Excerpts from the
Story of the Shipwrecked Sailor

Part I

Arrival to the Residence. The follower’s story begins. Storm at sea and the follower’s miraculous survival. The phantom island.

---

1 The grammar of the passages ShS. 1-36 and 56-80 is discussed in (XI.A) and (XII.A) of my Introduction to Middle Egyptian through Ancient Writings, Linus Learning, New York, 2013.

2 Literally, the island of k; Golenischeff’s “l’île enchantée” and Maspero’s “phantom island.” For a discussion of this concept, see S. Ignatov, JEA 80 (1994) 195-198.
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Vocabulary

dd  say
šsmsw  follower, retainer, herald
ikr  excellent, trustworthy
wd3  hale
wd3 ib.k  take heart, may it please you
ḥ3ti-े  local prince, monarch, commander, lord, mayor
ph  reach, catch, attack
ḥnw  home, interior
ṣzp  take, receive, accept
hrpw  mallet
hwī  hit, strike, smite
mnit  mooring stake
ḥitt  prow-rope
t3  land
ḥknw  praise
dw3  praise, worship, thank
ntr  god
z(i)  man
ḥpt  embrace
snw  companion, equal
izwt  crew
ii  come, return
d  safe

nhw  loss, need
mš  army, expeditionary force
ph  end, result
phwi  end, hinder-parts, hind-quarters
w3wt  Wawat (northern end of) Lower Nubia
zni  pass (by), surpass, transgress
snmwt  Senmut (the island of Biggeh, First Cataract region)
htp  calm, content (m in peace, safety)
sw  (dependent pronoun) he, him
sdm  hear, sdm n listen to
ink  (independent pronoun) I
šwi  empty, free (m of)
ḥ3w  excess, wealth
ifi  wash
mw  water
dbecue  finger
wšb  answer
wšd  address, question
mdw  (verb) speak, (noun) speech, word
nswt  king
ib  heart
dwn  stretch out, straighten knees
rd  foot
rh  learn, know
gmi  find
dbw  figs
i3rrt  grapes
i3kt  leeks, vegetables
nb  all, each, every, any
špss  špsi  fine, special, noble
k3w  sycamore figs
nk3wt  notched sycamore figs
šzpt  cucumber
rm  fish
3pd  bird
ss3i  satisfy
wr  great, much
šdi  take away, cut out
d3  fire drill, fire stick
shpr  bring about, make become, create
ht  fire
zi  go, perish
sdt  fire, flame; zi n sdt  burnt offering
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**Grammar Points**

\[ dd \text{ in } \delta m s w \ i k r \  w d b \ i b . k \ h 3 t i - i . i \ m . k \ p h . n . n \ h n w \]

The verb form of \( dd \) is narrative infinitive. (The only other alternative verb form for \( dd \) with \( in \) is the suffix conjugation, the \( s d m . i n . f \) form,\(^1\) meaning “then said.” This verb form is used for sub/consequent action to a prior action. The proponents of this,\(^2\) however, would have to admit the unlikely scenario that one or more pages of the papyrus are missing.) Narrative infinitive is common in journal entry type statements, commemorative inscriptions, historical narratives, literary verses, and narratives.\(^3\) As here, the actor is usually introduced by the agent particle \( in \). This type of infinitive seems to occur where there is a major break in the narrative, and can also be recognized by the absence of the introductory particle \( i w \), and by its reference to the past (when one would expect the verb form to be perfect).

In the formula \( w d b \ i b . k \) the subjunctive \( s d m . f \) of \( w d b \) is used to announce news. It is derived from the expression \( s w d b \ i b . k \), lit. “make your heart sound.” The follower’s master \( h 3 t i - i . \) ends with the seated man \( H a t i - a \) and whether this is determinative or a suffix pronoun is subject to interpretation. Accordingly, “master, commander, mayor” or “my lord” are possible translations.

The perfect of \( p h \) “reach” is introduced by the particle \( m . k \) (expressing completed action), and its object \( h n w \) with determinative can be translated as “home.”

\(^1\) Hoch (§131) and Allen (22.2).
We have here three clauses that form a compound. It is clear from the context that šzp and h(w) are both passive verb forms. These two clauses are followed by the third which concludes the sequence of actions. It contains a subject-stative construction involving the transitive verb rdi “put, place.” This construction involving a transitive verb has passive meaning (although it is mostly used with personal pronominal subject), and here it also emphasizes the resulting state: “the prow-rope is placed on land.”

The rope determinative should not to be confused with the uniliteral w.

Safeguard of the voyage by the divine is thanked in the first two clauses employing the passive forms of rdi and dw3. (Note that rdi cannot imperative because its imperative form is di.) The third clause is syntactically adverbial. It contains a pseudo-verbal hr + infinitive construction involving the verb hpt “embrace.” As such it describes an action currently in progress.

snw stands for snnw, the ordinal number “second,” and the seated man converts this to a noun “companion,” lit. “second one.” We see here a typical compressed writing of a double consonant with no vowel between them. Finally, note that is emended to. (It is tempting to think that sn means “brother”, therefore snwi is masculine dual “two brothers”, but this makes no sense here.)

Since the follower is a member of the crew, the suffix pronoun tn of izwt does not fit here. Rather, the suffix pronoun is n and the extant t is a graphic peculiarity of Middle Egyptian. The explanation is that the feminine ending t of nouns has often been lost, and, at times, especially in suffixed forms, the scribe wanted to emphasize that the t ending was

---

4 This is Allen’s terminology, Allen (17.9), and stative with adverbial comment in the Standard Theory, Hoch (§85).
pronounced, and indicated this by adding an extra t. Thus, in the suffixed form izwt.n of the feminine noun izwt the extant t should not be read as izwt.tn.5

This noun is the first (preposed) subject of two subject-stative constructions with the intransitive verbs ii “return” and d “safe, intact.” As such, they should be translated by English past or perfect tense.

The negative particle negates the last adverb clause in which n should be interpreted as a preposition “to, for.” Less likely, following the pattern nn A, it is also possible to regard nn nhw n mš.n as a negation of existence of A, where A is the noun phrase with indirect genitive nhw n mš.n “loss of our army.”

ph.n.n phwi w3w3t zn.n.n snmwt

The circumstantial sdm.n.f/perfect of the transitive verbs ph and zni indicate completed actions in the past.

It is also possible to view this passage as a pair of mutually dependent balanced sentences employing the non-attributive perfect relative forms of ph and zni.

The primary meaning of phwi is “end,” so that this clause may be interpreted as the follower’s boasting of how far the expedition went. Since phwi also means hinder-parts, hindquarters, ph.n.n phwi can also be interpreted as “we left behind...” w3w3t “Wawat” is Lower (northern) Nubia and snmwt “Senmut” is the island of Biggeh, south of Aswan in the First Cataract region.

m.k r.f n ii.n(w) m htp t3.n ph.n sw

Once again the subject-stative construction applied to the verb of motion ii emphasizes the resulting state and should be translated with past or perfect tense. As usual, the enclitic element r.f refers to what has been said before. The use of the dependent pronoun n after m.k as the subject and the 1PL stative suffix of ii (which actually has been added later) points to an early stage of Middle Egyptian.

5 See Allen, Essay 17.
The topicalized object \( t:\,n \) of the second clause and the sense of the completed action would be a “perfect” fit: \( ph.\,n.\,n \). It is disappointing to find here the indicative/perfective \( sdm.\,f \) of \( ph \), or else the scribe may have missed an \( n \). The dependent pronoun \( sw \) (and not \( st \)) refers to \( t:\,n \).

\[
\text{sdm}\ r\,k\ n\,i\ h\,li\,t\,i\,r\,i\ ink\ sw\ h\,\,w}
\]

The imperative of \( sdm \) followed by the very common enclitic particle \( r\,k \) (with the second-person suffix) is used by the follower to call the attention of his master. Note the contrasting uses of the enclitic elements \( r\,k \) here and \( r\,f \) in the previous sentence.

While \( r\,f \) refers to a prior statement in the text, the imperative with \( r\,k \) relates \( sdm \) to the commander.

For further emphasis that he needs to be listened to, the follower asserts his own fine qualities in an A B nominal sentence. The noun phrase B \( šw\,h\,\,w \) is a \( nfr\,hr \) construction.

\[
\text{i\,t\,w\,im\,m\,w\,h\,r\,d\,b\,w.}\,k
\]

The depressed mood of the commander and the efforts of the follower to cheer him up continue with two imperatives here. In the first construction, the (reflexive) dependent pronoun \( tw \) is the object of the imperative of \( i\,t\,i \). The second \( im\,i \) is the irregular (but most often used) imperative of \( r\,d\,i \) “give, put.”

\[
\text{i\,h\,w(š)b.}\,k\,w\,š\,d.\,t\,w.}\,k\,m\,d\,w.\,k\,\,n\,\,n\,s\,w\,t\,\,i\,b.}\,k\,m\,\,c.}\,k
\]

\[
\text{w\,š\,b.}\,k\,m\,n\,n\,i\,t\,i\,t
\]

As it is the case here, the particle \( i\,h \) is almost always followed by the subjunctive \( sdm.\,f \) and points to future action. It expresses the follower’s desire and expectation what the master should do.

The unmarked adverb clause that follows can be introduced by “when.” The verb form here is the circumstantial/imperfective \( sdm.\,f \) of \( w\,š\,d \) as it expresses a concomitant action to the governing clause.
The next two sentences may still be viewed being under the influence of *ih* (until the new particle *iw* comes up), and thereby the verb forms of *mdw* and *wšb* are both subjunctive *sdm.f* further detailing the follower’s expectations.

As indicated in the first clause, however, it is clear that the commander will have an audience with the king. In the next sentence, the main clause *mdw.k n nswt* contains no new information, whereas the adverb clause *ib.k m ḫ.k* does; it tells how the commander should act, lit. “your heart (being) with you.”

The frequently used compound preposition *m ḫ* with clumsy literal meaning “in the hand of” should be replaced by “with.” In addition, “mind” is more suitable than “heart” since according to the ancient Egyptians the heart was the center of thought and emotions. This adverb clause can then be translated as “presence of your mind.”

In summary, this passage should be considered as a sentence with emphasized adverb clause, where *mdw.k n nswt* is the theme and *ib.k m ḫ.k* is the rheme. This is an emphatic construction, the verb *mdw* is in a perfective relative form, and *mdw.k n nswt* is a noun clause serving as the subject. The emphasis can be brought out by the translation: “it is with presence of your mind that you should speak.” The second adverb clause has similar grammar employing the perfective relative form of *wšb.k*, the theme, and *nn nitit* employing the infinitive of the 5-lit. verb *nitit*, is the rheme.

We met this construction (negation of existence) in the previous text: *nn Hn* “there is no hurrying/without hurry.” Here too it can be translated using “without.”

*iw r n z(i) nhm.f sw iw mdw.f di.f tīm n.f hr*

The follower continues his efforts to lift up his master’s spirit, this time with making general (non-emphatic) parallel statements using the introductory particle *iw*. For these he employs circumstantial/imperfective *sdm.f*. In fact, the verbs *nhm* and *di* appear in *iw.f sdm.f* /subject-imperfective constructions. (Note that the circumstantial/imperfective of *rdi* always uses the first base stem *di*.) The subjects are *r n z(i) “(a) man’s mouth/speech” and *mdw.f “his speech/words.”

*tīm hr* is an interesting phrase. It uses the infinitive of *tīm* “veil” (with the cloth determina-
ir is the only biliteral sign that normally does not have a phonetic complement, so that the beginning of the passage reads as ir r.k and not ir.k. This sentence is grammatically similar to the one in line 12: sdm r.k n.i hitti/i. ir is imperative followed by the enclitic particle r.k for emphasis.

The phrase hrt ib “desire, wish” is derived from hrt “state, need, condition” which itself is a (feminine) nisbe “what is near” derived from the preposition hr “near, by, during.”

Grammatically it is also possible to view this sentence as irr.k m hrt ib.k and consider the verb form of iri as a circumstantial/imperfective sdm.f or as a non-attributive imperfective relative form (with emphasized adverb clause). Examples to this construction are: irr hm.k m mrr.f “Your majesty does as he wills,”6 and irr z(i) mrrt.f “How a man does what he wants…” 7 Note also that the idiom mrr.f irr.f “whenever he wills/likes he does” appears in religious texts8 as the name of the great primordial god. The imperfective however expresses a general (or ongoing) statement, and does not fit in the context here well.

swrd pw dd n.k

This is an A pw B nominal sentence “B is A.” The verb forms of swrd and dd are both infinitives used as nouns.

---

6 [Sin. B 263].
7 [CT VII, 190b].
8 Gardiner (§442, 4).
Although the previous sentence indicates that the frustrated follower is at the point of giving up, here he starts with a long narrative, his own tale, his story within the story.

From the point of view of grammar, the subjunctive $sdm.f$ of $sdd$ expressing exhortation is a typical way to begin a narrative. Various translations are possible: “Let me relate…” or “I shall tell…”

There is a bewildering variety of phrases that can be formed from the preposition $mi$ “like.” As here, the masculine and feminine prepositional nisbes $mitt$, $mitt$ “similar, the like” are the most immediate. $mi$ can also be used to form various nouns, such as $mit$ “copy,” $mitw$ “likeness”, and $miti$, $mitw$ “one like, equal.” These forms are not always distinguishable from each other. The compound phrase $mitt iri$ also contains the adverbial use of the preposition $ir$ meaning “pertaining to it, with respect to it,” or, at the risk of sounding a bit archaic, “thereof.” The literal meaning of the compound is “the like thereof.”

$hpr$ is clearly a perfective active participle meaning “that happened.” (Note the missing feminine $t$ ending.)

$Sm.kw r bi3 n ity/itii$

The stative of intransitive verbs (in particular, verbs of motion as here) expresses past or perfect tense. Note, however, that we are at the beginning of the narrative, in fact, a story within a story, and we therefore should translate the follower’s stative of $Sm$ as English past perfect. Alternatively, this can also be viewed as a circumstantial clause attached to the end of the previous passage. In the adverbial adjunct $n$ is either the genitival adjective or the preposition “for.”

Finally, note the spelling of $ity$ “sovereign” as a false dual. This may point to the change of the phonetic value of $Ad$ “aggressive, angry” to $it$ possibly through the sequence $Ad \rightarrow At \rightarrow it$. The word $ity$ may also be a nisbe from $iti$ “father”, that is why the alternative spelling $itii$. 
The stative of *h3i* should still be rendered as past perfect. Note how the feminine noun *dpt* makes the indirect genitive and the following two suffix pronouns feminine.

In ancient Egypt *mh* “cubit” was a standard measurement of length (52.5 cm or 20.6 inches). According to this, the ship was 63 m long and 21 m wide. This is about 45% longer than the Solar Boat of Khufu now in the Solar Boat Museum next to Khufu’s pyramid. Note also the irregular spelling of *wsh*.

Here and below we will notice how meticulously the different measurements, numbers, and various descriptions are taken care of while the names of the protagonists are not even mentioned!

The subject *skd* of the last adverb clause (that can be introduced by “with”) should be plural here. The feminine suffix attached to the prepositional adverb *im* refers to the ship *dpt*. Note that *kpt* is a short version of *stpw* “the choicest, pick.”

A pair of clauses with the (regular) subjunctive *sdm.f* form of the 2ae-gem. verb *m3b* praise the crew. They are subordinate⁹ (but not emphatic) to the following main clause with adjectival predicate employing the comparative. The latter is the same pattern as the best known example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nfr</th>
<th>st</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>xnt</th>
<th>nbt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

⁹ See Allen (25.11).
The circumstantial/imperfective $sdm.f$ (or the subjunctive $sdm.f$) of the 2-lit. verb $sr$ continues to praise the crew. It is not known why the giraffe $n\text{h}^{10}$ is the determinative of $sr$. (One of the students suggested that it is because the giraffe is the tallest animal and can see far, far away, maybe even into the future…) Its two objects, $d^r$ “the storm” and $n\text{sni}$ “the tempest” are followed by adverb clauses that contain $ni\ sdm.t.f$ constructions. This is a typical example of this construction and in an adverb clause $ni\ sdm.t.f$ needs to be translated as “before he (has/had) heard.” The association of the Seth animal $\text{Seth}$ with tempest and, in general, with rage and turmoil is clear.

d$^r$ pr(.w) iw.n m w$\hat{d}$-wr $ tp \ f s\text{h}.n t\text{b}$

The sentence begins with a subject-stative construction with the intransitive verb (of motion) $pri$ as the predicate. It expresses past or perfect tense not focusing on the action itself but the state which results from this action. The adverb clause introduced by the particle $iw$ refers to location. This clause being subordinate, the role of the introductory particle is only that of a carrier of the suffix pronoun $.n$. Loprieno$^{11}$ calls this a “void” $iw$. The choice of the connecting word “when, while, and” is up to the translator.

Finally, the adverbial phrase introduced by the compound preposition $tp \ f$ must govern a noun or a noun phrase. Therefore, the verb form of $s\text{h}$ must be infinitive used as a noun. Note that Allen$^{12}$ interprets the verb form of $s\text{h}$ as a non-attributive relative form used nominally, and Borghouts$^{13}$ as the nominal prospective $sdm.f$ of the Standard Theory.

The subject of $s\text{h}$ is a suffixed personal pronoun and can therefore be translated as a possessive pronoun. All in all, we arrive at the translation: “before we reached land”, lit. “before our reaching land.” Note the nice balance between the adverb clause and adverbial phrase of location and time.

---

$^{10}$ Note that according to Gardiner Sign List E, in hieratic $n\text{h}$ is often replaced by $\text{N}$ (that appears in the next passage).


$^{12}$ Allen (26.20).

$^{13}$ Borghouts (50.d.3).
This passage is difficult. First of all, \textit{fAi} means “raise, lift up, carry” and along with \textit{TAw} “wind” the phrase \textit{fAi TAw} can be literally translated as “carry the wind”, an Egyptian idiom for “sail.” It is tempting to regard the beginning of this passage as the infinitive construction \textit{fAt TAw}: “sailing” or “as (we) sailed.” But this does not really fit into the context; the emerging storm and the impending peril of the crew. So, we need to disregard this idiom, extend \textit{t} to the impersonal pronoun \textit{tw}, and render the beginning as the passive of phrase \textit{fAi TAw}: “the wind was raised.” The verb form of \textit{fAi} can be indicative/perfective \textit{sDm.f} (translated as simple past tense) or circumstantial/imperfective \textit{sDm.f} with concomitant meaning imbedded in adverb clause and attached to the previous passage. The circumstantial/imperfective \textit{sDm.f} of \textit{iri} (with the suffix pronoun \textit{.f} referring back to the wind) is a good choice for its object \textit{wHmyt} “repetition” and the whole circumstantial clause \textit{ir.f wHmyt} simply indicates the continually increasing strength of the wind. In the last adverb clause the intrusive short prepositional adverb \textit{im.f} (the predicate) has moved up.

An ironic side note: Here and in the next passage we are led to believe that a wave of 4.2 meter (8 cubits) tall could sink a 63 m long ship with Egypt’s best sailors on board!

\textit{in ht hwI n.i s(t)}

This sentence is short but problematic and several interpretations have been put forward. What is clear is that the construction follows the form: \textit{in + noun} + MS perfective/imperfective active participle and is therefore a participial statement.\footnote{Gardiner (§373A), Hoch (§134) and Allen (23.13).} The masculine noun \textit{ht} means “mast, piece of wood” so that the sentence starts as: “It was the mast/a piece of wood…” Most of the interpretations agree that \textit{hwI} is the perfective active participle of the verb \textit{hwI} “hit, strike,” and also “plunder, smite.”\footnote{For example, \textit{hwI hwm.sn} “their cattle was plundered” with \textit{hwI} in passive, [Semna 2, 15].}
doubling of $h$ in the spelling is possibly a “sportive dual” in much the same way as in the
throne name $NB-PHTI-RC$ of Ahmose I the double $t$ stands for $ti$. (Neither
the spelling nor the sense justify the imperfective active participle $hwwi$ here since it
would convey repetition “battering/pounding.”) An example for sportive (plural) is

$h$ in the compound preposition $\text{hr} \ hw$ “except, apart from.”

The various translations now differ in the interpretation of the last portion of the
sentence. According to the traditional rendering, $n.i$ is dative and $s$ stands for the 3N de-
pendent pronoun $s(t)$ (or the 3FS $si$) referring to the (feminine) noun $nwyt$ “the
wave/swell.” Hence a possible translation of this passage is “it was the mast/a piece of
wood that battered it/broke it up (the wave) for me.” This conveys the meaning that the
broken mast/a piece of wood actually helped the sailor$^{16}$ to survive, and describes a typi-
cal scene of a sailor clinging to the mast with his life to float ashore.

On the other hand, according to Lichtheim (I), $ni$ is an intrusive and “common
graphic peculiarity,” and the sentence should be transliterated as: $in \ ht \ hw[nj].s$ ($sw$). Here
the feminine suffix pronoun $s$ refers to the wave and the missing masculine dependent
pronoun $sw$ stands for the mast. With this the translation is: “It was the mast, it (the wave)
struck it (the mast).”

According to yet another interpretation,$^{17}$ the participle is from the (unknown)
verb $hh$ “strike/pierce through,” the transliteration is: $in \ ht \ hh \ n.i \ s(i)$ with the last de-
pendent pronoun referring to the (feminine) boat $dpt$. With this the translation is: “It was the
mast that pierced through it (the boat).” This version has a missing piece in the descrip-
tion, namely that the wave first broke off the mast.

\[\text{\textipa{chf.n dpt m(w)t(.ti) ntiw im.s ni zp w f im}}\]
\[\text{\textipa{chf.n}}\] “then” introduces a subject-stative construction with predicate the intransitive verb
$m(w)t$ “die.” Once again this is to be translated by English simple past or perfect tense.

The 3FS stative suffix $ti$ was often omitted if the verb ended with $t$. This was possibly due

---

$^{16}$ Here we rename our follower “sailor” since this time he was not with the commander.

$^{17}$ Ignatov, op.cit.; see also the many references therein.
to the loss of one $t$ in pronunciation and the scribe’s effort to reflect this in writing. This
is in contrast with the writing in line 7 of $\text{izwt.n}$ “our crew.”

The plural relative adjective $ntiw$ is used here as a noun, lit. “those who exist(ed).” In fact, the entire clause (with the prepositional adverb $im.s$) functions as a noun, the topicalized subject of the following clause. Here $\text{ni zp}$ is the negated indicative/perfective $\text{sdm.f}$ of the 3ae-inf. verb $zpi$ “survive, remain” and not the negated indicative/perfective of the 2-lit. verb $zp$ happen (by the same spelling). The prepositional phrase $w^c im$ “one of them,” lit. “one therein” serves as a modifier.

Finally, it has also been suggested$^{18}$ that the uniliteral $s$ in the last passage is the causative of $\text{h}^c$. This gives the following partition and possible translation:

\[\text{in ht hwi n.i s}^c \text{n dpt m(w)t ntiw jm.s ni zp w^c im}\]

“It was the mast that broke up for me, the ship reared up, those who were in it were dying, not one survived.”

$\text{h}^c.n.i rdi.kw r iw in w Some n w Some-d-wr$

The subject-stative construction of the intransitive verb $m(w)t$ above is contrasted here with that of the transitive verb $rdi$. We are still in English past or perfect tense but the construction has passive meaning. This is again clear since the action “put on” lit. “given to” is performed “by the wave of the sea” on the subject “I.”

$\text{ir.n.i hrw 3 w}^c.kw \text{ ib.i m snw.i}$

$sdr.kw m hw n k3p n ht \text{ kni.n.i swyt}$

Among the many meanings of the verb $\text{iri}$ we need to choose here “spend.” In $\text{sdm.n.f}$/perfect form it is the predicate of the first clause. Using $\text{iri}$ with primary meaning “make, do” in connection with time is not that unusual as in colloquial English we also say “doing time” with a bit different meaning. (It is up to the reader to decide which is worse: stranded in a deserted island or being in prison.)

The following three unmarked adverb clauses describe how this action happened. The verb forms are easy to identify: The middle adverb clause with an adverbial predicate is stuck between two with stative predicates. Note that the verb wꜣ‘ “be alone” is related to wꜣ “one.” (For snw “companion” see the discussion in line 6 above.)

The bare initial sḏm.n.f verb form of īrī indicates that we may have here an emphatic construction with emphasized adverbial comments. The emphasis can be brought out by using the English qualifier “with only” inserted before the emphatic ib.i.

The transitive verb dwn “stretch” with the introductory phrase ẖꜣ.n is in perfect form which clearly indicates past tense. The following pseudo-verbal r + infinitive construction (the so-called r of futurity) uses the verb rẖ “learn, know” and indicates planned action: “to find out/to discover.” In the last virtual question, dit.i is a perfective relative form of di.

There are no difficulties here with the grammar and the translation. Brrt is not only “grape” but also “wine.” In one spelling of Brrt the bilateral sign 𓆑 plays out its phonetic value ir, but in the text the determinative 𓊙 may also be suggestive to tiredness associated with the condition of drinking wine.

The scribe apparently makes distinction here between unripe and ripe (notched) sycamore figs. Note the forward position of the prepositional adverb im inside the loosely connected nouns in A ḫnꜣ.B.

---

19 See H. Polotsky, Egyptian Tenses, The Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Jerusalem, 1965; Allen (25.10) and Hoch §148.
In the last clause the object of the preposition *mi* is the infinitive of *irī* (used as a noun): “(as if) tending” lit. “(like/as if) making.” Its subject of the infinitive is the suffix pronoun .s and it refers to šzpt (and if .s is an exceptional writing of .sn, possibly also to k3w and nk₇wt).

Note that Blackman²⁰ views the last clause as *mi irī.tw*.s, and with the impersonal suffix pronoun .tw it converts the phrase into passive voice “as if it was tended.” The English translation does not reflect these differing points of view.

\[
\text{rmw im ḥn}^\ddagger 3pdw \ nn ntt nn st m ḥnw.f
\]

In the adverb clause the predicate (the prepositional adverb *im*) is once again moved up from the back in the compound *rmw ḥn*³ ³pdw *im* and placed directly after the first subject; not an unusual construction, provided that the adverbial predicate is short.

The second clause needs some elaboration. It contains the negated adverb clause *nn st m ḥnw.f* “it was not in its interior,” lit. “it in its interior is not.” The (feminine) relative adjective *ntt* placed in front of this serves as a marker and turns this into relative clause used as a noun: “that which it was not in its interior.” As such it can be negated using *nn*. We arrive at the phrase “there was nothing that was not in it.” In plain language this means that it (the island) had everything in it.

\[
\text{ḥf}.n \ ss3.n.(i) \ wi \ rdl.n.i \ r \ t^n \ wr \ hr \ ³wi.i
\]

This sentence starts with the perfect of the caus. 3-inf. verb *ss3l* (with omitted subject) and object *wi*, an English reflexive pronoun.

In the next sentence the governing clause has the perfect of *rdl* as a verbal predicate, lit. “I placed to the ground” meaning “I put down.” A clause of causality is then introduced by the preposition *n* “because” followed by the adjective *wr* (used as a noun) and the adverbial phrase *hr ³wi.i* “in my arms.” Lit. “because much in my arms,” meaning that the sailor had too much in his arms. Throughout, the object (the produce of the island) is omitted since it has been described in detail in the previous passage.

²⁰ A. M. Blackman, Middle-Egyptian Stories, 1932.
The only possible reason for the scribe to use here the narrative infinitive of šdt is that there is a break in the narrative; the sailor, after marveling at the riches of the phantom island, stuffed himself, and now it is time to give offerings to the gods for his good fortune.

According to the most widely accepted view, this passage is a compound of three clauses: the first is the main clause and it is continued by two other main clauses.

(Note that in the column writing of the original papyrus, the signs could not fit at the end of the column, so the scribe fitted them at the bottom of the next column.) After the introductory first clause, in the last two clauses the circumstantial (narrative) perfect verb forms of špr and ird are employed. Note that the compound phrase zi n šdt “burnt offering” comes from zi “go, perish” and šdt “fire,” lit. “go/perish to/by flame.” With this the traditional analysis is reflected in Lichtheim’s translation: Then I cut a fire drill, made a fire and gave a burnt offering to the gods.”

This point of view has been challenged by Berg who takes the principal meaning of the verb šdi as “remove.” Among others, this is supported by the use of šdi (and its causative sšdi) for “digging” (well): shnw kšwt m inr r šdt hnm nt m dw. According to Berg’s view, šdt.i d3 “I removed the fire drill” does not fit to the time sequence of the rendering above as this is just the opposite that the sailor is supposed to do when making a fire. Although it has been argued that the sailor may have carried a bag from which he pulled out the fire drill, this explanation (put forward by some scholars) is a bit hypothetical and there is no further reference to this in the text. Berg makes an argument illustrated by examples to retain the original meaning “remove” of šdi. The key point is to change the second clause from main clause to circumstantial and to recall that the perfect in adverb

---

21 Lichtheim (I).
22 E. Doret, op.cit.
23 Lichtheim’s translation is based on the meaning of šdi “cut out” originally suggested by Faulkner, DCME, 273. In addition, šdi also has the meaning “take, grab” which fits to this interpretation.
25 See e.g. [Neferti, 16].
26 See the Grammar Points in The Inscriptions of Sety I at Al-Kanais/Wadi Mia: Part I.
clauses is used to denote prior circumstance.\textsuperscript{27} With this, Berg’s translation is: “Removing the fire drill when I had ignited the fire, I made a holocaust to the gods.”

The principal objection to this is context: Why would a storyteller emphasize the removal of the fire drill after its use?

\textsuperscript{27} Hoch (§32) and Allen (18.11)