

HOCH LESSON 16 STUDY GUIDE

Section §188 Page 221

The only things I want to say are:

1) Remember that these second tense forms are **NOUNS**. You cannot get an understanding of the underlying meaning in Egyptian without keeping that in mind. It is English grammar that is forcing you to translate these things as verbs.

2) That there is a verbal quality to them is not denied. But that quality is secondary to the nominal status of the form.

Question: Why couldn't the sentence on the bottom of page 221 have read 'iw.f r smr m-m srw, iw.tw.f r rdit ...'?

Answer: It could have, but the meaning would be different. It would have simply been two statements, one after the other, end of story. But the sentence as it stands, with the 2nd tense prospective in there, it underlines/highlights the status that the man will have when that moment arrives. It may be extremely difficult to translate that into English, it may require a lot of words, footnote, bold face text, whatever, but the meaning is there in the original. If you are translating this for some one else's benefit, then you do them a disservice.

One way of translating a sentence like this is:

“He will be a companion among the officials because he will be one who will be put amongst the courtiers.”

Relative clauses in English are - you know by now - nominals. Everything after “because” is one big, huge, stinkin' noun clause. It has structure inside it, yes, but when you look at it as a whole, it is a noun clause.

Let's see if we can do this to the sentence on top of page 221.

“... I will be fortunate because I will be one who reaches the West ...”

Now, don't carried away with “because” + relative clause. It works in these two examples, and it may work a lot of times, but it ain't necessarily going to work all the time. Be alert.

The nominal functionality of these 2nd tense forms is highlighted in example 2) where 'hnw snf' is the object of the preposition 'r'. The objects of prepositions in both English and Egyptian are **NOMINALS**.

Section §189 Page 221

The sequence is, going from past to future...

'xr - in - kA'

Sometimes all you have to do is put the following words in quotation marks, if it's sufficiently clear to the reader that that's what's going on.

Pay close attention to the first example in this section:

'nn di.n aq.k Hr.n - **in** bnS n(y) sbA pn - n is Dd.n.k rn.n'

I highlighted the 'in' which is where the quotation is identified - but I wanted to talk about the last phrase, 'n is **Dd.n.k** rn.n', paying close attention to the verb. It's a past tense! It's past because the sentence really works like this..”

“It is not allowed/given to you to enter upon/past us - which is what the doorposts say - unless **you have (already) spoken** our name.” It's a past tense - meaning: “unless you've already done this, you ain't going nowhere.” Time relative to the main verb. English wants a past “perfect”¹ verb here.

Section §190 Page 222

All that needs to be said about this section is that...

of course the forms which come after 'n(y)' are nominal - and therefore second tense - because 'n(y)', as you learned a long time ago, joins two NOUNS.

Section §191 Page 223

Prepositional phrases are nouns? No. There ain't no verbs in them, and they end in nominals, that's for sure, but the whole phrase is a noun? No.

What is going on here is more subtle. As is often the case with constructions which don't seem to make sense, there's verbal shorthand going on here. To illustrate using the first example in this section:

“One who has the honor of being in the presence/favor of the king” -> “One honored by the king”. It's a lot easier to say it the shorter way and it removes little or nothing of the important point.

I'll leave the second example as an exercise for you. When you're done, you should see why the prepositional phrase appears where the original noun (now dropped) once stood. It's a grammatical abbreviation. e.g.: etc.

Section §192 Page 223

Nothing to say except that I've read a conjecture that the original Indo-European case endings were prepositions post-fixed onto the nouns. Maybe. Whatever. If you don't know what case endings are you don't need to for this language and just go on to the next section.

¹ What a horrible name for a verb tense. There's nothing “perfect” about it. I have to use it because otherwise I'd have to write an English grammar and then an Egyptian grammar and I don't want to do either. But I wish grammarians would get up to date with this term. They claim to be describing a language and then use terminology that that very language has evolved away from. It's stupid.

“m-reformative nouns” look to me to be the same phenomenon only

a) these got stuck to the start of the noun rather than the end (there's no reason why either end would be better than the other) and

b) if this was the start of some case system it was arrested in developed.

s-causal verbs may be an analogous development in verbs.

Section §195 Page 224

Skipping on ahead to this section, I want to start off by saying quietly (I just gotta rag on this)...

THERE AIN'T NO STINKIN' DATIVES IN EGYPTIAN ...

... AND THERE AIN'T NO SWEET-SMELLIN' DATIVES EITHER

Hoch knows better than this. He really does. I've met the man, we've lunched - twice! “Dative” is a technical term, it properly refers **ONLY** to cases of the noun in languages that have cases to the noun **AND** which also have a dative case.

English nouns actually do have a case ending. It's either nothing at all or it's the “s” or the plural “s” which pops up in situations like

“Dave hit Jims next pitch and broke the Joness window.”

The underlines indicate the so-called “genitival” ending in English. One singular, the other plural. That's it. German has four cases, Latin five or six, Russian six, Indo-European maybe had eight. French: none, Spanish: none, Egyptian - zero. Cases, when they occur, help identify what function the noun is taking on in a sentence, in Indo-European languages they do this by sticking a specific ending onto the end of the noun².

² In Latin, “Marcus loves Julia” can be expressed in the following ways:

Marcus amat Iuliam
 Marcus Iuliam amat
 Amat Marcus Iuliam
 Amat Iuliam Marcus
 Iuliam Marcus amat
 Iuliam amat Marcus

For example, a dative case can be used to identify the indirect object. But it also has other uses, so that's not a specific dative function. "Dative" refers only - only - to the different forms which the noun can take in the dative case, not to any particular grammatical function.

In this section Hoch is using the term to refer to a reflexive indirect object. That's all. That's all that needed to be said in the text.

End of rant.

Section §196 Page 224

A subject-less stative? No.

This section is a perfect example of what makes grammar so hard for students. If it were taught right, grammar would present fewer difficulties. It's not just a matter of terminology, it's also a matter of presenting things like that only as an apparent exception - and then showing you what's really going on.

Only in this case, you're going to determine what's going on. I'll help you a little bit. Each example given (and each case in the whole language) is a situation where - just like you saw earlier - something has dropped out because it's not needed to make the sense, but the concept is still there. So, look at these sentences, guess at what the dropped out antecedent might be, and you'll understand why this, apparent exception, appears. And you'll understand Egyptian better. So do the exercise.

Remember, it's only apparent. **There really is no such thing as a subject-less stative.** It's merely an abbreviated way of speaking without losing any of the meaning. Happens all the time. Like in this and the previous sentence.

Section §197 Page 225

I have a bunch of different examples of the offering formula, and one or two challenges, on my website at www.bobmanske.com. The first three items on the "Read Glyphs" heading on the menu at the left of the page show some such items.

Sections §198 Page 226 and § 199 Page 227

The strangeness that is Late Egyptian is something you will encounter - in the strangest places. Keep this stuff in mind.

They all mean "Marcus loves Julia". The exact word order depends on emphasis, poetic requirements, whatever. But what if Julia loves Marcus? (We can't leave him high and dry). Then things change. Can you spot the changes?

Iulia amat Marcum
 Iulia Marcum amat
 Amat Marcum Iulia
 Amat Iulia Marcum
 Marcum Iulia amat
 Marcum amat Iulia

Them's case endings at work. Egyptian doesn't do any of this.

EXERCISE 16-1

PAGES 230-231

Do the first 11 lines in Exercise A on pages 230 - 231

Well, you know the story by now, I hope.

Line 1: *st* refers to the goods that the sailor is going to load onto his ship.

Line 5: *rnpy* = perhaps "flourish" in this context. The serpent's speech ends at the break in the middle of the line.

Line 11: *nbt* refers to the same thing as *ddt*.

EXERCISE 16-2

PAGE 231

Do the last 10 lines in Exercise A on page 231

Line 12 $3q = \text{"go in"}$

mi = "come"

Line 13 *ms* = "deliver, transport"

Line 16 *m3* is an imperative.

s3h t3 = "reach land"

Line 17 *sdm* is another imperative.

Line 19 *in m* = "who?" then see Hoch's note.

Line 20 *iw.f pw* and *h3t.f r phwy.f* are apposite noun phrases.

Line 21 The son's name is given first, followed by the father's which is followed by an epithet (I am not referring to the last three symbols).

YOU'RE DONE!

Do not do the exercise on page 232.

Hoch should never have put this piece in here. This is a text book on Middle Egyptian. The piece is not Middle Egyptian and some of you will try, even though I tell you not to, some of you will try anyway to parse it out as Middle Egyptian. If I tell you that the grammar of Late Egyptian is very much different from Middle Egyptian - and it is - that ought to tell you not to knock yourself out with this - yet some of you will try - and you will fail, miserably - and you will become frustrated.



That's how it goes, from start to finish