =\( \zeta \), Erman Proc. S.B.A. xi. 415, comparing Mariette, Karnak 53.37 =\( \alpha \) =\( \pi \) =\( \omicron \). c Read =\( \beta \).

6.5. a Doubtless so to be read, cf. below 15.9. However, =\( \delta \) is not quite normally made, thus =\( \beta \). b Perhaps to be emended =\( \zeta \) =\( \gamma \) =\( \kappa \) =\( \chi \), for the spelling of =\( \omicron \) =\( \nu \) =\( \lambda \) =\( \kappa \) =\( \chi \) cf. 7.1. c For =\( \pi \), see 4.10, note 2.

6.6. a =\( \beta \) omitted, as above 5.5. b =\( \kappa \) is omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Brothers, 6.8-7.8</th>
<th>L-Eg. Stories, 16a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>a A rare sign.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>a is apparently wrongly for $\sim$. See below 11.4.5, note a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>a is not clearly legible, but the sense demands it, and there seems hardly room for $\sim$. Sadly disfigured by the modern restorer, but $\sim$ is certain and $\sim$ seems nearly so. After $\sim$, I see $\sim$, of which $\sim$ seems probable; the preceding sign can hardly be anything else than $\sim$, though d'Orbine uses the form $\sim$, not $\sim$ elsewhere. The normal position of signs in the word $\sim$ is, however, $\sim$, see 4.6.8;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>a Wrongly restored in modern times, but $\sim$ is ancient and certain. Sethe's [6.5. conjecture $\mathbb{Q}$] is quite impossible, but it is difficult to find an alternative. Before $\sim$, the available space is small, sufficient (e.g., for $\sim$); &quot;dwelling&quot; would, however, be with $\sim$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>a $\sim$ without dot, i.e. properly $\sim$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>a $\sim$ an abnormal writing, but found again below in 9.6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>a Diphthong. $\sim$ Doubtless to be emended $\sim$, see 11.4.5, of 7.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>For $\mathbb{Q}$, $\sim$; $\sim$ of the MS is a corruption due to assimilation of the pronouns; other good cases are 3.5, 9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Brothers, 7.8–8.5

L-Eg.Stories, 17
Two Brothers, 7.8-8.5

7.8. a The same meaningless termination also in 9.8.

7.9. a An error for $\text{I} \equiv 3$, a not uncommon writing of $\sim \equiv$ in L-EG Hieratic, e.g. below p.33, l.16; 34, l.3.

b Read $\text{II} \equiv 3$. c Emend $\text{II} \equiv 3$, the verb is misspelt again below 14,1 (similarly); 18,5 (differently).

8.1. a Emend $\text{II} \equiv 3$.

b Emend $\text{II} \equiv 3$ without $\sim$.

8.2. a Omit $\sim$.

8.3. a The parallel passage 7,2 has $\text{II} \equiv 3$, rightly with $\sim$.

b $\sim$, but doubtless intended for $\sim$, not for $\sim$.

8.4. a-b Emend $\sim \equiv 3 \equiv 3 \equiv 3$. The det. $\equiv$ is wrongly borrowed from 6.3; "recite"; read $\equiv 3$.

8.5. a Doubtless indeed for $\equiv$, as clearly in 13,5. "The space left for the entry in red ink was too short, the signs are therefore crowded and $\equiv$ looks more like $\equiv$," Griffith.
Two Brothers, 8.5-9.2

L-Eg Stories, 18
8.5. "Clearly " not ơ, though the verb is 뜩.

Read นม as in the parallel passage 13,9. Probably to be emended นม, see below note " on 14,7.

8.6. "As the text stands it means: (that I may take vengeance upon) him who hath transgressed against thee." All modern translations render, however, in the sense of 9,5; if rightly, it will be necessary to emend the text to นม (or อน) and นม as in 8,4.

Perhaps corrupt; not in the parallel passage 12,9, unless somehow connected with นม or ฌ there.

8.7. "The ơ is badly made but certain. See 6,3, note ".

8.8. "For ฌ or ฌ.

8.9. "Emend ฌ as in 10,1.

9.1. " is omitted.
Two Brothers, 9.2-10.3

9.3. a Emend $\Delta$; a similar error in the same expression below 19.6. b The scribe began to write $\nabla$ after $\Delta$, but saw his mistake in time, and changed this to $\nabla$.

9.5. a Probably to be emended into $\langle \ldots \rangle \frac{\nabla}{\nabla}$, the passive $\Delta$-m being unlikely. b Emend $\langle \nabla \rangle$ or the like.

9.6. a A peculiar hieratic group; similarly in 7.7. b A corruption of $\frac{\nabla}{\nabla}$ through assimilation of the suffix to that of $\frac{\nabla}{\nabla}$. Similarly above 7,8, see note c thereon (p.16a).

9.7. a A very abnormal writing, but of the old perfective $\frac{\nabla}{\nabla}$ in 8,1. b One expects $\langle \nabla \rangle \frac{\nabla}{\nabla}$, which occurs in 2,3. c $\nabla$ is superfluous.

9.8. a Emend $\langle \ldots \rangle$. b The MS reading is not impossible, but perhaps emend $\frac{\nabla}{\nabla} \langle \ldots \rangle$ as in 11,5.

c Corrupt for $\nabla$. d $\langle \ldots \rangle$. e Emend $\frac{\nabla}{\nabla} \langle \ldots \rangle$ as Pap. Egh. Beatty I, 3,7; the strange writing $\nabla \langle \ldots \rangle$ also above 7,8.

9.9. a It has an abnormal form $\nabla$. b On this writing see Sethe, Verhum, II, §25.

10.2. a Omit $\nabla$. b For $\nabla \langle \ldots \rangle$

c $\langle \ldots \rangle$. 

19a
Two Brothers, 10.3–11.2

10.3. \[\textit{a} \leftrightarrow \textit{b}\] Probably for \(\textit{\text{\textasciitilde R}}\), cf. 11.2 below, where \(\textit{\text{\textasciitilde R}}\) is wrongly written.

10.6. \[\textit{a} \text{ Emend} \leftrightarrow \textit{b} \text{ as in 12.5.}\]

10.9. \[\textit{a} \text{ The scribe wrote } \textit{\textasciitilde}, \text{ then partly deleted } \textit{\textasciitilde} \text{ and substituted } \textit{\textasciitilde}.\]

\[\textit{b} \text{ This writing again 10.10; 11.2; 19.10 for the verb "to fight" is probably only an eccentric spelling of } \textit{\textasciitilde} \text{ borrowed from } \textit{\textasciitilde} \text{ "warrior;" }

\text{but see below p. 29} \text{, note } \textit{b} \text{ on 19.10.}\]

10.10. \[\textit{a} \text{ Emend } \textit{\textasciitilde} \leftrightarrow \textit{b)}, \text{ as again below 14.7; 16.6 and other less certain cases.}\]

\[\textit{b} \text{ See above 10.9, note } \textit{b}.\]

11.1. \[\textit{a} \leftrightarrow \textit{b}\]

11.2. \[\textit{a} \text{ For } \textit{\textasciitilde R}, \text{ see above 10.3, note } \textit{b}.\]

\[\textit{b} \text{ Emend } \textit{\textasciitilde} \leftrightarrow \textit{\textasciitilde}; \text{ so already } \textit{Piehl}, \textit{ZÄS.} \textit{XXIV}, 80.\]
Two Brothers, 11.2-12.2

L-Eg. Stories, 21
11.3. a Some emendation appears necessary, perhaps in which case may stand as passive simf. if is without the usual dot.

11.4. a Read 

11.5. a A more complete spelling would be from *ni-st.

b-c As Erman has seen (cf. Proc. S.B.A. 31; Sethe, Untersuchungen, V, 35) is a corruption of, and contains the old phrase "tribute," "homage," he assumes as the original reading and renders "denn sie (die decke) ist ein Tribut für dich aus einem andernunde." One small modification is perhaps desirable: the suffix of (Erman's "für dich") should possibly be omitted as due solely to a thoughtless recollection of the formula "homage to thee."

11.7. a Emend with Sethe (in Moller, 1927); the adverb which he formerly favoured (ZAS, xiv. 84, n. 3) is not likely at this period.

b Emend . c Perhaps the suffix here is not quite indispensable.

d is certain in the original.

11.10. a Omit . b is the last letter of the line, but the end of curls sound behind it.

12.1. a Emend .

12.2. a So determined also 17.2; 14.9; 15.4; 18.9.
Two Brothers, 12.2-13.3

L-Eq.Stories, 22
12, 3. a For read simply \( \Delta \); in 18, 10 another misspelling \( \Delta \) which shows the initial \( \Delta \). b Understand \( \Delta \), a writing that occurs in 19, 3.

12, 4. For read simply \( \Delta \); see below 12, 6, note a.

b Read \( \Delta \) as in the same phrase 18, 1. c Read \( \Delta \) as in 19, 10.

12, 6. a For simple \( \Delta \) as in the same phrase 13, 4, 8.

b Read \( \Delta \).

12, 7. a Read \( \Delta \) and see above 3, 9, note a.

12, 9. a Emend \( \Delta \)
Two Brothers, 13.3-14.3  L-Eg Stories, 23
Two Brothers, 13.3-14.3

L-Eq. Stories, 23a

13.3. a See 5.1, note a.  b Emend $\alpha \beta \gamma < \gamma \delta \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \gamma > \omega \delta \gamma 

13.4. a $\gamma$ is superfluous; so again in this n 12, b 13, b.  b Emend $\alpha < \beta > \delta$; the dot-like sign after $\delta$ is quite inadequate as a representative of $\delta$.

13.6. a $\gamma$ is certain, but badly made.

13.7. a Emend $\gamma \delta \zeta < \gamma \delta \zeta \gamma > \omega \delta \gamma$ of Doomed Prince 5.14-6.1, where it would probably have been better to restore $\zeta \nu [\beta]$ rather than $\mu \nu [\beta]$ as I have given in my text.

13.8. a See above 13.4, note a.

13.9. a Emend $\mu \nu [\beta]$ as 1.5; 4.8 in this expression.  b is badly made

14.1. a Emend $\alpha \beta \gamma < \gamma \delta \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \gamma > \omega \delta \gamma$, see 7.9, note c.  b For $\omega \delta \gamma$.

c Disfigured by the modern restorer.

14.2. a-b Emend $\alpha \beta \gamma$, as proposed by Selhe ZÄS. xxix, 58, PP having been misread as $\alpha$; perhaps also the scribe was influenced by a memory of 8.1.

14.3. a Emend $\gamma < \delta \gamma \delta \gamma$ see p. 24a, first note.

23a
Two Brothers, 14,3–15,3
14.3. "Read 9\(\text{r}^9\) as proposed by Selhe, 2A5, 189.

14.4. "Omit this \(\text{r}\). 2 Emend \(\text{r}\) or less probably \(\text{r}\) for the latter of 15.3 and the note thereon.

14.5. "Read probably \(\text{r}\); similar examples in 6.9-11; 14.7-8; 14.8; 19.9. The last of these examples is demonstrably \(\text{r}\). 3 dm see 19.9, note a.

14.6. "Either an otherwise unknown reflexive use (hms\text{\textbackslash n}) or else omit \(\text{r}\); for the former alternative see below 13.5, note a. 2 The determinative \(\text{h}\) are wrongly borrowed from \(\text{h}\). Read \(\text{h}\). Similarly below 15.2

14.7. "Blackman rightly recognizes in this a new instance of the idiomatic \(\text{h}\), "until", on which see JEA, 217, 195. In point of fact, the scribe first wrote \(\text{h}\), but deleted the \(\text{h}\) before continuing with \(\text{h}\). a. 19 is superfluous.

14.8. "Read perhaps \(\text{r}\), see below Blinding of Truth 6.7; or else \(\text{r}\), see above 14.5, note a. b. See the last note.

15.1. "A rubric, not black as in the published facsimile.

15.2. "Read \(\text{r}\), see above 14.6, note b. 5

Two Brothers, 15.3—16.3

L-Eq. Stories, 25
15.3. a A correct late Egyptian spelling, but d'Orbigny usually writes simply ḥl, not ḫlẖ.

15.4. a Understand ⲭ⳪ ⲭ⳪; see note a on 12.3.

15.5. a Disfigured by the modern restorer, but the tail of an 𓊊 seems probable and original. For the possible reflexive use, see above 14.6, note a. But Griffith's suggestion ⲍ ⲍ seems more probable. "For this spelling of the plural see above, Horus and Seth, 14.7.

15.6. a ⲭ is a later addition.

15.8. a The scribe wrote ⲭ and then deleted the dot.

15.9. a For this rare and somewhat uncertain word, cf. 6.5 above.

b Emend ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ.

c Probably emend ⲍ, in spite of the fact that the parallel passage 17.7 also writes ⲭ. d See note a on 5.1.

15.10. a Cf. the parallel passage 17.7. At the end read in both cases ⲭ, cf. for the compound preposition hr-st-r above 7.8. Render "it was on account of me." At the beginning I doubtless stands for 𓊊, the spelling being possibly influenced by the verb ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ, cf. ⲍ ⲍ ⲍ "where is it?" Blinding of Truth, 8.6; Anast. I, 27.1. b-c ⲍ is a correction above the line. The text should be emended ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ, the corruption ⲭ being due to ⲭ ⲭ ⲭ in the following sentence (16.1).

16.1. a Emend ⲭ ⲭ for ⲭ ⲭ.
Two Brothers, 16.3-17.2

L-Eg Stories, 26
Two Brothers, 16.3–17.2

16.3. a ᾰ in part modern restoration.
  b Here again a modern falsification, but the end of ἐπίδεικνύω seems ancient. Cf. 17.10.
16.4. a Either an extreme example of confusion between όρατον recta and όρατον obliqua, or else emend ἐπίδεικνύω comparing 17.10.

Thus much is ancient. The signs have been tampered with by the modern restorer. The α, which is certain, is to be read after ἦ and before ἢ.

16.5. a Emend ἐπίδεικνύω or just possibly ἐπιδεικνύω, cf. for the latter 3.9.

16.6. a Understand ἐπίδεικνύω, see above 10.10, note a. b Emend ἐπιδεικνύω.

16.7. a The sign is damaged, but probably ο and not σ; for the word, see Admonitions, 8.10.12.
  b ω is very small.

16.9. a For ἐκκλήσεως. b Emend ἐκκλήσεως. c Emend ἐκκλήσεως.
  d Emend ἐπίδεικνύω into ἐπιδεικνύω; the α is badly made.
  e–f Emend ἐπιδεικνύω to ἐπιδεικνύω, or ἐπιδεικνύω of 19.

17.1. a ἄ is to be understood.
  b A mistake for ἄ.
17.2. Emend ἐπιδεικνύω
Two Brothers, 17.2–18.1
L-Eg. Stories, 27
17.2. a The same determinatives as in 12.2; see the note thereon.
17.3. a Retouched by the modern restorer.
   b $\alpha$ is here a mere stroke 1.
17.4. a Emend $\text{y}^2$ $\text{y}^3$.

   b Read $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^6$. c Some verb is lacking, perhaps $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^7$.

17.6. a There is a large omission here, as Maspero (Contes populaires, 49,2) has seen.
Perhaps emend: $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$

17.7. a Emend $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$, see 15,9, note c.
   b One expects $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ before $\text{y}^3$.
   c d Perhaps to be restored $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$.
17.8. a Read $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$ $\text{y}^3$; see 15,10, note a.

17.10. a One expects $\text{y}^3$; however, the present writing is not inexplicable, see JEA, 16, 227. b $\text{y}^3$ is for $\text{y}^3$, only here in d'Orbiney.
Two Brothers, 18.1-19.1

[Hieroglyphic text]

L-Eg. Stories, 28
Two Brothers, 18.1-19.1
L-eg. Stories, 28a

18.2. a Read with, as in the parallel passage 16.4. b is certain, as Griffith has seen; and are quite doubtful. The group is perhaps wholly superfluous. For after m-+t see too 4.3, with note e thereon.

Cf. below 18.3. is a strange, but well authenticated L-eg. writing of old text, cf. below, Horus and Seth, 4.1; 15.1.
18.3. is superfluous, see for the construction see 10.5. is for , see 4.10, note b.

is superfluous. Just before, emend into .
18.5. a-b. The same verb and suffix are written corruptly also 7.9, see note c thereon.

Emend , see above 18.2, note c.

18.7. a A very small n, perhaps later inserted, and touching the following sign.

18.8. a I lacks the usual dot. Omit ; see the same formula 12.2; 17.2
18.9. a Insert as in 15.4; in this cliché nhm is always followed by + suffix.

18.10. a has hitherto been interpreted (1) "named him" or (2) "footed him." Neither rendering suits the context, and both desiderate . I propose, therefore "in jubilation," emending or . The may be due to a faulty reading with the determinative /. b Read as in 15.6.

Emend , cf. 12.3 above. The corruption is due to the verb .
19.1. a Emend , cf. 12.3. is similarly omitted after below, this line; 19.6.
19.2. b . See the last note.
Two Brothers, 19.2-end

19.2. a Emend < . b Exceedingly faint, like all rubries on this page.
c So Griffith and Sitch. The space suits, and I think I see traces of "saltpetre."
19.3. a-b Faint, but certain. c Not nearly enough room for the correct reading [42]. Perhaps the scribe erroneously wrote [42] or the like.

19.4. a-b [42] kmf comes in very strangely after nisi: [42] was [42]. Perhaps the easiest way of removing the difficulty would be to substitute [42] for [42].

19.5. a I touched up with modern ink. b The sense is rather obscure; is it on correct?


c Read [42] for [42]; similarly above 19.3. c Emend < .

19.7. a X i.e. exactly hieratic [40] as in 19.6. Obviously a corruption of [40].

c-d is unnecessary and borrowed from maius "port", "harbour."

19.8. a Read simply --. b It seems to have been the original reading; it was then imperfectly deleted and written in front of it.

19.9. a 19 here takes the place of -- in the same formula Saller IV, on back of recto, p. 21. See JEA. XVII, 224, and above, note a on 14.5.

19.10. a Insert < . See the first two references in the last note.

b So written for [42] above 10.10; 11.2. This seems better than to assume a verb "hearty," as is done in WT I 218, though in favour of this one might perhaps quote [42] Saller IV, verso, loc. cit.

20.1. a A single line of large writing across the top of the page.
Two Brothers: Appendix.


on the back of recto, p. 17

III. The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood, from Pap. Chester Beatty II in the British Museum.
The Blinding of Truth by Falsehood

N.B. .... measures from .08 to .1 cm.

1.5. a The papyrus now starts with the final signs of the last five lines of a page which I have called page 1. Four lines of this page, which may have had a breadth of some .2 cm, are completely lost. Very possibly only one page preceded page 1. b Let just possibly part of 6.

1.7. a Restored from 2, 2, etc.

1.8. a-b The whole passage from jr pt dw n Jr (1, 8) to istnwr (2, 1) is found quoted again in 10, 3-4, and these later lines afford a certain basis for restoration, though clearly there were some slight variants.

1.9. a-b See the last note. b 10, 4 has the variant -9%.

2.1. a Supply <R> though this is absent also in 10, 4. b ; it is doubtful whether mskr was here determined with L 2 as in 10, 4. Supply <R> as in 10, 4.

d Var. = 17% - 16% - 10, 4; for the word see Westcar, 12, 5.

2.2. a Possible traces of 1 2; the proposed restoration must be right as regards [R] if the traces are of [R]. After this L barely fills the available space, but it is impossible to be certain, as the writing varies greatly in size. [R]:

2.3. a Note the strange division -9, there are others of the kind below, e.g. 2, 6-7; 7-8; 2, 8-3.1.
Blinding of Truth, 2.4–4.1

2.5. "... is broken in the middle and hence slightly conjectural; the traces suit well and ... is impossible.

2.6. a) without the sign below it. b) -c) of [\text{\textcircled{X}}] all that is left is ... how well the trace suits [\text{\textcircled{X}}] is seen from [\text{\textcircled{X}}]. The tail of [\text{\textcircled{X}}] is visible in 2.7. [\text{\textcircled{X}}] must have been small.

2.7. a) The lacuna is equal to [\text{\textcircled{X}}] in 2.6, but in this papyrus it is often highly compressed. b) the downward stroke belongs to the [\text{\textcircled{X}}].

2.8. a)–b) Perhaps restore [\text{\textcircled{X}}], which suits the space well.

3.1. a) The placing of the scanty fragments of p.3 is mainly the work of Dr. Ibscher; the fibres, the distance apart of the joins (Klebungen), and the evidence of the verso (p.11), make the reconstruction practically certain. Two fragments that could not be placed must belong to this page, not to page 1; they give ... b) The restoration [\text{\textcircled{X}}] does not appear very probable.

3.2. a)–b) Perhaps to be emended to [\text{\textcircled{X}}] that he might tell falsehood.

3.3. a)–b) Tiny traces, which suit [\text{\textcircled{X}}] none too well. Reading certain; there seems no room for [\text{\textcircled{X}}] (unc.) at the beginning; perhaps of [\text{\textcircled{X}}] in 6.2.

3.4. a)–b) Portion of red [\text{\textcircled{X}}] only; the space makes it probable that this belongs to [\text{\textcircled{X}}] of the formula, rather than to [\text{\textcircled{X}}]. The woman's name is never complete; cf. 3.7; 4.2.3.

3.5. This strange writing can apparently only be an error for [\text{\textcircled{X}}].

3.6. a–b) 53 cm.; the space would exactly suit [\text{\textcircled{X}}].

3.7. a)–b) 8.5 cm.; in 7.3 [\text{\textcircled{X}}] with [\text{\textcircled{X}}] omitted measures 3.5 cm.

3.1/4 cm., almost exactly the space occupied by [\text{\textcircled{X}}] in 4.4; very tiny traces suit [\text{\textcircled{X}}] and [\text{\textcircled{X}}] well. The trace below [\text{\textcircled{X}}] suits neither [\text{\textcircled{X}}] nor [\text{\textcircled{X}}] well.
<table>
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<th>Blinding of Truth, 4,1–5,5</th>
<th>L–Eg. Stories, 32</th>
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Blinding of Truth, 4.1-5.5

L-Eng. Stories, 32a

4.2. a-b 4.9 cm. of which \( \frac{1}{2} \) would need only 2 cm. This leaves over much room for the name. The same words (\( \text{in...a} \)) occupy 4 cm. in 3.4. For \( \frac{1}{2} \) certain.

4.3. a-b At the beginning very small black traces \( \frac{1}{3} \), which would suit \( \frac{1}{2} \) or possibly \( \frac{1}{2} \). As at the beginning of 4.2, exaggeratedly much space seems available for the woman's name.

4.4. a-b Certain traces of \( \frac{1}{2} \) at the end. Before these (cm.) lot \( \frac{1}{2} \) of which the tail of \( \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \) further back seem \( \frac{1}{2} \). Once probable. One thinks of \( \frac{1}{2} \) but there is no trace of \( \frac{1}{2} \) and perhaps no room for it.

4.5. a-b Certain traces of \( \frac{1}{2} \); as regards this phrase this passage and d'Orbigny 3.6 mutually confirm one another. Insert \( \frac{1}{2} \); see above 4.4.

4.7. a \( \frac{1}{2} \). \( \frac{1}{2} \) seems probable, but what word can be meant? \( \frac{1}{2} \) ; the determinative prohibits the restoration \( \frac{1}{2} \), i.e. \( \frac{1}{2} \) "palette."

5.1. a A correction above the line, a very short and half deleted. The scribe has wished to substitute the orthodox writing \( \frac{1}{2} \) for the phonetic one in the text (cf. Coptic anthrcae). So too in 5.2.

5.2. a In red, and faint, the same correction as in 5.1. See the last note.

5.3. a \( \frac{1}{2} \) is omitted.

5.4. a Emend shear \( \frac{1}{2} \) and bid \( \frac{1}{2} \), the erroneous \( \frac{1}{2} \) being due to the suffix \( \frac{1}{2} \) preceding. Another good case of corruption through assimilation of pronouns. Perhaps to be emended \( \frac{1}{2} \), see last note. But perhaps more probably a repetition of the preceding...
Blinding of Truth, 5.5–7.3
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5. a Understand $\text{}<\text{L}>\text{E}$.  

5.6. a The sense requires $\text{<->}$.  

5.7. a So again below 8.6 and Anast. I, 27, 7. The spelling is clearly due to the influence of the causative verb stin (stini).  

5.8. a Apparently either a ther- clause has been omitted, or else there is an apophasis.  

5.9. a The signs are thus arranged in the original.  

6.1. a Corrected out of $\text{<->}$.  

6.2. a $\text{<->}$ is superfluous.  

6.3. a A correction in red above the line. The omission has caused the verse-point to fall above 9 of the following sentence.  

6.4. a $\text{<->}$ is superfluous, and borrowed from $\text{<->}$ of following.  

6.5. a $\text{<->}$ is superfluous, see the same participle 6.6-7.  

6.6. a $\text{<->}$ here is superfluous, and borrowed from $\text{<->}$ of "blind man" 5.8.  

6.7. a Emend $\text{<->}$, see 10.6, beginning.  

7.3. a Insert $\text{<->}$ as in 8.5.
Blinding of Truth, 7.3–8.7
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7.3. a. The forms of the headman sign (minus) vary slightly in this papyrus, here in 7.8, etc., but they are always sufficiently like the sign for spent in 7.5 to be complemented from it. Hence too the mean of 7.1, see 7.6, with note c.

b. After it emend or . A dem. form is required after it.

c. 7.4. is a correction in red above the line.

7.5. a. Like a, but the same word in 7.2 has an add. , and b occurs for elsewhere, e.g. in 8, 7.2, beginning. b. Emend as in 7.2.

7.6. a. 123 here and in 8.1, quite exceptionally without b. b. Understand , see p. 332. c. 123 here 123 has borrowed b. from 123; see above 7.3, note a. and 7.7. a. Emend for 123, he is always being found elsewhere in this formula.

c. A large thin added as correction.

7.8. a. See above 7.3, note a; but here the correct complement 123 is added after 123.

b. The verso begins here.

c. A corruption of 123, carried still further in Max d'Anni, 8.2. See above 7.6, note a.


8.2. a. Emend .


8.3. a. See 7.3, note a. b. A correction in red above the line. The first signs are illegible, but 123 is certain. I think I see , i.e. , but of this only 123 is required by the context. c. One expects 123 “give it”, i.e. the bull.

d. After this place there are no more viewpoints.

c. is superfluous.

d. is the original. is erroneously written twice.

e. See 7.3, note a.

8.5. a. is superfluous.

c. 123 in the original is erroneously written twice.

e. See 7.3, note a.

8.6. For , see above 5.6, note b.

8.7. a. See 7.3, note a. b. An error for 123 or 123.
q.1. a Read <<.
q.2. a Read <P.

v Insert <18>.

q.3. a The scribe has substituted for J the determinative of вшие "rudder"

b It is a mistake for rii, see = 11 II = B+ in 9,4.

q.4. a Read = 99<>, see last line.

q.5. a Ditto.
n See 7,3, note a. c Emend —

q.6. a Insert <—> as in 8,5; the same omission above 7,3.

10,1. a Read <—> — , though a genuine ellipse of this suffix is perhaps just possible. b-c 6.5 cm., or as much as = и Hi sds (E1) at the end of 10,2.

10,2. a Emend rri or rri.

b-c 4.9 cm. The portion of = иг (E1) here lost occupies 3.5 cm. in 10,1, and since as can hardly take more than 1.8 cm, .. can barely have stood under .

10,3. a Presumably about 2.2 cm. is available for this word, the end of which is written .

10,4. a Insert <X> also omitted in 2,1. b See 2,1. c Restored with the help of 2,1.

10,5. a Read — 1.
Page 11 (p.4 of the verso) is separated by a vertical line from the rest of the papyrus to the left of it. Here there are a few journal entries - numerals (III, many times repeated), and a date (III, 300).
Blinding of Truth, 10.5–end
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10.5.  a Read \( \frac{2}{3} \).  b See above, 7.6, note c.

10.6.  a It is obvious that here the ordinary Ramesside oath is being used. Of the name of Amun \( \text{ alone is preserved.} \)

10.7.  a Here a correction.  b Another correction; in this expression (above 2.2; below 11.3) a preposition, perhaps \( \frac{2}{3} \) must be understood before \( \text{if} \) of 2.  c See 2.2.

10.8.  a restored from 2.3.  e Emend \( \frac{2}{3} \) for \( \text{if} \).  f–g The space suits excellently, see the same phrase in 11.3, where the writing is rather longer. At the end of the lacuna \( \approx \), i.e. \( \frac{2}{3} \) the traces suiting no other signs.

11.1.  a–b 15 cm., exactly the space employed for the same words in 10.6.

11.2.  a–b 12.5 cm. The reading \( \frac{2}{3} \) presents difficulties, the traces \( \approx \) displaying a horizontal stroke that seems inexplicable. Assuming, however, the reading to be correct, and allowing 2.7 cm. for \( \frac{2}{3} \), cf. 11.3, there remains 0.8 cm. to be filled. At the beginning \( \approx \) seems highly probable, and I am inclined to conjecture \( \frac{2}{3} \), cf. below Thoth and Seth, 7.12. 19 is probably a faulty substitute for \( \approx \).  e Emend \( \frac{2}{3} \) for \( \frac{2}{3} \).  f–g in some unpublished juridical fragments belonging to the Institut français in Cairo.

11.3.  a–b 12.8 cm., to be restored with certainty from 10.7, where the same text (except \( \frac{2}{3} \) in place of \( \frac{2}{3} \)) occupies 13.7 cm. d–f is likely here, as it is used throughout the rest of this passage.

11.4.  a–b Perhaps about 3.5 cm. I am unable to restore the final sentences of the 11.5.  a–b confused and corrected.  b Perhaps 2.3 cm.; before the rubric \( \approx \).  c–e 15 cm., of which the rubric occupied at least 9.5 cm.  f 10 cm. 11.6.  a The fragmentary remains of this line are so obscure, that it seems useless to discuss them in detail. The two unplaced fragments mentioned 8.1, note a, doubtless belong to p. 11. Their readings are rather obscure: \( \frac{2}{3} \), \( \frac{2}{3} \).
IV. The Contendings of Horus and Seth.

The length of an average is about 7 mm.

1.1. a 8 mm. only. At top left there is a trace of red of indeterminate shape. Possibly restore [ ] though even this is perhaps a little too much.
1.2. For å as sometimes elsewhere at this period. See Miltier, Hier. P II, no. 45, note 3.
1.3. a 48 mm. of which [ ] will take about 24 mm. Even if the det. R (only 3, 11) the remaining space is rather excessive for [ ] 2, 10, still more for [ ] 16, 2, as found in the similar phrases in this tale. There is sufficient space for [ ] 16, 16, 15, 15, which, moreover, seems required, since Osiris is always represented as dwelling in the West, the other world. e. d. Similarly in 1, 7. e. - d. Restored from 2, 23, 4, 12.
1.4. a 2. Sufficient traces. Cf. 14, 4, 5; also damaged, 1, 7.
1.5. a- b. Certain, cf. 1, 10 and often. c. Cf. 14, 5, where, however, meets (3, 7) is wrong. a. d. For 8, see Two Brothers, 4, 10, note e. e. Restored from 1, 1, 3, 12.
1.6. a. So too after row 16, 5. b. c. After the necessary restorations there is room for [ ] hardly more. [13, 4, note a.]
1.7. a. 37 mm. of which the quite certain restorations [ ] occupy 27 mm. This leaves 10 mm. for the first word of the speech, possibly [ ] 17, 17.
1.8. a- e. a trace of 4 very high up.
1.9. a- e. 2 mm. of which the quite certain restorations [ ] occupy 2 mm. This leaves 3 mm. for the first word of the speech, possibly [ ] 17, 4.
1.9. a. A correction in red above the line.
1.10. a- e. 13-4 mm. of which å will take 7 mm. At end æ, which I hesitantly guess to be the of ren. The phrase would then be <æ > we-ter, see Two Brothers, 5, 1, note e. e. 26 mm. less 18 mm. = 8 mm. This too little for [ ] too much for [ ] Perhaps [ ] d. The indeterminate spaces suit no other word than ren., see 14, 28 below 7, 12, 12.
Horus and Seth, 1,8-2,5

2. Eg. Stories, 38a

1.8. \( a \) Cf. 16,1 for this phrase. A clear trace of \( i \) is visible high up.
1.9. \( a \) For the word see 4,1 and Two Brothers, 18,2, note \( c \); for the entire phrase cf. Sallier I, 3,2-3. The determinative \( \text{c} \) are less usual than \( \text{d} \), but suit the sense better.
  \( b \) Clear traces of the ligature \( \text{d} \) found in \( \text{c} \) below 7,12; 10,1.
  \( c \) Barely room for \( \text{d} \).

1.10. \( a \) A quite abnormal form for \( g \), here usually \( g \). Is \( n \) intended?
  \( b \) Emend \( \text{d} \) as \( \text{d} \) in the same phrase 6,12; 7,9.

1.12. \( a \) On a newly found fragment.
  \( b \) The same mistake for \( \text{c} \) below 13,1. \( c \) Perhaps insert \( \text{d} \), this addition never failing elsewhere in this story, except once in 16,5.

2.2. \( a \) For this restoration see 10,11; 15,13.

2.3. \( a \) A substitute for \( \text{e} \) found only in hieratic; see Tollellus, Hier. Pal., II, no. 612.
  \( b \) Pecking traces. This damaged sign perhaps conceals a correction. No room for \( \text{f} \).
  \( c \) \( \text{d} \) \( \text{f} \) i.e. \( \text{g} \). The island of Schel in the First Cataract, is doubtless to be under \( \text{h} \).

2.14. \( a \) A substitute for \( \text{i} \) not uncommon in Dyn XX, e.g. Pap. jud. Turin, 6,1; Pleiade Ross.
  \( b \) A trace high up which points to \( \text{j} \), not \( \text{i} \).

\( \text{i} \) in place of the suffix \( \text{g} \) only here in this tale, and very rare outside it, e.g. Anasti 19, 17; Edinburgh, Ser. of Ant. 912.
2.5. \( a \) For this spelling cf. Wosamun 2,69, and frs \( \text{k} \) in this verb seen below 14, note \( a \).
2.7. a This same judgement-hall seems to be mentioned below 14.2 under the somewhat divergent name 倩司司司司.

2.9. a © is nearly deleted, perhaps intentionally.

2.11. a One would expect 倩司司司司司司司司司司, as always elsewhere in this phrase.

2.12. a This same writing again below 14.10; 16.1.2.

2.13. a-2 An addition in red above the line.

3.1. a For this sign see above 2.3, note a.

b Insert 其司; the suffix 2nd fem. is omitted in our tale only here.
Horus and Seth, 3.2–11

[Simplified hieroglyphs]

[Detailed hieroglyphic text]

[Further hieroglyphic text]
3.3. a-b Emend $\bar{\text{H}}\text{A}$, probably with direct obj., as Ebers, 106,14; Two Brothers, q.2. There is no good evidence for a construction with $\ldots$, but see Sallier IV, recto 2,5. Here as abbreviation for $\text{Hr}$.

3.5. $\text{id}$ for simple $\text{id}$ often again below, e.g. 4,5; 5,9; 8,4; 9,6.

3.7. $\text{id}$ a mistake for $\text{id}$.

3.8. $\text{id}$ For this sign with uraeus, see below $\text{id}$ 6,11, also Doomed Prince, 4,7,9.

3.9. a-b Emend $\text{id}$ $\text{id}$; the fantastic ending here is clearly borrowed from its 'sovereign'.
Horus and Seth, 3.11-4.6
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3,11. *This meaningless — again in the same phrase below 4,1. It is probably thoughtlessly borrowed from the adverb <99> found in 6,5; 8,5.

4,1. a See above 3,11, note a.

b Doubtless a quite correct writing of Coptic <88> from m w<88>f. Cf. the parallel form n w<88>f in Two Brothers 5,1, note e. c Insert <19>.

4,2. a For this writing see Blinding of Truth, 7,6, note c. Always so in this tale except in 5,6, where D is absent, and in 7,2, where D is omitted.

4,4. a Perhaps insert <2>; 'the Ennead' regularly shows the def. article, the other two exceptions (1,7; 12,7) being seemingly rather special cases.

4,5. a Ditto graph due to the passage from one line to another. Cf. belonging to for mm, see 3,5, note a.
Horus and Seth, 4.6-5.2
4.7. a This is an addition in red above the line, apparently a mistaken correction. Even if as be understood, the correction is unintelligible, since as is not employed to usher in direct speech after. Perhaps the scribe, in making the correction, was under the illusion that ain, not on, had preceded.

4.9. a is a later addition. The scribe occasionally makes thus his wā, which we expect here, see above 1.3, note e; 16, note e. Nevertheless, I have not ventured here to write n.š.ĕ.

4.11. a-t A strange writing for ŕ as, perhaps influenced by the word ŕ, and resulting from the treatment of as the suffix, cf. below ŕ, 14, 17, and again in this papyrus ŕ, verso, A8.

4.12. a < = >, cf. 4.9.

4.13. a A curious writing of 9 = 90 common in business documents of this date. Only here in this story, though 90 occurs not uncommonly.
Horus and Seth, 5.3–13
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5.3. "Emend <...> as everywhere else in this papyrus. is here ambiguously made, almost like III.

5.4. "For this writing of the name of the god which in M-69 is written see ZAS. xliii, 51, f. 9. The word is main, but is written without ty below; 17, 12, 13.

"The MS has with deleted. For the phrase see 5, 11.


"Here and often elsewhere below (and already 2, 9) assimilated to the det. in "child". The more correct det. of hms is °, see 1, 2; 4, 3.

5.7. "Here and in 7, 2 this writing alludes to a woman, so that there is some reason for the det. °. But note the same spelling for masc. sing. 6, 12; 7, 5, 9; 15, 12; as plural 14, 7, and of Two Brothers 15, 5.

5.8. "Probably either ° here or ° in 7, 1 has the wrong preposition. It is not clear which of the two is preferable. ° This writing again often below; see Blinding of Truth, 7, 3, note a. ° Emend ° with the dependent pron. °, cf. Blinding of Truth 6, 7; old °. Probably ° here is a corruption of °, as it does not occur elsewhere in this verb.

5.9. "Dittograph due to passing from one line to another; cf. 4, 4, 5; 5, 13, 14.

° So for ° often below. ° instead of ° owing to the horror vacui; see above 3, 5, note a.

5.10. "Here and often below throughout this episode there is a play upon words. Ostensibly ° is means ° "cattle", but secretly she is alluding to the ° "royal office" of Osiris. She speaks gives the one writing or the other indiscriminately.

5.11. "A mistake for °. So again below 6, 8.
5,13. a Understand 𓊥.  
5,14. a Ditto in passing from one line to another; so too above 4,4-5,5-6.  
  b For 𓊣𓊠, see 5,9, note 6.  
  c No division is marked, as these sentences are parenthetic in the long question ending with 𓊢. 5,14-6,1.  
  d Read 𓊣𓊠𓊢.  

6,1. a The parallel passage 5,8 has 𓊠. It is not clear which preposition is to be preferred.  

6,2. a A mistake for 𓊢 𓊢; here 𓊠 is barely distinguishable from 𓊠.  

6,3. a-b 𓊢 is written twice over, and the first occurrence has been later clumsily deleted in red.  
  c It seems meaningless here.  
  d Read 𓊢 𓊠.  

6,5. a For 𓊢 𓊢; so again 7,1.  
  b Superfluous. Or is here a space-filler?  

6,7. a A mistake for 𓊠𓊠.  

6,8. a 𓊣 i.e. perhaps 𓊣 unsuccessfully corrected into 𓊣.  
  b Read 𓊣 𓊣 as in 7,3.  
  c Cf. 𓊠𓊣 𓊣 𓊣 9,12; 15,13; and above all 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢 Wenamun 1,5-6; the writing of the suffix under 𓊣 is characteristic of late Rameside hieratic.  
  d In 𓊢 𓊢 as above 5,11.  
  e For 𓊢 𓊢 𓊢, borrowing its writing from the passive participle of 𓊣; for the writing with 𓊣 see Seth, Verbusch II, 589-90, and below, 14,1.
Horus and Seth, 6.8–7.3

L-Eg. Stories, 45

[Text in hieroglyphs]

45
6.10. a A less normal writing than $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12; 7.5}}$. b See above 4.2, note a. c See 5.5, note b.

6.11. a For this sign see 3.8, note a. b For the play upon words, see 5.10, note a. In the mouth of the stranger or, as below 6.12, of Seth the spelling $\text{\textsuperscript{3.14}}$ is expected.

6.12. a See 5.10, note a; 6.11, note b. b See above 5.7, note a.

6.14. a The horizontal stroke at bottom is here absent. For the purely fictitious sign employed in transcribing 1, see JEA xxv, 53.
b This eccentric writing of $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$ rmi “weep” several times below, also verse, Ch. 4; Anast. I, 16, 2; Amenemope 5, 6; 22, 6; 23, 9. It is probably due to the fact that $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$ was pronounced pame, so that $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$ could be taken as a phonetic sign for $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$. c Either $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$ or its later equivalent $\text{\textsuperscript{6.12}}$ here added to it is superfluous.

7.1. a The fact that the parallel passage 7.11 has $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ makes it probable that $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ here is a mere mistake. Still, $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ as dependent pronoun 2nd. sing. is found in Demotic and Graeco-Roman hieroglyphic, as also so early as in Wenamün, Ix + 2; Ix + 9, $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$; see ZAS, viii, 126. b See 6.14, note b.

7.2. a See 6.14, note b. Emend $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$. c See above 5.7, note a.
d Emend $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$ as 3.8. e Emend $\text{\textsuperscript{7.11}}$.
Horus and Seth, 7:3–12
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7.5. a See above 5.7, note a.

7.6. a Here is almost like §.

7.7. a For the play on words see 5.10, note a; 6.11, note b. One expects here §.

7.9. a Added in red above the line.

7.10. a For §9, as again below 7.13; 8.8, 10; etc. An abbreviated writing not rare at this period. b See below 8.13, note b.

7.11. a Insert <> or <> as elsewhere in this phrase, 3.5; 8.4; 16.13.

7.12. a For §7.1.2, Coptic n:pok. The writing §7.1.2 also e.g. Mayer A, 8,23; in that papyrus, however, the further development §7.1.2 is commoner.
7.12. a See 5,4, note a. b See 5,4, note b.

8.1. a One expects without 9a, infinitive + objective suffix. For the construction and sense of, Anasti. IV, 12,1.
   b had been omitted and was added as a correction above the line.

8.2. a-b One would expect these words to be in red, as in 11,2. Insert as in the rubric 11,2 quoted in the preceding note.

8.3. a Emend to, and for the verb of Two Brothers, 14,2; Blinding of Truth, 7,7. The det. has been borrowed from "grey-haired".

8.4. a was omitted, and was added later as a correction above the line.
   b A perverse writing of the verb , which seems to have been specially liable to distortions of this kind, see Two Brothers 12,3; 18,10. Words containing , were liable to receive the determinative , e.g. , .
   c For , see 3,5, note a.

8.5. a Corrected out of .

47a
Horus and Seth, 8.6-9.1
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8.7. a Read 𓊂𓊂𓊂, as everywhere else in this story.
8.8. a For 𓊂𓊂𓊂, see above 7.10, note a.

2 Read <𓊂𓊂𓊂> as 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 (in some cases with signs ablated to mere dashes and not properly counted). Here at the end of the line the writer had no room for these superfluous appendages.

8.9. a Insert 𓊂𓊂𓊂; the pronominal suffix is regular in this phrase. b So again 13, 3.4, doubtless because this word was pronounced ꜬGirls, cf. Coptic ꜬGirls. Apart from this word, Ꜭ never appears in the suffix of the 1st. plural, here regularly Ꜭ.
8.10. a Ꜭ with Ꜭ here more like Ꜭ, cf. 9.2, near beginning.

b For Ꜭ𓊂𓊂𓊂, see above 7.10, note a.

8.11. a Ꜭ is a later addition. b This strange writing of Ꜭ only here in this papyrus, which prefers the still stranger Ꜭ. Elsewhere it is not rare, cf. Ꜭ Ꜭ Ꜭ Wenamun, 2, 64, 67; cf. also Ꜭ Ꜭ Ꜭ Ꜭ, "fish," e.g. Anast IV, 13.10.

8.12. a For Ꜭ, cf. 3.5, note a. b Not Ꜭ, as the word has been read. It is the N. Eg. Ꜭ Beni Hasan, II, 4.13, and the Coptic Ꜭ "yarn," OLZ, 1924, 569.
8.13. a Ꜭ The sign is too large and important for simple Ꜭ.

b For this purely artificial sign used in transcription see JEA xv. 53 and the references there given.

9.1. a Ꜭ here is not a true Ꜭ, but Ꜭ (so at the end of this line) provided with a dot to assimilate it to Ꜭ. See again below 9.5.6.7.
Horus and Seth, 9.1-10

[Hieroglyphic text]
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Horus and Seth, 9.1-10

9.2. a For 𓊬. See 3.5, note 𓊬. 𓊬 is here like 𓊬, see 8.10, note 𓊬. b Imperative, with a mixture of oratio recta and oratio obliqua. So too below 9.5.

c-d Emend 𓊬 𓊬 𓊬. The 𓊬 of 𓊬, 𓊬(t) serves also as the suffix of 𓊬 𓊬; for this word with suffix see 9.2-5; 13, 10, though the possessive adjective also occurs, e.g. 9.6. 𓊬 is an extreme degradation of the imperative 𓊬 𓊬 as found above and in the related passage Sallier IV, recto, 2-10-31. The successive stages were 𓊬 𓊬, cf. 𓊬 𓊬 for 𓊬 𓊬 Harris I, 7/414; then 𓊬 𓊬 under the influence of the prep 𓊬; and lastly, 𓊬 𓊬 with 𓊬 both retained in the stem and repeated erroneously as suffix, cf. the participle (?) 𓊬 𓊬. Anast., II, 37.

9.4. a Read 𓊬 as above 9.1; cf. too below 9.7.

b Emend 𓊬 𓊬. The stroke is written 𓊬 with a curve at bottom as often elsewhere, e.g. 9.6, but here exaggerated.

9.5. a For 𓊬 𓊬, see above 9.2, note c-d, and in 9.3; 9.7 (bis). Here the 𓊬 is very small. b See above 9.1, note 𓊬.

9.6. a See above 9.1, note 𓊬.

9.7. a Read 𓊬 𓊬.

b Or else 𓊬. Both transcriptions are defensible. c Added in red above the line as a correction and doubtless in another hand.
**Horus and Seth, 9, 10-10, 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L-Eq. Stories, 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The text is in Ancient Egyptian script, featuring hieroglyphs. The page appears to be a page from a historical or mythological text, possibly related to Egyptian mythology given the context of the title and the script style. The content is presented in a table format, with the text arranged in columns, likely to provide a structured breakdown of the narrative or informational content.
9, 11. * One □ has here been omitted through lack of space. Similarly 15, 9, end.
9, 12. * For this writing see above 6, 8, note c.

10, 1. * The MS has ⍋, with □ incompletely deleted.

N.B. To the left of 10, 6, in the margin, is the diacritical sign ḫ, which is
found also in other papyri, but the meaning of which has not been determined.

10, 6. * This here is unnecessary. If retained, it should come after 17 £.
Horus and Seth, 10.7–11.3
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10,9. a Doubtless for ставка; cf. 겠습니다 for  предострел in Two Brothers 7,6. b The MS reading yields no known word; endimento is an easy correction.

11,3. a II is a correction added later above the line.
11.3. a $g\varepsilon$ with the $\varepsilon$ small and almost like $\varepsilon$.
11.4. a Read $\nu \nu$ as later in this line.
   b Here $\varepsilon$ is even smaller and less recognizably than in 11.3.

11.6. a A later addition in red above the line.

11.7. a $\frac{1}{2}$; perhaps $\frac{1}{2}$ would be a more correct transcription for the form of $\varepsilon$ see 11.6, end.
   b Or $\frac{1}{2}$, see 9.7, note b.

11.8. a-c Doubtless to be emended into $\frac{3}{2} < \lambda > \varepsilon$.
   c Read $\frac{1}{2}$. Cf. the similar corruption $\frac{3}{2} 1/2; 13,1.$

11.9. a Corrupted out of $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ or the like under the influence of $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$. For a similar corruption of the old $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ cf. $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ Anaat. 112,7. b For $\varepsilon a$, see 3.5, note a.

11.11. a Or $\frac{1}{2}$; see 9.7, note b.
   b $\frac{1}{2}$; certainly to be transcribed so and not $\frac{1}{2}$, but the ligature for $\varepsilon$ is badly made.
12,2. a $\text{R}$ is a correction added in black above the line.

b-c The papyrus shows $\text{R} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$, with a cross (as in the Ebers papyrus, see 2A5, xxxi, 61) to show where the omitted words are to be inserted. These, namely $\overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$ (note the deletion at the end) have been added at the top of the page. The omission was clearly due to homoeoteleuton.

12,3. a Or $\overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$, see 9,7, note b.

b I In all probability a mere variant of $\overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$, see Two Brothers, 10,9, note b; 19,10, note b. For the phrase of Blinding of Truth, 5,1.

12,4. a For $\overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$, as again 13,8; 15,10.

12,5. a For $\overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}} \overline{\text{R}}$, see 3,5, note a.

12,7. a For the omission of the definite article $<\text{R}>$ see 4,4, note a. Here the omission might perhaps be defended on the supposition that the title in which it occurs is a Middle-Egyptian one.

12,8. a $\overline{\text{R}}$. The meaning of these signs here, and indeed of the word which they determine, is quite obscure.
Horus and Seth, 12.9-13.5

L-Eq.Stories, 54
12.9. *For this spelling see 4,2, note a; Blinding of Truth, 7,6, note c.

13.1. *For $\equiv \breve{d}$, as also in 1,12.

13.2. *So several times in this papyrus (here; 16,7,8; verso B28) as a variant of $\equiv \breve{d}$ "when"(5,1; 14,10; 15,7): a new fact to add to those collected 2ÄS xvi, 6.

13.3. *For 9$\equiv \breve{d}$, see 7,10, note a.

b-c "until one has". For this strange, but clear, writing see JEA. xvi, 234.

d Here and again in 13,4 1st pers. plural, see above 8,9, note b.

Ex $\triangleright$ Here and below the hieratic sign for $\equiv$ has some resemblance to $\equiv$, and has borrowed from the latter the $\equiv$ which accompanies it in certain words, e.g. $\equiv \equiv$ "cubit" 13,8 (from $\equiv$). *Emend to simple genetival $\equiv$.

13.4. *Read $\equiv \breve{d}M$ without $\equiv$ as in all other instances of this phrase, for which see Blinding of Truth, 5,2; here, 1,10; 2ÄS xiv, 8,4.

e See above 13,3, note e. *For $\equiv$, see 3,5, note a.
Horus and Seth, 13,5-14,2

L-Eg. Stories, 55
13.7. a For 闪过, see 3.5, note a.

13.8. a 闪过 for 闪过, as in the related verb 闪在, Two Brothers, 12.3.

b See above 13.2, note c. c 闪过 is presumably a mistake for 闪过, and further 闪过 should be inserted before the numerals.

d For 闪过, as also 12.4; 15.10.

13.9. a We should expect 闪过 to be rubricised. From this point onwards the scribe occasionally writes in black formulae which are normally in red.

b This word projects far beyond the usual level of the line-endings, but shows no sign of being a later addition.

c The numeral is in red (cf. above 13.8), the 闪过 in black.

14.1. a 闪过 is perhaps for 闪过, and the verb-form resembles the perfect passive participle, see Selke, Verbum, II, § 939, 2, b, and for the 闪过 § 940.2. See too above 6.8, note e.

b We seem to require some such form as 闪过, to 闪过.

c A later addition above the line. Probably the scribe intended 闪过 to 闪过, to 闪过. a Here and henceforth without wings, which were clearly marked in 5.3; 8.8; 14.1.
Horus and Seth, 14.2-9

L-Eg Stories, 56
Horus and Seth, 14.2-9

2-Eq.Stories, 56a

14.2. a Evidently an alternative form of the name \( \text{m} \) \( \text{n} \). See the note a on 14,2 at the bottom of p. 55a.

14.3. a The name of this hall is identically written in 3,6 save for \( \text{d} \) in place of \( \text{t} \) at the end. b Everywhere else in these parallel sentences \( \text{d} \) follows \( \text{m} \).

14.4. a More probably \( \text{d} \) than \( \text{t} \), cf. 2,7.

b Or \( \text{d} \), see 9,7, note b.

14.5. a One would expect \( \text{d} \) to be written as a rubric. But this phraseology is found only here in the story.

b On this sign see 2,3, note \( \text{d} \). Only here without phonetic signs. Read \( \text{d} \).

c Emend \( \text{d} \) as probably in the closely parallel passage 1,5. So too 3,7, etc.

14.6. a On the determinative of \( \text{hms} \) see 5,5, note \( \text{b} \).

14.7. a For this writing of \( \text{d} \) see 4,11, note \( \text{a} \) - \( \text{b} \). b See 5,7, note \( \text{a} \).

14.8. a Doubtless a part of the fifth name. For this reason I have marked no division.

14.9. a \( \text{d} \) \( \text{t} \) must be taken as determining the entire name. But in that case \( \text{d} \) should have a determinative of its own. Emend \( \text{d} \).
Horus and Seth, 14, 9 - 15, 4
14, 9. a has been added above the line as a correction, apparently by a different hand. b-c These words ought to have been rubricized, as in 7, 6. Emend as in that passage. The same omission. 
14, 10. a Emend or . Here is borrowed from the word . The same miswriting below 15, 10. c Here one expects a rubric, as again several times on this page. c-d was written twice, and on its second occurrence has been clumsily deleted in red. For possibly emend . The infinitive seems impossible here, and the passive very unlikely.
14, 11. a Above was found as a writing of , see 9, 2, note c-d. Here and in 15, 2 below it represents , the ordinary L-Eg. term for "answer" a letter. Probably metathesis had taken place in both cases, > ; <.
b-c Emend as in 4, 3, 6, 6.

14, 12. a ought to be rubricized.

15, 1. a ought to be rubricized. b For , see 7, 10, note a.

15, 2. a For , see above 14, 11, note a.

c Emend . c-19 or 19 is possibly a precursor of the writing 19 found in letters of the beginning of Dyn. See particularly 19 Pop.Bib Nat. 198, 3, 5-6, which also illustrates the use of the preposition here. Henceforth written without the initial (or 9) as always hitherto.
15, 3. a-b ought to be rubricized. c See above 15, 2, note d. d Doubtless to be emended into (921) as above 15, 1, ad finem.
Horus and Seth, 15, 4-10

L-Eg. Stories, 58
Horus and Seth, 15, 4-10

15, 4. a Corrected very roughly into 9. The writing is so confused that the
reading 9 might possibly be called in question.  b  with a superfluous stroke.

15, 5. a Emend 9 9a.  b Emend 9 9b; the omission of phonetic
complements is contrary to rule in hieratic.  c Emend 9 9b; but so again 14.
d Insert 9; see above 14, 12.

15, 6. a Probably it was the author, not the scribe, who was responsible for
this strange change of person.  b Badly written, with a correction.

15, 7. a 9 is a correction added above the line possibly by another hand.

b Understand 9 9b.  c Insert 9, as above 15, 6.

15, 8. a 9 9a. This formula ought to be rubricized as above 7, 6. But it
occurred in block 14, 9, with the same omission of 9 10a 11a after m-dt.
15, 9. c See above 15, 2, note d.

d As in 9, 11, there has not been room at the end of the line for this name in its
full form, and 9 has been written in place of 9.

15, 10. a For 9 9a as also in 12, 4; 13, 8.  b For 9 or 9, see 14, 10, note a. This
accumulation of determinatives arises as follows: first 9 9a are reduced to mere strokes, and then
the need for the explicit expression of 9 9a causes these to be added in less cursive form.
Horus and Seth, 15, 10–16, 4

[Phoenician script text]

[Hieroglyphic text]

[Continued hieroglyphic text]
Horus and Seth, 15,10-16,4

15,10. a ḫn is here for ḥn passive, 1st pers. plur. b For this abbreviation of ḫn see 5,9, note b.
15,11. a For ḫn as often above.
15,12. a See 5,7, note a.
 b A correction added above the line, possibly by another hand. c For this sign see 2,3, note a.
15,13. a On this writing see 6,8, note c.
 b-c Only here in place of ḫn.
16,2. a ḫn is for ḫn, see 3,5, note a.
 b ḫn here represents the suffix 1st. fem. sing. b; a goddess is speaking.
 c ḫn has been added in red below the line, possibly by another hand.
16,3. a Emend ḫn, as in 3,5; 8,4; 16,1.
Horus and Seth, 16, 4 - end

L-Eg. Stories, 60
16, 4. a This writing in place of the normal [符号] also above 15, 5.

16, 5. a On this complex determinative (again below 16, 6, 7) see 15, 10, note c.

16, 6. a ought to be rubricized.

16, 7. a For [符号] in place of [符号] see above 13, 2, note a.

b The ligature [符号] is doubtless a corruption of [符号], i.e. [符号], but can hardly be transcribed otherwise than by [符号]. For as determinative of [符号], cf. 109 = [符号]. Harris I, 277. So often. [In Dyn. XX]

c During the last pages the scribe has written in black many introductory formulae that ought to have been rubricized. It is nevertheless surprising that this negligence has been extended to the colophon.

c The group is completely unintelligible as it stands. Can it possibly be a corruption of [符号] or [符号]?
V. The Misfortunes of Wenamun, from a papyrus now in the Moscow Museum.
V. The Misfortunes of Wenamun.

Abbreviations. G = Golénischeff's text in Rec. de Trav. XX, 135 foll. G' = Gol's earlier transcription of p. 1 in his Russian article. E = E. L. Green's collection of G with the original papyrus. (E) = readings of G left by E. L. Green without comment. photo = photographs of the original possessed by, or lent to me. N.B. The prepositions (= old R), (= old L), and 1θ are very often omitted. Such omissions are not as a rule mentioned in the following notes.

1.1. "So G' and all photos, confirmed by source; G(E) wrongly. The dates in 1.1.3, 4 are clearly irreconcilable, but since no firm basis for emendations is indicated, no alterations of the MS readings are here proposed." A variant of φ = not uncommon in and after Dyn. XXI; doubtless derived from the cursive hieratic writing φ frequent in Dyn. XX. In dates written in hieratic the numbers for the days are always laid on their sides, see Müller, Hier. Pal. II, nos. 67 foll.
11. a-b. Of £ only the dot is visible, and of the stroke only the top. After this a low long group, well suiting [22]. c. For the space-filler, see 1.9, note a.

12. a-b. Perhaps restore [2222]. The word ḫnd will have been rubricized. Possibly the genitival — following it is unnecessary.

So G, wrongly questioned by E. Interpretation is, however, difficult. Possible solutions are: (1) dtrw is really for once taken as a feminine, cf. ḫnd below 2.75; also see Horus and Seth 1.10, note b—c; (2) m dtrw being a well-known phrase, ḫd is superfluous, and is perhaps a mere abusive anticipation of the initial pronounced ḫ of ḫnd-tyw, a solution that might apply also to ḫnd 2.75; (3) less likely is the supposition that ḫd is semi-phonetic for [22], since the phrase [22] seems redundant. Pap. Dayden 3.50, 4.40, 3.32 uses ḫd, not m.

A ḫ is a semi-phonetic spelling of the infinitive ḫn, Coptic age; so too often below, e.g. 1.22; 3.4; but ḫnt, Pap. hier. Strasburg 23, recto b = ZA 1.11, Dyn. XV. e. G.E.; — is certain from photo, though obscured by a fold.

13. a. Or else ḫ with a space-filler; in this story ḫn there” is often either (1) ḫh, e.g. 1.4; 1.5; 1.6; 3.2; 3.5; 6.1; or else (2) ḫh only, e.g. 2.7; 2.20. b. ḫ only here in place of ḫd.

14. a. ḫ [22]; the stroke below ḫ is probably fortuitous. b. Wörterb. IV, 44 interprets this Tef depiever as smty “judge” doubtless on account of the rare ḫ and the rare ḫḥ “hear,” “judge;” this seems more likely than to take the word as a miswriting of ḫḥ, though the first signs suggest ḫd as a palaegraphical possibility.

15. a. So E, correcting the slight displacement of ḫ in G; the photo shows no trace of ḫ, but the edge of the papyrus is shown turned back upon itself.

17. a. (twice). —— “whether” “or.” see the passages quoted in my Index of Mes. p. 16, n. 28.

b. This strange writing of [2222] (again below 2.12; Anast. I, 10, 5) comes about by prefixing ḫ to a determinative its more usual phonetic writing. See ZA 1.76 and cf. [2222]; less close analogies are [2222], [2222]; also below [2222]; [2222].

19. a. A semi-phonetic writing of [2222] (cf. the full writings 3.9; 2.36) "until they have done"... "hears," Coptic yorcor, see JEA, XXXI, 231. Cf. below 3.9; 3.13; 3.66, and possibly also 3.4 (damaged).

20. a. For old Ṣ in this name, i.e. “whatever his name may be;” see Griffith, Rylands Pap., s.v. Ṣn; Setne (TJ, 3.6) for demotic examples.
Erman had already realized that the narrative contained in the damaged and threadbare fragment called p.3 by Götzenschaff must belong between 1,22 and 1,24, foll. Against this view, however, mitigated the fact that p.3, top, looked like the top of a page with a protecting strip. At the last moment Dr. Kisch has examined the photos with great care and has concluded that the supposed p.3 is a sheet that has become unglued from the well-preserved sheets over and under it. The supposed margin at top of p.3 is really underlap, and the tongue projecting down with the four signs numbered 1,4, 7 fits a lacuna in the left-hand part of the threadbare sheet. Similarly, the bottom of p.3 slightly overlaps the sheet with x+1 foll. This theory is, as seen above, brilliantly confirmed by the philological evidence.
1,21. a. This, the only example of the plural of #a 2007 "day" in the story, is also
the only case where ~ is written; for the singular 1,692 see 1, x+16, 2, 6.58. For
the present plural writing of the Akkadianic plural(s).

1,22. a. See above, 1, 12, note 2 for this writing.

1,23. a-b (2) The sign before #6, left unread by G.E. is just possibly #6, but
is very far from certain. The traces of the preceding word are illegible. I had thought of
#6 1, x+1) but the trace before #6 does not really suit #4 and 1, x+1 has as dat. #6 with
#6. Near the beginning of line we seem to have #4, which it is tempting to restore as #6.
If this is correct, we should then have the construction [th ... J (w); "imagery! how! ... me;
for #6 as dependent pron. 1st sing. see below 2, 26; Blinding of Saul, 67; Mayer A.2,2, end.
The writing with #6 only here and 2, 39 in this story, which has #6 for the infinitive,
see 1, 12, note 2. Here we have a participle, and probably so in 2, 39.

d-e I had guessed
#6, but Jescher's reasoning makes it clear that we have here the first letters of im
"sea." It is very curious that the definite article p# should be absent; but its absence can be ex-
plained by assuming a phrase 8m# in "go to sea." This is the one and only real difficulty in
the way of Jescher's reconstruction on the philological side. The top of this # in 3, 1 seems
visible in 1, 23, but owing to the bad mounting of p. 3 it is impossible to be certain from photo.

3. Probable from photos; omitted by G.E. E rightly #6 for #6 of G.

3.2. a-b (2) So photo; omitted by G.E.; it is not certain whether the first word should be read
as #6 or as #6. [1, 22] c Not #6 as G.E. but clearly #6; photo D; cf. 2, 17.

d-e Owing to the differing scale of photos, and present condition of p. 3 the size of the lacuna is
difficult to estimate. At #6 1, 12) certainly not #6; as G.E. but #6; I imagine some such restoration
as #6 (see below). 

G.E.; E. 9; 9 is certain.

3.3. a) see #6 in photo, much like #6 in 1, 14. A If Jescher's view be correct, this restoration is
necessary; no trace of #6. Not present time (may be) but doubtless prospective. #6; G.E. omit.

b) G.E. #6, but I am not sure it is not #6 (photo). f Uncertain; an unknown word. #6 photo; G.

3.4. a) See 1, 19, note a. T# recognized by me in photo before Jescher's reconstruction confirms
G.E. #6, but photo of p. 3 shows only a gap now filled by #6 of 1, 26.

3.5. a So E. photo; G omits. c 1, 27 #6 here fits in wonderfully well; tail of #6 photo; cf. 1, 22
for the word. At G(E) read #6, which is also possible.
Wenamun, 3, 6-14; \(1, x+1 \) to \( x+2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>more than (\frac{1}{3}) line lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>about (\frac{1}{3}) line lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\frac{1}{3}) line lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| (continued on p. 65) |

Fischer has made it highly probable (see p. 63, bottom) that \( p. 3 \) overlaps the lower half of \( p. 1\). In 3, 14, which gives nearly entire, are seen traces which may be top of \( \delta \). Much more contains, further on, trace of the top of \( \delta \) in \( \delta \) itself.
Wenamun, 3, 6–14; 1, x+1 to x+2

3.7. a photo; G 6; E deleted the note of interrogation. b Read \( \frac{E}{\text{see}} \), but E noted that there was no trace of this and insufficient space. c G shows the name entire, but without \( 1 \); of this I think to see traces in the photo.

3.8. a–b Certain, recognized by Gerny from the photos.

c For the space-filler see above 1.9, note a. d G 6; E 6; from the photo, \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) seems more probable, besides suiting the sense better. e–f The sense must here be: "I said to the owners of the ship: I have taken your money."

3.9. a See 1.9, note a. b–c Perhaps restore \( \frac{[\text{G}]}{[\text{E}]} \), which fits the available space well. Before the lacuna \( \frac{[\text{G}]}{[\text{E}]} \), omitted by G, but given by E, is certain.

3.10. a So photo; G 6. b So perhaps the photos; hardly 122; G.E omit. c So G/E in the photo. I think I see traces of both \( \frac{g}{g} \) and \( \frac{h}{h} \), though \( \frac{g}{g} \) is superfluous and ought to be accounted an error. d–e G 6; \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) seems certain, and \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) is the only one that seems to me certain, and \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) must be meant ("but as for you") though there is no trace of \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) over the \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \). G is possibly right in reading \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) for \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) after the lacuna, but the sign might also be a rather abnormal \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \). \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) seems certain.

3.11. a–b \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) The sign following \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) is a puzzle; it demands two ticks \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) and the same is true of \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \); G and E have no proposal. c–d G 6; E 6; \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) is a doubtful "set", with 6 perhaps borrowed from \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) or clay. It seems certain from photo; this passage and 1. x+2, end, mutually confirming one another.

An error for \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) i.e. \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \), "on the shore of"; \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) correctly 1. x+13, 2. 4k; \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) almost as here, 2. 62; intermediate writing \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \), 2. 14.

3.12. a–b G 6. 8. 5. This spelling of the old \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \), in Dyn \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \), occurs often below, e.g. 2. 30; also Max. d'Anii, 4. 10, 5. 5. The \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) is written large like \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \), and this, combined with \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) following, suggests the influence of \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \). e See 1.6, note d. f–g Restored from 1. x+13, 1. x+2 (see notes thereon); tail of \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) is visible. At end \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \) may have been omitted or written \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \).

1. x+1. a G 6; E 6 wrongly. b Suffice 1st; sing. after a fem. infini.; see 2. 74, note d; Horus and Seth, 4. 9.

1. x+2. a G 6; E 6; E "dod 20"; infra seems certain from photo, and is confirmed by 2. 27. c G, restores similarly, but wrongly omits \( \frac{\text{G}}{\text{E}} \); see 1. x+6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wenamun, 1, x+2 to 1, x+11</th>
<th>L-Eq. Stories, 65a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, x+3. a For $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ as dependent pronoun, 2nd masc. sing., see Horus and Seth, 7,1, note a; so too in this same phrase 3,12; 1, x+9; but $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ above 1,20. b $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ wrongly without $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+4. a Sufficient traces visible in photo; cf. 1, x+5. b The writing of ing with $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$, also e.g. 2,8, 15, alternates with forms without det. e.g. 12; 28, 11. Examples with $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ are rare at any period, but cf. Max Anc. 4, 12. c $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ at the end of the lacuna \text{\textdegree} \text{\textdegree}, which suggests $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$; however, &quot;red&quot; is written $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ without $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ in 1, x+7; 1, x+12. d This writing with initial $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ often below e.g. 2, 27-39; examples occur sporadically at all periods, see Erman, Zum ägypt. Wortverhältnis, i, in Stift. Berlin Ak d Aus 1912, 958, n. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+5. a Initial $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ also below 2, 68 and very often in papyri of this date, a shortening of older $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$; but in this tale $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ without tick is commoner, see 1, x+15; 2, 26, 63. 1, x+6. a The strokes $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ also in the preposition $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ below 2, 3, see too Horus and Seth, 15, 2, note b. Such writings are common at this period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+8. a Here there is a small $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$, almost a dot; under $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$; without $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ in 1, x+9, 11. b-c For $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ &quot;so says he, namely (n = old m)......&quot; So again below 1, x+11, and for the construction of $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ for $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ also in \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \text{\textit{\textdegree}}, Papy. Mayer A, 9, 19; Gardner, De Theban Ostraca, p. 162, n. 20; Pet, Tomb. Robberies, p. 165. d $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ in this tale occasions great difficulty. My conclusions are as follows: (1) it negatives a statement 1, x+23; 2, 11 (bis). 12. 13. 27 (?), (2) negation in a question expecting the answer &quot;yes&quot; = latin nonne? 1, x+8; x+9; x+20; (3) precedes another negation in a question expecting answer &quot;yes&quot; and therefore perhaps simply interrogative particle = old $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$, 1, x+22; x+28; 2, 27. 49. 65. 66. 77. 82; (hardly double negation as emphatic statement; 2 pis, 1977, 8, n. 1, see especially 2, 77, a clear question) (4) interrogative particle in question expecting answer &quot;no&quot; = latin nè? 2, 81 (hardly surely, as noted).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+9. a The same phrase 3, 12; 1, x+3; see note a on letter. b Negative question, see 1, x+8, note d, under e. c See 1, x+8, note a. d Certain; recognized by G. and by J. from photo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+10. a So G(E) photo; one expects $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ as e.g. 1, x+2. b See above 1, 12, note d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, x+11. a Without following $\text{\textit{\textdegree}}$ as in 4, 47; cf. too 3, 37; 2, 76. b See above 1, x+8, note a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wenamun, 1, x+11 to 1, x+21

L. Eq. Stories, 66
\[1, x + 11. \] a For \( \wedge \) see note \( b-c \).

\[1, x + 12. \] a See above \( 3, x + 11. \) note \( c-d \); \( \wedge \) wrongly \( \wedge \) or \( \wedge \).

\[1, x + 13. \] a So again with a space-filling dot 2,22.80. b See Möller, Hier.Pal.100, no. 33; used wrongly for \( \wedge \) below in 2,22.

c \( \wedge \), there is a space, not noted by G.E., between \( \wedge \) and \( \wedge \), and a trace \( \wedge \) is visible therein. This might be trace of \( \wedge \), though the photo shows no other indication of the sign. Grammatically, \( \wedge \) \( \wedge \) seems preferable to the accepted reading \( \wedge \) \( \wedge \).

\[1, x + 14. \] a \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \). The photo seems to show \( \wedge \) but the oblique stroke may be fortuitous. The sign can hardly be read as \( \wedge \), which has here a quite different shape.

d \( \wedge \), omitted by G.E. is here for \( \wedge \); as again in 2,23.53.59; see too above, in Blinding of Truth, 3,7, note \( b \).

e \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \) "Nur eines Gruseppe, gewiss, " The photo shows \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \) is probable, and the preceding sign, very unlike \( \wedge \) in \( x + 15 \), may owe its strange appearance to the roughness of the papyrus at this point. If \( \wedge \) be correct, there will be ditto at the beginning of the next line.

\[1, x + 15. \] a A common writing of \( \wedge \) at this period, particularly in cursive MSS.

\[1, x + 16. \] a A miswriting for \( \wedge \), incorporating \( \times \) with the principle discussed 1,17, note \( b \).

\[1, x + 17. \] a \( \wedge \) here and several times below after \( \wedge \) almost a mere dot. b

\[1, x + 19. \] a For this writing with one \( \wedge \) only see below \( 1, x + 24 \); 2,59.

\[1, x + 20. \] a Negative question, see above \( 1, x + 8 \), note \( d \), under \( c \).

\[b \] The reading is quite certain except perhaps as regards the determinatives; cf. Hour and Seth, 75. c \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \); \( \wedge \) "fehlte überhaupt..." Perhaps my \( \wedge \) is only the continuation of \( \wedge \).

\[1, x + 21. \] a So G.E.; not visible in photo, which shows the edge of the papyrus folded over.
Wenamun, 1, x+21 to 2,8

1, x+21. a Semi-phonetic for 𓊲𓊳𓊼𓊰𓊴, see ZHS LXIII, 6. So too below 1, x+22; 2,28; 2,6.
b 1, x+22. a Not visible in photo owing to the folding over of the papyrus edge.
   b. perhaps here for interrogative 𓊹, see 1, x+2; note 𓊹, under 𓊹.

1, x+23. a Not visible in photo; see 1, x+22, note a. b Reg Qatar "not": see 1, x+2; note 𓊹, under 𓊹. c Coptic 𓊹𓊳𓊼𓊰𓊴; cf. 𓊹𓊰𓊴 (m) di- or 2,29. d Interrogative particle, see 1, x+2; note 𓊹, under 𓊹.

1, x+24. a Not visible in photo; see 1, x+22, note a.
   b. With only one 𓊹 as 1, x+19; 2,29.

2.1. a The spelling is clearly influenced by 𓊰𓊳𓊼𓊰𓊴 and seems to point to the reading 𓊰𓊼𓊰𓊴. For this troublesome problem see my Notes on... Sineh, pp. 160; also Wörler III, 483. b Interrogative particle, see 1, x+2; note 𓊹, under 𓊹.
   c. 𓊥𓊰𓊼𓊰𓊴; for the reading 𓊰𓊼𓊰𓊴 see above 1, 9, note a. d See 1, 13, note 𓊹.

2.3. a This writing of the preposition again below in 2, 59. See too above 1, x+6, note a; and P. Mayer A, 3, 7; 8, 7; 9, 7, 29.

2.4. a See above 1, 2, note b.

2.7. a is made large like 𓊳. See above 3, 12, note c. b See below 2, 28, note a.

2.8. a So 𓊳; the rather scanty traces seem to suit. For the word cf. 1, 19.
2,8. a C §; the traces visible in photo suit the text excellently.
b For this writing see 1, x + 8, note b.

2,9. a Here probably with ≈, not Y as above 1, 11, 3,8. b “different things, right
see Wörterb. II, 354; so written often in the Decree of Pinedjem, e.g., 38, 40 (God’s number).
That the curious writing with ≈ above, instead of after, ≈ is purely graphic, seems
proved by ≈ whatever below 2, 70, see note b thereon. The sign ≈ similarly above
a suffix which is to be read before it, see 1,6, note a.

2,11. a (twice). Negative statement, see above 1, x + 8, note d, under d.

2,12. a Negative statement, see last note.

2,13. a Negative statement, see 1, x + 8, note d, under d.

2,14. a 1 at the beginning of a word is abnormal and a peculiarity of the
scribe of Wenamün and the God Glossary, see Borchardt, Altkam-Territorien, I, 28.
b Exceptionally so for 2, or rather for 2 below 2, 19; Horus and Seth, 15,7.
c A miswriting of 10, see above 3, 11, note e.

2,15. a < ⊂ ⊳ > has been omitted in passing from this line to the next. So already
Erman, ZAS. XXXIII, 9.

2,16. a-b Since 1 is certain from photo, the construction is clearly similar to that
of 2, 15 above, and the only really uncertain word in the restoration is 1.

2,17. a Photo 1; the trace is decisive for 1, but I cannot restore. b 1:

c "; the vertical sign appears not to be 1. e The traces suit well.

2,18. a This writing, cf. above 1, 17, with note b.

b-c Abnormal writing for 1 ⊂ ⊳ .
2,20. a... is superfluous, see grg. us immediately following. If not a mistake, it
can only be regarded as a very early example of the N (for m) found in Coptic before
the direct object; on this see Spiegelberg's remarks, Rec de Trav. xxvii, 34.
b See above, 1,13, note a.

2,22. a A writing of ṣriny parallel to that of the adverb ṣriny dealt with in
1,13, note a; so too again below 2,23, 77, 78. b Similarly with space-filling dot, l.x+13, 280.
c ṣu like the dot of ṣm, l.x+13, see note b thereon. The same word has the
child-determinative ṣu below in 2,23; this is better, the meaning being "silly" like
a child.
2,23. a See last note. b For ṣu ṣu, as is written in l.x+22; ṣu for ṣu, see l.x+14,
note b. c For this writing of ṣu ṣu ṣu, c100, see above 1,3, note a.

2,24. a For ṣu at the beginning of this name see above 2,14, note a.

2,25. a-b So G.(E); both photos show a lacuna. c "namely...", see l.x+8, note b.c.

2,26. a Photo ṣu; almost like ṣu or ṣu. b See 1,6, note a. c Dependent pron. 1st.
sing.; for this spelling see 1,23, note a-b.

2,27. a ṣu perhaps the simple negation here; a doubtful case. See above 1.x+8,
note d, under (1). b Negative question, see 1.x+8, note d, under (3); ṣu here is fn ṣu.

2,28. a This papyrus observes the usual L-Eq. distinction of ṣu (or ṣu) with two
ticks (or one) for the value ṣw, ṣu without tick for the value ṣm, see 2,5, 79. Cf.
the same distinction Horus and Seth, 14, 5. b See above 2,14, note a. For ṣu ṣu,
see 1.x+9, note a (p.77a). d See 1,6, note a.

2,29. a For ṣu ṣu ṣu ṣu ṣu; cf. above 1.x+23, with note b-c.

b For the determinative, see 1.x+4, note b. c Read ṣu ṣu ṣu, see 3/2, note c.
2,30. "See 3,12, note c.

2,32. "Between — and 6 a deleted vertical sign, probably 4.

2,34. <\(\overset{\sim}{\text{7}}\)\(\overset{2}{\text{3}}\)> has been omitted; see above 2,30. "See 3,12, note c.

"C (E) \(\overset{\sim}{\text{2}}\) ; photo clearly 7.

2,35. A chief scribe or at least a unique writing. Wörterb. II, 166 suggests that it may be merely a misspelling of \(\overset{\sim}{\text{c}}\) "officer." The phrase \(\overset{\sim}{\text{c}}\) seems to have influenced the writing.

2,36. "See above 2,9, note b.

b-c See 1,19, note a.

2,37. "For this spelling see 1,\(x\times4\), note d.

2,38. \(\overset{\sim}{\text{4}}\) \(\overset{\sim}{\text{7}}\) \(\overset{\sim}{\text{4}}\); \(\overset{\sim}{\text{4}}\) is E's proposal, and is rendered practically inevitable by \(\overset{\sim}{\text{4}}\) following — not \(\overset{\sim}{\text{4}}\) as G read. But the form is very strange, and differs from that used by the same scribe Col. Glass. 3,2.

2,39. "See 1,\(x\times4\), note d.
Wenamun, 2,39-48

2, 39. a The writing with Δ appears to indicate a participle "who had gone" see above 1,23, note c and as exact parallel to the present sentence Two Brothers, 11,8. However, we might expect the prothetic 3p. b 3p, see 1,8, note a. c With only one Δ, as above 1, x+19; x+24.

2,40. a G(E) read Δ for Δ; the sign is much damaged, but Δ seems barely possible. b Δ for the reading θ1Δ see Bull. de l'Inst. françois xxxiii, 173. c Δ a combination of Δ and Δ, as E recognized. d Δ; G: [Δ]; E "ob " oder Δ?* The final sign is probably a misspelled Δ.

2,41. a On this writing see Horus and Seth, 8,11, note b. c Δ much more oblique than Τ preceding. So too in 2,42. I transcribe as the writing demands, and as the scribe may have meant, but the word is Τ "basket."

2,42. a (twice). As above, 2,40, note c.

2,43. a See above 2,41, note c. Here the preceding group is Δ i.e. Δ, not Δ

2,44. a Δ; the ligature for Δ (Möller, Hier. Pal. II, no.312) is here written below Δ; cf. the analogous writing Τ above 1,8, see note a thereon.

2,45. a Τ is here clearly written; so G(E). For this miswriting of Τ see ZAS. XLVIII 36.

b Δ, a clear lotus leaf, Coptic captot; see Wörterb. IV, 195. c For AΔΔ, as below 2,46.

2,46. a See 1,6, note a.

2,47. a G(E) Τ; photo Τ i.e. Τ, as in 2,46 immediately following. Nonetheless the scribe may have intended to write the word as in 2,45, see note a thereon.
2.48. a This can hardly be correct, if interpreted literally, and might possibly be mechanically repeated from in a at the beginning of the sentence. But perhaps it is merely an inaccurate way of saying "for mine," i.e. "for my fathers."

2.49. a This is probably here for interrogative: "will they not....?" See above 1.x + 8, note d, under (3).

2.51. a For " with the not infrequent omission of the preposition ---. So too above 2.17. 30.33; below 2.17. See also Blinding of Truth, 5.6, note a. ^ See 1.x + 4, note d.

2.52. a For the writing of this word for "tomb" identically with rows are "life" (see 2.51) of the variant as, ed. Lieblein, Deux papyrus...... Turin, 4.6; G 294. Oost. Hood, 6, (unpublished). Nevertheless, there is reason to think that might, might should be read; so too Wörterbl. II, 49.

2.53. a See above 2.22, note a. b See 1.x + 4, note d. c Without 9; 1.x + 4; 2.56.

2.54. a e seems to be displaced above the line. The papyrus is here in great disorder. b The photo; E, who read n 404, has also recognized the. The following seems to me well-nigh certain. If might be accepted, the sense must be "thou hast not (still here before thee) one of his envoys." c Gall 1; E "vielleicht nichts bleibt." From the photo, though indistinct, appears highly probable; cf. 27 191 in a Dyn. letter, Proc. SBA. XXX, pl. 2.

2.55. a Scanty traces, but the reading is inevitable. So C. (E). b See below 2.59.

2.56. a Quite unusual writing. 2.8 or the like being normal.

2.57. a 1; C 1. It seems certain from photo, but A would here have a most abnormal form. However, spr is exactly the word required.
2,58. a 1 photo; G$ = 1$. See above 1,9, note b.

b For a $\rightarrow$ see 1,x+21,note a. c G.E $\rightarrow$; photo, clearly 9, though with an exceptionally long tail; for this see 9 in nrn 2,2.

d See above 1, x+16, note b. e See 1, x+4, note d.

2,59. a See 2,3, note a.

b For $\ll$, as several times elsewhere in this story. See 1, x+14, note b.

2,61. a Sic; the sense being future we should have expected $\rightarrow$ see Gunn, Studies in Egyptian Syntax, p. 57, nos. 99-100.

b See above 3, 11, note e. The following is superfluous.

c So E. photo.

2,63. a-b For old $\lll$, see Egyptian Grammar, § 331. Doubtless Coptic eynny, though nny is usually explained otherwise.

d See below 2, 69, 70; Max. d'Anii 72; Horus and Seth, 2, 5, note a.

2,64. a See above 1, x+13, note b. b For the spelling see Horus and Seth, 811, note b.

2,65. a A mistake for $\ll$, see 2, 68.

b $\ll$ is here a writing of interrogative $\ll$, see 1, x+8, note d, under (3).

2,66. a-b See above 1,19, note a.
2.66. a This is for interrogative ḫ, see 1.x+8, note d, under (a).

2.67. a See above 1,12, note d.

2.68. a See 1, x+5, note a.

2.69. a See 2.63, note c.

2.70. a See last note.

2.71. a 27.6; for the upper sign, the reading of which is certain, see Möller, Hier. Pal. II, no. 475.

2.72. a All translations give "with," clearly wrongly. Without emendation, 2 can be taken only as a writing of ḫ for ḫ. No other example of the kind occurs, however, in this tale.

2.73. a See 1,6, note d.

2.74. a (Twice). An unusual writing of the suffix 1st sing. occurring once again 2.81.

b-c. In the photos I see 3λ. The reading given in the text seems fairly certain, except that the dot over ḫ-is perhaps only part of the dot of ḫ. In Coptic 3λΔ 3μτ it would be ḫμτ, coinciding with Akhm. ḫμτ = old 3μτ (Saukie ḫμτ) which is perhaps here meant.

d Suffix 1st sing. after a fem. infin. see 1, x+1, note b; also 2,73, at b.
2.75. a Dm³, in 2.76 masculine, is here apparently taken as a feminine. For a similar difficulty and an alternative view, see 1.12, note c. A third view that here we have a fem. word dmit "port", "harbour", differing from the masc. dmit "town" in the next line (Selke, Ächtung freundlicher Fürsten, 57), seems to me exceedingly improbable.

b Probably suffix 1st. pers., see 1.8+1, note b. Wörterb. I, 368 appears to regard the complex ass.m as an old perfective, but since the sense is evidently dynamic ("pushed" or "forced my way") it is far more likely that we here have a fem. infin. with reflexive suffix 2.77.

c For 3, see above 2.51, note a.

d See doubtless an interrogative particle, old 3, see 1.8+8, note d, under (3).

e For 3/1/1, see 2.22, note a.

2.78. a See 2.22, note a.

2.80. a Ist. pers. suffix after a fem. infinitive, see 1.8+1, note e. In the same verb 2.74 4b was not written. b For the space-filling dot see 2.22, note b.

2.81. a Perhaps a writing of interrogative 7 as elsewhere in this tale, but all other examples appear to be before a negative word. See above 1.8+8, note d, under (4) and (5).

c For this writing of L-Eq. 9 a 1P e see below 2.83; Max. d'Unam 41, 16; Decree of Neskannun, 81. 90 (Gott's numbering). c For this writing of the suffix 1st. sing. see 2.74, note a.

2.82. a See above 1.8+16, note b.

d is doubtless the interrogative particle 7, see 1.8+8, note d, under (3).

2.83. a "belonging to thee", perhaps a mere misspelling of 2 here.

b See above 2.81, note b.
VI. The Legend of Astarte.

from the Amherst fragments now in the Pepiont Morgan collection, New York.
versed 1. a—t. Doubtless a personal name, but the end, 2 in the photo, is obscure to me. e Certain: for the spelling see recto 1.x+1, note t. d—t is to be understood. e? photo. Both C. and G. read 1, but 6 seems nearly certain.
versed 2. a—t photo; very obscure. e—t Traces of a few groups, which seem to have been intentionally erased.

VI. The Legend of Astarte.

Page 1 of the numbering here adopted was really the first page of the story, but seven or more lines are lost at the beginning of it. Of the symbols used in my numbering, "x" signifies the lines lost at the top of each page, and "y" the last line of the page. N.B. An average —— measures 7 mm. and constitutes what is here meant by a "group."

1.x+1. a—t is needed, but the trace in the original suits this very badly.
1.x+2. a The upper trace seems too low to suit 1, but 2 is not a likely alternative.
1.x+3. a Scanty traces, of which one high up seems to make 7 impossible.
1.x+4. a I thought of 7, which seems not improbable from 3.y.
1.x+5. a About two groups further on a red verse-point, under 1 of 1.x+2.

1.x+6. a The traces do not wholly suit 4, but I have no other suggestion.

1.x+5. a Perhaps restore 7 comparing Shipwrecked Sailor, 1, 7 h.e. 1 = 7.
Astarte, 1, x + 6 to 2, x + 2

- About 15 groups lost
- About 9 groups lost
- About 4 groups lost
- About 8 or 9 groups lost
- About 13 groups lost

- 10 or 11 groups lost
- 13 or 14 groups lost
- 10 or 11 groups lost
- About 16 groups lost
- About 12 groups lost

- About 9 groups lost
- Some 8 groups lost
- About 3 groups
- 6 groups lost
- About 5 groups

- Perhaps one or several lines (i.e., x lines) completely lost
- The rest of the line (i.e., about 35 groups) lost
- About 12 groups lost
- About 13 groups lost
1, x + 8. a Undoubtedly with 0, though the same word is written ḫ[n] in sy.

1, x + 10. a Cf. ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
Astarte, $2x + 3$ to $2x + 15$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 or 14 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>about 9 groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>about 12 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>about 11 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>about 12 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>about 9 groups lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>long lacuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3½ groups, $2x + 3$, rest of line lost, 33½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>rest of line lost, 33½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>rest of line lost, 33½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>rest of line lost, 33½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>rest of line, 30½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>rest of line, 30½ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>rest of line, 30½ groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.x+5. a Perhaps restore \( \text{\(W\)(\(X\)\(Y\)\(Z\))} \).

2.x+7. a Perhaps restore \( \text{\(W\)(\(X\)\(Y\)\(Z\))} \), cf. Doomed Prince, 6, 13.

2.x+8. a A tiny trace suits \( \text{\(R\)} \), but not \( \text{\(S\)} \). Perhaps read \( \text{\(T\)} \).

2.x+10. a For the spelling see 2.x+1.

2.x+11. a A miswriting of \( \text{\(T\)(\(Y\)\(X\)\(Z\))} \), only here.

2.x+12. a The first \( \text{\(R\)} \) belongs to \( \text{\(R\)\(R\)\(R\)} \), though written under \( \text{\(R\)} \) as shown in my transcription. We should probably read \( \text{\(R\)\(R\)\(R\)\(R\)\(R\)} \). Perhaps restore as above 1.x+13, etc. \( \text{\(R\)(\(R\)\(R\)\(R\)\(R\))} \).

2.x+15. a It is perhaps not quite certain that this line follows immediately upon that numbered 2.x+14, see the next note. b I am slightly doubtful whether the tops of \( \text{\(S\)} \) and \( \text{\(T\)} \) are really given in the traces on the upper fragment. If not, a whole line will be lost.
L-Eq. Stories, 79a

2, x+7.  a Above — a trace which might belong to S or O, probably placed too low for O.

2, x+8.  a For the curious dot below and behind 8, see again below 3, y.
   b Apparently certain, and undoubtedly not 2. However, 2 is possible, see Möller, Hier. Pal. II, no. 473, "Schnob." Another possibility is that the reading is 2 2, and that this should be read as 2 2, sm(y) 2, see Two Brothers 11, 2, also in reference to the sea.

2, x+9.  a The lower sign is 2, see gr in 2, x+1. The upper sign might be 2.
   b The suffix 2nd fem. sing. (O or D) seems to be omitted four times. c Perhaps 2, see 2.

3, 1.  a After this point we possess only the last line of each page ("y") together with small remains of those immediately preceding it (y-2, y-1).

4, y-1.  For this word, see below 4, y, note b.
Astarte, 4, y-1 to 14, y-1

L-Eg. Stories, 80

about 37 groups lost

at least 18 long lines lost

about 8 groups

rest of line lost, about 44 groups

16 groups lost

rest of line lost, but for a few illegible traces

18 long lines lost

some groups lost

at least 18 long lines lost

10 or 11 groups lost

about 17 groups

a whole page lost

rest of line lost

18 long lines lost

some 2 groups

at least 18 long lines lost

10 or 11 groups

16 groups

18 long lines lost

80 groups

11 long lines lost

11 long lines lost

10 or 11 groups

pages 12, 13, and most of 14, are lost; perhaps 14 groups
4, y-1. a For this word see 4, y, note b. b At a short distance before the end of the line there are some illegible traces, see Newbery's publication.

4, y. a For \( k \times \) "ante" see my Eg. Hieratic Texts, p. 22 *., n. 7. c Only the lower parts of the signs are left. The sign following \( \text{tarr} \) must be \( \text{t} \) as it is too close to the next sign to be \( \text{t} \). So too in the two other examples of the word in 4, y-1. However, \( \text{bdpyw} \) is unknown to the Wörterbuch, whereas \( \text{bdpyw} \) occurs as name of a fruit or the like. c Perhaps for \( \text{w} \) see above, p. 3, note b.; Horus and Seth, 10, 9, note a.

d No trace of a verse-point.

5, y-1. a The writing here becomes much smaller, measuring about 5 mm. The \( \text{mm} \) seen in the publication is now absent from the original. d See the publication.

5, y. a The reading \( \text{hj3} \) \( \text{y} \) is quite certain; 3 groups preceded \( \text{h} \), immediately before \( \text{d} \) we see \( \text{mm} \) so that \( \text{hj3} \) \( \text{y} \) is not possible. I think, however, that \( \text{hj3} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{mm} \) is a possibility. However, not enough remains to make this reading certain. b No verse-point here or after this point.

d-e Now broken away.

f Newbery's photographic plates come to an end soon after this point, but not only is the end of the line preserved, but also the bottom part of several more pages is extant.

g The space suits exactly. Restored from 4, y.

7, y. a Here the writing becomes larger again, measuring 7 mm.

7. b=\( \text{t} \)\( \text{t} \)\( \text{t} \)\( \text{t} \)\( \text{t} \)\( \text{t} \).

As the papyrus is at present unrolled, there is a distance of only 5 cm. (= 5-6 groups) between \( \text{t} \) and \( \text{t} \). Between these points there is, however, a break, and the measurement of the gummings (sheet-lengths) and of the page-length shows that the real distance may have been about 12 cm.

9, 11. The beginning of p. 9 must have fallen about 6 cm. from the left of strip 8, as numbered in the present mode of mounting. Strip 9 comprised two lengths, 9a, now entirely missing, and 9b, upon which we see 23 cm. of writing, including the page-end. I have assumed that what we see on strip 9b is p. 10, and that p. 9 is completely lost.

10, y. a \( \text{t} \) with traces of a vertical sign before \( \text{t} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{t} \) is a possible alternative.

11, y. a-b \( \text{d} \)\( \text{d} \)\( \text{d} \)\( \text{d} \)

P. 12, 13 correspond to strips 11, 12, 13a. of present mounting. These have practically no traces left upon them.

Bibl. Aegypt. 21.

80a
Astarte, 14. y to end.

The rest of the recto (if any) is lost.

The scraps of text on the verso cannot well be given page-numbers. They belong to the bottom lines of different pages. They are given below in what is presumably, but not certainly, the right sequence.

Final remark. The numbering of the pages of the recto after p. 8 assumes that the mounter has mounted his strips in the right order, though he has clearly made some false joins. Strip qa is lost. Strips qd, qh, and cub have been cut out of one consecutive piece (= recto 10, 11). Strips 13a, 13b, and 14 also clearly formed a consecutive strip; these carry all that remains of recto 14, 15. Strip 12 shows no clear connection with what precedes or follows.
Astarte, 14, y to end. L-Eg. Stories, 81a

14, y. a-b. Seeks highly probable, but what can the following word be? One expects the infinitive of a verb of movement. Before the traces suit (?), but the tail before the blank does not favour the restoration, though the possibility of this cannot be denied. The sign seems to be superfluous, if what precedes is rightly read.

15, y. a. The mounter appears to have made a false join here, for neither traces nor fibres correspond well. If the join be a false one, what follows, and also the scanty traces in 15, y-1, may belong to a sixteenth page.

Verse @. a. On the back of strip 13b, except the first, which is on strip 14.

Verse @. a. On the back of strip 13a.

Verse @. a. On the back of strip 12.

Verse @. a. On the back of strip 11. b. At these points there are obvious false joins.
VII. The Taking of Joppa,
from Pap. Harris 500, verso.

x pages are lost

[Hieroglyphic script]
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VII. The Taking of Joppa.

N.B. In the original averages about 5 mm. In my text the attempt has here been made to show the lacunae in their correct proportional size, i.e. 7 of the original, since my mm averages 7 mm.

1. a-b Assuming the restoration of 1, 8, beginning, to be correct, about 30 mm. is lacking to the right of 1, 9-13. To this 30 mm. must be added for 1, 1-8, the amount by which the beginnings of these lines recede behind the beginning of 1, 9-13. Here, therefore, the lacuna is 30 ± 35 mm. The angle of this tail suggests several hundred, not simply 100. * Not merely 10; more likely 20 than 100. * This is Peet's very probable suggestion for here and 1, 4-5; see JEA XV, 237.

d-2 41 mm. It seems hopeless to attempt serious restorations in these first lines.

1.2, a-b 30 + 41 = 71 mm. At b slight traces, somewhat misrepresented in the published photo, owing to a loose fibre; at all events not [12]. * For the sign following b of 1, 8 in * 1, 4; it does not follow, however, that [12] is here the right restoration, though the traces might suggest * 1, 2-4-1, 3-5. * Doubtless not 20, but a hundred-sign; but how to connect this with what follows?

1.3, a-b 30 + 25 = 55 mm.

1.4, a-b 30 + 25 = 55 mm. At b traces as seen in photo; 4 seems more likely than Ρ, but there is something above it. At beginning perhaps restore [12].

1.5, a-b 30 + 24 = 54 mm, which as Peet has seen, is probably to be restored as in the text. Measurements: [12]. * So Maspero and Peet; S was inclined to doubt mainly on the grounds that the first sign visible is vertical and would therefore not suit 9; but see 9a9 in 24.8. * d See JEA XVI, 220.

1.6, a-b 30 + 23 = 53 mm. * Certainly so, not Ρ9 as hitherto read; for Ρ9a.

1.7, a-b 30 + 23 = 53 mm.

1.8, a-b The restoration seems certain and may be measured thus: [12].

Since the present beginning of 1, 8 recedes 10 mm. behind 1, 9, if so, 30 mm. must be allowed for the loss in these.

These signs penetrate into the beginning of 2, 8. See the photographic facsimile.

1.9, a-b 30 mm., see 1, 8, note a-b. At b 1 seems likely to be Ρ. It is uncertain where the name begins; Ρ must have immediately preceded it. 1, 10 * See p. 340, at top.
Taking of Joppa, 1.10 - 2.8
Takino of Joppa, 11-10-26

L. Eg. Stories, 83a

19.8. For the length of the lacunae in p. 1 see 1. 8, note a-b. But Maspero and Peet estimate a greater loss.

1. 10. a-b 30 mm. In the lacuna the Roman supposes that there stood some such phrase as "Be so kind:" Peet thinks that the name [Punt-Infort (1.9) was here repeated in the same manner as in the line above. It is hardly open to doubt; above it is no trace of lost fibres.

1. 11. a-b 30 mm. Maspero's proposal [the caught hold of the enemy of Joppa] by his cloak gives better sense than Peet's [and concealed it beneath] his cloak, but is too long and otherwise impossible to the form suggested by Maspero. Perhaps we should restore 800 in a 2. 4, for the trace before it see the photo.

1. 12. a-b About 25 mm. Since [800 ] occupies 15 mm. in 2. 3 and more in 1. 13; 2. 10, only 9-10 mm. can be left to complete — always assuming the restoration of 1. 8 to be correct. Perhaps 800 in a 2. 4 stood in the lacuna.

1. 13. a-b Perhaps 28 mm. of which 800 in a 2. 4 takes 13 mm. The available 15 mm. would be completely filled by [800 in a 2. 4] proposed by Peet, leaving no room for the object. Just possibly restore 800 in a 2. 4; or else omit if, and restore some longer word for "power," might.

2. 1. a-b A similar, but there are slight traces above the hole in the first letter, see the photo. Maspero's proposal seems to me excellent.

2. 2. a-b 18 mm. Some word such as 800 in a 2. 4 is required. Peet "stretched out." So already Maspero, but omitting 9.

2. 2. a-b 35 mm., of which 15 are required for the rest of 800 in a 2. 4; the 8 is quite certain, and written in the same word in 2. 5.

2. 2. a-b 50 mm. For the traces see the photo. At the beginning seems a possibility but an incomprehensible tail of 800 follows. At 28 mm. perhaps 800 in a 2. 4, which is read at 28 mm., of which 800 in a 2. 4 would take about 18-9 mm.

2. 4. Much confused, and not really like 800 in 2. 3 (end). Still Maspero followed by Peet, was doubtless right in reading thus. In any case, 800 must be emended as in 2. 4.

2. 5. a 800 in a 2. 4 should be emended. The first sign is certainly not 800 in a 2. 4, (Masp, Peet).

2. 5. 800 in a 2. 4 omitted on account of the same consonant following. So too 2. 9; 3. 4.

2. 6. a 800 in a 2. 4, the upper sign is clearly not 800 in a 2. 4, nor is there any reason why 800 in a 2. 4, which might possibly be suggested, should be found in this word. Doubt it is 800 in a 2. 4 contracted from the contraction being due to its position.

2. 7. 800 in a 2. 4 without the usual oblique stroke which identifies the arm sign as 800 in a 2. 4.
Taking of Joppa, 28–3, 10

L-Eq. Stories, 84

[Hieroglyphic script]
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Taking of Joppa, 2.8-3.10.

2.8. a Presumably a miswriting for ḫ, see Two Brothers, 14.5, note a.

2.9. a Confused; probably a wrong sign later corrected. b (twice). Clearly for ی nhu 2nd. plur., ṚṬN; conversely ی nhu 1st. plur., ṚṬN, see Horus and Seth, 8.9, note b. c < ḫ > omitted; see 2.5, note a.

2.10. a ṚṬN (Peet) is certain, and doubtless a mere writing of ḫ as ḫ "namely." See Wenamun, 1. x-8, note b-c. For the much curved ḫ see ḫ in nṣy-ṣn, 2.5, end.

2.11. a Read < ḫ > if, cf. nṣm ṚṬN below 3.7-8; for the omission of the suffix 2nd sing. from, see Horus and Seth, 3.1, note b. b-c Emend ی nhu 9.8.4, comparing 9.8 for 9.1.2. A similar form ی nhu see Doomed Prince 6.10; also this same papyrus recto 11.5.8, but in those cases the reference is to future events.

2.12. a ḫ; ḫ is less clear than in 2.13 and much less clear than in 2.14. But such forms occur in this papyrus, e.g. Doomed Prince, 5.12. Already hesitatingly suggested by Peet, who thought ḫ (Maspero's reading) more probable.

b Peet proposes the certain emendation 𒄷, cf. ی nhu in Horus and Seth, 7.13.

3.1. a-b This invariable restoration is too small for the lacuna if the line was of normal breadth. Perhaps the scribe wrote ی nhu nṣm, repeating ḫ by dittography in 3.2, beginning 3.2. a-b The available space is barely sufficient for this restoration, even if written smaller than in 3.5. An alternative possibility is perhaps ی nhu i.e. < ḫ > nṣy, but after this pš dmi would be expected, though Wenamun 2.75 might be quoted.

3.3. a Emend < ḫ > = ḫ. b Emend ی nhu ی nhu Mātāa.

3.4. a < ḫ >, see 2.5, note a.

3.5. a The reading is certain, despite Peet.

3.6. a Emend ی nhu ی nhu, but similarly without ḫ Doomed Prince, 4.4.

3.10. a One expects the form ی nhu, see Sethe, Verbum II, 5.320.
Here ends the page, and with it the story of the Taking of Joppa. The following pages contain the tale of the Doomed Prince (above p. 84).

VIII. The Quarrel of Apophis and Seknenreš, from Pap. Sallier I.
Taking of Joppa, 3/10 - end  L-Eg. Stories, 85a

3,10. It is very pale, and 9 looks more like 8. Perhaps the scribe first wrote 9, and then tried to alter this into 8.
3,11. *Certainly a small A.
3,14. The name is illegible, the original showing no more than the photo. At the end perhaps "a", a space-filler.

VIII. The Quarrel of Apophis and Sekhennrê.

N.B. In the original averages 5mm. Abbreviations: ph. = the published photographic facsimile. N = Neiherlifft's hand-facsimile. M = Maspero.

1,1. Clear in original and N; ph. wrongly more like 8. b 18 is a corruption of A; so again towards end of this line at 8; Sinuhe, Cairo ostracon, 7; Pop. Leningrad 1161, recto 116. c Insert <I>. d Probably for left side of <I>; for how as writing of left compare <I> with Decree of Aminophis son of Yahu, 14-5, with <I> Anast IV, 43. e ) has been altered or corrected; see ph. f Corrupt for A; see above note 3.
9-h Probably emend 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, 9, an emendation which goes back to Goodwin; the alternatives proposed by M. and by Pichl (ZÄS XXIII, 60) are impossible. g Corrected secondly.
1,2. a Neither II nor yet a proper A, though probably derived from the latter; so always below this royal name. b Emend 177. c Emend 177, of my restoration of Two Brothers, 1, 16. d 177 is certain, see ph.; N. wrongly 1. The MS reading is a confusion of 1777 and 1777; the latter is doubtless the true reading. j The dot (so too below 32, 5, 7, but not 1, 2, 3, 4) is an abortive O; in cartouches L-Eg.scribes often insert a O where it does not belong, see ZÄS XLI 54. * See above, note a of this same line.
1,3. a Sic. in place of the usual A. b Cf. 21. c Emend 172. d See 1 with some fibres lost. Perhaps the true reading was 1777, though some strokes would remain unexplained.
1,4. a-b See ph. for the traces O is more likely than B; might be 1; left of this are 3 <5. c No room for MS swor in the lacuna; perhaps restore 177, 1777. d 20mm. The apparently detached fragment before is in place, but the signs are not legible with certainty; they resemble /, 19, see ph.

85a
Various misplaced fragments are mounted amidst or below the remains of page 1. Some of these have been restored to their approximate or exact place in the text given above. The rest are illegible with one exception. It seems possible that the beginning of the royal name here adjoins the remainder of that name in 2.11, see note thereon.
1.4. **a** 18 mm. One expects "of the king" or "of the palace." "**d**" seems to me probable, some fibers are lost. d Insert <k>. e Very confused traces. For **f** perhaps substitute 3.

1.5. a (*) seems nearly certain, it appearing impossible to take the traces to the right of the break as part of 9. Still, the space is small. 9 from the previous is very probable (see too 92), and the space just suffices for it. c-d All certain; before now insert «>> or «?» ?

e-f 25 mm. Perhaps a little much for the restoration proposed; nevertheless, to restore [25] seems less likely. 9-k Much of this rubric is now illegible, but where verifiable, agrees perfectly with 2.1. k See 2.1, note d. i The scribe of this papyrus uses —— again in 2.2; 9,6 as a mere space-filler.

1.6. a-b The same signs occupy exactly the same space in 1.2, beginning c-d 47 mm; for 97 see 3.1. a-f All uncertain. The supposed 97 has a cross-stroke which suggests 9, but the sign following it is low. After 97 the < is far more probable than 9 appears from 92. At 9 I see 9 so far from 9 I is the displaced fragment with |||| which belongs probably below |.6 e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97—50 mm. Before smi fairly clearly 9, which suggests the unsuitable 97.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7. a-b 110 mm. If the fragment with tur is here restored to its right place. On this see above 1.6, note f—g and below 1.8, note c—d. c-d Perhaps about 90 mm. The restoration isguaranteed by 2.2 below. e-f 60 mm. The trace here, more visible in ph. than in 92, suits very well. g—h The fragment with these signs seems nearly in place, as is confirmed by 97 below in 1.8; the signs after tur cannot be completed as 9, which would require 9, as in ||||| l. What follows appears to be a speech, see next note. i-j So correctly read from |||| by Erman (278: 37, 37) who compares Sell III 10,1 for the spelling. |||| by ||||

1.8. a-b 90 mm. If the fragment with tur is rightly placed. 2.2-2.5 of Kuentz, Qadeh, p.

c—d These signs are on the fragm. with |||| see above 1.8, note f—g, 1.7, note a—f, see too next note.

d—e On the large fragm., mounted bottom centre. 2.5 shows that the sign tur (last note) belong to the right of this, and further, in conjunction with 97 to a little way on, that this large fragm. is at least approximately rightly placed. e-f 70 mm. Of which ||||||| ||||| 10, 12 the exact amount required see 2.6. See above 1.7, note 3—k. See 97, cf. 2.6.

1.9. a-b Perhaps 110 mm. c-d On the large fragm., see 1.8, note d—e. 10,12 seems obvious, against 2.6.

d—d More than ½ line. 1.10 a-b Perhaps 110 mm. c On the large fragm., see 97. ||||| ||||| mer.pdf
Apophis & Sekenmut, 1/0-27

2,1. "Clear traces of the tails of $\gamma$ and $\delta$."

2,2. "The space suits well. The first word of the rubric is displaced and mounted at the beginning of 3,1. This meaningless extension of $\frac{3}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{1}$ from the pronoun written $\frac{1}{2}$ below 3,1. So too above 1,5 and written $\frac{2}{1}$ in the same formula, Pyjet.

2,2. See above 1,2, note 5. 6 See above 1,2, note 6.

3,1. "The superfluous second $\frac{3}{2}$ (again below 2,3, bis; 2,4, 5, 6) is always written small and never very distinctly. $\frac{3}{2}$ is meaningless and to be omitted, so too below 2,3, bis; 2,6."

3,2. "A preposition, probably $\frac{3}{2}$, is omitted here. Inserted later as a correction."

3,3. "A mere space-filler, see above note 5 on 1,5.

3,4. "Below spelled in less eccentric fashion in 3,2, 6; see 2,4, 7. See above 2, 2, note 7. See above 2, 2, note 8. See above 2, 2, note 8. See above 2, 2, note 8."

3,5. "Another space-filler."

2,5. "Insert $\frac{3}{2}$? In this case $\frac{2}{1}$ must be understood as passive $\delta m_{\frac{3}{2}} f$."

2,6. "One might have expected $\frac{3}{2}$, "their noise", but there seems no room for $\delta$ before $\frac{3}{2}$; $\frac{3}{2}$ is to be understood before $\delta m_{\frac{2}{1}}$. After $\frac{2}{1}$, which is certain, I see $\frac{2}{1}$, see too ph.; the upper sign shows a curve not quite normal for $\frac{3}{2}$, but the sign can hardly be erroneously repeated; formerly I thought of a reading $\frac{2}{1}, \delta m_{\frac{3}{1}}$."

2,7. "Omit $\frac{3}{2}$, see 2, 2, note 6. Perhaps a faulty writing of the verb belonging to $\frac{2}{1}$ "das Staunen" (Wösten, IV, 320). See below 3, 2-3 and note a on Horus and Seth, 1, 9."

2,7. "Of an upright stroke; this and the space both prohibit in high, one might read $\frac{2}{1}$ instead of $\frac{1}{2}$ but for the latter see "$\delta m_{\frac{2}{1}}$ Pap. Brit. Nat. 199, 9, 1, 9."

1,0. "Somewhere in this lacuna must have stood an indication that Apophis is now the speaker. It is highly improbable that 1 contained more than 10 lines."

2,1. "Clear traces of the tails of $\gamma$ and $\delta$."

87a
Apophis & Seknenrês, 27-32

L-EG. Stories, 88a

27. A is certain; not 8. The ligature for ë takes but little room in this papyrus. In 23, 28, a to 52 mm., not quite sufficient space for the desired, if one expects here. 9 and 6 are certain; 8 is covered by an intrusive fragment.
d-e 6 and 6 (this latter red) are certain, 9 nearly so (see ph. for this last); the construction is not clear. e from 64 mm., of which [in p. ap. p] will have occupied 33 mm. (2, 4).

After this one expects [2, Rv], but the very scant traces of signs visible for 24 mm. to the right of 8 do not suit, and except for a possible 8 I have failed to account for them. There is, however, a thin oblique stroke 9 above the line at the beginning of the said traces, and this might conceivably represent the remains of the first omitted by the scribe, and then added above the line as a correction. 9 A preposition omitted? k Emend [6] (old wi) or 6 or 6.

29. a-b 70 mm., of which 65 mm. are filled by the proposed restoration apart from its last word [2, 4], see 2, 6. This includes the superfluous [6] after [2], on which see 22 note.
c-d 65 mm. Of the restored words, those down to [6] occupy 52 mm. in 2, 3. At the end one expects 2, 4 [2].

2/10. a-b 150 mm. At b the trace suits 9, and there is a distinct possibility that the fragment mentioned at the bottom of p. 36 above may contain the rest of that sign.
c An error for 9, see above note a on Two Brothers, 19, 9. d Cf. Two Brothers, 17, 10; Taming of Joppa, 2, 12.

2/11. a-c 155 mm. d-c The beginning of this royal name perhaps on the fragment at the bottom of p. 36; see above 2/10, note a-b.

3/1. a The trace of red 9 wrongly mounted here belongs to the rubric in 21.
b For 81 as det. of 8 when Pharaoh is being alluded to, see Two Brothers, 14/7, 15, 2.
The story of Apophis and Sekhmet ends abruptly here, and is followed in 3.4 by a manual of letter-writing.

IX. Khensemhab and the Spirit, from potsherds in Turin, Vienna, Florence, and the Louvre.

A. The Turin and Vienna Fragments.
3.3. a On this spelling see Horus and Seth, 1.9, note a.

b Superfluous. c Probably superfluous and to be omitted.

d To be omitted.

IX. Khensemhab and the Spirit.
A. The Turin and Vienna Fragments.

Jur. 1. a-b A basis for estimating the amount lost at the beginnings and ends of the following lines is provided by the certain restoration of Jur. 9-10 below and the slightly less certain restoration of Jur. 7-8. It is impossible, however, to judge whether more was lost at the ends than at the beginnings, as here arbitrarily assumed.

Jur. 2. a \( \overline{2} \) Sic erroneously for \( \overline{2} \).

Jur. 3. a-b Restored from Louvre 3, see below p. 93.

c Cf. Hor. 26/6, 5.8.10; VI. 4.5.

Jur. 4. a-b Černý: "Très indistinct et douteux; semble être corrigé sur des signes effacés."

c Černý \( \overline{1} \) \( \overline{1} \), but the restoration seems obvious.

Jur. 5. a-b A verb for "adored," "worshipped," "called upon" is required.

c Probably to be read as plural adjectives: "southern, northern," etc.
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Jur. 5. a-b Černý saw 1, for which he suggests ḫ. This is hardly probable, see the following notes.  b-c If the restorations below in 7-8, 9-10 are correct, only 2 or 3 groups can be lost, so that the Vienna text must begin practically where the lacuna in Jur. starts. Jur. 6. a A correction over ḫ.

Vi. 1. a Some lines may be lost.  b-c ḫ seems to be certain, but suggests no word. Can the entire group be a corruption of .parallel to "the gods of the sky" and "earth" preceding? Jur. 6-7. a One might suggest for the latter part of the lacuna something like comparing Louvre 11. It is unwise to try to guess the important word missing after ḫ.  b Emend 1-8; the name occurs several times below.

The following restoration is desiderated by the Spirit's answer below Jur. 9.

Vi. 2. a-b Clearly the high-priest's question was omitted in Vi., the reason may have been a kind of haplography, the question and answer having many words in common. Jur. 8. a Emend 1-2 or 1-1.

b-c Emend 1-11 10-20.

d Černý: "Sur la photographie on croit voir l'en haut et on attend ḫ; n. sn. (Gardiner) ne n'ai pas vu au dessous de l'en sur l'original; ce pourrait être la faute du verse à travers laquelle la photographie a été prise." He continues to say that in this case the missing ḫ might be represented by the red stroke ḫ after added below ḫ in 8-8.

e A correction added in red above the line. 5-9 Perhaps 8 in ḫ; 11-12 in ḫ; cf. Hor. 2616, 5-6 (below p. 91).

Jur. 9. a-b Completed from Jur. 6 above.  c So the photo, apparently, omitted in the publication. a Černý 0; but surely ḫ must be read.

Vi. 3. a Ditography.  b 111 serves as spacefiller; see Horus and Seth, note on 3.5.

Jur. 10. a No more is left of line 10, but there are tiny traces of an eleventh line.
Khensenu, Vienna 3 - end

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L-Eg.Stories.q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khensenu, Vienna 3 - end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Florence 2616 and 2617</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Florence 2616 and 2617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>