

## LESSON SEVEN STUDY GUIDE

Last Revision Date 2013 June 8



### Bookends

The provocatively named Museum of Man in San Diego, California, has a very nice Egyptology section. Here's part of a coffin from its collection.

The inscription down the side is a standard “offering formula” which you'll learn later on.

*'ḥtp di nswt inpw ḥnty ḥrt nṯr ...'*

“An offering which the kings makes (to/for) Anubis, leader of the necropolis...”

There's Anubis (*'inpw'*) there, tail hanging down over his stand. You can see him also depicted on the front of the coffin.

The arrow points to the next part of the inscription and, coincidentally, to an example of the construction which this lesson is mostly concerned with.

*'... di.f krst nfr(t) n wsir mn...'*

“May he grant a wonderful burial for the Osiris Men...”

And then I lose the person's name at the bottom. It's there, I just can't make the signs out. The deceased is identified with Osiris because after death the justified become merged with the god. Kind of like Nirvana.

The inscription down the front of the coffin reads the same thing, this one is a bit easier to see.

Why did I call this “bookends”? Because we start this Study Guide with this picture of the coffin of a person who is already dead and we'll end up reading a text written by a person who wishes he was dead. Uplifting isn't it?

I told you it was going to get hard. And you already thought it was hard. Well, here it comes. In spades.

And this is the easy part of the hard part.

- In this lesson you are going to learn about - and you had better understand this before the end of this lesson:
  - The concepts of “nominal” and “verbal”
- and as a corollary, the idea that both concepts can be encapsulated in one and the same word in a given text.
- Demonstrative adjectives, i.e. descriptive words that point at things.
- More complexity in sentences.

OK. Now that I've scared you, and you should be scared, I'll let you in a little secret. I learned this stuff. That's the secret. I learned it - so can you. Here's another little secret: the casualty rate for learning Egyptian hieroglyphs is actually, really quite low. No one has ever been killed while reading this book, and very few people have ever been injured (but innocent bystanders may have, mostly, people who made the mistake of standing by people who were reading hieroglyphs - and even there there were just minor flesh wounds easily healed<sup>1</sup>). So you can do this. It will take effort.

If, up to now, you've been kind of skimming through the lessons and putting the homework off until that last glorious weekend - that ain't gonna work no more. You need a bit of this every day just to keep the neural pathways open and alert. I'm serious. After reading the lesson through from start to finish then, each day, re-read two sections. In grad school, which is where you are right now whether you want to be or not, “read” means “study for understanding”. For the homework, plan to do one sentence a day - which means you're gonna have to start earlier than the last Sunday. Which means that the readings - uhh - studying - has been completed before then. Oh, and for each sentence, make sure you've looked up the appropriate sections.

### **Sections #71 and #72, page 87**

Two things you have to understand before you can understand what Hoch is talking about in this section ( and in many others throughout the remainder of the book):

- verbal
- nominal.

A *nominal* is any word that can function as, or in concert with, nouns, including nouns. The part of speech list includes nouns, pronouns, and adjectives, things I call the “true nominals”. Why I call them that will be clear in a moment. Much more importantly, though, is what nominals can do in a sentence, that is, how they function. If I say these things can function as nouns that doesn't tell you a lot. But if I say a nominal can function as...

- the subject of verb
- the direct object of a verb
- the indirect object of verb

---

<sup>1</sup> From small flying objects, usually: pencils, erasers, etc. To hurl a heavier object, frustrated students usually have to wind up, which gives family members and house-guests a chance to seek cover. Which, if they are wise, they do.

- the object of a preposition
- the agent<sup>2</sup>

that's a little more helpful, assuming that you know what those functions are. If you don't, or if you have problems with them, ask. You need to know this stuff.

When I say that a nominal can function as

- the subject of verb
- the direct object of a verb
- the indirect object of verb
- the object of a preposition
- the agent

I mean to say the ***ONLY nominals*** can function like that. Nothing else.

Which words can operate verbally?

- verbs
- infinitives, although infinitives, as you already have seen, do not always function verbally.

Well, so far so good. But here's where it starts to get tricky. Some words can function as both nominals *and* verbals. In fact, any word that can function like a verb can function like a noun. They don't have to but they often do. Which is why there are “true nominals” (words that are always nominals) and verbals which are “occasional nominals”.

That's the secret to Lesson Seven. The verbs you're going to be studying here act initially as nominals, then subsequently as verbals. By the way, that's always the sequence. If a word is going to function both ways it ALWAYS starts out functioning as a nominal. *Always*.

So, you might wonder, if we can see verbs playing the part of nouns, is this kind of like where, in the last chapter, we saw nouns acting like verbs, in the '*r*' + infinitive construction which indicates the future? No. The “future tense” we saw there was an illusion, produced by the translation into English. '*r*' + infinitive is not a future tense from the viewpoint of Egyptian grammar. If it were, it would move up into the V slot. It never does. If it was a verb it could have a pronominal subject, '*r*' + infinitive.*f*. It never does. We've seen that if there is a suffix pronoun attached to the infinitive, it's really a direct genitive, not a subject<sup>3</sup>.

Which brings me to my next point. Infinitives are not verbs. They are not verb forms. Anyone who

---

2 The agent is the person or thing that performs the action indicated by the verb. The agent is always = to the subject if the verb is active. It is NOT = to the subject if the verb is passive. Cases in point:

“I see Mary”                      subject = “I”, agent = “I”. Verb is active.

“Mary is seen by me”           subject = “Mary”, agent = “by me”. Verb is passive.

As a footnote to a footnote I must say that grammar sticklers would argue that in the second example the agent is “me” and not “by me”. I argue that nothing useful is gained by analyzing this point any further than I did. In other words, there is often no point to performing analysis on every single word in a sentence - *it's the phrases that are important, that's where the functioning occurs*. “Me” cannot function in this sentence as an agent unless the word “by” is in front of it. Therefore, the agent is “by me”. And that's an end on it.

3 Although it might get translated into English that way. See the next example.

tells you that they are verb forms is *wrong*. That includes Mr. Allen. **Infinitives are nouns**. Repeat after me: **Infinitives are nouns**. I can't hear you. Shout: **Infinitives are nouns**. They are the names of actions. That does not deny that the action they name can't itself produce a verbal effect. Case in point:



*'iw m33.i prt.s m-s3 hm-k3.f'*

"I see her **emergence** from behind his Ka-priest."

Follow this carefully:

verb: '*m33*' = "see", this is the action. Since the action is actively performed (that is, it's an act of "seeing" and not one of being passively "being seen") the subject will be the one who performs the action.

So subject: '*.i*' = "I". "I see".

And what I am seeing is the direct object.

direct object: '*prt.s m-s3 hm-k3.f*' = "her emergence from behind his Ka-priest".

If that identification of the direct object surprised you, if you are not used to seeing whole phrases, indeed whole clauses, virtual or otherwise, as direct objects, you need to start getting used to it.

	P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
virtual clause #1 (as always, the whole sentence)	<i>iw</i>	<i>m33</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>prt.s m-s3 hm-k3.f</i>	
virtual clause #2		<i>prt</i>	<i>.s</i>					<i>m-s3 hm-k3.f</i>

Observe that what is going to be clause #2 appears in clause #1 as a unit. The whole unit is, in this case, the direct object. The rule is that if there is a subsequent clause buried in a preceding clause the clause is contained in a single unit, it is not split up among several slots.<sup>4</sup> The grid helps identify that unity of purpose for you. This is yet another rule that is always true. That's the second grammar rule you've had in this lesson that has no exceptions, it is always true! Treasure such grammar rules. They are not frequent.

So in clause #1 we see that whatever is in the O slot **MUST** be a nominal. That includes the word '*prt*'. But in the second clause we see '*prt*' acting as a verb. Only here do we see the suffix pronoun '*.s*' appearing as the subject because that has now become its function. This is a lot simpler explanation than the pages and pages that Hoch and Allen go through simply because they think of infinitives as verbal forms - when they're not.

So why do we have to go through all this?

Its because these "prospective" forms are all nominal. They are almost always the direct object of a verb which no longer appears in the sentence. I can hear your voices now, saying: "Whaaaat?"

<sup>4</sup> There is nothing to prevent other words and phrases from sharing that unit, the rule is that the clause stays together until it gets analyzed on its own line.

Let's look at the first example in section #72, down toward the bottom of the page.

*'wḏ' wi ḏḥwty ḥsf ḥnsw ḥr.i sdm r' mdw.i'*

“May Djehuty protect me, may Khonsu fight for me, may Ra hear my prayers.”

No *'iw'*, no *'m.k'* - just a bare verb to start off and it looks exactly like a subsequent clause in a statement-of-fact sentence, a so-called “circumstantial” statement, doesn't it?

*That's because it is.*

The whole sentence is a subsequent clause in a statement-of-fact sentence. You just don't see the first part. It's not because we picked the sentence out of context, it's not because we deliberately didn't include the initial clause. The initial clause was never spoken. You'll see why when I show you the complete thought sequence (using just the first of the three wishes, the other two follow suit).

*iw 3bi.i wḏ' i ḏḥwty...* etc.

“I hope that Djehuty protects me”

	P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
This clause is omitted	<i>iw</i>	<i>3bi</i>	<i>.i</i>				<i>wḏ' i ḏḥwty</i>	
This is all that's left		<i>wḏ'</i>			<i>.i</i>	<i>ḏḥwty</i>		

And now you know why these “prospectives” are nominal forms.<sup>5</sup>

Presumably the prospective verb forms sounded somewhat differently than what we might call the “basic” form. We see a bit of that in the fact that doubling verbs don't double in the prospective. That indicates that there were some vowel differences, that is: additions, omissions, merges, which made the verb forms sound different and therefore, under certain conditions, look different in writing.

English does the same thing, only a bit differently. Since the basic form of the English verb does not change from the present to the future, we have to put a so-called “helping” verb in front of it - like “will”, for example. As in “I will kill Bill”. Egyptian could do the “will kill” part all in one word because, I think, one or more vowels, which we don't see, changed.

In both languages it quickly became tiresome to have to say the first, introductory, clause. The result in English was that “I hope that St. so-and-so will protect me” became “May St. so-and-so protect me.” This type of omission happens a lot in languages. It's what's happening here.

<sup>5</sup> You will never get this kind of understanding from Allen. You'll never get the faintest clue. I am not by any means an uncritical devotee of the so-called “Standard Theory” which Hoch is presenting in this book, it deserves, and has received, much criticism, but in general it's a much superior idea to Allen's which I call the “what the hell comes next?, it's anyone's guess” theory. At least with the Standard Theory, as exemplified in this book, you get some clues. It helps put things in perspective. It helps bring a little order out of the utter chaos that is produced when you study Allen. And you thought you had chaos here.

So these prospective forms are really the direct objects of verbs whose clauses have dropped out because we're either too damned lazy or in too much of a rush or both to say the whole sentence. Same thing happened in Egyptian. These things are really sentence fragments.

In the first paragraph on the top of page 89 you're going to see Hoch saying the same thing I just did over the past several pages. These prospectives are really the direct objects of omitted verbs. But Hoch says this so quickly and so almost parenthetically that it's easy to overlook - that this is the real reason these prospectives are nominal and why no particles appear in front of them. All that stuff has been omitted for the convenience of the speaker.

In the middle of page 89 there's an example which I want to call some attention to:

*'wn.k m pr.k hn<sup>c</sup> hmt.k hrdw.k'*

“May you be in your home together with your wife and kids.”

Exactly the same thing is going on here as elsewhere: “I hope that you will be in your home...”. No problem there. The issue is the verb *'wnn'*. This verb is an equal sign, more or less. As far as I can tell, in the present tense statement-of-fact sentence, Middle Egyptian avoids the use of a verb which equates the two parts of a sentence. In other words, instead of saying “A *is* B” like we do in English (and French, and German), Middle Egyptian says “AB”. Nothing strange there, other languages do that too. Russian for example. “Ivan - doctor” (Иван доктор - if you must know) instead of “Ivan is a doctor”. They've done so with no problems for centuries. But in cases other than present tense statements of fact, these languages have to use some form of whatever verb they use to express equivalence. *'wnn'* is the verb of choice in Middle Egyptian. And that's (partly) why we see the difference between:

*'iw.k m pr.k hn3 hmt.k hrdw.k'* and

*'wnn.k m pr.k ...'*

“You are in your house...” - statement of present fact - and

“[I hope that] you will be in your house...” - statement of a future as of yet unrealized wish

That's what these prospectives are: statements of an as of yet unrealized future or even statements of a future we hope never happens<sup>6</sup>.

### **Section #73, page 89**

Having just gotten through telling you that these clauses where the prospective verb forms are appearing are not main clauses, Hoch goes ahead refers to “other main clauses” in the title of this section. Maybe he wasn't paying attention, I don't know. Anyway, precisely the same thing is going on here as was going on in the earlier sections - these are really subsequent clauses, the direct objects of initial clauses which have dropped out of speech because they're understood without actually being

6 “May the fleas of a thousand camels play hockey in your nose hairs.” That the future such as this is unrealized and uncertain is reflected in old Puritan statements “The fleas of a thousand camels will play hockey in your nose hairs, God willing”. The modern Arabic *'insha 'Allah'* is the exact equivalent.



spoken.

### Section #74, page 90

You might go away from this section thinking that the prospective here was simply the true verbal equivalent of the 'r' + infinitive phrase of purpose you learned earlier. Look again. Hoch is translating these things as prospectives of an uncertain and as of yet unrealized future.

Look at the first example:

*'iw wpi.n.i r.i wšb.i n.f*

"I opened my mouth so I could answer him."

Here's an alternative:

*'iw wpi.n.i r.i r wšb n.f*

"I opened my mouth for the purpose of answering him."

Not much difference. Hoch points out that the first example was used when the speaker wanted to identify the subject explicitly<sup>7</sup>. You can't do this with the 'r' + infinitive construction. Which is another reason why the 'r' + infinitive phrase used in the second expression should not be understood as a tense instead of the prepositional phrase it really is.

Over on page 91 the translation for the long example doesn't seem quite right to me. Hoch translates these prospectives as though they were statements of future fact. I don't think they are. I think the translation should read something like "If you are brave ... then you **can** fill your embrace ...", etc.

### Section #75, page 91

The only difference between what Hoch is saying in this section and the preceding sections is that previously the introductory clauses were understood but unspoken, here they are explicitly spoken. His

---

<sup>7</sup> I've decided to pick on Allen in this lesson. Mainly because I've been saying things about the presentations in Hoch's book that didn't make much sense to me, so I need to balance that a bit with criticisms of the other main modern grammar extant, a grammar which contains much, much more that doesn't make any sense. Here's a case in point. Allen would have you believe that 'r' + infinitive is used to express an "involuntary future" and the prospective (Allen calls it a "subjunctive" (see below for his reasons) being used for "voluntary" actions, such as the king saying (Allen's example): *'tw.i r tñn hn.f sd.i ht.f* = "I **have to engage** with him (in battle): I **intend** to cut open his belly." Allen actually goes on to say that the king says it this way because he has no choice in the matter of fighting the other guy but that cutting open his belly is, of course, a purely voluntary action (on the king's part). *This is patently nuts*. Of course the king has a choice as to whether to fight or not. A much better translation is: "I **intend** to fight him, I'd **like** to cut his guts out." That's really what the king is saying. There is no compulsion here at all. This kind of nonsense leads Allen to translate the following text from the Eloquent Peasant *'m.k wi r hñm ʕ3.k šti hr wnm.f šm(ʔ).i* as "Look, I **have to take** your donkey away, peasant, because of it's eating my barley." Allen is the only one who thinks that the bad guy (the one who is speaking) feels any compulsion at all. But the confiscation of the peasant's donkey is a purely voluntary, purely provocative (and purely unnecessary) act on the part of the bad guy. One major reason why Allen uses terms like "subjunctive, perfect, perfective, imperfect" and for all I know "imperfective" is that he is unhappy with standard grammatical terminology. There's nothing wrong with that, I am unhappy with much of it too, as you all well know. But Allen wants to cast this language in the terminology of something it is completely unsuited for: the classical Indo-European languages Latin and ancient Greek. Allen's terminology eliminates no confusion and creates additional issues for the student and the commentator. Why is Allen's work so ubiquitous? Marketing. His publisher actively gets his book out there. Hoch doesn't market his book at all (as many of us have found out). But I digress.

first example is a dilly:

**'di.i sDm.k mitt iry'**

“Let me have you hear something like it”

Did you see a **'iw'** or a **'m.k'** in front of that sentence? No? Neither did I. **'di.i'** itself is a prospective. It's the direct object of the unspoken “I want ...” as in “I want to cause that you hear...”. So it's a nominal - initially - when we first meet it. But then it becomes verbal in its own right and has its own direct object: the rest of the sentence. What I want you to do is *hear something like it*. Direct objects are nominal - **'sdm.k'** is nominal - it's a prospective. End of discussion.

OK, Bob, but on top of page 92 we see the example:

**'h<sup>c</sup>.n rdi.n.f ini.tw n.f ht-3'**

“Then he had a **'ht-3'** bird brought to him.”

and **'rdi'** is NOT a prospective form (see section #71) - so whaddaya say to that, Bobby?

I say that this is grammar you haven't seen yet. <sup>8</sup> **'h<sup>c</sup>.n'** functions just like a particle. In fact, it's force was not much more, if any more, than a particle. But **'rdi'** itself has a direct object - and by now you know the rest - or at least you'd better know it.

## **Part 2)**

Way up there we said that the object of a preposition must be a nominal. Here you go.

## **Part 3)**

This is tougher and I think you might need a little help here.

In the example,

**'m.k wd(w)'** is the old familiar particle + **'sdm.f'** construction (here a passive version) that we've seen before and have come to love and cherish. Particle + verb. Where's the subject? Well, the subject is whatever has been commanded. That is the rest of the sentence. **'sw<sup>c</sup>b.k p3 r-pr n(y) 3bdw'** “You purify the temple of Abydos”.

Here, too, we have a complete subsequent clause. You can grid this clause on its own line (which is what a virtual clause is). That helps you identify, as I said above, that the WHOLE CLAUSE functions as a unit. The whole thing is the subject and must appear in only slot - until it becomes expanded on its own line.

	P	V	s	i	o	S	O	A
initial clause	<b>m.k</b>	<b>wd(w)</b>				<b>sw<sup>c</sup>b.k p3 r-pr n(y) 3bdw</b>		
subsequent clause		<b>sw<sup>c</sup>b</b>	<b>.k</b>				<b>p3 r-pr n(y) 3bdw</b>	

You really have learned this before. This graphically demonstrates what the implication of saying that

<sup>8</sup> **'h<sup>c</sup>'** is a verb, but it's degenerated more into a particle. It means “then” in this context. Neither **'iw'** or **'m.k'** means “then” and Egyptian needed to express that somehow. What it did was water down the verb **'ht'** (= “stand”). The metaphor produces a visual image of one activity taking place (i.e. standing up in turn) after the other. In other words, these things are past tense statements-of-fact, i.e. what Hoch calls “circumstantial forms”.



what functions as a subject is nominal and that nominals are prospective verbs.

### **Section #76, page 93**

Suddenly something completely different. I don't know why this concept was introduced at this point, but here it is.

Egyptian can put into one word the idea of verb + adjective, something that English requires at least two words to express, using some form of the verb “be” + an adjective. Read Hoch's second paragraph in this section carefully. When he says that adjective verbs were never used in the so-called “circumstantial” *sdm.f* he implies that this kind of verb was treated differently than other verbs. Read the paragraph closely.

### **Section #77, page 93**

Nothing new here. As you already know, '*rdi*' means “cause” as in cause and effect. To appoint someone to a post is to cause them to hold that particular job title. So this meaning of '*rdi*' is no different than any you have seen before. '*rdi m*' is simply '*rdi*' + '*m*' of status. You've seen that before, too.

### **Section #78, page 94**

Complete change of pace. A demonstrative adjective - well - demonstrates something. It points to something over here or something over there. The difference is between “pick up a ball” and “pick up **that** ball”. “**That**” is a demonstrative adjective.

Note that in English I could say “pick up **the** ball” where I am speaking about a particular ball which has come to our attention. Both “pick up **that** ball” and “pick up **the** ball” can mean exactly the same thing. What you were taught in school as a “definite article” in English is really a demonstrative adjective!

Every language that I know of that has definite articles started them out as demonstrative adjectives. Even French. In the French definite article the force that the demonstrative adjective originally had has been largely, if not completely lost and the word has, to a great extent, fused with the noun - but not so in English.<sup>9</sup>

---

9 Russian and Latin have none at all. No definite or indefinite articles. I don't know how ancient Romans learned Greek which did (and still does) have definite articles and I've never learned English from a Russian point of view but I suspect that Russians are not told that these things are really mostly, if not entirely, demonstrative adjectives in English and so we see the trouble that Russians have in trying to produce them correctly when they speak English. Back to our earlier example: Иван доктор comes into English as “Ivan is a/the doctor” and the choice of article makes all the difference. Russians have a lot of trouble with this. They can distinguish between the two in Russian, but they do it with context and voice inflection which are not words and so are not part of the alphabet. From the English point of view French went overboard with this. An example of a parody of this can be found at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wbGlo01mgo4> For those who are not familiar with American culture (or what passes for culture in America) the choice of a skunk for our horny hero is not to imply anything bad about the French people or nation. It's merely a device to allow some female cat to accidentally get a white stripe painted down her back. Pepe the skunk then goes nuts about her. (It always happens, she's a cat, she gets painted by accident, he falls in love. Unrequited love, sad to tell. Every Pepe cartoon. You'll find a bunch of 'em on You Tube. But you'll notice that in these cartoons everything in French has “le” in front of it, which is my point - that is, if I have a point to any of this. “Le” makes it sound French to the ears of English speakers. Even Pepe le Pew's name has one. He is, of course, supposed to be none other than the great romantic

What is the point of all this? Well, just that one of these Egyptian demonstrative adjectives, 'p3, t3, n3 n(y)' eventually became a definite article in Late Egyptian. In fact, it's often the case that Middle Egyptian has them, although some New Kingdom snobs liked to say that they never used such things. They even wrote that message on their tomb walls to let you know that they wouldn't even be caught dead using a definite article. So even in Middle Egyptian, "the" is often a perfectly good translation. I've seen it as early as Djehutymes III's first campaign into Canaan. Which means I'm certainly not going to be picky about your choice of "the" or "that" - unless it's obvious.

### **Sections #79 and #80, page 95**

Ahh, one of my favorite nonsense words: "adverbial". It's a GNDN word. What's that? If you look at the doors on the set of the starship Enterprise in the original TV series you'll find some marked "GNDN". "Goes Nowhere, Does Nothing". = "adverbial".

"Modifier" is another one. Idiot word.

Anyway, the very definition of "adverbial" as in "adverbial modifier" given here shows how goofy this badly overused term really is. We can use it here but not in non-verbal sentences - which indicates that these are not the same function, so why give them the same name? Idiot word.

### **Section 81, page 96**

Pretty straightforward stuff. Just learn these.

---

Maurice Chevalier. These classic cartoons were made in the late '40's and throughout the '50's which is when Chevalier was a very big star in the movies - which made him and other Hollywood stars an obvious target for guys like these cartoonists. The gang of cartoonists at Warner Brothers was literally kept out of public sight on a back lot. Nothing was sacred to them and many of their cartoons poke fun at their bosses. A lot of inside jokes. Pepe is my favorite, even more so than Bugs Bunny or even Daffy Duck, personalities I admire.

I don't know if French cartoons do this to English or American culture, I suspect they do, and I'd love to see some examples. Maybe Dany can help us there.

Another recurrent, I say "another recurrent", theme among the Looney Toons bunch was a rooster named Leghorn, who poked fun at American Senators, particularly Senators from the southern states like Mississippi, Alabama, etc.

Opera took a hit from time to time, as you can see in <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=60Htv1t6sUU>

Liszt was lumped at : [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jkFg5QnvD\\_s](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jkFg5QnvD_s)

I love parody and the leveling of the playing field and the deflation of self-importance, as you've probably noticed by now. I think it would be a great move toward world peace if there were a requirement that every president, prime minister, king, queen, or whatever, had to have as their official photograph, a picture of them sitting, just like everyone else has to do, pants down, on the toilet, important papers ready at hand for the task which important papers, in such a situation, must perform.

## **HOMEWORK**

Pages 99-101

Welcoming Death. No, you're not close to that, I hope. It's the title Hoch gave to the poem on page 99. All I want you to do is read it, not perform it. So we'll spend a little extra time on Lesson Seven. Give you a better chance to absorb the material, which is rather involved. The homework will be divided into three parts. The title for the homework will appear in red for each part. Copy the red headings below into the title line of your posts to the Hoch GlyphStudy homework site.

Each part will be assigned in a different week.

### **HW 07-A for 2013 July 7**

The poem on page 99 consists of five lines, each line is written in two rows in the text. The first row of each line is fully left justified, the second row of each line is indented to the right. The poem is rather depressing, but it is an interesting view into the mind of someone who's tired of living.

Hoch wants you to use the vocabulary to look up many of the words but I'll save you some trouble. You should know most of the rest of them by now.

*min* = "today"

*mr* = "sick man"

*ihmt* = "confinement", also see note 21 on page 99.

*st(y)* = "fragrance, aroma, smell", (row one of line two). The word could also be written as *st(y)*.

*hmsi* = "to sit, dwell, live"

*ht3w* = "awning"

*sšn* = "water lily", not "lotus"

*tht* = "land of drunkenness"

*hwty* = "well-trodden, beaten", from the determinative we might infer that the Egyptian expression was similar to that of the English "beaten path"!

Hoch's footnote #23 should be kept in mind in future.

An alternative interpretation could be that in this case "man" was thought of as a collective noun, standing for "men".

*ndrt* = "captivity, imprisonment"



*Oh, my aching back!!!*

Feeling a bit run-down from all the work I'm making you do? Cheer up. Things could be worse.

They will be.

This is from an Amarna group in the San Diego, California, Museum of Man  
Apparently women don't get their own museum. Don't ask me why. I have no control over this.

### **HOCH 07-B for 2013 July 14**

Learn the biliterals in Part A on pages 99 and 100 during this time. Then do

Do lines 1-5 of part B

In sentence #4, '*swmt i3btt*' probably refers to the Eastern Desert, the strip of land between the Nile and the Red Sea.

sentence #5:

*dr* = "drive out, expell"

*i3ft* = "injustice"

tAS = "boundary"

### **HOCH 07-C for 2013 July 21**

Do lines 6-10 of part B

sentence #6:

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{š}}$ = "region"

sentence #7:

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{sr}}$ = "predict, foretell"

sentence #8:

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{m-k}3b}$ = "among, in the midst of".  $\text{\textcolor{blue}{k}3b}$ = "intestine". Quite a vivid word-picture here!

sentence #9:

This is a description of a defeated army after a battle. Note the tense sequence in this sentence.

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{m-gbgb}t}$ = "headlong". In this case they are heading for Megiddo and what they hope is safety behind its walls.

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{m}k\textcolor{blue}{ti}}$ = "Megiddo", a town in northern Canaan. Another name for it is "Armageddon". Yep, that Armageddon. Most fought over piece of real estate on the planet.

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{ssm}(w)t}$ = "horses"

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{wrr}(y)t}$ = "chariots". These were very richly appointed chariots.

sentence #10:

$\text{\textcolor{blue}{wr}}$ = "great one, chief"