

## Ägyptologie

Ein Überblick über die im vergangenen Jahr in der OLZ erschienenen Rezensionen zeigt ein ungebrochenes Interesse an Studien zu ägyptischen Texten und zur ägyptischen Religion durch die verschiedenen Epochen, wobei besonders die Erschließung großer Textcorpora oder Textgruppen im Vordergrund stand, wie z. B. Pyramidentexte, Totenliturgien, Inschriften der 22.–24. Dynastie oder solche zum Isiskult. Das Fach kann sich glücklich schätzen, solch religions- wie kulturgeschichtlich wertvolles Material in vorbildlicher Weise erschlossen bekommen zu haben.

Die Ägyptologie hat im Jahr 2009 zwei schwere Verluste zu beklagen: Jean Yoyotte (1927–2009), ehemals Professor am Collège de France und Forschungsdirektor an der École pratique des hautes études, und Peter Munro (1930–2009), emeritierter Professor an der Freien Universität Berlin, sind von uns gegangen. Beide haben mit ihren Arbeiten wesentlich zum Fortgang der Wissenschaft Ägyptologie beigetragen. Das Jahr 2009 hat auch einen Generationenwechsel auf manchen Positionen in Deutschland herbeigeführt: Im Deutschen Archäologischen Institut Abteilung Kairo folgte Stephan Seidlmayer dem bisherigen Direktor Günter Dreyer, am Ägyptischen Museum Berlin übernahm Friederike Seyfried die Geschäfte ihres Vorgängers Dietrich Wildung, an der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster trat Angelika Lohwasser die Nachfolge von Erhart Graefe an und einen Ruf an die Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn nahm Ludwig Morenz an.

**Uljas, Sami: The Modal System of Earlier Egyptian Complement Clauses.** A Study in Pragmatics in a Dead Language (Probleme der Ägyptologie 26). Leiden – Boston: Brill 2007. VII, 430 S. 8° = Probleme der Ägyptologie, 26. Hartbd. 140,00 €. ISBN 978-90-04-15831-3. – Bespr. von Helmut Satzinger, Wien.

A recent book by S. Uljas investigates Egyptian “that” clauses with respect to their modal qualities. Morphosyntactic variation displayed by “that” clauses (or complement clauses) encompasses

- (1) clauses introduced by *ntt* or *wnt*,<sup>1</sup>
- (2) clauses introduced by suffix conjugations *sḏm=f* or *sḏm.n=f*.

According to Uljas, the clauses introduced by *ntt* / *wnt*, and those with the marked and unmarked *sḏm=f* forms, serve different modal meanings. The clauses introduced by *ntt* / *wnt* are said to be kind of indicative, used, e.g., for object clauses of “assertive verbs” (“to say, to know, to see” etc.), for matters that are taken as reality by the speaker, and regarded as relevant to the hearer. “Semantic-pragmatically, in such clauses [the proposition] is presented as information of whose reliability the speaker is prepared to take full responsibility ...” (p. 99). The contrary is “non-assertion”, in particular, “an expression of the speaker’s ignorance, lack of commitment and acceptance of the complement proposition as well as of its known or perceived lack of discourse relevance. The overall formal signal of ... a modal status of these clauses is the absence of the elements *ntt* / *wnt* and the use of bare *sḏm=f* forms” (pp. 98–99). The modal character can, however, – according to Uljas – be differentiated, though only with a minor group of verbs, namely those of the mutable classes. Geminating/doubling forms of the *sḏm=f* are said to be expressive of a less irreal modality (called “proximal”), non-geminating/non-doubling ones of a more distinctly irrealis modality

(called “distal”). “The former is tantamount to lesser, the latter to greater degree of speaker non-commitment or information redundancy (p. 308).” (In Uljas’ opinion only “mutable verbs” display more than one *sḏm=f* form – a marked one, and an unmarked one –, whereas the majority of the verbs has but one; for this issue see below, towards the end.)

Object clauses of “assertive verbs” (“to say”, “to know”, “to see”, etc.) may either be introduced by *ntt* / *wnt*, or by a bare *sḏm=f* form. However, the object clauses of verbs of intention (“to wish”, “to cause”, “to prevent”, “to order”, etc.; Uljas’ “non-assertive verbs”) are never introduced by *ntt* or *wnt*, rather always by a bare *sḏm=f* form – it is argued that this is evidence for the priority of modality over “syntax” (kind of an alias used by Uljas for structuralistic morphosyntactic analysis). It would seem, though, that it is rather a question of time reference: matters that are stated are past or present, whereas things that are desired are future, at best.

Matters, or “situations that are both ‘objectively’ (...) and/or ‘subjectively’ (...) ‘near’ to the speaker” (p. 99) are formed with the geminating *sḏm=f*, “specialised or marked formal representative of this *proximal irrealis*” (ib.), contrasting “with the kind of *non-assertion* expressed by *non-geminating sḏm=f* forms” (ib.), typical of “complement clauses describing situations that are both temporally separated from the speaker – i.e. are future or past – and whose assertion is most clearly blocked by the ‘objective’ factor of lack of knowledge ...” (ib.). The said distinction is, however, restricted to “mutable verbs”. All others have to do without this: as they have – according to Uljas – just one *sḏm=f* form he believes that they do not distinguish between non-real assertions that are near in time, and others that are distant, and it does for them not matter whether the information is deemed worthy of assertion or not, etc.

Or, put more concisely:

“The Earlier Egyptian system of affirmative complement clause modality has been seen to be based on the variation of *ntt* / *wnt*-introduced construals and bare active suffix-conjugation forms. In general, the ab-

<sup>1</sup> For a differentiation in the use of the two particles see Hh. J. Polotsky, in: *Orientalia* 38, 1969, 480–81.

sence of a complementiser [= *ntt* / *wnt*] signals non-assertion, which is a reflection of diminished speaker commitment to or diminished relevance of what is said. [It will, however, be seen below that this is not the case: generally speaking, the use of a *ntt* / *wnt* construction is triggered by syntactic exigencies. H. S.] However, unlike immutable forms of the active *sḏm=f* and the *sḏm.n=f*, the different forms of *sḏm=f* of mutable classes divide the domain of irrealis further. Geminating/doubling forms of the *sḏm=f* are expressive of the so-called proximal, non-geminating/-doubling ones of distal irrealis modality. The former is tantamount to lesser, the latter to greater degree of speaker non-commitment or information redundancy. Some of the forms used to express irrealis appear to be marked for this function, i.e. at least in complementation they have no other role, and some are not." (p. 308.).

In traditional terminology, the "geminating" *sḏm=f* forms (of the stem-reduplicating weak verbs) are called "imperfective" *sḏm=f*; a really appropriate term would be "substantival form of the general present (aorist)". The non-geminating *sḏm=f* forms of the stem-reduplicating weak verbs are, as a perusal of the pertinent examples of object clauses makes evident, either the prospective or the subjunctive *sḏm=f*. The latter is found as object clause of verbs of intention only, like *rdj* "to cause", *mrj* "to wish", etc. (Uljas' "non-assertive verbs"). It is exactly with these verbs that no object clauses with *ntt* or *wnt* are found. Hence we find the following structural data (NB. this is my observation, H. S.).

(1) Objects of verbs of assertion (*to say*, *to know*, *to see*, etc.).

(1.1) *ntt* / *wnt*...; (1.2) "imperfective" *sḏm=f* for the general present; (1.3) prospective *sḏm=f* for the future; (1.4) subjunctive *sḏm=f* for modal meaning:

- of *dd* "to say": with *ntt* / *wnt* or indistinguishable prospective/subjunctive forms, rarely with clear prospective forms, according to time reference;
- of *rh* "to know": either with a *ntt* / *wnt* construction, or with an "imperfective" form (form of the general present, or aorist); rarely with prospective forms;
- of *m33* "to see" or *sḏm* "to hear": with a *ntt* / *wnt* construction, or with an "imperfective" form.

(2) Objects of verbs of intention ("to wish", "to cause", "to prevent", "to order", etc.; Uljas' "non-assertive verbs") – they are not formed with *ntt* / *wnt*.

(2.1) with "imperfective" *sḏm=f*, of general present reference; (2.2) with prospective *sḏm=f*, of future reference; (2.3) with subjunctive *sḏm=f*, of modal meaning:

- of *rdj* "to cause": mostly with subjunctive, rarely with prospective forms;
- of *mrj* "to wish": with imperfective and prospective forms, with present and future reference, respectively;
- of *wḏ* "to order": with imperfective (present) and indistinguishable prospective/subjunctive forms (future).

As for the option among the *sḏm=f* forms, it is primarily one of time reference, and in respect to the future, also of presence or absence of a modal value.

What, then, about the uses of *ntt* or *wnt*? The answer can only be found by a structuralistic analysis as it is not a matter of modes, or anything "pragmatic". For the major part, these particles are not found used unless their use is triggered by syntactic exigencies. For establishing this, it is advisable to proceed from the system of the Middle Egyptian tense transpositions.<sup>2</sup>

As can be seen from the above, there are but three cases in which the language disposes of a substantival form, to be employed in an object clause (or any other "that" clause): perfect (a), aorist (b), and prospective (c). In the last case, there is no rivalling *ntt* / *wnt* construction as the prospective *sḏm=f* is incompatible with adverbial use.<sup>3</sup> In the aorist, a *ntt* / *wnt* construction appears only in post-classical texts, as will be shown below. It is only the perfect where a *ntt* / *wnt* construction is normal and at all times more frequent than the substantival *sḏm.n=f*.

The cases in which *ntt* / *wnt* cannot be avoided, as there does not exist a pertinent *sḏm(.n)=f* form, are the progressive (d) and the future (e), as also a series of other constructions, as listed in the following. All these cases are insignificant for our question as there is no alternative to the *ntt* / *wnt* construction.

#### Non-pertinent cases (with no alternative for the use of *ntt* / *wnt*):

Verbal clauses (suffix conjugations) are at disposal for object clauses in the perfect (a), the general present or aorist (b), and the prospective (c). In all other cases an analytic construction is due, composed of either *ntt* or *wnt*, plus subject (where relevant), plus adverbial/circumstantial verb form or construction. The respective attributive constructions ("relative clauses") are formed with *ntj* (and in no other way), as everybody is aware; in the same manner, the corresponding substantival construction is based on *ntt* (or *wnt*). Furthermore, *ntt* or *wnt* are needed to substantivise any construction negated by *n* or *nn*, and all types of non-verbal constructions, whether with nominal or with adverbial predicate.

<sup>2</sup> H. Satzinger, "On tense and aspect in Middle Egyptian." G. Englund – P. J. Frandsen (Hg.), *Crossroad – Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm*, 1986, 297–313; also available from [http://homepage.univie.ac.at/helmut.satzinger/Wurzelverzeichnis/1981\\_90.html](http://homepage.univie.ac.at/helmut.satzinger/Wurzelverzeichnis/1981_90.html).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the corresponding initial constructions/forms: for the perfect and the aorist, the *jw* matrix is employed (as is the *ntt* or *wnt* matrix in "that" clauses), whereas this is obviously not possible in the prospective tense.



	1. Initial	2. Substantival	3. Adjectival (participles; fem. sing. forms given)	4. Adjectival (relative forms; fem. sing. forms given)
a. "Perfect": <sup>4</sup>	<i>jw sdm.n=f.</i> <i>jw=f + Stative</i> (intransitive, passive). <i>jw + Passive sdmw.f.</i>	<i>sdm.n=f.</i>  <i>sdm.n.tw.f.</i>	<i>sdmt</i> ("perf.").  <i>sdm(j)t.</i>	<i>sdmt.n=f.</i>  <i>sdm(j)t + noun.</i>
b. "Aorist" <sup>5</sup> (general present):	<i>jw(=f) sdm=f.</i>	<i>sdm=f (pr=f).</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>sdmt (prrt).</i>	<i>sdmt=f (prrt=f).</i>
c. Prospective:	<i>sdm=f.</i>	<i>sdm=f.</i> <sup>7</sup>	<i>sdm.tj=sj.</i>	<i>sdmt(j).f.</i>
d. Progressive:		<i>ntt=f hr sdm.</i> <sup>8</sup>	<i>ntt hr sdm.</i> <sup>10</sup>	<i>*ntt=f hr sdm.</i>
e. Future:		<i>ntt=f r sdm.</i> <sup>9</sup>	<i>ntt r sdm.</i> <sup>11</sup>	<i>ntt=f r sdm.</i> <sup>12</sup>

Negative aorist (*n sdm.n=f*): *ntt / wnt + n sdm.n=f*.<sup>13</sup>

73 (*m33* "to see") *ntt n h'c.n N* "that it cannot stand up".

Negativethetic expression (*nn + N*): *ntt / wnt + nn + N*.

65 (*sj3* "to know") *wnt nn jr.tj=f* "that there is no one who will ...".

Progressive: *ntt=f / wnt=f hr sdm.*

23 (*dd* "to say") *wnt=f hr ts=j* "that he is knitting me together".

Future: *ntt=f / wnt=f r sdm.*

20 (*dd* "to say") *wnt=k r jrt* "that you are going to construct".

Adverbial sentence: *ntt / wnt + SUBJECT + ADVERB PHRASE*.

59 (*m33* "to see") *ntt st hr ...* "that they carry ...".

62 (*rh* "to know") *wnt N hr N* "that N. is on ...".

<sup>4</sup> Originally, *sdm.n=f* and stative are expressions of a true perfect, similar to the perfect of Ancient Greek; in the later Old Kingdom, both forms assume an indefinite character of a past tense, including usage as present perfect, and also as a narrative past. In descriptive (synchronique) view a term like "preterite" would be more appropriate, as it encompassed this tense character by Middle Egyptian times; and a preterite is less marked than a perfect, therefore it is the more appropriate term for this merger.

<sup>5</sup> When Polotsky introduced this term for Egyptian and Coptic he was inspired by Turkish grammatical usage. Schenkel prefers "Generalis", as it is a general (non-progressive) present.

<sup>6</sup> Uljas' examples 82, 86, 87, 93, 100.

<sup>7</sup> Uljas' examples 29 through 38, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 95, 96, 97, 77.

<sup>8</sup> Uljas' example 23, with *wnt*.

<sup>9</sup> Uljas' example (20), with *wnt*.

<sup>10</sup> *ntt hr ms-t* "who is about to give birth" (P. Ramesseum IV C 30); *p3 ntj hr ndr-t mnt* "hey you, who are grasping the haunch!" (Kêmi 6, 1936, 91); *j hwnw ntj hr zwr* "hey, young man, who are drinking!" (Wreszinski, Atlas III, Tf. 54); *d3dt ntt hr sh3 m rht jrp* "the magistrates who are taking down the quantity of wine" (Lepsius Denkmäler II 61 a).

<sup>11</sup> *rht krhwt ntj r jrt r jnw* "The number of vessels that are to be made a tribut" (P. Kahun 26,2).

<sup>12</sup> *pw-tr ntj tw r jr.t* "What has to be done?" (Ipuwer 4, 6–7).

<sup>13</sup> The numbers are those of Uljas' examples.

67 (*rh* "to know") *wnt=sn hn'c=k* "that they are with you".

75 (*rh* "to know") *ntt N hr N* "that N. is on ...".

102 (*swd.t(w)* "to inform") *ntt st hr N* "that they are on ...".

186 (*dd* "to say") *wnt N m ...* "that there are ... among ...".

Nominal sentence: *ntt / wnt + N pw (N)*.

53 (*rh* "to know") *wnt N pw* "that he is ...".

60 (*m33* "to see") *ntt N pw* "that it was ...".

63 (*rh* "to know") *ntt N pw N* "that N is ...".

100 (*sdh* "to hide") *wnt mtwt w3ir js pw* "that it is Osiris' seed".

Cleft sentence (*jn N ... / ntj ...*): *ntt / wnt + jn N... / ntj ...*

74 (*rh* "to know") *ntt jn N jrr* "that it is ... who does".

76 (*rh* "to know") *ntt ntk rdj* "that it is you who has given".

Focalising ("emphasising") construction: *ntt / wnt + sdm(n)=f + ADV*.

103 (*rh* "to know") *ntt pr.n=k hnt=f* "(He gave you every land. Administer it for him as he knows) that it is from him that you have gone forth" *Urk. IV, 1241, 5–6* ("sachant que c'est de lui que tu es issu" Polotsky Études de syntaxe copte 186 (= *Coll. Pap. 82*)).

Topicalisation, *jr N*: *ntt / wnt jr N*.

54 (*rh* "to know") *ntt jr N ...* "that as for ..., it is not ...".

Topicalization,  $\emptyset N$ : *ntt / wnt \emptyset N*.

69 (*rh* "to know") *wnt + N n-sdmt=f* "that, as for N., he has not yet arrived".

Tenses in which an object clause cannot be anything but a *ntt* (or *wnt*) construction are not conclusive for answering our question, namely what motive is behind the use of a *ntt* (or *wnt*) construction vs. a substantival suffix conjugation. A progressive object clause, e.g., cannot have any other form than *ntt hr sdm*. The same is true of the opposite, namely a construction that is incom-

patible with *nty* and *ntt*, such as the prospective. This incompatibility has nothing to do with any modal or non-modal meaning, nor any argument that might be termed “pragmatic”. It has to do with the fact that the prospective *sdm=f* cannot have adverbial function.<sup>14</sup> In the *nty* and *ntt* constructions, however, an adverbial predicative element is essential.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, a prospective object clause can only be construed as *sdm=f*, without any *ntt* (for examples, see the appendix).

There are, however, two tenses which dispose of both possibilities for object clauses. These are:

- “Perfect”: substantival *sdm.n=f* vs. *ntt* / *wnt* + *sdm.n=f* and *ntt=f* / *wnt=f* + stative.

The greater part of the examples shows the analytic option, viz. a form with *ntt* or *wnt*.

- “Aorist”: “geminating” *sdm=f* vs. *ntt* / *wnt* + circumstantial *sdm=f*.

Most examples show the synthetic option, viz. substantival (“geminating”) *sdm=f*.

This is the only sector of the material that is relevant for Uljas’ question; all the rest, some eighty percent, is insignificant.

### Significant case no. 1: the “perfect.”<sup>16</sup>

Perfect active transitive (*jw sdm.n=f*): in Uljas’ book the examples of substantival *sdm.n=f* featuring as object clause are banned into chapter VII among “supplementary patterns of complementation” (pp. 264 ff.). What is presented in the main chapters of “affirmative object complementation” (pp. 50 ff.) are the constructions with *ntt* / *wnt*, namely *ntt* / *wnt sdm.n=f* (mainly of transitive verbs) and *ntt=f* + stative (of intransitive verbs). Both are found in a representative number. It is true that one or the other of the *sdm.n=f* forms in question is substantival (“emphasising”), like no. (103), above. It is of an intransitive verb of motion which should display the stative construction when expanding *ntt* or *wnt*; a *sdm.n=f* form of an intransitive verb of motion can only be substantival.

But such an interpretation is not possible in many of the other cases, which are all of transitive verbs.

- 18 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt jn.n=k* “that you have brought”.
- 19 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt jr.n=k* “that you have made”.
- 21 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt jn.n=k* “that you have brought”.
- 22 (*dd* “to say”) *ntt m.n=k* “that you have swallowed”.
- 24 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt rdj.n=k* “that you have caused”.
- 52 (*rh* “to know”) *wnt jr.n=j* “that I have made”.
- 55 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt dd.n N* “that N. has said”.

<sup>14</sup> The same is not true of the subjunctive which may be rhematic in the “emphasising construction”, to be translated as a final clause, as e.g. *wmn=j jj.kw m3n=j tw* (var. *m3=j tw*) “I have come that I may see you” CT 4,45 d; *jj.n=j dj=j tjt=k wrw d3hj* “I have come in order to make you beat the princes of Djahi” (Urk IV, 614, 15–16, et simile passim).

<sup>15</sup> Satzinger, Attribut und Relativsatz im Älteren Ägyptisch, in: F. Junge (Hg.), Studien zu Sprache und Religion Ägyptens. Zu Ehren von Wolfhart Westendorf, 125–156.

<sup>16</sup> Or rather, “preterite”; see above, note 3.

- 61 (*sdm* “to hear”) *wnt tz.n wj N* “that N. has elevated me”.

One further example: *j.dd=tn n jt=tn wnt rd.n n=tn W. p3wt=tn shtp.n tn W. m twt=tn shtp.n tn W. m twt=tn* “May you tell your father that W. has given you your offering loaves, that W. has satisfied you with your share(?)” Pyr. 448a–b.

There is an instance of *wnt* plus passive *sdm(w)* with non-pronominal subject; it is from an Old Kingdom inscription.

- 187 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt htm N* “that ... have been sealed”.

Object clauses with *ntt=f* / *wnt=f* + Stative, intransitive:

- 25 (*dd* “to say”) *ntt wj h.kw* “(I want to<sup>17</sup> let her know) that I am rejoicing”.
- 26 (*dd* “to say”) *ntt wj jj.kw* “(Tell him ...) that I have come”.
- 27 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt wj h.kw* “(May you tell Horus) that I am (!) delighted”.
- 28 (*dd* “to say”) *ntt wj snd.kw* “(If only someone would tell ...) that I am afraid”.
- 57 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt N wn.(w)* “(as they know) that N. exists”.
- 66 (*sj3* “to perceive”) *wnt N snd.(w)* “(May he perceive) that N. was afraid”.
- 68 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt w(j) pr.k(j)* “(to let it be known) that I had gone”.

Object clause with *ntt=f* / *wnt=f* + Stative, transitive-passive:

- 56 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt=s<sup>18</sup> mn.tj* “(Well, you know) that she is fixed”.

Object clauses with substantival *sdm.n=f*, however, are quite rare, compared with those with *ntt* / *wnt*.<sup>19</sup>

- 330 (*gmj* “to find”) *jr gmj=k tz.n=f* “if you find that it has consolidated” P. Ebers 40, 19 (Gardiner *Grammar* p. 141.3).
- 331 (*m33* “to see”) *n m3=f hpr.n=j* (var. *hpr=j*) *m hr=f* “he did not see with his own eyes that I had come into existence” CT I 334/335c.

Another example: (*rh* “to know”) *j(w)=k rh.t(j) dd.n=f n(=j) jnk smj=j jm=t* “You know that he said to me, ‘It is I who shall denounce you’” Piankoff & Clère “bowl in the Louvre” JEA 20, 1934, 157–169, in particular, 158, Z. 17–18,<sup>20</sup> after Edel Grammatik §§ 1015, 1016b (First Intermediate Period).

Subject clause:

- 335 (*gmj* “to find”) *n zp gmj jr.n smr jmj-r j3w nb prj r j3m tp-wj* “Never was it found that any ‘friend’ and head of mercenaries who had departed for Iam had done (it) before” Urk. I, 125, 10–11, after Edel Grammatik § 1016b.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. JNES 2, 1943, 249–283.

<sup>18</sup> Uljas’ transcription is *ntt sj*.

<sup>19</sup> Ex. 336 contains a relative form, rather than a “that” form: *n gmj tr pn jrj.n=f r=j* “That time did not accomplish what it had done against me” Tb 42, 22/Nu pl. 17, 21.

<sup>20</sup> A. Piankoff/J. J. Clère, A letter to the dead on a bowl in the Louvre, in: JEA 20 (1934) 157–169, 2 Taf.



Apposition to subject:

(*hpr* “to happen”) *hpr.n jrf n=k nn mj jššt... jj.n=k r st tn* “How did this happen to you ... – that you came to this place?” Pyr. 931a–c (M), after Edel Grammatik § 1014.

There are also instances of the Old Egyptian substantival passive form, *sdm(w)*.

111 (*gmj* “to find”) *gmj.n=f smn n=f stw 4 m hmt sty* “(Having come back (*jj.n=f js*), doing what I have (just) put to your attention, and entering (*ʿk.n=f rf*) his northern garden,) he (the king) found that four shooting-targets of Asiatic copper had been posted for him.” Urk. IV, 1280, 13 (Dyn. 18).

Subject clause:

110 (*gmj* “to find”) *gm.n.tw jnj snn m h3 n whmw n wʿrt mht m h3 n t3ty* “It was found that a copy had been brought from the office of the herald of the northern district and from the bureau of the vizier” Stèle juridique 15.<sup>21</sup>

The expected Middle Egyptian passive form, namely *sdm.n.tw=f*, is not found in Uljas’ material.

According to Uljas, *ntt / wnt* constructions are used for objects of “notionally assertive” verbs, whereas suffix conjugations serve for the objects of “notionally non-assertive” verbs (as a general line). Nothing of the kind can be found with the perfect tense object clauses. An object clause of “non-assertive” past content could be imagined as in “he hoped that NN. had (in the meantime) finished his job”, yet there do not seem to be such utterances preserved; actually all examples quoted are with verb whereas *ntt sdm.n=f / ntt=f* + stative is found for objects of both “notionally assertive” verbs and “notionally non-assertive” verbs, like *dd* “to say”, *rh* “to know”, *sdm* “to hear”, *sj3* “to perceive”, *m33* “to see”. What can be observed is that most of the clauses without *ntt / wnt* are objects of the verb *gmj* “to find” (which is certainly “assertive”). Quite obviously the difference between substantival *sdm.n=f* and *ntt sdm.n=f / ntt=f* + stative is not one of mood, of realis vs. irrealis, etc.

## Significant case no. 2: the aorist.

The substantival form of the aorist (*jw=f sdm=f*, more rarely *jw sdm=f*) is the reduplicating (“geminating”, “imperfective”) *sdm=f*.

82 (*rh* “to know”) *mrr N* “that<sup>22</sup> ... loves me” (Old Kingdom).

86 (*rh* “to know”) *mrr=k* “that you love” (Old Kingdom).

87 (*rh* “to know”) *dgg N* “that ... looks” (Middle Kingdom).

93 (*rh* “to know”) *hss=k* “that you favour” (Dyn. 18).

100 (*sdh* “to hide”) *mss=t* “that you give birth”, parallel *jwr=t* “that you become (!) pregnant” and *wnt mtwt wsir js pw* “that it is Osiris’ semen” (Coffin Texts).

The reduplicating (“geminating”, “imperfective”) *sdm=f* of a verb of quality may be regarded as the counterpart either of *jw nfr=f* (quality verbs prefer this form to *jw=f nfr=f*<sup>23</sup>), or of the adjectival predicate (*nfr sw*).

88 (*rh* “to know”) *knn=j* “that I am brave” (Sinuhe).

89 (*rh* “to know”) *hss=f* “that he is feeble” (Ptahhotep).

92 (*rh* “to know”) *ntrr=f* “that he is divine” (Dyn. 18).

As with *nfr sw*, also passive forms are found.

90 (*rh* “to know”) *pss=sn* “that they are cooked” (medical text).

91 (*rh* “to know”) *jʿ=sn* “they are washed” (medical text).

There have, however, been noted a few comparable cases where *ntt / wnt* plus “circumstantial *sdm=f*” is found. One example from the Old Kingdom has *wnt=f sdm=f* (in a rather fragmentary context).

104 (*dd* “to say”) *wnt=f db3=f*<sup>24</sup> “that he (constantly) falls down” (on account of a disease) (Old Kingdom).

The meaning is seemingly that of a habitualis, and this makes think of the construction with past *wn=f*, namely *wn=f sdm=f* “he used to hear” (*wn=(j) jr=(j)* “I used to act” Urk. I 59, 16; *wn=j wšd=j* “I used to interview” Sinai 90, 9; participle transformation *wnt sdm=f: wnw m33=sn w(j)* “who used to see me” Kaplony Methethi,<sup>25</sup> p. 28: fig. 5; *jnk wn jr=(j) n=sn šhr* “It was I who did the planning for them” Urk. I 102, 9; relative form transposition *wnt=f sdm=f: jr=k wnt=k jr=k m-b3h* “may you do what you used to do before” Pyr. 623c (sim. Pyr. 659c, 760b); *wn=(j) dd=(j)* “what I used to say” Urk. I 57, 15; relative form transposition *wnt sdm=f: jwn=j js pw wnt jr=j* “what I used to do was my (real) nature” Urk. IV 973, 14). This *wn=f sdm=f* is the past conversion of the aorist *jw=f sdm=f* (later *jw sdm=f*).

The other three examples have *ntt sdm=f*, transposition of the late variant of the aorist construction, *jw sdm=f*<sup>26</sup>. They are all of Dyn. 18 date. None of the examples displays a noteworthy habitualis character, in contrast to the earlier *wnt=f sdm=f* example.

58 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt jrj=f nsyt w3ht hr nhh* “that he exercises Kingship that lasts for eternity” (Dyn. 18).

<sup>21</sup> W. Welck, Historisch-biographische Texte der 2. Zwischenzeit und neue Texte der 18. Dynastie. 2., überarbeitete Auflage, 1983 (= Kleine ägyptische Texte), 65–69, notably 67.

<sup>22</sup> Here and in the following exx., Uljas translates the imperfective *sdm=f* forms with “how”, rather than “that”. The translation of ex. 100 follows J. Allen, Features of Nonverbal Predicates in Old Egyptian, in: G. Englund/P. J. Frandsen (eds.), Crossroad – Chaos or the Beginning of a New Paradigm, 25 ex. 45. This pattern for the rendering of the imperfective *sdm=f* goes back to John Callender’s concept of “manner nominalizations” (J. B. Callender, Middle Egyptian, 1975 (= Afroasiatic Dialects, 2) 3.4.11.1 et passim); it should be avoided.

<sup>23</sup> For which see H. Satzinger “Anmerkungen zu *jw.f sdm.f*”, in: Göttinger Miszellen 115, 1990, 99–102.

<sup>24</sup> In reading the verb as *db3h*, Uljas, like many others, follows, Edel Grammatik § 1021 (“nach Koll[ationierung]”). However, the tiny ring sign is hardly for *h*; it is rather the determinative of *dbn* “to be round” and its derivatives, protracted to the quasi-homonymous *db3*.

<sup>25</sup> P. Kaplony, Studien zum Grab des Methethi, 1976 (= Monographien der Abegg-Stiftung Bern 8).

<sup>26</sup> For which see Satzinger, *jw.f sdm.f*, in: Göttinger Miszellen 115, 1990, 99–102.

64 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt* *nh=f jm=s* “that he lives of it” (Dyn. 18).

105 (*rh* “to know”) *ntt* *hṭp=f hr=s* “that he is content with it” (Dyn. 18).

It seems that it is basically a diachronical feature. Whereas Classical Egyptian has the “geminating” *sdm=f* as the form of the noun clause of (general) present time reference (and *wnt=f sdm=f* for a habitualis meaning only), post-classical language prefers an analytic formation, viz. *ntt sdm=f*. Late Egyptian shows that the substantival forms were not in free use anymore in the New Kingdom but rather served the rhematising (“emphasising”) construction only. This is probably the reason why they were also avoided in high-register speech of that period.

The present analysis of Uljas’ material has shown that it is only in a few restricted cases that there is an option between using *ntt* for forming a noun clause, or a “that”-form *sdm(n)=f*, namely in verbal clauses of the perfect and aorist tenses; otherwise, *ntt* has to be used. But even here, there is no real option: in the perfect, the *ntt* construction is preferred by far; it is noteworthy that the few examples with substantival *sdm.n=f* do not display any discernable differences in respect to tense and mood or any “pragmatic” quality. In the aorist, on the other hand, the substantival *sdm=f* is almost exclusively used (*wnt=f sdm=f* serves for a habitualis); *ntt sdm=f* begins to replace the substantival *sdm=f* in post-classical times only.

Uljas has refrained from analysing the basic structure of the constructions in question as he is obviously of the opinion that a study of semantic details is sufficient. One of his major objectives, declared on many introductory pages, is to disprove the validity of the “syntactic approach” of the structuralist method, to free the way for the so-called pragmatic method. Here is a florilegium illustrating the style of his “arguments”: “turns out to be

bedevilled by various sorts of problems” (p. 9); “seems to be an oversimplification” (p. 12); “is also [!] seriously in doubt generally” (p. 13); “dubious syntactic analogy” (ib.); “highly suspect theory” (ib.); “it is disputable” (ib.); “good reasons to doubt” (ib.); “seems unlikely to be correct” (ib.).

What resulted from this endeavour is nevertheless a total failure in this respect. The exuberant philological evidence which he provides only proves the absolute priority of the structuralistic analysis. Categories come about, and are recognised and defined, by “structural identity”. Not by any accidental aspects.

\*\*\*

Uljas has the idea that verbal morphology is a matter of consonants only, meaning that consonantal writing displays all relevant discrimination of forms. For him, only “mutable verbs” display more than one *sdm=f* form – a marked one, and an unmarked one –, whereas the majority of verbs has but one. For his skeptical attitude, he even adduces an “admirably common-sense argument” of F. Junge’s (p. 30, n. 90). But even if the latter should be mistaken in assuming that no apophony, no variation of vowel or syllable structure (omnipresent phenomena in Afro-Asiatic languages) played a role of “grammatical significance” Uljas has a pragmatic argument for the total neglect of the role of vowel, etc., for “its application is in any case forever lost to modern egyptologists” (p. 30): a most questionable attitude – what I cannot make use of does not exist?

“The paradigm of the so-called ‘circumstantial *sdm=f*’ contains not a single writing that does not also serve some other function” (p. 31) – a well-known fact. However, the combinatory evidence shows that no other *sdm=f* variant displays the same pattern in the more important verb classes:

	perfect rhematic	perfect nominal	general present rhematic (“circumst.”)	general present nominal (“imperf.”)	prospective rhematic	prospective nominal	subjunctive
IIae gem.	AB	ABB	ABB	ABB	ABB	ABB	AB
IIIae inf.	ABj	ABj	ABj	ABB	ABjj	ABjj	ABj
<i>m33</i> “to see”	<i>m3</i>	<i>m33, m3n</i>	<i>m33</i>	<i>m33</i>	<i>m33</i>	<i>m33</i>	<i>m3(n)</i>
<i>rdj</i> “to give”	<i>rdj</i>	<i>rdj</i>	<i>dj</i>	<i>dd</i>	<i>rdj(j/w)</i>	<i>rdj(j/w)</i>	<i>dj</i>
<i>jwj</i> “to come”	<i>jj</i>	<i>jj</i>	<i>jwj</i>	<i>jww</i>	<i>jwj(j?)</i>	<i>jwj(j?)</i>	<i>jwt</i>

No textbook of Modern Literary Arabic would say, e.g., that most verb forms may be both active and passive:

- *ktb* is both “he wrote” and “he was written” [*kataba* vs. *kutiba*];
- *yktb* is both “he writes” and “he is written” [*yaktubu* vs. *yuktabu*];
- *rmy* is both “he threw” and “he was thrown” [*ramā* vs. *rumiya*];

- *yrm* is both “he throws” and “he is thrown” [*yarmi* vs. *yurmā*]; etc.<sup>27</sup>

As Old and Middle Egyptian have no living tradition, nor a holy book with vowel rendering, superficial evaluation sees a uniformity for the majority of the verbs,

<sup>27</sup> In non-vocalised text, visible distinction is only found with the hollow verbs: *q’l* “he said”, but *qyl* “he was said” [*qāla* vs. *qīla*]; *yqwl* “he says”, but *yq’l* “he is said” [*yaqūlu* vs. *yuqālu*].



whereas some sophistication and due scrutiny allow to see numerous forms.

This is, however, not the most fatal flaw of the book.

#### APPENDIX: Attestations of the prospective *sdm=f* in object clauses

As was to be expected, the prospective *sdm=f* is used for substantival clauses of the prospective tense. A *ntt* / *wnt* construction is not possible. The matrix of the latter is # *ntt* / *wnt* – SUBJECT – ADVERBIAL PREDICATE #; the prospective predicate, however cannot function as an adverb.

- 29 (*dd* “to say”) *d3=k* “you will ferry”.  
 30 (*dd* “to say”) *h3w N* “I should go down”.  
 31 (*dd* “to say”) *wd=k* “you thrust”.  
 32 (*dd* “to say”) *d3=k* “if you will ferry”.  
 33 (*dd* “to say”) *jry=k* “that you would do”.  
 34 (*dd* “to say”) *jrj=sn* “that they will do it”.  
 35 (*dd* “to say”) *h3=f* “he would fight”.  
 36 (*dd* “to say”) *sbj=f* “he would rebel”.  
 37 (*dd* “to say”) *h3=sn* “that they will fight”, *sbj=sn* “that they will rebel”.  
 38 (*dd* “to say”) *i.jrj=f* “that he can do”.  
 42 (*dd* “to say”) *d3=k* “that you will ferry”.  
 43 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.t(w)=f* “which) would be brought”.  
 45 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.tw=j* “that I am brought”.  
 46 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.tw=j* “that I be/am brought”.  
 47 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.t(w)=j* “that I am brought”.  
 48 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.tw=j* “that I be brought”.  
 50 (*dd* “to say”) *jn.t(w)=j* “that I am brought”.  
 77 (*rh* “to know”) *h3y N* “whether N. will descend”.  
 95 (*rh* “to know”) *jrj=j* “that I would exceed”.  
 96 (*rh* “to know”) *jrj=t* “that you would make”.  
 97 (*rh* “to know”) *jj=(j)* “that I would come”.

*dd=(j) rh=k r-ntt hpr prt Spdt m 3bd 4 prt sw 16* “I say (this) only that you might learn that the heliacal rising of Sothis will occur in the fourth month of winter, day 16” (P. Berlin 10012, 18–19).










Vomberg, Petra/Witthuhn, Orell: *Hieroglyphenschlüssel*. Entziffern, Lesen, Verstehen. Mit einer Schreibfibel von Johanna Dittmar. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2008. LXXI, 486 S. m. Abb. Format 8°. Kart. 24,80 €. ISBN 978-3-447-05286-3. – Bespr. von Tanja Pommerening, Mainz.

„Die geheimnisvollen Schriftzeichen der alten Ägypter findet man auf beinahe allen altägyptischen Altertümern: auf Tempelwänden und Obelisken, [...]. Was aber bedeuten sie, was sagen sie aus?“ – Eine Antwort auf diese und andere Fragen verspricht der Klappentext des vorliegenden Buches, das Studienanfängern das Entschlüsseln und Erlernen von hieroglyphischen Zeichen erleichtern will. Das ägyptologische Autorenteam möchte mit dem *Hieroglyphenschlüssel* didaktisches Neuland betreten.

Einem Vorwort (S. IX–X) und ausführlichen Benutzerrhinweisen (S. XI–XIX) folgt eine Einführung in Sprache, Schrift, Schriftprinzipien, Paläografie, Epigrafik

und Entzifferungsgeschichte (S. XX–LVII), bevor sich nach einer Kurzübersicht über die behandelten Zeichen die eigentliche Liste (S. 1–446) anschließt, die rund 750 Hieroglyphen in allseits enger Anlehnung an die klassische Zeichenliste in Alan H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford 1957, S. 438–543, vorstellt. Hier wie dort werden folgende Informationen gegeben: Zeichennummer nach Gardiner, Abbild der Hieroglyphe in moderner Typographie, Kurzbeschreibung des Zeichens, Aufschlüsselung der möglichen Funktionen des Zeichens im Wortverbund (die Bezeichnungen – nicht jedoch deren terminologisches System (s. u.) – und die Reihenfolge der Funktionsklassen sind diejenigen Gardiners: Determinativ, phonographisches Determinativ, Ideogramm, Phonogramm und Abkürzung), dazu Wortbeispiele jeweils in Hieroglyphen, Transkription und Übersetzung.

Den letzten Abschnitt (S. 471–486) des *Hieroglyphenschlüssels* bilden zunächst eine Suchliste, in der die Zeichen in vier Formenkategorien unterteilt sind, sodann eine Zusammenstellung der Ein-, Zwei-, „Drei- und Vierkonsonantenzeichen“ in ägyptologisch-alphabetischer Anordnung nebst einer Liste der Zahlzeichen und schließlich eine ältere, hier erstmals publizierte Hieroglyphen-Schreibfibel aus der Feder Johanna Dittmars.

Die vorgestellten Zeichen erscheinen im Raster der ägyptologisch üblichen 26 Sachgruppen (bspw. A. der Mann und seine Tätigkeiten, H. Teile von Vögeln, O. Architektur oder W. Gefäße). Allerdings wurde unter Beibehaltung der Gardiner-Nr. die Abfolge der Zeichen an 46 Stellen, die aus einer Konkordanz hervorgehen (S. LIX–LXXI), geändert, einerseits, weil einiges bei Gardiner nicht oder unrichtig Klassifizierte inzwischen benennbar geworden ist, andererseits, weil die intendierte Reihenfolge jeweils vom ganzen Objekt hin zu dessen Teilen nicht überall in voller Konsequenz durchgeführt worden war. Darüber hinaus wurde die Hieroglyphenliste des *Schlüssels* gegenüber derjenigen Gardiners um neun Einträge vermehrt:  C11e,  D31a,  E8a,  N12a,  N62a,  S17a,  S123,  S130a,  W24a – ein recht arbiträrer Zuwachs nicht zuletzt angesichts der großen Zahl schon vor der Ptolemäerzeit kursierender weiterer Hieroglyphen (vgl. die rund 1000 zusätzlichen Zeichen in der vierten Auflage von Rainer Hannigs *Handwörterbuch*).

Aufgrund der auch im Übrigen nur geringen Unterschiede zu Gardiners *sign-list* ist ein wertender Vergleich beider Listen angebracht. Der Pluspunkt des *Hieroglyphenschlüssels* ist die ausreichend große bildliche Darstellung der jeweils besprochenen Hieroglyphe, was manches Detail besser zur Geltung bringt. Eher ungewöhnlich ist indes der hier gewählte Typensatz, der ohne sachliche Motivation manche Zeichen fett- und andere dünnlinig konturiert. Im Layout hätte man ferner dadurch mehr Übersichtlichkeit gewinnen können, dass man in der Überschriftenzeile auf die Übersetzung der Zeichenbeschreibung ins Englische – der Rest des Buches ist ausschließlich in deutscher Sprache abgefasst – verzichtet hätte.

In wissenschaftlicher Hinsicht fällt der *Hieroglyphenschlüssel* deutlich ab, nicht nur weil seine Lemmata we-