Study Guide Eight

Revision Date 2013 July 21

You should be able to recognize what's going on on this stela which is found in the U. Penn Museum in Philadelphia. Actually two kings are recognized on the stela, one on the right side and the other on the left.
For extra credit, identify the two kings and as much of their royal titularies as you can. Cheat. Use the internet.
The red box encloses the birth name of one of the kings, Djehutymes III (you'll find him listed under a number of different versions of his name. The name contains a stative, one of the two major subjects of Lesson Eight. Djehy-ms(.w) (= “Thoth is born (and is still with us)”).
Lots of extra credit to anyone who can tell us what the last two signs in the cartouche mean.

When you complete this chapter you're half way through the book. That doesn't mean you're half way through the course. We're going to slow down a bit because the homework becomes longer and harder.

This chapter is going to talk mainly about two different subjects:
The stative, a new verb form – and you ain't never seen nothin' like this! Take your time with it. It's a powerful concept but one that's sometimes hard to recognize.
Various constructions with 'aHa.n' meaning “then X happened”, whatever X may be.

The homework will take place over four sessions, so after the reading is finished, a little bit of homework each week. Here's the homework schedule, as it stands right now, up front:

Homework 08-1 due on Aug 11
Homework 08-2 due on Aug 18
Homework 08-3 due on Aug 25
Homework 08-4 due on Sep 1.
The actual assignments are toward the end of the Study Guide,.

There's also an annex on Direct Objects because some of you still need help in that area. Once you have thoroughly mastered the concept you will be better citizens.

And if you believe that, well....

Page 102, #82 The Stative

A couple of definitions need to be provided first:

Direct Object:

1) Must be a nominal. Can only be a nominal[1].
2) For there to be a direct object the verb must be active. Cannot be passive.
    2a) The verb must show some kind of activity, not merely expressing equality (A is B).

For a further excursis on direct objects, see the Appendix at the end of this Study Guide.

"Verbs of Motion":

When Hoch uses this term, be careful. If he uses it in reference to the stative, he means only "intransitive verbs of motion". Putting that into something that approaches everyday English we can say this, that a verb of motion, i.e. something like "go, run, walk, etc." which cannot take a direct object is what is meant here.

"Adjective Verb":

English doesn't have these. It's as if there were a verb "be low" or "be green" or something like that. Egyptian has lots of them – but they do fall into a special category. Their use is restricted. We'll cover that later. I don't want to distract you from the stative.

OK. Now that you're ready, more or less, for the stative, here goes. Generally, a verb defines action. Even a verb like "be" or "exist" is a kind of action. Statives focus more sharply on the result of action. English used to have statives. There's a song from medieval England "sumer is icumen in". "Icumen" is the verb. The title is often mistranslated as "Summer is a-coming in." That's wrong. In medieval English it meant "Summer has arrived but the important thing is: it's still here!" Another example would be "Franco died and is still dead." Everything after "Franco" would be a single stative verb in Egyptian. I think an Irish expression like "we're after going out" handles the stative well. Yes, we've gone out, but the important thing is: we are still gone.

1 You *DO* remember what nominals are, don't you? If not, you'd better refresh your memory by reading some earlier Study Guides. NOW.

Now, when translating, don't go out of your way to attempt to get the force of the Egyptian stative. You can follow the lead given by Hoch in the translations in the book. The preceding paragraph is meant only to drive the actual meaning of the stative home, not to serve as a paradigm for translation.

The last sentence in section #82 evokes a sigh. Of course statives appear wherever you expect an adverbial, since "adverbial" is defined so loosely and has such wide scope, the statement helps you not at all. Forget it. Just to show you how confusing this kind of thing can be, it's easy to read the paragraph as thinking it says that '*ỉw.f ḥr prt*' and '*ỉw prw*' mean the same thing. They don't. The first one means "He is going out" the second one, the stative, means "He has gone out and is still out".

The easiest way to translate most statives into English is to usually (emphasis on "not always") translate it into the passive voice. The actual tense of the English verb will vary depending upon the circumstances. You must always remember, however, that the Egyptian verb is active. Active. Both languages agree that the stative of 'rx' is active. 'rx' means learn. The stative, *'rḫ.w*' means "have learned and still knows" , so you can translate it simply as "knows" in whatever tense, future, past, or present, the sense requires.

Page 102, #83, the Stative Endings and #84, Stative Forms

The almost-always way that statives are used is in a construction like subject – stative.stative ending. The subject comes first. It may precede the stative by a long distance but it'll be there, or if it's missing at least it will be understood. Then ending on the stative agrees with the subject in number and in gender. In other words, the stative acts a lot like an adjective. Forget the adverbial stuff, these things have an adjective quality to them. That doesn't stop them from being verbs, as you'll see.

Hoch does not call the endings pronouns. That's because these ending only appear with the stative, never anywhere else. But they act a lot like pronouns and if you want to call them that, be my guest. I don't care. They're more like specific adjectival endings, though. The corollary of this is that if a verb has a suffix pronoun ending then it can't be a stative.

Keep in mind that stative endings can be monstrously hard to infer, they are so often omitted in the writing. You'll have to keep a sharp eye.

Statives rarely exhibit any doubling of stem consonants. Doubling often indicates on-going action, statives don't. They indicate a past action that's done with and puts the focus on the results of the action.

Page #103, #84

It kind of makes sense. Since a stative describes an action that happened prior to the resulting circumstance that the focus is on, it follows that they should be statements of fact, or purported fact, so '*ỉw*' and '*m.k*' are obvious choices to lead such sentences. On the other hand, the very sense itself of the verb indicates a statement of fact so the particles really don't need to be there if you, as an Egyptian writer, don't feel the need for them.

I have some problems with the paragraph on the top of page 104. The examples might look alike, from a far distance seen through squinty eyes but:

'*m.k sw m pr*' (= "See, he is in the house") and
'*iw.f ḥr wnm*' (= "He is now eating")

are alike ONLY because they end in prepositional phrases which, as we have seen, are best described as other than "adverbial"[2].

'*iw.f ꜥḥꜥ(.w)*' (= "He stood up and is still standing") doesn't even have a preposition in it[3].

In the four examples at the bottom of the section, I can't underline the statives in your books but I can identify them for you. Don't proceed until you understand the reason for every use and have identified the subject and the stative ending and specifically noted their agreement in number and gender[4].

#1 - '*ꜥḥꜥ(.w)*'
#2 – '*šm.ti*'
#3 – '*ḫpr(.w), hɜ.w, nḏs.w, imr.w*'
#4 – '*mḥ.ti*'
I recommend putting a dot between the stem and the stative ending just to keep the stem as an isolated unit. Hoch doesn't because, I think, he considers them more as adjectival endings rather than pronominal ones[5].

Page 104, #86
I guess what I really want to point out about this section is something that's not there: a comparison between ways of saying something.

'*iw grt.k mt(.ti) rn.k ꜥnḫ(.w)*' (= "and yes, you have died but your name is still living.")
Note the suffix pronoun attached to the second particle.
Next comes the blander version as we have known the verb until now.
'*iw grt mt.n.k ꜥnḫ rn.k*' (= "Yes, you died and your name lives.")
The force of the stative is evident.

Page 106, #87
Well, nothing's being modified, something IS being described. The problem is, how do you

2 There is absolutely NO commonality of function between the two prepositional phrases.
3 It's as if (and I think this might actually be the case) that the stative got described as "adverbial" only because it followed '*iw*' or '*m.k*' which had already been defined as introducing "adverbial" phrases and clauses, rather than the other way around. In other words, the definition depends on looking at form instead of function, which is never the right way to proceed.
4 For those of you whose native language is not English, you might wonder at why I hammer so on agreement in number and gender. It's because grammatical gender is a rarity in English and native English speakers are not used to looking for it. It often causes surprise and even confusion when a translation depends upon recognizing agreement and then identifying the thing it's agreeing with. English speakers just ain't used to that kind of thing.
5 I seem to be slowly evolving in the direction of always separating the verb stem off. I'm not quite there yet, but a lot closer than ever before.

know that that the statives aren't participles, i.e., adjectives? Without the stative ending being there, I don't know unless something else in the sentence provides the decision. So often the form that is showing up in the Egyptian could be identified either way.

Page 107, #88

Remember the rule about "verbs of motion". Such a verb which does not take a direct object always expresses its past tense in the stative. Verbs of motion which do take a direct object use the past tense form you learned earlier.

Page 108, #90 and page 109, #91

Suddenly, without warning, we leave the statives for a while. I don't know why there's still more to tell. Oh well, we'll get around to it.

The '*ḥr.n sḏm.n.f*' construction is dirt common in Egyptian. Happens everywhere. The construction is a metaphor in which the action, supplied by whatever verb goes in place of the '*sḏm.n.f*' form, is thought of us actually standing up to be noticed. Metaphors abound in most, probably all, languages. An example of one in English is the very common "how come?" meaning "why" - where the idea is that something has happened, how did that come about? But here we have another metaphor, in the verb "come".

"John and Bill got into a fight."
"How come?" = "How did that come about?" - The idea of these two fighting is perceived as something that coming toward us. A related metaphor is found in the expression "then comes X, then comes Y, and then comes Z, as though the events described in X, Y, and Z were actually proceeding toward us. Time marches on. Egyptian events don't come toward us, they just stand there. '*ḥr.n sḏm.n.f*'.

Page 109, #92, 93, 94, 95, 96

Reverse course – back to the stative. Oh, well. But really the theme is really the metaphorical '*ḥr.n*'. There really isn't much to say about these things except learn them, learn their differences, write them down in your notebooks.

Page 111, #97

A longer section but there isn't much content here. And if you ignore the adverbial stuff which doesn't make any sense anyway, you'll find that if you follow your nose you'll probably get the sense of the translations right without worrying about this.

One quick note: the first example in this section contains a compound verb. That's a dash between the '*dwꜣ*' and the '*nṯr*'. See if you can figure out how we know that this is a compound verb.

HOMEWORK

As I said at the top of the Study Guide, the homework is divided into four parts. The due dates are listed at the top as well.

HOCH 08-1
Do the first three lines of the reading passage (exercise A) at the bottom of page 113.
Background:
Exercise A, the reading lesson, is taken from an Egyptian story about a sailor relating his experiences during a shipwreck.
Vocabulary help:
line 1): *šm*= "go, walk"
line 3): *sḫw*= "breadth"

HOCH 08-2
Do the last four lines of the reading passage (= the top four lines on page 114).
Vocabulary help:
line 4): *mꜥkꜣ*= "brave"
line 5): *mꜣw*= "lion"
dꜥ= "wind, storm"
tp-ꜥ+ infinitive = "before"
line 7): pay close attention to note #20 in the text.

HOCH 08-3
Do the first four lines of exercise B).

Notes:
line 1): *bꜣt*= "bush, ear of grain"
line 2): this is a story about a magician's handling of a wax model of a crocodile.
mnH= "wax"
mḥ m= "grasp"
nḏs= "commoner"
line 3): pds = "box, casket"
line 4): a proper burial was important to the Egyptians. After all, they were going to spend most of their time dead, so a good, proper burial was essential. So the king wishes for nothing but the best for his courtier.
Sms *wḏꜣ*= "funeral procession"
wḥ= "mummy case"
ḫsbt = "lapis lazuli"
mstpt= "portable shrine"
ḥtḥ= "drag"
šmꜥw= "musician
ḫr ḥꜣt= "in front"

HOCH 08-4

Do the last four lines of exercise B).
Notes:
line 5): This is from a letter home written by a traveler relating the deteriorating conditions in the part of the country he's located in.
Be aware of Hoch's note #23 in line 5-2.

line 6): This one is in the same unhappy vein as line 5. Hoch says that context requires a future meaning for this sentence. I'm not so sure.You can translate it either way as far as I'm concerned.

ḏ͡ʒ= "cross (a river)"
ḥḥy= "search for, seek out"
ḥ꜀w= "boat"
wʒ͡ḏb= "river bank"
line 7): *ḫrw*= "enemy"
line 8):*isft*= "injustice"
dr= "drive out"
rwty= "outside"

APPENDIX - DIRECT OBJECTS

English likes to put its direct object right after its verbs, but that doesn't mean that the word after a verb is always a direct object. The verb actually has to impart some activity upon the object.

"Bob lives here". "Here" cannot be a direct object It refers to a place, but it isn't a thing. It's not a nominal.
"Bob lives in Wisconsin." "Wisconsin" is a place. It is a nominal. It's still not a direct object because it's part of the phrase "in Wisconsin". In fact, it's the same sort of thing as "lives here". "In Wisconsin" is not a nominal, neither is "here".
"Bob lives happily". There is no such thing as "a happily". So it ain't a direct object. In fact (buckle up your seat belt and hold on tight) "happily" in this instance is one of the very few things I would actually call an "adverb".[6]
"Bob lives well". Same thing. In fact, another adverbial usage. Lordy, lordy!
"Bob lives a happy life". *Bingo!* There IS such a thing as "a happy life" (even if you don't have one). This IS a direct object.

Moral #1: Some verbs never have a direct object. Some verbs always have a direct object. Some verbs can work either way (see the examples with "live" above). It often depends on the meaning attached to the verb.

Moral #2: The word or phrase after a verb is not always a direct object.

"Jack is a hard hitter". Although there is such a thing as "a hard hitter" and "a hard hitter" is nominal, it's still not a direct object because it's not receiving any action. This is an "A is B" sentence and such things do not have direct objects. In English, no form of this verb: is, was, were, be, am (did I miss any?) ever takes a direct object. "Jack hits hard". There is no such thing as "a hard[7]", it's not a nominal, not a direct

6 Yep, adverbs really do exist, just not as ubiquitously as many grammarians would have you believe.
7 No snickering, now. Be adults about this and keep your focus on the subject.

object. In fact, yep, it's yet another one of those elusive adverbs.
"Jack hits Bill". Bingo! There IS such a thing as "Bill", it's nominal, and it's receiving action. Direct Object.

Moral #3: Verbs that can take a direct object in one language might not do so in another. Be careful.

Moral #4: One way of finding if a verb in a particular usage can take a direct object is to turn it into a passive.
"Bob lives a happy life" - active verb with a direct object.
"A happy life is lived by Bob" - passive verb. The old direct object is now the subject. Passive verbs cannot take a direct object.
but...
"Bob lives well" - active verb but no direct object – we can tell because:
"Well is lived by Bob" - don't make no sense.

Naturally, grammarians couldn't possibly let you get off with just saying that a particular verb "can take a direct object." No, that would be too simple. And it doesn't sound at all technical which seems to be much more important than actually conveying straightforward information[8]. So a verb which takes a direct object is called **"a transitive verb"**. The basic meaning is still somewhat visible there, the underlying idea being that the action of the verb transmits something to the direct object. I'll let you use your native intelligence to figure out what an **"intransitive verb"** is. Remember always that many verbs can have both "transitive" and "intransitive" meanings.

Moral #5: English sometimes hides the direct object behind another word or phrase. In "Bob gives Sue a kiss" the thing given is not "Sue" but "a kiss". It's exactly equivalent to "Bob gives a kiss to Sue".
Since we have a direct object, "Sue", just for fun let's turn it into a passive. In this case it can be done in several different ways:
"A kiss was given to Sue by Bob." (the original indirect object remains an indirect object)
"Sue was given a kiss by Bob". (the original direct object remains a direct object).
So here's a **sub-moral:** Passive verbs can have a direct object!

Moral #6: If you ain't got no verb – you ain't gonna have a direct object.

8 The rule in grammar is: never use a simple one or two syllable word where a longer word with more syllables, and preferably derived from Latin or Greek (or some bastardized combination of the two) will do. For example: never say that a verb is in the "past tense" – no, it's got to be called a "preterite". Never mind the fact that "preterite" conveys zero information to the average person, it sounds impressive – and that's the important thing. Some verbs are "perfect" or "imperfect". Well, no, they're past tenses too, they just talk about the action in slightly different ways – again, it makes no difference to many grammarians the "perfect" and "imperfect" have different meanings these days. No wonder grammar stinks. No wonder why people have so much trouble with it. So if you're having trouble with grammar – you ain't alone. In fact, you have lots of company.